

SELF-ESTEEM, ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN, ALCOHOL
ABUSE AND HISTORY OF FAMILY VIOLENCE
IN SPOUSE BATTERING MALES

By

JANE AURELL WAHL

Bachelor of Science
in Arts and Sciences
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1982

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1984

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 1987

Thesis
1987D
W136s
cop.2



SELF-ESTEEM, ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN, ALCOHOL
ABUSE AND HISTORY OF FAMILY VIOLENCE
IN SPOUSE BATTERING MALES

Thesis Approved:

Alfred Carlms

Thesis Adviser
Joseph Pearl

Noma Jo Campbell

Judith E. Dobson

Larry M. Beshi

Norman N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I appreciate the ongoing support of many individuals who have encouraged me throughout my graduate study at Oklahoma State University. I wish to express special gratitude to my committee chairperson and thesis advisor, Dr. Al Carlozzi, for his patience and for his guidance and supervision. Dr. Carlozzi, Dr. Judith Dobson and Dr. Jo Campbell all have offered continuing support and encouragement in my return to college, invaluable support that I sincerely appreciate. I also wish to thank Dr. Joe Pearl and Dr. Larry Perkins for their assistance as members of my doctoral committee.

I want to thank Richard Failla for his help with the collection of data and for sharing his knowledge and his enthusiasm. Special thanks are offered to Dean Montgomery and Dr. Dennis Hellwege for their ongoing encouragement when I needed it the most.

The continuous support of my parents, Punk and Lena Aurell, and of my children, David and Gretchen, is greatly appreciated. They never doubted that I would successfully complete this undertaking, and their love and confidence in me made this thesis and the degree possible.

I dedicate this research to the gentle men who have influenced my life, and to my grandsons, Alec and Adrik Wahl, with the hope and the expectation that they will follow the examples of their father, grandfather, and great-grandfather.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Definitions of Terms	5
Statement of the Problem	7
Hypothesis	7
Significance of the Study	7
Limitations and Assumptions	8
Organization of the Study	9
II. REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE	10
Introduction	10
Studies of Spouse Abuse	10
Studies of Male Spouse Batterers	19
Summary	28
III. METHODOLOGY	30
Introduction	30
Subject Selection	30
Instrumentation	38
Conflict Tactics Scale	38
Reliability	40
Validity	41
Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test	42
Reliability	43
Validity	44
Index of Self Esteem	45
Reliability	46
Validity	47
Attitudes Toward Women Scale	47
Validity	48
Reliability	49
Procedure	50
Analysis of Data	51
Summary	52
IV. RESULTS	53
Introduction	53
Statistical Analysis of the Data	53

Chapter	Page
Summary	59
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	61
Summary	61
Discussion and Conclusions	63
Implications for Treatment	67
Recommendations for Further Research	73
REFERENCES	76
APPENDIX - INSTRUMENTATION	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Means, Ranges, and Standard Deviations for Age	32
2. Frequency Distribution for Age	33
3. Summary of Means, Ranges, and Standard Deviations for Length of Marriage	34
4. Frequency Distribution for Length of Marriage	34
5. Summary of Means, Ranges, and Standard Deviations for Level of Education	35
6. Frequency Distribution for Level of Education	36
7. Summary of Means, Ranges, and Standard Deviations for Level of Income	37
8. Frequency Distribution for Level of Income	37
9. Results of Discriminant Function Analysis	55
10. Group Means and Standard Deviations for Predictor Variables	56
11. Ratio of Abuse in Family of Origin	57
12. Pooled Within-Group Correlations Among Variables	58
13. Classification Results	59

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Although the psychological literature has been replete with articles on violence in our society, until the last decade the issue of violence in the home was rarely considered (Sonkin, Martin, & Walker, 1985). Attention to domestic violence began with the women's movement of the 1970's when authors began to address the problem of violence in the home (Watts & Courtois, 1981).

Prior to 1970 the myth of family nonviolence was publicly preserved (Bagarozzi & Giddings, 1983; Flynn, 1977). The first attention of the public on family violence in our society focused on child abuse, presumably a socially safer topic to address than wife abuse (Martin, 1976). There was virtually no substantial study of wife abuse before the early 1970's (Gondolf, 1985). While the prevalence of wife beating has been apparent to the personnel working with victims, in the United States there were no convincing statistics available to back up their contentions (Martin, 1985).

It is now estimated that in the United States, in one out of two marriages at least one violent incident, will take place (Martin, 1985; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz

1980). In one out of five marriages in our country the violence will be ongoing, with five or more incidents a year (Straus et al., 1980). Though previously the social scientists have treated family violence with selective inattention (Gelles, 1979), the majority of helping professionals can no longer deny the seriousness of wife beating as an acute social problem.

Almost all of the researchers studying the personal characteristics of individuals involved in spouse abuse have focused on the women as victims (Davidson, 1978; Gondolf, 1985). While researchers have substantiated many of the characteristics of battered women that were originally described by the personnel working with this population, few studies have focused on the male batterer directly (Elbow, 1977; Giles-Sims, 1983, Sonkin et al., 1985). The characteristics of battering men have been reported from research from the perspective of battered women (Martin, 1976; Steinmetz & Straus, 1974; Walker, 1979). Direct information about physically abusive husbands has come from clinical observation, which is traditionally considered unreliable. This information gathered from programs for batterers across the country has generally corroborated the descriptions from the research on abused wives, though to date very few studies have been conducted directly with male batterers (Sonkin et al., 1985).

This lack of research is due in large part to the

difficulty of reaching the male population (Scher, 1981; Star, 1983). The few researchers who have attempted to include batterers in family studies have noted them to be elusive and uncooperative (Gelles, 1974; Snell, Rosenwald, & Robey, 1964; Sonkin et al., 1985). A few researchers have begun recently to address these problems by focusing directly on the examination of the characteristics of male batterers (Coleman, 1980; Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985; Johnston, 1984; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981).

A study of the literature describing conjugal violence indicates specific factors that appear to be correlated with the presence of violence in the home. No single personality structure has been found to describe a syndrome consistent with the patterns of violent behavior in men who batter wives, though there does appear to be a substantial degree of similarity in behavior and attitudes of physically abusive men (Brennan, 1985; Gondolf, 1985). According to the literature, the men involved in wife battering tend to have rigid traditional stereotypic attitudes toward sex roles in our society (Brennan, 1985; Martin, 1985; Star, 1983; Toby, 1974; Walker, 1979; Watts & Courtois, 1981; Weitzman & Dreen, 1982; Whitehurst, 1974). These men are described as having low self-esteem, (Gelles, 1982; Searle, 1985; Star, 1983; Waldo, 1987; Walker, 1979), as experiencing extreme stress (Carlson, 1977; Searle, 1985), and as feeling out of control of their lives (Brennan, 1985; Gondolf, 1985; Kardener & Fuller, 1970; Whitehurst, 1974).

According to many authors, men who batter come from all races, socioeconomic backgrounds, and religions (Giles-Sims, 1983; O'Brien, 1971; Straus et al., 1980; Walker, 1979, 1984). Though there is evidence that a higher incidence of family violence occurs in the homes of blue collar workers and of lower socioeconomic status families (Dibble & Straus, 1980; Gelles, 1974; Levinger, 1966; Straus et al., 1980).

Alcohol abuse has been described as being related to the presence of violence in the home. The use and abuse of alcohol and other drugs is often given as one cause of domestic violence. The male batterer is often described as an abuser of alcohol (Bard & Zacker, 1974; Gondolf, 1985; Ponzetti, Cate, & Koval, 1983; Sonkin et al., 1985; Walker, 1984). The experiences of observing parental violence and of being physically abused during childhood have been shown to be consistently correlated with men's current violent behavior in marriage (Allen & Allen, 1981; Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Cohen, 1984; Guerney, Waldo, & Firestone, 1987; Roy, 1982; Star, 1983; Steinmetz, 1977; Straus et al., 1980; Walker, 1984).

In the last five years nearly 150 men's programs have been developed in the United States, and more are needed (Gondolf, 1985). There is a great deal of controversy about which treatment approaches for spouse abusers will be most effective (Sonkin et al., 1985; Star, 1983). More definitive information gathered directly from the

population of battering husbands is needed to gain a better understanding of the problem of wife battering and to plan and to provide the programs that can effectively address the issues of family violence.

Definitions of Terms

The term domestic violence includes physical, sexual, and psychological abuse among persons in intimate and/or familial relationships. One of the earliest and most enduring problems for researchers in addressing the issue of domestic violence has been the lack of a clear, useful and acceptable definition of the terms violence and abuse (Gelles & Cornell, 1985). Violence has been defined as the intentional use of physical force or threatened use of physical force to harm another (Saunders, 1982). Physical violence can also be defined as the use of physical force to intimidate, control, or force another person to do something against his/her will. Using this definition, a battered woman has been defined as one who is "repeatedly subjected to any forceful physical or psychological behavior by a man in order to coerce her to do something he wants her to do" (Walker, 1979, p. xv). Spouse battering may also be defined as "physically, sexually, and/or psychologically assaultive behavior between adults in an intimate, sexual, theoretically equal relationship" (Sonkin et al., 1985, p. 37). Psychological abuse includes explicit and implicit threats, extreme controlling behavior and

mental degradation in the form of verbal abuse. Psychological abuse cannot be separated from physical abuse and is considered more difficult to stop than the violence (Walker, 1979).

In this study, the term battering is defined specifically as physical abuse. Physical abuse is operationally defined by the developers of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) as any "act carried out with intention of, or perceived as having the intention of physically hurting another person" (Straus et al., 1980, p. 20).

The legal definition of child abuse, according to Oklahoma State Law, is "... harm or threatened harm to a child's health or welfare" which can occur through "non-accidental physical or mental injury; sexual abuse, or negligent treatment or maltreatment" ("Public Policy," 1981, p. 2163). The law does not prohibit "ordinary force" as a means of discipline "including but not limited to spanking, switching or paddling" ("Ordinary Force," 1981, p. 2163). This is the definition that is used to define physical abuse of the subjects in their families of origin. The presence of physical violence in the subjects' family relationships is measured by self-report on the violence scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale, which measures the actual use of physical force (Straus, 1979).

Self-esteem is defined as an attitude of self-approval and self-respect. For this study, the measurement of self-esteem as an evaluative component of self-concept is the

Index of Self-Esteem (Hudson, 1982).

Attitude toward sex roles of women is defined as the personal belief in the rights and appropriate roles for women in contemporary society. This belief is measured by Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1972).

Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated in this study is: Can group membership as designated by husbands' physically abusive and nonabusive behavior toward wives be differentiated by the independent variables of self-esteem, attitudes toward women, alcohol abuse, childhood experience of abuse and observation of spouse abuse in families of origin?

Hypothesis

The following null hypothesis was tested at the .05 level of significance:

Group membership in physically abusive and nonabusive groups of husbands cannot be predicted on the basis of the men's levels of self-esteem, attitudes toward sex roles of women, alcohol abuse, their experiences of physical abuse as children and observations of spouse abuse in their families of origin.

Significance of the Study

Individuals who are held accountable for their violent behavior, which is viewed as problematic and destructive to

society, need to be given the option and opportunity to learn to change their negative behavior. The information gathered in the present study was intended to add to the understanding of conjugal violence from the direct perspective of the men involved in wife battering. This type of information is needed to aid in the preparation of programs for the prevention of domestic violence and the planning of treatment approaches for the families who are now involved in abusive behavior.

