

2002

# The perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans: their relationships to the incidence of partner abuse

Bonnie Ahn

*Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College*, bahn1@lsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations)



Part of the [Social Work Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Ahn, Bonnie, "The perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans: their relationships to the incidence of partner abuse" (2002). *LSU Doctoral Dissertations*. 2167.

[https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool\\_dissertations/2167](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_dissertations/2167)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized graduate school editor of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [gradetd@lsu.edu](mailto:gradetd@lsu.edu).

THE PERCEPTIONS OF AND ATTITUDES TOWARD PARTNER ABUSE  
AMONG FIRST GENERATION KOREAN-AMERICANS:  
THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO THE INCIDENCE OF PARTNER ABUSE

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Louisiana State University and  
Agricultural and Mechanical College  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

In

The School of Social Work

by

Bonnie Ahn  
B.S., Ewha Women's University, 1971  
M.S.W., California State University at Los Angeles, 1999  
May, 2002

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is an old Korean adage saying, “Helpers are useful in achieving success.” I was certainly blessed with many helpers in completing this dissertation. I would like to thank Dr. Kenneth Millar, and Dr. Steven Rose for their insightful feedback. I would also like to thank my advisor, Dr. Brij Mohan for his timely, indispensable support, and his extraordinary friendship. I am deeply indebted to Dr. Michael F. Burnett, for his dedication and support throughout my research adventures and for leading me to countless moments of revelation. I am grateful to Dr. Burnett beyond anything I can put on the page. I would also like to thank my husband, Myung Chull Choi for putting up with the many hours I spent in the study when I could have contributed more usefully to family activity. But most importantly, thanks to the courageous Korean women who have been abused but have survived, therefore have inspired me to conduct this research.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
Rationale.....	1
Objectives.....	9
Significance of the Study.....	13
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	17
Partner Violence as a Social Problem.....	17
Scope of the Problem.....	17
Partner Violence among Minority Groups.....	23
African Americans.....	23
Hispanics.....	25
Asian Americans.....	26
American Indians.....	27
Domestic Violence in Korean Immigrant Community.....	29
Backgrounds of Korean Immigrants.....	29
Traditional Family Organization and Value Orientation of Korean Immigrants.....	31
The Prevalence of Spouse Abuse among Korean Immigrants.....	33
Theories of Domestic Violence.....	34
Individual Theories.....	34
Environmental or Situational Theories.....	36
Structural/Cultural Theories.....	38
Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Domestic Violence.....	40
Definitions of Domestic Violence.....	40
Contextual Justification for Domestic Violence.....	41
Factors Contributing to Domestic Violence.....	43
Traditionalism.....	43
Rigid Sex role Socialization Factor.....	45
Socioeconomic Factors.....	46
General Attitudes toward Women.....	48
Attitudes toward Acceptance of Marital Violence.....	51
3 METHODOLOGY.....	53
Research Design.....	53
Population and Sample.....	53
Instrumentation.....	54
The Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Domestic Violence Questionnaire-Revised (PADV-R).....	54

Definitions of Domestic Violence.....	57
Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence.....	58
Causes of Domestic Violence.....	59
Contextual Justification.....	59
Experiences with Domestic Violence.....	60
Indirect Experiences with Domestic Violence.....	60
Direct Experiences with Domestic Violence.....	61
Participant Profile Form.....	63
Translation of Instrument.....	63
Data Collection Procedure.....	64
Data Analysis.....	64

#### 4 FINDINGS

Objective One.....	74
Gender of Respondents.....	74
Age of Respondents.....	74
Marital Status of Respondents.....	75
Length of Residence in the United States of Respondents.....	76
Occupation of Respondents.....	77
Annual Family Income of Respondents.....	78
Educational Status of Respondents.....	79
Religion of Respondents.....	80
Objective Two.....	80
Definitions of Domestic Violence.....	82
Factor Analysis.....	84
Sub-Scale Scores.....	85
Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence.....	86
Factor Analysis.....	88
Sub-Scale Scores.....	89
Attitudes toward the Causes of Domestic Violence.....	90
Factor Analysis.....	92
Sub-Scale Scores.....	94
Attitudes toward the Contextual Justification of Domestic Violence.....	95
Factor Analysis.....	95
Sub-Scale Scores.....	97
Indirect Experiences of Domestic Violence.....	98
Objective Three.....	98
Incidence of Partner Abuse as Perpetrator.....	102
Factor Analysis.....	106
Sub-Scale Means as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months.....	108
Lifetime Partner Abuse as Perpetrator.....	109
Sub-Scale Means as Perpetrator during the Respondents' Lifetime.....	109
Incidence of Partner Abuse as Victim.....	111

Factor Analysis.....	115
Sub-Scale Means as Victim during the Past 12 Months.....	116
Lifetime Partner Abuse as Victim.....	117
Sub-Scale Means as Victim during the Respondents' Lifetime..	120
Objective Four.....	121
Age.....	121
Religion.....	122
Verbal Aggression as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months....	124
Physical Violence as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months.....	125
Verbal Aggression as Victim during the Past 12 Months.....	126
Physical Violence as Victim during the Past 12 Months.....	126
Occupation.....	128
Verbal Aggression as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months....	129
Physical Violence as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months.....	130
Verbal Aggression as Victim during the Past 12 Months.....	131
Physical Violence as Victim during the Past 12 Months.....	132
Hypothesis One.....	133
Hypothesis Two.....	136
Hypothesis Three.....	137
Hypothesis Four.....	139
Hypothesis Five.....	140
Hypothesis Six.....	146
Hypothesis Seven.....	148
Hypothesis Eight.....	154
Hypothesis Nine.....	156
Verbal Aggression in Perpetrator Dimension.....	157
Physical Violence in Perpetrator Dimension.....	161
Verbal Aggression in Victim Dimension.....	164
Physical Violence in Victim Dimension.....	167
5 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	171
Summary .....	171
Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations.....	186
REFERENCES.....	197
APPENDIXES....	
A QUESTIONNAIRE.....	210
B INTRODUCTORY LETTER, AND INFORMED CONSENT.....	223
C PERMISSION TO USE THE INSTRUMENTS.....	227
VITA.....	230

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of the perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse, and various demographic characteristics on the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans. The study employed a correlational explanatory design using a cross-sectional survey technique utilizing a total of 223 Korean immigrant adults currently residing in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. A three-part instrument was used for data collection. Part I of the instrument measured the perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence among Korean-Americans. Part II measured the incidence and nature of domestic violence, and part III inquired demographic information about Korean-Americans. The use of domestic violence among Korean-Americans was highly prevalent. Demographic characteristics such as gender, age, religion, occupation and the length of residence in the United States were related to the occurrences of domestic violence. Korean men were more physically violent, whereas Korean women were more verbally abusive than their partners. Also, the younger the individuals were, the more abusive acts they employed. Generally, Confucians and Buddhists were more abusive than Protestants, and the unemployed and laborers were more abusive than professionals. The longer the individuals have resided in the United States, the less abusive they tended to be. There were significant relationships between various perceptions of domestic violence and the actual experiences with domestic violence.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### Rationale

Violence towards women by an intimate partner is an enormous social problem. In fact, former Surgeon General Koop declared interpersonal violence a public health emergency, stating that domestic violence causes more injuries to women than automobile accidents, muggings, and rapes combined (Koop, 1989). Additionally, the two National Family Violence Surveys indicate marital violence is very common (Straus, 1990). In fact, the high rate of marital violence led Straus and his colleagues to conclude that the marriage license might be in many ways considered a “hitting license.” National surveys indicate that approximately 16 percent of American couple (married and cohabiting) experienced one act of violence during the year prior to the survey. Data from both surveys also revealed that approximately 6 percent of married women experienced severe violence such as beatings or life-threatening assaults.

For most women, the family is the most violent group to which they are likely to belong. The home is the location of an extraordinary proportion of killings and that women are much more likely than men to be slain in their position as wives or intimates of men than are men in their position as husbands (Bachman & Saltzman, 1996). Although the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) gather data on offender-victim relationships for the crime of homicide, investigations fail to identify the offender in approximately 40% of cases (U.S. Department of Justice, FBI, 1992). Consequently, it is impossible to know exactly how many murders are

committed by intimates. However, a large percentage of U.S. murders are intrafamilial. The actual percentage of homicides committed by intimates is believed to be between 9% and 15% (Bachman & Saltzman, 1996; U.S. Department of Justice, FBI, 1992). When women are killed, they are often killed in an intimate setting. In fact, in 1992 husbands or boyfriends were the known assailant in 28% of all female homicides and 41% of the female homicides in which the offender was identified (Bachman & Saltzman, 1996).

Despite the current exposure of battered women, only a very few of them ever become public. Most go unnoticed or unmentioned as the women go on with their family life and work, successfully concealing their wounds and making up stories. Because approximately 90% of marital violence never becomes part of official Uniform Crime Reports (Teske & Parker, 1983), the experts have turned to self-report estimates as more accurate estimates of the frequency of marital violence. As a measure of marital violence, however, self-report data still underestimate the amount and seriousness of marital violence (Riggs, Murphy, & O'Leary, 1989). One of the various factors contributing to underreporting is that violent men tend to minimize the frequency and severity of their actions (Riggs, Murphy, & O'Leary, 1989; Szinovacz, 1983).

The impact of partner violence is broad and substantial with serious consequences. The individual impact of partner violence includes a variety of possible physical and psychological problems. Battered women suffer physical injuries ranging from bruises and scratches to permanent bodily damage or even death (National Research Council, 1996). Research with clinical samples has

consistently identified numerous psychological problems among battered women. Among the problems are anxiety, depression, anger and rage, nightmares, dissociation, shame, lowered self-esteem, somatic problems, sexual problems, addictive behaviors, and other impaired functioning (Dutton, 1993; Koss, 1990; Mitchell & Hudson, 1983; Orava, McLeod, & Sharpe, 1996). For example, when 234 physically abused women were presented with a checklist of 12 physical and psychological symptoms, most of the sample (65%) reported 3 to 7 symptoms (Follingstad, Brennan, Hause, Polek, & Rutledge, 1991). Only 3% reported no symptoms, and one woman reported all 12. Most frequently cited were depression (77%), Anxiety (75%), and persistent headaches (56%).

Partner violence has consequences not only for the women who are victimized, but also for the children. Battering men also hurt the children of the women they victimize. A substantial number of these children are physically injured themselves (Appel, & Holden, 1998; Jouriles, McDonald, Norwood, & Ezell, 2000). The psychological injury they suffer can range from severe emotional maladjustment, behavioral problems to a repetition of the violence and aggression to which they have been exposed. In the long run, intimate partner violence is related to violent patterns in the next generation. Witnessing physical violence between one's parents is highly correlated with severe aggression in one's own partner relationships (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Kalmuss, 1984).

The costs of partner violence are not measurable in many respects, however the social costs of this violence are substantial. Straus (1986) estimated that women make 1,453,437 medical visits per year for treatment of injuries resulting from an

assault by a spouse. Approximately 20% to 50% of all female emergency patients are there to receive treatment for marital assault (Campbell & Sheridan, 1989). Costs for hospital emergency room care for battered women in New York City may be as high as \$506 million annually (“The billion-dollar epidemic,” 1992). The Homelessness and welfare costs are another cost of battering. Studies indicate that domestic violence is the main reason for homelessness among women and children (Zorza, 1991). It was estimated that New York State spends \$30 to \$40 million annually to house homeless women (Zorza, 1994). Although the costs of criminal justice system processing are also difficult to estimate, some authorities suggest that domestic violence calls are the largest category of calls to the police each year (Gelles & Cornell, 1990). New York City made 12,724 domestic violence arrests at an average cost of \$3,241 per arrest. Including these police costs and those for the court and detention, the city paid at least \$41 million (Zorza, 1994). The great loss of productivity due to physical or psychological injury of battered women are also examples of the financial burden borne by society as a result of intimate violence (National Research Council, 1996). We all suffer practically and morally by failing to stop the partner violence.

After more than two decades of research, it is clear that partner violence is a serious social problem that affects many segments of society. Despite the increased interest on domestic violence, researchers are just beginning to explore the complexities of partner violence among ethnic minorities (West, 1998). Violence against women is oppressive and intolerable regardless of a woman’s cultural and social background. However, cultural distinctions have been overlooked.

Researchers identified several reasons for this void (West, 1998; Crenshaw, 1994). First, some researchers have taken a “color blind” approach to examining partner violence; second, other researchers have considered violence to be a problem primarily of poor, ethnic minorities; and finally information on ethnic minority partner violence is lacking because some members of the ethnic minority community have imposed a “political gag order” concerning battering. Some community members fear that research findings will be misinterpreted to reinforce negative societal stereotypes about minorities (Crenshaw, 1994; Eng, 1995; Ho, 1990).

Although violent families of all ethnic backgrounds may share some similarities, a color-blind perspective disregards the ways race/ethnicity shapes the experience and interpretation of violence (O’Keefe, 1994). Also when research findings have been presented without consideration for factors that might act as mediators between ethnicity and partner violence, it may account for higher rates of partner violence among ethnic minorities (Asbury, 1993; Cazenave & Straus, 1990; Jasinski, 1996). It is crucial to examine how cultural value systems color the life experiences of individuals from different cultural groups. Racism, discrimination, language barriers, prejudice, and different value systems color the social realities of members from different ethnic groups (Collins, 1989; Padilla, 1990). Furthermore, failure to consider sociocultural factors that influence minority partner violence may result in stereotypes, unfair public policies, and ineffective intervention efforts.

Immigration to the United States has become increasingly heterogeneous since the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 (Gordon, 1990). Although

people are immigrating from all over the world, the largest increases are in immigrants from Asia, Latin America, and the Caribbean. The 2000 census indicated that these three groups account for as much as 40% of the total population increase over the past decade in the United States (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). Koreans are one of the fastest growing ethnic groups in the United States. The number of Korean immigrants has increased rapidly in the past few decades, from 70,000 in 1970 to 1,076,872 in 2000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001).

Studies on marital violence in Korean community are only a few. However, these studies (Shin, 1995; Song, 1996) indicate that marital violence is more prevalent among the Korean immigrant population in comparison to other ethnic groups in the United States. One hundred and fifty Korean immigrant women were interviewed by Song (1996), and the results indicated that 60% (n=90) reported having been battered by their spouses. Shin (1995) interviewed 99 Korean men to examine the problem of partner violence with a special focus on Korean immigrant males. The results indicated that 35% of the respondents admitted at least one incidence of partner violence during the previous year; and 67% reported that they had at least one incidence of verbal aggression toward their partners during the year preceding the study.

In terms of prevalence, Korean-American families are recognized as having the highest rate of domestic violence among various Asian immigrant groups in Los Angeles County. Records of the Los Angeles County Attorneys' Office indicated that Korean immigrant males comprised the highest percentage of all Asian defendants accused of spouse abuse. (Chun, 1990). Also, the statistical report

presented by the Korean American Family Service Center (1995) indicates that violence against women accounts for the highest percentage (30.3%) of all cases serviced by the Center.

Rhee's study (1995) of marital dissolution among Korean immigrants also suggested that domestic violence is more serious in the Korean community than in other ethnic groups. Rhee (1995) collected data from divorced immigrant Korean women in Los Angeles to determine the causes for separation and divorce. For the most significant causes for divorce among the immigrant Korean subjects, Rhee (1995) suggested the following reasons by rank order: (1) frequent physical violence by husband; (2) husband's extramarital affairs; (3) gambling; (4) husband's heavy drinking; and (5) lack of financial support from husband. These findings are inconsistent with a similar study by Albrecht and his colleagues (1983) using non-Korean subjects. In the survey of 500 white American divorced respondents, in terms of rank order for the causes of divorce, the leading factors were (1) infidelity, (2) loss of love, (3) emotional problems, (4) financial problems, and (5) physical abuse. Among Korean immigrant families, contrary to the majority population, domestic violence was identified as the most significant factor for the marital dissolution.

There are old Korean sayings, which reflect traditional perceptions towards women and their expected roles, such as "the real taste of dried fish and women can only be derived from beating them once every three days"; "once you are married, you should be willing to end up as a ghost in your husband's house"; and "be deaf for three years, be mute for another three years, and be blind for another three years,

then, you will make your marriage.” It perpetuates the notion that a man can beat a woman when she does something wrong, and woman does not have other options than suffering and persevering these inhumane acts.

Suffering and persevering are valued virtues for women in many Asian cultures. The ability to persevere and suffer is fundamental to building a strong character. This emphasis on suffering and persevering has been adaptive in Korean culture in that it serves to preserve harmony and order in the family. Women are given support and recognition for enduring hardship and are discouraged from speaking up. Thus, they are taught to accept their suffering rather than change an intolerable situation. (Kim et al., 1981).

The concept of enduring suffering and persevering is also consistent with Buddhism’s belief in the acceptance of fate (Ho, 1990). In Korean philosophy and religion, fate is considered to be positive rather than negative. In Korean philosophy, it is important to accept a situation as fate or destiny intended, and not to challenge it (Kim et al., 1981). This concept, therefore, further supports the maintenance of tradition and order, and discourages attempts to change problematic situations such as violence in the family.

Although the wife abuse phenomenon has a long history, it is only recently that people have begun to study the problem more seriously. Considerable research on marital violence has increased substantially over the past two decades. However, the current domestic violence literature mainly examines Western cultures, families, and individuals (Hampton, 1999; Jasinski & Williams, 1998; Vincent & Jourliles, 2000). They do not take into account cultural and social factors, which differ from

those of Western culture. Although some attention has been given to cultural issues of domestic violence among Black Americans and Hispanic Americans (Jasinski & Williams, 1998), comparatively, the domestic violence problem in Asian American communities has been neglected. Particularly, examination and review of the available literature revealed that very little research has been conducted on partner abuse in Korean immigrant families. Therefore, there are the needs for more empirical data on socio-cultural dimensions involved with partner violence in Korean American community.

### Objectives

The primary purpose of this study is to examine the influence of the perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse, and various demographic characteristics on the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans. The objectives are as follows:

1. Describe first generation Korean-Americans on selected demographic characteristics including gender, age, marital status, length of residence in the United States, occupation, household income, educational status, and religion.
2. Determine the perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans, as measured by the Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Domestic Violence Scale (Yick, 1997).
3. Determine the self-reported incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans as measured by Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979).

4. Determine if a relationship exists between the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans and each of the following demographic characteristics: age, religion, and occupation.

Based on the review of related literature, the following hypotheses were established by the researcher.

1. Among first generation Korean-Americans, males will report higher levels of partner abuse as the perpetrator than will females. Additionally, females will report higher levels of partner abuse as the victims than will males.
2. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between household income and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with lower levels of income will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.
3. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between highest level of education completed and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with lower levels of education completed will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.
4. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between length of residence in the United States and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with fewer years in the United States will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.

5. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between the perceptions regarding the definitions of domestic violence as measured by the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who hold broader perceptions regarding the interactions that are included in domestic violence will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim while the individuals who hold narrower perceptions regarding the interactions included in domestic violence will tend to report higher levels of domestic violence as both perpetrator and victim.
6. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the sanction of the use of violence as measured by the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who sanction the use of violence to a greater degree will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim while the individuals who sanction the use of violence to a lesser degree will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.
7. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the attitudes regarding the causes of domestic violence as measured by the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who indicate a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim while the

individuals who indicate a narrower range of potential causes of domestic violence will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.

8. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the level of contextual justification of domestic violence as measured by the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who accept a wider range of contextual justification will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim while the individuals who accept a narrower range of contextual justification will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.
9. A model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans. The following groups of measures will make a significant contribution to the explanatory model in a hierarchical manner with the first measures providing the greatest contribution:
  - a. Perceptual measures including: definitions of domestic violence as measured by the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997); attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence as measured by the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997); attitudes toward causes of domestic violence as measured by the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997); and

perceptions of contextual justification as measured by the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997).

- b. The following demographic characteristics: gender, income, educational status, and length of residence in the United States.

Additionally, exploratory variables of investigation will be entered into the model using stepwise techniques after the hypothesized variables have entered the model to determine if these exploratory variables have additional explanatory power to contribute to the model.

#### Significance of the Study

Despite the great need for the study of domestic violence in Asian American populations, the implementation of research has proved difficult. It is a sensitive topic, and this is particularly true in Asian communities where there is a strong cultural emphasis in not losing face. Disclosing shameful behaviors may mean disgrace and loss of face not only for the individual but the entire family system (Ho, 1990).

Given the difficulties of studying domestic violence directly, it may be necessary to examine the underlying structures of the behavior; that is, public perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence. From a practical and methodological viewpoint, perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence may serve as a vehicle to studying this sensitive topic. Since American society views behaviors that occur within the family domain as private and deem them free from public scrutiny (Fagan, 1992), tapping into victimization and perpetration

experiences may be perceived as too threatening. Thus, querying into public attitudes toward domestic violence may be less threatening.

Our belief system has a direct influence on behaviors. Our belief system reflects our moral judgments about what is right or wrong, acceptable or unacceptable which serves to justify actions. Permissive attitudes and perceptions that regard domestic violence as an acceptable part of relationships increase the risk of abusive behavior (Cullen, 1983; Riggs & O’Leary, 1989). Studying attitudes toward domestic violence will lend theoretical insights to the nature of domestic violence. If attitudes are indeed underlying structures of behaviors, then understanding perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence will shed light on the relationship between attitudes and the occurrence, etiology, and maintenance of domestic violence (Dent & Arias, 1990). A direct link between social attitudes and behavior has been posited. Individuals who sanction the use of interpersonal violence will more likely employ violence against their spouses and/or possibly more likely to be victims themselves (Riggs & O’Leary, 1989). On the other hand, other scholars assert that the relationship is indirect; that is, perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence serve as a mediating variable between the independent and dependent variable. Cullen (1983) argues for the importance of identifying “structural variables” or those variables that intervene between the independent and outcome variable. Structural variables (i.e., intervening or mediating variables) have the effect of structuring the direction of the outcome, and they may serve in answering why one form of deviance occurs and not another (Cullen, 1983).

Although partner abuse is a common and serious problem among Korean immigrants, awareness of this problem in the community is very low. The current research will increase awareness and understanding of the dynamics in partner abuse. Studying Korean Americans' perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence might also shed light as to how culture impacts on domestic violence. Perceptions and attitudes can be viewed as template-like cognitive categories that are influenced by culture (Angel & Thoits, 1987). They are also composed of cultural aspects that are common to a group (Angel & Thoits, 1987), and they may guide and lead us in understanding symbolic meaning systems. It can also help assess the degree of cognitive equivalence of constructs of domestic violence. This can ultimately contribute to the research base, particularly in the epidemiology and reporting of domestic violence in Korean households and the development of culturally appropriate instruments.

Finally, the study findings will underscore the importance of multicultural approach in identifying problems of domestic violence among Korean immigrant families. The way we conceptualize and define our problems has everything to do with the solutions we seek. The perceptions toward domestic violence among Korean immigrants define the problems that we face in common, and the solutions that we seek. The societal perception toward domestic violence is reflected in the community resources available to battered women including shelters, financial resources, mental health and social services, and legal aids. Due to limited cross-cultural research on domestic violence and the general adherence to Western cultural hegemony in the social sciences (Hoff, 1992), effective services and

policies for specific ethnic groups have been impeded. In domestic violence, this often proves to be a detriment to victimized immigrant women and children of other cultures (Hoff, 1992). Therefore, it is important to understand the socio-cultural context of domestic violence in order to provide culturally sensitive interventions, and ultimately to seek practical and creative solutions to end domestic violence in Korean-American communities.

## CHAPTER 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review examines the domestic violence as a social problem, the comparison of the problem of domestic violence among various ethnic groups including Korean immigrants. Also the theories of domestic violence will be presented by contrasting different theoretical frameworks. The major works that have been conducted on public perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence will be highlighted as well. Lastly, the factors influencing domestic violence including history and culture of Korean-American community will be reviewed.

#### Partner Violence As a Social Problem

##### Scope of the Problem

When people talk about marital violence, they are talking about slaps, assaults, rapes, and murders between intimate partners. Although marital violence as a social problem provokes more public outrage, on a more personal level its acceptance remains at surprisingly high levels. “It is sometimes easier to get your point across with a slap,” we are told. “When you put a man and a woman together, sometimes sparks are going to fly – ain’t no way around it.” One has to wonder how violence between people who love each other came to be so acceptable.

There exist all forms of marital violence, extending from mild verbal abuse to severe physical abuse. Violence in intimate relationships is a behavior pattern that occurs in physical, emotional, psychological, sexual, and economic forms to perpetuate fear, intimidation, power, and control (Hampton, Jenkin, & Vandergriff-

Avery, 1999). Historically, women and children have been the subject of discussion on marital or family violence. Family violence studies (Straus & Gelles, 1986; Walker, 1991) show that large numbers of women are likely to be intended victims of men's violence, which ranges from simple assault to homicide. Women have traditionally occupied low status in the social hierarchy. Furthermore, such low standing in society made them vulnerable for victims of violence.

The nation's response to domestic violence has been uneven. Some concern was voiced in the late part of the nineteenth century and into this century (Pleck, 1987). Wife battering reemerged as a social issue in the 1960s. The dominant view held that marital violence was a "private affair." It was the women's Movement in the 1960's that brought the topic of domestic violence onto the national agenda, and what was viewed as normal and tolerated incidences were transformed into a social problem (Gordon, 1988). Female victims of partner violence were the primary focus of attention when partner violence gained wide recognition as a social problem in the 1970s. Early inquiries into this problem tended to derive from either grassroots shelter movements or traditional psychiatric viewpoints (Pizzey, 1974).

Then, again, in the latter part of the twentieth century, a battered women's movement awoke societal consciousness about the social problem of domestic violence (Schechter, 1982). By the early 1980s, public and professional interest in violence against women had lagged far behind interest in child abuse. In 1982, the first "national day of unity" against domestic violence was observed. This observance continued annually until 1984, when several days in October were designated Domestic Violence Awareness Week. In 1987, the annual violence

week was expanded to include observance during the entire month by the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, an organization of battered women, shelters, and support groups that conducts public education campaigns to continually inform the public about battering (Hampton et al., 1999).

The public discourse about domestic violence has changed significantly during the last decade. Domestic violence, by any measure, constitutes a social problem and a crime. In 1994, the U.S. Congress passed, and President Clinton signed, the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. Perhaps not coincidentally, this was the year that Nicole Brown Simpson was slain and Brown Simpson's ex-husband, O. J. Simpson, was charged with the murder. The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), which was part of this act, changed federal laws and grant procedures. The VAWA appropriated \$1.5 billion to fight violence against women, including \$3 million over 3 years to re-establish a national hot line to help victims and survivors of domestic violence. The focus of this act and its associated funding have already shifted state and local municipalities' methods of applying for and receiving federal funds to train workers and enact domestic violence policies (Hampton et al., 1999).

At about the same time the VAWA was passed, the Family Violence Prevention Fund, along with the Advertising Council, began a national public awareness campaign titled, "No Excuse for Domestic Violence." Public service announcements designed to educate the public about domestic violence and promote prevention and intervention appeared on television and in newspapers (Hampton et al., 1999).

Recent legislation to prevent domestic violence attempts to address problems specific to intimate and familial relationships and provide additional protections to the victims of abuse. They represent a strong statement of public policy: that domestic violence is a serious crime and cannot be dismissed as merely family business. Legislation varies slightly from state to state, but its content is similar, defining domestic violence or abuse relationships recognized by the particular state and including general descriptions of criminal conduct that is domestic in nature. Of particular importance are the remedies provided to protect the victim, in addition to criminal sanctions. Court-issued protection orders are now commonly issued in accordance with abuse prevention acts. Violation of protection orders is a criminal act. “Domestic Abuse Acts” also provide clear instructions to law enforcement on the intent of the law, outlining the responsibility of police officers. Mandated arrest and preferred arrest policies are routine for domestic violence-related crime (Gosselin, 2000).

Domestic violence is the single most frequent violence that police officers encounter. Police respond up to 8 million times per year to violence that involves a spouse or lover (Sherman & Rogan, 1992). At one time it was considered the most dangerous police call; now it is generally accepted as the most frequent form of violence in the United States.

The battered woman is by far the most frequent victim of domestic violence. She is typical of any woman that you encounter in public, but the danger for her is in her own home. She comes from every walk of life, every age, race, ethnicity, and social class. Women’s battering has reached epidemic proportions in the United

States and is considered a major social problem. Domestic violence is the leading cause of injury and death to American women, causing more harm than vehicular accidents, rapes, and muggings combined. Although many expect domestic violence victims to be poor uneducated women, the picture is inaccurate. Their partners victimize many professional women. This is true even though a number of the female victims earn more money than their abusers earn (Goode, 1996).

According to the Commonwealth Fund 1998 Survey of Women's Health: "The equivalent of three million women nationwide reported experiencing domestic abuse in the past year. Nearly two in five women had at some point been physically or sexually assaulted or abused, or had been a victim of domestic violence in their lifetime. One in five she had been raped or assaulted in her lifetime" (Collins et al., 1999).

Each year, an estimated 30 percent of women who become homicide victims die at the hands of men with whom they have a family (Brody, 1992). Husbands or boyfriends killed 28 percent of female murder victims in 1994 (Perkins & Klaus, 1996). Many people fault the battered woman who does not leave her abuser. Yet women do leave abusive relationships. It is at the time of separation that the women are most vulnerable to being beaten and killed. Women who leave their abusive partners are at greater risk of being killed, up to 75 percent greater than for those who stay. A woman is most likely to be murdered when trying to break off an abusive relationship (Sonkin & Durphy, 1997).

Abuse of pregnant women is the leading cause of birth defects and infant mortality, according to the March of Dimes. Lenore Walker has reported a high

degree of battering during first, second, and third pregnancies (Walker, 1984). Determining the extent of marital rape is complicated by the fact that some states still do not legally recognize marital rape, while others have extended their definitions to include cohabitators (American Society of Criminology, 1977). Walker has also found a strong correlation between marital rape and battered women; 50 percent of her sample stated that they were forced to have sex with their spouses (Walker, 1984). Studies have indicated that as many as 1 in 10 wives may have been sexually assaulted by their spouses at least once. Many studies indicate that the majority of domestic violence perpetrators have prior criminal records (Hirschel et al., 1992; Klein, 1993; Sherman & Berk, 1994). The implication is that many domestic violence perpetrators have indicated through prior legal proceedings that they are inclined toward noncompliance (Klein, 1993). This finding is problematic since the primary response of the court is to protect the domestic violence victim through court order.

The scope of domestic violence seems overwhelming when reading the statistics. It is important to note that research projects conclude with figures that are less than perfect. It is clear that we do not know exactly the extent of domestic violence. What they tell us is that there is a problem of domestic violence in the United States. We know that in intimate relationships, many people are being dominated, controlled, hurt, or even killed. We have to face the horrible truth, even if we don't know the exact numbers.

## Partner Violence among Minority Groups

Despite the greater recognition of domestic violence as a social problem, little is still known about domestic violence in ethnic minority groups. Only a few researches have been conducted with different ethnic groups and culture. Even when these researches were conducted, they focused almost exclusively on the comparative rates of occurrence (Asbury, 1999). Fortunately since 1993, many publications acknowledged the unique impacts of race or culture on family violence, however most of these studies addressed the problems of African Americans only (Asbury, 1999). Attention to race in the context of family violence is uneven. Rarely, information on Hispanic, Native American, or Asian American families are included. In the subsequent sections, some of the unique experiences of the four predominate ethnic minority groups in America will be highlighted as they relate to family violence. However, one has to caution that there are many subgroups in particular ethnicity representing different characteristics. Group generalizations must be understood as approximations.

### African Americans

African Americans were 12.3% of the population of the United States in 2000, and population projections suggest that their numbers will remain relatively stable between 15% and 16% of the population in 2050 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). African Americans' median income and levels of educational achievement are below those of European and Asian Americans (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996). Unlike other immigrants, African Americans entered the United States via the slave trade. Their 200-year history of enslavement was characterized by forced

separation of families, beatings, and loss of language and culture. Following slavery, discrimination took the form of segregation (Greene, 1994). Substantial societal gains have been made; nevertheless, black people have not achieved economic, employment, and educational parity with Anglo Americans. Despite social and economical injustices, African American families have developed cultural strengths including adaptability of family roles; strong kinship bonds; emphasis on work, education, and achievement; religious values; and a humanistic belief system that stresses concern for others and spontaneous interaction (Greene, 1994).

