

Violence Against Women in the Family What Causes Violence Against Women in the Home

The United Nations

Violence against women in the home is a widespread problem that has serious consequences for the individual woman, her family, and society at large. Responses to the problem are essential, but in order for these responses to be both effective and appropriate, it is critical that the cause of the violence should be isolated. Indeed, many attempts have been made to establish the cause of the phenomenon, the search producing a spectrum at the ends of which stand two main theoretical frameworks.

The first, and the earliest, seeks the origins of domestic violence in some form of eradicable cause. It focuses attention on the characteristics of the wife, husband and family, and finds the cause of the violence in the personal inadequacy of the husband or wife or in external stresses that affect the family. Thus, theorists argue that men are violent towards the women with whom they live "because of some internal aberration, abnormality or defective characteristic."¹ These vary, but include alcoholism, a violent upbringing, mental illness, and poor self-control. Others suggest that wives provoke their husbands to beat them or are predisposed to violence, being attracted to violent men and addicted to abuse. Further variations on this analysis based on external causes find the etiology of wife abuse in stress, frustration and blocked goals, often resulting from unemployment or poverty, which in turn can depend on ethnicity and social class, or on the psychological effects of violent practices or deprived culture.

The second theoretical framework goes beyond an analysis based on psychological or social causes, noting the pervasiveness and acceptability of violence

against women in the home and roots its cause in the structure of society itself. It suggests that wife battery is neither a private nor a family problem, but rather a reflection of the broad structures of sexual and economic inequality in society. Indeed, it suggests that violence by husbands against wives is not a breakdown of the social order at all, not an aberration, but rather, "an affirmation of a particular social order,"² arising out of the socio-cultural belief that women are less important and less valuable than men and so are not entitled to equal respect. Domestic violence, therefore, is seen as a part of a total social context that tolerates the subordination of women and the use of violence against them as a solution to frustration and conflict. In this analysis, wife abuse is seen as the product of an interrelated and complex set of values wherein women are regarded as inferior to men, suffering discrimination in employment and education and being grossly underrepresented in all areas of social and political life. This inferiority is confirmed particularly within intimate relationships wherein men are assumed to be dominant and women are legally and financially dependant. The analysis further suggests that the subordination of women within relationships and therefore, domestic violence, is condoned by cultural values that emphasize the privacy and autonomy of the family, rendering outside agencies loath to interfere, or if they do so, to stress reconciliation.³ This theoretical framework can be best summarized as follows:

We propose that the correct interpretation of violence between husbands and wives conceptualizes such violence as the extension of the domination and control of husbands over their wives. This control is historically and socially constructed. The beginning of an adequate analysis of violence between husbands and wives is the consideration of the history of the family, of the status of women therein and of violence directed against them. This analysis will substantiate our claim that violence in the family should be understood primarily as coercive control.⁴

While other theories have been advanced to explain domestic violence, most locate themselves along this broad spectrum. The following thus attempts to survey the literature that has analyzed the causes of violence against wives, starting first with those explanations that find the causes in external factors.

ALCOHOL AND DRUGS

Research has shown that there is a close relationship between the consumption of alcohol and drugs and violence in the home, such substances playing a significant role in the instigation of domestic violence as they do in violence in other contexts. Thus, Hilberman's study of 60 battered women in a general medical clinic revealed that drinking accompanied 93 percent of the incidents,⁵ while Renvoize indicated that alcohol was a factor in 40 percent of the cases she investigated.⁶ Similarly, Gelles discovered, in his 1974 study of violence in families in New Hampshire, that drinking accompanied violence in 48 percent of the families where assaults had occurred.⁷ Indeed, many of the women in his sample revealed that

their husbands only hit them when they were drunk. Further evidence supporting the link between alcohol and assaults against wives can be found in Gayford's study,⁸ where 52 percent of his sample of women who had been abused stated that their husbands were drunk at least once a week, while another 22 percent indicated that the violence only occurred when the man was under the influence of alcohol; Scott's study of the wives of 100 alcoholics; Pahl's study¹⁰ of 42 women who had used a women's refuge in the United Kingdom; and evidence gleaned from surveys in Australia.¹¹ Studies from Poland indicate that the one cause of violence against wives is alcoholism and that this is endemic in the country.¹²

Although research into the subject is very new in developing countries, similar findings have been made in Papua New Guinea,¹³ Samoa,¹⁴ Uganda,¹⁵ Chile,¹⁶ Kuwait,¹⁷ and Colombia.¹⁸

