

Perceptions of Domestic Abuse Among Mexican American and Anglo American Women

Arthur S. Evans, Jr.
Florida Atlantic University

Sara Torres
University of South Florida

This paper examines the role of culture in shaping perceptions, definitions, and interpretations Mexican American and Anglo American women hold of domestic abuse. Two theoretical views concerning perceptions that Mexican Americans may hold of domestic abuse are discussed. The first view suggests that Mexican American women follow a pluralist model and therefore differ significantly in their perceptions of domestic abuse from Anglo American women. The second position holds that Mexican American women are quickly becoming assimilated into the American mainstream and consequently share attitudes toward domestic abuse similar to those of Anglo American women. Interviews were conducted with women living in shelters for battered women in 1986. The findings suggest that for Mexican American women, cultural pluralism, rather than assimilation, may be the norm in understanding their perceptions of domestic abuse.

W. I. Thomas first introduced the concept "definition of the situation" in his book *The Unadjusted Girl*.¹ This concept is important because it suggests that stimuli have no fixed quality, and always involve interpretation. Events that seem to have objectified meanings do not exist in reality because they are always subject to shifting definitions and interpretations.² In other words, the meanings attached to stimuli are always socially derived through social interaction, rather than inherent in the stimuli themselves.

This paper explores the role of culture in shaping perceptions (i.e., definitions and interpretations) Mexican American and Anglo

American women hold toward domestic abuse. Domestic abuse of women occurs in families of all ethnic, racial, economic, religious, and educational backgrounds.³ However, there is a dearth of information comparing perceptions of domestic abuse among ethnic groups. Research on domestic abuse has for the most part focused primarily on Anglo Americans, although in some cases subjects from various ethnic groups have been included as part of the research sample.⁴ In the aforementioned research it has generally been assumed that the ethnic group in question holds similar perceptions about female abuse as do Anglo Americans. In other words, in these studies a conception of ethnic culture is held which suggests that the hierarchy of values for the evaluation of domestic abuse is roughly equal despite ethnic differences. Resulting from this reasoning, students of domestic abuse have generally overlooked the possibility of cultural differences in perceptions of domestic abuse. This research attempts to address this flaw by presenting data contrasting the perceptions of domestic abuse among Mexican American and Anglo American women. More specifically, the primary focus of this research is on the interplay of culture and the definition of domestic abuse.

The research of Ramirez,⁵ Ramirez and Castaneda,⁶ and Martinez⁷ shows that it is possible to differentiate between Mexican Americans and Anglo Americans in terms of meanings assigned to culturally sensitive issues such as social relationships between males and females, and the maternal and paternal family roles. In general, these writers have suggested that in contrast to Anglo Americans, Mexican Americans are more likely to hold patriarchal rather than egalitarian attitudes regarding the institution of the family. On the other hand, Hosch⁸ has argued that while some Mexican Americans are patriarchal in their orientation to family life, egalitarian notions of sex roles are quickly emerging in practice, particularly for families that are affluent and/or live farther from the United States-Mexican border.

Interviews for this study were conducted with fifty Mexican American and Anglo American women living in shelters for battered women in Texas in 1986. The findings of this research support the position that evaluation of spousal abuse involves a dialectical relationship between a system of objectified meanings and the group (or culture) as a creative unit, both reaffirming and changing those meanings. Because the number of respondents in this study is relatively small, readers are advised to treat this research as exploratory and therefore tentative. Until additional studies on perceptions of domestic abuse are undertaken involving larger samples, one needs to proceed cautiously when attempting to generalize the findings of this paper.

Two theoretical views concerning perceptions that Mexican Americans may hold of domestic abuse are discussed below. The first view suggests that Mexican American women follow a pluralist model

Evans and Torres - Perceptions of Domestic Abuse

and therefore differ significantly in their perceptions of domestic abuse from Anglo American women. The second position holds that Mexican American women over the years have become assimilated into the American mainstream and consequently share attitudes toward domestic abuse similar to those of Anglo American women.