Large national probability studies have consistently revealed a higher rate of partner violence among African Americans, compared with Anglo Americans. In the First National Family Violence Survey (Straus et al., 1980), the overall rate of black husband-to-wife abuse was four times higher than white husband-to-wife abuse (113 vs. 30 per 1,000, respectively). When the Second National Family Violence Survey (Hampton & Gelles, 1994; Straud & Gelles, 1986) was conducted a decade later, a similar pattern of racial differences emerged.

However, researchers have found contradictory results in rates of partner violence among African Americans when nonrepresentative samples were used. Fagan et al. (1983) conducted a research using case records of partner violence victims and found that white batterers were more violent toward both family members and nonfamily members. Other studies have not found ethnic differences in rates of partner assault in samples of battered women who were incarcerated

(Roundtree, Parker, Edwards, & Teddlie, 1982) or residents of a women's shelter (O'keefe, 1994).

### Hispanics

Hispanics were 12.5% of the population in 2000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). Projections indicate that they will be between 22% to 26% of the population by the year 2050, making them one of the fastest growing ethnic group in America (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996). Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans constitute the three largest Latino ethnic groups living in the U. S. Mainland. Mexican Americans make up 65% of the Hispanic population (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996). They differ substantially in terms of immigration history and number of generations in the United States. It is also acknowledged that different Hispanic groups have different culture, history, and demography (Marin & Marin, 1991).

Hispanics have a median income below that of European Americans and Asian Americans and have a larger proportion of their group in poverty than either of those groups. Their percentage of births to unwed mothers is higher than European and Asian Americans, but not African Americans. Their educational attainment is the lowest of the groups reported, with just over 9% having a college degree or higher (U. S. Bureau of Census, 1996).

Using shelter samples, Torres (1991) found no differences in rates of partner assaults between Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans. Similar results were found by Neff and his colleagues (1995) when used community samples. However, contradictory results were revealed in National probability studies. In the second

Family Violence Survey, Hispanics reported a higher rate of partner abuse than Anglo couples (23% vs 15%, respectively; Straus, & Smith, 1990).

Kaufman Kantor and his colleagues (1994) explored the possibility of Hispanics being more or less likely to engage in violence as a function of their cultural heritage but found no evidence for such an assertion. On the one hand, Hispanics experience more unemployment and economic stress and tend to have male-dominated families - factors that seem to contribute to greater family violence. On the other hand, Hispanics traditionally have close-knit family units and are very dependent on one another for economic and social support - factors that seem to diminish the tendency for violence.

#### Asian Americans

Asian Americans were 3.6% of the population in 2000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). By the year 2050, they are expected to be between 7% and 10% of the population, making them the other fastest growing ethnic groups in America. Of those over 25 years of age, 38.2 % of Asian Americans have a college degree or more, the highest proportion of any group reported, including Anglo Americans (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1996). Their median income exceeds that of all other groups, and their percentage of births to unwed mothers and percentage of female-headed households is lowest (Asbury, 1999).

Asian culture has been described as “face” oriented (Huang & Ying, 1989; Zane, 1992). Family appearance and status are extremely important, and the group’s desires or precedence over those of the individual (Huang, & Ying, 1989). Asian families tend to be hierarchical, with parents having status superior to that of

the children and men to that of women. Extended families are often considered the primary family unit. If violence is exhibited within the family, it may be difficult for an individual member to admit such a condition to outsiders, out of fear of bringing shame on the family.

Although no nationally representative studies of Asian American partner violence have been conducted, it is estimated that 1 out of 4 families in the Pacific Asian community are affected by domestic violence (Furiya, 1993). Ho (1990) used focus groups composed of 6 to 10 Chinese women, and reported that between 20% to 30% of Chinese husbands hit their wives. In another study conducted by Song (1996), a survey administered to 150 Korean women in Chicago revealed that 60% of Korean women were abused. In a study conducted by Yick (1997) in the San Gabriel Valley, a predominately Chinese immigrant suburban enclave in Los Angeles, approximately 40% of the sample were cognizant of family members experiencing physical and psychological abuse respectively. Contrary to the misconception that depicts Asian Americans as problem-free model minority, domestic violence is a serious problem in this ethnic group as well.

#### American Indians

The U.S. Bureau of the Census (2001) indicates that Native Americans were less than 1% of the population in 2000. Projections indicate they will be 1% of the population in 2050. LaFromboise, Berman, and Sohi (1994) estimates the Native American population can generally be characterized as growing, with the rise perhaps due to more people acknowledging their Indian identity and to interracial marriages, and birth rates greater than 79%. They also report that Native

Americans' median age is 22.6 years (compared to 30 years for other races) with 32% of population under the age of 15. Native Americans' average family size is 4.6, larger than any other U.S. ethnic group. Women, many of whom never married, head 45% of Indian households.

LaFromboise et al. (1994) note that intertribal diversities can make it somewhat difficult to generalize about Native American culture. However, chief among the common values are harmony with and respect for nature, emphasis on family traditions, and emphasis on group cooperation rather than on individual achievement (APA, 1993).

American Indian experience substantial rates of poverty due to the high unemployment rate (LaFromboise et al., 1994). Death at an early age primarily because of suicide, homicide, and accidents is also common. The prevalence of alcoholism, which is 3.8 times higher for American Indians than for other ethnic groups (Asbury, 1993), is a major contributor to many of these deaths. Despite many adversities, American Indian families maintain traditional values and customs, including reverence to elders, cooperation, and group cohesion (Wasinger, 1993).

No accurate prevalence rates of partner violence among American Indians are known to date (Chester, Robin, Koss, Lopez, & Goldman, 1994). Based on anecdotal reports (e.g., Allen, 1986) using small samples, estimates of battering have ranged from 50% (Wolk, 1982) to 80% (Chapin, 1990). Bachman (1992) analyzed the Second National Family Violence Survey and reported that American Indian couples were significantly more violent than their Anglo counterparts (7.2 vs. 5.3 per 100 couple).

In summary, although some community samples (Neff et al., 1995) and large nationally representative samples have indicated that African Americans (Straus & Gelles, 1986) and American Indians (Bachman, 1992) reported higher rates of partner violence than Anglo Americans, researches (Roundtree et al., 1982; O'Keefe, 1994; Neff et al., 1995; Torres, 1991) using nonrepresentative samples reported contradictory findings. They found no racial differences in rates of partner violence among African American, Latino, and Anglo battered women. The failure to consider ethnic group differences in much of the research may account for these conflicting findings.

### Domestic Violence in Korean Immigrant Community

#### Backgrounds of Korean Immigrants

Koreans are one of the fastest growing ethnic groups in the United States. The number of Korean immigrants has increased rapidly in the past few decades, from 70,000 in 1970 to over a million in 2000 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). Although the researches on the Korean immigrants in the United States are increasing in number recently, they are relatively little as compared to studies on Japanese and Chinese Americans (Kitano & Stanley, 1993).

In the early 1970s, the occupational immigrants, mostly professionals, and their families constituted the majority of Korean immigrants (Min, 1988). However, the majority of Korean immigrants admitted more recently have come to this country by virtue of their relationships to those already here.

The primary reasons for the Korean migration are better economic opportunities in the United States, followed by better opportunities for children's

education and political and social insecurity in South Korea (Hurh & Kim, 1984). Kim's (1978) study in Chicago showed that Koreans have stronger family ties than do other Asian groups and that family unification is the leading reason for the immigration of Koreans.

Underemployment is a major problem in Korean immigrants' occupational adjustment. Whereas more than 90 % of Korean adult immigrants were engaged in white-collar occupations in Korea (Min, 1988), the 1990 Census (U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1992) indicates that only 47 % of them are in white-collar occupational categories. The Korean group records the highest self-employment rate among 17 recent immigrant groups classified in the 1990 Census (U.S. Bureau of the Cunsus, 1992). Some 25-30 % of Korean households own at least one business (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1992). A typical Korean business is a small family business, usually operated by the husband and wife.

The adaptation experience of new immigrants varies according to their place of origin, premigration occupation and education, traditional values, and socialization (Portes & Rumbaut, 1990). Portes and Rumbaut (1990) have stressed some common aspects of experience among the immigrants, specifically in language, employment, adjustment stress, and interpersonal conflict.

Korea is characterized by non-verbal culture, thus most Korean immigrants face a great obstacle to learn a new language (Nah, 1993). Occupation determines the level of language skills that will be required. High-level professional jobs demand a higher level of command of the language, whereas low-level, unskilled jobs require a minimum level of language skills.

Immigration involves a drastic change in culture and environment.

Immigrants experience in giving up old roles and functions and adopting those demanded by the new society. Uncertainty, language deficiency, and financial insecurity are already a source of intense stress. Furthermore, a loss in roles, status, and support systems, as well as resocialization into new roles and values add more stresses.

Hurh & Kim (1990) found that sex differences correlates among Korean immigrants. Work-related variable, such as job satisfaction, occupation, and income, are strongly correlated with the male respondents' positive mental health. On the other hand, female respondents' positive mental health is more related to family life satisfaction, ethnic attachment variables (e.g., Korean church affiliation, kinship contact, and reading of Korean newspaper), and some variables of Americanization (driver's license, English proficiency, and American friends).

#### Traditional Family Organization and Value Orientation of Korean Immigrants

Historically, Korea was heavily influenced by the Chinese culture, especially Confucianism, which permeated the daily life and consciousness of Koreans. Confucianism, as applied to the Korean family system and social life, demanded children's one-sided obedience to and respect for parents and other adult members (Min, 1988). Confucianism emphasized a clear role differentiation and behavioral expectations between the husband and wife, and parents and children. This principle helped to establish a rigid form of patriarchy and hierarchy in Korea.

In the traditional Korean society, the husband was the breadwinner and decision maker and exercised authority over his wife and children. The wife was

expected to obey her husband, serve him and his family members, and produce children. Several researches conducted on Korean immigrant families in the United States confirm that traditional Korean values, rooted in the Confucian philosophy, have continued to be the single most influential force shaping family structure, gender roles, and marital relations (Hurh and Kim, 1984, 1990; Min, 1992; Yu, 1987).

Perceptions about the proper role for women and children in the family and society, the language they use, and expected behaviors are beginning to change in Korean society. However, in spite of the modernization in Korea, the traditional conjugal role differentiation has not been significantly modified (Min, 1988). The immigration of Koreans to the United States has led to many changes in the traditional Korean family system and structure, one of which is the disruption or at times reversal of this conjugal role differentiation. The 1990 Census shows that 56 % of immigrant Korean married women are in the labor force, primarily because the wife's work is necessary for economic survival, especially for self-employed families.

Hurh and Kim (1990) reported that Korean immigrant wives were faced with the burden of double roles, the traditional Korean women's roles in the family and working women's roles outside the home. As a result of immigrant life conditions and the persistence of the traditional gender-role ideology (woman as a homemaker), most of the employed wives carry a double burden of performing the household tasks and working outside the home. The traditional ideology of

conjugal-role differentiation persists in the Korean immigrant community and the double roles give Korean immigrant working wives additional stresses.

#### The Prevalence of Spouse Abuse among Korean Immigrants

Studies on marital violence in Korean community are only a few. However, these studies (Shin, 1995; Song, 1996) indicate that wife abuse is more prevalent among the Korean immigrant population in comparison to other ethnic groups. One hundred and fifty Korean immigrant women were interviewed by Song (1996), and the results indicated that the prevalence of wife abuse in Korean American families was exceptionally high. Of the 150 respondents, 60% (N = 90) reported having been battered by their spouses, while the other 40% (N = 60) were found to be nonbattered women. There was a wide range of wife battering in terms of frequency and severity of violence: 57 % (N = 51) of the battered women had been hit by their spouses with a closed fist; 24 % (N = 22) had been choked; 21 % (N = 19) had been hit with an object; and 37 % of the battered, or 22 % of all women in the study had been forced by their spouses to have sex. In terms of the frequency of violence, 24 % (N = 22) of the battered women had suffered from violence at least once a week and an additional 37 % (N = 34) had been subject to domestic violence at least once a month. As a consequence of the violence, 70 % (N = 63) of the battered women suffered bruises; 19 % (N = 17) had broken bones or teeth; 9 % (N = 8) experienced miscarriages; and 7 % (N = 8) were hospitalized.

Shin (1995) interviewed 99 Korean men to survey the problem of wife abuse with a special focus on Korean immigrant males. The results indicated that 35 % of the respondents admitted at least one incidence of wife abuse during the previous

year; and 67 % reported that they had at least one incidence of verbal aggression toward their wives during the year preceding the study.

There are two National Family Violence Surveys (Straus, 1990) conducted nationally to estimate the occurrences of marital violence. The first study conducted by Straus and his colleagues (1980) indicated that approximately 12 percent of American wives experienced domestic violence during the previous year of the research. The data from the latter survey (Straus, 1990) revealed that approximately 16 % of American couples (married and cohabiting couples) experienced at least one act of violence during the year prior to the survey. The previous findings of Korean American families in comparison with these national estimates, yield exceptionally high incidences of wife abuse.

#### Theories of Domestic Violence

Theories of domestic violence have been postulated to provide a framework for understanding the causes of domestic violence. However, there is a lack of consensus on the causes of domestic violence. Some researchers have focused on single-dimensional microtheories that address the issues like learning principles, individual psychopathology, and interpersonal interaction. Others have emphasized macrotheories such as social, cultural, and structural factors as determinants of domestic violence. This section provides an overview of the theories, which will be presented in three major categories: Individual, environmental or situational, and structural/cultural theories.

## Individual Theories

Individual explanations for domestic violence focused on undesirable individual abnormalities such as psychopathology, psychological traits, and biological characteristics. Psychopathology theories propose that various forms of family violence are committed by individuals who are seriously disturbed by some form of mental illness, personality disorder, or some other individual defect (Bolton & Bolton, 1987; Hamberger & Hasting, 1986). Other research has focused on psychological traits of the batterers that are less severe and would not be officially defined as psychopathology. These theories propose that psychological traits that characterize offenders contribute to their perpetration of domestic violence. For example, some listed feelings of vulnerability, dependency, inadequacy, loneliness, or cognitive distortions (Hanson, Gizzarelli, & Scott, 1994; Seidman, Marshall, Hudson, & Robertson, 1994), while others identified low self-esteem, anger and hostility, poor problem solving skills, and emotional dependency (Barnett & Hamberger, 1992; Dutton & Strachan, 1987; Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985).

Biological theories are the most controversial and have limited application to domestic violence. Possible biological bases for domestic violence have received almost no study until recently. A number of biochemical theories, including glandular and hormonal imbalances, as well as vitamin and diet deficiencies, have been suggested as possible causes of criminal behavior. Also many studies attempted to connect brain abnormalities, and chemical compounds that influence brain functions with criminality (Moffitt, 1997; Siegel, 1995; Alderman, 1997).

Intraindividual theories tend to focus on the personality deficits of victims, blaming them to stay in their abusive relationship. Victims have been perceived as “neurotic,” “dependent,” or “addicted” (Edwards, 1985). Abusive husbands have also been the objects of the stereotypes. Abusive husbands are frequently portrayed as “mentally ill,” “out of control,” and “alcoholic.” Nonetheless, a growing body of research suggests the importance of including personality, neurological, and even physiological factors (Miller, 1994).

#### Environmental or Situational Theories

Environmental or situational approaches include socioeconomic and personal stressors such as social class, education, and income, status incongruity, history of abuse, and family dysfunction. It has stressed social learning through experience and exposure to violence in the family (O’Leary, 1988; Straus et al., 1980). A widely accepted explanation of how socialization plays a role in domestic violence rests on social learning theory. A process called modeling, in which a person learns social and cognitive behaviors by simply observing and imitating others, resides at the core of this theory.

The popularity of social learning theory rests on several observations. First, violence tends to perpetuate itself from one generation to the next (Straus et al., 1980). Second, a wealth of laboratory experiments with humans lends strong validation to the claim that aggression can be learned through modeling (e.g., Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961). Finally, a large number of domestic violence studies have successfully linked exposure to violence in one’s childhood, either directly or through observation, to violence in adulthood (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986;

Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). Straus et al. (1980), for example, found that sons who had witnessed their fathers' violence had a 1,000% greater battering rate than those who had not.

There have been considerable evidence that supports the relationship between socioeconomic factors, such as unemployment, underemployment, and financial difficulties, and incidents of domestic violence (Gelles, 1992). In Song's (1996) study on Korean immigrant women, there was a statistically significant relationship between incidences of battering and disparity of employment held by husbands pre and post-immigration. Often, recent immigrants find themselves in menial jobs due to discrimination, the poor employment market, and lack of English skills, contrary to their prestigious positions as professionals in their homeland. When social and economic goals are outside the reach, strain occurs. Strain theory suggests that a sense of futility develops when one is unable to achieve financial success or security. In some circumstances, this will lead to crime (Gosselin, 2000).

Status incongruity theory also explains domestic violence that occurs when an individual perceives his/her status is inconsistent relative to societal norms (Eng, 1986). Likewise, Gamache (1998) points out that women of color experience battering in a different context than that of others in society. A perception of a lack of power or ability to have significant impact on the culture has led many minority men to make excessive demands on their partners for respect. Often, recent immigrant families find it necessary for both spouses to work given financial constraints. Traditional Asian husbands who are accustomed to being the primary provider, and decision-maker of their family may feel threatened when their wives

also assume the role of the breadwinner. Thus, violence is viewed as a means to restore one's sense of power.

According to family systems theory, violent behaviors are caused by the family structure rather than by an individual within the family. Conflict within an intimate relationship is blamed on the lack of communication between the partners. Family systems theory focuses primarily on the family and seeks to identify the problems that are a consequence of dysfunctional relationships among family members. The role that each family member takes in contributing to the abuse is considered (Garrett & Libbey, 1997). Violence may be a product of the interactions between individuals in a specific relationship rather than the result of the behavior of only one individual. A number of experts, have identified family dysfunction as a cause of domestic violence. It describes family as an interactive system in which each family member affecting others' behavior or emotion. For example, researchers have identified marital dysfunction as a dyadic stressor, parent-child interactional stress, and attachment problems as determinants of domestic violence (Giles-Sims, 1983; Wolfe, 1987; Egeland, Sroufe, & Erickson, 1983; Kolko, 1992).

#### Structural/Cultural Theories

Structural/cultural theories attribute domestic violence to the structures and cultural norms that legitimize deviance. In this category, culture of violence theory, patriarchal theory, and gender inequality theory are included.

In the feminist view, the central factors that foster partner violence include the historically male-dominated social structure and socialization practices teaching men and women gender-specific roles. Patriarchy is a cultural belief system that

allows men to hold greater power and privilege than women on a social hierarchy. In its extreme form, it literally gives men the right to dominate and control women and children (Dobash & Dobash, 1979).

In a more moderate form, the feminist approach holds a position of power relations between men and women. The position seeks to equalize power and share it between both genders. The status of women in society is related to the frequency of wife beatings, according to this view.

Although some might argue that patriarchy no longer dictates male-female interactions, many disagree. Straus (1976), in fact, identifies a number of contemporary cultural standards that not only permit but also encourage husband-to-wife violence. They include the greater authority of men in our culture, male aggressiveness that is a positive way to demonstrate male identity, the wife/mother role as the preferred status for women, and male domination of the criminal justice system that provides little legal relief for battered women. Indeed, Song (1996) also found a significant relationship between rigid sex role expectations and the incidences of domestic violence among Korean immigrants.

Domestic violence within Asian community is deeply rooted in the patriarchal system that oppresses Asian women. In Asian culture, men are taught that they are valued more highly than women (Ho, 1990). Men are socialized to hold higher status from birth, and women are socialized to be subservient to their spouses. Asian cultural norms indirectly sanction abuse against women. Asian culture rooted in the Confucian and Buddhist philosophy influenced women to

tolerate and persevere abusive treatment, and to preserve the proper role for women in the family (Hurh & Kim, 1984; 1990).

### Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Domestic Violence

#### Definitions of Domestic Violence

Operating under the premise that cultural belief systems color definitions of domestic violence, Torres (1991) hypothesized that the Mexican cultural ethos has an impact on definitions of domestic violence. Using a snowball sample of 25 Anglo-American and 25 Mexican American battered women, Torres (1991) asked respondents to select from a list of incidents they considered to be wife abuse. The data indicated that more Anglo-American women perceived more incidents to be abusive compared to their Mexican-American counterpart. In addition, psychological incidents were perceived to be less abusive by Mexican-American women than Anglo-American respondents.

In 1992, a national survey was conducted by the Violence Prevention Fund. This survey was launched to assess how the general public perceives domestic violence before the Fund launched their campaign to increase public awareness on this issue. Prior to this national telephone survey, focus groups were conducted with Anglo-American, African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American men and women in Connecticut, Arkansas, Dallas, Los Angeles, and San Francisco to assist in developing the telephone questionnaire. Once the questionnaire was developed, a national sample of 1000 men and women were drawn across the United States (EDK Associates, 1993).

Five vignettes were presented, and respondents were asked if they would define each scenario as domestic violence. Almost all respondents defined the scenario that involved physical beating as domestic violence. However, compared to Anglo-American respondents, ethnic minority respondents were less likely to define it as domestic violence.

On the other hand, the scenario that depicted a wife being grabbed and called a “worthless cow” by her husband was not as likely to be defined as domestic violence. It appears that situations involving overt use and a high degree of force are more likely to be viewed as domestic violence. In other words, psychological acts of abuse are more ambiguous compared to physical acts of aggression.

The literature indicates that when domestic violence is conceptualized in physical terms, individuals are more likely to view it as a problem and as a domestic violence. Psychological abuse is more abstract, and as result, greater ambiguity exists. This appears to be true for both American and Asian cultures, however, it may be accentuated in Asian culture. Asian culture tends to downplay psychological aspects of behavior and focus on physical aspects.

#### Contextual Justification for Domestic Violence

Two themes regarding contextual justifications emerge from the literature. The first justification revolves around defense such as self-defense and protecting a child. Indeed, Greenblat’s (1985) study found that although there was a high level of condemnation for domestic violence, a third (34%) of the respondents stated that situations of self-defense warranted the use of domestic violence, and 13% stated similar attitudes about the defense of a child. Arias and Johnson (1989) with a

sample of undergraduates found similar results: A third to 85% of respondents perceived male and female violence justified under situations of self-defense, in defense of a child, and when one's partner instigated the first slap. Further, Roscoe (1985) maintained that the use of self-defense is also gender-linked; that is, women are more likely to use self-defense as a justification because they realize they are vulnerable to injury than men.

The second justification involves retribution due to sexual infidelity. Stereotypically, the cause of male violence is linked to circumstances where the male ego is attacked. Cases of public rejection, humiliation, or when a woman is unfaithful are frequently depicted as justifiable instigations of violence (Dutton & Browning, 1988). Greenblat (1985) reported that 16% of the respondents justified the use of aggression when a wife's sexual infidelity is witnessed, and 10% agreed with the use of violence when the question of her faithfulness is raised. Similarly, Gentemann (1984) found that although the public perceives wife-beating as wrong, 18% agreed that there are certain situations where a man has a right to hit his wife. Situations such as flirting with another man, having an extramarital affair, intoxication, and nagging are believed to be justified. This theme also emerged in Arias and Johnson's (1989) study.

Length of residence in the United States was related to justifications for domestic violence (Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997). Respondents who lived in the United States longer tended to agree that hitting is justifiable in self-defense and in defense of a child. Those who have lived in the United States may be more familiar with the use of defense in the legal system. Several studies using mainstream

samples have shown that the general public believes that defense is a legitimate reason for violence (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Greenblat, 1985). An addition, respondents who lived in the United States longer tended to disagree that hitting is warranted if one does not obey his/her spouse (Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997).

There are few forms of behavior for which there are constant rules; rather, the rules vary by context and actor (Greenblat, 1985). In the case of domestic violence, the behavior is perceived justified in self-defense, defense of a child, and in cases of sexual infidelity. Greenblat (1985) commented that there exist cultural norms that prescribe rules of retributive justice. If there has been sufficient provocation for the violence, then these rules can be invoked. This appears to apply to domestic violence on a cross-cultural level.

#### Factors Contributing to Domestic Violence

Following sections of related literature examines how marital violence is related to Korean traditional beliefs and adjustment difficulties upon immigration to the United States. Since marital violence in Korean immigrant families more often targets women, sex-role attitudes or general attitudes toward women are to be examined as well. Despite the positive influence of the women's movement over the last few decades, a large segment of the society still holds traditional sex-role attitudes (Song, 1996).

#### Traditionalism

Attitudes toward domestic violence are rooted in Korean traditional values toward the family, marriage and sex-roles. These fundamental orientations reflect more on recent immigrants than people whose families have lived in the West for a

longer time, such as third and fourth generation Asian Americans (Ho, 1990). One major fundamental difference between East and West is the orientation toward the family and the group rather than the individual (Ho, 1990). Since the family is viewed as more important than the individual, its needs take precedence over the individual's needs. The Korean concept of "loss of face" implies that the entire family loses respect and status in the community when an individual is shamed. This places a severe burden on the individual to keep harmony, and to minimize any conflicts and problems, which could bring guilt and shame to the family.

In order to maintain order and peace in the family, Korean women have developed an ability to absorb insults and injuries without protest and to assume responsibility for others' faults (Lee, 1977). In many cases, Korean battered women are exemplified as society's image of an ideal woman as submissive, self-blaming, and accepting of whatever the married life brings. Song (1996) argues that wife battering in Korean immigrant families, is a product of the long history of the Korean tradition that demands endurance and self-blame from a wife while tolerating abusive behavior of a husband. In Song's study (1996), it was evident that Korean American women with more traditional attitudes regarding appropriate husband-wife relationships suffered from domestic violence more than those who held less traditional beliefs. More than one half of battered women (52 %), as opposed to less than one third of nonbattered women (32 %), scored "high" on their traditionalism, measured by the Traditional Family Ideology Scale (Levinson and Huffman, 1955).

Many researchers in the field of domestic violence postulate that adherence to traditional beliefs about expectation and roles of men and women (i.e., traditional gender role beliefs) contribute to the violence. Men, for example, who endorse traditional beliefs about gender roles will more likely hold attitudinal beliefs that sanction the use of violence and may possibly employ violence as well (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Schechter, 1982). Similarly, the literature suggests that women who hold traditional gender role beliefs will more likely be assaulted (Sugarman & Frankel, 1996).

#### Rigid Sex Role Socialization Factor

The domestic violence problem is also rooted in the oppression of women in Korean culture. The relationship hierarchy in Korean culture specifies a defined gender role expectation, distinguishing men from women. Members of the family are expected to conform to their specified role in the family. Males are highly valued in Korean culture. Comparatively, females are subjugated and devalued.

One of the most salient characteristics of wife batterers is their strict adherence to a rigidly defined male dominated gender role. This compulsive masculinity is reflected in an attempt to maintain total dominance over their wives (Martin, 1988). Also, the tendency among battered women is to regard men as superior, and to regard all women as inferior (Martin, 1988).

The results from Song's study (1996) showed that a significant proportion of Korean immigrant wives, regardless of their employment status, continue to live by rigidly defined traditional sex roles. About 41 % of all wives indicated that the Korean traditional pattern of a clear division of sex roles persisted in their family. It

was also observed that while the majority of the wives performed most of the household tasks, many husbands were involved in certain tasks such as paying the bills and making decisions to buy things for the family.

The prevalence of marital violence was found to be higher among the couples who adhered to a rigidly defined Korean traditional sex role performance than those who did not (Song, 1996). Fifty-eight percent of the wife battering cases occurred in the families with high congruency to rigidly defined sex roles, whereas only seventeen percent of nonviolent families conformed to the rigid Korean patterns of sex role performance (Song, 1996).

The high correlation between wife battering incidence and rigid sex role is in part explained by the combination of the wives' discontent with their husbands' strong demand for an ideal traditional Korean wifhood and the men's unwillingness to concede the absolute male dominant sex role.

#### Socioeconomic Factors

Socioeconomic factors influence perceptions. This assumption is based upon sociological theories of family violence advanced by Straus and his colleagues. They maintain that social and structural factors impact on domestic violence. Straus et. al. (1980) maintain that variables such as individuals' age, level of education, and income are related to domestic violence. Individuals from low income groups, for example, may be more vulnerable to domestic violence since such environments produce economic instability, which has been identified as a high marker of violence (Straus et. al., 1980).

Studies indicate that socioeconomic factors affect the level of wife abuse in Korean communities as well (Rhee, 1997; Song, 1996; Shin, 1995). The sources of stress and frustration among Korean immigrant couples, especially the newly arrived, seem to be the combination of many factors, including unsatisfactory employment status, language problems, and lack of socializability (Hurh, & Kim, 1984).

Song's study (1996) showed a high correlation between the incidence of wife battering and the inconsistency in the pre- and post-immigration employment status of husbands. Fifty-eight percent of wife batterers as opposed to 17 % of nonviolent husbands were holding lower employment status compared to their pre-immigration employment status. Unlike in Korea, Korean immigrant wives find it relatively easy to obtain a low- or moderate-wage job in the United States. As wives become partners in economic activities, many of them no longer obediently accept the superior position of men and find it difficult to fulfill the roles of a traditional Korean wife. Marital conflict often arises when the husband and wife do not agree about their respective roles in the new social and work environments (Song, 1996).

Language problems and social isolation are frequently associated with episodes of battering (Song, 1996). About one fifth of the battered women, whereas no one from the nonbattered group, reported not being able to speak English at all. Language problems of some Koreans severely limit their cultural and social activities. Language problems and social isolation are well known as a major obstacle, causing frustration for Koreans in the process of making a new life in the

United States. For example, only nineteen per cent of battered women, compared with over fifty per cent of nonbattered women, participated in a Korean association or other social clubs or professional organizations (Song, 1996). It has been suggested that the abuser systematically isolates the woman from others, and that she also withdraws to protect herself and family from further embarrassment (Martin, 1988).

The battered women in Song's study (1996) were not likely to be involved in voluntary organizations, other than churches. The results of this study indicated that women who belonged to churches tended to endure more violence. Therefore, attending Korean churches may actually contribute to ethnic segregation and may reinforce values that increase the risk of wife abuse.

In addition to cultural and environmental factors, Rhee(1997) argued that there is a strong relationship between drinking and wife battering in Korean immigrant families. Assaults frequently involve heavy drinking, and alcohol serves as an excuse for the battering. It was noted that high tolerance of and permissive attitude toward alcohol use among Koreans contribute to the high rate of alcohol abuse and dependence among Korean males. Rhee (1997) suggested that due to adjustment problems, many Korean male immigrants resort to alcohol to cope their stressful life situations, which in turn lead to wife battering.

#### General Attitudes toward Women

In reference to wife battering, sex-role attitudes or general attitudes toward women have been often studied. Surprisingly, little or no correlation was reported between general attitudes toward women and wife abuse (Hotaling & Sugarman,

1986). For example, Bernard and Bernard (1983) found no difference in ATW (Attitudes Toward Women) between abused and nonabused college females. The ATW scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1978) included a respondent's level of agreement with various statements about the roles, rights and privileges of women.

Unexpectedly, Makepeace (1981) found that college students who experience violence are more egalitarian in attitudes about dating than those who had never experienced violence in relationships. Moreover, groups of males who have relatively nontraditional sex-role stereotyping of women still have high rates of violence toward their female partners (Makepeace, 1981).

When those questions were posed to battered women in shelters, a different pattern of response was reported. They perceived their husbands as having more traditional sex-role expectations than nonbattering men (Walker, 1979). Battered women often portrayed battering husbands as men with rigid sex-role attitudes, poor self-concept, and drinking problems. Telch and Lindquist (1984) also found that wives perceive violent husbands to be more traditional in sex-role attitudes than nonviolent ones.

Neidig (1985), however, found that batterers and nonbatterers had no difference in their own attitudes toward women. Rosenbaum & O'Leary (1981) also reported no difference in attitudes toward women between abused wives and nonviolent, maritally discordant wives; furthermore abused wives had more egalitarian attitudes than satisfactorily married wives. In a literature review, Hotaling & Sugarman (1986) concluded that none of the husbands' and wives' attitudes toward women met the criteria of a consistent risk marker.