It is clear that there is an association between alcohol use and violence against wives, but the precise role of alcohol in the domestic context has yet to be determined. It has been suggested that re-analysis of studies that stress the link between wife abuse and alcohol may reveal that the relationship is meaningless as very little distinction is made in such studies between alcoholism or pathological drinking and episodic drinking associated with violence.¹⁹ Moreover, while the studies that do exist reveal that many abusive husbands are heavy drinkers, many of the men who beat their wives when they are drunk, also beat them when they are sober.²⁰ Further, drunkenness exists in many families that are non-violent and violence is present in others where there is no alcohol abuse.²¹

The studies suggest that in cases where violence is associated with alcohol, the link is peculiarly male as wives rarely become violent towards their husbands and children when inebriated.²² Some evidence also exists that links male drunkenness, ultimately resulting in an assault on the wife, with male drinking parties, during which men give each other support and encouragement and reaffirm their role as breadwinner and boss.²³

Drunkenness, therefore, is perhaps best seen not as a "cause" of violence, but as a condition that coexists with it. Indeed, men who wish to carry out a violent act may become drunk in order to perform the act. After the violence has occurred, both the man and his wife may excuse his behavior on the ground that he was drunk and therefore not responsible for his actions. In the end analysis, all that the studies which put forward the view that there is a connection between alcohol or drug abuse and wife beating indicate is that men who are drunk or drugged do beat their wives. They do not show us that they beat them because they are under the influence of alcohol or drugs. It may well be that they drink or take drugs in order to justify beating their wives.

CYCLE OF VIOLENCE: VIOLENCE AS LEARNED BEHAVIOR

A number of researchers locate the origins of wife assault in the childhood of the abusive man, suggesting that the violence occurs because he has witnessed or experienced violence in his family of origin. Thus, Straus, Steinmetz and

Gelles²⁴ concluded from their survey of intact couples in the United States that "the majority of today's violent couples are those who were brought up by parents who were violent to each other"²⁵ and that there is a "clear trend for violence in childhood to produce violence in adult life . . . violence by parents begets violence in the next generation."²⁶ They reported that compared to men from non-violent families of origin, men who saw their parents attack each other were 3 times as likely to hit their wives and 10 times more likely to attack them with a weapon. Even if they had only witnessed "wife beating"—hitting without punching or weapons—they were more likely to be violent adults, only 2 percent of men from non-violent homes hitting their wives, while 20 percent of men from the "most violent" families did so. Moreover, among 13 percent of their sample who reported being hit as teenagers, fully 35 percent indicated that they hit their wives, as opposed to only 11 percent of those who were not so hit.

Similar conclusions were reached by Stacey and Shupe²⁷ who determined from their research sample that 6 out of 10 abusive men had witnessed physical violence between their parents, 4 out of 10 had been neglected by their parents and 4 out of 10 had been abused by their parents. They found, further, that 1 out of 3 of the batterers' brothers and sisters had been abused by their parents and in two-thirds of the childhood homes where the batterers had been abused their siblings had been also.²⁸

The theory that violence is learned behavior and is cyclical is a popular one and has tended to be perpetuated by folk wisdom and personal impressions. A number of writers have, however, questioned its validity, particularly attacking the studies that are presented to support it.

It is suggested that many of the publications widely cited to support the theory present no empirical data,²⁹ often relying on self-reports from small criminal subgroups, anecdotal information from battered women on their husbands, individual case histories and reports from service providers.³⁰ Of those that produce data, a number draw on samples that are small and unrepresentative, frequently being based on groups of people known either to be violent in some way, or to be the victims of violence, whose backgrounds are then examined for evidence of violence in their families of origin.³¹ Further, even those studies that draw on a wide data base are problematic. No consistent definition of violence is used, rendering such studies inappropriate for comparative research, and most definitions used are ambiguous.³² If, as Dobash and Dobash point out, the definition is sufficiently vague, almost everyone will come from a violent family. Thus, information that a mass murderer was sometimes slapped as a child will lend support to the cycle of violence theory, but will hardly be concrete confirmation.³³ Moreover, it is rare to find studies that are designed to include comparisons or controls. Little attention has been paid, for example, to the siblings of the individuals studied, so it is often unknown whether they too have violent families. Results, therefore, which indicate that one in three husbands who are abusive were themselves abused will suggest that the cycle of violence thesis is accurate, but at the same time will cast doubt on the analysis as two out of three, or the majority, of such husbands come from non-violent homes.³⁴

It seems, thus, that while there is support for the theory that violence is cyclical, much more sophisticated research, which compares violent and non-violent individuals from violent and non-violent homes, is required to test it. Certainly, it is wrong to assume that all children of men who abuse their wives or all men that have themselves been abused will abuse their wives. The most that can be said is that a violent family of origin is yet another variable that may be involved in the etiology of violence against wives.

