

The Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating: The Construction and Initial Validation of a Measure of Beliefs and Attitudes

Daniel G. Saunders*

Ann B. Lynch*

Marcia Grayson*

Daniel Linz †

Although attitudes and beliefs about wife beating have been regarded as important for understanding the factors that cause and perpetuate woman abuse, researchers have not had adequate instruments to measure these attitudes and beliefs. This article reports on the construction of a scale of attitudes about wife beating and an assessment of the scale's dimensionality and validity. Data were collected from 675 students, 94 residents of a mid-western city, 71 men who batter, and 70 advocates for battered women. Five reliable subscales were derived, and seven tests of validity were supported. Sympathetic attitudes toward battered women were related, as predicted, with liberal views of women's roles and sympathetic attitudes toward rape victims. Abusers and advocates were the most dissimilar in their attitudes. Male and female students also differed significantly. Many of the results are analogous to those in studies of attitudes toward rape. Several possible uses of the measure are described.

The topic of wife beating evokes a wide variety of responses. Some people assign blame to victims, others blame the perpetrators, and still others divide the blame equally. Victims may be regarded with indifference, hostility, or compassion, depending on the belief held about the cause of the violence. Views about causation are equally varied and can center on the abuser's mental health or level of stress, on the victim's behavior, or on a cultural analysis that points to male domination as the cause.

Although there are a variety of reactions to wife abuse, the public and many professional groups are generally charged with holding negative attitudes toward battered women (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Gelles, 1976; Straus, 1976). It may be difficult for people to understand the plight of battered women because abused wives are more likely than other victims to be seen as being in an ongoing, intimate relationship with their abusers. Many people believe that those victimized in such

*University of Wisconsin-Madison; and Family Service, Madison, Wisconsin.

†University of California-Los Angeles.

relationships are responsible for their abuse, that the abuse is not serious, and that victims deserve little sympathy and assistance (Rossi, Waite, & Berk, 1974; Shotland & Straw, 1976).

The reaction of apathy or hostility experienced by many abused wives when they reach out for help, sometimes referred to as "secondary injury" (Symonds, 1980), is the focus of great concern. Such negative attitudes may actually help perpetuate abuse by turning women back into violent relationships, feeling even more helpless than before (cf. Stark, Flitcraft, & Frazier, 1979). A lack of options leads to both self-derogation and derogation by others (see, for example, Fine, 1981). This derogation may lead, in turn, to a further restriction of options.

A more direct contribution to wife abuse arises from the attitudes of the perpetrators. At least for some types of men who batter, a link has been established between the approval of marital violence and the actual perpetration of such acts (e.g., Dibble & Straus, 1981).

On a cultural level, there is evidence that attitudes about wife beating are part of a broader attitude domain about women's rights and roles in society (cf. Dobash & Dobash, 1979). For example, Yllo (1983) found patriarchal norms to be related to the physical assault of wives by husbands, using states as the unit of analysis. Such norms are also related to the acceptance of negative stereotypes about rape victims (Burt, 1980; Feild, 1978; Klein, 1981), suggesting that a search for parallels in attitudes about rape and wife beating may prove fruitful.

Several scales have been developed to measure attitudes toward rape (e.g., Burt, 1980; Feild, 1978; King, Rotter, Calhoun & Selby, 1978; Schwartz, Williams, & Pepitone-Rockwell, 1981). These scales have been useful in comparing different groups of professionals and other individuals, testing theories of attributions for rape, and measuring the effects of media depictions of rape (e.g. Burt, 1980; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Feild, 1978; King et al., 1978). However, a similar effort has not been made to understand general attitudes on wife abuse, despite the rapid growth of empirical work in this area. Most existing measures of attitudes about violence toward wives focus only on the normality or approval of the violence (Saunders, 1980; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980); the variance of these scales is generally low because most respondents report disapproval of the violence. Vignette studies of wife abuse have also been done (Cohn & Sugarman, 1980; Kalmuss, 1979; Richardson & Campbell, 1980; Skiffington, Parker, Richardson, & Calhoun, 1984) that focus primarily on measuring attributions of responsibility to victims and offenders. Other dimensions of attitudes about wife abuse—for example, the desirability of punishment for offenders, beliefs about victims, and reactions toward helping victims—are largely unexplored.

Greenblat (1985) attempted to assess some of these dimensions and found that it was important to distinguish between the general approval of wife abuse and approval for specific acts and situations. However, she relied on single items for each variable and did not establish the reliability and validity of her measures. Two other studies of attitudes about domestic violence also used single items for each variable (Powers, Schlesinger, & Benson, 1983; Stringer-Moore, Pepitone-Arreola-Rockwell, & Rozée-Koker, 1984). Finn (1986) constructed a unidimensional, five-item scale called Attitudes Toward Force in Marriage but also did not establish the reliability and validity of the scale.

The purpose of this article is to describe the development of a more comprehensive measure of attitudes and beliefs about wife beating, the Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating (IBWB). Although the IBWB covers both attitudes and beliefs, it is called an inventory of beliefs to make its contents sound less threatening or controversial to respondents. The focus of the measure is on violence against married rather than unmarried women because if a term covering both were used, responses could be confounded by any differences that may exist in reactions to married and unmarried victims (thus increasing error variance) and because "wife beating" seems to be the most commonly used term. This article describes an initial assessment of the measure's reliability and validity. The strategy of scale development recommended by Campbell and Fiske (1959) was used, particularly tests of convergent and divergent validity. A number of hypotheses were tested in the process of studying the measure's validity. In all, three studies were conducted in the development of the scale.

In the first study, we predicted that attitudes about wife beating would consist of a number of different dimensions and that most of these dimensions would be analogous to those found in rape-attitude scales. As a corollary, we further predicted that attitudes about wife abuse would be closely related to attitudes about rape.

The second study tested the construct validity of the measure, namely, the theoretical propositions that negative attitudes toward battered women and the approval of wife beating would be positively associated with traditional views of women's roles, hostility toward women, and self-reported likelihood of violence. To test divergent validity, we predicted that measures of personality and psychopathology would not be significantly correlated with the IBWB subscales.

