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ABSTRACTS

Investigating the Risk Factors of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) among Korean Immigrant Women in America

By

Chunrye Kim

Adviser: Dr. Amy Adamczyk

Objective: Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a serious social problem. Due to the underutilization of public and private human and social services due to language barriers, their illegal status, and stigma associated with violence, both victims and offenders of intimate partner violence are rarely captured by either the criminal justice system or public health radar screens (Hicks & Li, 2003). Also, the “model minority myth” has led to the underestimation of the risk of violence against women among Asian immigrants and thus leads to an underinvestment of research and service resources for this vulnerable population (Leong & Lau, 2001; Rhee, 1997; Yick, 2007). Thus, IPV among Korean immigrants are rarely investigated. This study seeks to assess intimate partner violence (IPV) and their psycho-cultural as well as situational risk factors among Korean immigrants in the Korean-American community.

Methods: Mixed methods using quantitative and qualitative study components have been utilized. Using a case-control design, I compared 64 Korean immigrant women who have experienced IPV in the past year with 63 Korean immigrant women who have never experienced IPV in their lifetime. Also, using nested design, 16 in-depths interviews with IPV victims were conducted of the survey participants.
**Results:** Quantitative study reveals that IPV victims, compared with non-victims, experienced higher level of acculturative stress and have patriarchal gender role values and narrow social networks. Through the qualitative study, 12 different themes - *Legal Status Dependency, Financial Dependency, Social or Emotional Dependency, Saving face, Self-Isolation, Online Social Networks, Stress and Frustration in Offenders, Victims’ Stress and Frustrations, Patriarchal values held by victims, victims’ families and the community, Gender Role Conflicts, Conservative attitudes in abusers* – related to four research questions in this study were discovered.

**Conclusions:** Acculturative stress, conservative gender role values and narrow social networks were risk factors of IPV among Korean immigrant women. To prevent their IPV victimization among Korean immigrants, I have suggested various policy implications.
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This study seeks to assess intimate partner violence (IPV) and their cultural and situational risk factors among Korean immigrant women in the Korean communities in America. According to the census data, Asians are one of the fastest growing populations in the U.S.A. – There were 43 percent (for Asians alone) and 46 percent increases (for Asians in combination with another race) between 2000 and 2010 (Hoeffel et al., 2012). Despite this increase in population, research on Asian immigrants (in particular Korean immigrants) is still needed, especially in the area of intimate partner violence. Studies reveal that violence against women is a serious social and family problem in this large and growing immigrant population (Chun, 1990; Han, Kim, & Tyson, 2010; Lee, 2007; Leung & Cheung, 2008).

However, the problem among this vulnerable population remains mostly invisible for various reasons. First, Asian immigrants including Koreans underutilize public and private human and social services due to language barriers, their illegal status, and stigma associated with violence. As a consequence, both victims and offenders of intimate partner violence are rarely captured by either the criminal justice system or public health radar screens (Hicks & Li, 2003). Second, the “model minority myth” has led to the underestimation of the risk of violence against women among Asian immigrants and thus leads to an underinvestment of research and service resources for this vulnerable population (Leong & Lau, 2001; Rhee, 1997; Yick, 2007). Third, although non-physical types of abuse also cause serious harm to victims, limiting the definition of violence to physical violence leads to the underestimation of other types of violence, such as sexual and psychological types of violence and under-perception of the seriousness of IPV violence (Outlaw, 2009).

IPV often begins, in terms of intensity, with less serious types of abuse, such as verbal
aggression and progresses to more serious types, which can lead to fatality among victims (Centers for Disease Control, 2006; Parish et al, 2004). In addition, as victims’ exposure to violence increases, the proportion experiencing multiple types of abuse increases (Thompson et al, 2006). Thus, it is important to prevent further victimization among this growing population before it becomes more serious.

In particular, Koreans make up a large sub-population among Asians in the United States and they might have different types of risk factors compared to other Asians, although Asian immigrants tend to share similar cultural backgrounds and immigrant characteristics. Unfortunately, Korean immigrants (or populations) tend to be excluded from national level studies or lumped with other ethnic groups as “Others” or “Asians” due to the relative small size of the populations, although the evidence suggests that IPV among Koreans is serious (Lee, 2007; Leung and Cheung, 2008; Liles et al, 2012). As a result, it is not easy to capture the differences and some of the unique characteristics of each ethnic group (such as Koreans) with regards to the experience of IPV. Thus, through this study, I aimed to understand the phenomenon of IPV among Korean immigrants and identify the risk factors in order to prevent further victimization.

Some researchers argue that both men and women can be equally abusive toward their partners (Archer, 2000; Howard & Wang, 2003; Straus, 1997-1998). However, evidence suggests that women are more likely to be victims of violence than men (Breiding et al, 2008) and the equality of violence between men and women is not a valid conclusion (Dobash et al, 1992; Johnson, 1995; Melton & Belknap, 2003; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Henning & Feder, 2004). The debates about the equality of violence are still continuing among some researchers. However, it is reasonable to argue that females are more vulnerable than males due to several
reasons. First, women are more likely to experience injuries caused by violence (Archer, 2000; Arias & Corso, 2005) or be murdered compared to men (BJS, 2013). Second, the costs caused by violence, such as the utilization of health care services and productivity losses among female victims, is about 2.5 times higher than male victims due to the more harmful injuries caused by violence (Arias & Corso, 2005). Third, the defensive tactics of women toward violence can be considered as violence by offenders, researchers and law enforcement (Henning & Feder, 2004). As a result, victims can be considered as offenders at the same time which might not be true.

As both male perpetrators and female victims are less likely to report violence (Shen and Takeuch, 2009), we only know a small part of the IPV problem among women. Thus, we can safely assume that women are more vulnerable to IPV than men and need more attention so that their interests can be protected. Thus, this study focused on violence against women rather than violence against men. In order to achieve a major breakthrough in the understanding of IPV against Korean immigrant women, this study sets out to empirically describe: 1) The determination (or risk factors) and patterns of IPV among Korean immigrants; 2) The connection between patriarchal perceptions or beliefs and experiences of violence among Korean immigrants; 3) The patterns and impact of acculturative stress on IPV vulnerability; 4) The role of interpersonal social networks such as family, relatives or friends, and religious affiliations (i.e., Christianity affiliations) as well as online social networks (i.e., online ethnic social groups, online social networking website such as Facebook) as a protective or intensifying factor of IPV among Korean immigrants; 5) The interaction effect of acculturative stress and social networks on IPV; 6) The interaction effect of acculturation and patriarchal perceptions or beliefs on IPV.

Mixed methods have been utilized to address the seven research goals stated above. Two study components – surveys and in-depth interviews – have been designed to collect research
data to address the goals of this study.

*Quantitative data collection – Structured Surveys (N=127)*

A case-control study in which 64 Korean immigrant women who have been in an abusive intimate relationship in the past 12 months were compared with 63 Korean immigrant women who have never been in any abusive intimate partner relationship in their lifetime. Data from the structured surveys were collected to discover the patterns of victimization and establish statistical correlations among the key variables of interest.

*Qualitative data collection – In-depth Interviews (N=16)*

In-depth interviews with 16 participants were conducted to gather in-depth narratives of the personal experiences of patriarchal culture, immigration stressors, the role of interpersonal and online social networks and IPV victimizations. Emphasis has been placed on the discovery of underlying value systems and key decision-making processes embedded in the dynamics of IPV facilitation and prevention. This qualitative data also provided the interpretive framework for the analysis of the quantitative data.

Below, I will provide literature reviews on the occurrence of IPV in general and among Korean immigrant populations, followed by an elaboration of theoretical frameworks which guided this study. This will be followed in turn by section on Research Design and Methods, Results, Discussions and Policy Implications, and Conclusions, Limitations and Contributions.
CHAPTER 2. OVERVIEW OF PROBLEMS

Occurrence of Intimate Partner Violence

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a serious social issue not only among immigrants but also among the general population. However, the seriousness of IPV has only recently been fully realized by researchers and scholars, and the estimated frequency of violence toward women varies. According to a report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, only 50% of violent crimes including IPV cases were reported to the police in 2011 (Truman & Planty, 2012). As not all crimes are reported to the police and only serious IPV cases tend to be reported to the police (Bonomi et al, 2006), we can reasonably assume that there are many more incidents than we know from the official police data.

To investigate the occurrence of violence against women and overcome the dark figure of the official police reports, numerous studies at the national level have been conducted in the U.S.A. According to the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) which surveys non-institutionalized English and Spanish speaking individuals aged 18 or older through the random digit dial (RDD) telephone, Black and colleagues (2011) estimated that more than 28% of women in the United States experience intimate-partner-related physical assaults, rapes, and stalking during their lifetime. In addition, according to this survey, about 1 in 17 women experienced sexual and physical violence as well as stalking in the last twelve months. Six out of 10 victims reported that they felt fearful about their safety because of their intimate relationship.

Similar to NISVS, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS, Bureau of Statistics) which investigates non-fatal victimization of the last 6 month through a self-report survey among a nationally representative sample of about 90,000 households (about 160,000 persons), revealed that the rates of physical and sexual victimization among women aged 12 or older by current or
former partners (including spouses or boyfriends) was about 4.7 per 1,000 females in 2011. Amongst them, 45% of female victims experienced physical attacks such as hitting, slapping or knocking the victim down. According to the NCVS report (Catalano, 2012), the rate of serious violence such as rape or sexual assaults between 1994 and 2011 has declined over 70% from 5.9 per 1,000 females aged 12 or older, to 1.3 per 1,000. However, it is important to note the homicide rate caused by intimate partners. Even though the numbers of homicide (including murder, non-negligent manslaughter or the willful killing of one human being by another) in general have decreased from 5,194 in 1993 to 3,032 in 2010, over 39% of women were killed by their intimate partners in 2010 (compared to over 29% in 1993) (Catalano, 2013). This indicates that the proportion of homicide by intimate partners has increased.

Although not a recent study, other national level surveys provide some estimates of violence among the general population in the US. Using data from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) collected from a telephone survey of men and women (n=16,000) in the U.S.A, Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) found that 4.5% of women who have been in marital/opposite-sex cohabiting relationships experienced forcible rape, 20.4% experienced physical assaults, and 4.1% experienced stalking in their life time by their current or formal partners. American Indians/Alaska Natives are at greatest risk of violent victimization while Asian/Pacific Islanders reported the lowest levels of life time victimization, although they suggested that lower rates of victimization among Asians might be due to underreporting caused by cultural values which prohibit the exposure of personal matters to others. Using the same data (NVAWS), Outlaw (2009) found that the occurrence of nonphysical abuse such as emotional, economic and psychological abuse by a current partner is four times higher compared to physical types of abuse, although the occurrence of all forms of violence is closely related to each other.
According to Outlaw (2009), nonphysical abuse increases the risk of the experience of physical abuse as well as the frequency of abuse. This indicates that nonphysical types of abuse should be investigated as being distinct from physical abuse.

The National Latino and Asian American Study (NLAAS) is the national level survey which focuses on specific ethnic groups – Latinos and Asian Americans. As a part of the Collaborative Psychiatric Epidemiology studies (CPES), the NLAAS collected national representative data from Latinos and Asian Americans in the US aged 18 or older through face-to-face interviews or telephone interviews using multistage area probability sampling (Alegria et al, 2004). As bilingual interviewers conducted the survey focusing on the Latino and Asian populations, the incidence of IPV among these ethnic subgroups could be identified by this study. The results show that Asians, when compared to Latinos, are less likely to experience less prevalent rates of IPV. Using the NLAAS data, Cho (2012) investigated the risk factors for IPV within Asian American subgroups – 193 Chinese, 188 Vietnamese and 167 Filipino. On average, 9.2% of Asian Americans in this survey reported the experience of less severe IPV (i.e., being pushed, grabbed or shoved, having something thrown at them, and being slapped or hit) while 1.6% of them reported the experience of severe IPV (i.e., being kicked, bitten or hit with a fist, being beaten up or choked, burnt or scalded, and threatened with a knife or gun). Among these subgroups, Chinese are the least likely to experience IPV while Vietnamese are the most likely to experience IPV. This study found that the prevalence rate of IPV among these subgroups varied, but the relationship disappears when controlling for demographic factors such as age, interpersonal, and cultural variables. In addition, American-born Asians and those who have higher levels of perceived discrimination tend to have higher risk factors of IPV when compared with their counterparts.
Although the above studies provide good estimates of the occurrence of violence using nationally representative samples, the occurrence of violence among immigrants, in particular among Asian immigrants (including Koreans) who might be at great risk, is not easily captured by these surveys due to several reasons. First of all, national level studies tend only to focus on English and/or Spanish speaking individuals. As many Asian immigrants cannot speak English fluently, especially recent emigrants (Carliner, 2000), the level of violence they experience cannot be captured by this survey as they cannot participate in the study. Second, illegal immigrants who might be at a higher risk of perpetration and victimization because of their status are prevented from actively engaging in these kinds of surveys. In addition, even national level studies tend to have a very small sample size of Asian Americans. As they have thus often been excluded from the analysis, the results of these analyses can hardly be representative of the growing Asian populations in the USA (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2013).

**Intimate Partner Violence among Korean Immigrants**

In particular, although Koreans make up a large sub-population among Asians in the United States and the prevalence rate of violence might be different among Asian subgroups, Korean immigrants tend to be excluded from national level surveys or end up lumped with other ethnic groups as “Others” or “Asians”. As a result, studies which focus on Korean immigrants or populations are very limited and it is difficult to understand the full scale of the problem among them.

To overcome these limitations, some researchers focus on the Korean population. Using the questions from the short version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS I), Leung and Cheung (2008) examined the prevalence of IPV in the last year among 6 different Asian ethnic groups – 610 Chinese (including 70 Taiwanese), 101 Filipinos, 154 Indians, 72 Japanese, 123 Korean, and 517
Vietnamese in the greater Houston area in Texas where a large number of the population is Asian. They revealed that the prevalence of partner abuse overall across the sample was 16.4% while Vietnamese (22.4%) and Filipinos (21.8%) were the highest in this study. Although overall experience of IPV among Koreans was not the highest in this study, the prevalence of physical abuse among Korean immigrants (19.5%) was more than twice as high when compared to Chinese (9.7%) and Japanese (9.7%) who share similar cultural characteristics.

Through purposive sampling, Lee (2007) recruited 136 Korean immigrant women from Korean nursery schools, clothing stores, language schools and grocery stores where Korean immigrants frequently visit in the Austin and Dallas (Texas) areas. The findings of this study reveal that about 30% of women experienced physical abuse by their partners and 70.6% experienced psychological aggression in the past year. Alcohol use and religious involvement of their partners as well as childhood victimization are highly associated with the occurrence of violence.

Similarly, Liles and the colleagues (2012) conducted telephone interviews with a representative probability sample of 592 Korean immigrant female adults in California. They used the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) and asked on the occurrence of violence in the past year. According to them, the rates of IPV in the past year for the full sample regardless of their age group was 2.0% for physical assault, 27.4% for psychological aggression and 17.3% for sexual coercion by their partners. Interestingly, although other types of violence such as psychological aggression and sexual coercion were the least among the oldest group (55 or older), physical assault by their partners was the highest among this group. This indicates that the occurrence of different types of violence varies by age group among Korean immigrants.

There have been some efforts to investigate the problem of IPV among Korean populations
in the US, but more attention is definitely needed. For instance, Yick and Oomen-Early (2008) conducted a content analysis of 60 scholarly journal articles which were published in five journals over 16 years between 1990 and 2005 focusing on domestic violence or intimate partner violence among Asian communities. Over 91% of articles were focused on a specific Asian group, such as Asian Indians (31.7%) and Chinese (28.3%), but only 2 articles were focused on Korean populations. Although this analysis only analyzed scholarly articles published in major journals, we can logically assume that not much attention has been paid to Korean populations.
Numerous factors have been identified as risk factors for IPV victimization and perpetration. Some risk factors of IPV for both males and females tend to be similar across different cultures or different environments, but not all factors are identical. Below are first listed various risk factors identified by researchers for IPV.

**Demographic Factors (Age, Gender, and Race/Ethnicity)**

As the most violent crimes such as physical and sexual assaults tend to decrease as the age of offenders and victims increases, some scholars investigate the relationship between age and IPV. According to a report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics (Rennison, 2001), younger women when compared to older women are more likely to become victims of intimate partner violence. This phenomenon tends to be similar across different ethnic and racial groups. Similarly, Rivara and colleagues (2009) interviewed 3,568 women aged 18 to 64 about IPV in their adult lifetime. These women were categorized by their age groups – 18 to 20, 21 to 25, 26 to 30, 31 to 35, 36 to 40, 41 to 45, 46 to 50, and 51 to 64. After controlling for the birth cohort and period effects, they found that the risk of any type of violent IPV was highest among women aged 26 to 30. And the risk of abuse decreases substantially for women over the age of 50. However, as this study only focused on violent crimes rather than other types of abuse such as verbal or psychological and emotional abuse, their findings do not give us a full picture of problems related with age.

Although it might be true that the risk of IPV decreases by age as other studies have suggested, elderly women are not immune to IPV (Teaster, Roberto & Dugar, 2006). Zink and Fisher (2007) investigate the incidence and prevalence of IPV among 995 women who were over 55 years of age in primary care offices in Southwestern Ohio through a telephone survey. The prevalence and incidence rates for physical and sexual abuse over the age of 55 years was 1.52%...
and 2.14% respectively, while psychological/emotional abuse was 45.2%. As there are only a very limited number of studies examining elderly IPV women, it is not possible to make comparisons with other studies. However, as the results of this study show, elderly women are not immune to IPV abuse although the types of violence might change with age.

Similarly, a study by Bazargan-Hejazi et al. (2013) examines the relationship between types of violence (physical, sexual and psychological violence or combination of them) and age of women in Malawi. Using the 2004 Malawi Demographic and Health Survey, they found that women aged 25 to 29 were more likely to experience physical violence such as being pushed or shaken, slapped or punched, and women aged 30 to 34 were more likely to experience sexual violence while women aged 15 to 19 were less likely to experience emotional abuse compared with older women (i.e., women aged 45 to 49). The findings of this study support the notion that IPV does not decrease with age if we consider the type of violence that victims experience. Thus, it will be important to look at the relationship between age and the type of violence that Korean immigrant victims experience.

IPV victimization and perpetration occur against women and men, in both heterosexual and same-sex couples. The most common violent victimization for women is domestic violence or intimate partner violence (World Health Organization, 2001) and males (like many other violent crimes) are more likely perpetrators and females are more likely victims (Breiding et al, 2008). Although some studies have found that both men and women are equally abusive toward their partners (Archer, 2000; Howard & Wang, 2003; Straus, 1997-1998) and the arrest rate of women as perpetrators or dual arrest have been increasing (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002), many argue that equality of violence between men and women is not a valid conclusion (Johnson, 1995; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). The debates about the symmetry of violence are still ongoing. However,
evidence suggests that women use physical or nonphysical violence as self-defense (Downs, Rindels, & Atkinson, 2007) and defensive violence by abused women can be considered as use of violence toward men (Miller, 2005), women are more likely to be victims of IPV violence than men and the severity of violence women experience is more severe than men (Archer, 2000; Arias & Corso, 2005; BJS, 2013). Thus, this study will focus on Korean immigrant female victims.

The findings about the effect of race/ethnicity on IPV occurrence are mixed. Many studies tend to argue that Asians, when compared to other ethnic groups such as Blacks and Latinos, are less likely to experience IPV but the relationship between race/ethnicity and IPV occurrence tends to disappear when controlling for other risk factors such as socioeconomic status, alcohol or substance use (Field & Caetano, 2004). As this study is only limited to Korean immigrant women, the effect of race/ethnicity as well as the gender variable will be controlled.

**Socioeconomic Status (SES)**

Several studies identified a relationship as existing between socioeconomic status and IPV (Ackerson & Subramanian, 2008; Cunradi, Caetano & Schafer, 2002; Field & Caetano, 2004). Field and Caetano (2004) reviewed cross-sectional and longitudinal research on the role of socioeconomic characteristics on IPV such as the National Longitudinal Couples Survey (1995 and 2000), National Violence Against Women Survey, National Family Violence Survey, and National family Violence Resurvey. The findings show that IPV varies by the ethnicity of victims, but the relationship between ethnicity and IPV disappears when controlling for socioeconomic characteristics, although Blacks tend to have higher risk compared to other ethnic groups even controlling for these risk factors. They argue that socioeconomic characteristics such as education, occupation and income of both abusers and victims play an important role in
the occurrence of IPV. Other studies support this argument that IPV is more likely to occur among uneducated and marginalized women living in poor households. Ackerson and Subramanian (2008) examined the socioeconomic and demographic patterning on the state and neighborhood level related to IPV using a sample of 83,627 women in India. This study reveals that IPV tends to occur among the uneducated, in marginalized castes, and among women living in poor families. In addition, gender inequality partially explains the differences in IPV between neighboring states. Similarly, another study by Benson and Fox (2004) using data from the National Survey of Households and families based on a nationally representative sample of U.S. Households reveals that household incomes play an important role in IPV. When household incomes go up and consistent employment status increases, IPV tends to decrease. In addition, using the cross-sectional British Crime Survey, Khalifeh and colleagues (2013) found that the lifetime physical IPV of women was associated with low incomes, low educational levels, and low social class. However, men’s physical IPV victimization was not associated with these variables of deprivation. Similar to this result, Tenkorang et al. (2013) also found that education was highly associated not with sexual abuse but with physical abuse among married women in Ghana.

A relationship between SES and IPV is not always supported by researchers. By using the vignettes that depicted scenarios of violence in a community sample, Mooney (2000) found that there is no statistical relationship between SES and IPV. In other words, IPV can occur regardless of class and economic structure. Although IPV can occur at all socioeconomic levels, researchers tend to agree that rates of IPV are higher among economically deprived individuals with a significantly lower SES (Buckner, Bearslee, & Bassuk, 2004; Dahlberg & Krug, 2002). Similarly, based on data from a population-based survey of 2,702 women and 28 in-depth
interviews of abused women during 2000-2001 in urban and rural Bangladesh, Naved and Persson (2005) reveal that a bit less than 20 percent of urban and 16 percent of rural women reported that they have been physically abused by their husbands in the 12 months prior to the survey. In general, a husband’s lower educational level increases the level of violence in both areas. However, women’s financial achievement increased the risk of being abused only in rural areas. Thus, it is important to consider the interaction effects between the socioeconomic status of victims and offenders as well as the location of the area of residence.

On the other hand, financial or social dependency of victims on abusers due to lack of SES is also related to IPV. For instance, Postmus et al., (2012) conducted a survey with 120 IPV survivors from a financial empowerment program called “Moving Ahead through Financial Management” which was created to provide self-sufficiency to survivors of violence. Among these participants, over 94% of participants reported experiencing some form of economic abuse. According to this study, lower educational level and income of victims are highly associated with economic abuse, such as economic control and economically exploitative behaviors which in turn reduces the self-sufficiency of victims. Lack of self-sufficiency limits the ability of victims to escape from abusive situations and increases their vulnerability. Some other studies support this argument (Barnett, 2000; Kim & Gray, 2008). Using data from the Domestic Violence Experiment in Omaha, Nebraska, Kim and Gray (2008) analyzed the factors affecting women’s decisions to leave or stay in abusive relationships. One of main factors that lead women to stay or leave their abusive relationship was financial (in)dependency. When the level of financial dependency increases by one unit, victims are 89% more likely to leave an abusive relationship.

Financial dependence of women can exacerbate the aggression of men when they are
dealing with unmanageable strains. However, at the same time, women’s financial independence or advancement can put them in risk of IPV when their male partners think they lost their power over them due to wife’s financial independency (Han, Kim & Tyson, 2010; Jin & Keat, 2010; Morash et al., 2000). Thus, depending on the situation, both financial dependence and independence of immigrant women can become a risk factor. Also, lack of social networks and resources (Thoits, 1986) coming from immigrant women’ lower educational level (Everett et al., 2011) and lack of employment opportunities than native-born women (Cooke et al., 2009) can make them to more vulnerable to violence. Also, immigrant women hesitant to leave their abusive husbands due to the legal dependency on their abusers (Bhuyan, 2008). For undocumented women, they concern being deported and losing their children (Murdough et al., 2004). All these characteristics of immigrant victims might have an influence on offenders’ abusive behaviors. Thus, understanding victims’ characteristics interaction with offenders’ characteristic will provide a more complete picture of the phenomenon of IPV caused by immigrant men. Based on this, we can hypothesize that Korean immigrant women with low SES are more likely to become victims of IPV, but higher SES of victims does not guarantee immunity from IPV.

