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Abstract

This research was designed to contribute to an understanding of intimate partner violence perpetration and help-seeking behaviours among Muslim immigrants. The mandate of this study is not to ostracize Muslims or cast judgement for or against religious beliefs, but to better understand how religion and culture might interact with other factors to influence domestic violence perpetration. This understanding is critical for the development and implementation of effective intervention.

In this study, I used a mixed-method to explore how religious perspectives, patriarchal attitudes toward women, cumulative childhood abuse and acculturation might be related to domestic violence and help-seeking at both attitudinal and behavioural levels. In a quantitative study, survey data was collected from 131 Muslim students. In a qualitative study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 8 abusive Muslim men. The results of both studies were converging: religiosity predicted acceptance of violence and intimate partner violence via non-egalitarian attitudes toward women. Contrary to intergenerational theories of family violence, cumulative childhood experiences of abuse were not related to either acceptance or experiences of violence or help-seeking behaviours.

In the quantitative study, acculturation also moderated the relationship between non-egalitarian attitudes towards women and domestic violence. The relationships were stronger for participants who were at lower levels of acculturation, compared with those at higher levels.
Similarly, in the qualitative study, abusive men indicated that women acculturated faster to Canadian society and were empowered by Canadian regulations. Different levels of acculturation were considered threatening to men's positions as heads of the family and seemed to contribute to conflict and violence in the relationship.

Non-egalitarian attitudes toward women also predicted beliefs toward help-seeking through acceptance of violence. Participants with higher levels of acculturation showed more egalitarian attitudes and tendencies toward help-seeking behaviours. The qualitative study also revealed that Muslim men were reluctant to seek formal help due to their traditional gender role ideology, their lack of familiarity with available services and their doubts about the effectiveness of those services.

Findings around both domestic violence and help-seeking behaviours have applications for effective prevention, as well as community-based and culturally-based intervention programs for Muslim immigrants.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Intimate partner violence (IPV) occurs in every culture, religion, class, education, income, ethnicity and age (Barnes, 2001). According to the World Health Organization (WHO), 1.3% to 12% of women in Europe and North America have suffered from IPV (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi & Lozano, 2002). In Canada specifically, Data from 2009 General Social Survey (Statistics Canada, 2009) showed that 6.4% of women who were married or were in an intimate relationship had experienced physical and/or sexual abuse by their spouses during the previous 5 years. Twenty-three per cent of women with experiences of physical abuse reported severe physical abuse including being beaten, choked, or threatened with a gun or knife by their intimate partner. In addition, 17% of Canadian women suffered from psychological abuse (Statistics Canada, 2009).

National incidence studies of intimate partner violence in Muslim countries around the world suggest higher rates of domestic violence among Muslim families (for review see Douki, Nacef, Belhadj, Bouasker, & Ghachem, 2003). A national survey of ever-married women (n = 5,613) in Egypt showed that nearly half reported experiences of physical abuse over the course of their marriage and 19% reported physical abuse at least once over the previous year (El-Zanaty & Way, 2005). Similarly, two national surveys of married Palestinian women (the majority of whom were Muslim) in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, using samples of 2,410 (1994) and 1,334 (1995), both found that slightly over 50% of women had experienced of one or more acts of physical abuse in the previous 12 months (Haj-Yahia, 2000a). Rates of other forms of abuse were also high, with 52% of the women reporting verbal abuse, 22% reporting controlling behaviour, 45% reporting financial control and 37% reporting experiences of sexual abuse (Haj-Yahia, 2000a).
Muslim women from South Asian countries also suffer from unusually high rates of IPV. In Bangladesh, a national survey of almost 11,000 women showed that almost half of all ever-married women experienced physical violence at the hands of their husbands, and 18% reported sexual violence at some time in their life. One in four women was subject to physical and/or sexual violence in the previous 12 months. In addition, 60% of ever-married men (n = 4000) reported being physically violent with their wives, and 16% had done so in the previous 12 months (Bangladesh Demographic and Health Survey, 2007). In Pakistan, cross-sectional studies with married Muslim women (Fikree & Bhatti, 1999) and married Muslim men (Fikree, Razzak, & Durocher, 2005) also showed high rates of physical abuse. Fikree and Bhatti (1999) found that 34% (51 out of 150) of Pakistani married women had experienced physical abuse and 41% of those who reported victimization experienced frequent slapping, hitting or punching. Pakistani men (49.4%, 87 out of 176) also reported perpetration of physical abuse toward their wives. Almost half of abusive men reported that their wives were injured (e.g., bruises and fractures) because of their aggressive behaviours. Men indicated that the issues that most frequently led to abuse were children, financial issues, failure to listen to or obey the husband’s wishes, visiting family or friends without permission, and being disrespectful to their mother/father-in-law (Fikree et al., 2005).

Data from other Muslim countries also revealed a high occurrence of domestic partner violence (e.g., Garrusi, Nakhaee, Zangiabadi, 2008; Ghazizadeh, 2005; Mousavi & Eshagian, 2005; Ozcakir, Bayram, Ergin, Selimoglu & Bilgel, 2008). For instance, of 1000 married Iranian women, 15% reported physical violence from their husbands in the year before the study and 38% at some time during their marriage (Ghazizadeh, 2005). In Turkey, among 1,150 married men, 29% reported that they had beaten their wives at least once during their marriage, while
58.5% of respondents reported that they had yelled, shouted, or used abusive language with their wives at least once during their marriages (Ozcakir et al., 2008). Although an accurate prevalence of IPV is difficult to estimate in Muslim countries because of limited nationally representative data, considerable variation in how abuse is defined across these studies, and methodological differences among studies (Douki et al., 2003; Boy & Kulczycki, 2008), it is still reasonable to conclude that rates of domestic violence are high among Muslims.

In Canada, Muslims form one of the most rapidly growing groups of immigrants, representing 3.2% of the total population (Statistics Canada, 2013). As in other communities, domestic violence is a concerning issue among Muslims. It has been reported that Muslim women suffer from verbal, physical and sexual abuse (Alkhateeb & Abugideiri, 2007; Alkhateeb, Ellis, & Fortune, 2001; Faizi, 2001), as well as isolation (Abraham, 2000; Ayyab, 2000). In spite of the rapid growth of this community, there are scarce empirical studies that address domestic violence among Muslim Canadians. Although research has shown that different factors may be related to acceptance and experiences of violence, it is not clear how these factors may contribute to the occurrence of violence among Muslims.

During the last decade, theories and empirical studies have explored factors that may contribute to the acceptance of experiences of intimate partner violence as well as to inform help-seeking behaviours. Social learning theory proposes that violent behaviour, and attitudes supporting violence, are learned through socialization processes during childhood and adolescence and are transmitted from one generation to the next (Jasinski, 2001). When children witness or are exposed to violent behaviour that is not condemned by society, they will internalize such behaviour as socially acceptable and justified (Hines & Saudino, 2002). There is sufficient evidence that cumulative experiences of abuse during childhood, including either
physical childhood abuse or witnessing parental violence, increase the acceptance of violence (Haj-Yahia, 1998a, 2003; Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008; Haj-Yahia & de Zoysa, 2007) as well as IPV (Bensley, Van Eenwyk & Simmons, 2003; Desai, Arias, Thompson.& Basile, 2002; Lindhorst, Beadnell, Jackson, Fieland & Lee , 2009; Schumacher, Slep & Heyman; 2001; Stith et al., 2000). Exposure to community violence has also been recently considered as a risk factor in the context of intimate partner violence.

In addition to social theory, feminist theories view IPV as a result of societal expectations about male and female gender roles and their role in shaping relationships as key causal factors in partner abuse (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). According to this theory, men with a traditional gender role ideology will be more likely to believe that they have a right to own, control, and dominate their female partners and view physical violence as one of the means used to gain and maintain such control. Studies have supported the idea that patriarchal beliefs – non-egalitarian attitudes toward women – are related to justification of violence against women (e.g., Haj-Yahia, 1998a, 2000a, 2000b, 2002, 2003), and domestic violence victimization and perpetration (e.g., Ayyab, 2000; Schumacher et al., 2001; Smith, 1990; Stith & Farely, 1993, Stith, Smith, Penn, Ward & Tritt , 2004; Sugarman & Frankel, 1996). Researchers have also emphasized that patriarchal beliefs may also affect help-seeking behaviours among both battered women and abusive men.

Researchers have underscored that previous research has often ignored the structural and cultural factors intertwined with dimensions of immigration in the occurrence of IPV among immigrants. Abraham (1998) indicated that ethnicity, including race, origin, language, history, religious practice, beliefs and values, is a social construct that is dynamic and mediated in situational contexts. She suggested that “the intersections of ethnicity, gender, and class” (p.
219) have to be considered in the context of domestic violence among immigrants. Specifically, violence may be a result of women’s oppression on sexual, ethnic, cultural, legal and economic factors (Abraham, 2000). Empirical studies have also confirmed that the intersection of gender, class and ethnicity (i.e., race, language, religion and belief systems) may affect the occurrence of IPV (Abraham, 1998; Kasturirangan, Krishnan, & Riger, 2004; Perilla, Roger & Norris, 1994; Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005; Yick & Berthold, 2005), as well as help-seeking behaviours among immigrants and refugees (Bhuyan & Senturia, 2005; Gill, 2004; Liang, Goodman, Tummala-Narra & Weintraub, 2005; Liao, 2006; Lipsky, Caetano, Field & Larkin, 2006).

Abraham’s focus on intersectionality within a cultural framework is likely to be of particular importance for understanding acceptance and experiences of IPV and help-seeking behaviours among Muslim Canadians. Although different factors such as patriarchal beliefs and cumulative childhood experiences of violence have been found to be related to both the acceptance of violence and experiences of IPV, many other factors should be taken in to account to address the occurrence of IPV among Muslims. For instance, exposure to community violence is a risk factor for Muslims, since a substantial proportion of the Muslim population immigrated to Canada due to religious and political oppression, persecution, and armed conflict (e.g. civil wars in Somalia, Yugoslavia and Iraq). In addition, the process of immigration and acculturation may influence acceptance of wife beating and IPV, as has been found in other ethnic communities (e.g., Bui, 2003; Bui & Morash, 2007; West, Kantor & Jasinski, 1998; Yoshioka, Gilbert, El-Bassel & Balg-Amin, 2003; Yick, 2000a). However, because the results of these studies are inconsistent, it is crucial to investigate how the process of acculturation may contribute to acceptance and experiences of abuse among Muslims. Moreover, religious beliefs play an important role in the lives of Muslims. As in other religious communities, religious
interpretation shapes Muslims’ understanding of and responses to social issues such as domestic violence (Alkhateeb & Abugideiri, 2007). Research has shown that religiosity may have different role, as both a psychological resilience factor (Ellison & Anderson, 2001; Ellison, Bartkowski, & Anderson, 1999), and as a contributing factor (Cunradi, Caetano & Schaefer, 2002; Nason-Clark, 1997) in the context of violence. It is not clear how religious beliefs may contribute to the acceptance of and experiences of abuse among Muslims.

The current study aimed to address these gaps in the literature by developing a socio-cultural model of the acceptance and experiences of IPV and help-seeking behaviours among Muslim Canadians immigrants. Since IPV is multi-dimensional (Abraham, 1998; Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005), multiple research methods are required to secure an in-depth understanding of this phenomenon (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Therefore, in this study, a mixed-method design (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutmann, & Hanson, 2005) was applied to investigate the interplay of four factors: religiosity, patriarchy, childhood experiences of violence (both family and community) and acculturation in the context of acceptance and experiences of intimate violence as well as attitudes toward help-seeking and help-seeking behaviours among Muslims immigrants.

The subsequent sections outline the relevant background for this study. First, both qualitative and quantitative findings on the relationships regarding acceptance of wife beating, IPV and other factors including attitudes toward women, religiosity, cumulative experiences of childhood abuse and community violence, and acculturation, are reviewed. The association of help-seeking attitudes and behaviours with the above-mentioned factors will also be explored. Second, a general statement of questions and hypotheses is provided.
**Attitudes Toward Violence and Intimate Partner Violence**

An examination of attitudes toward violence may be indispensable to the understanding of the dynamics of domestic violence. A strong link between endorsement of attitudes approving of violence against women, and both women’s victimization or men’s perpetration of violence has been found (Falchikov, 1996; Margolin, Jhon, & Foo, 1998; O’Keefe, 1998; Riggs, Caulfield, & Street, 2000; Schumacher et al., 2001; Smith, 1990; Stith, 1990; Stith & Farley, 1993; Stith et al., 2004; Sugarman & Frankel, 1996). Specifically, an analytical review by Stith et al. (2004) found a strong effect size ($d = 0.71$) between attitudes condoning violence and males being physically abusive. Women’s acceptance of violence, in turn, is also related to higher risk of victimization. For instance, Kantor and Straus (1987) found that women who approved of a husband slapping his wife were at greater risk of both minor and severe victimization.

Given the strong association between IPV and justification of violence, researchers have investigated the attitudes that condone and legitimize wife beating (e.g., DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993; Gentemann, 1984; Griffith, Negy & Chadee, 2006; Nayak, Byrne, Martin & Abraham, 2003). During telephone interviews with 422 American women, Gentemann (1984) found that although a majority of women rejected the act of wife beating, 18.8% of them justified wife assault under certain conditions (e.g., flirting, nagging, having an affair), and 20% blamed the victim for her beating. A national survey of 1,307 male Canadian college and university students also showed that 6.2% of respondents approved of a man slapping his partner if he found out that she was dating another man, and 7% approved if she hit him first in an argument (DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993). It was underscored that attitudes toward wife beating should be considered in the context of normative and legal issues related to violence, and whether there are generalized attitudes promoted by society that support an individual’s right to hurt his partner. For example, a cross-cultural study from four countries including India, Kuwait, Japan and the U.S. showed
that students from the United States were the most supportive of sexually and physically abused victims, while students from Kuwait reported the least positive attitudes toward victimized women and blamed women for their abuse (Nayak et al., 2003). In general, male students from each of the different countries were significantly more likely than their female counterparts to blame women for their abuse.

Studies from Muslim countries have shown high rates of justification for and acceptance of wife beating in some circumstances (Almosaed, 2004; Dhafer, Mikołajczyk, Maxwell & Krämer, 2010; Nayak et al., 2003; Nazar & Kouzkanani, 2007; Haarr, 2007; Haj-Yahia, 1997, 1998a, 1998b, 2000b, 2002, 2003; Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008; Linos, Khawaja & Kaplan, 2012). In Turkey, between 4.5% and 38.7% of students justified wife beating under particular conditions (Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008). Specifically, 38.7% and 13.9% of the participants agreed with beating an unfaithful wife and with beating a disobedying wife, respectively. Similarly, 48% of Kuwaiti college students endorsed the belief that a man has the right to hit a woman (Nazar & Kouzkanani, 2007). Among 434 Palestinian Arab men who were engaged to be married, Haj-Yahia (1997) also found that 44% of them expressed some level of agreement with the statement: "There is no excuse for a man to beat his wife." However, different levels of agreement were expressed regarding the following statements: "Sometimes it is OK for a man to beat his wife" (30%), and "A sexually unfaithful wife deserves to be beaten" (56.7%). Between 23% and 71% of Palestinian married men also justified wife beating when a woman: is sexually unfaithful, insults the husband in front of his friends, challenges the husband’s manhood, disobeys the husband, fails to meet the husband’s expectations, refuses to have sex with the husband, or reminds the husband of his weak points (Haj Yahia, 1998a, 2003). In addition, between 33% and 68% of Palestinian women justified abusive male behaviour under certain
conditions (Haj-Yahia; 1998b, 2002). Palestinian men and women showed a strong tendency to believe that women benefit from violence against them and to blame women for their beatings (Haj-Yahia 1998a, 1998b, 2000b, 2002, 2003). In Saudi Arabia almost 53% of men and 40% of women believed that using physical aggression is an appropriate way to deal with women (Almosaed, 2004). Similarly, a study of 400 Tajik women showed that they justified wife beating in different conditions; for example, if a husband is angry with his wife, he has the right to hit/beat her (72%), swear at her (72%) and say things to her that will hurt her or make her afraid (67.8%; Haarr, 2007). Iranian women (n= 398) also believed that violence and wife beating is normal in marital life, and 43% of them blamed women for being abused (Garrusi et al., 2008).

Results from two studies among Muslims immigrants also revealed a high level of justification of violence against women. A survey of 202 Arab Americans (97.5% were Muslim and 80% were female with low socio-economic status) showed that 58% of women and 59% of men approved of a man slapping his wife (Kulwicki & Miller, 1999). The most shocking findings were that 4% of the respondents believed that a man should kill his wife if she hit him first during an argument, and that 18% of the women believed that a man was justified in killing his wife if she had an affair with another man. Regarding controlling behaviours, 72% of men and 44% of women agreed, at some level, that a woman needs permission to go out in the evening with her friends (Kulwicki & Miller, 1999). Similarly, among 67 battered Arab women with low socio-economic status who had immigrated to the United States (85% of whom were Muslim), 16% to 25% of them justified wife beating and 24% of them agreed that a woman involved in adultery should be killed (Abu-Ras, 2007).
In sum, a significant association has been found between attitudes toward violence and IPV. Abusive men are more likely to justify abuse and blame women for their abuse. Similarly, victimized women may have a stronger tendency to accept violence. Studies of Muslims from diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds showed high rates of acceptance of violence. Although methodological differences should be taken into account, in general, studies have found that acceptance of violence tends to be higher in predominantly Muslim countries (Almosaed, 2004; Dhaher et al. 2010; Nayak et al., 2003; Nazar & Kouzekanani, 2007; Haarr, 2007; Haj-Yahia, 1997, 1998, 1998b, 2000b, 2002, 2003; Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008) than in Canada. Researchers have highlighted that justifying wife beating and occurrence of IPV may be related to non-egalitarian attitudes toward women.

**Gender Role Attitudes, Attitudes Toward Violence and Intimate Partner Violence**

Justifying domestic violence and IPV can be, at least in part, attributed to the patriarchal orientation of cultures on issues related to gender roles in the family and the community at large. Research has shown strong links between tolerance of intimate partner violence and patriarchal ideology, which includes beliefs about male privilege and adherence to traditional gender roles (Coleman & Stith, 1997; Haj-Yahia, 1998a, 1998b, 2003; Haj-Yahia, Sousa, Alnabilys & Elias, 2015; Haj-Yahia, Wilson, & Naqvi, 2012; Heise, 1998; Herzog, 2007; Sakalli, 2001; Simonson & Subich, 1999; Smith, 1990, Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Waltermaurer, 2012; Willis, Hallinan, & Melby, 1996). Coleman and Stith (1997) investigated the attitudes toward victims of domestic violence among 155 female nursing students. The researchers found that female students with more traditional attitudes were supportive of marital violence. Hostile and negative traditional gender role attitudes toward women and acceptance of domestic violence were also investigated through vignettes among a large adult sample (Herzog, 2007). Respondents were provided with different domestic violence scenarios and asked to judge each
scenario on two levels: first, by evaluating its perceived seriousness, and second, by determining its most appropriate punishment. Respondents with relatively high scores on sexist hostility were more likely to have less serious perceptions of offenses committed by men against women and to propose less serious punishments for them than those respondents with more egalitarian views. Moreover, this study showed that such gender role attitudes were the strongest predictor of lenient attitudes toward IPV in both the perception of its seriousness and in assigning appropriate punishment for such violence.

A similarly strong association has been found between traditional attitudes toward women and acceptance of violence among Muslims. For instance, Sakalli (2001) examined traditional gender role attitudes and acceptance of IPV among 221 Turkish students. Turkish males who scored high on support for patriarchal attitudes had the most positive attitudes toward wife beating. Similarly, Muslim Lebanese students with high traditional expectations of women’s roles expressed more willingness to justify wife beating (Obeid, Chang, & Ginges, 2010). Palestinian men and women’s justification of violence was also found to be related to their patriarchal beliefs. Haj-Yahia (1997, 1998a, 2003) indicated that Palestinian men’s tendency to justify wife beating, to blame wives for violence, and to consider violent husbands less responsible for their behaviours are best explained by several factors including their non-egalitarian expectations of marriage, traditional attitudes toward women, and patriarchal beliefs about family life. Haj-Yahia (2003) found that 50.8% of the variance in Arab men’s justification of wife beating was accounted for by their age, level of education, rigid gender role stereotypes, negative attitudes toward women, and non-egalitarian marital role expectations. Palestinian women who held more traditional attitudes toward women and familial patriarchal beliefs also showed more acceptance of wife beating (Haj-Yahia, 1998b, 2002). This non-egalitarian attitude
Attitudes toward women are also related to the perpetration of violence against women and to women’s victimization (Alexander, Moore, & Alexander, 1991; Smith, 1990; Schumacher et al., 2001, Stith & Farely, 1993, Stith et al., 2004; Sugarman & Frankel, 1996). A cross-cultural study of 16 nations showed a strong link between patriarchal values and physical aggression by husbands (Archer, 2006). Archer (2006) analysed studies from different nations that used the Sex Role Ideology Scale (SRIS) and the Hostile Sexism subscale of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (ASI) to investigate women’s victimization. The results of this study revealed a high correlation between hostile sexism and national rates of women's victimization. Societies with more traditional gender role attitudes showed higher rates of lifetime victimization of women by their male partners. A strong link between gender-based ideology and IPV within countries has also been found (e.g., Alexander et al., 1991; Faramarzi, Esmailzadeh & Mosavi, 2005; Smith, 1990). For instance, Smith (1990) conducted a random telephone survey of 604 Canadian women who were married or living in a cohabiting relationship asking about women’s perceptions of their husband's beliefs and attitudes toward women and their experiences of abuse. The researcher found that the more patriarchal the husband's beliefs and attitudes, the greater the probability that he beats his wife. Analytical reviews have demonstrated a moderate effect size between traditional gender role attitudes and males perpetrating physical violence (Schumacher et al., 2001; Stith et al., 2004; Sugarman & Frankel, 1996). However, more conflicting results are reported for the prediction of victimization. For example, Sugarman and Frankel’s analytical review (1996) showed a moderate effect size between holding liberal attitudes toward women and the likelihood of being the victim in a battering relationship. In other words, women who
express more liberal gender attitudes are more likely to be victims of a spouse’s violence, presumably because their husbands/partners want to maintain their control through force (Sugarman & Frankel, 1996).

In addition to quantitative research, qualitative studies have also revealed that gender role attitudes are a risk factor in the context of IPV (Agoff, Herrera & Castro, 2007; Bettman, 2009; Bui & Morash, 1999; Hunjan, 2003; Konczak, 2006; Ringel & Bina, 2007). Bettman (2009) indicated that domestic violence is a phenomenon rooted in patriarchal discourse. In his interviews with abusive men, non-egalitarian attitudes toward women were revealed such as: “the man is superior and head of family”, and deserves to have the “key position in the society” (p. 20-21), while women only have responsibility for the household. The researcher concluded that patriarchal ideologies remain the “energy source” of cultural discourse where an unequal gender order is promoted. Orthodox Jewish women also reported that male dominance was an important factor in their experiences of IPV, as their social norms support partners having an entitled right to control women either verbally or physically (Ringel & Bina, 2007). Similarly, battered Mexican women accepted their husbands’ aggressive behaviour because of a belief their husbands had the right to such behaviour. When the women believed themselves to be subordinates, they were especially tolerant of their husbands’ misbehaviours. For instance, one woman mentioned: “The man’s the boss in the home and after all, he brings home the bacon, right? So we had to obey” (Agoff et al., 2007, p. 1214).

In conclusion, non-egalitarian attitudes toward women might be underlying men’s acceptance and perpetration of violence. It is likely that men who hold non-egalitarian beliefs regarding gender roles are also more accepting of violence, which in turn puts them at higher risk of perpetrating intimate partner violence. Although empirical evidence supports these
associations, there is a gap in the literature examining these factors with respect to Muslim immigrants, most of whom come from patriarchal societies (Haj-Yahia, 1997, 1998a, 2003; Douki et al., 2003).

Attitudes Toward Violence, IPV, Attitudes Toward Women and Help-Seeking Attitudes & Behaviours

Gender role beliefs and attitudes towards domestic violence may affect help-seeking attitudes (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good, Dell & Mintz, 1989; Haj-Yahai, 1998a, 1998b, 2002; Haj-Yahai & Uysal, 2008; Haj-Yahai & de Zoysa, 2007; Mendoza & Cummings, 2001; Zeldow & Greenberg, 1979, 1980) and behaviours in the context of intimate partner violence (Abu-Ras, 2007; Campbell, Neil, Jeff, & Kelly, 2010). Attitudes about providing help to battered women (including legal and social services), specifically, have been evaluated among Muslims from different population and countries. A substantial percentage of the Muslim student population tended to believe that wife abuse is a social problem and should be considered as such by both social agencies and the law. Almost 88% of Turkish students, for instance, endorsed this belief (Haj-Yahai & Uysal, 2008). However, 26.3% of Turkish students expressed the opinion that domestic violence is a private matter and stated that they would not do anything if they heard a women being attacked by her husband. The results also showed that female participants were more likely than their male counterparts to support helping battered women. In contrast to the students’ belief that wife beating is a social problem, in the general population, Haj-Yahai (1998b, 1997, 2003) found that Palestinian women and men expressed a strong tendency to view wife abuse as a personal and family problem rather than a social one. As such, they indicated that incidents of wife abuse should be dealt with inside the family without intervention from social service agencies, and expressed reluctance to help battered women. For instance, 63% of the women strongly agreed or agreed that “If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, it
would be best to do nothing” and 84% of women strongly agreed or agreed that “A battered woman should be given all of the needed help and support by her family” (Haj-Yahia, 2002). Further, some members of the Muslim community believe that if a battered woman seeks formal help, it might ruin the family reputation (Al-Matalka & Hussainat, 2013). In general, research results have revealed that the more individuals held negative and traditional attitudes toward women, and the more they maintained patriarchal and non-egalitarian expectations of marriage, the less they tended to support helping battered women (Haj-Yahai, 1997, 1998b, 2003; Haj-Yahai & Uysal, 2008; Haj-Yahai & de Zoysa, 2007).

At the behavioural level of seeking help, research has also demonstrated that battered women and batterer men who were more accepting of wife beating and who held non-egalitarian attitudes toward women were less likely to utilize social services. For instance, battered Arab immigrant women (85% were Muslim) with more traditional beliefs and attitudes toward wife beating were less likely to take advantage of formal services to address violence (Abu-Ras, 2007). Similarly, a study with 109 abusive men showed that batterer men who held more traditional views of masculinity expressed negative attitudes toward seeking help (Mendoza & Cummings, 2001). On the other hand, men with more liberal gender role attitudes showed more positive help-seeking attitudes and were more likely to have sought counselling (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good et al., 1989; Zeldow & Greenberg, 1979, 1980). In addition, using a mixed-method qualitative and quantitative research design, Campbell and his colleagues (2010) explored batterers’ help-seeking behaviours among 73 abusive men who completed a questionnaire and 15 men who participated in focus groups. The results of this study showed that while 63% of the participants sought help, only 38% actually received help and support regarding their violent behaviours. The majority of abusive men preferred to seek help from a
counsellor, friend or family member, doctor, or religious leader, in that order. In addition, focus groups revealed that men were reluctant to seek help due to their traditional male gender role attitudes and feelings of shame.

In conclusion, there is growing research that shows gender role attitudes can affect attitudes around offering support to abused women, while influencing the intentions of abusive men and abused women to seek informal and formal help. However, there is a gap in the literature with respect to how gender role attitudes can affect help-seeking behaviours among Muslim immigrants specifically.

