

NONPHYSICAL INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE: EMOTIONAL ABUSE AND
CONTROLLING BEHAVIOR AGAINST WOMEN.

by

EGBERT ZAVALA

B.A., The University of Texas at El Paso, 2005

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Social Work
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2007

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Ryan E. Spohn

Copyright

EGBERT ZAVALA

2007

Abstract

Though many studies do show that emotional abuse exists within a pattern of other physical violence, few researchers have adopted nonphysical abuse as the crux of their research. The goal of this study is to contribute to the intimate partner violence literature by examining other forms of abuse such as controlling and emotional abuse that are largely neglected in social science research. More specifically, I examine the connection between women's employment (status compatibility) and their risk of intimate partner abuse. Examining the role of male power and control in intimate relationship increases our understanding of the causes and consequences of male-to-female violence. Data are from the survey of *Violence and Threats of Violence Against Women and Men in the United States, 1994-1996*. This survey involved telephone interviews with a national probability sample of approximately 8,000 English-speaking women and 8,000 men ages 18 and older residing in households throughout the United States. Only women are analyzed in this study. Respondents were asked about their general fear of violence and ways in which they managed those fears, emotional abuse on the part of their partners, and incidents of actual or threatened violence experienced by all types of offenders. Taping into status compatibility by measuring women's contribution to relationship economic well-being through employment and education, hypotheses are derived from feminist theory suggesting that women in relationships that benefit men's marital power will experience more emotional abuse than women whose status are compatible with their partners. Consistent with prior research, controlling and emotional abuse is associated with low education attainment and poverty. Results reveal that control and emotional abuse is not greatest in relationships in which a male is employed and their female partner is not or in relationships in which a woman is employed and their male partner is not. Contrary to prior research, relationships in which unemployed men are married to women who work were not found to have experienced more emotional abuse than couples in which both partners are employed.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Dedication.....	viii
CHAPTER 1 - Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
CHAPTER 2 - Literature Review.....	5
Family Violence Perspective on Intimate Partner Violence.....	6
Feminist Perspective on Intimate Partner Violence.....	8
Controlling in Intimate Relationships.....	9
Class, Economic Deprivation, and Abuse	12
Alcohol Abuse and Intimate Partner Violence	14
Child Victimization and Intimate Partner Violence	15
Research Hypotheses	16
CHAPTER 3 - Data and Methods.....	18
Data.....	18
Dependent Variable	18
Independent and Control Variables	19
CHAPTER 4 - Results, Conclusion, and Discussion.....	21
Results.....	21
Conclusion and Discussion.....	24
References.....	28
Appendix A - Descriptions of Variables Used in Scales.....	38

List of Tables

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Variables Used in the Analysis	40
Table 2: Bivariate Correlations Between Variables Used in the Analysis	41
Table 3: Logistic Regression Analysis Results ^a	42
Table 4: Logistic Regression Analysis Results ^a	43

Acknowledgements

I have written this section in my head a million times, but now that it is actually time to write it I am lost for words. I will do my best. I am particularly grateful to Dr. Ryan E. Spohn, my committee chair, for his guidance during this research and the *tremendous* patience he showed despite my many errors and, most importantly, my inexperience. Many times I went to Dr. Spohn's office with vague or jumbled ideas about what I wanted to do with this thesis and after every visit I was so energized that I wanted to go to the computer immediately and write out the entire thesis. His intellectual and professional enthusiasm are two traits every advisor should have. I consider myself most fortunate in having him as my professor, my boss, and finally my chair. For his guidance, as well as his support throughout the planning, researching, and organizing of this work, I owe him more than can be expressed here. I am also grateful to Dr. Patrick J. Akard who generously giving his time to be a member of my committee. This work would not have been completed without his assistance. His excellent input on the topic will make this research useful to others. Lastly, a special thank you is given to Dr. Michelle L. Bemiller who agreed to be on my committee when I could not find anyone else. She provided me with invaluable guidance and examples of quality scholarship. Although only one person's name appears on this research, the truth is that these three scholars all invested in it and their suggestions made this a better project than it could otherwise have been.

I am heavily indebted forever to my caring and loving parents, Jimmy and Alicia Zavala. It is extremely difficult for me to find the words that give adequate expression to my appreciation for their support and encouragement. Without their support my academic goals, both undergraduate and graduate, would have not been possible to attain. Though I am quite certain they do not know it, they are truly an inspiration in my life. I do not know how they do all that they do, but I am truly amazed by it all. I just know that things in life can only get better with them by my side. Their emotional support is the fuel that keeps me going. Finally, to my brothers Ricky and Eric, who have always been supportive of my endeavors. There are no other people in this world that could ever compare. My accomplishments are yours as well. Thanks for standing by me and I hope I made all of you proud!

This acknowledgment would be incomplete without giving thanks to my friends who made my years here at K-State a wonderful life experience. In particular, I want to thank my best friend Kasi Lane Morales, whose emotional support and encouragement kept me sane throughout my first year of study here at K-State. Her formal and informal advice (both academic and non-academic) continues to remind me that there is life outside the classroom and there is no reason to suspect that this support will come to an end. To my partner in crime, Cindy Whitney, who has given me more than she knows. She gave me a wonderful distraction at those times when writing was going poor, or usually not at all. Whether it is *Arts in the Park*, a *McCain Performance*, or simply teaching me how to swing dance at *Wendy's*, she made sure I had some fun. Because of “Bonnie,” I am a much better person. Cindy, thank you! To Daniel Aguilar, who through him I built a bridge to a group of people that I never in my life imagined meeting. It has been one of the most fulfilling and life altering encounters in my life. Also, to Ana Fraire, who answered my call for friendship at the time I needed it the most. Side by side or miles apart, a friend like you will always stay close to my heart. I also want to say thanks to Elizabeth Galvan for being there for me as well. Finally, I want to give thanks to two special people: Gaby Zamora and Yvonne Gonzales. I miss them as much as I know they miss me.

I must also give thanks to the person who set me on this academic road. A couple of years ago, Dr. Ted Curry recognized a quiet undergraduate student in his criminology class and in doing so he gave me confidence in my abilities to become a sociologist. Dr. Curry went beyond his role as an advisor and personally encouraged me to pursue graduate studies. He served as a wonderful mentor and simply put I would not be where I am today without him.

I end this note thanking every single person who has been part of my life. Thank you for sharing your experiences. Most importantly, I thank each and every one of you for being you.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to Beatriz Jiménez. She was always there for me during periods of self-doubt, but she continually believed in me. Her faith in me gave me great strength to carry on. She provided me with an emotional safe haven from the mental grind of academia, which continually refueled my desires to complete this thesis. I will always owe her a tremendous debt for this, and I hope this thesis serves as a partial repayment for the faith and friendship she has shown me.

CHAPTER 1 - Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Research on the use of dominance and emotional abuse as tools of control in intimate relationships has largely been neglected by social scientists. In contrast, research on intimate partner violence has gained momentum in the past two decades. The study of family violence has been so extensive that a separate subfield of intimate partner violence has emerged in sociology. Scholarly journals such as the *Journal of Family Violence*, *Violence Against Women*, *Journal of Marriage and Family*, and the *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* have spearheaded the movement and continue to suggest there is still a need to research intimate partner violence. Sociological research on the causes of family violence was largely introduced in the United States by Murray Straus and Richard Gelles in 1976 through the development of the National Family Violence Survey (NFVS). The National Family Violence Survey recorded people's involvement in family violence and measured the frequency of violence in families. Until this time, no nationally representative data existed that recorded violence among intimate partners and in families. Since the survey's inception, numerous studies indicate that intimate partner violence is a widespread social and health problem in the United States.

Most studies in intimate partner violence focus on physical violence (i.e. slapping, punching, kicking, etc). That is, most studies do not consider other forms of abuse, including emotional abuse, threatening physical harm, and attempting to control a partner's behaviors (Felson and Messner, 2000; DeKeseredy, 1995; 2000; Kaukinen, 2004; Johnson, 2006; Loring, 1998). This gap in the literature is largely due to ways in which social scientists, including sociologists and criminologists, define terms such as *domestic violence* and *intimate partner violence*. Research in family violence is replete with a variety of terms that are frequently used synonymously. Words such as *intimate partner violence*, *family violence*, *domestic abuse*, *spouse abuse*, and *domestic violence* are abundant in the literature. More often than not, these terms pose a problem in data collection and analysis, as well as interpretation (Gordon, 2000; Saltzman, 2004). Definitions of violence in the legal system generally focus on physical harm or injury. In other words, whether or not an act is considered abusive is determined by the amount of damage to a person's body. Consequently, someone who throws a punch in the intent to

physically hurt a person, but misses, would not be classified as committing violence because there were no physical injuries. Therefore, simply defining domestic violence or intimate partner violence by measuring physical damage to a person's body would fail to capture other abusive acts, such as the verbal, mental, and emotional abuse that victims are likely to endure (Demaris and Kaukinen, 2005; Carbone-López, Kruttschnitt, and MacMillan, 2006; Kaukinen, 2004; Loring, 1998; Stark, 2007).

Guided by a feminist perspective, some researchers suggest that intimate relationships may not be held together so much by love and intimacy but rather by aggression and intimidation (Johnson, 1995; Dobash and Dobash, 1992; Browne, 1987) and abuse in the context of a relationship becomes a way to construct masculinity (Anderson and Umberson, 2001; Anderson, 1997; Bowker, 1998; Stark, 2007). Control in intimate partner relationships can be conceptualized as a problem of men using threats and emotional abuse to maintain control over *their* wives or girlfriends (Johnson and Ferraro, 2000; Johnson, 1995; 2006; Stark, 2007). In any type of relationship, a male's sense of ego may heavily depend on his ability to control and dominate his partner, particularly in patriarchal cultures (Ogle and Jacobs, 2002; Ogle, Maier-Katkin, and Bernard 1995). In any relationship where the man's authority is challenged and his partner is perceived as being disobedient, he may use emotional abuse to establish his rule and reestablish command instead of (or in addition to) physically hurting his partner. The level of violence in those relationships will typically escalate as the abuser tests the limits of aggression (Leonard, 2002; Ogle and Jacobs, 2002). Women may threaten to leave in such cases, but the abuser/controller may exploit her feelings or needs by begging for forgiveness and promises of change (Browne, 1987). However, in many cases the change is only an increase of brutality as the male tries to tighten his control (Fox and Levin, 2001). Thus, examining the controlling behavior between offender and victim is warranted.