The pluralist model holds that Anglo American and Mexican American women's perceptions of domestic abuse are different. This perspective receives support from the observation that Mexican Americans are the most successful of all ethnic groups in the United States in maintaining their cultural heritage by resisting pressure to assimilate into the American mainstream.⁹ Stevens¹⁰ has pointed out that Mexican Americans are the exceptions to the pattern of ethnic groups acquiring a preference for English over the ancestral language with each succeeding generation. Moore and Pachon¹¹ note that while Mexican Americans have lived in the United States longer than other ethnic groups, the Spanish language is used by them to a greater extent than all other non-English languages combined. But other research points out that among native born Mexican Americans language use and preference shifts from Spanish to English by the second generation.¹² Despite this, the percentages of Mexican American children today who learn Spanish as their first language and of households using Spanish as the preferred tongue remain high in contrast to other ethnic groups. Because Mexican Americans are concentrated near the Mexican and United States borders, Spanish speaking and Spanish culture are in part reinforced by the continued influx of new immigrants. In addition, over the generations Mexican Americans have acquired economic power to sustain their speaking of Spanish and the Mexican culture through specialized radio and television programs, newspapers, and other forms of the mass media. For example, today one-half of all foreign language radio broadcasts in the United States are conducted in Spanish. According to Moore and Pachon,¹³ between 1970 and 1980 Spanish radio stations in the United States increased from sixty to two hundred. Many commercial advertisers know that the Mexican American market is potentially a profitable one which must be approached and cultivated first on the cultural level. In general then, on a broader level of analysis, Mexican Americans' continued preference for the Spanish language provides an indication that they have been reluctant to give up their Mexican heritage.

Some researchers have concluded that another area in which Mexican Americans have resisted joining the American mainstream is in their perception of domestic abuse. For example, in the literature, the Mexican American family has often been portrayed as traditional, religious, and patriarchal. Males (especially older males) are described as controlling the family sometimes in a violent and strict manner, while females are portrayed as subordinate sufferers. Such characterizations of Mexican American family life are attributed to a cultural carry-over from the

Explorations in Ethnic Studies Vol. 17, No. 2

Mexican heritage. Oppenheimer¹⁴ has provided some insight into the treatment of Indian women in some Mexican villages. Though his observations deal primarily with Indian women in remote regions of Mexico, they are nevertheless important in helping us understand why some some writers believe there is a general link between the status of women in Mexico and Mexican Americans. For example, in some regions of Mexico men are often seen chatting cheerfully as they walk on the roadside, while their wives walk at least ten yards behind them, carrying heavy loads with children clinging to their clothes. In these villages, most of the men wear sandals or shoes, but virtually all women go barefoot. After cooking meals women feel it their responsibility to serve their husbands first, then their children; prior to eating what remains. Discriminatory treatment against women results in their lower than average educational achievement and poor health. According to Oppenheimer more than fifty-one percent of Mexico's Indian women are illiterate compared with twenty-nine percent of Indian men, and as a result of their inferior social status Indian women are more likely to suffer from malnutrition, disease, and birth related deaths.¹⁵

Speaking specifically of the Mexican American woman, Horowitz¹⁶ and Schaefer¹⁷ have explained that among Mexican American males, there is considerable pride in maleness. This perception of virility, of personal worth in one's own eyes is called *machismo*. According to Schaefer¹⁸ *machismo* varies and is demonstrated differently. For some individuals it may entail resorting to weapons, fighting, being irresistible to women, and/or beating women.¹⁹ Other writers have suggested that the domination of women is a valued attitude among Mexican American men because they are the products of a collectivist culture rather than an individualist one. According to Hosch²⁰ and Hofstede,²¹ Mexican Americans are taught to subordinate their personal goals to those of the group, and to define the self in in-group terms. Within their collectivist culture, Mexican American behavior is seen as regulated by social hierarchies and harmony. Males generally are superordinate to females, and within the family the father is the boss. Both homogeneity of views and face-saving are believed by in-group members to be salient for maintaining group norms and social cohesion. In-group members are required to conform and not let out-group members be aware of differences or disagreements. People are free to think deviant thoughts as long as they behave correctly. Persons in collectivist cultures show great concern for the entire in-group and, in turn, are greatly influenced by the group—family integrity, obedience, and conformity are valued more than achievement, pleasure, and competition.²²

