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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In the last 20 years, the issue of domestic violence has surfaced in the consciousness of this country. In bringing this issue to light, much credit is due to the women's movement, which in the 1970's succeeded in focusing public attention on the topic of spouse abuse (Loseke & Cahill, 1984; McShane, 1979). We know from early research that domestic violence cuts across cultures, socioeconomic status, and age (Gelles, 1980; Straus, 1977; Straus, Gelles, & Steimentz, 1980), but despite being a widespread problem, it still does not receive the attention it deserves, and for many years the issue of abuse against women has been overlooked, ignored, and otherwise undermined as an issue worthy of scrutiny (Goodman, Koss, Fitzgerald, Felipe-Russo & Puryear-Keita, 1993).

In general, the topic of violence against women has enjoyed an "on-again-off-again" relationship with the public eye, so that different kinds of aggression against women have been studied at one time or another. Most recently, researchers have begun to focus not only on the phenomenon of violence against women during marriage, but also on the phenomenon of violence against women in other settings of society, such as schools and the workplace. Researchers are now bringing to light such issues as rape and sexual harassment as other forms of abuse that women endure (Fitzgerald, 1993; Goodman, Koss, Fitzgerald, Felipe-Russo & Puryear-Keita, 1993, Koss, 1993). But even as interest in investigating these issues has increased in the field of psychology, the results of psychological studies and surveys are still underestimated due to methodological flaws in sampling and interviewing of subjects (Browne, 1993; Koss, 1993; Fitzgerald, 1993), and women of color are
often severely underrepresented (Fitzgerald, 1993). Koss (1993) further asserts that in terms of the impact of various interventions, empirical data remain sparse, and often measures are not sensitive to the ethnic diversity of women victimized by male violence.

To understand the diverse needs of women of color, it is imperative to understand the different cultural factors at play that account for ethnic differences in spousal abuse, and in more general terms, the abuse of women in a romantic relationship. When this task is achieved, investigators can begin to design interventions tailored to abate the abuse suffered by women of color. This paper is a first attempt at understanding one such group, Mexican-American women.

Why do they stay? Conversely, why do they leave? What defines a woman who leaves a violent relationship? If we know what characteristics define such a woman, can we use this information to predict who will stay and who will leave a violent relationship? What would be a better treatment approach to help a woman lead a violence-free life? These are the questions that provided the impetus for this project. After several years of working with Mexican-American women, and always feeling the impotence of watching them endure the abuse of the men in their lives; the author felt the need to understand why the support services provided did not appear to have the desired impact on the abused women (ideally, that they leave the violent relationship).

Given the lack of information in the literature regarding the experience of violence in the life of Mexican-American women, this project was conceived as a first attempt to pinpoint what characteristics, if any, would define a Mexican-American woman and her subsequent response to violence. The purpose of this project is to understand how sex role attitude, locus of control, and level of acculturation are related to Mexican-American women’s decision to stay in or leave a romantic relationship once it turns violent. Using the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican
Americans (ARSMA), the Rotter Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement measure, and a survey of violent incidents, Mexican-American women 18 years of age and older were polled.

The specific research questions are the following:

1) How do subjects score on the instruments, and what is the relationship between the instruments themselves?

2) What is the incidence of violence experienced by the Mexican-American women participating in this study?

3) What is the women's response to violence?

4) What is the relationship of sex-role attitude, level of acculturation, locus of control and response to violence?

What follows is a first look at the results of this survey. For the purpose of this project, the term domestic violence will be defined as violence that occurs to women in heterosexual relationships be it marriage, cohabitation, or dating while living apart.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

It is common knowledge that historically, the role of women has been limited to the responsibilities of the home, giving birth and raising children. Women were expected to dedicate their time to the home serving and obeying their husbands in exchange for a place to live and a bite to eat; the so called security that marriage provided for a weak, dependent, helpless female. As such, this arrangement provided (and still provides) the male with incredible power and control over the life of the woman. And, as is often the case when absolute power is enjoyed, it led (and still leads) to abuse--of the power, of the control, and of the woman.

As society has changed, the roles of both men and women have also changed. Living arrangements have changed so that we no longer see only couples who are married living under the same roof. Now that couples often cohabitate without being married, it is common to find that violence exists in these arrangements as well (Yllo & Straus, 1981). Makepeace (1981) reported the startling finding of violence in courting couples, paving the way for research into the nature of violent relationships. After Makepeace's ground breaking research it became obvious that the abuse of women did not only occur within the confines of marriage, but also that it could occur in the context of a romantic relationship before any of the traditional expectations had been set and sanctioned by a marriage ceremony (Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985; Cate, Henton, Koval, Christopher, & Lloyd, 1982; Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd, & Christopher, 1983; Makepeace, 1986; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles 1984; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987).
With the continuing agitation of the women's movement, American society has become more aware of the plight of women who suffer sometimes unspeakable abuse at the hands of their partners. Researchers have mounted efforts to understand the incidence of violence against women, its etiology, its devastating effects, and possible preventive measures.

**Incidence of Abuse**

Thirty years ago, the idea of woman battery was considered to be an isolated, if not rare, occurrence. In his review of the research on family violence, Gelles (1980) concluded that research in the sixties tended to view domestic violence as rare and confined to mentally ill and/or poor people. Although studies on wife abuse were infrequent, the rare reports of wife abuse would portray both the abusive husband and his victim as suffering from personality disorders (Gelles, 1980).

As the seventies approached, and as investigators became more sophisticated in their sampling strategies for conducting research on domestic violence, much of the work concentrated on refuting the above mentioned views of family violence and replacing them with more informed data. For instance, researchers tackled the task of creating an operational definition of family violence that would allow them to obtain reliable data (Gelles, 1980).

One of the first nationwide surveys on wife beating was published by Straus in 1977. A "Severe Violence Index" and a "Wife Beating Index" were constructed for use in this study. Given the difficulty in defining the term "wife beating" in a way which could be objectively measured, the two questionnaires were based on a continuum of violent acts ranging from a push, to using a gun or a knife. Random sampling of over 2,000 couples, the initial estimates of wife beating were as follows: for the twelve month period preceding the survey, 3.8% of the respondents reported one or more physical attacks that fell under the operational definition of "wife beating". This meant that in one year,
approximately 1.8 million wives were beaten by their husbands. In addition, the yearly frequency of these attacks varied considerably, from only once during the year, to once a week or more often. Between these two extremes, Straus found that 19% of the couples surveyed reported two beatings during the year, 16% reported three or four beatings, and a third of the couples reported five or more beatings during the year. The median score for the entire group was 2.4 serious assaults per year.

