



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
**Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University**

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

5-2011

The Effects of Domestic Violence: The Male Victims Perspective.

RaMon B. Younger
East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Younger, RaMon B., "The Effects of Domestic Violence: The Male Victims Perspective." (2011). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 1257. <http://dc.etsu.edu/etd/1257>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact dcadmin@etsu.edu.

The Effects of Domestic Violence: The Male Victims Perspective

A thesis

presented to

the faculty of the Department of Criminal Justice & Criminology

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts in Criminal Justice & Criminology

by

RaMon Bernard Younger

May 2011

Larry Miller, Ph.D., Chair

Michael Braswell, Ph.D.

Dennis Hamm, Ph.D.

Keywords: Domestic Violence, Male Victims, Emotional Abuse, Physical Abuse

ABSTRACT

The Effects of Domestic Violence: The Male Victims Perspective

by

RaMon Bernard Younger

Domestic violence from a male victim's perspective is something that is not discussed in society very much because information is very limited and incidents are often unreported. Research was done on this aspect of domestic violence to see how the types of abuse have had an impact on the victim from a physical and emotional perspective. The secondary data used for this study were from the Violence and Threats of Violence Against Women and Men in the United States, 1994-1996. Eight thousand men were selected to participate in the survey. The question of whether domestic violence is a problem was examined by race. It was determined that there was a relationship between these 2 variables with an actual significance of .000.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated in memory of my grandfather, Walter H. Younger and my brother, Carlos D. Younger.

Granddaddy, I miss you very much and I want you to know that not a day goes by that I do not think about you. You are my angel, I was blessed to have you in my life for 21 years, and the memories that I have of you will last me for a lifetime! I love you and this one is for you!

Carlos, my brother, though we never got to meet on this Earth, I want you to know that I think of you every day and I know you are looking down upon me. I love you big brother and I hope that I am making you proud!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for allowing me to live out my dreams everyday and for giving me the strength and knowledge to pursue my passion here at East Tennessee State University. Secondly, I would like to thank my parents Robin Younger and Bernard Vennable for bringing me into this world; I love you both with all my heart, thank you for your support. My grandmother, Rebecca Younger, I would like to thank you for being the best grandmother in the world and I could not have gone through this without your love and support. To the members of the Hubbard and Younger families, thanks for all you have done for me. To my aunts, uncles, and cousins, thank you all for your continued love and support. My sister, Rekita, I love you and I am proud to be your big brother. To Shanice, Bryant, and Minnie, I hope that I can be best brother and stepson possible. My extended families, the Coe's (Kevin, Trish, Ashley, and Sandy), the Arnold and Kelsey families (Penny, Jay, Amanda, Audrey, Alysia, and Amani), Mrs. Pat Shaffer, Ms. Teresa Blackburn, the Clarks, the Jacksons, and the Elba Missionary Baptist Church family, thank all of you for your love and support down through years. I am blessed to have you all as a part of my family and love each of you. The family at Virginia Intermont College (past and present), I want to thank you for teaching me the skills I needed so that I can continue to move forward in pursuit of my dreams. To all my other family and friends, I love all of you and thank you for being there for me through the good times and the bad times.

Special thanks my committee chair, Dr. Larry Miller, for serving as my committee chair and guiding me along the way. Dr. Michael Braswell and Dr. Dennis Hamm, thank you all for serving as committee members, I was honored that you accepted my invitation to be a part of my committee.

I would like to thank the faculty, staff, and my peers in the Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology especially Christine Ketelaar for helping me get through process with minimal setbacks. My “CJ” brothers and sisters: Myles Cook, Dustin Osborne, Dustin Melbardis, Taylor Hayes, Kevin Flanary, Orrin Carr, John Haggerty, Michael Carter, Mical Carter, Megan Atwater, Chris Burkey, and Victoria Swenson, special thanks to each of you for making being wonderful classmates and friends and I will cherish the memories we made forever.

Lastly, I would like to thank Robin Elixson, Joe Nicholson, Dr. Mark Abel, KCRC, Ms. Toni Morris, and their staffs for being the most important part in my success from the instruction in the classroom in the early years to the setbacks and triumphs I have experienced in having to have surgeries and physical therapy sessions. I am forever grateful for what each of you has done to make my life so much better.

CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT	2
DEDICATION.....	3
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
LIST OF TABLES	8
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	9
Purpose of the Study.....	10
Limitations.....	11
Hypotheses.....	11
Definition of Terms.....	12
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	13
Theories of Abuse-Battering Defined.....	14
Types and Effects of Abuse.....	15
Types of Intimate Relationships Affected by Domestic Violence	19
Domestic Violence and Race.....	20
Domestic Violence and Children.....	21
Domestic Violence and Age.....	22
Domestic Violence Laws.....	22
Reporting Domestic Violence and Deaths.....	27
Battering Partners-Battered Men.....	29
3. METHODOLOGY.....	31
Data.....	31

Variables.....	33
Independent Variables.....	33
Dependent Variables.....	33
Methods of Analysis.....	34
4. FINDINGS-RESULTS.....	35
Statistical Summary.....	35
5. DISCUSSION.....	48
Null Hypothesis 1.....	48
Null Hypothesis 2.....	48
Null Hypothesis 3.....	49
Null Hypothesis 4.....	50
Null Hypothesis 5.....	51
Null Hypothesis 6.....	51
Null Hypothesis 7.....	51
Implications.....	52
Further Research.....	53
REFERENCES.....	54
VITA.....	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. States with Proarrest Policy.....	24
2. States with Mandatory Arrest Policy (Domestic Violence and Restraining Order).....	25
3. Aggressor Arrest Law.....	26
4. Frequencies for Age.....	36
5. Frequencies for Race.....	36
6. Frequencies for Respondent Income.....	37
7. Crosstabulation of Perception of Domestic Violence by Race.....	38
8. Crosstabulation of Respondent Income by Relationship Status.....	39
9. Crosstabulation of Wife or Partner Makes Victim Feel Inadequate by Age.....	40
10. Crosstabulation of Wife or Partner Frightens Victim by Age.....	41
11. Crosstabulation of Victim Slap or Hit as an Adult by Race.....	42
12. Crosstabulation of Victim Leaves Current Spouse or Partner by Age.....	43
13. Crosstabulation of How is the Violence from Spouse or Partner Upon Returning by Relationship Status.....	44
14. Crosstabulation of Current Spouse-Partner Leaves Relationship by Race.....	45
15. Crosstabulation of Victim Slap or Hit as an Adult by Age.....	46
16. Crosstabulation of Victim Slap or Hit as an Adult by Relationship Status.....	47

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Domestic violence is defined as an act of aggression that can be committed by a partner or family member. Warning signs of domestic violence are that victims are criticized by their spouses or partners for the small things, the victim is forced to have sex against his or her will, the blame for the violent outburst is placed on the victims, and the victims are monitored by their spouses or partners. Other warning signs are the uses of medications are controlled by his or her abusers, property of value to the victim is destroyed by the abuser, and threats are made against the victim and other members of their family (Montgomery, 2010). Barber (2008) stated that domestic violence could be defined from emotional, financial, and physical perspectives. Male victims of domestic violence rarely report their incidents of abuse. According to Barber a male is abused by his female partner every 14.6 seconds. Male victims often feel ashamed that this act of violence happens to them and struggle to decide what to do next. According to Fink (2006) in the United States intimate partner violence has affected 7.6% of males. The NCADV found that 1 out of 14 men have been assaulted physically by their current partner, spouse, or former partner in their lifetime. In addition, the NCADV found that 835,000 men are abused by their wives, spouses, or partners every year.

This was seen as a problem because males feel that they cannot address this matter because no one will listen to them and that any type of treatment will not help them solve their problems. Male victims are silent about the domestic violence incidents and do not contact authorities because they think that it is personal matter and they can take care of it. Battered men think that they will not be taken serious if they went to the authorities to report because of the stigma that domestic violence only happens to women and not men (Neeley-Bertrand, 2010).

The cost for treatment for male victims of domestic violence ranges around \$400 (Schneider, 2005). The Center for Disease Control and Prevention released a study that stated that the woman involved in the incident was the first to strike and that often the violence was one-sided (Chan, 2009). The perpetrator was the woman about 70% of the time. Domestic violence is not just experienced in the heterosexual community but also in the homosexual community.

Domestic violence shelters' focus is women and options for men are very limited especially with gay men. According to the Gay Men's Domestic Violence Project (n.d.), one in four gay men have experienced some form of domestic violence in their lifetime. Greenwood (2002) stated that males who are gay or bisexual are abused by their partner at a rate of 40%. The common types of abuse that male victims experience are emotional, physical, and psychological. Men tend to stay in abusive relationships for the same reasons that women do because they blame themselves for the abuse, there are children involved, and have some type of dependency as it relates to the abuser.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between male victims of domestic violence and the physical and emotional aspects of the abuse. It also examined how violence has had an impact on the male's current relationship. This study also examined how violence has had an impact on the male's current relationship. The demographics that will be examined in this study are age, race, relationship status, and individual income. This study provided an insight on how men can be affected by the violence and how it will follow them for the rest of the lives.

