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Introduction

Today’s American women have the capability to be more independent from men than ever before. A cursory glance at U.S. society suggests that this transition to self-reliance has been relatively smooth. For example, women have consistently earned more bachelor’s degrees than men since 1982 (Perry 2013, Francis 2016) and nine out of ten men claim to be comfortable with women earning more than them (Dunlop 2009). This cultural shift has empowered women to seek opportunities outside of the home and take on new roles within society. Women are accepted as confident, competent leaders who make substantial contributions to the U.S. work force.

However, significant cultural lag persists beneath the glossy veneer of gender equality. The displacement of long-held social norms has left a hole where traditional principles once dictated gender roles. Cultural acceptance and embrace of women who “do it all” diminish the labels that once defined masculinity. Men are left in limbo as the identity of provider, breadwinner, and head of household are swept aside by the contemporary woman. This can lead to the phenomenon known as insecure masculinity.

Insecure masculinity also goes by the names of fragile masculinity and machismo in literature. The sense of fragility and insecurity arises in men who believe that masculinity is a rigid quality, and it occurs when a man feels emasculated—experiencing a loss of manliness and power. Men with feelings of insecurity may not appear any less masculine to people around them; a man needs only to believe that others see him as less masculine than traditional standards mandate to experience insecure masculinity. Such an individual’s sense of self is based on how he thinks others perceive him.
Men experiencing insecure masculinity have diverse reactions ranging from social withdrawal to overt acts of defiance. In extreme cases, intimate partner violence may be used against women as a method to regain men's masculinity. Intimate partner violence refers to physical, sexual, or psychological aggression against an intimate partner. Men engage in this violence as a method of maintaining power and control over their partner. There are many reasons men act violently toward their wife or girlfriend; this paper specifically explores whether the female partner of a relationship is more likely to experience intimate partner violence if she has a more prestigious position through income, education, or occupation. I hypothesize that having a more prestigious position triggers insecure masculinity, which is displayed through the perpetration of intimate partner violence.

I used the Violence and Threats of Violence against Women in the United States 1994–1996 survey data for my analysis. This data was collected by Schulman, Ronca, Bucuvalas Inc. using a national random digit dialing sample of U.S. homes. Eight thousand women gave responses to questions regarding various forms of abuse they experienced. Examples include whether a woman’s partner tries to provoke arguments, tries to limit the respondent’s contact to their friends and family, and whether the partner shouts or swears at her. I used multivariable regressions to analyze how a woman’s difference in earnings from her partner and difference in education level affect her likelihood of experiencing intimate partner violence.

I found that women earning more than their partner is an important indicator of intimate partner violence. For every additional $1,000 a woman makes over her partner, she is .08 percent more likely to experience intimate partner violence. This suggests that social and cultural shifts associated with the gender identity of men are necessary to realign to the progressive nature of women’s gender roles. Social institutions should focus on creating new, healthy identities for boys and men. If cultural values can change to reflect a compatible man of today for the woman of today, the rate of intimate partner violence will drop. Less violence will be a reflection of the confident men and women that create contemporary society.

**Theoretical Framework**

*The Fluid Roles of Women Today*

Modernization has increased the number of acceptable positions that women can hold in society. Gender equality in social institutions, though not perfect, has vastly improved over the last few decades. In their book *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change Around the World*, Ronald Inglehart and Pippa Norris outline why postindustrial societies have experienced changes in gender roles. They argue that a revolution in the labor force, improvement in educational opportunities, and changes in the modern family all contribute to the convergence of gender roles (Inglehart and Norris 2003).

Shifts in the labor force have been occurring since World War II (Henslin 2015, 306). The first major change was an increase in female labor-force life cycle. This
means women keep their jobs much longer than they did in the past, even after they have children. The number of women in the workforce also presented an interesting trend: it grew 2.6 percent annually between 1950 and 2000 (Toossi 2005). Although this share is expected to slow in future years, it is projected to continue growing until at least 2050 when women will make up approximately 48 percent of the workforce (Toossi 2005). A final labor force shift is the increase in female employment to previously male-dominated jobs (Henslin 2015, 306). This has occurred mainly because of educational opportunities granted to women.

