

# **PREDICTORS OF MALE VIOLENCE IN DATING RELATIONSHIPS**

Allison Clifford Jeffrey

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Masters of Science  
in  
Psychology

Ellie T. Sturgis, Chairperson  
Richard M. Eisler  
Sigrid B. Gustafson

December 16, 1996  
Blacksburg, Virginia

Key words: dating violence, college males, adult attachment, attribution

## Predictors of Male Violence in Dating Relationships

### [ABSTRACT]

Dating violence among college students has become a pressing concern. However, to date, the bulk of the research in this area has attempted to discern correlates of marital violence. Little attention has been paid to the isolation of predictors of violence that occurs early in the relationship.

This paper demonstrates the utility of several risk factors identified among male college students in predicting dating violence. Factors included are history of abuse in the family of origin, insecure attachment style as measured by parental attachment and girlfriend attachment; attributional style; anger; and depression. Though it is likely that many other factors predict male dating violence, this study aims to isolate those factors which operate within the framework of history of abuse and insecure attachment.

Results indicated the following: 1. History of abuse accounts for a substantial portion of the variance in predicting dating violence. 2. The interaction of attachment to family and partner was related to verbal aggression and abuse toward and from the partner. 3. Attributional style did not significantly predict dating violence beyond history of abuse. 4. Depression was not significantly related to dating violence; however, anger was significantly and directly related to verbal aggression and overall abuse from self toward partner. 5. Results were also discussed in terms of the four abuse criteria, including some notable findings regarding partner attachment style and direction of abuse. In addition, implications for treatment and prevention and suggestions for future research were offered.

### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank each and every member of my committee for his/her active participation in this thesis. Specifically, I would like to thank Ellie for her constant encouragement, Sigrid for her vast knowledge of statistics, and Richard for his continuing patience and insightful observations. In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to Cynthia Lease for her constant support and advice regarding this thesis and for so willingly serving as an examiner in my defense. I would also like to thank my family members for their lifelong encouragement of my educational endeavors and their patience each time I falsely proclaimed to them that I no longer wanted to be a student. I only hope their patience lasts through my next degree...

## Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Methods	14
Results	16
Discussion	20
Implications	26
Limitations	28
Future Directions	30
References	33
Tables	37
Appendices	55
Vita	87

## List of Tables

Table	Description	Page
Table 1	Sample Demographics	37
Table 2	Summary Statistics for Predictor Variables	40
Table 3	Summary Statistics for Criterion Variables	42
Table 4	MAXR Analyses for Verbal Aggression	43
Table 5	MAXR Analyses for Physical Violence	44
Table 6	MAXR Analyses for Self to Partner	45
Table 7	MAXR Analyses for Partner to Self	46
Table 8	Final Model for Verbal Aggression	47
Table 9	Final Model for Physical Violence	48
Table 10	Final Model for Self to Partner	49
Table 11	Final Model for Partner to Self	50
Table 12	Correlation Matrix for Predictors	51
Table 13	Correlation Matrix for Criterion Variables	54

## Predictors of Male Violence in Dating Relationships

The phenomena of dating and marital violence have probably been in existence since the beginning of time. However, not until the last two decades did America begin to recognize their prevalence and destructive effects on society. The Women's movement, which gained strength in the early eighties, began America's first universal fight against domestic violence. Following closely behind, academicians began documenting the patterns of domestic abuse as well as the destructive effects on victims of abuse (e.g., Walker, 1984; Straus, 1977). In the late eighties, women's support groups were formed to help battered women cope with their family situations. When these groups proved to be fairly ineffective in stopping the abuse, batterer groups were formed to teach the men alternate methods of anger control. Yet, with all of this interest in domestic violence, treatment effects are inconsistent, ranging from no direct effect (Chen et al., 1989), to decreasing some violent behaviors (e.g., Bryant, 1994), to purportedly ending all aggressive and threatening behavior (e.g., Rachor, 1995). In addition, these studies are fraught with methodological problems including selection bias, therapist bias and lack of adequate follow-up; therefore, results are not easily generalizable to the public (e.g., Garner, Fagan & Maxwell, 1995). Moreover, preventative measures are rare and lack follow-up data (Zins et al., 1994). This gloomy prognosis raises the question of the etiology of domestic violence. What causes individuals to abuse others? What subtle factors increase the risk of an individual learning abusive behaviors? Does abusive behavior begin early in dating relationships, and how can it be recognized? What can we do to prevent abuse before it starts? This paper explores the general hypothesis that abusive behavior occurs in the dating relationship, and that men with a history of abuse in the family and insecure attachment style to family and/or partner are at increased risk of engaging in abusive behavior to their partner.

To date, little research has attempted to investigate the parameters of courtship<sup>1</sup> violence. Instead, most research has focused on marital violence. However, available data suggest that courtship violence is similar in composition to marital violence (White & Koss, 1991; Carlson, 1987). White and Koss (1991) administered the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) to a representative sample of 6,159 college students across the continental United States. Respondents were asked how frequently they had displayed each behavior during the past year and indicated whether they had engaged in the behavior one time, more than one time, or never. Subjects reported having engaged in repeated episodes of verbal aggression from 36 to 54% of the time, depending on the specific behavior. In addition, 13% of the men indicated having threatened to hit their partner or throw something at their partner, 5% had thrown something at the other person, 13% had pushed, grabbed or shoved their partner, 6% had hit or tried to hit the partner, and 2% had hit the partner with something. Thus, the results indicate that the acts of physical and verbal aggression in dating are very similar to those of married couples.

---

<sup>1</sup> The terms *dating violence* and *courtship violence* will be used interchangeably as will *abuser* and *batterer*.

In reviewing the literature on marital violence, it is important to note that this relationship violence includes more than verbal and physical aggression. Sonkin, Martin and Walker (1985) identified four types of relationship violence: physical, sexual, property and psychological. Their description of physical violence is identical to the behaviors described by White and Koss (1991). Sexual violence involves the forcing of a partner to engage in any sort of sexual activity through intimidation and threat of further violence. Property violence involves periods of aggressive behavior that purposively or inadvertently destroy the partner's belongings. Finally, psychological violence is a complex pattern of behaviors that includes many of the forms of verbal aggression measured in the study by White and Koss (1991). These behaviors include explicit and implicit threats of violence, extreme controlling types of behavior, pathological jealousy, mental degradation, and isolating behavior. In sum, all four of these types of behavior are designed to manipulate or control the partner, are potentially physically or psychologically harmful, and are against the law. (Unfortunately, we presently do not have a single validated inventory that measures the presence of all four of these types of abuse in relationships. Eisler (1995) is presently constructing an inventory designed to measure each of these four types of abuse in dating relationships, but the validity of the inventory has not yet been demonstrated.) Until future research demonstrates otherwise, based on the extant literature, one can assume that these forms of marital violence are identical to those in dating relationships, a logical assumption given that the marriage roles or behaviors are typically learned well in advance of the marriage ceremony (White and Koss, 1991).

The prevalence of dating violence in our universities is alarming. In a recent study, White & Koss (1991) reported that 81% of college males and 87-88% of college females indicated they had either inflicted upon or received verbal aggression from a partner at least once. Subtypes of verbal aggression included arguing heatedly, yelling, sulking, and insulting the partner. In addition, 37% of college males and 35% of college females indicated they had inflicted upon or received physical aggression from a partner at least once. The physical aggression included hitting, pushing, grabbing, and shoving. Results indicated that there is not a significant difference between rates of aggression from women against men and aggression from men against women. It is important to note that this data is merely descriptive and does not provide a context that might illustrate how often the aggression was initiated by the two genders or how often the aggression was seen as self-defense by each gender.

Additional research suggests that aggression among dating partners continues into marriage (O'Leary et al., 1989). Of 292 single (never-married), Caucasian couples, mean age in the mid-twenties, 31% of the males and 44% of the females reported having been aggressive toward the partner during the year before marriage. Of these same couples, 18 months after the wedding, 27% of the males and 36% of the females reported having been aggressive during the prior year. Thirty months after the wedding, 25% of the males and 32% of the females reported having been aggressive toward the partner during the previous 12 months. Stability estimates, derived from kappa coefficients of correlation, suggested that these pre-marital and marital prevalence rates were not significantly different from each other ( $p < .001$ ). Therefore, although estimates of marital aggression appear to decrease with length of time in the

marriage, the decrease is not large enough to predict that many people who are aggressive before marriage change their behavior once they are married. Aggression within the dating relationship reliably predicts continued aggression after marriage. For this reason, it is entirely appropriate to research aggression within dating relationships of the college population in order to identify the pattern at an earlier stage.

Research indicates that behaviors of relationship violence do not occur randomly. Extensive interviews with battered women have shown that battering occurs in cycles. Walker (1979) and Deschner (1984) offered two models of these cycles. Walker suggested that battering occurs in three phases. The first phase is a tension building phase during which the abuser typically makes numerous threats and the partner copes by attempting to be perfect, or counter-coerces the abuser. The second phase is the acute violence stage. At this time, acute violence breaks out and often involves physical attacks, yelling, screaming, throwing things, and other attack behaviors over an extended period of time (usually 2 to 24 hours). Most women learn to submit passively to their partners during this phase because they are physically unable to win the fight. The third phase is the repentance phase in which the abuser apologizes profusely and attempts to win the woman back with gifts and submission to her wishes.

Deschner (1984), after conducting series of domestic violence interviews and reviewing the literature for child abuse patterns, suggested that Walker's cycle needs to be expanded. She described the process as involving seven phases:

1. Mutual Dependency-- two or more very needy people form a relationship in which they tend to overrely on each other to fulfill individual needs.
2. Noxious Event-- the partner does something that the man feels is unpleasant.
3. Coercions exchanged-- the man attempts to stop the unpleasant behavior through threats or denunciations.
4. Last straw decision-- the abuser decides that the situation is intolerable.
5. Primitive rage- rage wells up in response to the preceding judgment. Anger is expressed by physically attacking the partner and inanimate objects and engaging in verbal derogation of partner. The aggression is more severe than would be considered necessary to win the conflict.
6. Reinforcement for battering-- the woman submits to the partner's demands so she will survive. In addition, she often placates him to relieve his anger and stop the attack. Unfortunately, both of these behaviors serve to reduce the man's anger and reinforce future use of aggression in solving conflicts.
7. Repentance phase-- both partners are shocked at the intensity of their behavior during the prior phase and promise it will never happen again. Batterers typically apologize profusely and express their need for their partner. Both partners are then pulled back into phase 1 (mutual dependency).

Again, due to lack of research, it is only assumed that courtship violence follows similar patterns.

Most research on partner violence is still mainly exploratory in nature. In the last decade an abundance of studies has attempted to identify characteristics of the abusive relationship, abusers, and abused women (e.g., Sabourin, Infante, & Rudd, 1993; Beasley & Stoltenberg, 1992; Launius & Lindquist, 1988). Most of these

studies have concentrated on marital violence and have integrated the mediators, correlates, personality characteristics, profiles and typologies of abusers and the abuse itself. However, because these data are merely descriptive in nature, there is still a need to integrate these isolated factors into predictive models, which could then guide early intervention efforts and potentially make the prevention of abuse a more accessible goal. This study examines a model of relational abuse for dating couples and incorporates four predictors of abuse found in the marital abuse literature. These predictors are history of abuse in the family of origin, attachment style, attributional style, and psychological factors (depression and anger). These predictors are interdependent and must be examined in conjunction with each other. The current research on these variables is summarized below.

### Review of Predictors

#### *History of Abuse*

Social learning theory suggests that observational learning is responsible for a wide variety of a child's repertoire of behaviors. Bandura (1977) noted that children learn many skills in the absence of direct reinforcement simply by watching others around them. Moreover, children are more likely to imitate the behavior of those that they consider to be in a position of power or who possess objects or characteristics that they would someday like to have. Thus, parental behavior is a potent influence on the behavior of children.

Family-of origin research in abuse relies on the supposition that children may learn violent behavior through modeling. Thus, the child has either seen or been a victim of a parent or other close family member who has repeatedly engaged in violent behavior in response to anger. The child internalizes this behavior as a potential means of coping with anger. Later in life, aggression is but one of a full repertoire of coping skills that the child has internalized over the years. However, if in a specific situation, the child-as-adult has no other skill that has proven successful in resolving conflicts, he will draw upon his model of violence as a potential means to cope with his present anger. Furthermore, if the violence proves to be successful in that situation, the adult's behavior is reinforced, and he will be more likely to use violence as a coping skill in future situations.

Kalmuss (1984) proposed that, as a child, the adult abuser experienced two types of modeling in the family-of-origin. First, the abuser experienced generalized modeling, defined as the transmission of the idea that violence is acceptable among family members. Second, the abuser experienced specific modeling of abuse or violence, which leads to the transmission of specific behaviors from the parents to the child. For example, the abuser may have learned from a family member to hit a person in the stomach to avoid noticeable bruises, or he may have learned that hitting a woman will stop her verbal aggression.

Kalmuss (1984), in assessing National Survey data (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980), concluded that both observation and being the victim of aggression from family members was significantly related to use of aggression as an adult. Further studies have replicated these results (e.g., Beasley & Stoltenberg, 1992; Briere, 1987; Caesar, 1988). Kalmuss also found that, of the two scenarios, witnessing abuse was the stronger predictor. In addition, Caesar, in a more methodologically sound study, found that batterers reported significantly more abuse in their family-of-origin

than non-batterers. Moreover, Caesar found that batterers were significantly more likely than non-batterers to have witnessed their father hitting their mothers. These results seem to support the hypothesis that batterers may learn their aggressive behavior through early modeling of family members, especially their fathers.

Upon closer analysis, it appears that the modeling explanation of abuse is incomplete. Caesar (1988) reported that 38% of the batterers evaluated in her study replied that they were not exposed to marital violence nor were they physically abused as a child. Though 60% of these individuals were exposed to corporal punishment, as opposed to 8% of the nonbatterers, she reported that this finding is best explained by socioeconomic status. However, the variable of socioeconomic status is often a proxy variable for many other influences on a person, such as level of education, cultural norms, financial resources, etc. Therefore, results indicated that unspecified variables may predict abuse as strongly as the prevalence of violence in family-of-origin.

One possible explanation for this discrepancy may lie in the distinction between courtship and marital violence. Kalmuss and Seltzer (1986) examined violence across relationships of batterers and found that the batterer's repertoire of aggressive behaviors was not necessarily related to family-of-origin violence, but may have been learned from a prior partner. The batterer then maintained the same pattern of response to conflict in subsequent relationships. Implications of this finding for courtship violence are meaningful. It seems that a man with no history of abuse in the family-of-origin would have to be in an intimate relationship for a significant period of time before constructing an entirely new coping model of aggressive behaviors. Therefore, one would expect that young, single men with limited experience in intimate relationships would not have had the opportunity to learn a model of aggressive behavior from a prior relationship. Thus, it seems that familial history of abuse for college-age men in dating relationships may be a stronger predictor than familial history of abuse for older, married men. Therefore, it is expected that abuse in the family-of-origin will be a significant predictor of courtship violence.

#### *Attachment Style*

The first predictor of abuse represented in this study is style of attachment, both to the family of origin and the present romantic partner. John Bowlby (1980) first posited the concept of attachment in children. He suggested that human beings have evolved to seek proximity to a caregiver, especially when tired, injured or distressed. During these instances especially, a person needs the support of others who are interested in the person's survival and well-being. Bowlby argued that during the course of this evolution, humans have acquired an attachment behavioral system or organization of appraisals, emotions and behaviors that increase the likelihood of the person establishing a close relationship with another. These attachment behaviors are typically activated only when required. Consequently, this attachment relationship serves as protection to the individual, thereby enhancing the individual's chance of survival, as well as providing the individual with a secure base from which to explore the environment when not distressed (Bowlby, 1988; Shaver & Clark, 1994).

If the attachment figure is perceived to be sufficiently available and accessible, the individual does not display attachment behaviors unless ill, tired or distressed in some way. However, if the attachment figure is not perceived to be sufficiently available, the individual experiences intense emotion, or separation anxiety. This

emotion is often manifested as anxiety or anger. The individual then typically exhibits attachment behaviors, often controlling or manipulative in nature, to keep the attachment figure in close proximity to the individual.

Conceptualizing attachment style as a system of repeated interactions of behavior and response, Mary Ainsworth examined this phenomenon experimentally. Ainsworth et al. (1978) suggested that if a child has developed attachment normally, he should show indicators of feeling comfortable with his mother and apprehension or anxiety with a stranger or when alone. To test this hypothesis, Ainsworth et al. designed a procedure called the strange situation in which young children were exposed to eight different episodes of separation and reunion with a parent. Measuring the children's responses upon re-entry of the mother, Ainsworth et al. identified the following three patterns of attachment behaviors, one secure and two insecure.

- **Secure.** These children may or may not cry at separation but their sadness appears to be in response to the mother's absence because they show preference for her presence over a stranger. When the mother returns, the children seek her contact and stop crying quickly
- **Avoidant.** These children do not outwardly show distress by separation from the mother. In addition, it seems that their distress is more a function of being alone than missing the mother. They react to a stranger in the same way as to the mother by avoiding or slowly greeting her, yet often failing to cling to her.
- **Anxious/Ambivalent (Resistant).** After separation, these children seek proximity to the mother but often demonstrate angry and resistant behavior such as pushing and hitting. These children are not easily comforted by the mother.

These attachment patterns seem to be relatively stable across the life cycle, differing only after periods of extreme stress and change in environment. Research has suggested that, for the most part, children exhibit their infant style throughout the first 10 years of life (Sroufe, Egeland, & Kreutzer, 1990). For example, it appears that, when young children are assessed at 6, 12, and 18 month follow-up intervals, approximately 60% of the children receive the same attachment classification (Vaughn, Egeland, Sroufe, & Waters, 1979; Thompson, Lamb, & Estes, 1982). Moreover, these authors have determined that those children whose classification changed tended to undergo more stressful life changing events that likely influenced change in the caregiving environment.

Relative stability across the life cycle is expected for several reasons. Patterns of attachment behaviors develop in order to prevent the individual from reexperiencing frustration and helplessness that previously caused anxiety or anger. Individuals learn that when they respond in certain manners, their caregivers meet their needs, and when they respond in other manners, their needs will not be met. Not only are these patterns of behaviors reinforced by consistent behavior on the part of their caregivers but the children begin to construct internal cognitive models of interaction. Subsequent events in their lives are then interpreted within this framework, or working model, and used to reinforce their developing attachment style. Unfortunately, working models that were effective in protecting the child raised in a deficient childhood attachment environment are not necessarily effective when applied to adult relationships. For example, a child who has learned from repeated unresponsiveness of his attachment

figure that his needs will not be met may then grow up to believe that all attachment figures are unwilling to meet his attachment needs. This adult then perceives the new attachment figure's behaviors as unresponsive, exhibits controlling and manipulative behaviors to try to secure the attachment figure, and proceeds to alienate himself from the attachment figure. This distance in the relationship then supports the individual's belief that no other can meet his needs and perpetuates the unhealthy cognitive and behavioral system.