Limitations

A limitation presented in this study on the effects of male victims of domestic violence includes the sample size of 8000 men chosen at random via telephone. Another limitation was that this data collection was done between the years of 1994 and 1996. Sexual orientation was a limitation because it was not defined clearly and no one who was homosexual was able to say that his relationship status was married.

Hypotheses

After reviewing the literature, I developed the null hypothesis indicated below:

H1: There is no relationship between the male victims' perception of domestic violence and their race.

H2: Domestic violence is not associated with the men's relationship status and their income status.

H3: Domestic violence is not related to a male victim's feelings of self-worth based on age.

H4: There is no relationship between physical violence and a male victim's age, race, and relationship status.

H5: There is no relationship between the age of the victims and whether victims will leave their current spouse or partner because of incidents of domestic violence.

H6: There is no relationship between domestic violence and whether the victim would return to the relationship.

H7: There is no relationship between the race of perpetrators and whether they (perpetrators) were leaving the relationship because of violence.

Definition of Terms

Abuse – physical or mental maltreatment often resulting in mental, emotional, sexual, or physical injury (Garner, 2004).

Abuser – One who abuses someone or something (Garner, 2004)

Domestic Violence – violence between members of a household, usually spouses; an assault or other violent acts committed by one member of a household against another (Garner, 2004).

Emotional Abuse – physical or mental abuse that causes or could cause serious emotional injury (Garner, 2004).

Perpetrator – a person who commits a crime or offense (Garner, 2004)

Intimate Partner Violence – abbreviation is IPV

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Domestic violence has been a controversial topic for some time now. This review section offers more insight as to how domestic violence has become an epidemic in the United States in recent years. Signs of domestic violence include but are not limited to the abuse of alcohol or drugs, behavioral change, and the threat of physical harm in order to receive attention from the victim (Stop Abuse for Everyone, 2002). Domestic violence has been a problem plaguing society since the times of ancient Babylon. The public started to become aware of domestic violence in the 1970s. The question of whether domestic violence is an intergenerational problem is answered based on the finding that the stronger predictor of violence is a result of witnessing parental violence as a child and not experiencing direct violence as child (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996).

The term of “domestic violence” is used loosely in society. The term is referred to in society in the context of male-to-female abuse (Johnson & Ferrero, 2000). In America three out of four citizens know someone who has been victimized domestically. Ten percent of males and 21% of female victims contact a social agency when trying to leave a relationship (Domestic Violence Resource Center, 2011). Intimate partner assaults that are physical are done to women at rate of 4.8 million compared 2.9 millions assaults committed against men (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011). In 1998 one million violent crimes against victims were committed by a current or former spouse. The number of male victim homicides between 1976 and 1998 fell about 4% per year. Simple assault is the type of crime that male victims experience most of the time (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). Women compared to men are five to eight times more likely to be abused by an intimate partner (An Abuse, Rape, and Domestic Violence Aid

and Resource Collection, 2011). Some of the myths of domestic violence include some people deserve the abuse they receive, domestic violence is not a community issue, mental illness can cause domestic violence, and that it is a problem between heterosexual couples (Creative Communications Group, 2009). The month of October serves as Domestic Violence Awareness Month (Domestic Violence Awareness Project, 2009). Stop Abusive and Violent Environments (2010) lists seven facts about domestic violence. The facts are that 1 in 10 American couple engages in intimate partner violence each year, men and women initiate domestic violence at similar rates, partner aggression is often two-way; domestic violence is concentrated in certain groups. Many factors contribute to incidents of domestic violence, improvements are being made nationally to reduce intimate partner aggression, and victims face obstacles when trying to seek assistance.

Theories of Abuse-Battering Defined

The generational theory of abuse states that males and females that who either experience abuse or witness violence or both in their childhood are more likely to become involved in violent relationships when they become adults. Symbolic interaction theory is based on a person's view of himself or herself and his or her view of the world. This theory suggests how the victim sees himself or herself through his or her own eyes is important and the individual can answer the question of individuality. The view of the world perception of the symbolic interaction theory suggests that one must make sense of others and behave according to that sense. The behavior is supporting the view of the world (Stets, 1988). There are three theoretical approaches to battering: intra-individual or psychological approach, social psychological approach, and the sociocultural approach. The intra-individual or psychological approach examines the biological aspect of violence. The social psychological approach explains how the

social learning theory is viewed in relation to violence. The sociocultural approach acknowledges the culture of violence (Stets, 1988). The intra-individual approach examines how a person responds to aggression and the characteristics displayed. The social psychological aspect highlights how violence is taught throughout life and not through experiences. The socialcultural aspect acknowledges how violence is used as a way to get a “rise” out of someone and how violence influences the relationship and one’s masculinity is the key component in how someone is perceived to be violent through interactions.

Types and Effects of Abuse

The concept of domestic violence is based around power and control. The Duluth Model acknowledges the cycle of violence and how it is continued through methods of economic abuse, emotional abuse and, isolation (Domestic Abuse Intervention Project, n.d.). The cycle of violence consists of six categories: abuse, guilt, excuses, “normal” behavior, fantasy and planning, and set-up (Smith & Segal, 2010). The definition of physical abuse is “using physical force to control an intimate partner by pushing, shoving, slapping, biting, punching, choking, throwing objects at the partner, or assaulting them with a weapon” (Rohrbaugh, 2006). Polsky and Markowitz (2004 p.1) also defined physical abuse “the intentional use of physical force with the potential for causing death, disability, injury or harm.”

Abuse from an economic perspective is defined as not letting the victim be financially independent. According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (n.d.), economic abuse is the reason that about half of domestic violence victims lose their jobs. The abusers feel as though they have the power to control the finances in their household. Behavior that constitutes economic abuse includes harassing the victim at the workplace, stealing from victim, and punishing victim by means of physical or sexual abuse because money was not accounted

for. The abuse affects all types of income levels. Economic abuse is a form of emotional abuse (Smith & Segal, 2010). Statistics from the study “A Closer Look at Men who Sustain Intimate Terrorism by Women” show that 67.2% of men were falsely accused by the women of beating or hitting her. Approximately 49% of the women falsely accused the men of physical abuse against the children in the household. About 15% of the men surveyed were accused falsely by the woman for sexually abusing the children. Approximately 39% of the men surveyed in this study had restraining orders filed against them based on false information given by the women (Hines & Douglas, 2010).

Emotional abuse is defined as “undermining an individual’s sense of self-worth, self-esteem or both” (Office on Violence Against Women, n.d.). Emotional abuse or psychological abuse can also be defined as “any use of words, voice, or lack of action meant to control, hurt or demean another person” (*Types of Domestic*, n.d.). Polsky and Markowitz (2004, p. 2) defined the term as “involving (emotional) trauma to the victim caused by acts, or coercive tactics.” The types of behaviors that are defined as emotional abuse are name-calling, humiliation, low self-worth, and manipulation. Emotional abuse can cause someone to feel worthless. The most common form of emotional abuse is verbal assaults. The abusers can say things that would insult, demean, or cause their victims to doubt themselves (University of Michigan Health System, 2007). Isolation is a form of emotional abuse. Isolation is done when abusers control every aspect of victims’ lives to the point where the victims cannot do anything without telling their partners (Domestic Abuse Intervention Project, n.d.)

The cycle of violence starts with abuse according to Smith and Segal (2010). The cycle begins of abuse begins when the perpetrator displays violent behavior. Guilt is displayed when the abusers acknowledge what they have done but worries about what happens after the violent

act has taken place. The perpetrators then begin to make excuses for what they had done by providing some type of justification as to why. “Normal” behavior is displayed so that the victim will not leave the relationship and the abuser promises to make things better. The fantasizing and planning stage is where the abusers think about committing the violent act again and how they are going to do it. The set-up phase is where the abuser receives the most pleasure because the plan begins to take motion thus setting up the stage for the violent act to take place. A study completed between December 1997 and March 2001 in Shelby County, Tennessee found that female batterers were more likely to use a weapon in an act of violence than male batterers were (Hines & Douglas, 2009). Herrera (2008) acknowledges that women possess the same qualities that a male abuser does such as charm, controlling, emotionally and physical abusive, isolation, and jealousy. The perpetrators display “charm” by being on their best behavior and does not show the signs that they are an abuser. Abusers want to have a sense of “control” in everything that does from working to interacting with others. The victim experiences emotional abuse by being constantly demeaned and has a low self-esteem. Jealousy is a trait that is displayed when the abuser is making accusations of infidelity (Herrera, 2008).

There are many reasons as to why men stay in abusive relationships. Brown explains some of these reasons in “Male Victims of Domestic Violence – When HE is the Victim.” The three main reasons that Brown (2009) states that men stay in abusive relationships are assuming blame, dependency on the abuser for survival, and for the children. Male victims of domestic violence often assume blame for the acts of violence because they feel as though they have done something wrong to cause their batterers to abuse them. Another reason is that male victims have a need to stay with their abusers because they are dependent on them for support. Children are also a reason that men stay because they feel that if they leave the children would have to suffer

the same consequences they have had to and they stay as way to protect the children. Getting out of an abusive relationship can be hard to do. If victims are planning on leaving their abusers there are certain steps that they should follow such as calling for help, finding somewhere safe to go to, staying away from their abusers, and enlisting help (Gleason, 2008). These steps are crucial because if victims leave and do not follow these steps, it can cause their abusers to become angry when victims are found. If victims decide to give the relationship another chance, it could have drastic consequences.

