Correlates of Wife Assault in Hong Kong Chinese Families

Ko Ling Chan[1]

The University of Hong Kong

Author's Note:

Correspondence to Dr. Ko Ling Chan, Department of Social Work & Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong, Pokfulam, Hong Kong SAR.

Tel: 852-28592077

Fax: 852-28587604

E-mail: eklchan@hkucc.hku.hk

(no. of words: 5550)

---

[1] Dr. K. L. Chan, Ph.D., is a lecturer in the Department of Social Work and Social Administration at the University of Hong Kong.

Abstract

Objective: To study the risk factors of wife assault in Hong Kong Chinese families.

Method: The sample included 107 battered women from a refuge for battered women. Factor analysis revealed risk factors like dominance, stress, poor anger management, aggressive personality, conflict, lack of empathy, masculine gender role stress, sense of insecurity, relationship distress, and violent socialization. Correlation analysis indicated that dominance, spousal conflict, and sense of insecurity increase the likelihood of carrying out minor physical assault and using psychological aggression, while aggressive personality predicts severe physical assault and injury. Conclusion: The risk factors were explained in terms of traditional Chinese concepts of gender role expectations of men and women and face orientations. The present study provides some evidence relating to the risk factors of wife assault in Chinese families.

(no. of words: 129)

KEY WORDS: wife assault; risk factor; Chinese face; dominance

Correlates of Wife Assault in Hong Kong Chinese Families

Wife assault is a problem found throughout the world and Hong Kong is no exception. In recent years, domestic violence has come to be recognized as a major social problem and has received greater social concern than before. The prevalence of husband-to-wife physical violence is about 10% (Tang, 1999b) to 14% of families (Tang, 1994). According to the Census & Statistics Department of the government of Hong Kong, there were 2.17 million households in Hong Kong in 2002. There should have at least 0.2 million households experienced husband-to-wife physical violence. According to statistics from the Centralized Information System of the government of Hong Kong, the number of reported battered spouse cases increased from 1009 in 1998 to 3034 in 2002, representing a threefold expansion in five years. About 92% of spouse abuse victims were women. Among these cases, 97.8% of the perpetrators were husbands and 2% were cohabitees. The majority of the cases involved physical abuse. In 2002, for example, 97% of the total cases involved physical abuse.

From the above figures, the occurrence of wife battering was seriously underreported. Indeed, the figures represent only the tip of the iceberg for wife battering which is regarded as a private domestic affair, especially in Chinese societies. Unless injuries are recognized or women need to see doctors, the problem does not become visible. There is a common Chinese belief that marital conflict is a daily routine of stressful couples. Conflict will turn to

harmony soon after the fight. According to the definition of the government of Hong Kong, domestic violence is "an act of violence committed by any member against another member of the family or co-habitation. In using violence or the threat of violence, physical or psychological harm is inflicted with the effect of establishing control by one individual over another" (Family and Child Welfare Branch, 2000). Although the definition is provided as a guideline for defining wife assault, professional practitioners are usually insensitive to the occurrence of assault and its risk factors.

Risk factors refer to characteristics associated with an increased likelihood that a problem behavior will occur (Kantor & Jasinski, 1998). Research on intimate violence in recent years has focused on the identification of risk factors for spousal violence and its association with severity/types/frequency of intimate violence, types of batterers, community populations, or clinical samples and stages of the violence cycle. Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) screened over 400 studies published in the professional literature and identified eight consistent risk markers of a husband's violence toward his wife: sexual aggression toward the wife; violence toward the children; witnessing parental violence as a child or teenager; low occupational status, especially working class; excessive alcohol usage; low income; low assertiveness; and low educational level. In a recent review of risk markers for partner violence, four main groups of risk markers were consistently found in research of the past 20 years (Jasinski & Williams, 1998): violence across generations (parental violence);

socioeconomic risk factors (income, education, and occupational status); alcohol and personality factors; and gender. These risk factors were commonly identified in studies conducted in Western countries.