VICTIM PRECIPITATION

Suggestions have been made that wife battery is caused by the behavior or personality of the victim. Hence, some researchers believe that violence arises when the victim reduces her husband's self-control by verbally tormenting him until he is no longer in control of his responses.³⁵ Others conclude that women have a psychological need for domination, excitement and attention,³⁶ one theory going so far as to hypothesize that women become addicted to the excitement and stimulation brought about by the violence because of some form of chemical reaction.³⁷

Research indicates that while patterns of this nature may exist, they are not the norm. Often a man will abuse a woman without any warning, let alone provocation, sometimes waking her from sleep to do so. Further, there is evidence which indicates that women do not seek out successive abusive relationships, which casts doubt on these psychological theories. Pahl's study, for example, of 42 women who had used a refuge in the United Kingdom, revealed that not one of the women who went on to another relationship was abused in that partnership; however, their abusers went on to replicate the pattern of abuse in their new relationships.³⁸

As Dobash and Dobash observe, moreover, the types of behavior defined by researchers and husbands as provocative are diverse, ranging from aggression, nagging and emasculation, to submission. Thus, they point out:

Being too talkative or too quiet, too sexual or not sexual enough, too frugal or too extravagant, too often pregnant or not frequently enough, all seem to be provocative. The only pattern discernible in these lists is that the behavior, whatever it might be, represents some form of failure or refusal on the part of the woman to comply with or support her husband's wishes and authority.³⁹

They point out, also, and this must be stressed, that explanations of wife abuse that rely on victim precipitation are dangerous. Such explanations accept the use of violence and also perpetuate the stereotype of female submission in intimate relationships.⁴⁰ As such, they absolve the man of his responsibility and place blame for the abuse on the woman.

MENTAL ILLNESS

Some theorists have characterized men who are violent in the home as passive, indecisive and sexually inadequate. Their wives, by contrast, are seen as

aggressive, masculine and masochistic. Others see men who abuse their wives as psychopaths.⁴¹ While some violent men are indeed sick, the widespread incidence of domestic violence against women and the variety of personality types, both women and men, who are involved in it, suggests that this is not a common cause of the conduct.

STRESS, FRUSTRATION, ROLE FRUSTRATION

Early scholarship on violence against wives emphasized the role of stress in its etiology. Thus, the British Association of Social Workers stated:

Economic conditions, low wages, bad housing, overcrowding and isolation: unfavorable and frustrating work conditions for the man: lack of job opportunities for adolescents/school-leavers and lack of facilities such as day care (e.g., nurseries), adequate transport, pleasant environment and play space and recreational facilities, for mother and children were considered to cause personal desperation that might precipitate violence in the home.⁴²

Explanations indicating stress as the cause of domestic violence, at the outset, directed attention to stresses derived from economic and social disadvantage. As such, violence against wives was seen as a primarily lower class phenomenon, as this class was most susceptible to such pressures. Again, however, while it is possible for economic and social stresses to incite violence, theorists who rely on stress as the explanation for such violence are unable to explain why all men subject to such pressure do not abuse their wives.

UNDERDEVELOPMENT

Research into family violence is very new in developing countries. A number of scholars have, however, addressed the issue and see family violence as a particular by-product of underdevelopment. Thus, research from Chile⁴³ points to the subsistence existence and economic dependence of many families involved in domestic abuse; Nigeria,⁴⁴ to the economic crisis of many such families; Kenya,⁴⁵ to the gaps between the rich and the poor, the urban and the rural, and the powerful and powerless; and Egypt⁴⁶ and Bangladesh⁴⁷ to tensions in society. It is suggested that in situations of underdevelopment violence becomes inherent as the result of a system wherein there is political and economic deprivation and oppression of individuals leading to social injustice.⁴⁸ In many developing countries, traditional social norms and practices, which may have once served to restrain wife abuse, are in the process of disintegration,⁴⁹ populations in the cities have swollen as migration from the rural areas has taken place as people have sought individual economic opportunities, and basic resources and services have proved to be inadequate. In such societies, poor housing and a precarious economic existence appear inevitable and violence becomes almost a way of life.⁵⁰ Such violence is vented against the most powerless who are inevitably women.⁵¹

This theory, which is a variation on the theme that stress and frustration produce wife abuse, may well have some validity. Again, however, it fails to explain why all men in deprived circumstances are not violent to their wives and why many men in economically privileged positions in both industrialized societies and developing countries are violent to their wives.