Though many studies do show that emotional abuse exists within a pattern of other physical violence (Stets and Burke, 1996; 2005; Felson and Messner, 2000; Kaukinen, 2004; Hamby and Sugarman, 1999; Stark, 2007), few studies have focused on nonphysical abuse as the crux of their research. Focusing on emotional abuse will increase our understanding of the etiology of the entirety of the phenomenon of intimate partner violence because it can establish physical victimization patterns that can persist during the duration of the relationship (Melton, 2007; Demaris and Kaukinen, 2005; Thompson et. al, 2002; Salari and Baldwin, 2002). This is

particularly important when women are victims because nonphysical abuse is more common than physical abuse, and can be as threatening as or more threatening than physical abuse (DeKeseredy, 1995; 2000; Burks, 2006). Nonviolent acts, such as being controlled by an intimate partner and emotional abuse, are highly injurious behaviors and are just as worthy of empirical research as those examining physical abuse (Schwartz, 2005; Kaukinen, 2004; Salari and Baldwin, 2002; Burks, 2006; Johnson, 2006; Loring, 1998).

Studying nonphysical violence such as emotional abuse and controlling behavior towards women is important for several reasons. First, many female activists and scholars argue that emotional abuse is the worst kind of abuse in intimate dating (see Burks, 2006 and Loring, 1998). Emotional abuse towards an exhausted female partner can convince her that she is not worthy of his affection or approval. Female victims of emotional abuse may never reach their full potential for happiness due to their destruction of their self belief in themselves (Loring, 1998). Second, abusers may use emotional abuse towards their female partners to feel better about themselves or their situations, or fill their desire for a sense of power and control. Therefore, some scholars argue that there is a notion of inequality of power in intimate relationships, especially in marriages (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). Men can fill their need for a sense of control over their situation by stealing the power of others. Third, nonphysical forms of violence need to be better understood in a legal context (Dutton and Goodman, 2005). In the criminal justice system, it is almost impossible to use emotional abuse as grounds for pressing domestic violence charges on perpetrators (Burks, 2006). Victims of emotional abuse will have a better chance of recovery when the legal system aims to make *all forms of abuse* unacceptable. Emotional abuse is the process by which an individual systematically diminishes and destroys the inner self of another person (Loring, 1998). In intimate relationships, this is almost always the female. Family violence researchers must incorporate nonphysical abuse such as emotional abuse and controlling behavior in their research to better understand violence against women.

The goal of this study is to contribute to the intimate partner violence literature by examining other forms of abuse that are largely neglected in social science research. Intimate partner violence is part of a systematic pattern of control and dominance over women and is not exclusive to men who have more income and social status than their female partners (Kwesign, et al., 2007). Examining the role of male power and control in intimate relationship increases our understanding of the causes and consequences of male-to-female physical violence. Testing

the idea that lack of power and dependence increases vulnerability to emotional abuse is necessary to understand the link between gender inequality and emotional abuse and controlling behavior (Hamby and Sugarman, 1999). Due to paucity of research on this topic, it is important to examine whether predictors of emotional abuse differ by status compatibility of partners. Men have traditionally possessed greater control in intimate relationships and this control has been connected to their status as breadwinner (Tichenor, 1999; 2005). Emotional abuse is perpetrated by both men and women in the context of relationships. However, the increase of married women into the labor force has led to a change in the quality of intimate relationships (Nock, 2001) and this change has been linked to the perpetration of violence towards women (Anderson, 1997; Macmillan and Gartner, 1999). For women, the imbalance of status compatibility is predicted to be salient in determining the levels of emotional abuse and control attempts. Specifically, this study examines the possible correlation between a woman's employment compatibility relative to her partner and the risk of emotional abuse. Examining the structural position of women and their risk of victimization, some theories argue that female victimization is largely due to women's economic, educational, and occupation status relative to their partner's power in these same areas. Testing status incompatibilities, as well as sociodemographic factors, alcohol consumption and personal dynamics between partners, will increase our understanding of controlling and emotional abuse that is largely absent in the literature.

CHAPTER 2 - Literature Review

In a controversial finding, Murray Straus reported that women are as violent as men toward their partners (Straus and Gelles, 1986; Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, and Daly, 1992). Using data from the 1975 and 1985 National Family Violence Survey (NFVS), Straus and Gelles (1986) reported that the prevalence of violence by wives against their husbands is the same or even greater than that of husbands against wives. Using the Conflict Tactics Scale to measure violence in relationships, the authors found that about twelve percent of each sex perpetrated one act of violence against their partner (Straus and Gelles, 1986). In what has been labeled as the *sexual symmetry in marital violence* and the *mutual combat hypothesis*, the authors stress that women often initiate violence against their husbands, rather than simply responding to a history of battering (Straus and Gelles, 1986; Dobash, et al., 1992). Largely as a response to this assertion, researching the problems of intimate partner violence has been of considerable interest to sociologists, criminologists, and feminists, and Straus and Gelles' claim has been heavily criticized (Dobash, et al., 1992; Worcester, 2002; Saunders, 2002; Johnson, 2006; Nazroo, 1995; Dasgupta, 2002; Morse, 1995).

The conclusion that females are as (or more) violent than males has led Johnson (1995; 2006) to suggest that family violence researchers and feminists are in fact studying two distinctly different forms of violence (also see Johnson and Leone, 2005). In what he termed *common couple violence*, this form of violence occurs when conflict situations between partners “get out of hand,” resulting in minor acts of violence—with some acts escalating to serious or life threatening forms of violence. Both men and women are subject to the use of this form of violence against each other. The second form of violence, which he termed *patriarchal terrorism*, is a general form of control where *men* are motivated by patriarchal tradition to exert control over their wives or girlfriends (Johnson, 1995; Johnson and Ferraro, 2000; Johnson and Leone, 2005). Such patriarchal terrorism can take the form of economic subordination, threats, isolation, and other control tactics and, thus, a male partner does not need to use actual physical violence in order to terrorize his partner (Johnson, 1995; 2006). Studying these two forms of violence, one somewhat neutral and the other clearly male dominated, increases our

understanding of the nature of emotional abuse perpetrated by each sex. Because common couple violence primarily stems from particular conflicts rather than from a general intent to control one's partner (Johnson, 1995), emotional abuse following particular conflicts are more likely to be performed by women. Patriarchal terrorism—the wish to exert control over women through nonviolent tactics for the sole purpose of gradually altering her view of herself and their relationship—is more likely to be perpetrated by men. Therefore, it is important to examine the different bodies of literature that have examined intimate partner violence separately—namely the family violence and feminist perspectives of intimate partner violence towards women.

Family Violence Perspective on Intimate Partner Violence

Most of the research on the causes of intimate partner violence has, in general, been divided into three categories. The first category involves socioculture theories that focus on the influence of social, structural, and family process that involves male domination, gender socialization, and power control in marriages (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). This type of research is mainly put forth by feminist scholars (Miller and White, 2003; Giordano et al., 1999; Kurz, 1989; Stark, 2007). The second type of research is a social-psychological perspective used by family violence researchers. The focus of this approach is on social learning experiences of victim and offender, stress, and violence in the family of origin (Hoffmann and Cerbone, 1999; Mihalic and Elliott, 1997; Simons, Lin, and Gordon, 1998). The third category involves individual or psychological approaches that primarily focus on substance abuse or psychological traits such as low self-esteem of people who engage in violence (Moffitt et al., 1997; McKenry, Julian, and Gavazzi, 1995). Walker's (1979) *cycling of battering* and Walker's (1984) *battered women syndrome* fall into this category. For example, arguing that women in long-term abusive relationships endure a cycling of abuse, women develop the battered women syndrome in which they learn (termed *Learned Helplessness*) that they cannot change their current situation and learn to accept their abusive fate (Walker, 1984). Sometimes used by attorneys as a supplement to insanity defenses and self-defense cases, this theory is largely dismissed by legal scholars and sociologists who argue that it focuses only on the victim, as if the victim is the causal factor to be understood (Ogle and Jacobs, 2002). This psychological theory ignores the social, cultural, structural, and situational factors that contribute to violence and implies that victims need

psychological therapy, rather than justice (Ogle and Jacobs, 2002). Furthermore, no explanation is given as to why the batterer is abusing his partner.

Most studies in family violence take a social learning approach in explaining intimate partner violence. Such research stresses the significance of factors such as exposure to or being the victim of family violence and violence-prone personality types (Simons, Lin, and Gordon, 1998; Foshee, Bauman, and Linder, 1998). Largely based on the work of Bandura (1977), a social learning approach stresses how individuals learn to engage in criminal behavior (like family violence) by observing others engaging in that behavior (see Akers, 1998; 2000). Individuals who witness or experience violence in their family of origin are believed to be more likely to participate in intimate partner violence themselves as parents who engage in violence are modeling what children may interpret as appropriate behavior between partners (Carter, Stacy, and Shupe, 1988; Simons, Lin, and Gordon, 1998; Foshee, Bauman, and Linder, 1998), especially during personal conflicts. This behavior can also be reinforced if the violent behavior achieves positive results (see Burgess and Akers, 1966), which would likely legitimate the value of violence. In the literature, there are both supporting and contradictory findings regarding a social learning approach to intimate partner violence. Early research tested small, clinical samples that were not generalizable to the general population, and some studies did not always control for variables that may have rendered a spurious relationship. More recent literature, however, has supported the notion that early abuse and neglect is related to later violence. For example, Foshee, Bauman, and Linder (1998) found that exposure to family violence was positively associated with intimate partner violence, and what happens early in a person's life can influence later events.

However, a social learning approach in explaining the link between violence in the family of origin and later violence towards an intimate has been heavily criticized for failing to explain two important shortcomings. First, the vast majority of children who experience or witness violence in the home do not grow up to physically hurt their partners. This leads to the second concern, which is to understand the mediating or intervening factors that reduce the effect of exposure to violence. Some intervening mechanisms that have been offered include the belief in the approval of violence towards one's partner (Williams, 1992) and social controls that prohibit individuals from later acting out what they have learned (Williams and Hawkins, 1989).

Research that fails to control or measure mediating/intervening factors such as those argued above will not support or provide evidence consistent with a social learning approach.