The concept of "power and control" (Dobash & Dobash, 1979) was usually adopted as a framework for understanding why Chinese men used violence against their wives. Based on this concept, Liu (1999) conducted a study on battered women from rural areas and cities in Mainland China. Some prominent risk factors such as in-law family conflicts, male dominance, conjugal power struggle (over parenting, family decision-making, and reproduction), and extra-marital affairs were identified. Another study in Hong Kong revealed that men's domination in marital relationships was associated with marital aggression and dissatisfaction (Tang, 1999a).

Violence is generally not approved in Chinese culture, which emphasizes morality at the individual level and harmony at the relationship level. Perseverance as a conflict resolution strategy and tolerance of pain are highly regarded by Chinese people. However, the exception to the use of violence takes place in the family. Violence in the form of corporal punishment is employed as a means of inducing the feeling of shame which is commonly found in the process of socialization for the control of children's behavior (Stevenson & Lee, 1996). Through socialization and control, Chinese people learn to follow social norms and avoid being shamed. Shame is not only felt by an individual but also by the whole family,

especially the head of the family (Cheung, 1986). In Chinese societies, personal success is

linked to family honor and face (Ho, 1976). Gaining face and the respect of others through

the pursuit of achievement and status is one of the major components of masculinity (Levant,

1995; Thompson & Pleck, 1986).

The expectations placed on sons are especially high. Studies show that males experience

more physical punishment in their lifetime, especially in childhood, than females do (Harris,

1996). Physical punishment happens especially in Chinese culture which accepts beating as a

way to socialize a competent male who is expected to be the inheritor of the family clan and

business (Lam, 1992). Being a man in Chinese society means that the individual represents

both his family and his family of origin. Though he receives power and privilege over other

family members, he bears the great burden of having to honor the family and to achieve as

well. Chinese male batterers are found to feel more obliged to follow traditional gender role

expectations. They are conscious of performing appropriate social behavior, believing that

men can bleed but not cry and that expressing emotions before others and losing control over

the self are marks of immaturity and incompetence. Burdened by the heavy demands of the

performance need and achievement orientation of masculinity, men seldom express emotion

and have difficulty articulating their feelings (Li, 1999). This results in the neglect of needs

and feelings, a sense of insecurity, lack of social support, and poor anger management.

The studies of wife assault in Mainland China and Hong Kong were still limited to a

small number of risk factors. The studies of risk factors were profoundly conducted in North America. The accumulated knowledge can provide a provisional but comprehensive list of risk factors for the study in Hong Kong Chinese society. In this study, a number of risk factors will be tested on their association of wife assault. It is hypothesized that the factors like dominance, spousal conflict, aggressive personality, sense of insecurity, gender role stress and violent socialization increase the likelihood of carrying out physical assault and psychological aggression. A comprehensive study of risk factors will help to develop a better understanding of wife assault in Chinese societies and Chinese immigrants in North America.

METHOD

Participants

The participants of this study were 107 women who were living in a refuge for battered women or who had left the shelter for less than one year. Table I shows the demographic information of the respondents and their husbands. Respondents' ages ranged from 21 to 61 years, with a mean age of 36.97 years ($SD = 7.60$). About 74.7 had junior high school education or less. Most were housewives (73.8%) and had children (99%). About 31.8% had immigrated from the Mainland China to Hong Kong less than five years before. About 57.1% of the respondents were separated or divorced from their husbands. At the time of the study, about 73.6% did not cohabit with their husbands while 88% cohabited with their children.

The age of the respondents' husbands ranged from 25 to 70 years, with a mean age of

43.3 years (SD = 9.07). About 81% had junior high school education or less. About 31.5% of the husbands were unemployed and 66.3% were employed.

[Table I about here]

Measures

Demographic questions

The questionnaire began with demographic questions about socioeconomic background, age, education level, occupational status, and current relationship.

Wife abuse

Occurrence of husband-to-wife abuse was measured by the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2) (Straus *et al*, 1996). The CTS2 has been used in over a hundred studies of both married and dating partners in the past 25 years, and there is extensive evidence of its reliability and validity. The first author translated the questionnaire and then back-translated it to maintain "conceptual equivalence" (Straus, 1969). In this study, the CTS2 showed satisfactory reliability (α ranged from .78 to .88).

