

S. M. JONES

MS

2003





1  
2013  
54530748



This is to certify that the  
thesis entitled

**How Family Support Affects Depression In Psychologically  
Abused Women: An Analysis Of Cultural Differences  
Between Black And White Women**

presented by  
**Shallimar M. Jones**

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for  
**Master of Arts degree in Psychology**

  
Major professor

Date 4-30-63

**PLACE IN RETURN BOX** to remove this checkout from your record.  
**TO AVOID FINES** return on or before date due.  
**MAY BE RECALLED** with earlier due date if requested.

| DATE DUE              | DATE DUE | DATE DUE |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|
| 121709<br>APR 20 2010 |          |          |
|                       |          |          |
|                       |          |          |
|                       |          |          |
|                       |          |          |
|                       |          |          |
|                       |          |          |
|                       |          |          |
|                       |          |          |
|                       |          |          |

**HOW FAMILY SUPPORT AFFECTS DEPRESSION IN  
PSYCHOLOGICALLY ABUSED WOMEN: AN ANALYSIS OF CULTURAL  
DIFFERENCES**

by

**Shallimar M. Jones**

**A THESIS**

**Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of**

**Master of Arts**

**Department of Psychology**

**2002**

## ABSTRACT

### HOW FAMILY SUPPORT AFFECTS DEPRESSION IN PSYCHOLOGICALLY ABUSED WOMEN: AN ANALYSIS OF RACIAL DIFFERENCES

By

Shallimar M. Jones

The present study investigated the relationship between family support and depression in a community sample of psychologically abused women. This study also examined how family support may differentially affect depression in abused Black and White women. A total of 138 participants (39 Black and 99 White) were obtained from the third time period of a longitudinal study examining the effects of domestic violence on women. The Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory was used to assess psychological abuse. The Beck Depression Inventory and the Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire were used to assess depression and social support, respectively. Results indicated a main effect for emotional support on depression for all women ( $t = -2.11$ ;  $p < .05$ ) and for White women ( $t = -2.34$ ;  $p < .05$ ), but significant results were not found for Black women. Implications from this study not only highlight the need for further research on the role of family support in the lives of psychologically abused women, but also the need to incorporate cross cultural perspectives when examining this issue.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank God for giving me strength to complete this process. Secondly I would also like to thank all of my family and friends, for providing me with encouragement and support when I needed it. I would also like to give a special thanks to my advisor Dr. Bogat, for leading me through this process. Without your help and guidance this thesis would have been impossible. In addition, I would also like to give a special thanks to my classmates; your encouragement was greatly appreciated. Finally, I would like to thank Aaron, your love and understanding made this process easier to complete.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                                                |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| INTRODUCTION.....                                              | 1  |
| IPV.....                                                       | 4  |
| Psychological Abuse.....                                       | 5  |
| Risk Factors for IPV.....                                      | 6  |
| Mental Health Consequences.....                                | 8  |
| Depression... ..                                               | 8  |
| Depression, Race, and SES.....                                 | 11 |
| Social Support.....                                            | 12 |
| Family Support.....                                            | 15 |
| Family support and IPV.....                                    | 17 |
| Rationale.....                                                 | 19 |
| Hypotheses.....                                                | 22 |
| METHODS.....                                                   | 25 |
| Participants.....                                              | 25 |
| Measures.....                                                  | 25 |
| Demographics.....                                              | 25 |
| Depression.....                                                | 26 |
| Psychological Abuse.....                                       | 26 |
| Social Support.....                                            | 26 |
| Procedure.....                                                 | 27 |
| RESULTS.....                                                   | 29 |
| Hypotheses.....                                                | 30 |
| DISCUSSION.....                                                | 32 |
| Limitations.....                                               | 37 |
| Implications and Future Research.....                          | 39 |
| REFERENCES.....                                                | 41 |
| APPENDICES.....                                                | 52 |
| Appendix A: Demographics.....                                  | 52 |
| Appendix B: Beck Depression Inventory.....                     | 57 |
| Appendix C: Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory..... | 61 |
| Appendix D: Norbeck Social Support Scale.....                  | 63 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|                                                                                  |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1. Means of demographic variables.....                                     | 72 |
| Table 2. ANOVA of racial differences on PMWI.....                                | 73 |
| Table 3. ANOVA of racial differences on BDI.....                                 | 74 |
| Table 4. ANOVA of racial differences on demographic variables.....               | 75 |
| Table 5. Chi square of racial differences on demographic variables.....          | 76 |
| Table 6. MANCOVA of racial differences on social support variables.....          | 77 |
| Table 7. Pearson correlations of variables for all women.....                    | 78 |
| Table 8. Pearson correlations of variables for White women.....                  | 79 |
| Table 9. Pearson correlations of variables for Black women.....                  | 80 |
| Table 10. Regression for total family support and frequency for all women.....   | 81 |
| Table 11. Regression of total family support and frequency for White women.....  | 82 |
| Table 12. Regression of total family support and frequency for Black women.....  | 83 |
| Table 13. Regression of non-nuclear family for Black women.....                  | 84 |
| Table 14. Regression of non-nuclear family for White women.....                  | 85 |
| Table 15. Regression of emotional support and practical support all women.....   | 86 |
| Table 16. Regression of emotional support and practical support Black women..... | 87 |
| Table 17. Regression of emotional support and practical support White women..... | 88 |

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the relationship between depression and family support in psychologically abused women and explore the differential impact cultural aspects of family support may have on the mental health of abused Black and White women.

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV—defined here as males' violence toward their female partners) has gained increased attention over the last three decades. Research estimates that between 8 and 12% of adult women who are married or cohabitating experience male-to-female violence (Morse, 1995). IPV can encompass physical, psychological, or even sexual abuse.

There are a myriad of consequences that women face when they are the victims of IPV. Though bodily injuries are common results of physical abuse, negative mental health consequences such as post traumatic stress disorder, anxiety disorders, and low self esteem have also been documented from all forms of abuse (Follingstad, Brennan, Hause, Polek, & Rutledge, 1991; Goodman, Koss, & Russo 1993; Hampton Coner-Edwards, 1993; Walker, 1984; Zlotnick, Kohn, Peterson, & Pearlstein 1998). However across all mental health consequences, depression by far, is one of the most common symptoms (Follingstad, et al., 1991; Goodman, Koss, & Russo 1993; Walker, 1984; Zlotnick, Kohn, Peterson, & Pearlstein 1998). For example, Follingstad, et al. (1991), reported that 76.6% of women who experienced physical and psychological abuse in their lives also reported depression. Although all types of abuse can cause depression, in comparison to physical abuse, psychological abuse is thought to be the most damaging,

particularly since it involves continuous attacks on a woman's sense of self (Follingstad, et al., 1990; Marshall, 1999; O'Leary, 1999; Sackett & Saunders, 1999).

One way to help prevent the development of depression is through social support. Researchers have demonstrated that quality social support in the lives of women experiencing abuse can decrease rates of depression (Coker, Smith, Paige, Thompson, McKeown, Bethea, & Davis, 2002; Tan, Basta, Sullivan, & Davidson, 1995), especially for women who are experiencing severe abuse (Mitchell & Hodson, 1983; Tan et al., 1995). Support networks can be composed of many types of individuals, such as family, friends, co-workers, or clergy members. While family support is cited more frequently than any other source (Bowker, 1983; Tan et al., 1995), most research on social support in abused populations only focuses on the quality of support provided by friends or the entire network. Few studies have examined the contributory influence that family support has on depression in abused women.

For some cultural groups, the presence of specific individuals within the support network may be highly valued and beneficial to an individual's mental health. In particular, family support in the lives of African Americans has been identified as an important link to decreased reports of depression (Adams, 1999; Belgrave et al., 2000; Maton et al., 1996; Utsey et al., 2000). Consequently, family support may be of even greater importance for Black women experiencing IPV. Although their study did not examine depression as an outcome, Cazenave and Straus (1979) found that family support was important in reducing violence in African American couples.

Aside from Cazenave and Straus (1979), who only examined the quantity of

family support, few researchers (with the exception of Fraser, McNutt, Clark, Williams-Muhammed, & Lee, 2002; Huang & Gunn, 2001) have conducted studies to examine how the quality and quantity of family support impacts depression in abused Black women. Since income has been associated with higher rates of IPV (Hall, Sachs, Rayens, & Lutenbacher, 1993; Lutenbacher, 2000) and depression, SES was controlled in this study. This thesis addressed the current gap in the violence literature and examined the role of family support in the lives of psychologically abused women, as well as cultural differences in family support for abused Black and White women.

### Intimate Partner Violence

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is a social problem that has gained increased attention over the past decades. The majority of studies examining IPV have primarily focused on physical violence between couples. Straus & Gelles (1990) define physical violence as “an act carried out with the intention or perceived intention of causing physical pain or injury to another person.” Using this definition as a basis, data compiled from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) revealed that in 1998; nearly 1 million incidents of IPV occurred between spouses, dating couples, or cohabitating partners (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). Of these incidents, the majority (nearly 85%) were committed against women. Since the NCVS was administered within the context of a crime survey, the actual incidents of IPV are probably underestimated. The National Violence Against Women Survey (NVWS), which randomly sampled men and women across the U.S., estimated that nearly 1.5 million women and 835,000 men experience

IPV annually (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; 2000). Given these findings, it is apparent that women comprise the majority of IPV victimizations.

### Psychological Abuse

Although physical abuse occurs at a fairly high rate within the population, it rarely occurs alone. In fact, research suggests that most physical abuse tends to occur simultaneously with psychological abuse (Follingstad et al., 1990; Marshall, 1999; O'Leary, 1999; Sacket & Saunders, 1999). Currently there is considerable debate within the field of violence regarding the actual inclusion criteria for psychological abuse. Even though the criteria may vary, research definitions of psychological abuse usually include acts of control, isolation, or ridicule (Goodman, Koss, & Russo, 1993; Katz & Arias, 1999) directed towards an individual.

Psychological abuse can fall into different categories (Goodman et al., 1993; Marshall, 1992; Marshall, 1999; Hamby & Sugarman, 1999). One category is expressive aggression where name-calling or shouting occurs as an expression of distress. Another is instrumental aggression where an individual destroys another's property to display anger. A third is insults or humiliation, which can also be labeled as malicious aggression. Finally, the most severe category of psychological abuse includes physical threats such as threatening to hurt or kill someone (Hamby & Sugarman, 1999).

Because psychological abuse involves continuous attacks on a woman's character, many experts feel that psychological abuse is just as emotionally damaging, if not more so, than physical abuse (Follingstad, et al., 1990; Marshall, 1999; O'Leary, 1999; Sackett & Saunders, 1999). In one of the first reports of psychological abuse, Lenore Walker

(1979) interviewed 400 self-identified mild to severely physically abused women and found that the majority of women reported that the psychological abuse they experienced was much worse than the physical abuse. Unfortunately, because the qualitative data was gathered from a nonrandomized sample, these reports were not statistically analyzed and may not be generalizable to the abused population at large. Follingstad et al. (1990) also examined the relationship between psychological and physical abuse. Using a community sample of women with various histories of physical abuse (some had only 1 incident while the majority were in long term abusive relationships), they found that 72% of the women reported that emotional abuse was worse than physical abuse. Using the same sample, Follingstad et al. (1991) reported that depression was more strongly correlated to psychological abuse than to physical abuse.

Psychological abuse within a relationship can occur by itself or concurrently with physical abuse (Follingstad et al., 1990; Murphy & O'Leary, 1989; O'Leary, 1999). When psychological abuse occurs in isolation, it is thought to act as a precursor for future physical violence (Murphy & O'Leary, 1989; O'Leary, 1999). As psychological abuse becomes more severe, it can occur in tandem with mild or severe physical violence (Follingstad et al., 1990; Follingstad et al., 1991; Marshall, 1999; O'Leary, 1999; Sacket & Saunders, 1999). Interestingly, many experts believe that the occurrence of physical violence without a psychological component is rare (O'Leary, 1999). For example, Follingstad et al. (1990) reported that 99% of their physically abused community sample also reported psychological abuse. Regardless of the type of abuse experienced, there are some factors which are thought to increase the likelihood of experiencing abuse.

### Risk Factors for IPV

Studies examining both physical and psychological abuse across community and shelter populations have found that certain demographic variables increase the probability of a woman experiencing IPV. Socioeconomic status (SES), ethnicity, marital status, and age of the woman are all related to increased incidents of IPV (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995; Brush, 2000; Craven, 1996; Hotelling & Sugarman, 1990; Lutenbacher, 2000; Sullivan & Rumpitz 1994; Zlotnick, Kohn, Peterson, & Pearlstein, 1998; Vivian & Malone, 1997). However, for the purposes of this study only SES and ethnicity are discussed.

Research on SES and IPV reveals that women in lower SES positions are at risk for experiencing more incidents of IPV than higher SES women (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995; Brush, 2000; Craven, 1996; Hotelling & Sugarman, 1990; Lutenbacher, 2000; Vivian & Malone, 1997). Data from the General Accounting Office, that synthesized reports from various government social service agencies, found that 22 to 80% of female welfare recipients report current physical abuse (Raphael, 1997). Using a community sample to examine risk factors for IPV, Aldarondo and Sugarman (1996) reported that low SES was associated with higher incidents of IPV. In addition to SES, ethnicity is also seen as a risk factor for IPV. Currently there are a limited number of studies examining racial differences in IPV among both community and shelter populations. The research that is available in this area is mostly obtained from survey research. Available data suggests that minority women, particularly Black women, are at greater risk for not only for experiencing IPV, but also for experiencing more severe IPV (Lutenbacher, 2000; Sullivan & Rumpitz 1994; Zlotnick et al., 1998) than White women. For example, analysis

of the 1993 and 1998 NCVS survey revealed that Black women were 35% more likely to experience IPV than White women (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). And Greenfeld et al. (1998) reported that Black women are 3 times more likely to be killed by their partner than are White women.

Some researchers believe that Black women face more IPV because of their economic position. The 2001 U.S. Census reported that 5% of all married households were below the poverty rate while 26% of all female-headed households were. When examined individually by race, nearly 8% of all Black two person homes and 34% of female headed homes were poor. Compared to 4.5% and 20% (respectively) of White families. Because of the lower economic position Black women face, income may well be a significant contributory factor in their experience of abuse.

Cazenave and Straus (1979) controlled for income when they examined data from the 1975 NCVS survey. Analysis revealed that when SES was controlled, incidents of IPV for Blacks and Whites were comparable in every SES group except the \$6;000-\$11;000 range. It was only in this group that Blacks reported more incidents of IPV than Whites. In a separate study, using a community sample matched for marriage status and SES, Lewis (1988) also found that after controlling for SES, Blacks were not more likely to experience abuse than Whites.

Aside from between group differences in SES for Blacks and Whites, there are also within group differences for Blacks as well. For example, in a study examining IPV in Black women, Lockhart and White (1989) found that low SES Black women reported more incidents of IPV than high SES Black women. Wyatt, Axelrod, Chin, Carmona, &

Loeb (2000) also reported similar findings. Given this data and the previously mentioned studies, it is apparent that when examining racial differences in IPV, SES must be taken into consideration. Otherwise, the results may not adequately represent group differences in the rates of IPV.