In an attempt to examine early and present attachment style of adults, Main and two colleagues created the Adult Attachment Interview (George, Kaplan & Main, 1984). This psychological assessment, the most detailed measure of early and present attachment of adults ever created, analyzes the coherency of responses to questioning about past attachment-relevant experiences with parents and other significant early caregivers. Using this interview, Main discovered that adult attachment styles can be characterized similarly to Ainsworth et al.'s (1978) childhood attachment styles. George et al. called these categories "secure-autonomous" (secure), "dismissing of attachment" (avoidant), and "preoccupied with early attachment" (ambivalent).

- Secure-autonomous adults spoke of their parents objectively, describing both positive and negative aspects of the relationships. These individuals were able to speak clearly and directly about any issues they may have had regarding their parents without harboring anger or resentment
- Dismissing of Attachment adults typically were resistant to answering questions about early relationships with parents. They often denied the importance of their early relationship with their parents, could not offer examples of positive aspects of their relationships with their parents and would not admit suffering negative effects of their relationship with their parents.
- Preoccupied with Attachment. These adults described childhoods in which they experienced intense pain and disappointment often due to role reversal with one or more parent. Some of these adults expressed a great deal of anger still held against the parents that seems to overwhelm their perceptions of attachment-related events. Others seemed to demonstrate more passive affect but were extremely distracted by seeking proximity to past and present attachment figures.

Research by Hazan and Shaver (1987) supports these three adult attachment styles. These authors found that adults tend to hold the same types of internal working models regarding their most important love relationships as children do toward their primary caregiver. The authors also found that, per individual, a strong predictor of the adult attachment type was the respondent's retrospective perceptions of the quality of his/her relationships with each parent and their relationship with each other as measured by common attachment style variables (e.g., the presence of an affectionate parental relationship, respectful mother, intrusive mother, caring father, etc.) suggesting continuity between the working models of child and adult.

Weiss (1982) has suggested important differences between child and adult manifestations of attachment style. In adults, attachment relationships are typically between peers instead of parents and children. Attachment in adults is not as likely to overwhelm other behavioral systems (such as the hunger response, etc.) Attachment behavior in adults often includes a sexual relationship. Adults seem to depend more heavily on their internal representation of their relationship than on feedback from

specific behavioral interactions with their partners. Attachment in adults is ideally a reciprocal interactional system in which the members alternate between giving and receiving care for each other. However, these different circumstances allow the adult to adopt roles that would have been life-threatening as a child, (e.g., withdrawal, self-sufficiency, rigid adherence to roles) but are merely unhealthy as an adult.

Considering such differences, Sperling and Berman (1994) offer this definition of adult attachment:

Adult attachment is the stable tendency of an individual to make substantial efforts to seek and maintain proximity to and contact with one or a few of specific individuals who provide the subjective potential for physical and/or psychological safety and security. This stable tendency is regulated by internal working models of attachment, which are cognitive-affective-motivational schemata built from the individual's experience in his or her interpersonal world" (p.8).

Given these different circumstances, Bowlby (1977) differentiated the insecure attachment style categorizations by the behavioral response systems that adults tend to hold towards present attachment figures. Bowlby's writings suggest that insecure attachment style working models are manifested as one of four behavioral systems outlined below: compulsive self-reliance, compulsive care-giving, and anxious attachment (1977) as well as angry withdrawal (1980). West and Sheldon (1988) have outlined the clinical implications for these attachment styles.

- Compulsive self-reliance. These individuals tend to avoid forming attachment relationships with others because of the inherent vulnerability in doing so. These individuals are independent, prefer to do everything for themselves, and are uncomfortable relying on others. It is likely that these individuals might have had childhood experiences similar to those of the dismissing of attachment adults described by George et al. (1984).
- Compulsive care-giving. These individuals tend to insist on providing care for others but refuse to receive care. It is likely that these individuals had many experiences of role reversal during childhood in which their attachment figures only responded to them when they acted as caregivers to the attachment figures.
- Anxious attachment. (later renamed compulsive care seeking) These individuals doubt the attachment figure's availability and responsiveness. They repeatedly demonstrate behaviors designed to elicit care-giving from the attachment figure. They tend to define the relationship in terms of how well the attachment figure provides care and responsibility for an endless array of life problems. These individuals likely had childhoods typical of those individuals in the preoccupied classification such that their needs were met inconsistently by their primary caregiver, and they were left doubting the responsiveness of all attachment figures.
- Angry Withdrawal. These individuals react to perceived inaccessibility of the attachment figure with intense anger. These individuals might display overt signs of anger seemingly as a result of frustration at not having needs met or they might display a more covert anger that is manifested in withdrawal followed by more spiteful behaviors. This typically results in a pattern of generalized anger towards the attachment figure.

*Attachment Patterns and Courtship Violence.* Stosny (1995) has conceptualized attachment abuse as involving repeated attempts of insecurely attached adults to regain attachment or safety. He notes that intimate attachment provides adults with a means of: 1. confirming their status as a lovable person; 2. experiencing happiness and contentment; 3. acceptance of personal beliefs and feelings; and 4. establishing a safe environment for self-development and enhancement. When the adult feels inadequate in any of these areas, he seeks pain relief from the attachment partner. If this relief is not provided through the expression of compassion in the relationship, he reacts in anger to relieve this perceived pain by forcing self-power and control. Therefore, he uses manipulative and controlling behavior to attempt to assuage these constant feelings of inadequacy regarding himself and his relationship to his partner.

Maysless (1991), in a theoretical review, hypothesized that both avoidant and anxious types of insecure attachment in men predict relationship violence, though the avoidant type would be a weaker predictor than the anxious/ambivalent type. She suggested that the individual with the avoidant attachment style would only engage in violence if he had first trusted his partner enough to make himself vulnerable to her. If at that point, there was real or perceived threat of abandonment from the partner and the individual had been exposed to violence through cultural norms or social learning, the individual might display overt hostility. However, because the individual tends to maintain the general coping style of avoiding strong emotion with another individual, the chances of him becoming violent are still slim.

Maysless (1991) proposed that the anxious/ambivalent attachment style would be a greater predictor of relationship violence. This individual's suspiciousness, resentment and jealousy predispose him to extreme anger that could easily be expressed as violence. This individual typically imagines or exaggerates inconsistencies regarding the partner's behaviors and the expressions of positive emotions in the relationship. He is then more likely to become angry that his partner has falsely represented her feelings for him or betrayed him in some way. Therefore, violence escalating from this anger is actually an attempt to pull the partner back into the relationship or to force the partner to become more consistent in her feelings for him or her proximity to him.

Though Maysless's (1991) predictions are in accordance with much literature describing typologies of male batterers (e.g., Elbow, 1977; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Faulk, 1974; Gelles & Straus, 1988; Walker, 1979), research directly assessing the relationship of attachment patterns to violence has been equivocal. Pistole and Tarrant (1993) measured attachment style in 62 males convicted of interpersonal violence. Of these males, 35% reported secure attachment styles, 23% reported dismissing (avoidant) attachment styles, 25% reported fearful (avoidant) attachment styles, and 17% reported preoccupied (anxious/ambivalent) attachment styles. These proportions are not as predicted. However, Pistole and Tarrant's results may not be a true indication of the relationship of attachment style to courtship violence due to the nature of her sample and her other methodological problems with the study. It is not clear (a) the extent to which her sample was representative to the general public, (b) the extent to which her respondents were motivated to give socially appropriate answers to end their mandatory treatment, and (c) that her measure of attachment style

was valid for this type of sensitive research. In general, further research is needed to explore the incidence of courtship violence for each of the attachment styles.

#### *Attributional Style*

There seems to be a link between attachment style and attributional style, or the way in which individuals attribute causality to events occurring in their lives. As mentioned above, research and speculation regarding attachment style has suggested distinct profiles of personality characteristics and interpersonal styles unique to each attachment pattern. Many of these characteristics involve mechanisms of cognitive appraisal inherent to attributional processes. For instance, the anxious/ambivalent person tends to feel that the partner is never close enough to him. He, in turn, consistently interprets neutral actions of the partner as attempts to be distant from him. He therefore makes a false attribution that the partner is to blame for his feelings and that the partner is always attempting to hurt his feelings. It appears that attributions are actually a part of the personality characteristics and interpersonal styles that make up the attachment styles. Therefore, research is needed to explore the relationship between these two constructs and to assess the ability of these constructs in the prediction of behavior.

The origins of attribution theory can be traced back to the 1950's when person perception theorists first began to study what people thought about one another. These theorists examined how people formed judgments about other people, how quickly these judgments formed, the bases of the judgments, and the extent to which these judgments would be based upon personal needs and desires (Antaki, 1982). This focus on the importance of judgments to everyday life led Heider (1958) to propose that the outstanding role of the perceiver in understanding the world around him was to decipher the causes of events occurring in his environment. Heider broke down all attributional causes of behavior into person and environment attributions. According to him, people explained any observed behavior by attributing its cause either to the disposition of the person exhibiting the behavior or the situation in which the behavior was observed. In fact, most people tend to attribute positive behaviors of others to situational forces and negative behaviors of others to dispositional forces. The reverse is true of themselves: people tend to attribute their own positive behaviors to dispositional forces and negative behaviors to situational forces. This tendency, called the fundamental attribution error, appears to be protective of individual health. More specifically, it seems to function by providing individuals with a sense of control over their environment.

Weiner (1979) elaborated Heider's original hypothesis by suggesting that attributions can be examined along two additional dimensions, stability and control. He posited that a person is motivated to do something by how well she did that same activity in the past and to what she attributes her degree of success. The stability of an event then refers to the person's expectation that the cause of an event will not change. Therefore, similar outcomes to a particular behavior should not change. The control of an event refers to the degree of control a person believes she has over the cause of an event. If she has great control over the cause of an event, she believes that she might be able to change the event; if she has little control over the cause of an event, she is probably not able to change the event.

Abramson et al. (1978) also categorized attributions along three dimensions. However, reflective of the clinical population with which he worked, he labeled the third dimension global/specific rather than control. Therefore, internal/external refers to the locus of the behavioral event, and stable/unstable refers to the tendency of the event to be repeated or long-term. However, global/specific refers to the range of situations to which the attribution of the event is applicable. Most research related to this model had been conducted in relation to depression. Depressed individuals tend to attribute conflict along the internal, stable, and global dimensions. Thus, the depressed individual believes that the conflict is his fault, always happens to him, and has made his whole life difficult. These individuals begin to experience symptoms of depression such as hopelessness about change and perceived inadequacy in dealing with present conflicts. Eventually, these individuals begin to believe that their efforts to control the environment are futile and, thus, stop trying to do so (Seligman, 1975).

*Male Batterers and Attributional Style.* Though considerable research has been conducted on the pattern of internal, stable and global attributions that often leads to depression, not many other patterns have been identified. However, it seems likely that changing one element of this pattern would produce highly discrepant findings. Abramson et al. (1978) suggested that an individual with an external attribution for a specific conflict would fare differently than an individual with an internal attribution. The individual with external attributions would feel no threat to self-esteem when engaged in conflict. Any perceived deficit in control would then be attributed to universal helplessness rather than personal helplessness.

It appears that the characteristics of a typical batterer (Walker, 1979) are consistent with the behavior of an individual who engages in external, stable, and global attributions about his partner. The individual with external, stable and global attributions about relationship conflicts would tend to attribute blame to the partner and perceive conflict as a long-term and all-encompassing problem. In short, the individual consistently finds fault with his environment, blames others for his actions, and perceives the situation as unchangeable. In fact, recent research profiling male batterers has shown that these men consistently make external attributions regarding the cause of their violent behavior (Hale et al., 1988; Overholser & Moll, 1990). Consider an example to illustrate the point. A man comes home to find that his partner has not cooked his dinner. To the insecurely attached man, this is a sign that the partner does not care enough about his well-being. Rather than question the origin of this assumption, he first makes an external assumption that his wife is failing in her job as care-giver. He then makes a stable attribution that she never provides him with adequate care and a global attribution that, as a result, his life is miserable. He does not become depressed, however, because he believes that his wife is incompetent and to blame, not himself. To the contrary, like Ainsworth et al.'s (1978) and Bowlby's (1980) anxious/ambivalent individual, he becomes angry.

#### *Depression*

As mentioned above, psychologists have suggested that an individual who believes that a negative event is stable and can not be changed by himself begins to feel a sense of hopelessness, or lack of control, when again confronted with this event (e.g., Seligman, 1975). Abramson et al. (1978) couched this phenomenon in terms of attributional theory. Individuals confronted with internal, stable, and global

attributions tend to feel helpless and hopeless, or depressed. The authors elaborate that the generality of depression is due to the globality of attributions, the chronicity of attributions is due to stability of attributions (internal), and motivational and cognitive deficits are influenced by attributions related to the person's expectation of failure. Priester and Clum (1992) empirically demonstrated this phenomenon. In fact, these authors found that the combination of negative and stable attributions specifically predicts depression as measured by the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, et al., 1961;  $F = 29.3$ ,  $p < .0001$ ). Because it is thought that violent men typically make external attributions regarding their behavior, it is expected that depression will be less related to violence than anger.

### *Anger*

In all individuals, violent or not, anger functions in four distinct manners. Anger often serves as a socially safe expression of painful emotions such as anxiety, hurt, and guilt. It sometimes serves to block the sensation of physical pain. It frequently functions to vent high emotional arousal caused by the frustration of a blocked goal, and it often acts as a motivating response to the experience of threat. Through these four functions, anger serves as one of many coping strategies to relieve stressful arousal (McKay, Rogers, & McKay, 1989).

Like other people, batterers may become angry because they feel that their needs have not been met by others, a goal of theirs has been blocked by others, or they are experiencing difficulty controlling arousal such as anxiety resulting from stress regarding some event(s) in their environment. Again, like other people, when this level of arousal becomes too great, they seek to release the tension through some coping behavior. Yet, for batterers, the release comes in the form of an "uncontrollable discharge of the tensions that have built up..." (Walker, 1979, p. 59). It is at this point that the angry man becomes a batterer, progressing from the tension phase of abuse and entering the violent phase (as outlined above in background information). Batterers differ from nonbatterers in that (a) they can not maintain some degree of control over their expression of anger and, (b) they have learned to use violence as a coping skill to release that tension. Consequently, the batterers become destructive to others, whereas the nonbatterers release tension in another manner.

### *Present Study*

The purpose of the present study is to examine the relationships among the following predictors of dating violence: history of abuse, attachment style, attributional style, and affective state (anger and depression). The model is intended to apply to young, single men with a history of familial abuse who demonstrate the insecure attachment style. The study is not suggesting that all violent men are insecurely attached, nor does it suggest that all violent men have the same attributional styles or history of abuse. However, the present study does posit that a significant number of abusive men who are insecurely attached will also engage in stable, global, external attributions, demonstrate significant amounts of anger, and have a history of abuse. This study should have great implications for targeting potential abusers and introducing preventative intervention before any harm is done.

### *Hypotheses*

Hypothesis One: History of abuse in the family of origin is significantly related to violence in dating relationships.

Hypothesis Two: Insecure attachment style, formed in the family of origin, demonstrated in the current relationship, is significantly related to dating violence in those individuals who have a history of abuse.

Hypothesis Three: Attributional style significantly predicts violence in dating relationships such that a more stable, global and external style will be related to increased violence.

Hypothesis Four: Anger significantly predicts violence in dating relationships, more so than depression.

## Method

### Subjects

Subjects were 142 male undergraduates, 16 years and older, most of whom were enrolled in Introductory Psychology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and, at the time of testing, had been in a heterosexual relationship lasting at least two months. Subjects decided to participate in this experiment of their own volition. A folder was displayed asking males who have been in a romantic, heterosexual relationship for at least two months to sign up to complete several questionnaires (see Appendix A). Subjects were given the choice of receiving two extra credit points or a raffle ticket for \$100 for their participation in this study.

### Procedure

Subjects met in groups of up to 25 students. After signing the obligatory consent form (see Appendix B), the subjects completed the questionnaires listed below. The subjects were then given informational sheets containing the names and phone numbers of the researchers (see Appendix C) and counseling resources in the area (see Appendix D).

### Measures (see Appendix E)

Subjects were first asked to supply demographic information, including age, race, familial structure, description of hometown (urban, suburban, rural), year in college, major area of study, participation in fraternity, corps of cadets, or other military affiliation, criminal offenses other than traffic violations, and length of present relationship with girlfriend. Psychological inventories were as follows:

*Reciprocal Attachment Questionnaire.* The Reciprocal Attachment Questionnaire (RAQ; West & Sheldon, 1988) is designed to measure pathological patterns of reciprocal attachment to another adult. This 40-item inventory measures adult styles of insecure attachment to current attachment figures. Attachment figures are people with whom the respondent is not related but has had a significant relationship for several months. The RAQ yields three measures of attachment based on Bowlby's (1977) conceptualization of Insecure Attachment, i.e., Compulsive Careseeking, Compulsive Self-reliance, and Compulsive Care-giving, in addition to one style later added to Bowlby's model, Angry Withdrawal (Bowlby, 1980). Respondents indicate the degree to which each item applies to them by using a five-point Likert scale. Internal consistency estimates range from .87 to .88. Interscale correlations suggest that the four scales evidence good construct validity and that the four patterns may be grouped in terms of distant, detached patterns (Compulsive Self Reliance, and Angry Withdrawal) and close, enmeshed patterns (Compulsive Care-giving and Compulsive Care-seeking). The RAQ was used to determine the nature of the respondent's attachment towards his girlfriend.

*Bell Object Relations Reality Testing Inventory.* The Bell Object Relations Reality Testing Inventory (BORRTI; Bell, 1991) assessed the extent to which formative relationships with early caregivers have become incorporated into the respondent's sense of self and have influenced subsequent relationships (Lyddon, Bradford, & Nelson, 1993). More specifically, the BORRTI measures the extent to which current deficits in relationship skills result from earlier relationship patterns. The inventory consists of 90 true-false items that test ego functioning and reality testing. Only the 45 items relevant to ego functioning were used in this study.

The ego functioning items cluster into four scales of ego functioning: Alienation, Insecure Attachment, Egocentricity, and Social Incompetence. Alienation refers to problems of basic trust and gratification in relationships as well as interpersonal instability and withdrawal tendencies. Insecure attachment assesses difficulties with separation and potential abandonment in relationships in addition to maladaptive behaviors such as jealousy, guilt, and hypervigilance to signs of threat that may result from these difficulties. Egocentricity assesses mistrust of the motivation of others as well as tendencies to manipulate and control others' behavior. Social incompetence measures shyness and uncertainty regarding interpersonal relations. The four scales demonstrate good validity in differentiating already identified clinical populations. Internal consistency estimates for the four scales range from .78 to .90.

*Conflict Tactics Scale.* The Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) measures both the severity and frequency of the respondents' past responses to conflict. Respondents were asked to rate the number of times specific behaviors are used to solve interpersonal conflicts. Behaviors were grouped into three categories: reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical aggression. The CTS was administered in two forms. The first form assessed the nature of the participant's relationship with his parents to provide an indication of violence in family-of-origin. The second form assessed the frequency and severity of violence in the participant's relationship with his girlfriend. A simple scoring method was used such that higher scores in each category indicate both higher frequency and severity of abuse.