**Exposure to Violence During Childhood/ Adolescence**

According to findings by the National Institute of Justice (Reno et al, 2000), about 54% of men and 40% of women experienced childhood victimization among the general population. It is well-known that childhood victimization—such as physical abuse, sexual abuse and neglect— increase the vulnerability of lifetime (re)victimization in violent crimes, including IPV (Widom, Czaja, & Dutton, 2008). Daigneault and colleagues (2009) found that childhood victimization is the greatest risk factor of IPV for the Canadian sample. Findings from a recent study using the
Ghana Demographic and Health Survey also reveals that women who witnessed family violence in their lives were more likely to have experienced physical and sexual IPV compared with those who had not (Tenkorang et al, 2013). Similar results have been found by other researchers, suggesting that violent childhood experiences and exposure to domestic violence profoundly increases the risk of victimization and perpetration of IPV (Gomez, 2011; Schewe et al, 2006; Whitfield et al, 2003) and individuals who experienced childhood maltreatment are more likely to be victimized by multiple partners when they become adults (Alexander, 2009). In addition, women who witnessed their parents’ violence are less likely to leave their abusive relationship compared to those who did not (Kim & Gray, 2008).

There are many explanations for why there is an association between the experience of childhood abuse and IPV offending and victimization. One explanation might be that children who grew up in an abusive home environment learn through direct and indirect abusive experiences (Renner & Slack, 2006; Stith et al., 2000) such that they become adept at accepting or rationalizing their current experience or use of violence (Tenkorang et al, 2013; Yount & Carrera, 2006). This concept is compatible with social learning theory that individuals learn some behaviors via observation (Bandura, 1977). For instance, according to a study conducted by Yount (2009), she founds that The other possible explanation might be that as violence is more likely to occur among individuals who live in low SES and socially disorganized neighborhoods and as these levels of SES tend to maintain themselves across a lifetime, the association between violence in adulthood and childhood victimization is due to the psychosocial context of individuals rather than other factors (Fergusson, Boden, Horwood, 2006).

Physical punishment is often used in many Asian countries as discipline and the definition of abuse is different in each culture, and thus it is possible that victims and offenders do not
consider their violent experiences as “abuse”. The problem with this is that they might use similar kinds of physical punishment on their children or even on their intimate partners without realizing the harmful effect. In addition, because revealing sexual abuse history is highly discouraged in the Korean community due to stigmatization (Kim & Kim, 2005), victims are less likely be treated for their trauma and thus might become more vulnerable. From this, we can assume that Korean immigrant victims are more likely to have child abuse histories than non-victims.

**Religious Affiliation and Religiosity**

Highly religious people tend to be more engaged with family, involved in their communities and feel happier than others (Pew Research Center, 2016). For immigrants, religion can play even more important role in their lives. The strength of religious belief and religious affiliation are important factors in helping immigrants integrate into a new culture and society (Kotin, Dyrness & Irazabal, 2011). They can help relieve acculturative stress (Lee, Koeske & Sales, 2004) and expand social networks (Park, Roh, & Yeo, 2011), which can increase social support.

When IPV victims have supportive social networks such as church groups, family or friends, so that they are not socially isolated, offenders are less likely to abuse victims, and victims can more easily escape from their abusive circumstances (Clark et al, 2010; Coohey, 2007; Levendosky et al, 2004). However, not all social networks that connect offenders and victims with others play a positive role in limiting victimization and perpetration (Nurius et al, 2003). In addition, when confronting family problems such as IPV, ingrained values and unrealistic expectations from religious authorizes and friends may increase stress and thus make the situation worse (Strawbridge et al, 1998). Levitt and Ware (2006) interviewed a total of 25
Jewish, Christian and Islamic faith religious leaders about their perspectives on IPV. The findings of this study show that religious leaders tend to think that victims have some responsibility for provoking offenders, staying in abusive situation, and low self-esteem. In addition, the most leaders do not support of divorce due to IPV.

In particular, about 71% of Korean immigrants are affiliated with Korean churches (Pew Research Center, 2012) and they tend to attend church more frequently and participate in church events more actively than other immigrant groups (Min & Kim, 2005). There is a lot of potential for religion to influence the daily lives and interpersonal (including intimate partner relationship) and social relationships of Korean immigrants.
CHAPTER 4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Three dominant theories that attempt to explain the causes of IPV guided this study to explain the occurrence of IPV among Korean immigrant communities in the USA. The first is a patriarchal culture theory that emphasizes patriarchal cultural norms held by (recent) immigrants which justifies and accepts IPV as an instrument of male dominance in the social order. The second is a theory of acculturative stress which locates the sources of IPV in the stress that immigrants face when adjusting to a new cultural environment, and the venting of such stress on the most convenient target: intimate partners. The third model is a social isolation theory which argues that the lack of social control and supportive networks of immigrant women lead women to be socially isolated and thus allowing offenders to gain control over victims.

The Culture Importation Model

The first theory argues that the culture of an individual’s sending country can be attributed as a cause of IPV. According to this cultural theory, the cause of IPV can be contributable to traditional cultural values and norms in patriarchal societies. This is due to the fact that in these cultures individuals believe in strong gender roles and tend to support patriarchal attitudes which specify that women place in lower position compared with men in the family structure or in the relationship between intimate partners, and women were regarded as “objects” to be possessed by men (Shibusawa & Yick, 2007). As a result of this, women become vulnerable to violence, and men feel justified in their use of violence against women. Studies reveal that there was a high association between men’s traditional gender role attitudes and the use of violence toward their wives (Crossman, Stith, & Bender, 1990). Women who hold conservative values also think that using violence toward their wives is justifiable in some situations (Parish, et al., 2004). Similarly, one study reveals that about 50% of Egyptian women
agreed that using physical violence (i.e., hitting or beating) can be justifiable in some situations such as when women neglects the children, goes out without telling him, argues with him, refuses to have sex with him, and so on. In this way, both abusers and victims of IPV rationalize and reinforce violent behaviors toward their families using traditional cultural beliefs and values.

Studies reveal that when offenders and victims believe in traditional gender roles and are embedded in patriarchal power structures, they are more likely to be victims of IPV. Morse and colleagues (2012) conducted a thematic qualitative analysis of 70 Jordanian women about the experience of violence and their perception toward violence. The interviews were conducted in 12 focus groups of women who were married, divorced or widowed. According to this study, Jordanian women were experiencing various forms of violence such as physical abuse, control or sexual abuse and victims attribute the cause of violence to different gender role expectations, the extended family role and stigma and social norms associated with violence. They argue that as Jordanian women rarely reveal their problems to health care providers or formal help seeking agencies due to cultural stigma, it is important to take a cultural approach which focuses on traditional gender roles to investigate the problems. Similarly, using eight focus groups of 47 Sri Lankan immigrant women who had received counseling services for IPV in Canada, Hyman and colleagues (2011) found that patriarchal social norms which focus on gender roles are one of the three main themes associated with IPV. According to them, participants identified gender inequality and financial dependence as a factor associated with their experience of IPV.

Traditionally, Sri Lanka family structures are patriarchal and the majority of people tend to share these structures and values in the community, and in Canada they realized that conflicts of gender roles after immigration and the stress caused by these conflicts contributes to violence.

However, it is wrong to assume that there is a universal patriarchy in all family and
socio-legal contexts to explain perpetration and victimization (Ogle & Batton, 2009). In particular, immigrants tend to experience acculturation which influences cultural and psychological changes among individuals (Graves, 1967; Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). As a result, we can assume that there will be some interaction effect of acculturation and patriarchal perceptions or beliefs on IPV among Korean immigrants.

**Patriarchal Culture and IPV among Korean Immigrants**

Historically, communities in East Asia and in Korea have been influenced by Confucianism for thousands of years (Park & Bernstein, 2008; Shim, 2009). This philosophy prescribes male dominance in all aspects of social life, and culturally scripted virtues for women are those such as submissiveness, passivity, and nurturance. Despite recent globalizing and Westernizing trends, Confucianism still powerfully regulates interpersonal relationships among Koreans and much research has identified the Confucian philosophy as one of the most important factors shaping family structure, gender roles, and marital relationships (Chang, 2010; Kim & Hurh, 1983; Min, 2001; Sleziak, 2013; Yu, 1987). For instance, the primary role of married Korean women is still that of taking care of husbands, children and other family members (Min, 2001). In addition, a report by the Pew Research Center (2010) reveals that 64% of Koreans say that having a successful marriage is the most important thing in their lives, a sizeable number when compared with the general Asian population (54%) and the general public (24%).

According to Kim and Sung’s study (2000), the residual influence of traditional Korean culture (and imbibed prior to immigration) which emphasizes patriarchal power structures and ideologies is highly associated with the occurrence of violence among Korean immigrants. They conducted telephone interviews with 256 Korean Americans in the Chicago and New York City metropolitan areas and found that the rate of severe violence and wife beating in male dominant couples where men have marital power for decision making was four times higher than in
egalitarian couples. In particular, male dominant couples with high levels of stress experienced higher levels of violence.

Although the intensity of patriarchic norms and values tends to change as immigrants acculturate into the new culture and society (Ho, 1990; Kim & Wolpin, 2008), they also still tend to preserve their own cultural values and identities, and reinforce them through various ethnic, family and religious activities and interactions into succeeding generations (Lee, 2005; Min & Kim, 2005; Inman et al, 2007; Song, 1996). According to one study, about 95% of Korean immigrants in the Chicago area wanted to teach their children the Korean language, history, Korean morals and general customs (Hurh, Kim, & Kim, 1978). Another study reveals that Korean immigrants significantly endorse traditional child-rearing attitudes such as valuing the hierarchical structure of the family, collective goals within the family, and family reputation compared to other Eastern Asian groups such as Chinese and Japanese immigrants (Barry, Bernard, & Beitel, 2009). In addition, the U.S Census of 2004 reveals that about 76% of Korean Americans in the US are born in Korea and 80% of Korean Americans speak Korean at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007) which is one of the important factors to maintain their cultural identity. Hyun (2001) compared the endorsement of Korean traditional values between 209 Koreans in Seoul, Korea and 158 Korean Americans in Detroit. Findings of this study indicate that Korean men both in Korea and the USA compared to women are more likely to endorse Korean traditional values such as promotion of age, gender and status hierarchy. Despite a large number of years living in USA, the endorsement of Korean traditional value by Korean immigrant men was similar from Korean participants in Korea. She suggested that as Korean immigrants who left Korea many years ago and had little contact with USA cultures tend to hold traditional values more than Korean people in Korea. Similarly, Min and Kim (2009) compared
Chinese, Indian and Korean immigrants which consist of the three large immigrant groups in New York City in their ethnic attachment. The findings of this study show that Koran immigrants compared to Chinese and Indian exhibits a high level of social ethnic networks such as involvement in ethnic affiliations, ethnic friend network, and ethnic and racial compositions of five best friends. This supports that Korean immigrants preserve their ethnic identity and traditional values and it affects the lives of Korean immigrants.

This suggests the idea that Korean immigrants who maintain their cultural norms and value system may be more likely to experience IPV victimization and perpetration.

These ideas lead to my first and second hypothesis:

**H1**: IPV victims are more likely to hold traditional gender role value than non-victims.

**H2**: Acculturation will moderate the effect of gender role attitudes on the occurrence of IPV.

**The Acculturation and Acculturative Stress Model**

When individuals contact two different cultures (host country’s culture and home country’s culture) due to the immigration, they experience the cultural and psychological changes, which refer to “acculturation” (Graves, 1967; Redfield, Linton, & Herskovits, 1936). Various forms of psychological and socio-cultural adaptations takes a place in the process of acculturation such as “learning each other’s language, sharing each other’s food preferences and adopting forms of dress and social interaction” (Berry, 2005. p. 700). However, different individuals and groups experience the different level of acculturation (Berry, 2005). Individuals can develop or adapt different strategies of acculturation but if individuals lack acculturative strategies when they encounter difficulties, they are more likely to experience acculturative stress (Berry, 1980). These strategies involve four different types of behavioral and value changes.
based on the level of adaptation into the immigrant society: separation, marginalization, assimilation and integration. Integration can be defined as individuals actively interacting with a dominant culture as well as maintaining their own culture, while separation can be defined as individuals who are detached from the host culture because of lack of interaction with others while maintaining their own culture (Berry, 1997). Similarly, assimilation is defined as individuals only accept the dominant society by avoiding their own cultural heritage while marginalization is defined as individuals neither interested in nor maintaining their own culture nor having relations with others in a dominant culture.

Many studies have identified acculturation as one of the significant risk factors for IPV among immigrants. Although the level of acculturation has been measured using different variables—some studies use validated scales such as the Marin and Marine Acculturation Scale and others use length of stay, English speaking ability, etc.—regardless of the measurement researchers use, they tend to agree that acculturation level is highly associated with IPV and factors related to IPV.

Kim-Goh and Baello (2008) examined the roles of acculturation level, demographic and socio-economic characteristics of individuals such as age and education level on attitudes toward domestic violence among 229 Korean and 184 Vietnamese immigrants in southern California. They found when individuals are more acculturated and have higher educational levels, they are less likely to support the use of violence toward their partners.

Gupta and colleagues (2010) examined the relationship between the perpetrations of intimate partner violence based on their immigration status. Among 1,668 men recruited from community health centers in Boston, about 24.8% reported that they had perpetrated some form of IPV in the past 12 months. According to this study, native-born men are more likely to report
IPV perpetration compared with recent immigrants (who have lived in the U.S. for less than 6 years). However, among immigrant men (recent and non-recent), non-recent immigrant men with low English speaking ability had the highest IPV perpetration rate while recent immigrant men with high English speaking ability had the lowest rate. Although it is not clear why English speaking ability has an influence on IPV perpetration, they argue that the lack of English speaking ability among immigrant men who have lived in the US for more than 6 years increases the chance of IPV perpetration. It might be possible that as the length of their stay in the US increases, their expectation to speak better English increases, but their real ability does not meet their expectation and this increases the frustration level among these men.

Interestingly, many studies indicate that immigrants are less likely to be victims of dating violence (Sanderson et al., 2004; Silverman, Decker, & Raj, 2007), be victimized physically and sexually (Sabina, Cuevas & Schally, 2013), feel depressed (Bauman & Summers, 2009), and bad mental and physical health condition (Perez, 2002) compared to Americans. However, the relationship between acculturation and victimizations by their partners tend to be different. For instance, Yick (2000) examined the relationship between acculturation and physical violence by a spouse or intimate partners among 262 Chinese Americans in the Los Angeles County. The finding of this study reveals that less acculturated Chinese women are more likely to experience physical violence. Similarly, Cunradi (2009) found that acculturation related factors such as their birth place or Language preference were not associated with either victimization or perpetration of IPV among a national sample of married or cohabiting Hispanic men and women. Hyman et al (2006) also found that more acculturated women, which was measured by the length of stay (less than 10 years or more than 10 years in Canada) in Canada have significantly lower rated of IPV experience than less acculturated women. This suggests that more acculturated Hispanic men
and women are more likely to be offenders and victims of IPV. Although not all studies found
the significant relationship between acculturation level and IPV victimization, as immigrants
women are more likely to feel distress or experience the trauma-related symptoms following
victimization (Cuevas, Sabina, & Bell, 2012), immigrant women might be more vulnerable to
future or repeat victimizations. There are many studies that suggest that immigrants experience
varying levels of acculturative stress which is highly associated with the occurrence of IPV.
Negative emotions and stress caused by various obstacles in the process of acculturation also
play an important role in the occurrence of IPV among immigrants. Immigrants often encounter
various difficulties and challenges during the acculturation process and they experience
acculturative stress due to language barriers, discrimination, cultural differences and immigration
conditions which can intensify or lead to IPV (Kim & Sung, 2000; Caplan, 2007). A large body
of research found that higher level of acculturative stress is correlated with lower level of violent
behavior and attitude such as suicidal ideation, depression and IPV (Caetano et al, 2007; Hovey,
2000). This concept is compatible with general strain theory. Agnew (1992) argues that
individuals engage in crime due to negative emotions such as anger, frustration, or anxiety when
they do not have the ability to cope with strains in a legal manner.

Studies reveal that other factors can increase or decrease the degree of acculturative stress
among immigrants. A large body of research contends that education levels have a significant
impact on the level of acculturative stress. Comparing immigrants, refugees, indigenous peoples,
sojourners and ethnic groups in Canada, Berry and colleagues (1987) found that less education
consistently predicts higher levels of acculturative stress across all groups. They argue that the
more educated tend to have more intellectual and economic resources to cope with their stress.
Therefore, the more educated are less likely to experience higher levels of stress. Similarly, the
income level of immigrants has been found to be significantly associated with acculturative stress among immigrants. If immigrant families have low levels of income or if they perceive their income level to be low, they are more likely to experience higher levels of acculturative stress (Jibeen & Khalid, 2010). The relationship between legal status and acculturative stress is well documented as well. Higher levels of deportation fear due to legal status was strongly associated with higher levels of acculturative stress among sample populations of documented and undocumented Hispanics living in the USA (Arbona et al, 2010). In addition, as the level of English language proficiency decreases, the level of acculturative stress increases dramatically (Lueck & Wilson (2009). Lower feelings of stress have also been found among those who arrived in the USA at an early age, have been resident for an extended period of time, and are female (Dow, 2011; Lueck & Wilson, 2009).

**Acculturation and Acculturative Stress and IPV among Korean immigrants**

Koreans tend to come to America for better occupational and educational opportunities for themselves and their children. Despite the fact that a relatively high percentage of Korean immigrants have received more than a college education, and though many Korean immigrant males held white-collar occupations in Korea prior to immigration (Bureau of the Census, 1993; Migration Policy Institute, 2010; Kim, 2004), many Korean immigrants nonetheless tend to experience high levels of frustration due to facing difficult conditions when searching for jobs and adapting to their new lives in the country of arrival. Although Korean Americans are more likely have higher educational attainment compared to other Asian populations in US, their median household income is lower than them (Pew Research Center 2010; Min, 2013) which would increase stress levels. There is evidence that Korean immigrants experience significant psychological stress from losing their previous occupational status (Rhee, 1997). In addition, as psychological health problems such as depression or aggression, which are highly associated
with aggressive behaviors, are stigmatized and regarded as more than a mere illness within the Korean community, Korean immigrants rarely reveal the psychological symptoms related to their emotional disturbances and stress to others even to mental health professionals (Kim & Rew, 1994; Yoon et al, 2010). As a consequence, is it likely that symptoms associated with difficulties to do with immigration may fester and develop into more serious problems.

These ideas lead to my third hypothesis:

**H3**: IPV victims are more likely to experience higher levels of acculturative stress compared to non-victims.

**The Social Isolation Model**

Social isolation can be defined as “a sense of loneliness or rejection by others” (Fischer, 1976, p. 172) or “the lack of contact of sustained interaction with individuals and institutions that represent mainstream society (Wilson, 1987, p. 60). Social isolation can occur due to geographic isolation or/and psychological isolation. Social isolation due to geographic isolation can occur when individuals reside in remote areas where they cannot get access to social services, help agencies or reach social networks (Gallup-Black, 2005) or are relocated to an unfamiliar area. Psychological isolation can occur when individuals perceive that they are isolated due to geographic isolation and lack of social participation. When individuals are isolated from mainstream society and social networks, they are more likely to have mental and psychological health problems (Coyle & Dugan, 2012; Heikkinen & Kauppinen 2004), higher rates of mortality (Brummett et al.2001), and more likely to become victims of IPV (Coohey, 2007; Farris & Fenaughty, 2002; Stets, 1991; Van Wyk et al, 2003).

Lack of social networks or social isolation has been known as one of the risk factors of IPV because it produces weakened social support and social control (Coohey, 2007; Farris &
According to a study (Gallup-Black, 2005), socially isolated rural areas when compared to urban areas tend to have higher rates of family and IPV murders whereas other crimes are higher in urban areas. Using the 1980 to 1999 FBI Supplementary Homicide Report, Gallup-Black (2005) found that homicides committed by family or intimate partners declined regardless of place, but the murder rate by intimate partners increased when the degree of rurality increases. As the degree of rurality or urbanity is closely related to the social services intimate partner violence victims can access such as shelters (Websdale, 1998), women living in rural areas are more likely to be victims of family or intimate partner violence. Peek-Asa and the college’s study (2011) also supports the idea that women in rural and isolated areas are much more likely to be victims of severe physical IPV compared to urban women. Victims tend to live in areas where IPV resources are fewer than non-victims.

Farris & Fenaughty (2002) examined the relationship between social isolation, domestic violence and substance dependency among 262 female drug users. Among these women, over 38% reported physical abuse by their recent sex partners. Physically abused women are more likely to meet the indicators of social isolation measured by the frequency of not being allowing meeting friends and being forced to stay at home by offenders than their counterparts, while there was no relationship between drug dependency and the experience of violence. Thus, the findings of this study suggest that social isolation is independently related to domestic violence.

However, some scholars speculate on the role of social networks on IPV. To understand the relationship between the social network of battered women and the severity of domestic violence they experience, Coohey (2007) compared three groups of women with children – 40 severely battered women, 46 who were abused not severely and 57 who were not assaulted – recruited from parents groups in community institutions including public schools, social service agencies,
day care centers, and libraries in Chicago. Severely assaulted mothers when compared with non-assaulted mothers and less severely assaulted mothers were more likely to have “fewer friends, fewer contacts with friends, fewer long-term friendships, and fewer friends who really listened to them (p. 508). However, even most severely assaulted women had family and friends who provided them with emotional support. Thus, she argues that it is wrong to assume that social isolation is invariant among all violence victims.

In addition, not all social or support networks play a positive role in preventing IPV (Nurius et al., 2003). For instance, being embedded in a violent community network tends to increase female’s IPV victimization as they come to believe that violence is a normal part of life (Raghavan et al, 2009). In addition, all-male friendship support networks can encourage violence by helping an abusive man justify their abusive actions (Dekesseredy, 1993). Having family members or relatives who put great emphasis on patriarchal norms and values might increase IPV victimization as they reinforce subservient attitudes toward men (Tiwari et al., 2009). If support networks do not assist victims even after the acknowledgement of violence victims experience, this is expected to further increase victimization and perpetration (Stanley, 1992).

Also, due to negative attitudes toward victims and the experience of domestic violence (i.e., the victims myth), victims tend to not seek help and this leads to further victimization (Campbell & Raja, 2005). This indicates that the quality or type of support network rather than their mere existence, is more important to explaining IPV victimization and prevention.

The relationship between social isolation and the occurrence of IPV can be explained in various ways. First, social isolation of offenders and victims decreases the social control or guardianship of offenders and increases the vulnerability of victims (Choi et al, 2012). This concept is compatible with routine activity theory. According to routine activity theory, when
motivated offenders, suitable targets and lack of guardianship meet together, crime can occur (Felson & Cohen, 1980). The social isolation of victims increases the vulnerability of targets (i.e., suitable targets) as it weakens social support networks for victims that can provide the role of guardianship (Coohey, 2007; Farris & Fenaughty, 2002; Stets, 1991; Van Wyk et al, 2003). By isolating victims from society or social networks, offenders can gain control over victims (Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project, 2005; Hilberman & Munson, 1977). Second, the social isolation of victims increases their dependency on offenders. When victims are dependent on offenders financially or emotionally, offenders’ control over victims increases (Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project, 2005). At the same time, it makes it hard for victims to leave abusive situations (Barnett, 2000; Kim & Gray, 2008). In addition, when victims perceive that there is no one who can help, they are more likely to endure the victimization (Bhuyan et al, 2005). For instance, Du Mont and Forte (2012) compared 218 immigrants and 1262 Canadian-born women who have been in abusive relationships to see the consequences of intimate partner violence as well as factors including social networks that play an important role in shaping their abusive experience. According to this study, there was no difference between these two groups of women in terms of the physical and psychological consequences of IPV. However, immigrant women when compared to Canadian women are more likely to report lower levels of trust toward their neighbors and colleagues. As victims of IPV tend to disclose their violence toward people whom they trust, the lack of trust among immigrant women might result in staying in abusive relationships.

**Social Isolation and IPV among Korean Immigrants**

The social isolation of Korean immigrants can be serious as they are geographically located far from their native country, which makes it hard for them to maintain physical interactions with other family members, friends or relatives. At the same time, immigration tends
to change the family structure of the conjugal family significantly (Kim, Kim & Hurh, 1991) so
that other family members or relatives who used to provide supportive networks are no longer
there with them. This absence of social support networks increases the loneliness of immigrant
Korean women (Yoon et al., 2010).

In addition, Korean immigrants are far more likely than other immigrants to be self-
employed (Pew Research Center, 2010). Between 2008 and 2011, on average 26% of Korean
workers were self-employed compared to 11% of non-Asian workers in three main industries:
other services, (21%), retail trade (19%), and professional, scientific and technical services (9%)
(Allard, 2011), which is highly associated with increased working hours among them (Hou &
Wang, 2011; Logan & Alba, 1999). This indicates that Korean immigrants might have limited
social interaction with other people and work longer hours (Kim, 2004); they are more likely to
be isolated from mainstream society. Korean immigrant churches provide a very important
source of socialization and social networking among Korean immigrants (Min, 2001), but at the
same time as they are relying on small sized ethnic-based communities (e.g., churches), they are
reluctant to seek help when they have personal issues due to stigmatization or fear of becoming a
target of gossip (Yoon et al., 2010), and thus they tend to isolate themselves. As a result, Korean
immigrant women become vulnerable to IPV victimization and perpetration.