A victim's health physical and mental health state can also be impacted because do domestic violence According to the Centers for Disease Control victims who are abused physically are likely to suffer from injuries such as broken bones, internal bleeding, and bruises. Emotionally, a victim can have trust issues in relationships and suffer from depression (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2006). The act of domestic violence can also have mental health effects such as anxiety and panic attacks (The Ripple Effect, 2002). Health risks factors of domestic violence include alcohol abuse, chronic pain, and attempted suicides (Moskovic, 2004). Some health effects such as brain damage and sexually transmitted diseases are long-term (World Health Organization, 2002). Wisner, Gilmer, Saltzman, and Zink (1999) stated that women who are victims have higher healthcare premiums than those who are not victims of domestic violence. The healthcare costs for domestic violence victims are different for women and men. The average medical cost for women according to the CDC was about \$500 compared to a cost under \$100 for men. The average mental health cost for women was over \$200 compared to a cost of \$80 for men (Corporate Alliance to End Partner Violence, 2002-2011). Men who are abused by women are found to suffer from mental health problems because of the violence, depression, and distress from psychological perspective are some of the effects. In

2004 according to the National Crime Victimization Survey 1.3 per 1,000 men had been assaulted by an intimate partner. The National Violence Against Women Survey found that men were physically assaulted by their current or former spouse at a rate of 0.8 %. The state of South Carolina released a study in October 2000 that analyzed the victims of domestic violence based on the status of their relationships, race, gender, and age. The South Carolina study was conducted in 1999 and 50 % of the cases were found to be recorded as simple assault. In 66.2 % of the cases, the relationship between the victim and the offender was a boyfriend or girlfriend (28.4), spouse (27.9), and common law spouse (9.9). The victims of domestic violence by relationship to the offender (husband to wife) and gender (female to male) based on marriage accounted for 81.1 % and 18.9 % respectively. The findings based on a link romantically were 83.9 % that were females and 16.1 % were males. The study also disclosed that victims of domestic violence in relation race and sex and it stated that 12.9 % were white males while 12.1 % were nonwhite males. White male victims (10.8 %) and nonwhite victims (8.1 %) were married at the time of the domestic incident (McManus, 2000). The state of South Carolina did this study to assist social services agencies in getting the proper resources to those who need it.

Types of Intimate Relationships Affected by Domestic Violence

The types of relationships that are affected by domestic violence are cohabitation, dating and courtship, and same sex relationships (Johnson & Ferrero, 2000). Individuals who are in cohabiting relationship are not protected by some laws of domestic violence. Factors that courts must weigh to determine in a case of domestic violence where the couple is deemed to be cohabiting are continuity and length of the relationship, joint ownership of property, sharing of income and expenses, whether parties are perceived as husband and wife, and a sexual relationship between the two while living together (Billingsley, 2010). The case of *Randall v.*

Stewart (223 S.W.3d 121) (Ky. App., 2007) highlighted that the dating relationship itself does not constitute getting a domestic violence order of protection. The Kentucky Court of Appeals determined because of this case that one has to be living with his or her partner to get an order of protection (*Randall v. Stewart*, 2007). The dating and courtship type of relationship in relation to domestic violence is commonly known as dating violence. Approximately 20% of people in a dating relationship experience abuse at some point during the relationship (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). The types of behaviors experienced in dating violence are similar to those common in other relationships. Dating violence is common among teenagers. Females are more likely to be victims to this type of violence than males. Teens are also more likely to suffer abuse from the partners than adults are. A same-sex relationship is another type of relationship that has been affected by domestic violence. As mentioned before, some states do not acknowledge same sex relationships in the context of abuse. Seven states have in their legislation that domestic violence is a crime involving heterosexual couples not homosexual. The domestic violence laws are gender-neutral in 37 states (Lehmann, 2002). Men in homosexual relationships are abused more than those in heterosexual relationships. The same comparison can be made for women. Women involved in homosexual relationships most likely have been abused at some point by a man. Domestic abuse tends to occur at the same rate as those in a heterosexual relationship. Treatment is different in same-sex relationships because police would not arrest someone who was abused by his or her partner who is involved in this type of relationship (Seelau & Seelau, 2005). Same-sex domestic violence shares some of the same characteristics as those involved opposite-sex domestic violence situations. The characteristics of violence are different in that abusive partners could threaten the victims by exposing their sexual orientation, and isolation is viewed more from a social perspective (Rohrbaugh, 2006). Domestic violence resources are

limited because incidents are commonly recorded as being between the opposite sex and not same sex.

Domestic Violence and Race

Domestic violence is higher in the African-American and Hispanic communities than in the White community. The state of California compared domestic violence arrests by race for a 10-year period from 1988 to 1998. The statistics were broken down by the population per 100,000. The arrest rates dropped for Whites (1988: 40.3%, 1998: 34.3%) and Blacks (1988: 22.0%, 1998: 19.2%) while Hispanics (1988: 32.9%, 1998: 40.6%) and Others (1988: 4.3%, 1998: 6.0%) saw an increase (Herbert, 1999). African-American men also have a higher chance of experiencing intimate partner violence than White men (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). Domestic violence affects all races. Domestic violence victims who are minorities experience and report the violence more than those in the White community.

Domestic Violence and Children

The relationship between domestic violence and children has been tumultuous. According to McDonald, Jouriles, Ramisetty-Mikler, Caetano, and Green (2006) about 23 million children live in households that had experienced some form of intimate partner violence. Children are the main reason victims tend to stay in the abusive relationship because victims do not want to take the children without having a back-up plan. Several studies have been done to see how many incidents of domestic violence children have seen and according to Kracke and Hahn (2008), about 3 to 17 million incidents had been seen by children. The effects of domestic violence have been substantial on children. Children experience some of the same effects such as anxiety and self-blame as women. They can also exhibit some of the abusive behaviors at school by acting out or fighting. Children growing up in violent households are more likely to become

batterers than those who grow in nonviolent households. Effects of domestic violence can also hurt the child socially. Negative behavior can cause the child to become isolated, thus making it hard for the child to make it in life successfully (Volpe, 1996).

Domestic Violence and Age

Women from ages 16 to 24 are more likely to be abused by their intimate partners than any other age group (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). At the other end of the age spectrum most women at risk of being murdered by their intimate partners ranged from ages 35 to 49 (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). McManus (2000) examined the ages of domestic violence victims in the state of South Carolina and it was determined that most of the victims ranged from ages 25 to 34, but a majority of the victims involved in a romantic relationship were ages 18 to 24. McManus's study also found that a majority of the victims were younger than their offenders. These findings are on target with national numbers. The average age of a male domestic violence victim in the United States was between the ages of 25 and 34 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2008).

Domestic Violence Laws

The law enforcement response to domestic violence is low partly because victims do not want to report the crime and police officers do not think that responding to calls relating to domestic violence is real police work. According to Buzawa and Buzawa (1996) the same can be said for the court system because the dismissal of domestic violence cases is high in part because the prosecution makes the victims feel responsible, the attitudes toward the abuser tend to change over time for the victim, and the victims think that the incident was a result of their behavior. Victims tend to bear the costs of prosecution in the form of retaliation from an economical and physical standpoint. In the late 1970s the laws began to make domestic violence punishable

under the law meaning that it is mandatory in some states that someone initially has to go to jail when a domestic dispute is reported and that charges can be dismissed after the case has been heard by the court. The Protection from Abuse Act adopted by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania allowed police officers to make warrantless arrests for acts of domestic violence that were not witnessed by anyone. Similar laws were adopted in other states. The response to help on a federal level with this issue was done through helping shelters by giving money and establishing the national domestic violence hotline. The post office could not disclose information about where victims lived. The location of shelters cannot be disclosed to their abusers. Moreover, it is a federal crime to cross state lines to commit an act of domestic violence (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996). Mandatory arrests were enacted after this law because someone had to be held accountable. Issuances of protective orders were also an option because they allowed victims to take some course of action against their abusers. Violating protective orders carried a mandated sentence and the sentences are handed down by a judge. Specialized courts can be found in some major cities that deal mostly with family and domestic issues because the traditional courts are being weighed down by having many of these cases in their systems. The National Crime Victimization Survey stated that in their relationships, 50% of couples in America have experienced one or more incidents of domestic violence (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996).

The laws pertaining to domestic violence differ from state to state. The language of the laws also is different because same-sex couples are excluded in some states. There are laws pertaining to domestic violence on a federal level. The Violence Against Women Act was passed by Congress in 1994. Reauthorizations to the Violence Against Women Act were made in 2000 and 2005. This federal law is only used in certain circumstances like crossing state lines

(National Domestic Violence Hotline, n.d.). Victims have rights under the federal law such as the right to be reasonably protected from the accused offender, the right to restitution, and the right to know information about the conviction, sentencing, imprisonment, and release of the offender. Federal domestic violence crimes that are committed are felonies. The FBI typically handles federal domestic violence cases (United States Department of Justice, n.d.). Most of domestic violence cases are handled on a local and state level (See Tables 1-3). The state of Wyoming is the only state in the United States in which mandatory arrest policies are not in place for domestic violence related offenses (Respecting Accuracy in Domestic Abuse Reporting, 2008). Women typically fill out more applications for protection orders than men (Davis, 2010).