In response to inconsistent findings, Flynn (1990) suggested that women's attitudes were related to their responses to abuse rather than a distinguishing factor between abused and nonabused women. His hypothesis, however, was only partially supported. The more modern a woman's attitude, the less time she remained in the violent relationship, but this was true only for the case of a single episode of violence. For those women who sustained repeated episodes of violence, sex role attitudes were not related to how long they remained with their partners.

The severity of violence is another correlate of traditional sex-role orientation. Rouse (1988) found, in a community sample, significant difference in sex-role orientation between those who were identified as batterers by court (thus were more violent) and those who reported minor violence. As predicted, identified batterers reported more rigid and extreme traditional sex-role orientation. However, wife assaulters typically rationalize their use of violence. Thus, the difference in sex-role attitudes may result from being identified as a batterer, rather than identified batterers having more rigid sex role attitudes from the onset of violence.

In developing a typology of male aggressors, attitude toward women was included. Saunders (1992) related that "generally violent" males were the most violent and aggressive across home and community; while "family-only" males were violent toward their wives, but not toward strangers. He reported that "generally violent" aggressive males had more rigid sex role attitudes than "family-only" males. This attitude variable was one of the distinguishing variables in clustering these two different groups of males.

The previous findings yielded an inconsistent report on the variable of general attitudes toward women. Thus, some argued for the need to develop the inventory of beliefs and attitudes specifically for wife beating (Saunders, et al., 1987; Smith, 1990). Moreover, the predictability of behavior from general attitudes was not high in most cases. The predictability increased when a variety of specific attitudes were used to predict a variety of attitude-relevant behaviors (Fazio, Powell & Herr, 1983).

#### Attitudes toward Acceptance of Marital Violence

Many couples accept a certain amount of marital aggression. O’Leary and his colleagues (1989) indicated that more than one third of younger couples may engage in “normative” aggression in which neither partner typifies the violence as abusive or self-defensive. In the study conducted on a nationally representative sample of 2,143 American couples by Dibble and Straus (1980), the results showed that rates of domestic violence are related to attitudes about violence. Twenty-eight percent of Americans believed that hitting a spouse is sometimes necessary, normal, or good and that one third had actually slapped a spouse.

Smith (1990) reported that both patriarchal beliefs and approval of violence against wives had significant and independent predictability in the occurrence of wife battering either by her present or former husband. As husbands held more patriarchal beliefs, they scored higher on the violence approval attitudes toward wives and they were more likely to beat their wives. The beliefs variable and attitudes variable together accounted for eighteen percent of the variance of wife beating. Attitudes toward wife beating rather than general attitudes toward women

had a more direct bearing on wife abuse and its perpetuation (Saunders, et al., 1987).

In summary, attitude-behavior relationships are of great interest to social science, and the field of domestic violence is no exception. The empirical literature poses two possible relationships. Some researchers propose that attitudes toward domestic violence have causal priority over the violent behavior (Riggs & O'Leary, 1989; Sugarman & Frankel, 1996). They view attitudes that espouse tolerance of domestic violence as directly leading to use of domestic violence. Others prefer to conceptualize a correlational relationship between attitudes toward domestic violence and actual incidences of violent behavior. This correlation between attitudes and behavior is further postulated to be reflective of cultural and structural norms of society (Dibble & Straus, 1980). Thus, individuals who tolerate or sanction the use of domestic violence may be more likely to use violence, and this may also be related to a range of sociodemographic factors (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980).

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the influence of the perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse, and various demographic characteristics on the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans.

This chapter presents information regarding the procedures that were used in conducting the study. The methodology of the study is organized in the following sections: (1) research design, (2) population and sample, (3) instrumentation, (4) data collection procedures, and (5) data analysis.

#### Research Design

The study employed a correlational explanatory design using a cross-sectional survey technique. Given the sensitive and dangerous nature of partner abuse, there cannot be an experimental component of randomly assigning the condition of partner abuse.

#### Population and Sample

The target population for this study was defined as first generation Korean-Americans. The accessible population was defined as first generation Korean-Americans currently residing in the Baton Rouge, Louisiana metropolitan area.

In order to establish the frame of the accessible population, the researcher used the Korean Directory of Baton Rouge (2000), published by the Korean Association of Baton Rouge. A total of two hundred and twenty-three Korean immigrant adults (105 males and 118 females) were listed in this directory. A

census was employed utilizing 100 % of the defined accessible population. Thus, a sample of 223 first generation Korean-Americans were asked to participate in the study.

In order to be eligible for participation, respondents had to meet the following inclusion criteria: (1) they had to be of adult age, that was, 18 years of age or older, (2) they had to currently live in the Baton Rouge metropolitan area, (3) they had to identify themselves as Korean, and (4) they had to be able to speak the Korean language.

### Instrumentation

A three-part instrument was utilized for data collection (see Appendix A). Part I of the instrument consisted of a measure of the perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence: The Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Domestic Violence Questionnaire – Revised (PADV-R), developed by Yick (1997).

Part II of the instrument consisted of a measure of incidence and nature of domestic violence: The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), developed by Straus (1979).

Part III of the instrument, a Participant Profile Form, was an investigator designed instrument constructed to obtain selected demographic information about Korean-American immigrants. Each of the three parts of the instrument is described in more detail in the following section.

#### The Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Domestic Violence Questionnaire – Revised (PADV-R).

The PADV-R is the instrument designed to measure perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence. The instrument was designed specifically for use with an Asian population.

The PADV-R was designed to measure a multidimensional concept of domestic violence and includes the following categories: (1) definitions of domestic violence; (2) attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence; (3) views about causes of domestic violence; (4) beliefs about the justifications warranting the use of domestic violence; (5) myths revolving around domestic violence victims and (6) the criminalization of domestic violence. For purpose of the current research, only the categories from (1) to (4) were used.

Since the findings drawn from the previously used instruments measuring the variable of general attitudes toward women or gender role yielded an inconsistent report, the need to develop the inventory of beliefs and attitudes specifically for wife beating has been argued (Saunders, et. al., 1987; Smith, 1990). In response to this, Yick developed the PADV-R. Yick's PADV-R is the most comprehensive multidimensional instrument specifically measuring the general public's perceptions of and attitudes toward domestic violence. Also, it was specifically designed for use with Asian populations.

According to Yick (1997), the development of PADV-R involved four stages. The first stage involved qualitative in-depth interviews with service providers who had expertise in the area of domestic violence in the Asian American community. They assisted in the development of the initial instrument (PADV) that was used in a pilot study. Based upon the findings from the in-depth interviews with the service providers, an abbreviated PADV was pre-tested with Asian American students on the UCLA campus. This was the second stage of the instrument development. The third stage involved pilot-testing the instrument with

Chinese American respondents in the San Gabriel Valley. Finally, the fourth stage involved using the findings from the pilot study in the San Gabriel Valley to revise the instrument.

Yick (1997) reported that the criteria for modification or elimination of items from the scales or subscales were based upon statistical and theoretical criteria. Statistical criteria included the use of corrected item-total correlations and Cronbach's alphas. The corrected item-total correlation is the correlation of the individual item with the scale total omitting that item. The rule of thumb is that the corrected item-total correlation should be at least 0.20, and items with correlations lower than that should be dropped from the measure. The Cronbach's alpha was also employed, and this provides a measure of internal consistency, which reflects how well each of the items correlates with the entire scale or sub-scale. The general rule is that the Cronbach's alpha should be 0.70.

Yick (1997) also used theoretical criteria, based upon the empirical findings in the literature. At times, statistical data did not provide adequate reason for the elimination of certain items given what the literature stated. These items were retained despite the statistical criteria set forth. The revised instrument (PADV-R) was the instrument used in a study by Yick in 1997. Permission was granted by the developer to use the instrument for this study (see Appendix C).

Content validity of the shortened instrument to be used in the current study was established by a panel of experts consisting of five Korean service providers from Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Chicago. Service providers were asked to review the completeness and appropriateness of the instrument for the Korean

culture. Revisions were made as necessary based on the service providers' comments and suggestions.

#### Definitions of Domestic Violence

The Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) was used to measure the respondents' concept of domestic violence regarding whether certain physical, psychological, and/or sexual acts of aggression were considered violence against spouses. Yick (1997) reported that the Cronbach's alpha for this scale in her study was .82. The Cronbach's Alpha Internal Consistency Coefficient of this scale for the current study was .96.

Three sub-scales comprise this scale. The Physical Aggression Subscale-Revised is composed of three closed-ended items and measures the extent to which respondents agree or disagree as to whether various physical forms of aggression are classified as domestic violence. The Psychological Aggression Subscale-Revised is composed of six closed-ended items. It measures whether certain types of psychological behaviors are defined as domestic violence. The Sexual Abuse Subscale-Revised is comprised of one closed-ended item. It measures whether forcing one's spouse to have sex is regarded as domestic violence.

The remaining four items are neutral items and are not considered abuse. The purpose of these items is to break response sets. All three subscales use a six point Likert-type scale, where "1" is "Strongly Agree" and "6" is "Strongly Disagree."

### Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence

The Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence-Revised Scale measured respondents' attitudes toward the use of violence in various situations. Yick (1997) reported that overall Cronbach's Alpha for this scale was .73. The Cronbach's Alpha of this scale for the current study was .87. Yick (1997) identified three sub-scales in her study. The first subscale was the Sanctioning Hitting Subscale-Revised and is comprised of two closed-ended items. It measured respondents' level of tolerance about hitting spouses. The second subscale was the Physical Force as Problem-Solving Subscale-Revised, and it was comprised of two closed-ended items. It measured respondents' attitudes toward using physical force as a means to solve problems. The third subscale, Physical Punishment with Children Subscale-Revised was to examine the degree to which respondents agreed or disagreed with using physical punishment for the purposes of disciplining children. Three closed-ended items made up this subscale. However the results of the factor analysis conducted by Yick (1997) in her study on the items in this scale was inconclusive, and therefore, these factors could not reasonably be used for confirmation in the current study. In the current study, these items were factor analyzed and the results of this analysis revealed one factor in the data. The single factor extracted by the analysis was labeled by the researcher as Sanctioning the Use of Interpersonal Violence.

The remaining three items were neutral items for purposes of breaking response sets. All closed-ended items in this section also used a six point Likert-type scale, where "1" is "Strongly Agree" and "6" is "Strongly Disagree."

### Causes of Domestic Violence

The Causes of Domestic Violence-Revised Scale measured individuals' beliefs regarding the factors that precipitate domestic violence. The overall Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .91 (Yick, 1997). The Cronbach's Alpha of this scale for the current study was .90.

Three sub-scales comprise the Causes of Domestic Violence Revised Scale. The first sub-scale is the Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-scale-Revised, and it measures respondents' beliefs regarding whether certain societal factors inherent in societal institutions, societal norms, and Asian cultural value systems play a role in causing or precipitating violence against spouses. This sub-scale is comprised of five items. The second sub-scale, Environmental Causes Subscale-Revised measures respondents' attitudes about whether existing external circumstances in one's environment play a role in causing domestic violence. This sub-scale consists of seven closed-ended items. The third sub-scale is the Individual-Related Causes Subscale-Revised and is composed of five items. This sub-scale measures respondents' beliefs as to whether there are factors within the perpetrator and/or characteristics within the marital dyad that causes spousal violence. All sub-scales utilized a six point Likert-type scale where "1" is "Strongly Agree" and "6" is "Strongly Disagree."

### Contextual Justification

The Contextual Justification Scale-Revised was employed to assess individuals' attitudes about whether certain circumstances might justify or warrant the use of interpersonal violence. It is comprised of eleven closed-ended items. A

scenario describing a man hitting his wife or partner really hard under nine different situations are presented to respondents. Utilizing a six point Likert-type scale, respondents selected the extent to which they agree or disagree that the violence was justified. The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .80 (Yick, 1997). The Cronbach's Alpha for this scale of the current study was .97.

### Experiences with Domestic Violence

Experiences with domestic violence measured in two ways – indirect and direct experiences. Indirect experiences with domestic violence entails whether respondents were aware of Korean friends and family members who had experienced physical and/or psychological abuse. Direct experiences with domestic violence examined respondents' personal perpetration and victimization experiences with various forms of psychological and physical abuse by a spouse or intimate partner.

#### Indirect Experiences with Domestic Violence

The Indirect Experiences with Domestic Violence Subscale-Revised is part of the PADV-R. It was to assess respondents' lifetime indirect experiences with domestic violence; that is, whether they were aware of friends and family members who experienced physical and/or psychological abuse.

Yick's (1997) Indirect Experiences with Domestic violence Subscale-Revised was comprised of twelve closed-ended questions. First, a set of six questions were asked to inquire whether respondents knew of any friends who had experienced various forms of physical, psychological, and sexual abuse by a partner, and then the same set of six questions was repeated for relatives who have

experienced various forms of abuse. For the purpose of the current study, only one set of six questions was presented for both friends and relatives. Respondents answered either a “yes” or a “no” for all six questions. When the data were coded for analysis, a “0” was coded for “no” and a “1” was coded for “yes.”

Yick (1997) reported that two reliability coefficients were computed – one for the friends section and one for the family section. The Kuder-Richardson was slightly higher at .74 for the friends section, and the Kuder-Richardson was .72 for the family section. The Cronbach’s Alpha of this scale for the current study was .80.

#### Direct Experiences with Domestic Violence

The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) was employed to measure individuals’ direct perpetration and victimization experiences with physical and/or psychological abuse within the last 12 months and within the respondents’ lifetime.

The CTS was developed by Murray Straus (1979) to assess the broad range of strategies or tactics used by family members to resolve conflicts in the family. Straus posited that there are three basic means by which families attempt to resolve conflicts: use of reasoning, use of verbal aggression, or use of violence or physical aggression. There have been three versions of the CTS: form A, N and R. Form A was used in the early studies of 1970s, form N in the 1975 National Family Violence study (Straus et. al., 1980), and form R in the 1985 National Survey (Straus & Gelles, 1986). This study employed the form N.

Studies that have used the CTS consider subjects abused or abusive based on whether they experienced or employed any of those physical violence items. Straus

in developing the CTS intentionally included only a few selected items of physical aggression in an attempt to make the instrument less threatening (Straus, 1979).

The scale has been used for two nationally representative studies of spouse violence (Straus, et al., 1980; Straus & Gelled, 1986).

A noticeable strength of the CTS is its ability to induce true responses to the items. The CTS contains a graduated series of items which describe the types of behaviors one can potentially use to resolve a conflict. The instrument begins with the least coercive strategy to more coercive or aggressive tactics. Thus, it is believed that social desirability is not a threat to the validity of CTS. The scale is arranged to deter socially desirable answers, thus it successfully obtains high rates of occurrence for verbal and physical aggression (Straus, 1979; Straus, et al., 1980).

The CTS has been widely used with populations from diverse cultural backgrounds, including African Americans (Cazenave & Straus, 1979) and Hispanics (Kantor et al., 1994). It has also been used with Asians overseas such as Hong Kong (Tang, 1994) and Japan (Kumagai & Straus, 1983).

CTS has good psychometric qualities and norms are available from a national study. Cronbach's alphas reported in wife abuse research studies range from .42 to .50 for reasoning tactics, .62 to .83 for verbal aggression, and .69 to .88 for violence (Straus, 1990). The CTS has also been used with Asian populations. Kumagai & Straus (1983) compared conflict tactics in Japanese, Indian, and American families. Using the Spearman-Brown formula to calculate the internal consistency of the CTS, the reliability coefficients for the Japanese sample ranged from .92 to .98 for the three subscales, and the reliability coefficients for the Indian

sample ranged from .91 to .97 for the three subscales (Kumagai & Straus, 1983). For the study conducted in Hong Kong employing Chinese undergraduate students, Tang (1994) reported reliability coefficients that ranged from .70 to .86 for each of the three sub-scales. In this study Cronbach's Alphas for various sub-scales were as follows: For the perpetrator dimension, .87 during the last 12 months and .86 during the respondents' lifetime; for the victim dimension, .87 during the last 12 months and .83 during the respondents' lifetime. Permission was granted by the developer to use the instrument for this study (see Appendix C).

#### Participant Profile Form

The third part of the instrument, the Participant Profile Form is a demographic form developed by the investigator using information derived from the relevant literature. The characteristics included: gender, age, marital status, length of residence in the United States, occupation, household income, educational status, and religion.

#### Translation of Instrument

The PADV-R, and CTS were translated into Korean by the investigator. Upon completion, a second individual who was fluent in both English and Korean backtranslated the Korean version into English. The translator and backtranslator then met, and inconsistencies were investigated to ensure the accuracy of the translation.

### Data Collection Procedure

The three-part instrument was used for data collection between October and November, 2001 (see Appendix A). The following procedures were followed by the investigator in collecting the data.

A list of two hundred and twenty-three Korean immigrants (105 males and 118 females) from the directory of Korean Americans of Baton Rouge (2000) was used. An introductory letter, an informed consent and a copy of the instrument written in Korean were mailed to all two hundred and twenty-three Korean immigrants with a stamped, self-addressed return envelope (see Appendix B). The researcher's name, address, and telephone number were listed in the letter in the event any questions were raised.

After ten days, a reminder post card was sent to all participants. Following another ten days, a telephone call was made to all participants who failed to return the completed instrument. Another set of the study instruments were provided to those who indicated a willingness to participate but who were unable to locate their original copies. At least three attempts, at three different times/days were made to contact these participants before a subject was declared as a non-contact and placed with the refusal group.

### Data Analysis

Data analysis procedures are described for each research objective. In all cases, the alpha level of statistical significance was set a priori at .05. Statistical analysis procedures entailed calculations using the SPSS Data Analysis System. Coding, data entry, and data analysis were completed by the investigator.

Whenever it was necessary to interpret the magnitude of findings presented as correlation coefficients, the descriptors developed by Davis (1971) were used as follows:

.70 or higher indicates very strong association

.50 - .69 indicates substantial association

.30 - .49 indicates moderate association

.10- .29 indicates low association

.01 - .09 indicates negligible association.

Objective one was to describe first generation Korean-Americans on selected demographic variables. The characteristics included the following: gender, age, marital status, length of residence in the United States, occupation, household income, educational status, and religion.

Characteristics that were measured on a categorical scale of measurement, that is, nominal and ordinal scales of measurement, were summarized using frequencies, and percentages. Those characteristics measured on a nominal scale were gender, marital status, occupation, and religion. The characteristic measured on an ordinal scale was educational status.

Characteristics measured on a continuous scale of measurement, that is, the interval scale of measurement, were summarized using means and standard deviations. These characteristics included age, length of residence in the United States, and household income.

Objective two was to determine the perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans, as measured by the

PADV-R. Each of the sub-scales which are included as part of the PADV-R was measured on six point Likert-type scales. These scales were treated as interval scale measurements for data analysis purposes; and therefore, both individual item means and standard deviations as well as sub-scale means and standard deviations were reported as summary data analyses. In addition, a factor analysis was conducted on each of the sub-scales to determine if the items could be confirmed to measure components of a common construct. Finally, each of the confirmed factors was summarized into a sub-scale score which was defined as the mean of the items in the factor.

Indirect Experiences with Domestic Violence Subscale-Revised asked whether respondents knew of any Korean friends or relatives who had experienced various forms of physical, psychological, and sexual abuse by a spouse/partner. Respondents answered either a “yes” or a “no” for all six questions. A “0” was coded for “no” and a “1” was coded for “yes.” These characteristics which were measured on a nominal scale of measurement were summarized using frequencies and percentages. In addition, the number of “Yes” responses was summed to yield an indirect experiences score. The summated scores were treated as interval data, therefore they were summarized as means and standard deviations.

Objective three was to determine the self-reported incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans as measured by CTS. There were separate measurements for each respondent as perpetrator and as victim. The continuous score reflected the summation of the frequency to which they used or sustained a particular type of abuse in the last 12 months. Characteristics to be

measured on a continuous scale of measurement were summarized using means and standard deviations. Also, a measurement of the portion of respondents that have experienced each abusive behavior at least once in the past 12 months was calculated. In addition, items in each of the two scales were factor analyzed to determine if underlying constructs existed in the scale based on the responses provided by participants.

The lifetime prevalence scores were only dichotomous (“yes/no”). For all dichotomous scores, a “0” was coded for “no,” and a “1” was coded for “yes” in SPSS. Characteristics measured on a categorical scale of measurement, that is, nominal scale were summarized using frequencies and percentages.

Objective four was to determine if a relationship existed between the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans and each of the following demographic characteristics: age, marital status, occupation, and religion.

The relationships between the incidence of partner abuse, and the variable of age were measured by Pearson’s Product-Moment Correlation, since both variables were measured on an interval scale. For variables that were measured on a nominal scale of measurement, the most appropriate correlation coefficient would depend on the number of categories of the variable of investigation (Point-Biserial for dichotomous variables and Cramer’s V for variables with three or more categories). However, to facilitate the interpretation of data, the most appropriate data analysis technique to measure these relationships was determined to be a comparison of the differences between the categories of the respective independent variables on the

outcome measures being analyzed. This technique was chosen for use in this study. Therefore, for categorical independent variables which had three or more response categories, the oneway Analysis of Variance was utilized.

Hypothesis one was that among first generation Korean-Americans, males will report higher levels of partner abuse as the perpetrator than will females, and additionally females will report higher levels of partner abuse as the victim than will males. The independent t-test (one-tail) statistical procedure was used to compare males and females on each of the two measures (as perpetrator and as victim) of the incidence of partner abuse.

Hypothesis two was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between household income and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with lower levels of income will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse both as perpetrator and victim. To accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between the reported level of household income and each of the two measures of incidence of partner abuse (as perpetrator and as victim).

Hypothesis three was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between highest level of education completed and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with lower levels of education completed will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse both as perpetrator and victim. Since the measures involved in this hypothesis were measured on different scales of measurement (education measured as ordinal data and incidence measured as interval data), the Kendall's Tau (one-tail) correlation coefficient was computed

between the highest level of education completed and each of two measures of incidence of partner abuse (as perpetrator and as victim).

Hypothesis four was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between length of residence in the United States and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with fewer years in the United States will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse both as perpetrator and victim. To accomplish this objective Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between the reported number of years of residence in the United States and each of the two measures of incidence of partner abuse (as perpetrator and as victim).

Hypothesis five was that among first generation Korean-Americans there will be a negative relationship between the perceptions regarding the definitions of domestic violence as measured by the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who hold broader perceptions regarding the interactions that are included in domestic violence will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as perpetrator while the individuals who hold narrower perceptions regarding the interactions included in domestic violence will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim. To accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between each of the sub-scale scores derived from the responses to the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Physical Aggression and Psychological Aggression) and the two measures of incidence of partner abuse (as perpetrator and as victim).

Hypothesis six was that among first generation Korean Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the sanction of the use of violence as measured by the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who sanction the use of violence to a greater degree will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim while the individuals who sanction the use of violence to a lesser degree will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim. To accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between the single sub-scale score derived from the responses to the Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised and the two measures of incidence of partner abuse (as perpetrator and as victim).

Hypothesis seven was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the attitudes toward the causes of domestic violence as measured by the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who indicate a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim while the individuals who indicate a narrower range of potential causes of domestic violence will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim. To accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between each of the sub-scale scores derived from the responses to the Attitudes toward the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the two measures of incidence of partner abuse (as perpetrator and as victim).

Hypothesis eight was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the level of contextual justification of domestic violence as measured by the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who accept a wider range of contextual justification will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim while the individuals who accept a narrower range of contextual justification will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and victim. To accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between the single sub-scale score derived from the responses to the Contextual Justification for the Use of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the two measures of incidence of partner abuse (as perpetrator and as victim).

Hypothesis nine was that a model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans, and the following groups of measures will make a significant contribution to the explanatory model in a hierarchical manner with the first measures providing the greatest contribution:

- a. Perceptual measures including: definition of domestic violence as measured by the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997); attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence as measured by the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997); attitudes toward causes of domestic violence as measured by the Causes of Domestic Violence

Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997); and perceptions of contextual justification as measured by the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997).

- b. The following demographic characteristics: gender, income, educational status, and length of residence in the United States.

Additionally, exploratory variables of investigation were to be entered into the model using stepwise techniques after the hypothesized variables have entered the model to determine if these exploratory variables had additional explanatory power to contribute to the model.

To accomplish this objective Multiple Regression Analysis was used with each of the two measures of incidence of partner abuse (as perpetrator and as victim) treated as the dependent variables and the selected perceptual and demographic measures treated as independent variables. The analyses were conducted as follows:

- a. For each of the dependent variables, incidence of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim, the following perceptual measures were entered into the regression model through deliberate entry techniques to reflect the indications in the research literature that they were explanatory of the incidence of this aspect of partner abuse:
  1. Definitions of domestic violence as measured by the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997).
  2. Attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence as measured by the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997).

3. Attitudes toward the causes of domestic violence as measured by the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997).
4. Perceptions of contextual justification as measured by the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997).

These four perceptual measures were entered into the regression model together as a block of explanatory factors.

- b. Next the following selected demographic characteristics were entered into the model:

1. Gender,
2. Household income,
3. Highest education level completed, and
4. Length of residence in the United States.

These variables were also entered simultaneously as a block of explanatory variables.

- c. Finally other variables that were being investigated as potential explanatory factors (age, religion, and occupation) were allowed to enter the model as appropriate using a stepwise entry technique. In this analysis, stepwise entry of the variables was used due to the exploratory nature of the variables being investigated. In addition, variables were added to the explanatory model which increase the total explained variance by 1% or more as long as the overall model remains significant.

## CHAPTER 4

### FINDINGS

This chapter presents findings of each objective and hypothesis. The results are organized by the objectives.

#### Objective One

The first objective of the study was to describe first generation Korean-Americans on selected demographic characteristics. The instrument was mailed to the sample of 223 first generation Korean-Americans. During the collection of data, the researcher learned that seven of the individuals included in the sample had moved from the area, thus reducing the population to 216. In addition, 12 individuals responded indicating that they could not provide data for the study since they did not have the necessary experiences. This brought the accessible population to 204. A total of 154 Korean-Americans (75.5%) provided usable data in response to the survey.

#### Gender of Respondents

One characteristic on which subjects were described was gender. Of the 154 respondents, 79 (51.3%) were male, and 75 (48.7%) were female.

#### Age of Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their age. The mean age for the Korean-Americans was 37.85 years ( $SD = 12.19$ ), the youngest respondent was 18 years, and the oldest was 66 years. When the age data was summarized into age categories, participants in this sample were predominantly between the ages of 18

and 45 ( $\underline{n} = 116$  or 76%), and the age category with the greatest number of Korean-Americans was 31 to 35 years (see Table 1).

Table 1

Age of First Generation Korean-Americans

Age in Years	$\underline{n}$	%
25 or less	26	16.9
26-30	22	14.3
31-35	28	18.2
36-40	18	11.6
41-45	22	15.0
46-50	8	5.2
51-55	9	5.8
56-60	14	9.1
61 or more	6	3.9
Total	154	100.0

Note. Age of respondents ranged from 18 to 66 years with a mean of 37.85 and standard deviation of 12.19.

Marital Status of Respondents

The majority ( $\underline{n} = 117$  or 76%) of the 154 Korean-American respondents indicated they were married. Twenty-three of the respondents (14.9%) reported that they had never been married. Marital status data for the study participants is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Marital Status of First Generation Korean-Americans

Marital Status	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Married	117	77.0
Never Married	23	15.1
Living with Someone	7	4.6
Divorced	3	2.0
Widowed	2	1.3
Total	152	100.0

Note. Two study participants did not respond to this item.

Length of Residence in the United States of Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their length of residence in the United States. The mean years in the United States was 10.84 years (SD = 8.32), the shortest residence was 1 year, and the longest residence was 44 years. When the data were summarized into categories of years in the United States, the years category with the greatest number of participants was 1 to 5 years (n = 57 or 37%). Approximately one half of the respondents (n = 84 or 54.5%) indicated the length of their residence in the United States as 10 years or less. The majority of respondents (n = 139 or 90.3%) had resided in the United States 20 years or less. Less than 10% of the study participants (n = 15, 9.74%) indicated that they had lived in the United States for more than 20 Years (see Table 3).

Table 3

Length of Residence in the U.S. of First Generation Korean-Americans

<u>Years in the U.S.</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
5 or less	57	37.0
6-10	27	17.5
11-15	35	22.8
16-20	20	13.0
21-25	4	2.6
26-30	6	3.9
31-35	4	2.6
36 or more	1	0.6
Total	154	100.0

Note. Length of residence in the United States ranged from 1 to 44 years with a mean of 10.84 years and standard deviation of 8.32.

Occupation of Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate the type of occupation in which they were currently employed by selecting one of the nine categories of occupations provided. The occupational category which was selected by the greatest number of participants was self-employed ( $\underline{n} = 42$  or 27.3%). The next most frequently reported categories were clerical, salesperson ( $\underline{n} = 32$  or 20.8%), student ( $\underline{n} = 22$  or 14.3%), and professional ( $\underline{n} = 19$  or 12.3%). (See Table 4.)

Table 4

Occupational Category of First Generation Korean-Americans

Occupation	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Self-Employed	42	27.3
Clerical, Salesperson	32	20.8
Student	22	14.3
Professional	19	12.3
Skilled Work	15	9.7
Housewife	12	7.8
Manual Work	6	3.9
Unemployed	4	2.6
Semi-Professional, manager	2	1.3
Total	154	100.0

Annual Family Income of Respondents

Study participants were asked to report their total annual family income. The mean annual family income was \$44,861.75 (SD = 37,523.93). The lowest annual family income was \$8,400, and the highest annual family income was \$250,000. When the annual income was examined in income level categories, the categories that were identified by the largest groups of respondents were \$30,000 – 39,999 (n = 38, 25.5%) and \$20,000 – 29,999 (n = 37, 24.8%). The majority of participants (n = 75 or 50.3%) had annual family incomes between \$20,000 and \$39,999. (See Table 5).

Table 5

Annual Family Income of First Generation Korean-American

Annual Family Income	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
< \$10,000	1	0.7
\$10,000 - \$19,999	9	1.3
\$20,000 - \$29,999	37	24.8
\$30,000 - \$39,999	38	25.5
\$40,000 - \$49,999	24	16.2
\$50,000 - \$59,999	17	11.4
\$60,000 - \$69,999	8	5.3
\$70,000 - \$79,999	3	2.0
\$80,000 - \$89,999	1	0.7
\$90,000 - \$99,999	3	2.0
\$100,000 - \$199,000	5	3.4
≥ \$200,000 <sup>a</sup>	3	2.0
Total	149 <sup>a</sup>	100.0

Note. Annual family income ranged from \$8,400 to \$250,000 with a mean of \$44,861.75 and standard deviation of 37,523.93.

<sup>a</sup>Five study participants did not provide usable data for this item.

Educational Status of Respondents

Respondents were asked to indicate their highest educational degree or diplomas attained. The response category which was reported by the largest number

of participants was Bachelors degree ( $n = 45$  or 29.2%), and the category reported by the fewest respondents was doctoral degree ( $n = 3$  or 1.0%). (See Table 6).

Table 6

Educational Status of First Generation Korean-Americans

Educational Status	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Less than High School	24	15.6
High School Diploma (or Equivalent)	39	25.3
Junior College Degree	24	15.6
Bachelors Degree	45	29.2
Masters Degree	19	12.3
Doctorate	3	1.9
Total	154	100.0

Religion of Respondents

When asked about their religion, the majority ( $n = 81$  or 52.6%) of respondents indicated they were Protestant, while four respondents (2.6%) reported they practiced no religion (see Table 7).

Objective Two

The second objective of the study was to determine the perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans, as measured by the Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Domestic Violence Scale. In the current study, four dimensions of domestic violence are measured using the Violence Scale: Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale (consisting of 14 items);

Table 7

Religion of First Generation Korean-American

Religion	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Protestant	81	52.6
Buddhism	34	22.1
Catholic	24	15.6
Confucianism	11	7.1
No Religion	4	2.6
Total	154	100.0

Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence (comprised of 10 items); Causes of Domestic Violence (consisting of 17 items); and Contextual Justification Scale (comprised of 11 items). Each of these four sub-scales used a six-point Likert-type response scale ranging from “Strongly Agree” to “Strongly Disagree.” To facilitate reporting of these findings, a scale was established by the researcher to guide the interpretation of the response to the individual items. This scale was developed to coincide with the response categories provided to the respondents and included the following categories: < 1.51 = Strongly Agree; 1.51 to 2.50 = Agree; 2.51 to 3.50 = Agree Somewhat; 3.51 to 4.5 = Disagree Somewhat; 4.51 to 5.50 = Disagree; > 5.50 = Strongly Disagree. Each of the four sub-scales are presented separately in the following sections.