CULTURAL FACTORS

In a number of societies customs or beliefs are offered to explain the existence of wife abuse. Thus, it is common for African surveys to indicate that wife abuse occurs because beating shows that the man loves the woman, that this is expected by her and that she will feel rejected if she is not beaten.⁵² Similarly, it is suggested that wives need beating.⁵³

South Asian studies point to the custom of dowry as a precipitating factor in wife abuse. Dowry is an important part of the negotiations for an arranged marriage, parents accepting that if they wish their daughters to be married, they must provide a suitable dowry. Recently, the custom has combined with the growth in consumerism and has become, in some cases, a life and death matter for the bride. This is because her husband or his family may consider the dowry that has been provided to be inadequate and harass the woman, sometimes to the point of death by murder or suicide, in order to extract more from her natal family.⁵⁴

Again, while certainly such customs may be factors in wife abuse, they do not explain why only some husbands in such systems abuse their wives.

STRUCTURAL INEQUALITY: THE POSITION OF WOMEN IN THE FAMILY AND SOCIETY

The overwhelming pervasiveness of violence against wives in the family led scholars to question the validity of explanations for the phenomenon that were based on an external cause. Further, studies that sought such causal explanations had discovered some "causes" for such violence that when taken together led inevitably to a new analysis.

For example, some researchers concluded that violence occurred when men failed to live up to the traditional stereotype of male superiority. Such could occur if the man believed he was an under achiever in employment or education,⁵⁵ if he were denied access to power and prestige outside the home,⁵⁶ or if his wife were perceived to be a superior achiever.⁵⁷ Others pointed to jealousy,⁵⁸ disputes over money,⁵⁹ and the wife's right to personal autonomy.⁶⁰ Surveys of women who were abused revealed that their husbands liked to dominate financial management within the family,⁶¹ often keeping them chronically short of money and even forcing them to give them their wages or, if available, their government benefits.⁶² Other surveys indicated that very often the abuser was unemployed.⁶³

Treated separately, such indications would result in a "cause"-based analysis, but looked at in aggregate they revealed a common thread, such being that there was an assumption by the man that he should be the dominant party in a relationship that was traditionally unequal and that where such dominance was threatened by some factor, even the woman's separateness as a human being, dominance would be reasserted, if necessary, by violence.⁶⁴

This common thread opened the way to an analysis that found the origins of violence against women in the family in the structure of the family itself, a structure that is mirrored and confirmed in the structure of society, which condones the oppression of women and tolerates male violence as one of the instruments in the perpetuation of this power balance. Hence, Straus concluded⁶⁵ "... wife beating is not just a personal abnormality, but rather it has its roots in the very structuring of society and the family; that is, the cultural norms and in the sexist organization of society."

This analysis has been taken even further by scholars, primarily feminists, who suggest that wife abuse is typical, not rare behavior and, indeed, behavior consistent with and condoned by general attitudes. They stress that economic, social and political factors are all interconnected, creating a structure wherein the low economic position of women is linked with their vulnerability to violence within the household. This, in turn, is connected to their powerlessness in relation to the State and men in general,⁶⁶ thereby resulting in a tacit acceptance by the community of abusive conduct within the home. This acceptance becomes manifest in societal attitudes that allow husbands to view their wives as chattels and that stress the privacy and autonomy of the family.⁶⁷

The analysis of wife abuse as a structural rather than a causal phenomenon began in the industrialized West. However, studies from developing countries have served to confirm rather than cast doubt on its validity. Thus, studies from India⁶⁸ suggest that family violence may be a by-product of the societal structure where authority lies in the male with the female conditioned to accept her secondary role. A Chinese study similarly finds the root of such behavior in the male-centered ideology in China where a husband will abuse his wife when something is not done to his satisfaction, even, for example, if the wife gives birth to a girl.⁶⁹ Confirmation is found in other studies from developing countries which reveal that violence often occurs when the man wishes to take another wife,⁷⁰ where he suspects his wife of infidelity⁷¹ and where he sees his wife as "rebellious," because of her ascending liberation⁷² or because of her "nagging."⁷³