A major source of invalidity for many attitude scales, particularly those with high face validity, is social desirability response bias. Persons exhibiting this bias tend to respond to questionnaires in a socially desirable manner. For example, some male college students have been shown to respond more liberally than their actual attitudes on a widely used measure of attitudes about women's roles (Bowman & Auerbach, 1978). Thus, the second study also evaluated whether the IBWB was contaminated by social desirability response bias.

In the third study, another type of validity, the "known groups" method, was evaluated, and again a prediction paralleling attitudes about rape was made. Feild (1978) found that rape crisis counselors and rapists were at the opposite ends of most rape attitude factors, with members of the public and police officers distributed between them. In the present study, the prediction was made that advocates for battered women and men who batter would be at opposite ends of the attitude dimensions, with students falling between them.

STUDY 1: SCALE DIMENSIONALITY AND RELATION TO RAPE MYTHS

Based on studies of attitudes toward rape, it was expected that there would be support for the multidimensionality of the IBWB. Study 1 assessed this proposition. We also predicted that there would be a direct association between attitudes about abuse of women and attitudes about rape.

Prior to the study, the authors constructed 119 items intended to reflect a variety of dimensions relating to wife beating. Sources for item content include rape-attitude scales, research and popular literature on wife abuse, consultation with the staff of a shelter for battered women, and clinical work with battered women and their partners. "Beating" was defined on the inventory as "repeated hitting intended to inflict pain." Items covered the broad domains of wife beating and encompassed the act of wife beating, the victim, and the offender. Items reflecting several types of responsibility included responsibility for simply causing the violence, responsibility because the beating was intended, responsibility because it should have been foreseen, and responsibility for solving the problem (Brickman et al., 1982; Cohn & Sugarman, 1980).

Items were eliminated if they were ambiguous or required knowledge of facts. Other items were eliminated (in a pilot study of 106 undergraduates) if they did not correlate with at least two other items, a prerequisite for constructing reliable subscales (Kim & Mueller, 1978, p. 77). The final scale for this study had 41 items.

Method

Six hundred seventy-five subjects participated: 578 were from a psychology department subject pool at a midwestern university, 86 were from a psychology department subject pool at a New England university, and 11 were students at a New England community college who were taking a course on the family.

Principal axis factoring (with iterations), followed by varimax rotation, was used as the major form of analysis because the study was exploratory and was attempting to create several independent subscales. However, some of the dimensions were expected to be closely related; thus, principal axis factoring with oblique rotation was performed to assess the relationship among factors. For the oblique rotation, the delta value was set at 0, reflecting an assumption of relatively high correlation.

The subscales were then correlated with a widely used and well-validated measure of attitudes about rape, the Rape Myth Acceptance (RMA) Scale (Burt, 1980). The RMA predicts self-reported sexual aggression (Koss, Leonard, Beezley, & Oros, 1985), self-rated likelihood of raping (Malamuth, Haber, & Feshbach, 1980), and acceptance of interpersonal violence (Burt, 1980). The internal reliability coefficient (α) of the RMA with this sample was .91.

Results and Discussion

Twelve factors with unrotated eigenvalues greater than one were extracted and retained for interpretation.¹ Table 1 shows the rotated factor structure for these twelve factors, their rotated eigenvalues, and the percent of variance explained by each factor. The appendix shows the actual items and subscales.

The factor correlation matrix resulting from the oblique rotation showed that the strongest intercorrelations are among Factors 1 through 5 and Factors 7 and 9, indicating that particular combinations of these factors are justified.

Factor 1 contains items that reflect the attitude that wife beating is justified in general (for example, "Sometimes it is OK for a man to beat his wife") or because of victims' specific behavior ("A sexually unfaithful wife deserves to be beaten"). It is not surprising that some of the more general items (for example, 7 and 9) loaded high on more than two factors. The factor that was conceptually and statistically most

TABLE 1. Varimax Rotated Factor Structure of the Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating (IBWB)

Item Number	Factor ^a											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1.	.65											
2.	.54	-.32										
3.	.54											
4.	.48											
5.	-.42		.37									
6.	-.41											.32
7.	-.38	.26		.30								.30
8.	-.36	.30										
9.	.32								-.29		-.26	
10.	-.29	.54										
11.	-.25		.75									
12.		.63										
13.		.49										
14.		.42							-.43			
15.		.36										
16.		.35			-.32							
17.		.31			-.36						.25	
18.		.27	.46									
19.			.61									
20.			.44									
21.				.65								
22.				-.42								
23.				.42					.26			
24.					.53							
25.					.36			.29				
26.					.26						-.33	
27.						.72						
28.						.43		.28				
29.						-.43						
30.						.33						
31.						.25		.69				
32.							.59					
33.							.59					
34.							.36					
35.							-.29					
36.								.63				
37.									.66			
38.									-.56			
39.										.41		
40.										.58		
41.												.29
Eigen- values ^b	8.4	1.7	1.2	1.0	.9	.9	.7	.6	.6	.5	.4	.4
% of variance ex- plained	48.1	9.9	6.8	5.5	5.4	5.3	4.1	3.5	3.3	2.9	2.6	2.6

^aFor readability, only coefficients at or above .25 are shown.

^bThe eigenvalues shown are after rotation.

similar to Factor 1 was Factor 3 ($r = -.34$). Factor 3 contained items similar to Factor 1, except with reversed valence (for instance, "Episodes of a man beating his wife are the wife's fault"). Combining the factors and performing an analysis of reliability, items 1 to 9 and 11, 18, and 19 formed a subscale with a standardized alpha coefficient of .86. In a study of nurses and physicians in which two subscales of the IBWB were used (Rose, 1984), this subscale had an alpha of .73. These alpha coefficients were higher than for either factor alone; thus, we decided to combine the factors into a single subscale that we labeled "Wife Beating Is Justified" (WJ).