**Cumulative Childhood Experiences of Abuse, Attitudes Toward Violence and Intimate Partner Violence**

Witnessing violence and experiencing maltreatment in childhood are both considered to be risk factors in the justification of domestic violence and experiences of IPV in adulthood. A strong link has been found between experiencing abuse in the family of origin and both women’s victimization (Bensley et al. 2003; Coker, Smith, McKeown & King, 2000; Desai et al., 2002; Dube, Anda, Felitti, Edwards & Williamson, 2002; Gilbert, El-Bassel, Schilling & Friedman, 1997; Kwong, Bartholomew, Henderson & Trinke, 2003; Lindhorst et al., 2009; Schumacher et al., 2001; Stith et al., 2000; Vatnar & Bjørkly, 2008; Whitfield, Anda, Dube & Felitti, 2003) and men’s perpetration of abuse in their intimate relationships (Carr & Vandeusen, 2002; Doumas, Margolin, & John, 1994; Lisak, Hopper & Song, 1996; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Schumacher et al., 2001; Straus & Gelles, 1986). A 10-year- longitudinal study (White & Widom, 2003) showed that individuals who were abused and/or neglected prior to age 12 reported significantly higher rates of hitting or throwing things at a partner than their matched controls. Whitfield et al. (2003) also found that experiences of childhood abuse more than doubled the risk of victimization among women and the risk of perpetration by men. Results of
this study demonstrated a strong relationship between the number of violent experiences and the risks of victimization among women and perpetration of violence by men. In addition, data from a two-year-longitudinal study showed that childhood physical abuse was a strong predictor of victimization and a risk factor for re-victimization among young mothers (Lindhorst et al., 2009) increasing between four-fold and six-fold their risk of physical and emotional abuse when compared to non-victims of childhood physical abuse (Bensley et al., 2003; Desai et al., 2002).

Exposure to domestic violence during childhood also increases perpetration and victimization of abuse during adulthood. For instance, Coker et al. (2000) found that women who reported that their fathers were physically abusive toward their mothers were at a three-fold risk of partner physical abuse and a four-fold risk of partner physical and sexual abuse. In terms of men’s perpetration of violence, Carr and Vandeusen (2002) also found that witnessing parental violence increased physical violence among male undergraduates when dating and might put second-generation men at higher risk of being perpetrators of marital aggression (Doumas et al., 1994). A National Family Violence Survey of 6,000 adults in the United States found that wife beating is substantially more prevalent among men who observed violence by their parents, especially where their mothers were violent (Straus & Gelles, 1986). Furthermore, meta-analytical reviews (Schumacher et al, .2001; Stith et al., 2000) showed medium effect size between violence in the family of origin and perpetration of IPV, though correlations to victimization were found to be less consistent.

In addition to experiencing abuse in the family of origin, a growing body of research suggests that community violence and intimate partner violence are associated (Kennedy, 2008; Malik, Sorenson & Aneshensel, 1997; Raghavan, Rajah, Gentile, Collado & Kavangh, 2009; Taylor et al., 2008). Kenndey (2008) assessed the relationship between IPV and exposure to
cumulative violence including childhood physical abuse, witnessing parental abuse, and community violence among African-American high school and college students. Among the female participants, severe community violence (e.g., witnessing someone being beaten in the community) and childhood physical abuse were significantly related to IPV victimization. Similarly, Taylor and her colleagues (2008) examined exposure to cumulative abuse before age 16 among 60 adolescents between ages 18 and 21. The results of the study again confirmed that experiences of childhood abuse and community violence were risk factors in female victimization. Exposure to weapons and violent injury in the community predicted IPV perpetration and victimization for both genders (Malik et al., 1997). Specifically, male adolescents who reported experiences of community violence six months before the study were at higher risk of perpetration of violence toward their partners (Raghavan et al., 2009).

Over and above the strong link between either experiencing abuse personally or witnessing domestic violence as a child and the increased risk of IPV, there has also been substantial research on an association between witnessing parental violence and/or childhood abuse, and attitudes toward domestic violence (Jin, Eagle & Yoshioka, 2007; Haj-Yahia, 1998b; Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008; Haj-Yahia & de Zoysa, 2007). For instance, Haj-Yahia and Uysal (2008) examined the relationship between childhood exposure to abuse and acceptance of wife beating among 73 Turkish students. The researchers found the more students reported childhood physical abuse and witnessing parental violence, the greater their tendency to justify wife beating, and to perceive battered women as being responsible for those beatings.

In spite of research that has supported association between experiences of abuse in the family of origin and acceptance and/or experiences of domestic violence, some studies did not support these finding (e.g. Carr & Vandeusen, 2002; Hai-Yahia et al., 2012; Linder & Collins,
For instances, Carr & Vandeusen (2002) found that acceptance of abuse among male students was unrelated to either childhood experience of abuse or witnessing parental violence. They also found no correlation between experiences of childhood abuse by a parental figure and adult perpetration of abuse. Similarly, Linder and Collins (2005) used longitudinal data to evaluate children’s exposure to IPV when they were young and then their intensive conflicted relationships when these children were 20 years old. This study showed that witnessing family violence in childhood was related to IPV victimization but not to IPV perpetration. Using prospective data on men, Capaldi and Clark (1998) also found that IPV exposure in early adolescence was not associated with partner violence in young adulthood.

A few studies have investigated a path mediation model to provide a better understanding of how the abuse in the family of origin might be related to the IPV later on in adulthood. One theory is that exposure to abuse during childhood increases non-egalitarian attitudes toward women, which in turn may increase tendencies toward violence and IPV. However, the results of studies that investigated the mediation model have been inconsistent. For instance, a quantitative study (Stith & Farely, 1993) showed that witnessing inter-parental violence had a negative effect on traditional sex role attitudes, which in turn predicted severe marital violence among abusive men. Consistently, a qualitative study (Agoff et al., 2007) of abused Mexican women found that women who observed parental violence, especially when their father abused their mother, received the message that as women, they deserve to be beaten. Walker (1984) suggested that women who observed parental violence might become more tolerant of their partners’ violence and believe that nothing can be done to change their spouse’s behaviour. On the contrary, Karakurt, Keiley and Posada (2013) could not find a path between witnessing or
experiencing family violence in childhood and later intimate partner violence via non-egalitarian
gender attitudes for either male or female students.

In conclusion, exposure to violence (witnessing or experiencing) in one’s family of origin
and exposure to community violence are risk factors in the acceptance of violence and IPV.
These factors might also affect attitudes toward women, which in turn may affect IPV. Although
research shows an association between childhood abuse and/or witnessing inter-parental
violence, and acceptance of violence in Muslim families (e.g., Haj-Yahia, 1998a, 2003; Haj-
Yahia & Uysal, 2008), there is a lack of research investigating how these risk factors may be
related to IPV among Muslims. In addition, it is not clear how cumulative violence may affect
acceptance of abuse and IPV among Muslim families. This is a particularly important gap in
literature given that many Muslims experience community violence due to civil war and other
forms of ethnic strife (e.g., Somalia, Yugoslavia, Iraq and Afghanistan) as well as religious and
political persecution (e.g., Iran and Pakistan).

**Cumulative Childhood Experiences of Abuse and Help-Seeking Attitudes & Behaviours**

There is scarce research exploring how the cumulative impacts of exposure to abuse in
childhood affects help-seeking behaviours among abusive men and abused women in adulthood.
However, in terms of attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours, studies showed that participants
(both women and men) who witnessed inter-parental violence and experienced violence from
their parents were less likely to support battered women (Haj-Yahia, 1997; Haj-Yahia & Uysal,
2008; Haj-Yahia & de Zoysa, 2007). Since there are not enough studies to investigate how
childhood experiences of abuse may be related to help-seeking behaviours among abused women
and batterer men, it is crucial to evaluate this association.
Religiosity, Attitudes Toward Violence, and Intimate Partner Violence

Religiosity is another factor that has recently received empirical attention in the context of IPV. Religiosity has been considered as a multidimensional concept and researchers have been trying to identify its different dimensions. For instance, Glock and Strak (1965) divided religion into five different dimensions: ideological (acceptance of the belief system), ritualistic (participation in religious rituals), experiential (emotional component of religious beliefs as a personal experience of religiousness), intellectual (knowledge of the belief system), and consequential (socially based consequences of religion). Considering behavioural, attitudinal, and motivational elements of religiosity, Allport and Ross (1967) suggested a model describing two kinds of religiosity; extrinsic and intrinsic. The intrinsic orientation is characterized as an internal motivation to follow the religion, whereas the extrinsic orientation is motivated by personal gain such as social needs, relief, and comfort. Allort and Ross (1967) indicated that intrinsic religiosity is a true and mature religious orientation. In contrast, Batson, Flink, Schoenrade, Fultz and Pych (1986) pointed out that although intrinsic religiosity might represent a mature faith, it is also strongly related to the rigid belief system, fundamentalism, which is described as an absolute belief in religious authority and strict adherence to religious texts and tradition, and is generally viewed as less mature (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992). Batson et al. (1986) suggested that a truly mature religiosity is the desire of the believer to deeply examine his/her life, to ask questions, to voice doubt, and ultimately, to be willing to shift his or her religious paradigm.

Religiosity may play a dual role in the context of IPV, and different aspects of religion may relate differently to IPV. On the one hand, regular attendance at religious services has been found to be inversely related to the incidence of domestic violence (Cunradi et al., 2002; Ellison & Anderson, 2001; Ellison et al., 1999; Ellison, Trinitapoli, Anderson, & Johnson, 2007). Data
from the National Survey of Families and Households in the United States, for example, showed that those who attended services more often reported less spousal abuse, even after controlling for variables such as social integration and social support (Ellison & Anderson, 2001). Similarly, using a Canadian sample, Brinkerhoff, Grandin and Lupir (1992) found a weak but negative association between attendance at religious services and IPV after adjusting for other covariates. In particular, weekly attendance was associated with lower rates of IPV victimization for women; however, the men’s weekly attendance at services was not associated with a decreased risk of IPV after controlling for covariates such as an alcohol problem (Cunradi et al., 2002).

On the other hand, religiosity may increase justification of wife abuse (e.g., Khalid & Frieze, 2004; Macey, 1999) and the experience of domestic violence (Cunradi et al., 2002; Nason-Clark, 1997, 2000). For instance, Khalid and Frieze (2004) compared religious ideology (i.e., liberal or conservative) and attitudes toward violence between Pakistani Muslims in both Pakistan and the United States. In general, men who identified themselves as adhering to conservative (more traditional) religious perspectives were more likely to justify abuse and less likely to consider any punishment for husbands’ abusive behaviours. Similarly, in a study of Saudi Arabian women, those who reported greater religiosity did not consider beating women as an aggressive act, unlike the women who endorsed lower levels of religiosity (Almosead, 2004). Haj-Yahi (2003) also examined attitudes toward wife beating and religiosity among Palestinian men. He assessed religiosity by asking three questions: to what extent do the men consider themselves religious, practice and adhere to the laws and customs of their religion, and identify themselves as religious. Although this study showed no significant association between religiosity and justification of wife beating, the respondents who were more religious showed a
greater tendency toward sexual conservatism, greater expression of rigid and masculine sex-role stereotypes, and held more patriarchal beliefs about family life.

Similar patterns were found in the qualitative research. These studies have shown that religious perpetrators justified their aggressive behaviour by relying on religious concepts (e.g., Levitt, Swanger, & Butler, 2008; Macey, 1999). During an explanatory study with Pakistani Muslims in England, Macey (1999) concluded that Muslim male abusers may manipulate the religious beliefs and their wives' faith to justify abuse and to maintain power and control. Battered women may also tolerate and accept abuse since obedience is a part of religious belief (Hassouneh-Phillips, 2003). A meta-synthesis of six qualitative studies with abused women (from 2000 to 2006) showed that women experienced conflict between expectations about their roles, submission and obedience founded in religious teachings, and accepting their abusive marriages (Yick, 2008). Abusive men also had ambivalent feelings about their marital roles due to the conflicting messages between religion and society (Levitt et al., 2008). Thus, although belonging to a religious community might have some benefits in terms of reducing domestic violence, religious beliefs may also promote patriarchal structure, male dominance and female submissiveness, which increases the acceptance and experience of violence.

The association between religion and gender role attitudes is well documented (Abu-Ali & Reisen, 1999; Bartkowski & Read, 2003; Hartmen & Hartmen, 1996; Harville & Rienzi, 2000; Jeffords, 1984; Lottes & Kuriloff, 1992; Morgan, 1987; Read, 2002, 2003; Read & Bartkowski, 2000; St. Lawrence & Joyner, 1991). Religious devoutness has been found to be significantly related to gender role attitudes toward women, including familial roles, extra-familial roles, male/female stereotypes, and gender preference. Harville and Rienzi (2000) found individuals with a stronger religious commitment expressed more traditional attitudes toward women than
moderately religious and nonreligious individuals. Taşdemir and Sakallı-Uğurlu (2010) investigated sexism among Turkish students. They found that when Turkish Muslim males held a more religious perspective, they reported more negative and aggressively sexist attitudes toward women. It is underscored that religiosity and ethnicity are more important in shaping women’s gender role attitudes than religious affiliation. Read (2003) compared Arab women with different religious affiliations — Muslim and Christian — with regards to their service attendance, belief in scriptural inerrancy and religious belief over their life course. The results showed that religious women held more traditional gender role attitudes. Furthermore, Muslim women held more non-egalitarian attitudes toward women than their Christian counterparts. However, after controlling for variables such as being born outside of the United State (U.S.), the length of residency in the U.S., affiliation with an ethnic organization and belief in scriptural inerrancy, there was no difference between women of different religious affiliations (i.e., being Muslim or Christian).

Studies have examined the association between religious ideologies/orientations and attitudes toward women. A few studies specifically looked at intrinsic and extrinsic religious orientations (see Jones & McNamara, 1991; St. Lawrence & Joyner, 1991). The results of these studies showed that intrinsic orientation may be related to holding more traditional attitudes towards women such as unequal rights, accepting differences in gender roles and male dominance (McClain, 1979), holding negative attitudes towards women’s employment (Harville & Rienzi, 2000) and expecting women to spend more time at home during children’s early years (Jones & McNamara, 1991). In addition to intrinsic orientation, the relationship between fundamentalist orientation and non-egalitarian attitudes toward women was investigated (Denton, 2004; Harris & Firestone, 1998; Peek, Lowe & Williams, 1991). For instance, by using
data from the National Research Opinion Center’s General Social Survey from 1974-1994, Harris and Firestone (1998) found that those individuals who were members of a fundamentalist religion tended to hold a more traditional gender role ideology. Among several religiosity variables, including fundamentalism, internalization, and religious commitment, Bang, Hall, Anderson and Willingham (2005) found only a significantly negative relationship between fundamentalism and gender role-sharing. Consistently, Denton (2004) analyzed gender role ideology, marital decision-making and religious ideology by using data from the 1996 Religious Identity and Influence Survey. This study showed that conservative Protestants favoured more traditional gender role attitudes regarding decision making; the husband, as the head of the family, was in charge of final decisions, while liberal Protestants endorsed involving both partners in making family decisions (Denton, 2004). A similar result was found by Khalid and Frieze (2004), as Pakistani Muslim men with more conservative religious perspectives showed more non-egalitarian attitudes toward women than did their liberal counterparts.

One of the mechanisms that has been underscored is that religiosity might be related to experiences and acceptance of abuse through traditional attitudes toward women. Only a few studies have been geared towards understanding the more proximal processes, with inconsistent results. For instance, Jeffords (1984) investigated relationships among gender role attitudes, religious orthodoxy, and attitudes toward forced marital intercourse. The researcher found that those who reported religious orthodoxy held more traditional gender role attitudes and were more likely to endorse the use of forced marital intercourse than those with egalitarian gender role attitudes or those who did not report religious orthodoxy. However, when Berkel, Vandiver and Bahner (2004) examined religious orientations and gender role attitudes as predictors of belief about violence against women among 316 Caucasian college students, they could not find
a mediation path. The results showed that belief in traditional gender roles was the best predictor of attitudes supporting violence against women for both men and women. However, the students' religious orientation was not significantly related to attitudes toward domestic violence, over and above gender role attitudes. Researchers concluded that the relationships among gender role attitudes, religious variables, and beliefs about aggression toward women may not be clear because religiosity is multidimensional, and gender role attitudes may mask a relationship between religiousness and attitudes supporting violence against women.

In conclusion, there is a strong association between religiosity and attitudes toward women. However, the mechanism and direction of how religiosity is related to acceptance and experiences of domestic violence is less clear. It is possible that individuals with intrinsic and/or more fundamentalist religious orientations hold more traditional gender role attitudes, which in turn may increase their acceptance and experiences of violence. Since there is limited research with inconsistent results, it is crucial to investigate how religiosity may be intertwined in the context of violence among Muslims immigrants.

**Religion and Help-Seeking Attitudes & Behaviours**

Meta-analytical reviews of qualitative studies show that religion and spirituality play a dual role in influencing help-seeking behaviours among abused women (Rahn, 2008; Yick, 2008), including whether they leave or stay in the abusive relationship (e.g., Potter, 2007; Senter & Caldwell, 2002). On the one hand, religious perspective gives women strength to seek help. For instance, a qualitative study with abused African-American women showed that relying on a "higher power" helped women in enduring the abusive relationship or in leaving the abusive relationship (Potter, 2007). Women may use religious beliefs as a way to get help (Park, 2005) by participating in religious services which may connect them to a larger community (Bryant-Davis, 2005; Watlington & Murphy, 2006) and as a way to receive social and spiritual support.
(Giesbrecht & Sevcik, 2000). On the other hand, abused women might be reluctant to get help because they attribute their abuse to the will of God, and use religious and spiritual strategies such as prayer and meditation to find strength to keep them in an abusive relationship and protect them from more severe abuse (El-Khoury et al., 2004; Potter, 2007). Similarly, religion has a double-edged effect for battered Muslim women. Interviews with 17 Muslim American women (Hassouneh-Phillips, 2003) revealed that Muslim women who survived domestic violence expressed that spirituality made them stronger, as well as more vulnerable. Battered Muslim women think that facing a crisis is a fate and a test from God. Therefore, they try to be obedient to their husbands in order to receive a reward for their patience and suffering (Hassouneh-Phillips, 2003). Some of them reported that they could turn to Allah when there was no one else, and they used spiritual methods, such as prayer, meditation, and listening to Quran recitation to cope with the abuse. They may continue to forgive their partners, pray for change, and not leave their relationships (Nason-Clark, 2004). Religion especially encourages the maintenance of the family, which may make women more reluctant to seek help and compromise women’s safety in the context of interpersonal violence (Hassouneh-Phillips, 2003). However, a woman may struggle with making sense of God in the midst of violence and begin to question her faith and the ability of the higher power to stop the violence (Yick, 2008).

Religious women may prefer to get help from their religious community rather than formal services. A qualitative study with clergy and secular clinicians who worked with abused women with conservative evangelical orientations showed that the women were more likely to seek support from their churches rather than from formal services (Nason-Clark, 1997). However, clergy were also reluctant to refer abused women to professional resources, and also proved unhelpful in alleviating the women’s spiritual distress or intervening in the violence
In general, women received different responses from religious leaders, ranging from encouragement to leave to assertions that they belonged to their husbands regardless of abuse (Gillum, Sullivan & Bybee, 2006; Nason-Clark, 1997). Interviews with leaders of different religious affiliations (i.e., Jewish, Christian, and Islamic faiths) also showed that most leaders of all faiths expressed hesitation in encouraging women to divorce as a way to leave their abusive partners (Levitt & Ware, 2006). Similar results were found with battered Muslim women who turned to religious leaders for help (Abdel Meguid, 2006); women reported that imams were not helpful in most of the cases and encouraged them to stay in their abusive relationships (Sheikh, 2008).

In sum, there are many qualitative studies about how religious beliefs may encourage survivors of abuse to stay in abusive relationships or postpone getting help, and how they use religious beliefs during their abusive relationship to cope and later to rebuild their strength. However, studies have yet to investigate how religion and religious coping strategies may impact men’s approach to help-seeking; whether encouraging them to seek help or manipulating religious concepts to justify their abusive behaviours, making them less inclined to seek help to end their abusive behaviours.

**Acculturation, Attitudes Toward Intimate Violence and Intimate Partner Violence**

The process of acculturation may affect attitudes toward violence and the rate of experiences of intimate partner violence among immigrants. Acculturation refers to the process of changes in values and behaviours that take place when individuals from different ethnocultural groups come into prolonged contact with one another (Berry, 1997). As immigrants experience the process of acculturation, they might modify and change their behaviours (e.g. learning language, sharing each other’s food preferences, and adopting forms of dress), social interactions (e.g., finding friends from other cultures) and attitude or belief systems (Berry,
2005). It is important to acknowledge that there are a number of ways that acculturation might be understood. In early work, a unidimensional model of acculturation was typically used, where acculturation was synonymous with the level of adoption of the host culture. In the 1980’s, a bidimensional model of acculturation became prominent. In this model, a quadric understanding is advanced, made up of two independent dimensions underlying the process of acculturation of immigrants, namely maintenance of heritage, culture and identity, and involvement with or identification with aspects of their host societies (Berry, 1997). Some researchers argued that acculturation should be considered a multidimensional model (e.g., Berry, 2005, Bourhis Moise, Perrault & Senecal, 1997). For instance, Bourhis and colleagues (1997) argued that the integration policy through the government legislation can have a strong effect on both immigrants and host community acculturation orientations and proposed an additional dimension.

Although there has been a huge enhancement in theory in understanding acculturation, when it comes to measuring this construct, it is still challenging (for review see Matsudaira, 2006). Using bidimensional scales, considering both receiving host culture acquisition and heritage culture retention as independent dimensions, may cover a much wider range of cultural factors and better capture the nuances of acculturation than a unidimensional one (Abraído-Lanza, Armbrister, Flórez & Aguirre, 2006). However, bidimensional scales either measuring four subtypes of acculturation (i.e., four acculturation strategies, Berry, 1997, 2005) or orthogonal dimensions of the new culture and the culture of origin (e.g., Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh, 2001; Ryder, Alden, & Paulhus, 2000) are still controversial. Researchers criticize that bidimensional scales may not differentiate four subscales accurately because the subscales are not substantially independent (Rudmin, 2003; Rudmin & Ahmadzadeh, 2001), and may not
be extracted in exactly four subscales (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005; Del Pilar & Udasco, 2004), and multiple variants of one or more of the subscales have been found (e.g., Schwartz & Zamboanga, 2008). When comparing unidimensional and bidimensional scales, some researchers suggested that a bidimensional scale should be used and is more appropriate for theoretical investigations while a unidimensional scale is more practical and measures a concise proxy of acculturation (Flannery, Reise & Yu, 2001).

In the study of acculturation in the context of DV, previous studies have almost always measured this construct with a unidimensional perspective. The levels of adaptation to the host culture were measured by different indicators including the degree of proficiency in the language of the host country (e.g., Harris & Firestone, 1998; Harris et al., 2005; Jasinski, 1998), the length of residency in the host country (e.g., Ali & Toner, 2001; Nilsson, Brown, Russell, & Khamphakdy-Brown, 2008), generational status (e.g., Adam & Schewe, 2007; Wallach, Weingram and Avitan, 2010) and rating scales used to evaluate a range of behaviours and attitudes adopted from main stream culture (e.g., Champion, 1996, Kim-Goh & Ba ello, 2008; Yick, 2000b).

Acculturating to North American cultural values may negatively predict attitudes toward intimate partner violence (Bhanot & Senn, 2007; Ganguly, 1998; Kim-Goh & Ba ello, 2008; Jaghab, 2005; Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997; Yoshioka et al. 2003). A study of male South Asian immigrant students showed that students who reported being more acculturated to Canadian culture expressed lower justification of physical violence towards women (Bhanot & Senn, 2007). Similarly, Jaghab (2005) found that Arab American women (the majority of whom were Christian), who declared to be acclimated to mainstream culture, reported less acceptance of IPV. Although some studies have supported that acculturation to North American culture may
negatively predict pro-violent attitudes, other studies have been inconclusive (Ali & Toner, 2001; Yick, 2000b). For example, Ali and Toner (2001) found no significant association between attitudes towards wife beating and acculturation among 40 Muslims by considering the length of their residency in Canada as an indicator of acculturation. It is possible that the inconsistency in the results is due to the varied definitions of acculturation and the different instruments used to assess it.

Acculturation to North American culture may be associated with less tolerance attitudes towards violence; however, it may not protect against actual experiences of violence (Champion, 1996; Garcia, Hurwitz, & Kraus, 2005; Lown & Vega, 2001; Nilsson et al., 2008; Yick, 2000a). A study with 62 Muslim married refugee women from Somalia living in the United States showed that women with greater proficiency in speaking English (as an indicator of acculturation) were more likely to experience both psychological abuse and physical aggression from their partners than those with a lesser command of the language (Nilsson et al., 2008). Those who had lived longer in the United States and had greater numbers of American friends also reported experiencing more physical assault at their partners’ hands. In addition, Yick (2000a) found that Chinese-Americans, who reported being more acculturated to American culture, were twice as likely to report experiencing severe physical violence during their lifetimes (Yick, 2000a). Similarly, by using the Acculturation Rating Scale of Mexican American-II (ARSMa-II), Garcia and his colleagues found that Latino-American women, who rated themselves in high and moderate levels of acculturation to American culture, were more likely to report IPV compared with less acculturated Latino women (Garcia et al., 2005). Specifically, reporting IPV was two times higher among US-born Mexican women than Mexican-born women (Lown & Vega, 2001). The results of the studies are not entirely
consistent, as in some studies, acculturation did not predict the prevalence of IPV (Adam & Schewe, 2007; Hyman, Forte, Du Mont, Romans & Cohen, 2006b; Kantor, Jasinski, & Aldarondo, 1994; Ramirez, 2007; Tong, 2003). For instance, Adam and Schewe (2007) found no significant differences among South Asian women in reporting IPV, by considering place of birth and pre-arranged marriage as indicators of acculturation. In terms of association between acculturation and men’s perpetration of violence, there are limited studies. For instance, using data of a national study on alcohol-related family violence, Jasinski (1998) investigated male perpetration of violence and acculturation by considering different indicators such as age of immigration, proficiency in English and generational status. The researcher found that third generation Hispanic men were more likely to have assaulted their spouse than first generation men. These conflicting results might be better explained by examining mediation by gender role ideology.

Acculturation may affect immigrants’ attitudes toward violence and their experiences of IPV through changing their attitudes toward women. For instance, Bhanot and Senn (2007) investigated gender role attitudes as a mediator between acculturation and attitudes toward wife beating. One hundred South Asian males from a Canadian university completed questionnaires that measured their acculturation, gender role attitudes and attitudes towards wife beating. The researchers found that gender role attitudes fully mediated the relationship between acculturation and the belief that wives benefit from being beaten. Yang (2006) also examined the relationships between acculturation, male privilege, and attitudes towards domestic violence among Asian Americans by using a vignette and asking participants who were responsible for the violence. Results indicated that male privilege serves as a complete mediator between acculturation and attribution of responsibility to the male aggressor, and as a partial mediator of attribution of
responsibility to the female victim. Students, who reported being less acculturated and held positive attitudes about male dominance, endorsed that abusive men were less responsible for their aggressive behaviours and that female victims were more responsible.

