1999

The awareness of domestic violence among Japanese Americans in the Bay Area

Taeko Misumi
San Jose State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses

Recommended Citation

Misumi, Taeko, "The awareness of domestic violence among Japanese Americans in the Bay Area" (1999). *Master's Theses*. 1829.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.zqum-n3y2>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/1829

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Graduate Research at SJSU ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of SJSU ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@sjsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

THE AWARENESS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
AMONG JAPANESE AMERICANS IN THE BAY AREA

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Sociology

San Jose State University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

by Taeko Misumi

May 1999

UMI Number: 1394541

Copyright 1999 by
Misumi, Taeko

All rights reserved.

UMI Microform 1394541
Copyright 1999, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.

UMI

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

copyright 1999

Taeko Misumi

ALL RIGHT RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

Dr. Carol Ray

Dr. Yoko Baba

Paul Munroe

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

THE AWARENESS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AMONG JAPANESE AMERICANS IN THE BAY AREA

by Taeko Misumi

This thesis determines the level of awareness of domestic violence among Japanese Americans. This study also examines the effect of gender on this level of awareness. By contacting organizations, using a mailing list, and a snow-ball sampling method, a questionnaire with a letter and a consent form was distributed. From the return mail, 100 U.S. born Japanese Americans in the San Francisco Bay Area of California were used in this research sample. Based on the chi-square tests and *t* tests, one result indicates that women are more likely than men to discuss battered women's shelters with others. Gender is, however, not related to knowledge and images of domestic violence and attitudes toward it. Overall, Japanese Americans' awareness of domestic violence programs is not at a very high level even though a large proportion of the sample knows someone who has experienced domestic violence, or knows an abuser.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like thank my committee members, Dr. Carol Ray, Dr. Yoko Baba, and Paul Munroe for their support as I wrote my thesis. A special thanks to my chairperson, Dr. Ray, for her strong patience and great assistance. I also would like to express my deep appreciation to my parents in Japan. DOUMO-ARIGATOU. Finally, this thesis could not have been possible without the cooperation of the Japanese American organizations in the Bay Area for responding to the questionnaire and the Japanese Americans who participated in this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the study	1
Reasons for the study	2
2. REVIEW OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	5
What Is “Domestic Violence”?	5
Historical Trend	5
Theory Review	10
Why Does Domestic Violence Occur?	10
Data Review	14
The Reality of Domestic Violence in the United States	14
Culture Review	17
The Reality of Domestic Violence in Asian and Asian American Culture	17
Theoretical Statement, Hypothesis, and Explanation	21
Theory	22
Hypothesis	22
Explanation	23
3. METHODOLOGY	24
Data Collection Procedures	24
Demographic Characteristics	26
Method of Analysis	30

Operationalization of Variables	31
Independent Variable	31
Dependent Variables	31
4. FINDINGS	33
Initial Findings	33
Knowledge about Domestic Violence	33
Discussion of Domestic Violence	38
Image and Definition of Domestic Violence	43
Attitude toward Domestic Violence	47
Understanding of Domestic Violence	48
The Reality	50
Quantitative Findings	51
Crosstabulation and Chi-Square Test	51
<i>t</i> Test	54
5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	60
Discussion	60
Conclusion	64
REFERENCES	66
APPENDIX A. Survey Questionnaire with Letter and Consent Form	69

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
1.	Respondent's Gender	26
2.	Respondent's Age	26
3.	Respondent's Generation	27
4.	Respondent's Income	28
5.	Respondent's Marital Status	28
6.	Respondent's Education Level	29
7.	Race of Friends of Respondent	29
8.	Respondent's Knowledge About Domestic Violence	33
9.1.	Respondent's Knowledge About Domestic Violence Programs	34
9.2.	Respondent's Knowledge About Battered Women's Shelters	35
9.3.	Respondent's Knowledge About Domestic Violence Restraining Orders	36
9.4.	Respondent's Knowledge About Victim Witness Assistance Centers	37
9.5.	Respondent's Knowledge About Mandatory Reporting of All Domestic Violence-Related Calls by Law Enforcement Officers	37
10.	Respondent's Discussion of Domestic Violence with Others	39
11.1.	Respondent's Discussion of Domestic Violence Programs with Others	39
11.2.	Respondent's Discussion of Battered Women's Shelters with Others	40
11.3.	Respondent's Discussion of Domestic Violence Restraining Orders with Others	41
11.4.	Respondent's Discussion of Victim Witness Assistance Centers with Others	42

11.5.	Respondent's Discussion of Mandatory Reporting of All Domestic Violence-Related Calls by Law Enforcement Officers	42
12.	Respondent's Image of Domestic Violence	44
13.	Respondent's Image of Action and Behavior of Domestic Violence	44
14.1.	Respondent's Image of Action and Behavior of Domestic Violence: Physical Abuse-Related Words	45
14.2.	Respondent's Image of Action and Behavior of Domestic Violence: Verbal and Psychological Abuse-Related Words	46
15.	Respondent's Definition of Number of Occasions Comprising Domestic Violence	47
16.1	Respondent's Attitude When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Situation Among Others	48
16.2.	Respondent's Attitude When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Situation Involving Himself or Herself	48
17.	Respondent's Understanding of the Cause of Domestic Violence	49
18.1.	Respondent's Knowledge of Domestic Violence Abuser	50
18.2.	Respondent's Knowledge of Abused Person of Domestic Violence	50
19.	Crosstabulation and Result of Chi-Square Test of Images by Males and Females	52
20.1.	Crosstabulation and Result of Chi-Square Test of Attitude of Males and Females When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Among Others	53
20.2.	Crosstabulation and Result of Chi-Square Test of Attitude of Male and Females When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Involving Himself or Herself	53

21.1.	Differences Between Males and Females in Knowledge About Domestic Violence Program	54
21.2.	Differences Between Males and Females in Knowledge About Battered Women's Shelter	55
21.3.	Differences Between Males and Females in Knowledge About Domestic Violence Restraining Orders	55
21.4.	Differences Between Males and Females in Knowledge About Victim Witness Assistance Centers	56
21.5.	Differences Between Males and Females in Knowledge About Mandatory Reporting of All Domestic Violence-Related Calls by Law Enforcement Officers	56
22.1	Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Domestic Violence Programs	57
22.2.	Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Battered Women's Shelters	57
22.3.	Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Domestic Violence Restraining Orders	58
22.4.	Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Victim Witness Assistance Centers	58
22.5.	Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Mandatory Reporting of All Domestic Violence-Related Calls by Law Enforcement Officers	59

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore and understand the awareness of domestic violence among Japanese Americans in the San Francisco Bay Area, including Santa Clara, San Mateo, and Alameda Counties. Although domestic violence has been a major issue and is a serious social problem in the United States (Asian Women's Shelter, 1997; Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997b), it has been treated in Asian culture as a hidden thing rather than as a major issue (Masaki, 1997; Furiya, 1993). This is partly because domestic violence is considered a private matter and rarely is recognized as a serious social problem (Masaki, 1997; Furiya, 1993). The normative patriarchal structure of male dominance, racism, the persistence of the traditional sex role orientation (Masaki, 1997), and a reserved and non-expressive cultural orientation (Furiya, 1993) all explain why domestic violence is treated as a hidden thing in Asian culture.

In my study, I focus on one Asian group, Japanese Americans, and I explore the awareness of domestic violence to determine Japanese Americans' images of domestic violence, attitudes toward it, and knowledge and discussions of domestic violence programs, because these domestic violence issues have rarely been discussed. What are Japanese Americans' images of domestic violence? How much knowledge do they have about domestic violence? How much have they talked with other people about domestic violence? What are their definitions of domestic violence? How might they react toward situations of domestic violence? Regarding these questions, I also examine whether or not

there is a relationship between gender and awareness of domestic violence. This study explores the level of awareness that might explain why domestic violence is a hidden thing in Japanese American culture.

To elaborate on the purpose of the study, there are four important steps in Chapter 2. First, I clarify what “domestic violence” is. Second, I discuss the causes of domestic violence, applying the power and control concept of a feminist theoretical perspective, which centers on “patriarchy.” Third, I discuss real situations of domestic violence in the United States. Fourth, I narrow the topic down to the existing realities in Asian American culture. Then, I state the hypotheses to examine the level of awareness of domestic violence among a specific Asian American ethnic group in the Bay Area, the Japanese Americans. In Chapters 3, 4, and 5, I present the demographic characteristics and findings, analyze them, and discuss the level of awareness along with the hypotheses respectively.

Reasons for the Study

In general, the term “Asian” is used to describe the broad range of people with ancestral heritage in the continent of Asia and the Pacific Islands. The term “Asian American” is used to describe Asian people living in the United States, including immigrants, refugees, and U.S. born people (Asian Women’s Shelter, 1997). In my study, only a sample of U.S. born Japanese Americans in the Bay Area is included.

One reason to focus on the Bay Area for this study is that this area has one of the largest and fastest growing Asian populations in the United States. According to “California Counties with the Largest Asian and Pacific Islander Population: 1990,”

presented by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1990a), San Francisco County has the largest Asian population in the state (approximately 30% Asian), exceeding the counties of Santa Clara, 17.5%; San Mateo, 16.8%; Alameda, 15.1%; and even Los Angeles, 10.8%. The Bay Area, which contains the top four counties in Asian population, greatly enhances research possibilities about Asians and various Asian ethnicities.

Moreover, one ethnic group, Japanese Americans, includes a unique demographic feature. According to “Foreign and Native Born for California Asian and Pacific Islander Populations: 1990,” by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1990b), the top five populations are, in order, Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, and Korean. Of these five populations, only the Japanese are estimated as consisting of more native born than foreign born people: The percentage of U.S. born Japanese is 65.9%, whereas, those of the other four U.S. born are Filipino, 29.2%; Chinese, 29%; Vietnamese, 20%; and Korean, 18.6%.

The other reason to focus on U.S. born Japanese Americans in the Bay Area is to explore the question of why Japanese Americans’ utilization of hotlines, shelters, and counseling is extremely rare compared to other Asians. According to Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence in San Jose, California, regarding clients who have access to the domestic violence hotline, who utilize the shelter, and who undergo counseling, the number of Japanese Americans is extremely small. The “Service Statistics Record,” by Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence (1997), indicates that the numbers of Asians and Pacific Islanders utilizing the services were 369 out of 5518 cases (approximately 6.7%) from July 1996 to June 1997. According to a coordinator of community outreach at the office and a counselor at the shelter, of the 369, the number of Japanese Americans was only 2 or 3 cases (Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence, 1997).

For Asian immigrants, refugees, and newcomers, most of the Asian communities' services involved in ending domestic violence in the Bay Area have provided ethnic-specific approaches such as establishing multilingual language support. However, based on speaking the fact that the majority of Japanese Americans in California are not immigrants but U.S. born people (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990b), they possess more resources, such as the English language, compared to other Asians, immigrants, refugees, and newcomers. Why do Japanese Americans' domestic violence incidents not reach the services? Is it because Japanese Americans experience little domestic violence? Is it because Japanese Americans are more reluctant to use the services than other Asians? Or, does it imply that Japanese Americans' level of awareness of domestic violence and of available resources is far lower than that of other Asians?

To investigate the above puzzle, I decided to conduct research on the awareness of domestic violence among U.S. born Japanese Americans in the Bay Area.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

What Is “Domestic Violence”?

Historical Trend

The 1960s. The issue of women battering as family violence was raised and commanded widespread attention in Europe. The battered women’s movement was begun by a group of women originally organized to protest high food costs in a London neighborhood. In the United States, however, most communities denied that violence occurred in nice families; they maintained that violence rarely occurred, and when it did, it was only between “sick” individuals, mostly people of the lower classes. When the feminist movement was rekindled in the 1960s, one of the first issues that American feminists addressed was rape. Therefore, even wife beating was not a social problem but an individual or psychological problem. It was not until late 1975 and early 1976 that American women and their supporters started demanding help and protection for women beaten by their husbands (Pagelow, 1981).