*Courtship Conflict Questionnaire.* The Courtship Conflict Questionnaire (CCQ; Eisler, 1995) was used on an experimental basis. The CCQ purports to measure severity and frequency of verbal, physical, and sexual aggression in dating relationships. Data from this inventory will be presented elsewhere.

*Expanded Attributional Style Questionnaire.* The Expanded Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson & Villanova, 1988) measured attributional style, or the manner in which respondents attribute causality to specific hypothetical events. The EASQ asked each respondent to imagine a hypothetical event, explain the cause of the event, and then rate each cause on a scale from 1 to 7 according to internality, stability, and globality. Scores then provided indices of each of the three dimensions. Composite scores indicated global styles for attributing negative events. Reliabilities for the composite scores range from .66 to .88.

*Beck Depression Inventory.* The Beck Depression Inventory (BDI; Beck, Wood, Mendelson, Mock & Erlbaugh, 1961) is a 21-item inventory that was used to determine the relationship between presence and severity of depressive symptomatology and extent of violence in dating relationships. The BDI has been shown to demonstrate good reliability and validity.

*State-Trait Anger Inventory.* The trait portion of the State-Trait Anger Inventory (Spielberger, Jacobs, Russel, & Crane, 1983) was used to assess the relationship between extent of long-term anger and violence in the relationship. The internal consistency of the 15-item trait anger measure is estimated at .87.

## Results

### Descriptive Information

One hundred and fifty men were recruited for this study. Eight men were excluded from the analysis as they omitted large portions of questions on their answer sheets or because they used the answer sheets to make designs. Therefore, data from one hundred forty-two men remained for data analysis. Participants ranged from age 16 to age 25 ( $M = 19.746$ ;  $SD = 1.652$ ). All participants were unmarried. Duration of the present romantic relationship ranged from 1 to 62 months ( $M = 15.755$ ;  $SD = 13.851$ ). Forty-two percent of the men were freshmen, 22% were sophomores, 17% were juniors and 19% were seniors. Demographic information is summarized in Table 1.

---

Insert Table 1 here

---

Summary statistics for the predictor variables are presented in Table 2. Summary statistics for the criterion variables are presented in Table 3. It is important to note that the criterion variable, physical violence in the family of origin, had a severely restricted range. The low mean demonstrates a floor effect, such that most men reported little or no physical violence in their relationships. The relevance of this restricted range will be discussed later in terms of results and limited implications of this model.

---

Insert Table 2 here

---



---

Insert Table 3 here

---

### Data Analysis

To determine overall predictive ability of the variables, a series of multiple linear regression analyses, using the four dependent variables of verbal aggression, physical aggression, abuse towards partner and abuse from partner, were performed using the MAXR regression procedure. The MAXR method selects one variable at a time from a list of potential variables and determines which variables are the greatest predictors by alternately including and excluding each variable at each step and determining which combination of variables yields the greatest increase in  $R^2$  at that particular step. Comparisons continue until the greatest increase in  $R^2$  is produced. The criterion for selecting the best model is based on the  $R^2$  value and determination of best fit. Three blocks of variables were entered: family abuse, attachment, and attributional style. In general, if the model alpha level was less than .05, all variables at that particular step were retained for the final hierarchical regressions, even though each variable in the block may not have been significantly related to the criterion variable. Tables 4 through 7 depict the variables that met the .05 criterion for block entry analysis presented for each outcome variable.

---

Insert Table 4 here

---

---

Insert Table 5 here.

---



---

Insert Table 6 here.

---



---

Insert Table 7 here.

---

The predictor variables were then entered into hierarchical block-wise regression equations for each dependent variable (verbal aggression, physical aggression, overall abuse from self toward partner and overall abuse by partner toward self). The variables were blocked into a hierarchical regression according to the results of the MAXR regressions. Blockwise regression, a conservative selection procedure, was chosen to control for Type I errors likely to occur with a large number of independent variables. The order of the blocks is in a rough chronological order, as follows: Family history of abuse; early attachment style and attributional style; months in the relationship; and affective state (depression and anger) and attachment to girlfriend. Thus, history of abuse in the family is an early experience that likely had a large effect on attachment to family and the individual's attributional style. Months in the relationship is reflective of the history of the relationship. Attachment to partner is influenced by early attachment style and the history of the relationship. Affective state is a measure of current functioning of the individual.

#### Hypothesis One

Results indicated that, in predicting verbal aggression, 21% of the variance was accounted for by the seven familial abuse variables (See Table 8). Within the block, none of these variables was significantly related to verbal aggression within the dating relationship. The individual relationship of each of these variables to verbal aggression was uninterpretable due to the multicollinearity among these variables (see Table 12). However, although multicollinearity leads to unstable regression weights with large standard errors, it does not affect the  $R^2$ .

Results indicated that total violence in the family of origin accounted for 4% of the variance in predicting physical violence in the dating relationship. However, given the range restriction on this criterion variable, any relationship between history of abuse and physical violence was likely to be underestimated (See Table 9). History of abuse variables accounted for 18% of the variance in predicting total violence from self toward the partner (see Table 10) and 7% of the abuse in predicting abuse from the partner toward the self (see Table 11). The implication of the finding that one's own history of abuse was related, at least to some extent (7%), to one's receiving abuse from one's partner will be addressed in the discussion.

Therefore, the data support the hypothesis that history of abuse accounts for a substantial portion of the variance in predicting abuse in the dating relationship. These findings were strongest when the criterion was verbal aggression or abuse from self to partner.

#### Hypothesis Two:

Family of origin attachment style variables were only retained from the MAXR regression analyses for the self to partner and partner to self regression equations. Results indicated that social incompetence and egocentricity were both significantly related to self to partner abuse, such that the more socially incompetent and egocentric the male, the more likely he was to be engaged in abuse toward his partner (see Table 10). Social incompetence was significantly related to abuse from the partner towards the self, such that the more socially incompetent the male, the more likely he was to be abused by his partner (see Table 11). When combined with nonsignificant attachment to family and nonsignificant attributional style variables, this block accounted for an additional 8% of the variance in predicting abuse from self to partner and 7% of the variance in predicting abuse from partner to self.

Partner attachment style variables were only retained from the MAXR regression analyses for the abuse from self to partner and abuse from partner to self regression equations. Angry withdrawal and compulsive caregiving were both significantly related to abuse from self to partner, such that the more the male engaged in angry withdrawal and the less he engaged in compulsive caregiving, the more likely it was that he engaged in abuse of the partner. These variables, combined with nonsignificant attachment and depression variables, and the significantly related anger variable, accounted for an additional 6% of the variance, over and above the contribution of history of abuse, family attachment, attributional style and months in the relationship variables in predicting abuse of the partner (see Table 10).

Angry withdrawal and compulsive careseeking were both significantly related to the partner abusing the male, such that the more the male engaged in angry withdrawal and the less he engaged in compulsive careseeking, the more likely he was to be abused by his partner. These variables, combined with nonsignificant anger, depression, and other attachment to partner variables, accounted for an additional 7% of the variance beyond that accounted for by history of abuse, family attachment, attributional style, and months in the relationship in predicting abuse by the partner (see Table 11).

To explore the possibility of an interaction that was not apparent in the above regression analyses, independent samples t-tests were conducted to determine whether men who scored low on insecure attachment to both family and partner differed significantly across the four criterion variables from men who scored high on measures of insecure attachment to family and partner. Men who scored below the median on both insecure attachment to family and the sum of the four insecure attachment to partner subscale scores were grouped as securely attached men. Men who scored above the median on insecure attachment to family and above the median of the sum of the four insecure attachment to partner subscale scores were grouped as insecurely attached men. (Cases in which men scored above the median in one category but below the mean in another category were not retained for analysis.) Results indicated that mean scores of verbal aggression, aggression from self toward partner and aggression from partner toward self differed significantly across these two groups of secure and insecurely attached men, indicating that the more securely attached men engaged in significantly less of these three types of dating violence. The two groups of men did not differ significantly in levels of physical violence; however, this result is not interpretable, given the severe range restriction on the physical violence criterion

variable. Therefore, the hypothesis that the interaction of family attachment style and partner attachment style predicts differences in dating violence was partially supported for these data when the entire pattern of attachment was considered.

#### Hypothesis Three

Attributional style variables were retained from the MAXR analyses for the verbal aggression, self toward partner and partner toward self criterion variables. However, the attributional style variables were not significantly related to any of the criterion variables. Therefore, the hypothesis that attributional style contributes significantly to dating abuse, beyond the contribution of history of abuse, was not supported by these data.

#### Hypothesis Four

As predicted, depression was not significantly related to any of the four criterion variables. Anger was significantly and directly related to verbal and total abuse toward the partner (see Tables 8 and 10). However, anger was not significantly related to physical violence, perhaps, again, because of criterion range restriction (see Table 9). Similarly, anger was not significantly related to being abused (see Table 11). Therefore, the hypothesis that anger is significantly related to dating abuse was supported for two criteria; moreover, the additional note that depression is less related to dating abuse than anger was also supported for both of these criteria.

## Discussion

### Verbal Aggression

Consistent with prior literature, familial abuse accounted for a large portion of the variance in predicting verbal aggression in the dating relationship. This finding appears to be more than just a specific modeling effect. The multicollinearity of the variables in this block suggested that these types of abuse tend to co-exist in the family of origin and are likely to contribute jointly to the male's tendency to be abusive in future relationships. In turn, the present results suggest a more general modeling effect, as described by Kalmuss (1984), in which the male is modeling behaviors and attitudes learned from a past history of all types of abuse. However, the present analyses are not capable of discerning independent contributions of the individual variables. Therefore, it is not known whether some past forms of abuse are more salient learning cues than others. In sum, consistent with prior literature, past history of abuse does put a man at increased risk of engaging in abuse in the future.

Contrary to earlier hypotheses, none of the family of origin object relations or attachment style variables were significantly related to verbal aggression. The nonsignificant relationship between attributional style and verbal aggression only accounted for 1% of the variance over history of abuse. Overall, these findings suggested that, when predicting verbal aggression, personological variables have little impact beyond that accounted for by history of abuse. This finding is good news to cognitive-behavioral therapists who would rather attempt to change learning patterns and situational variables than personological variables.

As expected, the number of months in the relationship was significantly related to verbal aggression such that the longer the couple stayed together, the more likely verbal aggression would occur in the context of the relationship. Though months was not entered until the third block, it nevertheless added substantially to predicting the criterion; however, months in the relationship was not so large as to suggest that length in the relationship might overshadow other variables in predicting verbal aggression. Hence, it can not be assumed that most couples will experience increased verbal aggression simply as a function of time in the relationship. An interaction might well exist, such that time in the relationship exacerbates other conditions present in the relationship (e.g., poor communication), partner variables (e.g., history of abuse and anger) or environmental variables (e.g., stress, alcoholism).

Of the psychological variables, anger was the only notable predictor of verbal aggression. The more angry the male, the more likely the couple was to have been verbally aggressive. These findings suggested that a male with trait anger who has a history of abuse is at high risk for being verbally aggressive. As discussed earlier, anger serves as a socially acceptable method (for males particularly) to express many emotions, including frustration at a blocked goal (McKay, Rogers & McKay, 1989). Verbal aggression is perhaps the easiest method of expressing anger, and in psychological inventories is often the proxy by which anger is measured.

However, one might speculate that this long-term elevation in anger reflects a pattern of verbal abuse that is not rewarding to the male in the relationship. Women who are in dating relationships, who have invested less in the relationship than married women, are more likely to fight back by matching partner verbal aggression with verbal aggression of their own. This pattern of fighting back would certainly not

reward the partner by giving him what he desires or by allowing him to relieve tension. To the contrary, this pattern of verbal aggression would more likely cause increased anger and tension in the male.

As predicted, depression had a much smaller, nonsignificant effect on verbal aggression. This finding was to be expected given that attributional style had little contribution to verbal aggression, and depression is highly correlated with both stable and global attributions both in prior literature and in the present study (See Table 12). Therefore, this finding is in support of the original hypothesis that depression would not show much effect in predicting dating violence.

Overall, the present model demonstrated that the combination of history of abuse, months in the relationship, and anger puts a male at substantial risk of being verbally aggressive. The adjusted  $R^2$  of 39% is large for a study of this nature, suggesting that these are important factors in predicting verbal aggression and that they should be addressed by universities and therapists alike as risk factors and potential points of intervention for verbally aggressive couples. Nevertheless, because 6% of the variance in verbal aggression was not accounted for by the present model, as will be discussed later, other variables also function as risk factors for verbal aggression.

#### Physical Violence

The one history of abuse variable maintained in this model, total abuse in the family of origin, was a significant predictor of physical violence in the dating relationship. This finding again suggested that men engaged in physical violence have experienced a generalized learning effect (Kalmuss, 1984). One might speculate that these men have learned much about coercion in general and are repeating this pattern in their present relationship as a method of coping with difficult situations.

Due to the restricted range of this criterion variable, it could not be determined the extent to which other aspects of history of abuse might also contribute to the prediction of physical violence. It is likely that the relationships demonstrated in this model were underestimated due to the lack of statistical power.

Though none of the personological variables thought to have been influenced by early development in the family were retained as predictors of physical violence, months in the relationship was a significant predictor. Results indicated that a male with a history of abuse was at higher risk of engaging in physical violence the longer that he had dated his partner. This finding was tentative, given that months in the relationship and history of abuse together only account for 8% of the variance in predicting physical violence.

It is interesting to note that this finding might be considered discrepant with the findings of O'Leary et al. (1989), which indicated that violence before marriage does not increase into the first two years of marriage. Perhaps, before the commitment is made, the partners feel increasingly large amounts of pressure to maintain proximity to each other in the face of conflict. Perhaps this pressure increases the risk of coercive manipulative behaviors. However, after the commitment is made, the threat of losing the partner might not seem so real; therefore the pressure is reduced.

No psychological variables were significant predictors of physical violence. However, it is not clear the extent to which these findings were due to an actual lack of relationship to physical violence or to the limited predictive power of the model

caused by the restricted range of this criterion variable. Furthermore, comparisons among models of verbal aggression and physical violence can not be made in this discussion due to the limited predictive power in the physical violence model.

#### Partner Abuse

Several history of abuse variables were retained as predictors of abuse from self to partner. When entered as a block, none of the variables were significantly related to abuse towards the partner; however, the block accounted for 18% of the variance in predicting abuse toward the partner. The high degree of multicollinearity of these history of abuse variables indicated that men who have a history of abuse likely experienced all types of abuse. Therefore, it might be suggested that these men are engaging in more general modeling of the coercive family environment rather than in a specific modeling of certain behavioral patterns.

Though all the family attachment and attributional style variables were retained in the second block for analysis, only two variables, social incompetence and egocentricity, demonstrated significant relationships to abuse from self to partner. Results indicated that, for men with a history of abuse in the family, being particularly socially incompetent and egocentric increases the risk of engaging in abuse from self to partner. Given our knowledge that deficits in social skills are related to increased levels of marital violence (e.g., Holtzworth-Monroe, 1992), it is not surprising that egocentricity and social incompetence would exacerbate risk of abusing the partner. The egocentric male is particularly likely to feel a constant slighting of his needs by others as well as to engage in neglect of others' needs. The social incompetence, learned earlier in life, may exacerbate these negative emotions, as the socially incompetent male may not have the skills to peacefully request that changes be made in the relationship. Thus, he may resort to manipulation and coercion in an attempt to meet needs that he feels are justified.

Months in the relationship was, as expected, significantly and directly related to abusing the partner. Together, the predictors of family abuse, social incompetence, egocentricity and months in the relationship accounted for 32% of the variance in predicting abuse toward the partner. Therefore, a male who has a history of abuse, is socially incompetent and egocentric is at much higher risk of abusing the partner the longer he is in the dating relationship.

The last block of variables indicated that some psychological variables do increase the risk of abusing the partner, raising the accounted variance to 41%. As with the other models, depression demonstrated no relationship to abusing the partner. To the contrary, anger and angry withdrawal had significant relationships to abuse toward the partner. Results indicated that the male who experiences anger and angry withdrawal is at higher risk of abusing the partner.

One might speculate that the angry withdrawal is a behavioral pattern typically reflected by anger at not having needs met followed by withdrawal from the interactions with the partner. Rather than acting to get the needs met, the individual avoids the partner, significantly decreasing the chance that any needs will be met and increasing overall anger towards the partner. This individual then has fewer opportunities to correct his perceptions that his needs are not met by the partner. Instead, he dwells on his negative emotions, increasing the salience of any future slights that he may receive from his partner. This often results in consistent feelings of

tension and anger directed towards the partner that underlie all interactions with the partner. This hypothesis is supported by the strong correlation between angry withdrawal and social incompetence (See Table 12).

The last predictor significantly related to abusing the partner is compulsive caregiving, such that the less a male engages in compulsive caregiving to his partner, the more likely he will abuse the partner. This predictor might well be functionally related to the variables of egocentricity and angry withdrawal. If a male egocentrically feels that none of his needs are being met by his partner and copes by withdrawing angrily from the partner and decreasing her availability to him, he is not likely to have any desire to help meet her emotional needs. Thus, less care-giving on the part of these males would logically be related to increased abuse toward the partner.

#### Abuse from Partner

As with the verbal aggression and abuse toward the partner models, a number of history of abuse variables were retained to predict dating violence from partner toward self. Together, history of abuse variables only accounted for 7% of the variance in males being abused by the partner. However, due to multicollinearity, none of the variables in the block was significantly related to abuse by the partner. The multicollinearity of these history of abuse variables again suggested that men who have a history of abuse have likely witnessed many forms of abuse, and all of these forms of abuse may be contributing to the later modeling of abusive behavior. These present analyses are not capable of discerning individual differences of the history of abuse predictors in predicting overall abuse from partner.

The notable finding from this block of variables is that the male's history of abuse increases his risk of receiving abuse from his partner. It is possible that a history of abuse teaches the male to be a victim of abuse; however, it is also possible that a history of abuse increases the risk of the male engaging in abusive interactions in which he and his partner are both abusive. Moreover, the nature of the data collection in this study does not provide information on accuracy of the male's report of the partner's behavior. Therefore, it is possible that the male has overestimated the partner's behavior to justify his own reporting of abusive behavior.

Of the attachment and attributional style predictors, only two indicated relationships to abuse by the partner, social incompetence and egocentricity. This block accounted for an additional 7% of the variance over history of abuse, indicating as much or more strength as a risk factor than history of abuse alone. Social incompetence evidenced a significant direct relationship to abuse by the partner, indicating that men who are more socially incompetent are more likely to be abused by the partner. Again, this relationship was expected. Lack of social competence might well lead to tension and dispute in relationships as well as to frustration and anger on the part of the partner who has great difficulty interacting with and understanding the male.

As before, months in the relationship was a significant predictor of abuse by the partner. Months accounted for an additional 13% of the variance over the above variables, totaling 27% of the variance. Therefore, months in the relationship appeared to be a significant risk factor when considered in conjunction with variables such as history of abuse, social incompetence and egocentricity.