Generally, Straus (1978) found that 28% of respondents reported experiencing at least one violent act, and 5.3% experienced violence that could be considered a beating. Unfortunately, the data did not distinguish between who was the assailant and who was the victim. However, it provided an initial index of the incidence of violence in American families. Furthermore, Straus speculated that given the possibility that not all couples had accurately or honestly responded to the survey, and since the study only sampled couples living together, that the true incidence rate was probably closer to 50 or 60% of all couples.

Most recent research continues to reflect similar trends of violence against women. Browne (1993) cites findings by Frieze, Knoble, Washburn and Zomnir (1980) that between 21% and 34% of all women will be physically attacked by an intimate male during her adult life. Furthermore, research estimates based on probability samples suggest that a least two to three million women are assaulted by male partners each year in the United States (Straus & Gelles, 1990; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). Straus and Gelles (1990) reported that in a nationally representative survey of couples conducted in 1985, close to one eighth of the husbands had committed one or more acts of physical aggression against their wives in the twelve months preceding the survey, a total of 1.8 million women had been severely assaulted (that is, that they were punched, kicked, choked, beaten, threatened with a
knife or gun, or had a knife or gun used against them by their partners). Browne (1993) cautions that these figures still represent a marked underestimate of the problem. She points out that national estimates are the product of self-reports obtained via in-person or telephone interviews, therefore excluding the very poor, people with poor English skills, military families who live on base, and individuals who are hospitalized, homeless, institutionalized, or incarcerated.

Another shortcoming is a self-selection bias, where estimates are based on those respondents who are home when the interviewer calls, who are willing to speak with the interviewer, and who are willing to report acts of violence they have experienced or perpetrated in their relationship. Browne (1993) states that based on the last 17 years of empirical findings, a more accurate national estimate of the incidence of violent acts against women by their partners may be closer to four million women in an average 12 month period. Even with all of their methodological flaws, there is no doubt that the studies on domestic violence are tapping into a disturbing reality that has to be reported, and most importantly, changed. Given the self-selection bias and the underrepresentation of women of color, the seriousness of the situation is only highlighted by the design shortcomings of the studies. A most important function has already been served, however, by bringing to light the plight of abused women of color.

**Etiology**

Researchers have attempted to understand the causes of violence against women by male partners. Several factors believed to be associated with family violence and wife abuse have been investigated. Dibble and Straus (1980) for example, investigated the relationship between attitudes about violence and actual violent behavior, and the social-structural determinants of attitude-behavior consistency. Further, their study also focused on the extent to which larger social forces (such as family's position on the larger society as indicated by
total family income) enabled husbands and wives to fulfill their mutual role obligations as socially defined, or inhibited them from doing so.

Dibble and Straus (1980) sampled 2,143 American couples and found that those individuals (either a wife or a husband) who held pro-violent attitudes (i.e., believing that slapping one’s spouse was normal behavior) were more likely to engage in minor violence against their spouse, than were individuals who believed that slapping one’s spouse was not normal behavior. Hence the respondent’s behavior was consistent with their attitudes about violence. The data also showed that for both men and women with pro-violent attitudes, violence by their partners increased attitude-behavior consistency.

One possible explanation for this finding was that being hit by one’s partner provided moral sanctioning or justification of one’s own subsequent violent behavior. In addition, among those persons with a nonviolent spouse and a violent attitude, or a violent spouse and a nonviolent attitude, consultation with a third party (a relative or a friend) was related to higher rates of violence. If there was a domestic problem, consultation with relatives and friends might be a last attempt to resolve the problem. In this case, a third party might actually sanction the use of violence. Couples violence was most frequent in those families in which the individual’s own violent attitude was accompanied by his/her spouse’s violent behavior. Dibble and Straus hypothesized that in terms of domestic violence, involvement in a personal network of friends and relatives can support normative acts, as well as acts that are clearly deviant as far as the standard norms of society are concerned.

Furthermore, Dibble and Straus (1980) found that as income increased, violence against spouses decreased, meaning that the lower the total family income, the greater the probability of violence. In addition they found that the belief that for a spouse to slap the other was normal, was not related to income. Dibble and Straus interpreted
these results as suggesting that the family’s position in the economic system may affect the role relationship inside the family, but not the attitudes about violence. At the same time, lower income men who believed that slapping one’s spouse was normal, were more likely than their higher income counterparts to actually use violence against their spouses. Dibble and Straus (1980) speculated that these findings reflected the fact the lower income husbands were less able to fulfill the provider role, and were perhaps less able to live up to the expectations of other family members than were husbands with higher incomes. In contrast to the higher social classes in which husbands had more prestige, money, and power, lower income men may have had no such resources upon which to rely in order to control their wives. Therefore, they resorted to violence, used as a means to obtain the socially approved leadership role within the family.

Dibble and Straus (1980) concluded that consistency between attitude and behavior could not be taken for granted in the study of domestic violence. Also, that patterns of interaction between spouse and family were as important in the study of domestic violence as were the respondent’s attitudes. These patterns of interaction related to the extent to which the environment facilitates or inhibits the performance of different familial roles, such as that of spouse, parent or provider.

In an earlier study, Straus (1976), proposed that wife-beating could be explained by sexual inequality and cultural norms. In this study, Straus made note of the largely unrecognized nature of wife-beating, and the difficulty in determining how extensive that phenomenon was in American society. Although he points out that married couples in general have a high frequency use of physical violence, Straus emphasized the disproportionate frequency with which wives were the victims. Straus (1976) cited chilling statistics dating back to the mid 1950’s in which of 588 homicide victims, a full 41% of the female
victims were killed by their husbands as opposed to only 11% of the males who were killed by their wives. Moreover, the cases of the female victims involved a higher degree of violence, illustrating a striking imbalance in the extent to which wives were the victims of violence by their husbands. Straus (1976) offered some of the factors he believed accounted for the high degree of violence against wives. These factors fell into two categories: Sexual inequality and Cultural norms.