## Definitions of Domestic Violence

Study participants responded to 14 items which were included in the Definition of Domestic Violence Scale. Before examining the responses to the individual items within the scale, the researcher eliminated the four neutral items that were included in the scale solely for the purpose of avoiding response patterns. These four items did not address issues related to domestic violence and would have been misleading if presented in conjunction with the domestic violence items. Of the 10 domestic violence items included in the scale, the items with which the respondents most strongly agreed included: “Constantly threatening to use a butcher knife to hurt one’s spouse/partner” ( $\underline{M} = 1.76$ ), “Punching one’s spouse/partner’s face real hard during an argument” ( $\underline{M} = 2.27$ ), and “Throwing objects like an ash tray at one’s spouse/partner” ( $\underline{M} = 2.40$ ). The mean response to each of these three items was classified in the “Agree” response category by the interpretive scale established by the researcher indicting that respondents “Agreed” that these actions would be considered domestic violence. The item with which respondents most strongly disagreed was “Demanding to know where one’s spouse/partner is all the time” ( $\underline{M} = 4.36$ ). This item was classified in the “Disagree Somewhat” response category. Overall, three items received ratings in the “Agree” category, three items received ratings in the “Agree Somewhat” category, and four items received ratings in the “Disagree Somewhat” category (see Table 8).

In addition to measuring the perceptions of respondents regarding the individual items included in the scale, the researcher also sought to measure concepts to be used as antecedent measures in subsequent analyses. The use of each

Table 8

Perceptions of First Generation Korean-Americans Regarding Definitions of Domestic Violence

Item	<u>M</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>SD</u>	Response <sup>b</sup> Category
Constantly threatening to use a butcher knife to hurt one's spouse/partner	1.76	1.17	A
Punching one's spouse/partner's face real hard during an argument	2.27	1.52	A
Throwing objects like an ash tray at one's spouse/partner	2.40	1.64	A
Pushing one's spouse/partner	2.51	1.40	AS
Forcing one's spouse/partner to have sex	2.84	1.71	AS
Always disregarding your spouse's/partner's opinions and feelings	3.49	1.61	AS
Not allowing spouse/partner to make any decision	3.53	1.74	DS
Criticizing one's spouse/partner in front of others	3.68	1.58	DS
Not allowing one's spouse/partner to have a bank account in his/her name	3.88	1.60	DS
Demanding to know where one's spouse/partner is all the time	4.36	1.36	DS

<sup>a</sup>Mean values based on the response scale 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = agree somewhat, 4 = disagree somewhat, 5 = disagree, 6 = strongly disagree

<sup>b</sup>Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: SA-Strongly Agree = <1.51. A-Agree = 1.51 to 2.50, AS-Agree Somewhat = 2.51 to 3.50, DS-Disagree Somewhat = 3.51 to 4.50, D-Disagree = 4.51 to 5.50, and SD-Strongly Disagree = >5.50.

individual item as a separate variable would create unacceptably inflated levels of experiment-wise error in the data, therefore the researcher conducted a factor analysis of the data derived from responses to this scale to identify underlying constructs in the data. Since Yick (1997) had used factor analysis to identify constructs in this scale, the most appropriate technique was determined to be using factor analytic procedures designed to determine if Yick's (1997) identified factors could be confirmed in this data. By using this procedure, the strength of the contribution to the body of knowledge would be substantially increased, especially if the factors from Yick's (1997) study were confirmed. One exception to this procedure was as follows: Yick (1997) identified sexual abuse as a single item factor in her data. The marginal usefulness of one-item factors is generally very low, and since sexual abuse among partners is most frequently identified in the literature as a form of physical abuse, the researcher combined the physical abuse and the sexual abuse factors together.

#### Factor Analysis

For the factor analysis procedure used to test the factors identified in Yick's study, the principal components analysis technique was employed. The analysis was conducted by including the items in each of Yick's factors in a separate analysis with the number of factors to be extracted designated as one in each of the analyses. By using this technique, the researcher was able to determine if the data in the current study could be used to confirm the items included in each of the previously identified factors. Since the number of factors to be extracted was set as one, the

rotation of the matrix was not a relevant procedure. When the items in the Physical Aggression Sub-scale were factor analyzed, the factor was confirmed. The loadings for each of the items included in the factor and the percentage of variance explained by the factor are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Factor Analysis of the Physical Aggression Sub-Scale of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised among First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Throwing objects like an ash tray at one's spouse/partner	.97	90.72
Pushing one's spouse/partner	.95	
Punching one's spouse/partner's face real hard during an argument	.94	
Forcing one's spouse/partner to have sex	.94	

The second factor examined was the Psychological Aggression Sub-scale, and the items included by Yick in the factor were confirmed in the current data. Factor loadings ranged from a high of .95 to a low of .72; and the one factor solution explained 77.65% of the variance in the sub-scale (see Table 10).

Sub-Scale Scores

To summarize the information regarding definitions of domestic violence, mean scores for each of the two confirmed sub-scales were computed. The sub-scale with which respondents most agreed was the Physical Aggression Sub-scale

Table 10

Factor Analysis of the Psychological Aggression Sub-Scale of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised among First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Not allowing spouse/partner to make any decisions	.95	77.65
Always disregarding one's spouse's/partner's opinions and feelings	.93	
Criticizing one's spouse/partner in front of others	.93	
Demanding to know where one's spouse/partner is all the time	.88	
Not allowing one's spouse/partner to have a bank account in his/her name	.86	
Constantly threatening to use a butcher Knife to hurt one's spouse/partner	.72	

with an overall mean of 2.50 ( $SD = 1.49$ ). This mean score was classified in the "Agree" response category by the interpretive scale established by the researcher. The Psychological Aggression Sub-scale showed an overall mean of 3.45 ( $SD = 1.34$ ), which was classified in the "Agree Somewhat" response category.

Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence

The second dimension of domestic violence examined was the attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence. Study participants responded to 10 items which were included in the Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale. The researcher eliminated the three neutral items that were included in the

scale solely for the purpose of avoiding response patterns before examining the responses to the individual items within the scale. Of the 7 items included, the one with which the respondents most strongly agreed was “Spanking a child is an effective way to discipline” ( $M = 3.16$ ). (See Table 11). This item was classified

Table 11

Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence of First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	$M^a$	$SD$	Response <sup>b</sup> Category
Spanking a child is an effective way to discipline	3.16	1.61	AS
The use of physical punishment teaches Children self-control	3.59	1.80	DS
In general, it is okay for a man to hit His wife/partner	4.78	1.58	D
Hitting a child with a belt is an appropriate form of discipline	4.79	1.67	D
Hitting is a good way to solve problems	4.98	1.41	D
In general, it is okay for a woman to hit her husband/partner	5.01	1.36	D
Hitting should be used if nothing else works	5.08	1.40	D

<sup>a</sup>Mean values based on the response scale 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = agree somewhat, 4 = disagree somewhat, 5 = disagree, 6 = strongly disagree

<sup>b</sup>Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: SA-Strongly Agree = <1.51. A-Agree = 1.51 to 2.50, AS-Agree Somewhat = 2.51 to 3.50, DS-Disagree Somewhat = 3.51 to 4.50, D-Disagree = 4.51 to 5.50, and SD-Strongly Disagree = >5.50.

in the “Agree Somewhat” response category by the interpretive scale established by the researcher. The items with which respondents most strongly disagreed included, “Hitting should be used if nothing else works” ( $\underline{M} = 5.08$ ), “In general, it is okay for a woman to hit her husband/partner” ( $\underline{M} = 5.01$ ), “Hitting is a good way to solve problems” ( $\underline{M} = 4.98$ ), “Hitting a child with a belt is an appropriate form of discipline” ( $\underline{M} = 4.79$ ), and “In general, it is okay for a man to hit his wife/partner” ( $\underline{M} = 4.78$ ). These five items were in the “Disagree” response category (see Table 11).

### Factor Analysis

The results of the factor analysis conducted by Yick (1997) in her study on the items in this scale was inconclusive, and therefore, these factors could not reasonably be used for confirmation in the current study. However, following Yick’s procedure, the neutral items that were added for the purpose of breaking response patterns were removed from the analysis after which the remaining items were factor analyzed using the principal components analysis with a varimax rotation. The results of this analysis revealed one factor in the data. The items included in this factor with their loadings and the corresponding percentage of variance explained are presented in Table 12. Loadings for the items ranged from a high of .95 to a low of .86 and the single factor explained 84.86% of the variance in the scale. The single factor extracted by the analysis was labeled by the researcher as “Sanctioning the Use of Interpersonal Violence” (See Table 12).

Table 12

Factor Analysis for the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised among First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
In general, it is okay for a man to hit his wife/partner	.95	84.86
Hitting a child with a belt is an appropriate form of discipline	.95	
Hitting should be used if nothing else works	.94	
Hitting is a good way to solve problems	.92	
In general, it is okay for a woman to hit her husband/partner	.91	
The use of physical punishment teaches Children self-control	.91	
Spanking a child is an effective way to discipline	.86	

Sub-Scale Score

To summarize the information regarding Korean-Americans' attitude towards the use of interpersonal violence, a mean score for the single sub-scale was computed. An overall mean for the Sanctioning the Use of Interpersonal Violence Sub-scale was 4.22 ( $SD = 1.13$ ), which was classified as "Disagree Somewhat" response category by the interpretive scale established by the researcher indicating that respondents "Disagreed Somewhat" with the statements stated.

### Attitudes toward the Causes of Domestic Violence

The third dimension of domestic violence examined was the attitudes toward the causes of domestic violence. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement /disagreement regarding selected possible causes of violence between spouses. The items with which the respondents most strongly agreed included: “Drugs” ( $\underline{M} = 1.80, \underline{SD} = 1.25$ ), “Mental illness” ( $\underline{M} = 1.82, \underline{SD} = 1.09$ ), “Arguments that get out of hand” ( $\underline{M} = 1.83, \underline{SD} = 1.20$ ), “Inability to control a bad temper” ( $\underline{M} = 1.87, \underline{SD} = .93$ ), “Alcohol” ( $\underline{M} = 1.98, \underline{SD} = 1.12$ ), “Lack of trust in a marriage” ( $\underline{M} = 2.25, \underline{SD} = 1.18$ ), “Lack of education” ( $\underline{M} = 2.35, \underline{SD} = 1.35$ ), and “Poverty” ( $\underline{M} = 2.38, \underline{SD} = 1.29$ ). These items were in the “Agree” response category. The item with which respondents most strongly disagreed included: “Beliefs that women are the properties of men” ( $\underline{M} = 4.68, \underline{SD} = .99$ ), and “Belief that men are authority figures over women” ( $\underline{M} = 4.56, \underline{SD} = 1.10$ ). These two items were in the “Disagree” response category (see Table 13).

Table 13

#### Attitudes toward the Causes of Domestic Violence of First Generation Korean-Americans Who Provided Usable Data for the Partner Abuse Study

Item	$\underline{M}^a$	$\underline{SD}$	Response <sup>b</sup> Category
Drugs	1.80	1.25	A
Mental illness	1.82	1.09	A
Arguments that get out of hand	1.83	1.20	A

table continues

Item	<u>M</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>SD</u>	Response <sup>b</sup> Category
Inability to control a bad temper	1.87	.93	A
Alcohol	1.98	1.12	A
Lack of trust in a marriage	2.08	1.12	A
Past experiences with violence during childhood	2.25	1.18	A
Lack of education	2.35	1.35	A
Poverty	2.38	1.29	A
Stress from immigrating to the U.S.	3.33	1.16	AS
Job pressure	3.41	1.44	AS
An overcrowded house	3.64	1.25	DS
A woman wanting to make more decisions in the home	3.75	1.06	DS
Belief that wives should be obedient	4.25	1.09	DS
Women's lower status compared to men's in Korean culture	4.27	1.52	DS
Belief that men are authority figures over women	4.56	1.10	D
Beliefs that women are the properties of men	4.68	.99	D

<sup>a</sup>Mean values based on the response scale 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = agree somewhat, 4 = disagree somewhat, 5 = disagree, 6 = strongly disagree

<sup>b</sup>Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: SA-Strongly Agree = <1.51. A-Agree = 1.51 to 2.50, AS-Agree Somewhat = 2.51 to 3.50, DS-Disagree Somewhat = 3.51 to 4.50, D-Disagree = 4.51 to 5.50, and SD-Strongly Disagree = >5.50.

### Factor Analysis

Since Yick (1997) had used factor analysis to identify constructs in this scale, factor analytic procedures were used in this data to confirm Yick's (1997) identified factors. Yick (1997) identified three factors in this scale including Individual Causes Sub-scale, Environmental Causes Sub-scale, and Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-scale. For the factor analysis procedure used to test the factors identified in Yick's study, the principal components analysis technique was employed. The analysis was conducted by including the items in each of Yick's factors in a separate analysis with the number of factors to be extracted designated as one in each of the analyses. By using this technique, the researcher was able to determine if the data in the current study could be used to confirm the items included in each of the previously identified factors. Since the number of factors to be extracted in each analysis was set as one, the rotation of the matrix was not a relevant procedure. When the items in the Individual Causes Sub-scale were factor analyzed, the factor was confirmed. The loadings for each of the items included in the factor and the percentage of variance explained by the factor are presented in Table 14.

The second factor examined was the Environmental Causes Sub-scale, and the items included in the factor were confirmed in the current data. Factor loadings ranged from a high of .83 to a low of .63; and the one factor solution explained 52.26% of the variance in the sub-scale (see Table 15).

The third factor examined was the Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-scale, and the items included in the factor were confirmed in the current data. Factor loading

Table 14

Factor Analysis of the Individual Causes Sub-Scale of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised among First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Lack of education	.89	72.29
Mental illness	.89	
Lack of trust in a marriage	.87	
Arguments that get out of hand	.84	
Inability to control a bad temper	.76	

Table 15

Factor Analysis of the Environmental Causes Sub-Scale of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised among First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Drugs	.83	52.26
Past experiences with violence during childhood	.77	
Stress from immigrating to the U.S.	.76	
Poverty	.72	
Alcohol	.67	
An overcrowded house	.66	
Job pressure	.63	

ranged from a high of .90 to a low of .34; and the one factor solution explained 49.85% of the variance in the sub-scale (see Table 16). One item showed a relatively low factor loading (.34); however it was included in the factor since factor loadings greater than .30 are considered to meet the minimal level for inclusion (Hair, Jr., Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998).

Table 16

Factor Analysis of the Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-Scale of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised among First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Belief that men are authority figures over women	.90	49.85
Beliefs that women are the properties of men	.89	
Belief that wives should be obedient	.70	
A women wanting make more decisions in the home	.53	
Women's lower status compared to men's in Korean culture	.34	

Sub-Scale Scores

To summarize the information regarding the causes of domestic violence, mean scores of the three sub-scales confirmed by factor analysis were computed. The sub-scale with which respondents most agreed was the Individual Causes Sub-scale with an overall mean of 2.02 (SD = .95), classified in the "Agree" response category. It was followed by the Environmental Causes Sub-scale (M = 2.91, SD =

.91), classified in the “Agree Somewhat” response category and the Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-scale ( $\underline{M} = 4.30$ ,  $\underline{SD} = .78$ ), classified in the “Disagree Somewhat” response category.

#### Attitudes toward the Contextual Justification of Domestic Violence

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement/disagreement regarding whether it is appropriate to “hit” in selected situations. Of the 11 items included in the scale, one had a mean rating in the “Agree” response category. This item was “He acted in self-defense” ( $\underline{M} = 1.75$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.36$ ). (See Table 17). The items with which respondents disagreed most included: “When she does not spend enough time at home” ( $\underline{M} = 4.97$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.34$ ), “When he was in a bad mood” ( $\underline{M} = 4.88$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.50$ ), “When she was trying to hurt their child” ( $\underline{M} = 4.73$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.58$ ), “When she was unwilling to have sex” ( $\underline{M} = 4.61$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.65$ ), and “When he caught her having an affair” ( $\underline{M} = 4.56$ ,  $\underline{SD} = 1.50$ ). These items were in the “Disagree” response category (see Table 17).

#### Factor Analysis

Since Yick (1997) had used factor analysis to identify constructs in this scale, a factor analytic procedure was used in this data to confirm Yick’s (1997) results. For the factor analysis, the principal components analysis technique was employed. Since Yick’s (1997) factor analysis revealed one factor in the scale, all of the items were included in the factor analysis with the number of factors to be extracted designated as one. By using this technique, the researcher was able to determine if the data in the current study could be used to confirm the previously

identified factor. The factor, the percentage of variance explained, and the items in the order that they were extracted are included in Table 18.

Table 17

Attitudes toward the Contextual Justification of Domestic Violence of First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	<u>M</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>SD</u>	Response <sup>b</sup> Category
He acted in self-defense	1.75	1.36	A
He caught her having an affair	3.66	1.77	DS
She was screaming hysterically	4.05	1.47	DS
He found her flirting with someone else	4.27	1.70	DS
She was always nagging	4.36	1.55	DS
She did not obey him	4.38	1.70	DS
He found her drunk	4.56	1.50	D
She was unwilling to have sex	4.61	1.65	D
She was trying to hurt their child	4.73	1.58	D
He was in a bad mood	4.88	1.50	D
She does not spend enough time at home	4.97	1.34	D

<sup>a</sup>Mean values based on the response scale 1 = strongly agree, 2 = agree, 3 = agree somewhat, 4 = disagree somewhat, 5 = disagree, 6 = strongly disagree

<sup>b</sup>Response categories based on the following scale established by the researcher: SA-Strongly Agree = <1.51. A-Agree = 1.51 to 2.50, AS-Agree Somewhat = 2.51 to 3.50, DS-Disagree Somewhat = 3.51 to 4.50, D-Disagree = 4.51 to 5.50, and SD-Strongly Disagree = >5.50.

Table 18

Factor Analysis for the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised among First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
He found her flirting with someone else	.95	78.55
She did not obey him	.95	
She was unwilling to have sex	.94	
She does not spend enough time at home	.93	
She was always nagging	.93	
He found her drunk	.92	
She was screaming hysterically	.91	
She was trying to hurt their child	.89	
He caught her having an affair	.89	
He acted in self-defense	.32	

Sub-Scale Scores

To summarize the information regarding the respondents' perceptions of contextual justification, mean score of the single sub-scale confirmed by factor analysis was computed. An overall mean for the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised was 4.20 (SD = 1.37), which was classified as "Disagree Somewhat" response category by the interpretive scale established by the researcher.

### Indirect Experiences of Domestic Violence

Respondents were asked to indicate if they have been told or known of any Korean friends or family members who have experienced various situations of domestic violence. Responses to these items were used as a measure of the respondents' indirect experiences with domestic violence. The experience that was reported as having been told or known of by the largest group of respondents was "Been verbally insulted by their spouse/partner" ( $n = 114$  or 74%). The indirect experience which was reported by the smallest proportion of respondents was "Been threatened with a gun or knife by their spouse/partner" ( $n = 15$  or 9.7%). (See Table 19).

To further summarize the data from the responses to the items in this scale, the researcher coded the data so that a response of "No" received a value of "0" and a response of "Yes" to an item received a value of "1." The responses to the six items were then summed to produce an overall score of Indirect Domestic Violence Experience. This score had a possible range of from 0 to 6 with higher scores representing higher levels of reported indirect experiences with domestic violence. The derived scores ranged from the lowest possible score of 0 to the highest possible score of 6; and the mean score was 2.03 ( $SD = 1.72$ ).

### Objective Three

The third objective of the study was to determine the self-reported incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans as measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale. In this study the Conflict Tactics Scale measured the incidence of partner abuse in two dimensions including the incidence of the

Table 19

Indirect Experiences of domestic Violence of First Generation Korean-Americans

Experiences	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%	<u>n</u>	%
Been verbally insulted by their spouse/partner	114	74.0	40	26.0	154	100.0
Been pushed or grabbed by their spouse/partner	76	49.4	78	50.6	154	100.0
Been slapped by their spouse/partner	72	46.8	82	53.2	154	100.0
Not been allowed to leave the house because their spouse/partner would not allow it	18	11.7	136	88.3	154	100.0
Been forced to have sex by their spouse/partner	18	11.7	136	88.3	154	100.0
Been threatened with a gun or knife by their spouse/partner	15	9.7	139	90.3	154	100.0

afflictions of partner abuse as the perpetrator and the experiences of partner abuse as the victim. In addition, respondents were asked to provide information regarding their level of involvement for two specified time periods on each of these two dimensions. These time periods included within the past 12 months and in their lifetime. The response scale used for each of the items included in the “Past 12 months” portion of both the perpetrator and victim sections of the instrument was a seven-point scale ranging from 0 to 6. Each response available to the participants had specific descriptors provided to serve as guidelines for their individual

information. For example, a response of “3” was indicative of the event having occurred “3 to 5” times in the past 12 months; while a response of “6” indicated the event having occurred more than 20 times in the past 12 months. While it is true that this data is most appropriately classified as ordinal data, the primary purpose of the use of this instrument was to develop summary measures that could be used to report the overall incidence of partner abuse. Using the data strictly as ordinal data would have limited the ability of the researcher to summarize the collected information. Therefore, these data were summarized by computing a mean score for each of the individual items and for the sub-scales developed by Straus and confirmed by factor analyses in this study. Also, the researcher felt that one additional summary of this data that would be useful in understanding partner abuse among Korean-Americans was a measurement of the portion that have experienced each abusive behavior at least once in the past 12 months. To accomplish this, responses were recoded so that a value of “0” was recorded for a response of “never” and a value of “1” was recorded for all other responses.

The two lifetime scales used a “Yes – No” response, and they were summarized by coding the data so that each item marked “Yes” received a value of “1” and each item marked “No” received a value of “0”. Items in each of the two sub-scales developed by Straus were then summed to produce two lifetime partner abuse sub-scale scores for each of the two dimensions (perpetrator and victim). However, the variables used as dependent variables in subsequent analyses were limited to the sub-scale scores for the “Past 12 months” response on each of the two

dimensions. The reasons for this decision on the part of the researcher included the following:

1. Responses to the lifetime scale could have encompassed excessive time periods that may have included multiple marriages and other life events that could make past involvement in partner abuse (on either dimension) not representative of their current circumstances. For example, a woman could have been married to an excessively abusive husband whom she left many years earlier and perhaps in a different environment (physical and/or cultural). This may cause her lifetime score to be highly atypical of her current partner abuse circumstances.
2. Since the variables that were being examined for relationships with the incidence of partner abuse sub-scale scores were largely perceptual, the perception responses provided by the study participants would logically have been based on their recent experiences, and examining the current perceptions for relationships with measures of experiences from the distant past would be tenuous at best.
3. The fact that an unequal number of items were included in each of the factors designed into the instrument by Straus would mean that the factor scores could not be meaningfully compared without standardizing the scores. If the scores were standardized, they would then be less meaningful as overall measures of the constructs being addressed.

### Incidence of Partner Abuse as Perpetrator

When the mean scores of partner abuse reported as perpetrator during the past 12 months were summarized, the behaviors which respondents indicated they had used most frequently in the past 12 months were “Discussed the issue calmly” ( $M = 3.72$ ,  $SD = .99$ ), and “Got information to backup your side of things” ( $M = 2.99$ ,  $SD = 1.00$ ). None of the respondents reported that they had “Used a knife or gun on other person” in the past 12 months ( $M = .00$ ,  $SD = .00$ ). Other behaviors that were reported to have been used least frequently were “Threatened with a knife or gun on other person” ( $M = .03$ ,  $SD = .22$ ), and “Beat up the other person” ( $M = .19$ ,  $SD = .63$ ). (See Table 20).

Table 20

### Self-Reported Incidence of Partner Abuse as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months for First Generation Korean-Americans

<u>Item</u>	<u>M<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>SD</u>
Discussed the issue calmly	3.72	.99
Got information to backup your side of things	2.99	1.00
Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	2.78	1.54
Insulted or swore at the other person	2.02	1.44
Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	1.79	1.47
Cried	1.57	1.60
Did or said something to spite the other person	1.42	1.22

table continues

Item	<u>M</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>SD</u>
Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	1.10	1.41
Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle on things	.82	1.08
Threw something at the other person	.70	1.23
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other person	.54	1.09
Slapped the other person	.40	.83
Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist	.29	.77
Hit or tried to hit the other person with some objects	.25	.68
Beat up the other person	.19	.63
Threatened with a knife or gun on other person	.03	.02
Used a knife or gun on other person	.00	.00

<sup>a</sup>Mean values based on the response scale 0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = twice, 3 = 3 to 5 times, 4 = 6 to 10 times, 5 = 11 to 20 times, 6 = more than 20 times.

In addition to summarizing the data by computing a mean score for each of the individual items, these data were further summarized to understand what portion of respondents used each abusive behavior during the past 12 months. For this purpose, frequencies and percentages of individuals who reported that they had used each item at least once during the past 12 months were computed (see Table 21). This was done by coding a “0” for each item that received a response of “never” and a “1” if the item received any other frequency response. The item that was reported to have occurred in the past 12 months by the largest proportion of respondents was

“Discussed the issue calmly” ( $n = 125, 99.2\%$ ). It should be noted that none of the respondents reported having “Used a knife or gun on the other person” ( $n = 0$ ) and 2.4% ( $n = 3$ ) reported having “Threatened with a knife or gun.” However, 10.3% ( $n = 13$ ) reported having “Beat up the other person” at least in the past 12 months (see Table 21).

Table 21

Frequencies of Incidence of Partner Abuse as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months for First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>
Used a knife or gun on other person	0	0.00	126	100.00	126	100
Threatened with a knife or gun on other person	3	2.40	123	97.60	126	100
Beat up the other person	13	10.30	113	89.70	126	100
Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist	19	15.10	107	84.90	126	100
Hit or tried to hit the other person with some objects	19	15.10	107	84.90	126	100
Slapped the other person	26	20.60	100	79.40	126	100
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other person	30	23.80	96	76.20	126	100
Threw something at the other person	38	30.20	88	69.80	126	100
Brought in or tried to bring In someone to help settle On things	52	41.60 <sup>b</sup>	73	58.40 <sup>b</sup>	125	100

table continues

Item	Yes		No		Total	
	n	% <sup>a</sup>	n	% <sup>a</sup>	n	% <sup>a</sup>
Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	53	42.10	73	57.90	126	100
Cried	80	63.50	46	36.50	126	100
Did or said something to spite the other person	86	68.30	40	31.70	126	100
Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	90	72.00 <sup>b</sup>	35	28.00 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Insulted or swore at the other person	100	79.40 <sup>b</sup>	26	20.60 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Sulked and/or refused to talk about	113	90.40 <sup>b</sup>	12	9.00 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Got information to backup your side of things	123	98.40 <sup>b</sup>	2	1.60 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Discussed the issue calmly	125	99.20	1	0.80	126	100

<sup>a</sup>Percentage based on the total number of 126 respondents. 28 respondents did not respond due to their marital status of not living with someone during the past 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Percentage based on the total number of 125 respondents. Additionally, there was one missing data.

The primary purpose of this measurement was to develop measures that could be effectively used in subsequent analyses as dependent variable measurements. In addition, the use of each individual item as a separate dependent variable would create unacceptably inflated levels of experiment-wise error in the data. Therefore, the researcher conducted a factor analysis of the data derived from responses to this scale to identify underlying constructs in the data. However, since

Straus (1979) had conducted a factor analysis of this scale, and previous researchers had confirmed these factors in various studies (Kumagai & Straus, 1983; Tang, 1993), the researcher chose to utilize factor analytic procedures designed to determine if identified factors could be confirmed to exist in the current data. When these procedures were followed, the researcher confirmed three factors in the data as identified by Straus (1979); Reasoning Tactics Sub-scale, Verbal Aggression Sub-scale, and Physical Violence Sub-scale.

#### Factor Analysis

For the factor analysis procedure used to test the factors identified in Straus' study, the principal components analysis technique was employed. The analysis was conducted by including the items in each of Straus' factors in a separate analysis with the number of factors to be extracted designated as one in each of the analyses. By using this technique, the researcher was able to determine if the data in the current study could be used to confirm the items included in each of the previously identified factors. Since the number of factors to be extracted was set as one, the rotation of the matrix was not a relevant procedure. When the items in the Reasoning Tactics Sub-scale were factor analyzed, the factor was confirmed. The loadings for each of the items included in the factor and the percentage of variance explained are presented in Table 22.

The second factor examined was the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale, and the items included in the factor were confirmed in the current data. Factor loadings ranged from a high of .89 to a low of .64; and the one factor solution explained 64.29% of the variance in the sub-scale (see Table 23).

Table 22

Factor Analysis for the Reasoning Tactics Sub-Scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale for First Generation Korean-Americans as Perpetrator

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Got information to backup your side of things	.85	56.09
Discussed the issue calmly	.83	
Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle on things	.52	

Table 23

Factor Analysis of the Verbal Aggression Sub-Scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale for First Generation Korean-Americans as Perpetrator

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Insulted or swore at the other person	.89	64.29
Did or said something to spite the other person	.85	
Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	.81	
Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	.80	
Cried	.64	

The third factor examined was the Physical Violence Sub-scale, and the items included in the factor were confirmed in the current data. Factor loadings

ranged from a high of .93 to a low of .59; and the one factor solution explained 72.06% of the variance in the sub-scale (see Table 24).

Table 24

Factor Analysis of the Physical Violence Sub-Scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale for First Generation Korean-Americans as Perpetrator

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Kicked, bit or hit with a fist	.93	72.06
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other person	.92	
Threw something at the other person	.91	
Slapped the other person	.88	
Beat up the other person	.87	
Hit or tried to hit the other person with some objects	.85	
Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	.78	
Threatened with a knife or gun on other person	.59	

Sub-Scale Means as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months

To summarize the information regarding the level of partner abuse as perpetrator during the past 12 months, mean scores of the three sub-scales, confirmed by factor analysis were computed. The sub-scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale for which respondents reported the greatest frequency of use was the Reasoning Tactics Sub-scale with an overall mean of 2.53 (SD = .78). The sub-scale of Conflict Tactics Scale for which respondents indicated the least frequency

of use was the Physical Violence Sub-scale with an overall mean of .44 (SD = .75), followed by the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale with an overall mean of 1.91 (SD = 1.16).

#### Lifetime Partner Abuse as Perpetrator

In addition to the measurement of the level of partner abuse behaviors exhibited as perpetrator during the past 12 months, respondents were also asked to indicate for the same behaviors whether or not they had exhibited each one at any point in their lifetime. The response scale used for this section of the instrument was a “Yes” or “No” answer. As in the case of the scores as perpetrator during the past 12 months, the behaviors which received a “Yes” response by the greatest number of participants were “Discussed the issue calmly” (n = 125 or 99.20%), and “Got information to backup your side of things” (n = 124 or 99.20%). None of the respondents reported that they had “Used a knife or gun on other person” (n = 0 or 0.00%). Other behaviors that were reported to have been used least frequently were “Threatened with a knife or gun or other person” (n = 3 or 2.4%), and “Beat up the other person” (n = 13 or 10.3%). (See Table 25).

