

DEFENSIVE ATTRIBUTIONS AS A FUNCTION OF GENDER

HONORS THESIS

Presented to the Honors Committee of

Texas State University-San Marcos

In Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements

For Graduation in the University Honors Program

By

Catherine Solon

San Marcos, Texas

May 2009

DEFENSIVE ATTRIBUTIONS AS A FUNCTION OF GENDER

Approved:

Dr. Heather C. Galloway
Director, University Honors Program

Approved:

Dr. Randall Osborne
Department of Psychology
Supervising Professor

Abstract

Two hundred thirty six students were assessed based on their self-esteem, locus of control, and defensive attributions made. Participants read two different scenarios of abuse and answered questions about who they blamed for the abuse. Participants with an external locus of control were found to blame the men more for the abuse in comparison to participants with an internal locus of control ($M = -1.8268$, $SD = 1.38355$, for external and $M = -1.1852$, $SD = 1.63146$ for internal). Participants with low self-esteem were found to blame the man less for the abuse in comparison with participants with high self-esteem ($M = -1.3147$, $SD = 1.64387$ for low self-esteem and $M = -1.7125$, $SD = 1.42702$ for high self-esteem). Self-esteem and locus of control were both found to be significant predictors of the ratings of the causes of abuse.

Defensive Attributions as a Function of Gender

With the field of Forensic Psychology becoming more popular, Battered Woman Syndrome and the effects of domestic violence are being discussed in classrooms. Students are learning about this Syndrome and the effects that abuse has on the victim. This study seeks to find out if there is a difference in the way the men and women approach domestic violence. Battered Woman Syndrome, often considered a subcategory of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, is a collection of psychological symptoms. There are three groups of symptoms: mind, body, and cognitive (Cronin, 2006), (Women's Rural Advocacy Programs, 2007). Body symptoms are automatic. They involve the “fight or flight” response such as when a woman becomes tense at the sound of a loud sound because she is hypersensitive to cues. These symptoms are similar to reactions in those individuals with PTSD. Mind symptoms involve distorted thoughts and cognitive symptoms include impairments such as phobias, denial, and panic disorders. To be classified as a battered woman, a woman has to have been through at least two cycles of abuse. A cycle of abuse occurs in a repeating pattern. Abuse is cyclical in two ways: generational and episodic. Generational cycles of abuse occur in more than one phase of life and within the context of at least two individuals within the family system. The episodic cycle of abuse is within the individual and is characterized by distinct periods of behavior (Cronin, 2006), (Women's Rural Advocacy Programs, 2007).

A woman with Battered Woman Syndrome goes through four stages of abuse. In stage one, denial, the woman denies the abuse to herself and others. In stage two, guilt, she realizes that there is a problem in her relationship but blames herself. In stage three, enlightenment, she recognizes her partner has a problem but she believes she just needs to try harder at bettering their relationship. In the last stage, responsibility, the woman realizes that her

abuser has a problem that only he can fix and she takes the necessary steps to leave her abuser. In some rare instances the abused woman will kill her abuser; she will commit the murder because she believes this is the only way to escape the abuse (Cronin, 2006), (Women's Rural Advocacy Programs, 2007). Research on Defensive Attributions and the Just World Theory has been used to predict men and women's attribution of blame for abuse.

Idisis, Ben-David, and Ben-Nachum (2007) define the Just World Theory as the belief that people get what they deserve and deserve what they get. Their research states that people blame the victim for the abuse in order to continue their belief in a just world. Paulsen (1979) explains that the Just World Theory occurs when people are seen as having something unpleasant happen to them for two reasons: because they are a bad person and are getting what they deserve or they are a good person and the misfortune occurs because they behaved in a such a manner as to cause something bad to happen to them.