Straus (1976) identified several ways in which sexism contributed to the frequency of wife-beating. First there is the need of men who lacked superiority in personal resources to use violence to maintain a superior power position in the family; (2) the antagonism between the sexes engendered by sex role differentiation; (3) the perceived inability of many women to escape from marriage to a violent husband because society thrusts the full burden of child-rearing on women, denied them equal job opportunities, created a negative self-image in respect to roles other than that of wife and mother, and perpetuated the myth that bringing up a child without a father in the house was damaging to children; and (4) the male-oriented organization of the criminal justice system which made it almost impossible for women to secure legal protection.

Straus (1976) explained that the disproportionate frequency with which wives were victims of violence in their marriage reflected the structure of contemporary Euro-America societies, in the form of cultural norms that implicitly made the marriage license a license to hit. He asserted that cultural norms legitimizing marital violence were found in the legal system, in literary works, and everyday discourse. To illustrate, Straus cited examples that ranged from the reluctance by police officers to arrest a violent husband; the difficulty that women encountered when trying to secure a warrant for the husband’s arrest; to jokes where a woman complains that her husband does not love her anymore because he has not hit her lately (Straus, 1976). It is rather sad to
know that 30 years later the same conditions are still present.

**A Theory of Domestic Violence**

One of the most prominent writers to put forth a theory of domestic violence was Lenore E. Walker who in 1978 proposed the social-learning theory of learned helplessness as a psychological rational that explained why the battered woman became a victim, and how the process of victimization further entrapped her. The learned helplessness theory has three basic components:

1) Information about what should happen (the contingency)
2) Cognitive representation about the contingency (expectation, belief, perception, learning)
3) Behavior (the action the person takes)

Learned helplessness occurs when a woman’s voluntary responses do not control what happens to her, as would be the case of an inescapable situation. The woman learns that no matter what she does, she cannot escape the setting. The woman then generalizes this experience to later experiences, and her learning of alternative behaviors is precluded.

As Walker (1978) explained it, in the process of sex-role socialization, women learn early on that there are certain behaviors that are reinforced more than others. For example, it has been observed that in classroom situations, boys receive positive feedback for their academic success, while girls receive inadequate feedback for academic work, and greater positive feedback for social behavior. Thus, girls learn a cognitive set that says their intellectual achievement is not as important to their survival as their social skills. Walker theorized that sex-role socialization could be responsible for inducing a faulty belief system that supported women’s feelings of helplessness. This faulty belief system comes into play when a woman finds herself in an abusive situation. She learns that her voluntary responses do not make that much difference in what happens to her, thus, it becomes extremely difficult for her to change her cognitive set to believe that her
competent actions can change her life situation.

Walker also indicated that helplessness might be learned on a relative continuum, and that there were different levels of learned helplessness that a woman learns from the interaction of traditional female role standards and individual personality development. The male/female dyadic relationship may be a specific area that was affected by this interactive development process. Battered women seem to be most affected by feelings of helplessness in their relationships with men. This is true for women who are housewives as well as women who have careers outside the home. Many of these women are well educated and function very well in high status positions. However, when it comes to their marriage or other social relationships with men, they resort to the more traditional male/female roles. They allow the men to make decisions, even when the women have manipulated the choices behind the scenes.

Walker further asserted that battered women value men's approval more than that of other women. In addition, battered women are embarrassed that their home life is not as they expected it to be; that they are not fulfilling the traditional role of making a successful marriage or relationship. Unable to believe that they cannot do anything to stop the batterer, they cover up the violence, and as predicted by the learned helplessness model, they cease all attempts to change their situation.

**Mexican-American Culture**

Much has been written about the Mexican-American culture and its adherence to very strict sex-role expectations (Amaro, 1988; Gonzalez, 1982; Mirowsky & Ross, 1987; Padilla & Ruiz 1974; Torres, 1987, 1991). The sex roles are clearly differentiated with the male characterized as manly, aggressive, fearless, courageous, and dominant of women (Gonzalez, 1982). The female characteristics are exemplified by extreme femininity, passivity, and self-abnegation. The female's primary duties
are confined to the home, where she is expected to wait on the male members of the family and to obey the authority of parents, males and older siblings. The main goal for the female is to be first and foremost a wife and mother, and self-sacrifice is considered an integral part of her role (Gonzalez, 1982).

There is disagreement in the literature regarding this representation of the Mexican-American culture, primarily regarding the conclusion that Mexican-American women assume a passive and subordinate role with their male partners (Amaro, 1988). Major criticisms of studies of Mexican-American women are that studies have often been based on unrepresentative samples, and that the impact of other relevant factors such as education, socioeconomic status, participation in the labor force, and rural vs. urban residence has not been assessed (Andrade, 1982; Baca-Zinn, 1982; Cromwell & Ruiz, 1979). There is also evidence in the literature that Mexican-Americans not necessarily agree with the sex roles traditionally dictated by their culture. Gonzalez (1982) for example, found that in a group of Anglo and Mexican-American students, Mexican-American female students did not generally accept the stereotypic Mexican-American family sex roles; and that although the male Mexican-American students tended to agree more with the sex roles than the female students, in general their position fell in the neutral category. He emphasized however, that while Mexican-Americans disagreed with the stereotyped sex roles, they still agreed more than their same-sex Anglo counterparts; and cautioned that the fact that the Mexican-American male group showed greater agreement with the stereotyped sex roles suggested that sex role may still be important to that group.

