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ABSTRACT

This study explored factors contributing to Indonesians’ perceptions and attitudes toward violence against wives. A total of 181 Indonesians lived in rural and urban households in Kota Bandung (Bandung City) and Kabupaten Bandung (Bandung Regency), West Java, Indonesia that were listed in the 2009 National Social Economic Survey were randomly selected. Data were collected using face-to-face interviews with open-ended and closed-ended questions. Qualitative data was analyzed using content analysis and hierarchical multiple regression was employed for hypotheses testing.

The majority of Indonesians in this study were aware of the existence of violence against wives in society. They tended to define violence against wives in physical terms, to justify a husband hitting his wife when she was perceived to deviate from traditional gender roles as a wife or mother, and to express ambivalent attitudes between protecting the victims and punishing the abusive husbands. Victim-blaming attitudes were prevalent. The participants reported preference for informal mechanisms in dealing with violence against wives.

Feminist and socio-demographic perspectives that were used to generate hypotheses were partially supported. Attitudes toward gender roles, location of residence, and marital status were among the most common variables significantly associated with the definitions, contextual justification, and responses to violence against wives. Findings were discussed in the light of a socio-cultural context. The study’s results posed some implications for social welfare practice, policy and research.
DEDICATION

I dedicated this dissertation to two extraordinary women who have shaped my life:

  My mother Muhayuni binti Ahmad Sayuti

  My daughter Mutia Assyifa binti Nurdin Ali
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Alhamdulillah, all praises are due to Allah, the most Compassionate and the most Merciful for without God’s mercy, help, and guidance I would have never finished this studies. Accomplishing a degree in doctoral studies is a very challenging task and in completing this magnitude requires a network of support from two continents, and I am indebted to many people. May God give much better reward to those who have helped, supported, and taken care of me and my family during our stay in the United States.

I would like to express appreciation to the following organizations, who without their financial assistance, I could not undertake my graduate studies in the United States and conduct the dissertation research: Fulbright Scholarship, School of Social Welfare and Research Foundation of State University of New York at Albany, P.E.O International Scholarship, Indonesian-American Education and Cultural Foundation Scholarship, Initiative For Women Grant, International Education Office University at Albany Research Grant, and Bonnie Carlson Dissertation Grant.

I would like to gratefully thank my parents who taught me the importance of education, provided me with the best opportunity to pursue my dream and prayed endlessly for my success and happiness. Ayah, you had gone before I finished my studies, but you’ll always be my inspiration and role model. I thank my husband Nurdin Ali, who supported me to start and finish my graduate studies. Thank you for your love and encouragement. Belahan jiwaku Mutia: you are my anchor through my stormy days, you are my light. Thank you for your priceless understanding and sacrifices, for which I cannot repay.
I would like to gratefully and sincerely thank my dissertation committee, who guided and shaped this study. Jan Hagen, Ph.D. generously accepted the role of chair of my committee at a critical point in the process. I have been very proud and fortunate to have her as my chair. Dr. Hagen’s incredible commitment, wide knowledge, and rich experience enabled this research to move forward in spite of a number of personal difficulties I faced along the way. She encouraged me to grow as an independent scholar and challenged me with high academic standard for which I am so thankful. I have been very touched by her loving, encouraging and caring personality. I also would like to sincerely thank Lynn Warner Ph.D., who provided me with rigorous guidance and support on research method and statistical analysis. She has been very approachable and supportive during my dissertation stage. Dr. Warner technical and editorial advice as well as valuable comments on my draft was essential to the completion of this dissertation. I would also like to thank Nancy Claiborne Ph.D. who I know as a great mentor, supervisor, and committee member. She strongly encouraged me to take leadership in my research assistantship and to grow as an independent thinker in my studies. Thank you to Barbara Sutton Ph.D. who had provided valuable references for the theoretical framework and comments on the draft. Her international research experiences on violence against women helped me viewing my study in a much broader context.

I would like to especially thank Mary McCarthy, Ph.D., the Director of Social Work Education Consortium. I obtained my research assistantship from the Consortium since I started my doctoral program. Dr. McCarthy’ incredible care and generosity have created a nurturing environment that is very critical to me and my family. Her leadership is excellent and she has been an inspiring role model for me in pursuing future career.
Thank you to a number of faculties who had been very supportive during my graduate studies at School of Social Welfare, especially to Dean Katharine Briar-Lawson Ph.D., Carolyn Smith Ph.D., Brenda Smith Ph.D., Eric Hardiman Ph.D. and his family, and Laura Moffitt, MSW. I am especially grateful to my fellow Ph.D. students: Lei Wu, Miseung Shim, Maureen Sinclair, Jay Park, and Yi-Yi Chen who offered me amazing friendship and sisterhood. Thank you for sharing many inspiring talks, joys, help, support and care in this long-bumpy journey. Thank you also to my colleagues and friend who helped sustaining and energizing me: Marilyn Rooney, Mary Lou Weseman, Pam Laverty, Linda Gilbert, Paul Urbanski, Yong Li, Cory Dennis, Patricia Weldon, Ratna Pane, Joseph Bohima, Dona Siregar, Joko Sayagyo, Zulkarnain Pulungan, Wiwit Estuti, Sri Rosanti, Aely Park, Jwa Kim, and Gina Park.

I could not have completed my dissertation without the cooperation of the respondents who participated in this study. Thank you for your time and your interest in the topic. Also, thank you to West Java Province Bureau of Statistics, especially the personnel at Social Statistics Division that provided and permitted me to utilize the listings from the 2009 Social Economic Survey to generate the study sample. My gratitude is extended to Renny Sekarningsih M.S., Dr. Soni A. Nulhaqim, Budhi Wibhawa M.S, Rudi Safrudin Darwis M.S., Nandang Mulyana M.S., Dani Kurnianto, Age Saputra, and Nurkumala Dewi who had facilitated the field preparation and helped me with data collection in Indonesia.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>viii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>xii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>xv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION ........................................................................................................... 1

- Statement of the Problem ............................................................................. 1
- Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in Indonesia .............................. 7
- Purposes of the Study .................................................................................... 10
- Significance of the Study and Relevance to Social Work ............................. 10

## CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW ........................................ 14

- Theoretical Framework .............................................................................. 14
  - Interdisciplinary Feminist Perspectives: Socio-Cultural Factors ............ 14
  - Sociological Perspectives: Socio-Demographic Factors ........................ 17
- Literature Review ......................................................................................... 20
  - Conceptualizing Attitudes and Attitudes Toward Violence Against Wives 20
  - Definitions Intimate Partner Violence Against Wives ......................... 23
  - Causes and Risk Factors of Violence Against Wives ............................... 31
  - Justification of Violence Against Wives .............................................. 35
  - Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives .................................... 40
Indonesian’s Socio-Culture Situations .........................................................46

and Intimate Partner Violence Against Women

   Indonesia Socio-Culture and Demographic Situations............................46
   Gender Roles and Women Status in Indonesia.........................................47
   Attitudes and Responses to Intimate Partner Violence..............................49
   Against Wives in Indonesia

Summary and Research Questions...............................................................52

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY.........................................................................................53

Hypotheses.......................................................................................................53
Instrumentation..............................................................................................58
Research Design.............................................................................................73

   Sampling Frame and Sample.................................................................73
   Sampling Methods and Procedures.........................................................74
   Data Collection and Procedures.............................................................76

Human Subject Protection ............................................................................79

Data Analysis.................................................................................................80

   Qualitative Data.........................................................................................80
   Quantitative Data......................................................................................81

Principle Component Analysis......................................................................86

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS.......................................................................................................89

Descriptive Statistics.....................................................................................89
Bivariate Analysis..................................................................................................................123
Hierarchical Multiple Regressions: Test of Hypotheses.................................................130
Summary.................................................................................................................................153

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION......................................................................................156
Discussion.................................................................................................................................156

Indonesian Awareness of Violence Against Wives.........................................................156
Indonesian Definitions of Violence Against Wives.........................................................158
Indonesian Perceptions About the Causes of.................................................................166
Violence Against Wives
Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives.......................................................168
Attitudes About Responses to Deal with Violence.........................................................173
Against Wives
Other Actions to deal with Violence Against Wives.......................................................177

Limitations of the Study........................................................................................................179
Implications of the Study....................................................................................................180
Conclusion..............................................................................................................................191

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....................................................................................................................193

APPENDIXES..........................................................................................................................221

Appendix 1 Study’s Questionnaire....................................................................................221

Appendix 2 Informed Consent............................................................................................232
Appendix 4 Principle Component Analysis .................................................................234

Appendix 5 Principle Component Analysis .................................................................235

Appendix 6 Principle Component Analysis .................................................................236

Appendix 6 Letters of Permit for Data Collection .......................................................238
# LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Summary of Instruments .................................................................70

Table 4.1: Frequency Distribution of Participants’ Socio-Demographic ................92
  Characteristics

Table 4.2: Participants’ Age and Length of Marriage........................................93

Table 4.3: Frequency Distribution of Participants’ Religion and .........................93
  Ethnicity

Table 4.4: Participants’ Attitudes about Gender Roles.......................................97

Table 4.5: Participants’ Awareness of Physical, Verbal, and Financial .................99
  Violence Against Wives Situation

Table 4.6: Frequency Distribution of Participants’ Categorization of ................103
  Husband’s Violent Behavior Against Wives

Table 4.7: Participants’ Definitions of Violence Against Wives .........................106

Table 4.8: Participants’ Perceptions about the Causes of Husband .....................109
  Physical Violence Against Wives

Table 4.9: Participants’ Contextual Justification of Violence Against ................113
  Wives

Table 4.10: Participants’ Attitudes toward Responses to Wife Abuse ................116

Table 4.11: Participants’ Perceptions about Actions Taken by Victims and ..........119
  Perpetrators in Dealing with Violence Against Wives

Table 4.12: Participants’ Perceptions about Actions Taken by .........................120
  Government and Society in dealing with Violence Against Wives

Table 4.13: Bivariate Analysis Associations of Socio-Demographic and .................125
  Socio-Cultural Factors with Definitions of Violence Against Wives

Table 4.14: Bivariate Analysis Associations of Socio-Demographic and .................126
  Socio- Cultural Factors with Contextual Justification and Responses to
  Violence Against Wives
Table 4.15: Bivariate Analysis Correlations Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Factors with Definitions of Violence Against Wives

Table 4.16: Bivariate Analysis Correlations Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Factors with Contextual Justification and Responses to Violence Against Wives

Table 4.17: One-way ANOVA Associations of Type of Employment with Definitions of Violence Against Wives

Table 4.18: One-way ANOVA Associations of Type of Employment with Contextual Justification and Responses to Violence Against Wives

Table 4.19: Regression Definitions of Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates from a Hierarchical Analysis

Table 4.20: Regression Definitions of Physical Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates from a Hierarchical Analysis

Table 4.21: Regression Definitions of Verbal-Psychological Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates from a Hierarchical Analysis

Table 4.22: Regression Definitions of Economic Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates from a Hierarchical Analysis

Table 4.23: Regression Definition of Sexual Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates from a Hierarchical Analysis
Table 4.24: Regression Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates from a Hierarchical Analysis.

Table 4.25: Regression responses to Wife Abuse on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates from a Hierarchical Analysis.

Table 4.26: Summary of Significant Predictors of Attitudes Toward Violence Against Wives.
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-2: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Normality Definitions of Violence ……212
Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors

Figure 3-4: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Normality Contextual Justification of…..212
Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors

Figure 5-6: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Normality Responses to Violence……….213
Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors

Figure 7: Regression Diagnostic; Test of Linearity Definitions of Violence …………214
Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors

Figure 8: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Linearity Contextual Justification…………215
of Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors

Figure 9: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Normality Responses to Violence…………216
Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors

Figure 10: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Homoscedasticity Definitions of …………217
Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors

Figure 11: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Homoscedasticity Contextual…………….217
Justification of Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-
Cultural Related Factors
Figure 12: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Homoscedasticity Responses to Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors

Figure 13: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Multicollinearity Definitions of Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors

Figure 14: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Multicollinearity Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural related Factors

Figure 15: Regression Diagnostic: Test of Multicollinearity Responses to Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Factors
The main purpose of this research is to study four domains related to perceptions of and attitudes about intimate partner violence (IPV) against wives among Indonesians: definitions of abusive behavior against a wife, causes of violence against wives, contextual justification of violence against wives, and responses to violence against wives. This chapter will explain the necessity of such a study, starting with the description about the extent of the problem and negative impacts caused by intimate partner violence against wives. The significance and relevance of the study for Indonesia and its potential contribution for social welfare and social work will be addressed afterward.

**Statement of the Problem**

Intimate partner violence against women is increasingly viewed as a global social problem and human rights violation (Burton, Duvvury, & Varia, 2000; Bond & Philips, 2001). International agencies including the World Health Organization, World Bank, and United Nations have increasingly called on “all governments to prioritize the elimination of violence against women” (Nayak, Byrne, Martin & Abraham, 2003, p. 333). The first World Health Organization report on health and violence in 2002 stated that IPV against females by male perpetrators is the most common type of violence against women in the world (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, & Lozan, 2002). Although women can be violent towards their male partners (Archer, 2002) and intimate partner violence also happens in
same sex intimate relationships (Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 1999) evidence has shown that women are more likely to be victimized by their male partners and experience more severe consequences from the violence than men who are victimized by their female partners (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Archer, 2006; Krug et al., 2002).

Attempts to measure and compare the problem at an international level have been challenged by the absence of, or difficulties in obtaining and applying comparable definitions, measurements, sampling methods, population characteristics, and data collection techniques (Krug et al., 2002). Cross-cultural studies suggest that IPV affects women worldwide regardless of their social, cultural, economic and political backgrounds (Levinson, 1989). Studies have suggested that the prevalence of IPV varies across regions but there is a reason to be concerned about the seriousness of the problem, especially in the developing world. For example, a compilation of 48 separated population-based surveys from 35 countries reviewed in the World Health Organization report suggested the percentage of women who had been physically assaulted by an intimate partner at some point in the previous 12 months ranged from 3 % or less among women in developed regions (Australia, Canada, and United States) to 27 % in Leon, Nicaragua and 52 % of currently married Palestinian women in the West Bank and Gaza Strip (Krug et al., 2002).

Standardized international research conducted to address the lack of comparable global studies also found that in addition to differences in the prevalence of abuse, there is variation with regard to the types and severity of IPV across regions. A survey of more than 24,000 randomly sampled women between ages 15 and 49 years in 11 countries (i.e. Bangladesh, Brazil, Ethiopia, Japan, Namibia, Peru, Samoa, Serbia & Montenegro,
Thailand, and Tanzania) suggested that lifetime prevalence rates of either sexual or physical partner violence or both ranged between 13% for one city in Japan to 61% for a Peruvian province. In all of the countries studied, the lifetime prevalence rate of sexual violence is lower than the physical abuse rate except in three sites: an Ethiopian province, a Bangladesh province, and a metropolitan area in Thailand (Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Heise, & Watts, 2006).

International differences in the nature of IPV have also been documented by the International Violence Against Women Survey (Johnson, Ollus, & Nevala, 2008). This study consists of interviews with 23,000 women from 8 developing and developed countries (e.g. Costa Rica, Mozambique, Australia, the Czech Republic, Denmark, the Philippines, Poland, Switzerland and Hong Kong). The participants were asked whether they ever experienced abusive behavior by a male partner in their current and previous intimate relationships. Except in Mozambique, women reported higher rates of violence in previous relationships. Rates of violence in current relationships were 10 times higher in Mozambique than in Denmark and 4 times higher than in Australia.

The study also assessed women’s experiences with seven types of male partner abusive behavior including being threatened, having something thrown at them, being pushed/grabbed, being slapped/hit, being strangled, having a gun or knife used against them, and other types of violence. The study found that in most countries the most common acts of IPV were threats of physical violence that frightened women or acts of pushing, grabbing, having an arm twisted or hair pulled. However, the highest percentage of the most serious or life-threatening forms of violence such as being strangled, suffocated, burned or scalded or having a gun or knife used against them were reported
by Costa Rican women whereas women in Mozambique were the most likely to be slapped, kicked, bitten or hit with a fist (Johnson, Ollus, & Nevala, 2008).

IPV against women is a social problem that violates human rights and is associated with negative consequences for victims, families, and society (Burton, Duvvury, & Varia, 2006). Depending on the frequency, duration, and severity of violence as well as coping skills and level of support available to the victims, IPV can impact the functioning and well being of the victims. Physical assault can result in injuries, ranging from cuts to death. Studies from countries as diverse as Australia, Canada, Israel, South Africa, and the United States show that between 40 and 70 percent of all female murder victims were killed by their intimate partners (Krug et al., 2002). Population based studies in countries including the United States, Nicaragua, Canada, Cambodia and the Netherlands reported that 40% to 72% of all women abused by their male intimate partners are injured at some point in their lives (Krug et al., 2002).

In addition, numerous studies also suggest long-term medical problems such as cardiac symptoms, sexually-transmitted disease and gynecological problems that continue even after the abuse has ended (Campbell, 2002; Krug et al., 2002). Victims of IPV are at high risk for experiencing psychological and emotional health problems that need medical attention including depression, suicidality, anxiety, substance abuse or post-traumatic stress disorder (Campbell, 2002, Haj-Yahia, 2000; Philips, Rosen, Zoellner, & Feeny, 2006; Sidibe et.al, 2006).

Aside from the physical and psychological pain associated with partner violence, incidents of IPV have negative impacts on children and continuous cycle of violence.
Studies in less-industrialized societies found a significant association between IPV experienced by the mothers and the mortality of their offspring (Asling-Monemi et al., 2003; El-Zanaty, 1996 cited in Ammar, 2006). Children and adolescents living with IPV are at an increased risk of experiencing all types of abuse, developing emotional and behavioral problems, experiencing other adversities (Holt, Buckley, and Whelan, 2008), or becoming IPV perpetrators in their adult life (Jewkes, Levin & Penn-Kenaka, 2002; Holt et al., 2008).

Furthermore, IPV depletes resources to pay direct costs of service provisions for the victims and perpetrators (medical, criminal justice system, social services) and indirect costs including due to possible increase of mental health problems. In addition, the impacts of IPV can lead to larger economic consequences resulting from loss of productivity and social impacts of the problem such as intergenerational transmission of violence and reduced quality of life (Burton et al., 2000). In studies in India and Canada, 13% to 50% of battered women were absent from paid work because of the injuries resulting from the abuse (Krug et al., 2002). In the United Kingdom $13.3 billion was spent to provide public services including policing, court costs, medical care and shelter for IPV in 1996 and in Nicaragua $32.7 million was lost due to the victimization of women (World Health Organization, 2004).

Over the decades, an extensive body of research on violence against women has been developed but the majority of the research is based on IPV in Western societies. Those studies have examined factors contributing to the incidence of wife abuse (e.g. Benson & Fox, 2004, Renner & Slack, 2006), built conceptual models to explain the etiology of wife abuse, developed policies based on theories, or created intervention
programs (e.g. Shobe & Dienemann, 2007), and evaluation of the effectiveness of intervention program (e.g. Gondolf, 2001). Also numerous studies have explored victims’ experiences of wife abuse and their coping strategies for survival (e.g. Zink, Jacobson, Pabst, Regan, & Fisher, 2006; Bauman, Haaga, & Dutton, 2008). In developing regions especially in South Asia, South East Asia and Africa, studies are primarily concerned with determining the prevalence of IPV against women and identifying contributing factors of such violence (Schuler, Riley & Shireen, 1996; Kocacik & Dogan, 1999; Hakimi, Hayati, Marlinawati, Winkvist, & Ellsberg, 2002; Hindin & Adair, 2002; Jeyaseelan, Sadowski, Kumar, Hassan, Ramiro, & Vizcarra, 2004; Fikree, Razzak, & Durocher, 2007; Naved, Azim, Bhuiya, & Persson, 2006; Farid, Saleem, Karim, & Hatcher, 2008).

In recent years, scholars and researchers from both developed and less developed regions have attended to the perceptions and attitudes of the public toward IPV. Beliefs and attitudes that foster or condone IPV against women are crucial elements that maintain or perpetuate the problem (Salazar, Baker, Price & Carlin, 2003; Gracia & Herrero, 2006). However, just as rates of IPV vary, societies vary in their perceptions of IPV against women as well as in their attitudes toward abused women, violent perpetrators, and acceptable responses to deal with it. The webs of social, cultural, legal, and economic conditions are considered as factors that might differentiate the IPV attitudes of one society from another (Haj-Yahia, 2002; Nayak et al., 2003). In developed regions such as the United States, the general normative climate has become less tolerant of domestic violence and penalties for wife assault have become increasingly harsher over time (Lieberman Research, reported in Klein et al, 1997; Johnson & Sigler, 2000).
Population-based studies with the American public indicated that the majority of participants believe it is unacceptable for a man to physically assault his wife (Gentemann, 1984; Greenblat, 1985; Straus, Kantor, & Moore, 1997; Carlson & Worden, 2005).

In contrast, in many developing regions, wife beating is still widely accepted as a man’s privilege to punish a woman (Krug et al., 2002; Haj-Yahia, 2002). Preliminary evidence from several developing countries in South America and Africa suggests that both men and women share the notion of men having a right to discipline their wives by use of force (Heise, Ellsberg, & Gottemoeller, 1996). For example, 70% and 61% of rural and urban Egyptian women, respectively, agreed that a wife can be beaten by her husband if she neglects children or household duties and refuses sex (Krug et al., 2002). Evidence from studies with population originated from Middle East and Asian in the United States points to preferences to treat wife abuse as private issue rather than involve outside parties (Btoush & Haj-Yahia, 2008; Yoshioka, DiNoia, & Ullah, 2001).

**Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in Indonesia**

Existing data indicated that violence against women is a growing problem in Indonesia. Annual surveys conducted by the Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women (NCVAW) since 2001 to record incidents of intimate partner violence against wives as reported by government and non-government organizations working in family and women services indicated that the number of reported cases of violence against women continues to increase. The increase might due to the rise of incidents or improve reporting behavior in general population. In 2008, there were 54,425
reported cases of domestic violence, dating violence, rape by strangers, and violence by government personnel against women. Reported incidents increased significantly to 143,586 cases by the end of 2009. Approximately 96% of cases in 2009 were reported as violence against wives by husbands. The NCVAW’s reports suspects that the figure under-represents incidents of IPV against women partly due to low response rates from the surveyed organizations and a presumably high proportion of unreported cases. However, there was also concern regarding the reliability of the data considering the absence of a consistent definition of violence and possible duplication of reported cases (Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women, 2009, 2010).

A more systematic data collection was conducted through the first National Survey on Violence Against Women and Children (SVAWC) conducted in 2006 with female adults from 68,000 households in all 33 provinces to explore the extent of IPV against women in private and or public lives. The SVAWC aimed to explore the extent of IPV against women in private and or public lives. The survey found Indonesian’ women suffered from various type of abuse and most of them were perpetrated by intimate male partner. Sixty-five percents reported they had ever been psychologically abused (i.e. cursed, threatened), 23% had been physically assaulted (i.e. hit, beaten), 18% had been financially neglected, and 11% had been sexually abused or harassed (i.e. raped, forced to have intercourse, or forced to have an abortion). Between 35 to 58 percent of the victims reported that they suffered the abuse several times. According to the victims, husbands were the perpetrators of 100% of the forced abortion, 89% of the instances of financial neglect, 88% of the forced work, 72% of the physical abuse, 68% of the forced
intercourse, and 32% of the psychological abuse (Indonesian Bureau of Statistic and the Ministry of Women Empowerment, 2006).

Consistent with the National Survey, a population-based survey with 765 married women in a district in Central Java in 2000 also found that non-physical violence against wives was common among Indonesian women. More than one-third of respondents experienced emotional violence from a husband, which included acts of humiliation, insults and threats of physical harm. About one out of every four women (27%) experienced physical or sexual violence by a husband at some point in her life. More women reported sexual violence (22%) compared to physical violence (11%). About half of the physical violence experienced by the women within the last 12 months was classified as severe such as being kicked or punched (Hakimi et.al, 2001).

Existing studies about wife abuse in Indonesia reveal negative consequences experienced by abused wives. For example, the 2006 SVAWC reported that 22% of physical abuse victims had physical injuries from the abuse and 38% who were forced to get abortion experienced depression or extreme stress afterwards (Indonesian Bureau of Statistics and the Ministry of Women Empowerment, 2006). Hakimi et.al. (2002) reported that women who had experienced sexual or physical abuse from a husband at any time in their lives were likely to rate their health status as “poor” and reported significantly more medical problems (i.e., ulcers, aches and pain, intestinal problems, pelvic pain) and were more likely to have contemplated suicide than women without violence. Furthermore, those who were physically abused while pregnant were twice as likely to have spontaneous miscarriages, premature labor, and underweight babies. A study of 165 abused women who sought help from a women crisis center in Jakarta
reported that 75% of the victims reported psychological problems (i.e., anxiety, low self-esteem, depression), 50% reported various physical problems (i.e., permanent injuries) and 5% experienced reproductive health problems (Kalibonso, 2002, cited in Hakimi et.al., 2002).

**Purposes of the Study**

This study aims to fill the gap in knowledge about IPV against wives in Indonesia by seeking empirical knowledge about attitudes of Indonesians towards wife abuse. The specific objectives of the study are:

1) To explore Indonesians’ knowledge or awareness about the existence of IPV against wives in the society.

2) To describe Indonesians’ perceptions of definitions of abusive behavior against wives, perceived causes of husbands’ abusive behavior, and attitudes about the contextual acceptability of IPV against wives and appropriate responses to IPV against wives.

3) To examine the association of socio-demographic and socio-cultural factors with the perceptions and attitudes about IPV against wives.

**Significance of the Study and Relevance to Social Welfare and Social Work**

This study is significant and relevant for social welfare and social work for several reasons. First, the literature review revealed a significant lack of information about the perceptions of and attitudes about wife abuse among Indonesians and factors associated with such perceptions and attitudes. This study will particularly contribute to knowledge on Indonesians’ perceptions and attitudes towards IPV and add to a small but
growing body of knowledge on societal attitudes toward women abuse in developing nations.

Second, understanding public perceptions about abusive behavior, justification of IPV against wives, and attitudes about responses toward IPV are crucial steps to understand factors that contribute to or maintain IPV. General population studies have found that acceptance of the use of violence is strongly correlated with actual perpetration of IPV (O’Neil & Harway, 1997; Heise, 1998; Archer & Haigh, 1997, cited in Nabors & Jasinski, 2009). Furthermore, women’s responses to their victimization are also influenced by their own attitudes and the people around them. The failures to recognize events as IPV or that IPV is unacceptable or wrong prevent the individuals subjected to violence from seeking help (Ahmad et.al, 2004; Petersen, Moracco, Goldstein, & Clark, 2005). Studies suggest that the chances of receiving help or of leaving violent relationships are significantly reduced when victims believe that they cause their own troubles or that they get what they deserve. Victims’ fear of being blamed and stigmatized by significant others and insensitive criminal justice could prevent the disclosure of the events (Felson, Messner,Hoskin, & Deane, 2002; Kingsnorth & MacIntosh, 2004). This in turn can put victims at greater risk and in more harmful physical and emotional situations.

Attitudes toward intimate partner violence against wives also influence the nature of community responses to such violence. Cross-cultural studies revealed that families, relatives, neighbors, friends, or co-workers are often contacted by the victims as resources to deal with the adverse impacts of IPV (Counts, Brown, Campbell, 1992; West & Wandrei, 2002; Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Watts, & Ellsberg, 2006). However, lack of
understanding about IPV, tolerance toward IPV, victim blaming, and lenient attitudes toward perpetrators can prevent significant others and the community in preventing the problem and providing helpful and effective responses to help the victims and to hold the perpetrators accountable (Pavlou & Knowles, 2001; West & Wandrei, 2002; Worden & Carlson, 2005). In short, support of pro-violent beliefs, even among those who may not perpetrate violence could create a context that encourages other individuals to commit violence.

This study is expected to contribute to social work practice and policy. For policy makers and social service providers, understanding attitudes toward violence against wives among Indonesians and factors influencing such attitudes is critical to design effective and appropriate program or services to address wife abuse. This is particularly important in Indonesian context as the country has just started to systematically address the problem through the introduction of the 2004 Anti Domestic Violence Law. As suggested by the available reports, rates of intimate partner violence against wives have been increasing in Indonesia. Support for this law and its enforcement may be influenced by public support of reformers’ assumptions about intolerance toward violence, victims’ protections and supports and offender accountability.

This study will contribute to social work research in several ways. The findings may be used as a foundation to inform further study about intimate partner violence in Indonesia. Furthermore, because this study will use some new developed instruments as well as existing standardized research measures that have not previously been used with Indonesian population, it can provide some information about the reliability and validity of those measurements for future application or modification in other related research.
The findings gathered and recommendations made from this study can inform and be used to expand studies about intimate partner violence in Indonesia in the future.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The previous chapter has clarified that an understanding of the public’s perceptions and attitudes toward intimate partner is important to address intimate partner violence against women in a society. This chapter reviews the theoretical framework and literature regarding intimate partner violence, and perceptions and attitudes toward intimate partner violence. Interdisciplinary feminist and sociological perspectives inform the theoretical framework and the factors associated with perceptions and attitudes toward violence against wives. Following the description of the theoretical framework, the reviews of relevant literatures and the discussion about Indonesian’ socio-demographic and socio-cultural contexts and violence against women are presented.

Theoretical Framework

This study utilizes an integrated conceptual framework which combines socio-cultural (i.e. feminist perspective) and socio-demographic (i.e. sociological) factors to understand violence against wives and factors associated with attitudes about IPV against wives.

Interdisciplinary Feminist Perspectives: Socio-Cultural Factors

A feminist perspective is the most prominent socio-cultural perspective to explain violence against women in general (Heise, 1998; Amirthalingam, 2003). Critical or radical feminists have argued that intimate partner violence constitutes one of the main social manifestations of patriarchy or gender inequality. Patriarchy has been
conceptualized on two levels: macro and micro. On the macro level, it is structural which manifests as male domination in the access and positions within social institutions: economic, social and political structures (Schecter, 1982; Yick, 1999). At the micro level, patriarchy is represented in the individual beliefs, norms, and values that legitimize male dominance over women (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Smith, 1990). According to Smith (1990), theorists also distinguish patriarchy as social and familial patriarchy. The term social patriarchy refers to dominance of male in the whole society whereas familial patriarchy refers to male dominance within the family.

Although patriarchy exists in most of the world communities, its manifestation and degree varied both within and across societies (Ahmad et.al, 2004; Bhanot, & Senn, 2007). Furthermore, although many societies have changed into more equal society, as happened in Western regions, the ideological basis of patriarchy usually change at slower pace than the structures of patriarchy in such societies. Therefore, although patriarchy may have weakened in some societies, women still live as men subordinates and are victimized in male violence (Smith, 1990).

In societies where men are dominant, patriarchal relationships are widely supported by stereotypical or traditional gender-role attitudes or expectations about the appropriate social roles for men and more especially for women. The traditional notion of gender-role attitudes are socialized and enforced by informal and formal institutions or agents including parents, culture, education, religion, and marriage that socialize men as aggressive and powerful class whereas women are usually viewed as the subordinate. The ideology of patriarchy in familial relations prominently emphasizes on the themes of a wife’s obedience, sexual fidelity, submission, respect, loyalty, sexual access, and
selflessness. In contrast, men are socialized and expected to be dominant, be the breadwinner, govern the family, and have the right to use physical force against their intimate female partner (Smith, 1990; Yllo & Straus, 1990; Pagelow, 1992; Abraham 1999; Ayyub, 2000; Yick, 2000; Haj-Yahia, 2002; Munir, 2005).

In other words, according to feminist perspectives, in patriarchal society, if men perceive that the women deviate from the prescribed ideal roles or behavior or if the men perceive that their power and privileges are threatened, they may use violence as a tactic for restoring their dominant status and power (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Therefore, according to feminist perspectives, society that sanctions violence against wife as husband privilege to correct wife’s transgression gender role tend to tolerate wife abuse when the wife has failed in her role or overstep her limits. In other words, violence is commonly seen as women’s faults, not men. At individual level, it can be assumed that individuals who adhere to patriarchal beliefs about male domination or female subordination would tend to condone intimate partner violence against women and indicated lenient attitudes toward the perpetrators.