Risk factors

A list of risk factors was constructed based on the Personal and Relationship Profile (PRP), which includes major significant risk factors (Straus *et al*, 1999). A comprehensive scale of risk factors is not available in Chinese societies. The purpose of the construction of a

checklist is to provide a preliminary list of risk factors for this study. An advantage of using the PRP was that it provided a comprehensive checklist of risk markers based on empirical research. The PRP is a multi-scale instrument that provides a profile of scores for variables that have an empirically demonstrated relationship with physical violence against a partner in a marital, cohabiting, or dating relationship. The mean alpha coefficient administered to college students was .74, which showed satisfactory internal reliability (Straus & Mouradian, 1999).

The PRP includes personal or intrapsychic scales, and relationship scales. Among the scales of the PRP, 16 risk markers were selected as a framework for item construction. The other risk factors were excluded from this study because of less likeliness of disclosure (like borderline personality, criminal history, post-traumatic stress, sexual abuse history and negative attribution) and control scale (social desirability). For risk factors such as antisocial personality, depression, gender hostility, history of neglect, approval of violence, anger management, communication problems, jealousy, relationship commitment, and relationship distress, one item was constructed by the author for each risk factor. Thus, 10 items were constructed altogether. The original risk factor substance abuse was replaced with alcohol abuse since the latter was more relevant to the clinical cases. For the remaining five risk factors, two items were constructed for each factor in order to give more specific descriptions. Social integration was operationalized with a lack of social support and feeling lonely and

isolated. Violent socialization was specified as witnessing one's mother battering one's father or one's father battering one's mother in childhood. Conflict referred to that between a wife and her in-laws, and a wife and her children as well. Dominance meant restraining a partner from seeing friends and relatives, and using fear or threatening to control partner. Stress condition included both stress and financial problems. Based on observation from clinical practice, two types of factors were added: gambling and gender role expectation. Gender role expectation was operationalized with three items: difficulty in performing the man's role, the belief that women should be obedient, and the belief that women have too much power. As a result of addition and exclusion, 25 items were constructed. Table II shows the constructed items. The 25 items were categorized into two checklists. The items of the Risk Factor Checklist One were rated according to the frequency of occurrence of such episodes as observed by the battered women in the past one year. A score of 1 indicated that an episode had never happened, 2 that it had happened 1 to 2 times, 3 that it had happened 3 to 5 times, 4 that it had happened 6 to 10 times, and 5 that it had happened more than 11 times. The minimum and maximum scores for each item were one and five respectively. The items of the Risk Factor Checklist Two were rated in terms of the respondents' degree of agreement toward the statement. A score of 1 indicated that they disagreed very much with the statement, 2 that they disagreed with the statement, 3 that they agreed with the statement, and 4 that they agreed very much with the statement. The minimum and maximum scores for each item were

one and four respectively.

[Table II about here]

Procedure

Recruitment of subjects was assisted by the social workers of a refuge for battered women in Hong Kong. The purpose of the study was explained to the subjects and the questionnaires were distributed to the residents and ex-residents of the refuge through interviews conducted by the research assistants. As the respondents might have become upset when recalling bad past experiences, the research assistants were trained to provide minimal support to them. The social workers had built up trust with the residents and ex-residents, thus the response rate was 97% which was very satisfactory.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analysis including the frequency and prevalence of wife battering was performed. In order to reduce the statistical redundancy among the 25 risk factors in the two checklists, a factor analysis employing the principle component analysis with Varimax rotation was performed to examine the factor structure of the Risk Factor Checklist. A scree test of the eigenvalues indicated that there were six factors and four factors respectively for the checklists with eigenvalues greater than 1. This procedure resulted in six latent variables, presented in Table IV, accounting for 75.11% of the total variance, and four latent variables, presented in Table V, accounting for 74.15% of the total variance. The correlation analysis of

the Risk Factors with the revised Conflict Tactics Scale was used to associate the presence or

absence of assaults in the previous year of reporting based on the risk factors.