Table 1

States with Proarrest Policy

Arkansas

California

Florida

Massachusetts

Michigan

Montana

North Dakota

Tennessee

Source: Respecting Accuracy in Domestic Abuse Reporting (Ed.). (2008).

Table 2

States with Mandatory Arrest Policy (Domestic Violence and Restraining Order)

Alaska***

Arizona*

Colorado***

Connecticut*

District of Columbia*

Delaware**

Iowa***

Kansas***

Kentucky**

Louisiana***

Maine***

Maryland**

Minnesota**

Mississippi***

Missouri**

Nebraska**

Nevada***

New Hampshire**

New Jersey***

New Mexico**

New York***

North Carolina**

North Dakota**

Ohio*

Table 2 (continued)

Oregon***
Pennsylvania**
Rhode Island***
South Carolina***
South Dakota***
Tennessee**
Texas**
Utah***
Virginia***
West Virginia**
Washington***
Wisconsin***

Note: *Denotes Domestic Violence Only **Denotes Restraining Order Only ***Denotes Domestic Violence and Restraining Order

Source: Respecting Accuracy in Domestic Abuse Reporting (Ed.). (2008).

Table 3

Aggressor Arrest Law

Alabama
Alaska
California
Colorado
Florida
Georgia
Iowa

Table 3 (continued)

Maryland
Missouri
Montana
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New York
Ohio
Oregon
Rhode Island
South Carolina
South Dakota
Utah
Virginia
Washington
Wisconsin

Source: Respecting Accuracy in Domestic Abuse Reporting (Ed.). (2008).

Reporting Domestic Violence and Deaths

Cases of domestic violence are generally not reported. According to the NCADV (2007) about one quarter of all physical assaults are reported. Felson and Paré (n.d.) studied the reporting aspects of domestic violence and found that in the National Violence Against Women Survey that men typically do not report acts of domestic violence to authorities. Reasons that

reporting may be on the rise are because of public awareness and mandatory arrest laws. Minor incidents of domestic violence are often not reported by victims. These acts of abuse are typically underreported for two reasons: the acts are committed behind the closed doors of the home and the police officers do not report it because of the socioeconomic status of the victim (Stets, 1988). According to Buzawa and Buzawa (1996) victims do not report the crime because interaction with police was poor and the perception that domestic violence is not a crime. There are many fears of reporting the incident ranging from PTSD to negative view in the community. Domestic violence calls range from 2% to 50% of police department calls. Calls for domestic violence incidents are during the nighttime hours and on weekends (Buzawa & Buzawa, 1996). Socioeconomic status is an issue because the lower class incidents are reported more often than in the higher class because of the resources that are used such as public assistance. The lower class tends to rely on agencies such as courts, police, and social services, whereas the higher class tends to use counseling to solve their problems (Stets, 1988). The average person's education level involved in a battering relationship is high school.

Lichtenstein and Johnson (2009) examined the reporting of domestic violence from an older African-American female perspective. These women did not report incidents of domestic violence to police because they were dependent on their abusers and did not want to split up their families. Instead of reporting the incidents to the police, African American women tend to rely on their religion to get them through hard times. The study by Lichtenstein and Johnson (2009) found that compared to White women, African-American women are less likely to report incidents of domestic violence. According to Catalano (2007) based on gender, the reporting of domestic violence incidents by males and females increased in the period of 1994 to 2005. Catalano also examines reporting in the context of race and gender. African American females

reported incidents of nonfatal intimate partner violence at a higher rate compared to females of other races. Between African American males and males of other races it was determined that African American males reported fewer incidents of nonfatal intimate partner violence compared to males of other races. Among African American women and men it was determined that the women reported more incidents of nonfatal intimate partner violence than men (Catalano, 2007).

Violent relationships can ultimately lead to victims dying from their injuries or committing suicide. Male victims are more likely to commit suicide than females (Davis, 2010). Davis (2010) acknowledges that in a report completed by the CDC titled *Surveillance for Violent Deaths – National Violent Death Reporting System* that intimate partner violence attributed to 30% of suicides. As of 2004 Alaska was number one in domestic violence deaths among women in the United States (Violence Policy Center, 2006). In 2001 San Joaquin County, California had four domestic violence related murders, the victims ranged from 25 to 42 years of age. San Joaquin County formed a team to examine how domestic violence deaths have affected their community and what local and state government agencies can do to help and promote awareness (Willett, n.d.). According to Violence Policy Center (2008), 92% of the female domestic violence victims murdered in the United States in 2006 knew their killers.

Battering Partners-Battered Men

Men find it hard to see themselves as victims. They tend to feel that battering is associated with women and not men. Men do not carry the label of ‘victim.’ Men who are bisexual or gay believe that they deserve the abuse that they have to endure because of their sexual orientation. Male victims find it hard to seek help because help is mainly gender based and they feel that they do not have the right to seek help because they have become part of the problem by defending themselves (Hamberger & Renzetti, 1996). “Mutual combat” is a term that

states that women take part in the abuse against their partners (Miller & Meloy, 2006). “Mutual combat” is also the definition of same sex battery (Hamberger & Renzetti, 1996). Women are less physical compared to males. The motives for women arrested for domestic violence include self-defense, retaliation, and knowledge that they were going to be abused. Women tend to commit violence on a less frequent basis than men do (Hamberger & Renzetti, 1996). A study by Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, and Sebastian (1991) stated that female college students were more likely than males to use violence in the form of control, anger, and retaliation for emotional hurt. The cycle of battering consists of three stages: tension building, the explosion or acute battering incident, and the calm, loving stage. The tension building stage is the atmosphere starts to turn negative and a violent act is imminent. The explosion or acute battering incident is when the abuser acts out because things are not going right. The calm, loving stage is when the abuser tries to make things better and promises never to abuse again (Stets, 1988).

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine if there is a relationship between male victims of domestic violence and the physical and emotional aspects of the abuse. It will also examine how violence has had an impact on the male's current relationship. Questions were taken from secondary data that analyzes the most common aspects of domestic violence on those two levels and the following hypotheses were generated:

H1: There is no relationship between the male victims' perception of domestic violence and their race.

H2: Domestic violence is not associated with the men's relationship status and their income status.

H3: Domestic violence is not related to a male victim's feelings of self-worth based on age.

H4: There is no relationship between physical violence and a male victim's age, race, and relationship status.

H5: There is no relationship between the age of the victims and whether victims will leave their current spouse or partner because of incidents of domestic violence.

H6: There is no relationship between domestic violence and whether the victim would return to the relationship.

H7: There is no relationship between the race of perpetrators and whether they (perpetrators) were leaving the relationship because of violence.

Data

The data obtained and used for the current study were from the archives of the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD). The dataset is accessible through the University of

Michigan's Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research website. The title of the dataset is Violence and Threats of Violence against Women and Men in the United States, 1994 – 1996 (ICPSR 02566). The study focused mainly on women, but men were also allowed to participate in the survey. The survey was titled National Violence Against Women Survey and was conducted via telephone by interviewers at Schulman, Ronca, Bucuvalas, Inc. The principal investigators of the survey were Patricia Tjaden and Nancy Thoennes. The survey focused on six aspects: general fear of violence, emotional abuse inflicted by a spouse or partner, physical abuse experienced as a child, physical abuse experienced as an adult by perpetrator, forcible rape or stalking experienced, and incidents of threatened violence experienced. The survey had 14 sections that ranged from respondent characteristics to detailed acts of victimization. The sample size for this study consisted of 8,005 men who were residents in the United States of America. The sample size was reduced to 8,000 men. The study was conducted from February to May 1996. The ages of the respondents were 18 and older. The findings of the study were published in 1999. The following questions that were selected from the questionnaire to be examined in this thesis in the context of age, race, relationship status, and individual income are:

- Do you think domestic violence (in general) is...more of a problem for men today, less of a problem for men today, about the same, or did not know?
- Does your current wife or partner make you feel inadequate?
- Does your current wife or partner frighten you?
- Have you ever been hit or slapped as an adult?
- Did you ever leave your current wife or partner because she or he was violent toward you?

- After you returned, did your wife's or partner's violence toward you...increase, decrease, stay the same, or did not know?
- Did your current wife or partner ever leave you because she or he was violent towards you?

Variables

The variables used for this study were selected from the dataset, Violence and Threats of Violence against Women and Men in the United States, 1994 – 1996 (ICPSR 02566).