The examination of gender and attitudes toward gender role and their impacts on the attitudes about violence against women has been used by many researchers to test the assumptions of feminist assumptions. It has been widely assumed that women tend to express stronger attitudes against violence against women than their men’s counterparts. They tend to disapprove violence against women as expression of solidarity to the victims who share same gender attribute as themselves (Greenblat, 1986). In contrast, male tend to have more lenient attitudes toward violence and perpetrators because they are reluctant to give up their superior position (Finn, 1988).
Gender role attitudes and religious orientation have been used as other indicators to predict patriarchal beliefs that associated with attitudes toward violence against women. Gender role beliefs refer to the orientation with regards to proper roles of male and female in public and private lives (Finn, 1988; Greenblat, 1986). Compared to men, women tend to have liberal attitude toward gender role and are more willing to change traditional gender roles because they are disadvantaged more from gender inequality (Finn, 1988). Meanwhile, religion has been criticized by some feminist proponents as one of the important agents that supports patriarchy and condones violence within marriage (Dobash & Dobash, 1983; Fortune, 2001). Some other maintains that the interpretations of religious teachings, not religion themselves that enforce patriarchy and women subordination (Fortune, 2001). Religious teachings might increase forgiveness for abuse due to doctrines on the submissive nature of wives and unconditional nature of forgiveness (Tsang & Standford, 2007) and increase risks for abused women due to emphasis on the sacredness of marriage (Fortune, 2001).

**Sociological Perspectives: Socio-Demographic Factors**

A sociological theory advocated by Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz (1980) argued that social and ecological factors including age, income, education, employment, residence and other socio-demographic variables are related to domestic violence. Individuals from low income groups, for example, may be more vulnerable to domestic violence since such environment produce economic instability, which has been identified as a high marker of violence.
This sociological perspective view attitudes as function of various demographic factors such as age, education and gender (Schuman, 1994). Education and employment are viewed to influence perceptions and attitudes toward IPV. Education facilitates people exposure to new knowledge, ideas, and perspectives either through their ability to use information and resources available in society, i.e. mass media and school. Klein et al. (1997) suggested that media do not only reflect group values and culture but also have a major role in shaping public perceptions and social values. Educational institutions may teach individuals about ideology of human rights and gender equality that may cause individuals to reassess their traditional cultures that emphasizes on women subordination (Bui, 2005) and for women, it confers social empowerment through social networks, and self confidence, (Jewkess, 1999). Similarly, employment may promote self-esteem, and increase the exposure to more egalitarian structures. Bolzendahl & Myers (2004) suggested that workforce participation “dispels myths about women’s capabilities to perform in the work place” which allows individuals to encounter social networks of nontraditional women (p.23).

On the other hand, having less education and not being employed can limit individual interactions with liberal gender relations and knowledge about wife abuse. Among women, low education and unemployment deepen women’s dependence on the husbands, which in turn limit their perspectives on violence against women and alternatives for dealing with it. Among men, unemployment may be associated with feeling of insecurity as a result of not being able to be the family provider as culturally prescribed, which in turn may increase their tolerance to use abuse as means to deal with stress or family problems (Jewkess, 2002). Meanwhile, low paid jobs, especially among
women, exposes individuals to the same gender inequality structures at the work place which may further strengthen the myths of male superiority (Uthman, Lawoko, & Moradi, 2009).

Age also affects individuals’ ability to learn new ideas or values. Older individuals may tend to have difficulty to absorb more liberal perspectives about family, gender roles and marriage lives because they had internalized their existing beliefs for a long period of times, thus making it difficult for them to accept new ideas that are not consistent with their belief system (Roberts & Strarr, 1989; Carlson & Worden, 2005). They also may be relatively less likely to get exposed or influenced by the impacts of public education/campaigns or law reforms on violence against women (Yick, 1997; Carlson & Worden, 2005). On the other hand, younger generation tend to adjust themselves with social changes or new values faster than adult groups (Yick, 1997; Bui, 2005).

Geographical area (i.e. urban, rural) may have impact on individuals’ perception and attitudes. For example, although rural area cannot be generalized in single characteristics, literatures suggested that living in rural may limit people interactions with non-conservative family values or liberal norms and values pertaining to women’s rights and gender equality either due to relatively low education, rigid social structures and norms about family and gender roles, conservative norms about family privacy, and or lack of availability/ access to information and access regarding IPV (Koenig, Ahmed, Hossain, Mozumder, 2003; Eastman, Bunch, Williams, & Carawan, 2007). As a result, rural residents tend to have limited understanding about violence against women and express less favorable attitude toward the issue.
In short, it can be assumed that socio-demographic variables may function as mechanism that can hinder or promote the development of positive or negative norms, beliefs, attitudes or behavior about IPV. Gender, education, employment, age, marital status and type of residence may affect both chance and degree of exposure to knowledge, ideas, beliefs, and practice about gender norms, women rights, marital relations, and intimate partner violence. In other words, socio-demographic characteristics can provide the structures through which individuals can either internalize or critically questions the established norms learned and challenge those that are not appropriate. Hence, these factors are expected to affect people’s attitudes toward intimate partner violence against women.

**Literature Review**

*Conceptualizing Attitudes and Attitudes Toward Violence Against Wives*

The construct of attitude has been very important in social psychology. Attitudes have been traditionally viewed as nexus between affect, cognition, and behavior. Attitudes have been defined in various ways and none of those definitions has been universally accepted (Albaracin, Johnson, & Zana et al., 2005). However, most definitions focus on the process of evaluating an object on a scale ranging from positive to negative. Eagly and Chaiken (1993, cited in Albarracin et al., 2005), for example, define an attitude as “a psychological tendency that is expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favour of disfavor” or as affect for or against an object (e.g an individual, group, institution, belief) (Schuman, 1995). Attitudes are assumed to be an underlying disposition that is reflected in specific behaviors, which may direct or indirect, verbal or nonverbal (Albaracin et al, 2005).
From the perspective of psychologists, attitudes are differentiated from beliefs. It is argued that beliefs can usually be verified or falsified by objective criteria, whereas attitudes cannot be assessed as either true or false (Eagly and Chaiken 1993). Beliefs are said to be based upon knowledge and those holding beliefs tend to believe that such knowledge is correct (Wyer and Albarracin 2005). Nevertheless, Schuman (1995) suggests that in much social sciences research and general language, the term “attitude” is applied in a more less restricted sense, so it used interchangeably as “belief,[…] perspectives, stance, or frame of reference” (p.68).

Gracia and Herrero (2006) summarizes that there are two major perspectives used in studies about attitudes. The first perspective focuses on attitudes toward target, suggesting the evaluation of a situation or behavior. The second perspective emphasizes attitude toward behavior. This perspective argues that attitudes are proxy to behavior, so a person’s attitudes is an as intention or readiness to behave in accordance with the expressed attitudes. Each perspective may be used separately or applied together.

Therefore, these two perspectives can be summarized as follows: Belief about an object or behavior lead people to indicate feeling or evaluation toward the object or behavior (attitude toward target). This attitude toward target leads individuals to develop intention or likelihood about doing the behavior (attitude toward behavior). This study focuses on attitudes toward target (violence against wives), not attitudes toward behavior that may include for example intention to perpetrate violence or intention to intervene the violence.

In the last few decades, the traditional psychological perspective that regards attitudes as stable dispositions and predictor of behavior has been subject to growing
critiques (Pease & Flood, 2009). Some scholars argued that people’s action may be less influenced by their attitudes but by social context and social norms (Prislin & Wood, 2005). In other words, attitudes are socially constructed and that changing social context is considered essential to change individuals’ attitudes. Pease and Flood (2009) argue that utilizing the perspective about socially constructed attitudes is more appropriate for attitudinal studies about violence against wives than focusing on mental structure and process considering the importance of changing social norms and dominant ideologies in people’s attitudes.

Despite many studies on attitudes toward violence against women, attitudes have not been clearly conceptualized. From the review of the literatures, it appears that the majority of studies concerning public attitudes toward violence against women focused on attitudes toward target (attitudes towards violence against women) and a very small number examined attitudes toward behavior (i.e. intention to perpetrate, intention to report to the police, etc). The studies also varied with regard to their conceptualization about attitudes toward violence against women. The majority of existing studies explored a single aspect of attitudes toward violence against women, with the majority focused on justification of wife abuse (Gentemann; 1984; Berkel, Vandiver, & Bahner, 2004; Fikree, Razzak, & Durocher, 2005; Harr, 2007).

This present study examines attitudes toward violence against wives along four dimensions: definition of violence against wives, perceived causes of violence against wives, contextual justification of violence against wives, and responses to deal with violence against wives. In this study, attitudes are defined as beliefs and feelings that
influencing an individual to respond either favorably or unfavorably toward definitions, contextual justification, and responses to violence against wives. The following section will describe existing studies with regards to various dimensions of attitudes toward violence against wives and factors associated with each dimension based on socio-cultural and socio-demographic perspectives.

**Definitions of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women**

Little consensus exists among scholars and researchers on what behavior should be included in a definition of IPV (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Renzetti, Edleson, & Berger, 2001). There are at least three major themes appeared in the discussion of violence against women. First, determining the meaning of violence; second, determining what behavior should be included in the definitions; and third, determining who the perpetrators and victims.

The term violence may be defined narrowly or broadly. Those who approach violence from a crime perspective tend to adopt a narrow legalistic definition of violence. For example, the United States Panel on the Understanding and Control of Violent Behavior defines violence as “behavior by persons against persons that intentionally threatens, attempts, or actually inflicts physical harm” (Reiss, 1993, p.35). Similarly, Gelles & Straus (1979), in early discussion on family violence defined violence as “an act carried out with the intention or perceived intention of physically hurting another person” (cited in Loue, 2001, p.1). In contrast, some feminist conceive violence broadly that cover both physical and non-physical violence including a wide range of controlling, intimidating and dominating behaviors by the perpetrator (Dobash & Dobash, 1998).
Using a narrow definition may have the advantage of providing clarity about the nature and context of a specific form of violence and making measurement less complicated (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2001; Maloney et.al, 2001). However, narrow definition has been criticized by feminist and human rights advocates and researchers for its possible failure to capture complex reality of the victim’s experience. If the definition fails to identify various forms of violence, the abused women may be reluctant to name their own experience and seek help (Renzetti et al., 2001; Tang, Wong, & Lee, 2000). Defining violence broadly may cause difficulty in measurement, but it brings benefit in making the issue larger, which results in increasing attention to the problem (Dobash & Dobash, 1998; Muhlenhard & Kimes, 1999; DeKeseredy, 2000).

There are four forms of intimate partner violence commonly discussed in the literature: physical, emotional or psychological, sexual, and economic abuse. Physical violence can include any minor physical aggression such as pushing or throwing things or severe acts that may lead to significant physical harm such as use of knife or gun, hitting, choking or striking (Gordon, 2000; Maloney, 2001). Sexual abuse can refer to “any sexual act that a woman submits to against her will due to force, threat of force, or coercion” such as forced intercourse and forced sex in situations that are personally unacceptable (Maloney, 2001, p. 150). Psychological abuse may include social humiliation through the use of aggressive or obnoxious behavior, social isolation and verbal battering that cause fear and degrade the self-esteem of the victims (O’Leary, 1999; Maloney, 2001; Outlaw, 2009). Economic abuse refers to deliberate control by the perpetrator over the family finances and resources and may prevent women from seeking financial independence or action of economic deprivations in which the husband refuse
to contribute financially or deny to provide food and basic needs of family members (Fawole, 2009).

Intimate Partner Violence is also identified in terms of its severity and chronicity. The severity of the abuse can be classified as minor, moderate, or severe, depending on the potential consequences that may result from certain acts (Gordon, 2000). In terms of its chronicity, IPV can be categorized as “common couple” or “patriarchal terrorism” (Johnson, 1995). The term “common couple” usually explains day-to-day conflicts that occasionally get “out of hand”, leading to minor violence but not escalating over time, whereas the term “patriarchal terrorism” is an ongoing and intensified type of systematic violence, subordination, and control of many aspects of the victims’ life (Johnson, 1995, p. 284). Although IPV can be differentiated based on severity and chronicity, it is important to take note of both types. Patriarchal terrorism tends to evolve from common-couple type of abuse. Furthermore, emphasis placed on severe IPV can lead to an interpretation that less severe violence can be tolerated, therefore, making it less likely for the victims to obtain relief or support (Hooks, 2007).

Finally, the term intimate partner violence has been used to generally refer to interpersonal violence that happen in marital or non-marital relations (cohabiting or dating couples) and within heterosexual or homosexual relations. Various different terms also have been utilized to describe the nature of violence and the choice of term is influenced by the school of thoughts. Feminist scholars for example criticize the term domestic violence because it can cover many different forms of interpersonal violence such as husband-to-wife violence, wife-to-husband violence, incest, child abuse, and elderly abuse. The term spousal abuse has been criticized because of its gender neutrality
and ambiguity in distinguishing the self-defense behavior and acts intended to dominate and control (Tang et al., 2000). Thus, feminist scholars prefer to use the term wife abuse because it facilitates one to look at gender and power dimensions of violence (Bograd, 1988).

Studies exploring how the society defines intimate partner violence against wives have been conducted in both Western and non-Western countries although not as frequent as the studies about general attitudes toward wife abuse. The majority of existing research focused on assessing public’ perceptions about definition of IPV as physically-related abusive behavior (Choi & Edleson, 1996; Shibusawa & Yick, 2007) but there is a growing attention to examine multi dimensional definitions of IPV that included both physical and non-physical abuse behavior (Sigler, 1989; Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997; Carlson & Worden, 2005). However, the review of literature found a serious lack of empirical research on how Indonesians defined intimate partner violence against wives. One ethnographic study explored the experience of 30 Indonesian women victimized in marital violence revealed that participants were more open about naming physical acts such as hitting, punching, slapping, and burning with cigarettes as kekerasan (violence). In contrast, they were often reluctant to name sexual abuse and other forms of non-physical maltreatment by their husband as violence (Idrus & Bennett, 2003).

Cross-culture studies suggested that the public tended to define abusive behavior in intimate partner violence as physical assault. In a community survey with 1,200 adults in New York State, United States, Carlson and Worden (2005) found that behavior that used physical force against partner was more likely to be categorized as abuse than acts that describe neglect and psychological abuse. For example, over 90% of the respondent
agreed that punching a wife with a fist, using physical force to have sex with a wife, and slapping wife during argument were abusive behavior. Nevertheless, respondent were less certain about behaviors such as stalking a former girlfriend or boyfriend and calling one’s spouse “a stupid slob” as abusive behavior.

The studies also suggested about greater likelihood to categorize severe actions as abusive act than of less severe behavior. A nationally representative survey in Singapore found that most overt forms of physical actions were viewed as wife assault, while some indirect forms of violence such as smashing objects were not necessarily considered as abusive behavior against wife. By far, blatant physical force such as the use of weapon was classified as abusive behavior (Choi and Edleson, 1996). Sigler (1989) revealed that factors that influenced participant’s decision to label an act as abuse included the severity of the act, the type of criticism given to the wife, an intent to do harm, if the act was done frequently, if it was done in anger, and if it was done in front of others.

Culture plays an important role in defining what constitutes abusive behavior. A behavior that may be considered violent or unacceptable in one culture may be socially sanctioned in another culture. In 1992, the Violence Prevention Fund conducted several focus groups with Anglo-American, African-American, Hispanic, and Asian-American Hispanic, and Asian-American men and women in several states to explore how the general public perceives domestic violence. Five vignettes were presented, and respondents were asked if they would define each scenario as domestic violence. Almost all respondents defined the scenario that involved physical beating as domestic violence. However, compared to Anglo-American respondents, ethnic minority respondents were less likely to define physical beating as domestic violence. This finding is supported by
Midlarsky et al. (2006) who reported that compared to American women, Chinese and South Asian women, did not perceive non-physical abuse acts (psychological, sexual, verbal, and control) as abusive as much as the American women did.

Five socio-demographic variables that were most commonly examined in attitudinal studies were gender, education, employment, age, and marital status. Nevertheless, no study assessed the association with location of residence. Existing evidence found that gender matters in defining abusive behavior against women. The majority of existing studies suggested that gender associates with definitions of wife abuse. Studies with general population and professional groups of Chinese in various locations of China and the United States found that males tended to have significantly narrower definition of violence against wives or women than females (Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997; Tang, Cheung, Chen & Sun, 2002). Women also tended to view abusive behavior as more violent and potentially threatening than men (Muhlenhard & Linton, 1987). However, Yick’s (2000) survey with Chinese American in the United States and Tam and Kang’s (2005) study with police officers and social workers in Hong Kong found gender was not associated with how participants defined various dimensions of violence against wives.

Education and employment have been found association between education level and definitions of IPV. Different surveys in China and Hong Kong found that education level positively influenced people’s perceptions of what constitute violence against women. High education attainment predicted the likelihood of defining wife abuse broadly (Tang, Cheung, Chen & Sun, 2002; Tam and Tang, 2005). Similarly, in a survey with American adults, Johnson and Sigler’s (2000) found that participants employed in
white collar jobs were significantly more likely to define various forms of wife abuse acts as more abusive than those who were unemployed.

Studies in the United States, Africa and Middle East suggested the association of age with the perceptions and attitudes toward IPV. These studies found that compared to the younger counterparts, older respondents tended to view physical assault against wives, e.g. slapping the wife not as abusive behavior (Carlson & Worden, 2005; Khan & Hussain, 2008) and were less sure that violent acts were illegal (Carlson & Worden, 2005). Furthermore, younger participants had higher levels of awareness and understanding about domestic violence than their older counterparts (ANOP Research Services, 1995).

The review of the literature suggested that associations between marital status and perceptions/attitudes toward wife abuse did not sufficiently assess in the developing country’s studies. This particularly because the studies about intimate partner violence in developing regions often conceptualize intimate partner violence within marital relationship, therefore, the studies mainly targeted married and ever married individuals as the participants. In addition to this limitation, the existing evidence revealed the association between marital status and attitudes toward wife abuse but the findings were conflicting. Some studies found no association (e.g. Gentemann, 1984; Choi & Edleson, 1995). However, studies that found associations indicated inconsistent findings. Some of them found that married individuals indicated greater likelihood to have more sensitive definitions of wife abuse (Johnson & Sigler, 2000; Tam & Kang, 2005). Whereas other study found that they were less likely to define either sexual aggression or financial abuse as domestic violence (Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997).
With regards to socio-culture perspectives, beliefs about gender role were the most frequent factor assessed in the study about public attitudes toward wife abuse. Existing studies found that attitudes toward gender roles have been among the most consistent factor associated with how participants define IPV or violence against women. Population-based research among various groups in the United States, China, and Israel found that beliefs in conservative or traditional gender roles were associated with narrow definition of wife abuse or violence against women (Yick, 1997; Tam and Tang, 2005; Steinmetz & Haj-Yahia, 2006).

The investigation upon the impacts of religiosity on the definition of violence against wives has been limited. Two studies with general population in Israel found that the participants with greater adherence to fundamentalist religious beliefs or who defined themselves as religiously conservative had narrower or less sensitive definitions of wife abuse (Gengler & Lee, 2003; Haj-Yahia & Schiff, 2007).

In short, the literature suggest that situations involving overt use of a high degree of force are more likely to be perceived as intimate abuse, probably because physical form of violence is more concrete and tangible and often leaves visible consequences such as injury. Non-physical violence including psychological abuse is more difficult to define because of the challenge to document visual injuries despite its possible negative impacts. Existing studies found that the definitions of violence against wives can be predicted by gender, age, education, marital status, attitudes toward gender roles, and religiosity.
Causes and Risk Factors of Violence Against Wives

Many theories attempt to explain the causes of IPV but so far the precise causes of domestic violence remain unclear because there are so many variables interacting and mediating factors (Jasinski, 2001; Michalski, 2004). In this section, focus is given to identifying the risk factors or the variables considered to be associated with IPV against women. Using an ecological framework, four levels of risk factors are identified as associated with IPV: sociocultural, social structural, family, and individual (Carlson, 1984; Heise, 1998).

Causes Associated With Sociocultural Factors

A sociocultural framework emphasizes power inequality in gender relationships, patriarchal ideology, and cultural norms that sanction the subordination of women (Yllo, 1993; Davis & Hagen, 1992). It has been postulated that violence against wife is caused from norms, belief systems, and cultural practice that ascribe more power and status to men than women. However, this socio-cultural view is limited to only explaining violence on female by male and does not apply to other forms of violence including female on male, female on female, or male on male (Carlson, 1992).

Ethnographic studies in different societies across continents found that wife beating occurs more often in societies with stronger ideologies of male dominance (Levinson, 1989; Counts et al., 1992). With regards to wife abuse in the Asian community, it is believed that wife abuse is rooted in the oppression of women in Asian cultures; that is, the patriarchal system indirectly contributes to husband violence against wife. In many Asian cultures, traditionally, men are valued more highly than women and
after marriage, women are socialized to be subservient to their spouses (Ho, 1990; Abraham, 1999).

In Asian population, cultural norms such as the emphasis on the family and concept of family honor or saving face are also commonly used explanation to account for the perpetuation of intimate partner violence. In many Asian societies, family is the source of personal identity, frame of reference and emotional security. Individual’s behavior and conduct are considered as reflection of the entire family system. The concept of saving face is emphasized to control individual behaviors and protect the dignity of the family (Yoshioka & Choi, 2005; Haj-Yahia & Sadan, 2008). As a result, wives may be reluctant to disclose incidents of abuse because of the fear of humiliating the entire family.

 Causes Associated With Socio- Structural Factors

Intimate partner violence may be explained in relation to social factors that predispose victims and perpetrators to intimate partner violence. A range of variables including socioeconomic stressors have been presented as contributing factors to wife abuse. Studies from different settings confirmed that poverty and its associated stressor are major contributors to the problem of IPV. While physical violence against a partner exists across all socioeconomic groups, women living in area stricken by poverty or other forms of social disadvantages are disproportionately affected (Straus et.al, 1986; Ellsberg et.al, 1999, Benson et.al, 2003). Similarly, most representative surveys reveal that perpetration of IPV tend to be numerous among men with low income, low educational attainment, and low occupational status (Steth & Straus, 1990; Straus & Smith, 1990).
It is still unclear why poverty and other structural disadvantage increase the risk of violence. One explanation could be that for men living in poverty is potentially to generate stress, frustration and a sense of failure to meet culturally expected role as provider (Jewkes et al., 1999). It may also work because poverty increases potential for marital conflict due to pressures from resource scarcity or prevents women to leave violent or unsatisfactory marital relations because of economic dependence (Krug et.al, 2002).

**Causes Associated With Family Factors**

Cross-culture studies have found that the frequency of verbal disagreement and high levels of conflict in a relationship are strongly associated with physical abuse (Hoffman et.al, 1994; Jewkes et.al, 2002; Stets, 1990). Studies in many developing countries found that husband domination in the family, including in decision making and control of wealth is also associated with IPV (Krug et.al, 2002). Family dysfunctions that include poor communication, dysfunctional relationships, and poor problem solving skills are also element of family behaviors that contribute to intimate partner. IPV also appears to be more common among couples that are economically distressed. However, this relationship is still unclear (Benson et.al, 2003). Kalmuss and Straus (1990) reported that violence is more likely to occur when there is a strong dependency between the batterer and the victim.

**Causes Associated With Individual Factors**

Alcohol consumption by husbands has been found to be a risk factor for any lifetime physical partner abuse in Chile, India, Egypt, and the Philippines (Jeyaseelan
et.al, 2004), although the exact relationship between alcohol and abuse remains unclear (National Research Council, 1996). Exposure to IPV in the childhood has been found to associate with both perpetration and victimization in intimate partner (Levinson, 1989; Heise, 1998). Some researchers, especially from the United States also suggested that psychological traits of the offenders including feelings of vulnerability, inadequacy, low self-esteem, anger and hostility, and poor problem solving skills contribute to the perpetration of IPV (Hanson, Gizzarelli, & Scott, 1994; Barnett & Hamberger, 1992; Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985).

Existing studies on public perception about the causes of IPV were mostly conducted in the United States. Evidence suggested significant agreement that IPV is caused by perpetrators’ personality characteristics or defects (Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997) and substance or alcohol abuse by the perpetrators (Gentemann, 1984; Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997; Worden & Carlson, 2005). Other factors that are believed by many or most people to cause IPV are household stress, financial difficulties, and unemployment. Studies found limited findings that community perceived the causes of IPV as rooted from socio-culture level (Davis & Carlson, 1981; Gentemann, 1984; Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997; Worden & Carlson, 2005).

One study includes the exploration of public’s perceptions about causes of IPV in a non-Western context was conducted among Jordanian men and women. From this qualitative study, the researchers found that perceived causes of IPV shared many similarities as in other studies. However, most participants in this study perceived that possible causes related and attributed to the wife, reflecting strong norms in which men are viewed to have greater power, privilege and control of women and the right to punish
them for their misbehavior (Btoush & Haj-Yahia, 2002). This is in contrast with the finding in from study in Western region. For example, Worden and Carlson’s study in the United States (2005) that found a very small proportion of participants who believed that women were the cause of their own abuse.

There is no study informs how Indonesians perceive the causes of wife abuse. Despite such limitation, data gathered from the abused Indonesian wives suggested that the perpetration of violence related to husband’s unemployment, polygamy, husband’s infidelity, alcohol abuse by the husband, and cultural and religious norms that sanction husband physical punishment on wife (Hakimi et.al, 2002; Idrus & Bennet, 2003; Munir, 2003; Rowe, Sutan, & Dulka, 2009). Some of these factors were similar as those reported from other studies in developing countries (Jeyaseelan et.al, 2004, Hassouneh-Philips, 2005).

To sum up, the public tended to view IPV as being caused by factors related to the perpetrator’s individual characteristics or personality deficits. Although factors at the personal level such as mental illness, alcoholism, or out of control personality have been confirmed to be the contributing factors of IPV, predominant perceptions over such individual factor may contribute to the tolerance of intimate violence.

*Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives*

Scholars argued that IPV exists in most societies regardless their social, economic, and political context. However, the degree of tolerance varies from one society to another and this variation influences the prevalence of IPV in each community (Levinson, 1989; Counts, Brown, & Campbell, 1992). In other words, while the use of
violence against women is condoned in most societies, they may differ with regard to specific circumstances that justified it and type of force used in the violence against wives.

In ethnographic studies with 90 relatively small peasant societies in North America, South America, Oceania, Africa, Asia, Middle East, Europe and Soviet Union, Levinson (1989) found the variation related to motivation, reasons and explanations for wife abuse. However, these reasons can be grouped into three categories: (1) beating due to sexual jealousy (i.e. basically when the man suspects of his wife’s adultery) that serves as a form of punishment which happened in 17 societies in the sample, (2) beating for cause, which occurred in 15 societies, where a man can beat his wife for a reason (i.e. when the wife fails in fulfilling her duties or in treating her husband with the respect he expects) and (3) beating at will, which happened in the majority of the society in the sample. The study clarified that this type of beating occurs simply because of the feel that battering can be a husband’s right for any or no reason. According to Amirthalingam (2003), the first cause illustrates power paradox in which men’ feeling of his power insecurity is manifested through violence, the second cause reflect the historical subordination of women as men was given right to “discipline and chastise women” (p. 9), and the third cause illustrates wife beating as the norm that is culturally accepted.

Studies that investigate public attitudes toward intimate partner violence usually examined the extent to which public justify intimate partner violence against wives. Justification is the process where the individual happenings to explain the validity of an act by taking into consideration external factors (Dutton, 1981). For example, an individual may interpret an isolated event in a particular manner, but when the event is
viewed within a social circumstance, the individual may have different or change the interpretation and definition of the incident. In the case of intimate partner violence, the public may not endorse wife abuse but if the violent act is placed within a context or circumstance, individuals may qualify their statements of disapproval and attempt to defend or rationalize the violence.

Stereotypically, the cause of male violence is linked to circumstances in which the women behavior deviated from prescribed traditional norms and where the male ego is attacked. Cases of public rejection or humiliation, self-defense or when a woman is unfaithful are frequently noted as justifications of violence (Dutton & Browning, 1988). The other justification is related to child abuse in which the participants believed that physical assault against wife is warranted if the wife abused their children. These themes appeared to apply to justification of IPV in both Western and non-Western regions (Gentemann, 1985; Arias & Johnson, 1989; Choi & Edelson, 1996; Haj-Yahia, 2000; Krug et.al., 2002).

Other themes of contextual justification of wife abuse seem to be more relevant in non-Western or developing countries’ contexts including neglecting the children, leaving the house without telling husband, and arguing with husband. Rani and Bonu’s (2009) study among married male and female subjects in 7 Asian countries (Armenia, Kazakhstan, Turkey, Nepal, Bangladesh, India, and Cambodia) found between 22 to 40% participants in those countries endorsed physical force against wife if she did not good care of the children. The proportion of those who justified wife beating if the wife left the house without her husband’s acknowledgment and if wife argued with husband range between 10 to 37% and 9 to 34% respectively. These authors argued that the
roles of good mother and good wife are cultural norms which are widely accepted and internalized. This is especially true among Asian families where women are socialized and highly expected to be wives and mother. In addition, preservation of traditional family structure is highly endorsed in many Asian cultures.

From socio-demographic factors, gender, age, education, employment, and marital status were frequently assessed in attitudinal studies. Many studies consistently demonstrated that women showed less tolerant attitudes toward of IPV as reflected in their tendency to disapprove physical assault towards wife in many circumstances (Choi & Edleson, 1995; Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997; Locke & Richman, 1999; Sakalh, 2001; Nayak et al., 2003; Shibusa & Yick, 2007; Haj-Yahia & de Zoysa, 2009) The exception, however, was found in the studies in African countries in which women were the justification of wife abuse were significantly higher among women than men (Hindin, 2003; Uthman, Lawoko, & Moradi, 2009). Another study among Chinese American found that gender was not a significant predictor for contextual justification of violence against wives (Yick, 2000).

Associations between education and employment status with acceptance of wife abuse or perceived responses to deal with wife abuse were also revealed in many studies. Higher education associated with greater likelihood to disapprove wife beating (Choi & Edleson, 1996; Yashioka et al., 2001; Hindin, 2003; Haj-Yahia, 2003; Kim-Goh & Baello, 2008; Btoush & Haj-Yahia, 2008; Uthman, Lawoko, & Moradi, 2009). Similarly, individuals men and/or women who worked in professional jobs reported lower justification of wife abuse compared to individuals with no job and those who were

The examination about the influence of residence location found inconsistent findings. Surveys in developing countries such as Egypt, Nicaragua, Palestine, and Kazakhstan suggested individuals living in rural areas or refugee camp reported greater endorsement of wife abuse in certain contexts than those in urban sites (Heise et.al, 1994; WHO, 1999; Hindin, 2003; Haj-Yahia, 2005; Haarr, 2007). However, population based studies in rural and urban areas of Palestine and Ghana (Haj-Yahia, 2002; Mann & Takyi, 2009) revealed that geographical sites were not a significant predictor.

The majority of existing international studies indicated that gender role attitudes predicted contextual acceptance of violence against wives. Egalitarian gender attitudes associated with greater disapproval of violence against wives whereas conservative attitudes toward gender roles correlated with higher justification or endorsement of a man’s use of physical abuse toward his wife (Finn, 1986; Yick, 1997; Haj-Yahia, 2005; Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008; Haj-Yahia & de Zoysa, 2009).

The association between religiosity and attitudes toward IPV is predominantly conducted in the United States and Middle East countries. There are some evidence to support that religious orientation associated with perceptions and attitudes toward IPV but the findings have been inconsistent. Studies found that religiosity was not associated with university students’ sympathy for battered women (Berkel, Vandiver, & Bahner, 2004) and acceptance of contextual justification of wife among Arab married men in Israel (2003). On the other hand, other studies found that individuals who reported
religious orthodoxy were more likely to endorse the use of forced marital intercourse (Jeffords, 1984), indicated more victim-blaming responses to battered women (Gengler & Lee, 2003) and held traditional stereotypes justifying sexual coercion and to attribute sexual coercion to female behavior on a date than participants who did not report religious orthodoxy (Geiger, Fischer, & Eyhet, 2004).