Shaver (1970) states that the Defensive Attribution Hypothesis has two factors. One factor of the theory, referred to as harm avoidance, is the need of an individual to defend themselves against the possibility that a random misfortune may happen to them. The other factor, blame avoidance, is the need of an individual to defend against the possibility that they will be held responsible if they encounter a similar misfortune. Witte (2005) found that when the victim is seen as provoking the abuse, there is an increase in attributions of blame on the victim; this study focused on victims of domestic violence. Witte (2005) also found that compared to men, women attributed less blame on the victim than on the perpetrator. In one study of attributions of rape victims, it was found that women attributed less blame on the victim even when the victim was an "ideal" victim (Gilmartin-Zena, 1983). An "ideal" victim is a woman who is married or a virgin. This study also showed that men and

women attributed more blame on the rape victim when they identified with the “ideal” victim.

In a study by Kristiansen and Giulietti (2006), the effects of gender, attitudes toward women, and just-world beliefs on their perceptions regarding the perpetrator and victim of wife abuse were examined. This study found that males blamed and derogated the wife/victim more as their attitudes toward women became less favorable. Females with positive attitudes toward women blamed, but did not derogate the wife/victim more as their just-world beliefs became stronger. These findings support the notion that females may blame a female victim of violence in an effort to gain perceived control over the possibility of their own possible victimization (Kristiansen & Giulietti, 2006).

A study by Bell, Kuriloff, and Lottes (1994), showed that women tend to attribute blame on the victim less than males. This study also showed a correlation between the high perceptions of similarity felt by the women for the victim compared to the rate of attributions of blame placed on the victim. Women tend to attribute more blame on the victim if they themselves identify with the victim. One study looked at sex-role beliefs and perceptions of vulnerability as a predictor of defensive attributions for crime (Finke, 1995). This study found that women’s perceived vulnerability was not a predictor of her attitude towards wife abuse. This study also found that males, moderately vulnerable to crime, reported perceiving the abusers as less responsible. When people blame the victim, they are able to keep a sense of control, safety, and protection from similar events. This idea can be used in the court room. If the defense attorney describes the victim in a way that the female jurors identify with her then research suggests they will be more likely to acquit the perpetrator and blame the victim.

Locus of control has also been examined with defensive attributions. People with an internal locus of control believe they can control events in their life; something good happens in

their life due to something they caused. A person who has an external locus of control believes that events in his or her life are out of his or her control and are due to fate. Locus of control has been used as a predictor for defensive attribution. Phares and Lamiell (1975) define locus of control as the extent to which individuals attribute the responsibility for the occurrence of reinforcement to themselves or forces outside themselves. Their study found that externals are more likely to have sympathy for others who need help and are more likely to need assistance themselves. This study also found that internals see themselves as the locus of control of reinforcement and are less likely to have sympathy for people who need help.

Phares and Wilson (1972) suggest that internals and externals use their own self-perceptions of locus of control and responsibility in judging the behaviors of others. They found that internals are prone to attribute higher levels of responsibility for an accident than are externals. Paulsen (1979) found that individuals with an internal locus of control attributed greater fault to rape victims than individuals with an external locus of control. Alexander (1980) reinforces the previous findings in, showing that nurses with an internal locus of control hold victims more responsible for their unfortunate circumstances than do nurses with an external locus of control. All of the above studies involving locus of control and defensive attributions have relatively small sample sizes. More recent research has not reinforced the findings of previous research. Muller, Caldwell, and Hunter (1994) found that greater external locus of control predicted higher levels of victim blame. This study has twice the sample size of the previous researched mentioned.

Little research has been done on the relationship between defensive attributions and self-esteem. Patten and Woods (1978) found that victims of verbal aggression with low self-esteem attributed more blame to themselves than victims with high self-esteem. Victims with low self-

esteem and an external locus of control attributed even more blame on themselves. If students in the current study identify with the victim then based on the study by Patten and Woods (1978), the student with lower self-esteem will attribute more blame on the victim. Based on the former research this study hypothesizes that women will make less defensive attributions than men unless the women identify with the victim. If the women identify with the victim, then they will make more defensive attributions. This study will also test the hypothesis that individuals with an internal locus of control will make more defensive attributions. Based on the conflicting research there is no speculation for the relationship between self-esteem and defensive attributions.