Fifty-seven percent of bachelor’s degrees and 60 percent of master’s degrees are earned by women (United States Census Bureau 2013). Women today do not shy away from taking math, science, and business courses in high school, and many have switched from traditionally female majors, such as childhood development and elementary education, to previously male-dominated majors, such as finance and health care (Henslin 2015, 307). These trends have changed the dynamics of family life. As women gain higher qualifications in school they also aspire to a life outside of the household.

One of the most significant changes in the modern family is that most women expect to have greater economic responsibility in their families than in the past. Along with this trend, fathers are increasingly contributing to childcare and housework duties (Pignataro 2014, 259). With both heads of the household assuming balanced responsibilities, women are better equipped to maintain employment outside the home. The stay-at-home expectation for mothers in committed relationships is dwindling. Women who are married or in a committed relationship and are in the labor force have created a transition from male dominated single-earning homes to dual-earning homes. These changes are positive harbingers for gender equality on the women’s side of the issue. However, change in one area of life often signals change in another.

The Less Fluid Position of Men

Many men are comfortable with the cultural shifts occurring within society. However, most social change has permitted progression for women but left men’s roles undefined. The traditional family values that once dictated gender roles particularly strains men as they struggle to find a new identity in society. There are new stereotypes about the women who “do it all” but no name for the men whose positions have also changed, usually toward more time spent with family and shared responsibilities in the home. A major roadblock to liberation in men’s roles is the “personal and societal pressure . . . to prove their masculinity” (Coontz 2013). This leads to the question of masculinity and how prevailing stereotypes about manhood apply to societal changes.

Traditional Masculinity is Today’s Masculinity

The social construction of the male identity is complex. Unlike women, who allow nature to determine entrance into womanhood, men often feel they must prove
their worthiness to enter the realm of manhood. In their paper "Precarious Manhood," Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford and Weaver find that manhood status is not easily gained, and it is easy to lose even after it has been achieved. Rather than receiving the encouragement and empowerment that women are increasingly granted in their new societal roles, men are still expected to be macho men’s men and not part-time homemakers. This is a conclusion that Victor Seidler reaches in his book Unreasonable Men: Masculinity and Social Theory. He argues that the “fear of the loss of identity along with the loss of power” urges many men to “hold themselves together through public presentations of boldness and strength” (Seidler 1994). Society maintains the rigid necessity for men to prove their manhood—it is something earned, not gained through age (Vandello et. al 2008, Pleck 1981).

The sociologist Charles Cooley developed the concept of the “looking glass self,” which posits that a person’s sense of self depends on how that person believes others view them (Cooley 1922). Applying this theory to masculinity, we could say that a man’s sense of masculinity is based on how he believes others think about his masculinity as opposed to how others actually do think about him. This means that men who believe others see them as weak or not manly enough are insecure in their masculinity. Some men feel their manhood is in question when they do not fit certain gender stereotypes. For example, the hyper-masculine man is considered aggressive, independent, unemotional, and competitive. He has many romantic relationships, is skilled in business, and is ambitious (Franklin 1984, 5). Masculinity is also tied to respect. In their research on masculine gender roles Santana, Raj, Decker, La Marche, and Silverman found that 76 percent of their sample, college-aged young men, agreed with the statement: “It is essential for a man to get respect from others,” and 83 percent agreed with the statement: “A man always deserves the respect of his wife and children” (Santana et.al 2006). The expectations of men in this group were that they personally be physically tough and not “act like a woman.”

Part of acting “like a man,” in the traditional sense, means that the male partner is either the sole or primary income earner of the household. Stefan Liebig, Carsten Sauer, and Jurgen Schupp authored a paper titled “The Justice of Earnings in Dual-earner Households,” in which they find that if a female partner contributes more than 50 percent of the household income, the male partner feels there is higher injustice in his own income. This is because the justice in their personal income is measured against men’s ability to conform to traditional gender roles (Liebig, Sauer, and Schupp 2012). The threat posed to an insecure man earning less than his female partner can necessitate action to rebalance power in his relationship.

In her study of gender roles, Mirra Komarovsky found that a strong norm persists that husbands should have a superior position occupationally and a higher level of education. Her study also suggests that equality of achievement is still unsatisfactory for traditional males; they need to know they rank above their female partner (Komarovsky 1973, 881). This type of man often uses his role in the family to empha-
size his masculine identity (Atkinson 2005), meaning the man is the breadwinner, the disciplinarian, and the head of the household.