Other aspects of the life experience of Mexican-American women have been studied in the context of their culture, and the findings are varied. For example, in her study of Mexican-American women's reproductive attitudes, Amaro (1988) concluded that overall, the results contradicted the common stereotypes that present Mexican-American women
as super-mothers whose cultural traditions require submissiveness and continuous reproduction. Torres (1987) on the other hand, found that culture played a major role in Mexican-American women's decision to stay in an abusive relationship, and on their perception of what exactly constitutes wife abuse (Torres, 1991). The seemingly conflicting information may undermine the importance of considering cultural factors in the study of Mexican-Americans, however other researchers (Rueschenberg & Buriel, 1989) have concluded that the reason that the existing literature does not yield an unequivocal picture of Mexican-American characteristics is due in part to the fact that Mexican-Americans are an extremely diverse group; and that the different findings in the literature are simply reflecting this diversity as well as the diverse nature of the literature itself, which varies considerably in terms of design, methodology, conceptualization, measures used, and populations sampled (Rueschenberg & Buriel, 1989).
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

The subjects were 34 Mexican-American women, 18 years of age and older, who were attending a secretarial training center in the city of Chicago at the time the data were collected. All subjects were either, English-speaking, or English/Spanish-speaking and literate in English. The mean age was 22.2 years with a standard deviation of 7 and a range of 17-50. Thirty-two percent of the subjects identified themselves as Mexican, and 68 percent reported Mexican-American as their ethnic identification. Eighty-five percent of the sample reported their country of birth as the United States, with the remaining 15 percent reporting Mexico as their country of birth. Marital status was reported as 62 percent single; 26 percent married; and 12 percent separated. Forty-four percent reported having no children; 29 percent of the sample had one child; 15 percent had two children; 9 percent reported three children; and 3 percent (one respondent) reported having 14 children. Of all respondents, 15 percent reported living on their own; a full 50 percent reported living with their parents; 17 percent reported living with their husband; 6 percent reported living with their significant other; and 12 percent reported having "other" living arrangement. This final answer generally meant that participants lived with another relative such as older siblings, and in one case the significant other's parents. Most of the subjects reported a very low income with 53 percent reporting an annual income between $4,000-$8,000. Six percent of the sample reported annual income to be between $9,000-$13,000; 9 percent had an income between $14,000-$18,000 per year, 9 percent
reported yearly income to be between $19,000-$23,000; 3 percent of the sample reported income at $24,000-$28,000 per year; and 6 percent reported an annual income of $29,000 and above. Twelve percent reported having no income. There was one missing response on the question of income. Source of income was reported as follows; 6 percent of the sample reported having no source of income; 21 percent of the sample reported Public Assistance as their source of income; 21 percent reported full time employment as their source of income; 17 percent reported part-time employment; and 35 percent reported "other" sources of income. Most of these responses included the report of a parent's income, and in one instance, the subject reported her income as "rents".

Education was reported as follows; 41 percent of the subjects reported having finished high school; another 41 percent had either completed or were in the process of completing a Grade Equivalency Diploma (GED); 9 percent (three subjects) reported on the "other" category and in all cases this included some junior college or college attendance. Three subjects, 9 percent of the sample, did not provide an answer to this question.

Procedure

In order to be included in the study, all participants had to be at least 18 years of age, have a Mexican-American background, and identify themselves as being of Mexican-American descent. The women need not have had experienced violence in their relationship(s) in order to participate in the study.

A five part questionnaire was distributed to the participants during a regular school day. The questionnaires were in a packet that included as its last part a list of agencies in the Chicago area specializing in services for abused women. The participants were encouraged to keep the list for their personal use, if they so wished. The researcher attended the women's weekly psychoeducational workshop and explained the purpose of the study before asking for their
participation. The women were told that the project was for the author's Master's thesis, and that it was an effort to understand the factors involved in a woman's decision to end or continue a relationship that turned violent. Once the volunteers had been identified, packets containing the questionnaires were distributed for their inspection, before they decided if they were willing to complete the survey. At this time, any questions the subjects had were answered, before being asked to read and sign the consent form. Once signed, the consent forms were collected and returned to the researcher. Due to the school's time constrains, it was not possible to collect the completed questionnaires during class time, therefore, the subjects were asked to complete the surveys on their own and return them to their instructor within a week from the day they received the packet. It should be noted that since the researcher was unable to monitor the completion of the questionnaires, it was stressed to the subjects the importance of completing the survey on their own, without consulting others for answers. The subjects were also advised of their right to withdraw from the study at any time, even if they had signed a consent form.

Completed questionnaires were returned to their instructors in a period of up to three weeks after initial contact. The procedure was repeated several times, spawning two training sessions until all groups had been approached for the study. There were a total of 53 packets distributed for this project of which 36 were returned. Two packets had to be excluded due to several missing responses for one of them, and the other due to the respondent not being of Mexican-American descent.

Instruments

Five instruments were used for this study. A demographic questionnaire designed by the researcher, The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1981); The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (ARSMA) (Cuellar, Harris & Jasso, 1980); The Rotter Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement scale (Rotter, 1966); and a Violence
Survey composed by the researcher based on the Straus Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979). All instruments were presented without their titles, and accompanied only by their individual instructions.

**Demographic Questionnaire**

This instrument was created by the researcher in order to collect basic demographic information about each participant. Included in the instrument were questions related to age, marital status, number of children, living arrangement, education, and income.

**The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI)**

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1981) is a 60-item self-administered inventory that was designed to measure an individual's psychological androgyny, the ability to integrate both feminine and masculine characteristics. Subjects are asked to rate themselves on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 ("Never or almost never true") to 7 ("Always or almost always true"). The inventory treats femininity and masculinity as two independent dimensions allowing the characterization of subjects as high on both dimensions (androgynous); low on both dimensions (undifferentiated); or high on one dimension but low on the other (either feminine or masculine). Internal consistency coefficient alpha for the female normative sample was .78 for the Femininity score; .86 for the Masculinity score; and .82 for the Femininity-minus-Masculinity Difference score. Product-moment correlation results for test-retest reliability for the female sample were as follows, .82 for the Femininity score; .94 for the Masculinity score; and .98 for the Femininity-minus-Masculinity Difference score. All scores were reported to be highly reliable (Bem, 1981).

**The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (ARSMA)**

The Acculturation Rating Scale for Mexican Americans (ARSMA) (Cuellar, Harris, & Jasso, 1980) is a measure of acculturation specifically designed for Mexican-Americans, and can be used with both psychiatric and normal populations. It consists of 20 questions scored
on a 5-point Likert scale and can differentiate subjects into five basic types: Type 1 = very Mexican; Type 2 = Mexican-oriented bicultural; Type 3 = true or syntonic bicultural; Type 4 = Anglo-oriented bicultural; and Type 5 = very Anglicized. It may be given in English, Spanish, or both languages, and can be administered individually (usually with psychiatric subjects), or as a group test (with normal adults of average intelligence and reading skills). Internal consistency for study samples was reported to be .88 and the test-retest reliability was reported to be .80 (Cuellar, et al, 1980).

