2006

Masculinity versus femininity : does masculinity lead to battering?

Pamela Wittman-McDonald
San Jose State University

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

Recommended Citation

Wittman-McDonald, Pamela, "Masculinity versus femininity : does masculinity lead to battering?" (2006).
Master's Theses. 3041.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31979/etd.3gx3-578n>
https://scholarworks.sjsu.edu/etd_theses/3041

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.

MASCULINITY VERSUS FEMININITY:
DOES MASCULINITY LEAD TO BATTERING?

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

Pamela Wittman-McDonald

December 2006

UMI Number: 1441135

Copyright 2006 by
Wittman-McDonald, Pamela

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

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 bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send 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.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 1441135

Copyright 2007 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.

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

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2006

Pamela Wittman-McDonald

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

David Asquith

Dr. David Asquith

Wendy Ng

Dr. Wendy Ng

James Lee

Dr. James Lee

APPROVED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

Rhea L. Williamson 12/05/06

ABSTRACT

MASCULINITY VERSUS FEMININITY: DOES MASCULINITY LEAD TO BATTERING?

by Pamela Wittman-McDonald

This thesis was undertaken to examine whether a positive correlation exists between masculinity and domestic violence. Three hypotheses were drawn at the onset of the study: (1) men who batter their female partners will hold more stereotypically traditional attitudes than nonbatterers; (2) men who batter their female partners will have more masculine characteristics than nonbatterers; and (3) men who batter their female partners will display a discrepancy between their gender role attitudes and gender role behavior. A questionnaire was administered to men in both a domestic violence treatment program as well as the general public to compare attitudes toward gender roles. Analysis of the results showed support for only the first hypothesis. However, in the course of research it was also found that the more traditional gender roles performed, the greater the likelihood a man has been abusive.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Yoko Baba, former graduate advisor, for her wisdom and encouragement before, during and after graduate school.

Dr. David Asquith, Dr. Wendy Ng, and Dr. James Lee, thesis committee, for all their hard work and encouragement.

Stand Against Domestic Violence for their permission and cooperation in my research study and Carroll Adams, Domestic Violence Treatment Program manager with Stand Against Domestic Violence for her invaluable mentoring.

My husband Jason, daughter Lilly Anna and sister Sharon for all their love, support, encouragement and assistance.

God, our Father who makes all things possible, even the seemingly impossible.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Socialization	3
	Importance of Gender	4
	Gender Stereotypes	6
	Gender Role Expectations	9
	Gender Role Socialization	11
	Forming Gender Identity	12
	Socialization by Parents	13
	Other Socializing Agents	16
	Summary	18
	Social Significance of Domestic Violence	20
	Literature Review	22
	General Domestic Violence	22
	Socialization and Domestic Violence	28
	Sex and Gender Roles	38
	Personality	42
	Masculinity	44
	Hypotheses	51
2.	METHOD	55
	Sample	55
	Instrument and Administration	56
	Variables	57
3.	RESULTS	63
	Demographics	64
	Major Independent Variables	70
	Degree of battering	76
	Summary	78
4.	DISCUSSION	80
	Key Findings	80
	Limitations	83
	Recommendations	84
	Implications	85

5.	REFERENCES	87
6.	APPENDICES	
	A. Script	96
	B. Questionnaire	97

TABLES

1. Demographics of Respondents	65
2. Bivariate Coefficients for Abuse and Individual Demographics	66
3. Covariates for Predicting Education	67
4. Race of Respondents	68
5. Multivariate Logistic Regression Coefficients for Demographic Variables	69
6. Logistic Regression Coefficients for Each Section	71
7. Covariates for Predicting Gender Role Attitudes and Abuse	72
8. Covariates for Predicting Actual Gender Role and Abuse	73
9. Multivariate Logistic Regression Coefficients for Major Independent Variables	75
10. Multivariate Logistic Regression Coefficients for Major Variables	76
11. Spearman's Rho with Degree of Abuse	77

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the annals of history, male dominance over women has been normative and male violence against a female partner commonplace. In the Old Testament of the Bible, a husband could have his wife put to death for unfaithfulness and have his children beaten or even killed for disobedience (Steinmetz 1978). Additionally, in old English common law, it was legal for a man to beat his wife with a rod as long as it was no thicker than his thumb; hence the phrase “rule of thumb.” (Gelles and Straus 1988; Lindsey 1994) Even for minor infractions by a wife, the law has generally supported a man’s right to beat his wife, and in the United States, it was not until the end of the nineteenth century that the courts decided it wasn’t a right for husbands to beat their wives (Lindsey 1994). Even today, “a husband’s prerogative in using physical force to ‘control’ his wife for the most part remains unchallenged” (Lindsey 1994:229).

The debate as to whether patriarchy is a causal factor in domestic violence is ongoing. There is a great deal of feminist literature that argues the inevitable negative effect of living in a patriarchal society upon us all. Feminist theorists view patriarchy as a social organization that perpetuates male dominance over women and patriarchal ideology as a system serving to justify and maintain the social organization

(Brownmiller 1975; Smith 1990; Sugerman and Frankel 1996). Stratified genders (from hegemonic masculinity to “sissies” in masculinity and tomboys to “girly girls” at the lowest end of femininity) and stereotyped gender roles are just a few of the systems in place that work to maintain the status quo. J. Ross Eshleman “sees violence against wives as a logical extension of a patriarchal system where the husband is viewed as the ruler and head of the family” (1991:502). If a woman violates this rule, it may be seen as a violation of a respectable tradition and as an act that provokes a legitimate angry response (Collins and Coltrane 1995; Gelles and Straus 1988; Jewkes 2002). The batterer uses whatever he deems necessary to maintain obedience and control with society rarely questioning this behavior (Lindsey 1994).

It is important to identify some terms such as what is meant by gender and socialization. Sex refers to the biology or anatomy of a person while gender involves the social, cultural, and psychological aspects one acquires based on one's sex as a female or male (Lindsey 1994). Socialization means the process by which a society's values and norms, including those pertaining to gender, are taught and learned. Men are socialized to be masculine, and women are socialized to be feminine. Gender roles then refer to behaviors (both the expected and actual) and characteristics that distinguish females from males in a given society. Gender role identity is the process by which the individual

develops the attitudes (behavior, personality characteristics, and beliefs) defined as appropriate for his or her sex and his or her culture. And finally, gender role stereotypes is used to refer to socially shared beliefs that certain qualities and behaviors can be assigned to individuals based on their biological sex (Lips 1988; Basow 1992).

Socialization

Another debate that often takes place is nature verses nurture. For decades we have assumed that differences between men and women or boys and girls were completely biological. However, social scientists predominantly believe that gender is socially constructed through socialization. The socialization process is the lifelong progression through which individuals learn their culture (e.g. social norms-both written and unwritten), develop their identity, and become functioning members of society (Lindsey 1994). There may be a variety of subcultures within a particular culture, and these subcultures may be divided by race, social class, and religion as well as gender. There are many socializing agents such as the media, school, religion, community, peers, and family, which have the most influence in the early years (Lindsey 1994).

Although there are many perceived differences between men and women, there are many more similarities than differences between men's and women's personalities and behaviors (Wharton 2005). As in all

differences of men and women, there is some overlapping. Using aggression as an example, some women will act equally aggressive, if not more aggressive than some men. Conversely, then, some men will rate less aggressive than some women. Therefore some argue that these differences may be inaccurate because they do not show a set degree of difference (Wharton 2005). These stereotypes may be justified, explained, and even celebrated. Additionally, stereotypes may even cause some behavioral differences between men and women due to gendered expectations (Skrypnek and Snyder 1982).

Importance of Gender

The first question typically asked about a new baby is whether it's a girl or a boy. This illustrates the importance society places on gender and gender roles. In fact, the first effort to socially define a person is in terms of gender. From an undifferentiated it, the baby becomes sex categorized into a "she" or a "he" and from here after is defined and perceived by that proclamation. Additionally, names, with a few exceptions, also signal gender which is another way to distinguish immediately whether someone is a male or female. Hospitals also immediately make this distinction as well. They initially refer to newborns as "Baby Boy Jones" or "Baby Girl Jones" instead of Baby Jones, which would be shorter and just as accurate. In short, from the

very beginning of life, the world acts as though gender makes an important difference (Nielsen 1978).

As an example of the impact of being called a “boy” or “girl” at birth, consider a case history of a hermaphrodite, a person whose physical sex is ambiguous or improperly differentiated. In this particular case, the patient was 24 years old and married at the time of the psychological study. He was found to be anatomically and physiologically female with no male reproductive organs initially discerned. The parents thought the child should be raised as a boy so the patient started male hormone therapy. By the time he was 24, he appeared quite masculine in stature and had a deep voice. The authors in this study wrote that the patient passed as an ordinary male college graduate, one of the more stable and well-adjusted (Money, Hampson, and Hampson 1955).

Physically, this man’s sex was ambiguous, and even initially, he was biologically more female with more female organs and reproductive system than male organs. Psychologically and socially however, there is no doubt that he had a strong male identification due in part to the fact that he was raised as a boy. This case illustrates rather convincingly the impact of sociological and psychological gender identity even when it contradicts biological sex.

Money, Hampson, and Hampson (1955) have done extensive medical and psychological studies of about 105 hermaphrodites. Of their

studies, their overall conclusion is that gender assignment and rearing has a profound effect on psychological sex identity and more often than not, outweighs their influence of biological sex. Moreover, sex of assignment and the raising of a child as a certain sex are almost irreversible. It is extremely difficult for hermaphroditic children to reverse their sexual identity after age 2 or 3. Not only is it hard to change one's sexual identity, there seems to be no place in society for a sexually ambiguous person. From the case studies of hermaphrodites, it can be concluded that socialization contributes to the process by which boys and girls develop their gender. Society is where people learn to be human or social; it does not happen biologically or inevitably through maturation as demonstrated by feral children. (Nielsen 1978).

Gender Stereotypes

“A boy and his father were involved in a serious automobile accident. The father was killed instantly; the son was severely injured. An ambulance rushed him to the nearest hospital, and a prominent surgeon was summoned to perform an immediate operation. Upon entering the operating room, however, the surgeon exclaimed, I can't operate on this boy. He's my son. Question: how can this be?” (Basow 1992:2).

Most people come up with an answer such as a stepfather, an adopted father, reincarnation, a mistake, or something of that nature.

The answer to this riddle is that the surgeon is the boy's mother. The fact that most people do not realize that a female can be a prominent surgeon demonstrates the prevalence of a male dominated society in which strict notions about status and gender roles exist. (Basow 1992) Further, within this system that accepts and expects men to hold the highest political offices, best paying, and highest-status roles in our society, our children are socialized into the status quo (Wharton 2005).

What does it mean to be masculine and feminine? These terms seem to elicit clear pictures of what we believe these mean. They appear to be two opposite sets of behaviors and personal attributes. We all have some ideas or stereotypes of what these words infer or mean. In fact, one of the most impressive aspects of these images is to the extent that Americans share them (Basow 1992). Men are considered to be strong, aggressive, rational, and independent to name a few, while women are considered the opposite of these terms; they are expected to be weak, passive, emotional, submissive, and dependent on men.

A study done by Broverman and others (1972), using 1,000 males and females demonstrated a widespread belief regarding the existence of different personality traits of men and women. This belief was found to be widely held regardless of the age, sex, religion, educational level or marital status of the respondents. More than 75 percent of the people asked believe that 41 traits clearly differentiated females from males.

More recent studies have been done that show similar findings (Smith and Midlarsky 1985; Spence and Sawin 1985). Williams and Best in 1990 sampled 25 countries and found males were associated with such descriptors as adventurous and forceful, where as women were associated with such descriptors as sentimental and submissive (Basow 1992).

As stated earlier, once a child is born, these gender-stereotyped beliefs and attitudes are activated by the proclamation of its sex. A study by Rubin, Provenzano, and Luria (1974) showed that 30 first-time parents within 24 hours of their child's birth had begun a significant amount of sex typing by referring to little girls as softer, smaller and finer and boys as firmer, stronger, and more alert. When an infant is otherwise unidentifiable and is labeled a male, observers perceive what the infant does as masculine. When that same infant is labeled a female, observers perceive what the infant does as feminine. Interestingly, men perceive more sex differences than women. Additionally, researchers found that parents tended to rate their infant daughters as softer, finer featured, smaller, and less attentive than their infant sons despite similarity in physical characteristics such as height, weight, and musculature (Rubin, Provenzano, and Luria 1974). Also, an infant crying will be responded to more quickly if it is a baby girl than if it were to be a baby boy (Culp, Cook, and Housley 1983).

Most consider these stereotypes to be fact and assume these apparent differences between males and females to be due to biologically based sex differences. However, to the extent that behavior or personality differences between males and females exist, most are due to social factors such as socialization practices, social rewards and punishments, status variables, and observer expectations to name a few (Basow 1992). Stereotypes may act as guidelines by which to conform, to rebel against or to evaluate others by. One effect stereotypes may have on society is to serve as a perceptual filter through which we see individuals. We are actually more likely to notice and remember stereotype-consistent behaviors than non stereotypic behaviors (Basow 1992).

Gender Role Expectations

Socialization teaches gender role expectations even when not fulfilled. "People learn that they will at some level be held accountable to them: that is they will be assessed in part on the basis whether they are 'appropriately' masculine or feminine" (Wharton 2005:31). The same is true of other's expectations of us. Other people's expectations seem to influence our own behavior. In a laboratory study, Skrypnek and Snyder (1982) observed males who were led to believe that they were paired with either another male or a female in a project requiring them to divide tasks between them. Men divided these tasks up more stereotypically

when they thought their partner was a woman. Also, women choose more stereotypically feminine tasks when her partner believed that she was female, even though she was not informed directly of his expectations (Basow 1992).

Another way stereotypes function is by serving as a self-fulfilling prophecy. If women are viewed as having more negative characteristics than males, some females may view themselves this way and may develop these very characteristics. For example, if women are expected to be less rational, some may view themselves this way and may actually become irrational. Women who believe this may steer clear of problem-solving activities or advanced math courses. For this reason, some women will not develop the skills, thus fulfilling the stereotype. Such beliefs as these may powerfully influence behavior either negatively if the expectations are low or positively if the expectations are positive (Snyder, Tanke, and Berscheid 1977).