RESULTS

Frequency and Prevalence of Wife Abuse

The study examined the frequency and prevalence of wife abuse including physical

assault, psychological aggression, injury, and sexual coercion as measured by the revised

Conflict Tactics Scale. Frequency of wife abuse was weighted as follows: 0 = never, 1 = once,

2 = twice, 4 = 3 to 5 times, 8 = 6 to 10 times, 15 = 11 to 20 times, and 25 = over 20 times

(Straus *et al*, 1996). Thus, the minimum score and the maximum score of each item were 1

and 25 respectively. The prevalence rate is the percentage of the sample that reported one or

more instances of the acts in each scale.

Table III shows a very high frequency of abusive acts against wives, especially minor

physical assault (Mean = 20.50, *SD* = 26.21) and minor psychological aggression (Mean =

51.75, *SD* = 32.25), causing a relatively high frequency of minor injury (Mean = 15.06, *SD* =

16.55). Results indicated that psychological aggression was more frequent than physical

assault. Insulting or swearing, shouting or yelling, showing spite, and threatening to hit were

common forms of psychological aggression. Regarding physical assault, 69.2% of the

respondents were punched and 61.7% had experienced pushing and shoving. Sexual coercion

was relatively less frequent. A common form of sexual coercion was insistence on sex

without the respondents' consent (Mean = 7.66, *SD* = 9.73).

[Table III about here]

Factor Analysis of Risk Factors

For the Risk Factor Checklist One, factor scores were computed for each of the six latent variables. The six factors represented dominance (Factor I), stress (Factor II), poor anger management (Factor III), aggressive personality (Factor IV), conflict (Factor V), and lack of empathy (Factor VI).

[Table IV about here]

For the Risk Factor Checklist Two, factor scores were computed for each of the four latent variables. Factor I represented the masculine gender role stress factor that had high loading on financial problems, negative feelings toward females, and difficulty in performing the man's role. Factor II involved childhood neglect, the belief that women should be obedient, approval of using violence for conflict resolution, and feelings of loneliness and isolation that suggest a sense of insecurity. Factor III denoted the relationship distress factor that included the belief that women have too much power, lack of action toward improving spousal relationship, and stress. Factor IV represented the violent socialization factor that had high loading on the witnessing of parental violence.

[Table V about here]

Correlation Analysis of Risk Factors with the CTS2

Table VI presents the correlation between the six factors and the subscales of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale. Results showed that dominance (Factor I), aggressive personality (Factor IV), and conflict (Factor V) had significant positive correlations with minor physical assault, while aggressive personality predicted severe physical assault and injury at both minor and severe levels. The lack of empathy factor (Factor VI) showed positive correlation with severe injury. Regarding psychological aggression, all factors except Factor II showed a significant correlation at both minor and severe levels. The conflict factor (Factor V) showed a positive correlation with severe sexual coercion.

[Table VI about here]

Table VII presents another correlation between the four factors and the CTS2. Results showed that the relationship distress factor (Factor III) predicted severe psychological aggression, and that a sense of insecurity (Factor II) was a strong predictor of minor physical assault, minor injury, and psychological aggression at both minor and severe levels.

[Table VII about here]

DISCUSSION

The present analysis suggests that a number of factors predict different types and levels of severity of wife abuse. First, it appears that the relationship variable (husbands' dominance

over wives and spousal conflict) and the intra-individual variables like aggressive personality and sense of insecurity predict minor physical assault. Consistent with the findings of other studies, the intra-individual factors usually predicted severe violence (Davies & Lyon, 1998). Such factors include aggressive personality, which predicted severe physical assault and injury, and a sense of insecurity and a lack of empathy, which predicted minor injury and severe injury respectively.

Further, it appears that a similar factor structure is closely related to psychological aggression. The relationship factors (such as husbands' domination, relationship distress, and conflict) and the intra-individual factors (such as aggressive personality, lack of empathy, a sense of insecurity, and poor anger management) are all predictors. The similar factor structure of physical assault and psychological aggression is consistent with studies demonstrating that higher levels of psychological aggression are associated with higher levels of physical assault (Murphy & O'Leary, 1989; Tolman, 1999). Surprisingly, stress (Factor II), masculine gender role stress (Factor I), and violent socialization (Factor IV) did not demonstrate significant associations with any kind of assault, as they were expected to do. One possible explanation for this is that the respondents were women who might not fully acknowledge the feelings, subjective views, and past history of their husbands. The respondents had difficulty responding to the questions regarding negative feeling toward females, difficulty in performing the man's role, and the witnessing of parental violence.