In short, studies indicated the existence of shared reasons to justify wife abuse across culture. However, existing evidence from developing countries suggested other form of circumstances that approve the use of physical force against wife. These justifications mainly refer to controlling women’s behaviors to conform to traditional role expectations. Gender, age, education, employment, location of residence, attitudes toward gender roles, and religiosity were found associated with contextual approval of violence against wives although the associations were not found to be consistent in some variables.

**Responses to Deal with Intimate Partner Violence**

Studies that investigated how the public perceives appropriate responses or strategies to deal with IPV against wives usually look at the extent to which the public approves or disapproves certain types of responses to deal with IPV. Literature revealed at least two major themes of responses. The first theme related to the acknowledgement of IPV as a private, personal or family matter. Viewing IPV as private or family matter means that IPV should be dealt among internal parties, hence are freed from external, especially intervention from formal institutions. The second theme related to acknowledgement of IPV as a social and crime problem. Acknowledging IPV as social problem results in the view that IPV should be criminalized; therefore, it deserves
external interventions from formal and or informal resources through which the perpetrators are punished. It also recognizes that the victims are to be protected and given choices to end the abusive relationship (Johnson & Sigler, 2000; Bui, 2005; Haj-Yahia, 2000c; Phail, Busch, & Kulkarni, 2007).

It has been suggested that assaults that occur between intimates is perceived as less serious than assault perpetrated against strangers (Saunders & Size, 1986). Several factors have contributed to the trivialization of intimate partner violence as a crime compared to other forms of violence. First, the society tends to view family as a harmonious and loving unit where the members live in mutual interactions. Consequently, it is difficult to accept that violent behavior can exist between spouses. Second, behaviors or events that occur under the family domain are often perceived as private, legitimate, and under the discretion of family members (Fagan, 1993). Families are viewed as systems bound with rules that are regulated by internal mechanisms which are not accountable to the public. Thus, public intervention for any problem in the family is deemed unnecessary. The consciousness raising and advocacy conducted by feminist scholars, researchers, and practitioners has been praised in shifting violence against wives as a private into public or social matter, the criminalization of wife abuse, and the provision of medical, welfare, and services for the victims (Bui, 2001).

Many studies with the victims of intimate partner violence revealed that shame and fear of stigma often discouraged victims to disclose their experience to others in order to obtain help. Although this is the pattern that exists in many societies, the barriers for disclosure might be much more significant in some cultures that emphasize individual family members protect family dignity and male honor. In Asian societies, for example,
disclosing family problem, including incident of intimate partner abuse, is considered to humiliate and embarrass the entire family. Women are more burdened with responsibility to maintain family harmony, endure marriage hardship, and protect the honor of the husband (Yick & Agbayani-Siewart, 1997; Yoshioka, DiNoia, & Ullah, 2001; Hakimi et.al, 2001).

Studies on public attitudes about formal and informal responses to deal with wife abuse have been conducted intensively in Western regions (Koski & Mangold, 1988; Sigler & Johnson, 2000; Bui, 2005; Frye, 2007). In a study with American public, Sigler (1989) found that generally the public favors legal sanctions against spousal abuse cases. A majority of respondents felt that abuse would not be sanctioned if it were made illegal. In their national survey, the Violence Prevention Fund reported that respondents felt that domestic violence is a problem that cannot be ignored. A great majority (90%) stated they would contact the police if they witnessed a man beating a woman, and if they know the abuser, most (79%) would intervene and encourage the perpetrator to stop. Public support for criminalizing IPV in the United States may relate to rigorous or continuous legal reforms and public campaign/education that result in the changes of public attitudes. The information on Indonesian public attitudes on how society should respond to IPV is not available.

In contrast, the tendency to perceive wife abuse as private matter, lenient attitudes toward the perpetrators, and lack of support for abusive women to resist the abuse was found from public studies with Asian and Middle Eastern societies. Yoshioka et.al (2001) examined the attitudes toward marital violence among 4 groups of Asian adults in America: Chinese, Korean, Vietnamese, and Cambodian. The study found that a
relatively high percentage of participants perceived a lack of alternative for battered women to end the abuse. Many of them indicated disagreement that divorce or moving away from the batterer and reporting the abusive spouse to the police should be taken by abused wife as alternatives to deal with IPV.

Similarly, Haj-Yahia (2002) examined the attitudes of 291 married Arab women from Israel about different patterns of coping with wife abuse. The participants were asked about their degree of support or opposition on 5 types of copings (wife changed behavior toward husband, wife assumed responsibility to change husband, wife asked for help from informal agents, wife asked help from formal agents, and wife expressed desire to break up family unit) that should be taken when a woman experienced psychological abuse, moderate physical abuse, and severe physical abuse by her husband. Regardless the nature of violence, participants reported a relatively high disagreement for the last two types of coping. For example, wife filing a divorce in court was disapproved at some level by 80% of respondents in cases of psychological abuse, 77% in moderate physical abuse incidents, and 72% in cases of severe physical abuse. A coping pattern in which victims filed a complaint with the police against their husbands were opposed on some level by 84% of participants in cases involving psychological abuse, 71% in cases of moderate physical abuse, and 50% in severe physical abuse cases.

Studies found inconsistent findings about the association of gender and marital status with attitudes toward violence against wives interventions or help-seeking. Some studies found that female participants were more likely to support harsher punishment toward the abusive male partner than men, to approve that abused women should be protected or helped, or to support punishing the husband (Choi & Edleson, 1995, Haj-
Yahia & de Zoysa, 2009) but other research suggested that being female associated with negative attitudes about criminal justice interventions toward violence against wives (Bui, 2005). Similarly, studies indicated marital status was not a robust predictor for attitudes about interventions. Bui (2005) found that participants who were married expressed more favorable attitudes toward the involvement of criminal justice systems than those who were divorced, widowed or separated (Bui, 2005). In contrast, other studies found that married individuals were less likely to support seeking help from the police in cases of wife abuse than their single counterparts (Btoush & Haj-Yahia, 2008).

There were some evidence indicated that education and age associated with attitudes about intervention and help seeking in the case of wife abuse. Existing studies suggested that lack of education associated with less supportive attitudes toward either formal or informal interventions to stop or minimize violence against wives. Less educated participants reported lower support for punishing the perpetrator and protecting the victims (Choi & Edleson, 1996), more disagreement that abused wives should seek help from the police (Btoush & Haj-Yahia, 2008) or be offered help from formal organizations (Haj-Yahia, 2005). Similarly, it was found that greater support helping the victims of husband’ violence through resistant strategies and external interventions were significantly more likely to be found among younger than older individuals (Nagel, Matsuo, McIntyre, & Morisson, 2005; Yick, 1997; Haj-Yahia, 2003; Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008).

There is very limited number of studies investigating the perceptions or attitudes of rural and urban residents beyond their attitudes about justification of abuse. A review of literature found no study examines how people in urban and rural areas define IPV.
Only one study includes the examination of residence and beliefs about coping or help seeking in the case of wife abuse. In a study among Arab women in Israel, Haj-Yahia (2002) examines the perceptions of participants in rural and urban areas regarding the help seeking or coping behavior toward wife abuse. The study found no significant differences in perceptions between rural and urban women on whether IPV should be resolved through private/informal mechanisms and formal mechanisms.

Several studies have found the associations between gender role attitudes and religiosity with attitudes about intervention toward wives abuse. Participants with conservative views of women’s roles were less likely to support putting husbands who beat their wives in jail (Khalid and Frieze, 2005), believing that outside involvement was needed, e.g. police should be called (Yick, 2000) or punishing an abusive husband compared to those with more egalitarian gender roles attitudes (Haj-Yahia; 2003, Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008). Furthermore, Haj Yahia (2003, 2005, 2002) also reported that greater religiosity associated with lower agreement to hold husband responsible, greater likelihood of justifying wife beating and attributing blame to the abused women, or greater belief that the abused woman should change her behavior toward her husband, the wife assumed responsibility to change her husband, and the wife seek help from informal agents in order to deal with wife abuse.

In summary, societies varied with regards to their attitudes about help-seeking and intervention towards violence against wives. This was reflected from the degree of support or disagreement they indicated as whether external interventions were warranted, whether the perpetrators should be punished, whether the victims should be protected and helped, and whether the problem should be regarded as social issues. Studies found
associations between socio-demographic and socio-culture variables with attitudes about dealing with violence against wives.

**Indonesian’ Socio-demographic-culture situation and Intimate Partner Violence**

The following section briefly describes Indonesian’s general situations with regards to its socio-demographic characteristics, socio-culture situations, and responses to intimate partner violence

**Indonesia Socio-Culture-Demographic Situations**

Indonesia is a geographically and culturally diverse country located in Southeast Asia. The latest national census reports that almost sixty percent of its 238 million people lived in Java, the smallest main island but the most developed region in the country. Among its 33 provinces, West Java is the most populated province (Indonesian Bureau of Statistic, 2010). The society is made up of hundreds of ethnic groups that practice different local languages, customs and belief systems. Islam is the largest religion, adhered by more than 85% of Indonesians whereas the rest follow Christianity, Buddhism, Hinduism, and other traditional religious beliefs (Indonesian Bureau of Statistic, 2005). More than half of Indonesians live in villages or rural areas where the availability of and access to employment, health care, education and social services is more limited than in urban areas (Indonesian Bureau of Statistic, 2006).

Industrialization and urbanization since the 1970s have transformed Indonesia from a traditional-agriculture to an industrializing country. Although agricultural sector remained the major employment for Indonesians, its share continued to decrease compared to other sectors like trading, services, and industry/manufacture (Indonesian...
Bureau of Statistics, 2010). Rapid economic growth from the mid 1980’s to the mid 1990’s has increased the government’s capacity to improve the quality of life of the people through the expansion of education, health, employment, and poverty alleviation (Booth, 1997; 2000a).

Nevertheless, the 1997 Asian financial crisis affected the country very significantly because it increased the rate of unemployment, underemployment, poverty, and social conflicts (Booth, 2000b; UNDP, 2006). Indonesia's unemployment rate stood around 9 percent in 2007 and it was considered among the highest in Asia (Indonesian Ministry of Labor, 2008). In addition, in 2010, almost 30% of the current economically active population worked as seasonal agriculture workers, seasonal non-agriculture workers and unpaid family workers (Indonesian Bureau of Statistics, 2010). In 2005, 21% of the population still lived below the international poverty line of US $1.25 per day, primarily in rural regions (Asian Development Bank, 2006). In 2002, almost 20% of adults aged 15 years and over were illiterate (UNESCO, 2002).

**Gender Roles and the Status of Women in Indonesia**

Some research studies argue that as in Southeast Asians, Indonesian women have relatively high status in the society. This argument was basically built based on their findings related to women’s active participation in economic activities and their roles in managing household finance, especially among Javanese women (Nurmila, 2009). However, this generalization has been criticized, partly due to the existence of patriarchal gender role ideologies and evidence of women’ low status in society. Although as citizen women and men have equal rights, responsibility and opportunities under the Indonesian
Constitution, other existing laws, religious customs and traditional norms in Indonesia’s multicultural society favor a male dominated society.

For example, in a typical family structure, the husband is head of the family and responsible for providing for the family’s economic and welfare needs whereas the wife is responsible for the household maintenance. This patriarchal family structure is supported by the Indonesian Family Act that stipulates that the husband is the head of the household and the wife is the manager of the household. The state, through its development ideology, especially under the New Order regime (1968-1998) has further subordinated and domesticated women by stipulating that the ideal roles for an Indonesian woman to be wife and mother to serve husband and family first, and later to serve her country (Suryakusuma, 1996).

Traditionally, an Indonesian woman is taught to submit, maintain harmony in her family and devote her life to the domestic domain and her family’s well being rather than be concerned with global issues. Beginning in childhood, Indonesian girls are socialized with idea of the good wife and good mother that is usually associated with feminine characteristics of submission and dependency on men and selflessness to the family (Nilan, 2003). A good wife and mother is believed to be loyal, obedient, polite, patient, she always pleases her husband, self-sacrifices, accepts whatever happens to or is given to them, cares and guides the children, and is good at managing the household (White 1992, in Ford and Parker, 1997). Women are expected to be able to endure hardships to keep the harmony and unity of the family (Munir, 2001; Doorn-Harder, 2006).

Rapid industrialization and modernization has opened many spaces for women to enter the workforce, attain good education, and work as professionals. Following the fall
of 32 years semi-authoritarian administration in the 1998, the political reforms has
provided many opportunities for women to be involved in politics. However, within the
country, more women than men are found in low skilled and low paid employment
including agriculture, manufacturing, services, and informal sector. Women also share a
disproportionate portion of being unpaid family workers (Asian Development Bank,
2006). Married working women are still perceived as secondary earners, thus are
expected to choose a career path that does not interfere with their primary roles and
destiny (Kodrat) as wives and mother (Utomo, 2004). While women are generally
consulted on a day- to -day basis, the husbands still dominates decision making about a
variety of family and social issues (Hardee, et.al, 1999). This gender disparity is more
evident in rural regions partly due to the strong practice of traditional customs and
conventional religious practices (Nurmila, 2009).

**Attitudes and Responses to Intimate Partner Violence Against Wife in Indonesia**

The issue of violence against women started to receive serious attention from
Indonesian government at the end of 1990-s. Following the country’ transformation from
decades of semi-authoritarian to democratic political structure in 1998, public concerns
over long time neglected human rights issues mushroomed. Backing by women
movement and human rights advocates, in late 1999, the government introduced “Zero
Tolerance Policy” declaring the commitment of government and society for not tolerating
any form of violence against women through the introduction of several reforms and
policies in legal, social, and economic aspects of the society.

The criminalization of intimate partner violence against women through the
introduction of The Elimination of Domestic Violence Law (EDVL) in 2004 was part of
legal reform targeted by Zero Tolerance Policy. Among the reasons for passing the Law was the urgent need to address the weaknesses and failure of the long existing penal code in recognizing multi forms of violence and legalizing the provision of protection and services for the victims. The EDVL accommodated different forms of abuse perpetrated to the less powerful members of the household such as wives, female domestic helpers, or children. Article 1 of the Law broadly defines violence in household as ”any act against anyone particularly woman, bringing about physical, sexual, psychological misery or suffering, and/or negligence of household including threat to commit act, forcing, or seizure of freedom in a manner against the law within the scope of household”.

The Law regards domestic violence as a crime in which the perpetrator is punished and the victims are protected. Depending on the types and the degree of impact of violence on the victim, the perpetrator can be sentenced to jail or fined. In addition, the judge may rule an additional sentence for the perpetrator in the form of restraining order and supervised counseling. The Law acknowledges the rights of victims to include: the protection of the victim by the police, judiciary, court, lawyers, and social institutions; medical service in accordance with the victim’s medical needs; the victim’s right to confidentiality; social service support and provision of legal aid at every stage of the investigation; and counseling services.

Since the introduction of the Law, mass media and non-government organizations have been working together to increase the awareness of the society on IPV (Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women, 2010). There has been growing initiatives from central government, local government and Non-Government Organizations to target the problem. For example, special units in hospitals and police
stations as well as shelters and legal consultation agencies have been established, especially in the cities or towns, to serve the victims of intimate partner violence.

However, the implementation of the law faces challenges such as the lack of financial allocation to build the systems (Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women, 2008). The interpretation of the Law has become another challenge. A study conducted to monitor the implementation of anti domestic violence Law in 6 provinces found that many criminal justice personnel still found difficulties to determine the standards used to differentiate severity of physical abuse and to do the investigation of psychological abuse. They also reported some inconsistent attitudes and incoherent interpretation or perception about the law among the criminal justice personnel that could impact the victims’ safety and effectiveness of the law. For example, the police placed high emphasize in mediating the couples involved in the violence. As a result, most of the cases reported or investigated by the police ended in reconciliation because the victims discharged the complaints (Hasyim & Kurniawan, 2009).

The challenge seems to be contributed by contradictory regulation as well. For example, although Indonesian Family Law stipulates that judicial divorce can be granted due to spouse negligence and cruelty or maltreatment endangering life of a spouse, the abuse by husband is not considered as a crime, thus, the perpetrator is not charged. Since many victims chose to resolve the abusive marriage through divorce court, it would be difficult to criminalize the abuse, punish the perpetrator, and protect the victims (The Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women, 2008).

Furthermore, while IPV has been recognized as a social problem and a crime by the Law, some findings indicated that IPV is still regarded by Indonesian people as a
private matter that should be dealt as a family issue, at least based on the findings from victim’s perspective. For example, population-based survey and qualitative studies with the women victimized in marital relations before and after the introduction of the Elimination of Domestic Violence Law revealed that most victims kept silent about their painful experience. Some of them asked for help from the family or relatives but the largest number remained the abusive relationships and sought no help from outsiders (Hakimi et.al, 2001; Munir, 2003; Idrus & Bennett, 2003; The National Bureau of Statistics and the Ministry of Women Empowerment, 2006; Rowe et.al, 2008).

Summary and Research Questions

The review of the literature found evidence that public perceptions and attitudes toward wife abuse have been studied in many countries but research in the Indonesian context is very limited. The majority of studies of public attitudes about violence against wives have utilized non-random samples and relied solely on quantitative analysis. The review also confirmed that socio-cultural and socio-demographic aspects influenced people perceptions or beliefs regarding definition of wife abuse, justification of wife abuse, and beliefs about appropriate responses to deal with wife abuse.

Also, it appeared that not all predictors from socio-demographic and socio-culture were examined at the same degree. Location of residence and marital status, for example, were less studied than others. The review of literatures found that the associations between socio-demographic and socio-culture variables and attitudes toward violence against wives revealed from earlier studies were not all solid. The differences in terms of measurements, sampling methods, and other social contexts might be considered as factors.
Given the lack of study about Indonesians’ perceptions and attitudes toward wife abuse, such a study was considered a necessity. Using the evidence found from the literature, a study will explore Indonesian perceptions and attitudes toward wife abuse and examine how socio-cultural and socio-demographic factors influence such perceptions and attitudes. The study will propose four research questions as follow:

1. What is Indonesians’ awareness of violence against wives, definitions of violence against wives, perceived causes of violence against wives, contextual justification of violence against wives, and responses to deal with violence against wives?

2. Do socio-demographic and socio-cultural factors influence Indonesians’ definitions of violence against wives?

3. Do socio-demographic and socio-cultural factors influence Indonesians’ contextual justification of violence against wives?

4. Do socio-demographic and socio-cultural factors influence Indonesians’ attitudes responses to deal with violence against wives?
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter reviews the methodology of the study and covers the following sections: hypotheses, measures, research design, and data analysis, including a principle component analysis of the instruments used to measure dependent variables.

Hypotheses

The overall and specific hypotheses for this study are listed below. Directional hypotheses were informed by the literature review.

Definition of Violence Against Wives

Overall hypothesis: Socio-demographic variables such as gender, age, education level, employment status, residence and socio-cultural factors such as attitudes about gender roles and religiosity will associated with Indonesians’ definitions of violence against wives as measured by the Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale.

H1: Indonesian female participants will be more likely than male participants to define various forms of behavior (as measured by the Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale) as violence against wives when other predictors are controlled.

H2: Younger Indonesians will be more likely than their older counterparts to define various forms of behavior (as measured by the Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale) as violence against wives when other predictors are controlled.

H3: Indonesians who attained higher education will be more likely than their counterparts with lower education to define various forms of behavior (as measured by the Definitions
of Violence Against Wives Scale) as violence against wives when other predictors are controlled.

H4: Indonesians who are employed in professional job will be more likely than their counterparts who are unemployed or employed in non-professional job to define various forms of behavior (as measured by the Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale) as violence against wives when other predictors are controlled.

H5: Indonesians who live in urban areas will be more likely than their counterparts who live in rural areas to define various forms of behavior (as measured by the Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale) as violence against wives when other predictors are controlled.

H6: Indonesians with more egalitarian rather than more conservative attitudes about gender roles will be more likely to define various forms of behavior (as measured by the Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale) as violence against wives when other predictors are controlled.

H7: Indonesians who report lower rather than higher religiosity will be more likely to define various forms of behavior (as measured by the Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale) as violence against wives when other predictors are controlled.

**Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives**

Overall hypothesis: Controlling for other variables, socio-demographic variables such as gender, age, education level, employment status, residence and socio-cultural factors such as attitudes about gender roles and religiosity will associate with Indonesians’ contextual justification of violence against wives as measured by the Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale.
H8: Indonesian female participants will more likely than male participants to disagree that violence against wives is justified under any circumstance (as measured by the Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

H9: Younger Indonesians will be more likely than older Indonesians to disagree that violence against wives is justified under any circumstance (as measured by the Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

H10: Indonesians who attained higher education will be more likely than their counterparts with lower education to disagree that violence against wives is justified under any circumstance (as measured by the Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

H11: Indonesians who are employed in professional job will be more likely than their counterparts who are unemployed or employed in non-professional job to disagree that violence against wives is justified under any circumstance (as measured by the Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

H12: Indonesians who live in urban areas will be more likely than their counterparts who live in rural areas to disagree that violence against wives is justified under any circumstance (as measured by the Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

H13: Indonesians with more egalitarian rather than more conservative attitudes about gender roles will be more likely to disagree that violence against wives is justified under
any circumstance (as measured by the Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

H14: Indonesians who report lower rather than higher religiosity will be more likely to disagree that violence against wives is justified under any circumstance (as measured by the Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

**Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives**

Overall hypothesis: Controlling for other variables, socio-demographic variables such as gender, age, education level, employment status, residence and socio-cultural factors such as attitudes about gender roles and religiosity will associated with Indonesians’ responses to violence against wives as measured by the Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale.

H15: Indonesian female participants will more likely than male participants to support active-resistant strategies to violence against wives (as measured by the Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

H16: Younger Indonesians will be more likely than older Indonesians to support active-resistant strategies to violence against wives (as measured by the Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

H17: Indonesians who attained higher education will be more likely than their counterparts with lower education to support active-resistant strategies to violence against wives (as measured by the Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.
H18: Indonesians who are employed in professional job will be more likely than their counterparts who are unemployed or employed in non-professional job to support active-resistant strategies to violence against wives (as measured by the Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale) when other predictors are controlled.

H19: Indonesians who live in urban areas will be more likely than their rural counterparts to support active-resistant strategies to violence against wives (as measured by the Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale) when other variables are controlled.

H20: Indonesians with more egalitarian rather than more conservative attitudes about gender roles will be more likely to support active-resistant strategies to violence against wives (as measured by the Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale) when other variables are controlled.

H21: Indonesians who report lower rather than higher religiosity will be more likely to support active-resistant strategies to violence against wives (as measured by the Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale) when other variables are controlled.

Instrumentation

There were three dependent variables in this study: (1) definitions of violence against wives, (2) contextual acceptance of violence against wives, and (3) responses to deal with violence against wives. The survey instruments utilized to assess these dependent variables were: Definition of Violence Against Wives Scale, Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale, and Appropriate Responses to Violence Against Wives Scale. These three scales were developed by the author.
The independent variables in this study included 6 socio-demographic variables namely: gender, age, education, employment status, marital status, and location of residence and 4 socio-cultural variables namely: ethnicity, religious affiliation, attitudes toward gender roles, and level of religiosity. Instruments used to measure socio-culture factors included two existing standardized scales: Attitude Toward Women Scale-short version (Spence, Helmreich, 1978) and Religiosity Scale (Haj-Yahia, 1998). The researcher also utilized self-developed instrument to measure awareness of violence against wives situations, all socio-demographic characteristics, ethnicity, and religion.

**Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale (DVAWS)**

The Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale (DVAWS) was utilized to measure participants definitions of violence against wives. Perceptions about definitions of violence against wives referred to participants’ perceptions whether to categorize certain physical, psychological, economic and sexual violence or social control targeted at the wife by the husband as violence against wives.

The scale consisted of 13 items with five-point Likert scale responses where 1 was “strongly agree”, 3 was “neutral”, and 5 was “strongly disagree”. For data analysis, the score was reversed so that a lower score indicates more disagreement. For analysis scores were summated. The highest possible score is 65 and the lowest possible score is 13, with higher scores signaling more agreement that a given behavior is classified to be violence against wives, whereas lower scores indicate less agreement that the presented behaviors is violence against wives. The Cronbach’s alpha of the whole scale in this study was 0.84; indicating a good internal consistency.
The 13 DVAWS’s items can be divided into 4 sub-scales: physical, psychological or verbal, economic, and sexual violence against wives. The Physical Violence sub-scale consists of five items and measures the degree to which the participant agrees or disagrees whether various physical violence acts addressed at wives are violence against wives (Refer to items III. 1, 2, 3, 4, and 12 in Appendix 1). The Psychological or Verbal Violence sub-scale is composed of five closed-ended items (Refer to items III.5, 6, 7, 8, and 13 in Appendix 1). It measures whether certain types of psychological violence or control are regarded as violence against wives. The Cronbach’s alpha for both Physical and Psychological Violence sub-scales in this study was 0.76.

The Economic Violence sub-scale is comprised of 2 items (Refer to items III. 10 and 11 in Appendix 1). This sub-scale measures whether a husband refusal to provide financial means (i.e., giving money to purchase daily needs) and his control over family income and wealth are considered as violence against wives. The Cronbach’s alpha of the sub-scale in this study was 0.49. Finally, the Sexual Violence sub-scale includes one item (Refer to item III. 9 in Appendix 1). It measures whether a husband forcing his wife to have sex is regarded as violence. (The Cronbach’s alpha was not calculated for this sub-scale because it only consisted of one item).

The DVAWS was adapted from Yick’s Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised (Yick, 1997). Yick’s Definitions of Domestic Violence Scale-Revised with six-point Likert scale responses is distributed across 3-subscaleres to measure respondent’s perceptions about whether certain physical, psychological, and sexual acts of aggression are considered violent behavior against spouse. Of the 14 items presented in Yick’s scale, only 10 items speak to abusive behavior against spouse, and 4 items are neutral
statements that were included to break the response pattern. The Cronbach’s alpha for the 14-item scale in Yick’s study with Chinese immigrants in the United States was .82 (Yick, 1997). Yick’s scale was selected because it was specifically designed for use with an Asian population which was relevant to the context of this study. Furthermore, the scale is comprehensive in that it covers multiple aspects of violent behavior in intimate relationships.

Seven items from Yick’s scale that were included in the DVAWS are described as follow: 1) hitting or slapping a wife’s face really hard; 2) throwing hard objects (e.g., ash tray) at a wife; 3) pushing a wife; 4) threatening to use a knife to hurt a wife; 5) demanding to know where one’s wife is at all times; 6) not allowing a wife to make any decisions; and 7) forcing one’s wife to have sex. Another 6 items that were developed by the author and included in the scale were: 1) yelling or cursing at one’s wife (e.g. calling her stupid or ugly); 2) criticizing one’s wife in front of others; 3) controlling the family income and wealth; 4) refusing to provide financial means to the wife (e.g. giving his wife money to buy things for daily needs); 5) pulling wife’s hair; and 6) forbidding wife to visit her family or friends. These 6 items were added because as an Indonesian citizen and researcher, the author believed they were relevant with the study’s context.

The author also included one open-ended question in the instrument related to the definition of abusive behavior against wives in marital relation: “When you heard the term “violence against wife”, from your perspective and in your own words, what kind of behaviors of husbands toward their wives would you consider to be wife abuse?”. This question was asked prior to the administration of DVAWS. The main purpose of asking this open-ended question was to direct participant’s attention to the nature of the research.
Since conversation about IPV is not an everyday subject for most people, it is necessary to familiarize the participants with the context of the research before asking them further questions. The answer obtained from this open-ended question was expected to provide additional insight about how Indonesians perceive definition of wife abuse that may not be captured from the closed-ended questions in the DVAWS.

**The Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale (CJVAWS)**

The Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale (CJVAWS) was employed to measure contextual acceptance of violence against wives. The concept referred to individuals’ attitudes about circumstances that might justify or warrant the use of physical violence by a husband against his wife. The scale include of 13 closed-ended items. A scenario describing a man hitting his wife “really hard” under 13 different circumstances was presented to respondents. All items were measured using a five-point Likert scale where 1 was “strongly agree”, 3 was “neutral”, and 5 was “strongly disagree”. Scores were summated across items with the highest possible score as 65 and 13 as the lowest possible score is. The higher the score means the more disagreement that a husband is justified in hitting the wife. The Cronbach’s alpha of the scale in this study was 89; reflecting a very good internal consistency.

Seven of the thirteen of CJVAWS’s items were adapted from Yick’s Justification of Abuse Scale. Yick’s original Justification Scale consists of eleven closed-ended questions measured in 6-point Likert scale. The original Cronbach’s alpha for this scale was .80 (Yick, 1997). The seven items adopted from Yick’s Scale were: 1) Wife was caught having sexual affair with another man; 2) Wife was found drunk; 3) Wife refused to have sex with her husband; 4) Wife is nagging most the time; 5) Husband was
stressful; 6) Wife tried to hurt their child (children); and 7) Wife flirted with someone else (Refer to items V.1-7 in Appendix 1). Informed by the literature and insight as an Indonesian’s researcher, the author added 6 items that are likely to be relevant in developing and Muslim countries’ contexts. These 6 items were: 1) the wife did not obey her husband, 2) the wife left the house for long hours without husband’s permission, 3) the wife spent too much money on herself, 4) the wife neglected taking care of the family and the house; 5) the husband found wife used drugs, and 6) the wife insulted her husband’s feeling (Refer to items V. 8-13 in Appendix 1).

**Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale (ARVAWS)**

The Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale (ARDVAWS) measures the participant’s attitudes about dealing with wife abuse. This attitude referred to individuals’ approval or disapproval of certain formal and non-formal active-resistant responses should be taken by the victims and society in dealing with wife abuse. The participants were informed that the term violence against wives in the scale referred to repeated physical violence by a husband against his wife (i.e. beating).

The scale consisted of 9 close-ended items. All items were measured using a seven-point Likert scale where 1 was “strongly agree”, 4 was “neutral”, and 7 was “strongly disagree”. Seven of the nine items of ARDVAWS were adopted from the Inventory Beliefs of Wife Beating (IBWB) developed by Saunders, Lynch, Grayson, and Linz (1987). Originally, the IBWB was composed of 32 items that are distributed across 5 sub-scales that measure attitudes related to the Justification of Wife Beating, Victims Blaming, Helping Victims, Punishing Perpetrators, and Perpetrators Taking
Responsibility. The IBWB has been used in many related studies and the internal consistency of this instrument has been reported to be very strong.

The author adopted several items from the Helping Victims and Punishing Perpetrators sub-scales. The original Helping Victims sub-scale consisted of 5 items: 1) Social agencies should do more to help battered women; 2) Women should be protected by law if their husbands beat them; 3) Wife-beating should be given a high priority as a social problem by government agencies; 4) If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, it would be best that I do nothing; 5) If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, I would call the police. The Punishing Perpetrator sub-scale was originally composed of 5 items: 1) If a wife is beaten by her husband, she should divorce him immediately; 2) Husbands who batter are responsible for the abuse because they intended to do it; 3) The best way to deal with wife beating is to arrest the husband; 4) A wife should move out the house if her husband beats her; and 5) How long should a man who has beaten his wife spend prison or jail?

Items adopted from the IBWB’s two sub-scales that were used in the Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale were: 1) Women should be protected by law if their husbands beat them; 2) Wife-beating should be given a high priority as a social problem by government agencies; 3) Although I knew that a wife was beaten by her husband, it’s better if I do not intervene; 4) When a wife beating occurred, the police should be called or informed; 5) A beaten wife should ask for a divorce from her husband; 6) An abusive husband should be arrested or put in jail; and 7) A wife should leave the house for safety if her husband beaten her. Two self-developed items added into the Scale were: 1) A wife should change her behavior to be a better wife so
that her husband stops beating her, and 2) A wife should ask for help from her family if her husband has beaten her (Refer to items VI. 1-9 in Appendix 1).