Internal Versus External Control of Reinforcement

The Rotter (1966) is a self-administered 29 item, forced choice instrument designed to assess whether a person perceives a reward as being contingent on her own behavior or independent of it. The Rotter was used to infer a subject's perception of her ability to be in control of her life. An externally controlled person will perceive reinforcement as following some action but not being entirely contingent upon that action. An internally controlled person will perceive reinforcement as being contingent on their own behavior. The scores range from 0-23 and are based on the number of external choices. The higher the score, the more times a subject made an external choice. Scores below 12.5 are classified as internal; and scores above 12.5 are classified as external. Internal consistency estimates have been reported to be relatively stable with a range of .65 to .76 (Rotter, 1966). Test-retest reliability estimates range from .60 to .83 for a 1 month interval and .49 to .61 for a 2 month interval (Rotter, 1966). The time requirement for completion of the instrument is estimated to be between five to ten minutes.
Violence Survey

To understand the violent life experience of the subjects, a 21 item survey was designed by the researcher based on the Conflict Tactics Scale (CT) developed by Straus (1979). As part of the present violence survey, subjects were asked to record as accurately as possible the number of times in their lifetime a violent event had been perpetrated against them by a love interest. The survey also asked for a count of romantic relationships, number of violent romantic relationships, number of violent romantic relationships left/terminated by the subject, and how long it had taken the subject to leave such relationship(s). The last item (# 21) was an open ended question asking subjects for a written response citing what reasons, if any, had prompted them to leave the violent romantic relationship(s). All questionnaires were pilot-tested on three Mexican-American female volunteers to assess ease of administration. All three volunteers reported needing 20-25 minutes to complete the entire packet.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Table 1 presents means, modes, standard deviations, and ranges for the three instruments for the total sample. For ease of interpretation of the Bem sex-role inventory scores, the T-score was used in the analysis of data. The T-score is calculated by subtracting the standard male score from the standard female score, the higher the T-score the more feminine the sex-role type of the subject, conversely, the lower the T-score the more masculine the sex-role type of the subject. The sex-role inventory scores ranged from 21 to 76 with a mean score of 52.4 (SD = 13.2) and a mode of 61. The acculturation scores ranged from 2.1 to 4.3 with a mean score of 2.8 (SD = .56) and a mode of 2.1. The range of scores for the Rotter scale was 3 to 14 with a mean of 9.8 (SD = 2.5), mode of 11.

Table 1

Summary of Mean, Mode, SD, and Ranges for all Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEM</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCULT</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2.1-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. BEM = Bem Sex-Role Inventory, ACCULT = Acculturation Scale, IE = Locus of Control.
To examine the nature of the relationship between the instruments, correlational analyses were performed on the three measures. Table 2 shows the correlational matrix for all instruments, as can be observed the only instruments to be correlated were the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and the locus of control scale. The correlation was statistically significant in the positive direction, $r = .33$, $p < .05$.

Table 2

Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEM</th>
<th>ACCULT</th>
<th>IE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BEM</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCULT</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. BEM = Bem Sex-Role Inventory, ACCULT = Acculturation Scale, IE = Locus of control.

*p < .05.

Table 3 shows a summary of the incidence of violence experienced by the subjects, citing percentage of women reporting at least one violent incident in their lifetime, mean number of times a violent incident was reported, and the range of times these incidents occurred. Table 4 shows the number of subjects reporting having had at least one violent relationship in their lifetime, as can be seen the sample ($N = 34$) was split exactly in half between women reporting having had no violent relationships in their lifetime, and the women who reported at least one violent relationship in their lifetime. A t-test was performed to assess whether the difference between these two groups was significant. As can be observed on Table 5, there was a significant difference found on the mean sex-role inventory scores between the women who reported no involvement in a violent relationship ($n = 17$) and those who did report involvement in a violent relationship ($n = 17$), $p < .05$. 
The women who had not been involved in a violent relationship scored significantly as more feminine sex-typed than the women who had been in at least one violent relationship. A correlational analysis ruled out age as a predictor for both involvement in a violent relationship, and as a predictor for length of time it took to leave a violent relationship. Table 6 summarizes the number of violent relationships left or terminated by the group of women reporting at least one violent relationship in their lifetime (n = 17). The average length of time that it took to terminate these relationships is presented in Table 7.

Table 3
Amount of Violence Experienced by Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean# of times</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 threw item</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 threaten to hit</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 threw item at me</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 pushed me</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 hit me</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 hit w/something</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 slapped</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 kick hit w/fist</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 choked</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 beat up</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 beat/hospital</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 threaten to kill</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 threatens/knife...</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 used knife/gun</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. % refers to percentage of women reporting at least one violent incident.

Table 4
Number of Lifetime Violent Relationships (N = 34)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of violent relationships</th>
<th># of S's reporting</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

**t-test for Mean Differences Between Women Who Did Not Experience Violence vs. Women Who Did**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>No violence ( n = 17 )</th>
<th>Violence ( n = 17 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCULT</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEM</td>
<td>54*</td>
<td>9.6*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ACCULT = Acculturation scale, BEM = Bem sex-role inventory, IE = Locus of control.

*\( p < .05 \)

Table 6

**Number of Violent Relationships Left in Lifetime (\( N = 17 \))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of violent relationships left</th>
<th># of S's reporting</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Average Length of Time It Took To End Violent Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of mos.</th>
<th># of S's reporting</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 16

One subject reported to still be in a violent relationship.