They also found it hard to observe their husbands' stress that was related to depression, financial problems, conflict with in-laws, and gambling, especially when the men were inexpressive as well.

The intra-individual and relationship factors can be explained through a consideration of Chinese culture. The intra-individual factors mainly include aggressive personality, a sense of insecurity, and poor anger management. These are quite closely related to the characteristics of Chinese men who are generally insensitive to personal needs and feelings, having a sense of insecurity and poor anger management.

The relationship factors reflect the problem of gender inequality between couples. In Chinese tradition, a woman does not occupy a powerful position but has to obey her father, her husband, and her son. As one Chinese saying puts it, "a husband sings, the wife hums along" (cited in Bond, 1991, p. 45). The husband-to-wife relation is defined as a hierarchy. The male usually dominates the family and inherits the family property. The masculine stereotype is often associated with a sense of superiority while the female stereotype is associated with a sense of inferiority (Cheung, 1996, pp. 47-53). Not many studies of risk factors have focused on the traditional gender role expectations of men and women. A common observation regarding the subordination of women involves a reference to the Confucian teaching that women should subject themselves to three obediences and four virtues. The model of behavior for women in relation to men in traditional Chinese society

was prescribed in the four books of Confucius:

> Woman yields obedience to the instructions of man, and helps to carry out his
>
> principles…. When young, she must obey her father and elder brother; when married
>
> she must obey her husband; when her husband is dead, she must obey her son….
>
> Woman's business is simply the preparation and supplying of drink and food. (Cited in
>
> Pearson & Leung, 1995, p. 4)

A woman must observe the four virtues, which are morality, proper speech, modest

manners, and diligent work. The social and cultural legitimacy of women's subordination is

regarded as an important factor that contributes to violence against women (Liu, 1999).

In modern China, after 1949, the government of the People's Republic of China (PRC)

declared in a constitutional legal document that women shall enjoy equal rights as men in

respect to politics, economy, culture, education, and social life (Chen, 1999). In reality,

however, legal equality between men and women does not amount to true equality (Liu,

1999). The patriarchal social order and patriarchal family system have long been supported

by the economic and social processes in Chinese society. This results in the subordination of

women and thus violence against women (Xu, 1997). Chen (1999) argues that there are

obstacles to realizing equality between men and women in China, such as the fact that the

traditional concept that men should be respected whereas women should be humble is deeply

entrenched in people's minds, as well as low educational levels, limited awareness and

understanding of legal systems, poverty, and widespread inequality between men and women in terms of involvement in government and policy-making.

In Hong Kong, there is a discrepancy between policy and practice, between knowledge and experiences. Since the establishment of the Hong Kong Equal Opportunities Commission in 1996, the public has been educated about the concepts of gender equality. At the levels of policy and cognition, people do accept that the status of women has been changed. However, there is lot of incongruence in daily practice relating to gender equality. In situations of spousal violence, couples are likely to hold traditional gender role expectations. Battered women accept that a woman's role involves subordination to her husband and being the caretaker responsible for the harmony and wholeness of the family. These beliefs keep battered women stuck in an abusive relationship for a long period.

CONCLUSION

This study has several implications. First, it is limited by the type and size of the sample. All the subjects were self-identified as victims of wife battering and were admitted to a refuge for battered women. Comparison of abused and non-abused groups should be considered in future studies. Second, the perspective of male batterers should be taken into account in future studies. Their subjective feelings and views on the dynamics of spousal abuse are significant for providing a comprehensive understanding of the risk factors such as masculine gender role stress; child witnessing of family violence; gender hostility and

attitude toward wives. Third, it seems important that researchers continue to focus on discriminating between couples who exhibit high levels of concern for face orientations, and the particular gender role expectations for men. Studies of risk factors usually focus on the dark side of male batterers and violent relationships. Such factors may not be widely shared in the community because they distinguish violent couples from non-violent ones. A study of culturally relevant concepts of risk factors should address the possibility that male batterers share socially legitimated cultural expectations and adopt these as a justification of violence against their wives.