Scores were summated with 63 as highest possible score and 9 as lowest possible score. In data analysis, the scoring of 7 items were reversed so that a higher scores means more support for active-resistant approaches to deal with violence against wives and a lower score indicates lower support for active-resistant responses to violence against wives. The scoring of two items was not changed and these items were: 1) Although I knew that a wife was beaten by her husband, it’s better if I do not intervene and 2) A wife should change her behavior to be a better wife so that her husband stops beating her.

The Cronbach’s alpha of the scale in this study was 0.73, reflecting moderate internal consistency.

Upon the completion ARVAWS, an open-ended question was asked to assess each participant’s opinion of other strategies to deal with wife abuse. The question was “In your opinion, what are other strategies do you think can be taken to deal with husband abusive behavior against wife?” (Refer to item VI. 10 in Appendix 1). The answer obtained from this open ended question was expected to provide additional insight about Indonesians’ perceptions about the parties that could be involved in dealing with violence against wives and the nature of responses that can be taken to deal with violence against wives that might not be captured from the closed-ended questions from ARVAWS.
Attitudes Toward Women Scale

This study used the short-version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (ATWS) to assess individual’s attitudes toward gender roles. The ATWS short-version measures attitudes concerning the rights, roles, and obligations that woman should have in modern society. The Scale consists of 15 items that are measured using a four-point Likert scale where 0=”strongly agree”, 1=”mildly agree”, 2=”mildly disagree”, and 3=”strongly disagree”. The ATWS provides scores along a continuum range from endorsement of traditional sex roles to an egalitarian view of the roles of women and men (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). The ATWS is scored so that a high score reflects more feminist, egalitarian attitudes and a low score reflects more conservative, traditional gender attitudes (Helmreich, Spence, & Gibson, 1982).

The ATWS (15 items) is a shortened version of the original scale developed by Spence, Helmreich & Strapp (1972) which is comprised of 55 items. The 55-item version was shortened to 25 items (Spence, Helmreich & Strapp, 1973) and later was shortened again to 15 items (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Comparison of the psychometric properties between the three versions indicates that the 15 items version is reliable and stable (refer to items II.1-15 in Appendix 1). In one study, for example, the psychometric properties of ATW short version were obtained with 43 Anglo-American female college students, their mothers, and their grandmothers and resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha 0.85 (Daughtery & Dambrot, 1986). The 15-item version has been used and validated cross-culturally, including with Asian and Arab populations (Lee & Cheung, 1991; Haj-Yahia, 2002). For example, the Cronbach’s alpha reported from studies with Chinese
undergraduates from Hong Kong (Lee & Cheung, 1991) and Chinese American adults in California (Yick, 1997) were 0.80 and 0.70 respectively.

In this study, the anchor points on the 4-point Likert scale were modified to be comparable to other Likert scales utilized in this research. Because zero score was used, “agree strongly”=1, “agree mildly”=2, “disagree mildly”=3, and “strongly disagree”=4. In this scoring system, the possible scores are between 15 (the lowest) and 60 (the highest). In data analysis, the scoring of 4 items were reversed so that “agree strongly”=4, “agree mildly”=3, “disagree mildly”=2, and “disagree strongly”=1. These 4 items were “husband should help wife washing dishes and doing laundry” (item #2), “it is insulting to women to have the words “obey her husband” remain in the marriage vows (item #3), “a woman should have the same freedom as man to propose marriage (item #4 check), and “women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professional along with men” (item #6). The Cronbach’s alpha for the Scale in this study was 0.73.

Religiosity Scale

This study utilized Haj-Yahia’s Religiosity Scale to measure the participants’ level of religiosity (1998). Haj-Yahia’ Religiosity Scale has been used in several studies with population from various religious affiliations (Islam, Christian, and Druze) in Middle East countries. The scale consists of three items to measure religiosity of the participants (e.g. in general, to what extent do you consider yourself religious?). Responses to the items are based on a 6-point Likert-type scale in which 1= very much, 2= much, 3= moderate, 4=little, 5= very little, 6=never/not at all (Refer to items VII. 1-3 in Appendix 1). The possible scores range from 3 to 18. In original scoring system a low
score means a high level of religiosity and a high score means low level of religiosity (Haj-Yahia, 1998). However, in this study, the scoring was reversed so that high score equals to high level of religiosity whereas low score equals to low level of religiosity. This change was made in order to make it consistent with scoring system for other instruments used in this study. The Cronbach’s alpha in this study was 0.80, suggesting a good internal consistency.

**Awareness of Violence Against Wives Situations**

Participants were asked three closed-ended questions regarding whether or not they have known or witnessed incidents or situations where a husband was physically, emotionally, and or financially abusive toward his wife (e.g. In your life time, have you ever witnessed, been informed about, or known a wife was physically assaulted by her husband?). Probing about the sources of participants’ indirect experience or knowledge about violence against wives situations was applied when necessary but there was no probing related to participants direct experience of violence against wives (Refer to items VIII. 1-3 in Appendix 1).

**Perceived Causes of Violence Against Wives**

One open-ended question asked participants’ perceptions about the causes of physical abuse against a wife by her husband. The question is stated as: “In your opinion, what are the possible reasons that could cause a husband to hit his wife?” (Refer to item IV in Appendix 1).
Socio-Demographic Characteristics

The respondents were asked to provide information about their age, level of education, employment status, religion, ethnicity, marital status, length of marriage and type of employment. Sex and residence were identified by the interviewers during the interview, and therefore were not asked of the respondents (Refer to items I.1-9 in Appendix 1).

The questions were ordered in a way that considered participants’ comfort. Socio-demographic information was asked first to reduce respondents’ possible anxiety or uncomfortable feelings because the participants could easily answer the questions related to their personal information. Then, questions related to attitudes toward gender roles, definition of violence against wives, perceived causes of violence against wives, contextual justification of violence against wives, and responses to deal with violence against wives were administered. The level of religiosity and awareness about violence against wives were asked the latest because these questions might ask a little more sensitive information.

Table 3.1. below summarizes the measures used to assess independent and dependent variables in this study.
Table 3.1.

Summary of Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Measures/Items</th>
<th>Scale and Scoring</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definitions of violence</td>
<td>Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale (13 items)</td>
<td>Five-point Likert scale in which strongly agree=5, agree=4, neutral=3, disagree=2, and strongly disagree=1. Higher scores=higher agreement to define presented acts as violence against wives, lower scores= lower agreement to view presented acts as violence against wives.</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against wives</td>
<td>One open-ended question, “In your opinion, what kind of husband behavior toward wife you consider abusive?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability of violence</td>
<td>Contextual Justification of Wife Abuse Scale (13 items)</td>
<td>Five-point Likert scale in which strongly agree=1, agree=2, neutral=3, disagree=4, and strongly disagree=5. Higher scores=higher disapproval of violence against wives, lower scores=higher approval of violence against wives.</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against wives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived causes of violence</td>
<td>One open-ended question “In your opinion, what caused a husband to physically assault his wife?”</td>
<td>Seven-point Likert scale in which 7= strongly agree, 6=agree, 5=mildly agree, 4=neutral, 3=mildly disagree, 2=disagree, and 1=disagree strongly. Higher scores= greater support for active-resistant strategies, lower scores= lower support for active-resistant strategies to deal with wife abuse. The scoring of 2 items are reversed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>against wives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to violence</td>
<td>Appropriate Responses to Violence Against Wives Scale (9 items)</td>
<td>Seven-point Likert scale; 7= strongly agree, 6=agree, 5=mildly agree, 4=neutral, 3=mildly disagree, 2=disagree, and 1=disagree strongly. Higher scores= greater support for active-resistant strategies lower scores= lower support for active-resistant strategies to deal with wife abuse. The scoring of 2 items are reserved</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Scale/Question</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of violence against wives situation</td>
<td>- One open-ended question  &quot;In your life time, have you ever witnessed, been told about, or known a wife was a) physically assaulted by her husband?; b) verbally assaulted by her husband; c) financially neglected by her husband?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived other responses to deal with violence against wives</td>
<td>- One open-ended question  &quot;In your opinion what other strategies or responses should be taken to address violence against wives?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about gender roles</td>
<td>Attitudes Toward Women Scale-short version (15 items)</td>
<td>Four-point Likert scale, strongly agree=1, mildly agree=2, mildly disagree=3, strongly disagree=4. Higher scores=egalitarian gender attitudes, lower scores=conservative/traditional attitudes about gender roles. The scoring of 4 items are reversed.</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>Religiosity Scale (3 items)</td>
<td>Six-point Likert scale. Higher scores=higher level of religiosity, lower scores=lower level of religiosity.</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male, Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of residence</td>
<td>The area where respondent lives during the interview</td>
<td>Urban, Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>&quot;How old are you?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest education level</td>
<td>&quot;What is the highest education level you completed?&quot;</td>
<td>No schooling=0, Primary School=1 , Middle School=2 High School=3, Some College=4, College=5, Graduate=6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>&quot;What is your current marital status?&quot;</td>
<td>Currently married=1, divorced/separated=2, widow/widower=3, single/never married=4, other=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status</td>
<td>&quot;Are you currently working?&quot;</td>
<td>Currently working=1, Not working=2, Seeking for employment=3, Going to school=4, Other=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of employment</td>
<td>&quot;What is your job?&quot;</td>
<td>Professional job=1, Non-professional job=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>&quot;What is your ethnicity?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>&quot;What is your religion?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Design

This study was a cross-sectional survey. This entailed data collection at one point in time from a sample that is representative of the larger population of interest (Fortune & Reid, 1999). The study had both exploratory and explanatory purposes. The study was quantitative in nature although a few qualitative questions were also included in this study. The design that combined qualitative and quantitative questions has been used in several related studies (Yick, 1997; Klein et al., 1997; Worden & Carlson, 2005).

Sampling Frame and Sample

The target population was individuals aged 18 years or older. The sampling frame of the study was the listing of households located in 148 census blocks in Kota Bandung and Kabupaten Bandung, West Java Province. These census blocks were the same ones used by the West Java Province’s Bureau of Statistic for the National Social Economic Survey of 2009. The listing contained the location of the block s, the addresses of the households, the names of the heads of households, and the number of family members in each household. Above twenty percent of the census blocks were categorized by the Bureau as rural areas and all located in Kabupaten Bandung and the remaining 80% were regarded as urban areas that were located in both Kota Bandung and Kabupaten Bandung. This target sample size was 200 individuals: 100 males and 100 females.

This sample size in this study met the requirement of “good sample size” to detect important effect. Although there was no clear-cut answer for “good sample size” (Allison, 1999), Miller and Kunce (1973, cited in Bartlett, Kortlik, & Higgins, 2001) argued that in a study that applies multivariate analysis, the conventional rule is at least a
10:1 ratio of observations to independent variables. If the minimum ratio is less than 10:1 there is a risk for overfitting, “…making the results too specific to the samples, thus lacking generalizability” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1995, p. 105). This study applied the simplest rule of thumb that N (number of observation) ≥ 50 + 8m (where m is the number of independent variables) for the multiple regression test. This rule of thumb assumes “a medium size relationship between dependent variables and independent variables, alpha=.05 and beta=.20” (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2002, p. 117).

**Sampling Methods and Procedures**

Multistage random sampling and simple random sampling procedures were applied in this study. Multistage sampling involves drawing samples through different levels (Fortune & Reid, 1999). In this study, at the first stage, the researcher stratified all of the census blocks obtained from the West Java Bureau of Statistic into two categories: rural (n=30) and urban (n=118). All of the census blocks from the urban or rural areas were numbered sequentially. At the second stage, three census blocks from rural and seven blocks from urban areas were randomly selected using a random number table. One initially selected urban block was replaced with equivalent block because for unknown reason the head of selected sub-district where the selected block was located had delayed to release the permit for data collection for more than 3 weeks. Then, households were randomly selected from each block. Using the list of households supplied by the West Java Bureau of Statistics the researcher selected 20 households from each selected block.

At each stage, random number tables were utilized for simple random selection. For example, to sample 7 of 118 urban blocks, the author read the digits off in groups of
three. The author read across the line until finding the first 7 pairs that are equal to or less than 118. Meanwhile, the total number of households located in each selected block was used as the reference for selecting the household. For example, if the total households in a block were 89, the author read the digits off in groups of two. The author will read across the line until finding the first 20 pairs of two digits numbers that are equal or less than 89.

Information from the local leaders was utilized in the sampling process. When submitting the letter of approval for data collection obtained from the higher government offices to the head of neighborhood board at the block level, the author asked the head of each board to help identify the number of adults living in each selected households as well as their names whenever possible, ages, and gender because such information is not available from the Census list. The ages of adult members of the households were listed in order from the oldest to the youngest.

The researcher determined which gender to select from each household. The rule was to select female from the first selected household in each block, male individual from the second selected household. If some houses had more than one eligible participant is the same of the sampled gender, one individual was randomly selected based on two-digit numbers from the random number table (01 to 10). For example, if there were three eligible participants with the same gender: grandmother, wife, and daughter, they were listed based on their ages and were ordered numerically as 1, 2, and 3. If the researcher randomly selected number 03 from the table, it meant that the grandmother was selected.
as participant from the household. The procedure was repeated if the selected random number was greater than 03 or lower than 01.

The author anticipated some non-responses from the participants either because the participants refuse to participate or because the participants are inaccessible (e.g., moving out, not available at home). The rule was to replace participants who moved out, died or could not be approached for interviews after 3 attempts was made. In each of these three circumstances, the replacement should be a member of the households next to the replaced households with the same gender as the replaced individual. Of the 200 individuals who were initially selected, 25 were replaced with the next neighbors because they were identified as moved out, died, travelled for a long period of time or were not available after 3 visits. Later, of the 200 contacted respondents, another 15 could not participate in the study either because they had personal obstacles (i.e. sickness, not allowed by husband), had conflicting schedule, or simply refused. At the end, 185 individuals agreed to be interviewed and 181 completed the interview (male=91, females=90).

Data Collection and Procedures

Studies that explored sensitive topics such as violence against wives have tended to utilize either self-administered or telephone interviews (e.g.Yick, 1997; Carlson & Worden, 2005; Haj-Yahia, 2008). This study employed a face-to face interview using a structured questionnaire to collect data from the participants for several reasons. First, it was anticipated that the participants in this study would be individuals with various levels of literacy skills. Many Indonesians have limited ability to write and read and are
not familiar with filling in forms. Face-to-face interviews will suit participants with low or high literacy skills. Second, face-to-face interviews usually result in a much higher response rates and quality when compared to a mail survey. In the interview, the interviewers can interpret or reword the questions that are not understood by the respondents without distorting them, therefore minimizing confusion or misunderstanding. Third, an interview offers advantage of naturalness and spontaneity, which in turn, may increase the quality of responses. Many people tend to feel more comfortable expressing their ideas in speech than writing. Interviews may help people to answer more spontaneously, free of self-censorship (Fortune & Reid, 1999; Babbie, 2001; Grinnell & Unrau, 2005). Finally, in general, Indonesians prefer direct and oral interactions with people and appreciate face-to-face communication (Setiawan, 2009). Based on the author’s and her colleague’s experiences in several field research studies in Indonesia, self-administered surveys usually yield in very low response rates, even when they target participants with high socio-economic status.

Once individual within household were selected, one of the 4 interviewers went to the house to meet the individual, explain the purpose of the study, show the letter of permit for data collection, and ask for his or her intention to participate in the study. On the agreed upon interview date and time, the interviewer read the informed consent. At each section of interview, the interviewer gave a card that contained Likert scale responses that could be referred by the respondents to answer the questions, then explained how to use the card. If the interviewer learned that the respondents had difficulties understanding the scale, he or she would read every option of answer from
each question. At the end of the interview, the interview handed in a small amount of cash (US $1.50 or Rp. 15,000) to each interviewee.

All interviews were conducted between late morning until evening time during the work days, and late morning to late afternoon on weekends. The interview for each participant lasted between 35 and 50 minutes. Times for interview considered the period when the participants were most likely to be approached. For example, most of employed participants were visited after-work hours whereas unemployed participants, especially the housewives were visited between the late mornings to late afternoons. If the visited participant was not available for interview when they were first contacted by the interviewers in their house, the interviewer would set another time for the interview. Seventy percent of participants were interviewed at the first visit, 20% during the second visit, and 10% in the third visit. Ninety-four percent of interviews were carried out at the participant’s house and the remaining 6 percent at other place such as a public park, participant’s garden, and participant’s neighbor’s house.

Data were collected within an 8 weeks period in summer 2010 by two male and two female interviewers. The male interviewers interviewed male participants whereas female interviewers surveyed the female respondents. The Principal Investigator (PI) completed interviews with 80% of female participants. Prior to data collection, the researcher delivered University at Albany approved Training on Human Subject material to the research assistants in Indonesia. The material had been translated into Bahasa Indonesia and discussed over the telephone. Upon the completion of the training, certification forms signed both by the researcher and the research assistants were submitted to the University at Albany IRB to certify that training has been provided by
the researcher and the material of the training had been understood by the trainee. All research assistants also received four-hours training from the PI delivered over 2 days. The first day was to orient them with the purposes of the study, understand the questions and sampling process, and learn data collection procedures and human subject protection. The second day was to practice the interview, take notes, and identify data collection locations. All of the interviewers had extensive prior experiences with social research and data collection.

**Human Subject Protections**

Prior to initiating the study, permission was obtained from the University at Albany Human Subjects Research Institutional Review Board. At the onset of the interview, the interviewers read Informed Consent to each participant. The Informed Consent explained the intent of the study underscoring the fact that respondent’s participation in the study was voluntary. The protection of confidentiality and the potential risk and benefits of participating in the study were explained as well. The participants were asked to provide verbal consent if they agreed to take part in the study. The signed consent was waived because the signature was the only link to the participant’s identity.

Additional steps taken to protect the participants’ identity included: assigning all participants with an ID number that only appeared in the questionnaire and dataset, keeping all completed questionnaires temporarily in a locked cabinet at the office of Principal Investigator’s residence in Indonesia, and keeping the lists of IDs and electronic
database in a password protected computer in which only the researcher had the password and access to the data.

Finally, although the study exposed participants to limited risks because it only assessed the participant’s perceptions and attitudes toward intimate partner violence rather than the actual experience with intimate partner abuse, when needed, the interviewers provided participants with contact information of counseling services at women shelters and women crisis centers located in Kabupaten Bandung and Kota Bandung.

**Data Analysis**

This study gathered two types of data: quantitative data from closed-ended questionnaires and qualitative data from open-ended questions. Different types of data analysis were applied depending on the type of data.

**Qualitative Data**

The responses from the several open-ended question obtained from the study were analyzed using content analysis method. Content analysis is used for several purposes (Patton, 2005), one of them is to transform qualitative material into quantitative data (Krippendorf, 2004). Content analysis can be applied to virtually any form of communication. Essentially, it consists of coding and tabulating the appearance of certain form of content that are being communicated (Rubin & Babbie, 1993). In other words, it refers to a type of data analysis that records the repetition of different types or recorded communication, such as words and phrases (Dudley, 2010).
The process of content analysis started with reviewing the responses and then inputted them into a Word table. The first level of analysis included coding and counting the responses. All responses were reviewed for clarity and familiarity. Then, each response was numerically coded and the frequency of the responses with the same coding were counted and interpreted. For example, the description of the findings would include the analysis about the most frequent and rare responses. Some coding and categories were created and added if the theory-informed preexisting arrangements were not sufficient to accommodate the findings gathered from the field. In some cases, the researcher categorized the findings based on the pattern emerged from the field, not from the pre-existing category. The second level of analysis was to integrate the responses into categories so that the findings became more general and their patterns/themes could be identified and reported (Rubin & Babbie, 1993; Carlson & Worden, 2005; Dudley, 2010).

Quantitative Data

All data analysis processes, including coding, data entry, data modification, and analysis were carried out by the PI. Data modification was done for the purpose of examining the research hypotheses. Quantitative data analysis was conducted using version 18 of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). This study included descriptive, bivariate, and multiple regression statistical analysis.

Descriptive Statistics

A series of descriptive statistical analyses were performed to describe respondents’ socio-demographic characteristics, participants’ awareness about the existence of wife abuse, attitudes about gender roles, level of religiosity, perceptions
about definitions of wife abuse, attitudes about contextual justification of wife abuse, and attitudes toward responses to wife abuse. All categorical variables such as gender, status of employment, type of residence, level of education, marital status were summarized using frequencies and percentages whereas variables such as age is summarized using mean, median, range and standard deviation. The mean and standard deviation of responses on dependent variables: definition of wife abuse, justification of wife abuse, and responses to deal with wife abuse were presented as well.

Recoding was conducted to several variables. Education level was changed into years and thus regarded as continuous variable. The employment status was re-coded into 3 groups: employed in professional job, employed in non-professional job, and unemployed. Those who did not have a job, went to school, retired and who were looking for job were categorized as unemployed. Marital status, ethnicity and religion were re-coded into two groups: married/ever married and never married, Sundanese and non-Sundanese, and Islam and non-Islam respectively.

**Bivariate Statistical Analysis**

Several forms of bivariate statistical analysis were conducted to identify general association or correlation between a predictor variable and outcome variable. Also, the analysis was conducted prior to multiple regressions to determine inclusion of the selected predictor variables as well as maximally include important variables in the models. Bivariate analyses performed in this study including Pearson tests of correlations, independent t-tests, and ANOVA one way analysis.
In this study, statistical significance is set at a standard criterion (p < .05). Also, the magnitude of correlation coefficients is interpreted, based on the following descriptions, as suggested by Davis (1971):

.70 or higher indicates very strong association

.50-.69 indicates substantial association

.30-.49 indicates moderate association

.10-.29 indicates low association

.01-.09 indicates negligible association

*Independent t-tests.*

To assess associations between a categorical independent variable that consists of two levels (independent groups) and a normally distributed interval dependent variable (Agresti & Finlay, 2009). In this study, t-tests were performed to test whether variables gender, marital status, area of residence, ethnicity, and religion associated with the perceptions about definition of wife abuse, attitudes towards justification of abuse, and attitudes about responses to abuse. In other words, t-test is applied to examine whether there was a significant difference in participants’ perceptions and attitudes between Indonesian males and females, who were married/ever married and never married, those who lived in rural and urban areas, those who were Sundanese and non-Sundanese, and those who were Muslim and non-Muslim.
**Analysis of variance.**

One way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) is performed to test association of an independent variable that consists of more than two levels with an interval dependent variable. One way ANOVA is used because the direction of association of the tested variable has been stipulated. In ANOVA test, the F-ratio is the statistic used to test the hypothesis that the means are significantly different from one another (Field, 2005; Fox, 2000; Agresti & Finlay, 2009). In this study, ANOVA was performed to test whether employment status is associated with the perceptions about the definition of wife abuse, attitudes towards justification of abuse, and beliefs about responses to deal with abuse. In this study, employment status was divided into 3 groups: unemployed, work in non-professional job, and work in professional job.

**Pearson’s correlation coefficient.**

Pearson correlation coefficient (r) is a measure of the strength of the association between one interval independent variable with one normally distributed interval dependent variable (Agresti & Finlay, 2009). In this study, one-tailed Pearson’s correlation coefficient test was be conducted to test whether there was significant relationship between independent variables: education level, age, attitudes toward gender roles, and level of religiosity with participants’ perceptions or attitudes. Statistical significance of r is indicated by p-value. If the r is significant, it means that there is a statistically significant relationship between the two tested variables.
Multiple Regressions

In order to test the hypothesis, hierarchical multiple regressions are performed. Multiple regressions will enable the examination of the degree of effect a predictor variable has on a dependent variable when other predictor variables are held constant (Field, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). For example, a simple comparison of some outcomes (i.e. the justification of wife abuse) for males and females might be deceiving, if these two groups are different in some ways besides gender. In other words, if there are potential pre-existing differences between female and male (i.e. males are more likely to have non-egalitarian attitudes toward gender), then the correlation, based on gender differences would be inappropriate or inaccurate. Similarly, the relationship of outcome variable with urban residency found in bivariate statistical analysis may be caused by more educated respondents were disproportionately distributed in urban areas, therefore, it could be misleading to say that residence is a factor in affecting the predicted variable without taking into account the existing difference of education level among participants in rural and urban areas. The multiple regression analysis can take into account such differences but the bivariate analysis cannot.

Hierarchical multiple regression also enables the researcher to investigate how much $R^2$ (variability explained by the regression model) increases by adding other variables in each model (equation). It also informs how much whether the effect of one block of independent variable changes when another block of independent variable is added into the (Field, 2005; Tanachnick & Fidell, 2007).
Principle Component Analysis

Principle Component Analysis was performed for perceptions and attitudes toward violence against wives questionnaires applied in this study. Principal Component Analysis was conducted to identify factors to represent relationships among sets of interrelated variables. The findings were obtained by looking at the table that describes the number of factor needed to represent the data and a varimax rotation to visually identify items that are related.

Definitions of Violence Against Wives

The rotated factor matrix identified 3 different factors which cumulatively explained 56.7% of variance. The 3 different factors identified represented the conceptual definitions of physical and non-physical violence against wives. Most of actions that represented physical violence against wives clustered around one factor (factor 2). In contrast, behaviors which according to literatures were regarded as psychological, sexual and economic violence were clustered in other 2 factors. Most of controlling behavior such as: always want to know where the wife's whereabouts everyday, criticize wife in front of others, prohibit wife making decision, and control wealth and income and forced sex were together in one factor (factor 1). Interestingly, actions like cursing wife, refusing giving money, pulling hair, and prohibiting wife to socialize clustered in another factor.

The findings from Principal Factor Analysis suggested that the participants might define the presented behavior based on several criteria. Act of severe physical assault such as hitting or threatening to injure was viewed as more severe and had higher potential to cause injuries or harm toward the victims, therefore they were clustered
together (factor 2). On the other followed, other acts clustered in factor 3 and 1 might be viewed less-threatening because they generally involved non-physical violence. Nevertheless, as informed by the literature, this study continued categorizing the presented behaviors as 4 different groups: physical, psychological-verbal, economic, and sexual violence. Refer to Appendix 4 for a summary of the findings.

*Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives*

A varimax rotation identified 3 different factors which collectively explained 63% of variance. As anticipated, 5 items that centered around the issues of wife’s infidelity, disobedience, disrespect and provocative actions were clustered together. As indicated in the literature, generally respondents believe these five circumstances warrant the use of violence against wives. In this study, however, the Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives was regarded as to measure one construct. Other circumstances were justified Refer to Appendix 5 for a summary of findings.

*Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives*

A varimax rotation found 3 different factors which cumulatively explained 53% of variance. It appeared that these 3 factors clustered around 3 types of strategies to deal with violence against wives: 1) Formal and informal strategies by external parties (government, criminal justice, and significant others of the victims), 2) General strategy by victims (leaning the house to safe herself, divorcing husband), and 3) Violence against wives as private issue (do not intervene, wife change her behavior to be better wife. However, in this study, the strategies presented were regarded as to represent one
construct as measured in the Scale instead of 3 as found in the varimax rotation. Refer to Appendix 4 for a summary of the findings.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter details the findings of the first study to explore Indonesians’ perceptions about and attitudes toward violence against wives and investigate the impact of socio-economic and socio-cultural factors on their perceptions and attitudes. The chapter is divided into three major parts. The first part describes the description of predictor variables examined in this study that included socio-demographic profile, attitudes toward gender roles, and level of religiosity. The second part illustrates the dependent variables, qualitative items and descriptive statistic regarding participants’ knowledge or awareness of violence against wives’ situations, definitions of violence against wives, perceptions of causes of violence against wives, contextual justifications of violence against wives, and attitudes regarding responses to deal with violence against wives. The third part presents the result of the bivariate analysis and hypothesis test using hierarchical multiple regression models.

Descriptive Statistics

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

A total of 181 Indonesians living in two regions, Kota Bandung (Bandung City) and Kabupaten Bandung (Bandung Residency) in West Java Province, Indonesia, completed the interview. They were 18 years of age and over and lived in the census blocks of the 2009 Indonesian Social Economic Survey. The participants were originated from 7 urban census blocks and 3 rural census blocks spread across 10 sub-districts.
By design, gender distribution was relatively even: 50.3% male and 49.7% female. Also, the majority of the subjects (67%) resided in urban areas and the other 33% in rural areas. Three-fourths of the respondents were married, one-fifth were single, and the remaining were widows/widowers or divorcees.

In terms of education level, almost a-half of the Indonesians in this study had education below high school: 3% never attended any formal education, 26.5% completed elementary education (equivalents to 6 years of education), and 19.4% graduated from middle school (equivalents to 15 years of education). More than one-third (35.4%) reported they had attained a high school diploma (equivalents to 12 years of education). The remaining 16% obtained tertiary education: 7% obtained some college diploma (associate degree), 6.6% obtained undergraduate degree from university (equivalents to 17 years of) and 2.2% had master degree (equivalent to 20 years of education). The statistical tests found that urban participants had significantly higher education level than their rural counterparts and that male participants were significantly more educated than female respondents.

Almost 60% of the participants in this study indicated that they were working at the time of data collection. One-third of them (31%) were not working or were housewives and the rest were seeking jobs (5%), going to school (4%) or retired from work (1%). The respondents reported various types of job and for the purpose of this study the types of job were divided into two major categories: those with paid and full-time jobs and self-employed or working half-time. According to the Indonesian Bureau of Statistics (2010), the first group refers to those who work in paid jobs (mainly in formal economic sector) and work for at least 40 hours /week all year or employed paid-
employee. The second group refers to people who are self-employed or work less than 40 hours/week all year (mainly in less formal economic sector including small-scale trading, small scale services, home industry, manual or agricultural labors).

Using the paid/full time and the self-employed/half time job categories, more than half of the participants (58%) of the study were considered working in self-employed or half-time type of jobs such as small or petty trading, manual labor, farming labor, housework, and home industry. The other 42% of the respondents were categorized as working in paid and full time employment including health, finance, education, communication, manufacturing, industry, government/military and health sectors. Significantly more male subjects in this study were employed than the female participants. Among male respondents, more than 80% were employed, whereas only 40% of the female participants were working when the survey was conducted. This difference was due to the fact that most of female participants who were unemployed were housewives.

Table 4.1 below illustrates information of subjects’ gender, residence, marital status, and education level, employment status, and type of employment.
Participant ages ranged from 18 to 70 years, with a mean age of 36.55 and the median age of 35 years (SD=11.86). Three-fourths of the participants were currently married with the average length of marriage of 16.22 years. The information about average age and length of marriage was presented in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2

*Participants’ age and length of marriage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>36.55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of marriage (years)</td>
<td>16.29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 describes the composition based on religion and ethnicity. The subjects of the study were predominantly Moslem (94.5%) and the remaining were either Catholics (3.3%) or Protestants (2.2%). In terms of ethnicity, most of respondents (80%) reported they were Sundanese (a predominant ethnic group living in West Java region). Eleven percent reported they were the Javanese by ethnicity and the remaining identified 6 different ethnicities: Chinese, Batak, Ambon, Malay, Bugis, and Dayak. By categorizing ethnic groups into Sundanese and non-Sundanese, the percentage of each ethnic group was 80% and 20% respectively.

Table 4.3

*Participants’ religion and ethnicity (N=181)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The comparison of respondents’ socio-demographic characteristics in this study with the whole population of West Java Province based on the information obtained from the latest West Java Regional Socio-Economic Survey suggested that they were quite similar in some aspects including gender composition, age groups, and ethnicity (West Java Province’s Bureau of Statistics, 2008). However, in some aspects, the sample of this study differed than the West Java population in that the respondents of this study were relatively more educated, more likely to be in marital relations, and more likely to be employed compared to overall population of West Java Province. Data from the West Java Regional Socio-Economic Survey of 2007 found that only 22% of the West Java’ population aged 10 years or above had high education or above compared to 51% of the study’s sample. The West Java survey found that 59% of people aged 15 years or above were married compared to 75% of the study’s sample. In addition, although 60% of the study sample was employed, the Regional statistics suggested that slightly above 41% of West Java’ population aged 10 years or above was economically active (West Java Province Bureau of Statistics, 2008).