Factor 2 has items reflecting the belief that battered wives intend to be abused and that they derive gains in the form of sympathy or attention from being abused. This factor is conceptually and statistically related to Factor 5 ($r = -.24$), which emphasizes pleasurable (masochistic) gain from the abuse. In combining these two factors, reliability analysis with all possible combinations of items showed that the most reliable subscale was formed with items 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, and 24. It has a standardized alpha coefficient of .77. We labeled this subscale "Wives Gain from Beatings" (WG).

Factor 4 pertains to the desirability of bystanders' taking immediate, personal action when battered women are attacked (for example, "If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, it would be best that I do nothing"). Conceptually and statistically, Factor 4 is related to Factor 7, which pertains to social interventions to aid battered women ($r = .34$). The combination of items from these two factors (items 21, 22, 32, 33, and 34) produced a subscale with a standardized alpha coefficient of .67. In the study of nurses and physicians by Rose (1984), this alpha coefficient was somewhat higher (.72). We labeled this subscale "Help Should Be Given" (HG).

Because of the intercorrelations among Factors 1 through 5 and 7 and 9, there is evidence for a higher order factor and thus justification for combining the above subscales into a larger one (after reversing the values of the HG scale). The standardized alpha coefficient of this larger subscale, "Sympathy for Battered Wives," is .89. The six factors represented in this subscale accounted for 79.8% of the variance of the factor structure (following 18 iterations of principal axis factoring).

Factor 6 has items that urge immediate separation of the couple through the woman's departure, through divorce, or through the jailing of the abuser. One of the items attributes intentionality to the abuser. This factor was correlated slightly with only one other factor. The five items (27 to 31) formed a subscale with a standardized alpha coefficient of .61. It was called "Offender Should Be Punished" (OP) because the majority of items dealt with the consequences the abuser should suffer.

Factor 8 focuses on the culpability of the abuser. Items that find fault with the abuser, attribute intentions to his actions, and call for his arrest loaded high on this factor. We called this subscale "Offender Is Responsible" (OR). Two of the items (28 and 31) are the same as in the OP subscale. The subscales could be combined but with very little gain in internal reliability. OR has a standardized alpha coefficient of .62.

The remaining four factors did not form reliable subscales. Factor 9 items mainly related to the belief that the offender is either mentally ill or "normal." With more items on this dimension it might have become a subscale. Factor 10 contained two items that viewed wives as "causing" or "triggering" their abuse and one that supported psychological help for abused wives. Factor 11 and Factor 12 were largely explained by previous factors. The variance explained in the factor structure by the

last four factors was only 11%. Thus, five subscales with adequate reliability were created from the factor analysis: Wife Beating Is Justified (WJ), Wives Gain from Beatings (WG), Help Should Be Given (HG), Offender Should Be Punished (OP), and Offender Is Responsible (OR).

The five subscales were then correlated with the RMA Scale. All the scales were significantly correlated with the RMA and in the expected directions. The WJ scale correlated .56 with the RMA Scale and the WG scale correlated .62 with it. The RMA's relationship with the other three scales was less strong but still significant (HG: $r = -.42$; OR: $r = -.25$; OP: $r = -.20$; all correlations = $p < .001$).

In summary, multiple dimensions of attitudes toward wife beating were discovered. Several of the factors were analogous to and correlated with those in rape-attitude scales, specifically (1) the victim's behavior as precipitant or justification for violence, (2) the offender as responsible and needing punishment, and (3) the victim as gaining from the attack. One of the rape-attitude dimensions, trauma to the victim (King et al., 1978), was not evident on the IBWB.

The lack of a strong contribution by the general items about victim "causation" or "triggering" of abuse may indicate that these concepts are ambiguous and not as clear as other items on issues of victims' intentionality and the justification for violence based on victims' specific behaviors. These findings are similar to those of Greenblat (1985). In her study, students strongly condemned marital violence when the violence was described abstractly. They were more likely to approve or at least tolerate the abuse when the wife's behavior or husband's motivation was specifically described.

STUDY 2: EVALUATION OF CONSTRUCT VALIDITY

To determine the construct validity of the five subscales, their relationships with theoretically relevant constructs were tested.² One prediction was that attitudes supportive of wife beating—for example, holding victims responsible, approving of the violence, or believing victims like the abuse—would be related to traditional views of women's roles. A number of authors have made this prediction (Martin, 1976; Schechter, 1983; Walker, 1979; Yllo, 1983). *An analogous relationship has been found for attitudes toward rape* (Alexander, 1980; Burt, 1980; Feild, 1978; Williams, 1979). Greenblat (1985) found that three statements approving the severity of wife abuse and one approving the masochism theory of wife abuse were less likely to be endorsed by "feminist" students. The findings were limited, however, because the measure of feminism and the items on wife abuse attitudes are of unknown reliability.

A second prediction was that general hostility toward women would be related to attitudes blaming battered women and holding them responsible for their abuse. Hostility toward women is a logical precursor of negative attitudes toward battered women and is perhaps a more blatantly misogynous factor than beliefs about women's roles (Check, 1985).

A third prediction was that men who reported a propensity to be violent with women would also tend to justify woman abuse and believe that victims gain from it. A number of studies have shown a relationship between rape-supportive attitudes and men's self-rated likelihood of raping (Briere & Malamuth, 1983; Malamuth, 1981; Malamuth et al., 1980; Tieger, 1981).

A fourth prediction was that attitudes about woman abuse would not be related to measures of personality, thus demonstrating divergent validity. This prediction was based on the consensus from clinical work with men who batter that they do not have any one type of personality disorder or severe mental disorder (Edleson, Eisikovits, & Guttman, 1985). Furthermore, the link between measures of antisocial personality and psychopathology and measures of acceptance of violence toward women has been weak or nonexistent (e.g., Malamuth, 1986). A fifth prediction was that those who identify most with female victims would be most likely to show sympathy for them. If one does not regard another person as being of similar status to oneself or even as being quite human, indifference and hostility are likely to follow (Sanford & Comstock, 1971). Identification with victims of violence was a major contributor to attitudes about violence in one study of American men (Blumenthal, Kahn, Andrews, & Head, 1972) and under some circumstances may override one's beliefs about justice (Chaikin & Darley, 1973). We predicted that women would hold stronger negative attitudes about wife beating than men would because of the greater likelihood they would identify with battered women.