This study is a preliminary attempt to draw up a checklist of risk factors that can predict wife assault in Chinese society. The results provide a scientific test of several factors that deserve more in-depth examination.

REFERENCES

Bond, M. H. (1991). *Beyond the Chinese face: Insights from psychology* (1st ed.). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press (China).

Chen, M. (1999). 'From legal to substantive equality: Realizing women's rights by action'. *Violence against Women, 5*(12), 1394-1410.

Cheung, F. M. (1996). 'Gender role development'. In Lau, S. (ed.), *Growing up the Chinese way: Chinese child and adolescent development* (pp. 45-68). Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

Cheung, F. M. C. (1986). 'Psychopathology among Chinese people'. In Bond, M. H. (Ed.), *The psychology of the Chinese people* (1st ed.) (pp. 171-212). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press (China).

Davies, J., & Lyon, E. (1998). *Safety planning with battered women*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.

Family and Child Welfare Branch (2000). *Guidelines on handling battered spouse cases*. Hong Kong: Social Welfare Department.

Harris, M. B. (1996). 'Aggressive experiences and aggressiveness: Relationship to ethnicity, gender, and age'. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*(10), 843-870.

Ho, D. Y. F. (1976). 'On the concept of face'. *American Journal of Sociology, 81*(4), 867-884.

Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. B. (1986). 'An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge'. *Violence and Victims, 1*(2), 101-124.

Jasinski, J. L., & Williams, L. M. (eds.) (1998). *Partner violence: A comprehensive review of 20 years of research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kantor, G. K., & Jasinski, J. L. (1998). 'Dynamics and risk factors in partner violence'. In Jasinski, J. L. & Williams, L. M. (eds.), *Partner violence: A comprehensive review of 20 years of research* (pp. 1-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lam, M. Y. (1992). 'The phenomenon and meaning of corporal punishment in Chinese society'. In Yang, K. S. & Yu, A. B. (eds.), *The psychology and behaviors of the Chinese* (pp. 271-319). Taipei: Guaiguan. (In Chinese)

Levant, R. F. (1995). *Masculinity reconstructed: Changing the rules of manhood at work, in relationships, and in family life*. New York: Dutton.

Li, C. L. S. D. (1999). *Face orientation and self-disclosure of ability and morality: Does gender make a difference* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Department of Social Work and Social Administration, The University of Hong Kong.

Liu, M. (1999). 'Enduring violence and staying in marriage: Stories of battered women in rural China'. *Violence against Women, 5*(12), 1469-1492.

Murphy, C. M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1989). 'Psychological aggression predicts physical aggression in early marriage'. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*(5),

579-582.

Pearson, V., & Leung, B. K. P. (eds.) (1995). *Women in Hong Kong*. Hong Kong: Oxford

University Press.

Stevenson, H. W., & Lee, S. Y. (1996). The academic achievement of Chinese students. In M.

H. Bond (Ed.), *Handbook of Chinese psychology.* Hong Kong: Oxford University

Press.

Straus, M. A. (1969). Phenomenal identity and conceptual equivalence of measurement in

cross-national comparative research. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31*(2),

233-239.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. (1999). *The personal and

relationships profile (PRP)* (Unpublished Manuscript). Durham, NH: Family Research

Laboratory.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). 'The Revised

Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data'.

Journal of Family Issues, 17(3), 283-316.

Straus, M. A., & Mouradian, V. E. (1999). *Preliminary psychometric data for the personal

and relationships profile (PRP): A multi-scale tool for clinical screening and research

on partner violence.* Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology,

Toronto, Ontario.

Tang, C. S. K. (1994). 'Prevalence of spousal aggression in Hong Kong'. *Journal of Family

Violence, 9(4), 347-356.