It is not easy to make compatible comparison between the population of West Java province and the sample of this study because the two studies surveyed different group of samples and used different criteria (i.e. age group), which therefore affected the results in socio-economic situations. For example, this study only surveyed participants who were at least 18 years whereas the West Java’s statistics referred to survey that included much younger population from 10 or 15 years and above. Thus, because this study sampled older population, it had higher chance of selecting individuals who were married or employed.
The difference might be also attributed to socio-economic characteristics of the study locations. Bandung City, the region where the sample was recruited is the capital of West Java Province, the biggest city in the province, the center of education and services as well as is highly urbanized. Bandung Regency, another region from which the sample was selected, is both an agriculture and industrial-based region that has grown more rapidly compared to the other regions in West Java Province. These two areas were among those with high education and employment rates in West Java province (West Java Province Bureau of Statistics, 2008).

**Attitude Toward Gender Roles**

Gender role attitudes were examined in this study with the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (ATWS) short-version. Table 4.4. below indicated the respondents’ degree of agreement or disagreement on women’s rights, roles, and obligations in the family and society based on ATWS. Three statements in which the participants responded with more egalitarian views about gender roles were: women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professionals along with men (M=2.70, SD=.937), swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man (M=2.70, SD=1.04), and it is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks (M=2.56, SD=.914). Forty-one percent strongly or mildly agreed that being involved in business and all professionals should be acceptable for both men and women. Fifty-seven and forty-nine percent respectively disagree strongly or mildly that swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman and view a woman running locomotive and man darn sock as ridiculous.
In contrast, the study found that there were three situations in which the subjects reported more conservative views about gender roles: virginity must be kept until marriage as a sign of a good woman (M= 1.14, SD= .480), the marriage vows that ask women to ‘obey’ her husband are insulting for a woman (M= 1.35, SD= .712), and a successful woman is one who worries more about her children and husband and less about pursuing her career (M=1.51, SD= .727). Ninety-six percent strongly or mildly agreed that women’s virginity must only be given up when married, 91% disagreed to some extent that women vowing the obedience to husband is insulting, and 88.4% supported the statement that paying more attention to family than career as an indicator of a successful woman.
### Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>MA (%)</th>
<th>DM (%)</th>
<th>DS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professional along with men*</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up the children</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under modern economic conditions, with women active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing laundry*</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman should be prohibited to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom as a man</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage*</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should worry less about their rights and more about being good wives and mothers</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should not be given equal opportunity with men for apprentices in various trades</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should focus more on their children and husband than have freedom to pursue career</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is insulting to women to have the “obey” clause still in the marriage service*</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>75.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginity must be preserved upon marriage as a sign of a good woman</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=reversed score; 1=SA (Strongly Agree), 2= MD (Mildly Agree), 3= MD (Mildly Disagree), 4=SD (Strongly Disagree)
The possible scores for the ATWS are 15 (the lowest) and 60 (the highest). In this study, the range was 21 to 44 and the mean was 28.12 (SD=5.08). Using the cut-off point at 37.5, the overall mean score of attitude toward gender role found among subjects in this study which was much lower than the cut-off point. In other words, on average, the participants in this study were only somewhat liberal in their attitudes toward gender roles.

As has been confirmed in many studies (Spence & Hahn, 1997; Yick, 2000), the women in this study indicated more liberal attitudes toward gender roles than their male counterparts, but not at a significant level. However, there was a significant difference with regards to location of residence. Overall, subjects in urban sites were significantly less conservative in the views about gender roles than their rural counterparts (p<.001).

**Level of Religiosity**

Level of religiosity was one of the predictors examined in this study using Hj-Yahia’ Religiosity Scale (2008). The possible scores of the level of religiosity were between 3 (the lowest) and 18 (the highest). In this study, the scores of religiosity reported by the participants ranged from 7 to 18 with the overall total mean score 13.89. In other words, in general, the participants reported a medium level of religiosity. There was a significant gender difference related to level of religiosity level. Female participants were significantly more religious than their male counterparts (p<.05). However, there was no significant difference in the religiosity level between rural and urban participants.
Indonesians’ Awareness of Violence Against Wives Situations

One purpose of this study is to assess the respondents’ knowledge, awareness or exposure to violence against wives situations. Participants were asked whether they directly or indirectly have ever known or were exposed to various forms of violence against wives cases. The question stated: “In your lifetime, have you ever witnessed, known or heard that a wife was a) physically abused; b) verbally abused; or c) financially neglected by her husband?” If the participants answered they knew or heard about the incident, further question was asked to probe how they knew or heard the incident. The findings related to participants’ knowledge, awareness or exposure to violence against wives situations were summarized in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5

Participants’ Awareness of Physical, Verbal, and Financial Violence Against Wives Situations (N=181)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The source of knowledge or information</th>
<th>Type of violence against wives (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever heard or knew</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass media (TV, magazines, etc)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer talk</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been told by victims</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever witnessed</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As illustrated in Table 4.5. above, the majority of respondents had knowledge or awareness about violence against wives situations. Ninety-two percents reported they ever heard or knew that a wife was physically abused by the husband, mainly from television, peer talk and newspaper. Fifteen percent had directly witnessed a husband
physically assaulted his wife and 6% had been told by the wives who were victimized. Although the survey did not ask about direct experience of physical assault, 6 female participants reported they were the victim of physical violence by the husband or former husband.

The findings regarding knowledge about or exposure to verbal abuse situation toward a wife were lower than for the physical violence. Eighty-five percent acknowledged that they ever heard or informed about verbal abuse against wives, mainly through television, followed by peer talk. Fifteen percent reported they had directly witnessed a wife being verbally abused by the husband and 6% said they were told about the situation by the victims. Although there was no question about direct experience to verbal assault, 8 female participants reported they were verbally abused by their current or former husband.

As indicated in Table 4.5., the findings regarding knowledge about or exposure to financial neglect towards wives were much lower than for the physical and verbal abuse against wives. Sixty-six percent reported they ever heard or knew about the situations, especially from the television or peer talk. Interestingly, compared to physical and verbal violence toward wives, slightly higher percentage of participant witnessed or been told by the victims about economic violence against wives situations: 18% and 7% respectively. Seven female respondents mentioned they ever been financially neglected by their current or ex husband.

In short, the majority of Indonesians in this study were aware of the existence of various forms of violence against wives. The largest percentage of respondents was
knowledgeable or aware about physical violence against wives, followed by verbal and
economic violence situations. The media, especially television was the major resource for
knowing or hearing about the cases of physical, verbal, and financial violence against
wives, followed by peer interaction. Smaller percentage reported they had directly
witnessed violence against wives, known the victims, or were themselves victimized.

**Indonesians’ Definition of Violence Against Wives**

The assessment of Indonesians’ definition about violence against wives was
conducted in two ways. Firstly, participants were asked an open-ended question about
their own definition of behavior constituting violence against wives. The question was
stated as “When you heard the phrase violence against wife, from your perspective and in
your own words, what kind of behaviors of husbands toward their wives would you
consider to be wife abuse?”. Secondly, respondents were asked to rate the extent of
agreement with statements that behaviors towards wives are violent acts. In this
assessment, the Definition of Abusive Behavior Against Wife Scale was used to assess
the subjects’ beliefs that certain physical, psychological, economic, and sexual violent
acts (13 items) towards a wife by the husband are considered violent behavior. The Scale
was used after the participants were asked the open-ended question. This order was taken
to give participants’ the opportunity to define the concept in their own words.

Ninety-six percent (n=174) respondents responded to the following open-ended
question: “*When you heard the term violence against wife, from your perspective and in
your own words, what kind of behaviors of husbands toward their wives would you
consider to be wife abuse?*”. Ninety percent of those who responded to the question
provided at least two different types of behavior and the remaining 10% supplied one
example of an act they considered as abusive. Quantitative and qualitative content analysis was applied to analyze the data. Quantitative content analysis was used to count the frequency and proportion of each answer and categorize the answers into various categories.

The summary of respondent’s responses about what they consider as abusive acts against wives by the husbands and their percentages was presented in table 4.6. Forms of husbands’ abusive behavior against wives reported can be categorized into physical violence, verbal and emotional abuse, sexual violence, and economic violence.
Table 4.6

*Frequency Distribution of Participants’ Categorization of Husband Violent Behavior Against Wives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency and percentage from total total respondents who answered (N=174)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Violence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitting with hands or object</td>
<td>115 (66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapping wife face with hands</td>
<td>49 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicking</td>
<td>31 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing hard objects</td>
<td>17 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burning with the cigarettes</td>
<td>16 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocking</td>
<td>16 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening to injure or kill</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdering</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulling hair</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grabbing</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological and Verbal Violence</strong></td>
<td>127 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursing or name calling</td>
<td>106 (61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belittling and being disrespectful</td>
<td>42 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling wife</td>
<td>33 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polygamy</td>
<td>30 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being emotionally unsupportive</td>
<td>30 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding wife to work at home without assistance)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Violence</strong></td>
<td>61 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not provide financial means</td>
<td>40 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibiting wife to pursue a career</td>
<td>17 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcing wife to obtain loans</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking away wife money</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual Violence</strong></td>
<td>56 (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withholding or unwilling to have sex with wife</td>
<td>35 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infidelity</td>
<td>21 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forced sexual intercourse that caused pain</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As indicated in Table 4.6., 96% of those who responded to the open-ended question defined violence against wives in physical-violence term. The three most-frequent stated physical aggression acts were hitting with hands (66%), slapping wife’s face with hands (28%) and kicking (18%). Approximately 40% of participants qualified their definitions by reference to the frequency or severity of the abusive physical behavior. The terms used to explain the frequency of acts included “often”, “repeatedly”, “many times”. They referred to the severity of physical assault by noting “the assaults that cause injuries on wife” and “the assaults that leave visible marks on wife’s body”.

Seventy-three percent of respondents mentioned behavior that can be categorized as emotional or verbal abuse against wives. The most typical acts referred to by the participants as verbal abuse were “cursing at wife” or “calling names” (66%). For example, calling wife using terms like “pig”, “stupid”, “useless”, “ugly”, “fat”, “slow”, “incompetent”, “bastard”, or “satan” (evil). Other forms of emotional abuse reported by the subjects included “blaming wife”, “belittling” or “humiliating wife” (24%), “screaming at the wife loudly” (20%), “prohibiting wife to meet her friends” (19%), “taking another wife despite wife’s objection” (17%), and “neglecting emotional support for wife” (17%). Approximately 10% of participants used the terms “often”, “constant” and “most of the time” to emphasize the frequency of husband’s acts they considered as abusive. Some of them also referred to the severity of emotional or verbal abuse behavior such as “verbal abuse in front of others” and “emotional pressures that caused wife a bit of stress”.

The least frequently reported types of violent behavior perceived by the respondents were economic and sexual violence. Of the total participants who answered
the open-ended question, 35% of them responded with forms of economic violence. This included “husband’s absence” or “negligence” to provide financial provision to wife (23%), “prohibiting wife to pursue a career or work outside the house” (10%), “forcing wife to get the loans from others” (5%) or “taking away wife’s money/income without consent” (5%). With regards to the absence or failure to provide wife and family with financial means, some respondents emphasized that the acts were done “on purpose” (i.e., refused to take care financial obligation to support wife or family) or “somewhat on purpose” (i.e., did not try hard enough to provide for financial support, provided family very little financial means but to depend on the wife). Some respondents also pointed to the duration of acts they considered as economic abuse as “3 months”, “6 months”, ‘1 year”, or “many years”.

Meanwhile, 32% of the total participants who answered the questions referred to forms of sexual violence against wives. This included “abandoning the wife sexually” (20%), “infidelity” (12%), and “forcing wife to have sex that caused pain” (4%). The study found that the majority of female participants referred to acts of sexual violence.

After the participants were asked to define violence against wives in their own words using an open-ended question, the Definition of Abusive Behavior Against Wife Scale (DABAWS) was administered to ask the extent to which they agree or disagree that various forms of husbands behaviors listed in the Scale as violence against wives using 5-point Likert scale. The findings are described in Table 4.7.
Table 4.7

Participants’ Definitions of Violence Against Wives (N=181)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you agree the following husband’s acts against wife as violent behavior?</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>DS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hitting wife</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulling wife’s hair</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening to injure wife with sharp objects</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursing or calling names to wife</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing hard objects to wife</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing give money for wife to purchase family’s basic needs</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibiting wife to socialize with her friends and family</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing wife</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticizing wife in front of others</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband control of family wealth and income</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibiting wife making any decisions</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcing wife to have sex with him</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demanding to know where one’s wife is at all times</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= SA (Strongly Disagree), 2= D (Disagree), 3=N (Neutral), 4=A (Agree), 5= SA (Strongly Agree)
Table 4.7 above suggests that overall, Indonesians in this study leaned toward agreeing that most acts in the scale are violence against wives, although this inclination was not very strong. Looking more closely, they tended to define violence behavior against wives as physical violence and were less likely to define it in non-physical abuse. For example, all respondents strongly agreed or agreed that pulling wife’s hair harshly is violent behavior. They also strongly agreed or agreed to view that hitting wife (99%) and threatening to injure wife with sharp objects (97%) is violent behavior against wives by the husbands.

In contrast, a smaller percentage of participants agreed that emotional/verbal abuse, controlling acts and forced intercourse are abusive behavior. For example, between 43% and 58% reported they strongly agreed or agreed that “demanding to know where one’s wife is at all times”, “forced sex”, and “prohibit wife to make any decision” as abusive behavior against wives. Of all non-physical violence listed, only cursing or calling names to wife was viewed as abusive behavior by most of participants (94%). Interestingly, more than one-third of the subjects remained uncertain whether to classify “criticizing wife in front of others” (33%), “prohibiting wife to make any decision” (36%) and “husband controls family wealth and income” (40%) as violent behavior against wives.

To sum up, the assessment of participants’ perceptions about definition of violence against wives using open-ended and closed-ended items revealed that most participants tended to view violence against wives as physical violence. The agreement to classify acts as violence against wives declined as they were presented with forms of
non-physical violence that included most forms of psychological, economic, and sexual violence. In other words, participants viewed physical assault as more abusive than non-physical violence. Findings from qualitative analysis found that the respondents also classified the abusive behavior based on the severity of acts that include some criteria such as frequency and length of violence against wives and possible injuries or harm the acts caused on victims (wives).

**Perceptions About the Causes of Violence Against Wives**

Indonesians in this study were presented with an open question that explored their perception about the possible causes of violence against wives. More specifically, they were asked “*In your opinion, what are the possible reasons that could cause a husband to hit his wife?*”. The categories of participants’ responses regarding the causes of violence against wives were presented in Table 4.8.
Table 4.8

Participants’ Perception about the Causes of Husband’ Physical Violence Against Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of causes</th>
<th>Frequency and percentage from total respondents who answered (N=174)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Wife factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wife negative characteristics</td>
<td>148 (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Wife disobedience</td>
<td>73 (42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Husband factor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aggressive personality</td>
<td>63 (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lack of faith/religiosity</td>
<td>17 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lack of personal confidence</td>
<td>17 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Excessive drinking or gambling</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lack of education</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Witnessing abuse in childhood</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Jealousy</td>
<td>5 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Couple/Family/Environmental Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Couple immaturity or weak marital commitment</td>
<td>45 (26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Miscommunication</td>
<td>44 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Continuous conflict</td>
<td>44 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family poverty</td>
<td>35 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pressure at husband’s work place</td>
<td>23 (13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Husband’s employment</td>
<td>16 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Crowded house</td>
<td>9 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Husband family/peer influence</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Values that placed husband as ruler</td>
<td>35 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Beliefs that wife is husband’s property</td>
<td>12 (7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As illustrated in Table 4.8, 94% of participants (n=174) responded to the following open-ended question: “In your opinion, what are the possible reasons that could cause a husband to hit his wife?”. Seventy percent of those who responded to the question provided at least 2 different reasons thought to cause a husband to hit his wife.

The largest percentage of respondents noted that causes of violence against wives related to situations or circumstances that could be categorized as individual-related factors. Most of those who viewed individual factors as the reasons that lead to the violence attributed to wife factors whereas a smaller proportion attributed to husband factors. Wives’ negative characteristics (85%) and disobedience (42%) were the most commonly reported causes of violence. Wives’ weaknesses reported in this study included wife “is unfaithful”, “talks too much”, “is too demanding although she knew the husband could not fulfill her demands”, “spends too much money that caused family to take loans”, “is rude or disrespectful toward husband”, “interacts with male acquaintance too freely, “has affair with other man”, “is dishonest”, “fails to fulfill her duties toward her husband, family and the household in general”. Disobedience toward husband mostly referred to “wife rebellion or wife is obstinate and stubborn” when she was asked or advised with good intentions to do something by her husband or “wife refuses to have sex with husband without valid reasons”.

Although stated less frequently than factors related to the wife, reasons related to husband’s personality, mental-illness, and social and spiritual situations were also believed by some participants as possible explanation for husband’ physical violence against his wife. These included husbands’ “aggressive personality” (36%), “low level of
religiosity” (10%), and “lack of confidence” (10%). Other husband-related reasons that were stated less frequently included husband’s “excessive drinking or gambling” (7%), “lack of education” (5%), “witnessed violence in childhood” (4%), and “excessive jealousy” (3%).

The second most frequently perceived possible cause was the couple, family or environmental-related situations. One-fourth of participants perceived the lack of marital adjustments between partners or the lack of appropriate knowledge and skills to build a good marriage (e.g. lacked of “open communication”, “mutual understanding”, and “couple’s maturity”) as possible reasons for the marital violence. Between one-fifth to one-fourth of them respectively thought that “family’s poverty” and “continuous disharmony that leads to arguments and anger” as the causes as well. Smaller percentage of participants also acknowledged various social-economic pressures related to “husband’s work”, “husband’s unemployment”, “crowded house” and “negative influence from husband’s natal family or friends” also could trigger the violence against wives.

In comparison to individual and couple/family factors, structural factors were the least noted reason for violence against wives. One-fifth believed that unequal power relations between husband and wife (i.e., beliefs that husband should be dominant or rule the households) explained the violence. Others thought that “beliefs that wife is her husband property” (7%) as another possible cause.

To sum up, respondents in this study reported that individual, couple/family, and structural factors are possible reasons of husband’s physical violence against his wife.
This means that many study’s subjects believed that violence against wives was not caused by single but various factors. Individual factors were believed by most of them whereas structural was the least likely to be noted. It appeared that the proportion of participants who believed in the wife’s behaviors as cause of violence substantially outnumbered those who believed in other factors. This finding strongly suggested the tendency of victim- blaming.

**Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives**

The participants were asked the extent to which they agreed or disagreed if hitting wife was justified in any of thirteen circumstances described in Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale. The summary of the findings about contextual acceptance of violence against wives was presented in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9

Participants’ Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives (N=181)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you agree that hitting wife is justified in the following situation?</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>DS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband is stressed</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife often nagging</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife spent too much money for herself</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife insulted husband’s feeling</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.001</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife rejected to having sex with husband</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife left house for long hours without husband’s permission</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.969</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife intended to hurt the child (children)</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife disobeyed husband</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife neglects to take care of the family and house</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.086</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife flirted with other men</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife takes drugs</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.157</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife is found drunk</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife has sexual affairs with other man</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.965</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1= SA (Strongly Agree), 2=A (Agree), 3=N (Neutral), 4=D (Disagree), 5=DS (Disagree Strongly)
As illustrated in Table 4.9., the Indonesians in this study tended to support that husband’s physical violence against a wife (i.e. hitting) was acceptable under several circumstances. Finding the wife having a sexual affair with another man (M=1.83) and the wife getting drunk (M=2.33) were the most justified circumstances for a husband to hit his wife. Seventy nine percent and 60% of respondents reported they strongly agreed or agreed that it was acceptable for a husband to hit his wife if she is sexually unfaithful and being drunk respectively. Furthermore, approximately one-third of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that hitting a wife was acceptable if the wife took drugs (M=3.03), flirted with another man (M=3.13), or neglected taking care of family and household (M=3.23).

Three circumstances in which respondents perceived it least acceptable for a husband to hit his wife were: husband was stressed (M=4.13), wife often nagging (M=3.88), and wife spent too much money for herself (M=3.72). Approximately 82%, 72%, and 61% of participants respectively indicated disagreement that a husband could hit his wife under such three situations. However, almost one-third of respondents remained ambivalent whether hitting a wife was warranted under three situations: if wife disobeyed the husband, flirted with other man, and neglected taking care of the family and house.

In short, some circumstances were viewed by the participants as acceptable for a husband to physically assault his wife. The most typical supported circumstances when the wives’ behaviors were perceived as deviating from prescribed expectations of faithful or good wife such as having extra marital affairs, getting drunk or taking drugs, or
neglecting to take care the family. Nevertheless, a quite large proportion of the participants were also still uncertain if a wife’s disobedience toward her husband, flirting with another man, and not taking care of the family/house was justifiable circumstances for a husband to hit the wife.

**Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives**

Respondents’ attitudes about dealing with violence against wives were assessed by asking them whether they agreed or disagreed if nine responses described in Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale were taken in dealing with wife beating. The results of assessing participant’s attitudes with the Scale are presented in Table 4.10 and the finding of exploring the participants’ perceptions using open-ended question was illustrated in Table 4.11.
Table 4.10

Participants’ Attitudes Toward Responses to Wife Abuse (N=181)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you agree with the following responses?</th>
<th>Mean (%)</th>
<th>SD (%)</th>
<th>SA (%)</th>
<th>A (%)</th>
<th>MA (%)</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
<th>DM (%)</th>
<th>D (%)</th>
<th>DS (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A beaten wife should obtain legal protection</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife beating should receive high attention or priority from government</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten wife should ask for help from her family</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A beaten wife should leave the house for her safety</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A beaten wife should ask for divorce</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.374</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although I knew a wife was beaten by her husband, I will not intervene*</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.745</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police should be contacted in wife abuse event</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.523</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator of wife beating should be arrested or jailed</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten wife should change her behavior to be better wife so the beating stop*</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reversed score; 1= DS (Disagree Strongly), 2= D (Disagree), 3=MD (Mildly Disagree), 4=N (Neutral), 5=AM (Agree Mildly), 6= A (Agree), 7= SA (Strongly Agree)
As suggested from Table 4.10., overall, Indonesians who participated in this study indicated the importance of protecting victims’ safety. For example, 97% and 94% respectively supported that legal protection should be provided for the victim of wife abuse (M=6.20) and that government needs to give high attention to violence against wives issue (M=6.08). Over three-fourths of the study’s subjects indicated their support for asking for help from the extended family (M=5.80) and leaving the house for safety (M=5.21) should be taken by the wife when dealing with violent circumstance. Over seventy percent of them supported the idea that asking for a divorce was a strategy that could be pursued by the abused wife.

Nevertheless, the findings also revealed that many respondents indicated lenient attitudes toward punishing the abusive husband. For example, one-fourth of the respondents strongly disagreed, disagreed, or mildly disagreed that the perpetrator of abuse should be arrested or jailed and another one-fourth remained ambivalence about whether abusive husband should be arrested for his acts (M=4.52). Furthermore, more than one-fifth, did not support to some degree calling the police when wife abuse occurred and one-fifth remained uncertain as to whether calling the police as appropriate response when the wife abuse occurred (M=4.65).

The results also suggested that the majority of respondents still preferred violence against wives be dealt with personally and not involve outsiders. For example, over three-fourths (81%) of the respondents agreed that the wife should change her behavior to be a better wife to stop the violence (M= 2.23, SD=1.239). Similarly, 61% strongly disagreed,
disagreed or mildly disagreed that they would intervene when they witnessed wife abuse or knew a wife was being abused by the husband (M=3.02).

In summary, the majority of Indonesians in this study revealed mixed attitudes about how to deal with violence against wives. A large percentage supported responses to protect the victims either through formal or informal provisions. However, many of them also disagreed or remained ambivalent about punishing the perpetrator through the criminal justice system. In addition, the majority of them still supported the idea that wife abuse should be dealt with by the couple and not involve interventions by the outsiders.

**Other Actions to Deal with Violence Against Wives**

After the Appropriate Actions to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale was administered, the participants were asked an open question that explored their perceptions of other responses they perceived as appropriate in dealing with violence against wives. Seventy-five percents (N=135) of participants responded to the following open-ended question:” Other than those listed in the previous scale, in your opinion, what other actions you think should be taken to deal with violence against wives?” One-fourth of the participants did not provide any answers. One-half of those who answered the question supplied at least two answers. The summary of the participant’s opinions about other forms of responses to deal with violence against wives was illustrated in Table 4.11. and table 4.12.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Actions</th>
<th>Frequency and percentage from total respondent who answered (N=135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions by victims</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Personal Strategy/Self-help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being patient, try to understand the husband’s situations, have empathy for him</td>
<td>40 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making a verbal or physical defense when feasible</td>
<td>20 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asking forgiveness from the husband for the sake of family unity, especially if wife was wrong</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not repeating behavior that could husband’s behave violently or angry</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to husband softly and nicely, asking him not to repeat the abuse</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screaming for help</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing prayers, asking God to heal husband and help solve the problem</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locking herself in a room for safety</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Asking or seeking help from informal resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting or asking help from the families to find solution</td>
<td>33 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting the incident to the neighborhood board and asking close neighbors to intervene</td>
<td>27 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching religious leader for guidance and advices</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Asking or seeking help from formal resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to shelter (safe house)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to National Commission on Violence Against Women</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions by victims and perpetrators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Asking or seeking help from informal resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple’s meeting with the religious leaders for guidance for reconciliation</td>
<td>14 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple’s asking for help (advice) from families</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Asking or seeking help from formal resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to psychiatrist or mental health counselor (especially for husband)</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to marriage counseling as a couple</td>
<td>3 (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.12

Participants’ Perceptions about Actions Taken by Government and Society in Dealing with Violence Against Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Actions</th>
<th>Frequency and percentage from total respondent who answered (N=135)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions by government and society</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Prevention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting public education about Anti Domestic Violence Law, the danger and consequences consequences of violence against wives</td>
<td>28 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening law enforcement through consistent implementation of punishment</td>
<td>20 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making legal process more friendly and accessible to the victims (i.e. reduce bribery practice that can discourage victims from reporting the incident to the police, making information about legal process procedure more accessible to the public)</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing community support against wife abuse (i.e. direct intervention to prevent the abuse and help the victims)</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Curative actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing medical and financial related assistance for the victims</td>
<td>10 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing mental health services for the victims and perpetrators</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, as illustrated in the two tables above, content analysis found that participant’s responses regarding other actions to deal with violence against wives could be classified into three groups: actions by the victims, by government or society in general and by the victims and perpetrator. This suggested that Indonesians in this study thought that various actors need to take actions to deal with violence against wives although there were differences with regards to degree of responsibilities assigned to each party.

Actions by abused wives (victims) were the most frequently stated. The majority of responses recommended that the abused wives should take self-help actions to deal with the abusive husband. Two major themes appeared for recommended self-help actions namely: wife should change her behavior, find a way to change her husband’s abusive character and self defense/self protection. Included in the first category of actions were that wives “be patient…understand husband have empathy” (30%), “ask for husband’s forgiveness if the violence was caused by wife’s mistakes” (10%), “avoid repeating acts that caused him to be mad” (10%), and “talk nicely and softly to calm him down and find the solution” (8%). Meanwhile, suggested self-defense or self-protection acts included “verbal or physical resistance” (15%), “screaming for help” (4%), or “locking herself in a room for safety” (2%).

In a smaller percentage, the respondents also recommended that the wives should find help from informal and formal resources. The three most cited informal resources from which the victims could find assistance to deal with physical assault by the husband
included the members of extended families; her own family members, in-laws and or
adult children (24%), neighborhood board and close neighbors (21%). However, very few
of them considered shelters for abused women as source of relief for the victims (3%).

The analysis also revealed the forms of help expected to be obtained from
extended families and neighbors. These included “direct intervention to stop the
violence”, “calm the husband down”, “protection for wife and her children”, “financial
and emotional support”, “warn the perpetrator”, and “discuss the matter to find the
solution”. Many participants also mentioned that the involvement of extended families or
neighbors in finding the solutions needed to be focused on “preserving the family” or
“reconcile the couple”.

Compared to the actions taken by victims, a smaller percentage of participants
suggested strategies or responses from government or society. The analysis found that the
government or society’s actions voiced by the participants can be classified into two main
strategies: preventive and curative. Preventive actions were reported by larger percentage
of subjects than curative actions. The preventive actions included public education on
violence against wives and anti-violence laws (20%), consistent law enforcement
especially related to the punishment of the perpetrators (15%), increased accessibility and
affordability of the legal process (8%), and improved public support against wife abuse
(8%). Curative actions that were proposed included medical, financial and mental health
services for the victims and perpetrators (9%).
The least frequently suggested action reported by Indonesians in this study was the actions by both victims and perpetrator. Both formal and informal parties were acknowledged as sources of assistance. Informal supports suggested including the extended family from both sides of the family and the religious leaders. They were expected to give advices about “good marriage”, “mutual understanding between couples”, and “the importance of forgiveness”. Mental health provider and marriage counselor were suggested by very few participants as another alternatives for help (6%).

In summary, participants suggested various forms of responses that could be taken, mainly by the victims, followed by government and general society to deal with violence against wives. The finding suggested that the majority of the participants perceived that the victims should be active in finding the solutions but the responsibility of the perpetrators in solving the problem was very rarely acknowledged. This indicated that many participants still believed that the burden or responsibility to find the solution remained with the victims. It also appeared that the participants focused more on informal mechanisms to deal with violence against wives such as involving extended family and neighborhood institutions in helping the victims and solving the problems. While outsider involvement was acknowledged to help the couple, it should be aimed to reconcile the couples, thus maintaining the unity of the family.
Bivariate Analysis

Bivariate analyses were conducted to explore general correlation/association between one predictor variable and one predicted variable prior to regression analysis. Initially, there were 11 predictor variables examined in this study but one variable, religion, was eliminated from bivariate analysis. This exclusion was because the vast majority (almost 95%) were Muslim and. As such, it was impossible to conduct a statistically meaningful and valid comparison of perception and attitudes about wife abuse among Indonesians from different religious groups.

Three different bivariate analyses (independent t-tests, one way ANOVA, or Pearson correlation test) were performed. Independent t-tests were applied to 6 categorical predictors, namely gender, location of residence, working status, marital status, and ethnicity. One-way ANOVA analysis was performed on type of employment because this variable consists of 3 groups: not working, working non-professional job, and working professional job. Pearson correlation analyses were conducted on 4 continuous variables: length of education, age, attitudes toward gender roles, and religiosity. The results of bivariate analyses using independent t-tests, Pearson correlation, and one-way ANOVA tests were summarized in Table 4.13, 4.14., and 4.15 respectively.
Table 4.13

**Bivariate Analysis: Associations of Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Factors with Definitions of Violence Against Wives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Definition of Violence Against Wives (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>47.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>53.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Working</td>
<td>50.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>51.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married/ever</td>
<td>54.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>50.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sundanese</td>
<td>54.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>49.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<.001,  ** p<.005,  * p<.05
Table 4.14

_Bivariate Analysis  Associations of Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Factors with Contextual Justification and Responses to Violence Against Wives_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Justification of VAW (Mean)</th>
<th>Responses Dealing with VAW (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43.90</td>
<td>48.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41.77</td>
<td>46.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>38.18</td>
<td>44.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>45.97 ***</td>
<td>49.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Working</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>46.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>44.09**</td>
<td>48.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>49.46***</td>
<td>52.49***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/ever married</td>
<td>41.24</td>
<td>46.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Sundanese</td>
<td>47.22**</td>
<td>50.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundanese</td>
<td>41.74</td>
<td>46.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p<.001, ** p<.005, * p<.05

The results of independent t-tests between 6 categorical predictor variables and 3 predicted variables presented in Table 4.13 and 4.14 above indicated that residence, marital status, and ethnicity were associated with definitions of violence against wives, contextual justification of violence against wives, and responses to deal with violence against wives. Being urban residents, single, and non-Sundanese significantly associated with broader definitions of violence against wives, higher disapproval of violence against wives, and greater support of active-resistant approach to deal with violence against wives. However, length of marriage, work status, and gender had more limited significant associations with the predicted variables.
As suggested from Table 4.15 below, Person correlation tests found that age, length of education, and attitudes toward gender role significantly associated with overall definition of violence against wives. Respondents whose who were younger, had higher education, and had less conservative attitudes toward gender roles reported significantly broader definitions of violence against wives than their counterparts. No significant correlation between level of religiosity and definitions of violence against wives.