### Mental Health Consequences of IPV

Regardless of the type of abuse, SES status, or ethnicity, all abused women are at risk for mental health problems associated with their abuse. Some problems abused women experience are post traumatic stress disorder, depression, anxiety disorders, and low self esteem (Aguilar & Nightingale, 1994; Cascardi & O'Leary, 1992; Follingstad et al., 1991; Gerlock, 1999; Gleason, 1993; Goodman et al., 1993; Hampton & Conner-Edwards, 1993; Sato & Heiby, 1992; Walker, 1984; Zlotnick et al., 1998). However, when compared to other mental health consequences, depression is, by far, one of the most commonly reported symptoms of abused women (Follingstad, et al., 1991; Cascardi & O'Leary, 1992; Gerlock, 1999; Goodman, et al., 1993; Sato & Heiby, 1992; Walker, 1984; Zlotnick et al., 1998).

Depression. Depression is one of the most frequently reported mental health problems for women in general (Weisman, Bruce, Leaf, Florio, & Holzer, 1991; Kessler, McGonagle, Zhao, Nelson, Hughes, Eshleman, et al., 1994). It is estimated that the lifetime prevalence for depression in women is between 10.2% (Weisman et al., 1991) and 21.3% (Kessler et al., 1994). However, the rate is significantly higher for physically and/or psychologically abused women. In a meta-analysis of IPV studies using shelter and community samples, Golding (1999) reported that the mean prevalence of depression

in abused populations was 47.6%. To further examine the rates of depression in abused women, Jaffe, Wolfe, Wilson, and Zak (1986) compared depression scores from a physically abused shelter sample to a non-abused community sample. They found that physically abused women had significantly more depressive symptoms than non-abused women. Gleason (1993) also found similar results when he examined the rates of depression in abused women from a battered women's shelter and women seeking services from a domestic violence agency. He compared their depression scores to a control sample obtained from the National Institute of Mental Health Epidemiological Catchment Area Program (ECA) survey, which was designed to "ascertain the incidence and prevalence of mental disorders in the U.S." (p 56). Results from the data analysis supported previous research by demonstrating that the prevalence of major depression for both samples of battered women was significantly higher than the non-battered ECA women (shelter = 81%, agency = 69%, ECA = 17%).

There are also within group differences for depression in abused women as well. Specifically, women who experience more severe forms of IPV are more likely to be depressed than women who experience less severe forms of IPV (Aguliar & Nightingale 1994; Campbell & Soeken, 1999; Cascardi & O'Leary, 1992; Cascardi, O'Leary, & Schlee, 1999; Follingstad et al., 1990; Follingstad et al., 1990; Gelles & Harrop, 1989; Golding, 1999; Vivian & Malone, 1997; Sato & Heiby, 1992; Zlotnick et al., 1998). Gelles and Harrop (1989) analyzed data from the National Family Violence Survey and found that women who experienced severe physical violence reported higher levels of psychological distress, when compared to women who experienced mild violence. Other

studies examining this issue within shelter samples (where IPV is typically most severe), also found elevated reports of depression for severely abused women. For example, Campbell, Kub, Belknap, & Templin, (1997) examined depression in a community sample of abused women. Results showed that women who were more severely abused experienced also higher levels of depression.

Some studies show that rates of depression decrease as the amount of time from the last IPV incident increases (Aguliar & Nightingale, 1994; Campbell, Sullivan, & Davidson, 1995; Campbell et al., 1994; Follingstad et al., 1991; Golding, 1999; Zlotnick et al., 1998). In a shelter sample, Campbell et al. (1994) measured depression across three time periods: immediately following shelter exit, 10 weeks later, and again at 6 months. Overall results illustrated that depression decreased as the time from the last IPV incident increased. Specifically, analysis of depression at shelter exit (when all women had recently experienced abuse) revealed that 83% of the women were depressed. However 10 weeks later, reports of depression for women who did not experience an IPV incident following shelter exit were lower than for women who did experience IPV. The same pattern was also shown at the 6-month follow up. In a separate longitudinal study examining a community sample, Campbell et al., (1995) found a similar pattern. Results demonstrated that for women who were no longer battered at time 2; their levels of depression were lower when compared to their depression at time 1. However there was no change in depression for women who were continuously abused across both time periods, suggesting that depression is influenced by the recency of abuse.

Depression, Race, and SES. Similar to the relationship between SES, race, and IPV, research has documented that depression and SES are associated as well (King, 1991; Murphy, Olivier, Monson, Sobol, 1991). A longitudinal study examining depression and SES found a negative correlation between depression and income (Murphy et al., 1991). Using a national sample, Miech & Shannon (2000) found that adults in low SES positions were more depressed than adults in higher SES positions.

Additionally, in the general population, depression differs among racial groups. Although research is limited, some studies suggest that Blacks in general, may be less likely to be depressed than Whites (Adams, 1999; Belgrave et al, 2000; McKelevy & McKenry, 2000; Pickett et al., 1993). For example, Black parents of mentally ill children had higher feelings of self-worth and lower levels of depression than White parents (Pickett, Vraniak, Cook & Cohler, 1993). McKelvey and McKenry (2000) examined the psychological well-being of divorced women and found that, after controlling for SES, black women tended to have lower levels of depression and higher personal mastery than White women. Maton, Teti, Corns, Viera-Baker et al. (1996) found similar results when they examined racial differences in psychological well-being of Blacks and Whites between the ages of 15 and 29. After controlling for SES, they found that Blacks had lower levels of depression and higher levels of self-esteem than their White peers.

Currently few studies have examined racial differences in rates of depression for abused women. It is unclear why researchers have generally ignored this issue. In some studies, the size of the sample may preclude such analyses, or it could be that some researchers are unaware of the differential rates of depression among racial groups. One

of the few studies to examine racial differences in depression for abused women was carried out by Campbell and Soken (2000). Using a community sample drawn from a heterogeneous SES background, they conducted a longitudinal study examining women's responses to abuse over time. They found that the average score on the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI) for non-Black women who were no longer abused was 13.8; compared to 24 for non-Black women who experienced abuse across all time periods. On the other hand, Black women who were no longer abused and those who were abused across the time periods, scored 16.6 and 18.2 respectively on the BDI. In other words, this means that depression for non-Black women was significantly influenced by abuse status, while depression in Black women was not. It may be that other culturally related variables differentially affect depression across racial groups. One factor that may explain this difference is social support.

### Social Support

Research has demonstrated that social support plays a significant role in the development of depression (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Kelly, Kelly, & Brown, 1999; Kleinke, 1998; Maton et al., 1996; Pearlin et al., 1981; Utsey et al., 2000). Social support refers to the people in one's life who can be relied upon for guidance, practical support (e.g., loan money), and/or emotional support (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Gottlieb, 1983; Kleinke, 1998; Maton et al., 1996; Pearlin et al., 1981). Social support can be obtained from formal support sources such as professional agencies, or informal sources such as family or friends. Individuals who possess good social support networks, compared to

those who do not, are less likely to be depressed and anxious (Kelly et al., 1999; Kleinke, 1998; Maton et al., 1996; Pearlin et al., 1981; Turner & Turner, 1999; Utsey et al., 2000)

According to Turner and Turner (1999), social support should be viewed as a multifactorial concept with three distinguishable aspects: quantity of support, quality of support received, and perceived support. Quantity refers to the number of people within the network. Quality refers to the amount of support given. Perceived support is the belief that the support network would provide different types of support (e.g. emotional or practical support) if needed (Cutrona, Suhr, & McFarlane, 1990). Studies have shown that each aspect of social support is related to mental health (Bisconti & Bergeman, 1999; Hall, Schaffer, & Greenberg, 1987; Mitchell & Hodson, 1983).

Currently there are two models used to explain the manner in which social support influences mental health: the main effect model and the buffering model. As reviewed by Cohen and Wills (1985), the main effect model purports that social support is always beneficial to an individual's well being, regardless of life circumstances. According to this model, the benefits of social support work via individual integration into the support network. Specifically, qualities of integration (also referred to as structural aspects of support) such as the quantity of supporters, source of support, or the number of interactions with the support network are seen as beneficial because they influence self worth, provide a sense of belonging, and promote well-being within an individual (Cowen, 2000; House, 1988; Laireiter & Baumann, 1992; Turner & Turner, 1999). In fact, several studies have shown that there is a connection between integration within the support network and mental health (Anotonucci & Akiyama, 1997; Cassel,

1976; Glass & Maddox, 1993; Hall et al., 1987; Hammer, 1981; Levinger & Huesmann, 1980; Moos & Mitchell, 1982).

Although beneficial to general mental well being, this model may not be applicable when individuals are under stress. According to a review by Turner and Turner (1999), social support may matter most when an individual is exposed to high levels of stress; that is, social support buffers the individual from the harmful effects of the stress or stressors. When people experience high levels of life stress (such as the death of a loved one or IPV), social support functions to help the person cope with the situation. Specifically, through perceived emotional support or practical aid, social support helps to alter an individual's perception of the stressor, thereby decreasing the likelihood of the individual experiencing depression (Dunkel-Schetter, Folkman, & Lazarus, 1987; Ennis, Hobfoll, & Schroder, 2000; Israel & Antonucci, 1987; Pearlin, Menaghan, Lieberman, & Mullan, 1981).

Studies examining social support in abused samples have found that the functional aspects of social support are related to decreased depression (Bowker, 1984; Coker et. al., 2002; Fraser et al., 2002; Mitchell & Hodson, 1983; Tan et al., 1995). For example, Tan et al. (1995) examined functional support in the networks of Black and White women leaving shelters. They found that the quality of support was related to decreased depression. Using the same sample, Sullivan and Rumpitz (1994) examined social support exclusively for Black women. Results were comparable to those in the larger study; women who had good supportive relationships also had better psychological well being. In other words, by altering their perception of abuse the quality of the

support served as a buffer against the women experiencing depression. Unfortunately, neither study conducted separate analyses to determine if social support differentially affected the mental health outcomes of Black and White women.

Another limitation of the IPV literature is that only certain sources of social support are examined. Specifically, even though studies have shown that family support is cited more frequently than any other source of support for battered women (Bowker, 1984; Tan et al., 1995), most studies only examine the quality of support provided by friends or the entire network. This could be problematic, because for some women, the support given by family may be equally if not more important than support given by friends. For example, Bowker (1984) not only reported that family support was cited more often than any other informal support, it was also found to be as at least fairly helpful in 80% of IPV incidents. Work by Coker et al. (2002) supports this. Specifically, they examined abuse in a community sample of women and found that family support was related to decreased depression. However, similar to previous studies, racial differences in support and mental health outcomes were not examined. Since family support is important to Black women (Coley & Bekcett, 1988; Huang & Gunn, 2001; Vandewater & Antonucci, 1998) this analysis is of particular importance.

Family Support. Cross-cultural research shows that family support is more important for Blacks than Whites (Mutran, 1985; Sagrestano et al., 1999). Mutran (1985), using a national aging survey, found that elderly Blacks received and gave more support to their family than did elderly Whites. Other studies on younger populations have demonstrated similar findings. Examining racial differences in social support

during pregnancy, Sagrestano, Feldman, Killingsworth, Woo, Dunkel, & Schetter (1999) found that Black women reported higher quality relationships with their family in comparison to White women. Additionally, Black women also reported receiving significantly more support from family members than did White women. One explanation for this difference may be the important role that family plays within Black culture.

It has been historically documented that Black culture traditionally focuses on the importance of family in an individual's life (Blassingame 1979; Hill, 1972; Scott & Black, 1989; Smith, 1989; Utsey et al., 2000). Originating from West African culture, the importance of family gained new meaning during slavery. It was at this time that many families were split apart and sold to various plantations across the western hemisphere (Blassingame 1979; Smith, 1989; Franklin, 1997). In response to this separation, the bonds between remaining relatives became strengthened. Given this social structure, both the nuclear and extended families were essential to the support network of Blacks during slavery.

Researchers have shown that the bond with extended family still remains an important aspect in the present day lives of Blacks (Barker, Morrow, Mitteness, 1998; Hill, 1971; Jackson, 1973; Seelback & Sauer, 1977). One reason for this occurrence may be the types of support provided by the family. The most common types of support given by the family are emotional support or practical aid (Ball, 1983; Dilworth-Anderson, 1992; Malson, 1983; McAdoo, 1978; Padgett, 1997; Scott & Black, 1989; Stack, 1974; Taylor, 1986). For example when one family member is in a difficult financial situation,

it is not uncommon for other relatives to open their home and allow the individual or family to stay with them.

One aspect of Black families that facilitates this exchange is the close proximity with which Black families live (Ball, 1983; Dilworth-Anderson, 1992; Malson, 1983; Padgett, 1997). Examining the supportive networks of Black families from the 1980 National Survey of Black Americans Hunter (1997) found that the majority of respondents reported that they had relatives either within the household, neighborhood, or city that could be counted on in times of need. The supportive network of Black families is also influenced by the frequency of interaction between relatives. For instance, several studies have shown that families interact anywhere from once a month to everyday (McAdoo, 1982; Padgett, 1997; Taylor, 1986). Data from the 1980 NSBA survey shows that 37% of respondents reported that they interacted with their relatives on a daily basis (Taylor, 1986); almost 82% had monthly contact.

Studies find that functional aspects of family support were positively correlated with psychological well-being (Adams 1999; Belgrave et al., 2000; Coley & Beckett, 1988; Maton et al, 1996; McKelevy & McKenry, 2000; Pickett et al., 1993) and lower levels of depression for Blacks, but not Whites (Belgrave et al., 2000; Coley & Beckett, 1988; Pickett et al., 1993). For example, using a college sample, Jung and Khalsa (1989), found that perceived family support and race was related to lower levels of depression in Blacks and Whites. Harris and Molock (2000) also used a college sample and found that family support was related to lower levels of depression for Blacks.

Family support and IPV. Although it has been documented that functional and

structural family support is important to abused women (Coker, 2002; Frazer et al., 2002; Tan et. al., 1995), few studies have analyzed racial differences in family support for abused women. Some studies do suggest that these types of support have a differential impact on IPV for Blacks. Using data from the 1975 NCVS survey, Cazenave & Straus (1979) examined the role of family in IPV. After controlling for SES, they found that structural support such as closeness to family was correlated with lower levels of spousal abuse for Blacks and not Whites. Specifically they found that the number of non-nuclear adult family members in the household and the proximity of relatives were related to decreased violence for Blacks and not Whites. Huang and Gunn (2001) also examined family and IPV using a sample of Black college students. They found that students who had a close relationship with their family were less likely to be involved in a violent relationship.

Other studies have also demonstrated the importance of family support for abused women. Using a community sample, Fraser et al. (2002), reported that abused Black women feel more comfortable talking about abuse with family members who have also experienced abuse. Further Nabi and Mehan (1998) conducted a telephone survey for Blacks directed at addressing attitudes and beliefs about IPV. Their results show that the majority of Black men and women would feel more comfortable talking to a family member rather than a close friend about abuse. Given these findings, functional and structural aspects of social support may differentially relate to depression in Black women as well.

## Rationale

The purpose of this study was to elucidate the relationship between family support and depression for women who have experienced IPV. Research has shown that women who experience physical and/or psychological abuse are at greater risk for depression than non-abused women (Follingstad, et al., 1991; Cascardi & O’Leary, 1992; Gerlock, 1999; Goodman, et al., 1993; Sato & Heiby, 1992; Walker, 1984; Zlotnick et al., 1998). However for women who possess quality social support, the risks of depression are greatly attenuated (Bowker, 1984; Coker et. al., 2002; Dobash et al., 1985; Frazer et al., 2002; Mitchell & Hodson, 1983; Tan et al., 1995). Unfortunately, most studies on social support and IPV have drawn their samples from shelter populations where violence is the most severe (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). These results may not generalize to women who live in the community and experience abuse. According to Johnson and Ferraro (2000), this could be problematic since severe violence is relatively rare within the population at large.