Within the abuse by the partner model, several psychological variables on the part of the male accounted for an additional 7% of the variance as predictors of abuse by the partner. A meaningful result was that anger on the part of the male showed no apparent relationship to being abused by the partner. Therefore, abuse by the partner was just as likely to occur against males with generalized anger as for those who did not have generalized anger. In contrast, those males who exhibited an angry withdrawal pattern of behavior were at much greater risk of being abused. Considering the high correlation between anger and angry withdrawal (see Table 12), this is a notable finding. Though the present study did not measure partner anger, it might be conjectured that the pattern of withdrawing from the female when in conflict serves to exacerbate her anger and increase the risk that she will aggress against the male, regardless of whether he maintains this level of anger or simply releases it in another context.

An additional finding from this block of predictors was that compulsive care-seeking was significantly and inversely related to abuse by the partner, indicating that males who engage in less care-seeking from their girlfriend are at greater risk of abuse from the partner. One hypothesis is that males who engage in less care-seeking are more emotionally distant from their girlfriends. Moreover, this pattern of not seeking assistance from the partner might well decrease the partner's sense of self-efficacy in the relationship. These feelings of the partner might then lead to increased feelings of frustration and anger in the partner, which would increase risk of being abused by the partner.

#### Comparison of Directions of Abuse

As expected, the study was more effective in predicting abuse of the partner than abuse by the partner. The predictor variables specified were chosen to predict males' tendency to aggress against partners. The variables were not chosen to specifically predict the partners' aggression against them. An encouraging finding of this study was that the variables of male history of abuse, male social incompetence, and male behavioral patterns of angry withdrawal and lack of compulsive care seeking accounted for fully 34% of the variance in predicting female aggression as reported by the male. It has long been hypothesized that abuse is the product of an interaction between the partners; though one person may be responsible for his own actual aggressive behaviors, the patterns of coercion and manipulation are a result of dysfunctional interactions between both partners. If the males accurately reported levels of partner abuse in this study, the present data supported this notion.

A second notable difference between abusing the partner and being abused was that generalized anger is only a significant risk factor of abusing the partner. Men who have high levels of generalized anger were more likely to be aggressive but not more likely to be recipients of aggression. This might have reflected a gender difference. It is possible that men who have large amounts of anger evoke a worried or nurturing response from their female partners as often as an aggressive one. Therefore, the anger itself is not a predisposing factor. Results indicated that angry withdrawal is a risk factor for both abusing the partner and being abused. The difference might be that angry withdrawal is a dysfunctional pattern of communication that leads to increased levels of frustration and anger in both partners. Research has shown that increased levels of anger, especially directed toward intimate partners, is correlated with abuse

by men (Beasley & Stoltenberg, 1992; Dutton, et al., 1994; Greene, Coles, & Johnson, 1994); it is assumed to be correlated with abuse by women as well. It would be interesting to know how much anger the women experience in these relationships. Then it could be empirically determined whether anger in women is a risk factor for abuse by men, as opposed to the finding that anger in men is not a predictor of abuse by women. This would support the hypothesis of a gender effect.

The final notable difference between the abuse from self to partner and abuse from partner to self models was reflected in the relationship of partner attachment style to abuse. Decreases in level of care-giving increased risk of abusing the partner, whereas decreased levels of care-seeking increased risk of being abused. Both of these findings might be related to partners' senses of personal control and self-efficacy in the relationship, typical rewards of procuring intimate attachments (Stosny, 1995). A male who is not care-giving to his partner, who is withdrawing from interactions with her, perhaps feels less control in the relationship, therefore, a decreased sense of personal self-esteem, and is more likely to engage in coercing manipulating behaviors typical of abuse towards the partner. A female who is experiencing less care-seeking from her partner has less opportunity to interact with him and attempt to meet his needs. Therefore, she is more likely to feel a decrease in her control in the relationship and is more likely to engage in coercing manipulative behaviors. In fact, research has suggested that personal self-esteem (Stith & Farley, 1993; Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988) and a sense of control in the relationship (Dutton, 1988) are inversely related to abusive behavior in the relationship. Again, it is important to note that these findings are tentative given the nature of the data collection. Report by the male of the female's abusive behaviors in the relationship may be somewhat biased.

### Implications

History of abuse is a significant predictor of dating violence. In general, it appears that the type of abuse in the family of origin is not as important a predictor as the overall abusive environment. Therefore, it appears that being raised in an abusive family teaches an individual that abuse is acceptable behavior and may be reinforcing to personal needs. However, current attachment style and psychological state may substantially increase the risk that a male with a history of abuse will engage in dating violence in the future. This finding is significant because these factors may be addressed in educational workshops for college freshman and/or potentially changed in a therapeutic context.

Insecure attachment to the family of origin was not a significant predictor of abuse in the present study. However, as discussed later, the scale used to measure family insecure attachment was not very specific. If this result is valid, it can be considered good news given the difficulty in changing working models that have been reinforced by familial interactions for many years.

Some insecure attachment variables were related to dating violence. These predictors suggested that behavioral patterns that decreased openness and communication in the relationship, therefore increasing anger and frustration (angry withdrawal), increased the risk of dating violence. In addition, attachment behaviors that resulted in a decreased sense of control and self-esteem for the partner increased the risk of the partner engaging in dating violence. This appeared to occur in both directions. This is again good news for psychologists who may strive to teach these dysfunctional couples better behavioral skills for communicating, problem-solving, and finding ways to meet each others' needs within their relationship.

No relationship was found between attributional style and abuse in the dating relationship. It is possible that attributional style does not yet exhibit a strong relationship to abuse in dating relationships because the males are young and have not experienced many dating relationships yet. Therefore, they may not have formed set styles of attributions regarding partners' behavior. Married men, on the other hand, generally have had a much richer experience interacting with the opposite sex and are more likely to have formed set attributional styles regarding the interpretation of their partners' behaviors. Therefore, cognitive restructuring based on faulty attributional patterns may not be a very effective treatment for a younger individual who has been engaged in dating violence.

As predicted, depression was not significantly related to dating violence. This finding is beneficial for the correction of treatment programs that may mistakenly focus on feelings of depression and inadequacy at the expense of providing anger control strategies. In addition, this finding would be beneficial to share with those partners of violent men who stay with the men because they know that the men are "only acting that way because they are depressed."

As always, time in the relationship was positively related to all forms of abuse. Not only does this reflect the honeymoon effect (i.e., couples are on their best behavior early on in the relationship), but also a tendency for couples to develop dysfunctional patterns of relating that escalate with time without appropriate intervention. This finding should be an integral part of dating violence prevention programs for college students.

The myth that things will naturally get better as the relationship progresses must be dispelled.

### Limitations

The biggest limitation of this study involved the criterion variable of physical abuse in the dating relationship. Fortunately for this university but unfortunately for the present study, levels of reported physical violence were very low. This restricted range severely limited interpretation of the physical violence model. Therefore, conclusions from this study regarding physical violence are tentative at best.

Another limitation involved the measurement of abuse within the dating relationship. To compare predictors of verbal aggression and physical aggression, endorsements of the Conflict Tactics Scale had to be categorized into component subscales. Though these subscales use independent samples of items, they are not an accurate reflection of verbal and physical aggression in the population for several reasons. First, the Conflict Tactics scale was not written for a college sample, and many of the items do not reflect the abusive behaviors that college students are thought to engage in. Second, in reality, verbal aggression and physical aggression can not be separated. Though verbal aggression can occur in a pure form without physical aggression, physical aggression rarely occurs without the presence of verbal aggression. Therefore, to treat them as discrete entities for statistical purposes loses some potential information about their interrelationship and possible escalation from one to the other.

Though the inventory chosen to measure family attachment (BORRTI) is very useful for purposes of object relations research, its specificity in measuring insecure attachment to the family is less than preferred by the author. The inventory was mainly chosen to compare results to an earlier study investigating attachment styles of maltreated and nonmaltreated women that utilized this inventory. Therefore, it is not clear whether the nonsignificant relations between family attachment and abuse in this study were accurate or a measurement artifact. The Adult Attachment Interview (George, Kaplan & Main, 1984) which must be administered individually, and thus was impractical for this study, would have been a more comprehensive assessment of family of origin attachment style and would likely have yielded clearer results. Furthermore, because of this limitation, one can not make the assumption of Bowlby (1977), that the maladaptive attachment behavioral systems working in the dating relationship were the result of the attachment style formed in the early family.

Given the demographics of this study, the results may not easily be generalized beyond college males aged 16 to 25, predominantly Caucasian, who are members of the mainstream American culture. Furthermore, all data was based on anonymous self-report. It is impossible to know the extent to which participants minimized or exaggerated their answers to difficult questions about both their behaviors and their partners' behaviors. Though Straus (1979) reported that underreporting of violence is not unusual, O'Leary, Vivian, and Malone (1992) have suggested that anonymously administering the CTS should maximize validity of the reports. Corroborating reports from partners, though difficult to collect and interpret, might have demonstrated the veracity of these reports.

This study did not assess several characteristics of abuse that might have yielded more validity in predicting dating violence. Most importantly, this study did not measure the specific behaviors of the partner and the tendency for her to initiate

abusive behavior. Secondly, this study did not assess history of abuse outside the family, a likely contributor to both learned aggression and increased levels of anger. It is expected that these variables would have increased the predictive utility of the present model.

### Future Directions

The present study did not explore the presence of some environmental triggers that may be salient in predicting both verbal aggression and physical violence. An obvious trigger seems to be level of alcohol or substance intoxication. As has been noted in the interpersonal violence literature (e.g., Gorney, 1989; Dutton, 1995), impaired judgment and disinhibition caused by intoxication are likely strong contributors to the decision to engage in abuse in the marital relationship. Dating environment may also be a contributor to abuse, possibly more so for physical violence than verbal aggression. Though verbal aggression is not universally socially accepted, within the college community verbal aggression of males is often seen as macho or “cool.” Physical violence towards women does not share this partial social acceptance. Thus, physical violence is much less likely to occur in public places. Therefore, it follows that partners who spend a great deal of time in public social situations may be at lower risk of physical violence than those who are more socially isolated.

In addition, many have hypothesized that men who are active in full contact athletic activities (e.g., football) are more likely to engage in physical violence (e.g., Jackson, 1991; Frinter & Rubinson, 1993). It has been hypothesized that these men have conditioned the excitement of competition and the reinforcement of winning to the physical contact required of their sport. Therefore, when feeling competition from their girlfriend, these men would be more likely to react physically than men who do not have this learning history. Unfortunately, results of these studies have only been descriptive in nature. The underlying mechanisms that make these athletes at higher risk of physical violence are unknown. Finally, it is also possible that the onset of physical violence is so gradual that the relationships of the men in this study were not long enough in duration to reflect the typical length of relationship achieved at the onset of physical violence. If total violence in a dating relationship is a gradual progression from verbal aggression to physical violence, which is yet unknown, it is likely that physical violence does not typically onset until many months, possibly years, into the relationship. There is a great need for identification of idiosyncratic and environmental variables that not only increase the risk of all types of abuse but serve as triggers to increase the chance that the partners cross the apparent threshold between verbal aggression and physical violence. Dutton (1995) has begun this field of research with married men, but the call remains for similar data regarding young, single men.

Research is also needed to compare the predictors of verbal aggression to those of physical violence within the population. It is likely that anger does not have the straightforward relationship in predicting physical violence that it has in predicting verbal aggression. It is suspected that verbal aggression leads to an escalation of anger as a result of lack of reinforcement for coercive behavior. To the contrary, physical violence likely invokes fear in the recipient and increases the chance that she will reward the male with whatever he is trying to achieve (e.g., sexual gratification, decision to (not) take part in certain social activities, etc.), thus decreasing his anger. Second, as noted earlier (Walker, 1979; Deschner, 1984), married abusers are known to go through a repentance phase after violent outbreaks. During this phase, the abuser reflects upon his past behavior, feels

sorrow and guilt, and attempts to apologize to his wife by showing his love and concern for her. It is likely that men who engage in physical violence undergo the same cycles of abusive behavior. Therefore, after the male is rewarded by the female's response to the physical abuse, he feels genuinely sorry and loving toward the female, thereby reducing any residual anger. In addition, it is possible that, at the actual moment of physical violence, many of these men experience dissociation and do not experience any of their emotions. Therefore, assessed at the right moment, in the tension cycle of abuse, these men would likely achieve high scores on state anger; yet, men who repeatedly engage in physical violence would not be expected to achieve high scores on trait measures of anger. Further research addressing this question is needed to compare time sequenced state measures of anger to trait measures of anger, preferably trait measures that are not highly correlated with our present measures of emotional abuse and/or verbal aggression.

Longitudinal studies are needed to determine (a) does verbal aggression directly escalate into physical violence, (b) given an escalation, what amount of time typically predicts the onset of physical violence, (c) what is the relation between dating violence and marital violence-- does the violence change in quantity and quality into the marriage, and (d) does family attachment, measured behaviorally at several points in time, reliably predict dating attachment?

Cross-generational studies are needed to compare the quality of parental abuse to the quality of dating violence. These studies might yield more reliable predictions regarding the manner in which learned models of abusive behavior are transmitted from parent to child.

Now that several studies have begun to suggest that abuse is interactional in nature, there is a call for research that attempts to document the sequence of these interactions behaviorally both in the laboratory and in the natural setting. This data is especially pertinent for the area of dating violence so that college preventative measures may be more effective.

Given the above mentioned limitation in assessing family of origin attachment style, further research is needed to clarify the relationship between early attachment and dating violence. It is recommended that this research use the Adult Attachment Interview (George, Kaplan and Main, 1984) not only for methodological considerations, but for theoretical reasons as well. Recent research has indicated that a newer, fourth category of early attachment, labeled disorganized/disoriented, may be strongly related to early abuse in the family of origin (Main, 1996). Therefore, further research is necessary to determine whether individuals demonstrating this attachment style are at increased risk of engaging in abuse as adults. At the present time, the only assessment tool available to measure the disorganized style of attachment is the Adult Attachment Interview.

Finally, research in domestic violence in general would benefit from cross-cultural studies investigating the parameters of abuse in different cultures and populations with the same cultures. Very little data have been collected to account for differing prevalence rates across cultures. In addition, little is known about differing patterns of dating violence across groups such as the physically handicapped, young mothers, students at different types of universities and young adults without college

education. This information may be critical, though, in determining factors that increase the risk of domestic violence in American families.

## References

- Abramson, L. Y., Seligman, M. E. P., & Teasdale, J. D. (1978). Learned helplessness in humans. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, *87*, 49-74.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, & Wall, S. (1978). Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Antaki, C., & Brewin, C. (1982). (eds) Attributions and Psychological Change: Applications of Attribution Theories to Clinical and Educational Practice. London: Academic Press.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Beasley, R., & Stoltenberg, C. D. (1992). Personality characteristics of male spouse abusers. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, *23*(4), 310-317.
- Beck, A.T., Wood, E., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erlbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. Archives of General Psychiatry, *4*, 561-571.
- Bell, M. (1991). An Introduction to the Bell Object Relations Reality Testing Inventory. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services.
- Bowlby, J. (1977). The making and breaking of affectional bonds. British Journal of Psychiatry, *130*, 201-210.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). Attachment and Loss: Vol. 3. Loss: Sadness and Depression. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1988). A Secure Base. London: Routledge.
- Briere, J. (1987). Predicting self-reported likelihood of battering: Attitudes and childhood experiences. Journal of Research in Personality, *21*, 61-69.
- Bryant, N. (1994). Domestic violence and group treatment for male batterers. Special issue: Men and groups. Group, *18*, 235-242.
- Burke, P. J., Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. Social Psychology Quarterly, *51*, 272-285.
- Caesar, P. L. (1988). Exposure to violence in the families-of-origin among wife-abusers and maritally nonviolent men. Violence and Victims, *3*, 49- 63.
- Carlson, B. E. (1987). Dating violence: A research review and comparison with spouse abuse. Social Casework, *68*, 16-23.
- Chen, H.T., Bersani, C., Myers, S. C., & Denton, R. (1989). Evaluating the effectiveness of a court sponsored abuser treatment program. Journal of Family Violence, *4*, 309-322.
- Deschner, J. (1984). The Hitting Habit: Anger Control for Battering Couples. New York: Free Press.
- Dutton, D. (1988). Profiling of wife assaulters: Preliminary evidence for a trimodal analysis. Violence and Victims, *3*, 5-29.
- Dutton, D. G., (1988). The Domestic Assault of Women: Psychological and Criminal Justice Perspectives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Dutton, D., & Golant, S. K. (1995). The Batterer: A Psychological Profile. New York: Basic Books.

- Dutton, D., Saunders, K., Starzomski, A., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Intimacy anger and insecure attachment as precursors of abuse in intimate relationships. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, *24*, 1367-1386.
- Eisler, R. (1995). The Courtship Conflict Questionnaire. Unpublished Inventory.
- Elbow, M. (1977). Theoretical considerations of violent marriages. Social Work, *58*, 515-526.
- Faulk, M. (1974). Men who assault their wives. Medicine, Science, and the Law, *14*, 180-183.
- Frintner, M. P., & Rubinson, L. (1993). Acquaintance rape: The influence of alcohol, fraternity membership, and sports team membership. Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, *19*, 272-284.
- Garner, J., Fagan, J., Maxwell, C. (1995). Published findings from the Spouse Assault Replication Program: A critical review. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, *11*, 3-28.
- Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1988). Intimate Violence. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- George, C., Kaplan, M. & Main, M. (1984). Adult Attachment Interview. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.
- Gorney, B. (1989). Domestic violence and chemical dependency: Dual problems, dual interventions. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, *21*, 229-238.
- Greene, A. F., Coles, C. J., & Johnson, E. H. (1994). Psychopathology and anger in interpersonal violence offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, *50*, 906-912.
- Hale, G., Zimostrad, S. Duckworth, J., & Nicholas, D. (1988). Abusive partners: MMPI profiles of male batterers. Journal of Mental Health Counseling, *10(4)*, 214- 224.
- Hamberger, L. K., & Hastings, J. E. (1986). Personality correlates of men who abuse their partners: A cross-validated study. Journal of Family Violence, *1*, 323-341.
- Hazan, C. & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love as an attachment process. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *52*, 511-524.
- Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1992). Social skills deficits in maritally violent men: Interpreting the data using a social information processing model. Clinical Psychology Review, *12*, 605-617.
- Jackson, T. L. (1991). A university athletic department's rape and assault experiences. Journal of College Student Development, *32*, 77-78.
- Kalmuss, D. S. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. Journal of Marriage and the Family, *46*, 11-19.
- Kalmuss, D. S., & Seltzer, J. A. (1986). Continuity of marital behavior in remarriage: The case of spouse abuse. Journal of Marriage and the Family, *48*, 113-120.