Acculturating to North American culture might be related to less acceptance of wife beating; however, it might increase IPV through changing partners’ gender role attitudes and gender power dynamics in the family (Harris et al., 2005), especially if there is a discrepancy between partners’ attitudes toward gender roles as a result of having different levels of acculturation. Caetano, Schafer, Clark, Cunradi and Raspberry (2000) found couples with one partner in the medium acculturation group were at least three times more likely to experience IPV than couples with both partners in the low acculturation group. Firestone and colleagues (2003) also examined the interaction of acculturation and gender role beliefs on IPV among low income and educated first and second generation immigrant Mexican women. The researchers found that women with higher levels of acculturation demonstrated less traditional gender roles and were at higher risk of abuse, especially when their spouses/partners insisted on retaining a traditional role arrangement and power structure within the family. First generation Mexican women, who reported having egalitarian decision-making in the family (e.g., both partners made major decisions), were also less likely to report abuse (Harris et al., 2005).

Consistent with quantitative studies, qualitative studies also showed that gender role ideology may change due to the process of acculturation, and result in IPV (Bui & Morash, 1999, 2008; Konczak, 2006; Moghissi, Rahnema & Goodman, 2009; Shiu-Thornton, Senturia & Sullivan, 2005). In a qualitative study with Vietnamese women, Bui and Morash (2008) found that immigrant women in the United States obtained autonomy and independence through involvement with society (e.g. getting a job to support their families financially), which may be
perceived by a traditional man as a threat to his position and authority in the family. He may, therefore, resort to using force and violence to keep his power. During her clinical work, Abraham (1998) also indicated that South Asian men wished their wives to modernise in some areas that are external to the home (e.g., work outside home), but expected women to follow traditional roles within the home, remaining obedient and self-sacrificing. While women desired to be equal to their husbands, their husbands tended to adhere strongly to traditional gender roles, which in turn led to violence (Bui & Morash, 1999). Four focus groups with 43 abused Vietnamese women also revealed that women tended to hold more egalitarian attitudes after immigration, which contrasted with their husbands’ attitudes. Where in Vietnam they had to suffer silently and accept responsibility for their abuse, in their new home, they realized that they had a right to speak. For instance, one woman mentioned that “When I come here, I have a different way of thinking, different from Vietnam. A man is also a human being. A woman is also a human being. I think it’s equal” (Shiu-Thornton et al., 2005 p. 966). Moghissi et al. (2009) also conducted a mixed methods study to obtain a better understanding of four ethnic groups in Toronto including Iranians, Pakistanis, Afghans, and Palestinians. Although the researchers found different levels of patriarchal attitudes toward women among the groups, they indicated that gender relations had changed during pre- and post-migration among all of groups, which in turn increased the tension in the families.

In the process of acculturation, religious ideology and orientations may also be modified that may, in turn, affect attitudes toward women. Religiosity plays a major role in preserving cultural identity (Yang & Ebaugh, 2001), and affects the rate and method of acculturation. Studies have shown that higher levels of adherence to religious ideology are related to lower acceptance of host cultural values (Ghorpade, Lackritz & Singh, 2006; Saroglou & Mathijsen,
2007). For instance, Ghorpade et al. (2006) examined the intrinsic religious orientation and acculturation among different ethnic groups: Asian Americans, African Americans, Filipinos and Latinos. This study showed a negative correlation between intrinsic religiosity and both psychological acculturation and increasing knowledge and understanding of the host culture's traditions, customs, values, beliefs, attitudes, behaviours, and life styles, especially for Asian Americans and African Americans. Khalid and Frieze (2004) also compared religious ideology (i.e., liberal or conservative) and attitudes toward violence between Pakistani Muslims in Pakistan and in the United States. They found that recent Pakistani immigrants were more conservative and held more traditional attitudes toward women than those who had been in the United States for a longer period. It was argued that acculturation might impact attitudes toward domestic violence through modifying immigrants’ religious perspective. In addition, Wallach et al., (2010) investigated how acculturation might impact attitudes toward violence among Jewish Ethiopians who immigrated to Israel and Ethiopians born in Israel. The results of this study showed that the first generation of Ethiopians held more lenient attitudes toward domestic violence than the second generation of Ethiopians. The researchers argued that the first group held a more restrictive religious perspective than the Israeli society, while the second group was more acculturated to Israeli society and showed a more modified religious perspective that was comparable to Israeli-born Jews.

In sum, acculturating to host cultural values and behaviours should be considered as an important factor in the acceptance of wife beating and IPV, especially because of changing gender role attitudes among immigrants. Since the literature demonstrated contradictory results and only a few studies considered how the process of acculturation might impact attitudes toward violence and IPV among Muslims, it is important to further investigate among this population.
Acculturation and Help-Seeking Attitudes & Behaviours

Acculturation may affect the types and rates of help-seeking behaviours among immigrants. Using the General Social Survey, Hyman, Forte, Du Mont, Romans and Cohen (2006a) found that recent immigrant women who experienced abuse are less likely to seek informal help (e.g., friends or neighbours, or others) than non-recent immigrant women. In addition, non-recent immigrants are more likely to use social services than recent immigrants in Canada, while recent immigrants are more likely to call police. In general, minority groups, especially less acculturated women, are less likely to seek help from social and legal services in the mainstream society (Bui, 2003; Kaukinen, 2004; West et al., 1998) for many reasons, including language barriers (Bui & Morash, 2007; Goldman, 1999; Nah, 1993), unfamiliarity with service systems, (Bui, 2003, Bui & Morash, 2007; Dasgupta & Warrier, 1996), economic dependency and having children, and fear of discrimination and racism (Fugate, Landis, Riordan, Naureckas & Engel, 2005; Wolf, Hobart & Kernic, 2003). Cultural values and cultural practices inconsistent with seeking help (e.g., privacy of the family) may also discourage women from looking for help (Graham, Bradshaw & Trew, 2008; Preisser, 1999; Rasche, 1988; Yick, 2000b). For example, interviews with 50 Canadian social workers who worked with Muslims revealed that Muslim women were concerned that contacting and involving social workers would break their family unit apart (Graham et al., 2008). Women in general prefer to solve problems within the family and to maintain the traditional family regardless of abuse (Bui & Morash, 2007; Graham et al., 2008). Women have concerns that contacting police could lead to involvement of legal services, mandatory arrest, prosecution, and sentencing policies, jeopardizing the family relationships they want to strengthen (Carlson & Nidey, 1995; Landau, 2000). Immigrant women may also be encouraged by their family and friends not to use legal services (Bui & Morash, 2007) and to stay with their batterer partners. Research has shown that cultural
perspectives might impact help-seeking behaviours. For instance, a comparative study among abused South Asian, African American, and Hispanic women showed that, although most of the women in each group sought help from their family network, nearly half of the African American and Hispanic women in the study sought help from a counsellor, the police, or a lawyer; however, only a quarter of the South Asian women sought help from these professionals (Yoshioka et al., 2003).

Research has shown that women with higher levels of acculturation have more positive attitudes toward seeking help (Abdel Meguid, 2006) through both formal and informal means (Bui, 2003; Hyman et al., 2006a; Liao, 2006, Preisser, 1999; West et al., 1998). Acculturation may influence help-seeking behaviours in two different ways: extending “human and social capital” (Bui & Morash, 2007) and challenging cultural values (Abraham, 1998). Bui’s (2003) qualitative study showed that “human capital” such as proficiency in English increases help-seeking among Vietnamese immigrants. West et al. (1998) also found that proficiency in English—as an indicator of acculturation—was positively associated with formal and informal help-seeking among Hispanic women who experienced IPV. Acculturation may also influence help-seeking behaviours by increasing social networks (i.e., friends, neighbours, community, etc.) that can provide emotional support and help make women aware of available services. The more “social capital” women have, the more likely they are to seek help (Bui & Morash 2007). Acculturation may also challenge the cultural and patriarchal values. It is possible that exposure to a system where women’s rights are practiced, egalitarian relationships are acceptable, and resources and laws are available to protect them, make women redefine their values and find resources to interrupt or reduce abuse (Abraham, 1998). In Canada, for example, a woman can call the police and have an abusive partner arrested for physical or sexual assault. She can also
utilize domestic violence shelters and seek mental health, legal, and living assistance if she feels that she is being abused. Abdel Meguid (2006) also found that Muslim women’s duration of residency in the United States and their level of education influenced their help-seeking preferences.

In conclusion, although researchers have explored how the process of acculturation may influence help-seeking among women, there is a lack of research exploring help-seeking among abusive immigrant men. In addition, the extent and nature of help-seeking behaviours, and how acculturation process affects help-seeking among Muslim men, requires more investigation. Moreover, it is not clear how acculturation can affect attitudes toward support and help for battered women.

**Purpose of This Study and Hypothesis**

In summary, literature has identified a number of factors that are potentially important to understanding domestic violence in the Muslim Canadian community. However, findings sometimes vary across studies and some potential risk factors, such as exposure to community violence, acculturation, and religiosity, have been examined infrequently among Muslims. In addition, although studies have explored some of these factors regarding help-seeking behaviours among abused women; there is a lack of research on how these factors are related to men’s help-seeking behaviours. Finally, there are significantly limited studies offering a comprehensive examination of the mechanisms by which these factors intertwine potentially increasing the risk for IPV and reducing help-seeking behaviours among Muslims. The current study addresses the aforementioned gaps in the literature and adds to the existing information in the area of domestic violence by offering a critical examination of the relationship between traditional attitudes toward women and acceptance and experiences of violence, as well as help-seeking behaviours,
by considering religious/cultural perspectives through the process of acculturation for Canadian immigrant Muslims.

Using the word “Muslim” needs clarification. The belief system inherent in any religion including Islam offers a way to interpret one’s experiences and give them meaning (Park, 2007). Therefore, Muslims can be considered a religious group that share a sense of belonging to the Muslim community (Ysseldyk, Matheson & Anisman, 2010). At the same time, Muslims might have diverse norms and value systems, attitude toward Islam, different level of religiosity and degrees of following religious rituals or practices (labeled as Cultural Muslim, Sofos & Tsagarousianou, 2013). Muslims might have different religious views but are attached to Islamic culture since they live in “a common discourse or structure of feeling” and share the same history, memories and experiences (Sofos & Tsagarousianou, 2013).

The present study examined a social-cultural model of acceptance and experiences of abuse, and help-seeking behaviours among Canadian immigrants who identified themselves as Muslim. Considering the complexity of some factors, such as acculturation and religiosity (Cousineau & Rondeau, 2004; Murphy & O’Leary, 1994; Yick & Berthold, 2005), in this study a concurrent, multilevel, triangulation design was applied (see Creswell et al., 2005). This method involved the collection and analysis of quantitative and qualitative data separately, in order to obtain different but complementary data on the same topic from different levels and to better understand the target research questions.

For the quantitative study, the possibility of collecting data from the community such as community services and religious services (i.e., mosques) was explored. However, some religious leaders did not show willingness to cooperate because of the sensitivity of the topic, besides there were practical barriers for administering the questionnaires during the religious
services. In addition, collecting data from community would limit the variety of participants regarding their religious denomination and beliefs, ethnical backgrounds as well as social-economic status. Since some researchers (Kardes, 1996; Lucas, 2003) argue that college students can be considered appropriate research subjects when testing theories related to human behaviours, data was collected from a sample of university students, who identified themselves as Muslim. It is important to note that this population were more likely to have a wide range of ethnicities, with different levels of religiosity, acculturation and experiences of childhood abuse.

In qualitative study, data was collected from a high-risk clinical sample of abusive Muslim men. Data was analysed independently for both of the quantitative and qualitative studies. The comparison of the findings from both the qualitative and quantitative data highlighted the concepts that were converged at the data interpretation stage. Equal priority was given to both forms of qualitative and quantitative data in order to cross-validate and corroborate study findings (see Creswell et al., 2005).

In the quantitative study, four research questions about experiences and attitudes toward domestic violence and help-seeking behaviours were investigated:

1) How are cumulative experiences of abuse during childhood, gender role attitudes, levels of acculturation and religiosity related to attitudes toward partner violence?
2) How are cumulative experiences of abuse during childhood, gender role attitudes, attitudes toward partner violence and controlling behaviours, levels of acculturation and religiosity related to IPV?
3) How are cumulative experiences of abuse during childhood, gender role attitudes, attitudes toward partner violence and controlling behaviours, levels of acculturation and
religiosity related to help-seeking behaviours and attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours among Muslims?

4) What are the best explanatory models for how these variables (i.e. witnessing parental violence and childhood physical abuse, gender role attitudes, levels of acculturation and religiosity) relate to domestic violence, attitudes towards partner violence and controlling behaviours, and help-seeking?

![Conceptual framework for contributing variables in intimate partner violence among Muslims.](image)

**Figure 1.** Conceptual framework for contributing variables in intimate partner violence among Muslims.

Figure 1 illustrates the conceptual framework that was developed for understating how different variables may contribute to acceptance and experiences of violence among Muslims. This study examined the specific hypothesis as follows:

1) Attitudes toward women would mediate the effect of religiosity on attitudes toward partner violence and IPV.

2) Attitudes toward partner violence would mediate the relationship between attitudes toward women and IPV.
3) Attitudes toward women would mediate the effect of childhood experiences of abuse on attitudes toward partner violence and IPV.

4) Acculturation moderates the relationships between religiosity, attitudes toward women, attitudes toward partner violence and IPV.

Figure 2. Conceptual framework for contributing variables in help-seeking behaviours among Muslims.

This study attempted to evaluate help-seeking at both the attitudinal and behavioural levels: attitudes toward helping battered women and the act of seeking help for experiences of abuse. Figure 2 illustrates the conceptual framework for the process of help-seeking among Muslims. The hypotheses examined included:

1) Attitudes toward women would mediate the effect of childhood experiences of abuse on attitudes toward help-seeking and help-seeking behaviours.

2) Attitudes toward women would mediate the effect of religiosity on attitudes toward help-seeking and help-seeking behaviours.

3) Acculturation moderates the relationships between attitudes toward women, attitudes toward help-seeking, and help-seeking behaviours.
In addition, it was hypothesized that attitudes toward partner violence would mediate the effect of attitudes toward women on attitudes toward help-seeking and help-seeking behaviours.

In the qualitative study, perpetration of violence was specifically examined. While there are many qualitative studies about women’s victimization, only a few studies have explored perpetration of abuse (e.g., Bettman, 2009; Levitt et al., 2008). An understanding of how different factors, including attitudes and experiences pre- and post-immigration combined with religious beliefs, provides an in depth view of perpetration from the perspective Muslims’ needs. In this study the following questions were explored:

1) How do abusive men interpret their abusive behaviour in the context of their religious beliefs?

2) How do men see the roles of men and women in the family and do they relate to or justify their abuse on the basis of gender?

3) Do men attribute violence to acculturation-related stress? What is the trajectory of violence in the context of acculturation?

4) How do abusive men negotiate the interrelated factors of attitudes and experiences of pre- and post-immigration, combined with religious beliefs and attitudes towards women in the context of violence?

5) What is the relative influence of childhood experiences of abuse inside the home and in the community on men’s perpetration of violence?

6) How do men see getting help from social services? What kind of help they have received? What was its efficacy?
Chapter 2: Quantitative Study

Method

The quantitative method, a deductive approach with the purpose of theory testing and prediction, was applied to obtain a more general understanding about how different factors may be associated to acceptance of abuse and IPV. The research methodology for quantitative study was approved by the Research Ethics Board at the University of Toronto (see Appendix 1).

Participant. Data was collected from a sample of 150 University of Toronto students. The inclusion criteria were: declaration of being born Muslim and being first or second generation, or as being an international student who was Muslim. Participants who were involved in an intimate relationship for at least three months over the past year completed the full package of questionnaires (described below) while those who had not completed everything except three questionnaires: domestic violence (i.e., CTS-2S), controlling behaviour, and help-seeking behaviours.

Procedure. The initial plan was recruiting graduate students who were more likely to come from diverse backgrounds and be in intimate relationship. In order to recruit the targeted population, the advertisement flyers about the study were posted online as well as on announcement boards in different locations around the University of Toronto including the Multi-Faith Center, social clubs and the International Student Centre. In addition, different students’ associations at the University of Toronto (e.g., Muslim Student Association, Afghan Student Association and Ahmadiyya Muslim Students’ Association) were contacted and requested to post the flyer on their website and to inform their members about this study. However, after almost a year and a half, the number of recruited graduate students was insufficient ($n=29$), partly due to lack of support from most of the Student Associations. Therefore, an alternative recruitment strategy was employed. Participants were recruited through
the psychology subject pool at the University of Toronto. It is important to note that students from very diverse backgrounds are participating in this introductory psychology course. A list of roughly 500 students’ names, along with their contact information, who were all enrolled in the course was obtained. The primary investigator and an undergraduate student screened the names and contacted the students whose names looked Muslim. They were informed that this study was about Muslim immigrant Canadians. Finally, 121 eligible undergraduate students, who identified themselves as Muslim and showed interest in the study, were recruited.

Students who were interested in participating and met the eligibility criteria for the study completed the package of questionnaires via online survey (Survey Wizard 2 was hosted by OISE’s website) or completed a paper form package by attending a one-time research appointment. Participants received a research information letter outlining the purpose of this study and, after providing written consent, completed the questionnaires privately and anonymously. Participants were compensated in recognition of the time commitment of approximately 45 minutes required to complete the research questionnaires. All participants were also provided a list of resources and support services in case participation elicited feelings of emotional discomfort or in cases where domestic violence services might be sought following participation.

Measurement

To collect the necessary information, different measurements were utilized in this study. Attempts were made to choose instruments with strong psychometric properties and which were appropriate for the multi-ethnic sample that was being recruited. In addition, some instruments were created in this study to measure some of the dependent variables.

Demographic information. Participants completed question sets (see Appendix 2) regarding their demographic characteristics (e.g. gender, age, marital status, and ethnicity),
socioeconomic information (e.g., level of education, their parents’ levels of education and family income), immigration information (e.g., immigration status, number of years living in Canada, their age at the time of immigration to Canada), indicators of acculturation (e.g., language spoken at home and with friends) and religiosity (e.g., religious affiliation, practicing Islamic duties, praying and attending religious services).

**Social desirability.** Since tolerance toward domestic violence is generally considered socially unacceptable, assessing attitudes toward it can become compromised by participants skewing their honest responses to ones deemed more socially desirable. Tendency to minimize reporting of socially undesirable behaviour was therefore controlled by utilizing the Limited Disclosure (LD) Scale from the Personal and Relationship Profile (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1999) that has been frequently used in the cross-cultural studies (e.g., Straus, 2004). The LD asks respondents to rate their agreement with 11 statements on a range of ‘strongly agree‘(1) to ‘strongly disagree‘(4). A higher score in this scale shows that a respondent tends to avoid disclosing undesirable behaviour. The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.78 in the current study.

**Religiosity.** A modified version of the Religious Life Inventory (RLI) (Batson & Schoenrade, 1991), one of the most widely used measures of religiosity in psychological research was used to measure different kinds of religiosity including intrinsic, extrinsic, and

---

1 Limited Disclosure Scale is protected by copyright http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/
quest religiosity. The intrinsic subscale (5 items) measures to what extent religious values are internalized and considered to be the guide in life. The extrinsic subscale (6 items) measures to what extent a person’s religiosity is related to his/her self-serving attitude and motivation in performing religious activities. The quest subscale (8 items) measures religious doubts, tentativeness, and openness. In addition to the RLI, a modified version of the Religion Fundamentalism Scale (RFS) (Altemeyer & Hunsberger, 1992, 2003) including 10 items was used. The RFS has been used in the past with different religious groups, including Muslims, with high internal consistencies reported (e.g., Hunsberger, Owusu & Duck, 1999; Moaddel & Karabenick, 2008). Items measuring religiosity (see Appendix 3) were rated on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from (1) ‘strongly agree’ to (7) ‘strongly disagree’. In this study, the Cronbach’s alphas for extrinsic, intrinsic, and fundamentalist types were 0.28, 0.91 and 0.86 respectively. Extrinsic items were deleted from the final analysis because of weak internal consistency. In addition, although internal consistency for the quest subscale was poor, an exploratory factor analysis showed that the items measuring religiosity quest loaded parsimoniously onto two factors. The items were therefore divided into two subtypes that were called Quest 1 and Quest 2 (Cronbach’s alpha 0.67 and 0.62) in this study. Quest 1 measured emphasis on open mindedness while Quest 2 measured emphasis on tendency toward devoutness to religion.

**Cumulative childhood experiences of abuse.** Experiences of violence in participants’ families of origin were assessed using three questions from a scale developed by Rosenbaum and O’Leary (1981) used frequently by researchers (e.g., Slep & O’Leary, 2007). Respondents were asked to indicate physical aggression by their parents toward them by rating on a scale ranging from ‘Never’ (1) to ‘Very often’ (5). Participants also reported whether they were exposed to
domestic violence during childhood by utilizing five modified questions from Straus’ (1979) Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS). The CTS has been used in many studies as a measurement for witnessing interpersonal violence (e.g., Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008). Participants also rated how often they saw their parents hit, beat, and threaten each other. In addition, six questions of Adapted Survey of Exposure of Community Violence (SECV; Richters & Saltzman, 1990) were used to measure exposure to community violence during childhood (e.g., How often did you see a person was shot by a gun or stabbed by a knife?). The Cronbach’s alphas for items measuring childhood physical abuse (0.81), exposure to domestic violence (0.89) and community violence (0.70) showed acceptable reliabilities.

**Attitudes toward women.** A modified short version of the Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS, Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1973) that has been employed in a number of cross-cultural studies including immigrant population studies (e.g., Abu-Ras, 2007; Haj-Yahia & de Zoysa, 2007; Yick, 2000b) was used. The AWS (see Appendix 4) measures attitudes toward behaviours and roles that are perceived to be more appropriate for men and women in various familial, occupational, educational, and political arenas. The modified AWS includes 12 closed-ended items rated on four-point Likert scale ranging from (1) ‘strongly agree’ to (4) ‘strongly disagree’. A scaled score is calculated, with high scores reflecting more pro-feminist, egalitarian attitudes, and low scores indicating more traditional attitudes. The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.84.

**Attitudes toward partner violence.** Attitudes toward partner violence were assessed using a revised version of the Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating (IBWB) (Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008) that was originally developed by Saunders, Lynch, Grayson and Linz (1987). The IBWB has been very widely used in cross-cultural studies (e.g., Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2008; Haj-Yahia, de Zoysa, 2007). IBWB (see Appendix 5) measures four beliefs about wife beating (1)
justifying wife beating (sixteen items, Cronbach’s alpha of 0.84); (2) women benefit from beating (four items, Cronbach’s alpha of 0.69); (3) offenders’ responsibility, i.e., violent husbands are responsible for their violent behaviour, (three items, Cronbach’s alpha of 0.53); (4) blaming women (four items, Cronbach’s alpha of 0.73). All items were rated on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from (1) ‘strongly agree’ to (7) ‘strongly disagree’.

**Attitudes toward controlling behaviours.** A questionnaire (see Appendix 6) was developed for this study to measure attitudes toward controlling behaviours, such as economic control, isolation, and intimidation. The items of this questionnaire were obtained and modified from the Controlling Behaviour Scale (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003), the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (Tolman, 1999) and Dominance and Jealousy scales from the Personal and Relationship Profile (PRP) (Straus et al. 1999). This includes 19 items (e.g., ‘a man has the right to control or monitor his partner/wife activities’, and ‘a man has the right to decide whether or not his partner/wife should work outside the home’) rated on seven-point Likert scale ranging (1) ‘strongly agree’ to (7) ‘strongly disagree’. The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.86 in the current study.

**Attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours.** Attitudes toward informal and formal help-seeking behaviours were assessed on both individual and community levels (see Appendix 7). Attitudes toward help-seeking related to physical abuse was assessed at the individual level by seventeen items consisting of seven items from IBWB and ten items from General Social Survey (GSS) on victimization (Statistic Canada, 2004). The Cronbach’s alpha was 0.84 for these 17 items. Attitudes toward help-seeking regarding controlling behaviours were also assessed by ten items (e.g., ‘a controlling husband/partner should only talk to his family or friends to help him to change his behaviour’) designed for this study (Cronbach’s alpha of 0.73). In addition, the
community help-seeking scale (ten items, Cronbach’s alpha of 0.78) was created to assess how the Muslim community reacts and facilitates help-seeking for abused women or abusive men (e.g., If a woman is abused or beaten, my community /mosque addresses it indirectly). All of these items rated on seven-point Likert scale ranging (1) ‘strongly agree’ to (7) ‘strongly disagree’.

**Intimate partner violence.** The most widely used measure for assessing domestic violence, the Conflict Tactic Scale-2 Short form (CTS-2 S)² (Straus & Douglas, 2004), was employed. This behavioural self-report instrument includes a 24-item scale to measure the prevalence, chronicity, and severity of three types of maltreatment in intimate partner relationships (6 items related to physical assault, 4 items related to sexual coercion, 6 items related to psychological aggression, 4 items related to injury in intimate relationships, and 4 items related to the use of negotiation). Respondents were asked to consider each item and then indicate whether they had perpetrated or experienced the target behaviour once, twice, 3 to 5 times, 6 to 10, 11 to 20 times, more than 20 times in the past year, not in the past year but at some time before, or never. The scale scores were computed by summing the relevant items, with higher scores reflecting greater abuse. It is noteworthy that internal consistency is not presented due to the low number of participants who endorsed items on the CTS-2 S.

² CTS-2 S is protected by copyright http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/ctsb.htm#CTS2
**Controlling behaviours.** In addition to evaluating belief systems regarding controlling behaviours (using the Attitude toward Controlling Behaviours Scale), it was essential to examine how participants engaged in controlling behaviours toward their partners (see Appendix 8). Therefore, a questionnaire was developed to measure controlling behaviours including economic control, isolation, and intimidation. This questionnaire is a modified version of the Controlling Behaviour Scale (Graham-Keven & Archer, 2003), the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (Tolman, 1999) and Dominance and Jealousy scales from The Personal and Relationship Profile (PRP) (Straus et al. 1999). The CBS includes 24 items rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) ‘Never’ to (5) ‘Always’. Respondents were asked to consider each item and then indicate whether they executed or experienced the controlling behaviours (e.g., My partner (I) prevents or makes difficult for me (my partner) to work or study, and My partner (I) demands to know whom I am (my partner is) with and where I am (My partner is) all the times). Since a few of participants endorsed being controlled by their partners or using controlling behaviours with their partners, the internal consistency was not reportable.

**Help-seeking behaviours.** Questions from the General Social Survey on victimization (Statistic Canada, 2004) were used to assess participants’ help-seeking behaviours (see Appendix 9). Respondents were asked if they sought any help because of their partner’s violent or controlling behaviour, as well as whether abusive partners/husbands sought any help regarding their abusive behaviour toward their partner/wife. Potential sources of help include family and friends, family community services (e.g. community center or religious advisor), legal services (e.g., reporting to the police and contacting lawyer), and social services (e.g., receiving counseling, calling hotlines and using shelters). Participants were also asked to indicate reasons for any reluctance to seek help from the police.
**Acculturation.** Acculturation was assessed by Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA, Ryder et al., 2000). The VIA (see Appendix 10) includes 20 items measuring heritage and mainstream dimensions of acculturation such as values and social relationships. Items were rated on a five Likert scale ranging from ‘strongly disagree’ (1) to ‘strongly agree’ (5) with a midpoint of ‘neutral/depends’ (3). Higher scores on the mainstream dimensions reflect more westernization and higher scores on the heritage dimensions reflect the maintenance of one’s cultural values; however, only the scores on the mainstream dimensions were used in the final analysis in this study. The VIA was selected because it has previously with different ethnicities in Canada (Ryder et al., 2000). Research also showed VIA to be one of the most acceptable instruments in examining different levels of acculturation (e.g., Matsudaira, 2006). The Cronbach’s alphas for heritage (0.88) and mainstream cultures (0.78) showed acceptable reliabilities.