Method

Participants

Two hundred thirty six participants, aged 19 to 33 years, took part in this study. All were undergraduate students at Texas State University. There were 84 males and 152 females. Of all the participants there were 140 Liberal Arts Majors, 3 Business Majors, 4 Applied Arts Majors, 10 Science Majors, 25 Fine Arts Majors, 12 Educations Majors, 33 Health Majors, 4 General Studies Majors, and 5 participants who were undecided. Participants had completed a range of 0 to 160 hours in their majors, with an average of 35 hours. Participants were recruited from Texas State University. Students with a history of abuse were asked not to participate.

Materials

Participants' locus of control, self-esteem, and perceptions of abuse were measured. A consent form was filled out by each participant. The consent gave a brief outline of the previous research found and outlined what was to be expected from the study. Participants were provided

with information regarding counseling services if the study invoked any negative feelings. A demographic questionnaire was completed by all participants. On the demographic questionnaire participants were asked to provide their gender, age, academic major, and the number of hours they had completed in their major. Rotter's Locus of Control Scale was used to measure the participant's locus of control (Rotter, 1966). A copy of this 29 item scale is presented in Appendix A. Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale was used to measure the participant's self-esteem (Rosenberg, 1965). A copy of this 10 item Likert scale is presented in Appendix B. Participant's perceptions of abuse were measured by the Commission of Crime Scenario Scale. This 7 item scale was generated by the experimenter and a copy of the scale can be found in Appendix C.

Procedure

Participants were recruited to participate in the study and were offered extra credit from their Professor for their participation. Students with a history of abuse were asked not to participate in this study, in order to reduce bias. Participants were handed out a packet containing the consent form, demographic questionnaire, Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, Rotter's Locus of Control Scale, the first and second scenarios of abuse and two copies of the Commission of Crime Scenario Scale. Participants read and filled out the consent form and demographic questionnaire. After completing these questionnaires, the participant's self-esteem was measured using Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale. The participant's locus of control was then measured by using Rotter's Locus of Control Scale.

After completing these scales, participants read the first scenario of abuse. The first scenario of abuse was generated by the experimenter and a copy of the scenario can be found in Appendix D. After reading the scenario of abuse, participants completed the Commission of

Crime Scenario Scale. Participants then read the second scenario of abuse. The second scenario of abuse was generated by the experimenter and a copy of the scenario is presented in Appendix D. After reading the second scenario of abuse, participants completed the Commission of Crime Scenario Scale.

Results

Self-esteem and locus of control were both found to be significant predictors of the ratings of the causes of abuse. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical data. A frequency analysis was done to split the self-esteem scores into low and high. A self-esteem score of 23 and lower was scored as low (1) and a self-esteem score of 24 or higher was scored as high (2). Abuse was scored with a scale of: -3 to 3. A score of (-3) indicates that the man is fully to blame and a score of (3) indicates that the woman is fully to blame. Table 1, reveals that participants with low self-esteem tend to blame the man less than participants with high self-esteem ($M = -1.3147$, $SD = 1.64387$ for low self-esteem and $M = -1.7125$, $SD = 1.42702$ for high self-esteem). The data from Table 2 supports the results on self-esteem.