- Launius, M. H., Lindquist, C. U. (1988). Learned helplessness, external locus of control, and passivity in battered women. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3, 307-318.
- Lyddon, W. J., Bradford, E., & Nelson, J. P. (1993). Assessing adolescent and adult attachment: A review of current self-report measures. Journal of Counseling and Development, 71, 390-395.
- Main, M. (1996). Introduction to the special section on attachment and psychopathology: 2. Overview of the field of attachment. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64, 237-243.
- Mayseless, O. (1991). Assault attachment patterns and courtship violence. Family Relations, 40, 21-28.
- McKay, M., Rogers, P., & McKay, J. (1989). How to Change Painful Feelings Into Positive Action: When Anger Hurts. New York: MJF Books.
- O'Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57(2), 263-268.
- O'Leary, K. D., Vivian, D. & Malone, J. (1992). Assessment of physical aggression against women in marriage: The need for mulitmodal assessment. Behavioral Assessment, 14, 5-14.
- Overholser, J. C. & Moll, S. H. (1990). Who's to blame: Attributions regarding causality in spouse abuse. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 8, 107-120.
- Peterson, C., & Villanova, P. (1988). An Expanded Attributional Style Questionnaire. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 97, 87-89.
- Pistole, M. C., & Tarrant, N. (1993). Attachment style and aggression in male batterers. Family Therapy, 20, 165-173.
- Priester, M. J., & Clum, G. A. (1992). Attributional style as a diathesis in predicting depression, hopelessness, and suicide ideation in college students. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 14, 111-122.
- Rachor, R. E. (1995). An evaluation of the First Step PASSAGES domestic violence program. Journal of Reality Therapy, 14, 29-36.
- Sabourin, T. C., Infante, D. A., & Rudd, J. E. (1993). Verbal aggression in marriages: A comparison of violent, distressed but nonviolent, and nondistressed couples. Human Communication Research, 20, 245-267.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (1975). Helplessness: On Depression, Development, and Death. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Shaver, P. R., & Clark, C. L. (1994). The psychodynamics of adult romantic attachment. In J. M. Masling, & R. F. Bornstein (Eds.), Empirical Perspectives on Object Relations Theory (pp. 105-156). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Sonkin, D. J., Martin, D., & Walker, L. E. A. (1985). The Male Batterer: A Treatment Approach. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Spielberger, C. D., Jacobs, G., Russel, S., & Crane R. S. (1983). Assessment of anger: The State-Trait Anger Scale. In J.N. Butcher & C.D. Spielberger (Eds.), Advances in Personality Assessment, (Vol. 2, pp. 159-187). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Sroufe, L.A., Egeland, B., & Kreutzer, T. (1990). The fate of early experience following developmental change: Longitudinal approaches to individual adaptation in childhood. Journal of child development, *61*, 1363-1373.
- Stith, S. M., & Farley, S. C. (1993). A predictive model of male spousal violence. Journal of Family Violence, *8*, 183-201.
- Stosny, S. (1995). Treating Attachment Abuse: A Compassionate Approach. New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Straus, M. A. (1977). Wife beating: How common and why? Victimology, *2*, 443-59.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, *41*, 75-88.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. (1980). Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family. Doubleday, NY: Anchor Press.
- Thompson, R. A., Lamb, M. E. & Estes, D. (1982). Stability of infant-mother attachment and its relationship to changing life circumstances in an unselected middle class sample. Child Development, *53*, 144-148.
- Vaughn, B. Egeland, E., Sroufe, L. A., & Waters, E. (1979). Individual differences in infant-mother attachment at 12 and 18 months: Stability and change in families under stress. Child Development, *50*, 971-975.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). The Battered Woman, New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L. E. (1984). The Battered Woman Syndrome. New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Weiner, B. (1979). A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. Journal of Educational Psychology, *71*, 1-29.
- Weiss, R. S. (1982). Attachment in Adult Life. In C. M. Parkes & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), The Place of Attachment in Human Behavior (pp. 171-184). New York: Basic Books.
- West, M., & Sheldon, A. E. (1988). Classification of pathological attachment patterns in adults. Journal of Personality Disorders, *2(2)*, 153-159.
- White, J. W. and Koss, M. P. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students. Violence and Victims, *6(4)*, 247-256.
- Zins, J. E., Travis, L., Brown, M., & Knighton, A. (1994). Schools and the prevention of interpersonal violence: Mobilizing and coordinating community resources. Special Services in the Schools, *8*, 1-19.

Table 1

Sample Demographics

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Age</b>		
16	1	.7
18	39	27.5
19	33	23.2
20	28	19.7
21	17	12.0
22	12	8.5
23	11	7.7
25	1	.7
<b>Marital Status</b>		
Single	142	100
<b>Religion</b>		
Catholic	39	27.5
Jewish	2	1.4
Protestant	44	31.0
Other	31	26.0
None	26	18.3
<b>Race</b>		
African American	6	4.2
Asian	9	6.3
Caucasian	119	83.8
Hispanic	2	1.4
Native American	0	0
Other	6	4.2
<b>Socioeconomic Status</b>		
Lower	6	4.2
Middle	117	82.4
Upper	19	13.4

Table 1 Continued

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Year in College</b>		
Freshman	60	42.3
Sophomore	31	21.8
Junior	24	16.9
Senior	27	19.0
<b>Affiliation with military or Corps of Cadets</b>		
Yes	11	7.7
No	131	92.3
<b>History of non-traffic related crime</b>		
Yes	12	8.5
No	130	91.5
<b>Location of Home</b>		
Urban	15	10.6
Suburban	99	69.7
Rural	28	19.7
<b>Mother's Educational Level</b>		
Some grade school	1	.7
Completed grade school	2	1.4
Some high school	3	2.1
Completed high school	21	14.8
High school and training other than college	17	12.0
Some college	22	15.5
Completed college	53	37.3
Some graduate work	5	3.5
Completed graduate work	18	12.7

Table 1 Continued

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
<b>Father's Educational Level</b>		
Some grade school	0	0
Completed grade school	0	0
Some high school	3	2.1
Completed high school	12	8.5
High school and training other than college	13	9.2
Some college	23	16.2
Completed college	37	26.1
Some graduate work	8	5.6
Completed graduate work	46	32.4
<b>Raised by...</b>		
Biological parents	117	82.4
Mother and Stepfather	8	5.6
Father and Stepmother	0	0
Single Mother	12	8.5
Single Father	1	.7
Grandparents	1	.7
Aunt and/or Uncle	2	1.4
Other relatives	0	0
Non-Relatives	1	.7

Table 2  
Summary Statistics for Predictor Variables (N = 142)

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Standard Deviation</b>
<b>Predictor</b>		
AGE	19.75	1.65
MARR	1.00	0.00
MTHS	15.76	13.85
SIBS	2.38	0.69
REL	3.02	1.44
RACE	3.01	0.91
SES	2.09	0.41
HOME	2.09	0.55
MOMED	6.25	1.71
DADED	7.02	1.73
BIOF	1.43	1.10
STEPF	2.85	0.45
BIOM	1.37	0.76
STEPM	2.78	0.62
RAISEDBY	1.51	1.35
YRINCOLL	2.13	1.16
MILIT	1.92	0.27
CRIME	1.92	0.28
CTVA	44.75	18.32
CTVIOL	42.47	7.15
CTTOT	91.82	24.90
CTFME	23.91	9.12
CTMEF	22.24	6.13
CTMME	23.49	7.69
CTMEM	22.18	6.15
BDI	7.89	6.67
TAS	29.11	7.15
CCS	14.47	4.97
CCG	24.99	4.48
CSR	15.05	4.25
AW	15.23	5.44
ALN	49.16	10.08
IA	49.34	8.75
EGC	50.21	8.98
SI	49.17	10.57
IS	80.28	13.39
SG	82.17	18.18
EI	89.11	12.86

## Table 2 continued

## Note:

AGE = age in years; MARR = marital status; MTHS = no. months in current relationship; SIBS = categorical rating of number of siblings; REL = identified religion; RACE = identified race; SES = socioeconomic status; HOME = setting of home; MOMED = mother's level of education; DADED = father's level of education; BIOF = marital status of biological father; STEPF = presence of stepfather; BIOM = marital status of biological mother; STEPM = presence of stepmother; RAISEDDBY = individuals acting as parents; YRINCOLL = year in college; MILIT = affiliated with military; CRIME = convicted of crime other than traffic violation; CTVA = verbal aggression in family of origin; CTVIOL = physical violence in family of origin; CTTOT = total violence in family of origin; CTFME = violence of father towards self; CTMEF = violence of self towards father; CTMME = violence of mother towards self; CTMEM = violence of self towards mother; BDI = depression; TAS = anger; CCS = compulsive care-seeking; CCG = compulsive care-giving; CSR = compulsive self-reliance; AW = angry withdrawal; ALN = alienation; IA = insecure attachment; EGC = egocentricity; SI = social incompetence; IS = instability/stability of attributions; SG = specificity/globality of attributions; EI = internal/external attributions

Table 3  
Summary Statistics for Criterion Variables (N=142)

Variable	Possible Range	Actual Range	Mean	SD
Verbal Aggression	12-72	12-60	22.13	9.53
Physical Violence	18-108	18-31	19.33	3.10
Self to Partner Dating Violence	12-72	15-46	20.35	5.42
Partner to Self Dating Violence	12-72	15-46	21.11	6.40

Table 4

Summary of Component MAXR Analyses for Variables Predicting Verbal Aggression Among Dating Partners (CTRVA)

Component Name	Variables	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>F</u>	df	Adj. <u>R</u> - squared
<b>Family Abuse</b>				<b>7.00</b>	<b>[7,134]</b>	<b>0.23</b>
	CTTOT	.62	.55			
	CTFME	-.07	.25			
	CTMEF	-.25	.27			
	CTMEM	-.17	.41			
	CTVR	-.05	.06			
	CTVA	-.23	.60			
	CTVIOL	-.67	.54			
<b>Attributional Style</b>				<b>3.36</b>	<b>[3,138]</b>	<b>0.05</b>
	IS	.12	.07			
	SG	.08	.05			
	EI	-.06	.06			

Note:

CTTOT = total violence in family of origin; CTFME = total violence from father to self; CTMEF = total violence from self to father; CTMEM = total violence from self to mother; CTVR = verbal reasoning in the family of origin; CTVA = verbal aggression in family of origin; CTVIOL = physical violence in family of origin; IS = instability/stability of attributions; SG = specificity/globality of attributions; EI = externality/internality of attributions

Table 5

Summary of Component MAXR Analyses for Variables Predicting Physical Violence  
Among Dating Partners (CTRVIOL)

Component Name	Variables	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>F</u>	df	Adj. <u>R</u> - squared
<b>Family Abuse</b>	CTTOT	.03**	.10	<b>6.55</b>	<b>[1,141]</b>	<b>0.03</b>

Note:

CTTOT = total violence in family of origin

\*\* $p < .01$

Table 6

Summary of Component MAXR Analyses for Variables Predicting Total Violence from Self to Partner Among Dating Partners (CTRMEP)

Component Name	Variables	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>F</u>	df	Adj. <u>R</u> - squared
<b>Family Abuse</b>				<b>8.10</b>	<b>[7,134]</b>	<b>0.26</b>
	CTTOT	.27	.31			
	CTFME	-.02	.25			
	CTMEF	-.05	.25			
	CTMME	.05	.23			
	CTVR	-.01	.03			
	CTVA	-.11	.33			
	CTVIOL	-.33	.30			
<b>Attachment</b>				<b>3.47</b>	<b>[8,128]</b>	<b>0.13</b>
	AW	.42**	.10			
	CCG	-.15	.12			
	CCS	.03	.11			
	CSR	-.14	.13			
	ALN	-.09	.05			
	IA	-.01	.07			
	EGC	.02	.06			
	SI	.04	.05			
<b>Attributional Style</b>				<b>2.83</b>	<b>[3,138]</b>	<b>0.04</b>
	EI	-.01	.04			
	IS	.07	.04			
	SG	.04	.03			

Note:

CTTOT = total violence in family of origin; CTFME = total violence from father to self; CTMEF = total violence from self to father; CTMME = total violence from mother to self; CTVR = verbal reasoning in the family of origin; CTVA = verbal aggression in family of origin; CTVIOL = total physical violence in family of origin; AW = angry withdrawal; CCG = compulsive care-giving; CCS = compulsive care-seeking; CSR = compulsive self-reliance; ALN = alienation; IA = insecure attachment; EGC = egocentricity; SI = social incompetence; EI = externality/internality of attributions; IS = instability/stability of attributions; SG = specificity/globality of attributions

\*\* $p < .01$

Table 7

Summary of Component MAXR Analyses for Variables Predicting Total Violence from Partner to Self Among Dating Partners (CTRPME)

Component Name	Variables	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>F</u>	df	Adj. <u>R</u> - squared
<b>Family Abuse</b>				<b>3.79</b>	<b>[7,131]</b>	<b>0.13</b>
	CTTOT	.29	.39			
	CTFME	-.03	.39			
	CTMEF	-.20	.19			
	CTMEM	-.12	.29			
	CTVR	-.02	.04			
	CTVIOL	-.29	.39			
<b>Attachment</b>				<b>2.99</b>	<b>[8,128]</b>	<b>0.11</b>
	AW	.49**	.12			
	CCG	-.07	.14			
	CCS	-.12	.13			
	CSR	-.15	.16			
	ALN	-.09	.06			
	IA	-.01	.08			
	EGC	.00	.07			
	SI	.08	.06			
<b>Attributional Style</b>				<b>2.74</b>	<b>[3,138]</b>	<b>0.04</b>
	EI	-.01	.04			
	IS	.08	.05			
	SG	.04	.03			

Note:

CTTOT = total violence in family of origin; CTFME = total violence from father to self; CTMEF = total violence from self to father; CTMEM = total violence from self to mother; CTVR = verbal reasoning in family of origin; CTVA = verbal aggression in family of origin; CTVIOL physical violence in family of origin; AW = angry withdrawal; CCG = compulsive care-giving; CCS = compulsive care-seeking; CSR = compulsive self-reliance; ALN = alienation; IA = insecure attachment; EGC = egocentricity; SI = social incompetence; EI = externality/internality of attributions; IS = instability/stability of attributions; SG = specificity/globality of attributions

\*\* $p < .01$

Table 8

Summary of Blockwise Regression For Components Predicting Verbal Aggression in Dating Relationships (CTRVA): Final Model

Component	Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Adj. R-squared</u>
<b><u>Familial Abuse</u></b>				<b>6.12</b>	<b>[7,131]</b>	<b>0.21</b>
	CTVA	-.13	.60			
	CTMEF	-.27	.27			
	CTVIOL	-.57	.55			
	CTTOT	.55	.55			
	CTVR	-.05	.06			
	CTMEM	-.22	.41			
	CTFME	-.14	.25			
<b><u>Family Attachment and Attributional Style</u></b>				<b>4.89</b>	<b>[10,128]</b>	<b>0.22</b>
	IS	.08	.06			
	SG	.05	.05			
	EI	.01	.06			
<b><u>Months in the Relationship</u></b>				<b>7.42</b>	<b>[11,127]</b>	<b>0.34</b>
	MTHS	.24**	.05			
<b><u>Psychological Variables</u></b>				<b>7.78</b>	<b>[13,125]</b>	<b>0.39</b>
	BDI	-.07	.12			
	TAS	.37**	.11			

Note:

CTVA = verbal aggression in the family of origin; CTMEF = total violence from self to father; CTVIOL = physical violence in the family of origin; CTTOT = total violence in the family of origin; CTVR = verbal reasoning in the family of origin; CTMEM = total violence from self to mother; CTFME = total violence from father to self; IS = instability/stability of attribution; SG = stability/globality of attributions; EI = externality/internality of attributions; MTHS = months in the relationship; BDI = depression; TAS = anger;

\*\* $p < .01$

Table 9

Summary of Blockwise Regression For Components Predicting Physical Violence in Dating Relationships (CTRViol): Final Model

Component	Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Adj. R-squared</u>
<b><u>Familial Abuse</u></b>						
	CTTOT	.02*	.01	<b>6.57</b>	<b>[1,137]</b>	<b>0.04</b>
<b><u>Months in the Relationship</u></b>						
	MTHS	.05**	.02	<b>6.86</b>	<b>[2,136]</b>	<b>0.08</b>
<b><u>Psychological Variables</u></b>						
	BDI	.06	.04	<b>4.12</b>	<b>[4,134]</b>	<b>0.08</b>
	TAS	-.01	.04			

Note:

CTTOT = total violence in family of origin; MTHS = months in relationship; BDI = depression; TAS = anger

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

Table 10

Summary of Blockwise Regression For Components Predicting Violence of Self to Partner in Dating Relationships (CTRMEP): Final Model

Component	Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Adj. R-squared</u>
<b><u>Familial Abuse</u></b>				<b>5.21</b>	<b>[7,126]</b>	<b>0.18</b>
	CTVA	-.29	.32			
	CTFME	-.05	.14			
	CTMEF	-.31	.25			
	CTVIOL	-.44	.29			
	CTTOT	.49	.30			
	CTMME	-.09	.23			
	CTVR	-.00	.03			
<b><u>Family Attachment and Attributional Style</u></b>				<b>4.27</b>	<b>[14,119]</b>	<b>0.26</b>
	ALN	-.02	.04			
	SI	.13**	.04			
	EGC	.11*	.05			
	IA	-.04	.06			
	IS	.05	.03			
	SG	.00	.02			
	EI	.02	.03			
<b><u>Months in the Relationship</u></b>				<b>5.20</b>	<b>[15,118]</b>	<b>0.32</b>
	MTHS	.10**	.03			
<b><u>Psychological Variables</u></b>				<b>5.36</b>	<b>[21,112]</b>	<b>0.41</b>
	BDI	-.01	.07			
	TAS	.13*	.06			
	AW	.22**	.09			
	CCG	-.28**	.10			
	CSR	-.19	.10			
	CCS	-.06	.09			

Note:

CTVA = verbal aggression in the family of origin; CTFME = total violence from father to self; CTMEF = total violence from self to father; CTVIOL= total physical violence in family of origin; CTTOT = total violence in family of origin; CTMME = total violence from self to mother; CTVR = total verbal reasoning in family of origin; SI = social incompetence; EGC = egocentricity; IA = insecure attachment; IS = instability/stability of attributions; SG = specificity/globality of attributions; EI - externality/internality of attributions; MTHS = months in relationship; BDI = depression; TAS = anger; AW = angry withdrawal; CCG = compulsive care giving; CSR = compulsive self-reliance; CCS = compulsive care-seeking

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

Table 11

Summary of Blockwise Regression For Components Predicting Violence From Partner to Self in Dating Relationships (CTRPME): Final Model