Limitations and Assumptions

The following limitations were inherent in this study. This study was limited to the issue of wife battering and will not consider other aspects of domestic violence such as sexual abuse, psychological abuse, child abuse, elderly abuse, sibling abuse, abuse of parents, or abuse of husbands.

The subjects were volunteers who were receiving counseling services. Caution should be exercised in generalizing the results from this atypical population to an overall population of physically abusive husbands.

The information used in this study was gathered by self-report instruments. Therefore the quality of the data is dependent upon the accuracy and the honesty of the respondents. This is a limitation of all self-report data. It is a serious limitation when working with a population that has been shown to deny and underestimate the serious

nature of their behavior.

The subjects reside in mid-sized cities in the mid-western United States. The information gathered may not describe a population from another section of the country, or from a rural or a large urban area.

Organization of the Study

Presented in this first chapter is an introduction to the topic under investigation, including definition of terms, statement of the problem, hypothesis, significance of the study, and limitations and assumptions. In Chapter II a review of relevant literature pertaining to spouse abuse is presented. The methodology used in conducting this study, including selection of subjects, instrumentation, and procedures for gathering and analyzing data is described in Chapter III. A summary of results is provided in Chapter IV, and the final conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter will present a review of literature relevant to the study of males who batter their wives. The major studies in the field of spouse abuse and the results of these studies will be reported. The characteristics of male batterers as reported from the perspective of females involved in research on victims of wife abuse, and from clinical observation of males in treatment programs across the country will be described. Finally descriptions of the few studies that have recently focused directly upon male batterers themselves will be given.

Studies of Spouse Abuse

One early study on intrafamily violence between spouses was conducted by Gelles (1974). This study was designed to determine whether physical violence between spouses was more common than was generally acknowledged at that time. Forty couples were identified from social service agencies and police reports as experiencing some form of family violence. For a control group, 40 other couples were

selected at random from among the neighbors of the abusive subjects. One spouse from each couple was interviewed in depth in the subjects' homes; 83% of these subjects interviewed were female.

In this study the greater violence occurred in age groups between 41 and 50 years of age. There was an inverse relationship between the husbands' education level and violence. The violent husbands had lower occupational status than their nonviolent counterparts in 84% of the families. There was a correlation between lower socioeconomic status incidence of violence, though this study excluded upper-middle and upper-class families with incomes over \$25,000.

From the total of 80 subjects, 44 reported one or more violent episodes in the marriage. Of these 44, 21 reported that violence occurred on a regular basis. Regular violence was defined as occurring from 6 times a year to daily. The data from the study showed the husband to be more violent than the wife; 47% were reported as having hit their wives at least once, 25% regularly. Of the wives, 32% were reported as hitting their husbands at least once, 11% on a regular basis. Almost every violent husband reported coming from a family in which spouse abuse had occurred.

In all cases where information was available from the agencies, the subjects' responses corresponded well with the outside data. There is an assumption that data from a

sample will underestimate the occurrence of violence, due to the bias that will operate against giving personal information about violence.

One surprising finding in this study was that in the control group, with no public record of family violence, 37% reported some incidence of spouse assault in their own families, and 15% reported regular violence. Gelles (1974) reported these figures as the best estimates of the occurrence of marital violence in the general public (Gelles, 1974). Stahly (1978) considers the figures an underestimate of violence in the general population, because it systematically excluded families with a record of violence and because self-reporting of information is considered biased in that direction. The biases inherent in this study make specification of the population to which the findings can be generalized difficult to identify.

Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, (1980) reported on the first national survey of family violence in American homes. The subjects consisted of 2,143 intact families, surveyed in 1975. One adult from each family was interviewed, and 56% of the respondents were female. Area or cluster sampling procedures were used to gather a sample with characteristics similar to the census data for the population of the United States. The authors describe the sample as an adequate group for generalization to families in this country.

Some limitations of the study were specified; the

subjects were limited to intact families and no single-parent families were included. Interviews were completed with members of 65% of the families identified as eligible for this study. Given the topic under study, this completion rate was considered high, but nothing is known about the other 35% of the potential sample. The level of violence in families was measured using the Conflict Tactics Scale, which was developed by one of the researchers (Straus, 1979).

There were only slight differences in violence among various areas of the country, and between city and rural populations. By race, wife abuse was reported to be highest among blacks, in comparison to white or other races. More spouse abuse was reported in families with no religious preferences; differences among religious affiliations was not clearly discriminated. In this study the younger couples, under 30 years old, were the most violent. The most violent men were those who had graduated from high school, the least violent were grammar school dropouts and men with some college education. Income was shown to have a direct bearing on levels of violence in families. Unemployed men were twice as likely to use severe violence on wives than men employed full time, and men with part-time employment had a rate three times that of full-time employed husbands. Families living at or below the poverty line had a rate of conjugal violence 500 times greater than the rate in families with incomes over

\$20,000, and blue collar workers had twice the rate of violence between husbands and wives as white collar occupations.

The most common situation found in violent marriages was for both spouses to use violence, 49% of violent couples reported this situation. The reports of types of violent behavior showed some differences. More wives threw things and hit with an object. More husbands slapped, beat up, and used a knife or gun.

From the findings of this study, the authors estimated 3.8% of American wives are beaten by their husbands every year, and one in every six couples commits at least one violent act against his/her spouse. Translating the survey findings for extreme violence into figures for the 1975 population of the United States, the authors reported rates would mean that over 1.7 million Americans had at some time been threatened with a spouse wielding a knife or gun, and over 2 million had been beaten up by a husband or wife (Straus et al., 1980, p. 34).

The authors of this study consider these to be low figures and very likely a substantial underestimate of family violence in the United States (Straus et al., 1980). This is due to the fact that the findings were based on self-report information and that the study excluded divorced and separated couples.

Steinmetz (1977) conducted research on the use of violence to resolve marital conflicts with a sample of

intact families with children in the state of Delaware. From a sample of 217 families selected by a stratified quota technique, 125 were contacted. Of these, 57 families volunteered to participate; 25 refused, and others were eliminated for various reasons.

Though the attempt was made to actively encourage husbands to participate in this research; the data gathered in this study is predominately from the wives. For the self-administered questionnaire, 35% of the husbands participated; in the interviews only five (9%) of the men participated.

Physical violence was reported being used by 60% of the families that participated. An early version of the Conflict Tactics Scale was used to measure marital violence. The author reports that the data suggest that husbands and wives with more education and higher levels of social status will use less physical force to attempt to resolve conflicts (Steinmetz, 1977).

Roy (1982) reported on 4000 cases of spousal violence in New York City and its environs. These subjects were the female victims of spouse abuse, the majority of whom had actively sought aid.

From the women's reports, 50% of the abusers were from 26 to 35 years of age, 23% were below 26 and 27% were between 36 and 60. The length of marriages was under five years for 46% of the couples, and between five and 10 years for 27%. In most of the partnerships, both spouses

were employed; 75% of the abusers held blue collar jobs.

The women reported that 35% of the male abusers were problem alcoholics, with only 10% enrolled in treatment. Of the abused women, 4% were reported as having serious alcoholic problems and 30% of these were members of Alcoholics Anonymous. According to the women's knowledge of the abusers' experiences of violence as children, 81% of the abusive partners came from homes in which they were beaten or where they witnessed their father abusing their mother (Roy, 1982).

The findings were based on the reports of female victims who were strongly motivated to find solutions to the violence in their lives and must be considered to be biased. There were a large number of cases studied, but they represented populations of only one urban area of the country. This trend analysis did contribute a basis on which to build other studies.

Stacey and Shupe (1983) reported on a study of family violence in Texas based mostly on information gathered from 542 residents of shelters for battered women. The authors state that their research includes the largest number of male batterers ever analyzed; however the information on batterers was gained from reports of the females involved.

Most of the battering men were described as being in their late twenties or early thirties. Few of the batterers had gone to college; 43% had not graduated from high school. Fifteen percent of the men were reported

to be unemployed, 51% were in clerical fields or skilled labor, and 24% were reported to be unskilled labor. Of the women who reported on the men's income, 15% reported it to be less than \$4,999, 54% reported between \$5000 and \$14,999, and 9% reported incomes over \$40,000. The women reported from their knowledge of the abusers' backgrounds that 57% of the men had witnessed spouse abuse between their parents, and 38% had been physically abused as children.

The information on the characteristics of male batterers reported in this study was gathered from the perspectives of women who, as victims of spouse abuse, were residing in shelters for battered women (Stacey & Shupe, 1983). These women would include mainly those of lower socio-economic status with few other resources on which to rely. The data must be viewed from the bias of the particular sample and cannot be considered to be generalizable to other populations.

Walker (1984) conducted a study with 400 self-identified battered women that was unique in that approximately half of the sample reported not only on battering males, but also on their perceptions of previous relationships with nonbattering men. Most of these women were from the metropolitan Denver area; one-third from surrounding areas.

The women reported that 67% of the batterers and 43% of the nonbatterers used alcohol frequently. From the women's

reports of their knowledge of the men's backgrounds, 81% of batterers and 24% of nonbatterers experienced or observed violence in their homes as children. The women completed the Attitude Toward Women scale for themselves and for the men involved. Their perception of the batterers' attitudes averaged significantly lower, or more traditional than their perception of the nonbatterers' attitudes. The results of this study indicated that the best predictor of males' future violent behavior in the home was a history of past violent behavior, either witnessing, receiving and/or committing violent acts (Walker, 1984).

In summary, the first major studies that focused on conjugal violence were sociological studies designed to document the prevalence of family violence in our country. These studies generally indicated correlations of spouse abuse with lower levels of socio-economic status and alcohol abuse (Gelles, 1974; Straus et al, 1980; Steinmetz, 1977). Later studies that reported on characteristics of the individuals involved in wife battering were based on information gathered mainly from the perceptions of women as victims, most of whom were seeking help in finding solutions for the violence. The results of these studies indicated a relationship between spouse abuse and participants' childhood history of family violence (Roy, 1982; Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Walker, 1984).

Studies of Male Spouse Batterers

In 1977 Coleman (1980) conducted one of the first reported studies on the characteristics of male batterers that utilized information gathered directly from the men themselves. Data was collected from 33 volunteers among men who requested psychotherapy at a family clinic. The men had complained of conjugal violence and had been involved in violent episodes in the prior 18 months. The characteristics and history of the men were examined by questionnaires and semistructured interview.

The men ranged in age from 23 to 44, with incomes from zero to \$30,000. The average subject was 31 years old, white, with a 12th grade education, an income of \$11,717, and two children. The length of their current partnerships ranged from 6 months to 14 years.

A total of 64% of the men had observed or experienced violence as children. A total of 43% of the sample reported being occasionally intoxicated prior to the fights. According to the author, these men believed characteristics of manhood included strength, dominance, success, and superiority; a sense of inadequacy in these areas was felt as devastating to their self-esteem. Sex role stereotypes reinforced the husbands' maintenance of their superior roles in marriage. When their wives disagreed or refused to follow their views, they were perceived as in the wrong. The men's reports of the violent episodes in their marri-

ages generally corresponded to reports available from their wives with only slight discrepancies (Coleman, 1980).