Feminist Perspective on Intimate Partner Violence

Feminist perspectives explain intimate partner violence by examining social factors such as class, sex, education, and income as they are related to power relations in society and the family (see Anderson and Umberson, 2001; Anderson, 1997). Feminists in particular examine the influence of male domination and the impact of strictly gendered socialization on the use of power. Consistent with this perspective, intimate partner violence is primarily a consequence of patriarchy, male dominance, and gender inequality (Schwartz, 2005). Violence against women reflects their social and economic inequality and thus allows men to exert and maintain power over women (Anderson and Umberson, 2001; Stark, 2007). In such explanations, these theories attempt to combine the significance of social and structural variables to explain the behaviors of both abusers and victims. This perspective thus provides a bigger picture of the extent of intimate partner abuse because it broadens the examination of emotional abuse against women by including social, economic, cultural, and power factors that shape female victimization.

In explaining intimate partner violence, feminist criminologists emphasize the importance of gender for understanding criminal behavior and victimization. In particular, such scholars see intimate partner violence as a fundamental mechanism through which men maintain their control and dominance over women (Brownmiller, 1975). Therefore, feminist criminologists argue that one cannot understand violence against women unless people recognize men's social, economic, and physical dominance over women. This imbalance of power between men and women (social, economic, and physical) allows men to exert control over women (Dwyer, Smokowski, Bricout, and Wodarski, 1996; Stark, 2007). The connection between violence and masculinity is thus important when examining intimate partner violence, particularly the use of control and emotional abuse towards women. Dominance and control are central characteristics of the masculine identity, and men are expected to dominate and be in control. This concept can be applied to explanations of emotional abuse as well. If a man perceives that his intimate partner is not obeying his authority, this is a serious challenge to his masculinity. The use of violence is more likely to occur when a man's masculinity is threatened (Anderson, 1997). In cases of intimate partner violence, not being able to control one's wife or girlfriend is seen as un-

masculine (Browne, 1987; Ogle, Maier-Katkin, and Bernard 1995; Ogle and Jacobs, 2002). Threats, verbal assaults, and emotional abuse can be ways of obtaining and maintaining masculinity (Polk, 1994; Anderson, 1997; Kaukinen, 2004). Patriarchal attitudes and beliefs, as well as male control over economic and other resources, may instigate emotional abuse towards women. Consequently, examining a person's social and economic power relative to their partner, as well as examining the role of power and influence in the family, is central for explaining intimate partner violence (Hamby and Sugarman, 1999).

Controlling in Intimate Relationships

The majority of published work examining controlling in relationships shows that a key element in intimate violence occurs when one partner tries to control the other. Current findings suggest that women use violence to try to gain control over the immediate situation or express control, whereas men use violence to produce fear in a partner (Hamberger and Guse, 2002)—with the goal of increasing the levels of control over the course of the relationship (Kimmel, 2002). In what has been called the *control theory*, research in intimate violence shows that violence tends to occur when one party tries to influence the behavior of their partner using some form of control (Felson and Messner, 2000; Umberson, et al., 1998; Dutton and Goodman, 2005; Stark, 2007). Much of the literature tends to focus on control that may lead to the use of violence, including emotional abuse.

From a feminist perspective, the use of emotional abuse by men against women to control their behavior is seen as an attempt to influence their partner's current or future behavior (Felson and Messner, 2000). By issuing a threat, whether physical or emotional, the person is sending a message to the other that they must comply with the demand or face harm (Felson and Messner, 2000; Dutton and Goodman, 2005). Emotional threats or abuse by women towards men may not have the same effects because the use of threats for control depends on their relative coercive power (Felson, 1996; Dutton and Goodman, 2005), and research indicates that threats delivered by people in positions of less power may lack credibility (Felson and Messner, 2000; Stets and Burke, 1996; 2005; Dutton and Goodman, 2005). Further, women who threaten physical harm or attempt to emotionally abuse their partners may receive retaliation from their male partners whose goal is to restore their male masculine identity (Felson, 1978).

According to Dutton and Goodman (2005), controlling (or coercion) in intimate relationships is dependent on several factors. The authors argue that the ability to control another individual is contingent on the ecological setting, the ability of the abuser to “soften” or create vulnerabilities in the victim, and the abuser’s ability to communicate the demand with a threat. In order to understand controlling, the authors argue that each of these factors (along with others) must be fully examined. The most salient factor of their argument, for the purposes of this study, is their notion that women with prior vulnerabilities are more apt to being controlled. A female’s vulnerability in the form of being financially dependent on the abuser (by withholding income), or simply having small child (by threatening to hurt them), are all mechanism in which the abuser can effectively coerce the victim (Dutton and Goodman, 2005). Past child victimization is another vulnerability which the authors argue is a tool of coercion and control by the abuser. Women who told their partners about past child victimization with the intent of seeking support later reported that this information were used against in a coercive manner (Dutton and Goodman, 2005). Financial and past victimization are vulnerabilities to nonphysical forms of violence.

A key element when examining emotional abuse is the unequal social distribution of power between sexes as well as economic dependence, which constitutes gender inequality. Sociologically speaking, it is not surprising that females are the victims of abuse (physical or emotional), as individuals with less power are often the victims of violence by those with power. As discussed above, feminist scholars see domestic violence towards women as inevitable consequences of patriarchy or male dominance. To the extent that physical and emotional abuse arise from women’s economic subordination, reducing gender inequality should reduce acts of physical and emotional abuse. Some studies suggest that intimate partner violence is positively associated with a person’s economic dependence (see Tolman and Raphael, 2000 for a review). That is, economic dependence (as measured by poverty, women not employed, or husband being the sole provider) is associated with violence against women.

Some studies have indicated that when women’s economic, political, and legal power are the same as that of men, crimes such as rape are low (Baron and Straus, 1987). Baron and Straus (1987), for example, developed a gender equality index for all fifty states in the United States. This index measured women’s economic equality with men, based on women’s median income. Obtaining rape rates from the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) for each state, the authors found that

states with greater gender inequality had higher rape rates. Social class differences give emphasis to an important consequence of economic inequality in society, especially for women. Theoretically, then, reducing the sex gap in wages, increasing career opportunities for women, and increasing social power should reduce rates of intimate partner violence against women.

Relationships of equally dependent partners that embrace egalitarian decision making and an equal division of power within the family are found to report higher relationship satisfaction (Tichenor, 1999; Schoen, et al., 2002), and studies report that such couples experience low levels of conflict, aggression, emotional abuse, and physical harm (Kaukinen, 2004; Nock, 2001). Females who break away from historically held gender roles (i.e. stay-at-home mother or working at a menial job) may challenge their partner's masculinity as provider or breadwinner, which may ultimately result in violence (Macmillan and Gartner, 1999). Kaukinen (2004) and McCloskey (1996), for example, found that women whose economic resources approached or exceeded their partners' resources were *more likely* to report victimization. That is, the greater equality (or less inequality) between partners will increase women's risk of violent victimization as it threatens men's position of power (Brewer and Smith, 1995; Gauthier and Bankston, 1997; Whaley and Messner, 2002; Stark, 2007). These studies (i.e. McCloskey, 1996; Nock, 2001; Tichenor, 1999; Macmillan and Gartner, 1999; Kaukinen, 2004) generally support the notion that conflict is more common in families in which there is an economic and power discrepancy between partners. When both the male and female have equal statuses (termed *status parity*), violence between partners should be low. In other words, men and women who have approximately equal education, income, and high social economic status relative to their partner should have equal power in their relationships (Macmillan and Gartner, 1999), and the chances for any type of victimization should be greatly reduced. In sum, egalitarian roles and equal power between partners should lead to a less violent relationship. Control and emotional abuse are used by some men to reassert authority at home when their partner hinders their ability to control the environment. Women who lack equal share of social resources and decisions in their relationship should experience more control and emotional abuse.

Studies done by MacMillan and Gartner (1999) and Kuakinen (2004) demonstrate the importance of examining the connection between economic contributions, power, and control. Using a large survey of women from Canada, these authors argue that a woman's risk for violence is conditioned by her employment and the employment of her partner. Women are at a

greater risk of control and emotional abuse when their partner is not employed, as this challenges their self-view as breadwinner, and might encourage controlling behaviors and emotional abuse to reassert their authority at home (Kaukinen, 2004). A female's educational attainment protects her from control and emotional abuse if her partner has a similar education; however, exceeding her partner's education attainment *increases* her likelihood of being victimized by emotional abuse and control. The following typologies capture the various status compatibilities examined in the literature on marital quality. *Status parity* signifies couples in which neither partner is dominant and both have similar occupational status in the workforce. Both partners are either employed or unemployed and have similar educational backgrounds. *Traditional status* couples are partners in which status incompatibility favors men. These relationships are characterized by men who have higher education than their partner and also the primary "breadwinner" in the family. Men are traditionally employed while their wives or partners are not. *Status reversal*, the least common among intimate relationships, characterizes relationships in which the female is employed and her husband or partner is not. In these relationships, the female typically has higher education and contributes more than her partner to the household income (Tichenor, 2005).

Goode (1971) was first to suggest that status reversal couples and couples in which only the male works (and the female does not) should experience more physical abuse than relationships characterized by status parity. Men who lack power, as measured by factors such as lower income, lower occupational status, or little education, may use violence to obtain power in the relationship. Economic stressors, therefore, serve as triggering factors for violence towards women. Though MacMillan and Gartner (1999) and Kaukinen (2004) test these premises, their use of a Canadian sample and limitations in their analyses hinder their ability to generalize their findings.

Class, Economic Deprivation, and Abuse

The question of social class, economic deprivation, and its role in intimate partner violence has been well examined by research, with research finding economic deprivation linked to higher rates of violence towards women (Peterson and Bailey, 1992; Tolman and Rachael, 2000; Leone, et al., 2004). For example, analyzing evidence from the National Crime Victimization Survey, Greenfeld et al. (1998) and Rennison (1999) found that the poorest

women had rates of violence almost eight times as high as women in the highest income level. Crucial to the debate on the etiology of intimate partner violence and victimization has been the relative importance of absolute poverty and relative economic inequality. This relationship is even more important when it intersects with the notion of masculinity (see Newburn and Stanko, 1994; Bowker, 1998). For some men, being economic successful is an important part of what it means to be a man (see Kimmel and Messner, 1998). Deprived of economic success, men at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder are more willing to engage in various forms of nonphysical dominating behavior as an attempt to demonstrate masculinity or to acquire the respect their low socioeconomic status denies them. Economic deprivation can lead to frustration, which can then lead to intimate partner violence (Anderson, 1997; Tichenor, 1999). From a feminist perspective, females become convenient scapegoats for the frustration men may feel over their low socioeconomic status. Violence, including nonphysical abuse, allows men to vent their frustration resulting from poverty and to prove their masculinity to women (Petrik, Olson, and Subotnik, 1994).