Johnson and Ferraro (2000), assert that Common Couple Violence (CCV) has a much higher prevalence. Found within community or survey populations, CCV “has a low couple frequency, is not as likely to escalate over time, (and) is not as likely to involve severe violence” (949). However most research with community samples focuses primarily on physical abuse. This is problematic because many studies have shown that psychological abuse may be more damaging to mental health than physical abuse (Follingstad, et al., 1990; Marshall, 1999; O’Leary, 1999; Sackett & Saunders, 1999). Given this, social support may be essential for psychologically abused women.

Currently though, no study has ever examined the connection between social support and psychological abuse within a community sample. Therefore the present study focused on understanding the role of social support among a community sample of psychologically abused women.

Research on social support and IPV has often overlooked the contributory role of family support. The majority of studies conducted on this topic have primarily focused on the connection between depression and the quality of emotional and critical support provided by friends or the entire support network. However some research in this area suggests that family support may also be important (Bowker, 1983; Coker et al., 2002; Frazer et. al., 2002; Tan et al., 1995). Because family represents the majority of supporters in these women's network, family support may be essential in decreasing the risk of depression for abused women. It may be that the results from studies examining the relationship between the entire support network and depression are really just reflecting the effect of family support.

In conjunction with the analysis of family support, another focus of this study was to examine possible racial differences in depression and family support for abused women. Research has documented that after controlling for SES, levels of depression (McKelvey & McKenry, 2000; Manton et al., 1996) and IPV were lower for Blacks than Whites (Cazenave & Straus, 1979; Lockhart, 1985). Several studies have shown that not only do Blacks interact more frequently with their family than do Whites (Mutran, 1985; Sagrestano et al., 1999), but also that family support is highly correlated with decreased levels of depression in Blacks and not Whites (Adams 1999; Belgrave et al., 2000; Coley

& Beckett, 1988; Maton et al , 1996; McKelevy & McKenry, 2000; Pickett, et al.,1993).

In light of this, it may be that family support is particularly important for abused Black women.

To date, very few studies have examined the relationship between family support and depression for abused Black women. Some studies that do show a connection have found that family support is related to decreased levels of IPV for Blacks and not Whites (Cazenave & Straus, 1979; Fraser et. al., 2002; Huang & Gunn, 2001; Nabi & Mehan, 1998). However, because some of these studies did not control for SES and one examined a college sample, the results may not generalize to the population at large. Thus, a definitive connection between IPV and family support cannot be established.

In spite of their limitations, these studies do offer evidence that the quantity and quality of family support influences IPV for Blacks. Given this, it stands to reason that these aspects of family support may also differentially affect depression in abused Black and White women.

Research on social support among abused women typically considers abuse as a severe stressor; therefore, most researchers use aspects of the buffering model to explain the relationship between social support and depression. Specifically it has been found that the quality of emotional support moderates rates of depression in abused women (Dutton, 1994). However, this model may not fully capture all of the benefits of social support.

Instead, the main effects model may also be useful in explaining the benefits of social support. Focusing on structural aspects of social support, this model contends that

integration within a support network (i.e., the quantity or frequency of interaction with supporters) is beneficial to mental health regardless of stressful situations (Cowen, 2000; House, 1988; Laireiter & Baumann, 1992; Turner & Turner, 1999). Some research with abused women supports this position. For example Tan et al. (1995) found that satisfaction of friend support was correlated to the quantity of friends within the network. In addition, Mitchell and Hodson (1986) reported that frequency of interaction with friends was correlated with better mental health in abused women. Consequently, integration within a network could be independently related to depression in abused women.

The same principle is also present in family support for Black women. Specifically, research shows that quality of family support and family integration are both related to the mental health of Blacks. So in order to gain a better understanding of this issue for all abused women, both the main-effects and buffering models will be used to examine family support within this study. Additionally, because research has shown that income is related to the severity of abuse (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995; Brush, 2000; Craven, 1996; Hotelling & Sugarman, 1990; Lutenbacher, 2000; Vivian & Malone, 1997), depression (King, 1991; Murphy et al., 1991), and racial differences in abuse (Lutenbacher, 2000; Sullivan & Rumpitz 1994; Zlotnick et al., 1998), SES will be controlled in this study. This study explored whether integration and quality of family support influenced depression differentially in abused Black and White women.

### Hypotheses

In order to examine family support in the lives of abused women, this study

addressed the following questions:

Integration within the family was defined by the following three variables: total family support, frequency of interaction with family members, and the number of non-nuclear family members living in the home.

1. It was predicted that total family support and frequency of interaction with family members would each have a significant, direct effect on depression experienced by the abused women in this study; however, these variables would predict a greater proportion of the variance for Black women as compared to White women. Hierarchical linear regression was used to test this hypothesis for the whole sample. Separate hierarchical regressions for Black and White women were conducted to compare racial differences in variance accounted for.
2. It was predicted that the number of non-nuclear family members living in the home would have a significant, direct effect on depression for Black women, not White women. Hierarchical regression was used to test this hypothesis.
3. It was predicted that emotional support and practical support given by family would moderate depression for all women. Hierarchical linear regression was used to test this hypothesis. A significant interaction between emotional support by psychological abuse and practical support by psychological abuse, such that both types of support are more beneficial under conditions of higher stress, will be indicative a

moderating affect.

4. Emotional and practical support from family members would have a stronger moderating relationship on depression for Black women than for White women. This was examined by comparing the regression coefficients for emotional and practical support for Black and White women. A t-test was conducted to determine if the difference was significant.

## METHODS

### Participants

Participants were 139 women, selected from the third time period of a larger longitudinal study of 207 women examining the effects of IPV on mother-infant interactions. There were a total of 39 Black women and 99 White women who participated in the study. The mean age of Black women was 25.3 years and for White women it was 27.2 years. This difference was significant ( $p < .01$ ). Seventy-seven percent of Black women were single and 23% were married, separated, or divorced. Thirty-four percent of White women were single and 65% were married, separated, or divorced. This difference was significant ( $p < .01$ ). Black women had a median monthly income of \$1300 (range \$341 - \$8,500) and White women had a median income of \$1,600 (range \$400 – 10,000). This difference was significant ( $p < .01$ ). The average length of Black women's relationships was 4.5 years and 5.6 years for White women, this difference was not significant. Black women averaged 2.2 children and White women averaged 1.8 children, this difference was not significant. Almost 40% of the Black women were at least high school educated and 34% White women were ( $p < n.s.$ ).

### Measures

Demographics. A demographic questionnaire assessing items such as race, marital status, family income, and participant education was administered. Income was recoded from 1 –7 to represent a continuous scale. For example women who did not complete high school were coded as 1; while women who completed PhD, MD, or Law degrees were coded as 7. See Appendix A for a copy of the measure.

Beck Depression Inventory (BDI, Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961). The BDI is an inventory used to assess various symptoms of depression. The inventory is composed of 21 categories of symptoms and attitudes that describe various behavioral manifestations of depression. Symptoms that are assessed in this questionnaire include guilty feelings, indecisiveness, changes in appetite, or sleep disturbances. Participants are asked to choose which of four evaluative statements best identifies how they have felt during the past week. Each statement is ranked in order of increasing severity from 1 to 4. The results are then summed. Scores can range from 0 to 63. Scores above 20 indicate moderate depression. The coefficient alpha was .85. See Appendix B for a copy of this measure.

Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI - Short Version; Tolman, 1995). The PMWI is a scale used to assess psychological abuse. The PMWI-S has 14 items and includes two scales for isolation/domination and verbal/emotional. Examples of items include “my partner used our money or made important financial decisions without talking to me about it” and “my partner blamed for his problems.” Participants are asked to rate the frequency of their experiences of abuse on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 “Never” to 5 “Very Frequently.” The results are then summed. Scores can range from 14 to 70. The coefficient alpha was .89.

Norbeck Social Support Scale (Norbeck, Lindsey, & Carrieri, 1981). The Norbeck assesses the quantity and quality of support provided by individuals within the participant’s social network. Areas assessed by this questionnaire include emotional support and practical assistance. Questions also assessed the frequency of contact.

Participants are asked to list each significant person in their lives and determine how much support each person provides a specific area. Participants then rate the amount of social support each supporters provides on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 “Not at all” to 5 “A great deal.” Results for each scale are then summed to reveal the total amount of support. The coefficient alpha was .85. See appendix D for a copy of this measure.

### Procedure

Participants were recruited for the study through fliers posted in public areas such as laundromats, bus stations, and libraries around rural and urban areas in Southeastern Michigan. Fliers were also posted in areas such as hospitals or domestic violence programs that provided services to victims of IPV. Women interested in participating in the study were screened over the telephone for relationship status, experience of IPV, age, and education. Women were excluded from the study if they were not involved in a romantic relationship for at least 6 weeks within the previous year, were not between the ages of 18 and 40; or if they had limited knowledge of the English language. If a woman met the criteria and agreed to participate in the study an interview date and time were scheduled. Women were assigned a subject number, which was kept separate from their identifying information (i.e. name, phone number).

A total of 13 research assistants (8 undergraduate and 5 graduate assistants) conducted the interviews. Training for this study lasted approximately 3 months. Training consisted of one weekly meeting, mock interviews, journal articles, and observing actual interviews. Interviewers were also trained on confidentiality and how to handle difficult situations that could be encountered during the interview. Trainees

conducted between 2 and 5 interviews under supervision until 95% inter-rater reliability was reached. After training was completed all interviewers attended weekly meetings to discuss problems and procedures.

Interviews were conducted in either the woman's home or in an office at Michigan State. All interviews were conducted in quiet areas where confidentiality could be assured. Prior to beginning the interview, each woman read and signed an informed consent form. The women were informed about anonymity and confidentiality and that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. Since violence questionnaires were administered last, interviewers were not aware of the battering status of the women. Interviews lasted approximately 3 hours. Upon completion of the interview, participants were given a list of community resources and paid \$75 for participating in the study.

## RESULTS

No missing data was present in the analyses for this study. A total of 138 women who were psychologically abused (39 Black women, 99 White women) participated in this study. Frequency analysis of variables revealed that some variables were skewed. Rank transformations were performed on skewed variables to ensure normal distribution. Except where indicated, all analyses used transformed variables.

To determine group differences on psychological abuse and depression, two ANOVAs were performed. Analysis revealed that Black and White women did not differ on psychological abuse [ $F(1; 156) = .77$ ]. Scores indicated that women were mildly abused ( $M = 22.56$ ; Black women;  $M = 23.46$ ; White women). There were also no differences on depression [ $F(1; 156) = .14$ ;  $M = 6.59$ ; Black women;  $M = 5.88$ ; White women]. See Table 2 and 3 for details. Chi Square and ANOVA analyses were performed to determine if there were group differences between Black and White women on demographic variables: work outside the home (yes/no), number of children, education, age, relationship length, marital status (never married/married, divorced, separated, widowed), age, and income. There were no significant differences between the groups on work outside the home [ $\chi^2(2; N = 136) = 10.40$ ;  $p = n.s.$ ], number of children [ $F(1; 136) = .57$ ], education [ $F(1; 136) = 5.75$ ] or in relationship length [ $F(1; 136) = 1.07$ ]. See Table 4 and 5 for more details. Black women were more likely to be single than White women [ $\chi^2(2; N = 136) = 20.40$ ;  $p < .01$ ]. Although there was only a 2-year age difference, the groups also significantly differed in age [ $F(1; 136) = .60$ ;  $p < .01$ ;  $M = 25.32$ ; Black women,  $M = 27.22$ ; White women]. Finally, the groups also

differed in monthly income [ $F(1;136) = 7.46; p < .01; \underline{M} = \$1708$ ; Black women,  $\underline{M} = \$2272$ ; White women]. See Table 4 and 5 for more details

MANCOVA analysis was used to examine group differences in social support variables: total family support, total support, frequency of contact, number of non-nuclear family members, emotional support, and practical support. Using race as a grouping factor and entering marital status, age, and income as covariates, group differences were found between the women. The overall model revealed significant results [ $F(4; 133) = 4.06; p < .01$ ]. Black women had significantly more contact with family members than White women ( $\underline{M} = 4.50$  and  $\underline{M} = 3.93$ ; respectively). There were no significant differences between the groups on the remaining variables. See Table 6 for details.

Pearson correlations for the variables revealed that depression was significantly correlated with emotional support and psychological abuse for White women ( $r = -.35; p < .01; r = -.48; p < .01$ ; respectively) and all women ( $r = -.30; p < .01; r = -.45; p < .01$ ). Significant correlations between these variables were not found for Black women. See Tables 7-9 for more details.

Hypotheses. The purpose of hypothesis 1 was to determine if total family support and frequency of contact with family members had a direct effect on depression for all women and separately for Black and White women. To test this hypothesis, three hierarchical linear regressions were conducted. The sum depression score was entered as the dependent variable. Independent variables were entered in a stepwise fashion. To control for age, income, and marital status differences between women, these variables

were entered as the first step of the regression. In addition to these variables, the total psychological abuse score was also entered in the first step in each regression. Total family support, total support, and the average frequency of interaction with family members were entered in the final step of the regression. The change in  $R^2$  for the model revealed that total family support and frequency of contact were not significant predictors of depression for all women [ $\Delta R^2 = .01$ ]. See Table 10 for details.

The same analysis was also conducted separately on Black and White women. The same pattern was duplicated in each group. The model was not significant for Black women [ $\Delta R^2 = .10$ ] or White women [ $\Delta R^2 = .32$ ]. See Table 10 and 11 for details.

The second hypothesis predicted that the number of non-nuclear family members in the home would have a significant direct effect on depression for Black women and not for White women. Hierarchical linear regression was also used to test this hypothesis. Step 1 was identical to that used in hypothesis one. The number of non-nuclear family members was entered as the second step in the regression. Results demonstrated that this model was not a significant predictor of depression for Black women [ $\Delta R^2 = .01$ ]. The model was also not a significant predictor for White women [ $\Delta R^2 = .00$ ]. See Tables 12 and 13 for details.

The third hypothesis predicted that emotional and practical support would moderate depression for all women. This was also analyzed using hierarchical linear regression. Step 1 was identical to the steps in the previous regressions. The second step of the regression included the average emotional support and practical support scores. To test the moderating effect, the product psychological abuse by emotional support and the

product of psychological abuse x practical support were entered as the final step of the regression. There was a significant main effect for emotional support ( $t = -2.11$ ;  $p < .05$ ) but not for practical support ( $t = -.25$ ). The interaction for practical support was not significant ( $t = .01$ ). See Table 14 for details.

The final hypothesis was that emotional and practical family support would have a stronger moderating relationship for Black women than for White women. This hypothesis was analyzed using the same steps of the previous regression. The model test for Black women revealed that the model was significant [ $\Delta R^2 = .01$ ], however individual  $t$  tests for emotional and practical support were not significant. Therefore, this hypothesis was not supported for Black women. See Table 15 for details.

Analysis of this hypothesis for White women revealed that although the model containing the interaction was not significant, the main effects model was [ $\Delta R^2 = .02$ ;  $p < .001$ ]. Specifically, tests for the main effects revealed that emotional support was a significant predictor of depression ( $t = -2.34$ ;  $p < .05$ ). This hypothesis was not supported for practical support. See Table 16 for more details.