Sonkin (Sonkin, Martin & Walker, 1985) gave a report of an analysis of intake data from 42 men who were treated in a program for male batterers in California. This report was offered as clinical observation and, no other information was available about the men or the study. Of these men, 21% were physically abused as children, 45% saw their father abuse their mother, and 50% either saw their mother being abused or were themselves abused. A total of 62% were under the influence of alcohol or drugs at the last battering incident; 43% had been violent both while under the influence and while not under the influence of alcohol. An alcohol screening test indicated that 46% had an alcohol problem (Sonkin et al., 1985).

One study often cited in literature as focusing directly on male batterers was conducted by Rosenbaum and O'Leary (1981). In this research the information gathered on male characteristics was also primarily gained from the wives. This is one of the few studies which compare physically abusive with nonabusive spouses.

Couples were divided into four groups and compared on a number of factors. The abused sample consisted of 52 women who were self-referred and receiving therapy for problems related to family violence. This physically abused group was divided on the basis of whether the couples were being treated together, or whether the women were being seen

individually without their husbands. The 20 couples being seen in conjoint therapy were designated the AC group. The AI group consisted of 32 women being seen in individual therapy. Two comparison groups of 20 couples each were designated as either satisfactorily married, the SC group; or nonviolent maritally discordant, the NV group. The SC group was selected from the telephone directory, from equivalent neighborhoods of the abused groups, to minimize socioeconomic differences. The NV group was self-referred for marital therapy without a known problem of violence in their relationship. The subjects were asked to fill out four standardized instruments, the short version of the Attitude Towards Women Scale (AWS), the Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (SMAST), a marital adjustment test, and measures of assertion.

Firsthand information was available from the males for three of the groups, but not for the AI group. To compare across the four groups, all wives served as informants for their husbands on the AWS and the SMAST. Information on assertion and marital adjustment instruments was not available for men in the AI group.

The average ages of the subjects ranged from 34 to 38; they were married for an average of 12.76 years. The subjects had an average of 12.5 years of education. There was no significant between-group differences in terms of age, years married, education, or religion. The physically abusive husbands were more likely to have been abused as

children, and were more likely to have witnessed parental spouse abuse than the nonabusive men.

Alcohol abuse was assessed for the males only and all scores came from the wives, whether or not the men were available to report themselves. The AI group differed significantly from the other three groups, reporting a higher score for alcoholism. The other three groups did not differ from one another. Women were asked to answer the AWS twice, once to determine their own attitudes and a second time as they felt their husbands would respond. The men in the AI group were seen by their wives as significantly more conservative than the men in the other three groups.

This study demonstrated that physically abusive husbands differ from comparison groups of non-abusive husbands, as perceived by their wives. These results support previous findings of strong associations between wife abuse and traditional sex role attitudes, alcohol abuse of husbands, and experience of husbands' family abuse as a children. The authors of the study suggested that more research should be focused on these characteristics of the husband/assailant (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981).

Another study which compared physically abusive husbands to nonabusive husbands focused on the differences in the men's level of self-esteem (Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985). The subjects were divided into three groups. The group of physically abusive husbands consisted of 20 men

who were self-referred for psychological treatment for problems related to marital violence. The 20 men, who were designated as satisfactorily married had scores within the satisfactory range on a marital adjustment test. Eighteen men who scored as dysfunctional on the marital adjustment test were designated as discordant nonviolent husbands. Both of these groups were nonviolent with their wives according to their self-reports. All data were collected as self-reported written responses to the marital adjustment test, a self-esteem scale, and a spouse interaction test developed for this study.

The average age of the physically abusive men was 30.94, as compared to 34.6 for the satisfactorily married men, and 38.5 for the maritally discordant husbands. The average income for the three groups also differed; for the abusive men it was \$13,870, for the satisfactorily married, \$18,125 and for the maritally discordant husbands, \$19,110. The physically abusive husbands were significantly younger and lower in income than the nonviolent maritally discordant husbands.

The results revealed significant group differences on the self-esteem scale, with the physically abusive husbands scoring significantly lower than either of the other two groups. These results supported the conclusion that wife abuse is associated with deficiencies in the self-esteem of abusive husbands. The differences in self-esteem were not interpreted to justify the conclusion that low self-esteem

is a cause of wife abuse. The direction of the relationship between wife abuse and self-esteem was not determined. According to the authors, the abusive behavior itself may be destructive to men's sense of self-worth. They recommended further empirical research on marital violence, and specified men's self-esteem as a promising direction for this future research (Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985).

A study by Telch & Lindquist (1984) utilized 50 couples in California, which were divided into three groups. The research compared the couples on characteristics of alcohol use, sex-role stereotypy, jealousy, self-concept, anger, assertion, communication skills, marital adjustment, and demographic items.

The violent group (V) consisted of 19 couples referred to counseling for wife battery and violent incidents in their marriages. The subjects in the other two groups indicated that violence was not present in their marriages. The nonviolent distressed (NVD) sample consisted of seven volunteer couples who were engaged in marital counseling. The nonviolent nontherapy (NV) sample consisted of 24 couples who voluntarily responded to announcements that requested couples to complete a research questionnaire. The instrument used for measurement of sex-role-stereotype was developed for this study. Self-concept was measured using an experimental version of an existing scale. These instruments are nonstandard measures which require further validation.

The violent couples reported significantly lower family incomes than the other couples, though the results can be misleading. The greatest percentage of couples in all the groups had incomes of over \$25,000, but a higher percentage of violent couples reported incomes of less than \$10,000. The violent couples had been in the marriages shorter periods of time than the other two groups. Over half (55%) of the V group had been married from 1-4 years; while 82% of the NVD group and 87% of the NV group had been married for over 4 years.

The incidence of violent behavior was significantly greater in the backgrounds of violent couples. A significantly greater number reported parents who were violent toward one another, (59.5% for V, 15.4% for NVD, and 23.9% for NV), and that they had been physically abused as children (53.8%, 23.1%, and 18.2% for V, NVD, and NV respectively). In the violent group 75% of the males and 27% of the females reported observing violence between their parents.

Both husbands and wives in the V group reported drinking problems that were significantly greater than their counterparts in the NVD and NV groups. The responses on the sex-role-stereotype scale indicated that couples in the V group held significantly more traditional attitudes than the couples in the other two groups, which did not significantly differ. The males reported more traditional attitudes than the females, and the V males reported the

most traditional attitudes overall. The results of the self-concept scale indicated that NV couples possessed a significantly higher self-concept than do either of the distressed groups; the mean scores of the V and the NVD couples were not significantly different.

The results of this study confirm that a history of violence in the family of origin was a significant factor in predicting the violent couples. Violent couples were also shown to have more stereotyped sex-role attitudes and more traditional views of marriage than nonviolent couples. Alcohol use was found to be the best predictor of membership in the violent group for both the husbands and wives (Telch & Lindquist, 1984). This study indicates the need for further research on the personal characteristics of both partners involved in marital violence.

Johnston (1984) conducted another research project which compared groups on the basis of information gathered directly from males. This study investigated the relationship between spouse abuse, and self-esteem, attitudes toward women, and observing or experiencing of violence as a child. The subjects in this study consisted of 105 men, classified into three groups: known wife-abusers who had been court-ordered for counseling (n=27), self-reported abusers (n=34), and non-abusers (n=44). The two groups of physically abusive men did not differ significantly on scores measuring spouse abuse. The men in the first group were required to complete the instruments as a part of a

court-ordered therapy program, the men in the other two groups were volunteers. The instruments used were a socio-demographic questionnaire, the Conflict Tactics Scale, the Attitudes Toward Women Scale and the Tennessee Self-concept Scale.

The mean age was 33.6 for the court ordered group, 42.4 for the self-reported abusers, and 42.6 for the non-abusers. The average income was \$18,000 for the court ordered men, \$27,558 for the self-reported abusers, and \$30,568 for the non-abusers. The exact mean of their incomes is unknown because 11 of the men had an income over the \$35,000 upper limit of the questionnaire. Their education ranged from an average of 13.55 years for the known abusers, 14.91 for the self-reported abusers, and 15.25 for the non-abusers. These variables were designated covariates as a substitute for experimental control.

The physically abusive and non-abusive men did not differ significantly on scores measuring self-esteem, attitudes toward women, observing violence, or experiencing violence as a child. The results indicated the probability of the occurrence of spouse abuse is increased if a man has observed or experienced violence as a child. The experience or observation of violence as a child also correlated significantly with lower levels of self-esteem and more traditional attitudes toward women.

The majority of these men came from an affluent area outside of Washington, D.C. The relatively high education

level and income of these men could be expected to affect their levels of self-esteem and attitudes toward sex roles. This would be a major factor that limits the generalizability of these results. The author recommended further research pertaining to these variables as related to spouse abuse (Johnston, 1984).

Summary

Authors agree that marital violence occurs in American families of persons of all ages, all social classes, and all levels of income and education. Research results indicating that men involved in family violence are younger and of lower socio-economic status may be due to their families being more visible and relying more on social agencies, or these men may actually engage in more violent behavior in their marriages. There are a variety of reasons suggested for the consistent mean differences reported between groups of violent husbands and nonviolent husbands. Extensive research aimed toward exploring these differences will be required before these questions can be resolved.

Following the early sociological studies which documented the prevalence of conjugal violence in our country, individual issues became the focus of an increasing amount of research. The majority of research on individual characteristics has been carried out with women as victims of wife battering. Descriptions of the characteristics of

males involved in spouse abuse have been gathered through information from the females' perceptions of the men and later from reports of clinical observations. The literature reviewed indicates the dearth of research which has utilized information obtained directly from the perceptions of the men involved in family violence. As programs designed for intervention with males involved in family violence are increasing and information directly from men becomes available, studies involving these males begin to be reported.

Factors that have been reported repeatedly in the literature as characterizing wife battering males are alcohol abuse, low self-esteem, rigid attitudes toward traditional sex roles for women, and history of family violence in the men's childhood homes. The objective of this study was to investigate these variables from information obtained directly from males in order to add to the growing knowledge base about battering men and help to increase the understanding of various personal factors relevant to spouse abuse.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents an explanation of the methods and procedures that were utilized in this project. The selection of subjects, a description of the instruments used, and the procedures for the collection and analysis of the data are presented.

Subject Selection

The 107 subjects for this project consisted of adult males applying for or receiving counseling services from community agencies and who were asked to participate in this study as volunteers. To obtain an acceptable level of power, i.e., approximately .80 with a medium effect size, a sample of 100 was identified as the minimum acceptable sample size (Cohen, 1977). The subjects were categorized into two groups. Seventy-six (71%) were designated as violent or physically abusive and 31 (29%) were designated as nonviolent or physically nonabusive.

Fifty-seven (53%) of the subjects were from a program developed for intervention with battering husbands. These

subjects composed 75% of the battering group in the study. Ten (5.7%) of these men were court-referred, but not necessarily court-mandated, to the counseling program. Of these 57 men who had been identified as physically abusive husbands, nine (16%) denied the violence on the self-report instrument. This was comparable to the 14% denial rate of a previous study using this same instrument (Johnston, 1984). Since all of these men previously had been identified as violent by inclusion in the intervention program, they were classified into the violent group for this analysis.

The remaining 50 (47%) of the total subjects were men who requested counseling services from community mental health agencies. These men were categorized into the two groups on the basis of their responses on the violence scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). Of these subjects 19 (38%) were identified as physically abusive, and 31 (62%) were classified as physically nonabusive.