In addition to the role of class, a number of studies indicate that intimate partner violence occurs disproportionately in non-white, minority groups (Neff, Holamon, and Schluter, 1995; Sherman et al. 1992; O'Keefe, 1997; Greenfeld et al., 1998; Rennison, 1999). For instance, Straus and Smith (1990) found that battering rates among Hispanic women, while controlling for income, were slightly higher than those of white women. Neff, Holamon, and Schluter (1995) used a multi-stage area probability technique using census tracts to collect information on Mexican-American, African-Americans, and Anglo couples in San Antonio. They found that, while controlling for demographic factors, financial stress, social desirability, sex role traditionalism, and drinking quantity, African-American females reported the highest rates of violence by their intimate partners. In a more recent study, Ramirez (2005) found that Mexican-Americans were more likely to be victims of minor acts of violence.

Though several major studies indicate that there is more physical violence in lower income families (Greenfeld et al. 1998; Rennison, 1999; Cunradi, Caetano, and Schafer, 2002), emotional abuse in these relationships is somewhat less clear. It is argued that emotional abuse most likely follows a similar pattern (Salari and Baldwin, 2002; Hamby and Sugarman, 1999). Because controlling and emotional abuse almost always follows physical assaults in intimate violence (Felson and Messner, 2000; Salari and Baldwin, 2002; Hamby and Sugarman, 1999),

and women reporting lower socioeconomic status to those of their partners report higher rate of violence (Macmillan and Gartner, 1999), the majority of those reporting controlling behavior and emotional abuse on the part of their partners will hold poverty status. In examining controlling behavior in intimate relationships, Stets (1995) suggests that males from minority groups may be more likely to attempt to control their partners. Arguing that members of minority groups are relatively powerless members of society who feel they cannot control their environment, they are more likely to control their partners in order to maintain control they would otherwise not experience (Stets, 1995). It is worth mentioning that if females of minority groups do have higher victimization rates than white women, their low socioeconomic status and lack of power may explain their experiences (see Frias and Angel, 2005; Leone, et al., 2004).

Alcohol Abuse and Intimate Partner Violence

A number of researchers have examined the correlation between alcohol abuse and intimate partner violence, as well as the relationship between alcohol inducing aggression and violent behavior in general (Parker and Auerhahn, 1999). Research has clearly shown a statistically significant relationship between alcohol abuse and violence between partners. Alcohol abuse and intimate partner violence are associated with one another (Miller, Downs and Gondoli, 1989; O'Farrell, Van Hutton, and Murphy, 1999; Testa, Quigley, and Leonard, 2003; Thompson and Kingree, 2006). For example, conducting a meta-analysis of quantitative studies of men who batter their partners, Tolman and Bennett (1990) found that alcohol use across the studies analyzed ranged from 56 percent to 70 percent. The authors concluded that chronic alcohol abuse is a predictor of physical abuse. Leonard and Quigley (1999) reported that drinking by husbands was more common in severely violent encounters. Analyzing data from the *National Violence Against Women Survey*, Thompson and Kingree (2006) found that women whose partners had been drinking were more likely to report an injury than women whose partners were not drinking. Alcohol is a risk marker for partner violence.

Consequently, whether or not alcohol *causes* intimate partner violence is still debated. It is argued that alcohol abuse does not cause intimate partner violence because alcohol is not involved in all cases of domestic violence and men who do drink do not always abuse their partners. Barnett and Fagan (1993) found evidence that the abuser and his victim are more likely to drink *after* the violent episode than before it. It is generally accepted that the aggression-

enhancing effects of alcohol occur in conjunction with other factors such as life stress, depression, and anger (Barnett and Fagan, 1993; Neff, Holamon, and Schluter, 1995). The role of alcohol in domestic violence is complex, but in the current study alcohol consumption by both offender and victim will be used to predict emotional abuse. It is important to examine both the offender's and victim's alcohol consumption, as research has indicated that a victim's alcohol use is often associated with partner's alcohol use (Leadley, Clark, and Caetano, 2000). Research including a measure of victim's alcohol use has shown that their alcohol consumption had little impact on being the victim of violence (Cogan and Ballinger, 2006; Thompson and Kingree, 2006). These studies show that alcohol use by a woman's partner increases her chance of victimization, but her own alcohol use does not contribute to her victimization. Based on such findings, greater alcohol use by the offender is expected to show a positive relationship with emotional abuse.

Child Victimization and Intimate Partner Violence

Child victimization has also been found to be a risk factor (i.e. a characteristic of individuals or situations that place individuals at a greater risk for some negative consequence) for subsequent victimization in the life course. Child abuse and maltreatment has been linked to subsequent criminal behavior for men (Weeks and Widom, 1998), but re-victimization for women later in their adult life (Hamilton and Browne, 1998). The victimological consequence of abuse refers to the assertion that children who are abused and/or neglected tend to be re-victimized as adults. This is particularly true for female victims. Several studies support this assertion. For example, Irwin (1999) found in her female sample that childhood trauma predicted proneness to both violent and nonviolent victimization in adulthood. Analyzing 163 female undergraduate students, Sanders and Moore (1999) reported that all types of abuse and neglect experienced as a child lead to a greater chance of being sexually assaulted later in their lives. Just as important is witnessing violence at home. Reporting data collected from a survey of 131 college women, Maker, Kemmelmeier, and Peterson (1999) showed that women who witness violence as a child were more likely to experience violence in their own dating relationships.

The apparent relationship between child abuse and subsequent victimization has prompted several scholars to offer various explanations. Irwin (1999) argues that a victim's

coping strategy and attachment style can play a role in determining whether victimization will occur in the future. Hamilton and Browne (1998) argue that child victims of sexual abuse are more likely to have more sexual partners, which translates into more sexual assaults. Sanders and Moore (1999) contend that psychological consequences of child abuse and neglect (i.e. depression and disassociation) increase the probability of future negative experiences. For example, some survivors of child abuse learn to use disassociation as a child to remove themselves from their negative situation. As a result, some women may use disassociation as an escape route as an adult instead of attempting to escape physically from abusive encounters (Sanders and Moore, 1999). These and other studies suggest that some female victims of child abuse are more likely to be victimized again later in their adult life. It is therefore important to examine if child abuse also contributes to emotional and controlling behavior against women.

Research Hypotheses

Based on previous research findings, predictions stemming from feminist theories of intimate partner violence, power discrepancies in relationships, and gender inequality, this research tests hypothesis derived from the literature review above and will examine emotional abuse in heterosexual relationships in the United States. In particular, from a socioeconomic standpoint, it will be argued that having low social status is associated with emotional abuse and, based on status norms in heterosexual relationships, relationships that challenges a male's masculinity as primary provider or breadwinner will result in the use of nonphysical violence. I make the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Education will be negatively related to nonphysical violence.

Hypothesis 2: Poverty status will be positively related to nonphysical violence.

Hypothesis 3: Partner's alcohol consumption will be positively related to nonphysical violence.

Hypothesis 4: As respondent's alcohol use increases, the effect of partner's alcohol use on emotional abuse will increase.

Hypothesis 5: Relationships in which neither the male nor the female is employed will experience more emotional abuse than women in status parity relationships.

Hypothesis 6: Women in a traditional status relationship (male employed, female not) will experience more emotional abuse than women in status parity relationships.

Hypothesis 7: Women in a status reversal relationship (male not employed, female employed) will experience more emotional abuse than women in status parity relationships.

Hypothesis 8: Women in traditional status relationship (male employed, female not) will experience less emotional abuse than women in relationships in which both partners are unemployed.

CHAPTER 3 - Data and Methods

Data

Data are from the survey of *Violence and Threats of Violence Against Women and Men in the United States, 1994 through 1996*. Conducted in 1994 and ending in 1996, the survey relied on telephone interviews with a national probability sample of approximately 8,000 English-speaking women and 8,000 men ages 18 and older residing in households throughout the United States. Respondents were asked about their general fear of violence and ways in which they managed those fears, emotional abuse on the part of intimate partners, and incidents of actual or threatened violence experienced by all types of offenders. A Spanish language version of the survey was used for respondents who spoke Spanish. Those disclosing victimization were asked more detailed questions about the characteristics and consequences of those experiences. The participation rate among female sample was 72 percent. Of those eligible women who started the interviews, 97 percent completed the survey (see Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000). Because the focus of this study is on the victimization of women and the characteristics of their intimate partners who use nonphysical abuse, I employ only the female sample for the analysis below. This research does not negate the existence of emotional abuse by wives or girlfriends, but since the frequency and severity are much more likely towards females than males, it will test emotional abuse toward females. Furthermore, because published work has demonstrated differences in the nature of intimate partner violence as a function of marital status, this analysis will pay particular attention to married couples, and partners between the ages of 18 through 64 as these are the ages in which respondents are more likely to be in the labor force (N=4,838).

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable indicates whether the victim experiences controlling and emotional abuse. In the survey, female respondents were asked a series of fourteen questions regarding their control and emotional abuse experiences. To conform to the predictions above on intimate partner violence and other previous published research, nine particular questions

were chosen to create the dependent variable. To determine *power* and *controlling behavior*, female respondents were asked if their current husband/boyfriend is either a jealous or possessive person; tried to provoke arguments; tried to limit their contact with family or friends, and insists on knowing who they are with at all times. To determine *emotional abuse*, female respondents were asked if their current partners called them names or put them down in front of others; made them feel inadequate; shouts or swears at them; and if their partner frightens them. These nine questions were then added up to create an emotional abuse scale. A scale reliability analysis of these nine questions demonstrated an alpha of .79. An exploratory analysis revealed that the dependent variable was heavily skewed, thus violating the assumption of normality. The decision was made to dichotomize the outcome, with respondents who experienced any of the above victimization coded 1 and 0 otherwise. Logistic regression, therefore, is used in the current analysis.

Independent and Control Variables

There are several variables that will be employed in this research as independent and control variables that are likely to be related to victimization. There are two primary independent variables: the relationship between the offender¹ and victim and the status compatibility of that relationship. *Married* is a dummy variable coded 1 if the victim and the offender are married and 0 otherwise. Status compatibility is captured by the respondent's and her partner's employment status. In this research, the respondent is considered employed if they indicated they were employed full-time, part-time, or are in the military and not employed if at the time of the survey indicated they were unemployed but looking for work or a homemaker. The respondent's husband/partner is considered employed if they were employed full-time, part-time, or are in the military and not employed if at the time of the survey were unemployed but looking for work, or a homemaker. *Status Compatibility* is captured then by four dummy variables. *Traditional status* is coded 1 for female respondents who were not working, but their male partners are and 0 otherwise. *Status Parity* is coded 1 if both partners are working and 0 otherwise. *Status Reversal* is coded 1 if only female respondents are working and their male

¹ Although an individual is technically not classified as an offender until convicted in a criminal court, I use the term *offender* to describe the assailant for ease of understanding.

partners are not and 0 otherwise. *Both Unemployed* status is coded 1 if both respondent and her partner are not working.