Self-perception of masculinity is so important that some men who feel their masculinity is threatened are compelled to demonstrate their manhood through action. They must prove that they do not have stereotypically feminine tendencies and characteristics, such as being passive, compassionate, or weak (Franklin 1984, 4). In this sense, manhood is considered to be fragile. Recent studies have suggested a phenomenon termed "insecure" or "precarious" masculinity to describe the need to demonstrate manliness.

Researchers predict that manhood is most readily proved through physical aggression (Bosson, Vandello, Burnaford, Weaver, and Wasti 2009). Men often employ aggression as a face-saving technique to restore a positive impression of masculinity (Archer 1994) or as a way of averting threats to a man's honor (Cohen, Nisbett, Bowdle, and Schwarz 1996). Sports, fighting, and forms of abuse can be used to prove that a man is dominant.

Dominance in the Home

Abuse is about gaining power and control over another person, and that person is usually a member of the perpetrator's household. While anybody can be a victim of intimate partner violence, most victims are women (domesticviolence.org 2016, Caralis and Musialowski 1997) and its prevalence is widespread (Garcia et al. 2006).

Men engage in abusive behaviors for a number of reasons; one theory is that men feel the need to reclaim their masculinity. By showing an intimate partner who is "boss," some men feel they have proved their masculinity through their ability to control someone close to them. A man with traditional gender role ideologies is more likely to use intimate partner violence (Santana et. al 2006), and this may be especially true if he does not provide enough or any economic support for his family (Atkinson 2005).

Regaining a sense of honor in the face of perceived shame is the goal of insecure intimate violence perpetrators. In the case of income discrepancy, the shame comes from feeling less than the partner, and violence serves to correct that imbalance. If a man is under-employed or un-employed while his wife works, his dependency on her paycheck is viewed as a humiliating reminder of his own shortcomings. Karen Pyke described marriages with a working woman as suffering "a scarce economy of gratitude because of the husband's sense of failure stemming from his chronic unemployment, low pay, low occupational status, a menial job, and/or sense that he is working below his potential" (1994, 77). In his book the Abusive Personality, Donald Dutton found that abusive men are easily threatened, jealous, and fearful (Dutton 2007). This means that a man who already has an abusive personality is more likely to be triggered by his partner earning more than himself.

Hypothesis

I propose that the employment of a female partner can have an emasculating effect on men that causes them to be insecure. Female employment, particularly
when the female’s salary is greater than her male partner, results in a higher likelihood of intimate partner violence (Belen, Vives, Otero, Muntaner 2015). Challenging a man’s manhood compels him to demonstrate his power and control through action (Eisler and Skidmore 1987, Pleck 1981); in this instance, through intimate partner violence.

Data

This sample is drawn from the 1996 Violence and Threats of Violence against Women and Men in the United States survey. The survey was designed by the Center for Policy Research and performed by interviewers at Schulman, Ronca, Bucvalas Inc. This data source was chosen for being the most comprehensive study on violence against women available. The survey was specifically created to better understand patterns of violence against women, especially regarding intimate partner violence and rape. It is a good representation of the U.S. female population and had a 72.1 percent participation rate with a 97 percent completion rate.

The survey was conducted in either English or Spanish, depending on the respondent’s preference, from November 1995 to May 1996. The subject pool included 8,000 women eighteen years and older in the United States. Respondents were chosen through a random digit dialing of telephone households. Nonresidential and non-working numbers were screened out of the sample. When more than one eligible respondent was within a household, the person with the most recent birthday was selected to participate in the survey.

Participants were asked a series of questions regarding violence, rape, and stalking they experienced throughout their lifetime. For this paper, I use demographic data and data regarding intimate partner violence with a current partner. (see Appendix for exact wording of survey questions and response options.)

Data Limitations

There are a number of obstacles in using this dataset. Predominantly, respondents were not overtly asked whether they had been physically abused by their current partner. This is perplexing, as other sections of the survey ask whether the respondent was ever “pushed, slapped, or hit” by an adult during their childhood or by a stranger in adulthood. Unfortunately, no comparable question was asked during the intimate partner violence section. Regardless of this oversight, there are enough alternative indicators for intimate partner violence that this missing information will not impair the analysis.

Another shortcoming of this dataset is that the study relies on data describing working women, but there are likely fewer participants who work outside the home due to the survey’s design. Women who work are less likely to be home to answer the phone. It is also unknown whether the women’s partners are male or female and heterosexual relationships may be generalized when same-sex relationships are represented in the data.
Finally, the age of the dataset limits the validity of applying these findings to today’s world as general culture is increasingly progressive and accepting of women’s heightened roles in society. Despite this, I believe the essential nature of home life has not changed in the last twenty years, and this data is adequate for the purposes of the study.