In order to determine the relationship between sex-role, locus of control acculturation, and response to violence, a stepwise multiple regression was performed using items 18 (number of lifetime violent relationships), 19 (number of violent relationships left in lifetime), and 20 (average length of time it took to end violent relationships) from the violence survey, as the dependent variables. For both item 18 and 19 level of acculturation was the only significant predictor. The multiple R for both was .40 and the R square was .16, p < .05. That is to say that for both, item 18 and 19, level of acculturation accounted for 16 percent of the variance. Table 8 and Table 9 show the respective summary table for the Stepwise regression results. No significant relationship was found with item 20 (average length of time it took to end violent relationships).
Table 8
Summary Table for Stepwise Regression Analysis for Dependent Variable # of Lifetime Violent Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Summary Table for Stepwise Regression Analysis for Dependent Variable # of Violent Relationships Left in Lifetime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acculturation</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

The following section summarizes the results found in this study as they relate to sex-role, locus of control, level of acculturation, and response to violence. Next the author discusses the significance of the findings, and the limitations of this project; the author closes with suggestions for future research.

Significance

This project investigated the relationship between sex-role, locus of control, level of acculturation, and response to violence. Of the 34 participants, 17 were found to have experienced at least one violent relationship in their lifetime, with the other 17 reporting never having been involved in a violent relationship. The results of the t-test indicated that sex-role attitude accounted for the difference between these two groups, with the women not involved in violent relationships being significantly more sex-typed as feminine. That is to say that the women not involved in violent relationships were more likely to share characteristics that are considered typically female (compassionate, affectionate, yielding, sympathetic, etc.). This finding may indicate that the more a woman adheres to her expected sex-role, the less conflict she will encounter in her relationship with a man. Having said this, however, it is important to point out that many of the respondents indicated not having had any romantic relationships at all, violent or otherwise. This restricted range of answers makes it impossible to draw any concrete, reliable conclusions regarding the sex-role differences found.

The fact that level of acculturation was the only significant
predictor of response to violence (items 18 and 19 on the violence survey) further complicates the efforts to understand and explain the results of this study. With the majority of the acculturation scores falling in the Type 2 true bicultural/syntonic category, it may appear that the women who share equally Mexican and Anglo characteristics and preferences, are more likely to find themselves in violent relationships; and more likely to leave these relationships than the women who fall towards either end of the acculturation spectrum. Given that the mean score (2.8) and the mode (2.1) for the entire group of subjects fell in the Type 2 true bicultural/syntonic category (Acculturation score of 1.0 to 2.79) it is not possible to assert with confidence that the women at either end of the acculturation spectrum will be less likely to involve themselves in a violent relationships, and less likely to end a violent relationship. Although level of acculturation accounted for 16 percent of the variance for both items 18 and 19, the question remains as to how much of the remaining variance is accounted for by sex-role and locus of control. There was a positive correlation detected between sex-role and locus of control, and sex-role score significantly differentiated the group with no history of violent relationships from the group who had experienced a violent relationship. However, the relationship of locus of control, sex-role attitude, and response to violence was not detected by the multiple regression analysis.

Should these conclusions be accurate, the implication for counselors would be that when working with battered Mexican-American women, level of acculturation may be an important factor in the woman's decision to leave a violent relationship. And, that in fact, showing a preference for the more Mexican or the more Anglo end of the acculturation spectrum will actually preclude the Mexican-American battered woman from leaving a potentially dangerous situation.
Limitations

Due to the small sample size (N = 34), the relative young age of the respondents (mode = 18), the restricted range of answers regarding history of violent relationships and history of romantic relationships in general, confidence in the results and their generalizability is very limited. Perhaps replicating the above study with a larger group of Mexican-American women would provide more reliable data, and make the results more generalizable and credible.

Suggestions for Future Research

1. An area of interest would be to do a longitudinal study and follow-up Mexican-American women who have ended a violent relationship and examine their pattern of relationships. Some of the questions to answer would be: Do they stay completely out of violent relationships? Do they continue a pattern of becoming involved in and leaving violent relationships?

2. What external factors are important in a Mexican-American woman's response to violence? How does the availability of resources such as child care, employment, familial support, community support, legal and protective services, psychological services impact their response to violence?

This project attempted to explore the relationship between sex-role, level of acculturation, locus of control and Mexican-American women's response to violence. While there were no reliable differences found to predict which women will remain in a violent relationship and which will leave, it did appear that level of acculturation and to some extent sex-role attitude may play a role in a Mexican-American woman's decision to end or stay in a violent relationship. As a first attempt to understand the relationship above mentioned, this project has raised more questions than it answers. It is the hope of the author that the questions raised will be considered valid and worthy of further study, and that this project serves the purpose of motivating others to explore
the Mexican-American woman's response to violence.
Dear Participant:

My name is Ana Gonzalez and I am a graduate student at Loyola University. I am in the process of completing a Master’s thesis, and your answers to the survey you have just been given are essential to my project.

I am trying to understand what are the factors involved in a woman’s decision to end or continue a relationship once it turns violent, and your responses will be greatly appreciated.

If you do not wish to participate in this survey, kindly return it to the person that distributed them in this classroom.

If you do agree to participate, your signature at the bottom of this page will attest to your willingness to participate. Your responses are private, confidential, and anonymous. Please be advised that you can withdraw from this project at any time. If you have any questions about the survey, please contact me at (773) 277-3455, or my research supervisor, Dr. Suzette L. Speight at (847) 853-3348.

Thank you in advance for your time and your valuable answers.

I freely and voluntarily consent to my participation in this survey.

Signature: ____________________________________________

Date ____________________________________________
APPENDIX B
INSTRUMENTS
PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

1. Age

2. Country of Birth

3. Ethnic Identification (circle one):
   (1) Mexican
   (2) Mexican-American
   (3) Puerto Rican
   (4) African-American
   (5) White

4. Marital Status (circle one):
   (1) Single
   (2) Married
   (3) Divorced
   (4) Separated
   (5) Widowed

5. Number of Children (fill in blank)

6. Living Arrangement (circle one):
   (1) Live on my own
   (2) Live with parents
   (3) Live with husband
   (4) Live with significant other
   (5) Other (please specify)

7. Education (circle highest grade completed):
   (1) High school
   (2) GED
   (3) Other (please specify)

8. Annual Income (circle one):
   (1) $4000-$8000
   (2) $9000-$13000
   (3) $14000-$18000
   (4) $19000-$23000
   (5) $24000-$28000
   (6) $29000 and above

9. Source of Income (circle one):
   (1) Public Assistance
   (2) Full-time work
   (3) Part-time work
   (4) Other (please specify)
DIRECTIONS

On the next page, you will find listed a number of personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics to describe yourself, that is, we would like you to indicate, on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you each of these characteristics is. Please do not leave any characteristic unmarked.