W.I. Thomas states that we define what is masculine and feminine. We teach these definitions to our children, and gradually the definitions become real and have real consequences all through life. Boys are defined as strong, so they do things to prove their strength. Girls are defined as dependent, so they act and feel that way, and it is thus a self-fulfilling prophecy (Duberman 1975). A child's gender dictates our expectations for his or her behavior, preferences, and personality, as well

as guidelines for interaction. When people rely on gender in newborns to provide gender expectations, this affirms the power and importance of gender categories in our society (Wharton 2005).

Gender Role Socialization

Just as in all learning, children observe, role play with adults, and finally internalize the gender role to the point where girls “instinctively” love their dolls and boys “naturally” enjoy playing with trucks.

Socialization is a reciprocal process. The person being socialized contributes to the changes or nonchanges in society. Thus, when a child accepts his gender role training, he continually justifies its values for the group, and in turn, socializes his children in the same way. The system then, is constantly being perpetuated and reinforced (Duberman 1975).

Because of the strong bonds between parents and children, parents are the first socializing agent that children are exposed to. Parents socialize their children into appropriate gender roles in multiple ways; some are overt, but most are subtle. Parents’ own gender role attitudes (the way they treat their children, how they react to their children, and the behavior they model) are important to socialization (Basow 1992). Then “it is not simply that household labor is designed as ‘women’s work’, but that a woman to engage in it and a man not to engage in it is to draw on and exhibit the ‘essential nature’ of each” (West and Zimmerman 1987:144).

Rubin, Provenzano, and Luria (1974) also found that fathers made more extreme and stereotypic judgments of their newborns-perhaps because they did not interact with the babies as much as the mother did. Coltrane (1998) states "male and female infants are similar to one another, but most adults go to great lengths to make them appear dissimilar" (1998:124).

Forming Gender Identity

Maccoby (1998) believes that children have developed their gender identity by the time they are three and can correctly identify themselves and others as either male or female. Once children assign gender labels to objects and activities, they use these labels to guide their expectations of others. Martin, Eisenbud, and Rose state, "a girl will reason that a doll is something girls usually like, I am a girl, therefore I will probably like to play with the doll. In some situations, this kind of reasoning may become so well learned that it is done virtually automatically" (1995:1452).

Research confirms that children have some sense of sexual identity by age 3 to 5. They call themselves girls or boys and react strongly if someone mistakes their gender. There are obvious, but sometimes overlooked sex differences in dress, physical movement, and demeanor. Mussen (1969) notes that lower-class girls and boys conform more closely and earlier to gender stereotypes. For example, lower-class

boys show stable, sex-appropriate choices by age 5, while middle-class boys don't do so until age 6. Lower-class girls show stable, sex-appropriate choices by age 6 and middle-class girls from ages 8 to 10 (Neilson 1978).

Girls and boys begin to show different toy and activity preferences between ages 3 to 5. A number of research studies report that pretty specific stereotyped play activities are developed by age 4 to 5 (Nielsen 1978). According to Maccoby and Jacklin (1974), girls tend to choose feminine activities such as sewing, stringing beads, playing house, while boys tend to choose playing with guns, toy trucks, and fire engines."

In picture preferences and projective tests of femininity and masculinity designed for children, Mussen (1969) found there is little consistency from test to test. A person scoring high on one test might not do so on another. But again, choices seem to be stereotypically feminine and masculine (Nielsen 1978). An example is that girls are more likely to choose stereotypically feminine things, activities, and clothes such as dolls, crib, dishes, shopping, and childcare, while boys are more apt to choose stereotypically masculine items like knives, guns, boats, racing cars, etc.

Socialization by Parents

Parents will purchase gender appropriate clothes, traditionally pink and frilly clothes for girls and rugged fabric with sports decals for

boys. Additionally, parents provide sex-appropriate toys such as dolls for girls and sports equipment, trucks, or tools for boys (Pomerleau et al. 1990). During play, toy choice influences the interaction between parent and child in that balls encourage physically rougher play than dolls. Some believe this type of play encourages boys to be more aggressive and girls to be more passive.

Additionally, fathers tend to provide more corporal punishment to sons than to daughters, and therefore may again encourage aggression in boys more so than in girls by indirectly encouraging physicality in boys (Wharton 2005). Additionally, Maccoby (1998) suggests that parents are somewhat more likely to tolerate aggression in their sons than in their daughters, and therefore may again encourage aggression in boys by indirectly encouraging physicality. Furthermore, fathers interact with their sons differently than their daughters. Many researchers have found that fathers react negatively when their sons engage in more feminine-categorized play (Wharton 2005). In addition, a study by Raag and Rackliff (1998) demonstrates that boys were very aware of their father's disapproval (Wharton 2005).

Parents also seem to assign gender-based chores for children as early as 5 or 6 (Burns and Homel 1989; Goodnow 1988; McHale et al. 1990). Boys are more likely than girls to be assigned maintenance chores such as painting things, mowing lawns, and performing outside

jobs, whereas girls are more likely to be assigned domestic chores such as cooking, laundry, and shopping. These gender-specific assigned chores increase from childhood to adolescence. Beside the content of chores themselves, where boys learn how to do maintenance work better than girls, and girls learn how to do domestic work better than boys, children also learn to link certain types of work with gender. Basow (1992) suggests that this linkage that may extend to later occupational choices. She suggests that from these chores, children may develop different personality traits: domestic work is associated with caring for others, while maintenance work is associated with caring for things. As well as assigning these different gender-specific tasks, parents often model them as well.

Girls seem to face less pressure regarding gender stereotypes and are much more likely to cross gender boundaries since it is acceptable and even encouraged for girls to strive toward masculinity (Wharton 2005). According to Bem (1993), American society is somewhat unique in what she calls andocentric formation gender identity. Androcentrism is a belief that what is male and masculine is superior to what is female and feminine. Additionally, what is associated with maleness or masculinity is the standard or the norm. Further, children then internalize this gender hierarchy in which masculinity is more desirable and highly valued. This androcentrism sets unattainable goals for both

men and women. Females are somewhat encouraged to strive toward masculinity. However, boys are strongly discouraged from anything feminine as the hierarchy suggests. "At the same time, androcentrism provides such an unreachable definition of what a real man is suppose to be that only a few men can even begin to meet it" (Bem 1993:150).

Therefore gender socialization tends to be more restrictive for boys than for girls. Socialization does not affect children, even of the same sex in the same ways. There can be different messages received from different socializing agents in their lives from toys, to cartoons, to modeled behavior. Additionally, some social scientists suggest that socialization maybe shaped by their temperament, physical environment, class and race which influences the interpretation of gender messages (Wharton 2005).

Other socializing Agents

Barrie Thorne (1990 and 1993), an ethnographer who studies gender by observing children in schools demonstrates that teachers are not immune to the effects of gender stereotypes and sexism. Teachers tend to display differential treatment to children based on their gender both consciously and unconsciously. Teachers tend to call on boys for answers more often than girls, assist girls more while encouraging boys to figure out the solution on their own, and tend to segregate children by sex.

Peers further reinforce the gender stereotypes in each other both directly, through approval for gender-linked behaviors, and indirectly, through sex segregation. The result is that school-age children know what girls and boys “should” and “should not” do and tend to behave accordingly. Boys often use terms associated with femininity to insult other boys or keep them in line. Thorne and Luria (2002) purport that children, especially boys, have begun to use derogatory homophobic terms as a means of insult. Boys tend to follow these stereotypes more than girls perhaps because boys tend to receive the more intense socialization pressures.

One future implication of this differential socialization pressure is that androgyny may be more difficult for males, since they are more committed to the masculine stereotypes. Although the effects of socializing agents are enormous, socializing agents alone cannot account for the entire socializing process. Children formulate their conceptions of gender roles from a wide range of social forces. Some social forces acting on a more impersonal level are such things as media, the education system and religion (Basow 1992).

Although Thorne’s (1993) observations fully support the construction of gender, she takes issue with some assumptions about socialization. Socialization is traditionally thought to be only unidirectional with the most powerful (adults) socializing the least

powerful (children). Thorne (1993) believes that children (the less powerful) are by no means passive or without agency. She criticizes the notions that the current social forces will create adults with either traditionally masculine or feminine gender constructs, and if not, the socialization process failed (Thorne 1993). Similarly, Maccoby (1992) believes that children are active participants in their own socialization, and Bem states, "this view of the passive child is inconsistent with the common observation that children themselves frequently construct and enforce their own version of society's gender rules" (1983: 600).

Summary

Young boys are socialized to be strong, macho, and tough. They soon learn expectations of their behavior based on their gender from parents and peers, and boys learn they have more power in our patriarchal society than girls. Boys who see inequitable power in our society modeled by parents exhibiting traditional gender roles, or by parents who model abusive behaviors, may expect girls to act submissively. When this does not happen in intimate relationships, boys may feel they have the legitimate right to use force or violence to maintain these expected roles (Gelles and Straus 1988; Smith 1990; Coltrane and Coltrane 1995; Jewkes 2002). Husbands who adhere to a familial patriarchal ideology (belief that wives should be obedient, respectful, loyal, dependent, sexually accessible to husbands, and

sexually faithful) are more likely to beat their wives. Patriarchal beliefs are embodied by a set of beliefs, attitudes, and norms that legitimize male authority over women in marriage and support the use of force against wives who violate the perceived norms (Smith 1990).

Additionally, if boys experiment with the use of violence (e.g. intimate violence) and it produces the desired results, they will be more likely to use violence to receive the desired outcome next time as well (Gelles and Straus 1988).

Socialization teaches gender role expectations where children learn what is expected of them based on their gender and learn they will be assessed by others as “appropriately” masculine or feminine. “Children from similar backgrounds who are exposed to similar cultural messages tend to agree on the content of those gender associations that do exist and use that information to organize their social worlds” (Wharton 2005:128). Children’s gender labels and stereotypes are influenced by their parents’ behavior. Because stereotypic roles are more learned than real, the possibility exists that they can be unlearned and the definitions of the roles themselves be redefined. Some modifications of the gender stereotypes seem to be occurring, but to what extent these changes will affect our society and socialization is not known.

Socialization fits within the framework of a patriarchal society in that children are socialized by parents (modeling and reinforcing

stereotypic gender roles) and environment (patriarchy). Little girls are taught to be victims (polite and passive) while boys are taught to be abusers (aggressive and violent) (Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer 1994).

Domestic violence, as well as other forms of violence against women, can be viewed as the inevitable outcome of the linkage of gender stereotypes and male domination (Smith 1990). The greater the inequality of power in the family, the greater the risk for abuse (Gelles and Straus 1988).

The equation of masculinity with power, dominance, and aggression and femininity with strong importance of relationships, pleasing men, and passiveness is very destructive. The feminine gender role may also contribute to domestic violence, in that females are socialized into stereotyped gender roles (passive, weak, and fearful) which are all qualities of a vulnerable victim (Lips 1988).

Social Significance of Domestic Violence

In more than one-third of marriages, husbands use violence towards their wives (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz 1980), and one in four women will experience domestic violence at some point in their lifetimes (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). Furthermore, every 15 seconds a woman is beaten by her male partner in the United States, and 30 percent of all female homicides were committed by the victim's partner or former partner (Paymar 1993). Gelles and Straus purport that "you are more likely to be physically assaulted, beaten, and killed in your own home at

the hands of a loved one than anyplace else, or by anyone else in our society” (1988:18). Statistics show the prevalence of domestic violence in our society; however, this social issue is important not only because of the number of women it affects. Domestic violence continues to be a critical issue as children who grow up in abusive households are likely to perpetuate the violence, thus dilating the problem exponentially. Beyond intergenerational transmission of violence, domestic violence has an economic impact on society that is staggering. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2003), domestic violence exceeds \$5.8 billion with \$4.1 billion coming from health care expenses alone. Moreover, when public services such as ambulance, police response, and the criminal justice process, in addition to property loss and personal suffering are considered, the total cost reaches \$67 billion (Miller, Cohen, and Wiersema 1996).

For many years, domestic violence research centered on victims and examined reasons women stayed in abusive relationships. This insinuated pathology for women who stayed in abusive relationships and tended to blame the victims rather than perpetrators. This is nothing new as blame is often placed not only on victims of domestic violence, but on victims of sexual assault and sexual harassment as well. In more recent years, however, research has focused on reasons men batter which is the first step to understanding and ending domestic violence.

Literature Review

In this paper, five overall themes regarding gender and domestic violence will be examined (1) general domestic violence, (2) socialization and intergenerational transmission of violence, (3) gender roles (a set of behaviors or tasks that are acceptable based on one's biological sex), (4) gender identity or personality traits (a list of traits typically used to describe oneself based on his or her biological sex), and (5) masculinity (a list of traits typically used to describe men). Masculinity was an additional theme that falls under gender identity. However, due to the amount of literature under masculinity alone, it was discussed as a separate category. The literature focused on these themes and how they may be associated with, or may lead men to abuse their female partners.

General Domestic Violence. Johnson and Ferraro (2000) reviewed literature on domestic violence research in the 1990s. They found two broad themes in the research and literature of that decade (1) distinctions among types and contexts of violence, and (2) issues of control which invites more investigation of the interaction of power, control, and violence. Both topics should influence future analyses and development of theoretical explanations (Johnson and Ferraro (2000).

Distinctions of violence are important because classification of levels of violence, motives of abusers, context of situation, and culture all impact our understanding of domestic violence. The authors believe that

research is severely handicapped without distinctions among violence, classification of perpetrators, category of relationship, and context of violence, as well as social context in the world. Johnson and Ferraro (2000) divided violence into four categories. The first is common couple violence which takes place in the midst of a heated argument that is not connected with a pattern of control. The second category is intimate terrorism which is characterized by a general pattern of control over one's partner, escalation of violence, and unidirectional violence which results in more severe injury. The third category is violent resistance which is defined as using violence to defend oneself. Lastly, mutual violent control is typified by a pattern of control by both husband and wife; mutual violent control "could be viewed as two intimate terrorists battling for control" (Johnson and Ferrero 2000:950).