Demographic information which has been considered as characteristic of physically abusive husbands was collected from the subjects. These characteristics included age, income, education, and length of marriage. This information is reported to describe the groups of subjects in this study; no effort was made to control for differences due to these factors.

Table 1 shows a summary of the means, ranges and standard deviations of the two groups according to age

distribution. The mean age of the violent group is lower ($\bar{M} = 32.4$) than the nonviolent group ($\bar{M} = 35.3$). This difference between groups is consistent with the results of previous studies which describe groups of physically abusive husbands as younger than comparable groups of nonabusive husbands. Table 2 shows the frequency distribution for ages of the groups.

Table 1
Summary of Means, Ranges, and Standard
Deviations for Age

Group	N	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Violent	76	19 - 51	32.42	6.85
Nonviolent	31	21 - 50	35.26	6.41

Table 2

Frequency Distribution for Age

Ages	Violent Group		Nonviolent Group	
19 - 29	26	34%	5	16%
30 - 39	40	53%	19	61%
40 - 49	8	10%	6	20%
over 50	<u>2</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3%</u>
Totals	N = 76	100%	N = 31	100%

In Table 3 is a summary of group means, ranges and standard deviations of the length of marital relationships. The nonviolent group in general have longer marriages (\bar{M} = 9.8 years) than the violent group (\bar{M} = 6.7 years). Table 4 shows the frequency distribution for length of marriages for both groups. In the violent group 40 (52%) have relationships of five years or less, compared with nine (29%) of the nonviolent group. Of the physically nonabusive group six (23%) reported relationships of over 16 years compared with six (8%) of of the physically abusive group. Previous studies have consistently suggested that abusive couples have shorter relationships than nonabusive couples. Five men did not report the length of their marriages.

Table 3

Summary of Means, Ranges and Standard Deviations
for Length of Marriage

Group	N	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Violent	74	1 - 29	6.65	6.23
Nonviolent	28	1 - 24	9.87	6.52

Table 4

Frequency Distribution for Length of Marriage

Marriages	Violent Group		Nonviolent Group	
Under 1 year	12	16%	2	6%
1 - 5 years	28	36%	7	23%
6 - 10 years	18	24%	10	32%
11 - 15 years	10	13%	3	10%
16 - 20 years	3	4%	4	13%
Over 20 years	3	4%	2	6%
Missing data	<u>2</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>10%</u>
Totals	N = 76	100%	N = 31	100%

Data relative to the level of education of groups is summarized in Table 5. The nonviolent group members have a higher average level of education ($\bar{M} = 14.3$ years) than the average of the violent group ($\bar{M} = 13.3$ years). Frequency distribution for levels of education for the two groups are shown in Table 6. In the physically nonabusive group 19 (61%) have some education past high school, compared with 33 (43%) of the physically abusive group. Only two (6%) of the nonabusive group have less than a high school degree, while 12 (16%) of the abusive group reported less than 12 years of education. The reports in the literature describe abusive husbands as generally completing less education than comparable groups of nonabusive husbands. Three men failed to report on their level of education.

Table 5
Summary of Means, Ranges and Standard Deviations
for Level of Education

Group	N	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Violent	74	9 - 20 yrs.	13.32	2.52
Nonviolent	30	9 - 20 yrs.	14.30	2.74

Table 6

Frequency Distribution for Level of Education

Education	Violent Group		Nonviolent Group	
Under 12 years	12	16%	2	7%
12 years	29	38%	9	29%
13 - 15	17	22%	7	23%
16	7	9%	6	19%
17 - 20	9	12%	6	19%
Missing data	<u>2</u>	<u>3%</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>3%</u>
Totals	N = 76	100%	N = 31	100%

A summary of means, ranges and standard deviations on the basis of income level is shown in Table 7. The average monthly income of the nonviolent group members is higher ($\bar{M} = 1353.46$) than the average of the violent group ($\bar{M} = 1188.96$). Table 8 lists the grouped frequency distribution for income levels. In the violent group eight men (11%) reported no income, as compared with two men (7%) in the nonviolent group. This difference between average income levels is again consistent with differences reported in studies of family violence. Nine men did not report their income level. Reported income ranged from zero for both

groups to \$3500 for the physically abusive group and \$2950. for the physically nonabusive group.

Table 7

Summary of Means, Ranges, and Standard Deviations
for Level of Income

Group	N	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Violent	71	0 - 3500	1188.96	798.76
Nonviolent	26	0 - 2900	1353.46	761.52

Table 8

Frequency Distribution for Level of Income

Monthly Income	Violent Group		Nonviolent Group	
0	8	11%	2	7%
\$100 - \$950	22	29%	7	24%
\$1000 - \$1950	30	40%	11	38%
\$2000 - \$2950	6	8%	7	21%
\$3000 - \$3950	5	6%	0	0%
Missing data	<u>5</u>	<u>6%</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>10%</u>
Totals	N = 76	100%	N = 31	100%

The differences found between the two groups' for each of the demographic characteristics are consistent with the previous reports in the literature. In general, men who are identified as being physically abusive toward their wives are reported as being younger, having less education and lower income, and having shorter term relationships than men who are identified as physically nonabusive.

Instrumentation

The instruments used in the study consisted of a demographic information questionnaire, Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Straus, 1979), Short Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (SMAST) (Selzer, Vinokur, & van Rooijen, 1975), Index of Self Esteem (ISE) (Hudson, 1982), and Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). In the following paragraphs, these instruments and the way in which they were used in this study are described.

Conflict Tactics Scale

The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Straus, 1979) was devised to measure intrafamily conflict in terms of the methods used to resolve conflicts (Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980). This scale was developed in a series of survey studies by Straus and his colleagues (Straus, 1974, 1979). This scale was originally designed to be used as a self-administered instrument; it also has been used in

structured interviews. It was designed to measure spouse abuse and child abuse.

The instrument consists of 18 statements related to the resolution of conflict in families. Conflict tactics are measured according to three different scales; Reasoning, Verbal Aggression, and Violence. The Violence scale which consists of the final eight items in the instrument is used to categorize individuals as either violent or nonviolent within a relationship.

In this study the CTS was administered in three versions to measure intrafamily violence in the current marital relationship and in the family of origin. The measurement of violence in the current relationship was utilized to differentiate group membership in abusive and nonabusive groups. The other two versions of the CTS were used to measure violence between each subject's parents and child abuse from parents to subject in the man's family of origin.

The CTS consists of items which question respondents about behavior during times of family conflict. The list of possible actions begins with the ones low in coerciveness and high in social acceptability. The items gradually become more coercive and physically violent. This sequence enhances the likelihood that the subject will become committed to the process and continue answering the questions. The questions on the CTS concern highly sensitive and normatively deviant types of behavior which can lead to

antagonism on the part of the respondent and to self-defensively distorted responses, or to refusing to continue to respond. Reported experience with this instrument indicates low refusal and antagonism rates. This is due to the presentation in the context of disagreements and conflicts which are recognized as occurring in almost every family, to the sequence of items previously described, and to the sequence of family roles with the past less threatening behavior being questioned first and present behavior probed after the questions are familiar (Straus, et al., 1980).

Reliability. The internal consistency reliability of the CTS was examined by two techniques: item-total correlation analysis and the alpha coefficient of reliability. The mean item-total correlation is .87 for the husband-to-wife violence index and .88 for the wife-to-husband violence index. These figures are based on a pilot study sample of 385 couples (Straus, 1979). For a later sample of 2,143 couples, the alpha coefficients are .83 for the husband-to-wife violence index, .82 for the wife-to-husband violence index (Straus et al., 1980).

The CTS used in this study was a version that modifies the time span covered in the original instructions. The previous use of the CTS had covered periods of 12 to 18 months. In this study the instrument was used to measure longer spans of time, both the entire time of the marriage and the first eighteen years of the subject's life.

Johnston (1984) used the CTS in this way and conducted a pilot study to check for test-retest reliability of this use of the instrument. The CTS with modified instructions was given twice to 67 graduate students a week apart. She found the correlations of .95 for husband to wife violence, .70 for mother to child violence, and .79 for father to child violence (Johnston, 1984).

Validity. Concurrent validity was reported in a study by Bulcroft and Straus (cited in Straus, 1979) in which 105 college students and their parents were asked to voluntarily and separately complete the CTS for the last year the students lived at home. The correlation of husband-wife physical aggression between the responses of student and husband was .64. The correlation between responses to the father-student violence scale was .64, with a tendency for the student to report more violence than the father. This is consistent with the literature reports that abusive men tend to minimize abusive behavior.

The items on the violence scale have a degree of content or face validity as they consist of descriptions of physical force being used by family members on another (Straus, 1979). Some evidence of construct validity is provided by the results of a number of studies using the CTS measure of violence (Gelles, 1974; Steinmetz, 1977; Straus, 1974).

The CTS is the most widely used instrument available for measuring family violence. It has one major disadvantage;

as a self-report instrument it is only as reliable as the honesty of the respondent. Johnston (1984) found that about 14% of the men who did not admit the violence in face-to-face interviews did report violence on the CTS; and 14% of the men who were court ordered to treatment for family violence denied violent behavior on the CTS (Johnston, 1984).

Short Michigan Alcohol Screening Test

In order to get a measure of alcohol abuse for the subjects, the Short Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (SMAST) (Selzer et al., 1975) was utilized. This 13 item self-administered questionnaire is a modified version of the original Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (MAST) (Selzer, 1971).

The MAST was designed to "provide a consistent, quantifiable, structured interview instrument for the detection of alcoholism" (Selzer 1971, p. 242). Many of the 25 questions also have been used by other surveys investigating alcoholism. The authors did not include questions related to the amount of alcohol consumed because of the vague answers encountered. This instrument was designed to be a screening device and is not intended as a fully diagnostic instrument.

Using a sample of 351 patients admitted to a general hospital, scores of MAST were correlated with the psychiatric diagnosis of alcoholism. Using Selzer's (1971)

cutoff score of three or above indicating alcoholism, Moore (1972) reported that an "overall correlation of 78% existed between the psychiatrists' diagnoses and the MAST scores" (Moore, 1972, p. 1567). The probability of this correlation happening by chance is less than .001 (Moore, 1972).

The MAST was modified into a 24 question self-administered instrument (Selzer et al., 1975). This modified version was administered to a total of 501 males in two groups; members of one group had been psychiatrically diagnosed as alcoholics. The percentages of responses indicating alcoholism were very similar to those obtained on the original norming group. This indicated that the MAST can be used either as a structured interview or as a self-administered questionnaire.

Reliability. The reliability of the MAST in terms of its internal consistency was determined by coefficient alpha. Separate computations for the two groups yielded coefficients of .83 for the non-alcoholic (n = 273), .95 for the alcoholic group (n = 228), and .95 for the entire sample. The authors considered these results to be an excellent indication of high internal consistency for a 24 item test (Selzer et al., 1975).

In constructing the SMAST, the goal was to produce an effective, shorter, self-administered version of the MAST (Selzer et al., 1975). The data obtained from the populations described above were used to develop this shortened version. Separate calculations of the SMAST

reliability coefficient alpha for each group and the groups combined yielded coefficients of .76 for the alcoholic (n = 273), .78 for the non-alcoholic (n = 228), and .93 for the combined groups; these are only slightly lower than those obtained for the MAST. This indicated the reliability of the 13 item SMAST is almost as high as the longer self-administered MAST. A product-moment correlation between the SMAST and the MAST yielded $r = .93$, $.90$, and $.97$ for alcoholic, non-alcoholic, and combined groups, respectively (Selzer et al., 1975).