## DISCUSSION

Drawing largely from shelter samples, numerous studies have demonstrated that social support is essential to alleviating mental health consequences associated with physical abuse (Bowker, 1984; Mitchell & Hodson, 1983; Tan et al., 1995). Studies have also demonstrated that functional support, particularly emotional support from family and friends, impacts depression in abused women (Bowker, 1984). Although it has been documented that family support is endorsed more than friend support (Bowker, 1984; Tan et al., 1995), no study has ever examined the individual relationship between family support and depression in a community sample of abused women. Further, no study has examined this issue with psychologically abused women. Given this, one of the purposes for the present study was to address this gap in the literature and elucidate the relationship between family support and depression for a community sample of psychologically abused women.

In addition to the importance of functional support, studies examining social support for abused women have discovered that structural aspects of support are also important to the mental health of abused women (Mitchell & Hodson, 1986). Studies examining family support and Black women have demonstrated that structural support variables, such as the number of non-nuclear family members in home, frequency of interaction, and the total number of family supporters, are all related to decreased IPV for Black women (Cazenave & Straus, 1979; Huang & Gunn, 2001). In fact, research on family support suggests that it may be more important for Black women than for White women (Mutran, 1985; Sagrestano et al., 1999). Considering this, the second purpose of

this study was to examine the differential role that family support may play in mitigating depression for psychologically abused Black and White women.

Because structural and functional aspects of support were deemed important to the mental health of abused women, several hypotheses were developed. The first hypothesis was that the frequency of contact with family members and total number of family would have a direct effect on depression for all women and individually for Black and White women. Results did not support this hypothesis. Previous studies examining the total number of supporters have found direct influences on mental health (Bowling & Browne, 1991; Cowen & Wills, 1985). However because these studies were conducted in non-abused populations, they do not generalize to this population.

Analysis of this hypothesis for racial differences also demonstrated no significant results. The small body of research in this area, demonstrates that frequency of contact and the number of family supporters does have a direct effect on abuse for Black women and not for White women (Cazenave & Straus, 1979). Unfortunately, this study only examined physical abuse and did not explore how family influences the mental health abused women. Therefore these results are not generalizable to this study. Instead, it is possible that the insignificant findings for this hypothesis may be due to psychological abuse itself. For example, even though results were congruent with literature that demonstrate that Black women have significantly more family support and more contact with their relatives than do White women (McAdoo, 1982; Padgett, 1997; Taylor, 1986); these variables were not correlated with psychological abuse for either group. This is contrary to Mitchell and Hodson (1986), which found a connection between mental

health and structural types of support. Of note is that this study examined a shelter sample of physically abused women. Since physical abuse rarely occurs alone (Follingstad et al., 1991; O'Leary, 1999), it is highly probable that these women also experienced psychological abuse. However what sets this Mitchell and Hodson apart from the current study is not necessarily the type of abuse examined, but the severity. Many researchers have documented that shelter samples experience more severe abuse than community samples (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). Because the current study examines a community population of mildly abused women, supporters may not have been aware of the abuse. Therefore, the presence of family would be unlikely to impact abuse.

The second hypothesis was that the number of non-nuclear family members in the home would be associated with decreased depression for Black women, but not for White women. Results did not support this hypothesis. Cazenave and Straus (1979) found that the number of non-nuclear family members was related to decreased abuse for Black women and not for White women. However mental health was not measured as an outcome. So coupled with the aforementioned results, this provides further evidence that the number of family supporters and physical proximity to them supporters may be inconsequential to the mental health of psychologically abused women. Perhaps psychologically abused women need other types of social support from their family.

The third hypothesis was that emotional and practical support would moderate depression for all women. Results did not support this hypothesis. There was no main effect for practical support, nor did practical support moderate depression. A significant main effect was found for emotional support. This finding is contradictory to previous

research that found a significant buffering effect of emotional support on depression (Dutton, 1994). With a larger sample, it is likely that an interaction may have been found. Nonetheless, the main effect for emotional family support is not unusual. In fact, most research demonstrates a direct effect of emotional support on the mental health of abused women (Kemp et. al., 1995; Mitchell & Hodson, 1983; Tan et. al., 1995). So in spite of the insignificant interaction, results indicate the importance of emotional support for the mental well being of psychologically abused women regardless of the severity of abuse.

Examination of this hypothesis for practical support revealed no significant results. This is contrary to Bowker's (1984) finding that practical aid was the most helpful type of support for abused women. However, since his study examined a shelter population, these results are not generalizable to the present study's community population. Another possible explanation for the differential findings may be that because psychologically abused women incur abuse directed at their sense of self (Follingstad, et al., 1990; Marshall, 1999; O'Leary, 1999; Sackett & Saunders, 1999), emotional support rather than practical support is of greater importance. Pearson correlations support this by demonstrating that emotional support was significantly correlated to psychological abuse and depression while practical support was not.

The final hypothesis was that emotional and practical support provided by the family would have a stronger moderating effect on depression for Black women than for White women. The hypothesis was not supported. Results for White women revealed that there was not a significant interaction for emotional or practical support. However,

there was a single main effect of emotional support on depression. Specifically, there was a direct inverse relationship between emotional support and depression for White women, suggesting that emotional support provided by the family is important for White women regardless of the severity of abuse.

The same analysis was also conducted for Black women. Surprisingly, results did not support this hypothesis for Black women. Studies exploring the role of family support and Black women have found that functional support provided by the family is not only related to better mental health (Mutran, 1985; Sagrestano et al., 1999), it is also related to decreased abuse as well (Fraser et al., 2002; Huang & Gunn, 2001; Nabi & Mehan, 1998). Given this, perhaps the lack of support for this hypothesis was due in part to the low sample size of Black women. However it is important to note that none of the three studies mentioned above examined family support in the context of psychological abuse. Since many experts believe that psychological abuse is more damaging than physical abuse (O'Leary, 1999; Marshall, 1999), it is quite possible that family support is still essential to the mental health of Black women, especially since results were found for all women and individually for White women.

### Limitations

This study had several limitations primarily associated with sample size, measurement instruments, and methodology. There were a total of 138 women in this study, however the group of Black women was quite small compared to the White women. As previously mentioned, the small cell size may have affected the ability of this study to detect significant effects. Future studies in this area should use a larger sample

to adequately explore the issue of family support and depression for all psychologically abused women, and for Black women in particular.

A second limitation associated with this study was that psychological abuse data was collected from the shortened version of the PMWI. Due to this abbreviated format many forms psychological abuse such as threats directed towards the woman, were not assessed. It may be that certain types of psychological abuse are more taxing on a woman's mental health. However because this instrument did not provide an overarching assessment of psychological abuse, this analysis was not possible. So, in order to better clarify the relationship between psychological abuse, mental health, and family support, a more comprehensive psychological abuse scale should be used.

A third limitation of this study is that the Norbeck et al. (1981) social support measure may not encompass all of the essential aspects of family support for Black women. Research in the general social support literature shows that embeddedness, or group membership, is related to self worth, provides a sense of belonging, and promotes well-being within an individual (Antonucci & Akiyama, 1997; Cassel, 1976; Cowen, 2000; Glass & Maddox, 1993; Hall et al., 1987; Hammer, 1981; House, 1988; Laireiter & Baumann, 1992; Levinger & Huesmann, 1980; Moos & Mitchell, 1982; Turner & Turner, 1999). Studies exploring social networks within the Black community have demonstrated the importance of family support by showing that Blacks are more collectively oriented in regard to family support than are Whites. This is not to say that family support is not as important for Whites, just that family support for Blacks tends to include nuclear and extended family, while family for Whites is centered primarily on

nuclear family (Barker et al., 1998; Hill, 1971; Jackson, 1973; Seelback & Sauer, 1977). Given this, because psychological abuse is so taxing to a woman's sense of self, the embeddedness or group connection with family may be more important to the mental health of psychologically abused Black women. Yet, since the Norbeck et al. (1981) instrument examines social support based solely upon nominated individuals rather than group assessment, it may not fully address embeddedness. Although it can be said that the nominated supporters (particularly mothers) may be the most important persons within the support network (Hunter, 1997), for Black women it is more likely that it is the family support of *all* persons within the family rather than simply individual family supporters that is essential (Barker, Morrow, Mitteness, 1998; Hill, 1971; Jackson, 1973; Seelback & Sauer, 1977). Therefore in order to examine family support for Blacks, perhaps family should be viewed as a collective unit, rather than the sum of nominated members. This may explain why social support variables were not found to be significantly correlated to depression in Black women.

#### Implications and Future Research

In spite of the limitations present in this study, this study adds pertinent information to the field of domestic violence. To date, no study has ever examined how the source of support may influence the mental health of psychologically abused women. This study provides evidence that family support may be important to the mental well-being of psychologically abused women. Further, this study also illustrates how the type of support (e.g., structural vs. functional) may also be important for abused women. In this study, the source of support (family) did not influence depression; whereas the type

of support (emotional) influenced depression for White women. Future research in this area should examine how the source and type of support differ across psychological as well as physical abuse. It may be that women experiencing certain types of abuse need different types of support from their supporters.

Aside from the previously mentioned implications, this study also highlights the need for more studies examining social support in ethnically diverse populations. With larger sample sizes and careful consideration of these issues, diverse women may need equally diverse support from their network.

Finally, because psychological abuse is thought to be a precursor to more severe violence (Marshall, 1999; O'Leary, 1999), domestic violence service providers should implement programs aimed at increasing the awareness of psychological abuse with an emphasis on the importance of the source and type of support individuals (especially family members) can provide.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, V.H. (1999). Predictors of african american well being. Journal of Black Psychology, 25(1), 78-104.
- Aguliar, R.J. & Nightingale, N.N. (1994). The impact of specific battering experiences on the self-esteem of abused women. Journal of Family Violence, 9(1), 35-45.
- Aldarondo, E. & Sugarman, D.B. (1996). Risk marker analysis of the cessation and persistence of wife assault. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64(5), 1010-1019.
- Antonucci, T.C. & Akiyama, H. (1997). Social support and the maintenance of competence. In S.L. Willis & K.W. Schaie (Eds). Societal mechanisms for maintaining competence in old age. Societal impact on aging. New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Bachman, R., Saltzman, L.E. (1995). Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey. U.S. Department of Justice.
- Ball, R. (1983). Family and friends: A supportive network for low-income American black families. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 15(1), 51-62.
- Barker, J.C., Morrow, J., & Mitteness, L.S. (1998). Gender, informal social support networks, and elderly urban African Americans. Journal of Aging Studies, 12(2), 199-222.
- Blassingame, John W. (1979). The Slave Community. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Belgrave, F.Z., Chase-Vaugh, G., Gray, F., Dixon-Addison, J., & Cherry, V.R. (2000). The effectiveness of a culture and gender specific intervention for increasing resiliency among african american preadolescent females. Journal of Black Psychology, 26(2), 133-147.
- Bisconti,-T.L. & Bergeman, C.S. (1999). Perceived social control as a mediator of the relationships among social support, psychological well-being, and perceived health. Gerontologist, 39(1), 94-103.
- Brush, L.D. (2000). Battering, traumatic stress, and welfare-to-work transition. Violence Against Women, 6(10), 1039-1065.

- Bowker, L.H. (1984). Coping with wife abuse: Personal and social networks. In A.R. Roberts (Ed), Battered Women and their Families: Intervention Strategies and Treatment Programs. (pp. 168-191) New York: Springer Publishing.
- Campbell, J.C., Kub, J., Belknap, R.A., & Templin, T.N. (1997). Predictors of depression in battered women. Violence Against Women, 3(3), 271-293.
- Campbell, J.C., McKenna, L.S., Torres, S., Sheridan, D. & Landenburger, K. (1993). Nursing care of abused women. In J.C. Campbell & J. Humphreys Nursing Care of Survivors of Family Violence. (pp 248-289). St. Louis, MI: Mosby.
- Campbell, J.C., Miller, P., Cardwell M.M., & Belknap, R.A. (1994). Relationship status of battered women over time. Journal of Family Violence, 9(2), 99-111.
- Campbell, J.C. & Soeken, K.L. (1999). Women's responses to battering over time: An analysis of change. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14(1), 21-31.
- Campbell, R., Sullivan, C.M., & Davidson, W.S. (1995). Women who use domestic violence shelters: Changes in depression over time. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19; 237-255.
- Cascardi, M. & O'Leary, K.D. (1992). Depressive symptomatology, self-esteem, and self-blame in battered women. Journal of Family Violence, 7(4), 249-259.
- Cascardi, M., O'Leary, K.D., & Schlee, K.A. (1999). Co-occurrence and correlates of posttraumatic stress disorder and major depression in physically abused women. Journal of Family Violence, 14(3), 227-249.
- Cassel, J. (1974). Psychosocial process and "stress": Theoretical formulations. International Journal of Health Sciences, 4; 471-482.
- Cazenave, N.A. & Straus, M.A. (1979). Race, class, network embeddedness, an family violence: A search for potent support systems. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 10; 281-300.
- Cohen, S. & Hoberman, H.M. (1983). Positive events and social supports as buffers of life change stress. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 13(2), 99-105.
- Cohen, S. & Wills, T.A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98(2), 310-357.
- Coker, A.L.; Smith, P.H.; Thompson, M.P.; McKeown, R.E., Bethea, L.; & Davis, K.E. (2002). Social support protects against the negative effects of partner violence on

- mental health. Journal of Women's Health and Gender Based Medicine, 11 (5); 465-476.
- Coley, S.M. & Beckett, J.O. (1988). Black battered women: A review of empirical literature. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66; 266-270.
- Cowen, E.L. (2000). Community psychology and routes to psychological wellness. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), Handbook of community psychology. New York: Kluwer/Plenum.
- Craven, D. (1996). Female victims of violent crime. (Special Report NCJ 16202). U.S. Department of Justice.
- Cutrona, C.E., Suhr, J.A. & MacFarlane, R. (1990). Interpersonal transactions and the psychological sense of support. In S. Duck (Ed), Personal relationships and support. London: Sage.
- Dilworth-Anderson, P. (1992) Extended kin networks in black families. Families and Aging, 29-32.
- Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R.P., & Cavanagh, K. (1985). The contact between battered women and social and medical agencies. In J. Pahn (Ed), Private violence and public policy: The needs of battered women and the response of public services. (pp 142-165). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Dunkel-Schetter, C., Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R.S. (1987). Correlates of social support receipt. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53(1), 71-80.
- Dutton, M.A., Honecker, L.C., Halle, P.M., & Burghart, K.J. (1994). Traumatic responses among battered women who kill. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 7(4), 549-564.
- Ennis, N.E., Hobfoll, S.E., & Schroder, K.E. (2000). Money doesn't talk, it swears: How economic stress and resistance resources impact inner-city women's depressive mood. American Journal of Community Psychology, 28(2), 149-173.
- Follingstad, D.R., Brennan, A.F., Hause, E.S., Polek, D.S., & Rutledge, L.L. (1991). Factors moderating physical and psychological symptoms of battered women. Journal of Family Violence, 6(1), 81-95.
- Follingstad, D.R., Laughlin, J.E., Polek, Rutledge, L.L., & Hause, E.S. (1991). Identification of wife abuse. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6; 2; 187-204.