Table 1: Scenario1 scenario2 Abuse * SE2

SE2		scenario1	scenario2	Abuse
1	Mean	-1.34	-1.31	-1.3147
	N	116	116	116
	Std. Deviation	1.739	1.801	1.64387
2	Mean	-1.82	-1.66	-1.7125
	N	120	120	120
	Std. Deviation	1.489	1.627	1.42702
Total	Mean	-1.58	-1.49	-1.5169
	N	236	236	236
	Std. Deviation	1.631	1.720	1.54704

Table 2

	SE2	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scenario1	1	116	-1.34	1.739	.161
	2	120	-1.82	1.489	.136
scenario2	1	116	-1.31	1.801	.167
	2	120	-1.66	1.627	.149
Abuse	1	116	-1.3147	1.64387	.15263
	2	120	-1.7125	1.42702	.13027

A frequency analysis was done to split the locus of control scores into internal and external. A locus of control score of 10 and below were categorized as internal (1) while scores of 11 and higher were scored as external (2). Table 3, indicates that participants with an external locus of control () tend to blame to man more for the abuse than participants with an internal locus of control ($M = -1.8268$, $SD = 1.38355$ for external locus of control and $M = -1.1852$, $SD = 1.63146$ for internal). Table 4, supports the same results. Independent samples and t -test data tables are presented in Appendix E. A complete correlation matrix is presented in Appendix F.

Table 3

LOC2		scenario1	scenario2	Abuse
1	Mean	-1.25	-1.09	-1.1852
	N	108	108	108
	Std. Deviation	1.681	1.867	1.63146
2	Mean	-1.87	-1.83	-1.8268
	N	127	127	127
	Std. Deviation	1.538	1.518	1.38355
3	Mean	.00	-1.00	2.0000
	N	1	1	1
	Std. Deviation	.	.	.
Total	Mean	-1.58	-1.49	-1.5169
	N	236	236	236
	Std. Deviation	1.631	1.720	1.54704

Table 4

LOC2		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
scenario1	1	108	-1.25	1.681	.162
	2	127	-1.87	1.538	.136
scenario2	1	108	-1.09	1.867	.180
	2	127	-1.83	1.518	.135
Abuse	1	108	-1.1852	1.63146	.15699
	2	127	-1.8268	1.38355	.12277

Discussion

Based on the statistical data, self-esteem and locus of control are both significant predictors of the ratings of the causes of abuse. Participants with an external locus of control tend to blame the man more, something outside of the woman was a cause or trigger for the abuse. This supports the hypothesis that individuals with an internal locus of control would blame the woman more. Although no participants in the study completely blamed the woman, participants with an internal locus of control blamed the

man less. There was not a significant difference between the abuse scores between scenario 1 and scenario 2 to support the hypothesis that woman that identify with the victim will blame the victim more. This study did find that males tend to blame the man more for the abuse than females, which supports the hypothesis. This study also found that participants with low self-esteem tend to blame the man less. Participants with low self-esteem made more defensive attributions. These findings are significant based on the lack of research done on the relationship between self-esteem and the defensive attribution hypothesis.

I would like to suggest some future direction for research in this area. About 10 participants wrote responses on the Commission of Crime Scenario Scale indicating that they had difficulty choosing only one response. They wanted to choose two answers, that the man learned the abuse and that the woman was to blame because she could have prevented the abuse by leaving. A very few amount of participants actually chose these two answers and their studies were not used in the data pool. In the future these results should be averaged and that score used. The option on the Commission of Crime Scenario Scale that indicates that both the man and the woman are equally to blame should be reworded. The new response should be worded to say that the man is to blame but the woman is also to blame because she could be prevented the abuse by leaving. This would allow participants an opportunity to blame the man and the women for different reasons.

This study should be expanded based on sample size and focus on comparing Psychology Majors and Criminal Justice Majors. With the field of Forensic Psychology becoming more popular, Criminal Justice students and Psychology students are becoming more intergraded. Students in both majors are taking similar courses and continue on to similar areas of work. By understanding the differences between the two majors, courses can be designed to better

integrate the majors so they will be better equipped to work together after college.