Validity. The same groups were used as criterion groups to determine the validity of the MAST. The authors reported that a product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated between the total MAST score and the group membership score which yielded a validity coefficient of $r = .79$. Using what the authors describe as "more certain criterion groups" of licensed drivers (n = 102) and hospitalized alcoholics (n = 129), similar calculations yielded a coefficient of $r = .90$ (Selzer et al., 1975, p. 120). These results indicated that the members of the groups diagnosed as alcoholic scored higher than the others (Selzer et al., 1975).

In light of articles describing the denial employed by alcoholics, the extent to which subjects deny characteristics implied by responses indicating alcoholism needed to be assessed. This was done by determining the correlation between MAST scores and scores on an instrument designed

to measure the denial of socially undesirable characteristics. These correlations were relatively weak, indicating that the effect of denial on the MAST responses is negligible. The authors concluded that "any tendency to deny undesirable characteristics does not materially affect the validity of the MAST" (Selzer et al., 1975, p. 122).

Selzer et al. (1975) reported that the criterion validity for the SMAST is slightly higher than that reported for the MAST. The product-moment correlation coefficient was $r = .83$ using the larger groups for the complete criterion groups ($n = 501$) and $r = .94$ for the "more certain" criterion groups ($n = 231$). The effects of denial were also examined for the SMAST and were found to be negligible. On the basis of the reported correlations, it was suggested that for most purposes the SMAST would be as effective as the MAST in screening for alcoholism (Selzer et al., 1975).

Index of Self-Esteem

The Index of Self-Esteem (ISE) (Hudson, 1982) was designed as a short-form unidimensional instrument, intended to measure the degree, severity or magnitude of a problem with self-esteem. In this instrument self-esteem is defined as the "evaluative component of self-concept" (Abell, Jones, & Hudson, 1984, p. 12). This definition avoids the concept of measuring self-esteem as a comparison between the ideal self and the real self, and allows self-

esteem to be measured along a single continuum at a single point in time (Abell et al., 1984).

The instrument consists of 25 item category-partition scale that can be answered on a five point scale, from (1) rarely or none of the time to (5) most or all of the time. Approximately one-half of the statements are worded in a negative direction, and the others are positively worded. This arrangement is an effort to control partially for response-set biases. After all of the items have been scored in the negative direction, the total score is obtained by subtracting 25 from the sum of the item scores. This total score can range from 0 to 100, with the lower score representing a relative absence of problems with self-esteem and a high score indicating the presence of possible problems.

The authors use 55 as the clinical cutting score, the point above which one can be reasonably sure of a problem with self-esteem and below which a problem probably is not present. This score correctly classifies 89.5% of those identified by experienced clinicians as free of self-esteem problems and 94.7% of those identified with these problems (Abell et al., 1984).

Reliability. The reliability of the ISE was estimated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient as a measure of internal consistency. The sample consisted of 1161 subjects pooled from previous studies on the ISE. For this sample, alpha is .93, and the standard error of measurement is 5.23.

For another sample of 85 subjects, alpha is .95, and the standard error of measurement is 6.01. On the basis of these findings, the authors concluded that in terms of reliability, this instrument is a sound measurement tool (Abell et al., 1984).

Validity. The criterion validity of the ISE was tested using two groups of subjects (N=85) gathered from experienced clinicians who classified their cases according to problems with self-esteem. The subjects used were those categorized by clinicians and themselves as either having no significant problems with self-esteem or as having definite self-esteem problems. The mean ISE score for the persons with self-esteem problems was 2 1/2 times larger than the mean score of the persons described as having no self-esteem problems. The difference between the means was about 35 points and was statistically significant (alpha = .05). The point-biserial correlation between the ISE scores and criterion-group status was found to be .78 (Abell et al., 1984).

Attitudes Toward Women Scale

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) (Spence & Helmreich, 1972) was designed to measure the beliefs about the rights and appropriate roles of women in contemporary society. For this study a short 25-item version of the AWS was utilized (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973).

The instrument consists of declarative statements, each

with four response alternatives ranging from agree strongly to disagree strongly. Each item is scored from 0 to 3, with 0 representing the most traditional, conservative attitude, and 3 the most contemporary, liberal response. By summing the values for the individual items, an overall score from 0 to 165 can be derived for the original form (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). The score can range from 0 to 75 for the short form used in this study.

The numerical index score presumably reflects the degree to which the individual holds traditional or liberal views. This score permits the comparison of attitudes of groups on this dimension and the prediction of other behaviors based on the individual's attitude score.

Validity. To develop the AWS an attempt was made to include items that described roles and patterns of conduct in main areas of activities in which men and women were capable of being granted equal rights. It has gone through several versions; statistical analyses led to some items being dropped or rewritten and others being added. The predecessor of the final scale consisted of 78 items which were given to over 1000 college students. Statistical analyses resulted in 23 items being dropped because of failing to discriminate among subgroups, redundancy of content, or failing to appear on any factor in a factor analysis. The final scale includes only the items which were found to measure the desired attitudes.

Reliability. The AWS was given to two groups of college students ($N_1 = 949$ and $N_2 = 532$) in successive semesters. Inspection of the data indicated the distributions for the two semesters were similar. The stability of the distributions suggests, indirectly, that a reliable phenomenon was being measured (Spence & Helmreich, 1972).

For the convenience of having a shorter version of the AWS that is highly correlated with the original, a 25 item form was devised (Spence et al., 1973). For each of the 55 statements an item analysis was performed on data from 527 college students, 241 female, 286 male. The subjects were divided into quartiles on the basis of their total responses for each sex separately. The 25 items which had distributions which maximally discriminated among quartiles for both sexes and which had the highest biserial correlations were selected for the short version of the AWS. A number of comparisons were made between the scores on both versions of the AWS. Data were available for students and for a number of parents, 292 mothers and 232 fathers. For each of the groups a correlation was obtained between the subjects scores on the 25-item version and the full scale instrument. For the student samples, the resulting $r = .97$ for both the males and females; for the parents, $r = .96$ for both the mothers and the fathers. In summary, the analyses of both samples indicate that scores on the shortened, 25-item form are highly correlated with the scores on the full scale form (Spence et al., 1973).

Procedure

The subjects were given a packet of the instruments, a demographic questionnaire and an informed consent form. The subjects were given the packet by individual counselors or individually during the intake process. The consent form explained the protection for confidentiality in the study and stated that participation in the study was voluntary and would not affect services received at the agency. The signed consent form was not part of the packet; it was kept in separate files in the agencies to protect the subjects' anonymity. The men completed the instruments and turned in the packet within the agencies. Information about potential subjects who refused to participate or who did not complete the instruments was not obtained.

The sequence of these instruments began with the ones which asked about the most socially acceptable and least threatening information. Questions pertaining to possible present violent behavior were in the final instrument. This is the sequence recommended by the developer of the Conflict Tactics Scale in order to obtain the most accurate information from respondents (Straus, 1979). The Index of Self-Esteem was presented first, followed by the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, the Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test and then the three versions of the Conflict Tactics Scales. The version of the CTS which measures conflict

between subjects' parents was first, followed by the one which measures conflict from parents toward subjects and finally, the version which measures conflict between the subjects and their wives. The absence of violence in the childhood families of the subjects was coded as "1" and the presence of violence was coded "2".

The subjects were divided into two groups designated as violent or physically abusive husbands and as nonviolent or physically nonabusive husbands. They were categorized either because of their inclusion in the intervention program for battering husbands or on the basis of responses on the CTS. These two groups were compared on variables that have consistently been reported as characteristics of physically abusive husbands. These variables are self-esteem, attitudes toward women's sex roles, alcohol abuse, and the history of experiencing and observing violence in the men's families of origin.

Analysis of Data

Discriminant function analysis was utilized to indicate those variables that would be the best predictors of group membership and to assess the relative contribution of each variable to the between-group differences using $\alpha = .05$. Discriminant analysis was selected for this nonexperimental research design which used naturally occurring groups of unequal size and variables which are not manipulated. Causality is not implied in the study.

Summary

The subjects for this study consisted of 107 adult males who were divided into two groups designated as violent or physically abusive husbands (n = 76) and nonviolent or physically nonabusive husbands (n = 31) on the basis of self-report on behavior or of membership in a battering husbands' program. These men were involved in counseling and participated as volunteers in this study. They completed a demographic information form and measurements of self-esteem, alcohol abuse, attitudes toward women's sex roles, and history of violence in family of origin.

The members of the violent group on the average are younger, have less education, lower income, and have shorter term marriages than the nonviolent group members. These characteristics are consistent with group differences reported in previous studies on marital violence.

The research hypothesis tested states that membership in groups of physically abusive husbands and physically nonabusive husbands can be predicted on the basis of the men's levels of self-esteem, attitude toward sex roles of women, alcohol abuse, their experiences of physical abuse as children and their observations of spouse abuse in the families of origin. Discriminant analysis was used to determine whether membership in abusive and nonabusive groups can be predicted from these five variables.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the statistical analysis to determine whether prediction of membership in groups of physically abusive husbands or physically nonabusive husbands can be made on the basis of responses to measures of self-esteem, attitudes toward sex roles for women, alcohol abuse, and history of experiencing and observing violence in families of origin. This chapter presents a description of the results determined from the discriminant function analysis utilized to test the hypothesis.

Statistical Analysis of the Data

According to Tabachnick and Fidell (1983), unequal sample sizes pose no problems for discriminant function analysis. No data was missing for any measurements in either group. The frequency data were examined to identify possible outliers, and all scores were found to deviate less than two standard deviations from each group mean. No skewness was indicated by examination of the frequency

tables. Pairs of predictor variables were evaluated for linearity by examination of scattergrams, and did not reveal gross deviation from linearity. The assumptions of multivariate normality and homogeneity of variance are robust to modest violation if sample size is large enough to produce at least 20 degrees of freedom (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1983). Sample sizes were large enough to suggest normality of sampling distributions of means. Thus, evaluation of the assumptions revealed no threat to multivariate analysis.

A direct discriminant function analysis ($\alpha = .05$) was performed using the five variables as predictors of membership in the two groups, physically abusive husbands and nonabusive husbands. The predictor variables were self-esteem, alcohol abuse, attitudes toward women's sex roles, and history of abuse in family of origin.

The discriminant function calculated resulted in a chi square of 13.654, $p < .05$. The loading matrix of correlations between the predictor variables and the discriminant function included in the results of discriminant analysis shown in Table 9 suggests that the three primary variables in discriminating between the two groups are alcohol abuse with a loading of 0.675, attitudes toward women's sex roles with a loading of -0.657, and abuse as a child with a loading of 0.519. Eta squared accounted for 12.5% of the variance shared between grouping variables and predictor variables.

Table 9

Results of Discriminant Function Analysis

Predictor Variable	Correlation of variables with discriminant function	Univariate F	Significance Level
SMAST	.67524	6.821*	0.0103
AWS	-.65735	6.465*	0.0125
Childhood Abuse	.51881	4.027*	0.0473
Abusive Parents	.49600	3.681	0.0578
ISE	.19775	0.585	0.4461

* $p < .05$.