Horowitz's²³ description of the role behavior of Mexican American males closely resembles Oppenheimer's observations of the Mexican male and supports the notion of the existence of a Mexican American collectivist

Evans and Torres - Perceptions of Domestic Abuse

culture. For example, she noted that Mexican American fathers tended to make familial decisions, and were served within the home by their wives and daughters. It was the fathers that determined whether or not children were to be punished, and if the women could work outside the home. If a male came home late it was expected that the wife would have dinner prepared. When clothing needs occurred, males demanded that the women of the house take care of them.²⁴ Young women learn to expect this from men. While many women submit readily to male wishes, others do so only reluctantly.²⁵

Inferring from the pluralist perspective then, one would expect that because of their cultural heritage, Mexican American women differ in their perceptions of incidents of domestic abuse from Anglo American women; i.e., they may not perceive abuse of females in domestic situations as seriously as the latter. To some extent this expectation rests on the notion that Mexican American assimilation into the American mainstream has been considerably slower than for other ethnic groups. As a result the pluralist perspective suggests that Mexican American culture has not been appreciably changed through social contact with dominants. In contrast, Anglo American women for the most part are seen as more likely to be active participants in American mainstream culture and its institutions. They are also viewed as more likely to have greater wealth, power, and prestige, in addition to more alternatives outside an abusive family relationship at their disposal than Mexican American women. Moreover, the pluralist perspective further assumes that because of the rise of the feminist movement and the increasing awareness and sensitivity of women's issues in the United States, Anglo American women are more likely than Mexican American women to learn early in life not to tolerate abusive treatment from males. Some indirect empirical evidence on Hispanics in general supports this contention. For example, data from Berenson et al.²⁶ shows that the prevalence of reported domestic abuse was three and one-half times higher among white non-Hispanic women than it was among Hispanic women. Their study also illustrated that risk factors generally associated with domestic abuse (e.g., being divorced, being separated, being unemployed, and alcohol or drug use by either partner) had no effect on amounts of domestic abuse of Hispanic women. Indeed, Berenson et al.²⁷ concluded that a Hispanic woman's response to an abusive situation is likely to be influenced by her culture, and in particular, Hispanic women may be more reluctant to leave an abusive partner than are white non-Hispanic or Black women.

In contrast to the pluralist perspective, those ascribing to the assimilationist perspective argue that as ethnic groups continue to live together, there occurs a progressive blending of the smaller group into the larger one. In this process individuals in the smaller group will increasingly adopt the culture of the larger group. Hence, as minority

Explorations in Ethnic Studies Vol. 17, No. 2

groups interact over time, they are expected to make adjustments by becoming more like dominants.²⁸

Some writers have suggested that to the extent that a masculine culture persists among Mexican Americans, several factors are contributing to its demise.²⁹ For example, Williams³⁰ explains that the portrayals of *machismo* are inflamed and heavily influenced by prejudice and stereotypical definitions of Mexican Americans held by dominants. Indeed, her study demonstrated that the power of Mexican American males in the family has declined significantly over the years, and that it never was as great as the idea of *machismo* suggests. She sees the decline in *machismo* as a result of responses to sociological processes such as industrialization, urbanization, and bureaucratization which operate on both the societal and global levels. In addition, she notes that these processes not only have influenced the characteristics of Mexican American families but Anglo American families as well.

Other writers have suggested that the feminist movement in the United States has functioned to change the way men and women both relate and respond toward one another. For example, Keefe and Padilla³¹ explain that today Mexican Americans, like their Anglo American counterparts, are highly urbanized and therefore more likely to be exposed to more cosmopolitan influences quickening the pace of their assimilation into the American mainstream. Other processes such as marital assimilation, urbanization, upward mobility, and acculturation have been identified as functioning to bring about rapid assimilation of Mexican Americans.³² In other words, those ascribing to the assimilationist perspective stress that Mexican Americans are an acculturated group—or at least quickly becoming one—and therefore do not differ significantly in terms of behavior, attitudes, and perceptions from Anglo Americans. Some empirical evidence on the family which exists supports this position. For example, several studies comparing Anglo Americans and Mexican Americans have found that there are no significant differences in family life between the groups. The variations that did occur were found to be of degree rather than kind.³³ Zinn's³⁴ research demonstrates that as Mexican American families achieve social mobility and move beyond the confines of the ethnic community, they develop egalitarian orientations. In summary, then, because of the operation of social processes, some believe that the Mexican American family displays the same values as the Anglo American family. The assimilationist view then, leads one to expect that there are few, if any differences between Mexican American and Anglo American women in terms of perception of domestic abuse.