#### Sub-Scale Means as Perpetrator during the Respondents’ Lifetime

To summarize the information regarding partner abuse as perpetrator during the respondents’ lifetime, mean scores of the three sub-scales, identified by Straus (1979) and confirmed by other researchers (Kugamai & Straus, 1983; Tang, 1993) were computed. Out of a possible score of 3 for the Reasoning Tactics sub-scale, the mean was 2.44, or 81.3% (SD = .53). This indicates that across all respondents, 81.3% of the Reasoning Tactics behaviors were reported to have been used. Out of

Table 25

Self-Reported Incidence of Partner Abuse as Perpetrator during the Respondents' Lifetime for First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>
Used a knife or gun on other person	0	0.00	126	100.0	126	100
Threatened with a knife or gun on other person	3	2.40	123	97.60	126	100
Beat up the other person	13	10.30	113	73.40	126	100
Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist	18	14.30	108	85.70	126	100
Hit or tried to hit the other person with some objects	19	15.10	107	84.90	126	100
Slapped the other person	30	23.80	96	76.20	126	100
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other person	34	27.00	92	73.00	126	100
Threw something at the other person	39	31.00	87	69.00	126	100
Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	55	43.70	71	56.30	126	100
Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle on things	59	47.20 <sup>b</sup>	66	52.80 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Did or said something to spite the other person	87	69.00	39	31.00	126	100
Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	90	72.00 <sup>b</sup>	35	28.00 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Cried	92	73.00	34	27.00	126	100

table continues

Item	Yes		No		Total	
	n	% <sup>a</sup>	n	% <sup>a</sup>	n	% <sup>a</sup>
Insulted or swore at the other person	106	84.10	20	13.00	126	100
Sulked and/or refused to talk about	115	92.00 <sup>b</sup>	10	6.50 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Got information to backup your side of things	124	99.20 <sup>b</sup>	1	.80 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Discussed the issue calmly	125	99.20	1	.80	126	100

<sup>a</sup>Percentage based on the total number of 126 respondents. 28 respondents did not respond due to their marital status of not living with someone during the past 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Percentage based on the total number of 125 respondents. Additionally, there was one missing data.

a possible score of 5 for the Verbal Aggression sub-scale, the mean was 3.89 or 77.8% ( $SD = 1.55$ ). Therefore, among the study participants, 77.8% of the Verbal Aggression behaviors had been used as a perpetrator during their lifetime. Out of a possible score of 9 for the Physical Violence sub-scale, the mean was 1.67 or 18.6% ( $SD = 2.41$ ) indicating that 18.6% of the Physical Violence behaviors had been used during their lifetime.

#### Incidence of Partner Abuse as Victim

When the mean scores of partner abuse reported as victim during the past 12 months were summarized, the behaviors which respondents indicated they had experienced most frequently in the past 12 months were “Discussed the issue calmly” ( $M = 3.60$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ), and “Got information to backup his/her side of

things” ( $M = 3.12$ ,  $SD = 1.03$ ). (See Table 26). None of the respondents reported that they had “Used a knife or gun on other person” ( $M = .00$ ,  $SD = .00$ ). Other behaviors that were reported to have been experienced least frequently were “Threatened with a knife or gun on other person” ( $M = .02$ ,  $SD = .18$ ), and “Beat up the other person” ( $M = .08$ ,  $SD = .41$ ). (See Table 26).

Table 26

Self-Reported Incidence of Partner Abuse as Victim during the Past 12 Months for First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	$M^a$	$SD$
Used a knife or gun on other person	.00	.00
Threatened with a knife or gun on other person	.02	.18
Beat up the other person	.08	.41
Hit or tried to hit the other person with some objects	.17	.6
Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist	.10	.44
Slapped the other person	.33	.83
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other person	.40	.95
Threw something at the other person	.63	1.14
Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	.85	1.25
Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle on things	1.08	1.24
Did or said something to spite the other person	1.56	1.43
Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	1.63	1.57

table continues

Item	<u>M</u> <sup>a</sup>	<u>SD</u>
Cried	1.79	1.89
Insulted or swore at the other person	2.07	1.59
Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	2.78	1.70
Got information to backup his/her side of things	3.12	1.03
Discussed the issue calmly	3.60	1.07

<sup>a</sup>Mean values based on the response scale 0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = twice, 3 = 3 to 5 times, 4 = 6 to 10 times, 5 = 11 to 20 times, 6 = more than 20 times.

In addition to summarizing the data by computing a mean score for each of the individual items, these data were further summarized to understand what portion of respondents experienced each abusive behavior as a victim during the past 12 months. For this purpose, frequencies and percentages of individuals who reported that they had experienced each item as a victim at least once during the past 12 months were computed. (See Table 27). This was done by coding a “0” for each item that received a response of “never” and a “1” if the item received any other frequency response. The item that was reported to have experienced most often in the past 12 months was “Discussed the issue calmly” ( $\underline{n} = 124, 99.2\%$ ). It should be noted that none of the respondents reported that their spouses had “Used a knife or gun on other person” ( $\underline{n} = 0$ ) and .80% ( $\underline{n} = 1$ ) reported that their spouses “Threatened with a knife or gun.” (See Table 27).

Table 27

Frequencies of Incidence of Partner Abuse Experienced as Victim during the Past 12 Months for First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>
Used a knife or gun on other person	0	0.00	126	100.00	126	100
Threatened with a knife or gun on other person	1	.80	125	99.20	126	100
Beat up the other person	5	4.00	121	96.00	126	100
Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist	8	6.30	118	93.70	126	100
Hit or tried to hit the other person with some objects	10	7.90	116	92.10	126	100
Slapped the other person	20	15.90	106	84.10	126	100
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other person	22	17.50	104	82.50	126	100
Threw something at the other person	33	26.20	93	73.80	126	100
Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	48	38.10	78	61.90	126	100
Brought in or tried to bring In someone to help settle on things	64	50.80	62	49.20	126	100
Cried	65	51.60	61	48.40	126	100
Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	78	62.40 <sup>b</sup>	47	37.60 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Did or said something to spite the other person	85	67.50	41	32.50	126	100

table continues

Item	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>
Insulted or swore at the other person	96	81.20 <sup>b</sup>	29	23.20 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Sulked and/or refused to talk about	110	90.30 <sup>b</sup>	15	12.00 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Got information to backup your side of things	124	98.40	2	1.60	126	100
Discussed the issue calmly	124	99.20 <sup>b</sup>	1	.80 <sup>b</sup>	125	100

<sup>a</sup>Percentage based on the total number of 126 respondents. 28 respondents did not respond due to their marital status of not living with someone during the past 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Percentage based on the total number of 125 respondents. Additionally, there was one missing data.

### Factor Analysis

The researcher conducted a factor analysis to determine if Straus' identified factors could be confirmed in the data of Korean-Americans' experiences of partner abuse as victim. The principal components analysis technique was employed to test these factors. The analysis was conducted by including the items in each of Straus' factors in a separate analysis with the number of factors to be extracted designated as one in each of the analyses. By using this technique, the researcher was able to determine if the data in the current study could be used to confirm the items included in each of the previously identified factors. Since the number of factors to be extracted was set as one, the rotation of the matrix was not a relevant procedure. When the items in the Reasoning Tactics Sub-scale were factor analyzed, the factor

was confirmed. The loadings for each of the items included in the factor and the percentage of variance explained by the factor are presented in Table 28.

Table 28

Factor Analysis for the Reasoning Tactics Sub-Scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale for First Generation Korean-Americans as Victim

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Got information to backup his/her side of things	.86	63.55
Discussed the issue calmly	.85	
Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle on things	.67	

The second factor examined was the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale, and the items included in the factor were confirmed in the current data. Factor loadings ranged from a high of .91 to a low of .58; and the one factor solution explained 67.78% of the variance in the sub-scale (see Table 29).

The third factor examined was the Physical Violence Sub-scale, and the items included in the factor were confirmed in the current data. Factor loadings ranged from a high of .86 to a low of .43; and the one factor solution explained 58.39% of the variance in the sub-scale (see Table 30).

Sub-Scale Means as Victim during the Past 12 Months

To summarize the information regarding the level of partner abuse as victim during the past 12 months, mean scores of the three sub-scales, confirmed by factor analysis were computed. The sub-scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale for which

Table 29

Factor Analysis of the Verbal Aggression Sub-Scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale for First Generation Korean-Americans as Victim

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Insulted or swore at the other person	.91	67.78
Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	.90	
Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	.88	
Did or said something to spite the other person	.81	
Cried	.58	

respondents reported the greatest frequency of experience was the Reasoning Tactics Sub-scale with an overall mean of 2.59 (SD = .88). The sub-scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale for which respondents indicated the least frequency of experience was the Physical Violence Sub-scale with an overall mean of .28 (SD =.52). This was followed in frequency by the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale with an overall mean of 1.95 (SD = 2.20).

Lifetime Partner Abuse as Victim

In addition to the measurement of the level of partner abuse behaviors experienced as victim during the past 12 months, respondents were also asked to indicate for the same behaviors whether or not they had experienced each one at any point in their lifetime. The response scale used for this section of the instrument was a “Yes” or “No” answer. As in the case of the scores as victim during the past

Table 30

Factor Analysis of the Physical Violence Sub-Scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale for First Generation Korean-Americans as Victim

Item	Factor Loading	% Variance Explained
Threw something at the other person	.86	58.39
Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	.85	
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other person	.84	
Slapped the other person	.792	
Hit or tried to hit the other person with some objects	.785	
Beat up the other person	.75	
Kicked, bit or hit with a fist	.72	
Threatened with a knife or gun on other person	.59	

12 months, the behaviors which received a “Yes” response by the greatest number of participants were “Discussed the issue calmly” ( $n = 125$  or 99.20%), and “Got information to backup his/her side of things” ( $n = 123$  or 98.30%). None of the respondents reported that their spouses had “Used a knife or gun on other person” ( $n = 0$  or 0.00%). Other behaviors that were reported to have been experienced least frequently were “Threatened with a knife or gun or other person” ( $n = 2$  or 1.46%), and “Beat up the other person” ( $n = 7$  or 5.6%). (See Table 31).

Table 31

Self-Reported Incidence of Partner Abuse as Victim during the Respondents' Lifetime for First Generation Korean-Americans

Item	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>
Used a knife or gun on other person	0	0.00	126	100.0	126	100
Threatened with a knife or gun on other person	2	1.60	124	98.40	126	100
Beat up the other person	7	5.60	119	94.40	126	100
Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist	11	8.70	115	91.30	126	100
Hit or tried to hit the other person with some objects	13	10.30	113	89.70	126	100
Slapped the other person	24	19.00	102	81.10	126	100
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other person	26	20.60	100	79.40	126	100
Threw something at the other person	35	27.80	91	72.20	126	100
Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	49	38.90	77	61.10	126	100
Brought in or tried to bring In someone to help settle on things	69	54.80	57	45.20	126	100
Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	80	64.00 <sup>b</sup>	45	36.00 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Cried	84	66.70	42	33.30	126	100
Did or said something to spite the other person	85	67.50	41	32.50	126	100

table continues

Item	<u>Yes</u>		<u>No</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>	<u>n</u>	<u>%<sup>a</sup></u>
Insulted or swore at the other person	99	79.20	26	20.80	126	100
Sulked and/or refused to talk about	115	92.00 <sup>b</sup>	10	8.00 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Got information to backup your side of things	123	98.40 <sup>b</sup>	2	1.60 <sup>b</sup>	125	100
Discussed the issue calmly	125	99.20	1	.80	126	100

<sup>a</sup>Percentage based on the total number of 126 respondents. 28 respondents did not respond due to their marital status of not living with someone during the past 12 months.

<sup>b</sup>Percentage based on the total number of 125 respondents. Additionally, there was one missing data.

#### Sub-Scale Means as Victim during the Respondents' Lifetime

To summarize the information regarding partner abuse as victim during the respondents' lifetime, mean scores of the three sub-scales, identified by factor analyses were computed. Out of a possible score of 3 for the Reasoning Tactics sub-scale, the mean was 2.51, or 83.67% (SD = .58). This indicates that across all respondents, 83.67% of the Reasoning Tactics behaviors were reported to have been used. Out of possible score of 5 for the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale, the mean was 3.67, or 73.40% (SD = 1.42). Therefore, among the study participants, 73.40% of the Verbal Aggression behaviors had been used as a perpetrator during their lifetime. Out of possible score of 9 for the Physical Violence Sub-scale, the mean

was 1.33, or 14.78% ( $SD = 2.08$ ) indicating that 14.78% of the Physical Violence behaviors had been used during their lifetime.

#### Objective Four

Objective four was to determine if a relationship existed between the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans and each of the following demographic characteristics: age, religion, and occupation. The scores for two of the three sub-scales of the Conflict Tactics Scale identified by Straus and confirmed with the data in this study were used to measure the incidence of partner abuse. The third Conflict Tactics Scale sub-scale was a Reasoning Tactics score. This sub-scale score was excluded from subsequent analyses that used partner abuse as an outcome measure. The basis for this decision was that while Reasoning Tactics is certainly an aspect of Conflict Tactics, it is not a component of partner abuse. Therefore, the examination of relationships between incidence of partner abuse and selected demographics to accomplish objective four of the study used only the Physical Violence and Verbal Aggression Sub-scale scores of the Conflict Tactics Scale.

#### Age

The relationship between the incidence of partner abuse and the demographic characteristic, age was measured using the Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. Each of the dimensions (as perpetrator and as victim) were examined, and within each of these dimensions, the sub-scale scores for the two confirmed sub-scales (Verbal Aggression and Physical Violence) as established by Straus were correlated with the self-reported age of the study participants. The

scores for the lifetime measurement of the two dimensions were not examined for relationships with the demographic characteristics due to the confounding nature of this measurement as discussed previously.

When the relationship between the partner abuse sub-scale scores were correlated with the age of respondents, significant relationships were found for each of the sub-scale scores within the perpetrator dimension. The strongest correlation was with the Physical Violence score ( $r = -.38, p < .001$ ). The nature of this association was such that first generation Korean-Americans who were younger tended to report a higher frequency of physical violence behaviors exhibited in the past 12 months. The Verbal Aggression Sub-scale score was also significantly related to the age of respondent ( $r = -.22, p = .02$ ), and the nature of the association was the same as for the Physical Violence score (see table 32). When the relationship between the partner abuse sub-scale scores were correlated with the age of respondents, no significant relationships were found for the sub-scale scores within the victim dimension.

### Religion

The second part of objective four was to determine if a relationship existed between the self-reported religion of the study participants and the incidence of partner abuse. The most appropriate statistical procedure for examining this relationship is the Cramer's V correlation coefficient since the variable, religion is a nominal variable that has more than two categories in the current study. However, examining this relationship using the Cramer's V procedure would require the presentation of accompanying contingency tables with the correlation coefficients in

Table 32

Relationship between the Incidence of Partner Abuse and Age of First Generation Korean-Americans

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Sub-Scale			
<u>Perpetrator</u>			
Physical Violence	126	-.38	< .001
Verbal Aggression	126	-.22	.02
<u>Victim</u>			
Physical Violence	126	.03	.71
Verbal Aggression	126	-.13	.14

order to make a meaningful interpretation of the data. Therefore, since the incidence of partner abuse sub-scale scores were measurements that were treated as interval data, the analysis of variance procedure was chosen to determine if differences existed in the incidence of partner abuse sub-scale scores (both as perpetrator and as victim) among the levels of religion.

When the sub-scales of the incidence of partner abuse as perpetrator were compared by levels of the variable religion, both the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale score ( $F_{4,121} = 7.15, p < .001$ ) and the Physical Violence Sub-scale score ( $F_{4,121} = 6.98, p < .001$ ) were found to be significantly different by religion (see Table 33).

Table 33

Comparison of Incidence of Partner Abuse Sub-Scale Scores by Categories of Religion among first Generation Korean-Americans

Dimension	Sub-Scale	df	F	p
<u>Perpetrator</u>				
	Verbal Aggression	4, 121	7.15	< .001
	Physical Violence	4, 121	6.98	< .001
<u>Victim</u>				
	Verbal Aggression	4, 121	7.68	< .001
	Physical Violence	4, 121	4.01	.004

Verbal Aggression as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months

To determine specifically which groups were significantly different on the Verbal Aggression score, the Tukey's Post Hoc Multiple Comparison test was used as a follow-up to each of the statistically significant analysis of variance tests.

Results of the Tukey's test for the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale score of the perpetrator dimension revealed that the Buddhists and Confucians had significantly higher Verbal Aggression Sub-scale scores than Protestants, but they were not different from one another nor were they different from Catholics. Table 34 provides the mean score of incidence of verbal aggression as perpetrator for the five religious groups and identifies the homogeneous sub-groups.

Table 34

Mean Scores of Incidence of Verbal Aggression as Perpetrator for the Five Religious Groups of First Generation Korean-Americans

Religion	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Protestant	68	1.52 <sup>a</sup>	1.13
Catholic	17	1.92 <sup>a,b</sup>	.86
Buddhism	28	2.56 <sup>b</sup>	1.08
Confucianism	10	2.86 <sup>b</sup>	.69
No religion	3	1.33 <sup>a,b</sup>	1.40
Total	126	1.91	1.16

Note.  $F_{(4,121)} = 7.15, p < .001.$

<sup>a,b</sup> Means not sharing a common superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$  (Tukey Test).

Physical Violence as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months

Results of the Tukey's test for the Physical Violence Sub-scale score as perpetrator indicated that the Buddhists and Confucians had significantly higher Physical Violence Sub-scale scores than Protestants, but they were not different from one another. Also Confucians had significantly higher Physical Violence scores than Catholics. Table 35 provides the mean scores of incidence of physical violence as perpetrator for the five religious groups and identifies the homogeneous sub-groups.

Table 35

Mean Scores of Incidence of Physical Violence as Perpetrator for the Five Religious Groups of First Generation Korean-Americans

Religion	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Protestant	68	.23 <sup>a</sup>	.48
Catholic	17	.32 <sup>a,c</sup>	.55
Buddhism	28	.80 <sup>b,c</sup>	1.03
Confucianism	10	1.19 <sup>b</sup>	.94
No religion	3	.00 <sup>a,b,c</sup>	.00
Total	126	.44	.75

Note.  $F_{(4,121)} = 6.98, p < .001$ .

<sup>a,b,c</sup> Means not sharing a common superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$  (Tukey Test).

When the sub-scales of the incidence of partner abuse as victim were compared by levels of the variable religion, both of the sub-scales, the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale ( $F_{4,121} = 7.68, p < .001$ ), and the Physical Violence Sub-scale ( $F_{4,121} = 4.01, p = .004$ ) were found to be significantly different by religion (see Table 33).

Verbal Aggression as Victim during the Past 12 Months

Results of the Tukey's test for the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale score as victim indicated that the groups reported as Buddhism and Confucianism experienced significantly more frequent verbal aggression than the group reported

as Protestants, but they were not different from one another nor from Catholics.

Table 36 provides the mean score of incidence of verbal aggression as victim for the five religious groups and identifies the homogeneous sub-groups.

Table 36

Mean Scores of Incidence of Verbal Aggression as Victim for the Five Religious Groups of First Generation Korean-Americans

Religion	<u>n</u>	m	<u>SD</u>
Protestant	68	1.47 <sup>a</sup>	1.23
Catholic	17	2.27 <sup>a,b</sup>	1.13
Buddhism	28	2.66 <sup>b</sup>	1.09
Confucianism	10	3.00 <sup>b</sup>	1.01
No religion	3	1.13 <sup>a,b</sup>	1.47
Total	126	1.91	1.16

Note.  $F_{(4,121)} = 7.68, p < .001.$

<sup>a,b</sup> Means not sharing a common superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$  (Tukey Test).

Physical Violence as Victim during the Past 12 Months

Results of the Tukey's test for the Physical Violence Sub-scale score as victim revealed that the religious groups that were significantly different from one another were Protestant and Buddhism. The group that identified their religion as Buddhism reported a significantly higher frequency ( $\underline{M} = .60$ ) of Physical Violence than the group who reported that their religion was Protestant ( $\underline{M} = .16$ ). (See Table 37).

Table 37

Mean Scores of Incidence of Physical Violence as Victim for the Five Religions of First Generation Korean-Americans

Religion	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Protestant	68	.16 <sup>a</sup>	.40
Catholic	17	.20 <sup>a,b</sup>	.38
Buddhism	28	.60 <sup>b</sup>	.73
Confucianism	10	.41 <sup>a,b</sup>	.53
No religion	3	.22 <sup>a,b</sup>	.19
Total	126	.28	.52

Note.  $F(4,121) = 4.01, p = .004.$

<sup>a,b</sup> Means not sharing a common superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$  (Tukey Test).

Occupation

The third part of objective four was to determine if a relationship existed between the self-reported occupation of the study participants and the incidence of partner abuse. To examine the relationship between the incidence of partner abuse and the occupation of the respondent, the researcher chose to use the oneway analysis of variance procedure to compare the incidence of partner abuse sub-scale scores by categories of the variable occupation. The rationale for this technique was the same as that for the variable religion since this technique would provide the reader with both a more interpretable and meaningful set of results for accomplishing this objective of the study. However, an examination of the data for

the variable, occupation revealed that there were insufficient subjects in some of the response categories (some had as few as two respondents) to make the comparisons meaningful. Therefore, the researcher determined that combining some categories to result in a smaller number of groups to be compared was both advisable and necessary. In combining the groups, reported occupations were combined to be consistent with occupational groupings as identified in the Occupational Outlook Handbook (2000). These combinations included the following: 1 – Unemployed; 2 – Labor consolidating the following response categories: Housewife, Manual work, Skilled work, and Clerical, Salesperson; 3 – Student; 4 – Professional consolidating the following response categories: Semi-professional, Manager, and Professional; and 5 – Self-employed.

When the sub-scales of the incidence of partner abuse as perpetrator were compared by levels of the variable occupation, both the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale score ( $F_{4,121} = 10.14, p < .001$ ) and the Physical Violence Sub-scale score ( $F_{4,121} = 5.39, p < .001$ ) were found to be significantly different (see Table 38).

#### Verbal Aggression as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months

To determine specifically which groups were significantly different, the Tukey's Post Hoc Multiple Comparison test was used as a follow-up to each of the statistically significant analysis of variance tests. Results of the Tukey's test for the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale score as perpetrator revealed that the unemployed, labor, and self-employed groups had significantly higher Verbal Aggression Sub-scale scores than the professional group, but they were not different from one another. Table 39 provides the mean score of incidence of verbal aggression as

perpetrator for the five categories of occupations and identifies the homogeneous sub-groups.

Table 38

Comparison of Incidence of Partner Abuse Sub-Scale Scores by Categories of Occupation among first Generation Korean-Americans

Dimension	Sub-Scale	df	F	p
<u>Perpetrator</u>				
	Verbal Aggression	4, 121	10.14	< .001
	Physical Violence	4, 121	5.39	< .001
<u>Victim</u>				
	Verbal Aggression	4, 121	10.02	< .001
	Physical Violence	4, 121	5.92	.004

Physical Violence as Perpetrator during the Past 12 Months

Results of the Tukey's test for the Physical Violence Sub-scale score as perpetrator revealed that the unemployed, and labor groups had significantly higher Physical Violence Sub-scale scores than the professional group, but they were not different from one another. Also, unemployed respondents had significantly higher Physical Violence scores than self-employed respondents. Table 40 provides the mean score of incidence of physical violence as perpetrator for the five occupations and identifies the homogeneous sub-groups.

When the sub-scales of the incidence of partner abuse as victim were compared by levels of the variable occupation, both of the sub-scales, the Verbal

Aggression Sub-scale score ( $F_{4,121} = 10.02, p < .001$ ) and the Physical Violence Sub-scale score ( $F_{4,121} = 5.92, p < .001$ ) were found to be significantly different by occupation (see Table 38).

Table 39

Mean Scores of Incidence of Verbal Aggression as Perpetrator for the Five Categories of Occupation of First Generation Korean-Americans

Occupation	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Unemployed	3	2.53 <sup>a</sup>	2.23
Labor	57	2.36 <sup>a</sup>	1.00
Student	6	1.83 <sup>a,b</sup>	1.04
Professional	19	.67 <sup>b</sup>	.85
Self-employed	3	1.81 <sup>a</sup>	1.03
Total	126	1.91	1.16

Note.  $F_{(4,121)} = 10.14, p < .001$ .

<sup>a,b</sup> Means not sharing a common superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$  (Tukey Test).

Verbal Aggression as Victim during the Past 12 Months

Results of Tukey’s test for the “Verbal Aggression” sub-scale scores as victim revealed that the labor, and self-employed groups experienced significantly more frequent verbal aggression than the professional group, and the labor group also experienced significantly more frequent verbal aggression than the self-employed group. Table 41 provides the mean score of incidence of verbal

aggression as victim for the five categories of occupations and identifies the homogeneous sub-groups.

Table 40

Mean Scores of Incidence of Physical Violence as Perpetrator for the Five Categories of Religions of First Generation Korean-Americans

Occupation	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Unemployed	3	1.71 <sup>a</sup>	1.90
Labor	57	.61 <sup>a,c</sup>	.80
Student	6	.44 <sup>a,b,c</sup>	.65
Professional	19	.03 <sup>b</sup>	.09
Self-employed	3	.30 <sup>b,c</sup>	.59
Total	126	.44	.75

Note.  $F_{(4,121)} = 5.39, p < .001.$

<sup>a,b,c</sup> Means not sharing a common superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$  (Tukey Test).

Physical Violence as Victim during the Past 12 Months

Results of the Tukey's test for the Physical Violence Sub-scale score as victim revealed that the unemployed, and labor groups experienced significantly more frequent physical violence than the professional group, but they were not different from one another. Also, the labor group experienced significantly more frequent physical violence than the self-employed group. Table 42 provides the mean score of incidence of physical violence as victim for the five occupations and identifies the homogeneous sub-groups.

Table 41

Mean Scores of Incidence of Verbal Aggression as Victim for the Five Categories of Occupation of First Generation Korean-Americans

Occupation	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Unemployed	3	2.00 <sup>abc</sup>	1.78
Labor	57	2.54 <sup>a</sup>	1.17
Student	6	1.97 <sup>abc</sup>	1.02
Professional	19	.63 <sup>b</sup>	.84
Self-employed	41	1.76 <sup>c</sup>	1.27
Total	126	1.96	1.33

Note.  $F_{(4,121)} = 10.02, p < .001$ .

<sup>a,b,c</sup> Means not sharing a common superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$  (Tukey Test).

Based on previous research findings, the following objectives were written in the form of research hypotheses:

Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis of the study was that among first generation Korean-Americans, males will report higher levels of partner abuse as the perpetrator than will females. Additionally, females will report higher levels of partner abuse as the victim than will males. The independent t-test (one-tail) procedure was determined to be the most appropriate analysis technique to accomplish this objective. Each of the two sub-scale scores within each of the two dimensions (perpetrator and victim) was compared by categories of the variable gender using this procedure. The one-

Table 42

Mean Scores of Incidence of Physical Violence as Victim for the Five categories of Occupation of First Generation Korean-Americans

Occupation	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Unemployed	3	.93 <sup>a,b,d</sup>	1.51
Labor	57	.47 <sup>a,b</sup>	.61
Student	6	.09 <sup>a,b,c,d</sup>	.23
Professional	19	.14 <sup>c</sup>	.29
Self-employed	3	.28 <sup>c,d</sup>	.52
Total	126	.44	.75

Note.  $F_{(4,121)} = 5.92, p < .001.$

<sup>a,b,c,d</sup> Means not sharing a common superscript are significantly different at  $p < .05$  (Tukey Test).

tailed test was used since the objective was stated as a directional hypothesis. When the male and female sub-scale scores of the perpetrator dimension were compared, one of the two scores was found be significantly different. For the Physical Violence Sub-scale score, the male respondents had a mean incidence score of 0.69 ( $SD = 0.89$ ) and the female respondents had a mean incidence score of 0.12 ( $SD = 0.29$ ). Therefore, the male respondents in the study reported more frequent use of the behaviors included in the Physical Violence aspect of partner abuse than the female respondents ( $t_{124} = 4.58, p < .001$ ). Male and female respondents were not found to have significantly different scores on the Verbal Aggression aspect of the perpetrator dimension. (see Table 43). Therefore, hypothesis one was supported by

the data in this study in that males were found to have a higher level of the incidence of partner abuse (on the Physical Violence component ) than females.

Table 43

Comparison of Mean Item Differences by Genders

<u>Dimension</u> Sub-Scale	Female <u>M / SD</u>	Male <u>M / SD</u>	Diff.	<u>t</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Perpetrator</u>					
Verbal Aggression	1.77 / 1.10	2.01 / 1.21	.24	1.15	.25
Physical Violence	.12 / .29	.69 / .89	.57	4.58	< .001
<u>Victim</u>					
Verbal Aggression	1.67 / 1.31	2.18 / 1.30	.51	2.16	.03
Physical Violence	.51 / .65	.11 / .30	-.40	-4.60	< .001

When the two sub-scale scores of the victim dimension of partner abuse were compared by categories of the variable gender, the hypothesized difference which indicated that females would report significantly higher levels of partner abuse as a victim than men was partially supported by the data. Women reported having experienced the behaviors in the Physical Violence aspect of the victim dimension significantly more frequently than men ( $t_{124} = 4.60, p < .001$ ). However, the Verbal Aggression component of the victim dimension was reported to have been experienced more frequently as victims by men than they were by women (see Table 43). Therefore, men indicated that they had experienced the behaviors associated with Verbal Aggression as a victim significantly more frequently than

women ( $t_{124} = 2.16, p = .03$ ). This does not support the differences proposed in hypothesis one. Two of the findings (females had higher Physical Violence score as a victim and males had higher Physical Violence score as a perpetrator) supported the first hypothesis of the study, and one finding was (males had higher Verbal Aggression scores as a victim) was contradictory to the hypothesis.

### Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis of the study was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between household income and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with lower levels of income will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse both as perpetrator and victim. To accomplish this objective, the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between the reported household income and each of the two sub-scale scores within each of the two dimensions (perpetrator and victim).

When the household income reported by respondents was correlated with the sub-scale scores, all calculated associations were found to be significant. In the dimension of perpetrator, the relationship between the reported household income and the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale score indicated a low negative association ( $r = -.29, p = .001$ ) (Davis, 1971). Also the relationship between the reported household income and the Physical Violence sub-scale score indicated a low negative association ( $r = -.29, p = .001$ ) (Davis, 1971). In the dimension of victim, both of the examined sub-scale scores were found to be significantly related to the income level of respondents. The Verbal Aggression Sub-scale score had the highest relationship with income level ( $r = -.30, p < .001$ ). This relationship as

characterized by Davis' descriptors was a moderate association (Davis, 1971). (See Table 44). The Physical Violence Sub-scale score was also negatively related to income ( $r = -.19$ ,  $p = .02$ ), however it was classified as a low correlation. Therefore, hypothesis two was supported by the data in this study in that respondents with lower levels of income tended to report higher levels of partner abuse.

Table 44

Relationship between Household Income and Partner Abuse for First Generation Korean-Americans

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Sub-Scale			
<u>Perpetrator</u>			
Verbal Aggression	121	-.29	.001
Physical Violence	121	-.29	.001
<u>Victim</u>			
Verbal Aggression	121	-.30	< .001
Physical Violence	121	-.19	.02

Note. One-tailed  $p$  values.

Hypothesis Three

The third hypothesis of the study was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between the highest level of education completed and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with lower levels of education completed will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse both as perpetrator and victim. To accomplish this objective the Kendall's

Tau correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between the reported level of education completed and each of the sub-scale scores within each of the two dimensions (perpetrator and victim).

When the highest level of education completed by respondents was correlated with the sub-scale scores in the perpetrator dimension of incidence of partner abuse, both of the sub-scales were found to be significantly correlated with education level. The correlation between level of education and Verbal Aggression as a perpetrator was found to be  $r = -.57$  ( $p < .001$ ). The nature of this association was such that individuals with higher levels of education tended to report a lower incidence of Verbal Aggression as a perpetrator. The correlation between level of education and Physical Violence as a perpetrator was  $r = -.46$  ( $p < .001$ ) which indicated that individuals with higher levels of education also tended to report a lower incidence of Physical Violence as a perpetrator. Using Davis' conventions for describing relationships, the correlation between education and Verbal Aggression was described as a substantial association and the correlation with Physical Violence was described as moderate. (see Table 45).

Examination of the correlation between level of education completed and the incidence of partner abuse sub-scale scores in the victim dimension revealed similar results to those found with the perpetrator dimension scores. The highest correlation was between level of education and Verbal Aggression as a victim ( $r = -.54$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The nature of this association was such that individuals with higher levels of education tended to have experienced a lower incidence of Verbal Aggression as a victim. The correlation between level of education and Physical

Violence as a victim was  $r = -.29$  ( $p = .001$ ) which indicates that individuals with higher levels of education also tended to have experienced a lower incidence of Physical Violence as a victim. Using Davis' conventions for describing relationships, the correlation between education and Verbal Aggression was described as a substantial association and the correlation with Physical Violence was described as low (see Table 45). Therefore, hypothesis three was supported by the data in this study.