The survey contains information on the following demographic characteristics of the respondents and will be serving as control variables. *Age* of the respondents is coded in years. To measure socioeconomic status, the respondent's education will be analyzed and their coverage of medical care is used to measure poverty. *Education* is coded from (1) no schooling to (7) post-graduate. Coverage of medical care will be a proxy variable for poverty.² *Poverty* is coded 1 for respondents whose medical care is covered by Medicaid or MediCal, by a free or low income clinic, or uninsured and 0 otherwise. Race is captured by four dummy variables. *White* is coded 1 for white respondents and 0 otherwise. *Black* is coded 1 for African Americans and 0 otherwise. *Hispanic* is coded 1 for Hispanic and 0 otherwise. *Other Minority* is coded 1 for American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, or mixed races and 0 otherwise. *Alcohol consumption* by both respondent and her partner are assessed by asking how often they drank any alcoholic beverage during the last twelve months. The variable is reverse coded in the current analysis and is coded from (1) never to (7) everyday. The Conflict Tactics Scale is used in the survey to capture physical victimization experienced as a child. Respondents were asked a series of twelve questions; however, a scale reliability analysis indicated that nine particular questions offered that highest alpha of .812. These nine questions—throw something at you that could hurt you; push, grab, or shove you; pull your hair; slap or hit you; kick or bite you; choke or attempted to drown you; hit you with some object; beat you up; threaten you with a knife or other weapon besides a gun; and use a knife or other weapon on you besides a gun—were add to create a scale to measure *child victimization*.

² Because a large number of women refused to report personal income (21%), this measure is not included in the analysis.

CHAPTER 4 - Results, Conclusion, and Discussion

Results

Table 1 reports means, standard deviations, and description for the variables used in the analysis. After omitting respondents with missing data and restricting the sample between the ages of 18 and 64, a total of 4,838 women respondents were used in the final analysis. Of these women, 24.3% reported experiencing emotional and controlling abuse. Nearly 90 percent of the respondents were married at the time of the survey and 24.2 percent indicated they were currently in a traditional status relationship. In regards to other relationships, 60.1 and 7.6 percent of respondents indicated they were in a status parity and status reversal relationship, respectively. Only 7.7 percent of couples in this survey were both unemployed.

Demographically, 81.3 percent of respondents were white, 8.2 percent were Hispanic, 6.0 percent were Black or African American, and 4.1 percent of respondents were either American-Indian or Alaskan-Native, Asian or Pacific Islander, or mixed races. In the current sample, 67.7 percent of respondents were employed and 84.5 percent of respondent's spouse or partner is employed. Average education for the current sample is a high school education and the average age is 40.38 years. Respondents' average alcohol intake averaged 2.19, while partner's alcohol intake average 2.80.

Table 2 reports the bivariate correlations among variables used in the analysis. The first hypothesis predicts that education will be negatively related to emotional abuse. Table 2 shows a negative correlation between emotional abuse and the respondent's education. The table reveals a significant Pearson correlation of $-.102$. Because education is negatively associated with emotional abuse, it provides some support for hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2 states that poverty will be positively related to emotional abuse. A look at the correlation between poverty and emotional abuse reveals a positive and significant relationship ($r = .102$), which is consistent with the hypothesis. Hypothesis 3 states that partner's alcohol consumption will be positively related to emotional abuse. Emotional abuse and partner's drinking is found to be positively correlated and significant ($r = .078$). However, the respondent's own drinking shows no relationship ($r = .001$). In regards to hypotheses 5 through 8, emotional abuse was found to be positive and significant correlated with both partners being *unemployed* ($r = .066$), negative and

insignificant with women in *traditional status* relationships ($r = -.014$), but positive and significant for women in *status reversal* relationships ($r = .036$). An unexpected finding is that emotional abuse and child victimization are negatively associated and significant ($r = -.195$).

Table 3 shows the results of the logistic regression analysis. Hypothesis 1 indicates that education will be negatively related to nonphysical violence. The model in Table 3 reports that education is negatively related ($b = -.177$) to emotional abuse and, therefore, providing partial support for this hypothesis. In substantive terms, this suggests that as a female's education increases, emotional and controlling abuse decreases. This result lends support to the notion that obtaining an education protects women from emotional abuse and is consistent with previous research. Thus, females with low educational attainment are likely to experience more emotional abuse and controlling. Hypothesis 2 states that poverty will be positively related to nonphysical violence. This hypothesis is also supported. Table 3 shows that levels of emotional abuse are higher for females who hold poverty status ($b = .548$). Women holding poverty status are 1.7 times more likely to experience emotional and controlling abuse. As stated above, Stets (1995) argues that women in the lower classes may be situated with men who can be frustrated by their economic conditions which may lead to violence against their female partners. Hypothesis 3 states that partner's alcohol consumption will be positively related to emotional abuse. Table 3 supports this hypothesis. In this sample, for each one unit increase in the alcohol consumption scale, the likelihood of emotional abuse increases by 1.2 times. The respondent's own alcohol intake was not found to be significant. The multivariate model was run with a variable representing the cross-product of partner's and respondent's alcohol consumption in order to test hypothesis 4. Hypothesis 4 predicted that as respondent's alcohol use increases, the effect of partner's alcohol use on emotional abuse will increase. As Table 3 indicates, this interaction term was not significant in predicting emotional and controlling behavior against women. Consequently, hypothesis 4 is not supported.

Hypothesis 5 posits that women in relationships in which neither the male nor the female is employed will experience more emotional abuse than women in status parity relationships. Results do not support this hypothesis. Although the coefficient is in the predicted direction ($b = .621$) it is found to be insignificant. Hypothesis 6 says that women in a traditional status relationship (male employed, female not) will experience more emotional abuse than women in status parity relationships. My analysis does not support this hypothesis as indicated in Table 3.

It is not statistically significant. This finding is somewhat surprising as literature reviewed above suggests that women who are dependent on their partner will experience more physical and emotional abuse. This finding differs from those of Kuakinen (2004) and Macmillan and Gartner (1999). Changing gender roles and contemporary attitudes about gender ideals (discussed below) may help explain this unexpected finding. Hypothesis 7 states that women in a status reversal relationship (male not employed, female employed) will experience more emotional abuse than women in status parity relationships. Again, Table 3 shows a positive relationship ($b = .183$) to emotional abuse, but the finding was not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis is not supported.

Hypothesis 8 predicts that women in a traditional status relationship (male employed, female not) will experience less emotional abuse than women in relationships where both partners are unemployed. In order to test this hypothesis, a second logistic regression model is needed in which the reference category for the employment variables is the condition in which both partners are unemployed. This model is found in Table 4, in which traditional status shows a negative relationship and is statistically significant ($b = -.759$). This means that couples in which both the male and female are unemployed experience more emotional abuse than couples in which only the male works, providing support for hypothesis 8. Women in traditional status relationships experienced approximately 53% less emotional abuse ($1-OR = .468$) than women in relationships where both partners are unemployed. This model also indicates that when both partners are employed, as opposed to both partners being unemployed, nonphysical abuse is less likely ($b = -.621$), supporting the role of economics in reducing nonphysical violence in intimate relationships.

Other findings needing mention are race/ethnicity, the effect of marriage, and the unexpected negative correlation between child victimization and emotional abuse. In the current analysis, Black and other minority women were found to have experienced more emotional abuse than white women. Table 3 indicates that Black women are 2.1 times more likely to experience emotional abuse and other minorities are 1.6 times more likely. Results for women of Hispanic origin were not found to be significant as demonstrated in Table 3. However, it is important to point out that perhaps this finding would disappear if I had a more adequate measure of poverty or socioeconomic status instead of the proxy variable used in the current analysis. Marriage was found to be negatively related to emotional abuse ($b = -.381$) and

significant. This result is consistent with Macmillan and Gartner's (1999) research. Compared to other individuals in non-marriage relationships, individuals who are married experience less emotional abuse. Perhaps the most stimulating finding of the research is the relationship between child victimization and emotional abuse. As demonstrated in Table 2, child victimization and emotional abuse were found to be negatively associated and significant. Logistic analysis results show child victimization with a negative statistically significant coefficient ($b = -.237$) and an odds ratio of .789. In substantive terms, this indicates that as child victimization increases (or the more victimization a female experiences as a child) the less likely they are to experience emotional abuse as an adult. Future research is needed to explain why this is the case.

Conclusion and Discussion

The main objective of this research is to examine nonphysical abuse in intimate partner violence. Although intimate partner violence is clearly a serious social and health problem in the United States, little research has examined nonphysical violence such as emotional and controlling behavior towards women. Research on intimate partner violence and the link between relationship compatibility and abuse have been largely conducted with a focus on poverty, welfare, or homelessness (Kwesiga, et al., 2007)—with little variability in employment, education, and social status. This study is one of only a handful of studies that examines emotional abuse in the context of a person's relationship compatibility.

It has been argued by many scholars that variables measuring women's social and economic status are important in predicting violence against women. At the core of this argument is the idea that women who have more resources (i.e. education) may be better able to protect themselves from physical violence and, as demonstrated in this study, are also able to protect themselves from emotional and controlling abuse. On the other hand, women with fewer resources are more likely to suffer from physical victimization and emotional and controlling behavior. Hypotheses one through four and hypothesis seven were set to test this notion. Socioeconomic status (measured by employment, education, and poverty) influences where a person lives and works, as well as the people to which they are exposed. In this study, it was found that low education, poverty, and being in a relationship in which neither person is employed are all related to higher levels of emotional abuse. Occupying the lower rungs of the

social and economic ladder, these women may be exposed to greater levels of gender inequality which may elevate their physical and nonphysical victimization rate by placing them at a disadvantage relative to men. This research supports other studies that suggest that economic conditions produce or increase frustration and stress, which can be vented towards female intimates. Increasing education and reducing poverty protects women from nonphysical violence.