**Results**

The data gathered was analysed through different stages and presented as follows. First, descriptive demographic information and analysis of data regarding cumulative childhood experiences of violence, and victimization and perpetration of abuse were explored. Second, the primary analysis was conducted to examine the hypothesized model. Primary analysis included conducting the bivariate correlation among the variables of interest, applying ANOVA to examine the relationship between some specific independent variables (i.e., gender and level of acculturation) and dependent variables of interest, and performing further analysis to explore whether the observed variables measured the latent variable; i.e., religiosity and attitudes toward
violence. Third, the proposed mediation model was examined. In the final stage the moderated mediation model analyses were run to examine how different factors might contribute to acceptance/or experiences of violence at different levels of acculturation.

**Participants’ Demographic Information**

Of the 150 questionnaires collected, 19 (12%) were excluded because a large section of dependent measures was not completed. In the final analysis, information from 131 questionnaires was considered. The participants had a mean age of 20.44 years ($SD = 5.00$). Approximately one quarter, 26.7% ($n = 35$) were male, and 73.3% ($n = 96$) were female. Most participants declared themselves affiliated with Sunni Islam (64.9%, $n = 85$) and described their level of religiosity as conservative (47.7%, $n = 62$). Almost 62% of participants were freshmen and came from different ethnicities. For instance, almost 36% of participants came from South Asian culture and 22% of them indicated coming from Middle East. The majority of participants reported voluntary immigration to Canada (80.5%) and had been living in Canada less than 10 years (47.3%, $n = 62$). Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for demographic variables.

**Exploring Experiences of Childhood Abuse and Intimate Partner Violence**

Participants’ experiences of being exposed to violence during childhood were examined. Participants reported childhood physical abuse ($M = 5.08$, $SD = 1.92$) based on three items on the questionnaire: 36.2% having been hit by a parent (sometimes ($n = 37$), often ($n = 8$) or very often ($n = 2$)), 13.7% having been beaten by a parent (sometimes ($n = 13$), often ($n = 4$) or very often ($n = 1$)) and 13% having been hit by a parent using a belt, stick or other object (sometimes ($n = 15$) or often ($n = 2$)). Between 80% and 88.5% of participants reported that they had never witnessed domestic violence, measured by different questionnaire items. Some participants reported,
Table 1
Descriptive of Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N(%)</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University /Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>Years of Residency in Canada</td>
<td>(M=10, SD= 6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>81 (61.8)</td>
<td>Less than 10 years</td>
<td>62 (47.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>21 (16)</td>
<td>More than 10 years</td>
<td>39 (29.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>6 (4.6)</td>
<td>Born in Canada</td>
<td>30 (22.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>8 (6.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>6 (4.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>9 (6.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Age Started Living in Canada</td>
<td>(M= 9.9, SD= 8.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>97 (74)</td>
<td>Less than 10/or 10 years old</td>
<td>40 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dating/Engaged</td>
<td>23 (17.6)</td>
<td>More than 10 years old</td>
<td>58 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>10 (7.6)</td>
<td>Born in Canada</td>
<td>31 (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>1 (0.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>My parents/ My Immigration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>14 (10.7)</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>99 (80.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab</td>
<td>18 (13.7)</td>
<td>Involuntary</td>
<td>5 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4 (3.1)</td>
<td>Both Voluntary and</td>
<td>19 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian</td>
<td>47 (35.9)</td>
<td>Involuntary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>29 (22.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19 (14.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s/ Mother’s Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>Describe your level of religiosity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>6 (4.6)</td>
<td>Very Strict/Orthodox</td>
<td>12 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school Degree</td>
<td>14 (10.9)</td>
<td>Moderate/conservative</td>
<td>62 (47.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college courses</td>
<td>13 (10.1)</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>35 (26.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Degree</td>
<td>16 (12.4)</td>
<td>Non Practicing</td>
<td>21 (16.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>41 (31.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master Degree</td>
<td>21 (16.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>13 (10.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (3.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious denomination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10,000</td>
<td>6 (4.7)</td>
<td>Sunni</td>
<td>85 (64.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-14,999</td>
<td>8 (6.3)</td>
<td>Shi’aa</td>
<td>34 (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>3 (2.3)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-24,999</td>
<td>12 (9.4)</td>
<td>Not Believer</td>
<td>5 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000-29,000</td>
<td>9 (7.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-34,999</td>
<td>6 (4.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000-39,999</td>
<td>9 (7.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000, 44,999</td>
<td>17 (13.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000-and Over</td>
<td>58 (45.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Resident</td>
<td>23 (17.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td>93 (71.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa/Refugee</td>
<td>14 (10.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>89 (67.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Generation</td>
<td>31 (23.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student</td>
<td>11 (8.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Marital status was reported in the table is reflective of participants’ status in the time of completing the survey. See page 54 for more details regarding their marital status in the year of the study
witnessing domestic violence ($M = 5.83, SD = 1.91$) including parents hitting ($n = 9, 6.9\%$) or beating ($n = 53.9\%$) each other, hitting each other by throwing objects ($n = 4, 3.1\%$) and threatening the other one with violence ($n = 9, 7.6\%$). Regarding childhood exposure to community violence, most participants reported never having witnessed a person being threatened with a weapon ($83.2\%, n = 109$), being shot/stabbed ($90.8\%, n = 119$) or being killed ($93.9\%, n = 123$). Only $13\% (n = 17)$ reported having sometimes observed a person (relative or stranger) being beaten.

Participants’ victimization or perpetration of violence was also explored. Although $97\% (74\%)$ of participants reported being single at the time of completing the questionnaires, $21$ of them had been in an intimate relationship in the year of study. Participants who indicated being in an intimate relationship included: those in a dating relationship at the time of the study ($17.6\%, n = 23$), those in a dating relationship over at least three months during the year of the study ($16\%, n = 21$), and those who were married or divorced ($8.3\%, n = 11$). A low percentage of participants who were in an intimate relationship reported having some experiences of domestic violence. Although verbal abuse was reported ($48\% (n = 25)$ insulted their partners or $46.2\% (n = 24)$ been insulted by their partners, ranging from one to more than $20$ times in the past year), experiences of physical abuse and controlling behaviour were reported at a significantly lower percentage. For instance, $13\%$ of participants ($7$ out of $55$) reported slapping or pushing one another (ranging from once or twice to between $3$ and $5$ times in the past year), while only two participants reported that their partner punched, kicked or beat them up. Since the number of participants reporting experiences of physical abuse and controlling behaviours in the current study was limited, variables measuring experiences of IPV and help-seeking behaviours were not included in the final analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Means, Standard Deviations, and Intercorrelations of the Main Variables in the Primary Analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Attitudes toward women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Justifying wife beating</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Blaming women</td>
<td>.37**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Women benefit from abuse</td>
<td>.31**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Offenders’ responsibility</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Attitudes toward controlling behaviours</td>
<td>.67**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Attitudes toward help-seeking for abuse</td>
<td>- .64**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Attitudes help-seeking for controlling behaviours</td>
<td>- .60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Attitudes toward help-seeking from community</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Religion-Fundamentalism</td>
<td>.42**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Religion-Intrinsic</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Religion-Quest1</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Religion-Quest2</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Acculturation-North</td>
<td>- .34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Acculturation-Heritage</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Childhood physical Abuse</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Witnessing domestic violence</td>
<td>- .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Exposure to community violence</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 ; ** p < .01
Preliminary Analyses

**Intercorrelations among the main variables.** Initially, the correlation between social desirability and study variables was explored. No significant correlation between social desirability and other variables were found except for one of the religiosity subscales, quest 1 (-.17, $p < .05$). As a result, the social desirability factor was not controlled in this study because a tendency to minimize reporting of socially undesirable behaviour was not found.

In examining a proposed mediation model, as Holmbeck (1997) indicated the results of indirect effect can be interpreted only in the presence of significant direct effect between variables. The correlations among variables were therefore obtained. Significant correlations were found among most dependent variables in this study as demonstrated in Table 2. For instance, there were high positive correlations between traditional attitudes toward women, justifying wife beating, and attitudes toward controlling behaviours. High negative correlations were also found between traditional attitudes toward women and attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours (for both abuse and controlling behaviours). However, the cumulative experiences of abuse during childhood including physical abuse, witnessing domestic violence and exposure to community violence were not correlated with most variables. For example, childhood abuse was only correlated with justification of abuse. Therefore, the variables measuring the cumulative experience of childhood abuse were not considered in the final analysis model. Similarly, there were no correlations between attitudes toward help-seeking at the community level and most main variables. It was therefore excluded in the final model.

**Gender and main variables:** Considering that 73.3% of participants in this study were female, the question of whether there were significant differences between males’ and females’ responses was explored. The results of a preliminary analysis (ANOVA) showed significant effect of gender on some dependent variables. Female students showed more intrinsic religiosity
with less traditional attitudes toward women, lower attitudes toward partner violence and had more positive attitudes toward help-seeking than their male counterparts (see Table 3).

Table 3
Comparing Gender and Main Study Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male Min (Max)</th>
<th>Male M (SD)</th>
<th>Female Min (Max)</th>
<th>Female M (SD)</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward women</td>
<td>13 (34)</td>
<td>23.11 (5.28)</td>
<td>12 (31)</td>
<td>18.94 (4.28)</td>
<td>(129) = 4.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying wife beating</td>
<td>14 (56)</td>
<td>27.56 (12.47)</td>
<td>13 (53)</td>
<td>21.30 (8.04)</td>
<td>(44.71) = 2.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming women</td>
<td>4 (16)</td>
<td>7.66 (3.07)</td>
<td>4 (19)</td>
<td>6.42 (3.51)</td>
<td>(129) = 1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women benefit from abuse</td>
<td>3 (16)</td>
<td>7.31 (3.31)</td>
<td>3 (16)</td>
<td>6.02 (3.17)</td>
<td>(129) = 2.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders’ responsibility</td>
<td>3 (17)</td>
<td>8.18 (3.39)</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>8.31 (3.70)</td>
<td>(129) = -.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward controlling behaviours</td>
<td>27 (80)</td>
<td>54.83 (15.61)</td>
<td>19 (80)</td>
<td>42.73 (12.65)</td>
<td>(51.20) = 4.12***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward help-seeking for abuse</td>
<td>33 (119)</td>
<td>89.22 (17.15)</td>
<td>67 (119)</td>
<td>95.10 (11.29)</td>
<td>(129) = -2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward help-seeking for controlling behaviours</td>
<td>20 (67)</td>
<td>49.84 (9.87)</td>
<td>33 (70)</td>
<td>51.76 (7.85)</td>
<td>(129) = -1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity/Intrinsic</td>
<td>5 (35)</td>
<td>22.80 (17.15)</td>
<td>7 (35)</td>
<td>26.42 (6.61)</td>
<td>(46.84) = -2.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity/ Fundamentalism</td>
<td>13 (56)</td>
<td>34.99 (13.23)</td>
<td>11 (56)</td>
<td>39.79 (12.21)</td>
<td>(129) = -1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity/ Quest 1</td>
<td>6 (25)</td>
<td>17.33 (4.72)</td>
<td>4 (26)</td>
<td>15.51 (4.75)</td>
<td>(129) = 1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity/ Quest 2</td>
<td>3 (21)</td>
<td>11.08 (4.69)</td>
<td>3 (23)</td>
<td>12.68 (4.05)</td>
<td>(129) = -1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Levels of acculturation and main variables. In this study, the items related to acculturation to North American culture from the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA) (Ryder et al., 2000) were considered. Participants obtained a score with a minimum of 24 and a maximum of 50 ($M = 37.45$, $SD = 4.86$) in the acculturation to North American culture. Three acculturated groups: high ($n = 44$), middle ($n = 56$) and low ($n = 31$), were identified by considering approximately 33% of data for each group. Table 4 shows the descriptive information for the three levels of acculturation.
A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to evaluate the relationship between the different levels of acculturation and the study variables. The results showed significant differences between levels of acculturations and some dependent variables. Follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means. Since the assumption of equal variance among three groups was met for attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours, as well as for fundamentalist and quest 1 religiosity, post hoc comparison was conducted with the use of the Tukey. However, the variances were not homogenous among three groups on attitudes toward women, blaming women and intrinsic religiosity; therefore, the Dunnett’s C test, a test that does not assume equal variances among three groups, was conducted. There were significant differences in the mean between the groups with high and low levels of acculturation as well as between middle and high levels of acculturation. However, there were no mean differences between low and middle of acculturation groups. It is noteworthy that there was significant difference only between high and low level of acculturation regarding the intrinsic and quest 1 religiosity. The results are presented in Table 5.

**Initial Confirmatory Factor Analysis:** To explore whether the data fit a hypothesized measurement model, and whether a relationship between observed variables and their underlying latent constructs exists, the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was conducted for religiously and acceptance of abuse. Confirmatory factor analysis of religiosity subscales demonstrated that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acculturation</th>
<th>Number/participant</th>
<th>Minimum Score</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Levels Together</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.45</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Level of Acculturation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30.81</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level of Acculturation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Level of Acculturation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42.45</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acculturation Low Level</td>
<td>Acculturation Middle Level</td>
<td>Acculturation High Level</td>
<td>F (2,128)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward Women</td>
<td>22.08 (5.52)</td>
<td>20.72 (4.77)</td>
<td>17.77 (3.68)</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justifying wife beating</td>
<td>25.17 (11.24)</td>
<td>23.98 (9.74)</td>
<td>20.28 (8.21)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming women</td>
<td>7.48 (3.51)</td>
<td>7.30 (3.77)</td>
<td>5.53 (2.54)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women benefit from abuse</td>
<td>6.35 (3.53)</td>
<td>6.45 (3.01)</td>
<td>6.27 (3.41)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders’ responsibility</td>
<td>8.58 (3.10)</td>
<td>8.85 (3.37)</td>
<td>7.34 (3.51)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward</td>
<td>48.61 (16.90)</td>
<td>47.76 (12.50)</td>
<td>41.62 (14.31)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward</td>
<td>89.25 (16.54)</td>
<td>91.06 (10.10)</td>
<td>99.69 (12.39)</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help-seeking for abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward</td>
<td>47.15 (8.63)</td>
<td>49.27 (6.77)</td>
<td>56.65 (7.60)</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity/ Intrinsic</td>
<td>28.13 (6.13)</td>
<td>25.90 (6.83)</td>
<td>23.00 (8.76)</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity/ Fundamental</td>
<td>44.49 (14.36)</td>
<td>39.24 (14.36)</td>
<td>33.36 (12.20)</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity / Quest 1</td>
<td>14.42 (5.17)</td>
<td>15.97 (4.16)</td>
<td>17.15 (5.04)</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity / Quest 2</td>
<td>13.45 (4.70)</td>
<td>12.17 (4.22)</td>
<td>11.52 (3.91)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The observed variables were loaded adequately on their respective latent variables, $\chi^2 (2) = 3.65$, $p = .16$, $\chi^2/df = 1.82$, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) = .08, comparative fit index (CFI) = .99. All factor loadings were of adequate strength and statistical significance, ranging from .72 to .87. Similarly, the result of CFA for attitudes toward acceptance of abuse (justifying wife beating, women benefit from abuse, blaming women, offenders’ responsibility and attitudes toward controlling behaviours) showed that the observed variables loaded
adequately on their respective latent variables, $\chi^2 (5) = 7.77, p = .17, \frac{\chi^2}{df} = 1.55, \text{RMSEA} = .06, \text{CFI} = .98$. However, a cross-loading error covariance with a modification index (MI) of 5.00 was found between blaming women and women benefit from abuse. It is likely that there are some degrees of overlap between these two variables. After adding the covariance path between these residuals, the model fit was significantly improved with $\chi^2 (4) = 1.01, p = .90, \frac{\chi^2}{df} = .25, \text{RMSEA} = .00, \text{CFI} = .99$. All factor loadings were of adequate strength and statistical significance (range from .37 to .80).

**Mediation Model**

**Mediation model testing procedures:** Structural equation modeling using the maximum likelihood method (FIML) through the Amos 19.0 statistical software (Arbuckle, 2010) was utilized to test the hypothesized models. All meditational models including pathways between religiosity, attitudes toward women, attitudes toward partner violence, and attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours were examined based on model fit. Model fit was assessed using several different criteria (a) the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), with values of .08 or less reflecting reasonable fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993), (b) the $\frac{\chi^2}{df}$ ratio, with values between 1 and 3 indicating acceptable fit (Arbuckle & Wothke, 1999) and (c) Comparative Fit Index (CFI), with values of .90 or more (Byrne, 2010).

**Hypothesis mediation model.** Figure 3 presents the proposed mediation model with religiosity, attitudes toward women, attitudes toward partner violence and attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours. The resulting model had an excellent fit: $\chi^2 (48) = 73.27, p = .01, \frac{\chi^2}{df} = 1.53, \text{RMSEA} = .06, \text{CFI} = .97$. Examination of path coefficients showed that religiosity predicted attitudes toward partner violence via non-egalitarian attitudes toward women. In addition, the negative relationship between attitudes toward women and attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours are predictable through attitudes toward partner violence. After trimming the
non-significant pathways, the model fit was $\chi^2 (51) = 80.04, p = .01, \chi^2/df = 1.58$, RMSEA = .07, CFI = .96.

\[ \text{Attitudes toward Partner Violence} \]
\[ \text{Attitudes toward Controlling Behaviours} \]
\[ \text{Justifying wife Beating} \]
\[ \text{Blaming Women} \]
\[ \text{Women Benefit from Abuse} \]
\[ \text{Offenders' Responsibility} \]
\[ \text{Attitudes toward Help-Seeking for Abuse} \]
\[ \text{Attitudes toward Help-Seeking for Controlling Behaviours} \]

\[ 0.83^{***} \]
\[ 0.72^{***} \]
\[ 0.58^{***} \]
\[ 0.51^{***} \]
\[ 0.30^{***} \]
\[ 0.33^{***} \]
\[ 0.90^{***} \]
\[ 0.85^{***} \]

Figure 3. Process model of the mediating role of religiosity, attitudes toward women, attitudes toward partner violence and help-seeking behaviours. Standardized path coefficients are presented.

***$p < .001$

Since the result of the exploratory analysis showed a significant effect of gender on some dependent variables, gender was considered as a covariate in the mediation model (see Figure 4). The proposed model showed an adequate fit to the data, $\chi^2 (56) = 81.11, p = .01, \chi^2/df = 1.45$, RMSEA = .06, CFI = .97. Entering gender as a covariate did not change the pathways of the original mediation model. Even though the direct effect of religiosity on attitudes toward partner violence was reduced when the mediating effect of attitudes toward women was considered in the model, the path coefficient was still significant, indicating a partial mediation model. As a result, even when considering gender as a covariate, attitudes toward women partially explained the association between religiosity and attitude toward partner violence.
Acculturation as a Moderator

**Moderation model testing procedures.** To examine whether acculturation was a moderator in the mediation model, a multigroup structural equation modeling approach was used to assess invariance (equivalency) among acculturated groups by using ML estimation in AMOS 19. Data analysis proceeded in several stages: (a) identification of a baseline model in each group separately; (b) multiple-group ANCOV modeling (the analysis of covariance-variance structures) to examine invariance across groups in a configural and constrained model, and if non-invariance was found, (c) investigation of invariance across two groups (configural, measurement and structural model), and if non-invariance was found (d) follow-up analyses to determine the sources of non-invariance (see Byrne, 2010).
Once adequate model fit is established for each group separately, multigroup modeling employs successive analyses where constraints to the models are added consecutively. The configural model is an unconstrained model requiring items to load onto the same factors across acculturated groups, but allowing item parameters including factor loadings, structural variances and structural path regression to vary across groups (see Byrne, 2010). Then the increasingly stringent invariance assumptions are tested in a sequential order, starting with the least restrictive model. With the measurement model nested under the configural model, equality constraints across groups are applied to factor loadings and model fit is re-evaluated. Evidence of adequate fit for this model ensures that a given factor has the same meaning across groups (Byrne, 2010). Then this procedure is continued with structural variance and structural regression paths.

Evaluation of measurement and structural invariance typically involves calculation of difference in fit indexes (e.g., $\chi^2$, CFI, etc.) between configuration and comparison models. The target model is compared against a less restrictive model. The classical approach considers non-invariance based on significant differences of $\chi^2$ ($\Delta\chi^2$) in two conditions, unconstrained (i.e., no equality constraints) and constrained parameters. Recently, considering the non-invariance decisions on a difference in CFI ($\Delta$CFI) rather than on $\Delta\chi^2$ values (Cheung & Rensvold, 2002; Byrne, 2010) has been strongly recommended. Thus, in this study, the evidence of non-invariance was considered based on a difference in CFI values exhibiting a probability greater than 0.01.

**Hypothesis moderation model.** Three groups consisting of low, middle and high levels of acculturation to North American culture (see Table 4) were considered in this study. To begin, adequacy of model fit for the baseline model for each individual group (see Table 6) was
examined based on a comparative fit index (CFI > .90) and RMSEA, with values of .08 or less reflecting reasonable fit (Browne & Cudeck, 1993).

### Table 6

**Model Fit Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>χ²/df</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>90% Confidence intervals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Level of Acculturation</td>
<td>43.78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.990</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level of Acculturation</td>
<td>51.56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Level of Accultation</td>
<td>67.30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08 - 0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Middle-Low Acculturation</td>
<td>163.02</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Low Acculturation</td>
<td>111.30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Low Accultation</td>
<td>119.24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04 - 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Middle Accultation</td>
<td>95.30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 6, the baseline model was found to be a good fit to the data for the highly acculturated group (CFI = .99, RMSEA = .04) and an adequate fit for the moderately acculturated group (CFI = .95, RMSEA = .07). However, model fit statistics indicated only a modestly well-fitting model for the group with low acculturation; CFI = .87, RMSEA = .14, while the low confidence interval (0.08) was in the accepted range. The configural model (i.e., an unconstrained model requiring items to load onto the same factors across acculturated groups) also indicated that the hypothesized multigroup model fits well across three acculturated groups (χ² (123) = 163.02, CFI = .94, RMSEA = .05). Moreover, all of the two-group pairings (high-low, middle-low and high-middle), had an acceptable fit model. Coefficient scores for different levels of acculturation has also provided at Table 7.

In the second step, invariance across groups in a configural and constrained model were examined. In this study both Δχ² and ΔCFI were comparable and reported, although the ΔCFI
was the criterion to be considered (see Appendix 11). The significant difference ($\Delta \chi^2 = 38.38, p < .01, \Delta \text{CFI} = .02$) between the configural (CFI = .94) and the constrained model (CFI = .92) showed non-invariances among the three groups. In the third step, a multigroup structural equation modeling was applied to each of the two-group pairings separately to find the sources of non-invariances (see Appendix 11).

Table 7

**Coefficient Score for Different Levels of Acculturation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathway</th>
<th>Low Level of Acculturation</th>
<th>Middle Level of Acculturation</th>
<th>High Level of Acculturation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity-Attitudes toward women</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward women-Attitudes toward partner violence</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes toward partner violence-Attitudes toward help-seeking</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, the test of invariance was conducted for high-low acculturated group. No statistically significant difference in CFI ($\Delta \text{CFI} = .00$) between configural and constrained model was found. This indicated that all factor loadings, structural variance and structural regression paths were invariant across high and low acculturated groups. Second, invariance was investigated across high-middle acculturated group. Comparison of configural and constrained models for high-middle acculturated groups yielded $\Delta \text{CFI} = .02$, indicating non-invariance between these groups. Follow-up analysis by applying successive equal constraints on factor loading and structural variance showed the measurement construct to be the same across two groups. However, the equality constraint on structural regression path, specifically attitudes toward women and attitudes toward violence, worsened the model fit from a practical perspective (CFI = .96, RMSEA = .05 vs. CFI = .97, RMSEA = .04). This indicated that the factor-loading regression path for attitudes toward women and attitudes toward partner violence cannot be considered equal across two high and middle acculturated groups. The regression path between
attitudes toward women and attitudes toward partner violence was 0.82 in the high acculturated group, while in the middle acculturated group, the regression path was 0.69. Thirdly, the different models were examined across middle and low acculturated groups. The result of ΔCFI = .03 demonstrated a non-invariance across the two groups. Further successive equality constraints revealed that two groups were non-invariant on structural variance of the religiosity factor. Specifically, further follow-up showed non-invariance at the measurement level on intrinsic religiosity (ΔCFI = .01) between two groups. Significant differences were found with respect to intrinsic religious perspective, where the variance was stronger for the group with lower level of acculturation compare to the middle level of acculturation. In summary, multigroup modelling found evidence of one measurement difference and varying pathway. In the less acculturated group, the intrinsic subscale of the religiosity measure contributed more to the latent religiosity factor than at higher levels of acculturation. In terms of pathways, that the path linking attitudes towards women and attitudes towards partner violence was significantly weaker in the moderately acculturated group than the highly acculturated group.

Summary

This quantitative study aimed to explore a mediation-moderation model to better understand and explain how different factors might contribute to IPV among Muslims immigrants. Data was collected from 131 university students with diverse cultural backgrounds and from different stages of immigration. The participants completed a package of questionnaires to measure the variables of interest in this study including religiosity, cumulative childhood abuse, attitudes toward women, attitudes toward partner violence, experiences of IPV, attitudes toward help-seeking and help-seeking behaviours. It is noteworthy that a number of variables were not explored in this study and excluded from the final proposed model. First,
since a limited number of participants were in an intimate relationship and a few of them reported experiences of IPV and help-seeking behaviours (as opposed to attitudes), hypotheses related to these two variables were not tested. Secondly, mediation models require direct effect between variables; therefore, correlations among variables were obtained. Most of the variables of interest in this study were correlated except for the cumulative childhood abuse including childhood physical abuse, witnessing domestic violence and exposure to the community violence; thus, these factors were excluded in the final model.

This study explored three main hypotheses related to mediation models. First, attitudes toward women would mediate the relationship between religiosity and attitudes toward partner violence. Second, attitudes toward women would mediate the relationship between religiosity and attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours. Third, attitudes toward partner violence would mediate the relationship between attitudes toward women and attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours. Structural equation modeling using the Amos 19.0 statistical software was applied to examine these hypotheses. The results showed that proposed model had a good fit (RMSEA = .06, CFI = .97). The path coefficients demonstrated that holding a more traditional religious perspective was predictive of greater acceptance of violence toward women via non-egalitarian attitudes. In addition, holding traditional attitudes toward women predicted lower acceptance of seeking help through greater acceptance of intimate violence. Since the exploratory analysis showed gender’s effect on some variables, gender was considered as a covariant in the proposed model. The mediation model was still acceptable; however, religious perspective partially mediated attitudes toward partner violence via tradition attitudes toward women.