The 1970s and 1980s. The U.S. battered women’s movement began with a small study conducted in Maryland and reported to the National Organization for Women (NOW), showing that the prevalence and severity of wife abuse was far greater than expected. Based on a small report that focused on wife beating, NOW announced the establishment of a task force co-chaired by feminist writer Del Martin (1976) to deal with

the problem from coast to coast, and called for shelters to protect the victims from further abuse. Feminists and grass roots groups began to provide safety for battered women (Martin, 1976; Pagelow, 1981). By 1980, there were 150 shelters and 300 “shelters, hotlines, and groups acting as advocates for battered women” in the United States (Tierney, 1982, p. 208), and 49 states and the District of Columbia passed laws to help protect the civil and personal rights of battered women (Pagelow, 1981).

Like Martin (1976), most researchers of domestic violence in this era focused on spouse abuse because the most common form of domestic violence is husbands’ physical abuse of wives (Stets & Straus, 1989; Van Hasselt, V. B., Morrison, R. L., Bellack, A. S., & Hersen, M., 1988). Compared to child abuse and neglect, it seems to be relatively easy to determine what adult violence, battering, and abuse are because victims can define it for themselves. It is extremely difficult, however, to measure invisible psychological abuse compared to visible physical abuse.

In the late 1970s through the 1980s, therefore, most research on domestic violence, especially spouse abuse or wife beating, concentrated on physical abuse in marital or quasi-marital relationships although psychological abuse was not dismissed or ignored as insignificant (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Pagelow, 1981; Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K., 1980).

The source for an overall appraisal of family violence comes from the national survey conducted by sociologists Murray Straus, Richard Gelles, and Suzanne Steinmetz (1980), which separates the concept of “violence” into two types. The first type, called “normal violence,” is defined as “an act carried out with the intention, or perceived intention, of causing physical pain or injury to another person” (p. 20). The second type, called “abusive violence,” is defined as “an act which has the high potential for injuring

the person being hit” (p. 22). The national study also defines “family” as “any couple living together who indicated they were married to each other” (p. 24). Like Straus et al. (1980), most researchers have not asked to see the respondents’ evidence of legal marriage. Straus et al. (1980) focus on the violent physical acts in spouse, child, and sibling abuse in American families. However, this does not mean that destructiveness, aggression, cruelty, and non-physical coercion are omitted from family violence consideration. Rather, it means that these researchers emphasize physical violence (Steinmetz & Straus, 1974).

The Pagelow study (1981) constructs the definition of “battered woman,” concentrating on physical violence. “Battered women” refers to “adult women who were intentionally physically abused in ways that caused pain or injury, or who were forced into involuntary action or restrained by force from voluntary action by adult men with whom they have or had established relationships, usually involving sexual intimacy, whether or not within a legally married state” (p. 33). Pagelow (1981) uses the term “battering” as “physical assault which ranges from painful slaps at one end to homicide at the other end” (p. 33).

In psychologist Lenore Walker’s research on battered wives (1979), however, the term “battered woman” is defined both physically and psychologically. A battered woman refers to “a woman who is repeatedly subjected to any forceful physical or psychological behavior by a man in order to coerce her to do something he wants her to do without any concern for her rights” (p. xv). Walker uses the term “battered woman” to include “only women who were abused more than once” (p. xv). If abuse occurs a second time and the woman remains in the situation, she is defined as a battered woman (Walker, 1979).

The 1990s. Facing the critical reality that domestic violence occurs not only physically but also in other ways, the organizations that deal with actual cases of domestic violence have recently defined domestic violence more broadly and describe the concrete actions and behaviors of domestic violence. The New York State Office for Prevention of Domestic Violence (1993), for example, describes domestic violence as a criminal act of assault, battery, sexual assault, sexual battery, or other act that injures or kills a family or household member by someone who is or was residing in the same dwelling unit. The office categorizes five areas of abuse that are utilized by the batterers to exercise power and control over the victims: physical abuse, psychological abuse, emotional abuse, economic abuse, and sexual abuse. The definitions are as follows:

Physical abuse is “inflicting or attempting to inflict physical injury or illness, e.g., by grabbing, pinching, hitting, hair-pulling, biting, arm twisting, kicking, punching, hitting with objects, stabbing, shooting” (The New York State Office for Prevention of Domestic Violence, 1993, p. 2). Psychological abuse is “instilling or attempting to instill fear by intimidation, threats of harm to the victim or others, threats of kidnapping, harassment, and destruction of pets and property” (The New York State Office for Prevention of Domestic Violence, 1993, p. 2). Emotional abuse is “undermining a person’s sense of self-worth by constant criticism, belittling, name calling, silent treatments, subverting of parent-child relationships, making and breaking promises, and so forth” (The New York State Office for Prevention of Domestic Violence, 1993, p. 2). Economic abuse is “making, or attempting to make, a person financially dependent, e.g., by maintaining control over both parties’ income, withholding money or access to same, keeping the person from outside activities, such as school or employment, harassment at the job, requiring justification for all money spent” (The New York State Office for Prevention of

Domestic Violence, 1993, p. 2). And, sexual abuse is “coerced sexual contact, including marital/date rape, forced sex after beating, beating sexual parts of the body, bestiality, forced prostitution, unprotected sex, fondling, sodomy, sex with others, the use of pornography and also undermining a person’s sexuality by derogatory treatment, criticisms of desirability, unfounded accusations of infidelity” (The New York State Office for Prevention of Domestic Violence, 1993, p. 2).

The San Francisco Family Violence Council’s Health Care Committee (1997) broadens the definition of domestic violence to include various relationships. The Committee asserts that “domestic violence is a pattern of coercive behaviors that involves physical abuse or the threat of physical abuse” (1997, p. 2). It also may include repeated psychological abuse, sexual assault, progressive social isolation, deprivation, intimidation, or economic coercion (1997). “Domestic violence is violence perpetrated by adults or adolescents against their intimate partners in current or former dating relationships, married or cohabiting relationships of heterosexuals, gay men, lesbians, bisexuals and transgendered people” (1997, p. 2).

My Definition. Including the above recent definitions of domestic violence rather than concentrating on the previous definitions of the terms “spouse abuse,” “violence,” “family,” and “battered women,” I generally define domestic violence as a pattern of any abusive action and behavior used to establish power and control by one person over another within all kinds of intimate relationships. Therefore, domestic violence can happen to anyone: of all races, all nationalities, all classes, and all educational levels. It can also include child abuse, teen abuse, elder abuse, and roommate abuse.

In my study, however, because of the fact that the most common form of domestic

violence is husbands' physical abuse of wives (Stets & Straus, 1989; Van Hasselt et al., 1988), I also add that the most common form of domestic violence is seen in the relationship between gender categories, males and females. Focused on gender, one of the causal factors of domestic violence relates to a theory that is discussed next.

Theory Review

Why Does Domestic Violence Occur?

For the explanation as to why domestic violence occurs, there are some major theories: exchange theory, social learning theory, and feminist theory. Exchange theory has been used to explain spousal abuse in relationships. Spousal abuse is maintained when rewards exceed costs for the abusive spouse (Straus et al., 1980). The primary reward for the abuser is power attained through intimidation. Force or threats of force allow abusive spouses to get their partners to do what they want them to do. The second reward for an abusive spouse is often an emotional rush through the abusive behavior. Violence can be addictive because it gives the abuser a high, an adrenaline rush (Winton, 1995).

Social learning theory views violent behavior as a product which is socially learned. Children's earliest socialization occurs in their homes. Thus, children receive reinforcement and/or punishment from their adult role models, and while they later learn sex-appropriate behavior from many other social sources, children are much more inclined to imitate a familiar aggressive model than an unfamiliar one, and this is especially true of boys. Children pay attention to their role models and observe them at home. When the

models' violent behavior appears to have value, children come to seek more opportunity to practice the violent behavior. The more opportunity for practice, whether physically or mentally rehearsed, the more permanent the behavior patterns become (Bandura, 1973).

As my definitions of domestic violence indicated above, domestic violence is linked to the issue of power and control. The most common form of domestic violence is husbands' physical abuse of wives (Stets & Straus, 1989; Van Hasselt et al., 1988). Exchange theory and social learning theory see gender-based power and control as reward and reinforcement. However, where do the gender-based power and control that lead to violence originally come from?

According to Dobash and Dobash, the fundamental cause of violence against wives is patriarchy, and violence against wives is conceived of as "one of the most brutal and explicit expressions of patriarchal domination" (1979, p. ix). Patriarchal domination is a structure in which males are superordinate and females are subordinate in all major social institutions such as occupations, education, families, politics, government, and religious institutions. Patriarchy also includes an ideology that legitimates these inequalitarian social arrangements. Therefore, victims of domestic violence come to believe that this structure is the way things should be (Dobash & Dobash, 1979).

Patriarchy literally means "rule of the father," and the term was originally used to describe social systems based on the authority of male heads of households (Marshall, 1994). It describes "the ideological aspects of relationships that are predicated on the paradigm . . . of a father-daughter relationship" (Rubin, 1975, p. 15). Husbands who view themselves as "fathers" to their wives — and males in general who see themselves as fathers to their female intimates — receive the ideological support for using violence against their surrogate "daughters." However, patriarchy now includes a broader usage,

especially in some feminist theories, where it has come to mean “male domination” in general (Marshall, 1994).

All oppression-based feminist theories, i.e., psychoanalytical feminist theory, radical feminism, socialist feminism, and third-wave feminism, see patriarchy as a system of gender-based power and control. In patriarchy, men subjugate women, and this is a universal and pervasive system in society (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992). These feminist theories view patriarchy as a primary power structure in which women are essentially used, controlled, subjugated, and oppressed by men. In these theories, only radical feminism deepens the image of patriarchy as violence practiced by men and by male-dominated organizations in society. Radical feminists view male abuse against female intimates within patriarchy as a display of power and coercive control in order to dampen a perceived threat to the male’s superior status in an intimate relationship (Steinmetz, 1987; Yllo, 1993). Therefore, I focus on radical feminist theory as an explanation for why domestic violence occurs.

According to Lengermann and Niebrugge-Brantley (1992), radical feminists believe that every society is characterized by oppression. In society, the most basic structure is that people dominate others in every institution. The continuous pattern of domination and submission happens between classes, races, ethnicities, religions, and age and gender categories. In all of these systems of domination and subordination, the most fundamental structure of oppression is gender-based, that is to say, the system of patriarchy. In patriarchy, men control women so that women come to be subordinate and to experience social inequality (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992).

In terms of violence, radical feminists believe that violence is mainly caused by patriarchy, i.e., male-dominance. They directly link patriarchy to violence as practiced by

men against women. To radical feminists, violence means not only overt physical abuse but also more complex practices of power and control (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992). As represented by physical abuse, power and control also include verbal or emotional abuse, sexual abuse, economic abuse, creating isolation, using prejudice or privilege, using religion or spirituality, and using threats against children, family, friends, or pets, intimidation, minimizing (deprecating), denial, and blaming (Asian Women's Shelter, 1997).

To maintain power and control, the most basic resource of male dominance is physical force or abuse, and the other power resources such as economic and emotional also can be utilized to protect men's privilege from women's resistance (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992). In terms of economic resources, income is the most important source of domestic power in families (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983). In marital relationships, husbands who acknowledge and relate positively to their wives' autonomy are least at risk for violent behaviors (Steinmetz, 1987; Yllo, 1993).

In order to change women's situation and to defeat patriarchy, radical feminists address women's consciousness. They suggest that women should create their own power; women should recognize their own values and strengths and reject patriarchal pressures to see themselves as weak, dependent, and second-class. The best way to establish women's power is unifying through sisterhood with trust, support, appreciation, and mutual defense, regardless of differences among them (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992). Raising women's consciousness and awareness is the key to defeating patriarchy and ending domestic violence.