In addition to the above tests, the subscales' relationships with social desirability response bias were evaluated.

Method

Subjects. Several diverse samples were used. An attempt was made to include samples expected to differ greatly from each other—for example, samples made up of abusers and advocates for battered women, as well as samples that would not be at the extremes of opinion. One sample consisted of the 97 New England students who were in Study 1. There were 44 men and 53 women in the sample, and they completed all the measures for both studies in a single session. Added to this sample for other tests of validity were 578 students from the psychology subject pool of a midwestern university. Most of the students completed only a portion of the measures in this study because they were completing the scales as part of other studies. All student samples were large enough to account for more than sufficient power for the bivariate analyses conducted.

Several nonstudent samples also completed the measure used in the first test of construct validity:

1. 145 nurses and 86 physicians at a Midwest teaching hospital and clinic (Rose & Saunders, 1986).
2. 21 men who were entering treatment for the problem of woman abuse.
3. 70 women advocates for battered women, all of whom were providing direct or indirect services in programs for abuse victims; 17 advocates were from two programs in the Midwest, and the remainder were from 12 New England programs.
4. 94 individuals who were part of a study comparing the attitudes of Hispanics and Anglo-Americans about woman abuse (Coffey, 1986).³

Measures. 1. Attitudes toward the rights and roles of women were measured using the 15-item version of the Attitudes Toward Women (AWS) Scale (Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). It is unifactorial and showed

a reliability coefficient of .89 with a sample of college students. Evidence of construct validity is shown by (1) the scale's differentiation of males and females and older and younger persons in expected directions (Spence & Helmreich, 1972 a), (2) the scale's ability to predict reactions to female competence (Spence & Helmreich, 1972b) and (3) the scale's relationship to sex-stereotyped traits on the Personal Attribute Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975).

2. A measure similar to the AWS is the measure of Sex-Role Stereotyping (SRS) used by Burt (1980) in her study of rape myths. The internal reliability reported in the original study was .80 and in this study was .69. The construct validity of the scale was shown in Burt's study by its correlation in predicted ways with measures of adversarial sexual beliefs, acceptance of interpersonal violence, and rape myth acceptance.

3. The Hostility Toward Women (HTW) Scale measures general hostility toward women using 30 true-false items (Check & Malamuth, 1983). The alpha coefficient of reliability obtained in the present study was .79 and in a study by Malamuth (1986) was .89. Check (1985) reports a test-retest reliability of the scale of .83. Included in its evidence of construct validity is its association with self-reported sexual aggression (Malamuth, 1986). Further information on the scale's reliability and validity can be found in Check's work (1985).

4. Two items assessed the propensity of the men in the study toward violence against women. They were "I have a good chance of becoming violent in a dating or marital relationship" and "There are times I would have hit a current or past partner if I could have gotten away with it." The latter item is directly analogous to the propensity-to-rape item used in several other studies (e.g., Malamuth, 1981).

5. The Psychoticism Scale of the Symptom Checklist-90 (SCL-90) (Derogatis, 1977) is one of nine subscales of the checklist. It lists ten symptoms associated with psychoticism and asks respondents to indicate their frequency. The SCL-90 has been used on a variety of samples, and the subscales are supported by factor analysis (Derogatis, 1977). The convergent validity is good, but its discriminant validity is not substantiated (Dinning & Evans, 1977). In the present study, the psychoticism subscale had an internal reliability coefficient of .85. Along with the following two measures, it was used as a measure of personality for testing divergent validity.

6. Two subscales of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ) were used: Extroversion and Neuroticism (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1969). The Psychoticism Scale of this questionnaire was not used in this study because it is more a measure of antisocial and sadistic traits than of psychoticism as generally defined (Claridge, 1983). A number of studies using factor analysis support the separation of traits into the three dimensions (e.g., Eysenck & Eysenck, 1971). In the present study, the internal reliability of the Neuroticism Scale was .84, for the Extroversion Scale, .83.

7. Social desirability response bias was measured using the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964). A 10-item version with high internal reliability was used (alpha coefficient of .90) (Greenwald & Satow, 1970). This scale is generally uncorrelated with measures of psychopathology, but it correlates significantly and in expected directions with the three validity scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (Crowne & Marlowe, 1964; Ramanaiah, Schill, & Lock, 1977). The Lie Scale of the EPQ was also used as a measure of response bias.

TABLE 2. Bivariate Correlations between Subscales of the Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating (IBWB) and Construct Validity Measures

Measure ^a	Sample ^b	N	Subscales ^c						
			WJ	WG	HG	OR	OP		
AWS	(S)	97	-.45***	-.45***	.42***	.18*	.25**		
	(ADV)	70	-.36***	-.12	.11	.10	.08		
	(AB)	21	-.56**	.32	.35	.38*	.16		
	(RN)	154	-.21*	NA	.23**	NA	NA		
	(MD)	86	-.35***	NA	.59***	NA	NA		
	(P)	94	-.41***	-.32**	NA	NA	.09		
SRS	(S)	303	.32***	.41***	-.33***	-.05	-.15**		
HTW	(S)	139	.34***	.27***	-.18*	-.11	-.14*		
Item 1: "I have a good chance of becoming violent"	(S)	97	.30***	.28**	-.12	-.16	-.17*		
Item 2: "There are times I would have hit a partner"	(S)	97	.21*	.21*	-.12	.02	-.01		
SCL-90-P	(S)	275	.01	-.06	.01	-.01	-.01		
Extroversion subscale	(S)	312	-.05	-.04	.17**	.07	.05		
Neuroticism subscale	(S)	311	.02	-.04	.00	.07	.15**		

^aKey: AWS = Attitudes Toward Women Scale; SRS = Sex-Role Stereotyping Scale; HTW = Hostility Toward Women Scale; and SCL-90-P = Psychoticism Scale of the Symptom Checklist-90.

^bKey: S = students; ADV = advocates; AB = abusers; RN = nurses; MD = physicians; and P = members of the public.