Data

The data reported in this paper were collected in 1986 in the state of Texas. The respondents in the study were women (seventy percent of them married) who lived in shelters for battered women. All respondents were eighteen years of age or older and had been physically abused at least two times during their relationship. To be included as Anglo American the respondents had to have been white, born in the United States, and personally identified themselves as Anglo Americans. Persons who were considered as Mexican American had to have been born in the United States or Mexico, personally identified themselves as Mexican Americans, and able to trace their Mexican ancestry. In all the sample consisted of fifty respondents (i.e., twenty-five Anglo American and twenty-five Mexican American). Table 1 (on page 132) illustrates the demographic features of the Anglo American and Mexican American groups. Both groups were compared along the lines of age, social class, educational level, occupation, religion, relationship status, and length of relationship.

Data were collected through face-to-face interviews with all respondents. The interview was an attempt to ascertain the degree of seriousness of abusive acts. Respondents were shown a list of twenty-one acts normally regarded as abusive,³⁵ and were asked to determine whether or not these items constituted abuse. Next, using this list the interviewer asked respondents to determine the degree of seriousness of each act, if it were to be committed against them one time. Lastly, respondents were asked to determine the degree of seriousness of items on the list if they were to be committed against them on a regular basis. Respondents rated the seriousness of each item using a Likert type scale, with five categories of responses (i.e., 1. Very Serious; 2. Serious; 3. No Opinion; 4. Not Serious; 5. Definitely Not Serious). In our Table presentations we collapsed the categories Very Serious and Serious into one and disregarded the other categories. In other words, only those respondents who considered an act to be serious or very serious are included in the analysis.

For the purpose of presentation we have divided the twenty-one items into two categories (i.e., acts which may result in physical harm and those which for the most part result in emotional stress). Those acts which may result in physical harm included the woman being pushed (or shoved or grabbed), threatened with a knife or and/or gun, having a knife and/or gun used against her, being slapped, having objects thrown at her, being bitten, being hit with a fist, being choked, being beaten with an object, having her hair pulled, being burned with a cigarette, and being raped. Those acts which could result in emotional stress included the male's verbal abuse (and/or verbal threats), psychological abuse, not providing food and shelter, withdrawal of affection, ignoring the female,

Table 1

Demographics of Battered Women Sample

	Anglo American (N=25) Percentage	Mexican American (N=25) Percentage
Age		
18-30	72	72
31-40	12	12
41-50	12	12
51+	4	4
Social Class		
Middle	20	20
Lower	80	80
Educational Level		
Advanced Degree	4	4
College Degree	8	0
Some College	36	12
High School	32	20
Less Than High School	20	64
Occupation		
Management	4	12
Clerical	32	8
Skilled	12	8
Unskilled	20	20
Housewife/Unemployed	32	52
Religion		
Catholic	16	64
Protestant	68	28
Other	8	8
None	8	0
Relationship Status		
Married	80	60
Cohabiting	20	28
Divorced	0	4
Separated	0	8
Length of Relationship		
1-2 Years	36	12
3-6 Years	48	32
7-15 Years	12	48
Over 20 Years	4	8

Evans and Torres - Perceptions of Domestic Abuse

providing no emotional support, refusing to communicate, and constraining the woman against her will.

We tested the data for significance on the difference between proportions from independent samples to determine whether or not Anglo Americans and Mexican Americans differed in their perception of those acts which constituted abuse. In order to justify using the test for differences between proportions, we assume that each of the observations are independent and that the samples are independent. It is further assumed that the samples are simple random samples of the population. The assumption that the null hypothesis is true serves as a rationale for getting a pooled estimate of the population proportion and using it to compute the standard error.³⁶

Findings

The data in Table 2 (on page 134) show that in general both Anglo American and Mexican American women regarded acts that could result in physical harm as abusive behavior. However Anglo Americans, in contrast to Mexican Americans, were significantly more likely to perceive punching, slapping, throwing objects, and pulling hair as abusive. With respect to acts which may result in emotional stress, Mexican Americans were significantly less likely to agree with their Anglo counterparts that the failure to provide and constraint against one's will were forms of abuse.