This study also explored the hypothesis of whether acculturation was a moderating factor in the proposed mediation model. Three levels of acculturation were identified according to
participants’ score on the Vancouver Index of Acculturation. A multigroup structural equation modeling approach was used to assess invariance (equivalency) regarding measurement and structural path regression among three acculturated groups by using ML estimation in AMOS 19. The results showed non-invariance across the low and middle acculturated groups with regards to the religious variable, specifically intrinsic religiosity. In addition, across middle and high acculturated groups non-invariance was found in the regression path between attitudes toward women and attitudes toward partner violence. The results showed that regression path was lower for the mid-level acculturated group compared to highly acculturated group. Specifically, the highly acculturated group displayed lower mean score for attitudes toward women (i.e., egalitarian attitudes toward women) and attitudes toward partner violence in comparison to other groups.
Chapter 3: Qualitative Study

Considering the multi-dimensionality and complexity of IPV (Abraham, 1998; Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005), a qualitative study was designed to examine how perpetration of violence shapes and impacts Muslim families pre- and post-immigration. There is limited literature regarding men’s perspectives on the perpetration of violence and their help-seeking behaviours in general, and among Muslims in particular. This qualitative study investigated how abusive Muslim men interpreted their abusive behaviours in the context of their religious beliefs and how their attitudes toward women might play a role in their perpetration of violence. The relative influence of cumulative childhood experiences of abuse on men’s violence was also explored. In general, this study investigated the way abusive men negotiated the interrelated factors of religious beliefs, childhood experiences and attitudes towards women through experiences of pre- and post-immigration in the context of violence. Furthermore, the factors that might have impacted men’s help-seeking behaviours were explored.

Framework. In this qualitative study, a critical point of view, specifically a critical social theory, was considered. Critical theory highlights that people experience domination in complex ways and seeks to develop a model of understanding that reflects these complexities in combination of theory and data (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000). This theory concerns “in particular issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy; matter of race, class, and gender; ideologies; discourses; education; religion and other social institutions; and cultural dynamics interact to construct a social system” (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000, p. 90). In the context of domestic violence, violence is likely a result of women’s oppression on sexual, ethnic, and cultural factors (Abraham, 1998). Therefore, taking a critical social perspective has significant potential to provide insight to better understand how domestic violence may be
constructed in the context of culture (i.e., religion, race), pre- and post- immigration and acculturation.

**Method**

After obtaining approval from the Research Ethics Board at the University of Toronto (see Appendix 12), qualitative data was collected through semi-structured interviews (see Appendix 13) using open-ended questions. The semi-structured interview provides a guideline for questions prior to interview yet gives the examiner flexibility during interview for additional probing questions. In this study, the semi-structured interview guide covered several content categories, including religiosity, attitudes toward women, experiences of immigration and acculturation, childhood experiences of abuse and exposure to domestic violence and community violence. Help-seeking behaviours were also queried. Questions were directed to elicit relevant factors but were broadened to encourage participants to elaborate based on their own unique experiences.

**Participants.** In this study eight male Muslim immigrants were recruited through two main sources: agencies and the community. This study was advertised in the Partner Abuse Response (PAR) program by group leaders at Family Services of Toronto. The advertisements were also published in Urdu and Arabic in multicultural newspapers. Three criteria were considered for recruiting participants through the advertisements: being a first generation immigrant, having an intimate relationship before immigration and having an intensely conflicted intimate relationship. The final sample consisted of 5 participants from the Partner Abuse Response (PAR) program and 3 participants from the community.

**Procedure.** The interested participants were invited for one-on-one interview meetings at the University of Toronto/Ontario Institute for Studies in Education clinic. Each participant was given the “Research Information and Consent Letter” and provided with an explanation in their
mother language. The participants were informed that their participation was voluntary and that they had the right to refuse to answer any questions and the option to opt out at any time during the interview. However, none of the participants expressed any concern or objection, and all completed the interview and answered all of the questions. After obtaining written consent, participants’ general demographic information was collected. Then participants completed a semi-structured interview in either English or their mother language, according to their preference. Interviews took between one and a half and two hours. After the interview, participants were compensated for their time and received a list of places to seek help.

All interviews were conducted in participants’ mother languages according to their requests, since they did not feel comfortable and competent in English, with the exception of one that was conducted in English. The primary investigator interviewed the participants from Iran and Afghanistan and a trained undergraduate student completed the interviews with the participants from Pakistan in the presence of the primary investigator. The interviews were recorded, translated and transcribed. The interviews conducted in Persian were first translated into English and transcribed by a bilingual person; later the interviews were reviewed by the primary investigator. The interviews in Urdu were translated to English and transcribed by two undergraduate students. Some researchers argued that there are advantages of conducting the interviews in the participants’ mother languages. Language is not only a way to express meaning (e.g., life narratives), but also influences how meaning is constructed through particular cultural concepts and social norms (Nes, Abma, Jonsson & Deeg, 2010); however, through translations it is possible to lose the “conceptual equivalence” because of words, phrases or metaphors used to describe concepts that do not exist in English (Squires, 2009). The translator’s interpretations play a major role in the transformation of the message to English. Challenges in interpretations
and representations of meaning would be more complicated when cultural contexts differ and inter-lingual translation is required (Nes et al., 2010). Therefore, all efforts were made to achieve true translations in this study. For instance, some comments were added in parentheses to make some cultural or religious concepts more comprehensible for an unfamiliar reader. It is noteworthy that all possible measures were taken to respect the privacy of participants and protect their confidentiality, including but not limited to not obtaining identifying personal information, deleting all extra copies of transcripts and using encrypted software data to which only the primary investigator had access.

**Analysis.** Critical discourse analysis (CDA) was applied in scrutinizing the data. CDA is an interdisciplinary approach that views language as a form of social practice and focuses on the ways it reproduces social domination (MacLure, 2003). "Discourse analysis involves the tracing of historical evolution of language practices and examining how language both shapes and reflects dynamic cultural, social, and political practices" (Starks & Trinidad, 2007, p. 1374). Wodak (2007) also defined CDA as "analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control, as they are manifested in language" (p.210).

The translated transcripts from the interviews were coded according to themes, ideas and keywords. Coding data from the transcripts was used to organize and classify the data in order to link similar ideas. After coding the transcripts of interviews, similarities and differences were analysed, and used to discover and expand upon the connections among various themes in the data. The coding procedures and emerging themes were frequently checked and validated by the secondary investigator of this study independently to ensure an unbiased analysis and conclusion.
Results

Participants’ Demographic Information

Participants ranged in age from 25 to 60. Most of them reported having a low-average to average income in Canada. All of them had post-secondary education but most of them were unable to find jobs commensurate with their education or past experience. Three of the participants in the study were unemployed and two were working as security personnel. Two others worked in better paid jobs, one as a researcher and the other as a real estate agent. The last participant had completed his education in Canada (college degree) and found a job related to his field of study as a technician. Six participants had lived in Canada between 3 and 5 years, and the two others had been living in Canada for over 10 years. Some participants immigrated to Canada through a third country, which was, in most cases, a Muslim country. All participants had been in an intimate relationship long before their immigration with one exception; a participant who married in Pakistan and spent only one month there. All participants from the PAR program had a no-contact order from court because of incidents of violence in which police became involved. The demographic information of the participants is provided in Table 8.

Understanding Men’s Abusive Behaviour

This section explores the men’s explanations of abuse in their relationships. It begins with a brief review of the abuse that men described perpetrating. Then, the explanations that men themselves provide for problems in their relationship are described – “We just didn’t know each other”, which men attributed to the lack of opportunity to get to know their partner prior to entering an arranged marriage. Analysis then turned to a deeper exploration of the nature of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants’ Quote</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Partner’s Level of Education</th>
<th>Occupation in Canada</th>
<th>Occupation prior to immigration*</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Length of Marriage</th>
<th>Length of Immigration to Canada</th>
<th>Immigrated to Canada through the Third Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>M.D.</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Medical professional</td>
<td>No Canadian income</td>
<td>17 Years</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Higher education professional</td>
<td>30000-35000</td>
<td>8 Years</td>
<td>2 Years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Iranian</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>Retired salesman</td>
<td>Civic servant</td>
<td>40000-45000</td>
<td>30 Years</td>
<td>22 Years</td>
<td>Spain (Short Term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Afghani</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>Grade6-7</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>Under 10000</td>
<td>8 Years</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>Iran (23 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>College Diploma</td>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45000- and Over</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>15 Years</td>
<td>Saudi Arabia (born)-Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>Security personnel</td>
<td>Higher education professional</td>
<td>25000-30000</td>
<td>17 Years</td>
<td>5 Years</td>
<td>Middle East (12 Years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Civic servant</td>
<td>Under 10000</td>
<td>19 Years</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>Master degree</td>
<td>Security Personnel</td>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>15000-20000</td>
<td>9 Years</td>
<td>3 Years</td>
<td>Kuwait-U.S.A(short Term)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In respect of participants’ confidentiality, their occupations were reported in more general categories*
differences that seemed to drive the lack of love and understanding in men’s relationships. Gender roles appeared central to this conflict. Men’s views of an ideal relationship are described in “Learned ideals: Men’s superiority and dominance”, along with men’s explanations of the cultural, religious and societal roots of this model of relationship. Then, in a section entitled “Relationships in Canada: Shift in power,” an analysis is provided of men’s views of the contribution of changes in power balance and women’s empowerment, and finally, in the section entitled “Taking advantage of Canadian resources and freedoms”, links are made to men’s view of Canadian society as supporting women in divorce, which in turn, contributes to relationship conflict and dissolution.

**Men’s descriptions of abuse.** The men in this sample admitted to some behaviours that would be classified as abusive. Although men often tried to minimize these kinds of behaviours (e.g., pushing their partner or hitting their partner with an object), and often did not label them as abuse, nevertheless, most of them reported using controlling behaviours to implicitly or explicitly gain compliance from their partners. Participants exercised controlling behaviours in different aspects of their partners’ lives including criticizing their clothing (1), ignoring them in decision making (1 & 5, 8), destroying property (4 & 5), intimidating (1, 2, 4, 5 & 8) and refusing to divorce (1, 2 & 4). For instance, a participant from Afghanistan refused his wife’s repeated requests for a divorce (4). He indicated that his marriage was a destiny, so he tried to keep the relationship at any cost. He reported that his wife ran away from home and that one of his friends found her and brought her back. She requested divorce after their immigration to Canada but he did not take her seriously. The man used different abusive behaviours to keep his marriage intact, mentioning “When I was too nervous, at the extreme, I cut her clothes with scissor or I broke something to calm both of us down and then I left home with my son”(4).
Another participant explained how he controlled his wife in different domains of life such as telling her how to dress and behave, and avoided giving her opportunities to be part of decision-making in their relationship (1). In addition, participants reported verbal and emotional abuse in their intimate relationships. For instance, one participant reported that “In the morning when she was waking up I called her stupid she was really an idiot…” (4). Another participant abruptly married the younger sister of his originally intended bride. He neglected his new wife who was a new immigrant to Canada and declined to start a family with her. This participant was actively looking for a way to end the marriage prior to his wife learning about her rights and entitlements in the event of divorce. He explained that “I basically just had a marriage and I was just sitting idly in front of TV, watching TV all the time. Go work, watch TV, not having any proper family life (laughs)” (5). The three participants who were not recruited from the PAR program also reported intense verbal arguments in spite of the fact that their relationships did not involve physical violence. For instance, a participant who did not see his wife before their marriage indicated that he made his wife feel uncomfortable by frequently reminding her that she was a burden and that “she is the person who got married to him on the basis of a lie itself” (7), although he acknowledged that it was their elders’ fault not his wife’s.

We just did not know each other. All but two participants explained that the intense conflict and violence in their relationship was a result of mismatch or of having an arranged marriage. Men explained that they had not had an opportunity to get to know their partners before marriage because of cultural and social limitations. For instance, a participant from Afghanistan explained a cultural custom in which his wife was chosen without his consent and whom he did not meet or see before their wedding day. The participant explained that his “Brother in law had murdered three people and she was given to the victim's family as “Khoon
Bass, خون پس” [to prevent retaliation], and then she escaped from there and came to their [our] home” (4). According to their tradition, he was obliged to marry her because he was single. Another man from Pakistan explained a kind of match making system in their local mosque that often led to marriages in his community. He also emphasized that he had not seen his bride before their wedding. He expressed the regret that he had carried for the rest of his life, feeling that his marriage arrangement was deceitful (7). Another participant indicated that he went to Pakistan to marry his cousin. However, when he found out that she had already married, he abruptly married her younger sister without having time to get to know her. He never accepted her as his wife and refused to start a life with her (5). Participants from Iran also claimed that they did not know their partners because of the limitation of their society, which did not allow them to spend time with their partners before marriage (1, 2 & 3). This is highlighted in quote from one participant:

I couldn’t have a girlfriend; one of the reasons was society... when we were going to get married, my wife told me “let us be friends for 3 months. I was working [teaching] in the University and if they [the university officials] found I had a girlfriend they would fire me very easy. But that friendship.... possibly that was my right to know the person I am going to marry. (2)

The men’s dominant discourse about their intensive conflicted relationships was centered on the idea that they did not start their marital relationship based on personal understanding and deliberate choice. As an example, one man explained that he was emotionally neglecting his wife because: “I think I made the mistake… because my knowledge about women was wrong, my reason for marriage was wrong, why did I get married? You know what I mean? And I couldn't fulfill my wife's emotional needs” (2). According to men’s explanations, not knowing their partners and having different viewpoints led to intensive conflict.

Learned ideals: Men’s superiority and dominance. Men’s descriptions of their relationships also clearly conformed to learned traditional and patriarchal models of
relationships. Participants expressed that men, as the heads of the family, should be in charge of financial issues and be responsible for making the important and sensitive decisions (1, 3, 5, 6, 7 & 8). Some men indicated that they consulted their wives, but eventually they followed their own judgment (1 & 6). As a participant noted “If the dominancy of my nature comes, I just accept her, (laughs) that she is right, but do it in other way” (6). Some participants claimed to share the decision making with their wives but only in small or routine issues rather than on major issues on the grounds that they, as men, were supporting the family financially. For instance, one participant indicated that “when I was working and I was the main breadwinner nobody would ever question my decisions” (3). Another participant expressed: “I was managing my life without help from anybody and because I was successful I tried to continue [to lead my life]. Naturally when my wife comes to my family and becomes my spouse can't tell a successful man what to do and not to do, she will follow [should be a follower]” (1).

Men saw this model of male dominance in intimate relationships as acquired from cultural or religious teachings and reinforced by social norms in the country in which they grew up. For instance, one participant indicated that “some people see man in Eastern culture as individual, while an Eastern man lives in a society that is shaped with cultural issues. It cannot be considered an Eastern man’s freewill [is not individual, it is socially dictated] and then Eastern man is labelled dictator and violent …. Society was telling me you are a man and you should do that” (1).

Some participants raised different cultural concepts that showed their understanding of women's position in the society as inferior to men. For instance, one participant explained how, in his culture, women are belittled as he mentioned that “They consider girls as a burden. So they feel that any relation [marriage offer] that comes forward, it’s better to get rid of that
burden” (7). Interestingly, when he was talking about his wife and daughter, he referred to them in the same way, as burdensome. Another participant raised that when a girl married, “Even if there is any conflict...the girl can't go back to her home in any circumstances since her safety will be on the line [her family may hurt her].” He also noted a cultural concept, “Khoon Bass, بس خون”, in which a woman related to a man who has committed a murder is expected to marry a relative of the murdered person as compensation for the crime and to prevent retaliation (4). Participants from Iran also indicated that traditional attitudes toward women are part of their culture or subculture. This traditional perspective was learned through observing their parents. For instance, one participant explained that in the city in which he grew up, when a man and his partner walk together, the woman should walk behind the man (1). This is also highlighted in the quotes of other participants:

*Especially in Iran, I thought women shouldn't take their husbands orders, but I was told to act the way that my wife would be submissive.* (2)

*Here we are a sample of Iran. Unfortunately the dominant culture in Iran is Patriarchal; we are grown up in that culture. My father for example never made a cup of tea for himself, never got a glass of water, it was always my mom's duties.* (3)

It is noteworthy that when this participant explained his own relationship with his partner, he labeled himself as “a dictator with good intentions.” He considered himself as the main decision maker, stating “whenever I insisted on something it was proved later that I was right.” These attitudes contributed to the conflicted relationship with his partner (verbal and sometimes physical confrontation, see section on shift in power).

Men viewed religion as another contributor to their views on women and relationships. Participants provided several anecdotes from traditional customs and religious teachings that described men as superior, protective and the leading figure of the family. These teachings hold that men are in charge of making decisions (including primary financial decisions) and
protecting integrity of the family. In contrast, women are described as delicate, sensitive, and in need of protection and support. Men’s superiority and dominance according to religious perspectives were highlighted in quotes of three participants:

*Role of men is always dominant. ...this dominance is by nature also. It has already been mentioned in different religions of the God, that is the Christianity or the Jewish or ah the Muslims. And, this, this dominancy to certain extent is related to the responsibility of the man and the responsibility of the women. God has created the woman, ... a very delicate creature. And, a beautiful and highly sensitive creature. (6)*

*According to me, every Muslim is guided better by their religion. ....according to the religion, the woman, in our religion, is supposed to manage the house. Her work is to mainly take care of the kids and raise them. And it has been said in our religion that the father provides their children with the best education and finances. (7)*

*....In our Islam it is said that man has been given superiority. With us, men are given a little superiority and it has been said that he earns for the household’s spending, that he does all the outside jobs. Whatever problems exist in the outside, in the office, he deals with them. The woman is supposed to look after the home, the clean up, taking care of the kids, and like cooking. She is to look after the home and she doesn’t have any outside responsibility on her. (8)*

Some of the men pointed out that according to Islam it is a man’s responsibility to support the family financially and work outside, while women are responsible for the household and taking care of children; however, this arrangement does not fulfill the demands of modern society. Others expressed an egalitarian view on getting an outside job (i.e., both men and women can and should work outside the home); however, they did not consider a woman as an autonomous agent who should decide for herself. According to their perspective, even a woman who does not follow the traditional role is still under governance of her husband and is not supposed to make decision on her own. In the words of one participant:

*The thing is that the woman is supposed to stay at home and that is never possible in Canadian society .... In Canadian society, then both have to be agreeing to work. It's not like a choice kind of thing. If it is like that, if it is about equality then both have to be bound to working but if it is Islamic law then woman has to stay home and man is responsible for all the bread and butter. .... Like now we are living in very much modern society so now if you want to go out, step out of the house, do it together. It is not like you do it when you feel like it or when you don’t. (5)*
Men also indicated that women should continue to “follow the rules”, and accept limitations in clothing and behaviour. As one participant noted that “For me who from time that I learned my left and right hand [early education] this culture was there that women should wear scarf and men are free” (1). It was also raised that women are not fully entitled to family assets, but consistent with religious and traditional views, should only own what they are offered at the beginning of their marriage.

If there was a conflict like in Pakistan or somewhere then she only takes the “Mehr” [in Muslim marriages, a gift given to wife by her husband; it is only for her to use as she wishes] and goes to her house.(5)

Participants indicated that social norms and laws in their countries, which are governed under religious paradigm, enforce patriarchal mindsets. One participant explained that living in a country governed by Islamic law requires accepting the rules of society. He explained that he was not responsible for the legislation of a country mandating the wearing of the hijab for women or granting the right to divorce exclusively to men. He indicated that they, including his wife, had to accept and follow the rules. He believed that his controlling behaviours were acceptable in Iranian society, and described that the roots of the conflicts “were mostly about controlling, naturally, because in Iran's society the main issue is about controlling.” He also explained:

for us who lived in traditional societies, that kind of societies ....... my family were blaming me for why my wife's voice is on our answering machine. Well, this shows that it wasn't important to me, or for example when we are together she prefers to pay the taxi, these things are not important........whatever she likes.... but in a traditional society like Iran these things are bold. I might not notice but for the elder of my family these things may be big deal. I behaved the way that she felt comfortable but when I saw the social reaction, I had to act in a way to be able to response to others as well. But she thought I am X [a tyrant dictator] in home...... they were issues that I didn't play a role (weren't my fault). When I am living in a society .... I should follow some of the society's rules. (1)
**Where religious perspective fits in IPV.** Since religious perspective was a main factor in this study, the role of religion in IPV was directly investigated. Participants reported different levels of religiosity, adhering to with varying degrees to religious rituals and practices, with the exception of one participant who was not religious at all (3). Most participants expressed ongoing devotion to their religious perspectives and beliefs. When participants were asked directly about whether or not religion or religiosity played any role in their intensive conflicts, they did not make a direct connection. In general, men’s responses could be divided into two groups. A number of men reported that there were not religiosity-based conflicts because they shared the same religious views with their wives. This perspective is highlighted in quotes from two participants:

*No, religion didn’t play a part in it because she was same religion, same views as me....So religion didn’t play much role in that.* (5)

*No, why would I feel a strain because of religion? In fact, I should say, that because our marriage is based on such similar religious beliefs, it’s actually a good thing and a positive point for us. Religion would have been an issue if I would have married a Christian or some other sect.* (7)

Others spoke about differences in levels of belief or religious practice between them and their partners, but stated that they respected these differences, often asserting that the end result would be worked out between a person and his or her God. This viewpoint is emphasized in quotes from the following two participants:

*I only suggested her to consider our religious orders like praying and so on. But I wasn't [religious] to that extent to put pressure on her, like saying you have to do something. Since [I believe] everybody has its own beliefs and will face the consequences of his/her actions. God has asked us to remind others such as spouses, brothers or children and show them the right path. Advise them a couple of times if they get the message, which would be good otherwise they will notice in the future.* (4)

*If she asks me then I tell her about religion. So there is no difference on that. But there is one thing in North America that I really like about religion. They say that religion is a totally personal thing.* (8)
All participants denied that religion or religiosity played any role directly in their conflicts; however, religious concepts surfaced when they expressed their perspective on attitudes toward women (as shown in previous section) that were challenged by the process of immigration and acculturation.

**Relationships in Canada: Shift in power.** Participants all agreed that problems in their intimate relationships (if there were any) became much greater post-immigration. They explained that immigration increased stress in the family and imbalanced the family dynamics through the empowerment of women. More specifically, participants blamed the Canadian process of immigration for increasing the tension in the family (2, 6 & 7), in particular because men were not able to find employment commensurate with their training and expertise. This is highlighted in quotes of two participants:

_I should be able to get adjusted. So, there is something missing in the system here. Either the system is not able to get adjusted all the well-qualified experienced immigrants here, they don't have lot enough positions. .... it is imposing a very, not good effect over our family life... (6)_

_Canada, I think, looks at immigrant firstly as a capital rather than a human being. Canadian government ignores the humanistic principle that a person who is granted immigration had a specialty which has been approved; do they really need his specialty? ....they just accept immigrants without programming, immigrant should look for job himself, he may have to do a job in which he is not expert......This influences the family, a parameter which is important, since some wounds could be healed but ....society doesn't let it be. (2)_

Men’s difficulty in finding employment greatly impacted the family dynamic through changing traditional gender roles by reducing the man’s position as the head of the family and empowering women. This imbalance, in turn, increased intensive conflict in the family, particularly around men’s level of dominance and superiority. For instance, one of the participants described that financial stress due to difficulties in finding a job impacted his position in the family, and his wife “couldn't count on” him anymore (2). He explained this
tension increased their verbal arguments and finally led to physical confrontations. Another participant explained that he and his wife tried different strategies to obtain employment, including updating their education and working as volunteers in various places; however, after 5 years they could not find work in their professions. In his words, “of course it has a not positive impact on our family life. So, when there is the shortage of money, so financially we are frustrated. …all this frustrations are going to pile up in our life” (6). He described how his frustration and hopelessness to support his family led to intense verbal arguments and emotional separation.

Participants explained that problems were significantly intensified by the fact that Canadian society changed women’s attitudes (1, 2, 4 & 5). Specifically, they described their partners as being spoiled by women’s status in Canadian society, which saw them increasingly reject a model of a relationship of deference to a male partner. In contrast to the value system of Canadian society, participants praised the value system of their societies of origin and noted the collective traditional construct in those societies is more compatible with their attitudes toward women. As one participant compared Canada to the country in which he grew up:

*In Saudi Arabia, the laws there are more towards you know man favouring laws, right? Like, women, I mean are in purdah [veil]. ...she stays within limits. Like what you would call the right limit. Here what you would call freedom and liberty, that is too much.* (5)

Another participant also stated that “In Iran if she wanted to mention.....this superior and inferior story, no one would buy it,” while “there is feminism being bold here and it is the opposite of Iran where everything is in favour of men”(1). He explained that his wife’s behaviours changed after immigration as she did not follow the traditional way. He stated that “a male Arab doesn't tolerate if his wife or his children walk shoulder to shoulder [in the same line]. Always a man goes first and wife or kids follow him”. Although he claimed he has been critical
of that traditional behaviour, in practice he indicated “Later in Canada, I saw my wife was treating me like that by walking ahead of me or when we come out of elevator she walked ahead of me toward our unit and it was for me like… (Pause).” He explained how this impacted his perception of his manhood, stating “if I want to summarize in one word that would be humiliation, you know what I mean? It was like she said I was not in her level.” This situation led to intensive conflict between him and his wife.

Women also obtained autonomy and independence through involvement with society (e.g., getting a job to support their families financially and participating in the educational system and ESL classes), which was perceived by men as a threat to their position and authority in the family. As one participant indicated, after his wife improved her proficiency in the English language and found a stable job, she sought more independence. “When she was working at Starbucks, her income was not much, both our incomes would have come in the house and we could manage, but once she got hired [in a company] she got a boost in her confidence. She started going out and not coming home” (2). He explained that his wife became more engaged with society and learned about resources that led to more tension in their intimate relationship. He described that “she was surrounded by friends who were reinforcing her mentality that she can easily live on her own here and she can easily raise her kid”. He added that she learned that “women receive a lot of support here.” His attempts to keep the family the way it was before only led to more tension. Finally, he stated “I reached to the point that I decided not to let her in the house and she called the police.”

Taking advantage of Canadian resources and freedoms. Men explained that women take advantage of access to more resources, information and facilities provided by the Canadian government and society, including calling police or accessing governmental and other forms of
support. Participants believed that women took advantage of freedom and Canadian law in two ways: reducing men’s position and paving the way for women to leave their intensive relationship. As it is cited below by two participants:

*The women who arrive from countries like Pakistan and other Muslim countries, they think that 911 is very much towards their edge and they just can complain about anything.* (5)

*She saw here as an environment with more freedom. Some people told her that single mothers receive a lot of support here……. I didn’t know that these things myself.* (2)

Men felt that this was threatening to them and their position in society. As one of them indicated, “You know here if you lift a hand then the police get involved” (8). He expressed concerns that police involvement would impact the process of Canadian citizenship.

Participants noted that women received information about different kinds of supports available to them through both informal channels (e.g., a family member who live in North America or a friend) and formal channels (e.g., organizations and the educational system). One man explained that his wife received information about Canada from his brother, who lived in North America. He indicated that his wife asked him about social position of women in Canada and the United States. “She said they are in charge… I had no idea that when women call the police they come and arrest the husbands. …. I didn't know about legal issues here so I wasn't taking these seriously” (4). Formal systems play an important role in giving women more power and informing them about their rights. As a participant indicated, his partner obtained information from an NGO to which she was connected through one of her friends. “She joined an NGO as well called Kayanat…. If a conflict happened they would take the man and nothing would happen to you (women). I mean, do whatever you (women) want, you are free” (5). The education system is another mechanism by which women learn about their position in society and become aware of resources available in the event of domestic violence. One man pointed
out that in different classes such as LINK classes or high school, feminism is promoted and women are encouraged to have a less traditional perspective (1).