Component	Variable	<u>B</u>	<u>SE B</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>Adj. R-squared</u>
<b><u>Familial Abuse</u></b>				<b>2.35</b>	<b>[7,126]</b>	<b>0.07</b>
	CTVA	-.25	.42			
	CTMEF	-.34	.19			
	CTVR	-.02	.04			
	CTVIOL	-.39	.38			
	CTTOT	.38	.38			
	CTMEM	.01	.30			
	CTFME	.08	.18			
<b><u>Family Attachment and Attributional Style</u></b>				<b>2.58</b>	<b>[14,119]</b>	<b>0.14</b>
	ALN	-.04	.06			
	SI	.16**	.06			
	IA	-.01	.08			
	EGC	.12	.07			
	IS	.08	.04			
	EI	.02	.04			
	SG	.00	.03			
<b><u>Months in the Relationship</u></b>				<b>4.31</b>	<b>[15,118]</b>	<b>0.27</b>
	MTHS	.17**	.04			
<b><u>Psychological Variables</u></b>				<b>4.25</b>	<b>[21,112]</b>	<b>0.34</b>
	BDI	-.03	.09			
	TAS	.05	.08			
	AW	.32**	.11			
	CCS	-.27*	.11			
	CSR	-.16	.14			
	CCG	-.14	.13			

Note:

CTVA = verbal aggression in the family of origin; CTMEF = total violence of father to self; CTVIOL = physical violence in the family of origin; CTTOT = total violence in the family of origin; CTMEM = total violence from self to mother; CTFME = total violence from father to self; ALN = alienation; SI = social incompetence; IA = insecure attachment; EGC = egocentricity; IS = instability/stability of attributions; EI = externality/internality of attributions; SG = specificity/globality of attributions; MTHS = months in the current relationship; BDI = depression; TAS = anger; CCS = compulsive careseeking; CSR = compulsive self-reliance; CCG = compulsive caregiving

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .01$

Table 12

Correlation Matrix for Variables Predicting Dating Violence

N = 142

<u>TAS</u>	CTTOT	CTVA	CTVIOL	CTVR	CTFME	CTMEF	CTMME	CTMEM	ALN	EGC	IA	SI	AW	CCG	CCS	CSR	EI	IS	SG	MTHS	BDI		
CTTOT	*	.98 <sup>b</sup>	.77 <sup>b</sup>	.35 <sup>b</sup>	.83 <sup>b</sup>	.89 <sup>b</sup>	.86 <sup>b</sup>	.87 <sup>b</sup>	.17 <sup>a</sup>	.17 <sup>a</sup>	.34 <sup>b</sup> .19 <sup>a</sup>	.28 <sup>b</sup>	.13	.12	.03	-.09	.21 <sup>a</sup>	.19 <sup>a</sup>	.08	.10	.28 <sup>b</sup>		
CTVA	*	*	.61 <sup>b</sup>	.40 <sup>b</sup>	.80 <sup>b</sup>	.89 <sup>b</sup>	.81 <sup>b</sup>	.85 <sup>b</sup>	.14	.18 <sup>a</sup>	.36 <sup>b</sup> .03 <sup>a</sup>	.29 <sup>b</sup>	.15	.13	.04	-.10	.21 <sup>a</sup>	.20 <sup>a</sup>	.08	.09	.29 <sup>b</sup>		
CTVIOL	*	*	*	.14	.71 <sup>b</sup>	.62 <sup>b</sup>	.81 <sup>b</sup>	.59 <sup>b</sup>	.22 <sup>a</sup>	.08	.19 <sup>a</sup> .13	.17 <sup>a</sup>	.02	.03	-.01	-.06	.14	.12	.02	.05	.15		
CTVR	*	*	*	*	.27 <sup>b</sup>	.39 <sup>b</sup>	.25 <sup>b</sup>	.35 <sup>b</sup>	-.26 <sup>b</sup>	.01	.06	-.15	.03	.03	-.11	-.02	.01	-.02	.09	.08	-.08	.19 <sup>g</sup>	
CTFME	*	*	*	*	*	.73 <sup>b</sup>	.52 <sup>b</sup>	.48 <sup>b</sup>	.19 <sup>a</sup>	.05	.23 <sup>b</sup> .13	.17 <sup>a</sup>	.08	.05	-.01	-.08	.25 <sup>b</sup>	.21 <sup>b</sup>	.08	.02	.21 <sup>a</sup>		
CTMEF	*	*	*	*	*	*	.61 <sup>b</sup>	.75 <sup>b</sup>	.14	.25 <sup>b</sup> .36 <sup>b</sup>	.18 <sup>a</sup> .28 <sup>b</sup>	.18 <sup>a</sup>	.11	.06	-.02	.28 <sup>b</sup> .19 <sup>a</sup>	.09	.14	.14	.26 <sup>b</sup>			
CTMME	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.82 <sup>b</sup>	.14	.16	.27 <sup>b</sup> .16	.27 <sup>b</sup>	.09	.15	-.01	-.12	.04	.10	.06	.10	.25 <sup>b</sup>		
CTMEM	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.07	.17 <sup>a</sup>	.34 <sup>b</sup> .19 <sup>a</sup>	.27 <sup>b</sup>	.11	.14	.07	-.08	.13	.16	.04	.10	.27 <sup>b</sup>		
ALN	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.34 <sup>b</sup>	.28 <sup>b</sup> .29 <sup>b</sup>	.35 <sup>b</sup>	-.01	.03	.37 <sup>b</sup>	-.02	.06	.18 <sup>a</sup>	-.25 <sup>b</sup>	.44 <sup>b</sup>	.33 <sup>b</sup>		
EGC	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.46 <sup>b</sup> .06	.30 <sup>b</sup>	.09	.14	.22 <sup>a</sup>	.07	.06	.18 <sup>a</sup>	-.10	.37 <sup>b</sup>	.28 <sup>b</sup>		
IA	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.52 <sup>b</sup> .50 <sup>b</sup>	.18 <sup>a</sup>	.33 <sup>b</sup>	.18 <sup>a</sup>	-.04	.08	.22 <sup>b</sup>	-.01	.43 <sup>b</sup>	.36 <sup>b</sup>		
SI	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.38 <sup>b</sup>	.12	.35 <sup>b</sup>	.18 <sup>a</sup>	-.07	.00	.10	-.02	.27 <sup>b</sup>	.24 <sup>b</sup>	
AW	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.04	.25 <sup>b</sup>	.43 <sup>b</sup>	-.19 <sup>a</sup>	-.00	.12	-.00	.33 <sup>b</sup>	.35 <sup>b</sup>	
CCG	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.46 <sup>b</sup>	-.38 <sup>b</sup>	-.05	.12	.12	.17 <sup>a</sup>	.24 <sup>b</sup>	.14	
CCS	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-.19 <sup>a</sup>	-.06	.09	.18 <sup>a</sup>	.12	.20 <sup>a</sup>	.05	
CSR	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.06	-.01	.08	-.19 <sup>g</sup>	.24 <sup>b</sup>	.24 <sup>b</sup>	
EI	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.26 <sup>b</sup> .28 <sup>b</sup>	-.04	.08	.08		
IS	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.45 <sup>b</sup>	.20 <sup>a</sup>	.25 <sup>b</sup>	.25 <sup>b</sup>	
SG	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.15	.31 <sup>b</sup>	.29 <sup>b</sup>
MTHS	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	.00	.04



## Table 12 continued

<sup>a</sup> = significant at alpha level  $p < .05$

<sup>b</sup> = significant at alpha level  $p < .01$

## Note:

CTVA = verbal aggression in family of origin; CTVIOL = physical violence in family of origin; CTTOT = total violence in family of origin; CTFME = violence of father towards self; CTMEF = violence of self towards father; CTMME = violence of mother towards self; CTMEM = violence of self towards mother; ; ALN = alienation; IA = insecure attachment; EGC = egocentricity; SI = social incompetence; AW = angry withdrawal; CCG= compulsive care-giving; CCS = compulsive care-seeking; CSR = compulsive self-reliance; EI = externality/internality of attributions; IS = instability/stability of attributions; SG = specificity/globality of attributions; MTHS = no. months in current relationship; BDI = depression; TAS = anger

Table 13

Correlation Matrix for Dating Violence Criterion Variables

N = 142

	CTRVA	CTRVIOL	CTRMEP	CTRPME
CTRVA	*	.53 <sup>b</sup>	.95 <sup>b</sup>	.94 <sup>b</sup>
CTRVIOL	*	*	.66 <sup>b</sup>	.71 <sup>b</sup>
CTRMEP	*	*	*	.88 <sup>b</sup>
CTRPME	*	*	*	*

<sup>a</sup> = significant at alpha level  $p < .05$ <sup>b</sup> = significant at alpha level  $p < .01$ 

Note:

CTRVA = total verbal aggression in the family of origin; CTRVIOL = total physical violence in the family of origin; CTRMEP = total violence from self to partner; CTRPME = total violence from partner to self

Appendix A

Are you...

**MALE?**

**18 YEARS OR OLDER?**

**IN A RELATIONSHIP WITH A  
WOMAN THAT HAS LASTED AT  
LEAST TWO MONTHS?**

If so, you can receive *two extra credit points!!*

All you have to do is to sign one of the sheets in this folder and attend a single session lasting less than two hours.

It's that easy!!

Questions? Call Allison at 231-8143.

## Appendix B

### Informed Consent Form

Predictors in Dating Relationships      Experiment # 95-264  
 Investigators: Allison C. Jeffrey and Ellie T. Sturgis

I. You are one of 300 men invited to participate in a study about college dating relationships. If you are at least 18 years of age and have been in a dating relationship with a female for at least three months prior to this date, you are eligible to participate in the study. This study is designed to compare aspects of your early relationships with close family members to aspects of your present dating relationship.

II. To accomplish the goals of the study you will be asked to complete a series of questionnaires as honestly as possible. The questionnaire session will last no longer than 2 hours.

III. There may be some risks from your participation in this study. You will be asked to recall events in your family or dating relationships that might be unpleasant. If you are uncomfortable answering these questions, you may discontinue participation in the study at any time. In this event, you will not lose credit for participation for discontinuing the experiment. If you continue to feel uncomfortable after the experimental session has ended, it is recommended that you contact the experimenter or any one of the resources listed below to discuss any questions in this survey that you found disturbing.

IV. It is hoped that this study will provide valuable information that will help to explain the origins of both healthy and unhealthy relationship practices. This information can then be used clinically for intervention regarding dysfunctional relationships. Students interested in the results of the study may contact the researcher or faculty advisor at the end of the academic year.

V. The results of this study will be strictly anonymous. The information you provide will not include your name; only a participant number will serve to identify you during analyses and any write-up of the research.

VI. Students enrolled in psychology courses accepting experimental credit will receive two extra credit points for participation in this study. The extra credit points will be added to their sum points for the course at the end of the semester. Students understand that Virginia Tech offers alternate methods of receiving extra credit, such as essay writing.

VII. You are free to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty.

VIII. This research project has been approved, as required, by the Institutional Review Board for Research Involving Human Subjects at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and by the Department of Psychology.

IX. I voluntarily agree to participate in this study. My responsibilities are to answer the questionnaires as honestly as possible and to contact the investigator or one of the community resources listed on the sheet given to me at the end of the session if I am bothered by the study in any way.

X. I have read and understand the Informed Consent and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent for participation in this project.

If I participate, I may withdraw at any time without penalty. I agree to abide by the rules of this project.

## Appendix C

Should I have any questions about this research or its conduct, I may contact:

Allison C. Jeffrey 1-8143

Investigator Phone

Ellie T. Sturgis, Ph.D. 1-5144

Faculty Advisor Phone

E. R. Stout 1-9359

Chair, IRB Phone  
Research Division

### Appendix D

This study is being conducted to explore the relationship between early family experiences and abuse in dating relationships of college males. We are investigating this topic by administering questionnaires to 300 college men. These questionnaires measure the quality of early relationships, present level of anger and depression, attributional style and the level of conflict in present relationships. Knowledge derived from this experiment will help mental health workers understand predictors of dating violence. This information may indicate points of early intervention (possibly during childhood) that could help reduce the incidence of dating violence in future generations. For this reason, we are grateful for your participation in this study. Again, the information that you provided in our questionnaires is anonymous, therefore it can not be linked to your name in any way. Furthermore, we realize that some of the questions asked in our survey may have been difficult for you to answer. When you leave this experimental session, if you are bothered by any of these questions, please contact the experimenter, faculty supervisor or any of the community resources listed below.

For questions about personal issues raised by questions in our survey, the following community resources may be helpful:

RAFT crisis hotline	382-1738	Mental health workers and volunteers offer phone counseling and referrals as a free service to the community.
University Counseling Center	231-6557	Staffed psychologists and supervised psychologists-in-training offer individual counseling to Tech students at no charge.
Psychological Services Center	231-6914	Supervised psychologists-in - training offer individual counseling to all members of the community on a sliding fee scale.

## Appendix E

## Demographics

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS AS BEST YOU CAN. RECORD YOUR ANSWERS ON THE OPSCAN SHEET PROVIDED.

1 & 2 Age (Mark the first digit of your age next to #1 and the second digit of your age next to #2. For example, if you are 21 years of age, you would mark “2” on line #1 and “1” on line #2.)

3 Marital Status

- 1 = single
- 2 = married
- 3 = divorced
- 3 = widowed

4 & 5 Estimate the number of months that you have been in your present romantic relationship. (Mark the first digit of the number next to #4 and the second digit of the number next to #5. For example: 2 months would be coded “02”; 4 years and 2 months would be coded “50”)

6 How many siblings (brothers/sisters) do you have?

- 1 = none
- 2 = 1 sibling
- 3 = 2 to 5 siblings
- 4 = 6 to 10 siblings
- 5 = more than 10 siblings

7 What is your birth order? (If you are the youngest, choose this answer, rather than a rank.)

- 1 = 1st born
- 2 = 2nd born
- 3 = 3rd born
- 4 = 4th born
- 5 = youngest
- 6 = other

8 What do you consider your religion?

- 1 = Catholic
- 2 = Jewish
- 3 = Protestant
- 4 = Other
- 5 = None

9 What do you consider your race?

- 1 = African American
- 2 = Asian
- 3 = Caucasian
- 4 = Hispanic
- 5 = Native American
- 6 = Other

10 Estimate your family of origin economic group.

- 1 = Lower
- 2 = Middle
- 3 = Upper

11 Would you describe your family home as:

- 1 = Urban (City)
- 2 = Suburban
- 3 = Rural (Country)

12 What was the highest level of education attained by your mother (or woman that you consider to be your mother-figure)?

- |  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 1 = Some grade school                                    | 6 = Some college            |
| 2 = Completed grade school                               | 7 = Completed college       |
| 3 = Some high school                                     | 8 = Some graduate work      |
| 4 = Completed high school                                | 9 = Completed graduate work |
| 5 = High school and some other training, but not college |                             |

13 Using the scale above, what was the highest level of education attained by your father (or father-figure)?

14 Is your biological father :

- 1 = living with your biological mother
- 2 = divorced or separated from her
- 3 = widowed
- 4 = living apart from your biological mother for some other reason
- 5 = deceased

15 Do (or did) you also have a stepfather?

- 1 = yes, but I did not live with him
- 2 = yes, and I lived with him before the age of 18
- 3 = no

16 Is your biological mother:

- 1 = living with your biological father
- 2 = divorced or separated from him
- 3 = widowed
- 4 = living apart from your biological father for some other reason
- 5 = deceased

17 Do (or did) you also have a stepmother?

- 1 = Yes, but I did not live with her
- 2 = Yes, and I lived with her before the age of 18
- 3 = No

18 Who would you say raised you as a child?

- |                           |                     |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 = biological parents    | 6 = grandparents    |
| 2 = mother and stepfather | 7 = aunt/uncle      |
| 3 = father and stepmother | 8 = other relatives |
| 4 = single mother         | 9 = non-relatives   |
| 5 = single father         |                     |

19 What year are you in college?

- |               |              |
|---------------|--------------|
| 1 = freshman  | 4 = senior   |
| 2 = sophomore | 5 = graduate |
| 3 = junior    |              |

20 Are you in the Corps of Cadets or otherwise affiliated with the military?

- 1 = yes
- 2 = no

21 Have you been convicted of a criminal offense other than a traffic violation?

- 1 = yes
- 2 = no

INSTRUCTIONS: Please try to vividly imagine yourself in the situations that follow. If such a situation happened to you, what would you feel was the cause of this event? While events may have many causes, we want you to pick only one-- the major cause if this event happened to you. WRITE THIS CAUSE IN THE APPROPRIATE BLANK ON THE SCRATCH SHEET PROVIDED.

Then we would like you to answer some questions about the cause that you provided and about the situation in general.

Use the scale below to code your answers.  
ALL ANSWERS SHOULD BE RECORDED ON THE OPSCAN PROVIDED.

<b>Totally due to other people or circumstances</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Totally due to me</b>	
<b>Will never again always be present</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Will present</b>
<b>Influences just this specific situation</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>Influences all situations in my life</b>	

- I*      *You have been looking for a job unsuccessfully for some time.  
On I your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 22      Is the cause of your unsuccessful job search due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 23      In the future, when looking for a job, will this cause again be present?
- 24      Is the cause something that just influences you when looking for a job, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- II*      *You give an important talk in front of a group and the audience reacts negatively.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 25      Is the cause of your unsuccessful talk due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 26      In the future, when giving a talk, will this cause again be present?
- 27      Is the cause something that just influences you when giving talks, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- III*      *A friend comes to you with a problem and you don't try to help.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 28      Is the cause of this situation due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 29      In the future, when a friend asks for help, will this cause again be present?

- 30 Is the cause something that just influences you when friends ask for help, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- IV You meet a friend who is hostile towards you.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 31 Is the cause of this situation due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 32 In the future, when interacting with friends, will this cause again be present?
- 33 Is the cause something that just influences your interactions with friends, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- V You can't get all the work done that others expect of you.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 34 Is the cause of your situation due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 35 In the future, when work demands are made of you, will this cause again be present?
- 36 Is the cause something that just influences you when work demands are made of you, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- VI You go out on a date and it goes badly.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 37 Is the cause of your unsuccessful date due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 38 During future dates, when work demands are made of you, will this cause again be present?
- 39 Is the cause something that just influences you on dates, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- VII You experience a break-up in a long-term, steady relationship.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 40 Is the cause of your unsuccessful relationship due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 41 In future steady relationships, will this cause again be present?
- 42 Is the cause something that just influences you in long-term romantic relationships, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- VIII You get into trouble with the school administration.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 43 Is the cause of your trouble due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 44 In the future, when interacting with school administrators, will this cause again be present?