The measure of alcohol abuse contributed the most in the discrimination between the two groups. The group of violent husbands have higher scores on the measure of alcohol abuse ($\underline{M} = 3.14$) than nonviolent husbands ($\underline{M} = 1.42$). The scores on the measurement of attitudes toward women's sex roles and reports of childhood abuse also contributed to the discrimination. Physically abusive husbands reported more conservative attitudes toward sex roles for women ($\underline{M} = 48.99$) than nonabusive husbands ($\underline{M} = 55.23$). The difference between groups on reporting

physical abuse as children was also significant at the .05 level. The violent group reported more abuse as children ($\underline{M} = 1.36$) than the nonviolent group ($\underline{M} = 1.16$). Group means and standard deviations for individual variables are shown in Table 10.

Table 10
Group Means, and Standard Deviations for Predictor Variables

Variables	Groups			
	Violent		Nonviolent	
	\underline{M}	SD	\underline{M}	SD
SMAST	3.144	3.34	1.419	2.41
AWS	48.987	10.91	55.226	12.89
Childhood Abuse	1.355	0.48	1.161	0.38
Abusive Parents	1.419	0.49	1.226	0.43
ISE	54.302	15.91	51.709	15.91

The majority of the men in both groups reported that their parents were not abusive toward them nor toward each other, however the violent group reported a larger

percentage of parents who were abusive. The percentages of group members reporting history of abuse are shown in Table 11.

Table 11

Ratio of Abuse in Families of Origin

		Violent Group	Nonviolent Group
Abuse between Parents	Nonabusive:	58%	77%
	Abusive:	42%	23%
Childhood Abuse	Nonabusive:	64%	84%
	Abusive:	36%	16%

Pooled within-group correlations among the five predictors are shown in Table 12. Of the ten correlations, four would show statistical significance at $\alpha = .05$, if tested individually. There are positive correlations between experience of abuse as children and alcohol abuse with $r = .21$, $p < .05$, and between abuse as children and scores of self-esteem with $r = .27$, $p < .01$. There is also a positive correlation between the reports of observing parental abuse and experience of abuse as children with $r = .55$, $p < .01$. There is a small negative

correlation between observing parental abuse and attitudes toward women's sex roles with $r = -.21$, $p < .05$.

Table 12

Pooled Within-Group Correlations Among Predictors

	AWS	SMAST	Childhood Abuse	Parents
ISE	-.19	.15	.27**	.16
AWS		-.07	-.06	-.21*
SMAST			.21*	.04
Childhood Abuse				.55**

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

Using these results and a priori information related to group sizes, 93.4% of the members of the violent group were classified correctly. A total of 72.9% of the overall cases were correctly classified into the two groups. Classification results are shown in Table 13.

Table 13

Classification Results

<u>Actual Group</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Predicted Group Membership</u>	
		Violent	Nonviolent
Violent	76	71 (93.4%)	5 (6.6%)
Nonviolent	31	24 (77.4%)	7 (22.6%)

Summary

The research hypothesis tested using an alpha level of .05 stated that men's responses on the measures of self-esteem, attitude toward women's sex roles, alcohol abuse and history of family violence can predict membership in the group of subjects identified as physically abusive toward their wives or the group identified as nonviolent toward wives. This model was tested with discriminant function analysis.

On the basis of this analysis the null hypothesis is rejected. The analysis indicates that group membership in physical abusive and nonabusive groups of husbands can be discriminated on the basis of scores on the variables. Three of the five variables, alcohol abuse, attitudes toward women's sex roles, and experience of childhood abuse

contributed most of the prediction of group membership. The other two variables, self-esteem and observing parental violence as children, added little to the ability to predict group membership.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between wife battering, and specific characteristics of husbands. The relationship between spouse abuse and the characteristics of self-esteem, attitudes toward contemporary sex roles for women, and abuse of alcohol was investigated. The men's histories of experiencing abuse from parents as children and of observing spouse abuse in their families of origin were also examined.

The subjects were 107 men who had requested counseling services from community agencies and who volunteered to participate in the study. The males were designated as either violent or as nonviolent on the basis of the men's behavior toward their marital partners. The violent or physically abusive group, which consisted of 76 men identified as having been violent toward their wives, was compared with the nonviolent or physically nonabusive group, which consisted of 31 men who denied marital

violence. The self-report instrument used for differentiation was the Conflict Tactics Scale.

Test data in the analysis included the subjects' scores on versions of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) which indicate violence in the family of origin. Attitude toward sex roles for women was measured using the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). The measurement for self-esteem used in this study was the Index of Self Esteem (ISE). The Short Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (SMAST) was used as the measurement of alcohol abuse.

The research hypothesis tested at the .05 level of significance stated that men's responses on the variables of self-esteem, attitude toward women's sex roles, alcohol abuse and history of family violence can predict whether husbands belong to the group identified as violent toward wives or to the group identified as nonviolent toward wives. Discriminant function analysis was used to determine whether group memberships can be accurately predicted from these five variables.

The variables of alcohol abuse, attitudes toward women's sex roles, and experience of childhood abuse were the three variables which were found to contribute most to the prediction of group membership. Self-esteem and history of observing parental abuse in their families of origin added little to the prediction of group membership. The men who reported experience of abuse as children scored higher on measurements of alcohol abuse and indicated lower

levels of self-esteem than men who reported no childhood abuse. Males who reported experience of childhood abuse also reported more observation of parental abuse. The men who reported observation of parental abuse as children reported more conservative attitudes toward women's sex roles than men who reported no observation of parental abuse.

Discussion and Conclusions

The combination of alcohol abuse, conservative attitudes toward women's contemporary sex roles, and experiencing childhood abuse in family of origin was the most significant predictor of membership in groups of male clients designated as violent or nonviolent toward their wives. The insignificant difference between groups on the observation of parental abuse in families of origin was unexpected. Though the majority of both groups reported nonviolent childhood homes, the violent group did report a higher percentage of both observing parental abuse and experiencing childhood abuse. The history of violence in men's families of origin is consistently reported as a significant factor in their violent behavior in adult relationships (Johnston, 1984; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Telch & Lindquist, 1984).

Minimal differences between groups occurred on the basis of self-esteem scores. The mean scores of both groups on this measurement were similarly close to the instrument's

cutting score of 55 for the diagnosis of serious problems with self-esteem. While the majority of the males would not be diagnosed as having pathological self-esteem problems, most of them could be considered to have a relatively low sense of self-worth. This finding could be considered to be due to the members of both groups consisting of males who had applied for counseling services. Problems with self-esteem are common among persons requesting these services.

The strong correlation between alcohol and family violence has consistently been reported in the literature (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Telch & Lindquist, 1984). Though various explanations have been offered for this consistent correlation between spouse abuse and alcohol abuse (Langley & Levy, 1977), they are not mutually exclusive. Two major viewpoints have been suggested as explanations for this correlation. One view is that alcohol has a disinhibiting effect on an individual who is more inclined to react with antisocial and violent behavior than if the person were not drinking (Guerney, Waldo, & Firestone, 1987). It has been reported that most husbands who are abusive when drinking are also violent when they do not drink (Sonkin, Martin & Walker, 1985). The abusers may have learned the "success" of their violent behavior when drinking and continued to repeat the behavior at other times. A man's violent behavior is reinforced when he is able to dominate and get

his own way with his wife when he is violent (Guerney et al., 1987). Drinking may also give the abuser a way to deny responsibility; alcohol can serve as an excuse for violent behavior (Gelles, 1979). A correlation has been found between the severity of the violence and actual drinking; the abuse is likely to be more severe when the perpetrator has been using alcohol (Coleman, 1980).

Another viewpoint is that alcohol abuse and violent behavior are a learned association (Saunders, 1982). Those who have difficulty postponing gratification have a tendency to turn to alcohol to relieve tensions. Drinking causes impairment in judgment, and men who have the inability to postpone need gratification may relieve their frustrations through violence toward their wives who are perceived as being responsible for fulfilling these needs.

The typical "everyday" type of batterers are basically oversocialized into the traditional male role predicated on control. They exhibit more rigidity than outright aggression or women hatred, and they appear to develop overbearing expectations for themselves as well as for their wives (Gondolf, 1985). Frequently men see their traditional role as man of the house to mean perfect and complete control over their partners' behavior (Edelson, 1984). They hold the belief that they are responsible for their spouses' feeling and actions. Since this is seldom the reality of the situation, the use of violence is often justified as a means to gain this control. These men with

traditional attitudes reassert their sense of self-worth through compulsive efforts to control.

Men are socialized to deny their own feelings and to objectify the world around them. Women become objects which are admired for parts of their bodies, rather than viewed as persons with whom to develop a relationship. One cannot interrelate with "things," so men are left to strive to control and possess them (Gondolf, 1985). The suggestion to these men that their wives are separate and independent human beings can be highly threatening to them, making it very difficult for them to relinquish their need to try to control the uncontrollable (Waldo, 1987). The man creates a double standard whereby he needs to consider himself in control of his partner's behavior and blames his own violent behavior on her actions. This, in effect, is giving her the power to control his violent behavior and seeing himself as a passive victim of his wife's provoking and his own uncontrollable anger. Once again, a double standard is created, the expectation of perfect compliance by the woman and justification of abusive behavior by the man.

This serves to explain the findings of this study that abusive husbands hold more conservative attitudes toward women's sex roles than nonabusive males. Contemporary sex roles for women, characterized as greater freedom and equality for women, may be quite threatening to males who expect perfect compliance from their wives.

While males who are involved in marital violence may

have observed violence between parents in their childhood home and may have relatively low self-esteem, these characteristics do not appear to be significantly different from other males who apply for counseling services. The majority of the men in both groups scored at a relatively low level on the measurement of self-esteem. This might be considered as characteristic of men who request counseling for a variety of problems that may or may not include family violence, since this study did not compare clinical groups with control groups from nonclinical populations. Surprisingly the results did not support the expected differences in reported abuse in childhood homes, which could be due to the lack of comparison nonclinical groups. Men who lived in abusive homes as children may experience problems such as depression, substance abuse, anxiety and relationship issues, which bring them to counseling. The history of experiencing and observing abuse in their childhood homes may have an impact on adults' abilities to cope with life situations and be relevant to other treatment issues. There are reports from clinical observations that a large proportion of men in therapy for more than three months bring up experiences of past violence (Scher & Stevens, 1987).

Implications for Treatment

The results of this study have implications for the interventions with males in the prevention and treatment of

spouse abuse. Society's response to battering males has historically been to condone, ignore or conceal their violent behavior (Waldo, 1987). It is important to recognize that men as well as women are trapped in the destructive patterns that produce negative consequences for the whole family. Furthermore, family violence may often be an issue for men who seek counseling services for identified problems in other areas.

Providing treatment for men who are family abusers is a relatively new and controversial endeavor. There is a remarkable degree of consistency in approaches and specific issues considered important to address in treatment programs for battering males (Brennan, 1985). There is a consensus that group counseling is the most effective approach for stopping violence and confronting the attitudes that lead to abusive behavior. The majority of programs emphasize behavioral techniques to help the males control their violent behavior. However, helping men simply to control themselves may be insufficient, and may even add to the problem; men who batter need to learn to let go of some of that control (Gondolf, 1985). Cognitive restructuring is reported to be an effective technique used in groups of men who are confronted by each other as well as by counselors with their unrealistic expectations of perfect compliance from their wives (Saunders, 1982). New men's programs offer counseling groups that focus first on education and techniques to stop the abusive behavior and

then follow through with approaches that give the men opportunities to change their own attitudes and to learn to relate to others, specifically women, in more constructive ways.