In addition, traditionally, interpersonal harmony within groups in East Asian society—
including Korean society—is considered to be very important such that various activities, which
encourage social networks and interpersonal relationships, are prevalent (Lum, 1998). This
means that weak social networks as a result of lower levels of acculturation, which might
otherwise have a stress-buffering role, might be a cause of higher levels of stress for Korean
immigrants who come from a country where social integration and relationships among group
members are emphasized. Thus, social networks and acculturative stress play an interactive role in IPV among Korean immigrants. These ideas lead to:

**H4.** Korean immigrant women who have more social networks are less likely to experience higher levels of acculturative stress.

**H5.** Acculturative stress will moderate the effect of the social network on the occurrence of IPV.

**Online Social Network**

According to the findings by Pew Research Center (Duggan et al., 2015), among internet users, over 50% of adults use two or more social media sites use and this number has been increasing. Online social media also provides some platform for discussion of social issues or policy related issues (Tufekci & Wilson, 2012) and can be bused as marketing tools (Chen, Fay & Wang, 2011). Regardless of impact of online social media on individuals, main reasons American, especially female users under 50 years old in America, use online social media is staying in touch with family members and friends (Smith, 2011).

Online social networks through online media can be an important source of social capital and are important social interaction (Ellison et al., 2007; Salem et al., 1997; Steinfield, Ellison, & Lampe, 2008) and communication tools (Mustafa & Hamzah, 2011). This will be more likely for immigrant populations who physically apart from their family and friends.

**Online social network and IPV among Korean immigrants**

Among immigrants, online social networks play an important role on their lives (Chen & Kay, 2011; Subrahmanyam et al, 2008). Through connections and communications with their families, friends and relatives far away (Subrahmanyam et al, 2008), many immigrants may feel that they are socially embedded (Chen & Kay, 2011), and more likely to receive emotional and
informational support (Shaw & Gant, 2002). According to qualitative interviews with Korean immigrants in Canada, Yoon (2016) found that Korean immigrants use internet to maintain sociocultural connections with their community back in Korea. The findings from other study (Son, 2015) also supported Yoon’s claims.

Online social networks also have a positive impact on reducing acculturative stress (Ye, 2006), helping socio-cultural and psychological adaptations (Chen & Kay, 2011), and relieving health related symptoms (Shaw & Gant, 2002). Thus, having online social networks possibly provides an important source of social capital and social support when IPV victims encounter some problem. Korea has one of the largest online user populations and internet usage among the population in South Korea is high regardless of their age groups (statista, 2016). Korean immigrants use the internet to maintain sociocultural connections with their family

Moreover, as online social networks can easily attract the attention of large numbers of people within short periods of time and lead to stigmatization and negative consequences for certain targeted groups and individuals, such as becoming a target of attack through aggressive postings, cyber-bullying or even physical harassment (Moore et al, 2012), involvement in online social networks of victims can also provide a strong basis of social control over IPV offenders.

These ideas lead to my next hypothesis:

**H6:** IPV victims are less likely to have social networks, including interpersonal networks, as well as online social networks compared to non-victims.

**H7:** IPV victims with strong supportive networks are less likely to experience abuse compared with IPV victims without strong supportive networks.
CHAPTER 5. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Quantitative Research Questions & Hypotheses

Based on the theoretical and empirical framework of the study, the quantitative study focused on three main research questions:

RQ1. What are the levels of gender role values among Korean immigrant women? What are the associations between conservative gender role values and IPV victimization? How does the impact of conservative gender role values on IPV differ by the acculturation level?

   H1: IPV victims are more likely to hold conservative gender role value than non-victims.
   H2: Acculturation will moderate the effect of conservative gender role attitudes on the occurrence of IPV.

RQ2. How does the level of acculturation and acculturative stress relate to IPV victimization? What is the interaction effect of acculturative stress and social networks on IPV?

   H3: IPV victims are more likely to experience higher levels of acculturative stress compared to non-victims.
   H4: Korean immigrant women who have more social networks are less likely to experience higher levels of acculturative stress.
   H5: Acculturative stress will moderate the effect of the social network on the occurrence of IPV.

RQ3. How do social network differ between IPV victims and non-victims? What is the role of social networks on IPV victimization?

   H6: IPV victims are less likely to have social networks, including interpersonal networks, as well as online social networks compared to non-victims.
   H7: IPV victims with strong supportive networks are less likely to experience abuse.
compared with IPV victims without strong supportive networks.

**Qualitative Research Questions**

Through the qualitative study (i.e., in-depth interviews with Korean IPV victims), I aimed to understand the following questions.

**RQ1.** What is the meaning of being an immigrant and experiencing IPV?

**RQ2.** What is the meaning for immigrants of social networks and interpersonal relationships? How does the perception and influence of social networks affect IPV?

**RQ3.** What coping strategies do immigrants have when they encounter stress due to situational difficulties? How does stress affect IPV?

**RQ4.** What is the nature of gendered perceptions and IPV? Have gender roles and attitudes changed since immigration? How do immigrants experience gender role conflicts? What is the significance of gender role conflicts and IPV?
CHAPTER 6. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

The purpose of this study is to capture the relationship between patriarchal beliefs, acculturative stress, social networks and the occurrence of intimate partner violence among Korean immigrants utilizing the mixed method (surveys and in-depth interviews). Mixed method designs have been used by many social scientists including criminologists, and it is a useful approach to understanding phenomenon as it integrates the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative research (Maruna, 2010).

For the quantitative study (i.e., surveys with victims and non-victims), a case-control design was adopted where 63 Korean immigrant IPV victims and 64 Korean immigrant non-IPV victims were matched. Although there was a sequential order to collecting the data (survey first), both the quantitative data and qualitative data were given equal weighting. For the qualitative study, 16 in-depth interviews were conducted using the nested design (i.e., embedded design) so that interview participants were recruited from the survey participants. Utilizing mixed methods verified the findings (via triangulation) derived from surveys with those derived from in-depth interviews (Small, 2011). Figure 1 describes the research method and the process of data collection. This study was approved by the institutional review boards (IRB) at John Jay College of Criminal Justice: CUNY.

Quantitative Data Collection Procedure

Eligibility

Self-reported criteria for the recruitment of IPV victims was: (a) must be aged 18 or older; (b) must identify themselves as Koreans or be of Korean descent; (c) have current residency in America; (d) have been subject to any one of the IPV types - physical, sexual, economical and emotional/psychological violence in the last 12 months.
Self-reported criteria for the recruitment of non-IPV victims was: (a) must be aged 18 or older; (b) must identify themselves as Koreans or be of Korean descent; (c) have current residency in America; (d) have never been subject to any types of intimate partner violence.

**Matched Case-Control Design**

To collect survey participants (IPV victims and non-victims), a case control design was implemented. A case control study is a retrospective study that identifies risk factors by comparing case and control cases. This study is useful when we suspect some exposure to risk factors but do not have strong evidence to suggest the relationship between exposures (IV) and disease (DV) (Gordis, 2014). Although IPV is a very serious social problem and many studies reveal that IPV among Korean communities is pervasive, this problem is hard to unveil due to stigmatization and a general lack of understanding (Park, 2005). Thus, we know little about IPV among the Korean population and it is not easy to identify the risk factors. To understand the problems of IPV among Korean immigrants, a national level study which samples the Korean population on the national level would be ideal, but this would require a massive expenditure of time and effort. Therefore, a matched case-control design that allows the assessment of risk factors in a smaller size was adopted and implemented for the collection of quantitative data. Using a matched case-control design facilitated a dependable examination of various potential risk factors while minimizing confounding from demographics and maximizing efficiency by identifying research candidates by outcome (IPV) and not exposure (i.e., IPV-related perceptions and acculturative stresses).

Frequency matching was implemented to select non-IPV victims (i.e., controls) in a manner that the proportion of non-IPV controls with a certain characteristic is identical to the proportion of IPV cases with the same characteristic. The matching variables are: age, education,
and employment status and income, all of which have been identified as IPV risk factors among not only Asian immigrants (including Koreans) but also for many others outside this population (Yick, 2000; Hicks, 2006; Leung & Cheung, 2008; Chang et al., 2009; Jin & Keat, 2010; Choi et al, 2012). No more matching variables will be included to avoid overmatching or the unnecessary restriction of the variance of the variables to be measured (Schlesselman, 1982).

**Recruitment Methods**

Through a case-control design, 64 Korean immigrant women who have been in an abusive intimate relationship in the past 12 months were surveyed first. IPV victims were recruited from three different channels – the Korean community organization called the Korean American Family Service Center (KAFSC), advertisements at two ethnic based websites, and referrals from previous participants. Initially, this study intended to recruit IPV victims only from the KAFSC and their referrals. However, recruitments from this organization did not yield sufficient participants as hoped. As not many Korean immigrants share their victimization experiences due to stigmatization, referrals also didn’t yield a large number of participants. Thus, I decided to recruit participants from two Korean ethnic based community websites used by many Korean immigrants in the US to gain recourses – jobs, housings, life in US, and so on, as well as exchanging information and sharing their personal stories. By extending the recruitment methods, this study aimed to successfully cover the hidden population who do not seek professional help. Twenty IPV victims who participated in this study were recruited from the KAFSC and 40 from the websites advertisements and 4 were referred by other participants.

Non-IPV victims were recruited in a similar manner from the online advertisements and various community organizations, but they never had abusive relationships with their partners in their lifetime. As this study used a matched case control research design, when about a half of
non-IPV victims (i.e., the control group) was recruited, non-victim participants were recruited selectively based on the analysis of the matching criteria (i.e., age, education, and employment status) as IPV victims. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of matching variables between a case group (i.e., victims) and a control group (non-victims). As you can see, there was no significant difference between these two groups of women in terms of their matching variables.

Each participant was informed of their right to refuse any questions at any time or withdraw from the study if they wish. In addition, if necessary, they can take a rest in the middle of surveys or interviews. All participants (regardless of whether they are victims or non-victims) were asked to be provided with the contact information of the free domestic violence hotline service and information about possible services they can utilize from the center. All surveys were conducted between March 2015 and April 2016.

**Monetary Compensation**

All IPV victims received $20 upon the completion of their 30-minute survey and $50 for their in-depth interview participation which lasted between 60 to 90 minutes. Participants were also paid an additional $5 for each of the eligible referrals. For non IPV-victims, they received $10 for their survey participation. The compensations for the participants were available through the various funding sources - Student Research Awards (Society for the Scientific Study of Religion), the NADRI Dissertation Fellowship (Research Center for Korean Community), Doctoral Student Research Grant (The Graduate Center: CUNY), Dissertation Year Fellowship (Graduate Center: CUNY).

**Qualitative Data Collection Procedure**

**Nested Design**

A nested design was utilized so that interview participants were selected from the original
survey sample. IPV victims who participated in surveys were invited to participate in in-depth interviews. A nested design allows within-subject confirmatory analysis and useful to understand the populations deeper within an overall study (Small, 2011). Table 2 shows the comparison between survey participants among victims (n=64) and in-depth interview participants (n=16).

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Matching Variables (N= 127)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Victims (Case group=64)</th>
<th>Non-Victims (Control group=63)</th>
<th>T-test (Chi2) P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20s</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
<td>26.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30s</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>34.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40s</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>23.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50s &amp; Above</td>
<td>19.75%</td>
<td>15.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$1,961</td>
<td>$2,496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>25.40%</td>
<td>20.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College or more</td>
<td>74.60%</td>
<td>79.17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: P value in Parenthesis indicates that Chi2 were used. Chi2 were used for Age, Employment and Education to measure the difference between victims and non-victims.
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics of In-depth Interview Participants and Survey Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Interview Participants (N=16)</th>
<th>Survey Participants (Victims) (N=64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>21.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s &amp; Above</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>19.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>32.25%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>$2,014</td>
<td>$1,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>25.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or more</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>74.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interview Procedure**

Face to face (n=10) and skype or phone interviews (n=6) were conducted and it last on average 90 minutes. All of the in-depth participants speak Korean as their primary language. As a native Korean, I speak Korean fluently which is an essential requisite for establishing rapport with the Korean population, I am well qualified for carrying out in-depth interviews. Thus, all interviews were conducted in Korean by me. Similar to the surveys, all participants were informed of their right to refuse any questions at any time or withdraw from the study.

All in-depth interviews were conducted in the PI’s office and other places where participants would feel comfortable talking with the PI. For skype or phone interviews, the PI made sure that participants were in a place where it was safe to talk. Ideally, all in-depth interviews would have been conducted face to face, but due to the inaccessibility of participants who resided in areas other than New York or New Jersey (where I could travel and meet the participants or the participants could come to my office for the interviews), skype or phone interviews were conducted instead. As much other research suggests (Crippa et al., 2008; Novick, 2008; Sturges
& Hanrahan, 2004), I could not find any meaningful differences between face to face interviews and phone interviews.

All the interviews were voice recorded after receiving oral consent from the participants and stored in the PI’s private computer with passcode so that no other people could gain access to this information. After each interview, the PI transcribed the recorded files.

The number of interviewees (n=16) was decided at a point when the PI believed that information redundancy or saturation was reached, since flexible research designs that build in iterative sampling encourage reflexivity (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). All in-depth interviews were conducted between April 2015 and January 2016.

In general, in-depth interview participants were older and not employed and have a higher educational level than the average victim who participated in the surveys (See table 2 for more details).

Compensation

Interview participants (IPV victims) were compensated $50 for their participation and they were paid an additional $5 for each of the eligible referrals.

Quantitative Study (Surveys) Measurement

Surveys consist of 131 questions including demographic information of participants and their partners, the measurement of acculturative stress, and gender role perceptions, and I took about 30 minutes to complete the surveys on paper (n=27) or online (n=100). Both victims and non-victims were given the option of completing online or paper surveys but most of them chose the online surveys. For those who chose paper surveys (n=27) for their convenience, either PI or

---

1 All measurements in the survey was translated into Korean by the PI (Chunrye Kim) and PI went over these questions with the director of KAFSC who is very familiar with Korean IPV victims and incorporated her opinions and that of other staff members into the survey questionnaires.
staff members\(^2\) at the Korean victim service agency administered the surveys. I could not find any meaningful differences between paper survey and online survey participants. Most of the recruiting, consent, and research procedures was conducted in Korean, although English language recruitment, consent, and interviews and surveys was available for subjects as well (less than 4% of participants preferred English version of the survey).

**Dependent Variable**

*Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)* was dichotomously coded; participants who self-identified as victims of IPV were coded as victims whereas participants who self-identified as non-victims were coded as non-victims. To ensure that self-reported criteria capture IPV victims and non-victims correctly, two separate measurements have been used. First, all participants were given questionnaires coming from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) developed by Straus and colleagues, which has been evaluated as being valid (Straus et al., 1996). As CTS2 asks about both IPV offending and victimization experiences, this study only adopted questions related to victimization as they are most relevant for this study. Also, to increase the validity of the measurement of IPV among Korean immigrants, physical, sexual, emotional and economical abuse questionnaires adopted from the Checklist of Controlling Behaviors (CCB) developed by Lehmann, Simmons and Pillai (2012). If participants experienced at least one type of violence within the past 1 year, they were categorized as “victims”. We could notice that all participants who self-identified as victims of IPV experienced at least one type of violence from the example given or/and CTS2 within the past 1 year. However, nine of participants who were self-identified as “non-victims” reported that they experienced some forms of violence in the 1 past year. They

\(^2\) Some victims who participated in this survey did not want to have direct contact with the researcher in person. Thus, I collected paper surveys with the help of staff members who were trained by the PI at the Korean Victim Service Agency.
were excluded from the analysis.

**Independent Variables**

*Conservative Gender Role Values* was measured using a short version of the ‘Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS)’ developed by Spence and colleagues (1973). A short version of the AWS consists of 25 items which describe attitudes toward the role of women in society (Spence et al, 1973). It is most often used by researchers to measure people’s beliefs about appropriate gender role related behaviors (Frieze & Ciccocioppo, 2009). Originally, “Strongly agree” was given a score of “0” and “Strongly disagree” was given a score of “3” and thus higher scores indicates a pro-feminist, egalitarian attitudes while a low score indicates a traditional conservative attitude (Spence et al., 1973). For the purpose of this study, I inverted the score system and used the 4 point Likert scale, “Strongly disagree” was given a score of “1” and “Strongly agree” was given a score of “4”. Thus, it ranges from 25 to 100 and a higher number indicates conservative views toward gender roles and attitudes. In this study, Cronbach’s Alpha (internal reliability) for these items was 0.7246.

*Acculturative Stress* was measured using the ‘Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory (RASI)’. The Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory was developed by Benet-Martinez and Haritatos to measure acculturation stress systematically (2003). The RASI includes 15 culture-related challenges including Language Skills, Work Challenges, Intercultural Relations, Discrimination, and Cultural Isolation using the 5 point Likert scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree). The RASI has been validated among Asian Americans (Miller & Benet-Martinez, 2011). “Strongly disagree” was given a score of “1” and “Strongly agree” was given a score of “5”. Thus, it ranges from minimum 15 (low acculturative stress) to maximum 75 (high acculturates stress). A higher number indicates the higher level of acculturative stress
participants’ experienced. In this study, Cronbach’s Alpha (internal reliability) for these items was 0.8906.

Supportive Social Networks was measured using the Social Support Questionnaires developed by Sarason et al (1987). Originally, there were 6 questions to measure social support, and these ask the participants to list as many individuals as they can think of. However, for the purpose of this study, these 6 questions were combined into 3 questions, and the numbers of individuals the participants can list were limited to 5 people. The total number of individuals who responded to the 3 questions was combined. Thus, the maximum number of social network participants could identify was 15 and minimum was 0. The mean numbers of social networks for Korean immigrant victims were 4.5 and 7.8 for non-victims in this study. Cronbach’s Alpha (internal reliability) for these items was 0.8763.

Online Social Networks: As there is no valid measurement for online supportive social networks, this study utilized the same questionnaires but asked about participants’ online networks (such as online social media, online messenger, and ethnic based websites) instead of interpersonal networks. For online social networks, the average number of people or online social network site victims connected was 2.7 whereas it was 5.3 for non-victims among Korean immigrant women in this study. Cronbach’s Alpha (internal reliability) for these items 0.9178.

Acculturation: Three indirect measures of acculturation level - English level (not at all - a little (0), well - very well (1)) and the length of stay in the US and age of migration was used in this study.

Control Variables

Living in populated state: California, New York and New Jersey were the most popular states for the Korean population in the USA. Participants from these three states were coded as 1
and participants living in other states were coded as 0.

Religion (being religious): Studies reveals that religion plays a role in IPV (Ross, 2012), As a large numbers of Korean immigrants are affiliated with Korean churches (Kim & Hurch, 1993) and they are highly religious (Pew Research Center 2015), this study controlled for being religious. Whether participants have religious beliefs or not was coded dichotomously and controlled in this study.

Number of Children: As the presence of children can increase or decrease IPV victimization (Capaldi et al, 2012; Jones et al. 1999; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Vatnar & Bjørkly, 2010; Vest et al, 2002), the number of children participants have been added as a control variable.

Childhood Physical Victimization: Violent childhood experiences and exposure to domestic violence profoundly increases the risk of victimization and perpetration of IPV (Gomez, 2011; Schewe et al, 2006; Widom et al, 2014; Whitfield et al, 2003). Participants were asked whether they were physically abused by their caregivers when they were young. This question was given the options of “Yes” or “No.”

Qualitative Study (In-depth interviews) Measurement

In-depth interviews with IPV victims were conducted to gather in-depth narratives of personal experiences of cultural strains, immigration stressors, the role of social networks and IPV victimization. Rather than using definitive concepts of research, this qualitative study utilized sensitizing concepts as Blumer (1954) has suggested, and attempted to understand the meaning and experience of being an immigrant away from one’s own country and extended family, their emotional response toward this state of affairs, and the meaning of social networks in the Korean community in the USA. Since conceptualization and measurement are an integral
part of data analysis, this was undertaken repeatedly throughout the data collection process. Emphasis was placed on the discovery of underlying value systems and key decision-making processes embedded in the dynamics of IPV facilitation and prevention.

Thematic analysis technique was utilized to understand the qualitative study. Thematic analysis is “a method for identifying, analyzing and interpreting patterned meaning or ‘themes’” (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.79). Similar to content analysis, the focus of thematic analysis is to examine qualitative data by breaking it down into its analysis content. However, unlike content analysis, which can be interpreted using the quantitative approach, thematic analysis can only be interpreted via a qualitative approach (Vaismoradi, Turunen, Bondas, 2013). Thematic analysis is frequently employed for qualitative studies (Attride-Stiring, 2001).
CHAPTER 7. QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

A total of 127 survey interviews with Korean immigrant IPV victims and non-victims were conducted. Table 3 shows the characteristics of participants by group (victims vs. non-victims) and Table 4 shows the correlations between all variables. Some variables included in this study were significantly correlated each other but none of the relationship were strong (r<0.60). This indicates that there is no multicollinearity among variables. Missing data were excluded from the analysis. The total amount of data included for each analysis can be found in each table. By looking at the pattern of missing data, it was missing completely random³.

Fifty percent of victims and 56% of non-victims said they spoke English well or very well. According to the report by the Migration Policy Institute (Zong & Batalova, 2014), about 47 percent of Korean immigrants who were 5 or older reported their English proficiency is ‘very well’ in 2013. If we consider that our sample only consisted of the adult Korean immigrants (18 or older), English proficiency of our participants of this study is not that different from the general populations.

On average, the participants came to the USA as adults (25.49 years old for victims and 24.45 years old for non-victims) and both groups have lived in the USA more than 14 years on average.

Eighty percent of victims and 70 percent of non-victims said they are religious – mostly affiliated with Catholic or Christian church. Studies (Kim & Hurch, 1993; Pew Research Center, 2012) reveal that more than 70% of Korean immigrants are affiliated with Korean churches or other religions and they tend to attend church more frequently and participate in church events more actively than other immigrant groups (Min & Kim, 2005). Thus, this high number of

³ Chi² tests show that there is no correlation between victim’s status (victims. Vs. non-victims) and missing variables. This indicates that missing data was missing randomly.
religious affiliations among participants in this study was not surprising.

Ninety percent of victims lived in the most populated states for Korean populations—such as California, New York and New Jersey—whereas 60% of non-victims did so. According to a report by the Migration Policy Institute (Zong & Batalova, 2014), 31 percent of Korean immigrant settled down in California, 10 percent in New York, and 6 percent in New Jersey. Although much larger numbers of Korean immigrants in this study live in California, New York or New Jersey the Korean immigrants in general, we can safely assume that they represent a large number of Korean immigrants in the USA living in metropolitan areas.

The numbers of children participants have been not different between victims and non-victims; 1.17 and 1.10 respectively. On average, victims had been in a relationship with their partners for 10 years and non-victims for 13 years. In case of the childhood victimization, victims had on average experienced childhood physical violence (35%) three times as often as non-victims (11%).
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Variables Included in the Analysis between Victims and Non-Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Victims (Case group=64)</th>
<th>Non-Victims (Control group=63)</th>
<th>T-test/ (Chi2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Role Values</td>
<td>48.96</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>32.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturative Stress</td>
<td>44.06</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Network</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Social Network</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Migration</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay (years)</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Populated State</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship (years)</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Physical Victimization</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: P value in Parenthesis indicates that Chi2 were used. Chi2 were used for English Level, Living in populated state, Not religious, and Childhood victimization to measure the difference between victims and non-victims.
Table 4. Correlations between All Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
<th>(9)</th>
<th>(10)</th>
<th>(11)</th>
<th>(12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Gender Value (1)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturative Stress (2)</td>
<td>0.193*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networks (3)</td>
<td>-0.233*</td>
<td>-0.183*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Social Networks (4)</td>
<td>-0.208*</td>
<td>-0.137</td>
<td>0.452*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level (5)</td>
<td>-0.329*</td>
<td>-0.190*</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Migration (6)</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.237*</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.424*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay (7)</td>
<td>0.245*</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.303*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Populated State (8)</td>
<td>0.185*</td>
<td>-0.024</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>-0.251*</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not religious (9)</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>-0.106</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children (10)</td>
<td>0.278*</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>-0.318*</td>
<td>0.337*</td>
<td>0.303*</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.192*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship (11)</td>
<td>0.320*</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>-0.184*</td>
<td>-0.263*</td>
<td>0.412*</td>
<td>0.560*</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.591*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood physical victimization (12)</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>-0.212*</td>
<td>-0.189*</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.061</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.10 +, P < 0.05 *, P < 0.01 **, P < 0.001***
Conservative Gender Role Values and IPV

As studies have found that conservative gender role values have an impact on IPV (Hyman, 2011; Morse et al., 2012; Kim & Sung; 2000) and conservative gender role values tend to change when acculturation levels increase (Ho, 1990; Kim & Wolpin, 2008), this study examined whether Korean immigrant IPV victims have a higher level of conservative values and if so, whether acculturation moderates the effect of conservative gender role values on IPV. I hypothesized:

**H1:** IPV victims are more likely to hold traditional gender role values than non-victims.

**H2:** Acculturation will moderate the effect of gender role attitudes on the occurrence of IPV.

First, the level of conservative gender role values between victims and non-victims were compared. Conservative gender role values which were measured using the ‘Attitudes Toward Women Scale’ (AWS) that ranges from 25 to 100, where a higher number indicates conservative views toward gender roles and attitudes. As table 3 shows, victims (mean= 48.96) had higher patriarchal values meaning they were more conservative compared to non-victims (mean=41.62). For victims, the minimum score was 32.00 and maximum score was 73.00, and it was 27.00 and 80.00 respectively for non-victims. Interestingly, compared to victims, non-victims tended to have a wide range of gender role values from very conservative to very liberal. The difference between these two groups (victims and non-victims) with regards to conservative gender role values was significant (p=0.000).