Independent Variables

Four independent variables were used to determine the relationship between the acts of domestic violence committed against men and their age, race, relationship status, and individual income. The variable of age was recoded as under 30=1, 30-45=2, over 45=3, and refused=4. Age was a scale variable. Race was recoded as White=1, Nonwhite=2, do not know=3, and refused=4. Race was a nominal variable. The nominal variable, relationship status, was recoded as married=1, unmarried=2, do not know=3, and refused=4. The variable of individual income is based on before taxes in 1995 was recoded as under \$10,000=1, \$10,000-\$25,000=2, \$25,000-\$50,000=3, \$50,000-\$100,000=4, over \$100,000=5, none=6, do not know=7, and refused=8. The variable of individual income was nominal.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables were thinking that domestic violence is a problem; wife or partner makes victim feel inadequate; and wife or partner frightens victim. Other dependent variables included are victim slap or hit as an adult, victim leaves current spouse or partner because of violence directed at him, how has the violence from the spouse or partner changed upon the victim returning to the relationship, and current spouse or partner leaving relationship

because of violence. The variable, thinking that domestic violence is a problem was coded 1=more of a problem, 2=less of a problem, 3=about the same, 4=do not know, and 5=refused. The variables of inadequacy, wife or partner frightens victim, victim slap or hit as an adult, victim leaves current spouse or partner because of violence directed at him, and current spouse or partner leaving relationship because of violence was coded as yes=1, no=2, 3=do not know, and 4=refused. These variables are nominal. The nominal variable of how is the violence from the spouse or partner upon returning to the relationship is coded 1=increase, 2=decrease, 3=stay the same, and 4=do not know.

Methods of Analysis

Contingency table analysis was used to test the hypotheses. The variables of age, race, relationship status, individual income, inadequacy, frightens, slap or hit, victim leaving spouse or partner, and current spouse or partner leaving partner were crosstabulated. The Chi-Square statistic was used to test and determine the significance of the relationship. Cramer's V was used to measure the strength and validity of significant relationships.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS-RESULTS

This study was designed to see how men are affected by acts of domestic violence committed against them from a physical and emotional perspective. The thesis was designed to see how male victims perceive themselves. It was also designed to see does domestic violence in general and the male's perception of domestic violence affect them.

This chapter reports the findings of the study from the statistical tests that were done in this study. Frequencies were done on the independent variables of the study. The results of the study are shown in Tables 7 through 16 that are included and discussed in the text.

Statistical Summary

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences was used to run the analysis of the results via cross-tabulations. The frequencies of the independent variables show the numbers and the percentages of how many of the 8,000 men answered the questions asked in the secondary data. The dependent variables are located on the rows of the tables and the independent variables are located on the columns of the tables. The independent variable of age showed the percentages of the men who participated in the survey. Males under age 30 accounted for 21.7%. Males between the ages of 31 and 45 accounted for 40.8%. Males over age 45 accounted for 37.5% (See Table 4).

Table 4

Frequencies for Age

Age	Frequency	Valid %
Under 30	1,722	21.7%
30-45	3,231	40.8%
Over 45	2,966	37.5%
Total	7,919	100%

The independent variable of race indicated how many of the males were white and nonwhite who responded to the questions on the survey. About 82.8% were white and 17.2% were nonwhite (See Table 5).

Table 5

Frequencies for Race

Race	Frequency	Valid %
White	6,424	82.8%
Nonwhite	1,335	17.2%
Total	7,759	100%

When the respondents were asked to provide how much their income was in 1995 before taxes, 12.5% stated that they had an income under \$10,000. Approximately 27.5% stated that their income was between \$10,000 and \$25,000. Respondents' income ranging from \$25,000 to \$50,000 accounted for 37.5%. Males who had an income ranging from \$50,000 to \$100,000

accounted for 18.1%. Approximately 4.4% of the respondents stated that they had an income over \$100,000 (See Table 6: Respondent Income).

Table 6

Frequencies for Respondent Income

Income	Frequency	Valid %
Under \$10,000	817	12.5%
\$10,000-\$25,000	1,807	27.5%
\$25,000-\$50,000	2,460	37.5%
\$50,000-\$100,000	1,190	18.1%
Over \$100,000	286	4.4%
Total	6,560	100%

The variable of whether does the respondent think that domestic violence (in general) is a problem was compared by race. The majority (60.6%) of the respondents who responded to the question stated that it was more of a problem for men today. Approximately 3.7% responded by stating that it was less of a problem meaning that domestic violence is less of an issue for men today. Approximately 35.7% stated that issue of the domestic violence was about the same or did not know if it was an issue for men today. When broken down by race, 60% white males stated it was more of a problem while 63.5% of nonwhite males agreed. Approximately 3.4% of the white males stated it was less of a problem and 5.2% of the nonwhite males agreed. The percentage of white males who said that it was about the same or did not know was 36.6 and 31.3% of the nonwhite males concurred. The Chi-Square value of 20.642 indicated that there was a significant relationship ($.000 = p < .001$) between race and whether domestic violence is a problem. The value of Cramer's V was .052, indicating a weak association however. (See Table 7).

Table 7

Crosstabulation of Perception of Domestic Violence by Race

Race		White		Nonwhite		Total	
<u>Think Domestic Violence is...</u>	More of problem	N: 3,848	%: 60.0	N: 846	%: 63.5	N: 4,694	%: 60.6
	Less of problem	N: 219	%: 3.4	N: 69	%: 5.2	N: 288	%: 3.7
	About the same or Do not know	N: 2,351	%: 36.6	N: 418	%: 31.3	N: 2,769	%: 35.7
	N =	6,418	100%	1,333	100%	7,751	100%
% of Total		82.8%		17.2%		100%	
x ² = 20.642		p = .000		Cramer's V = .052			

A comparison between the respondent's income and his relationship status was done to see if the respondent would have to rely on someone other than himself for financial support (See Table 8). Approximately 6,600 of the 8,000 respondents stated that some type of income was accounted for in 1995; 815 males had an income under \$10,000, 212 were married and 603 were unmarried which accounted for 12.4 %. Around 1,020 married and 786 unmarried males had an income ranging from \$10,000 to \$25,000, which accounted for 27.6%. Approximately 1,801 married and 657 unmarried males had an income that ranged from \$25,000 to \$50,000, which accounted for 37.5%. Around 18.1% of the respondents had an income from \$50,000 to \$100,000; 1002 were married and 186 were unmarried. About 4.4% of the respondents had income over \$100,000; 246 were married and 40 were unmarried.

Table 8

Crosstabulation of Respondent Income by Relationship Status

Respondent Income		Under \$10,000	\$10,000 - \$25,000	\$25,000 - \$50,000	\$50,000 - \$100,000	Over \$100,000	Total
<u>Are You Currently...</u>	Married	N: 212 %: 26.0	N: 1,020 %: 56.5	N: 1,801 %: 73.3	N: 1,002 %: 84.4	N: 246 %: 86.0	N: 4,281 %: 65.3
	Unmarried	N: 603 %: 74.0	N: 786 %: 43.5	N: 657 %: 26.7	N: 186 %: 15.6	N: 40 %: 14.0	N: 2,272 %: 34.7
	N =	815 100%	1,806 100%	2,458 100%	1,188 100%	286 100%	6,553 100%
	% of Total	12.4%	27.6%	37.5%	18.1%	4.4%	100%
x ² = 5.203		p = .000					

A crosstabulation was done to determine whether there is a relationship between whether the wife or partner makes the victim feel inadequate in relation to the age of the respondent. Approximately 5,800 of 8,000 respondents answered and 4.0% under 30 said yes, 3.7% between ages 30 and 45-said yes, and 2.7% over age 45 had stated that their wife or partner makes them feel inadequate. Approximately 94.8% under 30 answered no to this question. Approximately 95.3% of those who responded to this question and answered no were between the ages of 30 and 45. About 96.1% stated that their wife or partner did not make them feel inadequate. Around 0.7% under 30, 0.5% between ages 30 and 45, and 0.6% over 45 said they did not know whether their wife or partner makes them feel inadequate. Less than 1% of the respondents both under age 30 and between ages 30 and 45 refused to provide a response. Around 0.6% of the respondents over 45 refused to answer the question of inadequacy (See Table 9). The Chi-Square

value of 5.908 showed that there was no significant relationship between these two variables because of a significance (p= .434).

Table 9

Crosstabulation of Wife or Partner Makes Victim Feel Inadequate by Age

Age		Under 30		30-45		Over 45	
<u>Wife or Partner makes victim feel inadequate</u>		N:	%:	N:	%:	N:	%:
Yes		32	4.0	95	3.7	66	2.7
No		764	94.8	2,452	95.3	2,339	96.1
Do not know		6	0.7	13	0.5	14	0.6
Refused		4	0.5	13	0.5	15	0.6
N =		806	100%	2,573	100%	2,434	100%
x ² = 5.908		p = .434					

The relationship between whether the wife or partner frightens the victim and the respondent's age was examined. The cross-tabulation done on these two variables revealed that there was not a significant relationship (See Table 10). About 2.4% of the males under age 30, 1.4% between ages 30 and 35, and 1% of those over age 45 stated they their wife or partner does frighten them. Around 97.1% under 30, 98.1% of the males between ages 30 and 45, and 98.5% of the males over age 45 said that their partner or wife did not frighten them. The Pearson Chi-Square value of 8.951 represents how there is no relationship between these variables. The significance between these two variables was .176.