Some counseling services and self-help groups ease the batterers' feeling of guilt and help them restrain their violence without working toward changing the sexist attitudes related to the violence. Some groups, including self-help groups such as Batterers' Anonymous (Goffman, 1984), focus almost exclusively on the control of anger and violent behavior. Some male groups can actually support the perpetuation of the attitudes of male dominance, by offering the men the support of members with similar beliefs and values. There is evidence that abusive men who have a strong support system of males with similar values are more likely to continue to be abusive, which suggests that poorly run male groups may actually encourage violence in these individuals (Brennan, 1985).

Since attitudes toward women are considered to be an important focus of therapy for male abusers, it may be contended that female professionals need to be involved in the interventions with abusing men. An essential objective of counseling is to educate the men to the sex role stereotypes that lead to treating women as objects and subjecting them to abuse. It has been argued that women are most effective in confronting a group of men with the realities of sexism since they are the ones who have been the

recipients of it (Gondolf, 1985). A female co-facilitator in men's groups can relate her experiences and confront men, including the male leaders, with their subtle as well as blatant stereotypic attitudes.

Marital and family therapists have been implicated by some in the domestic violence area as being part of the problem, rather than the solution. Some of this concern is because of the failure of many therapists to detect abuse in couples. This is assumed to be due to the fear of women in revealing the violence in the presence of their husbands and the insistence of some therapists on working exclusively with the couple together (Cook & Frantz-Cook, 1984). Unreported violence may also be due to therapists' lack of experience and knowledge of the dynamics of abusive relationships. It is often only when a sensitive professional asks the right questions that the violence is revealed.

There is a tendency for many family therapists to hold both partners responsible for the man's violence. This implies that the battered woman could and should control her husband's actions and attenuates the man's responsibility for his violent behavior. As clinicians have recognized these biases, many have tried to refrain from blaming the victim by stating that the woman is an unwitting collaborator who plays a part in the assault but is not responsible for the man's behavior. The systemic view that partners are locked into a recurrent pattern

that each plays a role in maintaining, and the view that the man is the one responsible for his violent behavior need not be mutually exclusive.

Surprisingly little attention is given to the problem of alcohol abuse in the descriptions of intervention programs for spouse abusers. It is consistently acknowledged that the problems are correlated, but the issue of treating the alcohol abuse is not addressed directly (Brennan, 1985; Gondolf, 1985; Saunders, 1982). This approach would appear to give the impression that the interventions for ending spouse abuse will also address the substance abuse. Even if the two behaviors are related through a learned association, no evidence has been found to indicate that addressing the problem of spouse abuse would lead to a change in substance abuse. Some programs refer the individual with a severe alcohol or drug problem to programs for substance abuse (Sonkin et al., 1985). This would acknowledge that the two problems are related but not the same, and that substance abuse is a serious issue that needs to be addressed.

It is suggested that the most effective approach would be concurrent treatment and coordination of objectives for the two programs into a system of mutual goals. Sonkin et al. (1985) report that people who use even low amounts of alcohol continue to be at risk for violence. Former substance abusers may continue using the same psychological coping patterns they utilized when drinking

(Sonkin et al., 1985).

The issue of alcohol abuse is often one way an individual rationalizes his lack of responsibility for his behavior. Violence is blamed on alcohol use; being drunk is given as an excuse for being out of control. Emphasizing to individuals their responsibility for their own behavior, both for the drinking and for the violence, is essential in addressing both problems. Confronting clients with the double bind of wanting complete control and yet giving up personal responsibility can be effective in addressing both substance abuse and spouse abuse.

Additional services offered by some programs include expanded agendas for men's and couples' groups in educational and personal issues, as well as individual, marital and family counseling. Most of these modalities are effectively utilized while the violent behavior is monitored and after the violence is controlled. After the violence is controlled, marital therapy as conjoint therapy or in couples groups can be very effective in changing the dysfunctional patterns in the relationship that foster the situations that erupt in violence (Margolin, 1979). Whether treatment is provided primarily by male therapists, female therapists or male-female co-therapy teams, the results of this study strongly suggest that the male batterers' attitudes toward women be included as a major focus of therapy.

Recommendations for Further Research

The results from this study again raise the issue of the potential problems from the "woozle effect" (Gelles, 1980, p. 873) in which statements and empirical results from simple initial research in a new area are repeated by various authors until they reach the status of laws without being supported by any further exploration (Gelles, 1982). The perpetuation of these myths have become common in the area of family violence where inaccurate assumptions concerning patterns and causes are being applied to diagnostic and clinical interventions. These assumptions lead to overemphasis on variables that may fail to stand the test of more extensive research, despite their reported importance. These variables may be either marker variables which are in some way related to family violence or they may have a spurious association which appeared because of research procedures in sampling or methodology (Schumm, Martin, Bollman, & Jurich, 1982).

1. Many descriptive statements pertaining to physically abusive husbands are probably true to some extent. The question of whether violent and nonviolent men differ significantly on these characteristics continues to be unanswered. The paucity of research on wife batterers leaves serious uncertainties in our knowledge about physically abusive males from their own perspective. There is a continuing need for further investigation of the individual

characteristics that are consistently reported as being descriptive of violent husbands.

2. More appropriate methods for investigating and assessing family violence need to be developed to improve the ability to investigate this phenomenon. Controversy still surrounds the problem of describing a marriage as violent or nonviolent, and the question of how to define an appropriate label for abuse still exists (Margolin, 1987). This study has a number of limitations in methodology and sampling procedures which are shared with other studies utilizing data collected directly from men. Some of these limitations are related to the difficulty of gathering data from males about physical abuse. Inaccuracies no doubt exist due to the sensitivity of the subject and the shame in admitting even to oneself that one is involved in family violence.

3. The results suggest that further investigation of the variables is warranted, both singularly and in combination. The results infer that in the prediction of spouse abuse it is a combination of factors rather than simple characteristics that will have the most predictive value. The interaction of multiple factors would appear to be more important than these factors considered individually in seeking to understand how and why marriage partners become violent toward each other. The cumulative effects of the characteristics and patterns of behavior of both males and females in specific relationships may be the

most reliable in predicting whether or not a marriage relationship will erupt in violence.

REFERENCES

- Abell, N., Jones, B. L., & Hudson, W. W. (1984). Revalidation of the index of self-esteem. Social Work Research & Abstracts, 1, 11-16.
- Allen, J. R., & Allen, B. A. (1981). Violence in the family. Family and Community Health, 5, 19-33.
- Bagarozzi, D. A., & Giddings, C. W. (1983). Conjugal violence: Current research and clinical practices. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 11, 3-15.
- Bard, M., & Zacker, J. (1974). Assaultiveness and alcohol use in family disputes: Police perceptions. Criminology, 12, 283-292.
- Bernard, M. L., & Bernard, J. L. (1983). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. Family Relations, 32, 283-296.
- Bograd, M. (1984). Family systems approaches to wife battering: A feminist critique. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 54, 558-568.
- Brennan, A. F. (1985). Political and psychosocial issues in psychotherapy for spouse abusers: Implications for treatment. Psychotherapy, 22, 643-654.
- Carlson, B. E. (1977). Battered women and their assailants. Social Work, 22, 455-460.

- Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (rev. ed.). New York: Academic.
- Cohen, P. (1984). Violence in the family - An act of loyalty? Psychotherapy, 21(2), 249-253.
- Coleman, K. H. (1980). Conjugal violence: What 33 men report. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 6, 207-213.
- Cook, D. R. & Frantz-Cook, A. (1984). A systemic treatment approach to wife battering. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 10, 83-93.
- Davidson, T. (1978). Conjugal crime: Understanding and changing the wifebeating pattern. New York: Ballantine.
- Deschner, J. P. (1984). The hitting habit: Anger control for battering couples. New York: Macmillan.
- Dibble, U., & Straus, M. A. (1980). Some structure determinants of inconsistency between attitudes and behavior: The case of family violence. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 71-80.
- Edleson, J. L. (1984). Working with men who batter. Social Work, 29(3), 237-242.
- Elbow, M. (1977). Theoretical considerations of violent marriages. Social Casework, 58, 515-526.
- Flynn, J. P. (1977). Recent findings related to wife abuse. Social Casework, 58, 13-20.
- Gelles, R. J. (1974). The violent home: A study of physical aggression between husbands and wives. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Gelles, R. J. (1979). Family violence. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J. (1980). Violence in the family: A review of research in the seventies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 873-885.
- Gelles, R. J. (1982). Applying research in family violence to clinical practice. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 9-20.
- Gelles, R. J., & Cornell, P. C. (1985). Intimate violence in families. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Giles-Sims, J. (1983). Wife battering: A systems theory approach. New York: Guilford.
- Goffman, J. M. (1984). Self-help counseling for men who batter women. San Bernardino, CA: Batterers Anonymous.
- Goldstein, D., & Rosenbaum, A. (1985). An evaluation of the self-esteem of maritally violent men. Family Relations, 34, 425-428.
- Gondolf, E. W. (1985). Men who batter: An integrated approach for stopping wife abuse. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications.
- Guerney, B., Waldo, M., & Firestone, L. (1987). Wife-battering: A theoretical construct and case report. The American Journal of Family Therapy, 15, 34-45.
- Hudson, W. W. (1982). The clinical measurement package: A field manual. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Johnston, M. E. (1984). Correlates of early violence experiences among men who are abusive toward female

- mates (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, 1984). Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 639B.
- Kardener, S. H., & Fuller, M. (1970). Violence as a defense against intimacy. Mental Hygiene, 54(2), 310-315.
- Langley, R. & Levy, R. C. (1977). Wife beating: The silent crisis. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Levinger, G. (1966). Sources of marital dissatisfaction among applicants for divorce. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36, 803-807.
- Margolin, G. (1979). Conjoint marital therapy to enhance anger management and reduce spouse abuse. American Journal of Family Therapy, 7(2), 13-23.
- Margolin, G. (1987). The multiple forms of aggressiveness between marital partners: How do we identify them? Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 13(1), 77-84.
- Martin, D. (1976). Battered wives. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Martin, D. (1985). Domestic violence: A sociological perspective. In D. J. Sonkin, D. Martin & L. E. A. Walker (Eds.), The male batterer: A treatment approach (pp. 1-32). New York: Springer.
- Moore, R. A. (1972). The diagnosis of alcoholism in a psychiatric hospital: A trial of the Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (MAST). American Journal of Psychiatry, 128, 1565-1569.
- O'Brien, J. E. (1971). Violence in divorce prone families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 692-698.