Table 45

Relationship between Highest Education Completed and Partner Abuse for First Generation Korean-Americans

<u>Dimension</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Sub-Scale			
<u>Perpetrator</u>			
Verbal Aggression	126	-.57	< .001
Physical Violence	126	-.46	< .001
<u>Victim</u>			
Verbal Aggression	126	-.54	< .001
Physical Violence	126	-.29	.001

Note. One-tailed  $p$  values.

Hypothesis Four

The fourth hypothesis of the study was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between length of residence in the United States and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with fewer years

in the United States will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse both as perpetrator and victim. To accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between the reported years of residence in the United States and each of the two sub-scale scores within each of the two dimensions (perpetrator and victim).

When the years of residence in the United States reported by respondents was correlated with the sub-scale scores, all of the examined correlations were statistically significant. In the dimension of perpetrator, the relationship between the reported years of residence in the United States, and the sub-scales, Verbal Aggression ( $r = -.38, p < .001$ ) and Physical Violence ( $r = -.44, p < .001$ ) indicated a moderate association (see Table 46). In the dimension of victim, the relationship between the reported years of residence in the United States and sub-scales, Verbal Aggression ( $r = -.36, p < .001$ ) and Physical Violence ( $r = -.19, p = .02$ ) indicated from a low to moderate association (see Table 46). The nature of each of these significant relationships was such that fewer years of residence in the United States was associated with a higher incidence of partner abuse. Therefore, hypothesis four was supported by the data in this study.

#### Hypothesis Five

The fifth hypothesis of the study was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between the perceptions regarding the definitions of domestic violence as measured by the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who hold broader perceptions regarding the interactions that are

Table 46

Relationship between Years of Residence in the United States and Partner Abuse for First Generation Korean-Americans

<u>Dimension</u>		<u>n</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
Sub-Scale				
<u>Perpetrator</u>				
Verbal Aggression		126	-.38	< .001
Physical Violence		126	-.44	< .001
<u>Victim</u>				
Verbal Aggression		126	-.36	< .001
Physical Violence		126	-.19	.02

Note. One-tailed *p* values.

included in domestic violence will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse both as perpetrator and as victim while the individuals who hold narrower perceptions regarding the interactions included in domestic violence will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim.. To accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between each of the sub-scale scores derived from the responses to the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Physical Aggression and Psychological Aggression) and each of the two sub-scale scores of incidence of partner abuse within each of the two dimensions (perpetrator and victim).

When the Physical Aggression sub-scale score of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the sub-scale scores of the

incidence of partner abuse scale in the perpetrator dimension, the highest correlation was found with the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse ( $r = -.70, p < .001$ ). (See Table 47). This relationship as characterized by Davis'

Table 47

Relationship between Definitions of Domestic Violence Sub-Scale Scores and Incidence of Partner Abuse Sub-Scale Scores

Incidences of Partner Abuse Sub-Scales	<u>Definitions of Domestic Violence</u>			
	Physical Aggression		Psychological Aggression	
	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Perpetrator</u>				
Verbal Aggression	-.62	< .001	-.59	< .001
Physical Violence	-.70	< .001	-.58	< .001
<u>Victim</u>				
Verbal Aggression	-.58	< .001	-.58	< .001
Physical Violence	-.16	.04	-.22	.007

Note. One-tailed  $p$  values.

Note. The number of subjects included in the calculation of each correlation was 126.

descriptors was a very strong association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who held narrower definitions of Physical Aggression (lower scores on the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to have higher scores on the incidence of Physical Violence as a perpetrator

in partner abuse. The correlation between the Physical Aggression Sub-scale score of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse in the perpetrator dimension was  $r = -.62$  ( $p < .001$ ) which indicated that individuals who held narrower definitions of Physical Aggression (lower scores on the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to have higher scores on the incidence of “Verbal Aggression” as a perpetrator in partner abuse. This relationship as characterized by Davis’ descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). (See Table 47).

When the Psychological Aggression Sub-scale score of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in the perpetrator dimension, both of the correlations were found to be significant. The correlation between the Psychological Aggression Sub-scale scores of the Definition of Domestic Violence Scale and the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse as a perpetrator was  $r = -.59$  ( $p < .001$ ). (See Table 47). This relationship as characterized by Davis’ descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who held narrower definitions of Psychological Aggression (lower scores on the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to have higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a perpetrator in partner abuse. The correlation between the Psychological Aggression Sub-scale score of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the Physical Violence sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse in the perpetrator dimension was  $r = -.58$  ( $p < .001$ ) which indicated that individuals

who held narrower definitions of Psychological Aggression (lower scores on the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to have higher scores in the incidence of Physical Violence as a perpetrator in partner abuse. This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). (See Table 47).

When the Physical Aggression Sub-scale score of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse in the victim dimension, the highest correlation was found with the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse ( $r = -.58, p < .001$ ). (See Table 47). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who held narrower definitions of Physical Aggression (lower scores on the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to have higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a victim in partner abuse. The correlation between the Physical Aggression Sub-scale score of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse in the victim dimension was  $r = -.16$  ( $p = .04$ ) which indicated that individuals who held narrower definitions of Physical Aggression (lower scores on the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to have higher scores on the incidence of Physical Violence as a victim in partner abuse. This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a low association (Davis, 1971). (See Table 47).

When the Psychological Aggression Sub-scale score of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse in the victim dimension, both of the calculated correlation coefficients were found to be significant. The correlation between the Psychological Aggression Sub-scale score of the Definitions of Domestic Violence and the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse in the victim dimension was  $r = -.58$  ( $p < .001$ ). (See Table 47). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who held narrower definitions of Psychological Aggression (lower scores on the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to have higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a victim in partner abuse. The correlation between the Psychological Aggression Sub-scale score of the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse in the victim dimension was  $r = -.22$  ( $p = .007$ ) which indicated that individuals who held narrower definitions of Psychological Aggression (lower scores on the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to have higher scores on the incidence of Physical Violence as a victim in partner abuse. This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a low association (Davis, 1971). (See Table 47). Based on the significant negative associations between each of the aspects of Definitions of Domestic Violence and all measures of the incidence of partner abuse, hypothesis five was supported by the data in this study.

### Hypothesis Six

The sixth hypothesis was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the sanction of the use of violence as measured by the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised and the incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who sanction the use of violence to a greater degree will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim while the individuals who sanction the use of violence to a lesser degree will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim. To accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between the single sub-scale score derived from the responses to the Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and each of the two sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse within each of the two dimensions (perpetrator and victim).

When the Sanctioning the Use of Domestic Violence Sub-scale score was correlated with the sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in the perpetrator dimension, both of the sub-scales were found to be significantly correlated. The correlation between the Sanctioning the Use of Domestic Violence Sub-scale score and the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse was  $r = .61$  ( $p < .001$ ). (See Table 48). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who sanctioned the use of violence to a greater degree (higher scores on the Sanctioning the Use of Domestic Violence Sub-scale) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a

Table 48

Relationship between the Sanction of the Use of Domestic Violence Scores and Incidence of Partner Abuse Sub-Scale Scores

Incidences of Partner Abuse Sub-Scales	<u>Sanction of the Use of Domestic Violence</u>	
	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Perpetrator</u>		
Verbal Aggression	.61	< .001
Physical Violence	.63	< .001
<u>Victim</u>		
Verbal Aggression	.52	< .001
Physical Violence	.07	.23

Note. One-tailed p values.

Note. The number of subjects included in the calculation of each correlation was 126.

perpetrator in partner abuse. The correlation between the Sanctioning the Use of Domestic Violence Sub-scale score and the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse was  $r = .63$  ( $p < .001$ ). (See Table 48). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who sanction the use of violence to a greater degree (higher scores on the Sanctioning the Use of Domestic Violence Sub-scale) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Physical Violence as a perpetrator in partner abuse.

When the Sanctioning the Use of Domestic Violence Sub-scale score was correlated with the sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in the victim dimension, the correlation with the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale was found to be significant ( $r = .52$  ( $p < .001$ )). (See Table 48). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who sanctioned the use of violence to a greater degree (higher scores on the Sanctioning the Use of Domestic Violence sub-scale) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a victim in partner abuse. The correlation between the Sanctioning the Use of Domestic Violence Sub-scale score and Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse in the victim dimension was found to be non-significant. ( $r = .07$ ,  $p = .23$ ). (See Table 48). Based on three of the four examined relationships being significant, hypothesis six was supported by the data in this study.

#### Hypothesis Seven

The seventh hypothesis of the study was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the attitudes toward the causes of domestic violence as measured by the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who indicate a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim while the individuals who indicate a narrower range of potential causes of domestic violence will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim. To

accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between each of the sub-scale scores derived from the responses to the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Individual Causes, Environmental Causes, and Structural/Cultural Causes of Domestic Violence), and each of the two sub-scale scores within each of the two dimensions (perpetrator and victim) of the incidence of partner abuse.

When the Individual Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the two sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in the perpetrator dimension, both of the calculated relationships were found to be significant. The correlation between the Individual Causes Sub-scale score and the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse as a perpetrator was  $r = .33$  ( $p < .001$ ). (See Table 49). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a moderate association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who indicated a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence (higher scores on the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a perpetrator in partner abuse. The correlation between the Individual Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse in the perpetrator dimension was  $r = .34$  ( $p < .001$ ) which indicated that individuals who indicated a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence (higher scores on the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Physical Violence as a

Table 49

Relationship between the Causes of Domestic Violence Sub-Scale Scores and Incidence of Partner Abuse Sub-Scale Scores

Incidences of Partner Abuse Sub-Scales	<u>Causes of Domestic Violence</u>					
	Individual Causes		Environmental Causes		Structural/ Cultural Causes	
	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Perpetrator</u>						
Verbal Aggression	.33	< .001	.27	.001	.23	.01
Physical Violence	.34	< .001	.34	< .001	.19	.02
<u>Victim</u>						
Verbal Aggression	.34	< .001	.20	.01	.15	.052
Physical Violence	.08	.20	.01	.44	.02	.40

Note. One-tailed p values.

Note. The number of subjects included in the calculation of each correlation was 126.

perpetrator in partner abuse. This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a moderate association (Davis, 1971). (See Table 49).

When the Environmental Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the two sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale (perpetrator dimension), both of the calculated correlations were found to be significant. The correlation between the

Environmental Causes Sub-scale score and the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse as a perpetrator was  $r = .27$  ( $p = .001$ ). (See Table 49). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a low association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who indicated a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence (higher scores on the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a perpetrator in partner abuse. The correlation between the Environmental Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse (perpetrator dimension) was  $r = .34$  ( $p < .001$ ) which indicated that individuals who indicated a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence (higher scores on the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Physical Violence as a perpetrator in partner abuse. This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a moderate association (Davis, 1971). (See Table 49).

When the Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the two sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in the perpetrator dimension, both of the calculated correlations were found to be significant. The correlation between the Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-scale score and the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse was  $r = .23$  ( $p = .01$ ). (See Table 49). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a low association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who indicated a

wider range of potential causes of domestic violence (higher scores on the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a perpetrator in partner abuse. The correlation between Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse (perpetrator dimension) was  $r = .19$  ( $p = .02$ ) which indicated that individuals who indicated a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence (higher scores on the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Physical Violence as a perpetrator in partner abuse. This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a moderate association (Davis, 1971). (See Table 49).

When the Individual Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the two sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in victim dimension, the highest correlation was found with the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse ( $r = .34$  ( $p < .001$ )). (See Table 49). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a moderate association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who indicated a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence (higher scores on the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a victim in partner abuse. The correlation between the Individual Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the Physical

Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse (victim dimension) was found to be statistically non-significant ( $r = .08$ ,  $p = .20$ ). (See Table 49).

When the Environmental Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the two sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in the victim dimension, the highest correlation was found with the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse ( $r = .20$  ( $p = .01$ )). (See Table 49). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a low association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who indicated a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence (higher scores on the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a victim in partner abuse. The correlation between the Environmental Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised and the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse (victim dimension) was found to be statistically non-significant ( $r = .01$ ,  $p = .44$ ).

When the Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-scale score of the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was correlated with the two sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in the victim dimension, both of the calculated correlations were found to be non-significant. (See Table 49).

Based on the finding that 8 of the 12 examined relationships were significant and supported the hypothesis and that the 4 non-significant relationships were in the direction of the hypothesized relationships, this hypothesis was supported by the data in this study.

### Hypothesis Eight

The eighth hypothesis was that among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the level of contextual justification of domestic violence as measured by the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who accept a wider range of contextual justification will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim while the individuals who accept a narrower range of contextual justification will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as perpetrator and as victim. To accomplish this objective the Pearson's Product-Moment correlation coefficient (one-tail) was calculated between the single sub-scale score derived from the responses to the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and each of the two sub-scale scores within each of the two dimensions (perpetrator and victim).

When the Contextual Justification score was correlated with the two sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in perpetrator dimension, both of the calculated correlations were found to be significant. The correlation between the Contextual Justification Sub-scale score and the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse (perpetrator dimension) was  $r = .64$  ( $p < .001$ ). (See Table 50). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who accepted a wider range of Contextual Justification of domestic violence (higher scores on the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a perpetrator in

partner abuse. The correlation between the Contextual Justification Sub-scale score and the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse (perpetrator dimension) was  $r = .65$  ( $p < .001$ ). (See Table 50). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971).

Table 50

Relationship between the Contextual Justification of Domestic Violence Scores and Incidence of Partner Abuse Sub-Scale Scores

Incidences of Partner Abuse Sub-Scales	<u>Contextual Justification of Domestic Violence</u>	
	<u>r</u>	<u>p</u>
<u>Perpetrator</u>		
Verbal Aggression	.64	< .001
Physical Violence	.65	< .001
<u>Victim</u>		
Verbal Aggression	.58	< .001
Physical Violence	.15	.046

Note. One-tailed  $p$  values.

Note. The number of subjects included in the calculation of each correlation was 126.

The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who accepted a wider range of Contextual Justification (higher scores on the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Physical Violence in partner abuse.

When the Contextual Justification score was correlated with the two sub-scale scores of the incidence of partner abuse scale in victim dimension, the highest correlation was found with the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse ( $r = .58$ ,  $p < .001$ ). (See Table 50). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a substantial association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who accepted a wider range of Contextual Justification (higher scores on the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Verbal Aggression as a victim in partner abuse. The correlation between the Contextual Justification Sub-scale score and the Physical Violence Sub-scale of the incidence of partner abuse (victim dimension) was  $r = .15$  ( $p = .046$ ). (See Table 50). This relationship as characterized by Davis' descriptors was a low association (Davis, 1971). The nature of this relationship was such that individuals who accepted a wider range of Contextual Justification (higher scores on the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised) tended to report higher scores on the incidence of Physical Violence as a victim in partner abuse. Therefore, hypothesis eight was supported by the data in this study.

#### Hypothesis Nine

The ninth hypothesis of the study was that a model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans. To accomplish this objective Multiple Regression Analysis was used with each of the Incidence of Partner Abuse Sub-scale scores used as dependent variables in a separate analysis, and the specified groups of independent variables used in the order hypothesized.

### Verbal Aggression in Perpetrator Dimension

The perpetrator dimension of partner abuse was examined first with each of the sub-scale scores analyzed as dependent variables in separate regression analyses. The first score examined was the Verbal Aggression score of the perpetrator dimension. The hypothesis established that groups of variables would contribute to the explanatory model in a hierarchical manner. The first block of variables hypothesized to contribute to this model included the four scales of the Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Domestic Violence instrument initially developed by Yick (1997), and adapted for use in this study. The four scales were the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale (including the Psychological Aggression and Physical Aggression Sub-scale score); the Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale (reduced to a single scale score); Attitudes toward the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale (including the Individual Factors, Environmental Factors, and Structural/Cultural Factors Sub-scale scores); and the Perceptions of Contextual Justification Scale (reduced to a single scale score). Therefore, a total of seven perceptual measures were entered into the regression model as the first block of hypothesized explanatory factors.

When this block of variables was entered into the regression analysis, the test of significance for its contribution to the explanatory model was statistically significant ( $F_{7,113} = 13.53, p < .001$ ). This block of variables had a Multiple  $R$  value of .675 with an  $r^2$  of .456 indicating that this group of variables enabled the researcher to explain 45.6% of the variability in the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale

score of the perpetrator dimension of partner abuse (see Table 51). Therefore, this component of hypothesis nine was supported by the data in the study.

Table 51

Analysis of Variance of the Verbal Aggression as Perpetrator by the selected perceptual and demographic measures for the First Generation Korean-Americans

Model	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Regression	17	5.58	8.45	< .001
Residual	103	.66		
Total	120			

Variables in the Equation

Variable	R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> change	F change	p	Beta
<u>Perceptual block</u>	.675	.456	.456	13.53	< .001	
Contextual justification						-.322
Physical definition of domestic violence						-.221
Cultural factor for causes of domestic violence						-.220
Psychological definition of domestic violence						-.112

table continues

Variable	R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> change	F change	p	Beta
Individual factor for causes of domestic violence						.107
Environmental factor for causes of domestic violence						.085
Attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence						-.067
<u>Demographic block</u>	.744	.553	.097	2.853	.007	
Education: High school diploma <sup>a</sup>						.250
Education: Less than high school <sup>f</sup>						.208
Household income						.097
Education: Associate degree <sup>a</sup>						.092
Gender						.086
Education: Ph.D. degree <sup>a</sup>						-.048
Years of residence in the U.S.						-.024
Education: Master's degree <sup>a</sup>						.003
<u>Occupation:</u> <u>Professional<sup>a</sup></u>	.756	.572	.019	4.501	.036	-.207

table continues

Variable	R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> change	F change	p	Beta
<u>Religion:</u> <u>Buddhism<sup>a</sup></u>	.763	.582	.011	2.63	.108	.115

<sup>a</sup> Each of these variables is a dichotomous variable constructed from the original measurement such that 1 = The presence of the characteristic and 0 = the absence of the characteristic.

The second block of variables hypothesized to make a contribution to the explanatory model was a group of demographic variables including gender, household income, education level, and the years of residence in the United States. Since the variable, education level was measured in categories, each of the levels of measurement of the variable was established as a dichotomous variable using a dummy coding procedure. For example, the response category of less than high school was coded such that each respondent received a value for this variable. Codes used were “1”, if they responded less than high school as their highest level of education and “0”, if they did not report less than high school as their highest level of education. The same procedure was used for each of the other possible education level measurements. Since the use of all of the newly formed variables would create perfect collinearity among the independent variables in the analysis, one of the dichotomous variables was omitted from the analysis.

When this block of variables was entered into the model, it was found to make a significant contribution to the model as hypothesized. The Multiple R increased to .744, and the r<sup>2</sup> change for this block of variables was .097 indicating that this group of demographic characteristics collectively added 9.7% to the total

amount of explained variance. This  $r^2$  change was determined to be a statistically significant increase in the explained variance ( $F_{\text{change}} = 2.853, p = .007$ ). Therefore this component of hypothesis nine was supported by the data (see Table 51).

The next step in completing the analysis for the component of hypothesis nine was to enter the remaining demographic characteristics studied in the research into the model using a stepwise analysis procedure. Since the remaining variables did not have adequate substantiation in the literature to warrant a hypothesized contribution, the variables were allowed to enter if they made a contribution to the model. A contribution to the model was defined by the researcher as the addition of 1% or more of explained variance with the overall model remaining statistically significant. When this analysis was conducted, two variables were found to contribute to the model. These variables were “Whether or not the individual indicated that their occupation was professional” and “Whether or not the individual indicated that their religion was Buddhism.” These variables added 1.9% and 1.1% respectively to the model. Even though the individual contribution of the last variable entered (whether or not their religion was Buddhism) was not statistically significant, it was retained in the model since it added 1.1% of explained variance and the overall model remained significant (see Table 51).

#### Physical Violence in Perpetrator Dimension

The second score examined was the Physical Violence score of the perpetrator dimension. When the first block of perceptual measures was entered into the regression analysis, the test of significance for its contribution to the explanatory model was statistically significant ( $F_{7,113} = 17.91, p < .001$ ). This

block of variables had a Multiple  $R$  value of .725 with an  $r^2$  of .526 indicating that this group of variables enabled the researcher to explain 52.6% of the variability in the “Physical Violence” Sub-scale score of the perpetrator dimension of partner abuse (see Table 52). Therefore, this component of hypothesis nine was supported by the data in this study.

Table 52

Analysis of Variance of the Physical Violence as Perpetrator by the Selected Perceptual and Demographic Measures for the First Generation Korean-Americans

Model	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Regression	17	2.46	9.84	< .001
Residual	103	.25		
Total	120			

Variables in the Equation

Variable	<u>R</u>	<u>R<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>R<sup>2</sup></u> change	<u>F</u> change	<u>p</u>	Beta
<u>Perceptual block</u>	.725	.526	.526	17.913	< .001	
Physical definition of domestic violence						.695
Psychological definition of domestic violence						-.320
Contextual Justification						-.268

table continues

Variable	<u>R</u>	<u>R</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>R</u> <sup>2</sup> change	<u>F</u> change	<u>p</u>	Beta
Individual factor for causes of domestic violence						.227
Attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence						.173
Environmental factor for causes of domestic violence						-.154
Cultural factor for causes of domestic violence						.097
<u>Demographic block</u>	.765	.585	.059	1.88	.070	
Gender						-.180
High school diploma						.145
Less than high school						.118
Household income						-.053
Years of residence in the U.S.						.039
Associate degree						-.012
Ph.D. degree						.009
Master's degree						-.003
<u>Age</u>	.780	.609	.023	6.214	.014	-.211
<u>Unemployed</u>	.787	.619	.010	2.699	.103	.131

The second block of variables hypothesized to make a contribution to the explanatory model was a group of demographic variables including gender, household income, education level, and the years of residence in the United States. When this block was entered into the model, it was found to make a significant contribution to the model as hypothesized. The Multiple  $R$  increased to .765, and the  $r^2$  change for this block of variables was .059 indicating that this group of demographic characteristics collectively added 5.9% to the total amount of explained variance. Therefore this component of hypothesis nine was supported by the data (see Table 52).

The next step in completing the analysis for this component of hypothesis nine was to enter the remaining demographic characteristics studied in this research into the model using a stepwise analysis procedure. When this analysis was conducted, two variables were found to contribute to the model. These variables were “Age of the respondent” and “Whether or not the individual indicated that they were unemployed.” These variables added 2.3% and 1.0% respectively to the model. Even though the individual contribution of the last variable entered was not statistically significant, it was retained in the model since it added 1% of explained variance to the model and the overall model remained significant.

#### Verbal Aggression in Victim Dimension

The third score examined was the Verbal Aggression score of the victim dimension. When the first block of perceptual measures was entered into the regression analysis, the test of significance for its contribution to the explanatory model was statistically significant ( $F_{7,113} = 10.82, p < .001$ ). This block of variables

had a Multiple  $R$  value of .634 with an  $r^2$  of .401 indicating that this group of variables enabled the researcher to explain 40.1% of the variability in the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale score of the victim dimension of partner abuse (see Table 53). Therefore, this component of hypothesis nine was supported by the data in this study.

Table 53

Analysis of Variance of the Verbal Aggression as Victim by the Selected Perceptual and Demographic Measures for the First Generation Korean-Americans

Model	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Regression	16	7.204	7.667	< .001
Residual	104	.940		
Total	120			

Variables in the Equation

Variable	R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> change	F change	p	Beta
<u>Perceptual block</u>	.634	.401	.401	10.822	< .001	
Contextual justification						-.301
Physical definition of domestic violence						.180
Cultural factor for causes of domestic violence						-.108

table continues

Variable	R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> change	F change	p	Beta
Attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence						.089
Psychological definition of domestic violence						.073
Individual factor for causes of domestic violence						.073
Environmental factor for causes of domestic violence						.030
<u>Demographic block</u>	.727	.529	.127	3.543	< .001	
High school diploma						.324
Associate degree						.306
Less than high school						.115
Master's degree						.052
Gender						-.043
Ph.D. degree						-.035
Years of residence in the U.S.						.006
Household income						-.004
<u>Professional</u>	.736	.541	.013	2.859	.094	-.166

The second block of variables hypothesized to make a contribution to the explanatory model was a group of demographic variables including gender,

household income, education level, and the years of residence in the United States. When this block was entered into the model, it was found to make a significant contribution to the model as hypothesized. The Multiple  $R$  increased to .727, and the  $r^2$  change for this block of variables was .127 indicating that this group of demographic characteristics collectively added 12.7% to the total amount of explained variance. This  $r^2$  change was determined to be a statistically significant increase in the explained variance ( $F_{\text{change}} = 3.543, p < .001$ ). Therefore this component of hypothesis nine was supported by the data (see Table 53).

The next step in completing the analysis for this component of hypothesis nine was to enter the remaining demographic characteristics studied in this research into the model using a stepwise analysis procedure. When this analysis was conducted, one variable was found to contribute to the model. This variable was “Whether or not the individual indicated that their occupation was professional” This variable added 1.3% to the model, and even though its individual contribution was not statistically significant, it was retained in the model since it contributed more than 1% to the model and the overall model remained significant.

#### Physical Violence in Victim Dimension

The fourth score examined was the “Physical Violence” score of the victim dimension. When the first block of perceptual measures was entered into the regression analysis, the test of significance for its contribution to the explanatory model was statistically significant ( $F_{7,113} = 2.145, p = .044$ ). This block of variables had a Multiple  $R$  value of .342 with an  $r^2$  of .117 indicating that this group of variables enabled the researcher to explain 11.7% of the variability in the Physical

Violence Sub-scale score of the perpetrator dimension of partner abuse (see Table 54). Therefore, this component of hypothesis nine was supported by the data in this study.

Table 54

Analysis of Variance of the Physical Violence as Victim by the Selected Perceptual and Demographic Measures for the First Generation Korean-Americans

Model	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Regression	17	.997	5.969	< .001
Residual	103	.167		
Total	120			

Variables in the Equation

Variable	<u>R</u>	<u>R<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>R<sup>2</sup></u> change	<u>F</u> change	<u>p</u>	Beta
<u>Perceptual block</u>	.342	.117	.117	2.145	.044	
Attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence						.507
Physical definition of domestic violence						.414
Psychological definition of domestic violence						.274
Cultural factor for causes of domestic violence						-.087

table continues

Variable	<u>R</u>	<u>R<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>R<sup>2</sup></u> change	<u>F</u> change	p	Beta
Environmental factor for causes of domestic violence						.051
Individual factor for causes of domestic violence						-.017
Contextual justification						-.013
<u>Demographic block</u>	.676	.457	.340	8.228	< .001	
Gender						.576
Years of residence in the U.S.						-.308
High school diploma						.230
Associate degree						.193
Ph.D. degree						.120
Household income						.115
Master's degree						.098
Less than high school						.063
<u>Protestant</u>	.696	.485	.028	5.577	.020	-.208
<u>Age</u>	.704	.496	.011	2.295	.133	.155

The second block of variables hypothesized to make a contribution to the explanatory model was a group of demographic variables including gender, household income, education level, and the years of residence in the United States.

When this block of variables was entered into the model, it was found to make a significant contribution to the model as hypothesized. The Multiple  $R$  increased to .676, and the  $r^2$  change for this block of variables was .340 indicating that this group of demographic characteristics collectively added 34% to the total amount of explained variance. This  $r^2$  change was determined to be a statistically significant increase in the explained variance ( $F_{\text{change}} = 8.228, p < .001$ ). Therefore this component of hypothesis nine was supported by the data (see Table 54).

The next step in completing the analysis for this component of hypothesis nine was to enter the remaining demographic characteristics studied in this research into the model using a stepwise analysis procedure. When this analysis was conducted, two variables were found to contribute to the model. These variables were “Whether or not the individual indicated that their religion was Protestant” and “Age of the respondent.” These variables added 2.8% and 1.1% respectively to the model. Even though the individual contribution of the last of these variables (age) was not statistically significant, it was retained in the model since it contributed more than 1% to the model and the overall model remained significant.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Summary

The primary purpose of this study was to examine the influence of the perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse, and various demographic characteristics on the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans. The following specific objectives were formulated to guide the research:

1. Describe first generation Korean-Americans on selected demographic characteristics including gender, age, marital status, length of residence in the United States, occupation, household income, educational status, and religion.
2. Determine the perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans, as measured by the Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997).
3. Determine the self-reported incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans as measured by Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979).
4. Determine if a relationship exists between the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans and each of the following demographic characteristics: age, religion, and occupation.

Based on the review of related literature, the following hypotheses were established by the researcher.

1. Among first generation Korean-Americans, males will report higher levels of partner abuse as the perpetrator than will females. Additionally, females will report higher levels of partner abuse as the victim than will males.
2. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between household income and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with lower levels of income will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.
3. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between highest level of education completed and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with lower levels of education completed will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.
4. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between length of residence in the United States and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents with fewer years in the United States will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.
5. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a negative relationship between the perceptions regarding the definitions of domestic violence as measured by the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who hold broader perceptions regarding the interactions that are included in domestic violence will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as both

perpetrator and victim while the individuals who hold narrower perceptions regarding the interactions included in domestic violence will tend to report higher levels of domestic violence as both perpetrator and victim.

6. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the sanction of the use of violence as measured by the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who sanction the use of violence to a greater degree will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim while the individuals who sanction the use of violence to a lesser degree will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.
7. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the attitudes regarding the causes of domestic violence as measured by the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who indicate a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim while the individuals who indicate a narrower range of potential causes of domestic violence will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse both perpetrator and victim.
8. Among first generation Korean-Americans, there will be a positive relationship between the level of contextual justification of domestic violence as measured by the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised (Yick,

1997) and incidence of partner abuse such that respondents who accept a wider range of contextual justification will tend to report higher levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim while the individuals who accept a narrower range of contextual justification will tend to report lower levels of partner abuse as both perpetrator and victim.

9. A model exists explaining a significant portion of the variance in the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans. The following groups of measures will make a significant contribution to the explanatory model in a hierarchical manner with the first measures providing the greatest contribution:

- a. Perceptual measures including: definitions of domestic violence as measured by the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997); attitudes toward the use of interpersonal violence as measured by the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997); attitudes toward causes of domestic violence as measured by the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997); and perceptions of contextual justification as measured by the Contextual Justification Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997).
- b. The following demographic characteristics: gender, income, educational status, and length of residence in the United States.

Additionally, exploratory variables of investigation will be entered into the model using stepwise techniques after the hypothesized variables have

entered the model to determine if these exploratory variables have additional explanatory power to contribute to the model.

The target population for this study was defined as first generation Korean-Americans. The accessible population was comprised of 223 Korean immigrant adults (105 males and 118 females) currently residing in the Baton Rouge, Louisiana metropolitan area. A census was employed utilizing 100% of the defined accessible population.

Data was collected using a three-part instrument which was comprised of the Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Domestic Violence Questionnaire – Revised, the Conflict Tactics Scale, and a Participant Profile Form. The instrument was translated into Korean by the investigator. Data was collected during the months of October and November, 2001 by mailing a copy of the instrument to all 223 Korean immigrant adults in the Baton Rouge metropolitan area. During the collection of data, the researcher learned that seven of the individuals included in the sample had moved from the area, thus reducing the population to 216. In addition, 12 individuals responded indicating that they could not provide data for the study since they did not have the necessary experiences. This brought the accessible population to 204. A total of 154 Korean-Americans (75.5%) provided usable data in response to the survey.

The following list is a summary of the major findings of this study by objectives:

1. The demographic data showed that the gender of respondents was split proportionally (N = 79 males or 51.3%, and N = 75 females or 48.7%). The

major characteristics of the Korean-Americans included: Their mean age was 37.85 years (SD = 12.19); the mean years of residence in the United States was 10.84 years (SD = 8.32); the majority (n = 117 or 76%) were married; the greatest number of participants was self-employed (n = 42 or 27.3%); the mean annual family income was \$44,861.75 (SD = 37,523.93); the largest number of participants had completed a Bachelors degree (n = 45 or 29.2%); and the majority indicated that their religion was Protestant (n = 81 or 52.6%).