Data Review

The Reality of Domestic Violence in the United States

Domestic violence continues to be a serious problem in most countries. Many new laws and actions resulted from the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women that was held in Beijing in 1995. In the United States, in 1996, the U.S. Department of Justice awarded 122 communities a total of 46 million dollars to help implement policies that mandate or encourage arrest in domestic violence cases (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997a). Funded programs include establishing automated information systems to track perpetrators; creating a protocol for implementing mandatory or pro-arrest policies for all law enforcement agencies; delivering comprehensive training programs for police, prosecutors, probation, and parole officers and the judiciary; and establishing advocacy services for domestic violence victims (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997a).

Because of the effort to raise the awareness of domestic violence in the United States, however, the most rapid growth in the history of domestic relations caseloads has occurred in domestic violence filings. A study examining the work of state courts shows that between 1991 and 1993, of 24 states with three-year filing figures, 18 states reported an increase of 20 percent or more (National Center for the State Courts, 1995). In the first comprehensive national health survey of American women, the Commonwealth Fund (1993) estimates that almost 4 million American women are physically abused by their husbands or boyfriends. The same study (1993) also shows that 95 percent of domestic violence victims are women and that a woman is physically abused every 9 seconds in this country (1993).

As these survey findings indicate, many American women face the serious problem of domestic violence. It is useful to look at some specific statistics related to age, education level, and income. According to “Domestic Violence — Violence Between Intimates,” by the U.S. Department of Justice (1994), women who are 24 to 34 years old have the highest rates of violence victimization attributable to intimates. Women who graduated from college have the lowest rates of violence attributable to intimates compared to those with less than a high school education, high school graduates, or those with some college. Women with family incomes under \$9,999 are 5 times more likely to be attacked by an intimate than are women with family incomes of \$30,000 or more (1994).

There are also differences in the way domestic violence is defined by men and women. According to the “Women’s Work” domestic violence survey conducted by Liz Claiborne, Inc. (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997), men are less likely than women to define psychological control as abusive behavior. Nearly 96 percent of the survey participants agree that acts or threats of physical violence toward a woman comprise abuse. However, more men than women exclude behaviors such as telling a woman what clothes she can or cannot wear or refusing to give her money when she asks for it or needs it. Only 33 percent of the men surveyed say that controlling what a woman wears is definitely abuse. A similar gender difference is evident concerning whether a man is guilty of abuse if he refuses to give his wife or girlfriend money. Only 51 percent of the men but nearly 71 percent of the women said that this behavior is “probably abuse” (1997).

Despite the differences in definitions of domestic violence, more than 77 percent of the men and women surveyed agree that domestic violence against women is one of the

“major problems” facing the United States. Only 21 percent of the participants dismiss it as only a “minor problem,” and only 2 percent say that it is “not really a problem” at all. However, women are significantly more concerned about the issue than men; 85 percent of the women describe domestic violence as a “major problem” compared with 69 percent of the men (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997b).

Liz Claiborne Inc.'s survey (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997b) also tries to learn if there is domestic violence among the participants. Nearly 56 percent of respondents say that they have at least one friend, relative, or co-worker whom they know has been involved in domestic violence, either a woman who has been a victim or a man who feels he has been guilty of it.

In sum, as these survey results show, Americans as a whole are aware that domestic violence is a serious problem facing the nation. The awareness has led to establishing new laws and actions toward ending domestic violence. As radical feminists have stated, American women's higher consciousness and awareness have been the cue to rejecting patriarchal pressures such as domestic violence. Raising women's consciousness and awareness is tightly connected as strategies to defeat patriarchy (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992).

In Asian American cultures, however, patriarchy seems to be deeply ingrained, and in their consciousness and awareness of it, people still seem to treat the domestic violence issue as a “hidden” thing, compared to other Americans. Although the Bay Area has one of the largest and fastest growing Asian populations (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990a), when domestic violence occurs, the cases that we hear about in public have been far lower than those of other American groups. For example, from July 1996 through June 1997, of 5518 cases that reached the domestic violence hotline, shelter, and counseling in Next

Door Solutions to Domestic Violence in San Jose, the cases in which Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders used these services remained at only 369 (approximately 6.7%). Of 369 cases, those from Japanese Americans were 2 or 3 (approximately 0.7%) (Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence, 1997). Is it because Asian American women's consciousness and awareness have not been raised enough to reject domestic violence that is mainly caused by patriarchy?

Before focusing on U.S. born Japanese Americans' awareness of domestic violence in the Bay Area in Chapter 3, Asian Americans' culture as a whole is discussed in order to understand the reasons why Asian American culture tends to shape domestic violence as a hidden thing. Then, in order to examine Japanese Americans' awareness, the hypotheses are stated.

Culture Review

The Reality of Domestic Violence in Asian and Asian American Culture

In terms of Asians and Asian Americans as a whole, there exist two primary explanations why the domestic violence issue has been a "hidden" thing. In the two patriarchy-related explanations, it is found that culture and community affect people's individual lives through values, beliefs, and consciousness and awareness. Traditional culture and fear of community disapproval result in Asian and Asian American women's behaviors that condone domestic violence, especially when combined with emotional and financial dependence and psychological fear (Furiya, 1993).

First, according to the founder of an Asian Women's Shelter in San Francisco,

Beckie Masaki, traditional Asian historical cultural perspectives explain the deep roots of the Asian belief system, and Asian American traditional values condone domestic violence. Asia has some of the oldest continuous civilizations in the world. In Asian countries, a patriarchal social structure defines women's roles in society. Patriarchal structures are reinforced through language, laws, religion, daily customs, and beliefs. Although the culture has not been static and has undergone constant change and evolution, Asian culture has been defined by men without regarding women's culture and experiences (Masaki, 1997). The system of patriarchy has been "naturally" and culturally established in Asian and Asian American cultures so that patriarchy has contributed to women's position as dominated and oppressed by men (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992). As long as patriarchy is deemed to be the "natural" social structure for women, their consciousness remains embedded in the social assumptions of patriarchy, their awareness is not raised toward rejecting patriarchy, and they come to condone domestic violence even when it happens to them.

Moreover, in a patriarchal structure, Asian battered women and their children, especially immigrants, face additional barriers if they do not speak English, do not know the law and their rights, lack jobs and educational opportunities, and lack access to language and culturally competent services (Masaki, 1997). Batterers frequently take advantage of these barriers to control their partners. Here again, power and control (Steinmetz, 1987; Yllo, 1993), i.e., patriarchy, are used. For example, some batterers accuse their partners of "being too Americanized," "betraying their culture, family and community," and "not being a good Filipino, Chinese, Japanese, and so on," as a means to make their partners do as they say within the patriarchal family structure. Others do not allow their partners to obtain the necessary living skills for their new lives in a new

country, do not allow their partners to learn English, or threaten their partners' immigration status. In these situations, on the one hand, batterers attempt to excuse their abusive behaviors as "culturally acceptable" or as a consequence of immigrant stresses and other problems that they have experienced. On the other hand, the battered women are obliged to remain dependent in a culturally traditional patriarchal family structure. This leads battered women to stay in domestic violence situations (Masaki, 1997).

Second, an explanation as to why Asians as a whole tend to treat domestic violence as a "hidden" thing is related to their cultural community. They are afraid of being ostracized by community members. According to Linda Furiya (1993), Asian battered women culturally accept the blame for their abuse for the sake of keeping peace in their families. The stereotype of Asian families is as models of calmness and harmony, so a "hidden" problem, domestic violence, is often perceived as non-existent among Asian families. Extended patriarchal family structures, which are still common among Asians, provide the beneficial qualities of economic and emotional stability and well-established patterns of interdependence. In such a structure, however, when domestic violence exists, the families often condone the violence and then become impermeable barriers from which the victims cannot escape (Furiya, 1993).

A number of Asians and Asian Americans still see domestic violence as a private family matter, and battered women face being ostracized from their communities when they choose to do something about their situations. Furthermore, since Asian communities are very close-knit, it can be especially difficult for Asian women to escape from domestic violence relationships. Once the women leave the violent situations, it is sometimes difficult for them to be accepted back into their communities as divorced women and single mothers. Even for women who leave abusive situations and no longer

belong to the original communities, the option of living within other American communities also does not appear likely because of the barriers of language and racism. Therefore, Asian women in violent relationships are afraid to act and instead decide to keep peace in their families and maintain their place in the community (Furiya, 1993).

The above two Asian cultural explanations are well-established as overall descriptions of Asians and Asian Americans who tend to treat domestic violence as a “hidden” thing and a private matter. This leads them to remain in violent situations and relationships. However, in terms of U.S. born Japanese Americans, the population in this study, not all aspects of these explanations apply to them because of their uniqueness.

As explained above, a cultural and family structure of “patriarchy” could apply to all Asians and Asian Americans as a reason for domestic violence just as it does among any other Americans in such a structure. As stated earlier, however, the majority of Japanese Americans in California are not immigrants but U.S. born citizens (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990b). U.S. born Japanese Americans possess more resources such as speaking the English language, compared to Asian immigrants and refugees. However, domestic violence among them still is rarely reported (Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence, 1997).

In terms of the first cultural explanation, since the majority are born in the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990b), Japanese Americans are less likely to possess the strong cultural values of other Asian Americans. They also possess more resources to defeat domestic violence. Regarding the second community explanation, since the majority are born in the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1990b), Japanese Americans are more integrated into non-Asian communities than other Asian Americans, and thus, they do not have strong community ties with their own ethnic group. We would

thus expect high reporting of domestic violence. However, the reports of domestic violence among Japanese Americans have rarely reached the public, compared to other Asian Americans (Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence, 1997). To investigate this puzzle, based on the premise that patriarchy in Asian and Asian American culture affects people's consciousness and awareness and obstructs raising awareness of domestic violence (Furiya, 1993; Masaki, 1997), the research compares U.S. born Japanese Americans in the Bay Area by gender: males and females.

Theoretical Statement, Hypothesis, and Explanation

As the theory review has indicated, patriarchy means male domination in general (Marshall, 1994), and the most fundamental structure of oppression is gender-based in the system of patriarchy (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992), which is the fundamental cause of domestic violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). As mentioned earlier, for domestic violence to end, since patriarchy is deeply tied to women's consciousness and awareness, women should create their own unified power to defeat patriarchy (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992). It is very important to explore women's consciousness and awareness of domestic violence to understand the reality of domestic violence and to end it. Thus, this study focuses on gender as an indicator of awareness of domestic violence among U.S. born Japanese Americans in the Bay Area.

While gender is the core of this study, the recent study by Liz Claiborne Inc. on awareness of domestic violence (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997) also concentrated on gender. That study, however, did not focus on overall knowledge of domestic violence, images or definitions of domestic violence, and attitudes toward

domestic violence between men and women. This study focuses on these aspects with regard to gender.

Theory

Given that the awareness or lack of awareness of domestic violence is linked to the strength of the system of patriarchy:

(1) If patriarchal ideology is weak, men and women will show they are equally aware of the domestic violence issue because of the relative absence of domination and oppression.

(2) If the ideology is strong, both men and women will show they are not aware of the domestic violence issue because patriarchy obstructs raising the awareness of domestic violence.

(3) Regardless of whether patriarchal ideology is strong or weak, women will show they are more aware of the domestic violence issue than men because women are more oppressed and victimized by men's power and control.

Hypothesis

(1) Hypothesis 1: Females are more likely than males to have a broader image of domestic violence.

(2) Hypothesis 2: Females are more likely than males to get help for themselves or others who are involved in domestic violence.

(3) Hypothesis 3: Females are more likely than males to have knowledge about

domestic violence programs.

(4) Hypothesis 4: Females are more likely than males to discuss domestic violence programs with others.