To test whether the levels of conservative views have any association with IPV victimization (H2) among Korean immigrants, I conducted logistic regressions. Table 5 shows the role of conservative gender values on IPV victimization. A total 8 models were constructed
by adding one control variable to each – the acculturation level measured by English level, age of migration, and Length of Stay in the USA (Model 2), the locations (living in whether populated city or isolated city) (Model 3), religion (whether they are religious or not) (Model 4), the number of children between the victims and their partners (Model 5), length of relationship (Model 6) and childhood physical victimization (Model 7) – to examine the independent effect of each variable on IPV.

Throughout Model 1 (basic model) to Model 8 (full model), conservative gender role values had a strong impact on IPV victimization. Model 1 in Table 5 shows that conservative gender role values were highly associated with IPV victimization among Korean immigrants (basic model). The odds of IPV victimization among Korean immigrant women increased by 6.4% when the conservative gender role values increased. The conservative gender role values of victims explained about 6.3% of the variance in IPV victimization. By adding the acculturation level (Model 2), the variance of explaining IPV victimization increased by 1%. Sixteen percent of the variance in IPV victimization could be explained by the conservative gender role values and living in a populated city or not (Model 3). Victims living in a populated city increased the victimization by 8 times for Korean immigrant women when controlling for conservative gender values. This indicates that IPV victimization among Korean immigrants has a high association with the location in which they live (about 10% of variance can be explained by this variable). When religion (Model 4) and the number of children (Model 5) were controlled independently, there was not much change from the basic model (Model 1). However, by controlling for the length of relationship (Model 6), the conservative gender role predicted IPV victimization at 0.001 level. Also, the length of relationship is statistically significant and predicts IPV victimization (P<0.10). This applied also to childhood physical victimization. By adding
childhood physical victimization, total variance explained IPV victimization increased by more than 8%.

Model 8 is the complete model controlling for other possible control variables that impact IPV victimization among Korean immigrants. As Model 8 shows, the odds of becoming an IPV victim was 1.11 times higher for conservative Korean women than for liberal Korean women after controlling for other variables. This supports our H1 that IPV victims are more likely to have traditional gender role values than non-victims.

As individuals become more acculturated into Western society, they tend to adopt less conservative values. To test whether acculturation level moderates the effect of conservative gender roles on the occurrence of IPV (H2), an interaction term between acculturation—which was measured using the indirect measurements of English level, age of migration and length of stay in the USA—and conservative gender role values was added (Table 6). The results show that there was no interaction effect between two of the indirect measurements of acculturation (i.e., English level, length of stay), and patriarchal gender role values throughout the different models (Tables were not provided here as there was no interaction effect at all). This indicates that the impact of patriarchal values on IPV victimization is not different whether Korean immigrant women’s English level is high or low or they have lived in the USA for a short or long period of time.

However, I found that the age of migration moderates the effect of patriarchal values on IPV victimization (See Table 6, Model 1 – Model 5) although this significant relationship does not remain when adding other control variables such as “Not religious”, “Number of Children”, “Length of Relationship” and “Childhood physical victimization”. Although the moderation effect of acculturation measured using the age of migration does not remain significant
throughout the models, the interaction term remained significant until the other acculturation measures (English level, length of stay) were added. Thus, I checked the moderation effect of victims’ age when arriving in the USA on IPV victimization without other controlling variables (Model 2). Figure 2 shows that Korean immigrant women with conservative gender role values have a high risk of becoming IPV victims regardless of their age of migration. However, the effect of having conservative gender role values on IPV victimization is about 10% higher for Korean women who come to the USA when they were younger than for those who came to the USA when they were older. When I checked the interaction effect of victims’ age of migration and conservative gender role values by controlling for variables which were statistically significant such as “Living in populated state”, “Length of relationship”, and “Childhood victimization”, the results show that there was no interaction effect (Table was not provided here).
### Table 5. Logistic Regression: The role of conservative gender values on IPV victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 (n=123)</th>
<th>Model 2 (n=119)</th>
<th>Model 3 (n=123)</th>
<th>Model 4 (n=123)</th>
<th>Model 5 (n=121)</th>
<th>Model 6 (n=114)</th>
<th>Model 7 (n=122)</th>
<th>Model 8 (n=111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OR (b)</strong></td>
<td>1.064***</td>
<td>1.074**</td>
<td>1.057**</td>
<td>1.061**</td>
<td>1.070**</td>
<td>1.090***</td>
<td>1.075***</td>
<td>1.114***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.062)</td>
<td>(0.072)</td>
<td>(0.055)</td>
<td>(0.059)</td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
<td>(0.086)</td>
<td>(0.073)</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservative Gender Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High English Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.513</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.547+****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(0.414)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.935)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.115*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.011</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(0.011)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.983</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(-0.018)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.618**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Populated State</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.638***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.455</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(-0.787)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(-0.631)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.937</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.051)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(-0.065)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.886*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.961+</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.790**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.937</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(-0.040)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.915)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood physical victimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.129***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.129</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(1.813)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.057**</td>
<td>0.028**</td>
<td>0.013***</td>
<td>0.076**</td>
<td>0.049**</td>
<td>0.031***</td>
<td>0.023***</td>
<td>0.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.0630</td>
<td>0.0699</td>
<td>0.1627</td>
<td>0.0795</td>
<td>0.0690</td>
<td>0.1033</td>
<td>0.1463</td>
<td>0.3056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.10 +, P < 0.05 *, P < 0.01 **, P < 0.001***
Table 6. Logistic Regression: Interaction Effect of Conservative Gender Role Attitudes on the occurrence of IPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 (n=120)</th>
<th>Model 2 (n=120)</th>
<th>Model 3 (n=119)</th>
<th>Model 4 (n=119)</th>
<th>Model 5 (n=119)</th>
<th>Model 6 (n=119)</th>
<th>Model 7 (n=117)</th>
<th>Model 8 (n=111)</th>
<th>Model 9 (n=111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Gender Value</td>
<td>1.060** (0.058)</td>
<td>1.186** (0.171)</td>
<td>1.200** (0.183)</td>
<td>1.209** (0.190)</td>
<td>1.189** (0.173)</td>
<td>1.181** (0.166)</td>
<td>1.178** (0.164)</td>
<td>1.188* (0.172)</td>
<td>1.193** (0.177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Migration</td>
<td>1.010 (0.009)</td>
<td>1.225* (0.203)</td>
<td>1.247* (0.221)</td>
<td>1.240* (0.215)</td>
<td>1.224+ (0.202)</td>
<td>1.198+ (0.181)</td>
<td>1.196+ (0.179)</td>
<td>1.267* (0.237)</td>
<td>1.252* (0.225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Gender Value X Age of Migration</td>
<td>0.996* (-0.003)</td>
<td>0.996* (-0.004)</td>
<td>0.996* (-0.004)</td>
<td>0.996+ (0.003)</td>
<td>0.997 (0.003)</td>
<td>0.997 (0.003)</td>
<td>0.997 (0.003)</td>
<td>0.997 (0.003)</td>
<td>0.998 (0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High English Level</td>
<td>1.810 (0.593)</td>
<td>1.762 (0.566)</td>
<td>2.060 (0.723)</td>
<td>2.125 (0.754)</td>
<td>2.170 (0.775)</td>
<td>2.662+ (0.979)</td>
<td>0.979 (1.113)</td>
<td>3.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>0.980 (0.593)</td>
<td>0.976 (0.566)</td>
<td>0.969 (0.723)</td>
<td>0.971 (0.754)</td>
<td>1.045 (0.775)</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>3.044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Populated State</td>
<td>7.376** (2.082)</td>
<td>8.027** (2.015)</td>
<td>8.072** (2.075)</td>
<td>7.499** (2.083)</td>
<td>8.027** (2.083)</td>
<td>8.027** (2.083)</td>
<td>8.027** (2.083)</td>
<td>8.483** (2.138)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious</td>
<td>0.439 (1.998)</td>
<td>0.452 (2.082)</td>
<td>0.439 (2.082)</td>
<td>0.452 (2.082)</td>
<td>0.910+ (2.082)</td>
<td>0.910+ (2.082)</td>
<td>0.910+ (2.082)</td>
<td>0.910+ (2.082)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>1.013 (0.013)</td>
<td>1.013 (0.013)</td>
<td>1.013 (0.013)</td>
<td>1.013 (0.013)</td>
<td>1.013 (0.013)</td>
<td>1.013 (0.013)</td>
<td>1.013 (0.013)</td>
<td>1.013 (0.013)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td>0.910+ (0.095)</td>
<td>0.910+ (0.095)</td>
<td>0.910+ (0.095)</td>
<td>0.910+ (0.095)</td>
<td>0.910+ (0.095)</td>
<td>0.910+ (0.095)</td>
<td>0.910+ (0.095)</td>
<td>0.910+ (0.095)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Physical Victimization</td>
<td>6.548** (1.879)</td>
<td>6.548** (1.879)</td>
<td>6.548** (1.879)</td>
<td>6.548** (1.879)</td>
<td>6.548** (1.879)</td>
<td>6.548** (1.879)</td>
<td>6.548** (1.879)</td>
<td>6.548** (1.879)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.052** (-2.953)</td>
<td>0.000** (-8.339)</td>
<td>0.000** (-9.527)</td>
<td>0.000** (-9.383)</td>
<td>0.000** (-10.509)</td>
<td>0.000** (-9.899)</td>
<td>0.000** (-9.815)</td>
<td>0.000*** (-10.108)</td>
<td>0.000*** (-13.204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.0617 0.1003 0.1048 0.1097 0.1910 0.2037 0.1969 0.2480 0.3163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.10 +, P < 0.05 *, P < 0.01 **, P < 0.001***
The moderation effect of victims’ age when arriving in the USA on IPV victimization when controlling for other acculturation variables such as English level and the length of stay.

Figure 2. Moderation Effect of Conservative Gender Role on IPV by Age of Migration of Victims

---

4 The moderation effect of victims’ age when arriving in the USA on IPV victimization when controlling for other acculturation variables such as English level and the length of stay.
Acculturative Stress and IPV

Acculturative Stress is one of the risk factors of IPV among many other immigrant groups (Caetano et al, 2007; Caplan, 2007; Hovey, 2000; Kim & Sung, 2000). Korean immigrants tend to experience high levels of stress due to language barriers, discrimination and a gap between social status in Korea and social status in the USA. As acculturative stress is associated with both IPV perpetration and victimization, I examined the relationship between the level of acculturative stress and IPV among Korean immigrants and hypothesized that:

**H3**: IPV victims are more likely to experience higher levels of acculturative stress compared to non-victims.

**H4**: Korean immigrant women who experience higher levels of acculturative stress are more likely to be victims of IPV.

**H5**: Acculturative stress will moderate the effect of social networks on the occurrence of IPV.

I hypothesized that victims compared to non-victims would have a higher level of acculturative stress (H3). As table 3 shows, acculturative stress levels, which ranged from a minimum of 15 to a maximum of 75, were significantly different (p=0.000) between victims and non-victims. Victims in this study reported a higher mean of acculturative stress, 44.06 (ranged from 21 to 64) and non-victims reported 35.17 (from 14 to 63) respectively, which supports H3.

To test H4 that Korean immigrant women who experience higher levels of acculturative stress are more likely to be victims of IPV, I conducted a logistic regression (Table 7). As the relationship between acculturative stress and IPV victimization can be influenced by many other factors, to understand the independent effect of acculturative stress on IPV, each control variable – acculturation (Model 2), location of victims residence (residence in populated state vs. isolated
state) (Model 3), religion (being religious or not) (Model 4), and the number of children (Model 5), the length of relationship (Model 6) and childhood physical victimization (Model 7), which have been identified as important factors contributing IPV – were added in each model.

Model 1 shows that higher levels of acculturative stress are statistically associated with IPV victimization. The odds of becoming an IPV victim was 8.5% higher for when Korean immigrant victims experienced higher levels of acculturative stress and 12% of the variance in explaining IPV victimization could be explained by the level of acculturative stress. When controlling for acculturation level (Model 2), which was measured by using three indirect measurements – English level, age of migration, and length of stay in USA, Korean immigrant victims with higher levels of acculturative stress are almost 10% more likely to become victims of IPV.

Also, living in a populated state and having a high religiosity statistically predicts IPV victimization as Model 3 and Model 4 suggested, and when controlling for the locations of victims (living in a populated state vs. living in an isolated state) and religion (religious vs. not religious), the odds of victimization for Korean immigrant women with higher acculturative stress were 11% and 9.3% respectively. The number of children (Model 5) and the length of the relationship (Model 6) are not significantly associated with IPV victimization among Korean immigrants, but by controlling those two variables, variance in explaining IPV victimization increased by approximately 1% and over 2% from the basic model (Model 1). In the case of childhood victimization (Model 7), Korean immigrant women with a childhood physical victimization history were 5 times more likely to become victims of IPV. Variance in explaining IPV victimization increased more than 6% by adding childhood physical victimization. Model 8 shows the complete model. When controlling for acculturation, location of residence, religion
(being religious or not), the number of children, length of relationship and childhood victimization history, Korean immigrant women with higher levels of acculturative stress were highly associated with IPV victimization and more than 41% of the variance in IPV victimization can be explained by this model. This result supports H4 that Korean immigrant women with higher levels of acculturative stress are more likely to become victims of IPV.

When victims have social networks that can provide social support, they might experience lower levels of acculturative stress. To test whether social networks of victims moderate the level of stress (H5), the interaction between social network and acculturative stress was added to the model. As table 8 shows, although acculturative stress level and social networks independently predict IPV victimization, social networks do not moderate the impact of level of acculturative stress on IPV. This means that no matter the extent to which a social network support exists, there is a strong association between a higher level of acculturative stress and IPV victimization.
Table 7. Logistic Regression: The Role of Acculturative Stress on IPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 (n=124) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 2 (n=120) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 3 (n=124) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 4 (n=124) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 5 (n=122) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 6 (n=115) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 7 (n=123) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 8 (n=118) OR (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Acculturative Stress</td>
<td>1.085*** (0.082)</td>
<td>1.098*** (0.093)</td>
<td>1.114*** (0.108)</td>
<td>1.093*** (0.089)</td>
<td>1.086*** (0.082)</td>
<td>1.093*** (0.089)</td>
<td>1.091*** (0.087)</td>
<td>1.167*** (0.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High English Level</td>
<td>1.244 (0.219)</td>
<td>0.993 (-0.007)</td>
<td>1.008 (0.008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Populated State</td>
<td>18.524*** (2.919)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.245*** (3.147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Physical Victimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.038*** (-3.275)</td>
<td>0.023** (-3.792)</td>
<td>0.001*** (-6.656)</td>
<td>0.037*** (-3.299)</td>
<td>0.032*** (-3.451)</td>
<td>0.032*** (-3.428)</td>
<td>0.020*** (-3.896)</td>
<td>0.000*** (-11.273)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.1203</td>
<td>0.1421</td>
<td>0.2772</td>
<td>0.1590</td>
<td>0.1266</td>
<td>0.1409</td>
<td>0.1878</td>
<td>0.4112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.10 +, P < 0.05 *, P < 0.01 **, P < 0.001***
Table 8. Logistic Regression: Interaction Effects of Social Network and Acculturative Stress on IPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 (n=124)</th>
<th>Model 2 (n=124)</th>
<th>Model 3 (n=123)</th>
<th>Model 4 (n=120)</th>
<th>Model 5 (n=120)</th>
<th>Model 6 (n=118)</th>
<th>Model 7 (n=112)</th>
<th>Model 8 (n=112)</th>
<th>Model 9 (n=112)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Acculturative Stress</td>
<td>1.080*** (0.077)</td>
<td>1.093* (0.089)</td>
<td>1.088* (0.085)</td>
<td>1.101* (0.096)</td>
<td>1.125** (0.118)</td>
<td>1.121* (0.114)</td>
<td>1.127** (0.119)</td>
<td>1.151** (0.140)</td>
<td>1.182** (.1675)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Social Networks</td>
<td>0.878** (-0.130)</td>
<td>0.946 (0.056)</td>
<td>0.885 (-0.121)</td>
<td>0.923 (-0.080)</td>
<td>0.903 (0.101)</td>
<td>0.837 (-0.177)</td>
<td>0.858 (-0.152)</td>
<td>0.860 (-0.150)</td>
<td>0.934 (-0.067)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acculturative stress X Number of Social networks</td>
<td>0.998 (-0.019)</td>
<td>0.999 (-0.001)</td>
<td>0.999 (-0.001)</td>
<td>0.999 (-0.001)</td>
<td>1.000 (-0.001)</td>
<td>1.000 (-0.004)</td>
<td>0.999 (-0.001)</td>
<td>0.997 (-0.002)</td>
<td>0.997 (-0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High English Level</td>
<td>1.502 (0.407)</td>
<td>1.373 (0.317)</td>
<td>1.692 (0.526)</td>
<td>1.972 (0.679)</td>
<td>2.381 (0.867)</td>
<td>2.085 (0.735)</td>
<td>2.085 (0.808)</td>
<td>2.085 (0.808)</td>
<td>2.243 (0.808)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>1.008 (0.008)</td>
<td>1.002 (0.002)</td>
<td>0.994 (0.006)</td>
<td>0.990 (0.008)</td>
<td>1.026 (0.025)</td>
<td>1.026 (0.025)</td>
<td>1.026 (0.040)</td>
<td>1.026 (0.040)</td>
<td>1.041 (0.040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious</td>
<td>0.211* (-1.554)</td>
<td>0.225* (-1.490)</td>
<td>1.235 (0.211)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.329)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.329)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.329)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.329)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.329)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.329)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>1.235 (0.301)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.301)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.301)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.301)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.301)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.301)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.301)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.301)</td>
<td>1.389 (0.301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td>0.946 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.946 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.946 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.946 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.946 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.946 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.946 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.946 (0.041)</td>
<td>0.946 (0.041)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Physical</td>
<td>6.729* (1.906)</td>
<td>6.729* (1.906)</td>
<td>6.729* (1.906)</td>
<td>6.729* (1.906)</td>
<td>6.729* (1.906)</td>
<td>6.729* (1.906)</td>
<td>6.729* (1.906)</td>
<td>6.729* (1.906)</td>
<td>6.729* (1.906)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.101* (-2.295)</td>
<td>0.064* (-2.756)</td>
<td>0.060* (-2.824)</td>
<td>0.037* (-3.301)</td>
<td>0.002** (-6.407)</td>
<td>0.002** (-6.494)</td>
<td>0.001** (-7.123)</td>
<td>0.0001** (-9.101)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>0.363</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.10 +, P < 0.05 *, P < 0.01 **, P < 0.001***
Interpersonal Social / Online Social Network and IPV

One of the risk factors of IPV is social isolation (Coohey, 2007; Farris & Fenaughty 2002). When victims are socially and physically isolated from their supportive social networks, they are more likely to become victims of IPV. Nowadays, even when immigrants are physically isolated from the mainstream society or from their own country, they can be connected and get some support from their families or friends through online social network websites such as Facebook. Thus, this study examined whether not only having interpersonal social network support networks but also having social support through online social networks had an ameliorative effect on IPV victimization among Korean immigrants.

**H6:** IPV victims are less likely to have social networks, including interpersonal networks, as well as online social networks compared to non-victims.

**H7:** IPV victims with strong support networks are less likely to experience abuse compared with IPV victims without strong support networks.

Table 3 shows the numbers of interpersonal social networks and online social networks between victims and non-victims. Interpersonal/online networks were measured by using the revised Social Support Questionnaires developed by Sarason et al (1987). Originally, there were 6 questions to measure social support but for the purpose of this paper, these questions were combined into 3 and the participants identified up to 5 people in each question. Thus, the minimum number of people the participants can identify was 0 and the maximum number of people was 15.

As Table 3 shows, victims on average identified 5 people as their supportive social network whereas non-victims identified 8 people. For online social networks which include individuals who are connected through online social networks because they are living in other
cities or their home country (i.e., Korea) as well as ethnic based websites they use to maintain contact with other individuals, victims reported 3 online social networks on average whereas non-victims reported 5 on average. This result shows that non-victims are more likely to have not only interpersonal networks but also online social networks than victims, and the difference between victims and non-victims in terms of the number of interpersonal network (p=0.000) and online networks (p=0.001) is statistically significant. This supports our H6 that IPV victims are less likely to have (interpersonal and online) social networks than non-victims.

To test H7 whether the number of social networks predicts IPV victimization among Korean immigrants, I conducted logistic regression (Table 9). Throughout the different models (from Model 1 to Mode 8), the higher number of social networks victims have is statistically significant in predicting IPV non-victimization. In other words, if victims have extensive social networks, the odds of IPV victimization decreases. To understand the independent effect of each control variable along with the number of social network, each control variable has been added into each model. The odds of the social network did not change that much by adding acculturation (Model 2), victims’ location of residence (Table 3), religiosity (Model 4), the number of children they have (Model 5), the length of relationship (Model 6) and childhood physical victimization (Model 7). When controlling for acculturation level (Model 2), extensive social support network statistically predicts IPV victimization although the controlling variable (i.e., acculturation) is not statistically associated with IPV victimization. Model 3 shows that the odds of IPV victimization among Korean immigrant women with a small social support network statistically predicts IPV victimization when controlling for the location of the participants. Also, by adding victims’ location, the variance in explaining IPV victimization has increased from 8.6% to 19.6%. This means that victims’ location explained about 11% of the variance in IPV
victimization in Model 3. When victims lived in a populated state, the odds of becoming an IPV victim was 10 times higher than they lived in non-populated state (Model 3), and the relationship is statistically significant and this remains in the full model (Model 8). It is similar for the religiosity of the participants (Model 4). When Korean immigrant women had a wider social network and they were religious, the odds of IPV victimization increased. In Models 5 and 6, the number of children and the relationship length were added respectively. The length of the relationship was not related to IPV victimization (Model 6) whereas childhood victimization played an important role in IPV victimization (Model 7). Model 7 shows that Korean immigrant women with wider social networks were 13% less likely to be victims of IPV when controlling for childhood physical violence experience. Korean immigrant women with childhood physical victimization history were 3 times more likely to be victims of IPV when controlling for the social networks. All control variables were added in one model (Model 8) to see the impact of social network on IPV victimization among Korean immigrant women when controlling for all other variables. As Model 8 shows, the odds of IPV victimization when Korean immigrant women had larger social networks decreased 0.8 times when controlling for acculturation, the location, religion (being religious or not), the number of children, length of relationship, and childhood abuse history.