2. The second major finding included the perceptions of and attitudes toward partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans. This is summarized as follows:
  - a) In the Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale, respondents agreed most strongly that the item, “Constantly threatening to use a butcher knife to hurt one’s spouse/partner” (M = 1.76) was considered to be domestic violence. The item with which respondents most strongly disagreed was “Demanding to know where one’s spouse/partner is all the time” (M = 4.36). Four out of five items in the Physical Aggression Sub-scale were found to be in the “Agree” or “Agree Somewhat” response category, and five out of six items in the Psychological Aggression Sub-scale were found to be in the “Agree Somewhat” or “Disagree Somewhat” response category. The mean score for the Physical Aggression Sub-scale was 2.50 (SD = 1.49)

and for the Psychological Aggression Sub-scale was 3.45 (SD = 1.34).

- b) In the Attitudes toward the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale, respondents disagreed most strongly with the statement, “Hitting should be used if nothing else works” (M = 5.08), which was classified in the “Disagree” response category. Respondents agreed most strongly with the statement “Spanking a child is an effective way to discipline” (M = 3.16), which was classified in the “Agreed Somewhat” response category. Each of the other five items in the single sub-scale, the Sanctioning the Use of Interpersonal Violence, respondents received ratings in the “Disagree Somewhat” or “Disagree” response category. The overall mean score for the Sanctioning the Use of Interpersonal Violence Sub-scale was 4.22 (SD = 1.13), which was classified in the “Disagree Somewhat” response category.
- c) In the Attitudes toward the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale, three sub-scales were confirmed in the data. The sub-scale with which respondents most agreed was the Individual Causes sub-scale with an overall mean of 2.01 (SD = .95), classified in the “Agree” response category. It was followed by the Environmental Causes sub-scale (M = 2.91, SD = .91), classified in the “Agree Somewhat” response category and the Structural/Cultural Causes Sub-scale (M = 4.30, SD = .78), classified in the “Disagree somewhat” response category.

- d) In the Attitudes toward the Contextual Justification of Domestic Violence Scale, only one item, “He acted in self-defense”, had a mean rating in the “Agree” response category ( $M = 1.75$ ,  $SD = 1.36$ ). The rest of the items in the scale had ratings in the “Disagree Somewhat” or “Disagree” response category.
  - e) Approximately three-quarters of respondents ( $n = 114$  or 74.0%) knew of Korean friends or family members who have been verbally insulted by their spouse/partner. Almost half of respondents knew of Korean friends or family members who had been slapped by their spouse/partner ( $n = 72$  or 46.8%) or who had been pushed or grabbed by their spouse/partner ( $n = 76$  or 49.4%).
3. A summary of findings from objective three included:
- a) In the perpetrator dimension during the last 12 months, 90.4% ( $n = 113$ ) of Korean-Americans reported that they had used some form of psychological aggression indicating that they insulted or swore at the other person at least once. In addition 42.1% ( $n = 53$ ) used some form of physical violence indicating that they threw or smashed or hit or kicked something against their spouse/partner at least once in the last 12 months. No one reported use of a knife or gun on other person, although three respondents (2.4%) indicated that they threatened with a knife or gun on other person at least once during the last 12 months. Thirteen respondents (10.3%) reported that they beat up the other person at least once, 19 respondents (15.1%)

reported that they kicked, bit, or hit with a fist at least once, and 19 respondents (15.1%) reported that they hit or tried to hit the other person with some objects at least once during the last 12 months.

- b) In the victim dimension during the last 12 months, 90.3% ( $n = 110$ ) of Korean-Americans experienced some form of psychological aggression indicating that their spouse/partner sulked and/or refused to talk about it at least once. In addition, 38.1% ( $n = 48$ ) experienced some form of physical violence as victim indicating that their spouse/partner threw or smashed or hit or kicked something against them at least once in the last 12 months. No one reported that they experienced use of a knife or gun by their partner/spouse, although three respondents (2.4%) indicated that they were threatened with a knife or gun by other person at least once during the last 12 months. Thirteen respondents (10.3%) reported that they were beaten up by the other person at least once, 18 respondents (14.3%) reported that they were kicked, bit, or hit with a fist by the other person at least once and 19 respondents (15.1%) reported that they were hit or tried to hit by the other person with some object at least once during the last 12 months.
- c) In the perpetrator dimension during the past 12 months, the overall mean for the Physical Violence Sub-scale score for Korean-Americans was .44 ( $SD = .75$ ) indicating that physical violence occurred less than once during the last 12 months across the

respondents. The mean score for the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale was 1.91 ( $SD = 1.16$ ), indicating that verbal aggression occurred about twice during the last 12 months across the respondents.

- d) In victim dimension during the past 12 months, the overall mean for the Physical Violence Sub-scale score for Korean-Americans was .28 ( $SD = .52$ ) indicating that that physical violence occurred less than once during the last 12 months across the respondents. The mean score for the Verbal Aggression Sub-scale was 1.95 ( $SD = 2.20$ ), indicating that verbal aggression occurred about twice during the last 12 months across the respondents.

4. Findings for objective four included:

- a) The incidences of both psychological aggression and physical violence were found to be significantly related with age. The relationship between age and physical violence as perpetrator showed the strongest negative correlation ( $r = -.38, p < .001$ ) indicating that younger respondents tended to have higher incidence of physical violence.
- b) The incidences of both psychological aggression and physical violence were found to be significantly different by religion. The mean scores for the incidence of Verbal Aggression for the Buddhist were 2.56 (as a perpetrator) and 2.66 (as a victim), and the mean scores for the Confucians were 2.86 (as a perpetrator) and 3.00 (as a victim). These scores were significantly higher than the mean scores

for the Protestant, that were identified as 1.52 (as a perpetrator) and 1.47 (as a victim). The mean scores for the incidence of Physical Violence for the Buddhist were .80 (as a perpetrator) and .60 (as a victim), and the mean score for the Confucians was 1.19 (as a perpetrator). These scores were significantly higher than the mean scores for the Protestant group, that were identified as .23 (as a perpetrator) and .16 (as a victim).

- c) The incidences of both psychological aggression and physical violence were found to be significantly different by occupation. The mean scores for the incidence of Verbal Aggression for the unemployed were 2.53 (as a perpetrator), and the mean scores for the labor group were 2.36 (as a perpetrator) and 2.54 (as a victim). These scores were significantly higher than the mean scores for the professional group, that were identified as .14 (as a perpetrator) and .63 (as a victim). The mean score for the incidence of Physical Violence for the unemployed were 1.71 (as a perpetrator) and .93 (as a victim), and the mean scores for the labor group were .61 (as a perpetrator) and .47 (as a victim). These scores were significantly higher than the mean scores for the professional group, that were identified as .03 (as a perpetrator) and .14 (as a victim).

5. Findings for hypothesis one showed that there were statistically significant gender differences in the incidence of partner abuse. Females ( $\underline{M} = 1.67$ ) were significantly more frequently verbally aggressive than males ( $\underline{M} =$

2.18) reported as a victim, whereas males ( $\underline{M} = .69$ ) were significantly more frequently physically violent than females ( $\underline{M} = .12$ ) reported as a perpetrator. Males ( $\underline{M} = .11$ ) were also significantly more frequently physically violent than females ( $\underline{M} = .51$ ) reported as a victim. This hypothesis was partially supported.

6. Findings for hypothesis two showed significant negative correlations between household income and incidence of partner abuse reported as both a perpetrator ( $\underline{r} = -.29$  for Verbal Aggression and  $-.29$  for Physical Violence) and as a victim ( $\underline{r} = -.30$  for Verbal Aggression and  $-.19$  for Physical Violence) indicating that respondents with lower levels of income tended to report higher levels of partner abuse. This hypothesis was supported by the data.
7. Findings for hypothesis three showed significant negative correlations between the highest level of education completed and incidence of partner abuse reported both as a perpetrator ( $\underline{r} = -.57$  for Verbal Aggression and  $-.46$  for Physical Violence) and as a victim ( $\underline{r} = -.54$  for Verbal Aggression and  $-.29$  for Physical Violence) indicating that respondents with lower levels of education completed tended to report higher levels of partner abuse. This hypothesis was supported by the data.
8. Findings for hypothesis four showed significant negative correlations between the length of residence in the United States and incidence of partner abuse reported both as a perpetrator ( $\underline{r} = -.38$  for Verbal Aggression and  $-.44$  for Physical Violence) and as a victim ( $\underline{r} = -.36$  for Verbal Aggression and

-.19 for Physical Violence) indicating that respondents with fewer years in the United States tended to report higher levels of partner abuse. This hypothesis was supported by the data.

9. Findings for hypothesis five showed significant negative correlations between the perceptions regarding the definitions of domestic violence and incidence of partner abuse reported as a perpetrator (Physical Aggression of Definitions of Domestic Violence:  $r = -.62$  for Verbal Aggression and  $-.70$  for Physical Violence; Psychological Aggression of Definitions of Domestic Violence:  $r = -.59$  for Verbal Aggression and  $-.58$  for Physical Violence). In the victim dimension, also significant negative correlations between the perceptions regarding the definitions of domestic violence and incidence of partner abuse was reported (Physical Aggression of Definitions of Domestic Violence:  $r = -.58$  for Verbal Aggression and  $-.16$  for Physical Violence; Psychological Aggression of Definitions of Domestic Violence:  $r = -.58$  for Verbal Aggression and  $-.22$  for Physical Violence). These findings indicated that respondents who held broader perceptions regarding the interactions that were included in domestic violence tended to report lower levels of partner abuse. This hypothesis was supported by the data.
10. Findings for hypothesis six showed significant positive correlations between the sanctioning of the use of domestic violence and incidence of partner abuse reported both as perpetrator ( $r = .61$  for Verbal Aggression and  $.63$  for Physical Violence) and as a victim ( $r = .52$  for Verbal Aggression) indicating that respondents who sanctioned the use of violence to a greater degree

tended to report higher levels of partner abuse. This hypothesis was supported by the data.

11. Findings for hypothesis seven showed significant positive correlations between the attitudes regarding the causes of domestic violence and incidence of partner abuse reported as a perpetrator (Individual Causes:  $r = .33$  for Verbal Aggression and  $.34$  for Physical Violence; Environmental Causes:  $r = .27$  for Verbal Aggression and  $.34$  for Physical Violence; Structural/Cultural Causes:  $r = .23$  for Verbal Aggression and  $.19$  for Physical Violence). In the victim dimension, there were also significant positive correlations between the attitudes regarding the causes of domestic violence and incidence of partner abuse (Individual Causes:  $r = .34$  for Verbal Aggression; Environmental Causes:  $r = .2$  for Verbal Aggression). These findings indicate that respondents who indicated a wider range of potential causes of domestic violence tended to report higher levels of partner abuse. This hypothesis was supported by the data.
12. Findings for hypothesis eight showed significant positive correlations between the level of contextual justification of domestic violence and incidence of partner abuse reported both as perpetrator ( $r = .64$  for Verbal Aggression and  $.65$  for Physical Violence) and as a victim ( $r = .58$  for Verbal Aggression and  $.15$  for Physical Violence) indicating that respondents who accepted a wider range of contextual justification tended to report higher levels of partner abuse. This hypothesis was supported by the data.

13. Findings for hypothesis nine showed that models existed that were both substantively and statistically significant explaining a significant portion of the variance in the incidence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans.
- a) In perpetrator dimension, for psychological and physical violence, the first block of 7 perceptual measures explained 45.6% and 52.6% of the variability, and the second block of demographic variables explained additional 9.7% and 5.9% of the variability respectively. For psychological violence, the professional occupation and the Buddhism religion added 1.9% and 1.1% respectively. For physical violence, the demographic variable of age and the unemployed occupational status added 2.3% and 1.0% respectively. The total variance that this model was able to explain regarding the incidence of psychological violence as perpetrator was 58.2%, and for physical violence, 61.9%.
- b) In victim dimension, for psychological and physical violence, the first block of 7 perceptual measures explained 40.1% and 11.7% of the variability, and the second block of demographic variables explained additional 12.7% and 34% of the variability respectively. For psychological violence, the professional occupation added 1.3%. For physical violence, the Protestant religion and the demographic variable of age added 2.8% and 1.1% respectively. The total variance that this model was able to predict the incidence of

psychological violence as victim was 54.1%, and for physical violence, 49.6%.

### Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions, implications and recommendations were derived:

1. Korean-Americans tend to perceive domestic violence more in physical terms than in psychological terms. This conclusion is based on the following findings of the study: the mean score for the definition of physical violence was 2.50 (SD = 1.49) classified as the “Agree” response category; and the mean score for the definition of psychological aggression was 3.45 (SD = 1.34) classified as the “Agree Somewhat” response category.

This conclusion is also supported by earlier research which indicated that there is a general tendency to classify physical forms of aggression as abuse especially among ethnic minorities (EDK Associates, 1993; Torres, 1991; Yick, 1997). This is also consistent with the emphasis in the Asian culture on holistic psychological orientations (Hsu, 1985) that lead to less concern with one’s inner psyche. It contrasts from Western psychological orientations that emphasize a dichotomy between the mind and the body. As a result of ignoring psychological abuse, verbal or other types of psychological aggressions are not viewed as a problem by Korean-Americans. Consequently, abused Korean-Americans, especially those who are victims of psychological aggression do not perceive themselves as victims, which further prevents them from seeking appropriate help.

Responsibilities to disseminate the results and conclusions of this study rest on this researcher's shoulders. The researcher will contact leading social service agencies in the Korean community including the Korean American Family Counseling Service Center, and/or the Korean Family and Youth Community Center for their cooperation. The researcher recommends that collaborated efforts recruit community leaders such as religious leaders, notable professionals, and businessmen to educate regarding the scope and seriousness of domestic violence problems in the community so that they can first speak out and lead by example. These collaborated efforts should be able to reach the Korean community to the broader extent to educate the whole community. It should be emphasized that psychological abuse traditionally has been ignored and Asian norms do not emphasize intrapsychic concerns. Educational protocols can explore abuse and definitions of domestic violence, and the role of cultural factors in shaping definitions. It should also emphasize that seemingly nebulous indistinct psychological aggression can often develop into more distinct and dangerous physical violence. Murphy and O'Leary (1989) demonstrated in their longitudinal study that prior levels of psychological aggression predicted the use of physical aggression among married couples.

2. Korean-Americans generally do not sanction the use of interpersonal violence against spouses/partners. This conclusion is based on the following findings: Korean-Americans' mean score for the Use of Interpersonal Violence Scale-Revised was 4.22 (SD = 1.13), which was classified in the "Disagree Somewhat" response category.

This is supported in the literature. Gentemann (1984) and Greenblat (1985) concluded that increasingly, the public does not tolerate the use of physical aggression against spouses. Makepeace (1986) and Roscoe (1985) also demonstrated in their studies that domestic and dating violence were not generally justified under various circumstances. These findings reflect significant changes in the public's attitudes toward interpersonal violence since the report of Stark & McEvoy (1970) that revealed the general public's approval on the use of physical violence against wives. Due to much gained publicity through a battered women's movement in the latter part of the twentieth century, and the increase in media campaigns in their prevention efforts, public awareness of the problems stemming from domestic violence increased and this increased awareness is reflected in the public's perception regarding the use of aggression against spouses.

This researcher recommends that in the Korean-American community, public campaigns should be initiated in the Korean language that disseminate information about the effects of domestic violence, so that public attitudes toward family violence will continue to change. Major social service agencies in the Korean community should apply for funding or grants for this purpose. For public campaigns, the researcher recommends the use of Korean television or radio stations and Korean newspapers, which are popular in the community. These efforts will be able to reach and educate Korean-Americans who lead isolated life styles segregated from American mainstream society.

3. Korean-Americans identify individual factors more frequently than environmental or structural/cultural factors as the causes of domestic violence. This

conclusion is based on the finding that in the Causes of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised, mean score for the individual factors was 2.02 ( $SD = .95$ ) which was classified as “Agree” response category, while the mean score for the environmental factors was 2.91 ( $SD = .91$ ), in the “Agree Somewhat” response category, and the mean score for structural/cultural factors was 4.10 ( $SD = .78$ ) in the “Disagree Somewhat” response category.

This conclusion is consistent with earlier research which involved Chinese-Americans (Yick, 1997). Korean-Americans’ tendency to attribute individual related factors as the causes of domestic violence may have been shaped by cultural values regarding human character development. From earlier years, Korean Children are taught to function within one’s environment by improving oneself and developing a personal responsibility (Ho, 1987). This tendency is also reflective of Confucian teachings that emphasize the connection between individuals and their group. Confucian teachings emphasize that the individual’s identity exists based upon its relationships through others, and each person’s well-being and prosperity in the same group is dependent upon a collective effort of every member (Kim, 1987).

The experiences of the Korean-American community are very different from those of other minority groups in the United States. As a result, devising interventions must take into account their social realities and culturally-relevant clinical interventions are needed. Currently, many of the services and interventions for domestic violence victims are based upon empowerment approaches focused on the notions of American individualism. However, mainstream models of

empowerment are not congruent with Korean values that emphasize the collective unit such as the family.

This researcher recommends that the common individual counseling provided for domestic violence victims should be modified to include family members even at later stages of the helping process. In the counseling model commonly practiced at the current time, this family model is avoided because it frequently places the victim at greater danger. However, for the counseling services to be productive for Korean immigrants, including family members is critical. Because, their frame of reference is tied to the larger community and the extended family system, an emphasis on individual power and control without concerns for all family members is removed from their social realities. This is congruent with Ho's (1990) suggestion of the utilization of Asian values in delivering effective clinical interventions for Asian domestic violence victims. Ho (1990) recommended the involvement of perpetrators and other authority figures in the interventions confronting perpetrators of domestic violence using important Asian values of shame and authority.

4. Korean-Americans do not acknowledge the justifications for the use of aggression other than in the case of self-defense. This conclusion is based on the following findings: Korean-Americans' mean score for the item "He acted in self-defense" in the Contextual Justification of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised was 1.75 ( $SD = 1.36$ ), which was classified as "Agree" response category, while the overall mean for the Contextual Justification of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised

was 4.20 ( $SD = 1.37$ ), which was classified as “Disagree Somewhat” response category.

This conclusion is consistent with earlier studies. Greenblat (1985), Arias & Johnson(1989), and Roscoe (1985) reported that under situations of self-defense, the use of domestic violence was warranted. Individuals tend to interpret the events based upon the cues from the social environment, and attach contextual meanings to them. Depending on the context the violent incident is placed in, individuals either disapprove or justify the violence. According to Greenblat (1985), cultural norms that prescribe rules of retributive justice exist. When there has been sufficient provocation for the violence, the rules of retribution can operate. This rule seems to apply to domestic violence across the cultures.

5. The use of domestic violence among Korean-Americans is highly prevalent. This conclusion is based on the following findings: More than 90% of the sample reported that they employed psychological aggression against their spouses/partners at least once during the last 12 months. Approximately four out of ten respondents reported the use of some form of physical violence against their spouses/partners at least once during the last 12 months. The prevalence rate in this study was higher in comparison to the results of the two National Family Violence Surveys (Straus, 1990) conducted to estimate the occurrences of marital violence. These studies indicated 12% and 16% of American couples experienced at least one act of physical violence during the year prior to the survey respectively. However, comparing to the other two studies that used Korean samples, the current study showed mixed results. It was higher than Shin’s (1995) study that indicated a 35%

rate of marital physical violence, and was lower than Song's (1986) research that showed a 60% rate of marital violence. The discrepancies could be attributed to the different gender makeup of the samples. It should be pointed out that Shin used only male Korean respondents and Song used only female Korean respondents, whereas the current study used both male and female Korean respondents.

Although no use of a gun or a knife was reported, approximately fifteen percent of the respondents in this study used severe violence including kicking, or hitting with a fist. It should be noted that the use of severe physical violence among Korean-Americans is also quite prevalent at a higher rate than the national sample of Americans.

The researcher recommends subsequent studies investigate the prevalence of partner abuse for Koreans living in Korea to learn the differences and similarities in the characteristics and levels of partner abuse. The researcher also recommends to include American samples to compare the two groups.

The researcher also reiterates the urgency of community education and concerted public awareness campaigns given the high prevalence rate of domestic violence. Educational efforts should include helping individuals to identify the potential abuse early in the relationship and to devise strategies regarding negotiation, ultimately preventing occurrences of violence between couples.

6. Demographic characteristics such as gender, age, religion, occupation, and the length of residence in the United States were related to the occurrences of domestic violence. This conclusion is based on the following findings from the study. The results of the tests examining the relationship between the incidence of

domestic violence and these demographic variables separately indicated statistically significant correlations coefficients. These results are supported by previous studies that showed the influence of various demographic characteristics on domestic violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Levinson & Huffman, 1955; Schecter, 1982; Straus et. al., 1980).

It should be pointed out that Korean men were more physically violent, whereas Korean women were more verbally abusive than their partners. Also, the younger the individuals were, the more abusive acts they employed. Generally, Confucians and Buddhists were more abusive than Protestants, and the unemployed and laborers were more abusive than professionals. The longer the individuals have resided in the United States, the less abusive they tended to be. The younger age, insecure occupational standings, and the language problems and adjustment difficulties associated with less years of residency in the United States could be the source for stress among Korean immigrants. As immigrants reside in the United States longer, improving their language skills and adjusting to a new culture better, income level will likely be increased, lowering their stress level, thus reducing the occurrences of abuse.

For practice implications, the researcher recommends that treatment programs for couples focus on the theme of gender socialization and how this socialization influences intimate male-female relationships. Couples should be trained for stress management and communication skills to reduce negative verbal interactions and to modify aggressive behavior between them.

The researcher recommends that longitudinal research be done to investigate how the changes in these significant demographic variables will be reflected in the results. The researcher also recommends that instruments be utilized to measure the level of individual's stress, patriarchal ideologies and acculturation to assess their sociocultural characteristics and determine if they are correlated with the occurrences of domestic violence.

7. There were significant relationships between various perceptions of domestic violence and the actual experiences with domestic violence. In general, Korean immigrants who were aware of the range of behaviors that constitute domestic violence, who do not approve the use of violence, and who attribute the causes of violence more to non-individual related factors tended to be less abusive.

This conclusion is based on the finding that there were statistically significant correlation coefficients between the scores of various scales measuring perceptions of domestic violence, and the perpetration and victimization occurrences of domestic violence. This finding supports the earlier findings of Riggs and O'Leary (1989) which showed a direct causal relationship between attitudes toward domestic violence and actual violent behaviors.

The researcher recommends that subsequent studies include other possible causal or mediating factors to identify more of a concrete attitude-behavior relationship. Although the current study supports the direct relationship between the attitudes and behaviors involved in domestic violence, it can not establish the causal relationship. For example, it is not clear how other factors shaped behaviors. The congruence of the attitude and behavior in this study may have been due to other

psychological, social, and cultural influences. For example, information regarding the characteristics and quality of childhood experiences of both the abusers and the abused; status change between the pre-immigrant and post-immigrant life; and childhood experiences of specifically witnessing parental violence could be important issues to investigate how attitudes were formed and reflected in behaviors.

Changes in attitudes and perceptions are vital for changing behaviors. The researcher recommends macro-level public awareness campaigns targeting attitudinal changes. In addition to disseminating attitude altering information, discussion should focus on Confucian patriarchal ideologies that lie at the heart of the Korean culture. The extent to which Koreans are socialized in patriarchal belief systems will influence future attitudes and behaviors. It is the patriarchal ideologies that legitimize the use of violence in families, therefore the alternative egalitarian relationships should be encouraged.

For policy implications, the researcher recommends preparing all educational campaign materials in the Korean language and hiring Korean speaking staff to deliver services effectively. In this way, language barriers are eliminated. For the locations of service delivery, meetings should be held and agencies must be located in communities where a high concentration of Korean immigrants resides. Many Korean immigrants, particularly those who arrived more recently do not have transportation means and are reluctant to travel distances. In terms of service hours, the lifestyles of Korean immigrants should be considered.

8. Substantively and statistically significant models do exist explaining a significant portion of the variance in the occurrence of partner abuse among first generation Korean-Americans. This conclusion is based on the following findings: regression models examined explained 58.2% of the variance in incidence of psychological aggression as perpetrator, 61.9% of the variance in incidence of physical violence as perpetrator, 54.1% of the variance in incidence of psychological aggression as victim, and 49.6% of the variance in incidence of physical violence as victim. Despite the complexities of various potential factors for domestic violence, the models identified in the study are viable. These models in the study could be used to identify from the perceptual and demographic measures individuals who are most at risk of becoming perpetrators or victims of partner abuse.

The researcher recommends the application of this modeling process at various intervention sites such as counseling offices, shelters, or social service agencies as a way of assessment of individuals. Refinement of the model by replicating the study using random probability samples may further increase the viability and practicality of this model. The field of domestic violence requires rigorous research that will ensure effective assessment of individuals. This will strengthen the relationship between the research and the practice, and make a positive contribution to the field.

## REFERENCES

- Albrecht, S. L., Bahr, H., & Goodman, K. (1983). Divorce and remarriage: Problems, adaptations, and adjustment. Series: Contribution in women's studies, No. 42.
- Alderman, T. (1997). The sacred soul. Oakland, Ca: New Harbinger Publications.
- Allen, I. M. (1986). Violence and the American Indian woman. In M.C. Burns (Eds.), The speaking profits us: Violence in the lives of women of color (pp. 5-7). Seattle, WA: Center for Prevention of Sexual and Domestic Violence.
- American Psychological Association. (1993). Violence and youth. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Society of Criminology. (1997). Critical criminal justice issues: Task force reports. NCJ 158837. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Angel, R.J. and Thoits, P. (1987). The impact of culture on the cognitive structure of illness. Culture, Medicine & Psychiatry, 11(4), 465-494.
- Appel, A. E. & Holden, G. W. (1998). The co-occurrence of spouse and physical child abuse: a review and appraisal. Journal of Family Violence, 2, 139-149.
- Arias, I. & Johnson, P. (1989). Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4(3), 298-307.
- Asbury, J. (1993). Violence in families of color in the United States. In R. L. Hampton, T. P. Guillotta, G. R. Adams, E. H. Potter, and R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), Family violence: Prevention and Treatment (pp. 159-178). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Asbury, J. (1999). What do we know now about spouse abuse and child sexual abuse in families of color in the United States? In R. L. Hampton (Ed.), Family violence, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition: Prevention and treatment (pp.148-167). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bachman, R. (1992). Death and violence on the reservation: Homicide, family violence, and suicide in American Indian population. Westport, CT: Auburn House.
- Bachman, R., & Saltzman, L. E. (1996). Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey (Bureau of Justice Statistics special report). Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Justice. (NCJ No. 154348).

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67, 575-582.

Barnett, O. W., & Hamberger, L. K. (1992). The assessment of maritally violent men on the California Psychological Inventory. Violence and Victims, 7, 15-28.

The billion-dollar epidemic. (1992, January 6). American Medical News, 35(1), 7.

Bolton, F. G., & Bolton, S. R. (1987). Working with violent families. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Brody, J. E. (1992, March 18). When love turns violent: The roots of abuse. New York Times, Health p. 124.

Campbell, J. C., & Sheridan, D. J. (1989). Emergency nursing interventions with battered women. Journal of Emergency Nursing, 15, 12-17.

Cazenave, N. A., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Race, class, network embeddedness, and family violence: A search for potent support systems. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families (pp. 321-340). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Chapin, D. (1990). Peace on earth begins in the home. The Circle, 14(1).

Chester, B., Robin, R. W., Koss, M. P., Lopez, J., & Goldman, D. (1994). Grandmother dishonored: Violence against women by male partners in American Indian communities. Violence and Victims, 9(3), 249-258.

Chun, E. (1990). The Korean battered spouse: Where to go for help. KoreAm Journal, 1(3), 22-23.

Collins, P.H. (1989). The social construction of Black feminist thought. Signs, 11(1), 745-773.

Collins, K. S., Schoen, C., Joseph, S., Duchon, L., Simantov, E., & Yellowitx, M. (1999). Health concerns across women's lifespan. [http://www.cmwf.org/programs/women/ksc\\_whsurvey99\\_332.asp](http://www.cmwf.org/programs/women/ksc_whsurvey99_332.asp).1999.

Crenshaw, K. (1994). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color, In M. A. Fireman & R. Mykitiuk (Eds.), The public nature of private violence: The discovery of domestic abuse (pp. 93-117). New York: Routledge.

Cullen, F.T. (1983). Rethinking crime and deviance theory: The emergence of a structuring tradition. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Allanheld, Publishers.

Davis, J. A. (1971). Elementary Survey Analysis . Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dent, D.Z. & Arias, I. (1980). Effects of alcohol, gender, and role of spouses on attributions and evaluations of marital violence scenarios. Violence and Victims, 5(3), 185-193.

Dibble, U., & Straus, M. A. (1980). Some social structure determinants of inconsistency between attitudes and behavior: The case of family violence. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 71-80.

Dobash, R.E. & Dobash, R.P. (1978). Wives: The “appropriate” victims of marital violence. Victimology, 2(3-4), 426-442.

Dutton, M. A. (1993). Understanding women’s responses to domestic violence: A redefinition of battered woman syndrome. Hofstra Law Review, 21, 1191-1242.

Dutton, D.B. & Browning, J.J. (1988). Concern for power, fear of intimacy and aversive stimuli for wife assault. In G.T. Hotaling et. al. (Eds.), Family abuse and its consequences: New directions for research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Dutton, D. G., & Strachan, C. E. (1987). Motivational needs for power and spouse-specific assertiveness in assaultive and nonassaultive men. Violence and Victims, 2, 145-156.

EDK Associates (1993). Men beating women: Ending domestic violence. A qualitative and quantitative study of public attitudes on violence against women. San Francisco, CA: Family Violence Prevention Fund.

Edward, S. M. (1985). A socio-legal evaluation of gender ideologies in domestic violence assault and spousal homicides. Victimology, 10, 1-4, 186-205.

Egeland, B., Sroufe, L. A., & Erickson, M. F. (1983). The developmental consequences of different patterns of maltreatment. Child Abuse & Neglect, 7, 459-469.

Eng, P. (1995). Domestic violence in Asian/Pacific Island communities. In D. L. Adams (Ed.), Health issues for women of color: A cultural diversity perspective (pp. 78-88). Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.

Fagan, J. (1992). Contributions of family violence research to criminal justice policy on wife assault: Paradigms of science and social control. Violence and Victims, 3(3), 159-185.

Fagan, J. A., Stewart, D. K., & Hanse, K. V. (1984). Violent men or violent husbands? Background factors and situational correlates. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M.A. Straus (Eds.), The dark side of families (pp. 49-68). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Fazio, R. H., Powell, M. C. & Herr, P. M. (1983). Toward a process model of attitude-behavior relation: Assessing ones' attitude upon mere observation of the attitude object. Journal of Personality & social Psychology, 44, 723-735.

Flynn, C. P. (1990) Sex roles and women's response to courtship violence. Journal of Family Violence, 5(1), 83-94.

Follingstad, D. R., Brennan. A. F., Hause, E. S., Polek, D. S., & Rutledgem L. L. (1991) Factors moderating physical and psychological symptoms of battered women. Journal of Family Violence, 6, 81-95.

Furiya, L. (1993). Asian American women's shelters seek to empower victims of domestic violence. Los Angeles Japanese Daily, Monday, October4, 1993, p. 1.

Gamache, D. (1998). Domination and control: The social context of dating violence. In B. Levy (Ed.), Dating violence: Young women in danger, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., (pp. 69-83). Seattle, WA: Seal Press.

Garrett, A. & Libbey, H. (1997). Theory and research on the outcomes and consequences of child abuse and neglect. Child Abuse Intervention Strategic Planning Meetings, Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Gelles, R. J., & Cornell, C. P. (1990). Intimate violence in families. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gelles, R. J. (1992). Through a sociological lens: Social structure and family violence. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), Current controversies on family violence (pp. 31-46). Newbury Park, Ca: Sage Publications.

Gentemann, K.M. (1984). Wife-beating: Attitudes of a non-clinical population. Victimology, 9(1), 109-119.