Physical and nonphysical abuse is not the exclusive action of men who earn more (or less) than their partners or whose partners are unemployed. Gender and gender roles play a crucial role in the perpetration of violence against women (Schwartz, 2005). Males who hold strong masculine gender norms, such as being the primary provider for their families, may be more likely to use violence if they feel that these norms are being violated (see Heckert, Nowak, and Snyder, 1998). This gender-role conflict reflects the idea that socially constructed gender roles can be physically (and emotionally) damaging to individuals and their partners. Thus, males who hold a worldview in which the man should be the sole or primary provider may perceive their successful working, financially dependent partner as a threat to this worldview and their violence is a response to that threat. Hypotheses five and six were developed to tests these notions. Contrary to these arguments and other studies, this study did not find support for these hypotheses. The fact that the economic based hypotheses were supported, while the status norms hypotheses were not, is the most important finding in this research. Economic resources, education, and a person's demographic characteristics are not the only basis for nonphysical abuse; contemporary gender roles and ideals are another, which may help explain some of the findings.

Although portions of my results are not consistent with findings of previous research, the conclusions may support alternative explanations. For example, Nock (2001) argues that boys and young men are now more likely to be raised by single, working mothers (also see Aulette, 2002). As more and more young males grow up in these nontraditional households, the more they are likely to believe in nontraditional gender roles (Nock, 2001). People are now more likely to approve women working outside the home while caring for young children. Furthermore, males who marry females with higher education, income, and social status may not be threatened by such a relationship and the likelihood of using violence or emotional abuse to secure masculinity is reduced. Similarly, the public's attitudes about gender roles have changed

considerably. For example, Cassidy and Warren (1997) found that women who were full time employed were more likely to support nontraditional gender roles as compared to stay-at-home mothers who were more likely to hold onto traditional gender roles. Currently, more and more marriages are being formed in which the female is already participating in the labor force (Nock, 2001) and research finds that females in these relationships are contributing more of the income *and* making more marital decisions than females did in the past (Rogers and Amato, 2000). Traditional relationships in which only the male works and the female does not are now being replaced by dual income earning couples. As women continue to increase their representation in the workforce and obtain higher wages and higher status occupations, it is predicted that more relationships will be status parity (see Nock, 2001).

A number of shortcomings cause us to view the results of this research with caution. First, when using self-report measures of any human involvement, full disclosure can be a problem (Fowler, 2002). Because this survey relied on self-reported victimization, some respondents may not be willing to disclose full victimization to avoid embarrassment and/or acknowledging that their partners are abusive towards them. Furthermore, because the survey was conducted over the telephone, there is the possibility of the victimizer overhearing the administration of the survey. Thus, the respondent may be reluctant to disclose full victimization with the abuser present in the room. Second, the data is retrospective and recollection of events can be a problem in self-reported surveys (Flower, 1995). Third, several other unmeasured variables (i.e. depressive symptoms) may help explain the findings (see Thompson, et al., 2002). Fourth, the survey questions used to capture emotional and controlling behavior were measured using single, broadly worded items. These questions may lack evidence of content validity. Fifth, as pointed out by Brecklin and Ullman (2002), data on alcohol intake in this survey is limited by a lack of information on type or amount of alcohol consumed by both offender and victim. Sixth, when measuring alcohol intake, the survey relied on the victim's report about their partner's alcohol consumption. However, research indicates that victims of intimate partner violence can accurately report their partner's alcohol use (Lindquist et. al., 1997).

Yet, despite these limitations, this study contributes to the much needed body of research on nonphysical violence by assessing the linkage between emotional abuse and relationship status compatibility, while controlling for demographic factors related to intimate partner violence. Future research needs to address three important things. First, if we are to more

completely understand violence against women, we must also address the issue of controlling in relationships. Therefore, national studies such as the *National Violence Against Women Survey* and the *National Family Violence Survey* must ask questions about control tactics in addition to actual physical violence by both partners. Only then can scholars make distinctions between the use of control and violence by each sex. Similarly, Dutton and Goodman's (2005) proposed conceptualization of coercion and control needs empirical testing. Their central elements of their proposed model will help better understand the use of control and coercion in domestic violence. Second, further research needs to measure occupational and organizational status as potential variables. As more women enter the workforce and obtain high-wage, high-status occupations, it will become increasingly important to examine the relationship between intimate partner violence with high-status jobs and organizational support. Finally, to understand violence between couples, surveys need to address the issue of gender symmetry and asymmetry. Research is needed that includes measures of defensive violence by those who are assaulted, attacked, or emotionally abused. The domestic violence literature is full of research where it is unknown if the violent act against the partner was an act of self-defense as opposed to acting out first. Taking such precautions and incorporating them in the future will undoubtedly increase our knowledge of intimate partner violence.

References

- Akers, Ronald L. (2000). *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluations and Application*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- _____. (1998). *Social Learning and Social Structure: A General Theory of Crime and Deviance*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Anderson, Kristin L. (1997). "Gender, Status, and Domestic Violence: An Integration of Feminist and Family Violence Approaches." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 59: 655-669.
- Anderson, Kristin L. and Debra Umberson. (2001). "Gendering Violence: Masculinity and Power in Men's Accounts of Domestic Violence." *Gender & Society* 15: 358-380.
- Aulette, Judy Root. (2002). *Changing American Families*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bandura, Albert. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Baron, Larry and Murray A. Straus. (1987). "Four Theories of Rape: A Macrosociological Analysis." *Social Problems* 34: 467-489.
- Barnett, Ola W. and Ronald W. Fagan. (1993). "Alcohol Use in Male Spouse Abusers and their Female Partners." *Journal of Family Violence* 8: 1-25.
- Bowker, Lee. (1998). *Masculinities and Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brecklin, Leanne R. and Sarah E. Ullman. (2002). "The Roles of Victim and Offender Alcohol Use in Sexual Assaults: Results from the National Violence Against Women Survey." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 63: 57-63.
- Brewer, Victoria E. and M. Dwayne Smith. (1995). "Gender Inequality and Rates of Female Homicide Victimization Across U.S. Cities." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 32: 175-190.
- Browne, Angela. (1987). *When Battered Women Kill*. New York: The Free Press.
- Brownmiller, Susan (1975). *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*. New York: Fawcett Books.
- Burgess, Robert L. and Ronald L. Akers. (1966). "A Differential Association-Reinforcement Theory of Criminal Behavior." *Social Problems* 14: 128-147.

- Burks, Bobbie K. (2006). "Emotional Abuse of Women." In Paula K. Lundberg-Love and Shelly L. Marmion (Eds.), *"Intimate" Violence against Women: When Spouses, Partners, or Lovers Attack*. Pp.15-29. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Carbone-López, Kristin, Candace Kruttschnitt, and Ross Macmillan. (2006). "Patterns of Intimate Partner Violence and their Associations with Physical Health Psychological Distress, and Substance Use." *Public Health Reports* 121: 382-392.
- Carter, Jack, William A. Stacey, and Anson W. Shupe. (1988). "Male Violence Against Women: Assessment of the Generational Transfer Hypothesis." *Deviant Behavior* 9: 259-273.
- Cassidy, Margret L. and Bruce O. Warren. (1997). "Family Employment Status and Gender Role Attitudes: A Comparison of Women and Men College Graduates." *Gender & Society* 10: 312-329.
- Cogan, Rosemary and Bud C. Ballinger. (2006). "Alcohol Problems and the Differentiation of Partner, Stranger, and General Violence." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 21: 924-935.
- Cunradi, Carol B., Raul Caetano, and John Schafer. (2002). "Socioeconomic Predictors of Intimate Partner Violence Among White, Black, and Hispanic Couples in the United States." *Journal of Family Violence* 17: 377-389.
- Dasgupta, Shamita Das. (2002). "A Framework for Understanding Women's Use of Nonlethal Violence in Intimate Heterosexual Relationships." *Violence Against Women* 8: 1364-1389.
- DeKeseredy, Walter S. (2000). "Current Controversies on Defining Nonlethal Violence Against Women in Intimate Heterosexual Relationships." *Violence Against Women* 6: 728-746.
- _____. (1995). "Enhancing the Quality of Survey Data on Women Abuse: Examples from a National Canadian Study." *Violence Against Women* 1: 158-173.
- Demaris, Alfred and Catherine Kaukinen. (2005). "Violent Victimization and Women's Mental and Physical Health: Evidence from a National Sample." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 42: 384-411.
- Dobash, R. Emerson and Russell P. Dobash. (1992). *Women, Violence, and Social Change*. New York: Routledge.
- _____. (1979). *Violence Against Women*. New York: The Free Press.

- Dobash, Russell P., R. Emerson Dobash, Margo Wilson, and Martin Daly. (1992). "The Myth of Sexual Symmetry in Martial Violence." *Social Problems* 39: 71-91.
- Dobash, Russell P., R. Emerson Dobash, Kate Cavanagh, and Ruth Lewis. (1998). "Separate and Intersecting Realities: A Comparative of Men's and Women's Accounts of Violence Against Women." *Violence Against Women* 4: 382-414.
- Downs, William R., Barb Rindels, and Christine Atkinson. (2007). "Women's Use of Physical and Nonphysical Self-Defense Strategies During Incidents of Partner Violence." *Violence Against Women* 13: 28-45.
- Dutton, Mary Ann and Lisa A. Goodman. (2005). "Coercion in Intimate Partner Violence: Toward a New Conceptualization." *Sex Roles* 52: 743-756.
- Dwyer, Diane C., Paul R. Smokowski, John C. Bricout, and John S. Wodarski. (1996). "Domestic Violence and Women Battering: Theories and Practice Implications." In Albert R. Roberts (Ed.), *Helping Battered Women: New Perspectives and Remedies*. Pp. 67-82. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Felson, Richard B. (1996). "Big People Hit Little People: Sex Differences in Physical Power and Interpersonal Violence." *Criminology* 34: 433-452.
- Felson, Richard B. (1978). "Aggression as Impression Management." *Social Psychology* 41: 205-213.
- Felson, Richard B. and Steven F. Messner. (2000). "The Control Motive in Intimate Partner Violence." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 63: 86-94.
- Foshee, Vangie A., Karl E. Bauman, and G. Fletcher Linder. (1998). "Family Violence and the Perpetration of Adolescent Dating Violence: Examining Social Learning and Social Control Processes." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61: 331-342.
- Fowler, Floyd J. Jr. (1995). *Improving Survey Questions: Design and Evaluation*. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- _____. (2002). *Survey Research Methods*. 3rd Edition. Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fox, James Alan and Jack Levin. (2001). *The Will to Kill: Making Sense of Senseless Murder*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Frias, Sonia M. and Ronald J. Angel. (2005). "The Risk of Partner Violence Among Low-Income Hispanic Subgroups." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67: 552-564.