Example: sly
Write a 1 if it is never or almost never true that you are sly.
Write a 2 if it is usually not true that you are sly.
Write a 3 if it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are sly.
Write a 4 if it is occasionally true that you are sly.
Write a 5 if it is often true that you are sly.
Write a 6 if it is usually true that you are sly.
Write a 7 if it is always or almost always true that you are sly.

Thus, if you feel it is sometimes but infrequently true that you are "sly," never or almost never true that you are "malicious," always or almost always true that you are "irresponsible," and often true that you are "carefree," then you would rate these characteristics as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irresponsible</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malicious</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carefree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Affectionate</td>
<td>22. Dominant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conscientious</td>
<td>23. Tender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Independent</td>
<td>24. Conceited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sympathetic</td>
<td>25. Willing to take a stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assertive</td>
<td>27. Tactful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reliable</td>
<td>29. Gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Compassionate</td>
<td>34. Athletic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Truthful</td>
<td>35. Cheerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Have leadership abilities</td>
<td>36. Unsystematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td>37. Analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Warm</td>
<td>40. Make decisions easily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circle the number next to the answer that best fits the question. Where more than one answer seems appropriate, base your choice as best possible, on what would be the most correct under normal circumstances or under most conditions.

1. What language do you speak?
   1. Spanish only
   2. Mostly Spanish, some English
   3. Spanish and English about equally (bilingual)
   4. Mostly English, some Spanish
   5. English only

2. What language do you prefer?
   1. Spanish only
   2. Mostly Spanish, some English
   3. Spanish and English about equally (bilingual)
   4. Mostly English, some Spanish
   5. English only

3. How do you identify yourself?
   1. Mexican
   2. Chicano
   3. Mexican American
   4. Spanish American, Latin American, Hispanic American, American
   5. Anglo American or other

4. Which ethnic identification does (did) your mother use?
   1. Mexican
   2. Chicano
   3. Mexican American
   4. Spanish, Hispanic, Latin American, American
   5. Anglo American or other

5. Which ethnic identification does (did) your father use?
   1. Mexican
   2. Chicano
   3. Mexican American
   4. Spanish, Hispanic, Latin American, American
   5. Anglo American or other

6-7. What was the ethnic origin of the friends and peers you had as a child up to age 6?__________(use codes 1-5 below)
   from 6 to 18?__________(use codes 1-5 below)
   1. Almost exclusively Mexicans, Chicanos, Mexican Americans (La Raza)
   2. Mostly Mexicans, Chicanos, Mexican Americans
   3. About equally Raza (Mexicans, Chicanos, or Mexican Americans) and Anglos or other ethnic groups
   4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, or other ethnic groups
   5. Almost exclusively Anglos, Blacks, or other ethnic groups
8. Whom do you now associate with in the outside community?
   1. Almost exclusively Mexican, Chicanos, or Mexican Americans (La Raza)
   2. Mostly Mexicans, Chicanos, Mexican Americans
   3. About equally Raza (Mexicans, Chicanos, or Mexican Americans) and Anglos or other ethnic groups
   4. Mostly Anglos, Blacks, or other ethnic groups
   5. Almost exclusively Anglos, blacks or other ethnic groups

9. What is your music preference?
   1. Only Spanish
   2. Mostly Spanish
   3. Equally Spanish and English
   4. Mostly English
   5. English only

10. What is your TV viewing preference?
    1. Only programs in Spanish
    2. Mostly programs in Spanish
    3. Equally Spanish and English programs
    4. Mostly programs in English
    5. Only programs in English

11. What is your movie preference?
    1. Spanish-language movies only
    2. Spanish-language movies mostly
    3. Equally English/Spanish movies
    4. English-language movies mostly
    5. English-language movies only

12. a. Where were you born? (check one)
    _____Mexico _____U.S. _____Other

   (Parents)
   b. Where was your father born?
    _____Mexico _____U.S. _____Other

c. Where was your mother born?
    _____Mexico _____U.S. _____Other

   (Grandparents)
   d. Where was your father’s mother born?
    _____Mexico _____U.S. _____Other

e. Where was your father’s father born?
    _____Mexico _____U.S. _____Other

f. Where was your mother’s mother born?
    _____Mexico _____U.S. _____Other

g. Where was your mother’s father born?
    _____Mexico _____U.S. _____Other
13. Where were you raised?

1. In Mexico only
2. Mostly in Mexico, some in the U.S.
3. Equally in the U.S. and Mexico
4. Mostly in the U.S., some in Mexico
5. In the U.S. only

14. What contact have you had with Mexico?

1. Raised for one year or more in Mexico
2. Lived less than one year in Mexico
3. Occasional visits to Mexico
4. Occasional communications (letters, phone calls, etc.) with people in Mexico
5. No exposure or communications with people in Mexico

15. What is your food preference?

1. Exclusively Mexican food
2. Mostly Mexican food, some American
3. About equally Mexican and American
4. Mostly American food
5. Exclusively American food

16. In what language do you think?

1. Only in Spanish
2. Mostly Spanish
3. Equally in English and Spanish
4. Mostly English
5. Only in English

17. Can you read Spanish? _____Yes _____No

18. Can you write English? _____Yes _____No

19. Can you write Spanish? _____Yes _____No

19. If you consider yourself a Mexican, Chicano, Mexican American, member of La Raza, or however you identify this group, how much pride do you have in this group?

1. Extremely proud
2. Moderately proud
3. Little pride
4. No pride but do not feel negative toward group
5. No pride and feel negative toward La Raza

20. How would you rate yourself?

1. Very Mexican
2. Mostly Mexican
3. Bicultural
4. Mostly Anglicized
5. Very Anglicized
Instructions:

This is a questionnaire to find out the way in which certain important events in our society affect different people. Each item consists of a pair of alternatives lettered a or b. Please select the one statement of each pair (and only one) which you more strongly believe to be the case as far as you’re concerned. Be sure to select the one you actually believe to be more true rather than the one you think you should choose or the one you would like to be true. This is a measure of personal belief; obviously there are no right or wrong answers.