- Follingstad, D.R., Rutledge, L.L., Berg, B.J., Hause, E.S., & Polek, D.S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. Journal of Family Violence, 5(2), 107-120.
- Fraser, I.M., McNutt, L.A., Clark, C., Williams-Muhammed, D., & Lee, R. (2002). Social support choices for help with abusive relationships: perceptions of african american women. Journal of Family Violence, 17(4), 363-375.
- Franklin, J.H. (1997). African American families: A historical note. In H.P. McAdoo (Ed), Black families: Third edition. (pp 5-8). California: Sage Publications.
- Gelles, R.J.(1997). Intimate violence in families. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gelles, R.J. & Harrop, J.W. (1989). Violence, battering, and psychological distress among women. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4(4), 400-420.
- Gerlock, A.A. (1999). Health impact of domestic violence. Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 20; 373-385.
- Glass, T.A. & Maddox, G.L. (1993). The quality and quantity of social support: Stroke recovery as psycho-social transition. Social Science and Medicine, 34(11), 1249-1261.
- Gleason, W.J. (1993). Mental disorder in battered women: An empirical study. Violence and Victims, 8(1), 53-68.
- Golding, J.M. (1999). Intimate partner violence as a risk factor for mental disorders: A meta-analysis. Journal of Family Violence, 14(2), 99-132.
- Goodman, L.A., Koss, M.P., & Felipe-Russo, N. (1993). Violence against women: Physical and mental health effects. Part I: Research findings. Applied & Preventative Psychology, 2; 79-89.
- Gordon, M. (2000). Definitional issues in violence against women: Surveillance and research from a violence research perspective.
- Gottlieb, B.H. (1983). Social support as a focus for integrative research in psychology. American Psychologist, 38; 278-287.
- Greenfeld, L.A., Rand, M.R., Craven, D., Klaus, P.A., Perkins, C.A., Ringel, C, & Warchol, et al. (1998). Violence by intimates: analysis of data on crimes by current or former spouses, boyfriends, and girlfriends. (Special Report NCJ 167237) U.S. Department of Justice.

- Hall, L.A., Schaefer, E.S., & Greenberg, R.S. (1987). Quality and quantity of social support as correlates of psychosomatic symptoms in mothers with young children. Research in Nursing and Health, 10(4), 287-298.
- Hamby, S.L. & Sugarman, D.B. (1999). Acts of psychological aggression against a partner and their relation to physical assault and gender. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 61(4), 959-970.
- Hammer, M. (1981). "Core" and "extended" social networks in relation to health and illness. Social Science and Medicine, 17; 405-411.
- Harris, T.L. & Molock, S.D. (2000). Cultural orientation, family cohesion and family support in suicide ideation and depression among African American college students. Suicide and Life Threatening Behavior, 30(4), 341-353.
- Henderson, J.G. & Pollard, C.A. (1993). Prevalence of various depressive symptoms in a sample of the general population. Psychological Reports, Vol 71(1), 208-210.
- Hill, R. (1972). The strengths of black families. New York: Emerson Hall.
- Hotaling, G.T. & Sugarman, D.B. (1990). A risk marker analysis of assaulted wives. Journal of Family Violence, 5; 1; 1-13.
- House, J.S., Umberson, D., & Landis, K. (1988). Structures and processes of social support. Annual Review of Sociology, 14; 293-298.
- Huang, C.J. & Gunn, T. (2001). An examination of domestic violence in an African American community in north Carolina: Causes and consequences. Journal of Black Studies, 31(6), 790-811.
- Hunter, A.G. (1997). Counting on Grandmothers: Black Mothers' and Fathers' Reliance on Grandmothers for Parenting Support. Journal of Family Issues, 18(3), 251-269.
- Israel, B. & Antonucci, T. (1987). Social network characteristics and psychological well being: A replication and extension. Health Education Quarterly, 14(4), 461-481.
- Jackson, J.J. (1973). Family organization and technology. In K.S. Miller & R.M. Dreger (Eds). Comparative Studies of Blacks and Whites in The United States. New York: Seminar Press.
- Jaffe, P. Wolfe, D.A., Wilson, S., & Zak, L. (1986). Emotional and physical health problems of battered women. American Journal of Psychiatry, 31; 625-629.

- Johnson, M.P. & Ferraro, K.J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990's: Making decisions. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62; 948-963.
- Jung, J. & Khalsa, H.K. (1989). The relationship of daily hassles, social support, and coping to depression in Black and White students. Journal of General Psychology, 116(4), 407-417.
- Katz, J. & Arias, I. (1999). Psychological abuse and depressive symptoms in dating women: Do different types of abuse have differential effects? Journal of Family Violence, 14(3), 281-295.
- Kelly, W., Kelly, E., & Brown, K.E. (1999). Gender differences in depression among college students: a multicultural perspective. College Student Journal, 33(1), 72-76.
- Kleinke, Chris L. (1998). Coping with Life Challenges. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Kessler, R.C., McGonagle, K.A., Zhao, S., Nelson, C.B., Hughes, M., Eshleman, S. et al., (1994). Lifetime and 12-month prevalence of DSM-III-R psychiatric disorders in the united states: Results from the national comorbidity survey. Archives of General Psychiatry, 51; 8-19.
- Laireiter, A. & Baumann, U. (1992). Network structures and support functions-theoretical and empirical analysis. In Veiel & U. Baumann (Eds.), The meaning and measurement of social support. New York: Hemisphere.
- Lewis, B.Y. (1988). Psychosocial factors related to wife abuse. Journal of Family Violence, 2(1), 1-10.
- Lewis, E. (1989). Role strain in african American women: The efficacy of support networks. Journal of Black Studies, 20(2), 155-169.
- Levinger, G., & Husemann, L.R. (1980). An incremental exchange perspective on the pair relationship. In K.J. Jurgen, M.S. Greenberg, & R.H. Willis (Eds), Social exchange: Advances in theory and research. (pp 165-188) New York: Plenum.
- Littlejohn-Blake, S.M. & Darling, C.A. (1993). Understanding the strengths of African American families. Journal of Black Studies, 23(4), 460-471.
- Lockhart, L. & White, B.W. (1989). Understanding marital violence in the black community. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4(4), 421-436.

- Lutenbacher, M. (2000). Perceptions of health status and relationship with abuse history and mental health in low-income single mothers. Journal of Family Nursing, 6(4), 320-340.
- Miech, R.A. & Shannahan, M.J. (2000). Socioeconomic status and depression over the life course. Journal of Health and Human Behavior, 41(2), 162-176.
- Malson, M. (1983). The social support systems of black families. The Ties that bind. (pp 37-57) Haworth Press.
- Marshall, L. (1992). Development of the severity of violence against women scales. Journal of Family Violence, 7; 103-121.
- Marshall, L.L. (1999). Effects of men's subtle and overt psychological abuse on low income women. Violence and Victims, 14(1), 69-87.
- Maton, K.I., Teti, D.M., Corns, K.M., & Viera-Baker, C.C. (1996). Cultural specificity of support sources, correlates and contexts: Three studies of african american and caucasian youth. American Journal of Community Psychology, 24(4), 551-587.
- McAdoo, H.P. (1978). Factors related to stability in upwardly mobile black families. Journal of Marriage and Family, 40(4), 761-776.
- McAdoo, H.P. (1982). Stress absorbing systems in black families. Family Relations, 31; 479-488.
- McAdoo, H.P. (Ed) (1997). Black Families: Third edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- McFarlane, J., Willison, P., Malecha, A., Lemmey, D. (2000). Intimate partner violence: A gender comparison. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15; 2; 158-169.
- McKelvey, M.W. & McKenry, P.C. (2000). The psychosocial well being of black and white mothers following marital dissolution. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24; 4-14.
- Mitchell, R.E. & Hodson, C.A. (1983). Coping with domestic violence: Social support and psychological health among battered women. American Journal of Community Psychology, 11(6), 629-654.
- Moos, R.H. & Mitchell, R.E. (1982). Social network resources and adaptation: A conceptual framework. In T.A. Wills (Ed), Basic processes in helping relationships. (pp 213-232) New York: Academic Press.

- Murphy, C.M. & O'Leary, K.D. (1989). Psychological aggression predicts physical aggression in early marriage. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57; 579-582.
- Murphy, J.M., Oliver, D.C., Monson, R.R. & Sobol, A.M. (1991). Depression and anxiety in relation to social status: A prospective epidemiologic study. Archives of General Psychiatry, 48(3), 223-229.
- Mutran, E. (1985). Intergenerational family support among blacks and whites: Response to culture or socioeconomic differences. Journal of Gerontology, 40(3), 382-389.
- Nabi, R., & Mehan, T. (1998). It is your business: Report on formative research survey findings, University of Pennsylvania, Annenberg Public Policy Center, Philadelphia, PA.
- Norbeck, J.S., Lindsey, A.M., & Carrieri, V.L. (1981). The development of an instrument to measure social support. Nursing Research, 30 (5), 364-269.
- O'Leary, K.D. (1999). Psychological abuse: A variable deserving critical attention in domestic violence. Violence and Victims, 14(1), 3-23.
- Padgett, D.L. (1997). The contribution of support networks to household labor in african American families. Journal of Family Issues, 18(3), 227-250.
- Pearlin, L.I., Lieberman, M.A., Menaghan, E.G., & Mullan, J.T. (1981). The stress process. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 22; 337-356.
- Pickett, S.A., Vraniak, D.A., Cook, J.A., & Cohler, B.J. (1993). Strength in adversity: Blacks bear burden better than whites. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 24(4), 460-467.
- Pierce, G.R., Sarason, B.R., & Sarason, I.G. (1992). General and specific support expectations and stress as predictors of perceived supportiveness: An experimental study. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol 63(2), 297-307.
- Raphael, J. (2001). Public housing and domestic violence. Violence Against Women, 7(6), 699-706.
- Ratner, P.A. (1993). The incidents of wife abuse and mental health status in abused wives in edmonton, alberta. Canadian Journal of Public Health, 84(4), 246-249.
- Rennison, C.M. & Welchans, S. (2000). Intimate partner violence. NCJ 178247.

- Rodriguez, E., Lasch, K.E., Chandra, P., & Lee, J. (2001). Family violence, employment status, welfare benefits, and alcohol drinking in the United States: What is the relation? Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 55(3), 172-178.
- Sagrestano, L.M., Feldman, P., Killingsworth-Rini, C., Woo, G., & Dunkel-Schetter, C. (1999) Ethnicity and social support during pregnancy. American Journal of Community Psychology, 27(6), 869-898.
- Sato, R.A. & Heiby, E.M. (1992). Correlates of depressive symptoms among battered women. Journal of Family Violence, 7 (3), 229-245.
- Schumacher, J.A., Feldbau-Kohn, S., Smith-Slep, A.M., & Heyman, R.E. (2001). Risk factors for male-to-female partner physical abuse. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6; 281-352.
- Schumacher, J.A., Smith-Slep, A.M., & Heyman, R.E. (2001). Risk factors for male-to-female partner psychological abuse. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6; 255-268.
- Scott, J.W. & Black, A. (1989). Deep structures of African American family life: Female and male kin networks. The Western Journal of Black Studies, 13(1), 17-24.
- Seelbach, W.C. & Sauer, W.J. (1977). Filial responsibility expectations and morale among aged parents. The Gerontologist, 17; 492-499.
- Smith, E. (1989). African American women and the extended family: A sociohistorical review. The Western Journal of Black Studies, 13(4), 179-184.
- Sorenson, S.B., Upchurch, D.M. & Shen, H. (1996). Violence and injury in marital arguments: Risk patterns and gender differences. American Journal of Public Health, 86(6), 35-42.
- Stack, C.B. (1974). All Our Kin: Strategies for Survival In A Black Community. New York: Harper & Row.
- Stets, J.E. & Straus, M.A. (1989). The marriages license as a hitting license: A comparison, and married couples. Journal of Family Violence, 4; 2; 161-180.
- Straus, M.A. & Gelles, R.J. (1986). Societal change in family violence from 1975 to 1986 as revealed by two national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48; 456-479.

- Straus, M.A. & Gelles, R.J. (1990). How violent are American families? Estimates from the national family violence research survey and other studies. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.) Physical violence in American families (pp 95-112). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Sudarkasa, N. (1997). African American families and family values. In H.P. McAdoo (Ed), Black families: Third edition. (9-40) California: Sage Publications.
- Sullivan, C.M. (1991). Battered women as active helpseekers. Violence Update, 1(12), 8-11.
- Sullivan, C.M. & Rumptz, M.H. (1994). Adjustment needs of African-american women who utilized a domestic violence shelter. Violence and Victims, 9(3), 275-286.
- Staples, R. (1987). Social structure and black family life: An analysis of current trends. Journal of Black Studies, 17(3), 267-286.
- Tajden, P. & Thoennes, N. (1998). Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the national violence against women survey. (Special Report NCJ 172837). Department of Justice.
- Tajden, P. & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the national violence against women survey. Violence against Women, 6; 2; 142-161.
- Tan, C., Basta, J., Sullivan, C.M. & Davidson, W.S. (1995). The role of social support in the lives of women exiting domestic violence shelters. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10(4), 437-451.
- Taylor, R.J. (1986). Receipt of social support among black Americans: Demographic and familial differences. Journal of Marriage and Family, 48; 67-77.
- Turner, R.J. & Turner, J.B. (1999). Social integration and support. In C.S. Aneshensel & J.C. Phelan (Eds), Handbook of the Sociology of Mental Health. (pp 301-319) New York: Kluwer/Plenum Publishers.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (2000). Poverty in the United States: 2000. (Current populations reports: Consumer income series P60-214). Washington, D.C.: US Government Printing Office.
- Utsey, S.O., Adams, E.P., & Bolden, M. (2000). Development and initial validation of the Africultural Coping Systems Inventory. Journal of Black Psychology, 26(2), 194-215.

- Uzzell, O. & Peebles-Wilkins, W. (1989). Black spouse abuse: A focus on relational factors and intervention strategies. The Western Journal of Black Studies, 13(1), 10-16.
- Vandewater, E.A. & Antonucci, T.C. (1998). The family as a context for health and well being. Family Relations, 47(4), 313-314.
- Vivian, D. & Malone, J. (1997). Relationship factors and depressive symptomatology associated with mild and severe husband-to-wife physical aggression. Violence and Victims, 12(1), 3-18.
- Walker, L.E. (1977). Battered women and learned helplessness. Victimology, 2, 525-533.
- Walker, L.E. (1979). The battered woman. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L.E. (Ed). (1984). Women and mental health policy. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Wallace, K.A., Bisconti, T.L., & Bergeman, C.S. (2001). The mediational effect of hardiness on social support and optimal outcomes in later life. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 23(4), 267-279.
- Weinbaum, Z., Stratton, T., Chavez, G., Motylewski-Link, C., Barrera, N., & Courtney, J. (2001). Female victims of intimate partner physical domestic violence (IPP-DV), California 1998. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 21(4), 313-319.
- Weissman, M.M., Bruce, M.L., Leaf, P.J., Florio, L.P., & Holzer, C.I. (1991). Affective disorders. In Robins, L.N. & Regier, D.A. (Eds). Psychiatric Disorders in America: The Epidemiologic Catchment Area Study. (pp 53-80) New York: The Free Press.
- Wyatt, G.E., Axelrod, J., Chin, D., Vargas Carmona, J., & Loeb, T.B. (2000). Examining patterns of vulnerability to domestic violence among african american women. Violence Against Women, 6(5), 495-514.
- Zlotnick, C, Kohn, R., Peterson, J., & Pearlstein, T. (1998). Partner physical victimization in a national sample of american families. Journal of interpersonal violence, 13(1), 156-166.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A: Demographics

Subject # \_\_\_\_\_  
Date of Interview \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Interviewer \_\_\_\_\_

**Pregnancy Interview  
Demographic Questionnaire**

1. Name of baby: \_\_\_\_\_ (Interviewer: Get this information from T2 interview prior to interview)
2. Since we interviewed you during your pregnancy with \_\_\_\_\_ (name of baby), have you had any miscarriages, still births, or abortions? (Circle one)  
  
