

## Romanian-German Exchange of Ideas

### 1 Introduction

The ZKE is one of the partners in the Grundtvig-Project “Domestic Violence Met by Educated Women” (DVMEW). The group works on three elements. The first element is a program to prevent domestic violence. The second element is the questionnaire to identify problematic areas of domestic violence. Element Number three is an attempt to interpret the scientific findings from a women’s view. The research-team will present the program in the Paderborn-conference and the interpretation in a conference in Romania or Slovenia. The questionnaire has already been presented in Kiel and in Stockholm. The team describes the objective of the Grundtvig-activities, the theory, methods and terms in an own weblog under <http://zkewomenprojekt.files.wordpress.com> and invites for a discussion.

On Tuesday, 21<sup>th</sup> of January 2014, Georgeta Stoican distributed via E-mail a document entitled “Some comments on the questionnaire”. The document will be very helpful for the project in Kiel. In the following the full text is in new format literally quoted as chapter 2. The ZKE-team answers in chapter 3. Georgeta Stoican’s text consists of two main parts entitled “Some comments on the questionnaire” and “Strictly on the questionnaire”. As the weblog contributions answer to part one in detail, chapter 3 refers merely to part two.

### 2 The Document

#### Some comments on the questionnaire

The key concepts are not defined, although this is included in the project objectives. That should be the first thing that we have discussed in Stockholm.

Our point of view of the definitions / attempt to define key concepts will be sent by the end of the year.

We cannot abandon the questionnaire. This is a part of the project. Nothing prevents the partners to realize their interviews. The difference between questionnaire and interview is insignificant, while the person interviewed and the interview will have to answer questions predetermined point.

It is true that there are more possibilities response but questionnaire instructions permit, if no answer is appropriate, to mention the closest answer or leave empty space.

One suggestion would be to fill with the own answer, which is not found in the list of possible answers.

It is true that the questions and answers are not exactly suitable for all countries that carry out the study.

We have the possibility that after the pilot questionnaire to prepare a second questionnaire, agreed by all participants

#### Strictly on the questionnaire:

**The question** „*Do you live with somebody?*”

It is not clear if it refers to:

- To have a relationship with someone;
- To share a home with someone – in which case it has to be a man;
- The husband, life partner, the father, other male or a child age.

I mention again the lack of unanimous definitions on key concepts slows this questionnaire.

It is not clear whether in the domestic violence aggressor must be a man. Supposedly only.

**The question „Do you have / have you had a child / children of school - age**

The question is imprecise.

We must specify whether during relationship / cohabitation were minor children.

It is not relevant if lifetime victim had minor children / school, but only during cohabitation, because we suspect that regards children as collateral victims of violence.

Also, minor children may belong life partner.

Questions should be ordered according to the category of attitude.

For example, questions 1, 2, 10 and 11 refer aspects of physical violence.

They are close as content. They should they be grouped. We do not understand why they are dispersed.

In addition, their content is close to the overlap.

For example the question "*Why did you take hold of me so roughly*" has almost the same content like question "*Why did you kick me*".

If the program relates violence against educated women, why we chose this questionnaire to be sent to all categories of women, regardless of education level.

### 3 The Answer

Part two of Georgeta Stoican's contribution is entitled "Strictly on the questionnaire". This part contains several questions and remarks and objections. Probably the best way to answer is going back to the theory. Mere technical shortcomings always belong to a pretest phase and are negligible in the following.

Theoretical basis of the ZKE-questionnaire is a slightly modified classical test theory. The classical test theory formalised by Gulliksen (H. Gulliksen: Theory of Mental Tests. New York 1950) is an abstract theory. The most important conditions of this theory can be described in three axioms. The first axiom says that every observed test score (x) obtains a true score (t), which depicts the constant feature of a test person. According to the second axiom, the measuring is affected unsystematically by an error score (e). The third axiom expresses the idea that an obtained test score x may be conceived as a combination of a true component t and an error component e according to the equation  $x = t + e$ .

Because of the lack of qualified alternatives the majority of questionnaires which are used today are constructed on the basis of this theory. The classical test theory is abstract, because essentially it represents nothing else than a collection of arithmetic statements. Arithmetic sentences do not state anything about „our universe“. They are just a game with symbols. The classical test theory confines itself to the mathematical description of methodology of tests. No connection to reality is claimed. If test person A achieves 30 points in a questionnaire, test

person B 20 points and test person C 10 points, a proper information about the relationship of numbers can be given. One test person achieved more points than the other test person. One test person achieved three times more than the other one, and so on. But there are no rules explaining the meaning of the score points outside the area of numbers. To give explanations and to draw consequences would be the job of practice-oriented experts. But in the traditional empirical science there is no suitable theoretical foundation available. Traditional scientists are millionaires without ever washing the dishes.

To remove these difficulties, the Methodical Constructivism develops a scientific language beginning with everyday language. Instead of axioms speech acts are introduced, the correctness of which scientists are able to prove.

The main problem in this approach arises from the fact that pre-scientific and scientific language differ in two ways. Firstly a difference in the contents is to be noticed. Secondly there is a difference in the forms. The differences represent a problem in questionnaire surveys. The different languages require translation rules which ensure an understanding between science and everyday life. The rules have to prevent that the questioning scientists who make use of the terminology and the answering persons who use a pre-scientific language misunderstand each other.

For a solution the ZKE goes back to Böhme, who characterises the scientific perception as the registration of interaction processes of the system. Life worldly knowledge serves the immediate experience in a complex environment. It is – in contrast to scientific knowledge – situation related and therefore context open. The transition from the life worldly to the scientific sector is based on a change which transits the essential qualities of the life worldly experiences (G. Böhme: *Die Verwissenschaftlichung der Erfahrung. Wissenschaftsdidaktische Konsequenzen*. In: G. Böhme, M. v. Engelhard (Eds.): *Entfremdete Wissenschaft*. Frankfurt 1979, pp. 114 – 136). Bachelard (1978) characterises the transition from the life worldly perception to the scientific perception by means of discontinuities of epistemological break ups so that the scientific perception is not an immediate continuation of the life worldly perception. Both types of perception have their own function. The questions are: Which characteristics have the life worldly perception? What is the relation between the scientific perception and the life worldly perception? How changes or should change the life worldly perception in connection with the scientific perception? (G. Bachelard: *Die Bildung des wissenschaftlichen Geistes. Beitrag zu einer Psychoanalyse der objektiven Erkenntnis*. Frankfurt 1978).

Several methodical details serve to bridge the gap between scientific and ordinary language in the ZKE-study on domestic violence against women. To understand these details in the ZKE-questionnaire it is helpful to go back to the theoretical basis. For a better understanding and answering of the questions and the objections it will probably be useful to know the Romani-an approach of an own survey as well. The ZKE-team is looking forward to a further exchange of ideas.