Please answer these items carefully but do not spend too much time on any one item. Be sure to find an answer for every choice. In some instances you may discover that you believe both statements or neither one. In such cases, be sure to select the one you most strongly believe to be the case as far as you’re concerned. Also try to respond to each item independently when making your choice; do not be influenced by your previous choices.

1. a. Children get into trouble because their parents punish them too much.
   b. The trouble with most children nowadays is that their parents are too easy with them.

2. a. Many of the unhappy things in people’s lives are partly due to bad luck.
   b. People’s misfortunes result from the mistakes they make.

3. a. One of the major reasons why we have wars is because people don’t take enough interest in politics.
   b. There will always be wars, no matter how hard people try to prevent them.

4. a. In the long run people get the respect they deserve in this world.
   b. Unfortunately, an individual’s worth often passes unrecognized no matter how hard he tries.

5. a. The idea that teachers are unfair to students is nonsense.
   b. Most students don’t realize the extent to which their grades are influenced by accidental happenings.

6. a. Without the right breaks one cannot be an effective leader.
   b. Capable people who fail to become leaders have not taken advantage of their opportunities.

7. a. No matter how hard you try some people just don’t like you.
   b. People who can’t get others to like them don’t understand how to get along with others.

8. a. Heredity plays a major role in determining one’s personality.
   b. It is one’s experiences in life which determine what they’re like.
9. a. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.
    b. Trusting to fate has never turned out as well for me as making a decision to take a definite course of action.

10. a. In the case of the well prepared student there is rarely if ever such a thing as an unfair test.
    b. Many times exam questions tend to be so unrelated to course work that studying is really useless.

11. a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work, luck has little or nothing to do with it.
    b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.

12. a. The average citizen can have an influence in government decisions.
    b. This world is run by the few people in power, and there is not much the little guy can do about it.

13. a. When I make plans, I am almost certain that I can make them work.
    b. It is not always wise to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune anyhow.

14. a. There are certain people who are just no good.
    b. There is some good in everybody.

15. a. In my case getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
    b. Many times we might just as well decide what to do by flipping a coin.

16. a. Who gets to be the boss often depends on who was lucky enough to be in the right place first.
    b. Getting people to do the right thing depends upon ability, luck has little or nothing to do with it.

17. a. As far as world affairs are concerned, most of us are the victims of forces we can neither understand, nor control.
    b. By taking an active part in political and social affairs the people can control world events.

18. a. Most people don't realize the extent to which their lives are controlled by accidental happenings.
    b. There really is no such thing as "luck."

19. a. One should always be willing to admit mistakes.
    b. It is usually best to cover up one's mistakes.
20. a. It is hard to know whether or not a person really likes you.
   b. How many friends you have depends upon how nice a person you are.

21. a. In the long run the bad things that happen to us are balanced by the good ones.
   b. Most misfortunes are the result of lack of ability, ignorance, laziness, or all three.

22. a. With enough effort we can wipe out political corruption.
   b. It is difficult for people to have much control over the things politicians do in office.

23. a. Sometimes I can’t understand how teachers arrive at the grades they give.
   b. There is a direct connection between how hard I study and the grades I get.

24. a. A good leader expects people to decide for themselves what they should do.
   b. A good leader makes it clear to everybody what their jobs are.

25. a. Many times I feel that I have little influence over the things that happen to me.
   b. It is impossible for me to believe that chance or luck plays an important role in my life.

26. a. People are lonely because they don’t try to be friendly.
   b. There’s not much use in trying too hard to please people, if they like you, they like you.

27. a. There is too much emphasis on athletics in high school.
   b. Team sports are an excellent way to build character.

28. a. What happens to me is my own doing.
   b. Sometimes I feel that I don’t have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

29. a. Most of the time I can’t understand why politicians behave the way they do.
   b. In the long run the people are responsible for bad government on a national as well as a local level.
Please fill in the number of times these incidents have ever happened to you in all of your romantic relationships.

1. Threw something (but not at me) or smashed something.
   Number of times

2. Threatened to hit or throw something at me.
   Number of times

3. Threw something at me.
   Number of times

4. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved me.
   Number of times

5. Hit (or tried to hit) me but not with anything.
   Number of times

6. Hit (or tried to hit) me with something hard.
   Number of times

7. Slapped me.
   Number of times

8. Kicked, hit, or hit with a fist.
   Number of times

9. Choked me.
   Number of times

10. Beat me up.
    Number of times

11. Beat me up bad enough that I had to go to the hospital.
    Number of times

12. Threatened to kill me.
    Number of times

13. Threatened with a knife or gun.
    Number of times

14. Used a knife or gun.
    Number of times
Please answer all the questions that apply to you.

15. Are you currently involved in a romantic relationship where there is violence?
   
   ____yes       ____no

16. If yes, how long have you been involved in this relationship?
   
   ____weeks       ____months       ____years

17. In your lifetime, how many romantic relationships have you been involved in?
   
   Please enter number__

18. In your lifetime, how many violent romantic relationships have been involved in?
   
   Please enter number__

19. In your lifetime, how many violent relationships have you left?
   
   Please enter number__

20. On the average, how long did it take you to leave these relationships?
   
   ____weeks       ____months       ____years

21. What made you leave these relationships?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Mujeres Latinas En Accion  
1823 W. 17th Street  
Chicago, Illinois  
(312) 226-1544

Individual and group counseling, court advocacy.  
Se habla espanol

Southwest Women Working Together  
4051 W. 63rd Street  
Chicago, Illinois  
(773) 582-0550

Counseling for women and children victims of domestic violence and sexual abuse.  
Pre-employment training  
Homeless shelter for women and their children  
Housing assistance program

Sarah’s Inn  
Oak Park/Chicago  
(773) 287-2400  
(708) 386-4225 (24-hour hotline)

Referral services  
Transitional housing program

Rainbow House Arco Iris  
Chicago, Illinois  
(773) 762-6611 (24-hour 7 days a week)

Shelter for women and their children  
Information and referral service  
Children’s programs  
Support groups  
Individual counseling

Family Rescue  
Chicago, Illinois  
(773) 375-8400 (24-hours)

Shelter for women and their children  
Individual counseling  
Support groups  
Court, legal, and P.A. advocacy  
Se habla espanol
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