Table 3 (on page 135) shows the results for perceived abuse if an act is committed one time. Anglo Americans were more likely than Mexican Americans to believe that punching, threatening with a knife, slapping, throwing objects, biting, beating with an object and/or fist, pulling hair, and burning with a cigarette were abusive behaviors. With respect to those acts which may result in emotional stress there existed no significant difference between the two groups.

Lastly, respondents were asked about their perceptions of the items on the lists if these were to be committed against them on a regular basis. Table 4 (page 136) shows that unlike Anglo Americans, Mexican Americans were significantly less likely to perceive behaviors which could result in physical harm as abusive. Mexican Americans proved statistically different from their Anglo counterparts with respect to eleven out of the thirteen items listed in the category of physical harm. The groups also differed significantly with respect to those behaviors which could result in emotional stress. For example, a higher percentage of Anglo Americans than Mexican Americans reported that psychological abuse, failure to provide, showing no emotional support, and constraint against one's will are acts of abusive behavior if committed over time on a regular basis.

Table 2

Perceptions of Acts Constituting Abuse by Ethnicity

	Anglo Americans %	Mexican Americans %	Standard Error	Z	Significance
<u>Acts Resulting in Physical Harm</u>					
Pushing	92	80	.097	1.23	.109
Punching	100	88	.066	2.00	.022*
Threatening with Knife	100	96	.039	1.02	.153
Use of Knife or Gun	100	96	.039	1.02	.153
Slapping	96	80	.091	1.75	.040*
Throwing Objects	96	80	.091	1.75	.040*
Biting	100	80	.084	.24	.409*
Hitting with Fist	100	96	.039	1.02	.153
Choking	100	100	.000	0.00	.500
Beating with Objects	100	96	.039	1.02	.153
Pulling Hair	100	84	.076	2.10	.017*
Burning with Cigarette	100	92	.055	1.45	.073
Rape	100	96	.039	1.02	.153
<u>Acts Resulting in Emotional Stress</u>					
Verbal Abuse	96	88	.093	.86	.19
Mental Abuse	100	80	.084	-.24	.409
Failure to Provide	96	56	.120	3.33	.000*
Withdrawal of Affection	72	56	.135	1.18	.119
Ignoring Spouse	64	44	.140	1.42	.077
No Emotional Support	76	64	.129	.93	.176
Refusing to Communicate	64	48	.140	1.14	.127
Constraint Against Will	100	64	.108	3.33	.000*

* = $p < .05$

Table 3

**Perception of Acts Constituting Abuse
if Committed One Time**

	Anglo Americans %	Mexican Americans %	Standard Error	Z	Significance
<u>Acts Resulting in Physical Harm</u>					
Pushing	48	64	.140	.11	.127
Punching	96	80	.090	1.77	.038*
Threatening with Knif	100	88	.060	2.00	.022*
Use of Knife or Gun	100	92	.050	1.60	.054*
Slapping	88	60	.120	2.33	.009*
Throwing Objects	88	68	.050	4.00	.000*
Biting	84	76	.030	2.66	.003
Hitting with Fist	96	80	.090	1.77	.038*
Choking	96	92	.050	.80	.211
Beating with Objects	96	80	.090	1.77	.038*
Pulling Hair	88	72	.030	5.33	.000*
Burning with Cigarette	96	72	.100	2.40	.008*
Rape	88	80	.100	.80	.211
<u>Acts Resulting in Emotional Stress</u>					
Verbal Abuse	60	76	.130	1.23	.109
Mental Abuse	76	68	.126	.63	.103
Failure to Provide	76	60	.130	1.23	.109
Withdrawal of Affection	60	52	.140	.57	.284
Ignoring Spouse	24	32	.130	.62	.270
No Emotional Support	36	44	.138	.58	.284
Refusing to Communicate	36	52	.140	1.14	.127
Constraint Against Will	70	64	.133	.46	.322