Table 4.15

_Bivariate Analysis Correlations Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Factors with Definitions of Violence Against Wives_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Definition of VAW</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Score VAW</td>
<td>Physical VAW</td>
<td>Emotional &amp; verbal VAW</td>
<td>Economic VAW</td>
<td>Sexual VAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>-.228**</td>
<td>-.230**</td>
<td>-.244**</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of education (years)</td>
<td>.681**</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>.607**</td>
<td>.413**</td>
<td>.376**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes gender roles</td>
<td>.638**</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td>.521**</td>
<td>.399**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of religiosity</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

Table 4.16 indicates that age, length of education, and attitudes toward gender role significantly correlated with more favorable attitudes about violence against wives. The older the age, the lower the education, and the more conservative attitudes about gender roles, the more likely individuals reported higher contextual approval of violence against wives and lower support of an active-resistant approach to dealing with violence.
against wives. Nevertheless, level of religiosity did not have significant correlation with any dependent variables.

Table 4.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>Justification of VAW</th>
<th>Responses Dealing with VAW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td>-.207**</td>
<td>-.223**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of education (years)</td>
<td>.539**</td>
<td>.449**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes gender roles</td>
<td>.538**</td>
<td>.413**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of religiosity</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed)

The findings from one way ANOVA test between type of employment and perceptions and attitudes towards violence against wives were described in Tables 4.17 and 4.18 below. As indicated in the tables 4.17, in comparison to those who were not working or worked in non-professional jobs, participants who were working in professional reported significantly broader definition of violence against wives.
Table 4.17

*Associations of Type of Employment with Definitions of Violence Against Wives (one-way ANOVA tests)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Definition of Violence Against Wives (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Score VAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td>Not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working non-professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working professional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05

Table 4.18 suggests that type of employment associated with contextual justification and responses to violence against wives. Participants who worked in professional job indicated lower acceptance of violence against wives under any presented circumstance and greater support of active-resistant approach to deal with violence against wives than those who were unemployed or worked in non-professional employment.
Table 4.18

_Bivariate Analysis Associations of Type of Employment with Contextual Justification and Responses to Violence Against Wives (One way ANOVA tests)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Justification of VAW (Mean)</th>
<th>Responses Dealing with VAW (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not working</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>41.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working non-professional</td>
<td>41.22</td>
<td>41.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working professional</td>
<td>48.42*</td>
<td>45.40*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05

_Multivariate Regression: Tests of Hypothesis_

A more advanced statistic analysis technique was utilized to investigate the factors influence the Indonesians’ perceptions and attitudes toward violence against wives. In order to test the hypotheses, multiple regressions were performed, using the sequential entry method (hierarchical regression). Three sets of hierarchical regressions analysis were conducted separately to test 3 continuous outcomes variables: (a) perceptions about definition of violence against wives; (b) attitudes about contextual justification of violence against wives; and (c) attitudes about dealing with violence against wives.

_Testing for Violations of the Regression Assumptions_

Prior to regression analysis, the data was first inspected to determine if any of regressions analysis assumptions have been violated. In order to run accurate regression analysis, the data needs to be examined for violation of three assumptions: a) the assumption of normality; b) the assumption of linearity; c) the assumption of
homoscedasticity; and d) the absence of multicollinearity (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Berry & Feldman, 1985; Field, 2005).

The check of normality is an important step in most of multivariate analyses. The screening for normality can be done through different ways, including through the inspection of normal histogram of unstandardized residuals and expected normal probability plot and Q-Q plot of unstandardized residuals distribution. In this study, the test for histogram and expected normal probability plots and detrended normal probability plots looked normal, suggesting the absence of non-normality (Refer to figures 1-6).

The linearity of the relationship between dependent variable (outcome) and independent variables (predictors) represents the degree to which the change in the outcome variable is associated with the predictors. Simply, linearity indicates that the mean values of the outcome variable for each increment of the predictor(s) lie along a straight line (Field, 2000). A preferable method to detect non-linearity is through the examination of partial plots. The partial plots of produced from the analysis did not detect curvilinear relationships between predicted and outcome variables which indicated that non-linearity is not a problem (Refer to figures 7-9).

Homoscedasticity means constant variation across all values of independent variables and the presence of presence of unequal variances (heteroscedasticity) means the data encountered assumption violations. To test whether the observed variance of the error term is constant in, the standardized residual values are plotted against the standardized predicted values (Berry & Felman, 1985; Field, 2005). Ideally, residuals are
randomly scattered around 0 (the horizontal line), indicating a relatively even distribution. The presence of pattern to the residuals (i.e. residuals are not evenly scattered around the line) suggested the presence of heteroscedasticity (Field, 2005; Osborne & Waters, 2002). As indicated in figures 10-12, the assumptions of homoscedasticity was not violated in this study.

Finally, testing of multicollinearity is needed to assess the presence of high multicollinearity (high correlation between independent variables). When variables are multicollinear, they contain redundant information or probably measure the same thing (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Checking the matrix of bivariate correlations is the most frequent used test to detect multicollinearity. Any correlation that exceeds typical predefined cutoff value of .80 indicates the presence of high multicollinearity (Berry & Feldman, 1985). A more advanced collinearity screening can be done by looking at the tolerance and VIF scores. Cut-off scores for detecting multicollinearity varied. The informal rule is that tolerance values <.10 and VIF > 10 may indicate the presence of multicollinearity that merit further investigation. The more conservative one rules that tolerance values <.40 and VIF > 2.5 indicates the problem of multicollinearity (Fields, 2005; Allison, 1999). The screening of tolerance and VIF of the data in this study indicated high multicollinearity was not a problem. Refer to figure 13-15 for the analysis of multicollinearity.

_Hierarchical Regression Analyses_

In this study, each set of hierarchical regression analyses included 3 models (equations). Model 1 examined how much the demographic variables as a whole explain
the variance in each outcome variable, without knowing other control variables. Model 2 investigated how much socio-culture variables as a whole explain the variance in each outcome variable disregarded the demographic variables. In final model (model 3), socio-cultural related variables were added into the model 1 to examine whether the newly added variables are also significant for predicting the outcome variable controlling for other variables. Model 3 was the focus of data analysis in this study.

The regressions were performed to test the hypotheses. In the methodology chapter, the hypothesis for each independent and dependent variable was stated specifically, thus, resulted in many hypotheses. In this section, the number of hypotheses was shortened by categorizing all individual predictor variables into 2 groups: socio-demographic and socio-culture related variables and tested them with each 3 dependent variables namely definitions of violence against wives, contextual approval of violence against wives, and responses to deal with violence against wives.

1. Do socio-demographic and socio-cultural variables associated with how Indonesians’ define violence against wives?

Hypothesis 1: The definitions of violence against wives will be associated with socio-demographic and socio-culture related variables. Controlling for other predictors, Indonesians who are female, younger, more educated, work in professional employment, live in urban area, hold egalitarian gender beliefs, and less religious will reported broader definition of violence against women than their counterparts as measured in the Definitions of Violence Against Wives Scale.
As shown in table 4.19., the omnibus F-test in each model (equation) was significant, suggesting that the $R^2$ in each model differs from zero. Model 1 explained 53.5% of the variance in definition of violence against wives. Three variables in model 1: location of residence, age, and length of education were found to be significant predictors controlling for other socio-demographic variables. In model 2, three socio-cultural related variables namely ethnicity, attitudes toward gender roles, and level of religiosity were regressed. Model 2 alone explained 41.6% of variance in predicted variable. Only attitudes toward gender roles significantly associated with definitions of VAW when other variables in model 2 were held constant.

In model 3, both socio-demographic and socio-culture variables were put into the equation. Model 3 accounted for 58.7% of variance in the predicted variable, meaning that adding socio-cultural variables into model 1 increased the variance by 5.2%. The results indicated that definitions of violence against wives differed, based on socio-demographic and socio-culture related factors. Controlling for other predictors, age, location of residence, length of education, and attitudes toward gender roles significantly associated with perceptions about abusive behavior against wives. Model 3 showed that the standardized coefficients of the predictors ($\beta$) were: .306 (education), .172 (location of residence), -.180 (age), .331 (attitudes toward gender roles). The standardized coefficients indicated that the attitude about gender roles was the strongest variable in predicting the definitions about violence against wives.

The partial coefficients (Beta) for attitudes about gender roles, education, location of residence, and age were .33, .41, 1.87, and -.08 respectively. For a one-unit increase
(e.g. from mildly disagree to agree) in opinions about gender equality, we expect to see a 0.33-point increase in definitions of violence against wives after controlling for other variables. Similarly, for one-year increases in education, we can expect to see an average 0.41-point higher in definitions of violence against wives, when other variables remained the same. When the respondents were in urban sites, opinion about definitions of violence against wives was an average 1.87 point higher than that of rural participants controlling for other variables. For one-year increases in age, we would expect to see a 0.08 point lower in definitions of violence against wives when other variables are held constant.

To sum up, urban respondents and younger participants were more likely to view husband violent acts against wives presented to them as violence against wives. The higher the education of participants and the more strongly the participants believed upon egalitarian gender roles, the more likely they were to define a husband abusive acts targeted a wife as abusive behavior against wives. Attitude about gender role has the greatest effect in predicting definitions of violence against wives.
## Table 4.19

**Regression Definitions of Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables:**
*Parameter Estimates From a Hierarchical Analysis (N=181)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F=28.41 (0.000)</td>
<td>Beta (standardized β)</td>
<td>F=41.96 (0.000)</td>
<td>Beta (standardized β)</td>
<td>F=24.15 (0.000)</td>
<td>Beta (standardized β)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>46.64</td>
<td>-1.00 (-0.07)</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>-0.14 (-0.01)</td>
<td>41.96</td>
<td>-0.14 (-0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=Female)</td>
<td>.93 (.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12 (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (1=Urban)</td>
<td>2.25 (.21)***</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.87 (.17)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Not working)</td>
<td>-1.46 (-.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.88 (-.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Work Non-Professional)</td>
<td>-1.02 (-.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.76 (-.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.07 (-.16)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08 (-.18)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>.65 (.49)****</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41 (.31)****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (1=married/ever married)</td>
<td>-.87 (-.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.62 (-.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about gender roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>.64 (61)****</td>
<td>.33 (.32)****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>-.19 (-.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11 (-.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (1=Sundanese)</td>
<td>-1.00 (-.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.14 (-.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $R^2$</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td></td>
<td>.416</td>
<td></td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****p<.001, ***p<.005, **p<.010, *p<.050
While there were significant associations between some predictor variables and the overall definition of violence against women as presented in the table above, it might mask some important differences. Therefore, separate regressions were conducted to examine whether there were patterns of association between predictor variables and 4 different categories of violence against wives. The results of regressions with 4 groups of violence against wives; physical, psychological-verbal, economic, and sexual violence were presented in the Tables 4.20., 4.2.1, 4.22., 1and 4.23.

**Factors associated with definition of physical violence against wives**

As shown in table 4.20., the omnibus F-test in each model (equation) was significant, suggesting that the $R^2$ in each model differs from zero. Model 1 explained 30% of the variance in definition of physical violence against wives at the p-value <.001. Three variables: gender, education and age were significant predictors in the definition of physical violence against wives when other predictors in the model were controlled. Model 2 alone explained 28% variance in the predicted variable. Of the socio-culture related variables, only attitude toward gender role was the significant predictor when other variables in the model 2 were held constant.

Model 3 explained 33.3% of the variance in definition of physical violence against wife. Controlling for other predictors, age and attitudes about gender role significantly associated with the definition of physical VAW. The standardized coefficients were -.189 (age) and .199 (attitudes about gender roles). Attitude about gender role was the strongest predictor for definition of physical violence against wives in this model.
The partial coefficients for age and attitudes about gender roles were -.03 and .08 respectively. With one year increased in age, we would anticipate to see a .03 point decrease in definition of physical violence against wives. In addition, with one unit increased in attitudes toward gender roles (i.e. from mildly agree to strongly agree) we would expect to find a .08 point higher in the definitions of physical violence against wives. In other words, as the participants’ age increased, the less likely they defined the presented physical aggression by a husband to his wife as abusive behavior. In contrast, the more the participants believe in egalitarian gender roles, the more likely the individuals considered acts of physical aggressions against wives as abusive behavior.
**Table 4.20**

*Regression Definitions of Physical Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates From a Hierarchical Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>36.25</td>
<td>19.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=Female)</td>
<td>.82 (.20)*****</td>
<td>.56 (.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (1=Urban)</td>
<td>.50 (.12)</td>
<td>.39 (.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Not working)</td>
<td>-.64 (-.15)</td>
<td>-.39 (-.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Work Non-Professional)</td>
<td>-.40 (-.10)</td>
<td>-.22 (-.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.29 (-.17)*</td>
<td>-.03 (-.19)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>.16 (.32)*****</td>
<td>.10 (.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (1=Married/ever married)</td>
<td>-.36 (-.07)</td>
<td>-.30 (-.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about gender roles</td>
<td>.29 (.52)*****</td>
<td>.08 (.20)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>-.14 (-.09)</td>
<td>.04 (.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity(1=Sundanese)</td>
<td>-.08 (-.01)</td>
<td>-.37 (-.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Model R² | .300      | .279        | .329        |

***p<.001, **p<.010, *p<.050
Factors associated with definition of psychological and verbal violence against wives

As shown in table 4.21., the omnibus F-test in each model (equation) was significant, suggesting that the $R^2$ in each model differs from zero. Model 1 alone explained 44.6% of the variance in definition of psychological-verbal violence against wives. Controlling for other predictors in the model, residence, age and length of education significantly predicted definition of psychological-verbal violence against wives. Model 2 explained 22% variance in the predicted variable. Of the socio-culture related variables, only attitude toward gender role was the significant predictor when other variables in the model were held constant.

Model 3 explained 47% of the variance in definition of psychological-verbal violence against wives. Controlling for other variables, gender, age, education and attitudes toward gender role significantly associated with the definition of psychological-verbal violence. The standardized coefficients (beta) were: .36 (education), -.25 (age), .19 (residence), and .20 (attitudes toward gender roles). Education was the strongest predictor of the definitions of verbal-psychological definitions of violence against wives.

The partial coefficients (Beta) for education, residence, attitudes about gender, and age were: .26, 1.13, .11, and .06 respectively. When participants’ length of education increases by one-year, we could anticipate a .26-point higher in the definitions of psychological-verbal violence against wives assuming that other variables were the same. If participant live in urban area, we would expect a 1.13-point higher in the definitions of psychological-verbal violence against wives when other variables were held constant. Controlling for other variables, with one unit increased in attitudes toward gender roles
(i.e. from mildly agree to strongly agree) we would expect a .11-point increase in the definition. In contrast, as the age increases by one year, we can anticipate the decrease in the definition by .06 point when other variables were controlled.
Table 4.21.

*Regression Definitions of Verbal-Psychological Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates From a Hierarchical Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>16.03</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>15.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=Female)</td>
<td>.60 (.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (1=Urban)</td>
<td>1.24 (.21)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1= Not working)</td>
<td>-.52 (-.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Work Non-professional)</td>
<td>-.04 (-.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.06 (-.24)* **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34 (.47)****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (1=married/ever married)</td>
<td>.32 (.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about gender roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17 (.41)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04 (.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity(1=Sudanese)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.56 (-.110)</td>
<td>.32 (.05)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Model R²                                        | .446                          | .221                          | .470                          |

****p<.001, ***p<.005, **p<.010, *p<.050
Factors associated with definition of economic violence against wives

As shown in table 4.23., the omnibus F-test in each model (equation) was significant, suggesting that the $R^2$ in each model differs from zero. Model 1 explained 20.2% of the variance in definition of economic violence against wives. There were two socio-demographic variables: residence and length of education that associated significantly with definition of economic violence when other variables in the model were held the same. Model 2 accounted for 11.5% of variance in the predicted variable. Of the socio-culture predictors, only attitude toward gender role was significant controlling for other predictors.

Model 3 accounted for 23.2% of variance in the predicted variable. Only residence, and attitudes toward gender roles significantly influenced the participants’ likelihood to define “husband’s control over family income and wealth” and “husband’s refusal to provide financial means/money to the wife” as violence behavior against wives. The standardized coefficients ($\beta$) were: .202 (residence) and .248 (attitudes toward gender roles). Attitude about gender role was the strongest predictor of definition of economic violence against wives in this model.

The partial coefficients for residence and attitudes about gender role were .47 and .06 respectively. Controlling for other variables, when the participants lived in urban area, we can anticipate almost a-half point increase in the definition of economic violence against wives. Also, with one unit increased (i.e. agree to agree strongly) in attitude toward gender roles, we could expect to see an average .06-point higher in definition of economic violence against wives when other variables remained the same. Attitude toward gender roles was the strongest variable in economic violence against wives.
### Table 4.22.

**Regression Definitions of Economic Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates From a Hierarchical Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=Female)</td>
<td>-.12 (-.05)</td>
<td>-.26 (-.11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (1=Urban)</td>
<td>.52 (.22)*</td>
<td>.47 (.20)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Not working)</td>
<td>.01 (-.02)</td>
<td>-.09 (-.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Work non-professional)</td>
<td>-.04 (-.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01 (-.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.03 (-.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.01 (-.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>.08 (.29)***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.04 (.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (1=married/ever married)</td>
<td>.12 (.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14 (.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about gender roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06 (.29)***</td>
<td>.06 (.25)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>-.04 (-.07)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (1=Sudanese)</td>
<td>-.22 (-.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.12 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $R^2$</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.010, *p<.050**
Factors associated with definition of sexual violence against wives

As shown in table 4.23., the omnibus F-test in each model (equation) was significant, suggesting that the $R^2$ in each model differs from zero. Model 1 explained 22% of the variance in definition of sexual violence against wives. Gender, education, and marital status appeared to be significant factor predicted the definition of sexual violence against wives controlling for other predictors. Model 2 accounted for 16% of variance in the predicted variable. Of three socio-culture related variables, only attitudes toward gender roles significantly predicted the definition of sexual violence against wives when other variables were held constant.

Model 3 accounted for 25% of variance in the predicted variable. Three variables were significantly associated with definition of sexual violence (gender, marital status, and attitudes toward gender roles). The standardized coefficients were -.24 (gender), .21 (marital status), and .22 (attitudes about gender roles).

The partial coefficient for gender, marital status, and attitudes about gender roles were: -.51, .57, and .06 respectively. When the participant was female, we would expect an average a-half point lower in definition of sexual violence controlling for other variables. If the participants were married/ever married, we could expect an average .57-point lower in the definition when other variables remained the same. In contrast, one unit increased in the attitudes toward gender roles (e.g. from mildly disagree to agree), we would expect average .06 point higher in the definition of sexual violence holding other variables constant.
Table 4.23.  

**Regression Definition of Sexual Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates From a Hierarchical Analysis (N=181)**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Model 1 F=7.11 (.000)</th>
<th>Model 2 F=7.64 (.000)</th>
<th>Model 3 F=5.66 (.000)</th>
<th>Model R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=Female)</td>
<td>-.39 (-.18)*</td>
<td>-.51 (-.24)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (1=Urban)</td>
<td>.15 (.07)</td>
<td>.10 (.05)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Not working)</td>
<td>-.18 (-.08)</td>
<td>-.08 (-.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Work not professional)</td>
<td>-.05 (-.02)</td>
<td>.02 (.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01 (.08)</td>
<td>.01 (.06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>.06 (.22)**</td>
<td>.03 (.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (1=married/ever married)</td>
<td>-.61 (-.23)**</td>
<td>-.57 (-.21)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about gender roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09 (.40)**</td>
<td>.05 (.22)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>-.02 (-.03)</td>
<td>-.00 (00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity(1=Sudanese)</td>
<td>.01 (.03)</td>
<td>-.10 (-.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***p<.005, **p<.010, *p<.050
2. Do demographic and socio-culture factors associated with contextual justification of violence against wives?

Hypothesis 2: The contextual approval of violence against wives associated with socio-demographic and socio-culture related variables. Controlling for other variables, Indonesians who are female, younger, reside in urban area, more educated, work in professional employment, hold egalitarian gender beliefs, and less religious will report higher disagreement than their counterparts that violence against wives is justified under situations measured by Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives Scale.

As shown in Table 4.24, the omnibus F-test in each model (equation) was significant at .000. This means that $R^2$ in each model differs from zero. Model 1 explained 39% of the variance in contextual approval of violence against wives. Three variables in model 1: location of residence, education, and marital status were found to be significant predictors controlling for other variables. Model 2 explained 29.2% of variance in the predicted variable. Of the socio-culture variables, only attitude toward gender roles significantly associated with contextual acceptance of violence against wives when other predictors were held the same.

The results indicated that attitudes about contextual justification of violence against wives differed based on socio-demographic and socio-culture related variables. The ten variables combined in Model 3 accounted for 45% of the variance in this outcome variable. Three variables (residence, marital status, and attitude about gender roles) were found to be statistically significant predictors. The standardized coefficients were: .197 (residence), -.194 (marital status), and .353 (attitudes toward gender roles).
Attitude about gender roles was the strongest variable in predicting opinions about contextual approval of violence against wives in this model.

The partial coefficients of attitude about gender roles, residence, and marital status were .62, 3.56, and -4.33 respectively. For a one-unit change (e.g. mildly disagree to agree) in beliefs about gender equality, we expect to see a .62 increase in contextual approval of violence against wives on a 5-point scale, after controlling for other variables. Also, holding other variables the same, when the respondent lives in urban we would expect average 3.56 point higher in the scores of contextual acceptance of violence against wives. In contrast, when the participant is married or ever married, we can expect to see an average 4.33 point lower in the contextual justification of violence against wives when other variables were held constant.

In other words, the more strongly the participants believed in gender equality, the less likely they were to express contextual approval of wife violence. Those who lived in urban area were less likely to agree that husband was justified to hit the wife in any circumstance. Single or never married respondents were less likely to express contextual approval of violence against wives by the husband.
### Table 4.24

Regression Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates From a Hierarchical Analysis (N=181)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>41.79</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>28.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=Female)</td>
<td>- .31 (-.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.91 (-.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (=Urban)</td>
<td>4.18 (.23)***</td>
<td>3.56 (.20)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Not working)</td>
<td>- 2.71 (-.15)</td>
<td>- 1.67 (-.09)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Work Not professional)</td>
<td>- .44 (-.02)</td>
<td>.13 (.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>- .08 (-.11)</td>
<td>-.10 (-.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>.66 (.30)***</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23 (.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status(1=married/ever married)</td>
<td>-4.60 (-.21)**</td>
<td></td>
<td>- 4.33 (-.19)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about gender roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73 (.43)****</td>
<td>.62 (.35)****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92 (.52)</td>
<td>.08 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity(1=Sudanese)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.19 (-.04)</td>
<td>.41 (.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model $R^2$</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.451</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

****p<.001, ***p<.005, **p<.010, *p<.050
3) Do demographic and socio-culture factors associated with attitudes that support active-
resistance responses in dealing with violence against wives?

Hypothesis 3:

The attitudes toward responses in dealing with violence against wives associated
with socio-demographic and socio-culture related variables. Indonesians who are female,
younger, reside in urban area, more educated, work in professional employment, hold
egalitarian gender beliefs, and less religious will report higher support than their
counterparts toward active-resistance approach to deal with violence against wives
measured in Appropriate Responses to Deal with Violence Against Wives Scale.

As shown in Table 4.25. the omnibus F-test in each model (equation) was
significant at.000. This means that $R^2$ in each model differs from zero. Model 1
explained 31% of the variance in dealing with violence against wives. Three variables in
model 1: location of residence, length of education, and marital status were found to be
significant predictors when other variables were controlled. Model 2 accounted for 17.4%
of variance in the predicted variable. In this model, attitude toward gender roles was the
only variable significantly associated with predicted variable when other predictors were
held constant.

The results indicated that attitudes about responses to deal with violence against
wives differed based on socio-demographic and socio-culture related variables. The ten
variables combined in Model 3 accounted for 34 % of the variance in this outcome
variable. Five variables (gender, residence, age, marital status, and attitude about gender
roles) were found to be statistically significant predictors. The standardized coefficients
of the significant predictors were: 
-.15 (gender), .21 (residence), -.16 (age), -.18 (marital status), and .26 (attitude toward gender roles). Attitude about gender roles was the strongest variable in predicting opinions about responses to violence against wives in this model.

The partial coefficients of attitudes about gender role, residence, gender, age and marital status were .31, 2.8, -1.84, -.08, and -2.70. For a one-unit change (e.g. mildly disagree to agree) in beliefs about gender equality, we expect to see a .31 point higher in response to violence against wives, after controlling for other variables. Also, when the respondent lives in urban sites we would expect average 2.8 point higher in the scores of responses to violence against wives when other variables are controlled. In contrast, when the participant is female, the respondent’ age increase by one year, and the respondent is married or ever married, we would expect to see an average 1.84, .08, and 2.70-point lower in the response to wife abuse when other variables were held constant.

To sum up, the more strongly the participants believed in gender equality, the more likely they were to express support toward active-resistant responses to deal with violence against wives. Participants lived in urban areas were more likely to agree that active-resistant approach was taken to deal with wife abuse. In contrast, when the participants were female, older, or married/ever they were less likely to support active-resistant responses in dealing with wife abuse. Attitude toward gender role was the strongest predictor, suggesting that greater support toward active-resistant responses to wife abuse was best predicted by more egalitarian attitudes toward gender roles.
Table 4.25.

Regression Responses to Wife Abuse on Socio-Demographic and Socio-Cultural Related Variables: Parameter Estimates From a Hierarchical Analysis Hierarchical Regression (N=181)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>43.41</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>36.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (1=Female)</td>
<td>-1.04 (-0.09)</td>
<td>-1.84 (-0.16)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (=Urban)</td>
<td>2.80 (.23)**</td>
<td>2.84 (.21)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Not working)</td>
<td>-1.14 (-0.09)</td>
<td>-.61 (-0.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (1=Not work professional)</td>
<td>.12 (.01)</td>
<td>.42 (.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.07 (-0.14)</td>
<td>-.08 (-0.16)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>.32 (.22)*</td>
<td>.11 (.07)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (1=married/ever married)</td>
<td>-2.84 (-.19)*</td>
<td>-2.70 (-.18)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes about gender roles</td>
<td>- .47 (-.03)***</td>
<td>.31 (.26)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.47 (.40)</td>
<td>.04 (.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (1=Sudanese)</td>
<td>-.16 (-.05)</td>
<td>.14 (.01)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model $R^2$  
0.306       0.174       0.340

****p<.001, ***p<.005, **p<.010, *p<.050
Summary

One-hundred and eighty one of 200 selected male and female Indonesian adults completed the survey, suggesting above 90% response rate. By design, over three-fourth of participants lived in urban area. Participants were mainly working and married. The sample in this study was representative of Bandung City and Bandung Regency.

The study found that the majority of Indonesians were aware or had knowledge about violence against wives situations. Mass media, especially television was the source where most Indonesians learned about or were informed about violence against wives. Most of Indonesians tended to define violence against wives as physical violence and blaming the victims to lead husband’s violence against wife. A large portion of Indonesians in this study supported a husband hitting his wife if the wife deviated from her traditional prescribed roles of good/caring mother and or loyal/responsible wife.

The majority of Indonesians also showed ambivalent attitudes regarding the importance of active-resistant approach to deal with wife abuse. In one hand the participants believed that the victims should be protected or given option to leave abusive relation but on the other hand they expressed lenient attitude about punishing attitudes and supported to regard the problem dealt privately. Solving the problem of violence against wives through informal mechanism was preferred by the majority of Indonesians in this study. Wife is the main party who should be mainly responsible to find out the solutions for the problem.

Table 4.26. summarizes the results of the hypothesis testing. In conclusion, the hypotheses were partly supported. The definitions of violence against wives, contextual approval of violence against wives, and attitudes toward responses to deal with violence
against wives could be predicted by some socio-demographic and socio-culture variables. Broader definitions of violence against wives associated with those who had higher education, lived in urban area, were younger, and held more egalitarian gender role attitudes.

Looking more closely being at a younger age and having less conservative gender role beliefs associated with a greater likelihood to classify the acts as physical violence against wives. The likelihood of considering the acts as psychological-verbal violence against wives increased among those who lived in urban area, were younger, had higher education, and held more egalitarian gender role attitudes. The definition of economic violence against wives was broader among urban residents and those with less conservative gender role attitudes. Being male, single, and holding pro-feminist attitudes toward gender role associated with greater likelihood to classify the forced sex as sexual violence against wives.

The contextual approval of violence against wives was significantly associated by the location of residence, marital status, and attitudes toward gender roles. Those who lived in an urban area, were single, and had more egalitarian attitudes were more likely to disapprove that violence against wives was justified in more circumstances than those who reside in rural areas. Greater support for active-resistant strategies to deal with violence against wives was significantly predicted by being male, living in the urban site, being younger, being single, and holding less conservative gender attitudes.
Table 4.26. *Summary of Significant Predictors of Attitudes toward Violence Against Wives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall definitions of violence against wives</th>
<th>Broader definition of violence against wife if:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in urban areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More educated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical violence against wives</th>
<th>More likely to define the acts as violence against wives if:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological-verbal violence against wives</th>
<th>More likely to define the acts as violence against wives if:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living in urban areas</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>More educated**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More educated</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic violence against wives</th>
<th>More likely to define the acts as violence against wives if:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living in urban areas</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual violence against wives</th>
<th>More likely to define the acts as violence against wives if:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male**</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual approval of violence against wives</th>
<th>More likely to disapprove the use of violence against wives if:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living in urban</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitudes toward dealing with violence against wives</th>
<th>More likely to support active-resistant strategies to deal with wife abuse if:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Holding egalitarian attitudes toward gender role**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**indicates the strongest predictor
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This chapter discusses the major findings of the study within the socio-demographic and feminist theoretical framework and Indonesians socio-cultural contexts. Following the discussion, the limitations and implications of the study for policy, social work practice and future research are described. The conclusion of the study is illustrated at the end of the chapter.

Discussion

Indonesians’ Awareness of Violence Against Wives

Indonesians in this study acknowledged that they were aware of physical, verbal and economic violence against wives. The majority gained such information or knowledge indirectly through mass media or other forms of social interactions and some others learned directly from the abused wives or witnessed violence against wives. Indonesians who indicated they knew about or were aware of form of husband’ physical violence against wives were higher than verbal or financial violence.

Television was the major source from which the participants access to information about violence against wives. This may due to a growing attention among Indonesian mass media toward such issues. Traditionally, the issue of violence against wives was rarely talked about or discussed in public media but since the late 1990s, there has been increased publication about the issue presented by Indonesian academics and women activist through Indonesian television channels (Indonesian National Committee on Women, 2008). Furthermore, based on the researcher’s observation, there has been a number of violence against wives cases, including cases experienced by Indonesian’s
public figures or celebrities discussed on mass media. The number of entertainment segments, such as television drama series showing the features of violence against wives also has increased over the past decade.

The mass media has played an important role to increase the awareness of the society about violence against wives through public education. However, the nature of content and the quality of published information could be a concern. Antonio and Costa (2004) maintain that mass media can bring negative impacts upon public attitudes by exposing viewers with non-objective or biased materials. For example, depersonalized representations of female victims of violent crime decrease empathy toward them and engender blaming the victim. Citing several studies, Flood and Pease (2009) suggested that the exposure to media violence had great impacts upon aggressive attitudes and behavior as well as the perpetuation of violence against women, especially among young individuals and male.