What about online social networks? Do they play a similar role as interpersonal social networks? As table 10 shows, online social networks played a similar role on IPV victimization as the interpersonal relationship. When victims had more extensive online social networks, they were less associated with IPV victimization (from Model 1 to Model 8). To see whether this relationship remains significant when controlling for interpersonal social networks, an additional model (Model 9) controlled for all the possible control variables as well as the number of
interpersonal social networks. Model 9 in Table 10 shows that online social networks played an important role in IPV victimization among Korean immigrants although the significant level has decreased. Model 9 shows that when Korean immigrant victims had a more extensive online social network, they were 14% less likely to be victims of IPV. This indicates that having an extensive online network is as important as having an extensive in-person network with regards to IPV victimization prevention.
Table 9. Logistic Regression: The Role of Social Networks on IPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model 1 (n=127) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 2 (n=123) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 3 (n=127) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 4 (n=127) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 5 (n=125) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 6 (n=126) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 7 (n=126) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 8 (n=114) OR (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
<td>OR (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Social Networks</td>
<td>0.857*** (-0.155)</td>
<td>0.855*** (-0.157)</td>
<td>0.857*** (-0.154)</td>
<td>0.844*** (-0.169)</td>
<td>0.847*** (-0.166)</td>
<td>0.817*** (-0.202)</td>
<td>0.866*** (-0.144)</td>
<td>0.820*** (-0.199)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High English Level</td>
<td>1.059 (0.057)</td>
<td>1.004 (0.004)</td>
<td>9.788*** (2.281)</td>
<td>0.331* (-1.105)</td>
<td>1.065 (0.063)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
<td>3.421* (1.229)</td>
<td>1.736 (0.552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Migration</td>
<td>1.000 (0.000)</td>
<td>1.004 (0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.058 (0.057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in Populated State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.788*** (2.281)</td>
<td>0.331* (-1.105)</td>
<td>1.065 (0.063)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
<td>3.421* (1.229)</td>
<td>10.040** (2.307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.290* (-1.239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.113 (0.107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.926 (-0.077)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Physical Victimization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.899+ (1.064)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.580** (0.948)</td>
<td>2.289 (0.828)</td>
<td>0.403 (-0.909)</td>
<td>3.560*** (1.270)</td>
<td>2.564* (0.941)</td>
<td>3.951** (1.373)</td>
<td>1.816 (0.596)</td>
<td>0.069 (-2.673)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.0869</td>
<td>0.0880</td>
<td>0.1957</td>
<td>0.1180</td>
<td>0.1180</td>
<td>0.0988</td>
<td>0.1293</td>
<td>0.2803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.10 +, P < 0.05 *, P < 0.01 **, P < 0.001***
### Table 10. Logistic Regression: The Role of Online Social Networks on IPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model 1 (n=126) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 2 (n=122) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 3 (n=126) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 4 (n=126) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 5 (n=124) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 6 (n=116) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 7 (n=125) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 8 (n=113) OR (b)</th>
<th>Model 9 (n=113) OR (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Online Social Networks</td>
<td>0.859** (-0.152)</td>
<td>0.861** (-0.150)</td>
<td>0.877* (-0.131)</td>
<td>0.855** (-0.157)</td>
<td>0.859** (-0.158)</td>
<td>0.813*** (-0.206)</td>
<td>0.877** (-0.132)</td>
<td>0.806** (-0.215)</td>
<td>0.858* (-0.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High English Level</td>
<td>0.906 (-0.098)</td>
<td>1.307 (0.267)</td>
<td>1.124* (0.117)</td>
<td>1.119* (0.113)</td>
<td>1.196 (0.091)</td>
<td>1.096 (0.091)</td>
<td>1.252 (0.123)</td>
<td>0.288* (-1.243)</td>
<td>1.111 (0.105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Migration</td>
<td>1.001 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.996 (-0.004)</td>
<td>0.996 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.996 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.996 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.996 (0.001)</td>
<td>1.000 (0.001)</td>
<td>1.000 (0.001)</td>
<td>1.000 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td>0.996 (-0.004)</td>
<td>8.680*** (2.161)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in populated state</td>
<td>8.753** (2.161)</td>
<td>8.680*** (2.161)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
<td>8.753** (2.169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious</td>
<td>0.425+ (-0.855)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
<td>0.985 (-0.015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>3.510* (1.256)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td>0.976 (-0.025)</td>
<td>3.510* (1.256)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood Physical Victimization</td>
<td>0.880* (-0.128)</td>
<td>3.510* (1.256)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Social Networks</td>
<td>3.510* (1.256)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
<td>3.261* (1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.851* (0.616)</td>
<td>2.026 (0.706)</td>
<td>2.264** (0.817)</td>
<td>1.897 (0.640)</td>
<td>3.088** (1.128)</td>
<td>1.292 (0.256)</td>
<td>0.015* (-4.192)</td>
<td>0.040 (-3.223)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.0679</td>
<td>0.0649</td>
<td>0.1681</td>
<td>0.0877</td>
<td>0.0680</td>
<td>0.1073</td>
<td>0.1068</td>
<td>0.2680</td>
<td>0.3069</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.10 +, P < 0.05 *, P < 0.01 **, P < 0.001***
The Role of Conservative Gender Role, Acculturative Stress, and Social Network on IPV

To understand whether conservative gender values, a higher level of acculturative stress and extensiveness of social support network would have an impact on IPV when controlling for all other independent variables, all variables have been added in one model. Table 11 shows the results. When controlling for acculturative stress and social network, the strength of conservative values is highly associated with IPV victimization in 0.10 significant levels but the effect is not as strong when not controlling for other independent variables (Table 5, Model 8). Acculturative stress has a significant impact on IPV victimization among Korean immigrant women even controlling for conservative gender roles and social network. In the case of social network, the significance level decreases after controlling for other independent variables such as conservative gender values and acculturative stress, but it still remains significant at 0.05 levels. This indicates that conservative gender values, acculturative stress and social network have a strong impact on IPV victimization even when controlling for each other.

To estimate the predictive probabilities of IPV victimization by the strength of conservative gender role values, acculturative stress, and social support network while holding constant its mean, the marginal standardization has been calculated. Figure 3 shows the marginal effect of IPV victimization by conservative gender role values, acculturative stress, and social networks. As Figure 3 shows, the predicted probabilities for IPV victimization among Korean immigrant women with the mean level of acculturative stress, social network and gender role values are slightly less than 50%. However, once the level of acculturative stress increases (i.e., high acculturative stress) one standard deviation, the probabilities of victimization become over 80% whereas when the extensiveness of social network decreases (i.e., low social network) one standard deviation, the probability becomes less than 70%. In the case of gender role values,
when conservative gender role values increase one standard deviation, the probability of becoming a victim becomes slightly over 70%. This indicates that acculturative stress compared to social network and conservative gender role values has the highest impact on victimization.

Table 11. Logistic Regression: Conservative Gender Role Values, Acculturative Stress, and Social Network on IPV Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OR (b) (n=123)</th>
<th>OR (b) (n=111)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservative Gender Values</td>
<td>1.044+ (0.043)</td>
<td>1.077+ (0.074)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Acculturative Stress</td>
<td>1.072*** (0.069)</td>
<td>1.135*** (.1267)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Social Network</td>
<td>0.893* (-0.113)</td>
<td>0.857* (-0.154)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High English Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.357* (1.472)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.058 (0.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Stay</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.051 (0.050)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in Populated State</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.424*** (2.967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Religious</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.266+ (-1.324)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.568 (0.450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.887+ (-0.120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood physical victimization</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.055* (2.086)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>** (-4.051)</td>
<td>0.000*** (-12.069)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo R2</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>0.486</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P<0.10 +, P < 0.05 *, P < 0.01 **, P < 0.001***
Figure 3. Predicted Probabilities of IPV Victimization by the Conservative Gender Role Values, Acculturative Stress, Social Networks
CHAPTER 8. QUALITATIVE RESULTS

In-depth interviews with 16 IPV victims were conducted to answer three qualitative research questions. Using the nested design, 16 interviewees were recruited from the survey participants who experienced IPV in the past year. The purpose of this qualitative research was to understand the meaning or nature of being an immigrant and experiencing IPV, their social networks, and conservative gendered perception as immigrant women in the USA, and how these factors may affect how they deal with IPV as Korean immigrant victims.

As Table 2 shows, about 19% of the interview participants were in their 20s, 25% were in their 30s, over 31% were in their 40s, and 25% of the participants were in their 50s. Less than 70% of them were unemployed at the time of the interview. Their monthly income was $2,014. Most of them (87.50%) had a college or higher degree.

Table 12 shows a list of interview participants. The pseudonyms were used in the qualitative study to maintain confidentially and privacy of the participants. The most popular names in Korea in each birth year were used for the participants’ pseudonyms (http://efamily.scourt.go.kr/).

Thematic analysis was conducted to analyze the in-depth interview data. By utilizing thematic analysis as an analytic tool, I identified ten themes – Legal Status Dependency, Financial Dependency, Social or Emotional Dependency, Saving face, Self-Isolation, Online Social Networks, Stress and Frustration in Offenders, Victims’ Stress and Frustrations, Patriarchal values held by victims, victims’ families and the community, Gender Role Conflicts, Conservative attitudes in abusers – related to four research questions in this study.

Table 12. In-depth Interview Participants
### RQ1. What is the meaning of being an immigrant and experiencing IPV?

Experiencing IPV as an immigrant woman might be different from experiencing it as a native woman in general, although it is hard for both of them (Dasgupta, 2005; Hazen & Soriano, 2005). Due to social isolation (Choi et al., 2012; Hurtado-de-Mendoza et al., 2014; Stets, 1991) and acculturative stress (Gupta et al., 2008; Kim-Goh and Baello, 2008), they need to consider various factors when facing violence. Many Korean immigrant women in this study who experienced IPV said that things would have been very different if they were in Korea. Some said IPV might not have occurred if they were in Korea or they could have more easily left their abusive relationship.

It is well known that immigrant women’s legal, social, and financial dependency increases their vulnerability, as it provides room for their partners to control them (Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project, 2005). This was true for Korean immigrant women. In particular, their legal, financial, and social/emotional dependency on their partner was especially
high among recent-immigrant Korean women whose partners migrated to the USA earlier than they had or were born in the USA. When they experience a serious acculturation gap with their partners, their dependency increased. Victims mentioned that their abusers exploited their dependency on their abuser (as a recent immigrant) to control them. This study has uncovered three main types of dependency that increase their vulnerability due to their status as immigrant women.

**Legal Status Dependency: “I will make you illegal!”**

Many immigrant women come to the USA after marrying US citizens or as legal permanent residents. Without their families and friends, their social isolation, as well as their dependency on offenders, increases significantly (Raj & Silverman, 2002; Denham et al., 2007). Many Korean women in this study were also married to US citizens or needed to obtain their legal status via their partner’s job or legal status. Youngmi (46) came to the USA with her first husband about 20 years ago. She then divorced her first husband due to his violence. Angel and her ex-husband lived in Korea for 3 years and then they came to the USA, as he wanted to get his MBA degree and work in the USA. When he started to experience difficulty getting a job after his graduation, he experienced a high level of frustration and started to physically abuse her. When he started to abuse their son, she decided to get divorced. Almost immediately after her divorce, she met her current husband, who was a doctoral student at that time and is currently a professor at a university. She mentioned that as she needed to maintain her status through him and obtain her permanent residency from his school’s support system, he always threatened to make her illegal and brought up her legal dependency on him whenever they argued.

Threatening victims by using their legal dependency on the offender occurs among other victims too. Many victims tolerate or endure violence because of this, even though they want to
leave. Sujin (29) married a 52 year-old white man whom she met through an online dating website. After a short dating period (less than 3 months), they decided to live together and get married, even though she observed some signs of his abusive behaviors toward her and himself as well. After less than one year of marriage, he met another girl through the online dating website and asked her for money to use on his dates. When she refused to give him money, he became more abusive toward her. She mentioned that when she wanted to get divorced due to his physical, sexual, and economic abuse and infidelity, he started to threaten her using her unstable legal status, and he used this power to ask for money.

**Sujin**: He said I needed to give him $5,000 as he is helping me with my green card. He said that his life with me was miserable but he tolerated it so I can get a green card. I really didn’t want to give that money but I was so worried about my status and my life so I decided to give him that money.

**PI**: Did you have that amount of money?

**Sujin**: I was waiting to receive $8,000 from the egg donations I did before. Victor (Sujin’s husband) knew about it and wanted to have that money. ... But frankly, I am not sure he will help me with my green card even though I give him that money.

**Financial Dependency: “being a housewife is the best option I have”**

Financial dependency on offenders is not the only problem that immigrant victims experience. However, due to their poor English skills or lack of knowledge of the system, they become more dependent on their abusers financially. In many cases, it is not their choice to be financially dependent on their partners. Sometimes, even if they wanted to get a job and become dependent by themselves, the reality for immigrant women, in particular—who have been out of the job market, do not have good English skills, and are relatively old—is that it is very difficult
for them to find a job. Jungsuk (53 years old) mentioned that even in coffee shops in Koreatown, where most of the customers are Koreans, seek employees who can speak English, are young, and are pretty. Other participants also said similar things. After facing these problems, these women, who tried to be independent from their partners financially but are blocked by a lack of opportunities, tend to become very passive and do not try further.

Youngmi (46) stated:

“I tried to search for a job but it was hard to get it … my English is limited and my self-esteem is not high … every job I was looking for required strong communication skills and I am not there. I wanted to give up and go back to Korea… I just realized that being a housewife is the best option I have [even though my husband is abusive]”.

One of the problems of being passive about current situations due to blocked opportunities was that it became harder for them to leave their abusive situation, as the learned helpless theory argues (Walker, 1980). The learned helplessness theory suggests that victims who experience helplessness from uncontrollable circumstances lose the ability to foresee that their behaviors will generate successful outcomes and, thus, they do not try to actively escape from their currently abusive situations (Walker, 1977/1978). This passive attitude toward their current victimization and lack of motivation to learn from their past (direct or indirect) experiences increases the risk of further victimization. This theory has been criticized by many scholars that victims actually actively tried to leave by utilizing various strategies from their abusive situations (Gondolf & Fisher, 1988; Goodman et al., 2003).

I also found that not all victims in this study were passive and did try to escape from their abusive situation as learned helpless theory suggested. There were some Korean immigrant women who were financially dependent on abusers but actively tried to escape from them and
filed the protection order. This decision was possible because they were actively looking for the resources they could utilize such as victim services and the resources were available for them. However, not many IPV victims (especially immigrant victims) are aware of those resources (Logan et al, 2005; Moracco et al, 2005), it is not easy for them to get help. Thus, availability of resources for IPV victims is crucial.

Financial dependency increases especially when victims are immigrants and offenders are US citizens or have lived in the USA for a longer period of time than the victims. Over 31% of victims in this sample married Americans (Caucasian) or Korean-Americans, whereas almost all of their partners (Korean immigrant women) were recent immigrants. Offenders often used their partners’ financial dependency as their method of control.

Youngsuk (44 years old) met her current husband, who was a Korean-American lawyer, through online dating websites. She was lonely and tired of being an international student who needed to worry about her immigrant status. They got married less than 3 months after they started dating, as he seemed a nice person who was highly religious. Because she had limited income sources, she needed to depend on him financially, but he didn’t like the fact that she “used” his money. Whenever they had arguments, she said he took away the car keys from her so that she could not go to school and he refused to give any money to her.

Jiyoung (37 years old), who escaped from her husband with her son and is currently filing for divorce, said there was nothing she could do in the USA while she was with him, as he did not allow her to do anything. She said she even didn’t know how much the bus fare was. At first, she thought that it was his expression of love toward her but it became his method of controlling her behaviors.

“He didn’t want me to work and at the same time, he didn’t give me any money. I didn’t
know how to pay phone bills. I didn’t know anything. [The reason I didn’t know anything was] he did everything for me. He did everything for me and he didn’t want me to do anything. I could not do anything by myself without his help.”

Enyoung (45 years old) said her husband (a Caucasian American) always become more aggressive whenever she tried to get a job. They met through her friend and got married after three months of dating. He was always gentle until the wedding day. Even though he was more than 10 years younger than she was and had a successful career, he always wanted to have her under his control.

“He always said he wants me to have a successful career. But whenever I told him that I got a job interview, he became so angry at me, asking why I didn’t tell him I applied for that position. He always said “what are you hiding from me?” “What are you trying to do?” If I tried to explain, he got even more upset and asked me not to talk back to him. And then, he started to choke and press me on the wall.”

Social or Emotional Dependency: “He was the only source of love I had.”

Many of the Korean immigrant victims in this study came to the USA by themselves rather than with other family members, and they moved because of their partners or met their partners at the beginning of their stay. Because they do not have friends or family near them, they often feel homesick and lonely. The only person they can rely on is their partner, even though their partners abuse them. One mentioned that she would rather stay with her husband, who abused her physically and emotionally, than be alone.

“I have a fear [of being] alone. Some might think it would be better to get divorced and become free but if you haven’t had that divorce experience, you don’t know how you feel when you become alone. Being abandoned by others makes me feel terrible.”
Her husband hadn’t come back home for 15 days after a big argument at the time we held the interview. She said “I feel so afraid and lonely now. I realized how important his existence was. I should not complain about anything.” I felt sad for her when I was talking with her. At the end of the interview, she thanked me for listening to her story. She said she was so lonely and there was no one she could talk to. According to her, now she will accept him as he is if he decides to come back, because it is better to be with him than to be alone.

Seoyoung (26 years old), who came to New Jersey from Chicago a year ago for her job, was also partially independent from her parents, although her parents did not allow her to leave. She then met her Korean boyfriend who came to the USA for his degree. Although her family was in Chicago, she could not contact her parents or family when she had issues with her boyfriend because she didn’t want to go back to Chicago and be under her parents’ control. But at the same time, she said she was so lonely in New Jersey and she could not leave him because “he was the only source of love” for her.

Victims’ emotional dependency on their abuser tends to be exacerbated because of situational factors, such as being an immigrant woman largely isolated from her family and friends. Some victims thought that offenders purposely made victims dependent on them by limiting access to resources or looking for women they think may be easily controlled.

“He got married to me because I am easy to control. I am only person from my family in the USA and there is no one who can help me if something happens.” (Youngsuk, 44 years old)

“He said he likes “fob (fresh off the boat).” He said he only likes real Asian women and doesn’t like American Asian women because they are too Americanized. He didn’t explain the reason but I think I know the reasons. They are easier to control because they are naïve.” (Sujin, 29 years old).
Victims’ legal, financial, and emotional dependency on offenders is a very complex matter. Victims’ legal dependency can increase financial and/or emotional dependency, and their financial dependency affects emotional dependency, etc. Combining the nature of being immigrants and the nature of being women in abusive relationships, Korean immigrant women become even more vulnerable like other immigrant women (Dasgupta, 2005).

RQ2. For immigrants, what is the meaning of social networks and interpersonal relationships? How does the perception and influence of social networks affect IPV?

Studies reveal that when victims have social networks, they are more likely to leave their abusive relationships (Coohey, 2007; Farris & Fenaughty, 2002; Stets, 1991; Van Wyk et al, 2003). In particular, for immigrants, social networks play an important role. I observed that Korean immigrant women who experienced IPV tend to interact mostly with other Korean immigrants, as most victims in this study live in metropolitan areas with large Korean populations, such as New York, New Jersey, and California. Their social network groups are mostly built through religious affiliations. I found that their social networks built through their religious affiliations did not help them in a practical way to prevent or leave their abusive relationships, mostly because victims resist revealing their problems due to the stigma associated with it. Two main themes—saving face and self-isolation—became apparent in the interviews with victims.

_Saving face: “it’s like spitting in my face” (내 얼굴에 침뱉기)_

Saving face is one concept that many other IPV researchers have identified as occurring among Asian groups (Choi, 2015; Midlarsky, Venkataramani-Kothari, & Plante, 2006). I also witnessed the “saving face” concept within the victims in this study: they did not reveal their victimization to other social networks, including their friends, church friends, clergy, and
colleagues, because they do not want to lose respect.

One episode with one of the participants shows how much Korean immigrants care about social reputation. When I met Eunju (37 years old) for the interview, she was covering her face with her hands because she was very worried about whether I might know her personally or through her personal connections. She was doing it in a half-joking way, but I could notice that she was very concerned about losing respect by revealing her secret to me because I might spread that secret to others that might know her. She said that, as the Korean community in New York is very small, and her husband is well-known in the community, if I know her, their reputation will go down.

The desire to “save face” can be found even among Korean immigrant women who rarely interact with other Korean immigrants due to the location in which they live. Hyejin (35 years old) currently lives in a rural area in the USA where she rarely sees other Korean people. She came to the USA with her husband, who was in the American army based in Korea. They dated and lived in Korea for six years after they got married, and they later decided to come to the USA because of his job. She said she saw a small sign of aggressiveness while they were in Korea, but his truly aggressive behaviors, such as hitting her, started after they came to the USA. When I asked her whether she had sought some help from others to stop his abusive behaviors, she said “Talking about his abuse to other people is like spitting in my face (losing my respect or reputation). If I am not going to get divorced, it is better not to talk and just embrace it.”

Soonok (59 years old) also said she didn’t say anything to her friends or relatives because “I feel like my social reputation as well as his reputation go down to the ground if I say this to others. It’s like I spit in my face.”

The same rationale—not to seek any help from her social networks, such as friends or
family—applied to Eunju (37 years old). Eunju met her husband when they were traveling. As they fell in love at first sight, they spent about a month together while they were traveling, and he asked her to come to the USA and get married. She did come to the USA and they started to live together. He started to verbally abuse her almost right after they started to live together, but his physical abuse was not more than slapping her in the face, as they were living together with his parents at that time. However, once they moved out from his parents’ place, the abuse became more severe. For instance, he often used his leather belt to hit her. I asked her why she did not seek help even though his abuse was that serious. She mentioned that:

“Because if I say something about his bad behaviors, unless I get divorced, put him in jail, or become a total enemy, it all comes to me in the end. It’s like I spit in my face [according to the] Korean expression. That’s really like spitting in my face.”

Even though being victims of IPV is not their fault, most victims felt shameful about their situations with their partners. Even though they have some people around them who might help them, they choose not to seek help. It seems to me that for some of these victims, saving their face is more important than saving their lives. Although divorce might not be the only way to resolve their currently abusive situations, I observed that they tend to have a dichotomous idea about their situations with their partners between revealing their abusive situations to get help and getting divorced. That’s why they are having a harder time seeking help, because many of the victims don’t want to get divorced. Although the divorce rate has been increasing recently among Korean couples (Park & Raymo, 2013), the stigma associated with divorce is still high (Kim & Kim, 2002). This would be one of the reasons many of the victims do not wish to get divorced.

_Self-Isolation: “It’s my defense tactic to save my face”_
Unlike what I found from the quantitative study, Korean immigrant victims were not without social networks around them. Some of them had active social interaction with their friends, colleagues, and community people. However, similarly to what I observe related to “saving face,” they tried to isolate themselves emotionally from other social networks rather than seek help from them when they needed help. One of the main reasons they isolated themselves was that they were afraid of rumors about them and their family that might severely hurt their social reputation.

This fear of being a target of gossip does not originate out of nowhere, though. Most of them said they had shared their stories with others (e.g. church friends) in their communities at least one time, but they had become targets of gossiping later. After that, they decided not to reveal their problems anymore and pretend that everything with them was all right. Some victims said it’s a norm for churchgoers not to share anything about their personal lives with other churchgoers as the information will spread later.

“What I heard from other people is that I should be really careful when I interact with people at church. They said “don’t talk too much.” I didn’t know what it meant exactly at first...but now, I know why. I never never never trust people and do not say anything.”

(Youngsuk, 44 years old)

I heard similar experiences from other Korean women. Minji (26 years old) came to the USA with her parents when she was 7. Her father physically abused her mother and once her mother left him, she and her brother became the targets of his anger. She talked to her school counselor about his abuse when she was in high school. Because of that, she stayed in foster care until she became an adult. Now, she lives in an apartment by herself, supported by the government. Her father could not physically abuse her anymore, as they rarely meet each other,
and also she said her father was really shocked after the government took her and her brother.

Unfortunately, as many other IPV victims experience revictimization through their lives (Kuijpers et al, 2012), she became her boyfriend’s target of violence. Her boyfriend was shy at the beginning but started to emotionally abuse her when she refused to have sexual intercourse with him. She decided not to seek any help, even from the pastor that she considered to be one of the closest people in her social networks, because she didn’t want to get hurt by other church people.

**PI:** Isn’t it true that your pastor is one of the closest persons to you?

**Minji:** Yes, that’s why I don’t want to say anything. I tend not to say anything to someone whom I know well.

**PI:** Why?

**Minji:** I like going to church but I don’t like church people. I had a bad experience with church people when I was young ....I heard they [talked] about my family problem between my mom and dad, and us. I felt like they were enjoying the gossip about us. They will enjoy gossiping [about] my problem too [if I say].

I became sad when many of them decided not to talk to anyone and simply endure their pain. I asked them whether pretending everything is alright whenever they interact with people would be the right thing to do, and Eunju (38 years old) told me:

“**Well... this is a defense tactic. .. a self-defense.. a defense to protect myself. Merely sharing everything with other people is not a good social life. Think about American people. They don’t share anything with others, even their ages. My experience told me revealing and sharing everything is not a good thing. I think we all need a self-protection [to save our face]”**.”
Online Social Networks: “There is nothing they can do for me anyway”

Online social networks have been found to be an important source of social capital and social interaction (Ellison et al., 2007; Salem et al., 1997) and communication tools (Mustafa & Hamzah, 2011). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that online social networks prevent IPV (re)victimization.