Table 10

Crosstabulation of Wife or Partner Frightens Victim by Age

Age		Under 30		30-45		Over 45	
<u>Wife or Partner frightens victim</u>		N:	%:	N:	%:	N:	%:
Yes		19	2.4	35	1.4	24	1.0
No		783	97.2	2,524	98.1	2,396	98.5
Do not know		1	0.1	2	0.0	2	0.0
Refused		3	0.3	12	0.5	12	0.5
N =		806	100%	2,573	100%	2,434	100%
		x ² = 8.951		p = .176			

The next test examined the relationship between whether the victim has been slap or hit as an adult with the context of race (See Table 11). Approximately 7,800 men gave a response to this question. Approximately 28% of White males that responded stated that they had been slapped or hit as an adult. About 29% of Nonwhite males stated that they had been slapped or hit as an adult. Of the respondents who said no 71.6% were White and 70.9% were Nonwhite. Less than 1% of the respondents both White and Nonwhite said they did not know whether they had been slapped or hit as an adult and refused to answer the question. There was not a significant relationship between these variables because the Pearson Chi Square value was 1.855 and the significance was .603.

Table 11

Crosstabulation of Victim Slap or Hit as an Adult by Race

Race		White		Nonwhite	
<u>Victim Slap or Hit as an Adult</u>	Yes	N: 1,801	%: 28.0	N: 382	%: 28.6
	No	N: 4,602	%: 71.6	N: 947	%: 70.9
	Do Not Know	N: 15	%: 0.2	N: 3	%: 0.2
	Refused	N: 6	%: 0.2	N: 3	%: 0.2
	N =	6,424	100%	1,335	100%
		x2 = 1.855		p = .603	

The cross-tabulation of whether the victim leaves his current spouse or partner because of violence directed at him was studied in the context of age (See Table 12). The question, does the victim leave his current spouse or partner because of violence directed at him was answered by 193 males. Approximately 20.9% of the respondents under 30 stated that yes they had left their current spouse or partner because of violence that was directed at them. Around 13.5% of those who were between age 30 and 45 and 4.3% over age 45 stated that they had left their current spouse or partner because of violence directed at them. Approximately 70% under 30, 78.8% between age 30 and 45, and 84.8% over age 45 stated that they had not left because of violence directed at them. About 2.3% under 30 and 2.9% between age 30 and 45 stated that they did not know whether they would leave the relationship because of violence directed at them. Of the respondents that refused to answer the question, 7% were under 30, 4.8% were between age 30

and 45, and 10.9% were over age 45. The Pearson Chi-Square value was 8.456. Even though not that many males responded to the question, it was found that there was not a significant relationship between these two variables because the actual significance was .207.

Table 12

Crosstabulation of Victim Leaves Current Spouse or Partner by Age

Age		Under 30		30-45		Over 45	
<u>Victim leaves current spouse or partner because of violence directed at him</u>		N:	%:	N:	%:	N:	%:
Yes		9	20.9	14	13.5	2	4.3
No		30	69.8	82	78.8	39	84.8
Do not know		1	2.3	3	2.9	0	0.0
Refused		3	7.0	5	4.8	5	10.9
N =		43	100%	104	100%	46	100%
		x ² = 8.456		p = .207			

The following comparison was done to see if there was a relationship between violence upon the victim returning to the relationship and his relationship status. The question was asked how the violence from the spouse or partner upon returning to relationship was (See Table 13). About 8.3% of the married men saw an increase in the violence. About 67% of the married men saw a decrease in the violence, while 63.7% of unmarried men also saw the same. Approximately 25% of married men felt that it was the same or did not know. The percentages were high for both those who were married and unmarried, but it was determined that there was not a significant relationship. The Chi-Square value was 2.027 and actual significance was .567.

Table 13

Crosstabulation of How is the Violence from Spouse or Partner upon Returning by Relationship Status

Relationship Status		Married		Unmarried	
<u>How is the violence from the spouse or partner upon victim returning to the relationship</u>		N:	%:	N:	%:
Increase		1	8.3	0	0.0
Decrease		8	66.7	7	63.7
Stay the same or Do not know		3	25.0	4	36.3
N =		12	100%	11	100%
		x ² = 2.027		p = .567	

The variable of whether the current spouse or partner leaving relationship because of violence was examined in the context of race in a cross-tabulation. There were 189 responses to this question (See Table 14). About 8.2% of Whites said yes their current spouse or partner left the relationship while 9.7% of Nonwhites provide the same response. Approximately 82.3% of Whites said that their current spouse or partner did not leave the relationship because of violence. Around 2% of Whites stated they did not know whether their current spouse or partner left the relationship because of violence. Approximately 7.6% of Whites and 6.4% of Nonwhites did not provide a response to the question of did his current spouse or partner leave because of violence. The relationship was not significant because the Chi-Square value was .707 and the actual significance was .872.

Table 14

Crosstabulation of Current Spouse or Partner Leaves Relationship by Race

Race		White		Nonwhite	
<u>Current spouse or partner leaves victim because of violence</u>		N:	%:	N:	%:
Yes		13	8.2	3	9.7
No		130	82.3	26	83.9
Do not know		3	1.9	0	0.0
Refused		12	7.6	2	6.4
N =		158	100%	31	100%
		x ² = .707		p = .872	

A crosstabulation was done between whether a victim was slapped or hit as an adult and age. About 7,900 of 8,000 men who had given their age responded to this question (See Table 15). The total percentage of males that said yes they had been slapped or hit as an adult was 28.1%. The total percentage of males that responded to the question by saying no was 71.5%. Less than 1% of the total accounted for respondents who said that they did not know whether they had been slapped or hit as an adult. Less than 1% of the total accounted for respondents who refused to answer this question. The Pearson Chi-Square value was 139.913 and the Cramer's V value was .094. The actual significance was .000, which means that there is a significant relationship between the two variables.

Table 15

Crosstabulation of Victim Slap or Hit as an Adult by Age

Age	Under 30		30-45		Over 45		Total		
<u>Victim Slap or Hit as an Adult</u>	N:	%:	N:	%:	N:	%:	N:	%:	
Yes	556	32.3	1,057	32.8	615	20.7	2,228	28.1	
No	1,161	67.4	2,166	67.0	2,338	78.8	5,665	71.5	
Do Not Know	2	0.1	4	0.1	13	0.5	19	0.2	
Refused	3	0.2	4	0.1	0	0.0	7	0.1	
N =	1,722	100%	3,231	100%	2,966	100%	7,919	100%	
% of Total	21.7%		40.8%		37.5%		100%		
		x ² = 139.913		p = .000		Cramer's V = .094			

The final statistical test was tested the variables of whether a victim was slapped or hit as an adult in the context of relationship status (See Table 16). The responses for the questions were yes, no, do not know, and refused. The percentage of married respondents who said yes they were slapped or hit as an adult was 24.5. The percentage of married respondents who said no that they had not been slapped or hit was 75.2. The percentage of married respondents who did not know whether they had been hit or slapped was 0.2. Less than 1% of married respondents refused to answer the question. The percentage of unmarried respondents who stated that they had been hit or slapped as an adult was 35.1. Approximately 65% of unmarried respondents stated that they had not been hit or slapped as an adult. The percentage of unmarried respondents

who stated that they did not know whether they had been hit or slapped as an adult was 0.2. Less than 1% of the unmarried respondents refused to provide a response for this question. The Pearson Chi-Square value was 98.833 and the Cramer's V value was .111. The relationship was significant (.000).

Table 16

Crosstabulation of Victim Slap or Hit as an Adult by Relationship Status

Relationship Status		Married		Unmarried		Total	
<u>Victim Slap or Hit as an Adult</u>		N:	%:	N:	%:	N:	%:
Yes		1,297	24.5	938	35.1	2,235	28.1
No		3,978	75.2	1,727	64.6	5,705	71.6
Do Not Know		13	0.2	6	0.2	19	0.2
Refused		4	0.1	3	0.1	7	0.1
N =		5,292	100%	2,674	100%	7,966	100%
% of Total		66.4%		33.6%		100%	
		x ² = 98.833		p = .000		Cramer's V = .111	

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The current research study examined the relationship between male victims of domestic violence and the effects of the act. The effects are examined from the perspective of age, race, relationship status, and individual income. The research from Tjaden and Thoennes (1999) was the primary data source of information in gathering information used for this study. This study examined the relationships between male victims and the emotional and physical aspects of domestic violence.

Null Hypothesis 1

Null hypothesis 1 for this study was there is not a relationship between male victims' perception of domestic violence in general and their race. Based on the findings, this null hypothesis was rejected. The crosstabulation of perception of domestic violence and race did not support the null hypothesis. It suggested that the men's perception of domestic violence was influenced by race. The majority (60%) of White males perception of domestic violence is that it is more of a problem for men today while a slightly higher percentage (63.5%) of Nonwhite males agree. The Nonwhites males (5.2%) felt more strongly that it was less of a problem for men today compared to White males (3.4%). Approximately 36.6% of White males felt that the issue of domestic violence was about the same or did not know while 31.3% of Nonwhites agree. The findings from the current research determined that there was a relationship between the perception of domestic violence and a male's race ($p = .000$). The Cramer's V value was .052.