**Methods**

I performed two multivariable analyses to determine the relationship between women having a more prestigious position than men and intimate partner violence. For the first analysis, I regressed the indicators for intimate partner violence on the difference in the men’s and women’s incomes. The second analysis regressed the indicators for intimate partner violence on the difference in education. Income and employment are good signals of societal prestige, which places value on money, education, and occupational status. By using the difference between the men’s and women’s levels of prestige as my independent variables, we can observe how a woman’s higher position in society makes the man more prone to engage in intimate partner violence.

To perform the first regression, I subtracted the partner’s earnings from the respondent’s. This reduced the number of observations available for analysis due to missing data. I ended up using 3,627 observations. Response options about income offered amounts in ranges rather than specific numbers. Therefore, to examine the difference between men’s and women’s incomes, I averaged the highest and lowest number in each range. Although this weakens the precision in analyzing the results, general trends should still hold.

Indicators for intimate partner violence were chosen from yes/no questions asked about the respondent’s partner, because they suggest a pattern of power and control within the relationship.

**Table 1: Questions Used as Intimate Partner Violence Indicators**

I would like to read you some statements that some women have used to describe their husbands/partners. Thinking about your current husband/partner would you say he...

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shouts or swears at you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frightens you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income even when you ask?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prevents you from working outside the home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is jealous or possessive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tries to provoke arguments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tries to limit your contact with family or friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Insists on knowing who you are with at all times?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Calls you names or puts you down in front of others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Makes you feel inadequate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If any one of these questions were answered positively, I consider that person to have experienced intimate partner violence. The control variable “abused as a child” was similarly constructed. See Table 4 in the appendix for further reference.

The Center for Disease Control (CDC) lists four types of intimate partner violence: physical, sexual, stalking, and psychological. Any of these four is considered part of the consistent definition the CDC maintains as intimate partner violence (CDC 2016). Due to the nature of the questions asked on this survey, intimate partner violence is measured through the experience of psychological aggression. Behaviors that fall under this category include jealous and controlling behaviors, as well as threats, intimidation, forced isolation, and verbal attacks (Pittman 2012). Psychological abuse may be considered “violent” despite leaving no physical mark of damage in the same way that one can do editorial violence to a text—an act of distortion or unjustified alteration has occurred. Similarly, those experiencing psychological violence suffer from distortions of reality and an alteration of thinking. In their research on the psychological effects of partner abuse, Denise Hines and Kathleen Malley-Morrison found that partners who have been psychologically abused have higher rates of PTSD and are more likely to become dependent on drugs and alcohol (Hines and Malley-Morrison 2001). Thus, I feel comfortable including psychological abuse under the umbrella term “intimate partner violence.”

### Table 2: Education Level Numerical Assignments
What is the highest level of education you have completed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Numerical Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No School</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st-8th grade</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS graduate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 year college degree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I performed the second regression by assigning each categorical level of education a value between 0 through 6 for each member in a partnership as seen above. The male partner’s number was then subtracted from the female partner’s number. This difference in educations was then regressed on the presence of intimate partner violence and the other control variables.

Ideally, educational difference would be in number of years of schooling rather than the difference between assigned categories. The main concern is that each level does not correspond to an equal jump in number of years in school. Going from one to two, there could be a ten-year difference or a one-year difference. However, considering the restrictions of this dataset, this is the most effective method for the regression. I believe the analysis will present at least a crude idea of the relationship between the difference in education and experiencing intimate partner violence.
Results

Findings Model 1: Difference in Income

The results seen on Table 3 show there is a positive relationship between a woman out-earning her partner and experiencing intimate partner violence. For every additional $1,000 a woman makes over her partner, she is 0.08 percent more likely to be a victim of abuse. Considering more women attain higher education, thereby leading them to better occupational positions, this finding is significant. With better positions, they are likely to make more money than their partners who may have more unstable positions due to lower qualifications.

To put this into perspective, consider two women, a primary care worker and a lawyer. Both of their husbands are unemployed, the lawyer is 7.5 percent more likely to experience intimate partner violence based on the median incomes for each profession.