Similar to how they treat interpersonal networks, Korean immigrant victims tend not to discuss their personal problems with their friends or family back in Korea or other states. Most of them said that they did not say anything about their problems, as they did not want their family members to worry about them, and also, there was nothing their family members could do for them as they are living far away. Also, talking about personal problems like IPV victimization via online social networks (including messenger services) is not easy, as it cannot convey their emotions, so they do not talk to their friends. I found that many Korean victims do not want to share or reveal IPV to friends or families even through online media.

Distinct from online social networks or online social networking websites such as Facebook, which are used to maintain the personal relationships back in Korea or talk to individuals without physical interaction, ethnicity-based websites provide different types of support to Korean immigrant victims. Many of them mentioned that they get emotional support from other members of these websites by sharing their hardships in the bulletins, or they might gain some important information from the websites too. Particularly, I found that Korean immigrants rely on the ethnicity-based websites to gain legal information related to their victimization. Hyejin (35 years old) said “I often go to Missy USA (Korean ethnicity-based website) to check the legal information about divorce and custody.” The reason Korean immigrants seek some help from these websites is due to the websites’ anonymous nature and
the fact that they do not need to reveal their identity.

**RQ3. What coping strategies do Korean immigrants have when they encounter acculturative stress?**

Immigrants experience acculturative stress while they are adapting to a new culture and society. Other scholars (Gupta et al., 2008; Kim-Goh and Baello, 2008), as well as the quantitative part of this study, found that the acculturative stress immigrants experience is highly correlated with IPV. Although every individual experiences stress to a certain extent, some might feel it more than others, depending on the circumstances or resources they have. Agnew (1992) argues that if individuals have coping strategies when they experience negative emotions, such as anger, they are less likely to use violence. Korean immigrant women and their partners in this study seem like they did not have good strategies to overcome their stress caused by their current situations. In particular, drinking is an important part of social life among Koreans (Hong et al., 2010); when immigrants who do not have channels or strategies to cope with their stress drink alcohol, the consequences could be very serious.

**Stress and Frustration in Offenders: “He vented on me”**

I observed from this study that victims tend to perceive the cause of their partners’ violence as stress or frustration caused by their current status as immigrants. Youngmi’s first husband started physically abusing her when he completed his MBA degree but could not get a job. They were married more than 3 years before they came to the USA. She didn’t observe any sign of violent behavior from him before. That’s why she said it was so hard for her to endure his abusive behavior, and she decided to get divorced pretty quickly once it happened.

“After he completed his MBA degree, he tried to get a job… Most frustrat[ing] thing was his English was not improving a lot within a short period and the competition within the
business world was so high...Now I understand how hard [it] was. How painful it could be (not getting a job). On top of that, he liked alcohol. He was sweet even [while] he was drunk in Korea...but when he felt frustrated and his situation didn’t meet his expectation here, he vented on me. Once he started to hit me, I [became] a target of his anger.”

Hyunsuk (54 years old) also said similar things about the strain or frustration her abusive husband experienced due to unmet expectations he had.

“I think he [vented] on me because things didn’t work well for him. He studied theology. He was in Argentina as [a] missionary as well. He had a dream of becoming a good pastor but things didn’t work as he expected ... so he vented on me”.

Miyoung (45 years old) came to the USA with her husband in 2007. About 8 years ago, he stopped working and hasn’t financially contributed to their family since. He spends most of his time at home watching TV or sleeping. She is the breadwinner in her family. He was not like that at the beginning of their immigration, she said.

**PI:** Do you know why he doesn’t try to get a job?

**Miyoung:** I am not sure. I think it is because of lack of self-esteem. He tried to get a job at the beginning but it wasn’t easy for him. He doesn’t want to work at the market or [be] doing some jobs like Mexicans do because of his self-pride. He doesn’t have [a] hungry mind and only [thinks] about social reputation. He still could not get rid of his self-pride.

Many immigrant offenders experienced a gap between their social status while they were in Korea and current social status in the USA as immigrants. Thus, their frustration level increases. Frustration or strain due to their immigrant status doesn’t exist only for those individuals who do not have resources. For instance, Youngmi’s husband is a professor at a university. He came to the USA for his PhD studies and he achieved his dream to be a professor.
By looking at his current social status, it is not easy to think that he experiences a high level of frustration as he has a stable legal status, income level, and family. However, objective standards such as SES cannot easily estimate the degree to which individuals experience acculturative stress. If individuals are of a certain status, their expectation to maintain that social status would increase too. Youngmi discussed her abusive husband, who is a professor at a university:

“*He has been here for a while. What he has now is not what he obtained easily. Because of English…. His English has improved but still he has a strong Korean accent. He got lots of complaints from his students because of his accent at the university. He sometimes said he just wants to quit his job and work at McDonald’s or Burger King if he can.*”

**Victims’ Stress and Frustrations: “I pray and cry”**

As many other studies support the notion that men and women tend to have different ways to cope with their stress (Taylor et al., 2000; Tobin et al., 2000), Korean immigrant men tend to externalize emotions, such as anger and hostility, while women tend to internalize emotions, such as fear, sadness, or anxiety when they encounter stress.

I observed that difference in Korean immigrants too: offenders vent their frustrations on victims, and victims tend to resolve their stress or frustration caused by their circumstances or obstacles through passive means, such as praying. Kyounghee (45 years old) said “*I just pray.*” She mentioned that she feels much better after praying and crying, but nothing changes with her husband.

As most victims were less likely become aggressive when they encountered stress, unlike offenders, I could not observe how their acculturative stress and lack of coping strategies would affect their victimization directly. However, because they tend to internalize their emotions, when their partners become abusive, they tend not to seek other productive strategies that can
help them to escape from abusive situations. This means they would be less likely to cause problems that could harm others, but they harm themselves. Two of the victims in this study mentioned that they attempted to kill themselves, and one victim mentioned that she was diagnosed with depression. Mental health problems that victims experience can increase their vulnerability.

**RQ4. What is the nature of gendered perceptions and IPV? Have gender roles and attitudes changed since immigration? How do immigrants experience conflicts due to gendered perceptions? What is the significance of conservative gender roles and IPV?**

Immigrants experience various cultural and psychological changes in the process of adaptation into the host country, and this is called “acculturation.” One of the changes individuals experience is a change in values or attitudes toward the family structure or gender roles. In particular, if immigrants come from countries where those values and attitudes are very different from the host country (i.e. the USA), this might cause them to experience conflicts (Sodowsky and Lai 1997; Pan & Wong 2011). Also, if couples share different gender role attitudes or values, conflicts could become more severe.

**Patriarchal values held by victims, victims’ families and the community: “I thought I should endure”**

Many victims in this study tend to have conservative minds toward marriage, gender roles, and family. In particular, when their supportive networks, such as their family members, have conservative attitudes toward marriage or the wife’s role in the family, they stayed in abusive relationships for longer periods.

Kyounghee (45 years old) ran away from her husband recently with her daughter. She endured his abuse for more than 20 years. Once her daughter became a legal adult, she decided
to escape from him with her.

**PI:** It seems like you had endured for a long period of time?

**Kyonghee:** I was just thinking to endure. I thought that is the virtue of Korean women. My mom lived like that and I didn’t think it was a good idea to take a father away from my daughter.

One other important reason Kyonghee could not leave her abusive relationship was that her family also had a conservative attitude toward marriage, so they would not be supportive when she tried to leave him. She said:

> “Whenever I escaped from my husband and hid, she (my mom) always gave him the location where I was and she always said that if I endure the pain, I would be rescued by God like she had been. It was important for me to listen to her and I also thought my situation with my husband was better than my mom’s so... I just endured...”

Junghee (55 years old), who was in an abusive relationship for more than 30 years, mentioned how a conservative family environment, on top of other obstacles, prohibited her from leaving her abusive husband.

> “He was my children’s father... I was worried about other people’s judgmental attitudes (about divorce)... of course, my financial situation was not good. There were many things that prohibited me leaving him but especially.... my family is very religious. My oldest brother is a pastor at the well-known church. Because of his higher position there, divorce was not an option for me.”

Conservative attitudes toward marriage or family don’t apply only to older victims. Sujin, who was 29 at the time of the interview, got married to her abusive husband when she was 26. He was abusive to himself as well as to her while they were dating, and when I asked her the
reason why she got married to him even though he was violent toward her before their marriage, she said, “I had a Korean idea about marriage. I thought I should get married as we were already living together.”

**Gender Role Conflicts: “He is Korean only in a family relationship”**

I could not find any gender-role conflicts between couples when victims’ partners were non-Korean, such as when they were white men. Among Korean immigrant women who married Korean-American men (who were born in the USA or came to the USA when they were young) or Korean men (who came to the USA as adults), they tended to experience conflicts due to expected stereotypical gender roles toward the other party. In particular, I could observe gender-role conflicts among couples between Korean immigrant women who came to the USA as adults and Korean-American men who were born in the USA.

**Youngsuk (44 years old):** He always give me pressure to financially contribute to the household even when I didn’t have a job, but whenever we argue he always said I should not talk back to him because I am much younger than him and he is my husband. He is a pure Korean when he talks about the family life style.

**Eunju (38 years old):** Whenever I expressed my opinion about something, he always said “women” should not talk back when “men” talk. Even he was a student and I was working full time, he waited for me to cook for him and clean the house because he thinks those are women’s jobs.

One of the reasons those couples (Korean women and the second generation or 1.5 generation of Korean men) might experience more gender-role conflicts than “Korean and Korean couples” is that Korean women who married the second generation Korean men would expect their partners to be less conservative, like Western men, as they have been more assimilated into Western society. However, unlike what they expected, the second generation of
Korean men tend to preserve conservative family and gender role values. Studies support that the second generation men tend to maintain more traditional and conservative family values and gendered ideologies (Dasgupta, 1998; Tang and Dion, 1999). Thus, immigrant men are more likely to get married to women within the same racial or ethnic groups compared to immigrant women (Min & Kim, 2009). The conflicts between couples arose because Korean immigrant women, who expected to have liberal men, married Korean immigrant guys, who expected to have conservative women.

**Conservative attitudes in abusers: “He needs to be served like a king”**

Korean men’s conservative attitudes toward gender roles also generate the conflicts. Soonok (59 years old) and her husband (62 years old) were married for more than 30 years. Since they got married, they have been working together in a self-owned small printing shop. Even though they both work at the same place for the same hours, he has expected her to do all the housework, including cooking, cleaning, etc.

“I really tried to do everything he wanted, but sometimes I really feel tired after working for an entire day. My husband is very conservative. Because of that we encountered the problems sometimes, but I really tried to do everything [that] he wanted. I have been trying to serve him as many older Korean women did, but my husband doesn’t think I am doing something special as he thinks I am doing what women were supposed to do.”

According to her, because he thinks everything she does is what she needs to do as a woman (even though she is also working full time), whenever he feels that she hasn’t served him like servants do for a “King,” he gets upset.

Similar to this, offenders tend to think that engaging in sexual intercourse is one of the wife’s obligations. Miyoung (45 years old) was suffering from her husband’s sexual abuse.
Whenever they had arguments, he wanted to have sexual intercourse. She realizes that forcible sex is rape, even between married couples, but her husband doesn’t think so.

_**Miyoung:** It doesn’t work even if I pushed him over. I told him many times it is rape to force me to do it. But he is much stronger than me so there is nothing I can do…

_PI:** Why do you think he does?

_**Miyoung:** I don’t know. He sometimes said men need to resolve their sexual drives and it is [a wife’s obligation] to have sex with her husband (when he needs to resolve his drives).

The visible causes of violence tend to be different among the different types of couples (Korean and Korean couples vs. Korean and Korean-American couples). However, as I could observe from this study, conservative gender perception among Korean immigrant men and women plays an important role in IPV, as it creates the conflicts between them.
CHAPTER 9. DISCUSSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

In the following section, I am going to discuss how conservative gender role values, social networks, and acculturative stress influence IPV among Korean immigrant women based on the findings from my quantitative study. Also, the themes I discovered from my qualitative study results helped me understand more in depth why those relationships between conservative gender role values, social networks, acculturative stress, and IPV exist among Korean immigrants.

Conservative Gender Role Values and IPV Victimization

As the quantitative surveys revealed, victims compared to non-victims tended to have conservative attitudes toward stereotypical gender roles. Korean immigrant IPV victims had significantly higher conservative values than non-victims, although on average, neither group had extremely high conservative gender role attitudes. Evidence from other studies supports the idea that women who have conservative gender role values are more at risk of being victims of IPV than less conservative women, because they might not realize they are victims of IPV (Midlarsky et al. 2006; Parish et al. 2004; Yoshioka et al. 2001); they might not want to reveal their victimization due to stigma; and they might accept their victimization due to embedded patriarchal values (Morse et al., 2012).

The qualitative interviews with victims also show that Korean immigrant victims exhibited conservative attitudes toward married life and women’s roles as wives. Due to their conservative attitudes toward gender roles, Korean immigrant women tend to endure the pain or accept their current situations, rather than seek help from others or try to escape from their situations. Even while they thought of escaping from their abusive situations, due to their family’s conservative attitude toward women and family life, they could not receive any support.
from their family and needed to return to their abusers. Also, many victims were concerned about judgmental attitudes Korean communities held toward them when they got divorced and, thus, they stayed in abusive relationships. This can contribute to their chronic victimization.

Although the relationship did not hold throughout the different models, I observed that the impact of having conservative gender role values on IPV was much stronger for Korean immigrant women who migrated when they were young (See Figure 2). For Korean immigrant women who came to the USA when they were older, the impact of gender role values (i.e. if they were conservative or liberal) on IPV did not vary that much. This means that recent immigrant women are more at risk of being IPV victims regardless of their conservative gender role attitudes. However, for Korean immigrant women who migrated to the USA when they were young, the impact of their conservative values on IPV victimization was very different. As Figure 2 shows, I found that when Korean immigrant women who migrated early and had conservative values (compared to Korean immigrant women who immigrated as children and had liberal values), they have 50% more probability of IPV victimization. This indicates that Korean immigrant women who have lived in American society longer, but still maintain conservative values or attitudes, are more at risk of violence than Korean immigrant women with more conservative values who arrived when they were older. Why would this be?

One possible explanation is that when individuals migrate during the childhood, they are more susceptible to acculturation into the host country than the individuals who migrate once they reached adulthood (Burnam, et al., 1987). When individuals immigrate to other countries, they adopt various strategies—separation, marginalization, assimilation and integration—to adapt to the host country (Berry, 1997). When individuals are disconnected from the mainstream but hold onto their own culture (i.e. separation), they tend to experience various problems, such
as depression and anxiety disorders (Ince et al, 2014). This might explain the relationship among age of migration, conservative gender role values, and IPV. Korean immigrant women who have adopted “separation” strategies—rather than accepting the host country’s culture (i.e. American society), they hold their own culture, which emphasizes conservative gender role values—are more prone to experiencing IPV. The reported rate of IPV prevalence in South Korea decreased about 50% between 1999 and 2010, 34.1% to 16.5% respectively. However, it was still high compared to other developed countries (Kim & Nam, 2016). Maintaining a cultural identity among immigrants plays an important role in their successful acculturation process while interacting with a host society (Berry, 2005). A problem might occur when immigrant populations merely maintain their culture and resist accepting rules or regulations in the host country’s society. To reduce this problem, active participation and interaction efforts between Korean immigrant populations and the larger American society would be helpful so that they could reduce their patriarchal values’ hold on them, which could influence IPV victimization. Community programs that help ethnic communities to interact with other ethnic communities would be beneficial. To boost Korean immigrants’ participation in community programs with other communities from the immigrant populations, it would be important to enhance language skills, as limited language skills prohibit any immigrants from expanding their networks outside their own ethnic network (Chiswick & Miller, 1994). Thus, providing the community with services that increase English skills, as well as promote interaction with other community members, would be a necessary step in preventing Korean immigrants’ incidence of IPV.

However, it is premature to conclude that victims’, families’ and communities’ conservative attitudes themselves are a cause of IPV. IPV can occur among conservative as well as liberal couples. Depending on how victims’ gender role values interact with their partners’
values, the mechanism of victims’ conservative gender roles and how they influence IPV might be different. For instance, I could not find gender role conflicts that increased IPV victimization among Korean women/non-Korean men couples in this study. On the other hand, Korean women/Korean-American men couples were the ones experiencing the conflicts. The reason might be that Korean women who married second-generation Korean men or non-Korean men would expect their partners to be less conservative, like Western men, as they think those men have acculturated themselves into American society, which emphasizes gender equality. However, unlike what they expected, the second generation of Korean men tends to preserve conservative family and gender role values (Dasgupta, 1998; Tang and Dion, 1999). The conflicts between couples rose because Korean immigrant women, who expected to have liberal men, married Korean immigrant men, who expected to have conservative women. This indicates that even the same factor (i.e. conservative gender role values) might unfold differently depending on the relationship between couples. Thus, identifying the relationship factors that causes the conflicts between couples will help us develop better preventive strategies.

**Social Networks and IPV**

According to the quantitative survey findings, IPV victims compared to non-IPV victims have more social networks, and the number of social networks predicts IPV victimization. Not only having more in-person social networks, but also having online social networks, is associated with less IPV victimization. This indicates that having more social networks, including online social networks, decreases the victimization risk among Korean immigrants. Many other scholars have found supportive evidence for this relationship (Coohey, 2007; Farris & Fenaughty, 2002; Stets, 1991; Van Wyk et al, 2003). However, interestingly, and contrary to what I expected—that IPV victims are socially isolated due to the nature of their immigrant status, and that is the
reason they are more likely become IPV victims—I found that Korean immigrant IPV victims are not socially isolated from other Korean community members. Additionally, many of the interviewees were not geographically isolated from each other either, as most of the participants were residing in metropolitan areas such as California, New York, and New Jersey.

I believe that this discrepancy between the quantitative surveys and in-depth interviews is coming from the different perception of “social networks.” Although many of the Korean immigrant women’s social networks are limited to their church members, they tend to interact with other people regularly through church attendance or church events. However, victims tend to maintain superficial social networks with them, and they avoid sharing their personal problems with them because it is so important for Koreans to save face. This means that even though they are not socially isolated from others, the networks with which these Korean immigrant women engage are not considered “supportive social networks.” Thus, when the participants in the quantitative surveys were asked to identify their social networks” – whom they can really count on to be dependable when they need help, whom they really count on to help them feel more relaxed or better when they are under pressure or feel depressed or upset and whom they really count on to care about them, regardless of what is happening to them in the surveys – they could not name them as their supportive social networks even though they have social interactions with them. This indicates that Korean immigrant victims do not have meaningful social interactions with others.

Why is saving face so important among Koreans? The concept of saving face has been examined widely (Choi, 2015; Midlarsky, Venkataramani-Kothari, & Plante, 2006). Saving face refers to the respect or reputation you obtain from individual social networks, and “face is lost when the individual, either through his action or that of people closely related to him, fails to
meet essential requirements placed upon him by virtue of the social position he occupies (Ho, 1976, p.867)” Although all societies have the concept of “face” to some extent, in the collectivist societies—such as Korean society, where homogeneity is emphasized—it is more prominent and plays an critical role in their regular lives (Yu, 2003).

Individuals in many Asian cultures, which are characterized by interdependence, see themselves in relation to others, while individuals in Western cultures tend to focus on independent relationships, which gives meaning to an individual’s own internal thoughts, feelings and actions, rather than perceiving them in relation to others. Thus, Westerners separate themselves from others, while Asians understand individual actions as group actions (Markus & Kitayama, 2010). Similarly, according to the social identity theory (Tajfela & Turner, 1979; Turner, 1975), individuals categorize themselves as a group so they do not psychologically separate themselves from the group to which they belong. Through the process of depersonalization, individuals see themselves as interchangeable with their in-group. Thus, revealing shameful problems caused by their family members or intimate partners (e.g. husband or partners) is the same as revealing their own problems to others. Due to this, Korean immigrant women in such a situation intentionally choose to isolate themselves from their social networks. By doing so, it seems like they save their face but not their safety.

Additionally, because revealing their victimization or their partners’ abusive behaviors makes them lose their face, they tend to think dichotomously about their relationship with their partners between getting divorced and living together by enduring the pain. Korean immigrant women have said that unless they are going to get divorced, it is better not to say anything to others about their relationship. However, not all victims in this study wanted to separate from their partners (due to various reasons, including stigma, children, etc.); getting divorced is not an
easy option for them. Also, their social networks are very limited to religious people who do not support divorce even in the situation of IPV (Levitt and Ware, 2006), so they are unwilling to reveal their problems to their social networks. However, as many Korean immigrant women seek counsel from their clergy or pastors about IPV, clergy members’ roles will be very important for IPV prevention (Choi, 2015a; Choi, 2015b). According to Choi (2015b), most of the church leaders (92.7%) in her study said they counseled Korean immigrant women about IPV but only 16% of them considered themselves ready to counsel well to help their church members in matters regarding IPV. The community programs that focus on clergy members’ roles, such as providing information about victim’s services like shelter, counseling, etc., are crucial, especially among Korean immigrants, the majority of whom are affiliated with Christian congregations (Pew Research Center, 2010).

The concept of saving face does not only apply to Korean immigrant women embedded in Korean communities with mainly Korean social networks. Studies reveal that immigrant women who came from Asian countries feel less pressure regarding social or gender roles and enjoy more freedom while they are in the foreign country than while they are in their own countries (Zontini, 2004, Zhou, 2000). This can be because they are not surrounded by people who enforce traditional social and gender roles toward them. However, already established attitudes cannot be changed easily (Noh & Avison, 1996). I found that Korean immigrant women who are surrounded by non-Korean communities also have similar ideas about saving face. Korean immigrant women who rarely interact with Korean immigrants and are surrounded by American people still did not want to seek help from their social networks or reveal their problems to others because they didn’t want to lose their face. This phenomenon can be more problematic and dangerous for them, as they are not only geographically isolated from Korean
communities, who can potentially provide victim services specific to Korean immigrants, but also, they will not seek any help from their own communities where they live due to their desire to save face. Thus, it will be important for the service agencies to reach out to Korean immigrants outside of the metropolitan areas where lots of Korean immigrants reside. Developing various channels for Korean immigrant women to utilize—ones that do not necessarily require in-person interaction with agency workers or counselors—should be made available so that victims can get help, but at the same time, they are less worried about losing their face, as individuals who are concerned about losing face prefer informal channels through which to gain information (Hwang et al, 2003). For instance, providing counseling services in the Korean language through the phone or websites will be beneficial, as they can use it without revealing their identities. For instance, Jang and colleagues (2013) conducted a pilot study with older Korean immigrants, who had some depression symptoms, about the impact of telecounseling with counselors who speak Korean. They found that the telecounseling was effective in reducing the depression symptoms. Although this study focused on elderly immigrants and depression, and the impact among IPV victims thus might be different, telecounseling services for Korean immigrant victims and IPV survivors who are isolated from the service providers would be beneficial.

This study also revealed that Korean immigrant victims are less likely to have online social networks (including personal connections through online and virtual networks without any personal connections) compared to Korean immigrant non-victims. Similar to the interpersonal networks that victims maintain, I found that Korean immigrant victims do not reveal their personal problems, such as IPV, to their family or friends, even though online media. There are a couple of reasons that they did not share their personal problems with their friends or families
(who are far away) online. First, as their families or friends are geographically removed from them, they believe there is nothing they can do to help. Second, as experiencing IPV involve lots of emotional stress and trauma, conveying their emotions via online media, such as through messenger services, is not easy. Third, as their online social networks closely resemble their interpersonal networks, even though they do not have physical interaction with each other, the “saving face” concept may still come into play. The phenomenon of saving face while using online social media has been widely supported (Wilson, Proudfoot, & Valacich, 2014). Thus, victims tend to isolate themselves from online social networks, which form through interpersonal social networks.

Distinct from online social networks or online social networking websites, such as Facebook, Korean immigrant women used ethnicity-based websites that provide various information for immigrants in the USA. As those websites are anonymous in nature—they do not need to use their real name or identify themselves—they share their stories with others using the bulletin and obtain information necessary for their immigrant lives, such as legal matters. However, experts do not generally write or vet the information they can gain from those websites, so it can be very dangerous for Korean immigrant victims if they merely follow it. Thus, if IPV victim service agencies that provide legal services to immigrant victims offer legitimate advice via the major ethnicity-based websites, this would be beneficial for the users.

This study’s result indicates that perceived supportive social networks, rather than the mere existence of online and interpersonal social networks, do not help Korean immigrant women, as they do not reveal their victimization to others to save face. Also, this study revealed that online social networks similar to interpersonal social networks can be helpful if victims perceive them as their supportive social networks. Ethnicity-based websites where Korean
immigrants can connect without any interpersonal connections can be more helpful than online or personal social networks if victims do not perceive them as supportive social networks.