Null Hypothesis 2

Null hypothesis 2 for this study was that domestic violence is not associated with the men's relationship status and their income status. It was determined that there was a relationship

between the respondent's income and their relationship status. The crosstabulation done on these two variables stated that the Cramer's V value was .377 ($p = .000$). The percentage (86.0%) of respondents with the highest income were those who were married and had an income over \$100,000 in 1995. The lowest percentage (14.0%) of respondents who were unmarried had an income over \$100,000. The second highest percentage (74.0%) in relation to income and his relationship were those who were unmarried and had an income less than \$10,000.

Approximately 15.6% of unmarried respondents had the second lowest percentage in relation to income and relationship status. The highest total percentage of respondents had an income ranging from \$25,000 to \$50,000 which accounted for 37.5%. The lowest total percentage of respondents had an income that was over \$100,000 accounting for 4.4% of the respondents. The findings in the current research revealed that the null hypothesis was rejected. If this hypothesis were true then domestic violence would be more common for those with an income ranging from \$0 to \$50,000 compared than those with an income over \$50,000.

Null Hypothesis 3

The null hypothesis of domestic violence is not related to a victim's feeling of self-worth was determined by the dependent variables: inadequacy and wife and partner frightens. The crosstabulation for inadequacy and age does support the null hypothesis. Inadequacy is a feature in determining one's self-worth. Age represents how a male should be able to acknowledge his self-worth such as self-esteem, and wisdom. The findings in the current research suggested that the independent variable of age and the dependent variable of inadequacy in relation to domestic violence have no relationship. The Cramer's V value is .023 for inadequacy and age ($p = .434$). This study fails to reject the null hypothesis because there is no relationship between the feelings of self-worth and the age of male victim. The hypothesis was also supported by the question

being answered whether the wife or partner frightens the respondent. The crosstabulation that was conducted between respondents being frightened by their wife or partner and age determined that there was no relationship because $p = .176$. This study fails to reject the hypothesis in conjunction with age and inadequacy because there is no relationship with self-worth. Overall, the null hypothesis was supported.

Null Hypothesis 4

The null hypothesis of there is no relationship between physical violence and a victim's age, race, and relationship status was tested by crosstabulations. The findings in the current research suggested that that physical violence does not have an effect on a male victim in the context of the racial background. The hypothesis was supported by the crosstabulation of victim being slapped or hit as an adult and racial background. There is no relationship between race and physical violence ($p = .603$). The crosstabulations of victim being slapped or hit as an adult in comparison to age and relationship, the current research findings stated that there is a relationship between age and relationship ($p = .000$) for both variables. The relationship between physical violence and age and relationship status means that the null hypothesis was not supported and it was rejected overall. Male victims who are unmarried (35.1%) have been slapped as adult more compared to those victims who were married (24.5%). In the context of age, male victims who range from ages 30 to 45 had the highest percentage (32.8) in being hit or slapped as an adult compared to those over 45 that accounted for 20.7%. The highest percentage overall who responded to this question was those males who were ages 30 to 45 accounting for 40.8% of the responses given in relation to the question of being slapped or hit as an adult.

Null Hypothesis 5

The null hypothesis of there is no relationship between the age of the victims and whether they will leave their current spouse or partner because of incidents of domestic violence. Based on the findings from this study, one can conclude that the victim's age has no relationship on whether they will leave his current spouse or partner because of domestic violence. The crosstabulation of respondent leave current spouse stated that the Cramer's V value of .148 suggested that there is no relationship ($p = .207$). This study failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 6

The null hypothesis of there is no relationship between domestic violence and whether the victim would return to the relationship. There was no relationship between the variables. The crosstabulation of how the violence was upon returning to relationship in comparison to relationship status supports the null hypothesis. Findings in this study implied that the act of domestic violence has no effect on whether the victim chooses to return to the relationship. The question presented in the study was crosstabulated in the context of relationship status and the results show that with the Cramer's V value of .297 that there was no relationship ($p = .567$) between victim returning to relationship and violence. This study failed to reject the null hypothesis because the act of domestic violence is not an influential factor.

Null Hypothesis 7

The findings in the current research suggested that the null hypothesis there is no relationship between races of a perpetrator and whether they (perpetrator) were leaving the relationship because of violence was found to have no relationship between the two variables. This study failed to reject the null hypothesis because race does have not an effect on whether the perpetrator is leaving the relationship because of violence. Statistical findings in the study

reveal that there was no relationship between these two variables ($p = .872$). This means that men are not influenced in leaving because of violence that has taken place during the relationship.

Implications

The study suggests that male victims of domestic violence are affected from physical and emotional perspectives. However, though the data for this study were compiled over 15 years ago, not much has changed. The number of men being abused may have slightly increased but the effects are still the same. According to the National Coalition of Domestic Violence (n.d.) in 2003 and 2004 the state of Tennessee provided shelter to 11 men but was unable to find shelters for 192 men. Domestic violence resources are limited across the United States. Male victims of domestic violence are uncommon and what this study was designed to do was to showcase how males experience this type of abuse. Tjaden and Thoennes's (1999) data dealt with a select population of males but it exposed that this is an issue for men.

This study showed that there were relationships between some acts of domestic violence based on age, race, and relationship status. This study also examined how domestic violence is a problem. The majority of the males Tjaden and Thoennes surveyed said that domestic violence is more of a problem, which means that more needs to be done to assist male victims. Each male victim is affected differently. Male victims are affected by domestic violence emotionally more so than physically based on the results of this study because their masculinity and egos are questioned. The abuse can cause the male victims to feel as though they are worthless.

Further Research

The subject of male victims of domestic violence needs to be further investigated because it is happening more now than just a few years ago. Resources are still limited but males are beginning to be accepted as victims. The support systems for males and future relationships

need to be researched further. The effects of domestic violence can be hard on male victims because they tend to hide their emotions and tend to go on with life as if nothing ever happened. Studies can be done to see how male victims are moving forward after leaving a violent relationship and if any of long-term effects have caused any setbacks. Areas that need to be further examined are quality of life, psychological aspects, and the types of treatment that has helped the victim move forward with his life in a positive manner.

Further studies should examine how domestic violence resources should be provided equally across the board and not discriminate because of gender. There are resources out there for males and it takes one person to make a difference by educating the public that this is not just a problem plaguing women but men as well. Abuse is never okay, no matter what one's gender, color, or income level. Future studies can help educate the public in helping the male victims and not turn a blind eye because of the stigma that society has placed on domestic violence because it affects everyone in some way.

REFERENCES

- An abuse, rape, and domestic violence aid and resource collection. (2011). *Domestic violence statistics*. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from <http://www.aardvarc.org/dv/statistics.shtml>
- Barber, C. F. (2008). Domestic violence against men. *Nursing Standard*, 22(51), 35-39.
- Billingsley, S. (2010, November 23). *Domestic violence law does not apply to dating couples – courts lack jurisdiction to issue dv orders if couple doesn't live together*. Retrieved January 23, 2011, from WordPress website: <http://news.lawreader.com/?p=3302>
- Brown, J. (2009, May 21). *Male victims of domestic violence - when he is the victim*. Retrieved January, 17, 2011 from, Regal Magazine website: <http://www.regalmag.com/male-victims-domestic-violence-a-354.html>
- Buzawa, E. S., & Buzawa, C. G. (1996). *Domestic violence: The criminal justice response* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Catalano, S. (2007, December 19). *Intimate partner violence in the United States* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved January 22, 2011, from U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics website: <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/pub/pdf/ipvus.pdf>
- Centers for Disease Control. (2008, February 6). *Adverse health conditions and health risk behaviors associated with intimate partner violence*. Retrieved January 17, 2011, from <http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5705a1.htm#tab1>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2006). *Understanding intimate partner violence* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/dvp/ipv_factsheet.pdf

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). *Understanding intimate partner violence* [Fact sheet]. Retrieved February 28, 2011, from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/IPV_factsheet-a.pdf
- Chan, D. (2009, October 2). *Domestic violence against men*. Retrieved January 18, 2011, from <http://www.articlesbase.com/mens-issues-articles/domestic-violence-against-men-1294791.html>
- Corporate Alliance to End Partner Violence. (2002-2011). *CAEPV - facts & stats*. Retrieved January 20, 2011, from http://www.caepv.org/getinfo/facts_stats.php?factsec=2
- Creative Communications Group. (2009). *Common myths - Domestic violence*. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from Divorce Online website: <http://www.domesticviolence.org/common-myths>
- Davis, R. L. (2010, April). Domestic violence-related deaths. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 2(2), 44-52.
- Domestic Abuse Intervention Project. (n.d.). *The Duluth Model*. Retrieved January 20, 2011, from <http://www.theduluthmodel.org/documents/PhyVio.pdf>
- Domestic Violence Awareness Project. (2009). *The domestic violence awareness month*. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from <http://dvam.vawnet.org/>
- Domestic Violence Resource Center. (2011). *Domestic violence statistics*. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from <http://www.dvrc-or.org/domestic/violence/resources/C61/>
- Felson, R., & Pare, P.-P. (n.d.). *The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to police* (Doc No. 209039). Retrieved January 21, 2011, from U.S. Department of Justice website: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/209039.pdf>
- Fink, P. J. (2006). Intimate partner violence. *Clinical Psychiatry News*, 34(10), 18.