The authors examine two promising theoretical perspectives: (1) individuals act or react in an attempt to maintain a reasonable level of control when his or her life is impacted either by life events or the relationship itself; and (2) individuals explore "control identity" and "mastery identity" in terms of their relationship to gender, gender identity and controlling behaviors. They further suggest, "if this literature could be brought back to its initial connection with violence, and perhaps informed more by feminist analyses of the gendering of control issues in relationships, it might provide a context for major theory development"

(Johnson and Ferraro 2000:956). Perpetrators are divided into family-only, generally-violent-antisocial, and dysphoric-borderline while relationships are divided into same sex, dating or courtship, and cohabitation. The authors further suggest that gender, race, ethnicity, and social contexts should be considered when analyzing domestic violence. (Johnson and Ferrero 2000).

Gelles and Straus (1988) wrote about the results of the second National Family Violence Survey using their 15 years of prior experience in researching domestic violence. Simply put, Gelles and Straus state that perpetrators of domestic violence abuse their spouses “because they can” (1988:25). The authors use social exchange theory to explain why family violence occurs.

Social exchange theory suggests that people will have long-term intimate relationships when interaction entails reciprocal giving and receiving. The main assumption is that people pursue rewards and avoid punishment. When applied to domestic violence, this suggests abusers would only use violence toward an intimate partner when there are rewards for this behavior or the cost of violence does not outweigh the reward. Gelles and Straus (1988) note that social and family structures set the stage for family violence to occur. Some structures involved with reducing the cost, and to some extent increasing the rewards, are: “(1) the social attitudes concerning violence and, more specifically, family

violence; (2) the private nature of the modern household; and (3) the structural inequality that exists in the modern family.” (Gelles and Straus 1988:25).

The authors point out that societal attitudes may not support general violence, but society somewhat accepts the pervasiveness of violence. Additionally, society gives parents permission to use corporal punishment to discipline their children. The nature of family today is more private than it has been historically. The family is a much smaller unit, usually consisting of husband, wife, and one or two children living in one detached, single family home. This privacy tends to shield families from the public eye and even social controls. Gelles and Straus (1988) point to a couple types of inequality, one being physical strength and size, and the other being gender inequality. The authors found that mothers were much more likely to hit smaller children than older, larger children for fear of reciprocation. Additionally, they state men experience more social, legal, and economic privileges, both historically and presently. “The victims of violence in the home are disproportionately the smaller, the weaker, and the less powerful. Part of their weakness comes from hundreds of years of subordination and being treated as property” (Gelles and Straus 1988:32). They state that the greater the inequity of power in the family, the greater the risk of violence in the home and that

power, power confrontations, or perceived threats of dominance are at the heart of family violence. (Gelles and Straus 1988).

A study by Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) used a sample of heterosexual college students in dating relationships to examine physical and sexual abuse inflicted and sustained by both men and women. They looked at such factors as gender identity (masculine or feminine), witnessing parental violence or experiencing child abuse, seriousness of the relationship, self esteem, and acceptance of aggression.

The authors found no significant difference between sustaining (being victimized) and inflicting (perpetrating) physical abuse among men and women. Additionally, they found that men who were less masculine (more feminine) are more likely to be physically abusive. They found the same for women; the less masculine (more feminine) women are, the more likely she is to inflict abuse. This seems to refute the argument that masculinity leads to abuse since both men and women abusers hold less masculine gender identities. Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) believe that the notion men with more feminine gender identities abuse to “compensate” for their lack of masculinity is incorrect. Instead, they believe men and women with low masculine gender identities may be abusive due to emotional expressiveness associated with femininity.

Dobash and Dobash (2004) review domestic violence literature in terms of who tends to be the perpetrator and who tends to be the victim.

There is great contradiction among literature with some saying both men and women perpetrate violence equally (symmetry), while other social scientists report that men mainly tend to perpetrate intimate violence (asymmetry). The authors criticize Straus' Conflict Tactic Scale, which is a widely used instrument for measuring acts of abuse. They point out how an act of throwing a lamp at a partner is different from throwing a pillow, or attempting to hit someone and missing is different from actually hitting a partner although they may be categorized as the same act under the Conflict Tactic Scale. Additionally, usually only one commission of violence is necessary to be defined as violent. "This means that those who have perpetrated 'several violent acts' (no matter how serious) and those who have reported committing only one act (no matter how trivial) are both defined as 'violent'" (Dobash and Dobash 2004:330). Additionally, they believe that when investigating self reports of violence, it is best to utilize couples when possible, as each gives another view of the same incident.

The authors present findings of a study with 90 couples who were both interviewed about their own as well as their partner's violence. Dobash and Dobash (2004) take into account definitions of abuse, theoretical frameworks, forms of measurement, context of violence, as well as the consequences of violence. The authors suggest researchers who use the act-based measurement of the Conflict Tactic Scale, are

more likely to find symmetry between men's and women's violence. This can also be a result of examining the violence in the absence of context. From their couple study, Dobash and Dobash (2004) found that intimate partner violence is primarily asymmetrical with men being the perpetrators of violence toward women. Additionally, they found women's violence does not equate to men's in terms of frequency, severity, consequences, and the intended victim's perception of violence in terms of safety. (Dobash and Dobash (2004).

Johnson and Ferraro (2000) found that it is important to distinguish between types and contexts of violence as well as investigate interactions of power, control, and violence. While Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) found that women were just as violent as men, Dobash and Dobash (2004) found that intimate violence was perpetrated primarily by men. Dobash and Dobash point out that when researchers do not look at the context of violence, they will get very different results. Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) do not look at abuse in a context and therefore do not look at the context of violence to differentiate between "offensive" and "defensive" in inflicting and sustaining abuse. *Socialization and Domestic Violence*. Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer (1994) reviewed extensive literature and made a cohesive link between gender role socialization and the etiology and maintenance of domestic violence. They state "domestic violence is viewed as a direct result of the power

imbalance of men and women (Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer 1994:50).

Women are expected to care for the home (including husband and children) even if they maintain outside employment, are expected to serve and obey husbands, as well as have less decision-making power.

Feminists assert gender role socialization teaches males to be dominant while females learn to be subordinate; males are taught to be aggressive while females are taught to be nurturing. This gender role socialization affects men and women's intimate relationships in that men have greater power and dominance over their female partners. The authors state that men are also socialized to resolve conflict through violence including conflict in intimate relationships. The authors note that each individual internalizes and enacts traditional gender role norms differently and may specifically be affected by witnessing abuse, experiencing child abuse, or suffering from psychological disorders. For example, men incorporate messages about such things as power, entitlement, and aggression to varying degrees depending on factors of abuse and personality disorders. "Socialization lays the groundwork upon which these other experiences are built and interact" (Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer 1994: 51).

The authors go on to demonstrate how societal institutions such as family, school, and the media socialize children. They first point to research that suggests there are differences in parental responses to children based on their individual sex. Different responses range from

verbal acknowledgement, emotions encouraged (happiness versus anger expression), and reaction toward aggressive behavior. Furthermore, since females are the primary care provider, children learn that women will tend to their needs. "In addition, from the time they are able to talk, males learn that anger and its expression are appropriate components of their emotional repertoire, and that aggressive behavior receives attention" (Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer 1994: 52).

Additionally, children learn through modeled behavior, primarily the modeling of their parents' relationship and interaction with each other. Here, Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer (1994) cite various research on gender inequity in the division of household labor, power differential in decision making, and male-dominated conversation. They believe that children learn to accept male dominance as it is modeled through the various interactions from subtle (gender inequities) to overt (domestic violence).

The school system is another institution that socializes children. The authors note various research in which teachers, similarly to parents, treat and respond to children differently based on their sex. Teachers unknowingly reinforce and encourage gender-specific behavior by providing more praise for cognitive performance in boys, more criticism for misbehavior, and more instructions and encouragement to complete tasks independently (Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer 1994).

Peer groups are another institution that provides powerful messages about gender-appropriate dress, behavior, preferences, and abilities. The authors state that by the time children interact with each other, they have already internalized messages about appropriate gender-role behavior and enact them during play (Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer 1994). They pointed to research which examined children's strategies of dominance that showed groups of four- and five-year-old girls used verbal persuasion tactics to obtain a desired object, while boys used physical aggression and verbal commands. Then, when they intermixed the groups of children, they found the girls' tactics did not influence the boys, however, the boys' aggressive tactics worked to obtain the desired object. Even by age four, girls seem to be intimidated by male aggressiveness and submit (Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer 1994). This teaches children, from a very early age, that male aggression works.

Similarly to parents, teachers, and peers, the media, especially television, is a very powerful socializing agent. The authors point to research that demonstrates that children, as early as 14 months old, observe and mimic same-sex characters observed on television. This is staggering since the authors claim children's programming predominantly displays male dominance and female invisibility (Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer 1994). They also point to the fact that most children's characters conform to gender stereotypic behavior.

Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer (1994) purport that from birth, males and females are socialized into polarized gender-specific beings. "Males learn to assume a dominant role, with its concomitant attitudes and behavior. They are instructed, encouraged, and rewarded for being in control, aggressive, and ultimately 'entitled'" (1994:51). They believe these gender role behaviors are acted out in all parts of their social world, from work to home. Men's dominance is expressed to varying degrees from the more subtle conversation dominance to the overt coercive control through violence toward an intimate partner (Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer 1994).

Barrie Thorne (1990) is an ethnographer who observed elementary school children in regards to gender. She believes that the framework in which we analyze children's behavior should be a holistic method rather than an oppositional dichotomous one where children are looked at based on their gendered differences alone. Thorne concedes that there are some common gender differences. Boys' play groups are larger, more public in nature, and tend to partake in rougher, team sports oriented play. Girls, on the other hand, tend to play in groups of two or three in a more private setting and tend to participate in more turn-taking play with less physical conflict. Although there are many times when boys and girls play preferences and styles are differentiated, she also demonstrates times when there is relatively little, if any differences, especially when

examining the whole spectrum of boys and girls. There is much more common ground among the majority of children regardless of sex.

Additionally, Thorne criticizes the fact that existing theoretical frameworks on gender ignore the intermixed play that happens without a hint of gendered tension. Even though in school settings children will often segregate themselves, such as at lunch time, recess, and for desk assignments, there are also many more times when mixed gender interaction takes place with ease. She also points to neighborhood play that tends to include both sexes with a variety of age. Gender tends to be situational and more fluid than the traditional dichotomy suggests. "To grasp the fluctuating significance of gender in social life, we must examine encounters where gender seems largely irrelevant as well as those where it is symbolically and organizationally central" (Thorne 1990:108). She believes that broadening the view of significance from gender differentiated interaction only to encompass nondifferentiated interaction would greatly add to the theoretical framework to provide a fuller, richer understanding of gender (Thorne 1990). Further, Thorne believes that children are not simply socialized, but "girls and boys are granted agency in constructing culture and resisting it as well as in adapting to dominant ideologies" (Thorne 1990:112).

In a study by Simons, Lin, and Gordon (1998), the researchers tested intimate violence theories using panel data from 113 adolescent

males. One of the theories tested was socialization which posits that violence in a dating relationship is often thought to be a learned behavior based on the violence that one witnessed between his or her parents growing up. In addition, a child who is on the receiving end of severe corporal punishment may also have a greater propensity to be violent in dating relationships. Although the results have varied, studies have supported both of these hypotheses. The authors state that Straus and his colleagues believe that both harsh physical punishment and marital violence teach children that violence is legitimate and often necessary with loved ones. Exposure to family violence promotes attitudes that increase the probability one will grow up to behave aggressively toward a romantic partner (Simons, Lin, and Gordon 1998).

Simons, Lin, and Gordon (1998) argue that there is a distinction between witnessing domestic violence and experiencing child abuse. Violence directed from one spouse to another is generally met with some negative consequence such as, further violence, emotional outbursts or even hysteria. Corporal punishment, however, can be looked at as a normalization of violence as a means of behavioral control or modification. The authors state that while Straus and his colleagues believe that childhood exposure to both domestic violence and corporal punishment teaches the legitimization of violence toward loved ones, the authors believe corporal punishment alone teaches children to use

violence as an effective interpersonal strategy. "Children who experience corporal punishment, however, learn firsthand that violence changes behavior" (Simons, Lin, and Gordon 1998:475).

A study on intergenerational transmission of abuse by Dodge, Bates and Pettit (1990) establishes a relationship between a child being a victim of physical abuse by an adult and the development of violent behavior toward others by that child when he or she becomes an adult. The study found that children who were abused run the risk of developing chronic aggressive behavior. These children are likely to "develop biased and deficient patterns of processing social information, including a failure to attend to relevant cues, a bias to attribute hostile intentions to others, and a lack of competent behavioral strategies to solve interpersonal problems." The authors say this will lead these children to conceptualize the world in deviant ways that will later perpetuate the abuse.

Some of the concerns of Dodge, Bates, and Pettit (1990) are that in their research, they may be missing something that links being abused to being abusive. Since most studies on child abuse are done in conjunction with human services agencies, the authors sought to determine if other related factors, such as separation of the child from family, foster home placement, or labeling of child, might increase the propensity to be violent.

Alexander, Moore, and Alexander (1991) also explore intergenerational transmission of violence, but do so by looking at college men and women from a southern university who were in dating relationships for at least six months. Using survey research, the researchers found that witnessing violence between parents was not predictive of either abusing or being abused by a partner either physically or verbally. Further, being abused by one's mother was not predictive for men or women of either abusing or being abused. However, for men, being physically abused by their fathers was highly predictive for men to both abuse and be abused physically and verbally in dating relationships.

Another researcher interested in intergenerational transmission of violence reviewed a great number of studies on child abuse of at least three generations in the United States and the United Kingdom. Oliver (1993) found a great discrepancy in results of intergenerational transmission of child abuse with rates ranging from as low as under 10 percent to as high as 76 to 100 percent. Oliver (1993) argues that intergenerational abuse is consistently under rated in studies of intergenerational abuse for the following reasons:

- (1) Researchers don't want to over estimate the family's role in perpetuation of abuse when societal factors may be significant

(intrafamilial verses social or extrafamilial factors such as poverty, child extraction from home by social services and labeling family);

(2) The use of self-reported or self-recollected information about childhood and parents' abuse is not as accurate as case records from human services agencies because adults tend to romanticize their childhood. A study by Oliver, Cox, Taylor, and Baldwin (1974) found that mothers who abused had a greater likelihood of denial and falsely idealizing their own childhood. Parents presented an ideal or facade which bore little relation to reality. Children's later idealized versions of their own upbringing often led professional people to record accounts of false, nonviolent family histories (Oliver 1993); and

(3) Inadequate records by clinical, legal, and other agencies give researchers incomplete information and lead researchers to rely more heavily on self-recollected questionnaires which can be very inaccurate (as exemplified in number 2 above).