**Acculturative Stress and IPV**

This study found that Korean immigrant women with high levels of acculturative stress experienced IPV victimization. Many studies also support this relationship, noting that stress, including acculturative stress, leads to violent behaviors, aggression, and victimization (Capaldi, et al, 2012; Roberts et al, 2010). According to Agnew (1992), stressful events increase negative emotions, such as anger, frustration, or anxiety, and when individuals do not have the ability to cope with strains in a legal manner or the perceived cost of committing crimes is not high, they are going to commit crimes. A gender difference exists in terms of stress management and coping styles (Banyard & Grahma-Bermann, 1993; Broidy, 2001; Broidy & Agnew, 1997; Stein and Nyamathi, 1999). Broidy (2001) found that both males and females tend to experience a similar level of stress, but men are more likely to respond to it with anger and illegitimate coping strategies, whereas women are more likely to employ negative coping strategies not involving anger. Stein and Nyamathi (1999) found that women, compared to men, tend to adopt avoidant coping strategies such as passivity, anti-social behaviors, and fantasizing.

My qualitative research analysis also found similar results supporting the above argument. Korean immigrant IPV victims stated that their partners express their anger toward them when they experience stress and frustration, even though the source of their stress or frustration is not the victims. For instance, many Korean immigrant men experience acculturative stress due to their language barriers and social status gap between Korea and America. Korean immigrant victims stated that their partners started abusing them when the partners encountered frustration, and most of them did not have proper coping strategies other than drinking alcohol.
Thus, the problem became more serious. On the other hand, Korean immigrant victims adopted different strategies to deal with their stress. They also experienced acculturative stress caused by similar factors as what their partners experienced. However, rather than expressing their strains toward their partners in an aggressive way, Korean immigrant women took avoidant strategies, such as passivity, and anti-social behaviors, such as “praying,” rather than active coping strategies. As they only adopt very passive strategies, which do not yield any solutions that fix the root problems (Noh & Kaspar, 2003) or, worse, tend to lead to revictimization (Kuipers, van der Knaap & Winkel, 2012), their situation becomes more serious.

One interesting observation I found in this study was that acculturative stress among Korean immigrant victims could be heightened due to their anti-social behaviors, such as social isolation or maintaining superficial social networks. Substantial evidence suggests that social networks have a stress-buffering role (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Thomas A. Kim, Sherman, & Taylor, 2008; Pattison, et al, 1979) and social isolation increases stress-induced aggression (Matsumoto et al., 2005). As I mentioned earlier, Korean immigrant women in this study only superficially maintain their social networks and do not seek any help from them due to desiring to save face. By isolating themselves from the social networks, they may be inadvertently increasing their stress levels as well. According to these scholars (Kim, Sherman, & Taylor, 2008; Pattison, et al, 1979), social networks decrease anxiety, which is closely related to stress, insofar as persons integrated into dense social networks have lower rates of psychiatric symptoms and better coping skills when they encounter difficult events or situations (Pattison, et al, 1979). Also, traditionally, interpersonal harmony is considered to be very crucial, such that various activities that encourage social networks and interpersonal relationships are prevalent (Lum, 1998). This means that social isolation due to weak social networks (even if it was self-
selected isolation), when maintaining a strong social network has a stress-buffering role, might be causing higher levels of stress for immigrant women who come from countries where opportunities for social integration and relationships among group members are limited. Although this study did not find the interaction effect of social networks and acculturative stress on IPV victimization, future research should address whether maintaining numerous social networks decreases acculturative stress and, thus, reduces IPV victimization more in-depth.

Then, how can we help Korean immigrant men and women to deal with acculturative stress, which is highly associated with IPV? Basically, it would be important to focus on mitigating factors that increase acculturative stress, such as language barriers, discrimination, and social status gaps. If we can help them experience less difficulty as immigrants, that would be ideal. However, as not all individuals who experience stress become abusive, we also need to focus on the programs that deal with strains. As we can see, men and women often have different ways of dealing with stress. Thus, if we adopt gender-customized policies to help them to resolve their stress, IPV among Korean immigrant women, and even among immigrants in general, could be prevented. For instance, for Korean immigrant men, “anger control management treatment” and “alcohol treatment” might be more beneficial, whereas for Korean immigrant women, service providers can encourage them to become active role players in their lives by empowering them. Counselors could empower these women by employing techniques like cognitive-behavioral therapy focusing on empowerment, communication skills, and coping strategies, which have been found effective for IPV victims (Johnson & Zlontnick, 2009; Iverson et al, 2011).

**Patriarchal Gender Role Values, Social Networks, Acculturative Stress, and IPV**

This study has found that partial gender role values, limited (online and interpersonal)
social networks, and high levels of acculturative stress are highly associated with IPV victimization among Korean immigrants. IPV victimization is a serious health and social problem that affect not only victims, but also their children and society at large. Thus, if we can prevent IPV (re)victimization by estimating the risk among Korean immigrants, that would greatly benefit the policy makers. Thus, I estimated the predicted probabilities that IPV victimization would occur by the level of conservative gender role values, acculturative stress, and social networks. Among the three factors—patriarchal gender role values, social networks and acculturative stress—acculturative stress has the strongest power to predict IPV among Korean immigrants.

Why does acculturative stress have the strongest predictability for IPV among Korean immigrants compared to other factors? There are three possible explanations. Firstly, acculturative stress can arise due to various factors, including limited social networks (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Thomas A. Kim, Sherman, & Taylor, 2008; Pattison, et al, 1979); conflicts caused by gender role value differences between couples (Han et al. 2010; Jin & Keat 2010; Morash et al. 2000); and discrimination (Ellis et al, 2008); all of which impact IPV victimization risk. On the other hand, social networks and patriarchal gender role values are less likely to be influenced by other factors compared to acculturative stress. Thus, acculturative stress can have a stronger impact on IPV among Korean immigrants, as their current situations associated with being immigrants will contribute to increased stress levels.

Secondly, although patriarchal gender role values and limited social networks among victims can make them vulnerable to violence and revictimization, it is hard to say they are immediate precursors or precipitators to any IPV that occurred within the past year, as individuals tend to maintain a static level of patriarchal values and static numbers of social
networks. In other words, it takes longer for individuals to form and maintain their current levels of patriarchal values and social networks. On the other hand, acculturative stress is a psychological symptom that acts quickly and increase aggression within a short period of time when people encounter stress precipitators (Kruk et al, 2004). Thus, if Korean immigrant victims are currently experiencing a high level of acculturative stress (at the time of study participation), the stress’s impact on IPV would be immediate and strong.

Lastly, Asian immigrants tend not to seek professional help when they experience psychological or/and emotional health problems due to the stigma associated with it (Shin, 2009); thus, individuals who suffer from psychological or/and emotional health problems, including acculturative stress, might not resolve their problems and continue to have those symptoms. This indicates that these symptoms can accumulate and create a serious problem, including IPV.

This result does not mean that acculturative stress is a more important risk factor for IPV than other factors, such as social networks and patriarchal gender role values. They all have a strong association with IPV independently and it is worthwhile to understand why the relationship exists among Korean immigrants. Thus, we need to pay attention to all three of these risk factors that contribute to IPV victimization so we may prevent IPV (re)victimization. However, as Korean immigrant women with higher acculturative stress levels are predicted to have the highest victimization probability, this result can provide important policy implications that need to be urgently addressed among Korean immigrants so that we can prevent IPV.

Individuals experience acculturative stress through various personal and sociological factors (Berry, et al., 1984). To help immigrants reduce acculturative stress, it is important for policy makers to pay attention to individual factors, such as language ability, perceived
discrimination, social networks, etc., which are known to increase acculturative stress. However, more importantly, as societal factors within the host country (such as immigrant cultural diversity, acculturative policy, and the majority’s attitudes towards immigrants) are strongly associated with individuals’ acculturative stress levels (Berry, et al., 1984), the policy makers should make an effort to address those societal factors to reduce the acculturative stress that increases IPV victimization among Korean immigrants.
CHAPTER 10. CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND CONTRIBUTIONS

This study utilized a mixed method approach to investigate the role of conservative gender role values, acculturative stress, and social networks on IPV victimization among Korean immigrant women when controlling for acculturation levels (measured by English level, age of migration, and length of stay in the USA); their current locations (living in a populated state or not); religion (being religious); number of children; length of relationships; and childhood physical victimization. Quantitative results of the surveys—from 64 IPV victims who have been in abusive relationships with their partners in the past year and 63 non-IPV victims who have never been in abusive intimate partner relationships in their lifetimes—show that IPV victimization among Korean immigrant women was highly associated with have higher levels of conservative gender role values, higher levels of acculturative stress, and fewer interpersonal and online social networks compared to non-IPV victims. Among the three factors—acculturative stress, conservative gender role values, and having fewer social networks—this study found that acculturative stress had the strongest predictability in IPV victimization among Korean immigrants.

The qualitative results of in-depth interviews with 16 Korean immigrant women who experienced IPV in the past year revealed that the nature of being immigrant women increases their legal, social, and emotional dependency on their partners, which increases (re)victimization risk. The legal, social, and emotional dependency of Korean immigrant women on their partners was often used by offenders to control them. Offenders also intentionally made Korean immigrant women dependent on them by prohibiting them from working.

Korean immigrant women who had social networks around them, such as friends, colleagues, or church members, did not reveal their victimization to others. It is because the
“saving face” phenomenon in Korean culture very strong. The concept of saving face also applied to online social networks. Korean immigrants did not reveal victimization to their online social networks because most of their online social networks were based on the interpersonal networks. Even among Korean immigrant women who rarely interact with other Korean immigrants who shared the same culture, they did not seek any help because they did not want to lose face.

When they experienced acculturative stress due to strains caused by their immigrant status, language barriers or status frustration, most victims tended to adopt very passive attitudes to deal with it while their partners become more aggressive and abusive. Thus, rather than resolving acculturative stress directly, many of them relied on religious beliefs without any proper coping strategies, which would affect further victimization. It was the same for the offenders. They did not have healthy coping strategies. They tended to drink alcohol when they experienced stress and because of that, the situations become even worse. However, not all Korean immigrant women who experienced acculturative stress was passive when dealing with IPV. Some of them actively contacted the domestic violence service agencies and tried to leave the abusers. However, unfortunately, not all Korean immigrant victims were aware of the services available for them.

Patriarchal gender role values influence not only victims’ decisions to stay with their abusive partners, but also offenders’ attitudes toward victims. When victims had conservative attitudes toward marriage life or the wife’s role in the family, they tended to endure violence. Embedded in patriarchal communities and families, these values made it even harder for Korean immigrant women to leave their partners. Also, when couples had gender-role conflicts, it increased victimization. In particular, gender-role conflicts among couples between Korean
immigrant women who came to the USA as adults and Korean-American men who were born in the USA or immigrated when they were very young was observed in this study. The conflicts among those couples were coming from different expectation toward each partner – Korean immigrant women, who expected to have liberal men, married Korean immigrant guys, who expected to have conservative women. Thus, not only patriarchal gender role values of victims and offenders, but also the dynamics of relationship between couples are important factors for IPV occurrences. In conclusion, conservative gender role values, acculturative stress, and social networks play very important role on IPV victimization among Korean immigrant women in the USA. Thus, we need to pay special attentions to those risk factors to prevent their future victimization.

This study is not without limitations. First, as this study is cross-sectional study, it is hard to make a causal implication saying that acculturative stress, social networks, and patriarchal gender role values predict IPV victimization. Although I hypothesized that acculturative stress, social networks, and patriarchal gender role values could increase the risk of IPV victimization, some relationships might actually play out in the opposite direction. For instance, IPV victimization might increase acculturative stress and decrease their social networks. I found from the in-depth interviews with IPV victims that they intentionally isolated themselves socially due to their victimization to save their face. This indicates that IPV victimization influences victims’ social networks. However, this study’s purpose was not to predict the cause of initial victimization among Korean immigrants but, rather, find potential risk factors for repeat victimization. Also, through the qualitative study, I could establish that higher acculturative stress, limited supportive social networks, and patriarchal gender role values were highly associated with IPV victimization among Korean immigrants. As risk factor exposure and repeat
victimization is a reciprocal process and IPV victimization is a continuous event, I can safely assume these relationships. Second, the participation within this study was based on self-reported criteria. As with most other self-reported research, this study can suffer from reliability issues (Chan, 2010). However, through the screening questions and various questionnaires the survey employed to measure IPV (non)victimization, I could identify unqualified participants and remove them from the study. Third, a sample size of 127 is not large enough to give us the statistical power to generalize this finding to the entire Korean immigrant population, but this study aimed to explore trends among the Korean immigrant sample rather than form a generalization. Also, by adding qualitative in-depth interviews on top of the quantitative study, this study provides an in-depth understanding of the phenomenon.

The findings of this study made three contributions. First, this study made theoretical contributions in the field of IPV. Acculturative stress, social networks and the conservative gender role values have been studied as a separate factor for IPV victimization among immigrants. However, not all three factors interaction with each other have been studied among Korean populations. Through this study, I could test the theories of acculturative stress, social networks and conservative gender role values on IPV victimization among Korean populations. This study proved that the theories of acculturative stress, social networks and conservative gender role values can be applied to Korean immigrants when explaining IPV victimization.

Also, through this study, I provided additional evidence that ‘Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS)’, ‘Riverside Acculturation Stress Inventory (RASI)’ and ‘Social Support Questionnaires’ could be useful tools for the Korean immigrant IPV population. In addition, this study showed that not only interpersonal social networks but also online social networks can be measured using revised ‘Social Support Questionnaires’.
In particular, nowadays, online social networks can be an important source of social interaction tools, and the findings from this study about the relationship between online social networks and IPV broke new ground in the field of studies of IPV. Not only interpersonal networks but also online social networks play an important role in IPV victimization. Also, similar to interpersonal social network, the perceptions of online social networks rather than mere existence of online networks are important by two reasons – 1) as online social networks are connected through the persona networks, if individuals do not perceive their online social networks as supportive networks, they would not reveal their victimization and seek help and 2) the concept of “saving face” exist among online social networks.

In addition, this study filled the gap in what is a lacuna in scholarly research vis-à-vis the Korean population. Although Koreans make up a large population in the USA and IPV among them is serious, not many scholars pay attention to this population (Yick & Oomen-Early, 2008). As a result, we do not know much about them and thus the problems remain or even fester. Research provides good evidence for policy makers and practitioners to better understand certain phenomena. The findings of this study –Korean immigrant women’s high level of acculturative stress, limited social and online networks and high level of conservative gender role values are highly associated their victimization – helped us to better understand and provide better policy suggestions with regards to the issue of IPV among the Korean immigrant population in the United States.

Current policy is focused on removing offenders from victims (i.e. the mandatory arrest of perpetrators of domestic violence) rather than resolving the root cause of problems. However, it is only by understanding factors that more focused public policies toward them should be developed. Applying uniform techniques and knowledge developed to encompass all victims and
offenders but which are not sensitive to the specific needs and vulnerabilities of immigrant victims and offenders, overlooks important dimensions of IPV in this large and fast-growing immigrant population. Neither IPV offenders nor victims among immigrants benefit from current policies that ignore the specific needs and vulnerabilities of immigrant offenders and victims. We need to find better ways to handle IPV among immigrants – targeted interventions.

The findings of this study encouraged the creation of more community based programs which focus on reducing the stressors caused by their situations (not only individual level but also societal level), and increasing their social ties with other community members so that they not only maintain their own cultural identity but also accept the rule and regulations of the host country. In addition, this study encouraged active interaction between communities in providing and receiving support programs, which will likely further aid immigrant families to integrate successfully into their chosen country. However, the concept of “saving face” is very important in the Korean communities, providing service programs through different channels including ethnic based websites or telephones where they need to reveal their identify or does not require interpersonal interactions would be beneficial. Although this study is limited to the Korean population, the results of this study can be extended to understand other Asian immigrant populations such as the Chinese and Japanese who tend to share cultural, structural and situational backgrounds with Korean immigrants.
APPENDICES

Appendix A. Survey Questionnaires (English Version)

Please provide the following information. These questions are about yourself.

1. Your age: ___________ (or birth year)

2. Zip code of your current residence: __________

3. What is your income before taxes in a month? If you are not sure about the amount, please estimate. $ __________

4. What is the highest degree you have earned?
   a. No formal education
   b. Elementary school
   c. Middle school
   d. High school
   e. College
   f. More than college

5. In what country did you receive your last degree?
   a. Korea   b. USA   c. Other

6. When did you come to the USA? (yy/mm). _____________ / I was born here.

7. What is your legal status?
   a. student (F1)
   b. work visa (H1)
   c. Permanent resident
   d. Citizen
   e. f. g. Other Refugees Illegal

8. How good is your English?
   a. Not at all   b. A little   c. Well   e. Very well

9. What is your current employment status?
   a. Employed for wages
   b. Self employed
   d. Retired
   e. Not employed (looking for a job)
   f. Not employed (not looking for a job)
   g. other (please specify__ __)

10. If you are currently employed (including self-employed and employed for wages)
    a. What is your current job? ___________ (ex: waitress)
    b. How long have you worked in your current job? ___________ (please answer in months or days)

11. If you are not currently employed, have you ever held employment in the last 1 year period? ___________ (yes or no)

Note: If you have never worked in the USA, go to question 15.
If you have worked in the last 1 year period in USA but not currently employed, please answer questions ___
12-14 and then go to 15.

12. What was your latest job? _______________ (ex: waitress)

13. How long did you work in your latest job? (please answer in months or days)

_________ days / or _________ months

14. Why you are not working now?
   a. I voluntarily quit the job because of my issues with my partner
   b. I voluntarily quit the job because of other reasons not related to issues with my partner
   c. I got fired because of my issues related to my issues with my partner
   d. I got fired because of other reasons not related to my partner
   e. Others:

15. What is your religion?
   a. Protestantism  b. Catholicism  c. Buddhism  d. Other  e. No religion

16. In the past 12 months, how often did you participate in religious activities, including religious services, bible study, Sunday School, small group religious meetings, etc? (If you do not have religion, you can skip question 16-19)
   a. Once a week or more
   b. Once a month or more, but less than once a week
   c. Less than once a month
   d. Never

17. How important is religion in your life?
   a. Very important  b. Fairly important  c. Fairly unimportant  d. Not important at all

18. What is the main purpose of your attendance to religious activities, including religious services, bible study, Sunday School, small group religious meetings if you participated in the past 12 months?
   a. Religious belief
   b. Social networking (such as making friends)
   c. Getting emotional or/and informational support
   d. Because of your family, relatives, or partner’s coercion
   e. Other _________________________________

19. If you are currently attending religious services in the USA, did you attend religious services in Korea as frequently as you do now?
   a. No, I didn’t attend any religious services at all when I was in Korea.
   b. The number of times I attend religious services has increased
   c. The number of times I attend religious services has decreased
20. Have you been victimized physically during the childhood? Yes or No
21. Have you been victimized sexually during the childhood? Yes or No
22. Think about your typical week:
   a. On average, how many days per week do you drink alcohol? _____________
   b. On a typical drinking day, how many drinks do you have? _____________
   c. On any day in the past year, have you ever had more than 4 cups (of beers, wines or spirit)? Yes or No

Please provide the following information. These questions are about your partner.

1. His age: ___________ (or birth year)

2. Zip code of his current residence: ___________

3. What is his income before taxes in a month? If you are not sure about the amount, please estimate. $ __________

4. What is the highest degree he has earned?
   a. No formal education
   b. Elementary school
   c. Middle school
   d. High school
   e. College
   f. More than college
   g. I don’t know

5. In what country did he receive his recent degree?
   a. Korea
   b. USA
   c. Other

6. How good is his English?
   a. Not at all
   b. A little
   c. Well
   d. Very well

7. What is his legal status?
   a. student (F1)
   b. work visa (H1)
   c. Permanent resident
   d. Citizen
   e. Refugees
   f. Illegal
   g. Other

8. What is his current employment status?
   a. Employed for wages
   b. Self employed
   c. Retired
   d. Not employed (looking for a job)
   e. Not employed (not looking for a job)
   f. Other

9. If he is currently employed,
   a. What is his current job? ___________ (ex: waiter)
   b. How long has he worked for the current job? ___________ (please answer in months)

10. If he is not currently employed,
a. Has he worked in the last 1 year period? ___________ (ex: yes)

Note: If he has never worked in USA, go to question 14. If he has worked in the last 1 year period, please answer questions 11 to 13 and then answer question 14.

11. What was his latest job? _______________ (ex: waiter)

12. How long did he work in his latest job? _______________ (please answer in months or days)

13. Why is he not working now?
   a. He voluntarily quit his job  b. He got fired  c. Others

14. What is his race?

15. If he was born in Korea or outside of USA, when did he come to the USA? (yy/mm)
    _______________ / He was born in the USA.

16. What is his religion?
   a. Protestantism  b. Catholicism  c. Buddhism  d. Other  e. No religion

17. In the past 12 months, how often did he participate in religious activities, including religious services, bible study, Sunday School, small group religious meetings, etc?
   a. Once a week or more  b. Once a month or more, but less than once a week  c. Less than once a month  d. Never

18. How important is religion in his life?
   a. Very important  b. Fairly Important  c. Fairly unimportant  d. Not important at all

19. What is the main purpose of his religious activities, including religious services, bible study, Sunday School, small group religious meetings, etc attendance if he participated in the past 12 months?
   a. Religious belief  b. Social networking (such as making friends)  c. Getting emotional or informational support  d. Because of family, relatives, or partner’s coercion  e. Other _________________________________

20. Think about his typical week:
   a. On average, how many days per week does he drink alcohol? _______________
   b. On a typical drinking day, how many drinks does he have? _______________
c. On any day in the past year, have you ever had more than 4 cups (of beers, wines or spirit)? Yes or No

Please provide the following information. These questions are about relationship with you and your partner

1. What is your current relationship with your partner?
   a. Husband (Married)  b. Ex-husband (Divorced)
   c. Boyfriend d. Ex-boyfriend e. Other

2. If he is your current husband or boyfriend, what are your current residence arrangements?
   a. Living together b. Living separately

3. Since when have you been together with your current partner? (yy/mm). ____________

4. Do you have a child or children?
   a. Yes with current partner
   b. Yes but not with the current partner
   c. No. I don’t have any children

5. If yes, how many? ______________

6. Are there any other people other than you, your partner, or children in your household?
   These other people might include friends or family members?
   Yes ____________ (How many? ____________) or No ______________

For each of the statements below, please mark in the number that best explains the abusive behavior that you may have experienced within the relationship in the past 12 month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Very frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Threw something at me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pushed or grabbed me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pulled my hair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Choked me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pinned me to the wall, floor, bed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hit, kicked, or punched me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hit or tried to hit me with something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Threatened me with a knife, gun, or other weapon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Spit at me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Tried to block me from leaving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>Very frequently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Physical forced me to have sexual intercourse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pressured me to have sex when I said no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pressured or forced me into other unwanted sexual acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Treated me like a sex object</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Inflicted pain on me during sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pressured me to have sex after a fight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Was insensitive to my sexual needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Made jokes about parts of my body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Blames me because of others found me attractive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reject to use condoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Very frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Insulted me in front of others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Put down my sexual attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Made out I was stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Criticized my care of children or home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Swore at me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Told me I was crazy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Told me I was irrational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Blamed me for his problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Made untrue accusations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Very frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Did not allow me equal access to the family money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Told me or acted as if it was “his money, his house, his car, etc.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Threatened to withhold money from me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Made me ask for money for the basis necessitates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Used my fear of not having access to money to control my behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Made me account for the money I spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tried to keep me dependent on him for money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Used my or family’s saving without agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Not providing any financial resources to me and my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Has the severity (in terms of frequency) changed since he first started doing those things (examples above) to you?

a. Yes, it has been severe
b. No, it has been less severe

c. It remains the same

2. Since when did he start to do any of those behaviors to you? (yy/mm). _____________

3. Please mark how many times you did each to these things in the past year, and how many times your partner did them in the past year. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, mark a “7” on your answer sheet for that question. If it never happened, mark an “8” on your answer sheet.
   How often did this happen?
   1= once in the past year / 2= twice in the past / 3=3-5 times in the past year / 4=6-10 times in the past year / 5=11-20 times in the past year / 6= more than 20 times in the past year / 7. Not in the past year, but it did happen before / 8 =This has never happened

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My partner insulted or swore or shouted or yelled at me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut, or felt pain the next day because of a fight with my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My partner pushed, shoved, or slapped me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My partner punched or kicked or beat-me-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My partner destroyed something belonging to me or threatened to hit me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I went see a doctor (M.D) or needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My partner used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make me have sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My partner insisted on sex when I did not want to insisted on sex without a condom (but did not use physical force)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The following questions ask about people in your life who provide you with help or support. Each question has two parts. For the first part, list the 5 people you know in USA who you interact with the most face to face, excluding yourself, whom you can count on for help or support in the manner described. Give the person’s initials and their relationship to you (see example). Do not list more than one person next to each of the numbers beneath the question. If you cannot think of anyone, you can skip the question. If you do have less than 5 people, you can just list as many as you can think of. Please check V mark when applies to you.

Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Satisfaction of their help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>A little satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A little dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Whom can you really count on to be dependable when you need help?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Satisfaction of their help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Whom can you really count on to help you feel more relaxed or better when you are under pressure or feel depressed or upset?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Satisfaction of their help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Whom can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Satisfaction of their care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Nowadays, online social networking websites or messengers (such as kakao story, facebook, kakao talk, etc.) are frequently used among individuals to connect with friends, families and other members of society. Below are questions about your online networks with people back in Korea or those who you cannot meet face to face very often but interact with the most. If you do not use any online social websites or messengers, you can skip questions 4-6. Please list all the 5 people you contact through online methods because they are in Korea or other state (excluding yourself) whom you can count on for help or support in the manner described. If you use an online message board or chatting room (such as heykorean.com or missykorea.net) to communicate with others rather than specific individuals, please name the website instead of a person's initials. If you have less than 5 people, you can just list as many as you can think of.

**Example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Satisfaction of their help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>HeyKorean</td>
<td>website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Whom can you really count on to be dependable when you need help?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Satisfaction of their help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A little satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A little dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Whom can you really count on to help you feel more relaxed or better when you are under pressure or feel depressed or upset?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Satisfaction of their help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A little satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A little dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Whom can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Satisfaction of their help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A little satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A little dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fairly dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How often do you communicate with your friends, family, etc. through social network websites including the online messengers such as kakao story, facebook? You can answer one of them based on the frequency of your use.

(__________) times a day / OR (__________) a week / OR (__________) in a month

8. What is the main purpose of your visit or using online social network websites?
   a. Posting your activities or photos, etc.
   b. Checking other people’s activities or photos, etc.
   c. Communicating with people via chat or send messages, etc.
d. Having an opportunity to meet new people

e. Other ______________

Note: Sometimes negotiating more than one cultural orientation or identity can be difficult. How is it for you? Below are some statements that may or may not describe your own experience. Please, for each statement circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strong disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Because of my Asian background, I have to work harder than most Americans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel the pressure that what “I” do will be seen as representative of Asian’s abilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In looking for a job, I sometimes feel that my Asian background is a limitation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It’s hard for me to perform well at work because of my English skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I often feel misunderstood or limited in daily situations because of my English skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It bothers me that I have an accent (in English or an Sian language)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I have had disagreements with other Asians (e.g., friends or family) for liking American customs or ways of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have had disagreements with Americans for liking Asian customs or ways of doing things.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel that my particular cultural practices (Asian or American) have caused conflict in my relationships.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have been treated rudely or unfairly because of my Asian background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I have felt discriminated against by Americans because of my Asian background.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel that people very often interpret my behavior based on their stereotypes of what Asians are like.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel that there are not enough Asian people in my living environments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. When I am in a place or room where I am the only Asian person, I often feel different or isolated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. I feel that the environment where I live is not multicultural enough; it doesn’t have enough cultural richness.

Below are the questions about your attitudes toward the gender role behaviors. Please, for each statement circle the appropriate number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It is insulting to women to have the “obey” clause remain in marriage service.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A women should be as free as a man to propose marriage.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A women should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement as a man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. It is ridiculous for a woman to run locomotive and for a man to darn socks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage even their fiancés.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. The husband should not be favored by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Women should be concerned with their duties of childbearing and house tending rather than with desires for professional and business careers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than are men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
이하 질문은 설문지 본인에 관련된 질문입니다.

1. 나이: ___________ (혹은 태어난 연도: ___________) 
2. 현재 거주지 우편 번호: ___________ 
3. 귀하의 월 평균 소득은 얼마입니까? (세금 공제 전) ? $_______________ 
4. 귀하의 최종 학력은 어떻게 되십니까?  
   a. 공식 교육을 받지 않았다  
   b. 초등학교 (국민학교)  
   c. 중학교  
   d. 고등학교  
   e. 대학교  
   f. 대학교 이상  
5. 어느 나라에서 최종 교육을 받으셨나요?  
   a. 한국  
   b. 미국  
   c. 그 외 타 국가  
6. 언제 미국에 오셨나요? (년/월) _____________ / 미국에서 태어났다  
7. 현재 이민 신분은 어떤 상태입니까?  
   a. 학생(F1)  
   b. 워킹비자(H1)  
   c. 영주권  
   d. 시민권  
   e. 망명  
   f. 불법  
   g. 그외(F1)  
8. 영어를 어느정도 구사할 수 있습니까?  
   a. 거의 못함  
   b. 약간함  
   c. 잘함  
   e. 아주잘함  
9. 현재 직업을 가지고 계신가요?  
   a. 임금근로자  
   b. 자영업자  
   c. 은퇴  
   e. 직업은 없지만 찾고 있다  
   f. 직업은 없는지만 찾고 있지 않다  
   g. 그외  
10. 현재 일을 하고 계시다면 (자영업, 불법으로 일하는것 포함)  
   a. 어떤 일을 하고 계신가요? ___________ (예: 웨이트레스)  
   b. 현재 직장에서 얼마나 일하셨나요? _____________ 달 (달이나 일 수로 답해주세요. 예: 15 달)  
11. 만약 현재 무직이시면, 지난 1 년 동안 직업이 있었으셨나요? 네 혹은 아니오로 대답해주세요. 

*** 만약 미국에 오신 이후로 한번도 직장을 갖지 않거나 일을 하신적이 없으시면 15 번 질문부터 답해주세요.  
현재는 무적이지만 지난 1 년 동안 일을 하셨으면 아래 질문 12, 13 와 질문 14 번을 답해주시고, 15 번부터 답해주십시오***  

12. 가장 최근 직업이 무엇인가요? ___________ (예: 웨이트레스) 
13. 가장 최근에 하셨던 일을 얼마나 동안 하셨나요? (날짜수나 달수로 대답해주세요) _____몇일 /혹은 _____몇달 (예: 15 달)
14. 현재 일을 하고 있지 않은 이유가 있으시다면 무엇인가요?
   a. 파트너의 문제 때문에 스스로 그만두었다.
   b. 파트너와 관련되지 않은 이유 때문에 스스로 그만두었다.
   c. 파트너와의 문제 때문에 해고당했다.
   d. 파트너와 관련되지 않은 이유 때문에 스스로 그만두었다.
   e. 그 외 이유 ________________________________________________________________

15. 종교는 무엇인가요?
   a. 개신교   b. 카톨릭   c. 불교   d. 그 외   e. 무교

16. 지난 1 년동안 파트너가 얼마나 자주 종교 활동 (성경 공부, 주말 학교, 종교 그룹 미팅 등)에 참여했었나요?
   (종교가 없으신분은 16 〜 19 번 질문은 대답 안하시는 것도 됩니다.)
   a. 일주일에 한번 이상   b. 한달에 한번 이상   c. 한달에 한번 이상   d. 한달에 이상
   e. 안나남

17. 종교가 본인의 삶에 얼마나 중요한가요?
   a. 매우 중요함   b. 중요함   c. 별로 중요하지 않음   d. 전혀 중요하지 않음

18. 교회, 성당 혹은 절에 다니시는 주된 이유가 무엇인가요?
   a. 신앙심 때문에
   b. 사회 네트워크를 능리고자 (예: 친구 사귀고자)
   c. 정신적인 편안을 받고자
   d. 가족이나 파트너의 강요 때문에 혹은 그들이 원해서
   e. 다른 이유 _________________________________________________________

19. 현재 교회, 성당 혹은 절을 다니신다면 한국에 계실때도 다니셨나요?
   a. 한국에 있을때는 종교가 없거나 종교가 있었지만 미국에 와서는 교회, 성당 혹은 절에 다니지 않았다.
   b. 미국에 온 이후로 교회, 성당 혹은 절에 다니는 횟수가 늘었다.
   c. 미국에 온 이후로 교회, 성당 혹은 절에 다니는 횟수가 줄었다.
   d. 미국에 있을 때나 한국에 있을 때나 다를바 없다.

20. 어린시절 가정 폭력 (신체적 폭력)을 경험이신 적이 있으신가요? 네 혹은 아니오로 대답해주세요.

21. 어린 시절, 성폭력을 경험하신 적이 있으신가요? 네 혹은 아니오로 대답해주세요.

22. 명절 및 생일 같은 특별한 날을 제외한 평상시를 생각해볼때,
   a. 일주일에 몇일 술을 마신가요? __________일
   b. 어떤 종류의 술을 드시나요? __________(예: 맥주)
   c. 평상시 술을 마실경우 몇 병 (잔) 정도 마신가요? __________병
d. 지난 1 년 동안 하루에 맥주, 와인 혹은 양주를 3 병 (잔)이상 마신적이 있으신가요? ("네" "아니오"로 대답해 주세요)

아래 질문은 현재 혹은 과거 파트너에 관련된 질문입니다.

1. 나이: ___________ (혹은 태어난 연도)
2. 거주지 우편번호: __________
3. 파트너의 월 평균 소득은 얼마인가요? (세금공제 전)? $____________________
4. 파트너의 최종 학력은 어떻게 되십니까?
   a. 공식 교육을 받지 않았다
   b. 초등학교 (국민학교)
   c. 중학교
   d. 고등학교
   e. 대학교
   f. 대학교 이상
5. 어느 나라에서 최종 교육을 받으셨나요?
   a. 한국  b. 미국  c. 다른 나라
6. 파트너는 영어를 어느정도 구사할 수 있습니까?
   a. 거의 못함  b. 약간함  c. 잘함  d. 아주잘함
7. 파트너의 현재 신분은 어떤 상태입니까?
   a. 학생 (F1)  b. 워킹비자(H1)  c. 영주권  d. 시민권  e. 망명  f. 불법  g. 그외
8. 현재 직업을 가지고 계신가요?
   a. 임금 근로자  b. 자영업  c. 은퇴  d. 직업이 없지만 찾고 있다
   e. 직업이 없지만 찾고 있다
9. 만약 파트너가 현재 직업이 있거나 일을 하고 있다면 (불법으로 일하는 것 포함)
   a. 어떤 일을 하고 계신가요? ___________ (예: 웨이터)
   b. 현재 직장에서 얼마나 일하셨나요 ___________ (달이나 일수로 답해주세요. 예: 15 달)
10. 만약 현재 직업이 없거나 일을 하고 있지 않으시다면
    a. 지난 1 년 동안 직업이 있겠습니까? ___________ (예: 네)

*** 만약 미국에 오신 이후로 계속 무직이셨다면 15 번 질문으로 가시면 됩니다.
지난 1 년 동안 직업이 있겠지만 지금 일을 하고 계시지 않으시다면 질문 12,13 와 질문 14를
답해주세요.

11. 파트너의 가장 최근 직업이 무엇인가요? ___________ (예: 웨이터)
12. 파트너가 가장 최근 일을 얼마동안 하셨나요? (날짜수나 달 수로 대답해주세요)
   ______일/혹은______달 / (예: 15 달)

13. 파트너가 현재 일을 하고 있지 않은 이유가 무엇인가요?
   a. 스스로 그만 두었다
   b. 해고당했다
   c. 일을 할 수 없는 상황이다 (예: 장애)

14. 파트너의 인종은 무엇인가요?
   a. 한국태생
   b. 미국태생
   c. 한국인 제외
   d. e. f. 히스패닉
   g. 그외

15. 만약 파트너가 미국외의 다른 나라에서 태어났다면 언제 미국에 오셨나요? (연/월)
   __________ / 미국에서 태어났다.

16. 파트너의 종교는 무엇인가요?
   a. 개신교
   b. 카톨릭
   c. 불교
   d. 그외
   e. 무교

17. 파트너가 종교가 있습니까? 지난 1년 동안 파트너가 얼마나 자주 종교 활동 (성경 공부, 주말 학교, 종교 그룹 미팅 등)에 참여하셨나요? (파트너가 종교가 없으신 분은 17-19번 질문은 답내셔도 됩니다.)

18.
   a. 일주일에
   b. 한달에 한번 이상-
   c. 한달에 한번 미만
   d. 안달님

19. 종교가 파트너의 삶에 얼마나 중요한가요?
   a. 매우 중요함
   b. 중요한 편
   c. 별로 중요하지 않음
   d. 전혀 중요하지 않음

20. 파트너가 교회, 성당 혹은 절에 다니시는 주된 이유가 무엇인가요?
   a. 신앙심때문에
   b. 사교목적으로 (예: 친구 사귀고자)
   c. 정서적인 지지를 받고자
   d. 가족이나 다른 사람의 강요때문에 혹은 그들이 원해서
   e. 다른 이유 ________________________________

21. 병절 및 생일 같은 특별한 날을 제외한 평상시를 f 생각해볼때, 파트너가
   a. 일주일에 몇일 술을 마시나요? __________일
   b. 어떤 종류의 술을 드시나요? ________매주 (예: 맥주)
   c. 평상시 술을 마실경우 몇 병 (잔) 정도 마시나요? __________병
   d. 지난 1년 동안 하루에 맥주, 와인 혹은 양주를 몇 병 (잔)이상 마신적이 있으신가요? (“네” “아니오”로 대답해 주세요) __________

아래 질문은 본인과 파트너의 관계에 관련된 질문입니다.
1. 현재 파트너와의 관계가 어떻게 되나요?
   a. 남편   b. 전 남편 (이혼)   c. 남자친구   d. 전 남자친구   e. 그외

2. 현재 파트너와 거주 상황이 어떻게 되나요?
   a. 같이 산다   b. 따로 산다

3. 언제부터 현재 파트너와 관계가 시작되었나요? (____년/____월 부터)

4. 현재 자녀가 있으나?
   a. 네 현재 파트너 사이에서
   b. 네, 하지만 현재 파트너와가 아닌 다른사람 사이에서
   c. 아니요, 없습니다.

5. 만약 자녀가 있으시다면 몇명인가요?

6. 집안에서 본인, 파트너 그리고 자녀들과 다른 사람들이 같이 살고 있으나 (가족, 친구 포함)?
   a. 네 (몇명? __________) 혹은 아니오 ________________

아래의 질문은 본인이 현재 파트너 혹은 과거 파트너와가 관계에서 경험한 것에 관련된 질문입니다. 묘사된 내용의 경험을 지난 1 년사이에 하셨다면 해당 사항에 V 체크해 주세요.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>번호</th>
<th>경험한 안함</th>
<th>거의 안함</th>
<th>때때로 경험함</th>
<th>자주 경험함</th>
<th>매우 자주 경험함</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>물건을 나에게 던지다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>밀거나 심하게 잡아서 아프게 한다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>머리카락을 잡아 땡기다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>목을 조여서 숨을 못쉬게 한다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>벽이나, 침대, 바닥에 대고 몇 몇 움직이게 하다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>때리거나 차거나 주먹으로 때리다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>물건을 이용해 때리거나 때려고 하고 하다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>칼, 총 혹은 다른 무기를 사용하여 위협하다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>나에게 침을 빼다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>다툼시 내가 자리를 피하려는 것을 힘을 이용해 막다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>강제적으로 성적인 접촉을 하려하다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>설득하고 의사표현을 했음에도 불구하고 강제적으로 성적인 접촉을 하려하다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>원하지 않는 성적 행위를 강요하다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>나를 성적으로 대하지 않는 대상으로 대하다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>성적을 하는 동안 신체 고통을 가하다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>싸움 후에도 성적을 하도록 강요하다</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. 파트너가 위에 묘사되어 있는 행동을 할 시, 강도가 처음 경험했을 때에 비해 바뀌었나요?
   a. 네, 점점 심해짐
   b. 아니오, 점점 줄어듬
   c. 그대로임

2. 언제부터 위에 묘사되어 있는 행동을 하기 시작했나요? (연______/월 ________).

3. 지난 일년동안 얼마나 자주 아래의 경험을 하셨나요?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1번</td>
<td>2번</td>
<td>3-5번</td>
<td>6-10번</td>
<td>11-20번</td>
<td>20번 이상</td>
<td>지난 1년동안에는 경험하지 않았으나 그전에 경험하였음</td>
<td>한변도 경험하지 않았음</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |   |
아래 질문은 여러분의 인간 관계에 관련된 질문입니다. 미국에서 생활하면서 제일 자주 만나고 얘기하는 사람 5 명을 적어주세요. 제일 자주 만나고 도움을 받고 있는 지인 순서대로 적어주세요. 꼭 5 명을 다 쓰셔야 하는 것은 아닙니다. 있는대로 적어주시면 됩니다. 만약 자주 만나고 의지할 수 있는 사람이 없으면 “없음”이라고 쓰시거나 대답을 안하시면 됩니다.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>예:</th>
<th>이름</th>
<th>관계</th>
<th>그들 도움에 대한 만족도</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>친구</td>
<td>매우만족</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>동생</td>
<td>만족하는 perv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. 도움이 필요할때 의지할 수 있는 사람?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>이름</th>
<th>관계</th>
<th>그들 도움에 대한 만족도</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 기분이 우울하거나 나쁘거나 불안할때 또는 화가 난때 마음의 안정을 찾을 수 있게 도와줄 사람?
요즘엔 예전에 비해 온라인 소셜 미디어들(카카오, 페이스북 기타 등등) 통해 친구들과 연락을 자주 주고 받는 경우가 흔해졌습니다. 아래 질문은 한국에 계시거나 혹은 다른 주에 계셔서 직접은 못만나지만 온라인을 통해 연락하고 지내시는 친구에 관한 것 입니다. 직접적으로 아는 사람이 아니라도 혹시 온라인 채팅 웹사이트나 헤이코리안 같은 일반 웹사이트를 더욱 자주 사용하시면 그 웹사이트를 적으셔도 상관없습니다. 온라인을 통해 제일 자주 연락하거나 도움을 받는 친구 혹은 웹사이트 순서대로 5명을 적어주세요. 총 5명을 다 쓰셔야 하는 것은 아닙니다. * 만약 온라인 소셜 미디어 및 웹사이트를 전혀 사용하지 않으시면 4번부터 8번 질문은 건너뛰어 주세요.

4. 도움이 필요할때 의지할 수 있는 사람 혹은 웹사이트?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>이름</th>
<th>관계</th>
<th>그들 도움에 대한 만족도</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>매우 만족</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 나에게 무슨 일이 생기더라도 날 챙겨줄 사람?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>이름</th>
<th>관계</th>
<th>그들 도움에 대한 만족도</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>매우 만족</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. 기분이 우울하거나 나쁘거나 불안할 때 또는 화가 날 때 마음의 안정을 찾을 수 있게 도와줄 사람 혹은 웹사이트?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>이름</th>
<th>관계</th>
<th>그들 도움에 대한 만족도</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      |      | 매우 만족 | 만족하는 만족
|      |      | 주로 만족 | 보통 만족 |
|      |      | 매우 불만족 | 불만족 |
| 1)   |      |           |        |
| 2)   |      |           |        |
| 3)   |      |           |        |
| 4)   |      |           |        |
| 5)   |      |           |        |

6. 나에게 무슨 일이 생기더라도 날 챙겨줄 사람 혹은 웹사이트?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>이름</th>
<th>관계</th>
<th>그들 도움에 대한 만족도</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      |      | 매우 만족 | 만족하는 만족
|      |      | 주로 만족 | 보통 만족 |
|      |      | 매우 불만족 | 불만족 |
| 1)   |      |           |        |
| 2)   |      |           |        |
| 3)   |      |           |        |
| 4)   |      |           |        |
| 5)   |      |           |        |

7. 얼마나 자주 친구들과 소셜 미디어 (카카오, 페이스북 등등) 를 통해 연락하나요?
하루에 (__________) 몇 번 (혹은) 이주일에 (__________) 몇 번 (혹은) 한달에 (__________) 몇번

8. 소셜 미디어를 사용하는 가장 주된 이유가 무엇인가요?
   a. 사진이나 활동 정보를 올려서 친구들과 공유하기 위해
   b. 다른 사람들의 활동 정보나 사진을 체크하기 위해
   c. 사람들에게 메시지를 보내거나 대화하기 위해
   d. 새로운 사람들을 만나기 위해
   e. 그 외 ________________________________
아래 질문은 문화가 다른 나라에서 살면서 경험하고 느끼는 것들에 관련된 질문입니다. 해당되는 칸에 V 체크해 주세요.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>전혀 동의하지 않음</th>
<th>동의하지 않는 편</th>
<th>잘 모르겠음</th>
<th>동의하는 편</th>
<th>매우 동의함</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 아시안(한국인)이라서 미국 사람보다 더 열심히 일해야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 내가 하는 행동이 다른 사람들 눈에 아시아인을 대표하는 것처럼 보일까봐 부담스럽다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 직업을 구할때 아시안(한국인)이란 점이 가끔 제한으로 느껴진다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 영어문에 일을 제대로 하기가 힘들다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 내가 가지고 있는 제한된 영어 이해능력으로 인해 일상 생활에서 오타가 생긴다고 자주 느낀다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 내가 가지고 있는 한국어 엑센트가 거슬린다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 나는 친구들이나 가족들과 그들이 선호하는 미국 생활 방식이나 행동때문에 의견의 불일치를 겪은적이 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 나는 미국 친구들이나 미국인들과 내가 선호하는 아시아 생활방식이나 행동때문에 의견의 불일치를 겪은적이 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 나는 어떤 부분의 아시아(한국) 문화 때문에 다른 사람과의 관계에 문제가 생긴다고 느낀다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 내가 아시아인(한국인)이란 이유 때문에 무례하거나 불공평한 대우를 받은적이 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 아시아인(한국인)이란 이유 때문에 차별을 받는다고 느낀적이 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 나는 내가 하는 행동을 다른 사람들이 아시안에 대한 편견을 가지고 자주 해석한다고 느낀다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. 나는 내주변에 다른 아시아인(한국인)들이 충분히 살고 있지 않다고 느낀다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. 다른 아시아인이 없는 장소에 나만 혼자 있으면 나는 자주 그들과 다르거나 격리되어 있다고 느낀다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
아래의 질문은 이민자들의 태도 및 의견에 관련된 질문입니다. 해당되는 칸에 V 마크해 주세요.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>번호</th>
<th>문항</th>
<th>전혀 동의하지 않음</th>
<th>동의하지 않는 편</th>
<th>동의하는 편</th>
<th>매우 동의 함</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>여성의 욕을 하거나 왜곡적인 말을 하면 남성이 하는것보다 안좋아보인다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>사회문제 해결을 위한 리더십의 역할에 여성이 더욱 참여해야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>남편과 부인 모두 서로에게 같은 이유로 이혼을 요구할 수 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>저자분한 농담을 하는 것은 대부분 남성만의 특권이다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>술 취한 여성이 술 취한 남성보다 안 좋아보인다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>여성의 사회 활동이 증가한 요즘, 남성이 설거지나 빨래등 집안일을 도와야 한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>결혼식의 “복종” 이란 단어가 있는 것은 여성에게 모욕스러운 것이다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>성별에 상관없이 인사 채용 및 승진 시 철저하게 능력을 바탕으로 이루어져야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>여성도 남성과 독갈이 프로포즈할 수 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>여성은 자신의 권리보다는 가족과 자녀에 더 신경을 써야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>여성도 데이트 비용을 똑 같이 부담해야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>여성도 남성과 같이 사업을 하거나 전문직종에 종사해야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>여성은 자신이 남성과 똑같은 권한 및 자유가 있을 거라고 기대해서는 안된다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>아들은 가족내에서 남자답게 자라도록 북돋아줘야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>여성의 태도를 운전하거나 남성이 뜻계질을 하는 것은 결맞아 보이지 않는다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>자녀 양육에 있어서, 결정적인 권한은 어머니보다 아버지가 가져야 한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>여성은 결혼하기 전에 다른 남자와 (약혼자라해도) 성생활을 삼가해야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>부인이 남편보다 재산 분할에 있어 불이익을 받아서는 안된다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>여성은 자신의 전문적인 경력 보다는 자녀 양육 및 가정일에 더 신경을 써야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>커뮤니티 리더의 역할은 대부분 남성에게 맡겨져야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. 여성의 경제력 혹은 사회생활의 자유가 남성이 만들어 놓은 “여성”에 대한 고정관념을 따르는 것보다 훨씬 중요하다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. 평균적으로 여성이 남성보다 경제적인 능력이 낮다고 평가되는 것이 옳다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. 많은 직장이 직원 채용 및 승진시 남성들에게 편리한 경향이 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 여성에게도 무역 비즈니스 및 수련을 할 수 있는 동등한 기회가 주어져야한다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 현대 여자 아이들은 남자 아이들과 같이 여러가지 제약과 제한에서 자유로울 권리가 있다.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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