- Gauthier, DeAnn K. and William B. Bankston. (1997). "Gender Equality and the Sex Ratio of Intimate Killing." *Criminology* 35: 577-600.
- Giordona, Peggy, Toni J. Millholin, Stephen A. Cernkovich, M.D. Pugh, and Jennifer L. Rudolph. (1999). "Delinquency, Identity, and Women's Involvement in Relationship Violence." *Criminology* 37: 17-37.
- Goode, William J. (1971). "Force and Violence in the Family." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 33: 624-636.
- Gordon, Malcolm. (2000). "Definitional Issues in Violence Against Women." *Violence Against Women* 6: 747-783.
- Greenfeld, Lawrence A., Michael R. Rand, Diane Craven, Patsy A. Klaus, Craig A. Perkins, Cheryl Ringel, Greg Warchol, Cathy Maston, and James Alan Fox. (1998). *Violence by Intimates: Analysis of Data on Crimes by Current or Former Spouses, Boyfriends, and Girlfriends*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Hamberger, L. Kevin and Claire E. Guse. (2002). "Men's and Women's Use of Intimate Partner Violence in Clinical Samples." *Violence Against Women* 8: 1301-1331.
- Hamby, Sherry L. and David B. Sugarman. (1999). "Acts of Psychological Aggression Against a Partner and their Relation to Physical Assault and Gender." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61: 959-970.
- Hamilton, Catherine E. and Kevin D. Browne. (1998). "The Repeat Victimization of Children: Should the Concept Be Revised?" *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 3: 47-60.
- Heckert, D. Alex, Thomas C. Nowak, and Kay A Snyder. (1998). "The Impact of Husbands' and Wives' Relative Earnings on Marital Disruption." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60: 690-703.
- Hoffmann, John P. and Felicia Gray Cerbone. (1999). "Stressful Life Events and Delinquency Escalation in Early Adolescence." *Criminology* 37: 343-373.
- Irwin, Harvey J. (1999). "Violent and Non-Violent Re-victimization of Women Abused in Childhood." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 14: 1095-1110.
- Johnson, Michael P. (1995). "Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence Against Women." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57: 283-294.
- _____. (2006). "Conflict and Control: Gender Symmetry and Asymmetry in Domestic Violence." *Violence Against Women* 12: 1003-1018.

- Johnson, Michael P. and Kathleen J. Ferraro. (2000). "Research on Domestic Violence in the 1990s: Making Distinctions." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62: 948-963.
- Johnson, Michael P. and Janel M. Leone. (2005). "The Differential Effects of Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." *Journal of Family Issues* 26: 322-349.
- Kaukinen, Catherine. (2004). "Status Compatibility, Physical Violence, and Emotional Abuse in Intimate Relationships." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66: 452-471.
- Kimmel, Michael S. (2002). "Gender Symmetry in Domestic Violence: A Substantive and Methodological Research Review." *Violence Against Women* 8: 1332-1363.
- Kimmel, Michael S. and Michael A. Messner, eds. (1998). *Men's Lives*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kurz, Demie (1989). "Social Science Perspective on Wife Abuse: Current Debates and Future Directions." *Gender & Society* 3: 489-505.
- Kwesiga, Eileen, Myrtle P. Bell, Marshall Pattie, and Angela M. Moe. (2007). "Exploring the Literature on Relationships Between Gender Roles, Intimate Partner Violence, Occupational Status, and Organizational Benefits." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 22: 312-326.
- Leadley, Katrin, Catherine L. Clark, and Raul Caetano. (2000). "Couples' Drinking Patterns, Intimate Partner Violence, and Alcohol-Related Partnership Problems." *Journal of Substance Abuse* 11: 253-263.
- Leonard, Elizabeth Dermody. (2002). *Convicted Survivors: The Imprisonment of Battered Women Who Kill*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Leonard, Kenneth E. and Brian M. Quigley. (1999). "Drinking and Marital Aggression in Newlyweds: An Event-Based Analysis of Drinking and the Occurrence of Husband Martial Aggression." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 60: 537-545.
- Leone, Janel M., Michael P. Johnson, Catherine L. Cohan, and Susan E. Lloyd. (2004). "Consequences of Male Partner Violence for Low-Income Minority Women." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 66: 472-490.
- Lindquist, Carol U., Lillian E. Sass, Denise Bottomley, Suzanne M. Katin, Jennifer D. Maddox, Rose M. Ordonez, and Craig N. Teofilo. (1997). "Should Abused Women's Reports of Partner Substance Abuse be Accepted as Valid?" *Journal of Family Violence* 12: 75-83.

- Loring, Marti Tamm. (1998). *Emotional Abuse: The Trauma and Treatment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Macmillan, Ross and Rosemary Gartner. (1999). "When Women Brings Home the Beacon: Labor-Force Participation and the Risk of Spousal Violence Against Women." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61: 947-958.
- Maker, Azmaira Hamid, Markus Kemmelmeier, and Christopher Peterson. (1999). "Long-Term Psychological Consequences in Women of Witnessing Parental Physical Conflict and Experiencing Abuse in Childhood." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 13: 574-590.
- McCloskey, Laura Ann. (1996). "Socioeconomic and Coercive Power Within the Family." *Gender & Society* 10: 449-463.
- McKenry, Patrick, C., Teresa W. Julian, and Stephen M. Gavazzi. (1995). "Toward a Biopsychosocial Model of Domestic Violence." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57: 307-320.
- Melton, Heather C. (2007). "Predicting the Occurrence of Stalking in Relationships Characterized by Domestic Violence." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 22: 2-25.
- Mihalic, Sharon W. and Delbert Elliott. (1997). "A Social Learning Theory Model of Marital Violence." *Journal of Family Violence* 12: 21-47.
- Miller, Jody and Norman A. White. (2003). "Gender and Adolescent Relationship Violence: A Contextual Examination." *Criminology* 41: 1207-1248.
- Miller, Brenda A., William R. Downs, and Dawn M. Gondoli. (1989). "Spousal Violence Among Alcoholic Women as Compared to a Random Household Sample of Women." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 50: 533-540.
- Moffitt, Terrie E., Avshalom Caspi, Robert F. Krueger, Lynn Magdol, Gayla Margolin, Phil A. Silva, and Ros Sydney. (1997). "Do Partners Agree About Abuse in Their Relationship? A Psychometric Evaluation of Interpartner Agreement." *Psychological Assessment* 9: 47-56.
- Morse, Barbara J. (1995). "Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scales: Assessing Gender Differences in Partner Violence." *Violence and Victims* 4: 251-272.
- Nazroo, James. (1995). "Uncovering Gender Differences in the Use of Marital Violence: The Effect of Methodology." *Sociology* 24: 475-494.

- Neff, James Alan, Bruce Holamon, and Tracy Davis Schluter. (1995). "Spousal Violence Among Anglos, Blacks, and Mexican Americans: The Role of Demographic Variables, Psychological Predictors, and Alcohol Consumption." *Journal of Family Violence* 10: 1-21.
- Newburn, Tim and Elizabeth A. Stanko, eds. (1994). *Just Boys Doing Business: Men, Masculinities and Crime*. London: Routledge.
- Nock, Steven L. (2001). "The Marriage of Equally Dependent Spouses." *Journal of Family Issues* 22: 727-754.
- O'Farrell, Timothy J., Valerie Van Hutton, and Christopher M. Murphy. (1999). "Domestic Violence Before and After Alcoholism Treatment: A Two-Year Longitude Study." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 60: 317-321.
- O'Keefe, Maura. (1997). "Predictors of Dating Violence Among High School Students." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 12: 546-568.
- Ogle, Robbin S., Daniel Maier-Katkin, and Thomas J. Bernard. (1995). "A Theory of Homicidal Behavior Among Women." *Criminology* 33: 173-193.
- Ogle, Robbin S. and Susan Jacobs. (2002). *Self-Defense and Battered Women Who Kill: A New Framework*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.
- Parker, Robert Nash and Kathleen Auerhahn. (1998). "Alcohol, Drugs, and Violence." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 291-311.
- Peterson, Ruth and William C. Bailey. (1992). "Rape and Dimensions of Gender Socioeconomic Inequality in U.S. Metropolitan Areas." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 29: 162-177.
- Petrik, Norman D., Rebecca E. Petrik-Olson, and Leah S. Subotnik. (1994). "Powerlessness and the Need to Control." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 9: 278-285.
- Polk, Kenneth. (1994). *When Men Kill: Scenarios of Masculine Violence*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramirez, Ignacio Luis. (2005). "Criminal History and Assaults on Intimate Partners by Mexican American and Non-Mexican White College Students." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20: 1628-1647.
- Rennison, Callie Marie. (1999). *Criminal Victimization 1998: Changes 1997-1998 with Trends 1993-1998*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

- Rogers, Stacy J. and Paul R. Amato. (2000). "Have Change in Gender Relations Affected Marital Quality?" *Social Forces* 79: 731-748.
- Salari, Sonia Miner and Bret M. Baldwin. (2002). "Verbal, Physical, and Injurious Aggression Among Intimate Couples Over Time." *Journal of Family Issues* 23: 523-550.
- Saltzman, Linda E. (2004). "Definitional and Methodological Issues Related to Transnational Research on Intimate Partner Violence." *Violence Against Women* 10: 812-830.
- Sanders, Barbara and Dina L. Moore. (1999). "Child Maltreatment and Date Rape." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 14: 115-124.
- Saunders, Daniel G. (2002). "Are Physical Assaults by Wives and Girlfriends a Major Social Problem? A Review of the Literature." *Violence Against Women* 8: 1424-1448.
- Schoen, Robert, Nan Marie Astone, Kendra Rothert, Nicola J. Standish, and Young J. Kim. (2002). "Women's Employment, Marital Happiness, and Divorce." *Social Forces* 81: 643-662.
- Schwartz, Martin. (2005). "The Past and the Future of Violence Against Women." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 20: 7-11.
- Sherman, Lawrence W., Douglas A. Smith, Janell D. Schmidt, and Dennis P. Rogan. (1992). "Crime, Punishment, and the Stake in Conformity: Legal and Informal Control of Domestic Violence." *American Sociological Review* 57: 680-690.
- Simons, Ronald L., Kuei-Hsiu Lin, and Leslie C. Gordon. (1998). "Socialization in the Family of Origin and Male Dating Violence: A Prospective Study." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60: 467-478.
- Stark, Evan. (2007). *Coercive Control: The Entrapment of Women in Personal Life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stets, Jan E. and Peter J. Burke. (2005). "Identity Verification, Control, and Aggression in Marriage." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68: 160-178.
- _____. (1996). "Gender, Control, and Interaction." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 59: 193-220.
- Stets, Jan E. (1995). "Modelling Control in Relationships." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57: 489-501.