^cKey: WJ = Wife Beating Is Justified; WG = Wives Gain from Beatings; HG = Help Should Be Given; OR = Offender Is Responsible; and OP = Offender Should Be Punished.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. NA = not available.

Results and Discussion

Table 2 shows the correlation coefficients for the relationship between the IBWB subscales and the other constructs.

1. The AWS was generally related to the wife-beating attitude scales in the predicted direction across all samples. The strongest relationships with the AWS tended to exist for the three subscales of WJ, WG, and HG. Traditional views about sex roles were related positively with the beliefs that wife beating is justified, that wives gain from abuse, and that wives should not be helped. Significant but much smaller relationships existed with the other subscales. More liberal attitudes about women's roles were associated with beliefs that the offender is responsible and that he should be punished.

The Justify (WJ) and Gain (WG) subscales were significantly related to the AWS among female students ($r = -.28$ and $-.31$); similar correlations were found for male students ($r = -.37$ and $-.28$), but in addition, the Help (HG) subscale was significantly related to more liberal attitudes on the AWS ($r = .39$). Similarly, significant findings occurred in the Rose (1984) study of nurses and physicians, which used only the Justify (WJ) and Help (HG) scales. The physicians, most of whom were men, had higher correlations on the scales ($r = -.35$ and $.59$) than the nurses, most of whom were women ($r = -.21$ and $.23$).

Within the advocate and abuser samples in the present study, the relationship was strongest between conservative views of women's roles and the attitude that wife beating is justified. In addition, more liberal scores on the AWS in the abuser sample were linked with the belief that the perpetrator is responsible for the abuse.

Similar results were found when the SRS was used with a student sample. Four out of five of the IBWB subscales were correlated with the SRS in expected directions. Again the three scales WJ, WG, and HG had the highest correlations. Only the OR scale was not related to the SRS measure.

The results with the AWS and the SRS Scale are analogous to those in studies of attitudes toward rape and attributions of blame for rape. A similar link is found, in a variety of samples for both men and women, between beliefs about women's roles and rape myth acceptance (Burt, 1980; Check & Malamuth, 1983; Mazelam, 1980), rape attitudes (Costin, 1985; Feild, 1978), empathy for rape victims (Deitz, Blackwell, Daley, & Bentley, 1982), and belief in the social causation of rape (Krulowitz & Payne, 1978). The results are also consistent with those of two other studies (Finn, 1986; Greenblat, 1985) that showed a relationship between sexist attitudes and beliefs supportive of wife abuse. In the Finn study, gender was not related to beliefs about wife abuse after sexist attitudes were partialled out, demonstrating that sexist attitudes were the key variables.

2. As predicted, the HTW Scale was correlated with the IBWB scales in a similar manner to the SRS Scale. The strongest correlations were with the first three scales. There was no significant correlation with the OR scale.

3. The statements revealing a propensity toward violence toward intimates were both correlated positively and significantly with the attitudes that wife beating is justified and that wives somehow gain from abuse. The self-perceived chance of being violent was correlated to a lesser extent with the belief that the offender is not responsible and should not be punished.

4. The fourth prediction was that the scales would not be related to personality.

In this test of divergent validity, the three measures of personality did not show consistent correlations with the IBWB subscales, as expected. Only two out of the 15 correlations were significant. Extroversion was slightly related to a willingness to help battered women, and neuroticism was slightly related to the desire to punish the offender.

5. In the final test of the scales' construct validity, male and female students were shown to differ significantly ($p < .001$) on all but one subscale, the OR scale (see Table 3). Women were less likely to see violence as justified and to believe that victims gain from abuse. They were more likely to agree that help should be given and that the offender should be punished. Gender was also a significant discriminator in the same way on the Justify (WJ) and Help (HG) scales in Rose and Saunderson's (1986) study.

Similar results are seen in other studies. Greenblat (1985) found that men were more likely to show a tolerance of wife abuse and Finn (1986) showed that men were more accepting of abuse. In contrast, studies using single attributional scales found that men and women held victims equally responsible, but women were more likely to hold offenders responsible (Cohn & Sugarman, 1980; Kalmuss, 1979; Sugarman & Cohn, 1986). However, men tended to hold victims more responsible if they were portrayed as intending to cause the abuse (Cohn & Sugarman, 1980) or if the abuse had a long duration (Sugarman & Cohn, 1986).

6. Social desirability response bias did not appear to be a major contaminant of the IBWB scales. The Marlowe-Crowne Scale was correlated significantly with two of the scales, the OP and WG scales. Responding in a socially desirable manner was positively related to the belief that divorce or jail should be the consequence of abuse (OP) and with an unwillingness to claim that victims gain something from the abuse (WG). The shared variance with the Marlowe-Crowne Scale on these scales was not great, however (9.0% and 5.8%). As further evidence of the lack of response bias in the IBWB, the Lie Scale of the EPQ did not correlate significantly with any subscales. The measures of response bias can be used in conjunction with the IBWB scales, and the bias can be statistically removed with multivariate statistical techniques (such as analysis of covariance).

On the basis of the analyses described, the construct validity propositions received support using diverse samples and diverse measures. All the correlations discussed remained nearly the same when controlling for social desirability response bias using partial correlational analysis.

STUDY 3: KNOWN GROUPS VALIDITY

The IBWB should be able to differentiate groups who are known or presumed to have opposing attitudes about wife beating, thus establishing "known groups" validity. Advocates for battered women and men who batter were predicted to differ the most on attitudes about wife beating. Students were predicted to fall between these two groups in their attitudes.

The subjects for the study were the 578 students described in Study 1, the 70 advocates for battered women described in Study 2, and 71 men who were batterers. The men were voluntarily or involuntarily referred to three programs, one in the Midwest (61 men), one in Alaska (7 men), and one in New England (3 men).

Sixty-two percent of the men were involuntarily referred. Their average age was 30.7 (SD = 8.8). Thirty-eight percent were minority group members, 81% were high school graduates, and 12% had a college degree or education beyond college. The mean age of the advocates was 34.9 years (SD = 8.6). Eleven percent were minority group members, 97% were high school graduates, and 74% had a college degree or education beyond college. The average age of the students was 20.0 years (SD = 4.7). Their ethnicity was not recorded, but very few were minority group members.