This study did not explore whether the knowledge or information about the violence obtained by the participants in this study came from educational or entertainment-based broadcast/publication. However, there is a valid reason to be concerned about the latter because of growing popularity of television among Indonesians. In 2007, 68% of adults in West Java regularly watched entertainment programs from television (i.e. mini drama, infotainment) whereas only 8% and 20% regularly read newspaper and listened to news on television respectively (West Java Province Bureau of Statistics, 2008). Indonesian scholars have criticized growing violence features broadcasted or published in mass media and the lack of attention given by the mass media to discourage gender stereotypes and viewers’ critical thinking. For
example, many dramas portrayed abused women as bad people who deserve the punishment or passive, weak, and dependent women who patiently handled the miseries and always forgive the abusers.

Indonesians Definition of Violence Against Wives

The qualitative analysis found that Indonesians’ definitions of violent behavior against wives were similar to those that have been discussed in Western literatures. The participants defined various acts of physical, psychological, verbal, economic, and sexual violence against wives as forms of abusive behavior. Most of them reported forms of physical violence and less referred to the non-physical violence. This pattern was also confirmed in the quantitative analysis. For example, only 56% and 44% agreed to define “husband’s controls of family wealth and income” and “always wants to know where one’s wife all the times” respectively as forms of economic and psychological control over wife. In contrast, there was an overwhelming agreement to consider severe violence such as pulling wife’s hair, hitting wife, or threatening to harm wife with sharp objects as violence against wives. The qualitative analysis also revealed that some respondents also defined abusive behavior by referring to severity, frequency, and length of violence against wives.

The tendency to associate severe physical violence (i.e. hitting, chocking, murdering) and degrading verbal violence (i.e. cursing or calling names to wife) as abusive behavior against wives was not a surprise because this similar pattern was also found in many studies across cultures (Sigler, 1989; Yick, 2000; Tang et al., 2002; Carlson and Worden, 2005). The high tendency to disregard non-physical abusive acts,
especially psychological abuse and controlling behaviors also have been reported in previous studies with non-Western communities (Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997; Yick, 2000). Sigler (1989) and Tang et al. (2002) suggested that factors that influenced participant’s perceptions to classify a behavior as abusive included the severity of act, the type of criticism given to the wife, an intent to harm, a frequently done act, and an act that is done in front of others. They highlighted that since non-physical violence involved less direct or immediate physical injuries, study participants tended to view those acts as less-violent behavior.

Among all non-physical violence acts, the qualitative analysis found that forms of sexual violence against wives became the rarest act reported by the participants as violence against wives. Sexual violence against wives (forced wife to have sex with him) was also among the Scale’s listed acts that was least defined as violence against wives by most respondents. The quantitative analysis found only slightly over than one-half of Indonesians in the study agreed that forcing wife to have sex with her husband as violence behavior against wives. Two possibilities might explain this finding. First, the participants might not feel comfortable referring to sexual act in the open-ended question. Second, many participants probably did not consider forced sex in marriage as violence because they perceived that a husband’s access to sex does not need his wife’s consent.

These findings raise the importance to expand Indonesians perceptions about what constituting violence against wives. If an act was considered abusive only when it implicated injuries or harms, non-severe violent behavior will not be acknowledged as violence. Similarly, if violent acts were associated with frequency or duration of acts, it is likely that less frequent or short-term abusive behaviors might not be considered abusive.
In fact, however, many studies found that non-physical violence were as harmful as the physical ones (O’Leary & Daniel, 1999; Sackett & Saunders, 1999). Furthermore, discriminating severe or frequent violence from less severe or less frequent violence may lead to the tolerance of some forms of violence (Hooks, 2007).

Although this study found similar patterns or finding in the definition of violence against wives as revealed in other studies across cultures, the qualitative responses in this study also indicated that some acts considered as abusive were unique to Indonesian cultural context. For instance, responses like “poligamy “, cursing wife using words like “pig” or “satan”, “neglecting financial provision to the wife” or “refusing to have sex with his wife” might be more understandable in Indonesian socio-cultural context that is influenced by the predominant Islamic teaching and practice.

For example, in Islam, a man can have up to four wives and polygamy is legal in Indonesian legal system. Although the Family Law allows polygamy under specific circumstances (i.e. wife is not capable to perform her duties due to serious illness), men sometimes abuse this right. The existing data suggested that many Indonesian women who were in bigamist marital relations also suffered violence against wives (Rifka Annissa, 2008; Kalyana Mitra, 2008; Nurmila, 2009). Similarly, neglecting the provision of financial means to the wife and withholding sexual intimacy to the wife are considered the violation of wife’s right. In Islam, the husband is responsible to provide financially for his wife and children and forsaking the wife in their bed is considered as punishment that should be done only if the husband suspects that her wife has deviated from religious norms. Furthermore, calling someone with terms like “pig” or “satan” is considered very rude due to their negative associations with religious teaching.
The findings about culturally-specific acts as violence against wives found in this study implies the importance of accommodating those specific acts in the future measurement to help measuring the extent of violence against wives more accurately. The existing standardized tools to measure the extent of violence against wives are predominantly based on Western conceptualization of violence against wives, thus, they are not all appropriate to be used in other cultural or societal contexts.

With regards to the predictor of definition of abusive behavior against wives, initially it was hypothesized that socio-demographic variables namely gender, age, residence, level of education, type of employment and socio-culture variables: attitudes toward gender roles and religiosity will be associated with Indonesians’ definition about violent behavior against wives. Most of these hypotheses were supported in bivariate statistical analysis but further analysis through hierarchical multi regression analysis showed that the hypothesis was only partly supported.

The multivariate regression analysis revealed that controlling for other variables, residence, age, length of education, and attitudes toward gender roles significantly associated with the overall definition of violence against wives. However, when the analysis was specified at 4 sub-scales levels, the significance of some variables in predicting the definitions of different forms of violence against wives categories changed.

Attitude toward gender role was among the strongest predictors of violence against wives that consistently and significantly associated with the definitions of violence against wives. The study also showed that the more egalitarian gender attitudes the participants held, the more likely they were to define the acts of physical violence, economic violence, and sexual violence toward the wife as violence against wives. This
is consistent with various studies previously conducted in different countries and with
different groups of samples (DeGregoria, 1987; Yick, 2000; Cheung, Chen & Sun, 2002;
Tam and Tang, 2005).

For example, Yick’s (2000) study among Chinese American in California, United
States showed that participants with less conservative gender role beliefs were
significantly more likely than their conservative counterparts to agree to consider that
various acts presented as physical, psychological and sexual violence against
wives/partners were violent behavior. Similarly, DeGregoria (1987) has noted that
gender role belief has a profound impact on perceptions of non-physical abuse. Using the
ATWS, DeGregorio found that more traditional women rated vignettes that depicted
marital inequity and power imbalance as acceptable and socially less active compared to
non-traditional women. DeGregoria argued that non-traditional individuals experience
greater conflict in relation to their roles in society. Consequently, their own experiences
may sensitize them to marital struggles and furthermore abuse.

Therefore, it is also possible that Indonesians who adhere to traditional gender
role beliefs are more likely to subscribe to notions that structures of families as well as
social structures should be based on gender division. Traditionally, in Indonesia, men are
given more power to assume leadership and control in the family and society and women
as to compliment men and be submissive (Sulliva, 1991; Idrus & Bennet, 2003). Feminist
theorists argued that these power differential sets the stage for wife abuse (Dobash &
Dobash, 1992). Consequently, traditional Indonesian may be less likely to define various
forms of abuse as violence against wives.
Length of education was positively and significantly associated with the definitions of violence against wives in general and in particular with psychological abuse. This finding was consistent with studies in Hong Kong and China that found higher education associated significantly with broader perception about physical and psychological definitions of violence against women (Tang et al., 2002; Tam & Tang, 2005). Education usually exposes individuals to a wide range of knowledge, experiences and views that sensitized them with gender equality (Tang et al., 2002). Therefore, more educated respondents may have better awareness and understanding about the rights of women, including the rights to be freed from any forms of oppressions, discrimination, and violence. As a result, they were more likely to have a broader definition about violence against wives. Higher education, however, did not significantly associate with the definition of physical, economic and sexual violence, and thus, may warrant further investigation in future study.

As predicted, location of residency appeared to be an important factor associated with definition of violence against wives. Urban participants reported broader definitions of violent behavior than their rural counterparts. Although the perceptions about physical and sexual violence between the participants in these two areas were relatively the same, urban participants were significantly more likely to define various acts of psychological-verbal and economic violence as wife abuse. There was no previous study that examined the impact of geographical sites on individuals’ perceptions about definition of violence against wives. However, some associations found in this study were possibly related to the difference in the exposure to information between rural and urban residents. Compared to rural dwellers, urban residents might be more exposed more frequently to
information about gender equality and violence against wives either through mass media or campaign. Therefore, they became more aware of forms of psychological and economic violence than their rural counterparts.

Similar to attitudes about gender roles, location of residence and length of education, age was the significant predictor for the broader definitions of violence against wives. Also, younger the individuals were more likely than older respondents to classify various forms of physical assault and verbal abuse as violence against wives. Improved education and legal reform in violence against women that has taken place in Indonesia recently may sensitize younger generation about the issue at greater degree than the older population. This finding also confirmed a previous study. For example, a study with 1,200 adults in New York, United States, found that compared to the younger counterparts, older respondents tended to view physical assault against wives, e.g. slapping the wife not as abusive behavior and were less sure that violent acts were illegal (Carlson & Worden, 2005).

It was predicted that gender would associate with perceptions about what constituted violence against wives. The majority of studies reviewed for this research indicated that female subjects reported significantly broader perceptions about what constitutes violence against wives than their male counterparts. Since women are more likely to be the victims in intimate relations’ violence (World Health Organization, 2002), they were more sensitive to categorizing any violent acts against them as abusive. Nevertheless, the association between gender and definition of violent behavior against wives found in this study was mixed or inconsistent.
The study found that male and female ad similar definitions of violence against wives. However, when the analysis was taken to sub-scale levels, male individuals were significantly more likely than their female counterparts to consider “forced sex by husband” as violence against wives. Explaining the association between gender and definition of sexual violence is somewhat complicated, partly due to lack of previous study to refer to. This study is among the very few that examined the predictors of different forms of violence against wives.

Despite the lack of evidence, several possibilities might need to be taken into account to explain the finding above. Firstly, it could be that more women than men this study in reality still did not regard forced sex in marital relation as a form of violence against wives. Studies with Indonesian women who experienced “marital rape” suggested that culture and religious teachings played important roles in shaping women’s perceptions about sex in marriage. The norms sent strong messages, even much stronger to women that having sex with her husband was wife’s obligation, thus, refused having sex with her husband was discouraged (Hakimi et al., 2001; Munir, 2003; Idrus, 2003). Considering that such norms were directed more toward women than men, the internalization of such value may much stronger among women than men. Further study that investigates the interaction between gender and attitudes toward gender or interpretation of religious teaching about sexual relations in a marriage and their associations with definitions of violent behavior may be needed to validate such assumption.

Secondly, it was possible that male respondents in this study were reluctant to reveal a more honest response. For men, disagreeing to define forced sex by husband as
violent behavior may be viewed as putting themselves to be judged negatively, especially when they were asked directly through face to face interview.

Indonesians Perceptions about the Causes of Violence Against Wives

The findings related to perception about possible causes of violence against wives found in the qualitative analysis revealed that Indonesians perceived various factors that could lead a husband to physically abuse his wife. These factors were similar to those discussed in the general literature: individual, family/couple, or environment/structural factors. A small number of participants also pointed out that violence against wives was contributed to by husband, family/couple and societal factors. These views may reflect some changes in Indonesian society where violence against wives is no longer viewed as the fault of the abused wife solely but as a marital and societal problem, suggesting that the husband and society should considered as parts of the problem as well.

Nevertheless, individual-related factors were cited as possible cause by the majority of the subjects in this study whereas society/structural factors were acknowledged the least. Of this individual factor, the majority attributed the cause to wives’ weaknesses or failures. The pattern of viewing individual-related factors as possible reasons for violence against wives confirmed results from other international studies in this area (Yick, 2000; Haj-Yahia, 2004; Worden & Carlson, 2005). In addition, widespread victim-blaming attitudes were also found in studies with population in developing regions (Haj-Yahia, 2002; World Health Organization, 2002).

The tendency of victim-blaming attitudes may be explained from a gender relations perspective. In general, traditional Indonesians’ norms placed men as having greater power, privilege and control of women as well as the right to punish their
misbehavior. Women in Indonesia are constrained by the traditional feminine ideal that extols the virtues of submission and obedience. The traditional values in many parts of Indonesia are influenced by the cultural notions that interpret men as the leader of women, therefore, require a woman to be obedience to her husband (Cholil, 1999; Nurmila, 2009). Schecter (1982) argues that women’ roles as wives and mother are bound to moral dimensions. As in many Asian societies, women are socialized to be wives and mother and are hold responsible to maintain family unity and harmony (Idrus & Bennett, 2003; Nurmila, 2009). Consequently, if family or couple disputes occurred, wives tended to share disproportionate blame for the cause such problems.

Despite some similarities, this study found that some differences from other studies with regard to perceived causes of wife abuse. First, Indonesians in this study rarely referred to witnessing violence in childhood and alcohol abuse as causal factors. These two factors were largely cited in the findings of studies with Western societies, e.g. United States (Klein et al., 1997; Greenblat, 1987). Many Indonesians might be unaware or uninformed that domestic violence contributed to trans-generational intimate violence. Similarly, because alcohol use in Indonesia at large is highly discouraged socially, it might limit individuals’ perceptions about possible negative impacts of alcohol abuse on aggressive behaviors.

Second, many Indonesians referred to wife’s disobedience as possible reason leading to physical abuse, suggesting their beliefs upon hierarchical relations in marriage and the justification of abuse. For example, the matter of wife obedience in Islamic teaching is often interpreted narrowly as wife’s obligation without considering the necessity of mutual respects between husband and wife and the rights for wife to be
protected and taken care of by the husbands. Similarly, the teaching about husband’s right to ‘beat’ a disobedient wife is commonly interpreted literally. In fact, progressive interpretation of those Islamic teachings would negate religious justification for wife abuse (Faizi, 2001; Munir, 2003; Sukri, 2004). More studies upon the impacts of conservatives or moderate Islamic beliefs about marital relations on perceptions and attitudes may be helpful to give more understanding about this finding.

Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives

In general, Indonesians’ in this study indicated relatively wide support given to a husband to hit his wife under several situations. The most justified circumstances were when the wife deviated from the prescribed gender norms of good/loyal wife and caring mother. Some of the most acceptable circumstances that warranted a husband to hit his wife reported by Indonesians in this study were similar to those reported in some other studies across nations. This included wife’s sexual infidelity or failures to take care of the family and households (Greenbalt, 1985; Arias & Johnson, 1989; Choi & Edleson, 1996; Yick, 2000; Hindin, 2003).

However, the prevalence of contextual justification of wife abuse found in this study appeared to be much higher compared to other studies. For example, in a survey among 124 American adults more than two decades earlier (Greenblat, 1985) found that around 37% and 19% of participants agreed that hitting wife was warranted in a situation where a wife was sexually unfaithful and a wife was found drunk respectively. In contrast, 79% and 60% Indonesians in this study justified husband hitting wife under those two circumstances.
The study also revealed that some of the most justified circumstances for violence against wives reported by Indonesians would be more understandable in Indonesian’s socio-culture contexts. For example, a very high proportion of participants viewed wife’s drunkenness as acceptable reason for a husband to hit his wife. In addition, 25% and 20% of the participants reported hitting was acceptable if the wife disobeyed the husband and went out for long hours without his permissions. In Indonesia, drinking alcohol, especially among Muslims, is not only considered deviation from religious teaching but also from cultural expectation. Alcohol use is commonly associated with being an irresponsible or bad personality. The judgment is much harsher for drunken female/wives than male/husband, therefore physical discipline would be considered appropriate to educate women to behave as expected. Similarly, once married, wives were expected to obey the husbands as an indicator of good wives.

Initially it was hypothesized that social and demographic variables and socio-culture variables associated with contextual justification of wife abuse. Specifically, it was hypothesized that disapproval of violence against wives would be significantly higher among participants who were female, younger, lived in urban area, were more educated, were professionally employed, had less conservative gender attitudes, and were less religious. However, the hierarchical multi regression analysis suggested that these hypotheses were only partially supported.

Gender did not associate with contextual approval of violence against wives, suggesting that Indonesians men and women held similar attitudes about contextual justification of wife. This finding was contrary to the hypothesis and the findings of other studies that found females were significantly less supportive of violence against wives.
more than males (Greenblat, 1985; Finn, 1988; Choi & Edleson, 1995; Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997; Locke & Richman, 1999; Sakalh, 2001; Nayak, Byrne, Martin, & Abraham, 2003). Yet, evidence that negated or contradicted the associations also had been found in other studies. For example, a study among 268 Chinese-American in California did not show gender as predictor for approval of violence against wives (Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997; Yick, 2000). Studies in several countries in Middle East and Africa communities even found women were significantly more likely to condone wife beating (Hindin et al., 2003; Khawaja et al., 2008).

Some possibilities might explain the lack of association between gender and contextual acceptance of wife abuse in this study. First, policies to promote gender equalities (i.e. universal education, equality at work) in Indonesia may have similar degree of impact on women and men’s perspective about gender relations. Second, male participants in this study may give socially desirable responses to the interviewers. Third, the association between gender and contextual justification of violence against wives might not be as consistent as suggested in the existing studies. Many attitudinal studies conducted in this topic commonly involved non-random sampling with highly educated participants (Greenblat, 1985; Finn, 1988; Locke & Richman, 1999; Sakalh, 2001; Nayak, Byrne, Martin, & Abraham, 2003; Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008), which may influence the association.

Location of residence significantly predicted contextual justification of violence against wives in this study. Indonesians who lived in urban areas were less likely to approve violence against wives in any circumstance. This affirmed cross-culture studies in developing countries that found greater endorsement of violence against wives
reported by rural than urban residents (Heise et.al, 1994; WHO, 1999; Hindin, 2003; Haj-Yahia, 2005; Haarr, 2007; Uthman, Lawoko, & Moradi, 2009). Perhaps, due to a higher degree of exposure to information about violence against wives and to equal marital norms, urban residents in this study learned less tolerant attitudes towards the use of physical punishment even under circumstances where the wife as considered to behave against commonly accepted conservative norms in marriage and family lives. A survey with 1,700 Indonesian adult males and females regarding the justice sector suggested that urban residents were substantially more familiar with the concept of right to freedom from violence and discrimination than their rural or semi-urban counterparts (Asia Foundation, 2001).

Marital status was significantly associated with contextual acceptance of violence against wives. Participants who were single were less likely than their married/ever married counterparts to approve a husband hitting his wife under any circumstance. Studies that analyzed the influence of marital status on violence against wives were limited and the existing studies found inconsistent associations between marital status and violence against wives. However, study found that married individuals tended to have more conservative attitude than single or never married persons (Schuman, 1985). According to feminist scholars, marital institution is one of mechanism that strengthened patriarchal structures which in turn contributed to violence against wives (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Pagelow, 1998). Perhaps, being in marriage relations, individuals in this study were more socialized to accept the idea that tolerated a husband to discipline this wife through physical violence in order to educate the wife or to make the marriage
works. Consequently, they were more likely to justify physical violence against wives when the wives deviated from prescribed norms.

Gender role beliefs significantly predicted contextual acceptance of violence against wives. This was consistent with existing international studies that showed participants with traditional gender role attitudes were more likely to approve the use of physical force by a husband against the wife (Finn, 1986; Yick, 2000; Haj-Yahia, 2005; Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008; Haj-Yahia & de Zoysa, 2009). Proponent of feminist perspective such as Dobash & Dobash (1979) have argued that patriarchal structures in society influenced how individuals view femininity and masculinity and how violence against wives is rooted in patriarchal ideologies.

In Indonesia, despite some changes toward a more gender egalitarian structure, its social order and its family structure remained to be male-centered, therefore influencing individuals’ perception about violence (Sullivan, 1991; Cholil, 1999; Nurmila, 2009). Traditionally, Indonesian women are subordinate to men. On the one hand, males are expected to be in position of authority, heads of households, and social leaderships. On the other hand, the expectations of Indonesian women are focused upon the female as submissive, caretaker of the family and complement to male roles (Idrus & Bennett, 2003; Sukri, 2009). Consequently those individuals who are more conservative in their belief about gender roles will ascribe different meaning to intimate partner violence against wives than those with more egalitarian beliefs.

Contrary to the hypotheses, age, length of education, working status, and religiosity also did not significantly predict Indonesians’ approval or disapproval of violence against wives. A possible explanation is that the constructs of age and education
level could be overlapping with gender role attitudes, the strongest predictor of contextual acceptance of wife abuse. Gender role attitudes could be doing a better job of differentiating attitudinal score toward violence against wives versus age or education alone. Meanwhile, the lack of associations with working status and religiosity affirmed the lack of or inconsistencies of these two predictors in shaping attitudes of violence against wives found in some of the previous studies.

Attitudes about Responses to Violence Against Wives

Indonesians in this study revealed mixed attitudes as to whether the violence against wives should be dealt using active-resistant approach. A large percentage supported responses to protect the victims both through formal and informal provisions (i.e. had legal protection, left the house for safety, asked for help from the family, or asked for divorce). However, many believed that the problem should be dealt privately within the family and the abusers should be approached leniently (e.g. police should not be called, husband should not be arrested) and they supported the idea that wife abuse should be dealt by the couple (i.e. wife should change her behavior to be a better wife so that the husband stops beating her) and that direct intervention by the outsiders was discouraged.

This pattern was confirmed in the qualitative analysis as well. The majority perceived that the victims should be active in finding the solutions but the responsibility of the perpetrators in solving the problem was very rarely acknowledged. Informal mechanisms to deal with violence against wives such as involving natal or extended family and neighborhood institutions in helping the victims and solving the problems were preferred than formal approaches. Although the outsider involvement was
acknowledged to help the couple, the respondent believed that it should be aimed to reconcile the couples. This strategy is not only aimed at maintaining the unity of the family but also to avoid causing shame to the family.

The inclination to prefer private mechanism to resolve wife abuse found in this study was similar with earlier studies, especially studies that were conducted in non-Western communities. For example, a survey with 413 Korean and Vietnamese in the United States revealed only 27% participants supported arresting husband who abuse his wife (Kim-Goh & Baello, 2008). Similarly, a qualitative study with 291 married Arab women in Israel revealed that 92% indicated coping with violence against wives should begin with nuclear family (Haj-Yahia, 2000). While some informal or private strategies to deal with violence against wives may work, they might not helpful or work effectively in the long duration of times, therefore, might place the victims at greater risks from harms.

With regards to the predictors of attitudes toward responses to deal with wife abuse, initially it was hypothesized that socio-demographic and socio-culture factors would predict the Indonesians’ attitudes in dealing with violence against wives. Specifically, participants who were female, lived in an urban area, were younger, were highly educated, were professionally employed, had egalitarian view of gender roles, and were less religious would report higher support toward active-resistant approach in wife abuse. However, the hierarchical multi regression analysis indicated that only gender, location of residence, age, marital status, and attitudes toward gender roles significantly associated with the definitions of abusive behaviors against wives. Participants of the study who were male, lived in urban areas, were employed, were younger, were single
and held egalitarian views of gender-role behaviors were more likely than their counterparts to support active-resistant approach to deal with violence against wives. Male respondents in this study were significantly more supportive of active-resistant approaches to deal with violence against wives than female respondents. This finding seems at odds with some studies that showed female were more likely to have greater sympathy toward the victims, support protection of victims, and approve criminalizing the perpetrators, (Choi & Edleson, 1995, Haj-Yahia & de Zoysa, 2009; Robinson, 1999, cited in Bui, 2005).

Some possible reasons may explain this finding. First, culturally, Indonesians women bear more responsibility than men to maintain family harmony and unity at any costs. Therefore, the women tended to indicate greater support toward any attempts that treated wife abuse as private matter because the intervention from outsiders or external parties, especially criminal justice systems, or formal parties could break the family’s unity, cause the family humiliation, or caused the wives to be blamed. Second, many women in this study might be not aware of the existing formal provisions of protection and support for abused women or know how those provisions worked, thus affected their confidence to report the support toward formal and or criminal justice approach. In a survey with 1,700 Indonesian adults in 6 provinces (including West Java) it was found that male participants were more knowledgeable about the existing legal provisions for family and criminal problems as well as the procedures to access them (Asia Foundation, 2001). Third, the males in this study might report more socially desirable responses than the females.
Living in urban areas associated with attitudes more supportive of active-resistant approach to deal with violence against wives. Since most of legal and social services for family in general and for victims of domestic abuse in particular is concentrated in urban areas, the urban participants in this study might be more informed of various resources available (Asia Foundation, 2001; Indonesian National Commission on Women, 2001). In addition, as the rural population in Indonesia tended to have greater adherence toward the values of harmony and informal social control, active-resistant approach such as leaving the house, getting divorce, or having the husband arrested taken by abused women might be more discouraged in rural sites in order to avoid causing the humiliation to the entire family and stigma associated with being a divorcee. Literatures suggested that living in rural may limit people interactions with non-conservative family values or liberal norms and values pertaining to women’s rights and gender equality either due to relatively low education, rigid social structures and norms, or lack of availability and access to information and access regarding violence against wives (Koenig, Ahmed, Hossain, Mozumder, 2003; Eastman, Bunch, Williams, & Carawan, 2007; Alim, 2009).

Younger age associated with positive attitudes toward active-resistant approach to deal with violence against wives. Improved education and legal reform with regards to violence against wives may have more positive impacts upon Indonesian’s young generation in their perceptions about the importance of formal mechanism to deal with interpersonal violence in order to protect the victims and hold the husband accountable. Carlson and Warden (2005) found that older participants (who were born before the implementation of anti domestic violence in the United State) were less likely to define violence against wives (e.g. slapping the wife face) as breaking the law than the younger
cohort. Other studies found that younger participants reported lower tendency to blame the victims (Haj-Yahia, 2003; Haj-Yahia, 2005) and a greater tendency to hold husbands responsible for wife abuse (Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008).

Being single also predicted supportive attitudes toward an active-resistant approach to deal with violence against wives. This seemed consistent with the transitional nature of Indonesian society and the presence of more progressive and liberal views among single Indonesians. Haj Yahia and Uysal (2008) found that Jordanians who were single were significantly more likely to support the involvement of criminal justice system to deal with wife abuse than their married counterparts. In contrast, married participants preferred informal mechanism to resolve the problem.

Gender role beliefs predicted whether Indonesians view violence against wives should be dealt through active-resistant approach. Those who were more traditional in their gender roles were less likely to agree that wife abuse should be dealt through active-resistant approach. Indonesians who adhered to traditional gender role tended to justify the hierarchical relations that place men as the leader of women. Those who adhered to patriarchy might view punishing husband as weakening the husbands’ control over the family and degrading their status in social life (Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008). Consequently, they may believe that husbands have the rights to use violence against wives to maintain authority and that public intervention and criminalization of VAW are not warranted.

**Other actions to deal with violence against wives**

The qualitative analysis revealed some other coping strategies, especially those taken by the victims and society to deal with violence against wives. The majority
suggested that wives should bear more responsibility in dealing with the violence: the wife to change her behavior and assume responsibility to change her husband. For example, the wife should have more patience and respect for husband and talked sympathetically to the husband. These included “avoid doing something that can irritate husband”, “change behavior that caused husband’s anger”, “ask husband softly about the reasons for his abusive behavior”, “talk with husband at appropriate time when the things have cooling down”, and “ask him nicely not to repeat the behavior”. On the other hand, it is interesting that very small proportion of participants mentioned the husband’s responsibility in dealing with wife abuse.

The respondents also reported the importance of seeking help from or involving the intervention of external parties to resolve marital abuse. Both informal and formal interventions were acknowledged by the participants but resorting to informal sources (i.e. natal or extended family or community institution) was viewed as more appropriate, and therefore, preferred and prioritized over the formal interventions. Such agents were expected to play the roles to stop his abusive conducts, provide temporary protection, financial and emotional support to the victims and the children, and put social or moral pressures on the husband so he does not repeatedly abuse his wife. In the participants’ perspective, the informal resources also could play the role to educate the couples (i.e. give some advices to be good couple) and mediate the couple’ conflicts or misunderstanding to achieve reconciliation.

The study participants viewed that formal resources such as police or court could be utilized only if the abusive behaviors were severe and repeated many times or if “other means” including “deliberation” or “family mediation” failed to reconcile the couples or
have impacts on husband’s behavior. Such a perspective represents the overall beliefs that family unity should be preserved and that a formal approach including the utilization of criminal justice system should be viewed as the last resort. Furthermore, it might imply that the involvement of formal mechanisms may put the family unity at risks or cause marital relation to end. It is also interesting that very few of participants recommended the victims seeking refuge and protection from domestic violence shelter. Because few shelters have been available in the area of study, especially in urban sites, most participants probably were unaware of their existence and functions.

**Limitations of the Study**

There are two major limitations of this study. The first limitation was related to the issue of social desirability. This study did not utilize an instrument to measure social desirability. Although each study has the potential for social desirability that is often difficult to avoid or address by the researcher (Fortune & Reid, 1999), this study had higher potency to increase participants’ response biases given the nature of questions asked and the method of data collection applied. Partly due to the fear of being misjudged, the participants might be reluctant to reveal honest answers when they were asked directly in person about sensitive topic like violence against wives. Although this study did not explore the participant’s direct experience from or perpetration with wife abuse, many Indonesian still perceive IPV as a socially undesirable topic to be discussed with others.

This study applied three strategies to minimize social desirability issues. First, the study matched the gender of participants and interviewers in order to increase
participants comfort and trust, thus, made them more willing to answer the questions more accurately. Second, the interviews were conducted without the presence of other adults in order to maintain the respondents’ privacy. Third, interviewers wrote their personal evaluation about how the interview went, for example, whether they thought it was comfortable, at ease, or seemed to be truthful. However, the information gathered through this method was limited to reveal whether participants were honest or not in giving the answers. In other words, it could not measure the extent of response bias supplied by the respondents.

Another limitation concerned the generalization of this study. The comparison with other data about socio-demographic characteristics of the sample in this study indicated that this study is probably most representative of better educated people in West Java, and quite likely representative of Bandung City and Bandung Regency. This is because Bandung City and Bandung Regency are among developed and urbanized regions in West Java. Therefore, the generalization of the finding in this study would be more representative of the other West Java areas that share similar characteristics as the Bandung Regency and Bandung City.

**Implications of the Study**

In the context of the research findings, three domains of implications specifically targeted toward Indonesian community and violence against wives are described in this section.
Implications for Social Welfare Policies

The results from this study highlight the necessity to improve relevant policies to prevent and or address violence against wives as well as to promote gender equality in Indonesia which is detailed as follow.

1. Increasing the dissemination and improving the implementation of Anti Domestic Violence Law of 2004. The Anti Domestic Violence Law of 2004 broadens the definitions of domestic violence acts and introduces new provisions to protect and support the victims. However, the Law has been limitedly disseminated to the public (Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women, 2008; Hasyim & Kurniawan, 2009), thus contributed to the gap in public understanding about its content and provision. The limitations in the implementation of the Law, especially with regards to lack of availability and access to services as well lack of consistent enforcement to help the victims and to punish the victims (Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women, 2008; Hasyim & Kurniawan, 2009) might contribute to the community’s unfavorable attitudes toward violence against wives and responses to deal with the violence in the community.

In views of this research, improvements in the dissemination and implementation of the Law, especially directed toward both men and women, rural and population at low socio-economic segment are crucial considering the lack of understanding about violence against wives among these groups. This may include the increase of funding for preventive and curative programs, improve institutional capacity building (especially the legal and social service personnel) in implementing the laws, improve availability and
access to services, and enhance collaboration with wider segment of non-government sector including the mass media and other civil society organizations to challenge pro-violence attitudes and behavior.

2. Considering the significance of gender role attitude in this study, the policy makers need to pay more attention to promoting and strengthening policies that consistently counter gender discrimination. For long-term, anti-domestic violence policies are among the most significant instruments to promote gender equality and shift society’s attitudes toward violence against wives in Indonesia from a private to a public matter. However, some other policies appear to send inconsistent messages on how society should view the problem, thus contradicting the promotion of gender equality.