Participants also indicated that Canadian society and laws give women the upper hand by facilitating divorce which provides them a way to leave their intensive, conflicted relationships rather than compromising. Participants believed, regardless of conflict in their relationship, their family would stay intact in their home country, whereas they found Canadian society to be one that is not family oriented and that facilitates divorce. Participants highlighted a mindset that divorce is not acceptable in their culture and religion; they have to stay in their relationship at any cost. In the words of one participant, “Woman should come in with bridal white cloth and leave with white dress of the dead (stay married till death) …. so if there is any problem or disagreement I would never think of that framework in which divorce is an option” (1). Men indicated that the institutions of their countries of origin worked to try to stop, discourage or at least delay divorce in spite of intense conflict. This point of view is highlighted in quotes from the following three participants:

The only thing that kept us together when we were there was the traditional setting that ruled in Iran and our child. What I mean by tradition in Iran is that in Iran, people don’t divorce very easily; and here it’s much easier. In Iran it’s harder and especially for women when they get divorced. (2)

If in Iran she filed for divorce, then they would ask her “what is the reason? Is he refraining from paying the household expenses? Is he beating you? Is he addicted? Does he have affair?” these things were considered important over there. Naturally if she wanted to do it here, if she could make a file for me, a criminal record for me then she could easily get the results she wanted. ….I have come to the conclusion that here (Canada) they push you toward divorce. (1)

Here, you must have seen, what is it, ‘quick divorce’, that’s what they encourage. If you’re not compatible, then get separated? (7)

Men noted that when women come to Canada, the legitimacy of divorce in the Canadian system provides support for women deciding to leave their intensive conflicted relationships.
For instance, one participant indicated that his wife frequently expressed her intention to get divorced prior to their immigration but the husband refused. He explained “When we landed she said do you know what I am going to do if you speak [if you don't behave], here is Canada, she said she was going to get divorce.” The participant added that his wife told him if “she separated from me not only kids had support but also she would receive extra money or could get a house from government, that was her idea. I laughed and called her Idiot! Even if they give house it would be temporary” (4). Another participant noted that “When we came here, Canada’s situation gave her the feeling…that she can get divorce much easier”. He explained that he realized later that his wife was obtaining information (informally and formally) regarding the available supports for a single mother and how to secure a divorce to leave the relationship.

**Women’s faster pace of acculturation.** Men reported that woman’s status in Canada, their engagement with Canadian society and their access to different resources give women an upper hand in acculturation, which further contributed to conflict over roles and potential divorce. Women became more attuned to a Canadian society that afforded them more independence through freedom. As this occurred, men felt obliged to defend their positions against their partners who preferred the new paradigm, with result being even greater conflict in the family. Most participants demonstrated a low level of acculturation by different indictors: preference of mother language for the interview (with one exception), ethnical background of their friends (from their ethnicity or from a similar culture) as well as their narratives. In contrast, their partners became more acculturated than them (1, 2, 4, 5 & 7). One participant stated that his partner acculturated faster than him, as he stated that “I am adapted about 30-40 percent and she is 60 per cent. She became adapted faster” (2). This faster acculturation, specifically, can be observed in women’s more egalitarian attitudes. For instance, one participant admitted that he
was a main decision maker in their home country. After immigration he indicated that “from the moment in Canada that I said that everything won't be unilateral anymore and everything should be equal, now I feel that she likes... herself... to express her opinion even in big decisions like buying a house or travelling (destinations).” He explained that changes in his wife’s attitude and behaviours made him feel threatened and led to more tension in the family. He noted that “she was a kind of personality who prefers to arrange everything herself, she thinks she knows it all, she prefers to program everything herself and naturally I can admit that when she is behaving like this I lose my self-esteem.... automatically your self-esteem is lowered and [pause] you are not that strong” (1). This participant indicated that his partner “is always self-righteous and it means that I have to go through a whole process to show her that she is wrong.” The participant’s lowered self-esteem because of his partner’s changed attitudes after immigration led to his controlling behaviours.

**Understanding Men’s Help-Seeking Behaviours**

This section explores men’s behaviours to seek help regarding their conflicted intimate relationships. It begins by exploring men’s informal help-seeking, and then discusses barriers to seeking formal help, including gender role attitudes, the belief that such matters are private, lack of knowledge about where to receive help, doubts about effectiveness of services and the belief that women should be included in formal help.

**Seeking help through acquaintances.** Men reported that they sought informal supports in regard to their intensive conflicted relationships from their relatives or friends in both pre- and post-immigration stages. For instance, one participant indicated that “Only my parents tried to fix problems between us; they were giving suggestions or encouraging us to maintain the relationship. For example, my mom was giving me advices how to avoid things that are annoying to women” (2). Friends were reported to be another source of informal support for
As one participant reported “These friends are basically like my mosque friends also, they are really close friends so they are trying basically also to help me out” (5). However, none of the participants sought formal support. Even when they talked to professionals, it was in the context of their friendship rather than formal help, and it happened prior to their immigration.

**Men felt emasculated by seeking help.** Gender role ideology was raised as one of the main reasons that men did not seek help. The participants underscored holding traditional gender role attitudes and feeling that seeking formal or even informal help would bring them shame. They indicated that seeking help was humiliating and called their pride and honour into question. This perspective is highlighted in quotes from three participants:

*I didn't tell anybody due to some concerns and I didn't know what to do myself. But now I am thinking I wish I had got some advice from somebody. I was concerned about my honour.* (2)

*I am very private and proud. I have stupid pride. She has talked to every member of her relatives, shed alligator’s tears and victimized herself but no one from my relatives knows anything except for my sister.* (3)

*I will never say this to someone else, because if I do, that will bring shame to me and my family.* (7)

**Keep it quiet.** Some men indicated that they did not seek help to keep the matter private. Men indicated that intensive conflict in the family is a private matter, which should be resolved within the family. As one said, “My thinking is that what can someone help us with? Because the issues are personal and we need to tackle them ourselves” (7). The men believed that nobody could help them and they did not find anyone in whom they could confide. Another participant also noted:

*First I think what can this guy do for me? Second everybody has his or her own headaches so I don't like to share my problems unless it is a necessity and someone can help.* (3)
Lack of knowledge: Where is the help in Canada? Men indicated that a lack of knowledge of available services in Canada was another barrier to seeking formal help after immigration. Participants indicated that the immigration process was stressful and made them feel helpless, and they were unaware of the services available to immigrants. Men claimed that while their partners had access to different resources, and knew about legal systems in Canada (see immigration section), they remained unaware of them (5 participants). One participant indicated that “when I go to YMCA they tell me many things such as resume writing, English classes, job search, free time activities and so on. They adjust [explain] all of these for me, my wife and my children but nobody told me about social rules, family law etc. They [Canadian] say these are our rules which is 180 degree different with my own country laws and rules. How can I, as a new immigrant, know about these things?” (1) He believed that this education should be mandatory for immigrants before granting residency in Canada. Other participants echoed this sentiment:

You see, where should I had turned to for help? Either relatives or family services. I didn't have information about family services and in case of relatives I was embarrassed to tell them my wife is such and such. I had little information about family services and I didn't know what to do. Newcomers have their own problems they have lots of stress, about job about income etc. and this stress didn't let me think in addition to my wife's behaviour. (2)

I was thinking what, there was no authentic place that I could go, basically. Like which place? Like she had a support group, Kayanat, but I didn't know who was in Canada for me. ... I didn’t even know what organization would help me. (5)

The three participants recruited from the community rather than the PAR program were also unaware of resources in the case of their conflict getting out of hand, as one of participants noted:

So, I think that our family issues are not at the certain point that we should go to get such kind of services. And, we are trying to manage by ourselves. So, I think we don’t need any service, such kind of service. (6)
**Women are the ones who need help.** Men reported that they did not seek help because of doubts about service effectiveness. They claimed that services could not be effective since they were focused only on men. The participants indicated that their partners should receive help to modify their behaviours as well, and men did not want to be the only one receiving advice. One participant stated: “Even if I had gone to a professional, he would give some suggestions to me and not to my wife” (4). Specifically, men who participated in the PAR Program indicated that their partner should be in the program as well. They blamed their partners for the fact that they ended up in the program and expressed doubts about its efficacy.

**I do not deserve to be here.** Men did not believe their abusive behaviours to be serious enough to merit participation is a group specific to abusive men. While they indicated that the PAR program was a place to talk and release pressure, most of them did not think it was helpful. Only one participant indicated that he would apply the strategies that he had learned in his relationship. However, others were not willing to accept any help or even to be open to considering it. One participant indicated that he attended the program to provide proof to the court that he completed it, in order to have “a clean slate.” He stated that “they’re just chatting and chatting, we’re not getting any key outcome or any difference” (5). In the words of one man: “What everyone has done, based on their speeches, he has been drunk for example or he is using drug, he does not have commitment, he wants only sex, well such a person is sitting beside me…. The films they are showing is extreme [exaggerated], it is critical condition for example the man is coming home and starts yelling at his wife, yelling at his kid. Things I have never done I don't think it's useful for me to talk about or see movie about” (2).

**Effects of Childhood Experiences of Abuse on Intimate Partner Violence**

Cumulative childhood experiences of abuse were another indicator investigated in this qualitative study. Participants were directly asked if they had any childhood experiences of
abuse in the family of origin that may have contributed to current conflict. Men’s responses did not suggest that childhood experiences of abuse were a factor of key importance to this study. Only one of the participants reported that they had any experiences of abuse during their childhood. Similarly, only two participants reported witnessing domestic violence when they were young. One of them highlighted that his parents’ intensive conflict impacted him, as he stated:

*How many times in month [frequency] is not important because even once in a year but it stays in your mind for a long time for example 6 months so you can say they were arguing for six months.* (2)

Likewise, only two of the eight participants reported having experiences of community violence during their childhoods. One participant noted that witnessing war as a child might have impacted his ability to communicate and make decision effectively.

*I don't know if these things would have had effects later on our life or not, is it affecting our ability to make decisions, can we decide or not...right decision, right speeches. But I think there are some influences we are five brothers and my two elder brothers can manage better than rest of us, yes, I think it was effective in situations in Iran.* (2)

**Summary**

The qualitative study was designed to better understand the complexity of IPV among Muslims immigrants and to explore how attitudes and behaviours are related in the context of IPV. It examined how men relate their abusive behaviours on the basis of gender roles and in the context of their religious perspectives. Cumulative experiences of childhood abuse were also explored in the context of intensive conflicted relationships. In addition, it investigated how men negotiate various factors in shaping their abusive behaviours and their help-seeking behaviours pre- and post-immigration.

The semi-structured interviews were completed with eight Muslim men, who were recruited either through a local treatment agency for men who had been arrested for abuse in
their intimate partner relationship or through the community. By participant choice, the interviews were conducted in participants’ mother languages with the exception of one who chose to be interviewed in English. After translating and transcribing, the themes and ideas expressed in the interviews were coded by applying the critical discourse analysis (CDA), which shows how language is reflected in cultural and social practices.

The analysis of interviews demonstrated that most participants described a non-egalitarian attitude toward women reflected in the concepts of rights and responsibilities, decision-making and financial issues. Participants framed women as entitled to do housework and raise children, while viewing men as dominant, protective, in charge of finances and as the head of the family, making the important and sensitive decisions. Men mentioned that their patriarchal attitudes were deeply rooted in the context of religion, social norms and cultural and subcultural traditions. These patriarchal attitudes of male dominance legitimized and led to men’s abusive behaviours, including controlling behaviours.

Participants’ abusive behaviours, which are embedded in patriarchal ideologies acquired from culture/religion and society, were sustained or triggered after immigration due to changes in power balance and challenges to traditional attitudes. Men’s positions as the heads of their family changed because of difficulties in finding work in Canada. While men tried to maintain the status quo during the ups and downs of life in Canada, they lost their dominant position in the family. According to men, their wives became empowered through more involvement with Canadian society. Men indicated that women became empowered through employment (making it possible to support the family financially) and engaging with community services (e.g., English class) that enabled them to become aware of available supports including legal and governmental resources (e.g., contacting police and the right to divorce). Men claimed that in
their native countries, both society and law facilitated men’s dominance, while in Canada, the opposite is true. The available supports in Canadian society resulted in women acculturating faster to Canadian culture than men. Men perceived women’s empowerment as a threat to their position in the family; their attempts to retain power in the relationship after immigration were expressed through abusive behaviours.

Men claimed that while women accessed the available resources in Canada, they remained unaware of both the legal system as relates to IPV as well as where to seek help. Some of them sought informal help through their family members or friends but they did not seek formal help before or after immigration. They indicated that seeking formal or informal supports would challenge their manhood and pride. They believed family conflict to be a private matter that should be resolved in the family. They claimed that they not only were unaware of where to seek help but also were dubious of effectiveness of such services. Participants attending the PAR program as a result of legal proceedings against them also blamed women for the fact that they had been mandated to a program for “abusive men”. They believed the abuse in their relationships did not merit participation in a program specific to intensively abusive men.

In this study, non-egalitarian attitudes toward women stemming from cultural and religious perspectives were recognized to play a key role in men’s abusive behaviours. However, childhood experiences of abuse did not seem to be a factor of key importance in this study.
Chapter 4: Discussion

Over the last few decades, many theories have been developed to explain and explore factors that may contribute to the experience and acceptance of intimate partner violence. Although much has been learned, reviews of the literature have called for a greater consideration of cultural factors including race, ethnic origin, language, history, and religious beliefs that might be intertwined with dimensions of immigration in legitimizing IPV among immigrants (e.g., Abraham, 1998; Kasturirangan et al., 2004). Research on IPV among Muslim immigrants, especially research taking a more comprehensive approach, is particularly lacking. Similarly, there is a gap in the literature with respect to help-seeking attitudes and behaviours, specifically among abusive immigrant men. Therefore, this study explored a socio-cultural model of the acceptance and experiences of IPV and help-seeking behaviours among Muslim Canadian immigrants. Specifically, this study investigated how different factors including patriarchal ideology, childhood experiences of violence (both within the family and within the community), acculturation and religiosity might be intertwined in the context of acceptance and perpetration of violence among Muslim immigrants.

The complexity of these factors required the application of a mixed-method triangulation design (see Creswell et al., 2005). Both the quantitative and qualitative data was collected in order to obtain different but complementary datasets, while equal priority was given to both forms of qualitative and quantitative data in order to confirm, cross-validate, and corroborate the finding of the studies. Data for the quantitative and qualitative studies was collected and analyzed separately. The results of the qualitative data analysis resulted in different themes that were associated with factors related to domestic violence and help-seeking behaviours. The results from the parallel and independent analyses of the qualitative and quantitative data were
reviewed. Then the results from the independent analysis of both the qualitative and quantitative data were converged during the data interpretation stage. The results of the quantitative part validated the results of the qualitative part in this study.

In study 1, a quantitative study, structural equation modeling was used to explore mediating and moderating pathways using established risk factors for acceptance of abuse and IPV along with religiosity and immigration status. It is important to note that since few participants reported having intimate relationships or experiencing IPV, the final model used justification of abuse, rather than abuse experiences themselves, as the outcome variable. Results supported a mediation model in which religiosity predicted high acceptance of abuse via traditional attitudes toward women. This traditional gender role, in turn, predicted less acceptance of help-seeking behaviours through the attitudes toward partner violence. After entering gender as a covariate, the pathways of the original mediation model did not change, although traditional attitudes toward women partially explained the association between religiosity and attitudes toward partner violence. Surprisingly, childhood experiences of abuse at the family or community level did not contribute to prediction of acceptance of abuse, or attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours. Finally, this study showed that level of acculturation (low, medium, high) was a moderating factor for one path. The path linking attitudes towards women with attitudes towards partner violence was significantly weaker in the moderately acculturated group than in the highly acculturated group. It is noteworthy that participants with low levels of acculturation showed greater adherence to intrinsic religious perspectives than did participants with medium levels of acculturation (non-invariance in the measurement level on intrinsic religiosity).
In study 2, qualitative analyses similarly showed that religious beliefs, patriarchal ideology, social traditions and violence towards women are interwoven. Interviews with eight abusive men suggested that gender-based ideology shaped through religious concepts and social norms was challenged by immigration and acculturation, which in turn initiated or exacerbated perpetration of abuse. While men tried to maintain the traditional family structure and remain head of the family, women were exposed to a system where women’s rights are commonplace, and resources and laws are available to protect them. This clash resulted in abusive behaviours. Patriarchal ideology also appeared to be one of the factors that prevented men from seeking help, in addition to unfamiliarity with the services available in the new society.

In the following sections, a brief discussion on how Islam might contribute to shaping Muslims’ attitudes toward women is presented. The common results of both studies, including how traditional attitudes toward women might predict the justification of abuse and IPV as well as how acculturation might impact the context of acceptance and experiences of abuse will then be discussed in more detail, while attitudes toward help-seeking and help-seeking behaviours will be explained separately.

Islam and Attitudes Toward Women

There is considerable historical evidence indicating that Islam significantly improved the status of women in the Arabian Peninsula over what it was during the pre-Islamic period (Aslan, 2005). However, the current position of women in Islam has been a matter of controversy. The Qur’an contains paradoxical perspectives, as is true for all Holy Scriptures. On the one hand, there are verses in the Qur’an as well as numerous Hadith (sayings of the Prophet) that picture men and women as equals before God. Human beings are of inherent value as God’s creatures regardless of their sex, race, etc. For instance, in one verse, it is stated: “O mankind, indeed we have created you from male and female ... Indeed, the most noble of you in the sight of Allah is
the most righteous of you” (Al Hujurat, 13). On the other hand, when it comes to social realm and family structure, there are verses and Hadith that clearly picture men as dominant, protective, and leading figures and women as obedient and as followers (Aslan, 2005). For instance, in one verse of the Qur’an (Al Nisa: 34), men are in charge of both women by [right of] what Allah has given one over the other and of how they choose to spend their wealth. This verse also states that righteous women are obedient, and that men are given the right to physically punish (i.e., beat) their wives when they are unfaithful. Different interpretations have been provided for the latter part of this verse (see Ammar, 2007; Hamid, 2015); however, male dominance is generally perceived as the message of this verse as well as some other passages.

**Religion, Attitudes Toward Women, Attitudes Toward Violence and Intimate Partner Violence**

There is a well-documented link between religiosity and more traditional attitudes toward women (e.g., Abu-Ali & Reisen, 1999; Bartkowski & Read, 2003; Hartmen & Hartmen, 1996; Harville & Rienzi, 2000; Read, 2002, 2003; Read & Bartkowski, 2000), therefore, in this study a mediation model was proposed to explain how religiosity and gender role attitudes are associated with the acceptance of and perpetration of abuse among Muslim immigrants. The results of both the quantitative and qualitative studies confirmed the importance of attitudes toward women. Specifically, the quantitative study showed that attitudes toward women mediated the relationship between religious perspective and acceptance of IPV. This model demonstrated that higher adherence to religion was associated with more patriarchal attitudes towards women which were, in turn, related to greater acceptance of violent and controlling behaviours. In preliminary analyses, gender differences were established in some of the variables examined. Specifically, similar to other studies (Haj-Yahia & Uysal, 2007; Nazar & Kouzakanani, 2007, Obeid et al., 2010; Sakalli, 2001), female students showed a less traditional attitude toward
women and greater disapproval of abuse toward women than their male counterparts. Stated another way, men were more likely than women to agree with and to support violence against women, including blaming and expressing less empathy for the victim, and judging behaviours constituting violence against women to be less serious or damaging (Flood & Pease, 2009). As a result of these mean level differences, gender was included as a covariate in this study. However, even with the inclusions of this covariate, partial mediation was supported.

Expressing different perspectives about attitudes toward women by female and male students might be related to cultural constructs that encourage males to express anger, aggression, and approval of pro-violence attitudes (Funk, Elliott, Urman, Flores, & Mock, 1999), in contrast to encouraging females towards non-violent attitudes. Even women with a more traditional perspective might consider domestic violence to be unacceptable under any circumstance, in contrast to men, whose more traditional perspective could encourage a greater generalized conditioning toward violent attitudes.

Similarly, the qualitative study with abusive Muslim men underscored that gender-based ideology originating in the context of culture/religion gives women the submissive role while granting men permission to pursue their dominance in different ways that might lead to perpetrating abuse, especially controlling behaviours. It is important to note that in the qualitative study, participants did not make a direct connection between their religious perspective and their abusive behaviours; however, men explained that their cultural/religious perspective shaped their patriarchal attitudes and the social norms gave them the legitimacy to exercise control and use violence/force. In men’s accounts, there was no clear line separating culture per se from religion, since they grew up and lived in the environments/countries where religion governed different aspects of their lives. While men themselves reflected on having
different levels of religious involvement, their discussion of cultural teachings around the roles of men and women seemed to nevertheless be heavily influenced by religion. Men spoke of their attitudes towards women being directed by religious conceptualizations that picture a woman as a delicate creature who is submissive, economically dependent, unreliable in making decisions and not considered as an autonomous person. They also described how social relationships and cultural structures reinforce male dominance and control, while encouraging women to be submissive. In such societies, the dominant gender entertains many freedoms and rights that are not accorded to all. By the same account, women are taught and encouraged to remain within their limits, act according to their role, and avoid challenging men’s dominance. This gender-based ideology provided a context of justification and perpetration of abuse that manifested in different forms including physical, and verbal/emotional abuse, as well as controlling behaviours.

Comparable with the current study, Zakar, Zakar and Kraemer (2013) found that Pakistani men’s attitudes toward women were influenced by the combined effect of patriarchal culture and patriarchal interpretations of religious teachings about gender relations. Pakistani men defined an ideal wife as a woman who accepts a man’s control and dominance. Interestingly, a qualitative study with Muslim Canadian women also showed that women justified and condoned their husbands’ abusive behaviours in the context of religion, as they considered their husbands to have privilege within the family (Desai & Haffajee, 2011). Muslim male abusers may also manipulate religious beliefs to justify their own abuse and to maintain power and control in the family (Macey, 1999). Similar to the current study, a quantitative study (Jeffords, 1984) examined a mechanism among gender role attitudes, religious orthodoxy, and beliefs about forced marital intercourse. The study showed that those who adhered to religious
orthodoxy with more traditional gender role attitudes were more likely to endorse the use of forced marital intercourse than those with egalitarian gender role attitudes or those who did not report religious orthodoxy. Combined with the results of the current study, this work suggests that religious beliefs contribute to a patriarchal system that assigns the subordinate role to women and facilitates IPV.

**Immigration/Acculturation, Acceptance of Violence and Intimate Partner Violence**

This study also proposed that the process of acculturation would moderate relationships between religion, attitudes towards women and IPV. Once again, the results of both the quantitative and qualitative studies suggested that acculturation was critical for understanding IPV among Muslims. In the first study, acculturation (evaluated in three levels, low, medium and high) functioned as a moderator, specifically on the pathway between attitudes toward women and justification of abuse. For participants who showed a moderate level of acculturation, attitudes toward women were not strong predictors of acceptance of violence in comparison to participants with a higher level of acculturation where these two variables were strongly associated. Acculturation also predicted differences in participants’ religious perspectives, gender role attitudes and justification of abuse. Specifically, participants in the medium level of acculturation demonstrated less adherence to intrinsic religious perspective compared to participants in the lower level. Moreover, the results showed that higher levels of acculturation to Canadian culture were associated with reduced adherence to intrinsic and fundamental religious perspectives, less traditional gender role ideology and reduced justification of abuse, specifically victim-blaming, as compared to low and medium levels of acculturation.

After immigration, Muslims face a new country with different ideologies and perspectives that may challenge their belief system; they have to choose between maintaining their belief system and accepting new values by revising the old ones. Those with low levels of
acculturation in particular might perceive the process of acculturation as a threat to their cultural/religious identity, including their family values. They might try to preserve and retain their values and firmly hold on to their beliefs (Saroglou & Mathijsen, 2007; Zakar, Zakar, Faist & Kraemer, 2012). As Muslim immigrants engage with society and become more acculturated; obtaining more knowledge and understanding of the host culture's traditions, customs, values, beliefs, attitudes, behaviours, and life styles, they become more liberal or modify their religious adherence and acquire more egalitarian attitudes toward women. Consequently, higher levels of acculturation are associated with lower approval of abuse.

The results of the qualitative study provided a more in depth understanding of how acculturation, attitudes towards women, and justification of abuse are connected. Qualitative analyses confirmed that the process of immigration and acculturation increase the tension and perpetration of abuse in the family by changing the family dynamics. Men indicated that immigration reduces their power in the family and increases that of women. Men perceived women’s empowerment as a threat to their position as the head of the family. Problems seemed to become particularly intense in cases where men tried to hold on their cultural values while their partner was quickly becoming acculturated and open to Canadian culture; a clash between men’s traditional attitudes and women’s egalitarian attitudes ensued. The family becomes a scene in which women gain ground and increase their power and men try to hold their position and defend the traditional gender-role norms in the family. This situation intensifies the conflict and leads to violence.

The results showed that men blamed Canadian society and culture for providing many privileges for women including women’s status and freedom. Immigrant Muslim men explained that they came from a cultural background that was different from Canadian culture. Here in
Canada, the status of women is based on cultural concepts such as individualism, liberty and equality while in Muslim countries cultural tenets are based on collectivism, tradition and religion. After immigration these two world views collide and impact both men and women. Men indicated that they tried to prove themselves reliable and to secure their position as the head of family during the ups and downs in their new society and were frustrated by the difficulties of finding employment commensurate with their training and expertise. From men’s point of view, women saw more freedom and opportunities and became aware of their rights in Canada, including practical and quickly accessible services such as calling the police, or receiving government financial support in the context of domestic violence. It should also be taken in to account that the supports available through the legal system and law enforcement in Canada recognize women’s vulnerability to abuse and violence and seek to protect them, in contrast to their countries of origin in which these systems favoured men. Men are unaware of Canadian law and regulations. They do not know IPV is a criminal offense (Bauer, Rodriguez, Quiroga, & Flores-Ortiz, 2000; Huisman, 1996; Sorenson, 1996; Tran & Des Jardins, 2000) unlike their home countries where IPV is regarded and interpreted differently by law (Douki et al., 2003).

According to men, one of the cultural values challenged by Canadian society is how divorce is perceived, specifically because divorce is seen as a way to empower women and provide them with the possibility of leaving conflicted relationships. The participants stated that they are coming from a culture in which family should be kept intact and transcends individual interests or needs. As the religious/cultural perspective emphasizes the importance of marriage, it is considered to be the equivalent to fulfilling half the requirements of the tenets of the faith. Divorce, in contrast, is hated by God. Men believed that after a marriage has been consummated, whether its origins be arranged or through personal choice, it should be
maintained, and that men and women must conform and get along with each other. Although divorce is allowed according to Islam, it is preferable that it be avoided. Both religion and culture dictate that divorce is not the solution to intense marital conflict and the solution should be found within the family. Both sides are encouraged to modify and compromise and even sacrifice, if needed. Most of the time, women are the ones who are expected to conform to men’s wishes and to sacrifice. If the divorce is inevitable, men have the sole right to pursue it; if men refrain from divorce, it will be very hard for women to get a divorce. If a couple experiences intense conflicts, they are discouraged from divorce and the problems accumulate, waiting for an opportunity, such as immigration, to explode.