Table 3 shows the comparisons among the samples on the five subscales. The means and standard deviations for each sample are given, as well as the *t*-test comparisons between the abusers and the advocates in the samples.

The differences between the samples of abusers and advocates were highly sig-

TABLE 3. Comparisons among Study Samples on the Subscales of the Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating (IBWB)

Subscale ^a	Sample	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
WJ	Abusers	2.42	.82	11.12	.0001
	Advocates	1.26	.32		
	Students	1.81	.76		
	Male	2.17	.85		
WG	Female Abusers	1.53	.53	8.61	.0001
	Abusers	2.70	.90		
	Advocates	1.34	.52		
	Students	2.24	.82		
HG	Male	2.50	.83	5.90	.0001
	Female Abusers	2.02	.74		
	Abusers	5.48	.93		
	Advocates	6.67	.49		
OR	Students	5.91	.77	-9.49	.0001
	Male	5.61	.81		
	Female Abusers	6.16	.64		
	Abusers	3.83	1.14		
OP	Advocates	5.24	1.13	-7.37	.0001
	Students	4.48	1.05		
	Male	4.45	1.04		
	Female Abusers	4.50	1.06		
OP	Abusers	3.20	.88	-7.19	.0001
	Advocates	4.25	.84		
	Students	3.93	.91		
	Male	3.73	.87		
OP	Female	4.08	.92	-3.84	.0001

^aKey: WJ = Wife Beating Is Justified; WG = Wives Gain from Beatings; HG = Help Should Be Given; OR = Offender Is Responsible; and OP = Offender Should Be Punished.

nificant and in the predicted direction on all subscales. Abusers were more likely to believe that wife beating is justified and that victims gain from abuse. They were less likely to believe that help should be given, that the offender is responsible, or that divorce and jail are appropriate immediate actions in the face of abuse.

For each subscale, the students' scores fell between those of the abusers and advocates, as predicted. Since precise hypotheses were not made regarding the differences between the students and the other samples, a more conservative test was made to explore these differences. The Tukey test of post hoc comparisons at the .05 level of significance was used for this purpose. The students differed from both of the other samples on all the subscales. The three samples were closest in their views on what the consequences should be immediately after an incident of abuse (OP scale).

To explore the possibility that the students' scores fell between the other two groups because of an averaging of the scores of male and female students, a comparison of male and female students with the other samples was made. Even when the students' scores were separated by gender, they continued to fall between those of the abusers and advocates. Male students significantly differed from the abusers on the WJ scale ($t = 2.09; p < .04$), the OR scale ($t = -4.09; p < .0001$) and the OP scale ($t = -4.31; p < .0001$). The difference on the WJ scale, however, did not reach significance with a conservative, experimentwise alpha of $p < .01$. There were no differences on the HG ($t = -1.13; p < .26$) and WG ($t = 1.70; p < .09$) scales.

Female students showed significantly ($p < .0001$) less sympathy in their attitudes than advocates on all subscales but one: they did not differ with advocates in their views of whether jail or divorce should follow an incident of wife beating (OP scale). This finding indicates that advocates for battered women do not have a bias in favor of dissolving marriages or merely punishing the abuser, as some authors assume (e.g., Neidig, 1984).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This article reports on several steps in the development of a measure of attitudes about wife beating. Described are the tests that were made for scale dimensionality, reliability, and validity. Factors were derived that were analogous to some of those found in studies on attitudes toward rape, for example, the belief that the victim is responsible for precipitating the attack. Five subscales with acceptable internal reliability were constructed.

Support was found for the construct validity of the subscales pertaining to attitudes toward victims. As with attitudes toward rape, negative attitudes toward victims were linked with traditional views of women's roles in a variety of samples. Men's and women's scores differed significantly on four out of five subscales in the directions predicted.

Overall, the major strength of the measure's development thus far are the tests of validity. A major limitation of the measure is the internal reliability of three of the scales (HG, OR, OP) that fell at the low end of acceptable reliability. In addition, it seems likely that there are attitude dimensions that are not reflected in these scales, for example, the dimension of beliefs about the normalcy of the abuser. More work is needed to determine if additional dimensions can be added. A further limitation of

the measure at this time is the lack of norms derived from a large sample of the general population.

In conclusion, the initial evidence of the reliability and validity of the IBWB shows the promise of a new, much needed measure of attitudes and beliefs about wife beating. The IBWB has the potential for numerous uses. It can help us understand more fully social responses to the plight of battered women. It can be used to evaluate the impact of programs to train professionals and to treat men who batter. Finally, it can contribute to a greater understanding of the cultural origins of woman abuse, which can subsequently improve methods for preventing this serious and widespread problem.

NOTES

¹Before analyzing the results for all the students, the factor structures of the men and women were compared. The structures were highly similar. The women differentiated three rather than two types of justification and thus had 13 rather than 12 factors: female students separated the item on infidelity (item 5) from the item on refusing to have sex (item 11), making them into two separate factors.

²Both computed ("scaled") scores and factor scores were used. However, only computed scores will be reported because there were no differences in the results for computed and factor scores.

³Seventy-two Anglos were the neighbors of 22 randomly selected Hispanics in the survey conducted in a midwestern city. The two groups did not differ on demographic variables or on the attitude variables; thus, their scores were combined for the present analysis.