- Ordinary force as means of discipline not prohibited.
(21 O.S.1981 844). Oklahoma Statutes 2, 2163.
- Ponzetti, J. J., Cate, R. M., & Koval, J. E. (1983).
Violence between couples: Profiling the male abuser.
The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 62, 222-224.
- Public policy - Protection of children - Definitions.
(21 O.S.1981 845). Oklahoma Statutes 2, 2163.
- Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1981). Marital violence:
Characteristics of abusive couples. Journal of Consulting
and Clinical Psychology, 48, 63-71.
- Roy, M. (Ed.). (1982). The abusive partner: An analysis of
domestic battering. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Saunders, D. G. (1982). Counseling the violent husband. In
P. A. Keller & L. G. Ritt (Eds.) Innovations in clinical
practice: A source book (pp. 16-29) Sarasota, FL:
Professional Resource Exchange.
- Scher, M. (1981). Men in hiding: A challenge for the coun-
selor. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 199-202.
- Scher, M. & Stevens, M. (1987). Men and violence. Journal
of Counseling and Development, 65, 351-355.
- Schumm, W. R., Martin, M. J., Bollman, S. R., & Jurich,
A. P. (1982). Classifying family violence: Whither the
woozle? Journal of Family Issues, 3, 319-340.
- Searle, M. (1985). Introduction. In D. J. Sonkin, D.
Martin & L. E. A. Walker. The male batterer: A treat-
ment approach (pp. xi-xiv). New York: Springer.
- Selzer, M. L. (1971). The Michigan Alcoholism Screening

- Test: The quest for a new diagnostic instrument. The American Journal of Psychiatry, 127, 1653-1658.
- Selzer, M. L., Vinokur, A., & van Rooijen, L. (1975). A self-administered Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (SMAST). Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 36(11), 117-126.
- Snell, J., Rosenwald, R., & Robey, A. (1964). The wife-beater's wife. Archives of General Psychiatry, 11, 107-112.
- Sonkin, D. J., Martin, D., & Walker, L. E. A. (1985). The male batterer: A treatment approach. New York: Springer.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1972). The attitudes toward women scale. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society. 2(4), 219-220.
- Stacey, W., & Shupe, A. (1983). The family secret: Domestic violence in America. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Stahly, G. B. (1978). A review of select literature of spousal violence. Victimology: An International Journal, 2, 591-607.
- Star, B. (1983). Helping the abuser: Intervening effectively in family violence. New York: Family Service Association of America.
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1977). The cycle of violence. New York: Praeger.

- Steinmetz, S. K., & Straus, M. A. (Eds.). (1974). Violence in the family. New York: Harper & Row.
- Straus, M. A. (1974). Leveling, civility, and violence in the family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 13-29.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 75-88.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. New York: Anchor.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (1983). Using Multivariate Statistics. New York: Harper & Row.
- Telch, C. F., & Lindquist, C. U. (1984). Violent versus nonviolent couples: A comparison of patterns. Psychotherapy, 21(2), 242-248.
- Toby, J. (1974). Violence and the masculine ideal: Some qualitative data. In S. K. Steinmetz & M. A. Straus (Eds.). Violence in the family (pp. 58-64). New York: Harper & Row.
- Waldo, M. (1987). Also victims: Understanding and treating men arrested for spouse abuse. Journal of Counseling and Development, 65, 385-388.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). The battered woman. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L. E. (1981). Battered women: Sex roles and clinical issues. Professional Psychology, 22, 81-94.

- Walker, L. E. (1984). The battered woman syndrome. New York: Springer.
- Watts, D. L., & Courtois, C. A. (1981). Trends in the treatment of men who commit violence against women. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 60, 245-252.
- Weitzman, J., & Dreen, K. (1982). Wife beating: A view of the marital dyad. Social Casework, 63, 259-265.
- Whitehurst, R. N. (1974). Violence in husband/wife interaction. In S. K. Steinmetz & M. A. Straus (Eds.). Violence in the family (pp. 75-81). New York: Harper.

APPENDIX
INSTRUMENTATION

I Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)

Here is a list of things that your father and mother might have done when they had a conflict. Now taking into account all disagreements (not just the most serious ones), we would like you remember back to your family when you were a child and indicate how often your father and mother did the things listed below. Please include your earliest recollections up to age 18.

0 = Never 3 = 3-5 times 6 = more than 20 times
 1 = Once 4 = 6-10 times X = Do not know
 2 = Twice 5 = 11-20 times

<u>Father</u>											<u>Mother</u>									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	a. Discussed the issue calmly	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	b. Got information to back up his/her side of things	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	c. Brought or tried to bring in someone to help settle things	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	d. Insulted or swore at her/him	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	e. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	f. Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	g. Cried	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	h. Did or said something to spite her/him	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	i. Threatened to hit or throw something at her/him	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	j. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	k. Threw something at her/him	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	l.Pushed, grabbed, or shoved her/him	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	m.Slapped her/him	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	n.Kicked, bit, or hit with fist	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	o.Hit or tried to hit with something	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	p.Beat her/him up	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	q.Threatened with knife or gun	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	r.Used a knife or gun	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X

II Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)

Parents may use many different ways of trying to settle differences and disputes with their children. Here is a list of things that your father and mother might have done when they had a conflict with you. Now taking into account all disagreements (not just the most serious ones), indicate how often they did the things listed below. Include your earliest memories up to age 18.

0 = Never 3 = 3-5 times 6 = more than 20 times
 1 = Once 4 = 6-10 times X = Do not know
 2 = Twice 5 = 11-20 times

<u>Father</u>											<u>Mother</u>									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	a. Discussed the issue calmly.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	b. Got information to back up his/her side of things	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	c. Brought or tried to bring in someone to help settle things	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	d. Insulted or swore at me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	e. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	f. Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	g. Cried	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	h. Did or said something to spite me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	i. Threatened to hit or throw something at me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	j. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	k. Threw something at me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	l. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	m. Slapped me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X				

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	n.Kicked, bit, or hit with fist	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	o.Hit or tried to hit with something	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	p.Beat me up	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	q.Threatened with knife or gun	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X	r.Used a knife or gun	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	X

III

Conflict Tactics Scale

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have spats for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences. Below are listed some things that you and your wife might have done when you had a dispute with each other. Please indicate how often you and your wife have done each item with each other.

0 = Never 3 = 3-5 times 5 = 11-20 times
 1 = Once 4 = 6-10 times 6 = more than 20 times
 2 = Twice

<u>You</u>								<u>Your Wife</u>						
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	a. Discussed the issue calmly	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	b. Got information to back up my/her side of things	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	c. Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	d. Insulted or swore at her/me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	e. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	f. Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	g. Cried	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	h. Did or said something to spite her/me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	i. Threatened to hit or throw something at her/me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	j. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	k. Threw something at her/me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	l. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved her/me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	m. Slapped her/me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6

0 1 2 3 4 5 6	n. Kicked, bit, or hit with fist	0 1 2 3 4 5 6
0 1 2 3 4 5 6	o. Hit or tried to hit with something	0 1 2 3 4 5 6
0 1 2 3 4 5 6	p. Beat up her/me	0 1 2 3 4 5 6
0 1 2 3 4 5 6	q. Threatened with a knife or gun	0 1 2 3 4 5 6
0 1 2 3 4 5 6	r. Used a knife or gun	0 1 2 3 4 5 6

Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test

Please circle your answers to these questions.

- | | | |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. Do you feel you are a normal drinker? | Yes | No |
| 2. Does your wife, a parent, or other near relative ever worry or complain about your drinking? | Yes | No |
| 3. Do you ever feel guilty about your drinking? | Yes | No |
| 4. Do friends or relatives think you are a normal drinker? | Yes | No |
| 5. Are you able to stop drinking when you want to? | Yes | No |
| 6. Have you ever attended a meeting of Alcoholics Anonymous? | Yes | No |
| 7. Has drinking ever created problems between you and your wife, a parent, or other near relative? | Yes | No |
| 8. Have you ever gotten into trouble at work because of drinking? | Yes | No |
| 9. Have you ever neglected your obligations, your family, or your work for two or more days in a row because you were drinking? | Yes | No |
| 10. Have you ever gone to anyone for help about your drinking? | Yes | No |
| 11. Have you ever been in a hospital because of drinking? | Yes | No |
| 12. Have you ever been arrested for drunken driving, drinking while intoxicated, or driving while under the influence of alcoholic beverages? | Yes | No |
| 13. Have you ever been arrested, even for a few hours, because of other drunken behavior? | Yes | No |

Index of Self-Esteem

This questionnaire is designed to measure how you see yourself. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. Please answer each item as carefully and accurately as you can by placing a number by each one as follows:

1. Rarely or none of the time
2. A little of the time
3. Sometimes
4. A good part of the time
5. Most of the time

Please begin:

1. I feel that people would not like me if they really knew me well
2. I feel that others get along much better than I do.
3. I feel that I am a beautiful person.
4. When I am with other people I feel they are glad I am with them.
5. I feel that people really like to talk with me.
6. I feel that I am a very competent person.
7. I think I make a good impression on others.
8. I feel that I need more self confidence.
9. When I am with strangers I am very nervous.
10. I think that I am a dull person.
11. I feel ugly.
12. I feel that others have more fun than I do.
13. I feel that I bore people.
14. I think my friends find me interesting.
15. I think that I have a good sense of humor.
16. I feel very self conscious when I am with strangers.

17. I feel that if I could be more like other people
I would have it made.
18. I feel that people have a good time when they
are with me.
19. I feel like a wallflower when I go out.
20. I feel I get pushed around more than others.
21. I think that I am a rather nice person.
22. I feel that people really like me very much.
23. I feel that I am a likable person.
24. I am afraid I will appear foolish to others.
25. My friends think very highly of me.

The Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS)

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the role of women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you (A) Agree strongly, (B) Agree mildly, (C) Disagree mildly, or (D) Disagree strongly. Please indicate your opinion by marking before each statement the letter which corresponds to what best describes your personal attitude. Please respond to every item.

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| (A) Agree strongly | (C) Disagree mildly |
| (B) Agree mildly | (D) Disagree strongly |

1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.
2. Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.
3. Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.
4. Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.
5. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.
6. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.
7. It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.
8. There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.
9. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.
10. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.
11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.

12. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.
13. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.
14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.
15. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.
16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.
17. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even with their fiances.
18. The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.
19. Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house tending, rather than with desires for professional and business careers.
20. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.
21. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.
22. On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.
23. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.
24. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.
25. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given the modern boy.

VITA ²

Jane Aurell Wahl

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: SELF-ESTEEM, ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN, ALCOHOL ABUSE, AND HISTORY OF FAMILY VIOLENCE IN SPOUSE BATTERING MALES

Major Field: Applied Behavioral Studies

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Lawton, Oklahoma, September 20, 1934 the daughter of Lloyd and Lena Aurell.

Education: Graduated from Lawton High School, Lawton, Oklahoma in August, 1951; attended Christian College, Columbia Missouri in 1951; attended Oklahoma University, Norman, Oklahoma in 1952 and 1960; received Associate of Science degree from Northern Oklahoma College, Tonkawa, Oklahoma in 1978; received Bachelor of Science in Arts and Sciences in Psychology from Oklahoma State University in December, 1982; received Master of Science degree in Community Counseling from Oklahoma State University in May, 1984; completed requirements for Doctor of Philosophy degree in Applied Behavior Studies in Counseling Psychology at Oklahoma State University in December, 1987.

Professional Experience: Graduate Assistant, Oklahoma State University, 1983 - 1985; Stillwater Domestic Violence Service, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1982 - 1986; Practicum Outpatient Therapist: Oklahoma State University Mental Health Clinic, 1983 - 1984, Marriage and Family Counseling Service, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1984 -1986, Stillwater Community Mental Health, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1984 - 1985, Bi-State Mental Health Foundation, Ponca City, Oklahoma, 1985 - 1986; Psychology intern, Burrell Center, Inc., Springfield, Missouri, September, 1986 - August, 1987.