Explanation

All three hypotheses are based on the premise that the level of awareness of domestic violence is related to gender. The fundamental structure of patriarchy is gender-based, and men and women are differently and unequally situated in patriarchy (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992). When domestic violence occurs, indeed 95 percent of the victims are women (The Commonwealth Fund, 1993). In this situation, when women defend themselves from one of the most brutal and explicit expressions of patriarchal domination, i.e., domestic violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1979), women's consciousness and awareness of domestic violence are obviously strengthened (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992). Consequently, women who tend to be the subjects of domestic violence come to be aware of the issue; women no longer consider domestic violence as a private matter. On the other hand, when women still treat domestic violence as a private matter, they remain locked in the patriarchal structure. However, since women are more oppressed and victimized by men, women are more likely than men to see and hear about the domestic violence issue through the mass media; women have more opportunities to be aware of domestic violence. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that women are more likely to have a higher level of awareness of domestic violence than men. Measurements used to determine the level of awareness of domestic violence are of image in Hypothesis 1, attitude in Hypothesis 2, knowledge in Hypothesis 3, and of discussion among respondents in Hypothesis 4.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection Procedures

In order to investigate the awareness of domestic violence among U.S. born Japanese Americans in the Bay Area, a survey questionnaire was distributed between August 20, 1997 and September 20, 1997. Japanese Americans in the Bay Area, who are 18 years old and over, were included for the questionnaire in the study. A packet containing the questionnaire with a letter, a consent form, and a business reply return envelope was sent to respondents. All reply mail was sent back to the Department of Sociology at San Jose State University. The respondents were recruited from Japanese American associations, organizations, cultural centers, and clubs in the Bay Area because the members identified themselves as Japanese Americans. No compensation was awarded for participation in the study.

To distribute the packet, two methods were used: direct contact by the researcher at various meetings or by mail through use of a mailing list. With the permission of representatives of the contacted Japanese American communities (the Japanese American Association of San Francisco [NICHU BEI KAI], Japanese Community Youth Council in San Francisco, Union Bank of California in Japantown in San Francisco, the Japanese American Chamber of Commerce in San Jose, the board members of Japanese American Community Senior Service [YU-AI KAI] in Japantown in San Jose, Sumitomo Bank in San Jose, the Japanese American Student Club of UC Berkeley, the Japanese American Citizens League in San Mateo), the researcher visited meetings and explained

the purpose and the process of this study. All the respondents were assured anonymity. In order to increase the sample size, this study used the snowball sampling method, which is a non-probability sampling method. The snowball sampling method was done in stages. In the first stage, at the meetings, some Japanese Americans who already had the requisite characteristics were identified. The second stage involved asking those people to direct the researcher to more Japanese Americans who might participate in the research.

The other method was conducted by sending a packet to each respondent. Although it was very difficult to obtain a mailing list of members because of privacy concerns, one organization provided a mailing list after the researcher promised that it would only be used for that one time and that the researcher was the only person who would utilize the mailing list. A director of the organization wrote a letter of introduction to encourage the members to participate in this research, and it was included in each packet that was mailed out. All the members were also assured confidentiality by the consent form itself and by the introduction letter.

The letter and consent form were used to assure the respondents that participation in the research was entirely voluntary and they had the right to refuse to answer any or all of the questions. The questionnaire included an open-ended and a closed-ended question format. It asked the respondents' socioeconomic and demographic background before asking their degree of knowledge about domestic violence, their images of domestic violence, their definitions of domestic violence, and their attitudes toward hypothetical domestic violence situations. The total number receiving the questionnaire was 565, and the number of questionnaires the researcher received by return mail was 136; the response rate was 24%. However, of 136 respondents, 36 people were not U.S. born Japanese Americans. Thus, these 36 people were excluded; only 100 U.S. born Japanese

Americans in the Bay Area were included in this study. The survey questionnaire is in Appendix A.

Demographic Characteristics

The following seven demographic characteristics of the respondents are represented in Table 1 through Table 7. Table 1 indicates the gender of the respondents. Of the 100 respondents, 49 (49%) were males, and 51 (51%) were females.

Table 1: Respondent's Gender

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Male	49	49.0
Female	51	51.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 2: Respondent's Age

<u>Age in Years</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
18 - 24	11	11.0
25 - 34	12	12.0
35 - 44	17	17.0
45 - 54	37	37.0
55 - 64	12	12.0
65 and over	11	11.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 2 represents the age categories of the respondents. Of 100 respondents, 11 (11%) were 18 to 24 years old, 12 (12%) were 25 to 34 years old, 17 (17%) were 35 to 44 years old, 37 (37%) were 45 to 54 years old, 12 (12%) were 55 to 64 years old, and 11 (11%) were 65 years and over. The mean and median age categories were in the range of 45 to 54 years old.

Table 3 indicates the generation of the respondents. Of 100 respondents, in the identification of themselves, 21 (21%) were second generation (nisei), 62 (62%) were third generation (sansei), and 17 (17%) were fourth generation (yonsei). There existed no first generation (issei). The first generation immigrants of Japan in America, known as Issei, commonly refer to the original settlers between 1890 and 1920 because the Omnibus Act of 1924 prohibited all immigration from Asia. Their children, who were mainly born in America between 1915 and 1945, are known as the Nisei; the third generation, which means the children of the Nisei, who were mainly born between 1940 and 1960, are known as Sansei, and the fourth generation was born after 1960 and are called the Yonsei (Gonzales, 1992).

Table 3: Respondent's Generation

<u>Generation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
nisei	21	21.0
sansei	62	62.0
yonsei	17	17.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 4 represents the income categories of the respondents. The highest percentage (28.1%) existed in the category \$85,000 and over. The mean and median

incomes were in the category \$45,000 - \$54,999.

Table 4: Respondent's Income

<u>Income</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
\$0 - \$14,999	10	10.4
\$15,000 - \$24,999	4	4.2
\$25,000 - \$34,999	8	8.3
\$35,000 - \$44,999	15	15.6
\$45,000 - \$54,999	16	16.7
\$55,000 - \$64,999	6	6.3
\$65,000 - \$74,999	9	9.4
\$75,000 - \$84,999	1	1.0
\$85,000 and over	27	28.1
Total	96	100.0

Table 5: Respondent's Marital Status

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
single	22	22.0
married	69	69.0
separated	2	2.0
divorced	4	4.0
widowed	2	2.0
living with someone	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 5 indicates the marital status of the respondents. Of 100 respondents, 69 (69%) were married, 22 (22%) were single, and only 4 (4%) were divorced at the time of the data collection.

Table 6 represents the education level of the respondents. Of 100 respondents, 73

respondents (73%) graduated from four year-colleges.

Table 6: Respondent's Education Level

<u>Education</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
graduated from high school	9	9.0
technical/educational certificate	1	1.0
attended 2 year-college	2	2.0
graduated 2 year-college	2	2.0
attended 4 year-college	13	13.0
graduated 4 year-college	48	48.0
attend Master's program	6	6.0
received Master's degree	8	8.0
other (e.g. Ph.D, MD, etc.)	11	11.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 7 shows the race of the friends of the respondents. Of 95 respondents, the race of the friends of 59 respondents (62.1%) were Japanese and/or Japanese Americans.

Table 7: Race of Friends of Respondent

<u>Friends' Race</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Japanese and/or Japanese Americans	59	62.1
other	36	37.9
Total	95	100.0

Method of Analysis

For this study, the method of analysis was conducted by quantitative analyses; statistical tests were conducted by using SPSS/PC. In order to examine the four hypotheses, a statistical technique called the chi-square test was used first to test Hypotheses 1 and 2. The purpose of the chi-square test is to simplify comparisons among categorical variables. A chi-square test is a test of statistical significance based on a comparison of the observed cell frequencies of a joint contingency table with frequencies that would be expected under the null hypothesis of no relationship (Bohrnstedt & Knoke, 1994). If the test statistic is as large or larger than critical value, then the null hypothesis is rejected with an α -probability of a Type I (false rejection) error. If it is smaller than the critical value, then the null hypothesis is not rejected with a β -probability of a Type II (false acceptance) error (Bohrnstedt & Knoke, 1994). The larger the difference is between the observed frequency and the expected frequency, the larger the chi-square (χ^2) statistic, and the more likely the difference is statistically significant. If there is no relationship between variables in a population, it means that the variables are likely to be statistically independent (Bohrnstedt & Knoke, 1994).

Second, a t test was conducted to test Hypotheses 3 and 4. A t test is a test of the statistical significance of the results of a comparison between averages, or means, of two groups, a test of significance for continuous variables where the population variance is unknown and the sample is assumed to have been drawn from a normally distributed population, and a test that is used for smaller samples (Vogt, 1993). A one-tailed t test is called directional, and it tests the hypothesis that one of the averages of two groups is bigger. A two-tailed t test is called nondirectional, and it tests the hypothesis that says

there is a difference between two averages without saying which of the two is predicted to be larger (Vogt, 1993).

Operationalization of Variables

Independent Variable

Gender is defined as men and women. The respondents defined themselves as a man or a woman from the question: “What is your sex?” The respondent’s answer was either 1. male, or 2. female.

Dependent Variables

(1) For Hypothesis 1, image of domestic violence is defined as the respondents’ images of the words, “domestic violence.” The images are measured by the following open-ended question from the questionnaire: “What actions and behaviors do you imagine when you hear the words, ‘domestic violence’?” The descriptions were coded into three categories: “physical abuse” (scored 1), “physical or verbal abuse” (scored 2), and “other” (scored 3).

(2) For Hypothesis 2, attitude toward domestic violence is defined as the respondents’ attitudes when presented with hypothetical domestic violence situations. The attitudes are measured by the following open-ended questions from the questionnaire: “If someone whom you know begins abusing someone else, what would you do first?” and “If you encounter domestic violence and you are a victim, what would you do first?” For

the first question, the descriptions were coded into three categories: “take actions to stop” (scored 1), “take no action” (scored 2), and “do not know” (scored 3). For the second question, the descriptions were also coded into three categories: “take actions to stop” (scored 1), “take no action” (scored 2), and “do not know” (scored 3).

(3) For Hypothesis 3, knowledge about domestic violence programs is defined as knowledge about the following five possible resources: domestic violence programs, battered women’s shelters, domestic violence restraining orders, victim witness assistance centers, and mandatory reporting of all domestic violence-related calls by law enforcement officers. Knowledge is measured by the following question from the questionnaire: “How much knowledge do you have about the following things [five resources]?” Coded possible responses were “none” (scored 0), “very little” (scored 1), “some” (scored 4), “quite a lot” (scored 7), and “great amount” (scored 10).

(4) For Hypothesis 4, discussion of domestic violence programs among respondents is defined as discussions of the following five possible resources: domestic violence programs, battered women’s shelters, domestic violence restraining orders, victim witness assistance centers, and mandatory reporting of all domestic violence-related calls by law enforcement officers. Discussions are measured by the following question from the questionnaire: “How much have you talked with other people about the following things [five resources]?” Coded possible responses were “none” (scored 0), “very little” (scored 1), “some” (scored 4), “quite a lot” (scored 7), and “great amount” (scored 10).

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Initial Findings

From the questionnaire, the following characteristics of the respondents were found and are shown in Table 8 through Table 18.2.

Knowledge About Domestic ViolenceTable 8: Respondent's Knowledge About Domestic Violence

<u>Knowledge</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	2	2.0
1 (very little)	26	26.3
2	0	0.0
3	0	0.0
4 (some)	57	57.6
5	0	0.0
6	0	0.0
7 (quite a lot)	11	11.1
8	0	0.0
9	0	0.0
10 (great amount)	3	3.0
Total	99	100.0

As Table 8 shows, 57 (57.6%) of the respondents answered that they have “some” knowledge about domestic violence in the question, “How much knowledge do you have about domestic violence?” On the other hand, of 99 respondents, 11 (11.1%) respondents

said that they have a “quite a lot” of knowledge about domestic violence, and 3 (3.0%) said that they have a “great amount” of knowledge about it.

To investigate it more specifically, the question, “How much knowledge do you have about the following things?” was asked. Five items were listed with Likert scales: A. domestic violence programs (Table 9.1), B. battered women’s shelters (Table 9.2), C. domestic violence restraining orders (Table 9.3), D. victim witness assistance centers (Table 9.4), and E. mandatory reporting of domestic violence-related calls by law enforcement officers (Table 9.5). Each Likert scale consisted of five response alternatives in the scale of 0 through 10: “none” (scored 0), “very little” (scored 1), “some” (scored 4), “quite a lot” (scored 7), and “great amount” (scored 10).