* = $p < .05$

Table 4

**Perceptions of Acts Constituting Abuse
if Committed on a Regular Basis**

	Anglo Americans %	Mexican Americans %	Standard Error	Z	Significance
<u>Acts Resulting in Physical Harm</u>					
Pushing	96	76	.098	.22	.017*
Punching	100	84	.076	2.10	.017*
Threatening with Knife	100	84	.076	2.10	.017*
Use of Knife or Gun	100	84	.076	2.10	.017*
Slapping	100	68	.103	3.10	.001*
Throwing Objects	100	64	.108	2.96	.001*
Biting	100	76	.129	1.86	.031*
Hitting with Fist	100	80	.080	2.50	.006*
Choking	100	96	.039	1.02	.153
Beating with Objects	100	80	.080	2.50	.006*
Pulling Hair	96	76	.098	2.04	.020*
Burning with Cigarette	100	80	.080	2.50	.006
Rape	88	80	.129	.12	.109
<u>Acts Resulting in Emotional Stress</u>					
Verbal Abuse	96	88	.076	.10	.146
Vental Abuse	100	84	.076	2.10	.017*
Failure to Provide	100	72	.098	2.85	.006*
Withdrawal of Affection	76	80	.117	0.34	.3666
Ignoring Spouse	76	64	.072	1.66	.048
No Emotional Support	84	64	.124	1.61	.053*
Refusing to Communicate	76	64	.072	1.66	.048*
Constraint Against Will	96	80	.091	1.75	.040*

* = $p < .05$

Conclusions

This paper has explored perceptions of domestic abuse of Mexican American and Anglo American women. In this work we argued that humans, unlike other animals, are not born with complex innate behavior patterns that enhance their survival in society. It is only because of culture that humans have the unique ability to select, interpret and form different meanings of stimuli. Each person learns through culture how to adapt to the environment. These learned ways of acting always involve a "definition of the situation," which suggests that stimuli confronting a person have no fixed quality and/or meaning, and that self-aware conduct entails prior interpretation and deliberation by the individual using cultural definitions.

In this research we wanted to explore whether or not Mexican American women fit a pluralist or an assimilationist model with respect to how they perceived domestic abuse. In general the data in this paper suggest that for Mexican American women, the kind of cultural assimilation expected by Park and Allport³⁷ appears not to have occurred, at least with respect to their perceptions of domestic abuse. For example, our research demonstrates that Mexican American women are defining abuse in a more general way—one which may be consistent with their cultural ethos but inconsistent with the norms of the American mainstream. If the data presented in this paper are truly indicative of the feelings of Mexican American women, then their apparent acceptance of abuse may be placing them in dangerous situations—ones that many Anglo American women would find objectionable. However, readers should keep in mind that because the sample used in this research was relatively small the findings of this paper should not be considered as definitive. Nor do the findings of this paper allow us to generalize to larger populations or to control for other social-economic variables to determine what influence these may have on perceptions of domestic abuse. Despite this however, this study has important exploratory implications for scholars, since it provides a starting point for the investigation of spousal abuse among people that are racially and ethnically distinct.

In these writers' view, the comparative difference between Mexican American and Anglo American women in their perceptions of domestic abuse is best explained by the pluralist model. As we have already noted, Mexican Americans have been more successful than other ethnic groups in maintaining their distinctive heritage. This heritage includes a collectivist culture in which one is expected to show great concern for the entire ethnic group. In a collectivist culture males have a higher social status than females, individuals are expected to conform to tradition, and family integrity, obedience, and conformity are valued more than achievement, pleasure, and competition. In contrast, individualist cultures, in which most Anglo American women have been socialized, are not likely to see a sharp

contrast between in-groups and out-groups. In this situation, individual goals tend to take precedence over group goals, and behavior is regulated by the individual's likes and dislikes and by cost/benefit analysis. The contrast between collectivist and individualist cultures suggests that in the former, perceptions of domestic abuse are more likely to be tolerant, because these are influenced by group norms and conformity. However, in the latter perceptions of domestic abuse are less tolerant because they are determined by one's sense of personal independence from the group and personal achievements.