REFERENCES

- Alexander, C. S. (1980). Blaming the victim: A comparison of police and nurses' perceptions of victims of rape. *Women and Health, 5*, 65-75.
- Blumenthal, M. D., Kahn, R. L., Andrews, F. M., & Head, K. B. (1972). *Justifying violence: Attitudes of American men*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Bowman, P. C., & Auerbach, S. M. (1978). Measuring sex-role attitudes: The problem of the well-meaning liberal mate. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4*(2), 265-271.
- Brickman, P., Rabinowitz, V. C., Coates, D., Cohn, E., Kidder, L., & Karuza, J. (1982). Models of helping and coping. *American Psychologist, 37*(4), 368-384.
- Briere, J., & Malamuth, N. M. (1983). Self-reported likelihood of sexually aggressive behavior: Attitudinal vs. sexual explanations. *Journal of Research in Personality, 17*, 315-323.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and support for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217-230.
- Campbell, D., & Fiske, D. (1959). Convergent and discriminant validation by the multitrait-multimethod matrix. *Psychological Bulletin, 65*, 81-105.
- Chaikin, A. L., & Darley, J. M. (1973). Victim or perpetrator? Defensive attribution of responsibility and the need for order and justice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25*, 268-275.
- Check, J. V. P. (1985). *The Hostility toward Women Scale*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba.
- Check, J. V. P., & Malamuth, N. M. (1983). Sex role stereotyping and reactions to depictions of stranger versus acquaintance rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*(2), 344-356.
- Claridge, G. (1983). The Eysenck Psychoticism Scale. In J. N. Butcher & C. D. Spielberger (Eds.), *Advances in personality assessment* (Vol. 2) (pp. 71-114). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Coffey, P. (1986). *A comparative analysis of Hispanic and Anglo attitudes about domestic violence*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Women's Studies Department.
- Cohn, E. S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1980). Marital abuse: Abusing the one you love. *Victimology: An International Journal, 5* (2-4), 203-212.
- Costin, F. (1985). Beliefs about rape and women's social roles. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 14*, 319-325.

- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence*. New York: John Wiley.
- Deitz, S. R., Blackwell, K. T., Daley, P. C., & Bentley, B. J. (1982). Measurement of empathy toward rape victims and rapists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(2), 372-384.
- Derogotis, L. R. (1977). *SCL-90: Administration, scoring and procedures manual--I, for the revised version*. Unpublished manuscript, John Hopkins University.
- Derogotis, L. R., & Cleary, P. A. (1977). Confirmation of the dimensional structure of the SCL-90: A study on construct validation. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*.
- Dibble, V., & Straus M. A. (1981). Some social structure determinants of inconsistency between attitudes and behavior: The case of family violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 42(1), 71-80.
- Dinning, W. D. & Evans, R. G. (1977). Discriminant and convergent validity of the SCL-90 in psychiatric inpatients. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 41(3), 304-310.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.
- Edleson, J. L., Eisikovits, Z., & Guttman, E. (1985). Men who batter: A critical review of the evidence. *Journal of Family Issues*, 6(2), 229-247.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. (1969). *Manual of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Eysenck, H. J., & Eysenck, S. B. (1971). Orthogonality of psychoticism and neuroticism: A factorial study. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 33, 461-462.
- Feild, H. S. (1978). Attitudes toward rape: A comparative analysis of police, rapists, crisis counselors, and citizens. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 36(2), 156-179.
- Fine, M. (1981). An injustice by any other name. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 6(1-4), 48-58.
- Finn, J. (1986). The relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes supporting marital violence. *Sex Roles*, 14(5-6), 235-244.
- Gelles, R. J. (1976). Abused wives: Why do they stay? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38, 659-668.
- Greenblat, K. (1985). "Don't hit your wife . . . unless . . .": Preliminary findings on normative support for the use of physical force by husbands. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 10(1-4), 221-241.
- Greenwald, H. J., & Satow, Y. (1970). A short social desirability scale. *Psychological Reports*, 27, 131-135.
- Kalmuss, D. (1979). The attribution of responsibility in a wife abuse context. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 4(2), 284-291.
- Kim, J., & Mueller, C. W. (1978). *Factor analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- King, H. E., Rotter, M. J., Calhoun, L. G., & Selby, J. W. (1978). Perceptions of the rape incident: Physicians and volunteer counselors. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 6, 74-77.
- Klein, D. (1981). Violence against women: Some considerations regarding its causes and elimination. *Crime and Delinquency*, 27(1), 64-80.
- Koss, M. P., Leonard, K. E., Beezley, D. A., & Oros, C. J. (1985). Nonstranger sexual aggression: A discriminant analysis of psychological dimensions. *Sex Role*, 12 (9-10), 981-992.
- Kruelewitz, J. E., & Payne, E. J. (1978). Attributions about rape: Effects of rapist force, observer sex and sex role attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 8(4), 291-305.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1981). Rape proclivity among males. *Journal of Social Issues*, 37, 138-157.
- Malamuth, N. M. (1986). Predictors of naturalistic sexual aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(5), 953-962.
- Malamuth, N., Haber, S., & Feshbach, S. (1980). Testing hypotheses regarding rape: Exposure to sexual violence, sex differences and the "normality" of rapists. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 14, 121-137.
- Martin, D. (1976). *Battered wives of America*. San Francisco: Glide.
- Mazelam, P. M. (1980). Stereotyping and perceptions of the victims of rape. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 5(2-4), 121-132.
- Neidig, P. H. (1984). Women's shelters, men's collectives and other issues in the field of spouse abuse. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 9(3-4), 464-476.
- Powers, R. J., Schlesinger, L. B., & Benson, M. (1983). Family violence: Effects of a film program for alcohol dependent persons. *Journal of Drug Education*, 13(2), 153-160.
- Ramanaiah, N. V., Schill, T., & Lock, S. L. (1977). A test of the hypothesis about the two-dimensional nature of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 11, 251-259.