Table 9.1: Respondent’s Knowledge About Domestic Violence Programs

<u>Knowledge A</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	8	8.1
1 (very little)	26	26.3
2	20	20.2
3	9	9.1
4 (some)	16	16.2
5	5	5.1
6	2	2.0
7 (quite a lot)	7	7.1
8	2	2.0
9	1	1.0
10 (great amount)	3	3.0
Total	99	100.0

As Table 9.1 represents, in terms of item A, domestic violence programs, a majority of the respondents (63.7%) answered that their knowledge about domestic

violence programs was at the level of less than “some.” On the other hand, of 99 respondents, 16 (16.2%) answered that they have “some” knowledge, and 7 (7.1%) said that they have “quite a lot” of knowledge about such programs. The mean scored 3.0, and the median scored 2.0.

Table 9.2: Respondent’s Knowledge About Battered Women’s Shelters

<u>Knowledge B</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	9	9.1
1 (very little)	22	22.2
2	12	12.1
3	13	13.1
4 (some)	22	22.2
5	5	5.1
6	4	4.0
7 (quite a lot)	7	7.1
8	1	1.0
9	1	1.0
10 (great amount)	3	3.0
Total	99	100.0

Regarding item B, battered women’s shelters, more than half of the respondents (56.5%) also said that they have less than “some” knowledge about battered women’s shelters. Of 99 respondents, 22 (22.2%) said that they have “some” knowledge, and 7 (7.1%) said that they have “quite a lot” of knowledge. The mean was 3.2, and the median was 3.0.

Concerning item C, domestic violence restraining orders, more than half of the respondents (51.6%) also answered that they have knowledge at the level of less than “some,” and 24 (24.2%) said that they have “some” knowledge. Of 99 respondents,

9 (9.1%) answered that they have “quite a lot” of knowledge about it. The knowledge about domestic violence restraining orders has the highest percentage of knowledge (24.2%) at the “some” level.

Table 9.3: Respondent’s Knowledge About Domestic Violence Restraining Orders

<u>Knowledge C</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	9	9.1
1 (very little)	18	18.2
2	15	15.2
3	9	9.1
4 (some)	24	24.2
5	8	8.1
6	1	1.0
7 (quite a lot)	9	9.1
8	3	3.0
9	1	1.0
10 (great amount)	2	2.0
Total	99	100.0

In terms of item D, victim witness assistance centers, of 99 respondents, 30 respondents (30.3%) answered that they have no knowledge about it, and including the 30.3%, the vast majority (81.8%) showed that their knowledge about it is at the level of less than “some.” The respondents who said that they have “some” knowledge represented 8 (8.1%), and those who said “quite a lot” represented only 5 (5.1%). The mean was 1.8, and the median was 1.0.

Table 9.4: Respondent's Knowledge About Victim Witness Assistance Centers

Knowledge D	Frequency	Valid Percent
0 (none)	30	30.3
1 (very little)	23	23.2
2	21	21.2
3	7	7.1
4 (some)	8	8.1
5	4	4.0
6	0	0.0
7 (quite a lot)	5	5.1
8	0	0.0
9	0	0.0
10 (great amount)	1	1.0
Total	99	100.0

Table 9.5: Respondent's Knowledge About Mandatory Reporting of All Domestic Violence-Related Calls by Law Enforcement Officers

Knowledge E	Frequency	Valid Percent
0 (none)	16	16.2
1 (very little)	20	20.2
2	20	20.2
3	3	3.0
4 (some)	24	24.2
5	3	3.0
6	3	3.0
7 (quite a lot)	5	5.1
8	2	2.0
9	0	0.0
10 (great amount)	3	3.0
Total	99	100.0

With regard to item E, mandatory reporting of all domestic violence-related calls by law enforcement officers, more than half of the respondents (59.6%) answered that

they have less than “some” knowledge about it. On the other hand, the highest percentage (24.2%) of knowledge was at the “some” level. Of 99 respondents, 24 (24.2%) answered that they have “some” knowledge about it. The mean was 2.8, and the median was 2.0.

In Table 8, 57.6% of the respondents reported that they have “some” knowledge about domestic violence. In the shift from this general question to the specific questions, however, there existed differences in the level of knowledge about domestic violence resources. A large proportion of the respondents have less than “some” knowledge about the five listed resources; 63.7%, domestic violence programs; 56.5%, battered women’s shelters; 51.6%, domestic violence restraining orders; 81.8%, victim witness assistance centers; and 59.6% have knowledge about mandatory reporting of all domestic violence-related calls by law enforcement officers.

Discussion of Domestic Violence

Based on their knowledge of domestic violence and domestic violence programs, have Japanese Americans talked with other people about them? If they have, how much have they talked about it? Utilizing the same five resources A, B, C, D, and E in Table 9.1 through Table 9.5 with the same Likert scales and five response alternatives in the scale of 0 through 10, the frequencies that the respondents have talked with other people about domestic violence and domestic violence programs are shown.

Table 10 indicates how much the respondents have talked with other people about the overall issue of domestic violence. Half who have talked about domestic violence with other people are at the “very little” level. Combining that with Table 8, the majority of the respondents have “some” knowledge about domestic violence, but they have not

talked about it with others. Moreover, of 100 respondents, 17 (17%) have no experience in talking about domestic violence with others. However, 27 (27%) answered that they have talked about it with other people to “some” degree.

Table 10: Respondent’s Discussion of Domestic Violence with Others

<u>Talked</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	17	17.0
1 (very little)	50	50.0
2	0	0.0
3	0	0.0
4 (some)	27	27.0
5	0	0.0
6	0	0.0
7 (quite a lot)	5	5.0
8	0	0.0
9	0	0.0
10 (great amount)	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 11.1: Respondent’s Discussion of Domestic Violence Programs with Others

<u>Talked About A</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	39	39.0
1 (very little)	18	18.0
2	17	17.0
3	6	6.0
4 (some)	11	11.0
5	2	2.0
6	1	1.0
7 (quite a lot)	3	3.0
8	2	2.0
9	0	0.0
10 (great amount)	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

Regarding item A, domestic violence programs, Table 11.1 indicates that more than one third of the respondents (39.0%) answered that they have never talked about domestic violence programs with others. Of 100 respondents, 18 (18%) said that they have talked about it with others “very little,” and 11 (11%) said that they have talked “some” about it with others.

Table 11.2: Respondent’s Discussion of Battered Women’s Shelters with Others

<u>Talked About B</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	38	38.4
1 (very little)	14	14.1
2	20	20.2
3	5	5.1
4 (some)	6	6.1
5	6	6.1
6	4	4.0
7 (quite a lot)	4	4.0
8	1	1.0
9	0	0.0
10 (great amount)	1	1.0
Total	99	100.0

In terms of item B, battered women’s shelters, Table 11.2 shows that of 99 respondents, 38 (38.4%) answered that they have never talked about it with other people. Including these respondents, the percentage that the respondents have talked about it at the less than “some” degree was almost 80%.

Table 11.3: Respondent's Discussion of Domestic Violence Restraining Orders with Others

<u>Talked About C</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	40	40.4
1 (very little)	16	16.2
2	15	15.2
3	5	5.1
4 (some)	10	10.1
5	4	4.0
6	2	2.0
7 (quite a lot)	6	6.1
8	1	1.0
9	0	0.0
10 (great amount)	0	0.0
Total	99	100.0

In terms of item C, domestic violence restraining orders, Table 11.3 indicates that of 99 respondents, 40 (40.4%) said that they have never talked about it with others, whereas 10 (10.1%) have talked about it with others to “some” degree.

Regarding item D, victim witness assistance centers, as Table 11.4 shows, almost 90% of the respondents answered that they have talked about it with others at the less than “some” level, including more than half of the respondents (56.6%) who said that they have never talked about it with others.

Table 11.4: Respondent's Discussion of Victim Witness Assistance Centers with Others

<u>Talked About D</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	56	56.6
1 (very little)	18	18.2
2	14	14.1
3	4	4.0
4 (some)	2	2.0
5	1	1.0
6	1	1.0
7 (quite a lot)	2	2.0
8	1	1.0
9	0	0.0
10 (great amount)	0	0.0
Total	99	100.0

Table 11.5: Respondent's Discussion of Mandatory Reporting of Domestic Violence-Related Calls by Law Enforcement Officers with Others

<u>Talked About E</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
0 (none)	42	42.4
1 (very little)	17	17.2
2	18	18.2
3	7	7.1
4 (some)	7	7.1
5	1	1.0
6	3	3.0
7 (quite a lot)	2	2.0
8	1	1.0
9	0	0.0
10 (great amount)	1	1.0
Total	99	100.0

In terms of item E, mandatory reporting of domestic violence-related calls by law

enforcement officers, as Table 11.5 represents, of 99 respondents, 42 (42.2%) answered that they have never talked about it with others. Including the number, the vast majority of the respondents (92.9%) have talked about it with others at less than the “some” level.

The highest percentages of all the specific five items in Table 11.1 through Table 11.5 concentrated on the level of “none,” which means that the respondents have never talked with anybody about the five resources. Compared to Table 10, however, in terms of the question that asked how much they have talked with other people about domestic violence in general, half (50%) answered that they have talked a little bit and 27 (27%) said that they have had “some” talk about domestic violence with others.

Image and Definition of Domestic Violence

Table 12 represents the respondents’ images of domestic violence. Of the 100 respondents, 92 (92%) answered that they see a relationship where husband abuses wife in their mind immediately when they hear the words, “domestic violence.” Only 4 (4%) imagined the relationship in which a boyfriend abuses a girlfriend. 96 (96%) did not imagine a relationship in which a female is an abuser and a male is a victim. Only 1 (1%) answered that the relationship is that of a parent who abuses a child, and 3 (3%) imagined other relationships. The vast majority of the respondents (88%) answered that the images came from the mass media, especially from television, based on answers to the question, “How did you obtain your image of the words, ‘domestic violence’?”

Table 12: Respondent's Image of Domestic Violence

<u>Relationship</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
husband abuses wife	92	92.0
wife abuses husband	0	0.0
boyfriend abuses girlfriend	4	4.0
girlfriend abuses boyfriend	0	0.0
parent abuses child	1	1.0
child abuses parent	0	0.0
other	3	3.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 13 shows the respondents' images of the actions and behaviors involved in domestic violence. Of the 100 respondents, the highest percentage (28.4%) saw an image of "physical abuse," and the second highest (22.1%) saw an image of "physical and verbal abuse."

Table 13: Respondent's Image of Action and Behavior of Domestic Violence

<u>Action and Behavior</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
physical abuse	27	28.4
verbal abuse	1	1.0
physical and verbal abuse	21	22.1
physical and psychological abuse	12	12.6
physical, psychological, and sexual abuse	1	1.0
spousal abuse	8	8.4
child abuse	1	1.0
spousal and child abuse	5	5.3
all of the above	2	2.0
other	17	17.9
Total	95	100.0

Table 14.1 and Table 14.2 also indicate the respondents' images of the actions and behaviors of domestic violence. 21 words or phrases were given: bruises, pouting, throwing things, concussion, blaming, black eye, kicking, broken bone, threaten divorce, scream, shot, hitting, cut, leave home, cursing, use weapons, abrasion, slapping, minimizing (deprecating), threat, and fear, for the responses to the question, "Which words remind you of domestic violence?" Respondents were asked to circle as many as apply. The words or phrases the respondents circled were scored as "yes."