Table 3: OLS Regression Results for IPV on Income and Educational Differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>P-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Difference</td>
<td>8.12e-07</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Difference</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years married</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience abuse as a child</td>
<td>0.1761</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.3029</td>
<td>0.044*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>-0.0314</td>
<td>0.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>-0.0039</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Law Marriage</td>
<td>0.5228</td>
<td>0.005*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings Model 2: Difference in Education

I did not find a significant relationship between the difference in education and intimate partner violence. This may be because the level of education is a more ambiguous means of determining social standing. It has also been suggested that being well educated is seen as less masculine or less necessary for men, as they still require fewer qualifications than women for equal positions (Henslin 2015, 309). The method used to determine the difference in education was also crude and possibly impaired gaining real results from the data. Different results might be attained if the difference between the numbers of years of education is used rather than the levels of education.

Other Variables

Also significant in this data is whether subjects experienced abuse as a child. This is not surprising, as the cycle of abuse traps individuals into patterns of either victimization or perpetration. It is the most significant indicator for experiencing abuse as an adult. This analysis indicates that if you experienced abuse as a child there is a 17.8 percent chance that you will be abused as an adult by your intimate partner. I
suspect this number would be even higher if my analysis were expanded to include previous marriages and cohabitation partners.

Both marriage status and the number of years spent as a married couple are significant as well, with the likelihood of abuse rising over time. This demonstrates that abuse is more common when a relationship is established, and it is more difficult for one of the partners to leave.

Demographic variables were also controlled for but none were significant. This is not surprising, as despite popular stereotypes, intimate partner violence permeates all races, socioeconomic backgrounds, and employment statuses.

Discussion and Conclusion

Men's Turn for Change

One in four women will experience intimate partner violence in her lifetime. This is a tragedy in itself, but more concerning is the fact that changes in women’s social position may cause the amount of intimate partner violence to increase. The annual growth rate of women in the labor force is 2.6 percent (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2012). My findings suggest that the more money a woman earns over her partner, the more likely she is to experience intimate partner violence. As women increasingly earn higher wages and occupy more prestigious positions in society, adjustments must be made to fit the new dynamics of relationships. Specifically, social and cultural shifts associated with the gender identity of men are necessary to keep up with the progressive nature of women’s gender roles.

Studies show that men who are less concerned with masculinity are happier (Coontz 2013). Men who share responsibilities with housework and childcare are much less likely to get a divorce and are more likely to feel socially connected (Sigle-Rushton 2010). Coincidentally, this allows men to feel more confident and more secure in their identity. This identity may be a father, housekeeper, husband, or simply a man.

It took time for women to reach the position they are in today, where women’s value outside of the home is recognized. The transformation to complete equality is still far away. Men are on the path to equality as well, where their value inside the home will be recognized—by men themselves. Breaking down masculine stereotypes is difficult but definitely possible. Opportunities opened up for women as they gained educational rights and lost feminine expectations. Perhaps a similar method might help men lose masculine expectations. Destigmatizing boys’ involvement in emotionally expressive activities such as art, choir, and drama classes presents one possibility. Boys who engage in such activities actually become more engaged in school and are encouraged to attend college (Coontz 2013). This could help reverse the growing gender disparity in men’s and women’s college enrollment and keep men mindful of their emotional needs.

Over time, cultural values will change to reflect a compatible man of today for the woman of today. As this change comes, I am hopeful that the rate of intimate partner violence will drop.
Suggestions for Further Research

Future research should further investigate how differences in prestige trigger insecure masculinity and affect intimate partner violence. A numerical value, rather than categorical information, should be gathered on the educational attainment of men and women in couples. An analysis using more precise numbers would provide interesting findings. I also think it would be useful to look at employment status (full-time, part-time, searching for job, unemployed, etc.) and how it can affect intimate partner violence. These future analyses should use the most recent data gathered from the 2015 Violence and Threats of Violence against Women and Men in the United States survey.

APPENDIX

Table 4: Intimate Partner Violence Indicators
Thinking about your current husband/partner would you say he . . .