From his review of literature, Oliver (1993) concluded that the predictions of Wright and Lunn (1971) of intrafamilial rates were most accurate. Wright and Lunn predicted that intergenerational rates of perpetuating abuse were that one-third of children will continue the pattern, one-third will not, and the other one-third will be vulnerable to extrafamilial stresses and pressures for perpetuation of the cycle of violence.

Using data from the 1976 National Survey of Family Violence, Seltzer and Kalmuss (1988) examined the effects of childhood socialization and stress (or negative life events) for predicting spouse abuse. They found that childhood experiences of family violence (both witnessing domestic violence as well as being a victim of child abuse) have a greater impact on the likelihood to perpetrate domestic violence than either chronic or short-term life stresses.

Additionally, those who witnessed domestic violence in their early childhood were more likely to perpetrate domestic violence than those who had been victims of child abuse. The authors conceded that this association is not perfect since many abusers come from nonviolent homes as well as many nonabusers come from violent homes, and therefore offer socialization from other extrafamilial sources as a component to be further studied.

While Birns, Cascardi, and Meyer (1994) use previous literature on domestic violence to connect socialization to the cause of intimate partner violence, the literature on intergeneration transmission of violence appears to be somewhat mixed. Seltzer and Kalmuss (1988) found that previous childhood exposure to domestic violence was more of a predictor for abuse than life stresses.

Sex and Gender Roles. West and Zimmerman use the term “doing gender” to refer to an “accomplishment embedded in everyday

interaction" (1987:125). This involves the management of conduct that is assigned based on one's sex category. Men monitor their own and other's gendered behavior. They believe gender is, "an emergent feature of social situations: both as an outcome of and a rationale for various social arrangements and as a means of legitimating one of the most fundamental divisions of society" (West and Zimmerman 1987:126).

Glick and Fisk (1997) created a 22-item self-report survey, called the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, which both distinguish between and measure hostile and benevolent sexism. The authors define hostile sexism as negative and derogatory stereotypical views of women, whereas they define benevolent sexism as viewing women more positively (such as idealizing and romanticizing women or the idea that women need protecting), yet still being sexist. They surveyed well over 2,000 people and found "both forms of sexism [hostile and benevolent] serve to justify and maintain patriarchy and traditional gender roles" (Glick and Fisk 1997:119). However, they also stated that traditional roles, usually associated with sexism, are not only negative, but highly positive as well. An example of a negative attitude is "only men should work," but a more positive attitude is that "women are better caregivers" and are better suited to stay home with children. Another example is "women are sex objects," but a more positive attitude is that "a woman is necessary to make a man complete." Hostile sexist attitudes tend to see women as

inferior to men, however, benevolent sexist attitudes views women as better than men in certain traditional roles. Therefore, they concluded that traditional gender roles not only reflect negatively on women, but also show women positively and both go hand in hand (Glick and Fisk 1997).

Crossman, Stith, and Bender (1990) found a significant variance in batterers in relation to gender role attitudes depending on the classification of their violence as either "minor" or "severe." They found that men using violence classified as severe seemed to be less egalitarian (or more traditional). In this study of 115 participants, the results indicated attitudes supporting marital abuse and actual violence categorized as severe were both accurate predictors of traditional sex-role attitudes.

A study by Mintz and Mahalik (1996) surveyed 71 men in dual-career marriages using a 28-item scale called the Sex-Role Orientation Inventory. The Sex-Role Orientation Inventory measures gender role orientation pertaining to family life with respect to gender role conflict, measures of participation in childcare, and management of household. Mintz and Mahalik (1996) used gender role orientation and gender role conflict in an attempt to predict men's attitudes about their wives' roles as well as their own role in their family.

The men were categorized (traditional, participant, or role-sharing) according to the amount of their participation in the family related to

childcare and management of the household. Traditional men are men who do not participate in either childcare or household duties with the wives solely responsible for the home. Participant men are defined as men who share in parenting responsibilities, but their wives are still responsible for household duties and role-sharing men are actively involved in both parenting and housework.

In light of radical feminist theoretical perspective, the authors then hypothesized that role-sharing men would hold the least traditional gender role attitudes, followed by (in descending order) participant and then traditional. The results indicated the following: (1) role-sharing men were more likely to view their wives' interests as equal to their own than either traditional or participant; (2) role-sharing men had less traditional attitudes about husbands' authority than both participant and traditional men, and participant men had less traditional attitudes about husbands' authority than traditional; and (3) traditional husbands reported greater pressure to be successful, powerful, and competitive than both participant and role-sharing. However, all three categories of husbands were similar in (1) how they viewed their wives' roles, (2) their willingness to sacrifice traditional roles to accommodate their wives' interests, and (3) how much conflict they experienced between work and family roles. Mintz and Mahalik found that men's gender role attitudes

affected their actual gender roles enacted despite the need for dual participation within the family since both partners had careers.

There is a wide variance of results on how gender roles and gender role attitudes relate to domestic violence. Even with the variance of results, Glick and Fisk (1997) state there is a connection between traditional gender role attitudes and sexism and state that this serves to justify and maintain patriarchy. Crossman, Stith, and Bender (1990) found men who use severe abuse are less egalitarian and found that this was also associated with attitudes favoring abuse. This study relates well with the Mintz and Mahalik (1996) study which found that the more egalitarian roles a man holds, the less likely he is to abuse. Similarly, the more traditional roles a man holds, the more likely he is to abuse his wife, and the abuse tends to be more severe. This is in accordance with the belief we are socialized within a patriarchal system.

Personality. A self-reported scale, the Propensity for Abusiveness Scale, was created to assess men's tendency to batter a female partner in intimate relationships (Dutton 1995). The scale focuses on personality trait descriptions, anger expression, experiences of trauma, and individual's treatment by his parents. The Propensity for Abusiveness Scale correctly classified 82 percent of men into either high or low abusive categories as was reported by their female partners.

Hamberger and Hastings (1990) examined demographics and personality traits of batterers in two groups: one who completed a batterers treatment program and one who did not complete the treatment program. Respondents completed a questionnaire which included the Bem Sex-Role Inventory within the first four weeks of a 16-week treatment program. The findings showed that recidivists are more likely to abuse alcohol and drugs and to score significantly higher on the Gregarious Scale as well as the Narcissism Scale. The basis for administering the Bem Sex-Role Inventory was not given, nor were the results.

Personality assessments of male abusers were conducted using multiple scales. Seven of the eight forms of power and control tactics of the Minnesota Power and Control Wheel were significantly intercorrelated. This suggests that there is a "syndrome of abuse of power and control" (Dutton and Starzomski 1997:70). Moreover, significant correlations were found between the same seven forms of power and control tactics and psychopathology. Dutton and Starzomski (1997) recommended an integrated model using both social and psychopathological measures. "Of great assistance to this task would be the construction of a model of personality development which more appropriately deals with such sociological factors as gender roles and the experience of power in relationships" (Dutton and Starzomski 1997:79).

The literature connecting personality traits to domestic violence is mixed. Dutton's (1995) Propensity for Abusiveness Scale correctly classified 82 percent of men as to their degree of abusiveness while Hamberger and Hastings (1990) found that certain personality trait tests were successful in predicting recidivism. Dutton and Starzomski (1997) found significant findings using the Minnesota Power and Control Wheel and recommend constructing a sociological model of personality development that examines gender roles and experiences of power in relationships.

Masculinity. Even though masculinity scales have been considered more clinical or psychological, masculinity (and the masculinity scales) will be examined in more of a sociological sense because of its social construction (Connell 1987, Kimmel and Messner 1989; Lindsey 1994; Connell 1995). According to Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera (1990), there are two broad theoretical approaches to masculinity: trait and normative. Masculinity is viewed "not as a dimension of personality in the trait sense, but as an ideology, a set of beliefs and expectations about what men are. Masculinity ideology is assessed by measures of attitudes about the male gender role, i.e., beliefs about the importance of men adhering to culturally defined standards for male behavior" (Pleck, Sonenstein, and Ku 1993:15).

In 1974 Sandra Bem created the Bem Sex-Role Inventory which categorized individuals into four categories: androgynous (scoring high on both masculinity and femininity), undifferentiated (scoring low on both masculinity and femininity), feminine (scoring high on femininity and low on masculinity), and masculine (scoring high on masculinity and low on femininity). She used 20 stereotypically masculine personality characteristics, 20 stereotypically feminine characteristics, and 20 that serve as filler items (neither stereotypically masculine nor feminine) for a total of 60 traits. The inventory is based on the notion that a traditionally sex-typed person (one who holds traditional gender roles) is someone who uses cultural definitions of sex-appropriate behavior as the ideal standard for his or her behavior.

The results of a study by Sugarman and Frankel (1996) showed that battered women were more likely to be classified as having a traditional feminine gender identity than their nonabused counterparts. It also showed that abusive husbands were more likely to perceive use of violence in their marriage as acceptable than nonabusive husbands. Because men are taught and socially expected to be macho, strong, and dominant, using a radical feminist theoretical perspective, the study predicted that batterers would hold more traditional attitudes (attitudes that would legitimize men's dominance over women and support the use of violence in relationships). Also, men who batter would be more likely

than nonbatterers to be more stereotypically masculine. However, the study yielded these surprising results: (1) batterers were more likely to be classified as having undifferentiated gender identities than nonbatterers; and (2) battered women held more liberal gender role attitudes than did nonbattered women (Sugarman and Frankel 1996).

The traditional male in terms of trait has culturally defined masculinity characteristics, but in normative terms, is one who endorses the ideology that men should have these characteristics. Janet Spense, who co-authored the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (similar to the Bem Sex-Role Inventory), argues that the Personal Attributes Questionnaire and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory are measures of personality attributes that are not necessarily gender phenomena. "The Personal Attributes Questionnaire is a measure of instrumental and interpersonally expressive personality traits, which have been stereotypically associated with men and women, respectively." (Thompson, Pleck, and Ferrera 1990:575). Sandra Bem also argues that the Bem Sex-Role Inventory measures cognitive constructs derived from gender roles that individuals use to organize their perceptions of the social world. Connell (1987, 1995) suggests that not only is masculinity socially constructed, but there are several different masculinities. He contends that there is a hierarchy of masculinities and that hegemonic masculinity is the dominant form of masculinity for a particular group.

Messerschmidt (1993) states that there are deficiencies with the feminist perspectives and combines Marxist feminism and the work of R.W. Connell to offer what he calls "an improved framework." He categorizes the underlying relations between women and men into three social structures: the gendered division of labor (which also includes the division of gender, race, and class), gender relations of power, and sexuality. Further, social structures are both constituted by human agency and yet at the same time, are the very medium of this constitution. "In this sense, structure is not external to the agent nor is it simply and totally constraining. Rather structure is implicated in social action and social action is implicated in social structure so that structure both constrains and enables human actions" (Messerschmidt, 1993:77). Men and women simultaneously produce gendered divisions of labor through everyday interaction.

Messerschmidt (1993) states violence perpetrated in households by men is derived from their belief in domestic authority supported by traditional patriarchal expectations. He believes domestic violence is a resource for masculine construction within the patriarchal framework of household authority and control. He purports that domestic violence is a result not only of gendered inequality, but also from women's resistance to subordination. The abuser feels he has a legitimate right to punish his partner for inadequately fulfilling her domestic obligations and for any

challenge of his authority. He also points to the fact that the more traditionally divided gender roles, regardless of class or race, the greater the likelihood of abuse. Messerschmidt (1993) purports domestic violence is, "a specific practice designed with an eye to one's accountability as a 'real man' and, therefore, serves as a suitable resource for simultaneously accomplishing gender and affirming patriarchal masculinity" (1993:150).

Kimmel and Messner (2001) wrote *Men's Lives* in order to exemplify men's struggles, the multiple definitions of masculinity, as well as inequitable power relations. They believe definitions of masculinity and femininity as well as gender-appropriate roles reproduce inequitable power relations. They purport power dynamics are an important element of gender definitions as well as gender role enactment.

Kimmel and Messner (2001) point out the assumption of earlier research that there was only one definition of masculinity which was based on white, middle-aged, middle-classed, heterosexual gender beliefs. They say this definition, the dominant form of masculinity, is the definition in which all men in our society struggle to attain. They believe "men are not born: they are made and men make themselves, actively constructing their masculinities within a social and historical context" (Kimmel and Messner 2001:xv).

Philippe Bourgois says that marginalization in the United states has had grave consequences for how poor men 'do masculinity' as they take refuge in the underground economy and increase their levels of domestic and interpersonal violence" (Kimmel and Messner 2001:43).

R.W. Connell writes that hegemonic masculinity, the most honored or desired, does not need to be the most common form. "Many men live in a state of some tension with, or distance from, hegemonic masculinity; others 'such as sporting heroes' are taken as exemplars of hegemonic masculinity and are required to live up to it strenuously" (Kimmel and Messner 2001:57). Connell believes masculinities do not exist "prior to social interaction, but come into existence as people act. They are actively produced, using the resources and strategies in a given milieu" (Kimmel and Messner 2001:57).

Michael Kaufman states, "racism, sexism, and heterosexism has been institutionalism in our societies are socially regulated acts of violence" (Kimmel and Messner 2001:5). Kaufman states that masculinity is deeply embedded in men's identities, and the masculine norm is further dependent on class, race, religion, and environment. He explains that adolescence is filled with uncertainty in men's roles "the emotional pain created by excessive masculinity is stifled by reinforcing masculinity itself" (Kimmel and Messner 2001:7). He further explains that masculinity's fragility is due to this intangible nature. Kaufman

states, "it exists as ideology; it exists as scripted behavior; it exists within 'gendered' relationships. But in the end it is just a social institution with a tenuous relationship to that with which it is suppose to be synonymous: our maleness, our biological sex" (Kimmel and Messner 2001:7). Masculinity causes internal strife because it requires men to suppress their human needs, feelings, and expressiveness. This tension causes men to feel insecure about their maleness. Kaufman believes, "this insecurity exists because maleness is equated with masculinity; but the later is a figment of our collective, patriarchal, surplus-suppressive imaginations" (Kimmel and Messner 2001:7).