1 = YES                      2 = NO
2. How many biological children do you currently have?
4. How many people, including yourself, live in your household?  
(If participant is living in a shelter, questions 4 & 5 refer to household composition before moving into shelter.)
5. Please list these: (Write in specific relationship to mother. Be specific—is the person (for ex.) a husband, stepfather, biological child, foster child, or partner's child?)  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
  
\_\_\_\_\_  
  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. Choose the one that best describes your current marital/relationship status (choose only one):
  - (a) single, never married (see below)
  - (b) married                      For how long? \_\_\_\_\_ (in months)
  - (c) separated                      For how long? \_\_\_\_\_ (in months)
  - (d) divorced                      For how long? \_\_\_\_\_ (in months)
  - (e) widowed                      For how long? \_\_\_\_\_ (in months)

If (a) is circled: Are you currently in a relationship?                      YES    NO
7. Please provide the first name of your current partner or the partner you were with most recently since the birth of \_\_\_\_\_ (baby=s name): \_\_\_\_\_
8. Are you currently living with your partner/spouse? (Circle one)  
1 = YES  
2 = NO

9. If yes to Question 8; how long have you been doing so? (Circle one)

1 = less than 1 year  
2 = 1-3 years  
3 = 4-6 years  
4 = 7-9 years  
5 = 10-12 years  
6 = 13-15 years  
7 = 16 - 18 years  
8 = 19 - 21 years  
9 = 22 - 24 years  
10 = 25 or more years

10. Prior to your current romantic relationship, specified in Question #10

|                                       |                |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| (a) were you ever married?            | 1 = YES 2 = NO |
| (b) did you ever live with a partner? | 1 = YES 2 = NO |
| (c) were you ever separated?          | 1 = YES 2 = NO |
| (d) were you ever divorced?           | 1 = YES 2 = NO |
| (e) were you ever widowed?            | 1 = YES 2 = NO |

11. What is your current relationship with the father of your baby? (Circle one)

1 = spouse  
2 = ex-spouse  
3 = partner  
4 = ex-partner  
5 = friend  
6 = acquaintance  
7 = stranger  
8 = other Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

12. Does the baby live with you? YES NO

If NO, who does the baby live with? \_\_\_\_\_  
(relationship of person to mother)

13. How many people, including yourself, live in your household?

Can you tell me who they are and what their relationship to you is? (*Write in specific relationship to mother. Be specific--is the person (for ex.) a husband, stepfather, biological child, foster child, or partner's child?*) MAKE SURE THE NUMBER OF NAMES EQUALS THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN HOUSEHOLD.

|       |       |       |       |
|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

14. What is your current relationship with the father of your baby? (Circle one)

1 = spouse

2 = ex-spouse

3 = partner

4 = ex-partner

5 = friend

6 = acquaintance

7 = stranger

8 = other Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

15. Has this relationship changed since the last time we interviewed you? YES NO

16. Is the baby's father involved with the baby? YES NO

17. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Circle one)

1 = grades 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; GED (circle specific grade)

2 = trade school

3 = some college

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

4 = AA degree

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

5 = BA/BS

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

6 = some grad school

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

7 = graduate degree

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ MA?

\_\_\_\_\_ Ph.D.?

\_\_\_\_\_ Law?

\_\_\_\_\_ MD?

8 = other; Specify (e.g., Beauty School, nursing school)

\_\_\_\_\_

18. Do you currently work outside the home? YES NO

If NO, did you work outside the home during the last year? YES NO

19. If YES to either part of Question 18; what is/was your occupation? \_\_\_\_\_

*Please be specific. For example, bookkeeper, cashier, computer programmer.*

*If there were two jobs/occupations, have participant choose the one that she feels best represents her occupation.*

20. What is the highest level of education your partner/spouse has completed? (Circle one)

1 = grades 1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9; 10; 11; 12; GED (circle specific grade)

2 = trade school

3 = some college

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

4 = AA degree

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

5 = BA/BS

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

6 = some grad school

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

7 = graduate degree

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ MA?

\_\_\_\_\_ Ph.D.?

\_\_\_\_\_ Law?

\_\_\_\_\_ MD?

8 = other; Specify (e.g., Beauty School, nursing school)

\_\_\_\_\_

- 56

## **Appendix B: Beck Depression Inventory**

### **BDI**

In answering these questions, think about each item carefully and circle the answer out of the group of 4 items that best reflects how you have been feeling **during the past week.**

1.     [1 ]     I do not feel sad.  
       [2 ]     I feel sad.  
       [3 ]     I am sad all the time and I can't snap out of it.  
       [4 ]     I am so sad or unhappy that I can't stand it.
  
2.     [1 ]     I am not particularly discouraged about the future.  
       [2 ]     I feel discouraged about the future.  
       [3 ]     I feel I have nothing to look forward to.  
       [4 ]     I feel that the future is hopeless and that things cannot improve.
  
3.     [1 ]     I do not feel like a failure.  
       [2 ]     I feel I have failed more than the average person.  
       [3 ]     As I look back on my life, all I can see is a lot of failures.  
       [4 ]     I feel I am a complete failure as a person.
  
4.     [1 ]     I get as much satisfaction out of things as I used to.  
       [2 ]     I don't enjoy things the way I used to.  
       [3 ]     I don't get real satisfaction out of anything anymore.  
       [4 ]     I am dissatisfied or bored with everything.
  
5.     [1 ]     I don't feel particularly guilty.  
       [2 ]     I feel guilty a good part of the time.  
       [3 ]     I feel quite guilty most of the time.  
       [4 ]     I feel guilty all of the time.
  
6.     [1 ]     I don't feel I am being punished.  
       [2 ]     I feel I may be punished.  
       [3 ]     I expect to be punished.  
       [4 ]     I feel I am being punished.
  
7.     [1 ]     I don't feel disappointed in myself.  
       [2 ]     I am disappointed in myself.  
       [3 ]     I am disgusted with myself.  
       [4 ]     I hate myself.
  
8.     [1 ]     I don't feel I am any worse than anybody else.  
       [2 ]     I am critical of myself for all my weaknesses or mistakes.  
       [3 ]     I blame myself all the time for my faults.  
       [4 ]     I blame myself for everything bad that happens.

9.    [1 ]    I don't have any thoughts of killing myself.  
      [2 ]    I have thoughts of killing myself, but I would not carry them out.  
      [3 ]    I would like to kill myself.  
      [4 ]    I would kill myself if I had the chance.
10.   [1 ]    I don't cry any more than usual.  
      [2 ]    I cry more now than I used to.  
      [3 ]    I cry all the time now.  
      [4 ]    I used to be able to cry, but now I can't cry even though I want to.
11.   [1 ]    I am no more irritated by things than I ever am.  
      [2 ]    I am slightly more irritated now than usual.  
      [3 ]    I am quite annoyed or irritated a good deal of the time.  
      [4 ]    I feel irritated all the time now.
12.   [1 ]    I have not lost interest in other people.  
      [2 ]    I am less interested in other people than I used to be.  
      [3 ]    I have lost most of my interest in other people.  
      [4 ]    I have lost all of my interest in other people.
13.   [1 ]    I make decisions about as well as I ever could.  
      [2 ]    I put off making decisions more than I used to.  
      [3 ]    I have greater difficulty in making decisions than before.  
      [4 ]    I can't make decisions at all anymore.
14.   [1 ]    I don't feel that I look any worse than I used to.  
      [2 ]    I am worried that I am looking old or unattractive.  
      [3 ]    I feel that there are permanent changes in my appearance that make me  
             look unattractive.  
      [4 ]    I believe that I look ugly.
15.   [1 ]    I can work about as well as before.  
      [2 ]    It takes an extra effort to get started at doing something.  
      [3 ]    I have to push myself very hard to do anything.  
      [4 ]    I can't do any work at all.
16.   [1 ]    I can sleep as well as usual.  
      [2 ]    I don't sleep as well as I used to.  
      [3 ]    I wake up 1-2 hours earlier than usual and find it hard to get back to sleep.  
      [4 ]    I wake up several hours earlier than I used to and cannot get back to sleep.

17. [1 ] I don't get more tired than usual.  
[2 ] I get tired more easily than I used to.  
[3 ] I get tired from doing almost everything.  
[4 ] I am too tired to do anything.
18. [1 ] My appetite is no worse than usual.  
[2 ] My appetite is not as good as it used to be.  
[3 ] My appetite is much worse now.  
[4 ] I have no appetite at all anymore.
19. [1 ] I haven't lost much weight, if any, lately.  
[2 ] I have lost more than five pounds.  
[3 ] I have lost more than ten pounds.  
[4 ] I have lost more than fifteen pounds.
20. [1 ] I am no more worried about my health than usual.  
[2 ] I am worried about physical problems such as aches and pains, or upset stomach, or constipation.  
[3 ] I am very worried about my physical problems and it's hard to think of much else.  
[4 ] I am so worried about my physical problems that I cannot think about anything else.
21. [1 ] I have not noticed any recent change in my interest in sex.  
[2 ] I am less interested in sex than I used to be.  
[3 ] I am much less interested in sex now.  
[4 ] I have lost interest in sex completely.

## Appendix C: Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory

## PMWI

**\*\*\*\*\*This questionnaire refers to \_\_\_\_\_ [NAME, see page 2, Question 10]\*\*\*\*\***  
**Use a separate form for each partner listed on page 2, Question 10**

Please rate how often each of the following behaviors occurred during the last year using the following scale: *INTERVIEWER: If participant did not have a partner in the last year, do not administer: code answers as "X."*

| Never | Rarely | Sometimes | Frequently | Very Frequently | No Partner<br>During Last<br>Year<br>X |
|-------|--------|-----------|------------|-----------------|----------------------------------------|
| 1     | 2      | 3         | 4          | 5               |                                        |

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. My partner called me names.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. My partner swore at me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. My partner yelled and screamed at me.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. My partner treated me like an inferior.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. My partner monitored my time and made me account for my whereabouts.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. My partner used our money or made important financial decisions without talking to me about it.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. My partner was jealous or suspicious of my friends.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. My partner accused me of having an affair.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. My partner interfered in my relationships with other family members.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 10. My partner tried to keep me from doing things to help myself.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 11. My partner restricted my use of the telephone.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 12. My partner told me my feelings were irrational or crazy.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 13. My partner blamed me for his problems.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 14. My partner tried to make me feel crazy.

## Appendix D: Norbeck Social Support

## SOCIAL SUPPORT QUESTIONNAIRE

PLEASE READ ALL DIRECTIONS  
ON THIS PAGE BEFORE STARTING

Please list each significant person in your life on the right. Consider all the persons who provide personal support for you or who are important to you.

Use only first names or initials, and then indicate the relationship, as in the following example:

| Example: | First Name or Initials | Relationship |
|----------|------------------------|--------------|
| 1.       | _____                  | _____        |
| 2.       | _____                  | _____        |
| 3.       | _____                  | _____        |
| 4.       | _____                  | _____        |
| 5.       | _____                  | _____        |
|          | etc.                   |              |

Use the following list to help you think of the people important to you, and list as many people as apply in your case.

- spouse or partner
- family members or relatives (specify: mother, father, grandmother, etc.)
- friends
- work or school associates
- neighbors
- health care providers
- counselor or therapist
- minister/priest/rabbi
- other

You do not have to use all 24 spaces. Use as many spaces as you have important persons in your life.

WHEN YOU HAVE FINISHED YOUR LIST, PLEASE TURN TO PAGE 2.

For each person you listed, please answer the following questions by writing in the number that applies.

0 = not at all  
1 = a little  
2 = moderately  
3 = quite a bit  
4 = a great deal

**Question 1:**

How much does this person make you feel liked or loved?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_
18. \_\_\_\_\_
19. \_\_\_\_\_
20. \_\_\_\_\_
21. \_\_\_\_\_
22. \_\_\_\_\_
23. \_\_\_\_\_
24. \_\_\_\_\_

[EMO1]

**Question 2:**

How much does this person make you feel respected or admired?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_
18. \_\_\_\_\_
19. \_\_\_\_\_
20. \_\_\_\_\_
21. \_\_\_\_\_
22. \_\_\_\_\_
23. \_\_\_\_\_
24. \_\_\_\_\_

[EMO2]

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

**Question 3:**

How much can you confide in this person?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_
18. \_\_\_\_\_
19. \_\_\_\_\_
20. \_\_\_\_\_
21. \_\_\_\_\_
22. \_\_\_\_\_
23. \_\_\_\_\_
24. \_\_\_\_\_

[EMO3]

**Question 4:**

How much does this person agree with or support your actions or thoughts?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_
18. \_\_\_\_\_
19. \_\_\_\_\_
20. \_\_\_\_\_
21. \_\_\_\_\_
22. \_\_\_\_\_
23. \_\_\_\_\_
24. \_\_\_\_\_

[EMO4]

GO ON TO NEXT PAGE

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>0 = not at all<br/>1 = a little<br/>2 = moderately<br/>3 = quite a bit<br/>4 = a great deal</p> <p><b>Question 5:</b><br/>If you needed to borrow \$10; a ride to the doctor, or some other immediate help, how much could this person usually help?</p> <p>1. _____<br/>2. _____<br/>3. _____<br/>4. _____<br/>5. _____<br/>6. _____<br/>7. _____<br/>8. _____<br/>9. _____<br/>10. _____<br/>11. _____<br/>12. _____<br/>13. _____<br/>14. _____<br/>15. _____<br/>16. _____<br/>17. _____<br/>18. _____<br/>19. _____<br/>20. _____<br/>21. _____<br/>22. _____<br/>23. _____<br/>24. _____</p> <p>[AID5]</p> | <p>0 = not at all<br/>1 = a little<br/>2 = moderately<br/>3 = quite a bit<br/>4 = a great deal</p> <p><b>Question 6:</b><br/>If you were confined to bed for several weeks, how much could this person help you?</p> <p>1. _____<br/>2. _____<br/>3. _____<br/>4. _____<br/>5. _____<br/>6. _____<br/>7. _____<br/>8. _____<br/>9. _____<br/>10. _____<br/>11. _____<br/>12. _____<br/>13. _____<br/>14. _____<br/>15. _____<br/>16. _____<br/>17. _____<br/>18. _____<br/>19. _____<br/>20. _____<br/>21. _____<br/>22. _____<br/>23. _____<br/>24. _____</p> <p>[AID6]</p> | <p><b>Question 7:</b><br/>How much advice and guidance you get from this person(e.g. baby's diet, how to comfort the baby?)</p> <p>1. _____<br/>2. _____<br/>3. _____<br/>4. _____<br/>5. _____<br/>6. _____<br/>7. _____<br/>8. _____<br/>9. _____<br/>10. _____<br/>11. _____<br/>12. _____<br/>13. _____<br/>14. _____<br/>15. _____<br/>16. _____<br/>17. _____<br/>18. _____<br/>19. _____<br/>20. _____<br/>21. _____<br/>22. _____<br/>23. _____<br/>24. _____</p> <p>[PAR1]</p> | <p><b>Question 8:</b><br/>How much practical assistance about parenting do this person? (e.g., take you to the pediatrician, lend or give you things for the baby, babysit)</p> <p>1. _____<br/>2. _____<br/>3. _____<br/>4. _____<br/>5. _____<br/>6. _____<br/>7. _____<br/>8. _____<br/>9. _____<br/>10. _____<br/>11. _____<br/>12. _____<br/>13. _____<br/>14. _____<br/>15. _____<br/>16. _____<br/>17. _____<br/>18. _____<br/>19. _____<br/>20. _____<br/>21. _____<br/>22. _____<br/>23. _____<br/>24. _____</p> <p>[PAR2]</p> |
| <p>GO TO NEXT PAGE</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <p>GO TO NEXT PAGE</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |

|                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Question 9:</b><br/>How much emotional support about parenting do you get from this person? (e.g., listens to you when you're upset or worried)</p> <p>0 = not at all<br/>1 = a little<br/>2 = moderately<br/>3 = quite a bit<br/>4 = a great deal</p> <p><b>Question 10:</b><br/>How much does this person influence how you see yourself as a mother?</p> <p>0 = not at all<br/>1 = a little<br/>2 = moderately<br/>3 = quite a bit<br/>4 = a great deal</p> | <p>1. _____</p> <p>2. _____</p> <p>3. _____</p> <p>4. _____</p> <p>5. _____</p> <p>6. _____</p> <p>7. _____</p> <p>8. _____</p> <p>9. _____</p> <p>10. _____</p> <p>11. _____</p> <p>12. _____</p> <p>13. _____</p> <p>14. _____</p> <p>15. _____</p> <p>16. _____</p> <p>17. _____</p> <p>18. _____</p> <p>19. _____</p> <p>20. _____</p> <p>21. _____</p> <p>22. _____</p> <p>23. _____</p> <p>24. _____</p> <p>[PAR3]</p>                                      |
| <p>0 = not at all<br/>1 = a little<br/>2 = moderately<br/>3 = quite a bit<br/>4 = a great deal<br/>5 = not applicable</p> <p><b>Question 11:</b><br/>How much does this person criticize, or seem intrusive, or conflict, or disappoint you?</p> <p><b>Question 12:</b><br/>If any of the events on the VAWS happened to you during the last year, how often did you discuss them with this person?</p>                                                              | <p>1. _____</p> <p>2. _____</p> <p>3. _____</p> <p>4. _____</p> <p>5. _____</p> <p>6. _____</p> <p>7. _____</p> <p>8. _____</p> <p>9. _____</p> <p>10. _____</p> <p>11. _____</p> <p>12. _____</p> <p>13. _____</p> <p>14. _____</p> <p>15. _____</p> <p>16. _____</p> <p>17. _____</p> <p>18. _____</p> <p>19. _____</p> <p>20. _____</p> <p>21. _____</p> <p>22. _____</p> <p>23. _____</p> <p>24. _____</p> <p>[PAR4]</p> <p>[VAW1]</p> <p>GO TO NEXT PAGE</p> |