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shouts or swears at you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frightens you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prevents you from access to knowing about or having access to family income?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prevents you from working outside the home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Is jealous or possessive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tries to provoke arguments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tries to limit your contact with family and friends?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Insists on knowing who you are with at all times?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Calls you names in front of others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Makes you feel inadequate?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey Questions Included in Regression Analysis

How old are you?
Range of 1–96

How many children under 18 years of age live in this household?
Range of 0–97

Including income from all sources, such as work, child support, AFDC, how much income did you personally receive in 1995 before taxes? Stop me when I get to the category that applies. Was it
Less than $5,000?
$5,000 to $10,000?
$10,000 to $15,000?
$15,000 to $20,000?
$20,000 to $25,000?
$25,000 to $35,000?
$35,000 to $50,000?
$50,000 to $80,000?
$80,000 to $100,000?
Over $100,000?
Don’t know
Refused/Missing
Are you currently
Employed full-time?
Employed part-time?
In the military?
Unemployed and looking for work?
Retired and not working?
A student?
A homemaker?
Something else?
Don’t know
Refused/Missing

What is the highest level of education you have completed?
No schooling
1st–8th grade
Some high school
High school graduate
Some college
4-Year College degree
Postgraduate
Don’t know
Refused/Missing

Which of the following categories best describes your racial background?
White?
Black or African-American?
Asian or Pacific Islander?
American Indian or Alaskan Native?
Mixed race?
Don’t know
Refused/Missing

Are you of Hispanic origin?
Yes
No
Don’t know
Refused/Missing

Now I’d like to ask you some questions about your current and past relationships.

Are you currently
Married?
Common-law relationship
Divorced
Separated
Widowed
Single and never married
Don’t know
Refused/Missing

Is he/she (spouse) of Hispanic origin?
Yes
No
Including income from all sources, how much income did your current husband/partner personally receive in 1995 before taxes? Please stop me when I get to the right category. Was it

- Less than $5,000?
- $5,000 to $10,000?
- $10,000 to $15,000?
- $15,000 to $20,000?
- $20,000 to $25,000?
- $25,000 to $35,000?
- $35,000 to $50,000?
- $50,000 to $80,000?
- $80,000 to $100,000?
- Over $100,000?
- Don't know

Answered Only if Respondent is Married

- How long have you been married?
  - Range is 0–97
- How old is he?
  - Range is 1–97

How would you describe your husband/partner’s current employment situation? Is he

- Employed full-time?
- Employed part-time?
- In the military?
- Unemployed and looking for work?
- Retired and not working?
- A student?
- A homemaker?
- Something else?
- Don’t know
- Refused / Missing

What is the highest level of education he had completed?

- No schooling
- 1st–8th grade
- Some high school
- High school graduate
- Some college
- 4-Year College degree
- Postgraduate
- Don’t know
- Refused / Missing
Which of the following categories best describes his/her racial background?
   White?
   Black or African-American?
   Asian or Pacific Islander?
   American Indian or Alaskan Native?
   Mixed race?
   Don’t know
   Refused / Missing

I would like to read you some statements that some women have used to describe their husbands/partners. Thinking about your current husband/ partner would you say he
   Shouts or swears at you?
      Yes
      No
      Don’t know
      Refused / Missing
   Frightens you?
      Yes
      No
      Don’t know
      Refused / Missing
   Prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income even when you ask?
      Yes
      No
      Don’t know
      Refused / Missing
   Prevents you from working outside the home?
      Yes
      No
      Don’t know
      Refused / Missing
   Is jealous or possessive?
      Yes
      No
      Don’t know
      Refused / Missing
   Tries to provoke arguments?
      Yes
      No
      Don’t know
      Refused / Missing
   Tries to limit your contact with family or friends?
      Yes
      No
      Don’t know
      Refused / Missing
Insists on knowing who you are with at all times?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Refused/Missing

Calls you names or puts you down in front of others?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Refused/Missing

Makes you feel inadequate?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Refused/Missing

Now I'm going to ask you some questions about physical violence you may have experienced as a child. Aside from any incidents already mentioned, when you were a child did any parent, step-parent or guardian ever

Throw something at you that could hurt you?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Refused/Missing

Push, grab or shove you?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Refused/Missing

Choke or attempt to drown you?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Refused/Missing

Hit you with some object?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Refused/Missing

Beat you up?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know
- Refused/Missing

Threaten you with a gun?
- Yes
- No
Don’t know
Refused / Missing

Threaten you with a knife or other weapon besides a gun?
Yes
No
Don’t know
Refused / Missing

Use a gun on you?
Yes
No
Don’t know
Refused / Missing

Use a knife or other weapon on you besides a gun?
Yes
No
Don’t know
Refused / Missing
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