The differences found between Anglo Americans and Mexican Americans in this study may reflect social economic status rather than culture. For example, while both samples were similar to one another with respect to age and social class, Mexican Americans were more likely to be less educated, unemployed, and Catholic—factors which are known to affect one's perceptions and attitudes toward abuse.³⁸ In other words, people in these categories, irrespective of race or ethnicity, tend to tolerate abuse to a greater degree than others not in those groups. Thus it might be the case that Mexican American women are responding to abusive behavior in the same manner that women who are of a different ethnicity but the same economic status respond to this phenomenon. Indeed, it may be that such variables as education, religion, and employment status play an even greater role than ethnicity in determining how an individual's perception of domestic abuse of women is shaped. Using this view then, one might expect that as Mexican American women attain higher levels of occupation, education, and income they will become less tolerant of domestic abuse.

Again we note that this study is exploratory and thus limits our ability to generalize to larger populations. One limitation is the small size of the sample; another was that in this study only women provided the information about abuse. Indeed, it would have been better if both sexes could have been heard from on this matter. Lastly, we propose several questions for future research. How do the attitudes toward domestic abuse of individuals that have not experienced it compare to those that have been battered? What are the attitudes about hostility toward women, and the characteristics and the perceptions of the causes and legitimacy of violence, of Anglo American men compared to Mexican American men and other minority groups of both sexes? Lastly, what are the implications for domestic abuse workers with respect to cultural variations among ethnic groups, regarding intervention in domestic abuse situations?

NOTES

¹ William Isaac Thomas, *The Unadjusted Girl* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Co., 1931), 41-50.

² Thomas, 48-50; Herbert Blumer, *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1956), 683-690; Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (New York: Doubleday, 1959), 123-42.

³ R. Emerson Dobash and Russell Dobash, *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against the Patriarchy* (New York: Free Press, 1979); Murray Arnold Strauss et al., *Behind Closed Doors* (New York: Anchor Books); Lenore F. Walker, *The Battered Woman Syndrome* (New York: Springer Publishing, 1984).

⁴ Richard J. Gelles, *The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Aggression Between Husbands And Wives* (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1972); William A. Stacey, *The Family Secret: Domestic Violence in America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1983); Straus et al.; Richard Teske and Mary Parker, *Spouse Abuse in Texas: A Study of Women's Attitudes and Experiences* (Texas, Criminal Justice Center Publication No. 82-T-0003, 1982).

⁵ M. Ramirez III, *Psychology of the Americas* (New York: Pergamon Press, 1983).

⁶ M. Ramirez III and A. Castaneda, *Cultural Democracy, Bicultural Development and Education* (New York: Academic Press, 1974).

⁷ J. L. Martinez, Jr., "Cross-cultural Comparison of Chicanos and Anglos on the Semantic Differential: Some Implications for Psychology," in *Chicano Psychology* (1st ed.), ed., J. L. Martinez, Jr. (New York: Academic Press, 1977).

⁸ Harmon M. Hosch, Gloria J. Chanez, Robert K. Bothwell, and Henry A. Munoz, "A Comparison of Anglo-American and Mexican-American Juror's Judgements of Mothers Who Fail to Protect Their Children from Abuse," *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 21, 20 (1991): 1681-98.

⁹ Helen P. Hazuda, Michael P. Stern, and Steven M. Haffner, "Acculturation and Assimilation Among Mexican Americans: Scales and Population-Based Data," *Social Science Quarterly* 69 (September 1988): 687-706.

¹⁰ Gillian Stevens, "The Social and Demographic Context of Language Use in the United States," *American Sociological Review* 57 (April 1992): 171-85.

Explorations in Ethnic Studies Vol. 17, No. 2

¹¹Joan W. Moore and Harry Pachon, *Hispanics in the United States* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1985), 119-20.

¹²Susan E. Keefe and Amado M. Padilla, *Chicano Ethnicity* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1987), 190.

¹³Moore and Pachon, 122.

¹⁴Andres Oppenheimer, "The Harsh Life of Chiapas Women," *The Miami Herald* (28 March 1994): 10A.