- 1 = yes  
2 = no  
3 = don't know/not sure

**Question 13:**

Have any of the events listed on the VAWS happened to this person?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_
18. \_\_\_\_\_
19. \_\_\_\_\_
20. \_\_\_\_\_
21. \_\_\_\_\_
22. \_\_\_\_\_
23. \_\_\_\_\_
24. \_\_\_\_\_

[VAWS2]

- 1 = victim  
2 = the one doing the actions  
3 = some of each  
4 = don't know/not sure

**Question 14:**

Was this person a victim or the one doing the actions?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_
18. \_\_\_\_\_
19. \_\_\_\_\_
20. \_\_\_\_\_
21. \_\_\_\_\_
22. \_\_\_\_\_
23. \_\_\_\_\_
24. \_\_\_\_\_

[VAWS3]

- 1 = less than 6 months  
2 = 6 to 12 months  
3 = 1 to 2 years  
4 = 2 to 5 years  
5 = more than 5 years

**Question 15:**

How long have you known this person?

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_
18. \_\_\_\_\_
19. \_\_\_\_\_
20. \_\_\_\_\_
21. \_\_\_\_\_
22. \_\_\_\_\_
23. \_\_\_\_\_
24. \_\_\_\_\_

[DURATION]

- 5 = daily  
4 = weekly  
3 = monthly  
2 = a few times a year  
1 = once a year or less

**Question 16:**

How frequently do you usually have contact with this person? (phone calls, visits, or letters)

1. \_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
5. \_\_\_\_\_
6. \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_
8. \_\_\_\_\_
9. \_\_\_\_\_
10. \_\_\_\_\_
11. \_\_\_\_\_
12. \_\_\_\_\_
13. \_\_\_\_\_
14. \_\_\_\_\_
15. \_\_\_\_\_
16. \_\_\_\_\_
17. \_\_\_\_\_
18. \_\_\_\_\_
19. \_\_\_\_\_
20. \_\_\_\_\_
21. \_\_\_\_\_
22. \_\_\_\_\_
23. \_\_\_\_\_
24. \_\_\_\_\_

[FREQCON2]

GO TO NEXT PAGE

|     |                        | Subject Number _____    | Interviewer Name _____ |
|-----|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|
|     |                        | <b>PERSONAL NETWORK</b> |                        |
|     | First Name or Initials | Relationship            | Male/Female?           |
| 1.  | _____                  | [SOU1]                  | M                      |
| 2.  | _____                  | [SOU2]                  | F                      |
| 3.  | _____                  | [SOU3]                  | M                      |
| 4.  | _____                  | [SOU4]                  | F                      |
| 5.  | _____                  | [SOU5]                  | M                      |
| 6.  | _____                  | [SOU6]                  | F                      |
| 7.  | _____                  | [SOU7]                  | M                      |
| 8.  | _____                  | [SOU8]                  | F                      |
| 9.  | _____                  | [SOU9]                  | M                      |
| 10. | _____                  | [SOU10]                 | F                      |
| 11. | _____                  | [SOU11]                 | M                      |
| 12. | _____                  | [SOU12]                 | F                      |
| 13. | _____                  | [SOU13]                 | M                      |
| 14. | _____                  | [SOU14]                 | F                      |
| 15. | _____                  | [SOU15]                 | M                      |
| 16. | _____                  | [SOU16]                 | F                      |
| 17. | _____                  | [SOU17]                 | M                      |
| 18. | _____                  | [SOU18]                 | F                      |
| 19. | _____                  | [SOU19]                 | M                      |
| 20. | _____                  | [SOU20]                 | F                      |
| 21. | _____                  | [SOU21]                 | M                      |
| 22. | _____                  | [SOU22]                 | F                      |
| 23. | _____                  | [SOU23]                 | M                      |
| 24. | _____                  | [SOU24]                 | F                      |

**PLEASE BE SURE YOU HAVE RATED EACH PERSON ON EVERY QUESTION. GO TO THE LAST PAGE.**

17. During the past year, have you lost any important relationships due to moving, a job change, divorce or separation, death, or some other reason?

\_\_\_\_\_ 0. NO (*Interviewer: If NO is checked, interview ends*)

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. YES

IF YOU LOST IMPORTANT RELATIONSHIPS DURING THIS PAST YEAR:

17a. Please indicate the number of persons from each category who are no longer available to you.

\_\_\_\_\_ spouse or partner

\_\_\_\_\_ family members or relatives Specify:

\_\_\_\_\_ friends

\_\_\_\_\_ work or school associates

\_\_\_\_\_ neighbors

\_\_\_\_\_ health care providers

\_\_\_\_\_ counselor or therapist

\_\_\_\_\_ minister/priest/rabbi

\_\_\_\_\_ other (specify) \_\_\_\_\_

15b. Overall, how much of your support was provided by these people who are no longer available to you?

\_\_\_\_\_ 0. None at all

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. A little

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. A moderate amount

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Quite a bit

\_\_\_\_\_ 4. A great deal

## TABLES

Table 1

Demographic Means of Variables

|                      | <b>Black Women</b> | <b>White Women</b> | <b>All Women</b> |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Total                | N = 45             | N = 113            | N = 158          |
| Age*                 | 25.32              | 27.22              | 26.68            |
| Relationship Length* | 4.52               | 5.55               | 5.26             |
| Marital Status*      | 1.23               | 1.66               | 1.54             |
| Number of Children   | 2.15               | 1.79               | 1.89             |
| Income*              | 1708.97            | 2272.87            | 2113.51          |
| High                 | 8500               | 10000              | 10000            |
| Low                  | 341                | 400                | 341              |
| Education Level      | 1.97               | 2.40               | 2.28             |
| Work Outside Home    | 1.36               | 1.35               | 1.36             |
| Sum PMWI             | 22.56              | 23.46              | 23.21            |
| Sum BDI              | 6.59               | 5.88               | 6.08             |
| Total Family*        | 4.50               | 3.93               | 4.09             |
| Total Support        | 6.51               | 7.02               | 6.88             |
| Non Nuclear Family   | .36                | .37                | .37              |
| Emotional Support    | 13.07              | 12.85              | 12.91            |
| Practical Support    | 6.14               | 5.63               | 5.77             |
| Frequency            | 4.49               | 4.14               | 4.24             |

\* / + represents a significant difference

Table 2

ANOVA of Race x Transformed PMWI(N = 138)

| Source           | DF  | MS      | F   |
|------------------|-----|---------|-----|
| Between subjects | 1   | 1216.67 | .77 |
| Error            | 136 | 1581.37 |     |
| Total            | 17  |         |     |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 3

ANOVA of Race x Transformed BDI(N = 138)

| Source           | DF  | MS     | F   |
|------------------|-----|--------|-----|
| Between subjects | 1   | 223.07 | .14 |
| Error            | 136 | 1597.5 |     |
| Total            | 137 |        |     |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 4

ANOVA TABLE OF RACIAL DIFFERENCES INDEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES (N = 138)

| <b>Source</b>       | <b>DF</b> | <b>MS</b> | <b>F</b> |
|---------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Number of Kids      | 1         | 793.51    | .57      |
| Error               | 136       | 1387.92   |          |
| Total               | 137       |           |          |
| Income              | 1         | 11369.40  | 7.46**   |
| Error               | 136       | 1524.48   |          |
| Total               | 137       |           |          |
| Age                 | 1         | 864.25    | .60*     |
| Error               | 136       | 1444.11   |          |
| Total               | 137       |           |          |
| Education           | 1         | 8881.98   | 5.75     |
| Error               | 136       | 1544.93   |          |
| Total               | 137       |           |          |
| Relationship Length | 1         | 1583.74   | 1.07     |
| Error               | 136       | 1487.07   |          |
| Total               | 137       |           |          |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 5

CHI SQUARE TABLE OF RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN DEMOGRAPHICVARIABLES (N = 138)

| Source                   | $\chi^2$ | df  |
|--------------------------|----------|-----|
| Race x marital status    | 20.09*   | 137 |
| Race x work outside home | 10.38    | 137 |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \* p < .05; \*\*p < .01

Table 6

MANCOVA TABLE OF RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN SOCIAL SUPPORTVARIABLES (controlling for demographic differences) (N=138)

+

| Source          | Dependant Variable | Df  | F        | MS      |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----|----------|---------|
| Corrected model | Emotional support  | 4   | 1035.71  | .643    |
|                 | Practical support  | 4   | 1199.73  | .750    |
|                 | Total support      | 4   | 5741.23  | 4.064** |
|                 | Frequency          | 4   | 2312.84  | 1.484   |
|                 | Non-nuclear family | 4   | 2581.10  | .371    |
| Error           | Emotional support  | 133 | 1611.001 |         |
|                 | Practical support  | 133 | 16.00.08 |         |
|                 | Total support      | 133 | 1412.88  |         |
|                 | Frequency          | 133 | 1558.09  |         |
|                 | Non-nuclear family | 133 | 590.47   |         |

trend, \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 7

## Correlation Table of All Variables for All Women

(N = 138)

|                    | 1                  | 2       | 3      | 4       | 5      | 6       | 7                  | 8       | 9                 | 10      | 11                | 12   | 13   |
|--------------------|--------------------|---------|--------|---------|--------|---------|--------------------|---------|-------------------|---------|-------------------|------|------|
| 1. Marital Status  | 1.00               |         |        |         |        |         |                    |         |                   |         |                   |      |      |
| 2. PMWI            | -0.38**            | 1.00    |        |         |        |         |                    |         |                   |         |                   |      |      |
| 3. # of Kids       | 0.02               | 0.10    | 1.00   |         |        |         |                    |         |                   |         |                   |      |      |
| 4. Income          | 0.49**             | -0.25** | -0.15  | 1.00    |        |         |                    |         |                   |         |                   |      |      |
| 5. Age             | 0.44**             | -0.11   | 0.34** | 0.32**  | 1.00   |         |                    |         |                   |         |                   |      |      |
| 6. Education       | 0.39**             | -0.23** | -0.14  | 0.44**  | 0.43** | 1.00    |                    |         |                   |         |                   |      |      |
| 7. Rel Length      | 0.45**             | -0.24** | 0.13   | 0.37**  | 0.40** | 0.31**  | 1.00               |         |                   |         |                   |      |      |
| 8. Total Family    | 0.07               | 0.01    | -0.05  | 0.03    | -0.02  | -0.01   | -0.05              | 1.00    |                   |         |                   |      |      |
| 9. Emotional Supp  | 0.07               | -0.28** | -0.07  | 0.12    | 0.04   | -0.04   | 0.05               | -0.11   | 1.00              |         |                   |      |      |
| 10. Practical      | -0.06              | -0.07   | -0.06  | 0.00    | -0.07  | 0.01    | 0.07**             | -0.32** | 0.37**            | 1.00    |                   |      |      |
| 11. Frequency      | -0.23*             | 0.06    | -0.05  | -0.25** | -0.16  | -0.20   | -0.14              | -0.27** | 0.16 <sup>+</sup> | 0.37**  | 1.00              |      |      |
| 12. BDI            | -0.18 <sup>+</sup> | 0.45**  | 0.17*  | -0.23** | -0.01  | -0.23** | -0.32**            | 0.07    | -0.30**           | -0.12   | 0.07              | 1.00 |      |
| 13. Non Nuc Family | -0.32*             | 0.20*   | -0.04  | -0.18*  | -0.21* | -0.21*  | -0.15 <sup>+</sup> | 0.00    | -0.01             | 0.11    | 0.17 <sup>+</sup> | 0.02 | 1.00 |
| 14. Total Supp     | 0.14               | -0.11   | -0.07  | 0.19*   | 0.03   | 0.13    | 0.10               | 0.79**  | -0.06             | -0.22** | -0.29**           | 0.00 | 0.00 |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \* .05; \*\*p < .01

Table 8

## Correlations Table of All Variables for White Women

(N = 99)

|                    | 1       | 2                 | 3      | 4       | 5                  | 6                  | 7       | 8       | 9       | 10     | 11     | 12   | 13    |
|--------------------|---------|-------------------|--------|---------|--------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|------|-------|
| 1. Marital Status  | 1.00    |                   |        |         |                    |                    |         |         |         |        |        |      |       |
| 2. PMWI            | -0.36** | 1.00              |        |         |                    |                    |         |         |         |        |        |      |       |
| 3. # of Kids       | 0.13    | 0.16              | 1.00   |         |                    |                    |         |         |         |        |        |      |       |
| 4. Income          | 0.45**  | -0.31**           | -0.06  | 1.00    |                    |                    |         |         |         |        |        |      |       |
| 5. Age             | 0.47**  | -0.06             | 0.32** | 0.38**  | 1.00               |                    |         |         |         |        |        |      |       |
| 6. Education       | 0.39**  | -0.29**           | -0.05  | 0.48**  | 0.54**             | 1.00               |         |         |         |        |        |      |       |
| 7. Rel Length      | 0.49**  | -0.26*            | 0.06   | 0.52**  | 0.41**             | 0.33**             | 1.00    |         |         |        |        |      |       |
| 8. Total Family    | 0.06    | 0.02              | 0.00   | -0.01   | -0.02              | -0.03              | -0.09   | 1.00    |         |        |        |      |       |
| 9. Emotional       | 0.08    | -0.26*            | 0.02   | 0.15    | 0.04               | 0.02               | 0.06    | -0.09   | 1.00    |        |        |      |       |
| 10. Practical      | -0.08   | -0.07             | -0.08  | 0.04    | -0.16              | -0.34              | 0.05    | -0.28** | 0.33**  | 1.00   |        |      |       |
| 11. Frequency      | -0.15   | 0.01              | -0.13  | -0.17   | -0.19 <sup>+</sup> | -0.12 <sup>+</sup> | -0.16   | -0.23*  | 0.13    | 0.37** | 1.00   |      |       |
| 12. BDI            | -0.18   | 0.48**            | 0.27** | -0.27** | 0.07               | -0.30**            | -0.29** | 0.08    | -0.35** | -0.17  | 0.07   | 1.00 |       |
| 13. Non Nuc Family | -0.41** | 0.18 <sup>+</sup> | -0.09  | -0.18   | -0.28**            | -0.26**            | -0.24** | -0.07   | 0.01    | 0.12   | 0.13   | 0.02 | 1.00  |
| 14. Total Support  | 0.08    | -0.09             | 0.02   | 0.17    | 0.06               | 0.15               | 0.08    | 0.74**  | -0.01   | -0.16  | -0.21* | 0.03 | -0.04 |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \*.05; \*\*.p < .01