45 Is the cause something that just influences your interactions with school administrators, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

*IX You transfer to a new school.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*

46 Is the cause of your transfer due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?

47 In the future, will this cause again be present?

48 Is the cause something that just influences you in school, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

*X You have a major change in your involvement in school activities.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*

49 Is the cause of your change in activities due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?

50 In the future, will this cause again be present?

51 Is the cause something that just influences your extracurricular activities, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

*XI You find yourself drinking more than you usually do.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*

52 Is the cause of your drinking due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?

53 In the future, will this cause again be present?

54 Is the cause something that just influences your drinking habits, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

*XII You have a major illness or injury.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*

55 Is the cause of your illness or injury due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?

56 In the future, will this cause again be present?

57 Is the cause something that just influences you in this situation, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

*XIII You have to take out a loan of less than \$10,000.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why you might find yourself in this situation.*

58 Is the cause of your needing a loan due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?

- 59 In the future, will this cause again be present?
- 60 Is the cause something that just influences you in financial situations, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- XIV You begin using drugs more than you usually do.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 61 Is the cause of your drug use due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 62 In the future, will this cause again be present?
- 63 Is the cause something that just influences your drug use, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- XV You change your major.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why you might find yourself in this situation.*
- 64 Is the cause of your change in major due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 65 In the future, will this cause again be present?
- 66 Is the cause something that just influences you in this situation, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- XVI You become engaged to be married.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why you would become engaged.*
- 67 Is the cause of your engagement due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 68 In the future, will this cause again be present?
- 69 Is the cause something that just influences you in this situation, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- XVII You are fired from your job.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 70 Is the cause of your being fired due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 71 In future employment settings, will this cause again be present?
- 72 Is the cause something that just influences you in employment settings, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- XVIII You have a major change in the amount of independence and responsibility.  
On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*

- 73 Is the cause of your change in responsibility due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 74 In the future, will this cause again be present?
- 75 Is the cause something that just influences you only in this situation, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- XIX *You father a pregnancy.*  
*On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 76 Is the cause of your situation due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 77 In the future, will this cause again be present?
- 78 Is the cause something that just influences you in this situation, or does it also influence other areas of your life?
- XX *You experience sexual difficulties.*  
*On your scratch sheet, write down one major reason why this might happen to you.*
- 79 Is the cause of your situation due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances?
- 80 In the future, will this cause again be present?
- 81 Is the cause something that just influences you in this situation, or does it also influence other areas of your life?

SCRATCH PAPER FOR QUESTIONS I TO XX

PARTICIPANT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

I Looking for a job unsuccessfully...

---

---

---

II Audience reacts negatively...

---

---

---

III You don't try to help...

---

---

---

IV A friend is hostile towards you...

---

---

---

V Can't get work done...

---

---

---

VI A date goes badly...

---

---

---

VII Break-up in relationship...

---

---

---

VIII Trouble with the school administration...

---

---

---

IX Transfer to a new school...

---

---

---

X Change in school activities...

---

---

---

XI Drinking more than usual...

---

---

---

XII Major illness or injury...

---

---

---

XIII Take out a loan...

---

---

---

XIV Using drugs more than usual...

---

---

---

XV Change major...

---

---

---

XVI Engaged to be married...

---

---

---

XVII Fired from your job...

---

---

---

XVIII Change in independence and responsibility...

---

---

---

XIX Father a pregnancy...

---

---

---

XX Sexual difficulties...

---

---

---

## Beck Depression Inventory

On this questionnaire are groups of statements. Please read each group of statements carefully. Then pick out the one statement in each group which best describes the way you have been feeling the PAST WEEK, INCLUDING TODAY! On your OPSCAN sheet, record the number beside the statement you picked. If several statements in the group seem to apply equally well, circle the statement with the highest number. **Please be sure to read all the statements in each group before making your choice.**

- 85     0     I do not feel sad.  
        1     I feel sad.  
        2     I am sad all the time and I can't snap out of it.  
        3     I am so sad or unhappy that I can't stand it.
- 86     0     I am not particularly discouraged about the future.  
        1     I feel discouraged about the future.  
        2     I feel I have nothing to look forward to.  
        3     I feel that the future is hopeless and that things can not improve.
- 87     0     I do not feel like a failure.  
        1     I feel I have failed more than the average person.  
        2     As I look back on my life, all I can see is a lot of failures.  
        3     I feel I am a complete failure as a person.
- 88     0     I get as much satisfaction out of things as I used to.  
        1     I don't enjoy things the way I used to.  
        2     I don't get real satisfaction out of anything anymore.  
        3     I am dissatisfied or bored with everything.
- 89     0     I don't feel particularly guilty.  
        1     I feel guilty a good part of the time.  
        2     I feel quite guilty most of the time.  
        3     I feel guilty all of the time.
- 90     0     I don't feel I am being punished.  
        1     I feel I may be punished.  
        2     I expect to be punished.  
        3     I feel I am being punished.
- 91     0     I don't feel disappointed in myself.  
        1     I am disappointed in myself.  
        2     I am disgusted with myself.  
        3     I hate myself.
- 92     0     I don't feel I am any worse than anyone else.  
        1     I am critical of myself for my weaknesses or my mistakes.  
        2     I blame myself all the time for my faults.  
        3     I blame myself for everything bad that happens.
- 93     0     I don't have any thoughts of killing myself.  
        1     I have thoughts of killing myself, but I would not carry them out.  
        2     I would like to kill myself.  
        3     I would kill myself if I had the chance.

## Beck Depression Inventory

- 94    0    I don't cry any more than usual.  
       1    I cry more now than I used to.  
       2    I cry all the time now.  
       3    I used to be able to cry, but now I can't cry even though I want to.
- 95    0    I am no more irritated now than I ever am.  
       1    I get annoyed or irritated more easily than I used to.  
       2    I feel irritated all the time now.  
       3    I don't get irritated at all by the things that used to irritate me.
- 96    0    I have not lost interest in other people.  
       1    I am less interested in other people than I used to be.  
       2    I have lost most of my interest in other people.  
       3    I have lost all of my interest in other people.
- 97    0    I make decisions about as well as I ever could.  
       1    I put off making decisions more than I used to.  
       2    I have greater difficulty in making decisions than before.  
       3    I can't make decisions at all anymore.
- 98    0    I don't feel I look any worse than I used to.  
       1    I am worried that I am looking old or unattractive.  
       2    I feel that there are permanent changes in my appearance that make me look unattractive.  
       3    I believe that I look ugly.
- 99    0    I can work about as well as before.  
       1    It takes an extra effort to get started at doing something.  
       2    I have to push myself very hard to do anything.  
       3    I can't do any work at all.
- 100    0    I can sleep as well as usual.  
       1    I don't sleep as well as I used to.  
       2    I wake up 1-2 hours earlier than usual and find it hard to get back to sleep.  
       3    I wake up several hours earlier than I used to and cannot go back to sleep.
- 101    0    I don't get more tired than usual.  
       1    I get tired more easily than I used to.  
       2    I get tired from doing almost anything.  
       3    I am too tired to do anything.
- 102    0    My appetite is no worse than usual.  
       1    My appetite is not as good as it used to be.  
       2    My appetite is much worse now.  
       3    I have no appetite at all anymore.
- 103    0    I haven't lost much weight, if any, lately.  
       1    I have lost more than 5 pounds. I am purposely trying to lose weight.  
       2    I have lost more than 10 pounds without trying.  
       3    I have lost more than 15 pounds without trying.

## Beck Depression Inventory

- |     |   |  |
|-----|---|--|
| 104 | 0 | I am no more worried about my health than usual.   |
|     | 1 | I am worried about physical problems such as aches and pains; or upset stomach; or constipation. |
|     | 2 | I am very worried about physical problems and it's hard to think of much else.                   |
|     | 3 | I am so worried about my physical problems that I cannot think about anything else.              |
| 105 | 0 | I have not noticed any recent change in my interest in sex.                                      |
|     | 1 | I am less interested in sex than I used to be.   |
|     | 2 | I am much less interested in sex now.  |
|     | 3 | I have lost interest in sex completely.  |

## State Trait Anger Scale (Trait only)

A number of statements that people have used to describe themselves are given below. Read the statements below and indicate how you generally feel by recording the appropriate number on your OPSCAN sheet. SKIP NUMBERS 106-109!!

**1 = Almost Never**

**2 = Sometimes**

**3 = Often**

**4 = Almost Always**

- 110. I have a fiery temper.
- 111. I am quick tempered.
- 112. I am a hotheaded person.
- 113. I get annoyed when I am singled out for correction.
- 114. It makes me furious when I am criticized in front of others.
- 115. I get angry when I am slowed down by others' mistakes.
- 116. I feel infuriated when I do a good job and get a poor evaluation.
- 117. I fly off the handle.
- 118. I feel annoyed when I am not given recognition for good work.
- 119. People who think they are always right irritate me.
- 120. When I get mad, I say nasty things.
- 121. I feel irritated.
- 122. I feel angry.
- 123. When I get frustrated, I feel like hitting someone.

Conflict Tactics Scale (Parent Version)

130. Who served in the role of “father” in you life? \_\_\_\_\_ (If more than one response applies, choose the person who you believe had the greatest influence upon your development.)

1. Biological Father
2. Step-Father
3. Adoptive Father
4. Legal Guardian
5. Other

131. Who served in the role of “mother” in your life? \_\_\_\_\_ (If more than one response applies, choose the person who you believe had the greatest influence upon your development.)

1. Biological Mother
2. Step-Mother
3. Adoptive Mother
4. Legal Guardian
5. Other

Instructions:

Record your responses to the following items on the OPSCAN sheet.

The following set of questions refers to conflicts which occurred between you and your father (QUESTION # 130) and you and your mother (QUESTION # 131 ) and how these conflicts were settled. Answer by recording one of the numbers from the scale below for the number of times your parent (s) did these things to you and for the number of times you did these things to your parent.

- 1 = Never**
- 2 = Once**
- 3 = Two or three times**
- 4 = Often, but less than once a month**
- 5 = About once a month**
- 6 = More than once a month**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| A. Discussed an issue calmly with him/her.            | 132. My father to me<br>133. Me to my father<br>134. My mother to me<br>135. Me to my mother |
| B. Got information to back up his/her side of things. | 136. My father to me<br>137. Me to my father<br>138. My mother to me<br>139. Me to my mother |
| C. Brought in someone else to help settle things.     | 140. My father to me<br>141. Me to my father<br>142. My mother to me<br>143. Me to my mother |
| D. Insulted or swore at him/her.                      | 144. My father to me<br>145. Me to my father<br>146. My mother to me                         |

- |   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| E. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue.        | 147. Me to my mother |
|   | 148. My father to me |
|   | 149. Me to my father |
|   | 150. My mother to me |
|   | 151. Me to my mother |
| F. Stomped out of the room or house or yard.        | 152. My father to me |
|   | 153. Me to my father |
|   | 154. My mother to me |
|   | 155. Me to my mother |
| G. Cried.   | 156. My father to me |
|   | 157. Me to my father |
|   | 158. My mother to me |
|   | 159. Me to my mother |
| H. Did or said something to spite him/her.          | 1. My father to me   |
|   | 2. Me to my father   |
|   | 3. My mother to me   |
|   | 4. Me to my mother   |
| I. Threatened to hit or throw something at him/her. | 5. My father to me   |
|   | 6. Me to my father   |
|   | 7. My mother to me   |
|   | 8. Me to my mother   |
| J. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.     | 9. My father to me   |
|   | 10. Me to my father  |
|   | 11. My mother to me  |
|   | 12. Me to my mother  |
| K. Threw something at him/her.                      | 13. My father to me  |
|   | 14. Me to my father  |
|   | 15. My mother to me  |
|   | 16. Me to my mother  |
| L. Pushed, grabbed or shoved him/her.               | 17. My father to me  |
|   | 18. Me to my father  |
|   | 19. My mother to me  |
|   | 20. Me to my mother  |
| M. Slapped or spanked him/her.                      | 21. My father to me  |
|   | 22. Me to my father  |
|   | 23. My mother to me  |
|   | 24. Me to my mother  |
| N. Kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist.          | 25. My father to me  |
|   | 26. Me to my father  |
|   | 27. My mother to me  |
|   | 28. Me to my mother  |
| O. Hit or tried to hit him/her with something.      | 29. My father to me  |
|   | 30. Me to my father  |

- |  |                     |
|--|---------------------|
|  | 31. My mother to me |
|  | 32. Me to my mother |
| P. Beat him/her up.                        | 33. My father to me |
|  | 34. Me to my father |
|  | 35. My mother to me |
|  | 36. Me to my mother |
| Q. Burned or scalded him/her.              | 37. My father to me |
|  | 38. Me to my father |
|  | 39. My mother to me |
|  | 40. Me to my mother |
| R. Threatened him/her with a knife or gun. | 41. My father to me |
|  | 42. Me to my father |
|  | 43. My mother to me |
|  | 44. Me to my mother |
| S. Used a knife or fired a gun.            | 45. My father to me |
|  | 46. Me to my father |
|  | 47. My mother to me |
|  | 48. Me to my mother |

## Bell Object Relations Reality Testing Inventory

**Answer the questions according to your most recent experience.**

If a statement tends to be true for you, blacken the circle on your OPSCAN for letter A.

If a statement tends to be false for you, blacken the circle on your OPSCAN for letter B.

SKIP NUMBERS 49-54!!

**0 = TRUE      1 = FALSE**

55. I have at least one stable and satisfying relationship.
56. Sometimes I think I have been possessed by the devil.
57. If someone dislikes me, I will always try harder to be nice to that person.
58. I would like to be a hermit forever.
59. I usually have trouble deciding whether something really happened or if it was a dream.
60. I may withdraw and not speak to anyone for weeks at a time.
61. Even if my perceptions are inaccurate, I am quickly aware of it and can correct myself easily.
62. I usually end up hurting those closest to me.
63. Drinking alcohol or smoking marijuana can so drastically affect my mind that I cannot be sure what is real.
64. I believe that people have little or no ability to control their sorrows.
65. My people treat me more like a child than an adult.
66. I experience hallucinations.
67. If someone whom I have known well goes away, I may miss that person.
68. I can deal with disagreements at home without disturbing family relationships.
69. I feel out of touch with reality for days at a time.
70. I am extremely sensitive to criticism.
71. Exercising power over other people is a secret pleasure of mine.
72. At times I will do almost anything to get my way.
73. I possess mystical powers.
74. When a person close to me is not giving me his/her full attention, I often feel hurt and rejected.
75. I am usually able to size up a new situation quickly.
76. If I become close with someone and he or she proves untrustworthy, I may hate myself for the way things turned out.

77. I almost never have reason to doubt the accuracy of my own perception of reality.
78. I know my own feelings.
79. It is hard for me to get close to anyone.
80. My sex life is satisfactory.
81. There is an organized plot against me.
82. I tend to be what others expect me to be.
83. No matter how bad a relationship will get, I will hold onto it.
84. I feel my thoughts are taken away from me by an external force.
85. I don't usually have strong opinions about things.
86. I have no influence on anyone around me.
87. I have the feeling that I am a robot, forced to make movements or say things without a will of my own.
88. People do not exist when I do not see them.
89. Often, I read things in other people's behavior that really aren't there.
90. I've been hurt a lot in life.
91. I have someone with whom I can share my innermost feelings and who shares such feelings with me.
92. I believe that I am being plotted against.
93. No matter how hard I try to avoid them, the same difficulties crop up in my most important relationships.
94. I am being followed.
95. I yearn to be completely "at one" with someone.
96. I am not sure what month or year it is.
97. I am usually able to say the right things.
98. In relationships, I am not satisfied unless I am with the other person all the time.
99. I experience strange feelings in various parts of my body that I cannot explain.
100. Being independent is the only way not to be hurt by others.
101. I am a very good judge of other people.

102. Relationships with people of the opposite sex always turn out the same way with me.
103. Others frequently try to humiliate me.
104. I can hear voices that other people cannot seem to hear.
105. I am rarely out of touch with my own feelings.
106. I generally rely on others to make my decisions for me.
107. It is common for me to be convinced that people, places, and things are familiar to me when I really don't know them.
108. I am usually sorry that I trusted someone.
109. When I am angry with someone close to me, I am able to talk it through.
110. My thoughts are being broadcast so that other people know what I am thinking.
111. People are often angry at me, whether they admit it or not.
112. Manipulating others is the best way to get what I want.
113. I often feel nervous when I am around members of the opposite sex.
114. At times I feel like my body is being changed into that of the opposite sex.
115. I often worry that I will be left out of things.
116. I feel that I have to please everyone or else they might reject me.
117. People who hardly know me are reading my thoughts whenever they want.
118. Sometimes I have dreams so vivid that, when I wake up, it seems like they really happened.
119. I shut myself up and don't see anyone for months at a time.
120. I am sensitive to possible rejection by important people in my life.
121. I am often the victim of the cruelty of other people.
122. Making friends is not a problem for me.
123. I believe that I am a condemned person.
124. I do not know how to meet or talk with members of the opposite sex.
125. When I cannot make someone close to me do what I want, I feel hurt or angry.
126. I hear voices that others do not hear, which keep up a running commentary on my behavior and thoughts.
127. It is my fate to lead a lonely life.

128. I am under the control of some force or power other than myself, which forces me to think things or have impulses that are not my own.
129. My mood affects how I see things.
130. People are never honest with each other.
131. I can always distinguish between reality and fantasy, even during the time I am going to sleep or waking.
132. I put a lot into relationships and get a lot back.
133. I have the feeling that the world is about to come to an end soon.
134. I feel shy about meeting or talking about members of the opposite sex.
135. The most important thing to me in a relationship is to exercise power over the other person.
136. I have a good sense of direction and virtually never lose my way.
137. I try to ignore all unpleasant events.
138. I experience anxious feelings that I cannot explain.
139. When I drink or use drugs, it seems as if those around me have it in for me.
140. I pay so much attention to my own feelings that I may ignore the feelings of others.
141. I frequently don't know where I am, even in my own neighborhood.
142. I have a hard time accepting the reality of tragic events in my life, like a death in the family.
143. I believe that a good mother should always please her children.
144. Sometimes I see only what I want to see.

Reciprocal Attachment Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS: The following questions will ask you to describe your relationship with one of your “attachment figures.” Please read the following definition of an attachment figure.

**An attachment figure is a person who is not a member of the family of origin, with whom there is usually a sexual relationship, and with whom there has been a special relationship for at least 3 months.**

Now, having read the above description, please answer the following questions, substituting the name of your attachment figure in the space provided. For each item use the following scale to record your answers on the OPSCAN sheet.