¹⁵Oppenheimer, 10A.

¹⁶Ruth Horowitz, "Passion, Submission and Motherhood: The Negotiation of Identity by Unmarried Innercity Chicanas," *Sociological Quarterly* 22 (1981): 241-52.

¹⁷Richard T. Schaefer, *Racial and Ethnic Groups* (Glenview, CA: St. Martin's Press, 1988): 314-15.

¹⁸Schaefer, 302-14.

¹⁹Schaefer, 314.

²⁰Hosch, 1681.

²¹G. Hofstede, *Culture's Consequences* (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980).

²²Hosch, 1682.

²³Horowitz, 241-52.

²⁴Horowitz, 245.

²⁵Horowitz, 244.

²⁶Abbey B. Berenson, Norma J. Stiglich, Gregg S. Willkinson, and Garland D. Anderson, "Drug Abuse and Other Risk Factors for Physical Abuse in Pregnancy among White Non-Hispanic, Black and Hispanic Women," *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 164, 6 (1991):1491-99.

²⁷Berenson et al., 1494.

Evans and Torres - Perceptions of Domestic Abuse

²⁸Robert E. Park, "The Concept of Social Distance," *Journal of Applied Sociology* 8 (July-August 1924): 339-44; Gordon Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1958), 87-92.

²⁹David Alvarez and Frank Bean, "The Mexican American Family," in *Ethnic Families in America: Patterns and Variations*, eds. C. Mindel and R. W. Habenstein (New York: Elsevier, 1976), 277-78; John Burma, *Mexican Americans in the United States* (New York: Schenkman, 1970), 23-24; Howard S. Erlanger and Fred Persily, "Estrangement, Machismo, and Gang Violence" (Madison, Wisconsin, unpublished discussion paper, University of Wisconsin Institute for Research on Poverty, 1976); Alfredo Mirandé, *The Chicano Experience: An Alternative Perspective* (South Bend, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1985), 165-81; William A. Vega, et al, "Cohesion and Adaptability in Mexican American Families," *Journal of Marriage and Family* 48 (1986): 858.

³⁰Norma Williams, *The Mexican American Family: Tradition and Change* (Dix Hills, NY: General Hall, 1990), 145.

³¹Keefe and Padilla, 144.

³²Alejandro Portes and Ruben G. Rumbaut, *Immigrant America: A Portrait* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 14; Alvarez and Bean, 285; Edward Murguia and W. Parker Frisbie, "Trends in Mexican American Inter-marriage: Recent Findings in Perspective," *Social Science Quarterly* 58 (December 1977): 374-89; Mary Sherwood, "Striving Toward Assimilation," *Corpus Christi Times-Caller* (29 December 1988): D14-16; Edward Murguia, *Chicano Inter-marriage* (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1982), 5; *Assimilation, Colonialism and the Mexican American People* (Lahman, MD: University Press of America, 1989); Joan W. Moore and Harry Pachon, *Hispanics in the United States* (Englewood, CA: Prentice-Hall, 1985); Evelyn P. Stevens, "Machismo and Marianismo," *Society* 10 (1973): 57-63.

³³Vega, 858; Leo Grebler, Joan W. Moore, Ralph C. Guzman, *The Mexican American People: The Nation's Second Largest People* (New York: Free Press, 1970), 350-77; Mirandé, 165-81; Steven P. Wallace, "Macro and Micro Issues in Intergenerational Relationships within the Latino Family and Community" (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, San Antonio, 1984); Steven P. Wallace and Elisa Linda Facio, "Moving Beyond Familism: Potential Contributions of Gerontological Theory to Studies of Chicano/Latino Aging" (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, New York, 1986).

Explorations in Ethnic Studies Vol. 17, No. 2

³⁴M. Baca Zinn, "Employment and Education of Mexican-American Women: The Interplay of Modernity and Ethnicity in Eight Families," *Harvard Educational Review*, 50 (1980): 47-62.

³⁵Teske and Parker.

³⁶Herman Loether and Donald McTavish, *Descriptive and Inferential Statistics: An Introduction* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976), 345-56.

³⁷Park, 1924; Allport.

³⁸Horowitz, 241-52.