A review of current global research by Jewkes (2002) found that poverty is a key factor in violence against female partners in that it increases conflict, reduces women's power and challenges male identity (masculinity). Additionally, violent relationships tend to have greater conflict about "women's transgressions of conservative gender roles or challenges to male privilege, as well as matters of finance" (Jewkes, 2002:1425). Jewkes cited Gelles' (1974) theory that poverty challenges men's masculine identity because they are unable to reach the social expectations of masculine ideals of success. When this happens, masculine ideology is reshaped to promote misogyny, crime, and substance abuse (Bourgois 1996a, 1996b). Violence toward women they can no longer control nor financially support becomes a social norm.

Furthermore, children who grow up in abusive homes think of violence as normal. The author states that in these homes, “men learn to use violence and women learn to tolerate it” (Jewkes, 2002:1426). Jewkes further points to cross-cultural studies that purport domestic violence is more prevalent in societies where violence in situations of conflict and political struggles are the norm (Levinson 1989).

According to many of the writers on masculinity, socialization within a patriarchal society leads men to use violence against women, as well as against each other in order to reinforce masculinity itself. Therefore, a high masculine gender identity, as well as traditional gender role attitudes should be common in batterers. The Male Role Norm Scale (Thompson and Pleck 1986) as well a gender role attitudes scale constructed specifically for this thesis will be used to measure gender role attitudes. Since Kimmel and Messner (2001) and Jewkes (2002) suggest that gender role transgressions (or gender role conflict), gender role attitudes will be compared to the actual gender roles performed to measure gender role conflict. The Bem Sex-Role Inventory will be used to measure gender orientation or levels of masculinity. These scales will be used to determine differences between abusers and nonabusers.

Hypotheses

The goal of this study is to determine whether a causal relationship exists between hegemonic masculinity and a propensity toward partner

abuse. A questionnaire was administered to batterers and nonbatterers in the hope of differentiating between the two groups. The questionnaire included some basic demographics, a masculinity and femininity scale (Bem Sex-Role Inventory), a gender role attitudinal scale, a gender role actual scale, and a gender role assessment scale (Male Role Norm Scale). The purpose of this research is to find some commonality in the ideology of batterers (i.e. degrees of masculinity, gender role attitudes, and gender role conflict). If it can be accomplished, then efforts can be made to reshape and redefine that ideology in society as a whole, particularly in batterer's treatment programs.

Under the assumption that the masculinity writers (Connell, Kaufman, Kimmel, Messner, and Messerschmidt) and feminist theorists are valid and boys are socialized to become tough, masculine men who hold rigid, stereotypic gender roles, a hypothesis may be drawn that a positive correlation exists between masculinity and domestic violence. The expectation was to find: (H1) men who batter their female partners will hold more stereotypically traditional attitudes than nonbatterers; (H2) men who batter their female partners will display higher levels of masculinity on the masculinity/femininity scales than men who do not; and (H3) men who batter their female partners will display a discrepancy between their gender role attitudes and gender role behavior, particularly

if the gender role attitude is more traditional than the gender role behavior.

Do men who have been abusive score higher on a masculinity scale than men who are not? The greater implication of this research question is that men who batter vigorously ascribe to an idealized hyper-masculinity and traditional gender roles in order to compensate for some inadequacy related to masculinity. If this were the case, then definitions of masculinity could be redefined to be more androgynous. Some examples of stereotypic masculine personality traits as defined by the Bem Sex-Role Inventory include the following: leader, assertive, and dominant. The terms battering and abuse refer to physical violence such as pushing, hitting, slapping, punching, choking, grabbing, raping, or beating of a female by a male intimate partner. Additionally, the expectation is that men who hold more traditional gender role attitudes will be more likely to batter their female partners than men with less traditional gender role attitudes. The term gender role refers to behaviors, actions or duties deemed appropriate according to maleness or femaleness. An example of traditional gender role attitudes would be the opinion that it is the man's job to financially support the family and fulfill the role of decision maker while it is the woman's task to fulfill the role as the caretaker of the home and family.

The independent variable for the first hypothesis is level of masculinity, and the dependent variable is the likelihood a man will batter his female partner. For the second hypothesis, the independent variable is the level of traditional gender role attitudes, and the dependent variable is the likelihood a man will batter his female partner. Finally, for the third hypothesis, the independent variable is the level of discrepancy between gender role attitudes and gender role behavior, and the dependent variable is the likelihood a man will batter his female partner.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Sample

There were two samples of batterers; one was men who had been arrested for domestic violence and court-ordered to complete a 52-week batterer's treatment program and one from the general population. These two groups of batterers were combined into one larger group. Coordinating with the batterer's treatment program STAND Against Domestic Violence in Concord, California, the goal was to obtain at least 30 male first-time clients to participate in this survey research. As men were interviewed to enter the domestic violence treatment program, they were given a flyer with information about participating in the study. Those who were interested scheduled an appointment for a one-on-one informational session regarding anger management techniques as well as information about obtaining healthy boundaries. The individual session counted as one of 52 sessions required for completion of the program. The questionnaire was given before the men completed five group sessions in the program in order to accurately measure levels of masculinity and attitudes before the program had an influence on their attitudes. The population of nonbatterers was men who had never abused their female partner. Nonprobability sampling was employed to target specific neighborhoods in an attempt to simulate the batterers

treatment program population as closely as possible for ethnicity, socioeconomic status and education. A grocery store in a strip mall was chosen in a nearby neighborhood as well as an electronics store located in a strip mall of a different neighborhood. Those who volunteered to complete the questionnaire from the general population were offered a two-liter bottle of soda.

Instrument and Administration

After receiving approval from the Human Subjects Review Board for the study, the questionnaire was then administered to respondents. Before administering the survey, a statement was read aloud which appears at the top of the questionnaire (see script in Appendix A). Respondents were asked to sign a consent form before beginning the questionnaire. Participation in this study was voluntary and respondents were guaranteed anonymity since they were instructed to not write their names on the questionnaires (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 1996:88). The respondents were given a clipboard with a questionnaire with a lead pencil in order to ensure all questionnaires were similar with no distinguishing features (e.g. blue ink pen or red pencil). When finished, respondents were instructed to put their completed questionnaire into an envelope which contained other completed surveys. When approximately 35 questionnaires had been completed, they were reviewed for proper completion of each section.

Those questionnaires that were missing whole sections or key demographic information were disqualified from the study.

The questionnaire (See Appendix B) consisted of five different sections totaling 65 questions. The first section (questions 1-24) used the Bem Sex-Role Inventory in order to measure respondents' gender identity from masculine to feminine. The second section (questions 25-36) measured respondents' gender role attitudes toward household division of labor while the third section (questions 37-48) used the same statements to measure actual gender role enactment of household chores. The fourth section (questions 49-59) used the Male Role Norms Scale to measure respondents' attitudes about appropriate gender roles and acceptable behaviors for men. The fifth and final section (questions 60-65) of the questionnaire consisted of demographics and abuse inventory.

Variables

The independent variable for hypothesis H1 was level of traditional gender role or gender role attitudes which was measured by the Male Role Norm Scale (questions 49-59). Men were asked to rate to what extent they would agree or disagree with each statement. The statements ask about attitudes regarding traditional gender roles. This was also measured by the attitudes toward division of household labor by appropriate gender role expectations (questions 25-36) and actual

gender roles performed (questions 37-48). Questions 25 and 37 asked about husbands' preferences for women and what actually happens in regards to women's outside employment. The response categories were, "stay at home," "work part-time," and "work full-time."

The other questions asked about household division of labor with response categories of, "only men," "mostly men," "equally," "mostly women," and "only women." Response categories were scored 1 for "only women" (feminine) through 5 for "only men" (masculine) with men receiving the higher score of 5 for traditionally masculine gender role items such as maintaining cars or taking out the trash. Likewise, reverse scoring was used for traditionally feminine gender roles such as grocery shopping or washing dishes with "only women" receiving a higher score of 5 for being more traditional (gender appropriate roles as either masculine or feminine). Again, in order to measure the overall sections, the responses to each question were totaled and divided by the number of questions in the section to derive the average male role norms score, the average gender role attitude score, and the average actual gender role performed score for each respondent.

The independent variable for hypothesis H2 was level of masculinity. The independent variable was operationalized by using 24 traits from the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. The questionnaire (Appendix B) asked men to rate their masculinity traits or ideologies (questions 1-24)

such as “affectionate” (feminine) and “defend my own beliefs” (masculine). For publication of this paper however, I was only allowed to list five of the 24 items used due to stipulations made by the copy write holder. The response categories for men to rate their masculinity traits were “never” through “always.” Traditionally masculine traits were scored 1 through 5 with 1 meaning never true, 2 meaning rarely true, 3 meaning sometimes true, 4 meaning usually true, and 5 meaning always true. The higher score of 5 is always associated with the more “masculine” response. Similarly, for the more traditionally feminine traits such as affectionate, 1 is scored to mean always affectionate (less masculine, more feminine) and 5 is scored to mean never affectionate (more masculine, less feminine). Then, in order to measure the overall masculinity section, the responses to each question were totaled and divided by the number of questions to obtain the average masculinity score for each respondent.

And finally, the independent variable for the hypothesis H3 was level of conflict between gender role attitudes and actual gender roles or division of household labor. This was measured by taking gender role attitudes (questions 25-36) and comparing it or subtracting it from actual gender roles (questions 37-48). Additionally, the gender role attitude average score was taken and subtracted from the actual gender role average to get the gender role conflict average score.

The dependent variable for all three hypotheses was the likelihood of a man to batter his female partner. Batterers (men who have abused their female partners) were collected from a batterers treatment program and from the general public and nonbatterers (ideally men who had never abused their intimate partner) were collected from the general public and were screened for enrollment in a batterer's treatment program. Any questionnaire that did not have abuse checked was discarded from the batterers treatment program set. Likewise, any questionnaire from the general public that had not checked any abuse was put in the nonabusive set while those that had checked any abuse was placed in the abusive set and combined with those that had enrolled in a treatment program.

Measurement was then taken by asking questions 64 and 65 respectively, "Have you ever enrolled in a batterers treatment program" and "Have you ever done the following to a dating or married partner: (Please use the following scale listed below and write the corresponding number in the blank). Due to the sensitive nature of this question, the abuse inventory was placed at the end of the questionnaire since respondents would be more likely to complete the questionnaire. The response categories were "slapped," "punched," "destroyed your possessions," "kicked," "pushed," "used a weapon (gun, knife, etc.)," "hit with object," "choked," and "restrained her." The men were asked to rate

how often these incidents occurred per to the following scale: "1=never," "2=once," "3=once a year," "4=twice a year," "5=once in 3 months," "6=once a month," "7=twice a month," "8=once a week," "9=twice a week," "10=daily," and "11=other" (which had a space to specify). They were additionally asked to write the number which corresponded with how often in the blank in front of each incident. The abuse inventory was ranked for severity by San Jose State University students in a sociology introduction to methods course. Students ranked the items in ascending order of severity. The items were then given a score with one being the least severe through nine being the most severe. Each item (e.g. slapped) was then totaled and ranked from the lowest score to the highest. The consensus from the students was that "destroyed her possessions" was the least serious followed by "restrained her," "pushed," "slapped," "kicked," "punched," "hit with object," "choked," to the most serious "used a weapon (gun, knife, etc.)." The respondents' self reported frequency was then multiplied by the severity ranking to come up with a weighted value for each item. The items were then totaled to come up with the degree of severity for each respondent.

Four demographic variables were also taken into consideration: race, age, income level, and education level. These variables were operationalized by asking open-ended questions such as the following: "What is your race/ethnicity?" (question 60), "What is your age?"

(question 61), "Over the last 2-3 years, what has been your approximate individual income per year (before taxes)?" (question 62), and "What was your highest year in school or degree you completed?" (question 63).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

This section will examine the general demographics of the sample, as well as the results of the data analysis in relation to the hypotheses. Both bivariate and multivariate logistic regression were used as modes of analysis since the dependent variable was categorical with only two categories (i.e. abusive and nonabusive). Bivariate logistic regression was employed to check individual relationships, and multivariate logistic regression was applied to take into consideration the influence of all the independent variables. With multivariate analysis one is able to control for the influence of potentially spurious factors when analyzing relationships (Sweet 1999).

Additionally, Spearman's rho was used to examine the relationship between the degree of battering and the major independent variables as well as the demographic variables. Spearman's rho, sometimes called Spearman's rank correlation is used to measure the strength of a relationship between two variables that is either increasing or decreasing because it is based on a ranked order. When items are ranked, Spearman's rho can measure the strength of an association by minimizing the influence of the extreme values (Elliott and Woodward 2007). The values for Spearman's rho used to measure the strength of the relationship ranges from -1 to 1. The closer the value is to either -1

or 1, the stronger the relationship while the closer the value is to 0, the weaker the relationship. Generally a score from 0 to .2 is weak, .3 to .5 is moderate and .5 to 1 is strong.

The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows was used to calculate the outcomes. The logistic regression coefficients for the tables as listed in the “B” column indicate the direction of the relationship between the chosen independent variable and the dependent variable (i.e. the likelihood of having been abusive). The “Exp(B)” score is the odds ratio which indicates a change in odds of occurrence for each one-unit increase in the independent variable (Sweet 1999). The “Sig” value states the level of significance regarding the direction and the strength of the relationship indicated by B and Exp(B). The direction and strength of the relationship are only statistically significant if the level of significance is less than .05. If the significance level is greater than .05, it indicates the observed direction and strength of the relationship are as likely to be due to chance, and no further interpretation is necessary. However, if the regression coefficients are statistically significant, then one may use the coefficients to make predictions using probabilities.

Demographics

The total sample contained 61 abusers and 32 nonabusers generating a sample size of 93 men. The demographics of interest for

this study were age, race, income, and education. Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation for age, income, and education.