Table 9

## Correlations Table of All Variables for Black Women

(N = 39)

|                    | 1      | 2                 | 3                  | 4     | 5      | 6     | 7       | 8       | 9      | 10                 | 11                | 12    | 13   |
|--------------------|--------|-------------------|--------------------|-------|--------|-------|---------|---------|--------|--------------------|-------------------|-------|------|
| 1. Marital Status  | 1.00   |                   |                    |       |        |       |         |         |        |                    |                   |       |      |
| 2. PMWI            | -0.40* | 1.00              |                    |       |        |       |         |         |        |                    |                   |       |      |
| 3. # of Kids       | -0.07  | -0.05             | 1.00               |       |        |       |         |         |        |                    |                   |       |      |
| 4. Income          | 0.42** | -0.07             | -0.29 <sup>+</sup> | 1.00  |        |       |         |         |        |                    |                   |       |      |
| 5. Age             | 0.24*  | -0.21             | 0.46**             | 0.07  | 1.00   |       |         |         |        |                    |                   |       |      |
| 6. Education       | 0.40*  | -0.07             | -0.31 <sup>+</sup> | 0.32* | 0.11** | 1.00  |         |         |        |                    |                   |       |      |
| 7. Rel Length      | 0.24   | -0.14             | 0.33*              | -0.09 | 0.36   | 0.24* | 1.00    |         |        |                    |                   |       |      |
| 8. Total Family    | 0.15   | -0.04             | -0.15              | 0.12  | -0.02  | 0.02  | 0.04    | 1.00    |        |                    |                   |       |      |
| 9. Emotional       | 0.09   | -0.34*            | -0.26              | 0.09  | 0.05   | -0.18 | 0.03    | -0.15   | 1.00   |                    |                   |       |      |
| 10. Practical      | 0.17   | -0.10             | -0.05              | 0.01  | 0.25   | 0.18  | 0.20    | -0.43** | 0.47** | 1.00               |                   |       |      |
| 11. Frequency      | -0.17  | 0.15              | 0.08               | -0.28 | 0.10   | -0.15 | 0.03    | -0.41*  | 0.24   | 0.32               | 1.00              |       |      |
| 12. BDI            | -0.17  | 0.35*             | -0.03              | -0.15 | -0.18  | -0.04 | -0.43** | 0.04    | -0.18  | -0.02 <sup>+</sup> | 0.04              | 1.00  |      |
| 13. Non Nuc Family | -0.19  | 0.28 <sup>+</sup> | 0.09               | -0.23 | -0.04  | -0.09 | 0.15    | 0.18    | -0.07  | 0.12               | 0.35 <sup>+</sup> | 0.02  | 1.00 |
| 14. Total Support  | 0.15   | -0.16             | -0.21              | 0.15  | -0.10  | 0.06  | 0.11    | 0.89**  | -0.17  | -0.32*             | -0.42**           | -0.04 | 0.08 |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \*.05; \*\*.p < .01

Table 10

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Total Family Support and Frequency for AllWomen (N = 138)

| Source         | Df  | $\Delta F$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ | T                  |
|----------------|-----|------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|
| <b>Step 1</b>  |     |            |              |         |                    |
| Marital status | 1   |            |              | -.06    | -.54               |
| Age            | 1   |            |              | .20     | 1.84 <sup>+</sup>  |
| Income         | 1   |            |              | -.20    | -1.95 <sup>+</sup> |
| PMWI           | 1   |            |              | .42     | 4.41**             |
| Total          | 133 | 9.43*      | .22*         |         |                    |
| <b>Step 2</b>  |     |            |              |         |                    |
| Marital status | 1   |            |              | .01     | .09                |
| Age            | 1   |            |              | .09     | 1.04 <sup>+</sup>  |
| Income         | 1   |            |              | -.16    | -1.79 <sup>+</sup> |
| PMWI           | 1   |            |              | .42     | 5.18**             |
| Total Family   | 1   |            |              | .01     | .40                |
| Total Support  | 1   |            |              | .04     | .30                |
| Frequency      | 1   |            |              | .04     | .50                |
| Total          | 130 | .45        | .01          |         |                    |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \* p < .05; \*\*p < .01

Table 11

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Total Family Support and Frequency for WhiteWomen (N = 99)

| Source         | Df  | $\Delta F$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ | T                  |
|----------------|-----|------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|
| <b>Step 1</b>  |     |            |              |         |                    |
| Marital status | 1   |            |              | .01     | .07                |
| Age            | 1   |            |              | .09     | .99 <sup>+</sup>   |
| Income         | 1   |            |              | -.16    | -1.85 <sup>+</sup> |
| PMWI           | 1   |            |              | .42     | 5.17**             |
| Total          | 133 | 13.64**    | .31**        |         |                    |
| <b>Step 2</b>  |     |            |              |         |                    |
| Marital status | 1   |            |              | -.06    | -.54               |
| Age            | 1   |            |              | .21     | 1.20 <sup>+</sup>  |
| Income         | 1   |            |              | -.19    | -1.90 <sup>+</sup> |
| PMWI           | 1   |            |              | .42     | 4.44**             |
| Total Family   | 1   |            |              | .05     | .33                |
| Total Support  | 1   |            |              | .07     | .52                |
| Frequency      | 1   |            |              | .09     | .92                |
| Total          | 130 | .25        | .32          |         |                    |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 12

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Total Family Support and Frequency for BlackWomen (N = 39)

| Source         | Df | $\Delta F$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ | T                 |
|----------------|----|------------|--------------|---------|-------------------|
| <b>Step 1</b>  |    |            |              |         |                   |
| Marital status | 1  |            |              | .07     | .38               |
| Age            | 1  |            |              | -.11    | -.67              |
| Income         | 1  |            |              | -.14    | -.841             |
| PMWI           | 1  |            |              | .34     | 2.03*             |
| Total          | 38 | .154       | .15          |         |                   |
| <b>Step 2</b>  |    |            |              |         |                   |
| Marital status | 1  |            |              | .04     | .23               |
| Age            | 1  |            |              | -.13    | -.713             |
| Income         | 1  |            |              | -.14    | -.75              |
| PMWI           | 1  |            |              | .32     | 1.73 <sup>+</sup> |
| Total Family   | 1  |            |              | -.19    | .49               |
| Total Support  | 1  |            |              | .21     | -.43              |
| Frequency      | 1  |            |              | -.06    | -.29              |
| Total          | 31 | .01        | .10          |         |                   |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \* p < .05; \*\*p < .01

Table 13

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Non-Nuclear Family Support for Black Women

(N = 39)

| Source                 | Df | $\Delta F$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ | T     |
|------------------------|----|------------|--------------|---------|-------|
| <b>Step 1</b>          |    |            |              |         |       |
| Marital status         | 1  |            |              | .07     | .38   |
| Age                    | 1  |            |              | -.11    | -.67  |
| Income                 | 1  |            |              | -.14    | -.84  |
| PMWI                   | 1  |            |              | .34     | 2.03* |
| Total                  | 34 | 1.54       | .15          |         |       |
| <b>Step 2</b>          |    |            |              |         |       |
| Marital status         | 1  |            |              | .08     | .32   |
| Age                    | 1  |            |              | -.12    | -.63  |
| Income                 | 1  |            |              | -.16    | -.95  |
| PMWI                   | 1  |            |              | .37     | 2.11* |
| Non- Nuclear<br>Family | 1  |            |              | -.11    | -.66  |
| Total                  | 33 | .44        | .01          |         |       |

\* trend, \*.05; \*\*p &lt; .01

Table 14

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Non-Nuclear Family Support for White Women(N = 99)

| Source                 | Df | $\Delta F$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ | T      |
|------------------------|----|------------|--------------|---------|--------|
| <b>Step 1</b>          |    |            |              |         |        |
| Marital status         | 1  |            |              | -.657   | -.54   |
| Age                    | 1  |            |              | .20     | 1.84   |
| Income                 | 1  |            |              | -.20    | -1.95  |
| PMWI                   | 1  |            |              | .42     | 4.41** |
| Total                  | 94 | 8.79**     | .27**        |         |        |
| <b>Step 2</b>          |    |            |              |         |        |
| Marital status         | 1  |            |              | -.07    | -.67   |
| Age                    | 1  |            |              | .19     | 1.73   |
| Income                 | 1  |            |              | -.20    | -1.96  |
| PMWI                   | 1  |            |              | .43     | 4.44** |
| Non- Nuclear<br>Family | 1  |            |              | -.06    | -.67   |
| Total                  | 93 | .45        | .00          |         |        |

+ trend, \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 15

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Emotional Support and Practical Support for AllWomen (N = 138)

| Source                            | Df  | $\Delta F$        | $\Delta R^2$     | $\beta$ | T                  |
|-----------------------------------|-----|-------------------|------------------|---------|--------------------|
| <b>Step 1</b>                     |     |                   |                  |         |                    |
| Marital status                    | 1   |                   |                  | .01     | .07                |
| Age                               | 1   |                   |                  | .09     | .99                |
| Income                            | 1   |                   |                  | -.16    | -1.85 <sup>+</sup> |
| PMWI                              | 1   |                   |                  | .42     | 5.17**             |
| Total                             | 133 | 9.43*             | .22*             | .01     | .07                |
| <b>Step 2</b>                     |     |                   |                  |         |                    |
| Marital status                    | 1   |                   |                  | -.00    | -.03               |
| Age                               | 1   |                   |                  | .09     | .99                |
| Income                            | 1   |                   |                  | -.14    | -1.72 <sup>+</sup> |
| PMWI                              | 1   |                   |                  | .37     | 4.47**             |
| Emotional Support                 | 1   |                   |                  | -.17    | -2.04*             |
| Practical Support                 | 1   |                   |                  | -.02    | -.27               |
| Total                             | 131 | 2.77 <sup>+</sup> | .03 <sup>+</sup> |         |                    |
| <b>Step 3</b>                     |     |                   |                  |         |                    |
| Marital status                    | 1   |                   |                  | .00     | .01                |
| Age                               | 1   |                   |                  | .07     | .75                |
| Income                            | 1   |                   |                  | -.13    | -1.60 <sup>+</sup> |
| PMWI                              | 1   |                   |                  | .37     | 4.47**             |
| Emotional Support                 | 1   |                   |                  | -.18    | -2.11*             |
| Practical Support                 | 1   |                   |                  | -.02    | -.25               |
| Interaction emo x<br>Psych abuse  | 1   |                   |                  | .14     | 1.82               |
| Interaction prac x<br>Psych abuse | 1   |                   |                  | .15     | .01                |
| Total                             | 129 | 3.30 <sup>+</sup> | .02 <sup>+</sup> |         |                    |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 16

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Emotional Support and Practical Support for BlackWomen (N = 39)

| Source                            | Df | $\Delta F$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ | T     |
|-----------------------------------|----|------------|--------------|---------|-------|
| <b>Step 1</b>                     |    |            |              |         |       |
| Marital status                    | 1  |            |              | .67     | .38   |
| Age                               | 1  |            |              | -.11    | -.64  |
| Income                            | 1  |            |              | -.14    | -.81  |
| PMWI                              | 1  |            |              | .34     | 2.03* |
| Total                             | 34 | 1.54       | .154         |         |       |
| <b>Step 2</b>                     |    |            |              |         |       |
| Marital status                    | 1  |            |              | .06     | .31   |
| Age                               | 1  |            |              | -.12    | -.75  |
| Income                            | 1  |            |              | -.13    | -.75  |
| PMWI                              | 1  |            |              | .31     | 1.67  |
| Emotional Support                 | 1  |            |              | -.10    | -.50  |
| Practical Support                 | 1  |            |              | .09     | .44   |
| Total                             | 32 | .15        | .01          |         |       |
| <b>Step 3</b>                     |    |            |              |         |       |
| Marital status                    | 1  |            |              | .27     | 1.35  |
| Age                               | 1  |            |              | -.11    | -.65  |
| Income                            | 1  |            |              | -.16    | -.88  |
| PMWI                              | 1  |            |              | .05     | .28   |
| Emotional Support                 | 1  |            |              | -.11    | -.56  |
| Practical Support                 | 1  |            |              | .09     | .47   |
| Interaction emo x<br>Psych abuse  | 1  |            |              | .12     | .68   |
| Interaction prac x<br>Psych abuse | 1  |            |              | -.532   | -.649 |
| Total                             | 31 | .46        | .01          |         |       |

+ trend, \*  $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

Table 17

Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Emotional Support and Practical Support for WhiteWomen (N = 99)

| Source                            | Df | $\Delta F$ | $\Delta R^2$ | $\beta$ | T                  |
|-----------------------------------|----|------------|--------------|---------|--------------------|
| <b>Step 1</b>                     |    |            |              |         |                    |
| Marital status                    | 1  |            |              | -.06    | -.54               |
| Age                               | 1  |            |              | .20     | 1.84 <sup>+</sup>  |
| Income                            | 1  |            |              | -.20    | -1.95 <sup>+</sup> |
| PMWI                              | 1  |            |              | .42     | 4.41**             |
| Total                             | 94 | 8.77**     | .27**        |         |                    |
| <b>Step 2</b>                     |    |            |              |         |                    |
| Marital status                    | 1  |            |              | -.07    | -.65               |
| Age                               | 1  |            |              | .19     | 1.83 <sup>+</sup>  |
| Income                            | 1  |            |              | -.17    | -1.77 <sup>+</sup> |
| PMWI                              | 1  |            |              | .36     | 3.83**             |
| Emotional Support                 | 1  |            |              | -.22    | -2.34*             |
| Practical Support                 | 1  |            |              | -.04    | -.38               |
| Total                             | 92 | 3.46*      | .05*         |         |                    |
| <b>Step 3</b>                     |    |            |              |         |                    |
| Marital status                    | 1  |            |              | -.06    | -.59               |
| Age                               | 1  |            |              | .17     | 1.61               |
| Income                            | 1  |            |              | -.16    | -1.64              |
| PMWI                              | 1  |            |              | .36     | 3.88*              |
| Emotional Support                 | 1  |            |              | -.22    | -2.36*             |
| Practical Support                 | 1  |            |              | -.03    | -.37               |
| Interaction emo x<br>Psych abuse  | 1  |            |              | .14     | 1.67               |
| Interaction prac x<br>Psych abuse | 1  |            |              | .266    | 1.041              |
| Total                             | 91 | 2.78       | .02          |         |                    |

<sup>+</sup> trend, \*.05; \*\*p < .01

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 02487 3451