Table 14.1: Respondent's Image of Action and Behavior of Domestic Violence: Physical Abuse-Related Words

Image			Frequency	Valid Percent	
Physical Abuse	bruises	yes	96	96.0	
		no	4	4.0	100%
	black eye	yes	91	91.0	
		no	9	9.0	100%
	broken bone	yes	79	79.0	
		no	21	21.0	100%
	cut	yes	73	73.0	
		no	27	27.0	100%
	concussion	yes	71	71.0	
		no	29	29.0	100%
	abrasion	yes	71	71.0	
		no	29	29.0	100%
	hitting	yes	92	92.0	
		no	8	8.0	100%
	kicking	yes	85	85.0	
		no	15	15.0	100%
	shot	yes	60	60.0	
		no	40	40.0	100%
	slapping	yes	85	85.0	
		no	15	15.0	100%
	use weapons	yes	65	65.0	
		no	35	35.0	100%
	throwing things	yes	65	65.0	
		no	35	35.0	100%

As Table 14.1 shows, higher percentages are found in “yes” in the following words; the vast majority of the respondents answered that they imagine the words, “bruises” (96%), “black eye” (91%), “hitting” (92%), “kicking” (85%), and “slapping” (85%) with the definition of domestic violence.

Table 14.2: Respondent’s Image of Action and Behavior of Domestic Violence: Verbal and Psychological Abuse-Related Words

Image			Frequency	Valid Percent	
Verbal and Psychological Abuse	threaten divorce	yes	63	63.0	
		no	37	37.0	100%
	fear	yes	79	79.0	
		no	21	21.0	100%
	pouting	yes	16	16.0	
		no	84	84.0	100%
	threat	yes	75	75.0	
		no	25	25.0	100%
	blaming	yes	43	43.0	
		no	57	57.0	100%
	leave home	yes	36	36.0	
		no	64	64.0	100%
	cursing	yes	60	60.0	
		no	40	40.0	100%
	scream	yes	64	64.0	
		no	36	36.0	100%
	minimizing	yes	25	25.0	
		no	75	75.0	100%

In Table 14.2, there were some higher percentages in “no”; of 100 respondents, 84 (84%) of respondents concerning the word, “pouting,” 75 (75%) regarding the word, “minimizing,” 64 (64%) in terms of the word, “leave home,” and 57 (57%) regarding the word, “blaming” did not associate the words with an image of domestic violence. As Table 14.1 and Table 14.2 show, the respondents had higher percentages of physical abuse images of domestic violence, compared to verbal and psychological abuse images.

Table 15 indicates the respondents' definitions of the number of occasions comprising domestic violence. Of the 100 respondents, even if the violent action and behavior occur only "once," 73 (73%) of respondents defined it as "domestic violence."

Table 15: Respondent's Definition of Number of Occasions Comprising Domestic Violence

<u>No. of Occasions</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
once	73	73.0
twice	13	13.0
three times	8	8.0
other	6	6.0
Total	100	100.0

Attitude Toward Domestic Violence

Table 16.1 represents the respondents' attitudes toward a hypothetical domestic violence situation. For the question, "If someone whom you know begins abusing someone else, what would you do first?," the vast majority of the respondents, 80 (86%), answered that they would take actions to stop the violence. Among 80 respondents, 34 said that they would intervene or confront both the abuser and the person who was being abused, 15 said that they would advise both the abuser and the abused person to seek professional help, 14 answered that they would call 911, 11 answered that they would talk to the person who was being abused, and 6 answered that they would talk to the abuser. Of 93 respondents, 6 (6.5%) said that they would take no action about the situation.

Table 16.1: Respondent's Attitude When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Situation Among Others

<u>Attitudes Toward the Abuser</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
take an action to stop	80	86.0
take no action	6	6.5
don't know	7	7.5
Total	93	100.0

For the question, "If you encounter domestic violence and you are a victim, what would you do first?" in Table 16.2, 84 (92.3%) respondents answered that they would leave or try to leave the situation, and only 1 (1.1%) answered that he/she would take no action about the situation.

Table 16.2: Respondent's Attitude When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Involving Himself or Herself

<u>Attitude Toward Him/Herself</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
leave the situation	38	38.5
try to leave the situation	49	53.8
take no action	1	1.1
don't know	2	2.2
other	4	4.4
Total	91	100.0

Understanding of Domestic Violence

Table 17 shows the causal factors of domestic violence that the respondents

understood. For the responses of the question, “What do you think causes domestic violence?” Respondents were asked to choose as many as apply. The listed possible causes that the respondents circled or checked were scored as “yes.” Of the 96 respondents, the vast majority of the respondents thought that “drinking” (88.5%) and “the abuser’s experience that he or she was abused as a child” (84.6%) cause domestic violence. The majority of the respondents answered that “frustration” (79.2%), “stress” (65.6%), and “money problems” (61.5%) cause domestic violence. Besides the listed possible causes, in the category “other,” 10 out of 15 respondents mentioned that “low self-esteem” is understood as one of the causes. The majority of the respondents said that “the children” (74%), “something the abused person did” (64.6%), and “job-related” (56.3%) are not the causes of domestic violence.

Table 17: Respondent’s Understanding of the Cause of Domestic Violence

Possible Causes	Frequency (Valid Percent)		
	yes	no	Total
the abuser was abused as a child	83 (84.6)	15 (15.4)	96 (100.0)
drinking	85 (88.5)	11 (11.5)	96 (100.0)
bad day/stress	63 (65.6)	33 (34.4)	96 (100.0)
something the abused person did	34 (35.4)	62 (64.6)	96 (100.0)
the children	25 (26.0)	71 (74.0)	96 (100.0)
money problems	59 (61.5)	37 (38.5)	96 (100.0)
job-related	42 (43.8)	54 (56.3)	96 (100.0)
frustration	76 (79.2)	20 (20.8)	96 (100.0)
don’t know	15 (15.6)	81 (84.4)	96 (100.0)

The Reality

Finally, Table 18.1 and Table 18.2 indicate real situations of domestic violence concerning the respondents. As Table 18.1 shows, for the question, “Do you know anyone who has abused his or her companion?” 38 (38.8%) out of 98 respondents answered that they know a person who has abused his or her companion. For the question, “Do you know anyone who has been abused by his or her companion?,” on the other hand, 47 (48%) said that they know a person who has been abused by his or her companion as shown in Table 18.2.

Table 18.1: Respondent’s Knowledge of Domestic Violence Abuser

<u>Know Abuser</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
yes	38	38.8
no	60	61.2
Total	98	100.0

Table 18.2: Respondent’s Knowledge of Abused Person of Domestic Violence

<u>Know Abused Person</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
yes	47	48.0
no	51	52.0
Total	100	100.0

Quantitative Findings

As a first step in testing Hypotheses 1 and 2, chi-square tests were conducted to examine the null hypotheses that the independent and dependent variables are not related, and to see any relationship between gender and images of domestic violence and attitudes toward domestic violence. Second, *t* tests were used to examine the null hypotheses for Hypotheses 3 and 4, and to see if there is evidence to indicate a difference in knowledge and discussions of domestic violence between men and women.

Crosstabulation and Chi-Square Test

(1) Hypothesis 1: Females are more likely than males to have a broader image of domestic violence.

Table 19 represents the crosstabulation of the respondents' images of domestic violence by males and females. The result of the chi-square test was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($\chi^2 = 1.58$, $df = 2$, $p = .45$). This means that no evidence was found to support a relationship between gender and the images of domestic violence; Hypothesis 1 was not supported. Although there was no statistical significance, when Japanese American men and women in the sample hear the words, "domestic violence," the men were slightly more likely than the women to imagine only "physical abuse," whereas the women were slightly more likely than the men to imagine either "physical or verbal abuse."

Table 19: Crosstabulation and Result of Chi-Square Test of Images by Males and Females

Gender	Respondent's Impression of What Constitutes Domestic Violence			Total
	physical abuse	physical or verbal abuse	other	
Males	25 (54.3)	15 (32.6)	6 (13.0)	46 (48.4)
Females	21 (42.9)	22 (44.9)	6 (12.2)	49 (51.6)
Total	46 (48.4)	37 (38.9)	12 (12.6)	95(100.0)

$$\chi^2 = 1.58, df = 2, p = .45$$

Note. Values in parentheses are percentages.

(2) Hypothesis 2: Females are more likely than males to get help for themselves or others who are involved in domestic violence.

Table 20.1 shows the crosstabulation of the respondents' attitudes when presented with hypothetical domestic violence among others by males and females for the following variable: attitudes toward the situation in which the respondents know an abuser. The result of the variable was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($\chi^2 = .18, df = 2, p = .913$). It indicates that gender is not related to attitudes about actions toward others in domestic violence situations.

Table 20.2 represents the crosstabulation of respondents' attitudes when presented with hypothetical domestic violence involving himself or herself by males and females for the following variable: attitudes toward the situation in which the respondents are victims of domestic violence. The result of the variable was also not significant at $p < .05$ level ($\chi^2 = 4.33, df = 2, p = .114$). Although there was no statistical significance, women in my sample were slightly more likely than the men to say that they would take action

concerning domestic violence situations. In Table 20.2, 46 women (nearly 98% of the women) out of 47 answered that they would take action by “leaving the situation” or “trying to leave the situation” when they encounter domestic violence, while 38 men (86.4%) out of 44 answered the same.

Table 20.1: Crosstabulation and Result of Chi-Square Test of Attitude of Males and Females When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Among Others

Gender	Respondent's Attitude When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Among Others			Total
	take actions to stop	take no action to stop	not sure/ don't know	
Male	39 (84.8)	3 (6.5)	4 (8.7)	46 (49.5)
Female	41 (87.2)	3 (6.4)	3 (6.4)	47 (50.5)
Total	80 (86.0)	6 (6.5)	7 (7.5)	93(100.0)

$$\chi^2 = .18, df = 2, p = .91$$

Note. Values in parentheses are percentages.

Table 20.2: Crosstabulation and Result of Chi-Square Test of Attitude of Males and Females When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Involving Himself or Herself

Gender	Respondent's Attitude When Presented with Hypothetical Domestic Violence Involving Himself or Herself			Total
	take actions to stop	take no action to stop	not sure/ don't know	
Male	38 (86.4)	1 (2.3)	5 (11.4)	44 (48.4)
Female	46 (97.9)	0 (0.0)	1 (2.1)	47 (51.6)
Total	84 (92.3)	1 (1.1)	6 (6.6)	91(100.0)

$$\chi^2 = 4.80, df = 4, p = .308$$

Note. Values in parentheses are percentages.

t Test

As a next step, *t* tests were performed to examine the differences between genders concerning the level of knowledge and discussions of domestic violence as measurements of the level of awareness of domestic violence among the respondents. The results are represented in Table 21.1 through Table 22.5. For all of the comparisons, the possible range of answers is from 0 (no knowledge) to 10 (great amount of knowledge).

(3) Hypothesis 3: Females are more likely than males to have knowledge of domestic violence programs.

Table 21.1: Differences Between Males and Females
in Knowledge About Domestic Violence Programs

Gender	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (one-tailed)
Male	2.792	2.278	-.855	97	.198
Female	3.216	2.633			

Table 21.1 shows the difference of means between men ($M = 2.792$, $SD = 2.278$) and women ($M = 3.216$, $SD = 2.633$) in the level of knowledge about domestic violence programs. The result was not statistically significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = -.855$, $df = 97$, $p = .198$). It indicates that no evidence was found to support the hypothesis that women have a higher level of knowledge about domestic violence programs than men; Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Table 21.2 represents the difference of means between men ($M = 2.917$, $SD = 2.369$) and women ($M = 3.490$, $SD = 2.461$) in the level of knowledge about battered

women's shelters. The result was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = -1.180$, $df = 97$, $p = .121$). It indicates that no evidence was found to support that women have a higher level of knowledge about battered women's shelters than men; Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Table 21.2: Differences Between Males and Females
in Knowledge About Battered Women's Shelters

Gender	Mean	SD	t	df	p (one-tailed)
			-1.180	97	.121
Male	2.917	2.369			
Female	3.490	2.461			

Table 21.3 shows the difference of means between men ($M = 3.625$, $SD = 2.841$) and women ($M = 3.118$, $SD = 1.935$) in the level of knowledge about domestic violence restraining orders. The result was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = 1.044$, $df = 97$, $p = .150$). It means that there is no statistically significant difference between men and women in the level of knowledge about domestic violence restraining orders. Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Table 21.3: Differences Between Males and Females
in Knowledge About Domestic Violence Restraining Orders

Gender	Mean	SD	t	df	p (one-tailed)
			1.044	97	.150
Male	3.625	2.841			
Female	3.118	1.935			

Table 21.4 represents the difference of means between men ($M = 1.938$, $SD = 2.197$) and women ($M = 1.765$, $SD = 1.882$) in the level of knowledge about victim witness assistance centers. The result was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = .421$, $df = 97$, $p = .338$) indicating that gender has no statistically significant effect on the level of knowledge about victim witness assistance centers. Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Table 21.4: Differences Between Males and Females
in Knowledge About Victim Witness Assistance Centers

Gender	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (one-tailed)
			.421	97	.338
Male	1.938	2.197			
Female	1.765	1.882			

Table 21.5 shows the difference of means between men ($M = 2.604$, $SD = 2.430$) and women ($M = 3.020$, $SD = 2.445$) in the level of knowledge about mandatory reporting of all domestic violence-related calls by law enforcement officers. The result was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = -.847$, $df = 97$, $p = .200$). This means that no evidence was found to support that women are more likely than men to have a higher level of knowledge about the reports; Hypothesis 3 was not supported.