Table 1. Demographics of Respondents

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Age	19	56	33.41	10.52
Income	0	200,000	45,441	38,510
Education	9	20	13.38	2.62

The age of the men ranged from 19 to 56 with the average age being 33 years old (as stated in Table 1). Although the results were not statistically significant, bivariate analysis using logistic regression showed a negative relationship between age and abuse (as displayed in Table 2) in that the older a respondent was, the less likely he was to have been abusive. The range of income for the sample was no reported income to \$200,000 with the average income being \$45,441 (as stated in Table 1). Like age, bivariate analysis of income and abuse was calculated and displayed a positive, although not statistically significant, relationship as displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. Bivariate Coefficients for Abuse and Individual Demographics

Variable	B	Exp(B)	Sig
Race	-.0711	.9314	.6003
Constant	.7807	-----	-----
Age	-.0155	.9846	.4547
Constant	1.1673	-----	-----
Income	.000004	1.0000	.4278
Constant	.4317	-----	-----
Education	-.4163	.6595	.0005**
Constant	6.3440	-----	-----

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Education was measured in highest year completed in school and ranged from grades 9 to 20 (i.e. freshman in high school to post doctoral) as displayed in Table 1. As Table 2 illustrates, education and abuse indicate a negative relationship using logistic regression in that the higher the level of education, the lesser the likelihood a man has been abusive. Each one-unit increase in education reduced the odds of being abusive by 34 percent. Because Exp(B) is less than one, the odds of being abusive decreased .6595 for each one-unit increase in education. This means a man with an 11th grade education was .6595 times as likely to be abusive than a man with a 10th grade education and a man with a 10th grade education was .6595 times as likely to be abusive than a man with a 9th grade education.

Then, taking the log-odds and converting it to probabilities, one can predict that a man with a 9th grade education has a .93 probability of having been abusive compared to a high school graduate who has a .79

probability of having been abusive as shown in Table 3. Similarly, a man with a college degree has a probability of .42 of having been abusive compared to a .12 probability of a man with a post doctoral degree having been abusive. This model was significant using chi-square at a level of .0001, and therefore it can be concluded this is a useful model and unlikely to be due to chance.

Table 3. Covariates for Predicting Education

Level of Education	Probability
Freshman in High School	.93
High School Degree	.79
Two Years of College	.63
College Degree	.42
Master's Degree	.24
Post Doctoral Degree	.12
Model is significant at .0001	

There were nine categories for race: white, black, Hispanic, Asian, Filipino, Native American, Creole, Indian & other. When race was analyzed using bivariate logistic regression, it showed a negative relationship, but was not statistically significant as displayed in Table 3. Table 4 displays the frequencies and since 59.1 percent of the sample was white, race was condensed into two categories: "white" coded as 1 and "other" coded as 2.

Table 4. Race of Respondents

Race	Frequencies	Percent
white	55	59.1
black	13	14.0
Hispanic	10	10.8
Asian	5	5.4
Filipino	1	1.1
Native American	4	4.3
Creole	1	1.1
Indian	1	1.1
Other	3	3.2
Total	93	100.0

After the bivariate analysis was completed, multivariate logistic regression was employed to analyze the relationship of abuse to all the demographic variables, using race recoded into two values. Because all of the variables were being compared against each other, multivariate logistic regression gave a more accurate analysis (Sweet 1999). Table 5 illustrates that education remained statistically significant, however, income now became statistically significant when controlling for the influence of the other variables. Education and abuse indicated a negative relationship using logistic regression in that the higher the level of education, the lesser the likelihood a man has been abusive. Each one-unit increase in education decreased the odds of being abusive by a factor of .5897. Income displayed a positive relationship in that the higher the income, the higher the likelihood a man has been abusive. Each one-unit increase in income increases the likelihood of having been

abusive by a factor of 1.0. Although domestic violence cuts across socioeconomic lines, previous research reports abuse tends to occur more often in the lower socioeconomic groups (Jewkes 2002; Smith 1990).

Table 5. Multivariate Logistic Regression Coefficients for Demographic Variables

Variable	B	Exp(B)	Sig
Education	-.5281	.5897	.0001**
Income	.00001	1.0000	.0414*
Age	-.0057	.9943	.8150
Race Recoded(1)	-.2001	.8187	.6948
Constant	7.3649	-----	-----

The model is statistically significant at .0002*

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Then, using the relationship between odds and probabilities, as done similarly with the bivariate analysis with education, the predicted probabilities were calculated. The most common value was inserted for race (i.e. white), the mean value of age (i.e. 33), and then the chosen education and income values were inserted into the equation. From this, the prediction can be made that a man with a low education (using 9th grade education value) and a high income (\$100,000) has a .99 probability of having been abusive. A respondent with the average education (13) of one year of college with the average income (\$45,441) has a .76 probability of having been abusive compared to a graduate

degree holder who has a .10 probability of having been abusive. This model was significant using chi-square at a level of .0002.

Major Independent Variables

This section discusses the major independent variables that were used to evaluate the hypotheses. Hypothesis H1 was that men who batter their female partners will hold more stereotypically traditional attitudes than nonbatterers. This was tested using the Male Role Norm Scale section and the gender role attitude section. Hypothesis H2 was that men who batter their female partners will display higher levels of masculinity than nonbatterers. This was tested using the masculinity section (Bem Sex-Role Inventory) of the survey. Hypothesis H3 was that men who batter their female partners will display a discrepancy between their gender role attitudes and gender role behavior, particularly if the gender role attitude is more traditional than the gender role behavior. This was tested using the gender role conflict section.

In order to assess overall sections, an average score for each section of the questionnaire was derived. To achieve this, the responses (ranging from 1 to 5) for a particular respondent were summed and divided by the number of questions in that section. Bivariate analysis of average masculinity and abuse, as stated in Table 6, displayed a positive relationship between masculinity and abuse. This indicated the higher average masculine score a man has, the greater the likelihood he has

been abusive. Although the second hypothesis was not supported, as it was not statistically significant at a level of .6351, the overall direction was as predicted.

Table 6. Logistic Regression Coefficients for Each Section

Variable	B	Exp(B)	Sig
Average Masculinity	.4530	1.5729	.4963
Constant	-.6267	-----	-----
Gender Role Attitudes Average	1.9836	7.2687	.0174*
Constant	-6.0013	-----	-----
Actual Gender Role Average	1.4750	4.3710	.0231*
Constant	-4.4593	-----	-----
Male Role Norm Scale Average	-.1891	.8277	.5763
Constant	1.1125	-----	-----
Gender Role Conflict Average	-.3211	.7254	.5436
Constant	-.6054	-----	-----

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

In order to test hypothesis H1, bivariate analysis of gender role attitudes average and abuse was utilized. This indicated a positive relationship in that the more traditional gender role attitudes a man holds, the greater the likelihood he has been abusive. The Exp(B) score, as shown in Table 6, is the odds ratio of 7.2687 which means a man holding more traditional gender role attitudes is 7 times as likely to have been abusive. Each one-unit increase in the average gender role attitudes score increased the odds of being abusive by 7.2687. Hypothesis H1 was supported by these finding, and the results were statistically significant at .0174.

Then, when the log-odds were converted to probabilities, it could be predicted that a man with a highly traditional average gender role attitudes score of 5 has a .98 probability of having been abusive compared to a man with nontraditional gender role attitudes average score of 1 who has a .02 probability of having been abusive as shown in Table 7. The results were significant using chi-square at a level of .0094, and therefore one can conclude it is a useful model.

Table 7. Covariates for Predicting Gender Role Attitudes and Abuse

Gender Role Attitudes Average	Probability
5 – Highly Traditional	.98
4 – Moderately Traditional	.87
3 – Egalitarian	.49
2 – Moderately Nontraditional	.12
1 – Highly Nontraditional	.02
Model is significant at .0094	

Although there was no initial hypothesis with respect to actual gender roles performed since this variable was created in order to calculate gender role conflict, actual gender role average and abuse was analyzed using bivariate logistic regression. The results yielded a positive relationship with a B score of 1.4750. This reveals the more traditional gender roles performed, the greater the likelihood a man has been abusive. The Exp(B) score of 4.3710 which signifies men performing more traditional gender roles in the home are more than four times as likely to have been abusive. For each one-unit increase in the

average score of actual gender roles held, the odds of being abusive increased by 4.3710. Actual gender roles performed were found to be statistically significant at .0231.

Again, using the log-odds score to predict probability, a man with a highly traditional actual gender roles performed score of 5 has a .95 probability of having been abusive compared to a man with a highly nontraditional actual gender role performed score of 1 who has a .01 probability of having been abusive as shown in Table 8. This model is significant using chi-square at a level of .0162, and therefore it can be concluded this is a useful model.

Table 8. Covariates for Predicting Actual Gender Role and Abuse

Actual Gender Role Average	Probability
5 – Highly Traditional	.95
4 – Moderately Traditional	.81
3 – Egalitarian	.49
2 – Moderately Nontraditional	.18
1 – Highly Nontraditional	.05
Model is significant at .0162	

Likewise, average Male Role Norm Scale and abuse were analyzed using logistic regression in order to test hypothesis H1 which states that men who batter their partners will be more likely to hold stereotypically traditional gender roles. The B value, as shown in Table 6, demonstrates a negative relationship between the Male Role Norm Scale and abuse which suggests the higher, more traditionally masculine score on the

Male Role Norm Scale, the lesser the likelihood a man has been abusive. This was contradictory to hypothesis H1 but was not found to be statistically significant at a level of .5763, and therefore is as likely to be due to chance.

As stated earlier in the method section, gender role conflict was a created variable produced by taking the gender role attitudes average score for each respondent and subtracting from it the actual gender role average score. Bivariate analysis was then used to test hypothesis H3 which stated the greater the conflict between actual gender roles and gender role attitudes, the greater the likelihood a man is to be abusive. The results demonstrated a negative relationship between gender role conflict score and abuse as displayed in Table 6. This implies the higher the conflict score, the lesser the likelihood he has been abusive which is contradictory to the hypothesis. However, this was not found to be statistically significant at a level of .6758 and is just as likely to be due to chance.

Comparing the major variables against one another using multivariate analysis as shown in Table 9 gives a more accurate analysis because it controls for the influence of the other variables. Using multivariate analysis, neither gender role attitudes or gender role actual were found to be statistically significant. However, the male role norms scale was now found to be statistically significant at .0348. This

displayed a negative relationship in that the more traditionally masculine gender role attitudes one held, the less likely a man had been abusive.

Table 9. Multivariate Logistic Regression Coefficients for Major Independent Variables

Variable	B	Exp(B)	Sig
Masculinity Average	.3817	1.4647	.6083
Gender Role Attitude Average	2.9678	19.4499	.0991
Actual Gender Role Average	.3042	1.3555	.8441
Male Role Norms Average	-.9177	.5499	.0348*
Gender Role Conflict Average	-.7471	.4738	.5971
Constant	-9.2358	-----	.0104*

Model is significant at .0201 using chi-square

* $p < .05$

Again, since comparing the major variables against one another gives a more accurate analysis, multivariate analysis was used to analyze all the major variables (demographic and independent variables) as displayed in Table 10. Similarly to the multivariate analysis of the major independent variable, neither gender role attitudes nor gender role actual was found to be statistically significant. Education was the only major variable that was now found to be statistically significant at .0007. This displayed a negative relationship in that the higher education one had, the less likely a man had been abusive.

Table 10. Multivariate Logistic Regression Coefficients for Major Variables

Variable	B	Exp(B)	Sig
Race	-.0048	.9952	.9812
Age	.0008	.9992	.9773
Income	.0000	1.000	.3824
Education	-.5303	.5884	.0007**
Masculinity Average	1.0889	2.9709	.2395
Gender Role Attitude Average	2.5381	12.6557	.4404
Actual Gender Role Average	.2849	1.3296	.9260
Male Role Norms Average	-.8464	.4289	.0959
Gender Role Conflict Average	-1.1384	.3203	.7076
Constant	-2.9750	-----	.5157

Model is significant at .0004 using chi-square

* $p < .05$ * $p < .01$

Degree of Battering

Spearman's rho was then used to examine the relationship between degree of abusiveness and the major independent variables. Hypothesis H1 states that men who batter will hold more stereotypically traditional attitudes than nonbatterers. This can further be extrapolated that the more stereotypically traditional gender role attitudes a man holds, the more frequent and severe the abuse. As explained in the methods section, the abuse inventory was then ranked for degree of severity or degree of abuse. Spearman's rho was employed to examine the relationship of gender role attitudes average and degree of abuse. Spearman's rho was .264 (as displayed in Table 11) which demonstrates a weak to moderate relationship in that the more traditionally masculine gender roles attitudes held, the greater the degree of abuse committed.

Hypothesis H1 was then supported and was significant at .005 as displayed in Table 11.

Table 11. Spearman's Rho with Degree of Abuse

Variable	Correlation	Significance
Masculinity Average	.053	.305
Gender Role Attitude Average	.264	.005**
Actual Gender Role Average	.193	.032*
Male Role Norms Average	-.020	.425
Gender Role Conflict Average	-.029	.393

Significance (1-tailed test)

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

To further test Hypothesis H1, Spearman's correlation was used to examine the relationship between male role norms average and degree of abuse. Spearman's rho was -.020 (shown in Table 11) which demonstrates a weak relationship between male role norms and degree of abuse. However, this was not statistically significant at a level of .425 as displayed in Table 11.

Spearman's correlation was then used to test Hypothesis H2 which states that men who batter will display higher levels of masculinity than nonbatterers. This can further be expanded that the more stereotypically masculine a man is, the greater degree of abuse will have been committed. Spearman's rho was employed to examine the relationship of masculinity average and degree of abuse. Spearman's rho was .053 (as displayed in Table 11) which demonstrates a weak relationship in that

the higher the level of masculinity, the greater the degree of abuse committed. Although the results were not statistically significant as displayed in Table 11, it was in the direction hypothesized.

Hypothesis H3 states that men who batter will display a discrepancy between their gender role attitudes and gender role behavior, particularly if the gender role attitudes are more traditional than the gender role behavior. Further, those with greater gender role conflict between traditional gender role attitudes and less traditional gender roles performed will tend to abuse with greater severity and frequency.

Spearman's rho was employed to examine the relationship of gender role conflict average and degree of abuse. Spearman's rho was .019 (as displayed in Table 11) which demonstrates a weak relationship in that the higher the level of conflict, the greater the degree of abuse committed. Although the results were not statistically significant as displayed in Table 11, it was in the direction hypothesized.