- Richardson, D. C., & Campbell, J. L. (1980). Alcohol and wife abuse: The effect of alcohol on attributions of blame for wife abuse. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6(1), 51-56.
- Rose, K. (1984). *Physicians' and nurses' attitudes toward woman abuse*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Ann Arbor, MI. (University Microfilms International).
- Rose, K., & Saunders, D. G. (1986). Nurses' and physicians' attitudes about woman abuse: The effects of gender and professional role. *Health Care for Women International*, 7, 427-438.
- Rossi, F. E., Waite, C. E., & Berk, R. (1974). The seriousness of crimes: Normative structure and individual differences. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 224-237.
- Sanford, N., & Comstock, C. (Eds.). (1971). *Sanctions for evil*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Saunders, D. G. (1980). *The police response to battered women: Predictors of officers' use of arrest, counseling, or minimal action*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Ann Arbor, MI. (University Microfilms International, No. 80-08840)
- Schechter, S. (1982). *Women and male violence*. Boston: South End Press.
- Schwartz, J., Williams, H., & Pepitone-Rockwell, F. (1981). Construction of a rape awareness scale. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 6(1-4), 110-119.
- Shotland, R. L., & Straw, M. K. (1976). Bystander response to an assault: When a man attacks a woman. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 990-999.
- Skiffington, S. T., Parker, J. B., Richardson, D., & Calhoun, J. F. (1984). The applicability of the empathic set effect to modify perceptions of domestic violence. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 12(1), 39-44.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972a). The Attitude toward Women Scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 2, 66.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. (1972b). Who likes competent women? Competence, sex-role congruence of interests, and subjects' attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 2, 197-213.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 2(4), 219-220.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 29-39.
- Stark, E., Flitcraft, A., & Frazier, W. (1979). Medicine and patriarchal violence: The social construction of a 'private' event. *International Journal of Health Services*, 9, 461-493.
- Straus, M. A. (1976). Sexual inequality, cultural norms, and wifebeating. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 1, 54-76.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. New York: Doubleday.
- Stringer-Moore, D., Pepitone-Arreola-Rockwell, F., & Rozée-Koker, P. (1984). Beliefs about and experiences with battering: Women and men in two populations. *Sex Roles*, 11(3-4), 269-276.
- Sugarman, D. B., & Cohn, E. S. (1986). Origin and solution attributions of responsibility for wife abuse: Effects of outcome severity, prior history, and sex of subject. *Violence and Victims*, 1, 291-304.
- Symonds, M. (1980). The "second injury" to victims. *Evaluation and Change*, Special Issue, 36-38.
- Tieger, T. (1981). Self-rated likelihood of raping and the social perception of rape. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 15, 147-158.
- Walker, L. (1979). *The battered woman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Williams, J. E. (1979). Sex role stereotypes, women's liberation and rape: A cross-cultural analysis of attitudes. *Sociological Symposium*, No. 25, 61-97.
- Yllo, K. (1983). Sexual equality and violence against wives in American states. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 14(1), 67-86.

APPENDIX: INVENTORY OF BELIEFS ABOUT WIFE BEATING^a

A. Subscale WJ: Wife Beating Is Justified^b

1. A husband has no right to beat his wife even if she breaks agreements she has made with him.
2. Even when a wife's behavior challenges her husband's manhood, he's not justified in beating her.
3. A wife doesn't deserve a beating even if she keeps reminding her husband of his weak points.
4. Even when women lie to their husbands they do not deserve to get a beating.
5. A sexually unfaithful wife deserves to be beaten.
6. Sometimes it is OK for a man to beat his wife.
7. It would do some wives some good to be beaten by their husbands.
8. Occasional violence by a husband toward his wife can help maintain the marriage.
9. There is no excuse for a man beating his wife.
11. A woman who constantly refuses to have sex with her husband is asking to be beaten.
18. Episodes of a man beating his wife are the wife's fault.
19. Wives could avoid being battered by their husbands if they knew when to stop talking.

B. Subscale WG: Wives Gain from Beatings

10. Battered wives are responsible for their abuse because they intended it to happen.
12. Wives who are battered are responsible for the abuse because they should have foreseen it would happen.
13. Battered wives try to get their partners to beat them as a way to get attention from them.
14. When a wife is beaten, it is caused by her behavior in the weeks before the battering.
16. Most wives secretly desire to be beaten by their husbands.
17. Wives try to get beaten by their husbands to get sympathy from others.
24. Women feel pain and no pleasure when beaten up by their husbands.

C. Subscale HG: Help Should Be Given

21. If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, it would be best that I do nothing.
22. If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, I would call the police.
32. Wife beating should be given a high priority as a social problem by government agencies.
33. Social agencies should do more to help battered women.
34. Women should be protected by law if their husbands beat them.

D. Subscale OP: Offender Should Be Punished

27. If a wife is beaten by her husband, she should divorce him immediately.
28. The best way to deal with wife beating is to arrest the husband.
29. How long should a man who has beaten his wife spend in prison or jail?^c
30. A wife should move out of the house if her husband beats her.
31. Husbands who batter are responsible for the abuse because they intended to do it.

E. Subscale OR: Offender Is Responsible

25. Cases of wife beating are the fault of the husband.
36. Husbands who batter should be responsible for the abuse because they should have foreseen that it would happen.

Repeat items 28 and 31 from Subscale OP.

^aResponses: SA = strongly agree; A = agree; SLA = slightly agree; N = neither agree nor disagree; SLD = slightly disagree; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree. When SA equals 1 and SD equals 7, the values of the following items will need to be reversed before adding the scores to derive subscale scores: 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36.

^bThe titles of the scales were not included in the questionnaire used in the studies.

^c Response format for item 29: 0, 1 month, 6 months, 1 year, 3 years, 5 years, 10 years, don't know.

Acknowledgments: This research was supported in part by NIMH Grants MH-15161-06 and MH-17139-01 from the National Institute of Mental Health awarded while the first author was a postdoctoral research fellow and by Grant MH-408894-01 awarded to the fourth author. The authors are grateful to the following individuals and organizations who helped gather the data: Barbara Carson, Ellen Cohn, Eileen Hodges, Diana Kunce, Barry MacMichaels, the New Hampshire Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Family Service, Madison, Wisconsin, and the Wisconsin Coalition Against Domestic Violence. Helpful comments on the inventory items and drafts of the manuscript were provided by Sharon Araji, Larry Baron, Sharon Berlin, John Brekke, David Finkelhor, Irene Frieze, Luan Gilbert, Valerie Hurst, Candace Leonard, James Ptacek, and Murray Straus.

Reprints: Requests for reprints and more information on the IBWB should be directed to Daniel G. Saunders, Family Service, 214 N. Hamilton Street, Madison, WI 53703.