Tang, C. S. K. (1999a). 'Marital power and aggression in a community sample of Hong Kong

Chinese families'. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*(6), 586-602.

Tang, C. S. K. (1999b). 'Wife abuse in Hong Kong Chinese families: A community survey'.

Journal of Family Violence, 14(2), 173-191.

Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). 'The structure of male role norms'. *American

Behavioral Scientist, 29*, 531-43.

Tolman, R. M. (1999). 'The validation of the Psychological Maltreatment of Women

Inventory'. *Violence and Victims*. *14*(1), 25-37.

Xu, X. (1997). 'The prevalence and determination of wife abuse in urban China'. *Journal of

Comparative Family Studies, 28*, 280-303.

TABLE I: Demographic Information of Respondents (N=107)

	Wife		Husband	
	N	Valid %	n	Valid %
Age				
21-30 years	19	18.1%	5	4.8%
31-40 years	57	54.3%	37	35.2%
41-50 years	23	21.9%	44	41.9%
>51-60 years	6	5.7%	19	18.1%
Missing data	2		2	
	Mean	*SD*	Mean	*SD*
	36.97	7.60	43.3	9.07
Education				
None	4	3.7%	5	5%
Primary	37	34.6%	40	40%
Junior high school	39	36.4%	36	36%
Senior high school	25	23.4%	16	16%
University or above	2	1.9%	3	3%
Missing data	0		7	
Marital Status				
Married	44	41.1%		
Cohabiting	2	1.9%		
Divorced	19	17.8%		
Separated	42	39.3%		
Working Status				
Full-time	8	7.5%	49	53.3%
House keeping	79	73.8%	2	2.2%
Part-time	12	11.2%	12	13.0%
Unemployed	8	7.5%	29	31.5%
Missing data	0		15	
Years of residence in Hong Kong				
1-5	34	31.8%		
6-10	30	28.0%		
11-20	16	15.0%		
> 20	27	25.2%		
No. of children				
0	1	1.0		
1-2	74	73.3		
3-5	26	25.7		
Missing data	6			

TABLE II: Items of Risk Factors

Personal and Relationship Profile	Items constructed
Antisocial personality	Conflicts between husband and other people *(1)*
Depression	Depression *(1)*
Gender hostility	Negative feelings toward females *(2)*
History of neglect	Childhood neglect *(2)*
Social integration	Lack of social support *(1)*
	Feeling lonely and isolated *(2)*
Substance abuse	Alcoholic *(1)*
Stress condition	Financial problems *(2)*
	Stress *(2)*
Approval of violence	Approval of using violence for conflict resolution *(2)*
Violent socialization	Witnessed mother battering father in childhood *(2)*
	Witnessed father battering mother in childhood *(2)*
Anger management	Bad temper *(1)*
Communication problems	Lack of empathy *(1)*
Conflict	Conflict between wife and in-laws *(1)*
	Conflict between wife and children *(1)*
Dominance	Restraining partner from seeing friends and relatives *(1)*
	Using fear or threats to control partner *(1)*
Jealousy	Jealous and suspicious *(1)*
Relationship commitment	Lack of action taken toward improving spousal relationship *(2)*
Relationship distress	Marital conflict *(1)*
	Gambling *(1)*
	Difficulty in performing the man's role *(2)*
	Belief that women should be obedient *(2)*
	Belief that women have too much power *(2)*

NOTE: (1) Indicates the items of the Risk Factor Checklist One while (2) Indicates the items of the Risk Factor Checklist Two.

TABLE III: Frequency and Prevalence of Wife Abuse (N=107)

	Frequency		Prevalence
	Mean	*SD*	%
Minor physical assault	20.50	26.21	91.6
Severe physical assault	21.19	32.77	86.9
Minor injury	15.06	16.55	89.7
Severe injury	9.53	14.87	74.8
Minor psychological aggression	51.75	32.25	94.4
Severe psychological aggression	29.21	25.74	87.9
Minor sexual coercion	7.66	9.73	57
Severe sexual coercion	4.76	8.26	37.4

NOTE: Weighted frequency: 0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = twice, 4 = 3 to 5 times, 8 = 6 to 10 times, 15 = 11 to 20 times, and 25 = over 20 times