Table 21.5: Differences Between Males and Females in Knowledge About Mandatory
Reporting of All Domestic Violence-Related Calls by Law Enforcement Officers

Gender	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (one-tailed)
			.421	97	.200
Male	1.938	2.197			
Female	1.765	1.882			

(4) Hypothesis 4: Females are more likely than males to discuss domestic violence programs with others.

Table 22.1 represents the difference of means between men ($M = 1.592$, $SD = 2.101$) and women ($M = 1.941$, $SD = 2.231$) in discussions of domestic violence programs with others. The result was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = -.805$, $df = 98$, $p = .211$). It indicates that gender has no statistical significance on this item. Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Table 22.1: Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Domestic Violence Programs with Others

Gender	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (one-tailed)
			-.805	98	.211
Male	1.592	2.101			
Female	1.941	2.231			

Table 22.2: Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Battered Women's Shelters with Others

Gender	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (one-tailed)
			-1.739	97	.043*
Male	1.542	2.073			
Female	2.333	2.430			

* $p < .05$

Table 22.2 shows the difference of means between men ($M = 1.542$, $SD = 2.073$) and women ($M = 2.333$, $SD = 2.430$) in discussions of battered women's shelters with others. The result was statistically significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = -1.739$, $df = 97$,

$p = .043$). The result indicates that women are more likely than men to discuss battered women's shelters with others. Hypothesis 4 was supported.

Table 22.3: Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Domestic Violence Restraining Orders with Others

Gender	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (one-tailed)
			.848	97	.200
Male	2.042	2.584			
Female	1.667	1.763			

Table 22.3 represents the difference of means between men ($M = 2.042$, $SD = 2.584$) and women ($M = 1.667$, $SD = 1.763$) in the level of discussions of domestic violence restraining orders with others. The result was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = .848$, $df = 97$, $p = .200$). This means that no evidence was found to support that women have a higher level of discussion than men on this item. Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Table 22.4: Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Victim Witness Assistance Centers with Others

Gender	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i> (one-tailed)
			.243	97	.405
Male	1.042	1.650			
Female	.961	1.661			

Table 22.4 shows the difference of means between men ($M = 1.042$, $SD = 1.650$)

and women ($M = .961$, $SD = 1.661$) in the level of discussions of victim witness assistance centers with others. The result was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = .243$, $df = 97$, $p = .405$) indicating that there is no evidence to support that women have a higher level of discussion than men on this item. Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

Table 22.5: Differences Between Males and Females in Discussion of Mandatory Reporting of All Domestic Violence-Related Calls by Law Enforcement Officers with Others

Gender	Mean	SD	t	df	p (one-tailed)
Male	1.479	1.935	-.502	97	.309
Female	1.686	2.159			

Table 22.5 shows the difference of means between men ($M = 1.479$, $SD = 1.935$) and women ($M = 1.686$, $SD = 2.159$) in the level of discussions of mandatory reporting of all domestic violence-related calls by law enforcement officers with others. The result was not significant at $p < .05$ level ($t = -.502$, $df = 97$, $p = .309$). It indicates that gender has no statistically significant effect on discussion on this item. Hypothesis 4 was not supported.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Discussion

The quantitative findings from Chapter 4 provide support for the differences in Japanese Americans' level of awareness of domestic violence based on gender. In terms of Hypothesis 1, which states that females are more likely than males to have a broader image of domestic violence, the chi-square test did not support this hypothesis as shown in Table 19. However, when Japanese American men and women hear the words, "domestic violence," women are more likely than men to imagine "physical or verbal abuse," whereas men are more likely than women to imagine only "physical abuse." Although there was no statistical significance, it might suggest that the women in my sample had a slightly broader image of domestic violence than the men.

Japanese Americans as a whole indicate that they have a higher percentage of physical abuse images of domestic violence compared to verbal and psychological abuse images. Women in my sample, however, were slightly more likely than the men to imagine the words, "threaten divorce," "fear," "pouting," "threat," "blaming," "leave home," "cursing," "scream," and "minimizing" (deprecating) when they hear the words, "domestic violence." As an image of domestic violence in a relationship, 92% of Japanese American men and women imagine "husband abuses wife" relationships as shown in Table 12. On this point, neither Japanese American men nor women see a broad range of victims of domestic violence.

In terms of Hypothesis 2, which states that females are more likely than males to

get help for themselves or others who are involved in domestic violence, the chi-square test did not support this hypothesis. However, women appear to be much more likely than men to take action to leave or try to leave their situation if they encounter domestic violence. Almost all the women, 46 (97.9%) out of 47, answered that they would take action to leave or try to leave the situation, whereas only 38 (86.4%) out of 44 men gave the same answer. In my sample, it appears that Japanese American women, when measured on this point, would not hesitate to take action if they find themselves in a situation of domestic violence.

When Japanese American women state that they would take action to leave a situation if they are involved in domestic violence, patriarchal ideology appears to be weakening. The women say that they would leave or try to leave the situation to end domestic violence, which would weaken the system of patriarchy, since violence is mainly caused by patriarchy (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992). The women's attitudes toward domestic violence would seem to be sufficiently developed that it would not allow men to use power and control, that is to say, domestic violence. When the women are married, however, the question is whether or not they would leave their marriage. I speculate that they may only leave their abusers temporarily.

Hypothesis 3 suggested that females are more likely than males to have knowledge about domestic violence programs. The *t* tests did not support this hypothesis; there was no relationship between gender and knowledge about domestic violence programs.

On the other hand, when separately examining the five discussion categories that were also used for knowledge in Hypothesis 3, one *t* test supported Hypothesis 4, which suggested that females are more likely than males to discuss domestic violence programs with others. Japanese American women are more likely than men to discuss battered

women's shelters with others. In patriarchy, because women are more oppressed and victimized by men's power and control (Lengermann & Niebrugge-Brantley, 1992), women have more reason to obtain the information that they need to protect themselves. Women seem to be more sharing of information of battered women's shelters.

As for the entire Japanese American sample, it is interesting to note that there was a difference between knowledge about domestic violence programs and discussions of them although the same five lists were used. While more than half of the Japanese Americans answered that they have less than "some" knowledge about domestic violence programs, battered women's shelters, domestic violence restraining orders, victim witness assistance centers, and mandatory reporting of all domestic violence-related calls by law enforcement officers, the most common response was "none" concerning talking with others about the above categories. Table 11.1 through Table 11.5 showed that more than one third of Japanese Americans have not talked about any of the five with others although they have "some" or "a little" knowledge about the five resources. In terms of knowledge about domestic violence programs, Japanese Americans' awareness was not at a high level. Even if Japanese Americans have some knowledge about domestic violence in various categories, they do not seem to share the knowledge with others. This may be related to a cultural factor. For example, Japanese American people may not be open enough to talk about domestic violence issues with others. They may not seem to share very sensitive issues. As a result, they may be less likely to utilize services for victims of domestic violence.

To summarize, there is statistical significance by gender in discussion of battered women's shelters with others. Japanese American women are significantly more likely than men to talk about battered women's shelters with others. Regarding Japanese

Americans as a whole, initial findings indicate that they do not have a high level of knowledge about domestic violence programs. Note that the ranges and means of the *t* tests were low overall, indicating that the issue of domestic violence may not be very salient for my sample. Given this, and the small sample size, it is difficult to observe differences between men and women. Future studies should utilize larger sample sizes.

By exploring the awareness of domestic violence among Japanese Americans, this study also tries to solve a puzzle. Although U.S. born Japanese Americans possess more resources, such as knowledge of the English language, compared to other Asian Americans including Asian immigrants and refugees, why is Japanese Americans' utilization of domestic violence hotlines, shelters, and counseling extremely rare compared to the others? Is it because domestic violence rarely occurs among Japanese Americans?

The most unexpected findings of this study show, however, that among U.S. born Japanese Americans sampled in the Bay Area, almost 39 percent of them know a person who has abused his or her companion, and 48 percent know a person who has been abused by his or her companion. Based on the question that asked Japanese Americans the race of their friends, more than 62 percent of them answered that the majority of their friends are Japanese and/or Japanese Americans. Therefore, it can be inferred that domestic violence among Japanese Americans certainly exists. It is not reported, however, and services are not sought.

Although domestic violence occurs in Japanese American culture, why are Japanese Americans' domestic violence incidents rarely reported to the appropriate programs? This study reveals that Japanese Americans do not possess a very strong knowledge of such services. This may be caused by their Asian-style patriarchal culture. In Asian and Asian American cultures, since the system of patriarchy has been "naturally"

and culturally established, patriarchy has maintained women's position as dominated and oppressed by men. In this structure, Japanese American women's consciousness might remain embedded in the social assumptions of patriarchy, and their awareness might not be raised toward rejecting domestic violence, i.e., patriarchy. Thus, even when domestic violence happens to Japanese American women, they might treat the domestic violence issue not as a serious social problem but as a private matter. Even when U.S. born Japanese Americans possess more resources than other Asian Americans, such as speaking English, and might reside in non-Asian environments, I speculate that Asian-style patriarchy still may be more persistent than we might think among U.S. born Japanese Americans. At the same time, almost 98 percent of the women answered that they would leave or try to leave the situations of domestic violence when they encounter it. Japanese American women's awareness of domestic violence seems to be at a high level. Therefore, on this point, there seems to exist a paradox.

Conclusion

This study explores the awareness of domestic violence among U.S. born Japanese Americans in the Bay Area. Radical feminists believe that violence is mainly caused by patriarchy, and the fundamental structure of patriarchy is gender-based. Therefore, increasing women's consciousness and awareness is the key to weakening patriarchy and to ending domestic violence. The present study is a first step in this direction.

The overall awareness of domestic violence among Japanese Americans in the Bay Area is at a low level. Japanese Americans' extremely rare instances of contacting services for victims of domestic violence might be caused by their low level of knowledge

about domestic violence services. Their low level of knowledge might be caused by a cultural factor that they may not seem to share information of domestic violence services even though they have some knowledge about such information. Domestic violence certainly exists among Japanese Americans. The fact that so many Japanese Americans in my sample know someone who has abused his or her companion or who has been abused by his or her companion suggests the need to raise the awareness of domestic violence, the programs, and the services that save victims. One way is to furnish Japanese Americans with information about these through their various organizations, such as the ones mentioned earlier in this paper.

For further study, research about Japanese Americans' family structure, for instance, whether they are patriarchal or non-patriarchal, might be beneficial to determine the level of awareness of domestic violence among Japanese Americans, for patriarchy affects people's lives through values, beliefs, and consciousness and awareness (Furiya, 1993). Research about Japanese American cultural characteristics, such as whether they are reserved or not reserved, also might be beneficial to determine how they affect their level of awareness of domestic violence since their low level of awareness may be a cultural issue. When concentrating on Japanese American women, additional independent variables are needed to examine the level of awareness of domestic violence. For example, income might be considered, for income is the most important source of patriarchal domestic power in families in terms of economic resources (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983). Domestic violence is a major issue and a serious social problem. Domestic violence can happen to anyone. Raising the awareness of domestic violence to end domestic violence is only a half way step. In order not to trivialize it and in order to defeat patriarchy, everyone must take action to help to prevent domestic violence.