Summary

The first hypothesis, H1, was tested using the Male Role Norm Scale section and the gender role attitude section. The Male Role Norm Scale average was not statistically significant and therefore did not confirm the hypothesis that batterers will hold more stereotypically traditional gender role attitudes. However, the gender role attitudes

average was statistically significant in the bivariate logistic regression analysis as well as with Spearman's rho used for degree of abuse.

Hypothesis H2 was tested by using the masculinity section. The masculinity average was not statistically significant and therefore was not able to confirm the hypothesis that men who batter will have more masculine characteristics than nonbatterers. Hypothesis H3 that batterers will display a discrepancy between their gender role attitudes and gender role behavior was tested using the gender role conflict section. Gender role conflict was not statistically significant and therefore was not able to confirm the hypothesis.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Key Findings

This study examined how the level of masculinity, gender role attitudes men hold, as well as gender role conflict might impact their propensity toward domestic violence. In light of socialization theory, a positive correlation was predicted between abuse and high levels of masculinity, high levels of gender role conflict, and traditional gender roles.

The first hypothesis (H1) was that men who batter their female partners will hold more stereotypically traditional gender attitudes than nonbatterers. Both the Male Role Norm Scale and the gender role attitudes average supported this hypothesis, however, only the latter was statistically significant. The second hypothesis (H2) was that men who batter their female partners will have more masculine characteristics than nonbatterers. This hypothesis was generally supported, however, the overall results were not statistically significant. The third hypothesis (H3) was that men who batter their female partners will display a discrepancy between their gender role attitude and gender role behavior, particularly if the gender role attitude is more traditional than the gender role behavior. This was not supported by the gender role conflict variable.

Both masculinity and traditional gender role attitudes had a positive correlation with abuse as predicted in the hypotheses. This bolsters both patriarchy and socialization theory given that masculinity and gender roles are social constructs, learned and not innate (Basow 1992; Wharton 2005; Money, Hampson, and Hampson 1955; Neilson 1978). Boys who see the advantages of patriarchal society modeled by traditional gender roles expect girls to be submissive. If girls are not submissive as anticipated by their traditional gender role expectations, then boys may feel entitled to use violence, or the threat of violence, in order to maintain their beneficial traditional roles (Smith 1990; Sugarman and Frankel 1993; Collins and Coltrane 1995).

Some statistically significant correlations were uncovered during the course of research that was unrelated to the hypotheses. With respect to gender roles performed, the overall average showed men who fulfilled more traditional gender roles in their households were more likely to have a history of abuse. This is corroborated by literature on socialization, masculinity, and patriarchy.

In addition, there was a statistically significant correlation between lack of education and the likelihood to batter. While statistically significant, this point was of lesser interest as it has been borne out in previous studies. Even though domestic violence is found at every socioeconomic level, men with lower socioeconomic status and less

education are more likely to batter their wives (Smith 1990). However, after the multivariate analysis was run of all the major variables with the demographic variables and the results showed only education was statistically significant, education now appeared to be an important predictor of abuse. The relationships of gender role attitudes and gender role actual with abuse may be spurious in that those who hold more traditional gender role attitudes and enact traditional gender roles may actually be a result of having lower education. Given the link between education and income, this notion may be supported by findings stated earlier in the literature review that lower socioeconomic status children tend to form their gender identities earlier and conform more closely to gender stereotypes than their middle class counterparts (Mussen 1969).

Further, when income and abuse were analyzed alone, income was not statistically significant. However, when all the demographics were analyzed using multivariate analysis, income was now statistically significant with surprising results. Since education and income are thought to be somewhat linked, income is conventionally believed to have a negative relationship to abuse (Jewkes 2002; Smith 1990). However, the results of the study indicated a positive relationship in that the greater income, the greater the likelihood one has been abusive. This could be a result of nonprobability sampling or even might be a phenomenon specific to the San Francisco Bay area. Blue collar workers

such as truck drivers, sanitation workers, taxi drivers, policemen, etc., may earn higher salaries than average white collar workers.

Traditionally, white collar workers are more highly educated, but may not receive commensurate pay. Additionally, perhaps due to the high cost of housing specific to this area, workers in the construction industry, such as plumbers, electricians, and general contractors might earn a greater income than average white collar workers. Other industries specific to the Bay Area, such as computer and oil, may pay more money than average white collar fields without the need for a great deal of education.

Limitations

Since probability sampling is both time consuming and cost prohibitive, especially for students, it was not employed. With consideration of both time and money, a small sample employing nonprobability sampling was chosen. Since nonprobability sampling was used, the sample is not representative of the general population (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 1996:113). Although this study cannot be used to make inferences about the general public, it still offers many important insights on domestic violence.

Additionally, because respondents tend to provide socially desirable responses, especially regarding potentially embarrassing questions, the assumption was made that those who had been abusive

would either not offer to complete the survey in a public setting or not answer the abuse questions truthfully. (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias 1996:265). For this reason, collaboration was sought with the batterers treatment program of Stand Against Domestic Violence.

Although the overall acquisition of the 93 completed questionnaires was slow and took close to a full year, respondents who completed the survey in public did admit to having committed abuse. The assumption of social desirability in this case turned out to be false since approximately half of the respondents from the general public had checked abuse on their questionnaire. Perhaps this indicates a higher rate of domestic violence than previously estimated.

Recommendations

Future research might want to further examine gender role attitudes, actual gender roles performed, and education, as well as income, to see if any correlation exists. Since an effective strategy for ending abuse is dependant upon an understanding of causal factors, it is important to determine if lack of education affects gender role attitudes with education being the true link to abuse.

Additionally, if time and money allow, a larger probability sample should be taken to both increase the likelihood of significance as well as to provide generalizability. Further, given the high number of abusers found when giving this questionnaire apart from the domestic violence

treatment program, the survey might only need to be given to the general population. Also, more attention should be paid to actual gender roles performed since this section was a byproduct of gender role conflict in that it was specifically created to compare with gender role attitudes. Additionally, a few questions regarding intergenerational transmission of violence (to identify those who were abused by a parental figure, those witnessing domestic violence, and those who had no exposure to abuse) could be included which would give further information about socialization of violence. Finally, given general tendencies for respondents to give socially desirable answers in order to present themselves in the best light, respondents' partners should also complete the questionnaire on behalf of their male partner. This may give more realistic answers, especially regarding severity and frequency of abuse and issues of gender role conflict.

Implications

As stated earlier in this thesis, domestic violence is a national epidemic that affects us all in a myriad of ways from personal relationships to tax dollars. Additionally, as socialization theory would predict, children who grow up witnessing abuse are more likely to perpetuate the behavior. Therefore, intergenerational transmission of violence creates a perpetual problem for society as a whole. Because of

the impact domestic violence has on each individual and society, measures should be taken to assist in the abolition of this problem.

Education may be a key component to eliminating abuse. Considering the findings of this thesis, society should place an even greater emphasis on improving individuals overall level of education as well as education regarding the pitfalls of gender role stereotypes. Early warning signs, or relationship red flags, are being taught to victims by domestic violence agencies in an effort to eliminate domestic violence. These red flags are a list of behaviors used to as warning signs of potential abusive behavior. Perhaps actual gender roles performed as well as gender role attitudes could be added to the list of red flags and used as part of a larger predictive model.

As socialization theory states, behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs are learned, and therefore these behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs, however difficult, can also be unlearned. Educational programs should be implemented in every school starting as early as elementary school. These programs should include examples of healthy relationships, egalitarian gender roles, healthy boundaries, relationship red flags, communication, conflict resolution, and the importance of education.

Children can be taught at an early age that each person, including themselves, has equal value, deserves equal respect, and therefore should have equal opportunities. No one should be limited to particular

professional fields or a set of expected behaviors based on his or her sex, race, religion or creed. Each individual should be free to pursue a full range of behaviors, preferences, gender role tasks, or professions without being limited to those deemed appropriate for one's sex. Glick and Fisk (1997) believe traditional gender role stereotypes and attitudes may not be entirely negative as stated earlier in the literature review. Aside from this, both males and females are restricted in their preferences, behaviors, and educational choices which affect future jobs and income. Society seems to be doing itself a disservice by setting false limitations on what is considered appropriate for a specific gender. One must be able to envision true equality in gender (familial, political, and economic) in order to strive for total equality including race, class, and religion.

References

- Alexander, Pamela C., Sharon Moore, and Elmore R. Alexander III. 1991. "What is transmitted in the intergenerational transmission of violence?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 53:657-667.
- Basow, Susan A. 1992. *Gender: Stereotypes and Roles*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Bem, Sandra L. 1974. "The Measurement of Psychological Androgyny." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 42:155-162.
- Bem, Sandra L. 1983. "Gender Schema Theory and Its Implications for Child Development: Raising Gender-Aschematic Children in a Gender-Schematic Society." *Signs* 8:598-616.
- Bem, Sandra L. 1993. *The Lens of Gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Birns, Beverly, Michele Cascardi, and Shannon-Lee Meyer. 1994. "Sex-Role Socialization: Developmental Influences on Wife Abuse." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 64:50-59.
- Bourgois, P. 1996a. "In Search of Masculinity--Violence, Respect and Sexuality Among Puerto Rican Crack Dealers." *BJ Criminology* 36:412-427.
- Bourgois P. 1996b. In *Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Broverman, I., S.R. Vogel, D. Broverman, F.E. Clarkson, and P.S. Rosenkrantz. 1972. "Sex Role Stereotypes: A current Appraisal." *Journal of Social Issues* 28:59-78.
- Brownmiller, Susan. 1975. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Burke, Peter J., Jan E. Stets, and Maureen A. Pirog-Good. 1988. "Gender Identity, Self-Esteem, and Physical and Sexual Abuse in Dating Relationships." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 51: 272-285.

- Burns, A. and R. Homel. 1989. "Gender Division of Tasks by Parents and their Children." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 13:113-125.
- Collins, Randall and Scott Coltrane. 1995. *Sociology of Marriage and Family: Gender, Love and Property*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Coltrane, Scott. 1998. *Gender and Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Connell, R.W. 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R.W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Crossman, Rita K., Sandra M. Stith, and Mary M. Bender. 1990. "Sex Role Egalitarianism and Marital Violence." *Sex Roles* 22:293-304.
- Culp, R.E., A.S. Cook, and P.C. Housley. 1983. "A Comparison of Observed and Reported Adult-Infant Interactions: Effects of Perceived Sex." *Sex Roles* 9:475-479.
- Dobash, Russell P. and R. Emerson Dobash. 2004. "Women's Violence to Men in Intimate Relationships." *British Journal of Criminology* 44:324-439.
- Dodge, Kenneth A., John E. Bates, and Gregory S. Pettit. 1990. "Mechanisms in the Cycle of Violence." *Science* 250:1678-1683.
- Doyle, James A. and Michele A. Paludi. 1991. *Sex and Gender*. Washington D.C.: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Duberman, Lucile. 1975. *Gender and Sex in Society*. New York: Praeger.
- Dutton, Donald G. 1994. "Patriarchy and Wife Assault: the Ecological Fallacy." *Violence and Victims* 9:167-180.
- Dutton, Donald G. 1995. "A Scale for Measuring Propensity for Abusiveness." *Journal of Family Violence* 10:203-221.

- Dutton, Donald G. and Andrew K. Starzomski. 1997. "Personality Predictors of the Minnesota Power and Control Wheel." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 12:70-82.
- Elliott, Alan C. and Wayne A. Woodward. 2007. *Statistical Analysis Quick Reference Guidebook with SPSS Examples*. London: Sage Publishing.
- Eshleman, J. Ross. 1991. *The Family: an Introduction*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and David Nachmias. 1996. *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Gelles, Richard J. 1974. *The Violent Home*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Gelles, Richard J. and Murray A. Straus. 1988. *Intimate Violence: The Definitive Study of the Causes and Consequences of Abuse in the American Family*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Glick, Peter and Susan Fiske. 1997. "Hostile and Benevolent Sexism." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 21:119-130.
- Goodnow, J.J., 1988. "Children's Household Work: Its Nature and Functions." *Psychological Bulletin* 103:5-26.
- Hamberger, Kevin L. and James E. Hastings. 1990. "Recidivism Following Spouse Abuse Abatement Counseling: Treatment Program Implications." *Violence and Victims* 5:157-172.
- Jewkes, Rachel. 2002. "Violence Against Women III: Intimate Partner Violence: Causes and Prevention." *The Lancet* 359:1423-1429.
- Johnson, Michael P. and Kathleen J. Ferraro. 2000. "Research on Domestic Violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62:948-963.
- Jukes, Adam Edward. 1999. *Men Who Batter Women*. New York: Routledge.
- Kimmel, Michael S. with Amy Aronson. *The Gendered Society Reader*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Kimmel, Michael S. and Michael A. Messner. 2001. *Men's Lives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Klier, Barbara A., Nancy R. Jacobs, and Jacquelyn Quiram. 1999. *Violent Relationships: Battering and Abuse Among Adults*. Wylie, TX: Information Plus.
- Levinson, David. 1989. *Family Violence in Cross-cultural Perspective*. Newbury Park: Sage Publication.
- Lindsey, Linda L. 1994. *Gender Roles: A Sociological Perspective*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Lips, Hilary M. 1988. *Sex and Gender: An Introduction*. Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E. 1998. *The Two Sexes: Growing Up Apart, Coming Together*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E. 1992. "The Role of the Parents in the Socialization of Children: An Historical Overview." *Developmental Psychology* 28:1006-1017.
- Maccoby, Eleanor E. and Carol Jacklin. 1974. *The Psychology of Sex Differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Martin, Carol L., Lisa Eisenbud, and Hilary Rose. 1995. "Children's Gender-Based Reasoning about Toys." *Child development* 66: 1453-1471.
- Matthews, Dawn D. 2004. *Domestic Violence Sourcebook*. Detroit: Omnigraphics, Inc.
- McHale, S.M., W. Bartko, A. Crouter, and M. Perry-Jenkins. 1990. "Children's Housework and Psychosocial Functioning: The Mediating Effects of Parents' Sex-Role Behaviors and Attitudes." *Child Development* 61: 1413-1426.
- Messerschmidt, James W. 1993. *Masculinities and Crime*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