This analysis, which goes beyond the search for an external cause and locates the origin of violence against women in the family in the structure of marriage and the family and in the wider society, in sum, argues that it is impossible to understand the nature of wife assault without taking account of the social and ideological context within which it occurs.⁷⁴ The analysis leads us to question the family as an institution and also leads us to question the role of society, particularly the helping professions, such as the police, the courts, the medical profession, in the tacit condonation of a structure that "supports the male's use of violence to maintain his dominance over his mate."⁷⁵

CONCLUSION

Explanations of violence against women move, therefore, from explanations that seek the origin of the abuse in an individualized cause to an approach that sees the issue as located in a broader social-structural context, focusing upon the entire social situation within which the violence takes place. This approach stresses the subordination of women within society that allows them to become the "appropriate"⁷⁶ victims of marital violence.

While this analysis is helpful, the fact remains that although violence against women in the family is common it is not universal, thus explanations of such violence must go beyond a mere assertion that violence against women arises out of structural inequality and will exist as long as men are regarded as more important than women. Certainly, such inequality is the context in which such violence is condoned and even encouraged and the context in which violence against women in the home becomes crystallized as a cultural and societal norm. Notwithstanding this, the analysis fails to explain how sociological and cultural factors that are universal, interact with individual personal behavior.⁷⁷

One commentator has attempted to grapple with this difficulty and while basing her analysis in the theory that domestic violence arises out of a social structure that perpetuates the subjugation of women as a community to the overall dominance of men as a community, she suggests that there are three particular situations wherein the social and cultural norm will result in violence against the wife.⁷⁸ Thus, she hypothesizes that wife assault is most likely to occur in three "milieus," a term she uses to encompass the norms, values, and attitudes of a particular cultural context, the traditional, transitional, and modern industrial.

In the traditional milieu, where social norms and customary law tolerate some use of physical force as a means of disciplining female members of the family in certain circumstances, the man is usually afforded a right to sanction what is regarded as unsuitable behavior, the sanctionable behavior being primarily sexual and being regarded as involving the man's honor. Here, clearly, violence against the wife will arise out of her subordination, but if the man who perpetrates the violence is traditionally assigned authority over her, such violence will be considered legitimate, and, indeed, not even defined as violence. If, however, a man who has not been granted authority over her performs the same act, as the purpose of the violence is not in accordance with tradition, sanctions may be available.

Migrant populations, refugees and others in situations where the modes of living and authority structures are in transition and flux come within the definition of the transitional milieu. Here, attitudes, mores and roles are changing rapidly, and frequently the male's position is threatened, as often he is no longer in a position to support the family, and the woman may be obliged to undertake tasks and responsibilities that challenge previously held beliefs and attitudes. In this context, the man may seek to establish his dominance within the relationship by means of force.⁷⁹

The third situation wherein domestic violence is common is the modern, industrial milieu. Here the official ideology proclaims the equality of the sexes,

permitting neither the expression of male authority over women, nor any coercive measures to maintain such authority. In this milieu, however, there is a gap between prevalent attitudes and the law, the legal system being characterized by unevenness and contradictions. Hence, while the expressed philosophy is that violence against women in the family is unacceptable, the law may still tacitly condone such violence by, for example, not criminalizing marital rape.

The approach outlined above confirms and extends the analysis of violence against women in the domestic context as arising out of a power structure where men are traditionally dominant within the family and society. Other analyses that similarly accept this structural background suggest that violence erupts because of the general acceptance of violence as a reasonable response to frustration, conflict or despair, such acceptance being manifested in the existence of war, sport, the encouragement of violence in various sub-cultures, and its popularity and celebration in the media.⁸⁰

The combination of structural inequality within the family and society and the general acceptability of violence as a method of conflict resolution within society as the fundamental cause of violence against wives is attractive, appearing to be a rational and logical explanation. However, there is no empirical data to support it as there have been no studies that have compared the level of violence against wives in societies at war with societies at peace; the level of violence against wives in societies with violent punishments with those without them; and societies with standing armies with those without. Finally, there is little empirical data linking violence in the media with violence in the home.⁸¹

In sum, it would appear that there is no simple explanation for violence against women in the home. Certainly, any explanation must go beyond the individual characteristics of the man, the woman and the family and look to the structure of relationships and the role of society in underpinning that structure. In the end analysis, it is perhaps best to conclude that violence against wives is a function of the belief, fostered in all cultures, that men are superior and that the women they live with are their possessions or chattels that they can treat as they wish and as they consider appropriate.