References

- Alexander, C. (1980). Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of locus of control. *Journal of Social Psychology, 21*(1), 22-33.
- Bell, S., Kuriloff, P., & Lottes, I. (1994). Understanding attributions of blame in stranger rape and date rape situations: an examination of gender, race, identification, and students social perception of rape victims. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*(19), 1719-1734.
- Cronin, C. (2006). Forensic Psychology. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Kristiansen, C., & Giulieeti, R. (2006). Perceptions of wife abuse: effects toward women, and just-world beliefs among college students. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14*(2), 177-189.
- Paulsen, K. (1979). Attribution of fault to a rape victim as a function of locus of control. *Journal of Social Psychology, 107*(1), 131.
- Patten, T. & Woods, D. (1978). Victim attributions regarding the source of verbal aggression. *Journal of Psychology, 100*(2), 293.
- Phares, J., & Lamiell, J. (1975"). Internal-external control, interpersonal judgment of others in need, and attribution of responsibility. *Journal of Personality, 43*(1), 23- 28.

- Phares, J., & Wilson, K. (1972). Responsibility attribution: role of outcome severity, situational ambiguity, and internal-external control. *Journal of Personality, 40*(3), 392-406.
- Finke, H. (1995). Wife abuse attitudes and attributions: the role of fear of crime and sex- role ideology. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering, 56*(3-B), 1697.
- Gilmartin-Zena, P. (1983). Attribution theory and rape victim responsibility. *Deviant Behavior, 4*(3), 357-374.
- Idisis, Y., Ben-David, S., & Ben-David, E. (2007). Attribution of blame to rape victims among therapists and non-therapists. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 25*(1), 103-120.
- Muller, R., Caldwell, R., & Hunter, J. (1994). Factors predicting the blaming of victims of physical child abuse or rape. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 26*(2), 259-270.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press
- Rotter, J. (1966). Generalized expectancies for interval versus external control of reinforcement.

Psychological Monographs, 80, 1-28.

Shaver, K. (1970). Defensive attribution effects of severity and relevance on the responsibility assigned for an accident. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 14, 101-113.

Witte, T. (2005). Attribution of cause, responsibility, and blame for domestic violence: an experimental investigation. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 65(12-B), 6680.

Women's Rural Advocacy Programs (2007). Psychological stages of battered woman syndrome. Retrieved on May 4, 2009 from <http://www.letswrap.com/dvinfo/psych.htm>.

Appendix A

Rotter's Locus of Control Scale

For each of the following number items circle the letter next to the response that most closes matches you opinion. If, for example, for one of the numbered items you agree most with option "b", just circle the "b". Please do not leave any item blank. There is no right or wrong answers we just want your opinion.

1. a.) Children get into trouble because their patents 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.

Appendix A Continued

- b.) People who can't get others to like them don't understand how to get along with others.
8. a.) Heredity plays the 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 in 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.

Appendix A Continued

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.

Appendix A Continued

- 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 on a local level.
-

Appendix B

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Use the following scale to rate how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please be as honest as possible with your answers.

	STATEMENT	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	
1.	I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	0
2.	I feel that I have a number of good qualities..	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	0
3.	All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am Not a failure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	0
4.	I am able to do things as well as most other people.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	0
5.	I feel that I have much to be proud of.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	0
6.	I take a positive attitude toward myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	0
7.	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	0
8.	I feel that I have I respect for myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	0
9.	I certainly feel valuable at times.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	0
10.	I usually have good feelings about myself.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

Appendix C

Commission of Crime Scenario

Please select one answer after reading the selection. Please keep in mind all answers will remain confidential and completely anonymous.

The abuse happened because:

A.) The man has a problem and he is to blame

B.) The man learned the behavior

C.) Society has placed conflicting role demands on men and women, therefore society is to blame

D.) The man and the woman are both equally to blame

E.) The woman could have prevented the abuse by leaving and she is to blame

F.) The woman learned the behavior

G.) The woman has a problem and she is to blame

Appendix D

Scenarios of Abuse Used

Scenario 1

Jane is 20 and a college student. She met Eddie while working part time as a waitress at a local restaurant near campus. They started dating and at first everything was great. He was sweet and understanding. They had been dating for about 4 months when things started to change. Eddie began verbally abusing Jane when she stayed out late with her friends. Jane began spending less time with her friends and family and more time with Eddie. One night when Jane came home late from work, Eddie struck her across the face. The next day he apologizes and did not hit Jane again for a couple of weeks. Eddie gave Jane a black eye a couple of weeks later after he claimed she embarrassed him while they were out with his friends. Jane stayed with Eddie for the next two years.