- Giles-Sims, J. (1983). Wife battering: A systems theory approach. New York: Guilford.
- Goldstein, D., & Rosenbaum, A. (1985). An evaluation of self-esteem of maritally violent men. Family Relations, 34, 425-428.
- Goode, E. (1996). Domestic violence is a serious problem for women. In B. Leone (ed.), Domestic violence (pp. 22-27). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press.
- Gordon, L. (1988). Heroes of their own lives: The politics and history of family violence. New York, New York: Viking Penguin Inc.
- Gordon, L. W. (1990). Asian immigration since World War II. In R. W. Tucker, C. B. Keely, & W. Wrigley (Eds.), Immigration and U.S. foreign policy (pp. 169-191). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Gosselin, D. K. (2000). Heave hands: An introduction to the crimes of domestic violence. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Grenblat, C.S. (1985). "Don't hit your wife...unless..."; Preliminary findings on normative support for the use of physical force by husbands. Victimology, 10(1-4), 221-241.
- Greene, B. (1994). African American women. In L. Comas-Diaz & B. Greene (Eds.), Women of color: Integrating ethnic and gender identities in psychotherapy (pp. 10-20). New York: Guilford.
- Hair, Jr., J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). Multivariate Data Analysis, fifth edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Hamberger, L. K., & Hastings, J. E. (1986). Characteristics of spouse abusers. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1, 363-373.
- Hampton, R. L. (1999). Family violence: Prevention and Treatment. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hampton, R. L., & Gelles, R. J. (1994). Violence toward Black women in a nationally representative sample of Black families. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 25(1), 105-119.
- Hampton, R. L., Jenkins, P., & Vandergriff-Avery, M. (1999). Physical and sexual violence in marriage. In R. L. Hampton (Ed.), Family violence: Prevention and treatment. (pp. 168-197). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hampton, T. P. Gullota, G. R. Adams, E. H. Potter, & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), Family violence: Prevention and treatment (pp. 159-178). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hansen, R. K., Gizzarelli, R., & Scott, H. (1994). The attitudes of incest offenders. Criminal Justice and Behavior, *21*, 187-202.

Hirschel, D. J. et. al. (1992). Charlotte Spouse Assault Replication Project, 1987-1989. ICPSR6114. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Ho, C. K. (1990). An analysis of domestic violence in Asian American communities: A multicultural approach to counseling. In L. S. brown & M. Root (Eds.), Diversity and complexity in feminist therapy (pp. 129-150). New York: Harrington Park.

Ho, M. (1987). Family therapy with ethnic minorities. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hoff, L.A. (1992). Review essay: Wife beating in Micronesia. Journal of Micronesian Studies, *1*(2), 199-221.

Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, *1*(2), 101-124.

Hsu, J. (1985). The Chinese family: Relations, problems, and therapy. In W. S. Tseng and D. Y. H. We (Eds.), Chinese culture and mental health (pp. 95-112). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Huang, L. N., & Ying, Y. W. (1989). Chinese American children and adolescents. In J. T. Gibbs, L. N. Huang, & associates (Eds.), Children of color (pp. 30-66). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hurh, W. M., & Kim, K. C. (1984). Korean immigrants in America. Cranbury, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.

Hurh, W. M., & Kim, K. C. (1990). Adaptation stages and mental health of Korean male immigrants in the United States. International Migration Review, *24*.

Jasinski, J. L. (1996). Structural inequalities, family and cultural factors, and spousal violence among Anglo and Hispanic Americans. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of New Hampshire, Druham.

Jasinski, J. L. & Williams, L. M. (1998). Partner Violence: A comprehensive review of 20 years of research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jouriles, E. N., McDonald, R., Norwood, W. D. & Ezell, E. (2000). Documenting the prevalence of children's exposure to domestic violence: issues and controversies. In S. Graham-Berman & J. Edleson (Eds.), Intimate violence in the lives of children: The future of research, intervention, and social policy. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Kalmuss, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. Journal of Marriage and the family, 46,11-19.

Kaufman Kantor, G., Jasinski, J. L., & Aldarondo, E. (1994). Sociocultural status and incidence of marital violence in Hispanic families. Violence and Victims, 9(3), 207-222.

Kim, B. L. (1987). The Asian Americans: Changing patterns, changing needs. Montclair, NJ: Association for Korean Christian Scholars in North America.

Kim, B. L., Okamura, A. I., Ozawa, N., & Forrest, V. (1981). Women in shadows. La Jolla, CA: National Committee Concerned with Asian Wives of U.S. Servicemen.

. Kitano, H. L., & Stanley, S. (1993). The Model Minorities. The Journal of Social Issues. 23.

Klein, A. R. (1993). Spousal/partner assault: A protocol for the sentencing and supervision of offenders. In Domestic violence: The challenge for law enforcement. Quincy, MA: Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Kolko, d. J. (1992). Characteristics of child victims of physical violence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7, 244-276.

Koop, C. E. (1989, May). Violence against women – A global problem. Paper presented at the Pan American Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

Korean American Family Service Center . (1995). The quarterly statistical report. Los Angeles, California.

Korean Immigrants Association of Baton Rouge. (2000). Korean Immigrants Directory of Baton Rouge.

Koss, M. P. (1990). The women's mental health research agenda: Violence against women. American Psychologist, 45, 374-480.

Kumagai, F. And Straus, M. A. (1983). Conflict resolution tactics in Japan, India, and the USA. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 14(3), 377-392

LaFromboise, T. D., Berman, J. S., & Hohi, B. K. (1994). American Indian women. In L. Comas-Diaz & B. Greene (Eds.), Women of color (pp. 30-71). New York: Guilford.

Lee, I. H. (1977). Women's liberation in Korea. Korea Journal, 17, 4-11.

LeVinson, D., & Huffman, P. (1955). Traditional Family Ideology and its relation to personality. Journal of Personality, 23, 251-273.

Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. Family Relations, 35, 181-188.

Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. Family Relations, 30, 97-102.

Martin, M. (1988). Battered Women. In N. Hutchings, (Ed.), The Violent family: Victimization of women, children, and elders. New York: Human sciences Press.

Marin, G., & Marin, B. V. (1991). Research with Hispanic populations. Newbury Park, CA : Sage.

Miller, S. L. (1994). Expanding the boundaries: Toward a more inclusive and integrated study of intimate violence. Violence and Victims, 9(2), 183-194.

Min, P. G. (1988). The Korean American family. In C. H. Mindel, R. W. Habenstein, & R. Wright (Eds.), Ethnic families in America: Patterns and variations. New York: Elseview.

Min, P. G. (1992). Korean American wives' overlook. Korean Journal of Population and Development, 91, 557-592.

Mitchell, R. E., & Hodson, C. A. (1983). Coping with domestic violence: Social support and psychological health among battered women. American Journal of Community Psychology, 11(6), 629-654.

Moffitt, T. E. (1997). Neuropsychology, antisocial behavior, and neighborhood context. In J. McCord, (Ed.), Violence and childhood in the inner city. pp. 116-170. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Murphy, C. M. & O'Leary, K. D. (1989). Psychological aggression predicts physical aggression in early marriage. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57, 579-582.

Nah, K. (1993). Perceived problems and service delivery for Korean immigrants. Social work, 38 (3), 289-296.

National Research Council. (1996). Understanding and preventing violence. N. A. Crowell and A. W. Burgess (Eds.) Panel on research on violence against women. Washington DC: National Academy Press.

Neff, J. a., Holamon, B., & Schluter, T. D. (1995). Spousal violence among Anglos, Blacks, and Mexican Americans: The role of demographic variables, psychosocial predictors, and alcohol consumption. Journal of Family Violence, 10(1), 1-21.

Neidig, P. H. (1985). Domestic violence in the military. Part II: The impact of high level of work-related stress on family functioning. Military Family, 5(4), 3-5.

Jist Works. (2000) Occupational Outlook Handbook. 2000-2001 edition. Indianapolis, IN: Jist works, Inc.

O'Keefe, M. (1994). Racial/ethnic differences among battered women and their children. Journal of Child and family Studies, 3(3). 283-305.

O'Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J. & Tyree, A.(1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57(2), 263-268.

Orava, T. A., McLeod, P. J., & Sharpe, D. (1996). Perceptions of control, depressive symptomatology, and self-esteem of women in transition from abusive relationships. Journal of Family Violence, 11,167-186.

Padilla, Y.C. (1990). Social science theory on the Mexican American experience. Social Science Review, 261-275.

Perkins C. & Klaus, P. (1996). National crime victimization survey: Criminal victimization 1994. NCJ 158022. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Pizzey, E. (1974). Scream quietly or the neighbors will hear. Short Hill, NJ: Ridley Enslow.

Pleck, E. (1987). Domestic tyranny: The making of American social policy against family violence from colonial times to the present. New York: Oxford University Press.

Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. G. (1990). Immigrant America. Berkeley University of California Press.

Rhee, S. (1995). Separation and divorce among Korean immigrant families. In Y. S. Kim & A. Moon (Eds.), Korean American women from tradition to modern feminism. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press.

Rhee, S. (1997). Domestic violence in the Korean immigrant family. Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 24(1), 63-77.

Riggs, D.S. & O'Leary, K.D. (1989). A theoretical model of courtship aggression. In M.A. Pirog-Good and Stets, J. E. (Eds.), Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues (pp. 53-71). New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.

Riggs, D. S., Murphpy, C. M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1989). Intentional falsification in reports of interpartner aggression. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, 220-232.

Roscoe, B. (1985). Courtship violence: Acceptable forms and situations. College Student Journal, 19(4), 389-393.

Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1981). Children: The unintended victims of marital violence. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51, 692-699.

Roundtree, G. A., Parker, A. D., Edwards, D. W., & Teddlie, C. B. (1982). A survey of the types of crimes committed by incarcerated females in two states who reported being battered. Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Behavior Technology Methods and Therapy, 28, 23-26.

Rouse, L. P. (1988). Conflict tactics used by men in marital disputes. In G. T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T., Kirkpatrick, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), Family abuse and its consequences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Saunders, D. G., Lynch, A. B., Graysn, M. & Linz, D. (1987). The inventory of beliefs about wife beating: the construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. Violence & Victims, 2(1), 39-57.

Schechter, S. (1982). Women and male violence. Boston, MS: South End Press.

Seidman, B. T., Marshall, W. L., Hudson, S. M., & Robertson, P. J. (1994). An examination of intimacy and loneliness in sex offenders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9, 518-534.

Sherman, L. & Rogan, D. (1992). Policing domestic violence: Experiments and dilemmas. New York: Free Press.

Sherman, L. W. & Berk, R. A. (1994). The specific deterrent effects of arrest for domestic assault. American Sociological Review, 49, 261-272.

Shin, H. L. (1995). Violence and intimacy: Risk markers and predictors of wife abuse among Korean immigrants. Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.

Siegel, L. J. (1995). Criminology, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: West Publishing Company.

Smith, M. D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: A test of feminist hypotheses. Violence & Victims, 5(4), 257-275.

Song, Y. (1986). Battered Korean women in urban America: the relationship of cultural conflict to wife abuse. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.

Song, Y. (1996). Battered women in Korean immigrant families. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Sonkin, D. J., & Durphy, M. (1997). Learning to live without violence: A handbook for men, 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Volcano, CA: Volcano Press.

Spence, J. T. & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). Masculinity & femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates & antecedents. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Stark, R. and McEvoy, J. M. (1970). Middle class violence. Psychology Today, 4, 56-65.

Straus, M. A. (1990). The National Family Violence Surveys. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families (pp. 3-16). Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Straus, M. A. (1986). Medical care costs of intrafamily assault and homicide. Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 62, 556-561.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. Journal of Marriage & the Family, 41(1), 75-88.

Straus, M. A. (1976). Sexual inequality, cultural norms, and wife beating. Victimology: An International Journal, 1, 54-76.

Straus, M. A., & Smith, C. (1990). Violence in Hispanic families in the United States: Incidence rates and structural interpretations. In M. A. Straus, & R. J. Gelles. (Eds.), Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families (pp. 341-368). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Straus, M. A. & Gelles, R. (1986). Societal change in family violence from 1974 to 1985 as revealed by now national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 465-479.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. (1980). Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. Garden City, NJ: Anchor.

Sugarman, D.B. & Frankel, S.L. (1996). Patriarchal ideology and wife assault: A meta-analytic review. Journal of Family Violence, 11(1), 13-40.

Szinovacz, M. E. (1983). Using couple data as a methodological tool: The case of marital violence. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 633-644.

Tang, C. S. (1994). Prevalence of spouse aggression in Hong Kong. Journal of Family Violence, 9(4), 347-356.

Telch, C. F. & Lindquist, C. U. (1984). Violence versus Nonviolence couples: A comparison of patterns. Psychotherapy, 21(2), 242-248.

Teske, R. H. C., Jr., & Parker, M. L. (1983). Spouse abuse in Texas: A study of women's attitudes and experiences. Huntsville, TX: Sam Houston State University, Criminal Justice Center, Survey Research Program.

Torres, S. (1991). A comparison of wife abuse between two cultures: Perceptions, attitudes, nature, and extent. Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 12, 113-131.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. (1996). Statistical abstract of the United States. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2001). Statistical abstract of the United States. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of Justice (FBI). (1992). Crime in the United States, 1991. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Vincent, J. P. & Jourliles, E. N. (2000). Domestic violence: Guidelines for research-informed practice. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

- Walker, L. E. (1979). The battered women. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L. E. (1991). Posttraumatic stress disorder in women: Diagnosis and treatment of battered woman syndrome. Psychotherapy, 29, 21-29.
- Wasinger, L. (1993). The value system of the Native American counseling client: an exploration. American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 17(4), 91-98.
- West, C. M. (1998). Lifting the “political gag order”: Breaking the silence around partner violence in ethnic minority families. In J. L. Jasinski & L. M. Williams (Eds.), Partner violence: A comprehensive review of 20 years of research. (pp. 184-209). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wolf, D. A. (1987). Child abuse: Implications for child development and psychopathology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Wolk, L. E. (1982). Minnesota’s American Indian battered women: The cycle of oppression; A cultural awareness training manual for non-Indian professionals. St. Paul, MN: St. Paul Indian Center.
- Yick, A. G. (1997). Chinese-Americans’ perceptions of and experiences with domestic violence and factors related to their psychological well-being. Doctoral dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Yu, E. Y. (1987). Korean American Women: demographic Profiles and Family roles. In E. Y. Yu & E. H. Phillips, (Eds.), Korean women in transition: At home and abroad. Los Angeles: California State University.
- Zane, N. (1992). Health status of Asian Americans. Focus, 6(1), 8-10.
- Zorza, J. (1991). Woman battering: A major cause of homelessness. Clearinghouse Review, 61, 421-429.
- Zorza, J. (1994). Woman battering: High costs and the state of the law. Clearinghouse Review, 28, 383-395.

APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE

**Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Domestic Violence Questionnaire**

I. We are interested in your opinions about what behaviors are considered violence between spouses or couples. Please read the key sentence with various behaviors listed below from a to n, inserted in the blank of the key sentence. Answer how much you agree or disagree whether the behavior is considered violence between spouses or couples. There are six choices for you to choose from. Circle the number that best reflects your opinion.

1 = STRONGLY AGREE	4 = DISAGREE SOMEWHAT
2 = AGREE	5 = DISAGREE
3 = AGREE SOMEWHAT	6 = STRONGLY DISAGREE

Key Sentence:

( \_\_\_\_\_ ) is considered violence between spouses or couples.  
(INSERT WITH ITEMS BELOW)

- a. Punching one's spouse/  
partner's face real  
hard during an argument..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- b. Arguing with one's  
spouse/partner..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- c. Forcing one's spouse/  
partner to have sex.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- d. Constantly threatening to  
use a butcher knife to hurt  
one's spouse/partner.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5..... 6
- e. Demanding to know where  
one's spouse/partner is  
all the time.....1.....2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- f. Disagreeing with one's  
spouse/partner about  
how much to spend  
on personal items..... 1.....2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....6
- g. Criticizing one's  
spouse/partner  
in front of others.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6

- h. Throwing objects like an ash tray at one's spouse/partner..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- i. Pushing one's spouse/partner.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- j. Not allowing spouse/partner to make any decisions.....1..... 2.....3..... 4.....5..... 6
- k. Disagreeing about who will do certain household chores.....1..... 2..... 3.....4..... 5.....6
- l. Always disregarding one's spouse's/partner's opinions and feelings.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....6
- m. Not being aware of one's spouse's/partner's feelings on a political issue.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- n. Not allowing one's spouse/partner to have a bank account in his/her name..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6

II. People have different opinions about how to handle family matters and how to solve problems in the family. Read following statements and answer how much you agree or disagree with that statement. Again, you will choose your answer from six choices.

1 = STRONGLY AGREE	4 = DISAGREE SOMEWHAT
2 = AGREE	5 = DISAGREE
3 = AGREE SOMEWHAT	6 = STRONGLY DISAGREE

- a. In general, it is okay for a man to hit his wife/partner..... 1.....2..... 3.....4..... 5..... 6
- b. Spanking a child is an effective way to discipline..... 1.....2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6

- c. It is important to have a family meeting at least once a month to discuss any family problems..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- d. Hitting is a good way to solve problems..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- e. It is important for a husband and a wife to resolve conflicts before going to bed..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- f. Hitting should be used if nothing else works..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- g. Hitting a child with a belt is an appropriate form of discipline..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- h. In general, it is okay for a woman to hit her husband/partner..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- i. Communication is the most important thing in a marriage..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- j. The use of physical punishment teaches children self-control..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6

III. People have different opinions about why violence happens between spouses or couples. We are interested in your opinions about what might cause violence between spouses or couples. Please read the key sentence with various possible causes of violence listed below from a to q, inserted in the blank of the sentence. Answer how much you agree or disagree. Again, you will choose your answer from six choices.

1 = STRONGLY AGREE	4 = DISAGREE SOMEWHAT
2 = AGREE	5 = DISAGREE
3 = AGREE SOMEWHAT	6 = STRONGLY DISAGREE

Key Sentence:

( \_\_\_\_\_ ) causes a man to use violence on his wife/partner.  
(INSERT ITEMS BELOW)

- a. Job pressure..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6

- b. An overcrowded house..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- c. Inability to control  
a bad temper.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- d. Stress from immigrating  
to the U.S.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- e. Women's lower status  
compared to men's in  
Korean culture.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- f. A woman wanting  
to make more  
decisions in the home .....1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5..... 6
- g. Past experiences with  
violence during  
childhood.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- h. Lack of education.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- i. Arguments that get  
out of hand .....1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5..... 6
- j. Beliefs that women are  
the properties of men.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- k. Mental illness.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- l. Belief that men are authority  
figures over women.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- m. Lack of trust in a marriage.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5..... 6
- n. Poverty .....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- o. Alcohol.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- p. Belief that wives should  
be obedient .....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....6
- q. Drugs .....1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6

IV. People have different opinions about when it is or isn't acceptable to hit. Read the key sentence with various situations listed below from a to j, inserted in the blank of the sentence. Answer how much you agree or disagree. You will have to choose your answer from six choices.

1 = STRONGLY AGREE	4 = DISAGREE SOMEWHAT
2 = AGREE	5 = DISAGREE
3 = AGREE SOMEWHAT	6 = STRONGLY DISAGREE

Key Sentence:  
 You just found out that a man hit his wife real hard because \_\_\_\_\_.  
 (INSERT ITEMS BELOW)

- a. he caught her having an affair..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....6
- b. he found her drunk..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- c. he acted in self-defense..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....6
- d. she was screaming hysterically..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....6
- e. she was unwilling to have sex..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....6
- f. she was always nagging..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....6
- g. he was in a bad mood..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5.....6
- h. she was trying to hurt their child..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- i. does not spend enough time at home..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- j. he found her flirting with someone else..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6
- k. she did not obey him..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4..... 5..... 6

V. Have you ever been told or know of any Korean friends or family members who have experienced following situations? Please answer yes or no. If your answer is yes, circle 1, and if your answer is no, circle 2.

- |   | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |
|---|------------|-----------|
| a. Been pushed or grabbed by their spouse/partner?.....                                     | 1.....     | 2         |
| b. Been threatened with a gun or knife by their spouse/partner?.....                        | 1.....     | 2         |
| c. Been verbally insulted by their spouse/partner?.....                                     | 1.....     | 2         |
| d. Been forced to have sex by their spouse/partner?.....                                    | 1.....     | 2         |
| e. Been slapped by their spouse/partner?.....   | 1.....     | 2         |
| f. Not been allowed to leave the House because their spouse/partner would not allow it..... | 1.....     | 2         |

**Conflict Tactics Scale**

VI. In the last 12 months, have you been married, living with someone, or in an intimate relationship? If your answer is yes, circle 1, and continue with all items in question A and B. If your answer is no, circle 2, skip questions A and B, and go to section VII.

Yes..... 1 (Continue with all items in question A and B).

No..... 2 (Skip question A and B, and go to section VII).

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences.

A. Read a following list of some things that you might have done when you had a dispute with your husband/wife/partner. In the last 12 months, when you had a dispute with your husband/wife/partner, how often have you used these behaviors? If your answer is never, circle 0; if once, circle 1; if twice, circle 2; if 3 to 5 times, circle 3; if 6-10 times, circle 4; if 11 to 20 times, circle 5; if 20 times or more, circle 6. In your lifetime, have you ever used these behaviors? Please choose your answer either yes or no.

0 = NEVER	1 = ONCE	2 = TWICE	3 = 3 TO 5 TIMES
4 = 6 TO 10 TIMES	5 = 11 TO 20 TIMES	6 = MORE THAN 20 TIMES	

a. Discussed the issue calmly.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime.....yes..... no

b. Got information to backup  
your side of things.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime.....yes.... no

c. Brought in or tried  
to bring in someone to  
help settle on things..... 0.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime.....yes.....no

d. Insulted or swore  
at the other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime.....yes.....no

e. Sulked and /or  
refused to talk about it..... 0..... 1.....2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime.....yes.... no

f. Stomped out of the room  
or house (or yard)..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime..... yes.... no

g. Cried.....0.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime.....yes.....no

h. Did or said something  
to spite the other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime..... yes.... no

i. Threw or smashed or hit  
or kicked something.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime..... yes.... no

j. Threw something at  
the other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime..... yes.....no

k. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved  
the other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime..... yes..... no

l. Slapped the other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime..... yes..... no

m. Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime.....yes.....no

n. Hit or tried to hit the other  
person with some objects..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime..... yes..... no

o. Beat up the other person..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime..... yes..... no

p. Threatened with a knife  
of gun on other person..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime.....yes.....no

q. Used a knife or gun  
on other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In your lifetime..... yes..... no

B. Now, let's talk about your wife/husband/partner and how often he/she used these behaviors. Thinking about the past 12 months, when your husband/wife/partner had a dispute with you, how often did he/she use these behaviors? If your answer is never, circle 0; if once, circle 1; if twice, circle 2; if 3 to 5 times, circle

3; if 6-10 times, circle 4; if 11 to 20 times, circle 5; if 20 times or more, circle 6. In his/her lifetime, has he/she ever used these behaviors? Please choose your answer either yes or no.

0 = NEVER    1 = ONCE    2 = TWICE    3 = 3 TO 5 TIMES  
 4 = 6 TO 10 TIMES    5 = 11 TO 20 TIMES    6 = MORE THAN 20 TIMES

a. Discussed the issue calmly.....0.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

b. Got information to backup his/her side of things.....0.....1.....2.....3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.... no

c. Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle on things..... 0.....1..... 2..... 3.....4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

d. Insulted or swore at the other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

e. Sulked and /or refused to talk about it.....0..... 1.....2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.... no

f. Stomped out of the room or house (or yard)..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.... no

g. Cried.....0.....1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

h. Did or said something to spite the other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

i. Threw or smashed or  
hit or kicked something.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

j. Threw something  
at the other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

k. Pushed, grabbed, or  
shoved the other person..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

l. Slapped the other person.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

m. Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist.....0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

n. Hit or tried to hit the other  
person with some objects..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

o. Beat up the other person..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

p. Threatened with a knife  
of gun on other person..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

q. Used a knife or gun on  
other person..... 0..... 1..... 2..... 3..... 4.....5.....6

In his/her lifetime.....yes.....no

### **Participant Profile Form**

VII. Now I want to ask you some questions about yourself. Again, all answers will be confidential.

1. Gender.

- Male..... 1
- Female..... 2

2. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Are you currently married, living with someone, widowed, divorced, separated, or never married?

- Married..... 1
- Living with someone..... 2
- Widowed..... 3
- Divorced..... 4
- Separated..... 5
- Never married..... 6

4. How long have you lived in the U.S.? \_\_\_\_\_ years

5. What is your occupation?

- Unemployed..... 1
- Housewife..... 2
- Student..... 3
- Manual work..... 4
- Skilled work..... 5
- Clerical, salesperson..... 6
- Semi-professional, manager..... 7
- Professional..... 8
- Self-employed..... 9

6. What is the household's total annual income? \$ \_\_\_\_\_

7. What is the highest degree or diplomas you have attained? (Circle the highest degree)

- Less than high school..... 1
- High school diploma (or equivalent)..... 2
- Junior college degree (A.A.)..... 3
- Bachelors degree (B.A., B.S.)..... 4
- Masters degree (M.A., M.S.)..... 5
- Doctorate (Ph.D.)..... 6
- Professional (M.D., J.D., etc.)..... 7

8. What is your religion?

- Protestant..... 1
- Catholic..... 2
- Buddhism..... 3
- Confucianism..... 4
- No religion..... 5
- Other..... 6
- If other, please specify\_\_\_\_\_

APPENDIX B: INTRODUCTORY LETTER, AND INFORMED CONSENT

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

School of Social Work  
311 Long Fieldhouse  
Baton Rouge, LA 70803

October 10, 2001

Dear Sir or Madame:

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, or just have spats or fights for some reason. Also, people have different ways of handling their conflicts. Research reports that as many as 60 percent of Korean immigrant families experienced the incidence of partner abuse in their families. Unfortunately, we have only a sketchy idea of what this is all about, how frequently, and what kinds of persons are participants in these situations. Without such information, sensible and effective prevention and treatment programs are difficult to formulate.

All two hundred twenty-three Korean adults in the Baton Rouge metropolitan area are asked to give their opinion on these matters. You are one of this small number. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of the Korean immigrants, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned.

Your participation in the study is strictly voluntary. You may choose to return or not to return the questionnaire. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. Do not put your name on the questionnaire. The questionnaire has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This is so that we may check your name off the mailing list when your questionnaire is returned. Your name will never be placed on the questionnaire nor will your responses ever be associated with your name.

This research study will help service providers in understanding partner abuse in the Korean community so that they can help this community more effectively.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call. The telephone number is (225) 755-2570.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Ahn, M.S.W.  
Investigator

## INFORMED CONSENT

1. Study Title: “The Perceptions of and Attitudes toward Partner Abuse among First Generation Korean-Americans: Their Relationships to the Incidence of Partner Abuse”
2. Performance Site: School of Social Work  
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College
3. Investigators: The following investigators are available for questions about this study, M-F, 8:00 a.m. – 4:30 p.m.  
  
Bonnie Ahn, M.S.W.                    755-2570  
Dr. Brij Mohan                         388-1345  
Dr. Robert C. Mathews                578-8692
4. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research project is to investigate how Korean immigrants perceive various aspects of domestic violence, and how these perceptions relate to the incidence of partner abuse.
5. Subject Inclusion: First generation Korean Americans, 18 years and older, living in the Baton Rouge metropolitan area.
6. Number of subjects:            223
7. Study Procedures: Subjects will spend approximately 20 to 40 minutes completing a questionnaire, which was mailed to subjects’ home address. Subjects will be asked to give opinions about certain aggressive behaviors that can occur between couples. In addition, there will also be some questions about subjects’ own personal experiences with domestic violence.
8. Benefits: The information collected will assist service providers and policy makers in understanding perceptions toward domestic violence in the Korean American community so that they can help this community more effectively. The results of this study may benefit society as the findings will be used to make recommendations about policies and interventions.
9. Risks: The survey will not ask any questions that cause any physical risks or long term discomforts. The only study risk is that the survey may ask some sensitive questions which may or may not make subjects feel uncomfortable. To minimize risk, we recommend that you do not discuss your answers with your

spouse. Subjects are informed not to put names anywhere in the survey to ensure anonymity. Identification numbers used on the instruments will be assigned to each of the subjects' original individual identification numbers to add a layer of anonymity to the participants. The original mailing list with names will only be referenced for non-response follow-up mailings. Every effort will be made to maintain the confidentiality of the study records. Files will be kept in secure cabinets to which only the investigators have access.

10. Right to Refuse: Participation in the study is strictly voluntary. Subjects may choose to return or not to return the questionnaire, or choose not to answer any particular questions without any consequences.

11. Privacy: The questionnaire will have an identification number for mailing purposes only. The original mailing list with names will only be referenced for non-response follow-up mailings. Subjects' name will be checked off the mailing list when questionnaire is returned. Subjects' name will never be placed on the questionnaire nor will their responses ever be associated with their names. In addition, after all non-response follow-up procedures are completed, the original list including individual names will be destroyed. Therefore, after this point, no potential connection between responses and individual names will exist.

Subject is aware that by answering the questions and returning the survey, the subject is providing and documenting his/her consent.

APPENDIX C: PERMISSION TO USE THE INSTRUMENTS

Subj: Instrument  
Date: 6/4/01 4:55:10 PM Pacific Daylight Time  
From: [agyick@yahoo.com](mailto:agyick@yahoo.com) (Alice Yick)  
To: [Bonniechoi@aol.com](mailto:Bonniechoi@aol.com)

Dear Bonnie,

You have my permission to use the Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Domestic Violence Scale.

When you have completed your study and analyzed your results, I would like to know what you find, and your psychometric findings for the instrument. It would be interesting to know how this instrument works with other Asian groups.

Good luck with your dissertation.

Best,

Alice Yick Flanagan

## FAMILY RESEARCH LABORATORY

Murray A. Straus, Co-Director  
University of New Hampshire  
126 Horton Social Science Center  
Durham, NH 03824  
Phone (603) 862-2594, FAX (603) 862-1122  
E-Mail [Murray.Straus@unh.edu](mailto:Murray.Straus@unh.edu)  
<http://www.unh.edu/fr1>  
<http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2>

[Terms of Agreement to use the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales \(CTS2\) and Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales \(CYSPC\)](#)

[Psychometric data on the CTS2 and CTSPC to be provided under user agreement](#)

[Online Application to use the CTS2 and CTSPC](#)

[Table of Contents for CTS Handbook](#)

[Order Form for additional papers](#)

The CTS was extensively revised in 1996 and 1998. There is now a revised version of the CTS for use with married, cohabiting or dating couples called the CTS2, and the CTSPC, which is a version of the CTS revised to measure the behavior of parents. (Copies of the Original CTS, are included in the Handbook for the CTS. See the order form.

Permission to Use. The CTS2 and the CTSPC are copyright instruments. We will be Pleased to give you permission to use either or both for research purposes. To obtain Permission, please submit an [Application to Use the CTS2 and CTSPC](#).

Permission to use original CTS. There is no copyright, so no permission is needed. If, However you feel you need a signed permission, this page gives my permission.

CTS Handbook. Much new information has become available since the original paper on The CTS which was published in 1979. A 368 page handbook is available. It included a 40 page bibliography of studies using the CTS and a paper Use of the CTS for Measuring Physical and Psychological Abuse of Children. Most of the contents of this manual is also Applicable to the CTS2 and the CTSPC. The cost is \$25 including postage (but outside the US and Canada please add \$10.00) and packaging. [A table of contents for the handbook is Available online](#), to obtain the entire handbook see the order form.

I am please that you are considering using the CTS2 of the CTSPC. If problems or issues Come up that I can assist with, please phone of E-mail.

Sincerely,

Murray A. Straus  
[http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS\\_Application](http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS_Application)

6/14/01

## VITA

Bonnie Ahn was born in Seoul, Korea. She obtained a Bachelor of Science Degree in Home Economics in 1971 from Ewha Women's University, and a Master of Social Work degree in 1999 from California State University at Los Angeles. She will receive the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in social work from Louisiana State University in May, 2002. She is currently living in Baton Rouge, Louisiana with her husband.