On the other hand, in Canada, social and legal restrictions against divorce are lessened. During the interviews, men admitted that they tried to ignore the situation and refrain from agreeing to divorce before immigration as a way to control women. However, after immigration, their partners became empowered by receiving more support through Canadian culture and regulations to pursue divorce. The empowering environment for women which increases the tension in the family in addition to men’s response through perpetration of abuse pave the way for women to end the intensely conflicted relationship. Consistent with this result, Ayyub (2000) indicated that South Asian women are discouraged from getting divorced, as that would bring shame to the family. Women are encouraged by extended family to consider the best interests of the family and to stay with abusive men. In addition, a study with Iranian immigrants found that Iranian men expressed that Canadian values such as individualism versus family orientation are opposite to their own cultural values. Canadian values give women more freedom and equal opportunity to file for divorce after immigration (Shirpak, Maticka-Tyndale & Chinichian, 2007).
In both attitudinal and behavioural levels, the results of this study are comparable with others (e.g., Abraham, 2000; Bui & Morash, 1999; Firestone et al., 2003; Harris et al., 2005; Moghissi et al., 2009; Wallach et al., 2010). For instances, Khalid and Frieze (2004) found that Pakistani immigrants with short term exposure to American culture were more conservative in religious beliefs and held more traditional attitudes toward women than those with longer exposure to the host culture. Similarly, Wallach et al., (2010) found that the first generation of Jewish Ethiopians held more lenient attitudes toward domestic violence than Israeli-born Jews. They argued that the more restrictive religious perspective held by Ethiopian immigrants might be related to more acceptance of IPV among this group than the Israeli residents. The researcher indicated that the Jewish Ethiopians (i.e., the second generation) who were more acculturated to Israeli society showed a more modified religious perspective resulting in lower acceptance of violence. In addition, a study (Yoshihama, Blazevski & Bybee, 2014) with Gujarati immigrants in Metropolitan Detroit found that less acculturated immigrants held more traditional cultural values, followed native dress codes, used a native language and participated in cultural and faith-based organizations, were more likely to condone IPV. Studies with immigrants from different communities (such as Asian, Middle Eastern and Mexican) also found that women developed more egalitarian attitudes toward themselves and their roles, shifting their attitudes more quickly overall than men (Abraham, 2000; Bui & Morash, 1999; Firestone et al., 2003; Harris et al., 2005; Moghissi et al., 2009). Consequently, women may not follow traditional gender based norms, while men increase their efforts to control women, which may lead to violence (Bui & Morash, 1999; Bui & Morash, 2008; Morash, Bui, & Santiago, 2000; Raj & Silverman, 2003). During clinical work, Abraham (1998) found that South Asian men adhered strongly to traditional gender roles to keep their positions as head of the family, while women desired to be
equal to their husbands. The men wanted their wives to follow modern customs outside the home such as supporting the family financially by working, while inside the home, women were expected to follow traditional roles and remain obedient. This too, in turn, led to violence.

**Attitudes Toward Help-Seeking and Help-Seeking Behaviours**

While literature explores help-seeking behaviours among battered immigrant women, there is limited research about abusive men’s help-seeking behaviours, and specifically a lack of studies with abusive Muslim men. Therefore, the current study explored both attitudes and behaviour on help-seeking among Muslims immigrants.

In the quantitative part of the study, a mediation-moderation model was proposed to evaluate attitudes toward help-seeking behaviours including seeking informal (e.g., talking to family members or a friend), and formal help (e.g., receiving mental health care or using legal system) for both abused women and abusive men. The proposed mediation model illustrated that participants’ justification of abuse mediated between traditional attitudes toward women and attitudes toward help-seeking. Participants with higher levels of acceptance of abuse were less likely to support help-seeking among abused women or abusive men.

The results of the qualitative study expanded on understanding of help-seeking among men who have perpetrated violence. This study showed that one of the main reasons that men did not seek out help for their abusive behaviours formally or informally, pre- or post-immigration, was inherent in their gender role attitudes. Men expressed that seeking help challenges their masculinity and they felt shame and embarrassment. Muslim men also indicated being uncertain about effectiveness of services, since their ideal formal help should include their partners. Interestingly, the participants who received support from a service specifically designed for men arrested as a result of abuse of an intimate partner (PAR) were still doubtful about the effectiveness of the program. It is likely that men’s masculinity interferes with their
openness to receive support since they believed themselves to have been singled out. They questioned why there is not a program parallel to PAR program for women. They believed that receiving help should include both partners, especially because they believed their partners to be partly or fully responsible for their conflicted relationship. They explained that when they sought professional help in their own countries (in the context of friendship), they were advised that their wives were the ones in greater need of consultation. Moreover, men minimized and justified their abusive behaviours and did not consider themselves to be abusive. They expressed resentment over being included in a group specifically for abusive men.

Comparable with the results of both parts of this study, other studies with different Muslim populations have found the more the participants held negative and traditional attitudes toward women, the less they tended to support the idea that battered women should receive help (Haj-Yahai, 1997; 1998b; 2003; Haj-Yahai & Uysal, 2008; Haj-Yahai & de Zoysa, 2007). Similarly, at the behavioural level, focus group studies with abusive men (Campbell et al., 2010) have shown that men are reluctant to seek help because of holding traditional male gender role attitudes and feeling shame. Previous research on male batterers’ help-seeking behaviours also illustrated that men who held more traditional views of masculinity expressed negative attitudes toward seeking help and were less likely to have sought counselling (Blazina & Watkins, 1996; Good et al., 1989; Zeldow & Greenberg, 1979, 1980).

Cultural values and cultural practices incompatible with seeking help were also a barrier for men with respect to seeking help. In the countries from which men immigrated, intensive conflict in the family is considered a private matter that should be solved in the family. This finding was similar to Haj-Yahai’s findings (1998b, 1997; 2003) that Palestinian women and men expressed a strong tendency to view wife abuse as a personal and family problem. Similar
to studies that found women believed wife abuse should be dealt with by the family without intervention from social service agencies (Bui & Morash, 2007; Graham et al., 2008), abusive men in the current study also indicated that they wanted to keep this private matter in the family and solve conflict within the family.

In this study, it was also explored how acculturation would affect attitudes and behaviours regarding help-seeking. The results of the qualitative study revealed that acculturation moderated the pathway between attitudes toward women and justification of abuse (as discussed in the previous section) that consequently impacted beliefs toward seeking help. Participants with higher level of acculturation showed less tendency to non-equalitarian attitudes toward women and justification of abuse toward women, which in turn resulted in the greater tendency to consider the right for abused women or abusive men to seek help compared to participants with medium or low level of acculturation. Participants with higher level of acculturation also were more likely to offer help or use the legal services to support battered women or batterer men. Interestingly, in the qualitative part of this study, it was revealed that abusive Muslim men who demonstrated low levels of acculturation did not seek help after immigration. In addition to gender role ideology, one of the reasons the men indicated for this was lack of familiarity with service systems in the host country. Similar to the studies with battered immigrant women (Bui, 2003; Bui & Morash, 2007; Dasgupta & Warrier, 1996; Kaukinen, 2004), abusive men reported that they did not know where to access help during their intensive intimate relationships. Abusive men highlighted that the immigration process was stressful and made them feel helpless, and they were unaware of the social and legal services available to them. Similar to studies with abused women (Bui & Morash, 2007), which showed immigrants’ help-seeking behaviours are related to human and social capital, this study showed
that when men’s social supports (i.e., friends, neighbours, community, etc.) were limited, they were less likely to be aware of supports and to seek help actively. Participants indicated that while their partners received information about available services in case of domestic violence, such as calling the police, men were not aware of services. Men highlighted that the information regarding domestic violence and where to get help should be provided to male immigrants as a mandatory education.

**Childhood Experiences of Abuse**

On the basis of research demonstrating association between childhood experiences of abuse and later acceptance and perpetration of abuse, the current study hypothesized that childhood experiences of abuse would be related to justification of abuse and domestic violence through attitudes toward women. In addition, it was expected that cumulative childhood experiences of abuse would be associated with attitudes toward seeking help as well as help-seeking behaviours. Surprisingly, the results did not support the proposed hypotheses, since no significant direct paths were found between family of origin and/or community violence and either acceptance of IPV or attitude toward women. Only childhood physical abuse was positively related to justification of abuse \( r = .21, p < .05 \).

The results of current finding are not in line with research that supports the intergenerational transmission of violence theory (Carr & Vandeusen, 2002; Ehrensaft et al., 2003; Whitfield et al., 2003). There are several possible reasons for this null result. First, the relationship between the early experience and later perpetration of violence might be far more complex than one might assume, as some critics have argued (Jasinski, 2001; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). For instance, after reviewing the published domestic violence research, Johnson and Ferraro (2000) concluded that the strength of the cycle of violence as it affects IPV appears overstated. Their review showed fairly weak bivariate relationships between growing up in a
violent home and adult violence. These researchers concluded that “the metaphor of transmission introduces gross distortions of the reality of family of origin effects on the adult lives of children” (p. 958). Stith et al.’s (2000) meta-analytical review also showed weak to moderate effect size between exposure to violence during childhood and perpetration of abuse in adulthood. In addition, the relationship between history of abuse and acceptance or experiences of abuse might be more complicated among immigrant populations. For instance, the results of a study (Jin et al., 2007) comparing a control group with a group of battered Chinese immigrants showed no significant correlation between the witnessing of domestic violence as a child and acceptance of wife beating as well as IPV in either group. In addition, no correlation was found in the control group between early personal experience of physical abuse and positive attitudes towards marital violence in contrast to the batterer group. Interestingly, early childhood abuse was not a good indicator to differentiate the two groups.

Second, the quantitative study has examined only the relationship between history of childhood abuse and beliefs about domestic violence. Not finding a relationship between these variables might reaffirm other studies’ findings (e.g., Haj-Yahij, 1997; Haj-Yahia et al., 2012, 2015) that learning theory might explain how exposure to violence during childhood is related to violent behaviours of men against intimate partners rather than beliefs about and attitudes toward violence against women. Consistent with the current study, a cross-sectional study (Haj-Yahia et al., 2012) investigated how childhood abuse predicated acceptance of wife beating including justification of wife beating, blaming women for being beaten and believing women benefit from being beaten among 624 Palestinians (18 years or older). The results showed experiencing and witnessing family violence were not associated with attitudes toward wife beating.
A third reason is that attitudes toward women emerged as a strong predictor of acceptance of IPV in this study, which might overshadow the history of abuse. This is consistent with other studies (i.e., Haj-Yahij, 1997; Haj-Yahia et al., 2012, 2015) which concluded that patriarchal ideology is a stronger indicator than social learning theory to explain beliefs about wife beating that may contribute to views about violence against women. Similar to the current study, Karakurt et al. (2013) found that witnessing or experiencing family violence during childhood was unrelated to later intimate partner violence through attitudes toward women for both male and female students. The result of their study showed no significant association between childhood experiences of abuse and aggressive behaviours, nor between childhood abuse and attitudes toward women in adulthood in students of either gender. They found that the inter-parental conflict and parent-to-child aggression variables predicted 10% of the variance of female egalitarian attitudes and 4% of the variance of male attitudes.

Finally, the current study was conducted among university students who might have fewer experiences of serious abuse, which could in turn weaken the observable effects of child abuse on acceptance/experiences of IPV. Participants in the current study reported fewer experiences of abuse in comparison to other studies among undergraduate students (e.g., Paivio & Cramer, 2004; Paivio & McCulloch, 2004). For instance, the prevalence of experiences of abuse in the current study (M = 5.08) was lower than prevalence of childhood physical abuse among both male (M= 6.51) and female undergraduate students (M= 6.29) at University of Saskatchewan (Paivio & Cramer, 2004), and among male (M= 7.1) and female students (M= 6.7) at University of Windsor (see Paivio & Cramer, 2004) using the same measure. It is possible that the lower levels of abuse reported are associated with different social norms around the acceptability of violence towards children. Participants in this study were coming from cultural
backgrounds in which parents have greater leeway to exercise authority over their children as they see fit, and where physical punishment is more common (e.g., Ben-Arieh & Haj-Yahia, 2008). Therefore, what would be considered physical abuse in Canada might have been dismissed as corporal punishment by study participants. As a study with college-educated women from different ethnicities including South Asian, Middle Eastern, East Asian and Latinos showed, parental violence was accepted as a privilege or right across these groups (Maker, Shah & Agha, 2005). It is also possible that abuse levels were simply lower. In addition, participants in the second study reported very low levels of childhood abuse experiences. Prior studies have suggested that less serious experiences of abuse might not be associated with attitudes toward violence (Briere, 1987). Comparable with this study, Briere (1987) investigated the relationship between witnessing or/and experiencing violence in childhood and attitudes toward the use of violence among 191 male university students. The participants completed the Attitudes Toward Wife Abuse Scale and answered five questions assessing the participant’s likelihood to physically abuse their partner under certain conditions (e.g. “How likely would you be to hit your wife in an argument if she refused to have sex with you?”). Results showed that experiences of childhood abuse were a weak predictor of acceptance of abuse in the future.

Implications

The current study highlighted that gender-role attitude is an important risk factor in the acceptance of violence and in initiating and perpetuating domestic violence among Muslim immigrants. This perspective also directly and indirectly impacts help-seeking attitudes and behaviours. Muslim immigrants carry their cultural legacies, which are shaped by religion and tradition. The results of this study highlighted that religious perspectives are not directly associated with domestic violence; however, these religious and cultural perspectives result in attitudes supporting a superior status of males, which is associated with domestic violence.
among Muslims. After immigration, Muslim immigrants revise their traditional attitudes toward women, with greater and faster changes for women than for men. This gap in the attitudes seems to act as a facilitator for IPV, as Muslim men holding a patriarchal ideology are more likely to believe that they have a right to control and dominate their partners and view physical violence as a way to gain and maintain such control.

These findings have important implications for theories regarding domestic violence in the Muslim community. In particular, this model of violence is consistent with feminist theory that considers domestic violence as rooted in a patriarchal system that serves to maintain male dominance over women (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Patriarchal ideology indirectly impacts attitudes toward seeking help through the acceptance of abuse, and directly impacts whether abusive males seek formal help. In addition to patriarchal ideology, other religious and cultural perspectives such as a high value on marriage, avoidance of divorce, keeping family matters private and a lack of familiarity with existing resources and the legal system contribute to IPV and an absence of help-seeking behaviours among Muslim families.

In addition to the theoretical perspective, these findings have important practical implications. Specifically, they suggest that in order to address IPV in a Muslim population, different approaches should be considered at the prevention and intervention levels. At the prevention level, Muslim immigrants should be introduced to an educational program covering cultural, social and legal concepts. These issues include concepts of equality, autonomy and individual rights, as well as legal issues related to domestic violence. Considering that immigrants are coming from a collective culture, it would be enlightening to provide a comparative evaluation of both cultures. Explaining concepts like equality and autonomy and individual rights, which are usually considered negative and a threat to the family in the home
cultures, would help newcomers to understand them and take a constructive approach. The result of such programs might be challenging to some participants because they would be asked to change their ways of thinking and re-define gender relations.

This program should also include educating Muslim immigrants about the definition of domestic violence, the legal protections for victims and the legal consequences for perpetrators, especially as Muslims may have a different perspective in regard to abuse and its sanction in their families or their culture of origin. Muslim immigrants also should be informed about resources and supports available for both men and women. In addition to the information that is generally provided for immigration and settlement such as finding a job, etc., immigrants should be informed about cultural shock and how immigration may impact the family dynamic, and be provided with some recommendations for conflict resolution in the family. To add even more complexity to this picture, researchers have found that one of biggest fears of immigrants is divorce (Liao, 2006; Raj & Silverman, 2002). Immigrants should be informed that controlling and abusive behaviours not only do not protect the family but also increase the possibility of divorce. Instead, emphasizing the cultural values that support healthy family dynamics could alleviate existing problems.

Culture- and language-specific IPV programs should be implemented and incorporated into a community and culturally based service network that includes religious communities. Religious leaders can play an important role in promoting egalitarian attitudes toward women by utilizing the Verses and Hadiths that promote equality and harmony between couples. Just, kind and fair treatment toward women and the mutuality of the marital relationship should be encouraged. Educational workshops should be provided for religious leaders. The content of this workshop could include information and statistics regarding the prevalence of IVP in all
communities including the Muslim community, different prevention strategies and the introduction of available services. Well-informed religious leaders can take some steps toward addressing the topic of domestic violence in their sermons and teachings. The emphasis should be placed on the preventive model for family abuse, while at the same time providing guidance for appropriate intervention once abuse has occurred.

At the intervention level, considering and assessing adherence to Muslim cultural values should be considered when working with perpetrators of domestic violence. Changing the traditional attitudes toward women should be given more prominence, and incorporated into treatment programs for abusive Muslim men. Successful treatment should lead to more egalitarian attitudes toward women. Changing attitudes could serve as a measurement for treatment outcomes. Clinicians should also be sensitive to males’ acculturative stressors, shifts in cultural expectations that might be perceived as potential “threats” to their cultural values, and how these may interact and contribute to domestic violence in the Muslim community.

**Limitation and Future Directions**

The present study is contributing to the literature exploring how different factors might be intertwined in developing attitudes toward violence, IPV as well as help-seeking attitudes and behaviours among Muslim immigrants. This study is unique in applying both quantitative and qualitative approaches. In the quantitative study, different factors were explored in a normative population of Muslim immigrant university students, and then the same constructs were examined among a sample of high-risk abusive men. In addition, this study enriches literature regarding help-seeking behaviours among men, specifically Muslim immigrant men, as there was scarce research in this area. Thus, this study lays the groundwork for future research in domestic violence and related issues among immigrants, especially the Muslim immigrant community.
Results should be regarded in the context of their limitations related to the internal and external validity of the study in addition to design methodology. Firstly, the quantitative portion was based exclusively on self-report measures that can be vulnerable to bias through social desirability. Desirability factors might be a concern for Muslim students due to common stereotypes about Muslims being violent. Although, attempts were made to control for social desirability (i.e., no correlations was found between social desirability and main variables in this study), it cannot be entirely ruled out. In addition, shared method variance (i.e., variance that is attributable to the measurement method rather than to the constructs the measures represent, see Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003) might impact the results, even though different remedial procedures were applied in the instrument (e.g., counter balancing questions order and avoiding vague items) and statistical levels (e.g., applying CFA for two variables; religiosity and attitudes toward partner violence).

Another limitation was related to the measurements. First, some of the subscales measuring attitude toward partner violence (i.e., women benefit from beating and offenders’ responsibility) and religiosity (quest 1 and quest 2) showed low coefficient alpha. Low reliabilities were not a major concern of this study because subscales were used only as part of latent constructs in structural equation modelling. Latent constructs represent shared variance amongst a number of variables, in this case those around religiosity and attitude towards partner violence. As such, it is only the shared parts of the subscales used to create these variables that are used in the model, with additional variance (i.e., non-shared) considered error. When used in this way, the internal consistency of the individual subscales are of less concern, as subscale scores are not being used as a observable variables. In addition, as a primary step in analysis, all measurement constructs were explored independently. Specifically, Confirmatory Factor
Analysis (CFA) was done to examine the latent religiosity and attitude towards partner violence variables. The results of CFA showed that observed variables including justifying wife beating, women benefit from beating, blaming women and offenders’ responsibility were loaded adequately on their respective latent variables; attitude toward partner violence. Similar results were found regarding observed variables (i.e., intrinsic, fundamentalism and quest 1 and quest 2) for latent religiosity variable. Therefore, in general, there were acceptable internal structures among the variables above mentioned in this study in spite of some low coefficient alpha for some subscales.

Second, in this study different religious orientations were measured such as intrinsic/extrinsic and fundamentalism/quest. However, in the factor analysis, religiosity, regardless of religious orientation, was examined and ultimately was considered to be a latent factor. Therefore, future studies should explore whether holding different religious orientations make a difference in acceptance and experiences of domestic violence, and how that can be influenced by acculturation.

Third, a unidimensional model of acculturation was considered in this study, so for this purpose only the sub-scores related to acculturation to mainstream culture from the Vancouver Index of Acculturation (VIA, having two sub-scores, the heritage and the North-American culture separately) were used in the final analysis. Considering acculturation as one continuous concept does not effectively capture the multidimensional nature of acculturation (Abráido-Lanza et al., 2006; Schwartz, Unger, Zamboanga & Szapocznik, 2010). It is important to consider a multidimensional or bidimensional model of acculturation in future studies. In addition, the items evaluating acculturation in this study mostly targeted the behavioural and attitudinal basis of acculturation. Some researchers have suggested that the multidimensionality
of acculturation should be considered in terms of practices, values, and identifications that a person might show adherence to his traditional or mainstream cultures based on different contexts (Schwartz et al., 2010). Therefore, it is valuable to evaluate acculturation in different bases; the behavioural, attitudinal as well as the identity-based levels using both closed and open-ended questions. Moreover, different levels of acculturation were obtained by using an arbitrary cut off point approach (almost 33% of data in each three groups) in this study. For future studies instead of dichotomizing acculturation by creating groups based on cut-off scores, it is suggested to use more rigorous approach (e.g., cluster analysis method).

There were also external validity limitations related to the sampling procedure. In the first study, convenience sampling was used to recruit university students. This sampling strategy may provide a variety of participants regarding their levels of religiosity and acculturation; however, it may influence the generalizability of the findings. Although some researchers (e.g., Kardes, 1996; Lucas, 2003) have argued that college students are appropriate research subjects, other researchers (Wintre, North & Sugar, 2001) have questioned whether undergraduate subject pools are representative of the university students as a whole or a representative of the larger population. In this study, the participants from the psychology pool were contacted to investigate their eligibility and interest; therefore, they might have less prejudice toward the study, be more open-minded and possibly hold less traditional perspectives. In addition, 73% of participants were female who might be more open and interested in the topic that could, in turn, impact the results. Moreover, Muslim university students might not be good representatives of the Muslim community. Therefore, this mediation moderation model should be re-examined using a community sample in the future.
It is noteworthy that in spite of applying different strategies such as online and paper advertisements and connecting to different Muslim and ethnic students’ associations at the University of Toronto, most participants were at undergraduate level. Therefore, the majority of participants were not in an intimate relationship and the participants who were in a relationship did not report any experiences of IPV. This resulted in evaluating attitudes, rather than behaviours, toward domestic violence. Many studies have shown a strong correlation between holding beliefs supportive of domestic violence and committing violent acts against partners (e.g., Schumacher et al., 2001; Stith & Farley, 1993; Stith et al., 2004; Sugarman & Frankel, 1996). For instance, Archer and Graham-Kevan (2003) found that beliefs about perpetration of violence were strong predictive of physical aggression toward a partner among different groups; college students, women in domestic violence shelters and male prisoners convicted of physically abusing their partners. However, some researchers argued that to what extent attitude toward violence can predict violent behaviour. Using a national data set in the United States, Dibble and Straus (1980) found that attitudes could be a predictor of violent behaviours in the presence of certain social structural factors (such as low family income and unemployment) that might reinforce abusive behaviours. In other words, a person’s beliefs about violence can predict his abusive behaviours under circumstances that bring forth violent behaviours. Some research found inconsistency between attitudes and violent behaviours. For instance, using a large sample of Portuguese participants between age of 15 and 67 years, Machado, Martins and Caridade (2014) compared dating and married couples. The researchers found that dating couples showed less approval of the use of violence but higher levels of physical violence toward their partners compared to married couple with greater acceptance of violence but lower levels of violence in their relationship. Therefore, generalizing attitudes favouring violence to actual violent act from
university students to general population should be considered with caution. It is recommended that future study should evaluate both attitude and behaviour toward acceptance and experiences of violence among Muslim immigrants.

The results of both the qualitative and the quantitative studies showed that some proximal factors such as patriarchal attitudes toward women are a core concept in accepting and perpetrating abuse among Canadian Muslims immigrants. It may be fruitful to continue to explore the intersection of cultural values, family relationships, and immigration in addressing domestic violence attitudes and behaviours among Muslim immigrants, especially in evaluating how distal factors might impact IPV. For instance, according to the intergenerational transmission of violence, experiences of abuse in the family of origin and community violence are considered to be important distal factors in accepting violence and in perpetrating domestic violence. Surprisingly, in the current study these factors were not found to be correlated to IPV. Further investigation is therefore required in this area. In addition, other distal factors should be accounted for in future investigations such as the form of marriage (arranged or personal choice), and marital satisfaction as well as communication skills. For instance, a meta-analytical review (Stith et al., 2004) found that marital satisfaction is strongly related to IPV.

Acculturation seems contributing to modify religious perspectives and change beliefs toward the position of women in the family. It is important to investigate whether the proposed pathway mechanism will account for second generation Muslim immigrants, as a study found significant differences between first and second generation immigrants in accepting violent behaviours (Wallach et al., 2010).

The current research was cross-sectional and applied SEM Path analysis to examine a theory of pathways among different variables. This path model allows for an understanding of
the existence and possible directionality of different variables and how they might be interrelated. However, no causal inferences should be made (Lei & Wu, 2007). As Klem (2000) indicated, a well fitted path model shows that model is plausible and valid, but there is no guarantee that a single path model is correct as different models can be consistent with the same observed variables. It should be cautioned not to make unwarranted causal claims; therefore, considering the complexity of cultural/religious values and immigration processes, future longitudinal studies are required to better understand how the cultural values might be influenced or modified among immigrants.

In the second part of this study, although the sample represents diversity among Muslim immigrants as participants were Iranian, Pakistani and Afghani, the results cannot be generalized to all Muslims. Therefore, further research with other ethnic groups are recommended. Participants were recruited from two different sources: the Partner Abuse Response program in Toronto and the community. It is likely that the range and severity of their abusive behaviours toward their partners were different in scope. Moreover, participants were exclusively male. Thus, the impacts of acculturation and acculturative stress on the acceptance, experiences of abuse and help-seeking behaviours were investigated among abusive Muslim men. It is crucial to examine these factors in the dyadic form by investigating both men’s and women’s perspectives in the context of IPV and help-seeking behaviours.

**Considerations: The Role of Religion and Intimate Partner Violence**

The aim of this study was to better understand how domestic violence is shaped among Muslim immigrants. Given the importance of religiosity for this group of immigrants, religiosity was examined as a variable. As reviewed, results of both studies suggested that the religiosity needs to be considered. The results of the first study showed that religiosity was associated with attitudes toward partner violence through traditional attitudes toward women. In accordance
with first study, the results of the second study showed that religious perspective play an
important role in shaping traditional models of relationship which in turn facilitate men’s
perpetration of violence toward their partners. It is important to note that this study did not find
a direct relationship between religion, specifically Islam, and violence – in other words, there
was no evidence that religion is directly promoting violence against women.

Muslims may share a universal religion but coming from a diverse ethnic and cultural
heritage. Therefore, the intertwine of religion and cultural concepts might be more complicated
and a tendency to mix religion and ethnicity as a unique Islamic tradition might be misleading.
Islam offers a foundation for an ideology to provide concepts such as justice and humanity
through the Quran and religious scriptures. However, interpretation of Islamic teachings has
been formed through historical and cultural contexts and is promoted by religious traditional
institutions (Alkhateeb & Abugideiri, 2007; Alkhateeb et al, 2003; Hamid, 2015). The important
role of cultural/ sub-cultural elements in this interpretation that promote gender role ideology and
intimate partner violence should be considered. In addition, Islam is not the only resource used
to shape Muslims’ behaviours. In the quantitative study, cultural concepts were not investigated
in shaping gender role ideologies; however, in the qualitative study, it was underscored how
patriarchal ideology might be embedded in the cultural construct. Therefore, it is important to
further investigate whether cultural/ sub-cultural concepts are responsible for promoting non-
egalitarian attitude toward women (as a risk factor for IPV) rather than religious perspectives per
se.