REFERENCES

- Asian Women's Shelter. (1997). Dynamics of Domestic Violence. Gathering Strength '97, (p. 30), (Book originally prepared for the conference for ending domestic violence in Asian and Pacific Islander communities, held at San Francisco State University, California, June 20 - 21). San Francisco, CA: Asian Women's Shelter.
- Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Blumstein, P. & Schwartz, P. (1983). American Couples: Money/Work/Sex. New York: William Morrow.
- Bohrstedt, G. W. & Knoke, G. (1994). Statistics for Social Data Analysis, (3rd ed.). Itasca, IL: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.
- The Commonwealth Fund. (1993, July). First Comprehensive National Health Survey of American Women. New York: The Commonwealth Fund.
- Dobash, R. E. & Dobash, R. P. (1979). Violence Against Wives: A Case Against the Patriarchy. New York: Free Press.
- Family Violence Prevention Fund. (1997a, January). News Flash. San Francisco, CA: Family Violence Prevention Fund.
- Family Violence Prevention Fund. (1997b, July). News Flash. San Francisco, CA: Family Violence Prevention Fund.
- Furiya, L. (1993, October 8). The Special Problems of Asian and Asian American Women and Domestic Violence. Asian Week, A1.
- Gonzales, J. L. Jr. (1992). The Japanese American Family. Racial and Ethnic Families in America. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Lengermann, P. M. & Niebrugge-Brantley, J. (1992). Contemporary Feminist Theory. In G. Ritzer (Ed.), Contemporary Sociological Theory, (7th ed.), (pp. 308 - 357). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Marshall, G. (1994). The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Sociology (pp. 383). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, D. (1976). Battered Wives. San Francisco, CA: Glide.

- Masaki, B. (1997). Water on Rock: Changing Domestic Violence Perceptions in the Asian American Community. In Asian Women's Shelter (Ed.), Gathering Strength '97 (pp. 59 - 65). San Francisco, CA: Asian Women's Shelter.
- National Center for the State Court. (1995). Examining the Work of State Court, 1993. A National Perspective from the Court Statistics Project. New York: National Center for the State Court.
- The New York State Office for the Prevention of Domestic Violence. (1993, July). Spouse Abuse and Battered Wife Syndrome. New York: The New York State Office.
- Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence. (1997). Service Statistics Record. San Jose, CA: Next Door.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1981). Woman-battering: Victims and their experience. Family Violence. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rubin, G. (1975). The traffic in women: Notes on the "political economy of sex." In R. R. Reiter (Ed.), Toward an Anthropology of Women (pp. 13 - 32). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- The San Francisco Family Violence Council. (1997). San Francisco Domestic Violence Health Care Protocol. San Francisco, CA: The Health Care Committee.
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1987). Family violence: Past, present, and future. In M. B. Sussman & S. K. Steinmetz (Eds.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family, (pp. 725 - 766). New York: Plenum.
- Steinmetz, S. K. & Straus, M. A. (1974). Violence in the Family. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stets, J. E. & Straus, M. A. (1989). The marriage license as a hitting license: A comparison of assaults in dating, cohabiting, and married couples. In M. Pirog-Good & J.E. Stets (Eds.), Violence in Dating Relationships: Emerging Issues (pp. 33 - 52). New York: Praeger.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family. New York: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Tierney, K. J. (1982). The battered women movement and the creation of the wife beating problem. Social Problems, 29(3): 207 - 220.

- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1990a). California Counties with the Largest Asian and Pacific Islander Population. 1990 Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1990b). Foreign and Native Born for California Asian and Pacific Islander Populations. 1990 Census.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (1994). Domestic Violence – Violence Between Intimates. Justice Statistics.
- Van Hasselt, V. B., Morrison, R. L., Bellack, A. S., & Hersen, M. (1988). Handbook of Family Violence (pp. 334 - 356). New York: Plenum.
- Vogt, P. W. (1993). Dictionary of Statistics and Methodology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). The Battered Women. New York: Harper Colophon.
- Winton, C. A. (1995). Frameworks for Studying Families. Guilford, CT: Publishing Group, Inc.
- Yllo, K. A. (1993). Through a feminist lens: Gender, power, and violence. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), Current Controversies on Family Violence (pp. 47 - 62). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX A.

Survey Questionnaire with Letter and Consent Form

Agreement to Participate in Research

Responsible Investigator: Taeko Misumi
Masters Candidate in Sociology

Title of Protocol: The Awareness of Domestic Violence
Among Japanese Americans in the Bay Area

You have been asked to participate in a research study investigating the awareness of domestic violence among Japanese Americans. You will be asked to complete a survey questionnaire. The research may involve personal questions which may create uncomfortable feelings. The magnitude of harm will be no greater than that of daily life. Your participation in the research will give you an opportunity to discuss your feelings and concerns over several different issues regarding domestic violence. The results of this study may be shared with other researchers but no information that could identify you will be included.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact Dr. Carol Ray, the chairperson of my thesis committee, at (408)924-5329. Also any complaints about the research may be presented to the sociology department chair, Dr. Bob Gliner, at (408)924-5320. Moreover, any questions or complaints about research, subjects' rights, or research-related injury may be presented to Dr. Serena Stanford, Associate Academic Vice President for Graduate Studies and Research, at (408)924-2480.

If you choose not to participate in this study, no service of any kind, to which you are entitled, will be lost or jeopardized. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate in the study or in any part of the study. If you decide to participate in the study, you are free to withdraw at any time without prejudice to your relationship with San Jose State University or any other participating institutions.

I have received a signed copy of the consent form regarding my participation in the study.

Respondent's Signature

Date

Investigator's Signature

Date

Dear Respondent:

I am a graduate student at San Jose State University and need your help in conducting research on the awareness of domestic violence among Japanese Americans. I have no relation with social services or a school board. Will you please spend 15 minutes to complete the form and mail it before September 20, 1997?

I would appreciate it if you would take some time to answer the following questions. Your participation in the research will give you an opportunity to discuss your feelings and concerns over several issues regarding domestic violence.

Your participation is entirely voluntary and you have the right to refuse to answer any or all of the questions. Your answers to these questions are all anonymous and will be held in strict confidence. Because your name or any other type of identification will not be marked on the completed questionnaire, I will not be able to identify you in any way as the person who was asked to participate in this study.

Thank you for participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Principal Investigator

Date

SURVEY FOR THE AWARENESS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

• For questions 01) through 12), please circle the appropriate number or response for each question.

01) What is your sex?

1. male
2. female

02) What is your age category?

1. 18 - 24
2. 25 - 34
3. 35 - 44
4. 45 - 54
5. 55 - 64
6. 65 and over

03) Where were you born?

1. in the U.S.
2. in Japan
3. in other countries (specify _____)
4. I do not know

04) What is your generation?

1. issei
2. nisei
3. sansei
4. yonsei
5. other (specify _____)

05) What is your annual income category?

1. \$0 - \$14,999	6. \$55,000 - \$64,999
2. \$15,000 - \$24,999	7. \$65,000 - \$74,999
3. \$25,000 - \$34,999	8. \$75,000 - \$84,999
4. \$35,000 - \$44,999	9. \$85,000 and over
5. \$45,000 - \$54,999	

06) What is your marital status?

1. single
2. married (What is your spouse's race? _____)
3. separated (What is your spouse's race? _____)
4. divorced (What was your former spouse's race? _____)
5. widowed (What was your spouse's race? _____)
6. living with someone (What is your partner's race? _____)

07) What is the highest level you have completed in an educational setting?

1. less than high school
2. graduated from high school
3. GED
4. technical certificate (e.g. beautician, mechanic, etc.)/
educational certificate (e.g. court reporter, etc.)
5. attended 2 year-college
6. graduated from 2 year-college
7. attended 4 year-college
8. graduated from 4 year-college
9. attended Master's program
10. received Master's degree
11. other (e.g. Ph.D, MD, law degree, etc.)

08) Of what race is the majority of your friends? _____

09) How much knowledge do you have about domestic violence?

1. none
2. very little
3. some
4. quite a lot
5. great amount

Why or why not? _____

10) How much knowledge do you have about the following things?

A. domestic violence programs

B. battered women's shelters

C. domestic violence restraining order/protective orders

D. victim witness assistance centers

E. mandatory reporting of all domestic violence-related calls
by law enforcement officers

11) How much have you talked with other people about domestic violence?

1. none
2. very little
3. some
4. quite a lot
5. great amount

With whom?

1. friend
2. relative
3. coworker
4. other (specify _____)

12) How much have you talked with other people about the following things?

A. domestic violence programs

B. battered women's shelters

C. domestic violence restraining orders

D. victim witness assistance centers

E. mandatory reporting of all domestic violence-related calls by law enforcement officers

13) What relationship do you see in your mind immediately when you hear the words, "domestic violence"? Please choose the most appropriate one.

1. husband abuses wife	5. parent abuses child
2. wife abuses husband	6. child abuses parent
3. boyfriend abuses girlfriend	7. other (specify _____)
4. girlfriend abuses boyfriend	

14) How did you obtain your image of the words, "domestic violence"? Please choose as many as apply.

1. from media	5. family member's experiences
2. from current experiences	6. childhood experiences
3. from friend's experiences	7. other (specify _____)
4. from educational experiences	

15) What actions and behaviors do you imagine when you hear the words, "domestic violence"? Please describe.

16) When do you define behavior as "domestic violence"? In other words, how many times would violent actions and behaviors occur before you consider them "domestic violence"?

Please choose the most appropriate one.

A. how many times?	1. once	4. more than four times
	2. twice	5. more than ten times
	3. three times	6. other (specify _____)

- 17) When do you define behavior as "domestic violence"? In other words, how frequently would violent actions and behaviors occur before you consider them "domestic violence"? Please choose the most appropriate one.

- B. how frequently?
1. once a week
 2. once a month
 3. several times a month
 4. once a year
 5. several times a year
 6. other (specify _____)

- 18) Which words remind you of domestic violence? Please circle as many as apply.

bruises	pouting	throwing things	concussion	blaming
black eye	kicking	broken bone	threaten divorce	scream
shot	hitting	cut	leave home	cursing
use weapons	abrasion	slapping	minimizing	threat
fear	other (specify _____)			

- 19) Have you ever heard the actual activities of domestic violence around you? Please choose one.

1. yes
2. no

If yes, how many times have you heard? _____ time(s)

• Please imagine the following situations and respond to question 20) through 24).

- 20) If someone whom you know begins abusing someone else, what would you do first?

- 21) What would you say to the person whom you know and who is abused currently?

- 22) If you encounter domestic violence and you are a victim, what would you do first?

- 23) Would you be able to talk to somebody about the situation in which you are abused?

1. yes (To whom? _____)
2. no
3. I am not sure

Why or why not? _____

24) Would you try to change the situation in which you are abused?

1. yes (How? _____
_____)

2. no (Why not? _____
_____)

3. I am not sure (Why? _____
_____)

25) Do you know anyone who has abused his/her companion? Please choose one.

1. yes
2. no

26) Do you know anyone who has been abused by his/her companion? Please choose one.

1. yes
2. no

27) What do you think causes domestic violence? Please choose as many as apply.

1. the abuser was abused as a child
2. drinking
3. bad day/stress
4. something the abused person did
5. do not know
6. the children
7. money problems
8. alcohol
9. job-related
10. frustration
11. other (specify _____)

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer these questions, and again everything you have answered here will remain confidential and anonymous.

IMAGE EVALUATION TEST TARGET (QA-3)

APPLIED IMAGE, Inc
1653 East Main Street
Rochester, NY 14609 USA
Phone: 716/482-0300
Fax: 716/288-5989

© 1993, Applied Image, Inc., All Rights Reserved