- Straus, Murray A. and Christine Smith. (1990). *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Straus, Murray A. and Richard J. Gelles. (1986). "Societal Change and Change in the Family from 1975 to 1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 48: 465-479.
- Testa, Maria, Brian M. Quigley, and Kenneth E. Leonard. (2003). "Does Alcohol Make a Difference? Within-Participants Comparison of Incidents of Partner Violence." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18: 735-743.
- Thompson, Martie P., Linda E. Saltzman, and Holly Johnson. (2003). "A Comparison of Risk for Intimate Partner Violence-Related Injury Across Two National Surveys on Violence Against Women." *Violence Against Women* 9: 438-457.
- Thompson, Martie P., Ileana Arias, Kathleen C. Basile, and Sujata Desai. (2002). "The Association Between Childhood Physical and Sexual Victimization and Health Problems in Adulthood in a Nationally Representative Sample of Women." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 17: 1115-1129.
- Thompson, Martie P. and J.B. Kingree. (2006). "The Roles of Victim and Perpetrator Alcohol Use in Intimate Partner Violence Outcomes." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 21: 163-177.
- Tichenor, Veronica Jaris. (1999). "Status and Income as Gendered Resources: The Case of Marital Power." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61: 638-650.
- _____. (2005). *Earning More and Getting Less: Why Successful Wives Can't Buy Equality*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Tjaden, Patricia and Nancy Thoennes. (2000). "Prevalence and Consequences of Male-to-Female and Female-to-Male Intimate Partner Violence as Measures by the National Violence Against Women Survey." *Violence Against Women* 6: 142-161.
- Tolman, Richard M. and Jody Raphael. (2000). "A Review of Research on Welfare and Domestic Violence." *Journal of Social Issues* 56: 655-682.
- Tolman, Richard M. and Larry W. Bennett. (1990). "A Review of Quantitative Research on Men Who Batter." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 5: 87-118.

- Umberson, Debra, Kristin Anderson, Jennifer Glick, and Adam Shapiro. (1998). "Domestic Violence, Personal Control, and Gender." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60: 442-452.
- Walker, Lenore. (1979). *The Battered Women*. New York: Harper & Row.
- _____. (1984). *The Battered Women Syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Whaley, Rachel B. and Steven F. Messner. (2002). "Gender Equality and Gendered Homicides." *Homicides Studies* 6: 188-210.
- Weeks, Robin and Cathy Spatz Widom. (1998). "Self-Reports of Early Childhood Victimization Among Incarcerated Males Felons." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 13: 346-361.
- Williams, Kirk R. (1992). "Social Sources of Marital Violence and Deterrence: Testing an Integrated Theory of Assaults Between Partners." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 54: 620-629.
- Williams, Kirk R. and Richard Hawkins. (1989). "The Meaning of Arrest for Wife Assault." *Criminology* 27: 163-181.
- Worcester, Nancy. (2002). "Women's Use of Force: Complexities and Challenges of Taking the Issue Seriously." *Violence Against Women* 8: 1390-1415

Appendix A - Descriptions of Variables Used in Scales.

Variables

Components of the Dependent Variable

Power and Controlling Behavior

Is jealous or possessive (1=Yes, 0=No)

Tries to provoke arguments (1=Yes, 0=No)

Tries to limit your contact with family or friends (1=Yes, 0=No)

Insists on knowing who you are with at all times (1=Yes, 0=No)

Prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income (1=Yes, 0=No)

Emotional Abuse

Calls you names or puts you down in front of others? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Makes you feel inadequate? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Shouts or swears at you? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Frightens you? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Child Victimization

Throw something at you that could hurt you? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Push, grab, or shove you? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Pull your hair? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Slap or hit you? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Kick or bite you? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Choke or attempted to drown you? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Hit you with some object? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Beat you up? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Threaten you with a knife or other weapon besides a gun? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Use a knife or other weapon on you besides a gun? (1=Yes, 0=No)

Education

(1) No schooling

(2) 1st-8th grade

(3) Some high school

- (4) High school graduate
- (5) Some college
- (6) 4 Year College degree
- (7) Postgraduate

Respondent's Alcohol Consumption

- (1) Never?
- (2) Once a month or less?
- (3) Two or three days a month?
- (4) One or two days a week?
- (5) Three or four days a week?
- (6) Nearly every day?
- (7) Every day?

Respondent's Husband/Boyfriend Alcohol Consumption

- (1) Never?
- (2) Once a month or less?
- (3) Two or three days a month
- (4) One or two days a week
- (5) Three or four days a week
- (6) Nearly every day?
- (7) Every day?

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Variables Used in the Analysis

Variables	Description	Mean	S.D.	N
Emotional Abuse	1=Yes, 0=No	.243 .734		1,177 3,549
Relationship	Married: 1=Yes, 0=No	.889 .111		4,299 537
Status Compatibility	Traditional Status: Male employed, Female Not: 1=Yes, 0=No	.242 .758		1,172 3,666
	Status Parity: Male Employed, Female Employed: 1=Yes, 0=No	.601 .399		2,885 1,914
	Status Reversal: Male Not Employed, Female Employed: 1=Yes, 0=No	.076 .924		369 4,469
	Unemployment Status: Male Not Employed, Female Not Employed: 1=Yes, 0=No	.077 .923		373 4,465
Age	Age in Years	40.38	11.07	4,838
Race	Self-Reported Race: 1=White, 0=Non-White 1=Hispanic, 0=Non-Hispanic 1=Black, 0=Non-Black 1=Other, 0=Non-Other	.813 .187 .082 .918 .060 .935 .041 .959		3,913 899 393 4,426 290 4,522 197 4,812
Poverty	1=Medicaid or MediCal, Free or low income clinic, Uninsured, 0=Otherwise	.067 .933		324 4,480
Employment	Respondent's Employment: 1=Yes, 0=No	.677 .323		3,268 1,560
	Respondent's Spouse/Partner Employment: 1=Yes, 0=No	.845 .155		4,063 744
Education	Self-Reported Education: Respondent's Education	4.84	1.13	4,830
Child Victimization	Ten Item Scale	9.00	1.67	4,765
Alcohol Use	Reverse Coded Scale: Respondent's Drinking Partner's Drinking	2.19 2.80	1.36 1.77	4,824 4,766

Table 2: Bivariate Correlations Between Variables Used in the Analysis

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Emotional Abuse 1		-.140**	-.014	.036*	-.014	.066**	-.102**	-.127**	.077**	.077**	.050**	.102**	-.102**	-.195**	.001	.078**
2. Marriage		1	-.049**	-.037*	.073**	-.038*	.240**	.082**	-.027	-.094**	-.014	-.172**	.061**	.077**	-.066**	-.075**
3. Status Parity			1	-.235**	-.915**	-.161**	.025	.018	-.111**	.080**	.024	-.158**	.226**	.019	.101**	.071**
4. Status Reversal				1	-.102**	-.018	-.009	-.013	.024	.008	-.033	.044*	-.023	-.039*	-.002	.022
5. Traditional Status					1	-.069**	-.021	.005	.085**	-.090**	-.015	.110**	-.201**	-.004	-.098**	-.075**
6. Both Unemployed						1	-.007	-.079**	.090**	.019	.007	.155**	-.104**	-.007	-.023	-.026
7. Age							1	.119**	-.136**	-.016	-.038**	-.117**	-.010	.045**	.023	-.013
8. White								1	-.630**	-.528**	-.431**	-.111**	.116**	.036*	.134**	.077**
9. Hispanic									1	-.076**	-.062**	.118**	-.178**	-.048**	-.100**	-.053**
10. Black										1	-.052**	.013	-.014	.040**	-.059**	-.040**
11. Other Minority											1	.043**	.046**	-.052**	-.047**	-.018
12. Poverty												1	-.180**	-.019	-.051**	-.033*
13. Education													1	-.007	.196**	.121**
14. Child Victimization														1	-.027	-.047**
15. Respondent's Drinking															1	.549**
16. Partner's Drinking																1

Note: *p ≤ .05, **p ≤ .01

Table 3: Logistic Regression Analysis Results ^a

Variable	b	Odds Ratio	p
Married	-.381** (.138)	.683	.006
Age	-.013** (.005)	.987	.007
Hispanic	.281 (.156)	1.324	.072
Black	.761*** (.169)	2.140	.000
Other Minority	.514* (.226)	1.671	.023
Respondent's Education	-.177*** (.043)	.838	.000
Poverty	.548** (.189)	1.730	.004
Child Victimization	-.237*** (.024)	.789	.000
Respondent's Drinking	.067 (.086)	1.069	.438
Partner's Drinking	.217*** (.048)	1.242	.000
Respondent's Drinking by Partner's	-.033 (.018)	.968	.073
<u>Employment Variable</u>			
Status Reversal	.183 (.273)	1.201	.502
Traditional Status	-.138 (.106)	.871	.195
Both Unemployed	.621 (.355)	1.860	.080
Constant	2.021*** (.407)	7.547	.000
-2 Log likelihood	3075.502***		.000

Note: *p≤.05, **p≤.01, ***p≤.001,
(standard errors in parentheses)

^a Both Employed is the reference category

Table 4: Logistic Regression Analysis Results ^a

Variable	b	Odds Ratio	p
Married	-.381** (.138)	.683	.006
Age	-.013** (.005)	.987	.007
Hispanic	.281 (.156)	1.324	.072
Black	.761*** (.169)	2.140	.000
Other Minority	.514* (.226)	1.671	.023
Respondent's Education	-.177*** (.043)	.838	.000
Poverty	.548** (.189)	1.730	.004
Child Victimization	-.237*** (.024)	.789	.000
Respondent's Drinking	.067 (.086)	1.069	.438
Partner's Drinking	.217*** (.048)	1.242	.000
Respondent's Drinking by Partner's	-.033 (.018)	.968	.073
<u>Employment Variable</u>			
Status Parity	-.621 (.355)	.538	.080
Status Reversal	-.438 (.438)	.646	.318
Traditional Status	-.759* (.357)	.468	.034
Constant	2.642*** (.520)	14.038	.000
-2 Log likelihood	3075.502***		.000

Note: *p< .05, **p< .01, ***p< .001,
(standard errors in parentheses)

^a Both Unemployed is the reference category.