- |  |                          |   |   |   |                       |
|--|--------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------|
|  | 1                        | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5                     |
|  | <b>Strongly Disagree</b> |   |   |   | <b>Strongly Agree</b> |
- 
145. I feel that it is best not to depend on \_\_\_\_\_
  146. I put \_\_\_\_\_'s needs before my own
  147. My life is so full of problems that I have to depend a lot on \_\_\_\_\_
  148. I get frustrated when \_\_\_\_\_ is not around as much as I would like
  149. I usually discuss my problems and concerns with \_\_\_\_\_
  150. I can't get on with my work if \_\_\_\_\_ has a problem
  151. I rely on myself and not on \_\_\_\_\_ to solve my problems
  152. I get really angry at \_\_\_\_\_ because I think s/he could make more time for me
  153. I'm so used to doing things on my own that I don't ask \_\_\_\_\_ for help
  154. It makes me feel important to be able to do things for \_\_\_\_\_
  155. I wish that I could be a child again and be taken care of by \_\_\_\_\_
  156. I resent having to handle problems on my own because \_\_\_\_\_ is often unavailable
  157. It bothers me that I can't seem to get close to \_\_\_\_\_
  158. Taking care of \_\_\_\_\_ is not my mission in life
  159. I do not need \_\_\_\_\_ to take care of me
  160. I know better than to ever expect \_\_\_\_\_ to take my worries seriously
  1. I enjoy being close to \_\_\_\_\_
  2. I'm not the type to be a "martyr" for \_\_\_\_\_

3. I would be helpless without\_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_only seems to notice me when I am angry
5. I want to get close to \_\_\_\_\_, but I keep pulling back.
6. I don't sacrifice my own needs for the benefit of my attachment figure
7. I feel that the hardest thing to do is to stand on my own
8. I get annoyed at \_\_\_\_\_ because it seems that I have to demand support
9. It's easy for me to be affectionate with\_\_\_\_\_
10. I try to anticipate\_\_\_\_\_ 's needs
11. I often feel too dependent on\_\_\_\_\_
12. I'm furious that I don't get any comfort from\_\_\_\_\_
13. I feel that there is something wrong with me because I'm remote from\_\_\_\_\_
14. I expect \_\_\_\_\_ to take care of his/her own problems
15. I'm quite capable of organizing my own life
16. \_\_\_\_\_is always disappointing me
17. I wouldn't want \_\_\_\_\_ relying on me
18. I enjoy taking care of \_\_\_\_\_
19. I'm never certain about what I should do until I talk to \_\_\_\_\_
20. I wish there was less anger in my relationship with\_\_\_\_\_
21. I would turn away if \_\_\_\_\_ asked me for advice
22. I don't make a fuss over\_\_\_\_\_
23. If I make a decision, I always check it out with\_\_\_\_\_
24. I often feel angry with\_\_\_\_\_ without knowing why

Conflict Tactics Scale (Partner Version)

**INSTRUCTIONS: The term “partner” in this questionnaire refers to the person with whom you currently have a romantic relationship.** Answer the following questions by recording one of the numbers from the scale below for the number of times your partner did these things to you and for the number of times you did these things to your partner.

SKIP NUMBERS 25-29!!

- 1 = Never**
- 2 = Once**
- 3 = Two or three times**
- 4 = Often, but less than once a month**
- 5 = About once a month**
- 6 = More than once a month**

- |   |                      |
|---|----------------------|
| A. Discussed an issue calmly with him/her.            | 30. My partner to me |
|   | 31. Me to my partner |
| B. Got information to back up his/her side of things. | 32. My partner to me |
|   | 33. Me to my partner |
| C. Brought in someone else to help settle things.     | 34. My partner to me |
|   | 35. Me to my partner |
| D. Insulted or swore at him/her.                      | 36. My partner to me |
|   | 37. Me to my partner |
| E. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue.          | 38. My partner to me |
|   | 39. Me to my partner |
| F. Stomped out of the room or house or yard.          | 40. My partner to me |
|   | 41. Me to my partner |
| G. Cried.   | 42. My partner to me |
|   | 43. Me to my partner |
| H. Did or said something to spite him/her.            | 44. My partner to me |
|   | 45. Me to my partner |
| I. Threatened to hit or throw something at him/her.   | 46. My partner to me |
|   | 47. Me to my partner |
| J. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.       | 48. My partner to me |
|   | 49. Me to my partner |
| K. Threw something at him/her.                        | 50. My partner to me |
|   | 51. Me to my partner |
| L. Pushed, grabbed or shoved him/her.                 | 52. My partner to me |
|   | 53. Me to my partner |

## Conflict Tactics Scale (Partner Version)

- |  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
| M. Slapped or spanked him/her.                 | 54. My partner to me |
|  | 55. Me to my partner |
| N. Kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist.     | 56. My partner to me |
|  | 57. Me to my partner |
| O. Hit or tried to hit him/her with something. | 58. My partner to me |
|  | 59. Me to my partner |
| P. Beat him/her up.                            | 60. My partner to me |
|  | 61. Me to my partner |
| Q. Burned or scalded him/her.                  | 62. My partner to me |
|  | 63. Me to my partner |
| R. Threatened him/her with a knife or gun.     | 64. My partner to me |
|  | 65. Me to my partner |
| S. Used a knife or fired a gun.                | 66. My partner to me |
|  | 67. Me to my partner |

## Courtship Conflict Questionnaire

Please answer the questions below with respect to your current romantic relationship  
 Read the following statements describing things that you might have done to your dating partner.  
 Use the scale below to record your answers on the OPSCAN sheet.  
 SKIP NUMBERS 68-74!!

- 1 = NEVER**  
**2 = ONCE OR TWICE**  
**3 = THREE TO FIVE TIMES**  
**4 = SIX TO TEN TIMES**  
**5 = MORE THAN TEN TIMES**

75. Asked her for emotional support
76. Pulled her hair.
77. Ordered her around.
78. Acted jealous of her friends.
79. Treated her angrily or roughly during sex.
80. Listened attentively to her.
81. Tried to choke or did choke her.
82. Insulted her in front of others.
83. Lent her money.
84. Threatened to leave her over sex.
85. Complained about the way she did household tasks.
86. Withheld affection to get your way.
87. Acted out of control to frighten her.
88. Broke things in anger.
89. Pushed her further than she wanted to go sexually.
90. Gave her good advice.
91. Cursed or swore at her.
92. Would not let her leave the house/apartment/dorm room.
93. Insisted on having sex with her without using birth control.
94. Blamed her for provoking you.
95. Made her feel guilty.

## Courtship Conflict Questionnaire

- 1 = NEVER**  
**2 = ONCE OR TWICE**  
**3 = THREE TO FIVE TIMES**  
**4 = SIX TO TEN TIMES**  
**5 = MORE THAN TEN TIMES**

96. Blamed her for causing your violent behavior.
97. Was insensitive to her feelings.
98. Made sacrifices for her.
99. Insisted in engaging in sexual activities she found distasteful.
100. Pinned her so she couldn't move.
101. Accused her of being unfaithful.
102. Expressed affection towards her.
103. Broke down a door.
104. Satisfied her sexually.
105. Forced her to have sexual intercourse.
106. Did nice things for her.
107. Yelled or screamed at her.
108. Tried to control her having money.
109. Told her that she was crazy.
110. Supported her even though she disagreed with you.
112. Burned or scalded her.
113. Refused to stop sexual activities when she wanted to stop.
114. Made her feel emotionally close to you.
115. Treated her like she was stupid.
116. Put down her appearance.
117. Was there for her when she was upset.
118. Threatened to have an affair with someone else.
119. Threatened to hit her.

## Courtship Conflict Questionnaire

- 1 = NEVER**  
**2 = ONCE OR TWICE**  
**3 = THREE TO FIVE TIMES**  
**4 = SIX TO TEN TIMES**  
**5 = MORE THAN TEN TIMES**

120. Embarrassed her sexually in public.
121. Told her that you loved her.
122. Destroyed her personal belongings.
123. Apologized to her for making a mistake.
124. Treated her like a servant.
125. Criticized her sexual performance.
126. Threatened to leave the relationship.
127. Forcefully attempted to have sexual intercourse.
128. Told her that you needed her.
129. Tried to prevent her from socializing with her friends.
130. Threatened or harmed a pet.
131. Followed or stalked her.
132. Threatened to harm yourself.
133. Asked her not to leave you.
134. Blamed her for your problems.
135. Sexually grabbed or fondled her body against her will.
136. Tried to prevent her from seeing her family.
137. Acted suspicious about her relationships with others.

**BEFORE GIVING YOUR MATERIALS TO THE EXPERIMENTER, PLEASE MAKE SURE YOU HAVE RECORDED YOUR PARTICIPANT NUMBER AND THE WORKBOOK NUMBER ON EACH OPSCAN!!!**

**ON YOUR WAY OUT, THE EXPERIMENTER WILL GIVE YOU AN INFORMATIONAL SHEET REGARDING THE NATURE OF THIS STUDY. FOR THE INTEREST OF THE STUDY, PLEASE KEEP THIS INFORMATION STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.**

**THE INFORMATIONAL SHEET ALSO CONTAINS A LISTING OF PHONE NUMBERS TO CALL IF YOU FIND THAT YOU HAVE QUESTIONS ABOUT ANY PERSONAL MATTERS RAISED**

BY QUESTIONS IN THE WORKBOOKS. PLEASE FEEL FREE TO CONTACT ANY RESOURCE ON THIS LIST.

THANK YOU SO MUCH FOR YOUR SINCERE PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY.

GOOD LUCK IN SCHOOL!

**THE END!!**

## Curriculum Vitae

**Allison Clifford Jeffrey**

### Addresses:

<b>Home:</b>	1500 J Houndschase Ln. Blacksburg, VA 24060 (540) 951-2536	<b>School:</b>	Department of Psychology Derring Hall-5th Floor VPI & SU Blacksburg, VA 24061 (540) 231-8143 (leave message)
--------------	--	----------------	---

### Personal Data:

Date of Birth:	September 22, 1972
Citizenship:	United States
Marital Status:	Single
Social Security:	043-62-7254

### Education:

**Masters of Science Candidate, Clinical Psychology      1994-1996**  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Thesis Title:	Predictors of Male Violence in Dating Relationships	
Defended:	December 16, 1996	
Major Professor:	Ellie T. Sturgis, Ph.D.	

Graduate Student Representative to the Psychology Department	1995-1996
Clinical Psychology Student Representative	1995-1996

**Bachelor of Arts, Psychology and Music      June 1994**  
Furman University, Greenville, SC      1990 - 1994

Honors:	Furman Honors Scholarship	1990 - 1994
	Psi Chi	1993 - 1994
	Allport Award for Excellence in Psychology	1994
	Timmons Music Scholarship	1990 - 1994
	Hartness String Quartet Scholarship	1990 - 1994

**Graduate Course Work:**

Assessment of Human Intelligence	Fall 1994
Statistics I	Fall 1994
Research Methods	Fall 1994
Graduate Teaching Assistant Training Program	Fall 1994
Behavioral Assessment and Treatment	Spring 1995
Statistics II	Spring 1995
Personality Processes	Spring 1995
Personality Assessment	Fall 1995
Social Psychology	Fall 1995
Biological Bases of Psychology	Spring 1996
Child Psychopathology	Spring 1996
Interventions in Psychological Systems	Spring 1996
Adult Psychopathology	Fall 1996
Ethics	Fall 1996

**Other Educational Experience:****January 24 - March 23, 1995. Women's Resource Center Training Program****(45 hours)**

Presented by Mary Forti, MSW.

**October 9, 1995. Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (3.0 hours)**

Sponsored by HPR - III Training Consortium Institute, VPI &amp; SU, Blacksburg, VA.

**October 10, 1995. The Therapeutic Use of the Self (6.0 hours)**

Sponsored by HPR - III Training Consortium Institute, VPI &amp; SU, Blacksburg, VA.

**November 10, 1995: The Psychology of Domestic Violence (5.5 hours)**

Presented by Lenore Walker, Ph.D. Sponsored by Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA

**November 17, 1995. Integrated Treatment of Eating Disorders: Cognitive Behavioral Approaches to the Treatment of Anorexia Nervosa and Bulimia Nervosa (3 hours).**

Presented by Wayne A. Bowers, Arnold Anderson, and K. Kay Evans, University

of Iowa at the Association for Advancement of Behavior Therapy 29th Annual Convention, Washington, D.C.

**November, 18, 1995. Treatment of Psychological and Physical Abuse in**

**Marriage (3 hours).**

Presented by K. Daniel O'Leary, Peter Neidig, Ileana Arias, and Alan Rosenbaum at the Association for Advancement of Behavior Therapy 29th Annual Convention, Washington, D.C.

**Supervised Clinical Experience:**

**Clinical Practicum, Master's Level August 1994 - May 1996**  
**(10 - 15 hours/week: Approximately 800 hours)**

As part of the requirement of the clinical program, graduate students conduct a variety of individual, family, couples, and group therapies at the Psychological Services Center. Sessions are viewed with ongoing supervision by a licensed clinical psychologist. Clinical responsibilities involve a variety of clinical cases, including both children and adults. My major emphasis has been on adults with problems regarding dating, marriage, or previous child abuse, as well as couples therapy and recovery from dissolution of relationships. I have carried both short and long-term (> 6 months) cases.

Supervisors: Thomas H. Ollendick, Ph.D.; Kerri W. Augusto, Ph.D.; Richard M. Eisler, Ph.D.; and Cynthia P. Lease, Ph.D.

**Summer Externship at the National Crime Victim Research and  
 Treatment Center, Medical University of South Carolina**  
**(40 hours/week: Approximately 230 hours) May 20 - June 27, 1996**

Observed individual therapy to victims of crime and other traumatic experiences. Conducted psychological assessment and initial screenings of victims. Assisted in psychological assessment of perpetrators of crime. Acted as cotherapist to the inpatient cognitive behavioral therapy group at the Institute of Psychiatry. Assisted in legal evaluation of crime victims. Assisted and observed evaluation of physical and sexual abuse of children. Conducted follow-up interviews of victims of sexual assault and caregivers of children who had previously been physically or sexually abused. Attended case conferences, NCVC and community case staffing meetings, psychiatric seminars and grand rounds. Supervised by a licensed clinical psychologist.

**Group Therapist: Abused Women**  
**(12 hours)**

**Fall 1995**

Conducted short term (8 session) group therapy with small group (6 people) of women currently in or recovering from physically and emotionally abusive marriages or dating relationships.

Supervisor: Richard M. Eisler, Ph.D.

**Women's Shelter Volunteer**

**1995 - 1996**

**(> 100 hours)**

I volunteer weekly at the Women's Resource Center shelter for abused women.

On a regular basis, I:

- (a) answer a crisis line, offering empathy, problem-solving and suicide prevention to a variety of anonymous callers;
- (b) manage the women's shelter during evenings, weekend afternoons, and overnight shifts, providing support and crisis counseling to the shelter residents;
- (c) facilitate the use of community resources by victims of domestic violence (e.g., help women report child abuse to social services, file assault reports with the police, etc.).

Supervisor: Mary Forti, MSW.

**Assessment Experience:**

<u>Assessment Instrument</u>	<u>Number of Supervised Administrations</u>
Achenbach Child Behavior Checklist	5
Beck Depression Inventory	13
Beck Hopelessness Scale	4
Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	5
Child Depression Inventory	3
Child Sentence Completion Inventory	1
Conner's Continuous Performance Task	4
Developmental Test of Visual Motor Integration	4
Locke-Wallace Marital Inventory	1
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (2nd ed.)	3
Paced Auditory Serial Addition Test	2
Posner Visual Spatial Orienting Task	1
Role Construct Repertory Test	1
Rorschach, Exner's Comp. System	2
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale	1
State Trait Anxiety Inventory	7
Structured Clinical Interview - I for DSM	1
Structured Clinical Interview - II for DSM	1
Test Anxiety Inventory	1
Thematic Apperception Test	2
Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale, Revised	5
Wechsler Individual Achievement Test	4
Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (3rd ed.)	4
Wechsler Memory Scale- Revised (Verbal Sections)	1
Wender Utah Rating Scale	2
Woodcock-Johnson Achievement Battery	5

**Research Experience:**

**Master's Thesis: Predictors of Male Violence in  
Dating Relationships**

**1994-1996**

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

The study is designed to explore the extent to which interrelationships among several person variables predict male dating violence. Variables considered are attachment style, attributional style, depression, anger, and personal history of abuse. Subjects are approximately one hundred fifty male college students who are at least 18 years of age and have been in a heterosexual relationship for at least two months duration. It is hoped that results of this study will indicate points at which intervention/education might be the most effective in reducing the incidence of dating violence among college students.

**Research Assistant:**

**1993-1994**

Furman University

1. Correlations between fragile self-esteem and likelihood for developing coronary heart disease were measured. Subjects were asked to self-administer the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale six times daily, as signaled by wristwatches on variable alarm schedules, for a period of five days. Fragility scores were computed as indicated by variance of the self-esteem scores. Fragility scores were then correlated with cardiovascular reactivity as measured by pulse rate and systolic and diastolic blood pressure during several tasks. Findings were mixed, suggesting interactions not accounted for by this procedure.
  
2. Mood state was measured several times daily for four days, according to how subjects felt at the moment. The averages of these scores were computed and compared to single administrations assessments asking the subjects to report how they felt in general over the preceding four days. Results indicated that single administration assessments are poor indications of actual mood state over a specified period of time. Replication of this study also showed that repeated estimations of mood scores and self-esteem decline with time, suggesting that pre- and post-intervention effects may not always be due to an intervention, rather to repeated exposure to psychological inventories. Paper presented at the National Conference for Undergraduate Research, Kalamazoo, MI (1994).
  
3. The relation between child caretakers' parenting style and level of need for external evaluation of their children was assessed. Results indicated that several interactions are present among aspects of parenting styles and the child's familial and external relationships. However, in general a modest correlation exists, such that the more dysfunctional the parenting behaviors (e.g., lack of empathy, elevated physical punishment, and role reversal), the greater the child's need for external validation. Poster presented at the Southeastern Psychological Association Conference, New Orleans, LA (1994).

**Teaching Experience:**

**Teaching Assistant**

Intellectual Assessment

**Fall 1996**

Department of Psychology  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Position entails demonstrating the administration and scoring of intellectual, achievement and visual motor integration tests to first-year clinical graduate students; observing student administrations; assisting students in writing integrated assessment reports; grading and proofing those reports; and holding office hours to meet with students in the course.

**Teaching Assistant** **1994-1996**

Department of Psychology  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Led group (35 students) discussion sections for Introductory Psychology course. Duties also included holding office hours to meet with students, proctoring exams, and grading essays and quizzes.

**Teaching Assistant** **1992-1994**

Department of Psychology  
Furman University  
Supervised by Charles L. Brewer, Ph.D.

Tutored students in Introductory Psychology and Experimental Psychology. Graded tests and research papers. Managed the animal laboratory. Assisted Dr. Brewer in editing page proofs for the journal, Teaching of Psychology.

**Professional Affiliations:**

Student affiliate, Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy

**Publications:**

Rasmussen, P. R., Jeffrey, A. C., Willingham, J. T., & Glover, T. L. (1994). Implications of the true score model in assessment of mood state. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, *9*, 107-118.

Rasmussen, P. R., & Jeffrey, A. C. (1995). Assessment of mood states: Biases in single-administration assessments. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, *17*, 177-184.

**Presentations in graduate school:**

Poster, "Predictors in Dating Relationships, presented at the Association for Advancement of Behavior Therapy 30th Annual Convention, New York City.

**Present Clinical and Research Interests:**

1. Assessment and treatment of victims of trauma that is related to physical and emotional abuse during adulthood or childhood.
2. Treatment of PTSD that is not related to physical/sexual abuse.
3. Treatment of dysfunctional or distressed families.
4. Treatment of male perpetrators and female victims of dating/marital violence (both individual and couple).
5. Development of educational procedures designed to prevent patterns of dating violence in college students.

**References:**

Ellie T. Sturgis, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Psychology  
Associate Dean of College of Arts and Sciences  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Blacksburg, VA 24061  
(540) 231-5144

Richard M. Eisler, Ph.D.  
Professor of Psychology  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Blacksburg, VA 24061  
(540) 231-7001

Cynthia A. Lease, Ph.D.  
Assistant Professor of Psychology  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Blacksburg, VA 24061  
(540) 231- 2615