- Miller, Ted, R., Mark A. Cohen, and Brian Wiersema. 1996. "National Institute of Justice Research Report, Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look." National Criminal Justice Reference Service. Retrieved on May 16, 2006 (<http://www.ncjrs.gov/txtfiles/costcrim.txt>).
- Mintz, Robert D. and James R. Mahalik. 1996. "Gender Role Orientation and Conflict as Predictors of Family Roles for Men." *Sex Roles* 34:805-822.
- Money, J., J.G. Hampson, and J.L. Hampson. 1955. "Hermaphroditism – Recommendations Concerning Assignment of Sex, Change of Sex and Psychologic Management." *Bulletin of the Johns Hopkins Hospital* 97(4): 284-300.
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. 2003. *Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved May 16, 2006 (http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/ipv_cost/IPVBook-Final-Feb18.pdf).
- Nielsen, Joyce McCarl. 1978. *Sex in Society: Perspectives on Stratification*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Nielsen, Joyce McCarl. 1990. *Sex and Gender in Society: Perspectives on Stratification*. Prospect Heights, Illinois. Waveland Press, Inc.
- Oliver, J.E. 1993. "Intergenerational Transmission of Child Abuse: Rates, Research, and Clinical Implications." *The American Journal of Psychiatry*. 150:1315-1324.
- Paymar, Michael. 1993. *Violent No More: Helping Men End Domestic Abuse*. Alameda, CA: Hunter House Inc.
- Pleck, Joseph H., Freya L. Sonenstein, and Leighton C. Ku. 1993. "Masculinity Ideology: Its Impact on Adolescent Males' Heterosexual Relationships." *Journal of Social Issues* 49:11-29.
- Pollack, William. 1998. *Real Boys: Rescuing our Sons from the Myth of Boyhood*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

- Pomerleau, A., D. Bolduc, G. Malcuit, and L. Cossette. 1990. "Pink or Blue: Environmental Stereotypes in the First Years of Life." *Sex Roles* 22:359-367.
- Raag, Tarja and Christine L. Rackliff. 1998. "Preschoolers' Awareness of Social Expectations of Gender: Relationships to Toy Choices." *Sex Roles* 38: 685-700.
- Rubin, Jeffrey Z., Frank J. Provenzano, and Zella Luria. 1974. "The Eye of the Beholder: Parents' Views on Sex of Newborns." *American Journal of Orthopyschiatry* 44:512-518.
- Selzer, Judith A. and Debra Kalmuss. 1988. "Socialization and Stress Explanations for Spouse Abuse." *Social Forces* 67:473-491.
- Simons, Ronald L., Kuei-Hsiu Lin, and Leslie C. Gordon (1998). "Socialization in the Family of Origin and Male Dating Violence: A Prospective Study." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60:467-478.
- Skrypnik, B.J. and M. Snyder. 1982. "On the Self-Perpetuating Nature of Stereotypes about Women and Men." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 18:277-291.
- Smith, Michael D. 1990. "Patriarchal Ideology and Wife Beating: A Test of a Feminist Hypothesis." *Violence and Victims* 5:257-273.
- Smith, P.A. and E. Midlarsky. 1985. "Empirically Derived Conceptions of Femaleness and Maleness: A Current View." *Sex Roles* 12:313-328.
- Snyder, M., E.D. Tanke, and E. Berscheid. 1977. "Social Perception and Interpersonal Behavior: On the Self-Fulfilling Nature of Social Stereotypes." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 35:656-666.
- Sonkin, Daniel J., Del Martin, and Lenore E. Walker. 1985. *The Male Batterer: A Treatment Approach*. New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Spence, J.T. and L.L. Sawin. 1985. "Images of Masculinity and Femininity: A Reconceptualization." Pp. 35-66 in *Women, Gender and Social Psychology*, edited by V. O'Leary, R. Unger, and B. Wallston. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Steinmetz, Suzanne K. 1978. "The Battered Husband Syndrome." *Victimology* 2:499-509.
- Straus, Murray, A., Richard J. Gelles, and Suzanne K. Steinmetz. 1980. *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the Family*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.
- Sugarman, David and Susan Frankel. 1996. "Patriarchal Ideology and Wife-Assault: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Journal of Family Violence* 11:13-40.
- Sweet, Stephan A. 1999. *Data Analysis with SPSS*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Thompson Jr., Edward H., Joseph H. Pleck, and David L. Ferrera. 1990. "Men and Masculinities: Scales for Masculinity Ideology and Masculinity-Related Constructs." *Sex Roles* 27:573-607.
- Thompson Jr., Edward H. and Joseph H. Pleck. 1986. "The Structure of Male Role Norms." *American Behavioral Scientist* 29:531-543.
- Thorne, Barrie. 1993. *Gender Play: Girls and Boys in School*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Thorne, Barrie. 1990. "Children and Gender: Constructions of Difference." Pp. 100-113 in *Theoretical Perspectives on Sexual Difference*, edited by Deborah Rhode. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Thorne, Barrie and Zella Luria. 2002. "Sexuality and Gender in Children's Daily Worlds." Pp. 52-58 in *Sociology: Windows on Society An Anthology* edited by Robert H. Lauer and Jeanette C. Lauer. City, State: Roxbury.
- Tjaden, Patricia and Nancy Thoennes. 2000. "Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence." *National Institute of Justice and the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention*. Retrieved May 17, 2006 (<http://www.ncjrs.gov/txtfiles1/nij/181867.txt>).
- Wharton, Amy S. 2005. *The Sociology of Gender: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Williams, J.E. and D.L. Best. 1990. *Measuring Sex Stereotypes: A Multinational Study*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Withers Osmond, Marie and Barrie Thorne. 1993. "Feminist Theories: The Social Construction of Gender in Families and Society." Pp. 591-623 in *The Sourcebook of Family Theories and Methods: a Contextual Approach*, edited by Pauline Boss, William Doherty, Ralph LaRossa, Walter Schumm, and Suzanne Steinmetz. New York: Plenum.

APPENDIX A

Script

You have been selected to participate in a study about violence against a dating or marital partner. Your responses will be anonymous and confidential which means that I will have no way of linking you to this questionnaire. In order to ensure anonymity, please don't write your name anywhere on this questionnaire. If you have any questions about this questionnaire, please don't hesitate to ask. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may choose to end your participation at any time. I sincerely thank you for your participation and cooperation in this study. From this point, participation in this study will be considered implied consent.

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

Instructions

On the following pages you will find a number of characteristics listed. Please use those words to describe yourself to the best of your ability using the scale from “never” to “always” to rate how true you think each of these characteristics is of you. Please do not leave any question unmarked.

Example:

1. Honest

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always

Mark an X in the “never” blank if it is never true that you are honest.

Mark an X in the “rarely” blank if it is seldom true that you are honest.

Mark an X in the “sometimes” blank if it is sometimes true that you are honest.

Mark an X in the “usually” blank if it is usually or often true that you are honest.

Mark an X in the “always” blank if it is always true that you are honest.

Thus, if you feel that it is sometimes true that you are honest or honest about half the time, (which means that this is true of you more often than if you put “rarely” and less often true than if you marked “usually”), then you would mark the blank next to “sometimes” so it would look like the following.

1. Honest

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☒ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always

Please mark the appropriate box.

1. Defend my own beliefs

☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always

2. Affectionate
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
3. Emotionally tough
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
4. Assertive
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
5. Sensitive to needs of others
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
6. XXXXX
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
7. XXXXX
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
8. XXXXX
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
9. XXXXX
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
10. XXXXX
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
11. XXXXX
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
12. XXXXX
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always
13. XXXXX
☐ Never ☐ Rarely ☐ Sometimes ☐ Usually ☐ Always

14. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
15. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
16. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
17. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
18. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
19. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
20. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
21. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
22. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
23. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always
24. XXXXX
____Never ____Rarely ____Sometimes ____Usually ____Always

This next section deals with ATTITUDES about what household chores are appropriate for men and for women. Rate the following statements based on who you feel SHOULD be responsible for the following household tasks according to your work/stay at home preference. Please mark the appropriate box.

25. If money were not a problem, would you prefer your partner to:
 ___ Stay at home ___ Work part-time ___ Work full-time
26. Grocery shopping
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
27. Washing dishes
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
28. Maintaining cars
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
29. Making dinner
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
30. Washing clothes
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
31. Cleaning the house
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
32. Taking out the trash
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
33. Supporting the family financially
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
34. Caring for children
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
35. Paying the bills
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women
36. Making household repairs
 ___ Only Men ___ Mostly Men ___ Equally ___ Mostly Women ___ Only Women

This section examines how your household ACTUALLY DOES/DID divide household chores. Rate the following statements based on who in your household ACTUALLY DOES/DID complete these chores. Please mark the appropriate box.

37. Your partner does/did :

☐ Stay at home ☐ Work part-time ☐ Work full-time

38. Grocery shopping

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

39. Washing dishes

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

40. Maintaining cars

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

41. Making dinner

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

42. Washing clothes

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

43. Cleaning the house

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

44. Taking out the trash

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

45. Supporting the family financially

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

46. Caring for children

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

47. Paying the bills

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

48. Making household repairs

☐ Only me ☐ Mostly me ☐ Equally ☐ Mostly she ☐ Only she

**This section deals with attitudes about what behaviors
may or may not be appropriate for men. Rate the following
statements based on how likely you would agree/disagree with them.
Please mark the appropriate box.**

49. I like a guy who does not complain.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
50. When a man is feeling a little pain he should try not to let it show very much.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
51. Nobody respects a man very much who frequently talks about his worries, fears and problems.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
52. It disgusts me to see a man show weakness.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
53. It bothers me if a man does something that I consider "feminine."
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
54. A man whose hobbies are cooking, sewing, and going to the ballet probably wouldn't appeal to me.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
55. It is a bit embarrassing for a man to have a job that is usually filled by a woman.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
56. Unless he was really desperate, I would probably advise a man to keep looking rather than accept a job as a secretary.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
57. If I heard about a man who was a hairdresser and a gourmet cook, I might wonder how masculine he was.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
58. I think it is extremely good for a boy to be taught to cook, sew, clean the house and take care of younger children.
☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Not Sure ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

59. I might find it a little silly or embarrassing if a male friend of mine cried over a sad love scene in a movie.
___ Strongly Agree ___ Agree ___ Not Sure ___ Disagree ___ Strongly Disagree

This section will ask for personal information about yourself. Let me remind you that all of the information that you provide will be kept anonymous and confidential. I will have no way of linking you to this questionnaire, so please feel free to answer truthfully.

60. What is your race/ethnicity? _____
61. What is your age? _____
62. Over the last 2-3 years, what has been your approximate individual income per year (before taxes)? _____
63. What was your highest year in school or degree you completed? _____

64. Have you ever enrolled in a batterers treatment program? Yes _____
No _____
65. Have you ever done the following to a dating or married partner: (Please use the following scale listed below to rate how often the action occurred and write the corresponding number in the blank.)

1=never	2=once	3=once a year
4=twice a year	5=once in 3 months	6=once a month
7=twice a month	8=once a week	9=twice a week
10=daily	11=other (please specify) _____	

___ slapped	___ punched	___ destroyed her possessions
___ kicked	___ pushed	___ used a weapon (gun, knife, etc)
___ hit with object	___ choked	___ restrained her

855 Oak Grove Avenue, Suite 215 Menlo Park, CA 94025
650-322-6300 fax 650-322-6398 www.mindgarden.com

Date: November 6, 2006

To whom it may concern,

This letter is to grant permission for: Pamela Whittman McDonald
to use the following copyright material;

Instrument: Bem Sex Role Inventory

Author: Sandra Lipsitz Bem

Copyright: 1978, 1981 by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. all rights reserved
for her/his thesis research.

In addition, five (5) sample items from the instrument may be reproduced for inclusion in a proposal, thesis or dissertation.

The entire measure may not at any time be included or reproduced in other published material.

Sincerely,

Vickie Jaimez
Director of Operations

Pamela Wittman-McDonald
1100 Surrey Lane, Allen, TX 75013
pamelaandjason@yahoo.com
(214) 547-7285

August 30, 2006

Dr. Joseph H. Pleck
Professor, Human & Community Development
Christopher Hall
UIUC MC-081
904 W. Nevada St.
Urbana, IL 61801-3811

Dear Dr. Pleck:

I am a graduate student at San Jose State University currently working on my master's thesis in sociology. Through the course of my research, I came across your Male Role Norms Scale and found it most useful when conducting my study. I am close to turning in my thesis for approval to graduate studies and was informed that I should seek your permission to reproduce your scale in my thesis. I would greatly appreciate your permission and assure you that it will only be used for academic purposes. I regret having to put a timetable on this, but I would appreciate your approval by September 15th.

If you are the copyright holder, may I have your permission to reprint the Male Role Norms Scale in my thesis? I appreciate your consideration in this matter. Your work has been instrumental in making my thesis a reality. If you wish a copy of the finished work I would be happy to provide one. If you have any questions or concerns I can be reached at this email address or by phone at 214-547-7285.

Best regards,

Pamela Wittman-McDonald

The above request is hereby approved on the conditions specified below (if any), and on the understanding that full credit will be given to the source.

Conditions: _____

Date: 9/9/06 Approved by: Joseph H Pleck

Pamela Wittman-McDonald
1100 Surrey Lane, Allen, TX 75013
pamelaandjason@yahoo.com
(214) 547-7285

August 30, 2006

Dr. Edward H. Thompson, Jr.
Director, Gerontology Studies Program
Holy Cross College
1 College Street
Beaven Hall, Room 211
Worcester, MA 01610-2395

Dear Dr. Thompson:

I am a graduate student at San Jose State University currently working on my master's thesis in sociology. Through the course of my research, I came across your Male Role Norms Scale and found it most useful when conducting my study. I am close to turning in my thesis for approval to graduate studies and was informed that I should seek your permission to reproduce your scale in my thesis. I would greatly appreciate your permission and assure you that it will only be used for academic purposes. I regret having to put a timetable on this, but I would appreciate your approval by September 15th.

If you are the copyright holder, may I have your permission to reprint the Male Role Norms Scale in my thesis? I appreciate your consideration in this matter. Your work has been instrumental in making my thesis a reality. If you wish a copy of the finished work I would be happy to provide one. If you have any questions or concerns I can be reached at this email address or by phone at 214-547-7285.

Best regards,

Pamela Wittman-McDonald

The above request is hereby approved on the conditions specified below (if any), and on the understanding that full credit will be given to the source.

Conditions: None

Date: 9/7/06 Approved by: E. H. Thompson