In some societies, this philosophy is reinforced by devices such as bride price⁸² that lead a man to believe that he has bought his wife and thus his conduct towards her should not be open to question. Even in those societies where there are no such overt indications of subordination, the social framework relegates the woman, nonetheless, to the level of a chattel. Here structures place her in a position of dependence on the man and predict that she will fulfill certain roles. This combines with the isolation of the family as an institution and the respect that is offered to it in terms of privacy and autonomy by all agents within the society, to allow violence to occur if the wife is seen to overstep her traditional role.

The collected scholarship that seeks to explain violence against women in the home indicates that the explanation is complex and certainly multi-factorial. Any explanation must, however, be seen against a background of gender inequality, wherein the victim of such violence is most often the woman and the perpetrator most often the man and wherein the structures of society—be they economic, political or legal—act to confirm this inequality.

NOTES

- ¹ M.D.A. Freeman, "Legal ideologies, patriarchal precedents and domestic violence," in *State, Law and Family* (London, Tavistock, 1984), p. 69.
- ² *Ibid.*, p. 52.
- ³ J. Pahl, ed., *Private Violence and Public Policy: The Needs of Battered Women and the Response of the Social Services* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985), pp. 187–188.
- ⁴ Dobash and Dobash, *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against the Patriarchy* (London, Open books, 1980), p. 15. See also M.D.A. Freeman, "Violence against women: does the legal system provide solutions or itself constitute the problem?", *British Journal of Law and Society*, No. 7, 1980, p. 216.
- ⁵ E. Hilberman and F. Munson, "Sixty battered women," *Victimology*, No. 2, 1978, p. 460.
- ⁶ J. Renvoize, *Web of Violence: A Study of Family Violence* (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978).
- ⁷ R. J. Gelles, *Family Violence* (Beverly Hills, Sage, 1979).
- ⁸ J. J. Gayford, "Wife battering: a preliminary survey of 100 cases," *British Medical Journal*, No. 1, 1975, p. 194.
- ⁹ P. D. Scott, "Battered wives," *British Journal of Psychiatry*, No. 125, 1974, p. 433.
- ¹⁰ Pahl, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
- ¹¹ See, for example, Domestic Violence Phone-In Report (Adelaide, Australia, Women's Information Switchboard, 1980); Report on Phone-In on Domestic Violence (Victoria, Australia, 1985).
- ¹² W. Stojanowska, case study from Poland (Warsaw, Instytut Badania Prawa Sadowego, 1987).
- ¹³ S. Ranck and S. Toft, "Domestic violence in an urban context with rural comparisons," in *Domestic Violence in Urban Papua New Guinea*, Occasional Paper No. 19 (Boroko, Law Reform Commission of Papua New Guinea, 1986), p. 3.
- ¹⁴ N. P. Simi, case study from Samoa (Prime Minister's Department, Apia); See also Report in Conference on Alcohol Related Problems on Pacific Island Countries, sponsored by the South Pacific Commission and the World Health Organization, Noumea, New Caledonia, 9–13 September 1985. This Conference stressed the link between alcohol abuse and domestic violence in the Pacific.
- ¹⁵ L. E. M. Mukasa-Kikonyogo, Ugandan case study (Kampala, High Court of Uganda, 1987).
- ¹⁶ ISIS Internacional, case study from Chile.
- ¹⁷ B. A. Al-Awadi, Kuwaiti case study (Safat, University of Kuwait).
- ¹⁸ M. I. Plata, case study from Colombia (Bogota, Population Concern, 1987).
- ¹⁹ J. Downey and J. Howell, *Wife Battering—A Review and Preliminary Enquiry into Local Incidents, Needs and Resources* (Vancouver, B.C., Social Policy and Research Department, United Way of Greater Vancouver and the Non-Medical Use of Drugs Directorate, National Department of Health and Welfare), p. 56.
- ²⁰ L. H. Bowker, *Beating Wife-Beating* (Lexington, MA, 1983), p. 467.
- ²¹ Downey and Howell, *op. cit.*
- ²² R. Gelles, *The Violent Home* (Beverly Hills, Sage, 1972).
- ²³ R. Epstein, R. Ng and J. Trebble, *The Social Organisation of Family Violence: An Ethnography of Immigrant Experience in Vancouver* (Vancouver, B. C., Women's Research Centre, 1978), p. 27.
- ²⁴ M. Straus, R. J. Gelles and Steinmetz, *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family* (New York, Anchor Books, 1980).
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 100.
- ²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 113.