TABLE IV: Varimax-Rotated Factor Analysis of the Risk Factor Checklist One

Variables	Factors					
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Jealous and suspicious	*.870*	**0.044**	**-0.068**	.175	.113	**0.079**
Restraining partner from seeing friends and relatives	*.839*	**0.051**	**-0.056**	0.070	-0.062	**0.049**
Depression	.178	*.746*	**0.066**	.206	**0.029**	-.377
Conflict between wife and in-laws	.101	*.738*	**-0.056**	-.188	-.220	.295
Gambling	-.241	*.648*	**-0.079**	**-0.028**	.395	**0.087**
Conflict between wife and children	.204	-.105	*-.848*	**-0.056**	**0.066**	**-0.062**
Lack of social support	**0.080**	-.255	*.768*	-.217	**-0.008**	**-0.029**
Bad temper	.249	.318	*.537*	.417	.332	-.104
Alcoholic	**0.051**	**0.006**	-.154	*.886*	**-0.004**	**-0.055**
Use of fear or threat to control partner	.395	**-0.093**	.153	*.685*	.108	.344
Conflicts between husband and other people	**0.018**	**0.047**	**-0.074**	**0.048**	*.903*	**0.030**
Marital conflict	.470	**-0.091**	.214	**0.038**	*.491*	-.196
Lack of empathy	**0.077**	**0.045**	**0.012**	**0.076**	**-0.017**	*.916*

NOTE: Italics indicate that the items loaded highly on the factor.

WIFE ASSAULT IN HONG KONG

TABLE V: Varimax-Rotated Factor Analysis of the Risk Factor Checklist Two

Variables	Factors			
	1	2	3	4
Financial problems	*.888*	**0.083**	-.119	.106
Negative feelings toward females	*.794*	**0.050**	**-0.024**	**0.045**
Difficulty in performing the man's role	*.750*	**-0.051**	.294	.126
Childhood neglect	.157	*.843*	.116	-.153
Belief that women should be obedient	-.458	*.757*	.133	.185
Approval of using violence for conflict resolution	**-0.024**	*.722*	-.437	.274
Feeling lonely and isolated	.391	*.646*	.293	.173
Belief that women have too much power	.171	**0.004**	*.869*	-.149
Lack of action taken toward improve spousal relationship	.166	**-0.080**	*-.705*	-.106
Stress	.429	.214	*.580*	.463
Witnessed mother battering father in childhood	**0.058**	**-0.095**	**0.001**	*.878*
Witnessed father battering mother in childhood	.150	.287	**0.011**	*.824*

TABLE VI: Correlates of the Risk Factor Checklist One with the CTS2

Variables	I (dominance)	II (stress)	III (poor anger management)	IV (aggressive personality)	V (conflict)	VI (lack of empathy)
Minor physical assault	.285**	.085	.106	.301**	.262**	.070
Severe physical assault	.118	-.059	-.038	.226*	.077	.102
Minor injury	.082	-.055	.014	.201*	.076	.172
Severe injury	.006	-.011	.048	.239*	.000	.223*
Minor psychological aggression	.375***	.117	.225*	.473***	.342***	.311***
Severe psychological aggression	.397***	.028	.221*	.435***	.344***	.326***
Minor sexual coercion	.050	-.075	.058	.160	.090	.173
Severe sexual coercion	-.016	-.119	-.023	.060	.195*	.090

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$

TABLE VII: Correlates of the Risk Factor Checklist Two with the CTS2

Variables	Factors			
	1 (masculine gender role stress)	2 (childhood neglect)	3 (relationship distress)	4 (violent socialization)
Minor physical assault	.088	.247*	.037	.127
Severe physical assault	.097	.162	.065	.105
Minor injury	.114	.195*	.155	.061
Severe injury	.051	.143	.062	.049
Minor psychological aggression	.093	.464***	.160	.015
Severe psychological aggression	.112	.298**	.262**	-.058
Minor sexual coercion	-.067	.048	-.103	-.020
Severe sexual coercion	.046	.055	-.088	.005

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$