For example, the Indonesian Family Law of 1974 stipulates husband as the head of household and the wife as household manager. Furthermore, although the Law justifies domestic violence as a valid reason for a divorce, it does not regard the violence as a crime and does not provide any provision to protect and support the victimized wife. In fact, Family Court uses this Family Law to process most of filed divorce (Indonesian Commission on Violence Against Women, 2008). This study found that asking for divorce was a much more supported strategy taken to deal with violence against wives rather than calling the police or arresting/jailing the perpetrator. The continuation of such contradictive provision would provide incentive for the perpetrators to continue their behavior because if the divorce due to domestic violence is brought to the Family Court, the perpetrators of wife abuse can be easily freed from any criminal charge. In contrast, no provision will be provided for helping or assisting victimized wives.
At the same time, a new Bill entitled Applied Law of Religious Court on Marriage (Hukum Materiil Pengadilan Agama) that is currently discussed in the Parliament further strengthens gender role divisions and weaken women’s right in marital relations (Wahyudi, 2010). The Bill cites that the husband is the head of household who is responsible to guide, protect, and educate the wife as well as to provide for the household and child care and the wife is a housewife who is responsible for obeying the husband and taking care of the household. The Bill loosening the restriction for polygamy regulated in the Family Law by negating the wife’s right to disagree to her husband’s decision to take another wife if the decision has been decided by the court (Indonesian National Commission on Violence Against Women, 2010). Although the Bill has not been approved into the Law and may be subject to revision, its content reflects the strong norms about gender role segregation in marriage institution that subordinates women position.

Therefore, it is necessary for the policy makers to revise those contradictory policies and promote a more progressive marital policy in order to improve gender equality and make the eradication of violence against wives more effective. This included the utilization of Anti Domestic Violence in the Family Court to process divorce cases due to wife abuse. For example, in cases where the reconciliation between the couple is still feasible, the Family Court (i.e. Religious Court) can assign the husband to attend compulsory therapy. Or the Court may refer the victimized wives to relevant services or abusive husband to the crime court when necessary. In doing so, the authority of the Family Court may need to be expanded to enable the Court to function better.
It is also important to encourage the re-interpretations of potentially pro-violence norms or beliefs that stem from conventional or gender bias cultural and religious teaching that still exist in the society. At the same time, the promotion of cultural and religious teachings that strengthen gender equality, especially the ones that promote the rights of women in general and wives in particular needs to be strengthened.

3) The promotion of universal education policies that integrated the material related to violence against women or gender justice into educational curriculum. This study found that education was a key factor in shaping Indonesian attitudes about violence against women. Increased levels of education may facilitate people’s access to information about the new legislation and their understanding of its implications. Similarly, education may in time provide people with more access to media in which issues of gender inequality and human rights violation against women are becoming increasingly prominent, helping to solidify people growing sense of injustice and reinforcing their increasing knowledge regarding gender justice and laws and resource mechanisms.

**Implications for Social Work Practice**

The findings from this study emphasize the importance of community education and social work intervention to change Indonesians’ perceptions and attitudes toward violence against wives. These efforts need to address the following aspects:

1. Improving Indonesians knowledge and awareness about what constitutes violence against wives with particular attention given to expanding the public definition about violence against wives beyond physical violence and beyond severe or frequent abusive acts. If violence against wives is considered as such only when it involves extreme
physical force, repeated violence or causes severe/visible injuries, it is more likely that some violence, especially non-physical or less severe forms of violence may be acceptable. Consequently, wives who experienced those acts may not perceive themselves as victims, the perpetrators would not consider their behavior abusive or illegal and those who witness or know about such violence may not be motivated to help or support the victims. These efforts need to specifically target both male and female individuals as well as the population who reside in rural areas, are older, and are less educated because these groups appear to lack understanding about the social problem of violence against wives.

2. Promoting social norms that counter beliefs conducive to blaming abused wives for their victimization and counteract the social acceptability of violence against wives. Victim-blaming attitudes and tolerant attitudes toward violence against wives can inhibit attempts to reduce violence and help the victims. The community also needs to be educated about negative impacts of various forms of violence against wives for the victims and society as well as the destructive impacts of violence on children who witness such behavior.

3. Educating the community to realize that violence against wives should not be treated as a family matter and to be aware that by treating intimate partner violence as private problem, a husband violent behavior is more likely to persist, perhaps even worsen. At the same time, it is also important to develop or strengthen the attitudes and beliefs that violence against wives is a social and criminal problem that requires formal intervention by the criminal justice system as well as social welfare, health and mental health institutions. Female individuals, the married population, rural residents, and the older
generations should be considered as the major target in this education program. Specific efforts should be made to help these groups to be aware of effective patterns for coping with the problems, the importance of closure, and help seeking.

4. Promoting education on gender equality. The findings show that attitude toward gender role were the most consistent and among the strongest predictor that influenced perceptions and attitudes toward violence against wives. However, a closer inspection of the item endorsement frequencies of the Attitude Toward Women Scale shows that this sample of Indonesians still adhere closely to traditional gender norms in various social situations. For example, 88.9% respondents’ supported the idea that women should focus more on their children and husband than the freedom to pursue career, 83% agreed that women should not be given equal opportunities with men for apprentices in various trades. In view of these findings, the promotion of egalitarian gender attitudes should be included as major components when designing violence against wives educational programs or public campaigns for Indonesians.

5. Encouraging disclosure and help seeking, especially among female, married, and rural individuals. In addition, attempts need to be directed at promoting appropriate and culturally appropriate services for the victims and perpetrators of violence against wives. It is very important for helping professionals or service providers, including social workers to consider that although maintaining family unity is important goals for the clients, the protection of victims’ safety and the change of perpetrator’ abusive behavior should be the priority. The practitioners may need to focus on assisting clients to reduce their feelings of shame by focusing on clients’ dilemma of seeking outside help, ensuring confidentiality, and strengthening motivation of help-seeking efforts.
6. Historically, and as demonstrated in the current study, neighborhood and religious institution have been very influential institutions in the Indonesian society. The majority of Indonesians in this study believed that family and community-based institutions as the major source of help to prevent and deal with violence against wives. The collaboration with community institutions including the community and religious leaders and offering community education in partnership with neighborhood board, mosques, and churches may help reduce resistance from the community members in seeking needed help. Trainings for these local agents in order to sensitize them with violence against wives, improve their skills to manage crisis situations, and enhance their knowledge about available services and provisions for victims and perpetrators as well as the procedures to access them are important to improve the effectiveness of community-based institutions to deal with violence against wives.

7. To accelerate attitudinal change, collaboration with women groups and women organizations at grassroot and higher levels is necessary. The study found that unfavorable attitudes including victim blaming and contextual justification of violence against wives were spread across gender, including women themselves. It is important for women improve their solidarity by challenging the pre-existing negative beliefs about the victims and acceptance of violence against women as well as advocating on women’s interests.

8. Policy advocacy and monitoring

   Social workers can play an important role in advocating for revising the existing gender-bias policies, including the Family Law and the Bill on Applied Law of the
Religious Court on Marriage; expanding Anti Domestic Violence Law utilization across the Religious Court; and improving availability and access to legal and social services that help or protect the victims and hold the perpetrators accountable. In addition, social workers need to engage in policy monitoring in the implementation of legislation or regulations on violence against women at national, regional and local impacts and their impacts on victims, perpetrators, and society.

Directions for Future Research

This study was the first that explored and investigated Indonesians perceptions and attitudes toward wife abuse. Since this study provided initial data on a topic that has receive minimal research, the findings are viewed as first step for future study.

First, future studies need to consider minimizing or neutralizing social desirability. Given that social desirability may still influence the responses of participants in a study dealing with sensitive topic, it is recommended that future studies include a social desirability instrument as part of the research measurement. Saunders (1991) maintains the importance of utilizing social desirability instrument to statistically adjust scores from self-reported measures in the study of interpersonal violence.

Second, future studies need to consider more representative samples. The sample in this study is probably most representative of better educated people in West Java, and quite likely representative of Bandung City and Bandung Regency. Further studies are needed to examine whether the same pattern of results would be found if people with lower education or employment are oversampled or if the studies are conducted in areas with different demographic composition from the locations of this study. In addition, in
some respects, the sample in this study is quite homogenous in terms of religious affiliation and ethnicity. Since Indonesian society is very diverse culturally, larger scale studies focusing on how differences in religion and ethnicity affect the perceptions and attitudes of wife abuse are needed. The subjects in this study were predominantly Muslims and originated from Sundanese ethnic group. Therefore, it was less feasible to perform a statistically meaningful and valid comparison about perceptions and attitudes from different religious and ethnic groups. Studies with a larger and more representative sample that enables the comparison of individuals of all different religious and ethnic groups along with other predictors are needed in the future. It is possible that with larger and more varied samples, the difference in religion and ethnicity may impact the findings regarding perceptions and attitudes.

Third, future studies need to consider longitudinal research in order to examine whether the perceptions and attitudes toward violence against wives have changed over time. This longitudinal study might be integrated in Indonesian population census or other forms of regular national census since they cover a wide range of population and can be conducted regularly. Understanding the change in society’ attitude about domestic violence has crucial implications for policy and service delivery (Johnson & Sigler, 2000).

Four, earlier studies with the victims of wife abuse in Indonesia suggested the influence of religion on victims’ responses but this study found no correlation between attitudes and religiosity. Some studies also stipulated the influence of fundamentalist religious belief on violence against wives. Considering the significance of religion in Indonesian’ private and public lives, future studies may need to develop or use a more
appropriate instrument to measure religiosity in order to better understand the possible link between religion and violence against wives. The instrument used in this study was to measure general religiosity, thus it had limitation in measuring the nature of individuals’ religious beliefs about marital or social relations held by the individuals (i.e. conservative versus moderate).

Fifth, the study found that socio-demographic and socio-culture perspectives explained a quite large variance in the perceptions and attitudes toward violence against wives. Future studies need to consider the integration of additional theoretical perspectives in order to gain better understanding about factors predicted such perceptions and attitudes, social learning perspective, for example. Future studies may need to consider including participants’ current and previous personal experiences with domestic violence as witness, victims or perpetrator and to investigate how those experiences play a role in shaping the perceptions and attitudes about wife abuse. Many studies have examined these aspects and they found significant associations between personal experiences and attitudes toward interpersonal violence but none of these studies were carried out in Indonesia.

Finally, it is crucial to expand this study to personnel of human services (social workers, doctors, counselors, clergies) and criminal justice (police officers, judges). The perceptions and attitudes of these personnel shape the formal responses of professionals and institutions to the victims and perpetrators of violence against women. Studies found that unsympathetic attitudes toward violence against women inhibit effective and appropriate responses to female victims and male perpetrators (Nayak, Byrne, Martin & Abraham, 2003; Stewart & Maddren, 1997).
Conclusions

Understanding community perceptions and attitudes about wife abuse is one key step to address the issue of gender violence. Perceptions and attitudes toward abuse shape the victim’s reactions toward her victimization, the perpetrator reactions over his abusive behavior and community responses toward the occurrence of the violence. Failure to understand abusive acts could prevent or delay help seeking. Widespread justification of wife abuse and the attitudes toward viewing wife abuse as private matter may lead to increase public’ tolerance on gender violence and restrict the effectiveness of intervention to minimize the problems. Hindin (2003) maintains that although some may argue that understanding the prevalence of abuse is more important, perceptions and attitudes serve as important marker to understand the occurrence or persistence of the problem.

Despite a growing body of knowledge on the public perceptions and attitudes toward intimate partner violence over the past decades, a review of the literature revealed that extremely few similar studies focused on the Indonesians’ public. This research was the first study that filled the gap in empirically valid knowledge on perceptions and attitudes of Indonesians on violence against wives and the factors associated with such perceptions and attitudes. Also, it contributed to a small body of knowledge about violence against wives in non-Western societies. This study also added more understanding about predictors of perceptions of different forms of violence against wives.

The hypotheses proposed in this study were partly supported. Perceptions about definitions of violence against wives and attitudes toward violence against wives (e.g.
contextual approval of wife abuse and attitudes toward active-resistant responses in wife abuse) were not fully explained by socio-demographic and socio-cultural related factors. Attitudes toward gender roles appeared to the factor that was consistently and significantly predicted the perceptions and attitudes, followed by level of education, location of residence, and marital status. Nevertheless, this study added to new understanding about the potential influences of other variables that were rarely examined in the previous studies (i.e. location of residence and marital status).

Considering this study as the pioneer in Indonesian context, it cannot measure whether there has been change with regards to public’ attitudes. However, the findings from this study highlight the importance of improving Indonesians’ perceptions and attitudes toward violence against wives. The structural changes that have been taking place to promote gender-justice need to be continued but stronger and more consistent attempts are required. The development and implementation of relevant policies to address norms and practice of gender inequality is one of key strategy. Social work becomes one of professions that can play important role in this transformation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>41.826</td>
<td>3.246</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of participants</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.179</td>
<td>-2.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of education (years)</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>3.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence dichotomous</td>
<td>1.858</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>2.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of participant</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (WorkNonProf=1)</td>
<td>-.745</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (Not working=1)</td>
<td>-.885</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>-1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married/ever vs not married</td>
<td>-.629</td>
<td>.821</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity dichotomous</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ATWS</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>4.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total score religiosity</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Total score definition of violence against wives
### Figure 14
Regression Diagnostic: Test of Multicollinearity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>29.952</td>
<td>6.200</td>
<td>.4831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of participants</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>-1.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of education (years)</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>1.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence dichotomous</td>
<td>3.578</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>2.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of participant</td>
<td>-1.872</td>
<td>1.237</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-1.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status (WorkNonProf=1)</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working status(Not working=1)</td>
<td>-1.683</td>
<td>1.597</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married/ever vs not married</td>
<td>-4.328</td>
<td>1.569</td>
<td>-.193</td>
<td>-2.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity dichotomous</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>1.434</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ATWS</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>4.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total score religiosity</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Total score Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives
### Figure 15
Regression Diagnostic: Test of Multicollinearity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>38.312</td>
<td>4.576</td>
<td>8.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of participants</td>
<td>-.080</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of education (years)</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence dichotomous</td>
<td>2.491</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender of participant</td>
<td>-1.742</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>-.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working status (WorkNonProf=1)</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working status (Not working=1)</td>
<td>-.631</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Currently married/ever vs not married</td>
<td>-2.705</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>-.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity dichotomous</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total ATWS</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total score religiosity</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Total score actions to deal with violence against wives
Appendix 1

Study’s Questionnaire

I. Socio-Demographic Information

Gender:________ (M/F)

Residence:_______ (U/R)

1. How old are you?: ___________ years

2. What is the highest level of education you completed?
   ____0= Never attended school
   ____1= Elementary school
   ____2= Junior high
   ____3= Senior high
   ____4= Some college
   ____5= College and Undergraduate
   ____5= Graduate

3. What is current employment status?
   _____1. Currently working (GO TO QUESTION NUMBER 4)
   _____2. Not working (GO TO QUESTION NUMBER 5, SKIP Q NUMBER 4)
   _____3. Looking for a job (GO TO QUESTION NUMBER 5, SKIP QUESTION NUMBER 4)
   _____4. Going to school (GO TO QUESTION NUMBER 5, SKIP QUESTION NUMBER 4)
   _____5. Other___________________________(specify)

4. What is your job?_________________________

5. What is your marital status?
   _____1. Currently married (GO TO QUESTION 6)
2. Divorced or separated (GO TO QUESTION 7)
3. Widow
4. Never married
5. Other

6. How long have you been married? _________

7. How long have you been divorced or separated? ______

8. What is your religion? _________

9. What is your ethnicity? ____________

Before we continue the interview, I want to let you know that if during the interview you have any question, please let me know. If you want me to repeat something at any time, please stop me and I will be glad to repeat the questions. We are interested in your opinions, and please remember there is no right or wrong answer.

Now I will give you 5 cards (DISTRIBUTE THE CARDS TO THE RESPONDENTS). As you see, each card has been numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Each card contains the choices you can select to answer my questions. I will tell you which card to use before I ask you the questions. Now we will begin with the interview.

II. Attitudes Toward Women Scale

Please take a look at CARD #1. You will see that there are 4 choices for you to choose from: 0= strongly agree, 1=mildly agree, 2= mildly disagree, and 3= strongly disagree. I will ask how much you agree or disagree to various statements. For example, let’s say that I read this statement “I like to cook”. If you really do like to cook, then you would choose 1 because you strongly agree with what I just said. However, if you strongly disagree about liking to cook, you would choose 4. Do you understand?

GIVE RESPONDENT A MOMENT TO THINK ABOUT IT. THEN ASSESS WHETHER RESPONDENT (R) UNDERSTANDS HOW TO USE THE SCALE. IF R DOES NOT UNDERSTAND, GO THROUGH THE EXAMPLE AGAIN. IF R UNDERSTANDS, CONTINUE THE INTERVIEW.

People have different ideas about the roles of women in society. Please tell us how much you agree or disagree with the following statements
1. Cursing and dirty words are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than of a man.
0  1  2  3

2. In today’s economic time, with wives being active outside the house, husbands should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing laundry.
0  1  2  3

3. It is insulting to women to have the word “obey” her husband remains in the marriage vows.
0  1  2  3

4. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage
0  1  2  3

5. A woman should worry less about her rights and more about being good wives and mothers
0  1  2  3

6. It is logical for a woman to practice or occupy the same jobs and position as men
0  1  2  3

7. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same place or to have the same freedom of actions as a man
0  1  2  3
8. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks

0 1 2 3

9. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men

0 1 2 3

10. Women should worry more about how to take care of her family than about her socioeconomic freedom?

0 1 2 3

11. Sons in a family should be more given more encouragement to go to college than daughters

0 1 2 3

12. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of the children

0 1 2 3

13. It is very important for the woman to be a virgin before marriage as an indicator of her good behavior

0 1 2 3

14. A successful woman is one who worries more about her children and husband and less about herself

0 1 2 3

15. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted

0 1 2 3
III. Definitions About Violence Against Wives

We are interested in your opinion about intimate partner violence against wife.

When you hear the term violence against a wife by a husband, in your opinion, what kinds of husband behaviors against wife do you think are considered as abusive?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Now I will read to you a list of behaviors, and we want to know if you think these acts are considered violent behavior against a wife. Please tell me how much you agree or disagree whether the behavior is considered abusive against wife. Please look at CARD #2. This time, there are six choices for you to choose from: 1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4= disagree, 5= strongly disagree. Do you understand? (IF R DOES NOT UNDERSTAND, REPEAT THE INSTRUCTION).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARD #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1=STRONGLY AGREE 4=DISAGREE SOMEWHAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2=AGREE 5=DISAGREE STRONGLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3= NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(INTERVIEWER: REMEMBER, YOU MUST READ THE COMPLETE SENTENCE WITH THE INSERT FOR THE FIRST THREE ITEMS, IF R UNDERSTANDS, THEN YOU CAN JUST READ THE INSERTS. OTHERWISE, YOU MUST READ THE COMPLETE SENTENCE)

________________________________ is considered abusive behavior against wife

(INsert WITH ITEMS BELOW)

1. The husband punches or slaps wife’s face really hard during an argument
   1 2 3 4 5
2. The husband throws hard objects like an ash tray or plate at wife
1 2 3 4 5

3. The husband pushes his wife
1 2 3 4 5

4. The husband threatens to use knife to hurt his wife
1 2 3 4 5

5. The husband demands to know where his wife is all the time
1 2 3 4 5

6. The husband yells or curses at his wife (i.e. calling her stupid or ugly)
1 2 3 4 5

7. The husband refuses giving his wife money to buy things
1 2 3 4 5

8. The husband does not allow his wife to make any decisions
1 2 3 4 5

9. The husband forces his wife to have sex with him
1 2 3 4 5

10. The husband controls access to family income and assets
1 2 3 4 5

11. The husband criticizes his wife in public
1 2 3 4 5

12. The husband pulls his wife's hair harshly
1 2 3 4 5

13. The husband prohibits his wife to socialize
1 2 3 4 5
IV. Perceived causes of Violence Against Wives

“In your opinion, what are the possible reasons that could cause a husband to hit his wife?”.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

V. Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives

People have different opinions about whether wife beating in certain situation is justified or not. I wanted to know whether or not you think the following situations can be justified for a husband to beat his wife. Please look at CARD # 3. There are five choices for you to choose from: 1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4= disagree, 5= strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARD # 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= STRONGLY AGREE 2= AGREE 3= NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE 4= DISAGREE 5= STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You just found out that a husband hit his wife really hard because

INSERT ITEMS BELOW)

How much do you agree or disagree that the husband should have hit his wife?

1. He caught her having a sexual affair with another man

   1 2 3 4 5

2. He found her drunk

   1 2 3 4 5

3. The wife refused to have sex with her husband

   1 2 3 4 5
4. The wife was always nagging
1 2 3 4 5

5. The husband was in the bad mood
1 2 3 4 5

6. He found that the wife trying to hurt their child (children)
1 2 3 4 5

7. He found that the wife was flirting with someone else
1 2 3 4 5

8. The wife disobeyed her husband
1 2 3 4 5

9. The wife left the house for long hours without husband’s permission
1 2 3 4 5

10. The wife spent too much money for herself
1 2 3 4 5

11. The wife neglected taking care of the family and the house
1 2 3 4 5

12. The husband found his wife took drugs
1 2 3 4 5

13. Wife insulted her husband feelings
1 2 3 4 5

VI. Now, I want to know your opinion about how people should deal with wife abuse. Below are a number of statements about wife beating against wife which some people agree with and others disagree with. The term beating used in the statements below means repeated hitting intended to inflict pain. Please indicate how much you agree or
disagree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Please look at CARD # 4. There are seven choices for you to choose from: 1= strongly agree, 2= agree, 3= slightly Agree, 4= neither agree nor disagree, 5= slightly disagree, 6= disagree, 7= strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARD # 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= STRONGLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2= AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3= SLIGHTLY AGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4= NEITHER AGREE NOR DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5= SLIGHTLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6= DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7= STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, it would best if I didn’t get involved

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. If a wife is beaten by her husband, she should divorce him

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. A wife should move out the house if her husband beats her

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Wife beating should be given a high priority as a social problem by government agencies

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. Police should be called or informed if wife beating occurred

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. Women should be protected by law if their husbands beat them

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. A husband who beats his wife should be arrested or jailed

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. A battered wife should change her behavior to be a better wife so that her husband stops beating her
9. Battered wife should ask for help from her family, friends or neighbor if her husband beats her

10. In your opinion, are there strategies/responses you think would be better or more appropriate to deal with wife abuse?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

VII. Religiosity

I am interested to know how you perceive your level of religiosity. Please look at CARD # 5. There are six choices for you to answers the questions which are 1= very much, 2= much, 3= moderately, 4= little, 5= very little, and 6= never/not at all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CARD #5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1= very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2= much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3= moderately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. In general, to what extent do you consider yourself religious?

1 2 3 4 5 6

2. To what extent do you practice and adhere to the laws and customs of your religion?

1 2 3 4 5 6

3. To what extent do you identify and feel affiliated with your religion?

1 2 3 4 5 6
VIII. Awareness of Violence Against Wives

For next 3 questions, I would like you to answer with Yes or No.

1. Have you ever known, heard, or witnessed one of your female family members, friends or neighbors being beaten by her husband?
   Yes    No

2. Have you ever known, heard, or witnessed one of your female family members, friends or neighbors being cursed or yelled at by her husband?
   Yes    No

3. Have you ever known, heard, or witnessed one of your female family members, friends or neighbors being financially neglected by her husband?
   Yes    No
Appendix 2

Informed Consent

I, (Ms. Binahayati) from the School of Social Welfare, University at Albany, in New York, United States of America. I am conducting a research study about perceptions and attitudes toward wife abuse among residents of Kota and Kabupaten Bandung. I would like to request your participation in this research project. You are selected to participate in the study because you are at least 18 years old, resident of Kabupaten or Kota Bandung, and live in area selected as census block of the National Social and Economic Survey conducted by the Indonesian Bureau of Statistic in 2009.

Your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect you in any way. If you agree to participate, I will interview you face to face and write down your responses. I will ask you questions related to your perceptions or opinions about definition of wife abuse, causes of wife abuse, contextual justification of wife abuse, and responses to deal with wife abuse. Also, there will be questions related to your knowledge about the existence of wife abuse in society. You do not have to answer any question(s) you do not want to answer. You can withdraw from the study at any time and your decision will involve no penalty. The interview will last 45 minutes. It is expected that I can conduct the interview here, at your house, but you can suggest the site for interview you feel most comfortable with.

The study is expected to provide information that can be used to make recommendations about programs and services for women and family in the community. You might feel a little anxious to answer some questions but we anticipate such discomfort will not permanent. Any information you give including your identity will be held strictly confidential so you may feel free to tell what is on your mind without worrying about anyone finding out. All documents will be stored in locked cabinet at my (Ms. Binahayati) house and all database will be stored in password protected computers that only myself (Ms. Binahayati) can access. Your name will not appear in the questionnaire or the database. Any publication related to the finding from this study will not include any information that can identify you.

You would be paid one and half U.S. dollar (15,000 Indonesian rupiah) for your participation. If at any point, you have questions about this project, please feel free to contact Ms. Binahayati at 201-5567 or email her at binahayatirusyidi@yahoo.com. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject that have not been answered by the investigators or if you wish to report any concern about the study, you
may contact the University at Albany Office of Regulatory Research Compliance at 1-518-442-9050 or orrc@uamail.albany.edu.

Your agreement to answer the survey questions indicates that all of your questions have been answered to your satisfaction and you voluntarily agree to participate in the study.
### Appendix 3

**Rotated Component Matrix: Definitions of Violence Against Wives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hitting or slapping as violent behavior</td>
<td>-.233</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throwing hard objects at wife</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.729</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing wife</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.650</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening to hurt wife with sharp objects</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always wants to know where wife is all the times</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>-.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursing wife or name calling</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticizing wife in front of others</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibiting wife making any decision</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forcing wife to have sex with him</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>-.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling family wealth and income by husband</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusing to give wife money for daily use</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulling wife's hair harshly</td>
<td>-.290</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibiting wife to socializing</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4

Rotated Component Matrix: Contextual Justification of Violence Against Wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife was caught having sexual affair with another man</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife was found drunk</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife often rejected husband's request to have sex with him</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife was nagging</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband was stressful</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife intended to hurt the child</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife was found flirting with another man</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.570</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife disobeyed the husband</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife left the house for long hours without husband permission</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife spent too much money for herself</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td>.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife neglected to take care the family and house</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife was found taking drugs</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife insulted husband's feelings</td>
<td>.637</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rotated Component Matrix: Responses to Wife Abuse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although I knew a wife was beaten, I will not intervene</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A beaten wife should ask for a divorce</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>-.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A wife should leave the house when she is beaten</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife beating should receive government's priority</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police should be contacted when wife abuse occurred</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A beaten wife should obtain legal protection</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator should be arrested or jailed</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A beaten wife should change her behavior to be a better wife</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If she is beaten, a wife should ask for help to her family, neighbor or friends</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6

Letter of Permit for Data Collection
PEMERINTAH KABUPATEN BANDUNG
KANTOR KESATUAN BANGSA, POLITIK
DAN PERLINDUNGAN MASYARAKAT
Jl. Raya Soreang Km. 17 Telp. (022) 5891580 Soreang 40912

SURAT KETERANGAN IZIN PENELITIAN
Nomor : 0701/QD/KesbangPoliLinmas

KEPALA KANTOR KESATUAN BANGSA, POLITIK DAN PERLINDUNGAN MASYARAKAT
KABUPATEN BANDUNG

Memperhatikan :
1. Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah ;
2. Peraturan Daerah Nomor 21 Tahun 2007 Tentang Pembentukan Organisasi Lembaga Teknis Daerah Kabupaten Bandung ;

MENERANGKAN dan TIDAK KEBERATAN untuk Mengadakan Penelitian Kepada :

Nama : BINAHAYATI MSW
Intansi/Dinas/Universitas : UNIVERSITAS PADJADJARAN
Alamat : Jl.Balong Gede No.59B Bandung
Tujuan/Survey/Riset : Penelitian/Mencari Data
Dalam Rangka : Menyusun Disertasi dalam Bidang : ‘Persuasi dan Sikap Mengenai Tindak Kekerasan Terhadap Istri’
Lokasi : Kecamatan Majalaya, Soreang, Rancabali, Cicalengka dan Ciwidey Kab. Bandung
Lamanya : 25 Juni s/d 25 September 2010
Penanggungjawab : Prof. J. Hagen

Dengan ketentuan sebagai berikut :
1. Melaporkan kedatangannya serta maksud Kuliah Praktek Lapangan/Penelitian dengan menunjukan surat keterangananya kepada Pemerintah setempat dan instansi yang diperlukan segera setelah ditempat tujuan.
2. Memoal ketentuan yang berlaku dalam hukum pemerintahan setempat.
4. Surat izin ini dicabut dan dinyatakan tidak berlaku apabila bahwa pemegang surat keterangan ini tidak memenuhi ketentuan-ketentuan seperti tersebut diatas.

Soreang, 25 Juni 2010

An. KEPALA KANTOR KESATUAN BANGSA, POLITIK
DAN PERLINDUNGAN MASYARAKAT
KABUPATEN BANDUNG

Tembusan : disampaikan Kepada :
1. Yth. Bapak Bupati Bandung (Sebagai Laporan) ;
2. Yth. Camat Majalaya, Soreang, Rancabali, Cicalengka dan Ciwidey Kabupaten Bandung ;
3. Yth. Rektor UNIVERSITAS PADJADJARAN ;
PEMERINTAH KOTA BANDUNG
BADAN KESATUAN BANGSA, PERLINDUNGAN DAN
PEMBERDAYAAN MASYARAKAT
Jl. Wastukencana No. 2 Telepon (022) 4230393 Bandung

Nomor : 070/1647/BKPPM/2010
Lampiran : 1 Lembar
Perihal : Pemberitahuan Survei / Penelitian/Praktek Kerja

Bandung, 25 Juni 2010
Kepada
Yth Bapak/Ibu/Sdr :

Terlampir

Kota Bandung
di-

BANDUNG

Memperhatikan:
2. Surat Edaran Walikotamadya Kepala Daerah Tingkat II Bandung Nomor 7 tanggal 1 Februari 1975.

Bersama ini disampaikan dengan hormat, bahwa:

Berdasarkan surat dari : BADAN KESBANG POL & LINMASDA PROP JABAR

No./tanggal : 070/29/HAL

Sehubungan hal tersebut diatas, kami hadapkan:
Nama : DINAHAYATI MSW ( Ketua Kelasapot )
Tempat Tanggal Lahir : Bangka, 17 Oktober 1968
Pekerjaan, NRP/NPM : S 184374

Yang bersangkutan telah menghadap kami tanggal : 25 Juni 2010

Dengan memperhatikan identitas serta untuk kelancaran memveroleh bahan yang diperlukan, pada prinsipnya kami tidak keberatan yla melaksanakan Survey/ Penelitian/Praktek Kerja. scapanjang tidak mengganggu tugas yang menyangkut rahasia j i bata mising-mising instansi/SKPD. Untuk melakukan 
Penelitian

Dengan Judul " Persepsi dan Sikap Masyarakat mengenai Tindak Kekerasan terhadap Istri di Perkotaan dan Perdesaan Jawa Barat ".

Dari tanggal : 25 Juni 2010 s.d 25 September 2010

Demikian, atas kerjasamanya kami ucapkan terima kasih.

An KEPALA BADAN KESATUAN BANGSA,
PERLINDUNGAN DAN PEMBERDAYAAN MASYARAKAT
KOTA BANDUNG

Kepala Dinas Pustaka, Ideologi dan Waisara

Drs. FDI ROSLIHAN
Pembina TK I
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Daftar Lampiran

1. Camat Bojongloa Kaler
2. Camat Ujungberung
3. Camat Kiaracondong
4. Camat Sukasari
5. Camat Cibeuying Kidul
6. Lurah Babakan Tarogong
7. Lurah Pasirati
8. Lurah Jamika
9. Lurah Kebo Kangkung
10. Lurah Gegerkalang
11. Lurah Sukapada
12. Lurah Sirajadi

Kotabandung