The pathways linking religiosity, traditional attitudes toward women and intimate partner
violence may not be unique to the Muslim immigrants populations, as it has also been found in
other religious individuals (Cunradi et al., 2002; Levitt & Ware, 2006; Levitt et al., 2008; Nason-
Clark, 1997, 2000; Read, 2003, Ringel & Bina, 2007). Since patriarchal ideology is promoted in different religious groups, it is important to investigate variations in the religious concepts that prompt greater or lesser adherence to traditional attitudes. Further investigation is required to explore whether there are different understandings and interpretations of the relationship between men (husbands) and women (wives) within the family and the general society across religious denominations, specifically for fundamental / orthodox affiliations. Some studies have found that people who belong to orthodox and fundamental religious affiliations held more traditional gender role attitudes than people who belong to moderate affiliations (Bang et al., 2005; Denton, 2004; Harris & Firestone, 1998; Khalid & Frieze, 2004; Peek et al., 1991). It is worth studying whether domestic violence is more prevalent in fundamental /orthodox affiliations.

One implication of this study is the importance of promoting marital relationships based on equality between two partners in different aspects of their lives including making decisions and taking responsibility. This model of relationships should be advocated through different resources such as faith leaders, faith communities and multicultural media.

**Conclusion**

The current dissertation contributes to literature in the area of domestic violence and help-seeking behaviours by considering the intersection of cultural/religious perspective and attitudes toward gender inequality in the process of immigration and acculturation among Muslim immigrants. Although previous studies found relationships between religious perspectives and attitudes toward women, this study advanced research by exploring a mediation model by which religious perspective might play a role in acceptance and experiences of IPV through reinforcing traditional attitudes toward women. This study also highlighted the importance of accurately assessing cultural values in understanding attitudes towards domestic
violence. Perceptions of domestic violence in particular may be vital in recognizing the help-seeking patterns of Muslim immigrants. This study also moved one-step further in exploring how process of acculturation would be a moderator in the context of violence and help-seeking behaviours. These findings not only provide deeper understanding of attitudes towards domestic violence and IPV in the Muslim community, but are also relevant to recommendations for culturally appropriate methods for intervention, and prevention in Muslim communities.
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Appendix 2
Demographic Information

For each the following questions, please select the answer that best describe you or fill the blank space out.

1. What is your gender? □Male □Female

2. How old are you? _________

3. What is your year at the university?
   Undergrad: □ Freshman □ Sophomore □ Junior □ Senior
   Graduate: □ Master □ Ph.D.

4. What is your Father’s highest level of education?
   □ Less than high school □ High school degree □ Some College courses
   □ College degree □ Bachelor’s degree (3 or 4 years university)
   □ Masters Degree (or equivalent)
   □ Doctoral Degree □ Other (please specify) __________

5. What is your mother’s highest level of education?
   □ Less than high school □ High school degree □ Some College courses
   □ College degree □ Bachelor’s degree (3 or 4 years university)
   □ Masters Degree (or equivalent)
   □ Doctoral Degree □ Other (please specify) __________

6. What is your family’s income? (Make your best estimate)
   □ Under 10,000 □ 10,000-14,999 □ 15,000-19,999
   □ 20,000-24,999 □ 25,000-29,999 □ 30,000-34,999
   □ 35,000-39,999 □ 40,000-44,999 □ 45,000- and over

7. What is your marital status?
   □ Single □ Common-in low □ Separated □ Dating Engaged
   □ Married □ Divorce □ Other (Please specify) __________

8. If you have a relationship, how long have you been in this relationship? __________

9. If you were recently in a relationship, how long had you been in that relationship?__

10. If you were recently in a relationship, how long ago did that relationship end? _____

11. What is your country of origin? __________

12. How many years/months have you lived in Canada? _____ Year(s) _____ Months

13. How old were you when you started living in Canada? ______________

14. What is your immigration status?
   □ Permanente Resident □ Citizen □ Refugee
   □ Visa □ Other (Please specify)

15. Please check the category that best describes you:
   □ First generation immigrant □ Second generation
   □ International student □ Other (please specify) __________
16. My parents’ immigration/my immigration to Canada were (was):
□ Completely voluntary
□ Involuntary or unplanned (e.g. political or religious exile)
□ Both voluntary and involuntary

17. If you an immigrant, Did you immigrate to Canada from your original country?
□ Yes □ No

-If No, Please specify from which country you came to Canada.

-How long had you lived in that country before you immigrated to Canada?

18. What is your ethnic identity?
□ Arab □ Asian □ South Asian
□ Middle-Eastern □ African □ Eastern-European
□ Other (Please specify)

19. What language do you prefer to speak?
□ Only English □ Mostly English
□ English and my native language equally □ Mostly my native language
□ Only my native language

20. What language do you speak at home?
□ Only English □ Mostly English
□ English and my native language equally □ Mostly my native language
□ Only my native language

21. What language do you speak with your friends?
□ Only English □ Mostly English
□ English and my native language equally □ Mostly my native language
□ Only my native language

22. Do you watch television in your native language?
□ Never □ Once in while □ Sometimes (every couple weeks per month)
□ Often (Once a week or more) □ Always

23. To what extend do you think you have adopted Canadian Culture so far?
□ I see myself as Canadian rather than my own ethnicity.
□ I see myself as a Canadian who is proud of my ethnic background and follows both values and traditions of Canadian and my own ethnicity.
□ I see myself as my own ethnicity in values and culture.
□ I do not see myself either Canadian or my own ethnic identity, neither category describe me.

24. What is your religious affiliation? □ Sunni □ Shi’aa □ Others (please specify)

25. How often do you pray?
□ Several times daily □ About once a day □ About once a week
□ About once a month □ Sometimes in a year □ Never

26. How often do you attend religious services/mosques?
□ At least once a week □ 1-3 times a month □ 7-11 times a year
□ 3-6 times a year □ 1-2 times a year □ Never

27. How would you describe your level of religiosity?
□ Very strict/Orthodox □ Moderate/Conservative □ Liberal □ Non practicing
28. Do you recite Quran?
   □ Frequently □ Sometimes □ Rarely □ Never

29. Are you practicing Islamic duties (e.g., Zakat, and fasting)?
   □ All of them □ Some of them □ Few of them □ None of them

30. How much do you involve with your community?
   □ Fully involve □ Somehow involve □ Rarely involve □ Not involve
Appendix 3
Religiosity

The following items deal with various types of religious ideas and opinions. There is no right or wrong choice. Please indicate the response you prefer or most closely to your opinion by circling the number corresponding to your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. What religion offers me most is comfort when sorrow and misfortune strike.
2. It doesn’t matter so much what I believe as long as I lead a moral life.
3. I try hard to live all my life according to my religious beliefs.
4. The primary purpose of prayer is to gain relief and protection.
5. Religion is especially important to me because it answers many questions about the meaning of life.
6. Quite often I have been keenly aware of the presence of God or the Divine Being.
7. Although I am a religious person I refuse to let religious considerations influences my everyday affairs.
8. I pray because I have been taught to pray.
9. I go to mosque to establish a person in the community and to be with my friends.
10. It is important for me to spend time in private religious thought and prayer.
11. I read books about my faith.
12. It might be said that I value my religious doubts and uncertainty.
13. I am constantly questioning my religious beliefs.
14. Questions are far more central to my religious experiences than are answers.
15. My goal is to discover the truth, even if that means changing my beliefs.
16. The real goal of religion ought to be to make us wonder, think, and search, Not take the word of some earlier teachings.
17. When my religious beliefs are challenged by personal unhappiness, or by some argument, it just makes me believe stronger than ever.

18. My religious beliefs are more important to me to be jeopardized by a lot of skepticism and critical examination.

19. Allah has given humanity a complete, unfailing guide to happiness and salvation, which must be totally followed.

20. The human mind is too limited to discover Allah and the Truth by itself; we simply have to accept the truth that have been revealed.

21. There are basically only two kinds of people in the world: the Righteous, who will be rewarded by Allah, and the rest who will not.

22. The only acceptable religion to Allah is Islam and only devoted Muslims go to Heaven.

23. God will punish most severely those who abandon his true religion.

24. Hadith may contain general truths, but they should NOT be considered literally.

25. Allah’s true followers must remember that he requires them to constantly fight Satan and Satan’s allies on this earth.

26. No one religion is especially close to Allah, nor does Allah favor any particular group of believers.

27. Islamic rules should be adapted to modern life.

28. There is a particular set of religious teachings in this world that are so true; you can’t go any "deeper" because they are the basic. bedrock message that God has given humanity.

29. To lead the best, most meaningful life, one must belong to the one, fundamentally true religion.
Appendix 4
Attitude toward Women

The statements listed below describe attitudes towards the role of women in society. There is no right or wrong answer. Please express your feelings about each statement by circling the number corresponding to your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing laundry.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A woman should be free as a man to propose marriage.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Women should have the right to work in business and all the professions along with men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In general the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of the children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A woman should worry less about how to take care of her family than about her socioeconomic freedom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5
Attitudes toward Partner Violence

For each of the statements below, please indicate by circling the most appropriate number beside each statement that describes your personal views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A husband has no right to beat his wife, even if she breaks agreements she has made with him.
2. Even when a wife challenges her husband’s manhood, he has no right to beat her.
3. Even when women lie to their husband, they don’t deserve to be beaten.
4. A wife doesn't deserve to be beaten even if she continues reminding her husband of his weak points.
5. A sexually unfaithful wife deserves to be beaten.
6. Sometimes it is OK for a man to beat his wife.
7. It would do some wives good to be beaten by their husbands.
8. Occasional violence by a husband toward his wife can help maintain the marriage.
9. There is no excuse for a man to beat his wife.
10. A woman who constantly refuses to have sex with her husband is asking to be beaten.
11. A husband has the right to beat his wife if she doesn’t respect his parents or siblings.
12. A husband has the right to beat his wife if she insults his relatives or friends.
13. A woman who constantly disobeys her husband doesn't listen to him is asking to be beaten.
14. Based on religious beliefs, it is justifiable for a man to beat his wife in some situations.
15. A woman who constantly fails to meet the expectations of her husband deserves to be beaten.
16. Episodes of a man beating his wife are the wife’s fault.
17. Wives could avoid being battered by their husband if they knew when to stop talking.
18. Battered wives are responsible for their abuse because they intended it to happen.
19. Battered wives are responsible for their abuse because they should have foreseen that it would happen. 
20. When a wife is beaten, it is because of her behaviour sometimes before the battering. 
21. Battered wives try to get their partners to beat them as a way to get attention from them. 
22. Most wives secretly desire to be beaten by their husband. 
23. Wives try to get beaten by their husbands to get sympathy from others. 
24. The battered wife feels pain and no pleasure when beaten up by their husbands. 
25. Husbands who batter should be responsible for their abuse because they should have foreseen that it would happen. 
26. Cases of wife beatings are the fault of the husband. 
27. Husbands who batter are responsible for their abuse because they intended to do it.
Appendix 6
Attitudes toward Controlling Behaviours

For each statement below, please circle the appropriate number that describes your personal views.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A man has the right to decide whether or not his partner/wife should work outside the home.

2. A man has the right to limit the amount of time that his partner/wife spends with her family.

3. A man has the right to decide whether his partner/wife should go out in the evening with her friends.

4. A man has the right to control or monitor his partner/wife activities.

5. A man has the right to know where his partner/wife went and who his wife/partner spoke to.

6. A man has the right to control his partner/wife phone calls (e.g. listening or tracking).

7. A man is the only one who has the right to decide about divorce.

8. A man has the right to decide what her partner/wife wears including hijab.

9. It is normal that a man becomes suspicious and accuses his partner/wife if she pays a lot of attention to someone else besides him.

10. It is normal that a man would be mad if someone else paid a lot of attention to his partner/wife.

11. It is normal that a man would be mad if his partner/wife were helpful to someone of the opposite sex.

12. A man would feel betrayed if his partner/wife was too busy to spend time with him.

13. Only a man has the right to have access to family income.

14. A man has the right to control his partner’s/wife’s money.

15. Sometimes it is OK that a man humiliates his partner/wife in front of others, if she made a mistake.

16. Sometimes it is OK that a man calls his wife/partner unpleasant names or put her down.

17. Sometimes it is OK that a man shouts at his partner/wife if she does not obey him.
18. Sometimes it is OK that a man smashes property when he is angry/annoyed.
19. A man has the right to have sex with his wife when he wants, even though she may not want to.
Appendix 7
Attitudes toward Help-Seeking Behaviours

Please indicate the response you prefer or most closely to your opinion by circling the number corresponding to your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

2. The best way to deal with wife beating is to arrest the husband.

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

4. If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, it would be best that I do nothing.

5. If a battered woman asks for help from outside the family, she will be responsible for breaking down the family.

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

7. If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, I would call the police.

8. Social agencies should do more to help battered women.

9. The police and the courts should intervene to help battered women as long as their husbands refuse to receive treatment.

10. If a battered wife approached me and told me about her problems with her husband, I should provide her with the help she might ask for.

11. The problem of the battered wife is a private matter and others should not get involved.

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

13. A battered woman should get help from legal services (e.g. police).

14. A battered woman should get help first from her friends/family instead of legal services/professional because it is a private matter.

15. A battered woman should get help from mosque/religious advisor to keep this issue in the community.

16. A battered women should only pray and ask Allah for strength to keep her family together.
17. A abusive man should get help from social/ professional services instead of his partner.  
18. A woman should get help from legal services (e.g., police) if her partner/husband tries to control her life in many ways.  
19. A woman should move out of the house if her partner/ husband tries to control her in many ways.  
20. If I knew a woman was controlled by her partner/ husband, it would be best that I do nothing because it is a private matter.  
21. A woman should be protected by law if her partner/ husbands control her life in many ways.  
22. If a woman was controlled by her partner/ husband, she should get help from family/ friends instead of legal services/ professional help.  
23. If a woman was controlled by her partner she should get help from only mosque or religious adviser.  
24. If a woman was controlled by her partner she should get professional help (e.g. counselor/psychologist).  
25. If a woman was controlled by her partner/husband, she should only pray and relies on her religious beliefs to tolerate the situation in order to keep her relationship/ marriage.  
26. A controlling husband/partner should talk only to his family or friends to help him to change his behavior.  
27. A controlling husband/partner should get professional help (e.g. counselor/psychologist) instead of his wife/ partner.  
29. My community/ mosque supports a woman if she wants to get divorce because of an abusive relationship.  
30. My community /mosque is sensitive if a female member is beaten or abused.  
31. If a woman is abused or beaten, my community /mosque addresses it indirectly (e.g. giving advice, lecturing, providing pamphlet).  
32. If a woman is abused or beaten , my community /mosque addresses it directly (e.g., providing resources, helping women to be safe)  
33. If a woman is abused or beaten, my community /mosque believes that the woman is partially responsible for her beating.  
34. My community/mosque promotes male dominance and women submissiveness.
35. My community/mosque is OK to refer battered women to police.

36. My community/mosque encourages an abusive man to get professional help.

37. My community/mosque talks to abusive man to change his behavior.
Appendix 8
Controlling Behaviours

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, and want different things from each other. Couples have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. Please circle if this happened in your relationship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My partner prevents or makes difficult for me to work or study.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I prevent or make difficult for my partner to work or study.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My partner monitors and controls my money.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I monitor and control my partners’ money.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My partner prevents me to know about or having access to the family income, even if I ask.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I prevent my partner to know about or having access to the family income, even if my partner asks.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My partner restricts the amount of the time I spend with my family or friends.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I restrict the amount of the time my partner spend with his/her family or friends.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My partner demands to know whom I am with and where I am all the times.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I demand to know whom my partner is with and where my partner is all the times.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My partner limits my activities outside our relationship.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I limit my partner’s activities outside our relationship.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My partner feels suspicious and jealous and doesn’t want me to talk to others.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel suspicious and jealous and don’t want my partner to talk to others.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My partner accuses me of having an affair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I accuse my partner of having an affair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My partner threatens to end our relationship.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I threaten my partner to end our relationship.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My partner threatens to send me back to my country.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. I threaten to send my partner back to his/her country.
   0  1  2  3  4

21. My partner is afraid of me.
   0  1  2  3  4

22. I am afraid of my partner.
   0  1  2  3  4

23. My partner threatens to take our children away from me (If you have children answer this).
   0  1  2  3  4

24. I threaten to take our children away from my partner (If you have children answer this).
   0  1  2  3  4
Appendix 9
Help-Seeking Behaviours

Please mark √ if you /your partner received any help from the following services regarding you/your partner violence as well as you/your partner controlling behaviors such as controlling money, activities, being suspicious or threatening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Because of my partner’s violence I sought help from:</th>
<th>Because of my partner’s controlling behaviour I sought help from:</th>
<th>Because of my violence, I sought help from:</th>
<th>Because of my controlling behaviour, I sought help from:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imam in the mosque / religious advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short /long term counseling program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims professional counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community center or family center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s/men’s centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call/report to the police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted a lawyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being in court/ obtained a court order protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis centre or Crisis line</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter or transition house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group for abusive men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you didn’t get help from legal services (e.g., police) because of your partner violence / excessive controlling behavior, what the reason(s) was(were):

- I was afraid of my spouse/partner.
- They could not do anything about it.
- They would not help.
- I did not want to get involved with legal services.
- I did not want my spouse/partner arrested or jailed.
- The incident was a personal matter.
- I didn’t want anyone to find out about it.
- I was afraid of publicity/news coverage, especially because I am Muslim.
- I was afraid of discrimination.
- Other (please specify)____________________________

Thank you for participating in this research.
Appendix 10
Vancouver Index of Acculturation

Please answer each statement as carefully as possible by circling one of the numbers beside each statement to indicate your degree of agreement or disagreement. Many of these questions will refer to your heritage culture, meaning the culture that has influenced you most (other than North American culture). It may be the culture of your birth, the culture in which you have been raised in, or another culture that forms part of your background. If there are several such cultures, pick the one that has influenced you most (e.g., Egyptian, Arab, Pakistani, Turkish, Iranian, and etc). If you do not feel that you have been influenced by any of these cultures, please try to identify a culture that may have had an impact on previous generations of your family. Use the following key to help guide your answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral / Depends</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I often participate in my *heritage cultural* traditions.  
2. I often participate in mainstream North American cultural traditions.  
3. I would be willing to marry a person from my *heritage culture*.  
4. I would be willing to marry a North American person.  
5. I enjoy social activities with people from the same heritage culture as myself.  
6. I enjoy social activities with typical North American people.  
7. I am comfortable working with people of the same *heritage culture* as myself.  
8. I am comfortable working with typical North American people.  
9. I enjoy entertainment (e.g., movies, music) from my *heritage culture*.  
10. I enjoy North American entertainment (e.g., movies, music).  
11. I often behave in ways that are typical of my *heritage culture*.  
12. I often behave in ways that are 'typically North American.  
13. It is important for me to maintain or develop the practices of my *heritage culture*.  
14. It is important for me to maintain or develop North American cultural practices.  
5. I believe in the values of my heritage culture.
16. I believe in mainstream North American values. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I enjoy the Jokes and humor of my heritage culture. 1 2 3 4 5
18. I enjoy typical North American jokes and humor. 1 2 3 4 5
19. I am interested in having friends from my heritage culture. 1 2 3 4 5
20. I am interested in having North American friends. 1 2 3 4 5
### Appendix 11

**Goodness-of-Fit Statistics for Tests of Invariance Across Three Levels of Acculturation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Description</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Comparative Model</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$/df</th>
<th>$\Delta$ df</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>$\Delta$CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA (90%CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural model (Model A)</td>
<td>High, Middle and Low Acculturated</td>
<td></td>
<td>163.02</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.05 (.03-.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings, structural regression paths and structural variance constrained equal (Model A1)</td>
<td>High, Middle and Low Acculturated</td>
<td>Model A</td>
<td>201.40</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38.38**</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.05 (.03-.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configural model (Model 1a)</td>
<td>High and Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>111.30</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.07 (.03-.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings, structural variance and structural regression paths constrained equal (Model 1a)</td>
<td>High and Low</td>
<td>Model 1a</td>
<td>123.65</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.07 (.03-.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Configural model (Model 1b)</td>
<td>High and Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.35</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.7 (.04-.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings, structural variance and structural regression paths constrained equal</td>
<td>High and Middle</td>
<td>Model 1b</td>
<td>114.32</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.97*</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.05 (.00-.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loading constrained equal (Model 2b)</td>
<td>High and Middle</td>
<td>Model 2b</td>
<td>103.24</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.04 (.00-.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2b with structural variance (Religiosity) constrained equal (Model 3b)</td>
<td>High and Middle</td>
<td>Model 2b</td>
<td>104.89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.04 (.00-.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3b with structural regression path constrained equal</td>
<td>High and Middle</td>
<td>Model 3b</td>
<td>114.32</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.43*</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.05 (.00-.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3b with structural regression path on attitudes toward women—attitudes toward partner violence and attitudes toward partner violence—attitudes toward help seeking behaviours constrained equal (Model 4b)</td>
<td>High and Middle</td>
<td>Model 3b</td>
<td>106.40</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04 (.00-.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 4b with structural regression path on attitudes toward women—justification of abuse constrained equal (Model 5b)</td>
<td>High and Middle</td>
<td>Model 4b</td>
<td>114.32</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.92*</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.05 (.00-.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: $\Delta\chi^2$ = difference in $\chi^2$ values between models; $\Delta$ df = difference in number of degrees of freedom between models; $\Delta$CFI = difference in CFI values between models, *$p < .05$; **$p < .01$.  

**Note:** The table includes goodness-of-fit statistics for different models that test invariance across three levels of acculturation. The models compare structured models with their configural counterparts, testing for changes in fit statistics to determine if the models fit the data equally across groups. The statistics include $\chi^2$, degrees of freedom (df), $\chi^2$/df, $\Delta$ df, $\Delta\chi^2$, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) with 90% confidence intervals (CI).
### Appendix 11-Continued

*Goodness-of-Fit Statistics for Tests of Invariance across Three Levels of Acculturation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Description</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Comparative Model</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>χ²/df</th>
<th>Δ df</th>
<th>Δχ²</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>ΔCFI</th>
<th>RMSEA (90%CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Configural model (Model 1c)</td>
<td>Middle and Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>119.24</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.914</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07 (.04-.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings, structural variance and structural regression paths constrained equal</td>
<td>Middle and Low</td>
<td>Model 1c</td>
<td>145.22</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.98*</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.08 (.05-.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings constrained equal</td>
<td>Middle and Low</td>
<td>Model 1c</td>
<td>135.31</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.07*</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.08 (.05-.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor loadings on quest 1&amp;2 constrained equal(Model 2c)</td>
<td>Middle and Low</td>
<td>Model 1c</td>
<td>123.69</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.07 (.04-.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2c with Factor loadings on intrinsic constrained equal</td>
<td>Middle and Low</td>
<td>Model 2c</td>
<td>131.35</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.66**</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.08 (.05-.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2b with Factor loadings on attitudes toward partner violence and attitudes toward help seeking behaviours constrained equal(Model 3c)</td>
<td>Middle and Low</td>
<td>Model 2c</td>
<td>127.65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.07 (.04-.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3c with structural variance constrained equal</td>
<td>Middle and Low</td>
<td>Model 3c</td>
<td>133.56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.91*</td>
<td>.897</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.08 (.05-.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 3c with structural regression paths constrained equal</td>
<td>Middle and Low</td>
<td>Model 5c</td>
<td>133.98</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.07 (.04-.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Δχ² = difference in χ² values between models; Δdf = difference in number of degrees of freedom between models; ΔCFI = difference in CFI values between models, *p < .05; **p < .01
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Appendix 13
Semi-Structured Interview

Please select a pseudonym:

How old are you?
- □ 20-25
- □ 25-30
- □ 30-35
- □ 35-40
- □ 40-45
- □ 45-50
- □ 50-60
- □ Over 60

What is your highest level of education?

What is your partner’s highest level of education?

What is your family’s income? (Make your best estimate)
- □ Under 10,000
- □ 10,000-14,999
- □ 15,000-19,999
- □ 20,000-24,999
- □ 25,000-29,999
- □ 30,000-34,999
- □ 35,000-39,999
- □ 40,000-44,999
- □ 45,000- and over

What is your occupation?

What was your occupation in your country?
For the interview today, as I mentioned in the consent letter, I am trying to understand the factors that may contribute to severe conflict in intimate relationships. Do you have any questions before we begin? As I mentioned in the consent letter, you don’t have to answer any questions that you don’t feel like answering. At this point, I will also turn the recording device on so I don’t miss any of your responses or information during the interview. Let us start from your intimate relationship:

**Intimate Relationship**
Tell me about your intimate relationship before you came to Canada:

[probes / follow-up questions such as …]
- What is your marital status?
- How long have you been in that relationship?
- Was your marriage an arranged marriage or love one?
- How was your relationship with your wife?
- Experiences of severe conflict? Details of abuse including severity, emotional, sexual and physical incidents, control, financial abuse. How had this affected your children? Your wife, you?

**Immigration/Acculturation:**
Tell me about your experiences of immigration. I am interested in understanding the experiences of your family after immigration.

[probes / follow-up questions such as …]
- When you immigrated to Canada? How many years have you lived in Canada?
- You came to Canada as refugee / immigrant /as Visa
- Your immigration to Canada was / Completely voluntary/ Involuntary or unplanned (e.g. political or religious exile)/ Both voluntary and involuntary
- What barriers did you face when you came to Canada?
- How did moving to Canada affect your relationship with your wife?
- How did you adopt / To what extend do you think you have adopted Canadian Culture so far? Tell me more about it?
- In general, what were the reasons of severe conflict in your family after immigration?

**Cultural Factor/ Traditional Attitude toward Women:**
You have identified severe conflict in your family. In your opinion, how do cultural values affect on experiences of domestic violence on your community? How do cultural values affect on your experiences of domestic violence?

[probes / follow-up questions such as …]
- In your culture, what is the role of women and men (Regarding of working, financial matters, children, making a decision in the family?)
- What is your opinion about the ideal roles of husbands and wives? (Regarding of working, financial matters, children, housework)?

**Childhood Experiences of Abuse**
How was your relationship with your parents?
[probes / follow-up questions such as …]
• Were you disciplined harshly by your mother/ father (beating, kicking,)?
• How frequently and bad were those?
• How were your parents’ relationships?

[probes / follow-up questions such as …]
• Did they have a conflicted relationship as well?
• Did you observe that your parents physically fight with each other?
• How frequently and bad were those?

Exposure to Community Violence
Please tell me if you had exposed to the violence when you were in your country.

[probes / follow-up questions such as …]
• Was there any political/ religious oppression, civil war, war?
• Had you observed severe violence (see a person was threatened by a weapon/ see a person shot by a gun or stabbed by a knife/ see a person killed)
• Were you beaten by a relative or strangers?
• Were you frequently threatened by a relative or stranger

Religious beliefs:
In your opinion, how do religious values affect domestic violence in your community? What were your experiences of domestic violence?

[probes / follow-up questions such as …]
• Do you think severe relationship conflict has anything to do with your religious background?
• Are you religious, what about your wife?
• How has your faith affected on your relationship?
• How often do you attend religious services/ mosques? Are you practicing Islamic duties (e.g., praying/ read Quran/ Zakat, fasting and etc)? How would you describe your level of religiosity?

Help seeking:
Describe what kind of help you sought (family, friends, religious leaders, informal networks, community agencies, hotlines, counseling, etc.).

[probes / follow-up questions such as …]
• Describe the help you received from family, friends, and informal networks.
• Describe the help from community agencies.
• Have things changed for you, how? (Psychologically, socially, family dynamics, safety, religion, community, financially)
• Describe in detail the help you received from your religious leader (if applicable). Was it helpful, how, and if not, what would you want done differently?
• Describe in detail the help you received from counsellors (if applicable). Was it helpful, and if not, what would you want done differently?