Scenario 2

Sarah was 35 when she met Roy. Sarah was divorced with two children; two boys aged 8 and 12. Sarah met Roy because he was client for the insurance company she worked at. Sarah did not have a college degree and worked as a secretary for the local insurance company. They started dating and Sarah was very happy and when Roy asked her and the kids to move in she said yes. Everything was going great until one night when Sarah returned home from her parent's house; Roy was infuriated that she had stayed out so late and he hit her in the stomach. Roy told her that she needed to come home earlier; he reminded her that he paid most of the bills, this was his house, and she should appreciate him for taking her and her children. The next day he apologized and brought her flowers. Over the years, Roy became more abusive but Sarah was afraid to leave and she continued to stay with Roy.

Appendix E

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
scenario1	Equal variances assumed	6.109	.014	2.282	234	.023	.480	.211	.066	.895
	Equal variances not assumed			2.276	226.051	.024	.480	.211	.064	.896
scenario2	Equal variances assumed	.592	.442	1.559	234	.120	.348	.223	-.092	.788
	Equal variances not assumed			1.556	229.818	.121	.348	.224	-.093	.789
Abuse	Equal variances assumed	1.202	.274	1.987	234	.048	.39784	.20018	.00345	.79224
	Equal variances not assumed			1.983	227.107	.049	.39784	.20066	.00245	.79324

Appendix E Continued

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
scenario1	Equal variances assumed	3.875	.050	2.970	233	.003	.624	.210	.210	1.038
	Equal variances not assumed			2.949	219.229	.004	.624	.212	.207	1.041
scenario2	Equal variances assumed	12.292	.001	3.324	233	.001	.734	.221	.299	1.169
	Equal variances not assumed			3.270	205.820	.001	.734	.225	.291	1.177
Abuse	Equal variances assumed	3.671	.057	3.262	233	.001	.64159	.19667	.25412	1.02906
	Equal variances not assumed			3.219	210.909	.001	.64159	.19929	.24873	1.03445

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.663	.491	.048	.053	.101		.000	.007	.023	.000
	N	236	236	236	236	236	236.000	236	236	236	236
Scenario2	Pearson Correlation	-.015	.020	-.099	-.078	.176**	.584**	1.000	-.206**	-.101	.883**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.817	.758	.128	.230	.007	.000		.002	.120	.000
	N	236	236	236	236	236	236	236.000	236	236	236
LOC2	Pearson Correlation	.051	-.040	-.088	-.082	.784**	-.175**	-.206**	1.000	.161	-.175**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.436	.545	.178	.212	.000	.007	.002		.014	.007
	N	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236.000	236	236
SE2	Pearson Correlation	.030	.015	.178**	.837**	.224**	-.148*	-.101	-.161*	1.000	-.129*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.643	.814	.006	.000	.001	.023	.120	.014		.048
	N	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236.000	236
Abuse	Pearson Correlation	.006	-.037	-.151*	-.088	-.152*	.836**	.883**	-.175**	.129*	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.925	.573	.021	.178	.020	.000	.000	.007	.048	
	N	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236.000

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Randall Osborne. Without his direction and guidance this thesis would never have been started. His lectures on Battered Woman Syndrome influenced me to reexamine my own way of thinking. I will always be grateful for his help.

I would also like to thank Professor Diann McCabe for her help. Professor McCabe gave me guidance and helped me focus on my work. I would also like to thank Dr. Shirley Ogletree for allowing me to recruit students from her classroom. Dr. Ogletree is the reason I was able to have such a large sample size.