- Follingstad, D. R., Wright, S., Lloyd, S., & Sebastian, J. A. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. *Family Relations: Journal of Applied Family & Child Studies*, 40, 51-57
- Garner, B. A. (Ed.). (2004). *Black's law dictionary* (8th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Group.
- Gay Men's Domestic Violence Project. (n.d.). Retrieved January 20, 2011, from <http://gmdvp.org/>
- Gleason, C. (2008, May 25). *Male victims of domestic violence: why men don't report physical abuse*. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from <http://www.suite101.com/content/male-victims-of-domestic-violence-a54969#ixzz1GqBS5oII55>
- Greenwood, G. L. (2002). Battering and victimization among a probability based sample of men who have sex with men. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92, 1964-1969.
- Hamberger, L. K., & Renzetti, C. (1996). *Domestic partner abuse*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Herbert, M. K. (1999, August). *Report on arrests for domestic violence in California, 1998*. Retrieved January 20, 2011, from State of California Office of the Attorney General Bureau of Criminal Justice Information and Analysis website: <http://ag.ca.gov/cjsc/publications/misc/98.pdf>
- Herrera, D. (2008, November 8). *Battered husbands*. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from <http://www.suite101.com/content/battered-husbands-a77267>
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2009). Women's use of intimate partner violence against men: prevalence, implications, and consequences. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma*, 18, 572-586.
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2010). A closer look at men who sustain intimate terrorism by women. *Partner Abuse*, 1, 286-313

- Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000, November). Research on domestic in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 948-963.
- Kracke, K., & Hahn, H. (2008). The nature and extent of childhood exposure to violence: What we know, why we don't know more, and why it matters. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 8(1/2), 29-49.
- Lehmann, C. (2002, June 21). Domestic violence overlooked in same-sex couples. *Psychiatric News*, 37(12), 22-28. Retrieved January 20, 2011, from <http://pn.psychiatryonline.org/content/37/12/22.full>
- Lichenstein B., & Johnson I. M. (2009). Older African American women and barriers to reporting domestic violence to law enforcement in the rural Deep South. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 19 (4), 1-21
- McDonald, R., Jouriles, E. N., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Caetano, R., & Green, C. E. (2006). Estimating the number of American children living in partner-violent families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 20, 137-142.
- McManus, R. (2000). South Carolina victims of domestic violence in 1999. Office of Justice Programs. South Carolina Department of Public Safety. Retrieved January 29, 2011, from <http://www.scdps.org>
- Montgomery, S. (2010, January 27). *Seven warning signs of domestic violence: violence in the home: a growing threat to families*. Retrieved from January 20, 2011, <http://www.suite101.com/content/seven-warning-signs-of-domestic-violence-a194776>
- Moskovic, C. (Ed.). (2004, Fall). *Women's Rx: UCLA National Center of Excellence in Women's Health*. Retrieved January 28, 2011, from

<http://womenshealth.med.ucla.edu/community/newsletter/Fall%202004/Print%20NewsletterFall2004.qxd.pdf>

Miller, S. L., & Meloy, M. L. (2006). Women's use of force: voices of women arrested for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 12*, 89-115.

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (n.d.). Male victims of violence [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved January 22, 2011, from <http://www.ncadv.org/files/MaleVictims.pdf>

National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (n.d.) Tennessee domestic violence facts [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved January 22, 2011, from <http://www.ncadv.org/files/tennessee%202.09.pdf>

National Domestic Violence Hotline. (n.d.). Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). Retrieved January 22, 2011, from <http://www.thehotline.org/get-educated/violence-against-women-act-vawa/>

Neeley-Bertland, D. (2010, April 10). *Help for men who are victims of domestic violence.* Retrieved January 21, 2011, from <http://www.suite101.com/content/help-for-men-who-are-victims-of-domestic-violence-a230494>

Office on Violence Against Women. (n.d.). *About domestic violence.* Retrieved January 23, 2011, from United States Department of Justice website: <http://www.ovw.usdoj.gov/domviolence.htm>

Polsky, S. S., & Markowitz, J. (2004). *Color atlas of domestic violence.* St. Louis, MO: Mosby.

Randall v. Stewart, 223 S.W.3d 121 (Kentucky Court of Appeals 2007), Retrieved January 25, 2011, from <http://opinions.kycourts.net/coa/2008-CA-000451.pdf>

- Rennison, C. M. & Welchans, S. (2000 May). *Intimate partner violence*. (Publication #NCJ178247). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved January 26, 2011, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs>
- Respecting Accuracy in Domestic Abuse Reporting (Ed.). (2008). *An epidemic of civil rights abuses: rankings of states' domestic violence laws* [Web]. Retrieved January 22, 2011, from <http://www.mediadaradar.org/docs/RADARreport-Ranking-of-States-DV-Laws.pdf>
- Rohrbaugh, J. B. (2006, April). Domestic violence in same gender relationships. *Family Court Review*, 44, 287-299.
- Schneider, M. E. (2005, December). Cost of intimate partner violence. *OB GYN News*, 40(23), 31. Retrieved January 19, 2011, from http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy.etsu.edu:2048/gtx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC-Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T003&prodId=ITOF&docId=A140513997&source=gale&srcprod=ITOF&userGroupName=tel_a_etsul&version=1.0
- Seelau, S. M., & Seelau, E. P. (2005, December). Gender-role stereotypes and perceptions of heterosexual, gay, and lesbian domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 20(6), 363-371.
- Smith, M., & Segal, J. (2010, November). *Domestic violence and abuse: Signs of abuse and abusive relationships*. Retrieved January 26, 2011, from http://www.helpguide.org/mental/domestic_violence_abuse_types_signs_causes_effects.htm
- Stets, J. E. (1988). *Domestic violence and control*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Stop Abuse For Everyone. (2002). *Are you (or someone you care about) a male subjected to intimate partner violence* [Brochure]. Tualatin, OR: Author.

The Ripple Effect. (2002). *Health effects of domestic violence*. Retrieved January 28, 2011, from <http://www.the-ripple-effect.info/pdf/healtheffects.pdf>

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. Violence and threats of violence against women and men in the United States, 1994-1996 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Denver, CO: Center for Policy Research [producer], 1998. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 1999.

Types of domestic abuse. (n.d.). Retrieved January 26, 2011, from Gay Men's Domestic Violence Project website: <http://gmdvp.org/domestic-violence/types-domestic-abuse/>

United States Department of Justice. (n.d.). *Federal domestic violence laws* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved January 26, 2011, from <http://www.justice.gov/usao/gan/documents/federallaws.pdf>

University of Michigan Health System. (2007, January). *Emotional abuse*. Retrieved January 26, 2011, from http://www.med.umich.edu/1libr/aha/umemot_abuse.htm

Violence Policy Center. (2006, September 20). *When men murder women: An analysis of 2004 homicide data: Females murdered by males in single victim/single offenders incidents*. Retrieved January 26, 2011, from <http://vpc.org/studies/wmmw2006.pdf>

Violence Policy Center. (2008, September 25). *Nevada ranks #1 in rate of women murdered by men for second year in a row according to vpc study released annually for domestic violence awareness month in October* [Press release]. Retrieved January 26, 2011, from <http://vpc.org/press/0809wmmw.htm>

Volpe, J. S. (1996). *Effects of domestic violence on children and adolescents: An overview*. Retrieved January 27, 2011, from The American Academy of Experts in Traumatic Stress, Inc. website: <http://www.aaets.org/arts/art8.htm>

Wisner, C., Gilmer, T., Saltzman, L., & Zink, T. (1999). Intimate partner violence against women do victims cost health plans more? *Journal of Family Practice*, 48: 439-443

Willett, J. P. (n.d). Domestic violence death review statistics for 2001: Official review. Office of the District Attorney, County of San Joaquin. Retrieved January 29, 2011, from <http://janus.ucc.nau.edu/ndvfri-p/wp-content/uploads/ndvfri/30198.pdf>

World Health Organization. (2002). *World report on violence and health: summary*. Retrieved February 1, 2011, from http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/en/summary_en.pdf

VITA

RAMON B. YOUNGER

Personal Data:

Date of Birth: February 12, 1987

Place of Birth: Roanoke, VA

Marital Status: Single

Education:

Gretna High School, Gretna, VA, 2005

Virginia Intermont College, Bristol, VA:

B.A. Criminal Justice, May 2009

East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN:

M.A. Criminal Justice & Criminology May 2011

Professional Experience:

Commonwealth's Attorney Intern, City of Danville,
Virginia; January 2005 – June 2005

Security Intern, Virginia Intermont College Security;
January 2009 – February 2009

Lecturer, Virginia Intermont College; Department of
Social Work, February 2011 – April 2011

Honors and Awards:

Vice President of Senior Class 2008 – 2009

Ideal Intermont Finalist 2009

Cardinal Key National Honor Society Member 2008 – 2009
Virginia Intermont Chapter 2008 – 2009

Student Government Association Board 2006 – 2009