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(ABSTRACT)

Serious dating relationships of college freshmen (N = 284) were investigated, comparing relationship dimensions, negotiation styles and coping strategies between violent and nonviolent students and between male and female respondents. Multiple analysis of variance techniques revealed significant effects for gender and violence on the dependent research variables. Findings indicate that men report more conflict in their dating relationships than women. When negotiating, women use more Ultimate Effort strategies. With respect to coping, women are more likely to use Social Support while men are more likely to rely on Withdrawal techniques. Those in violent dating relationships report greater conflict and ambivalence. In addition, violent dating partners use more Direct Appeal, Negative Affect, Indirect Appeal and Ultimate Effort negotiation styles and more frequently rely on Anger/Blaming and Withdrawal coping strategies.
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Introduction

Numerous recent articles have called attention to violence between dating partners (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Deal & Wampler, 1986; Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Makepeace, 1981; Marshall & Rose, 1987; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984). Most studies have been descriptive, reporting frequencies and attempting to discern personality, demographic and social context differences between those in violent and those in violence-free relationships. With few exceptions, these inquiries have focused on individual characteristics and have ignored defining or describing aspects of the relationship itself. Scholars have called for future research to move beyond frequency reports and to look more at the relationship dynamics of violent partnerships (Deal & Wampler, 1988; Sigelman et al., 1984).

This research represents a shift from the study of 'violent individuals' to the study of 'violent relationships.' It extends prior research by investigating relationship dimensions, negotiation styles and coping strategies, and making comparisons by gender and between violent and nonviolent groups. Study of the four relationship dimensions of love, maintenance, conflict and ambivalence provides information on how respondents view their ongoing relationships (Braiker & Kelley, 1979).
Identification of negotiation styles reveals strategies used to influence partner's behavior, while investigation of coping responses allows the description of individual reactions to an upsetting disagreement with the dating partner (Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Taken together, the study of relationship dimensions, negotiation and coping provides knowledge of the behaviors, cognitions and feelings surrounding conflict and/or violence in dating relationships. Specifically, the following research questions were addressed by this study:

1. Are there differences between violent and nonviolent dating partners on measures of relationship dimensions (love, maintenance, conflict and ambivalence), negotiation styles and coping strategies?

2. Do differences exist between male and female respondents on these same variables simultaneously?
Review of Literature

Relationship Dimensions

Braiker and Kelley (1979) were among the first to investigate dimensions of premarital relationships. In a qualitative study, couples were asked to retrospectively describe the important elements of their dating relationships. From these descriptions, scale items were developed and tested. Subsequent factor analysis revealed four clusters of items: love (amount of interdependence, feelings of belonging and attachment), conflict (frequency of arguments and negative feelings), maintenance (amount of self-disclosure, communication and problem-solving), and ambivalence (feelings of uncertainty and confusion about continuing the relationship). Braiker and Kelley concluded that these four dimensions constitute major components of premarital relationships and are a good source of information about ongoing partnerships. Each of these dimensions will be reviewed individually.

Love. Cate and Huston (1980) found that men report more love at an earlier stage in the dating relationship, move more quickly from the "dating" to the "couple" stage, and perceive a greater likelihood of marriage throughout the dating period. No gender differences were found at the more serious stages of dating relationships. Women, however, appear to be more cautious, both in falling in
love, and in deciding to marry, despite being more likely to report the emotional and euphoric symptoms of love (Dion & Dion, 1973, 1975). Rubin, Peplau, and Hill (1981), report that men and women in dating relationships appear to love their partners equally.

Only one reviewed unpublished study has compared violent and nonviolent groups on love, defined and measured in the same way as the Cate and Huston study. Koval and Lloyd (1986), found that individuals in violent dating relationships report higher love scores than two comparison groups: individuals in nonviolent relationships and individuals who have experienced violence but have left the relationship. No differences were found by gender.

**Maintenance.** Braiker and Kelley (1979) defined maintenance as including self-disclosure and communication. Clark and Reis (1988) suggest that research in the area of gender differences in self-disclosure yields inconsistent and difficult to reconcile findings. They reported that generally women are more likely to self-disclose than men, while some studies report the opposite (Derlega, et al., 1985). In a study of college dating couples, Rubin, Hill, Peplau, and Dunkel-Schetter (1980) found a high proportion of both men and women disclosed intimate thoughts and feelings to their partners. When there was unequal disclosure, it was the male who was considered less
revealing. They suggest that younger more educated couples may be moving toward more equal levels of self-disclosure.

Peplau and Gordon (1985) suggest that a norm of reciprocity encourages similar levels of disclosure between intimates. However, Kelley et al. (1983) reported a greater preference on the part of women to disclose, and that even when levels are the same, that the content of the self-disclosure is likely to differ by gender. Differences in instrumentation, length and type of relationship, and research setting (laboratory versus natural environment) make comparisons across studies and subsequent generalizations difficult.

Research has found consistent differences by gender in use of verbal and nonverbal communication (Deaux, 1978; Henley, 1977). For instance, men do more interrupting, claim greater personal space, initiate more physical contact, and are poorer at decoding nonverbal messages. Fishman (1978) in studying spontaneous conversations among couples, found clear sex differences in verbal communication. Women asked three times as many questions and were more supportive of male speakers than vice versa. In addition, women were more likely to use "mm's" and "oh's" to indicate interest and attentiveness. Fishman concluded that there is an unequal "division of labor" in communication, with women doing more of the work than men.
Burke and Weir (1977) found that women are more likely to tell their husbands when they were feeling stressed, and to try to explain their feelings. Men on the other hand, are more likely to keep it to themselves. Peplau and Gordon (1985) suggest that in general, men prefer lower levels of verbal communication, and that women are the "facilitators" of communication in close relationships. They offer two explanations of these findings. One is that women have greater communication skills and are more expressive than men. A second is that communication differences reflect women's lower relationship status: Men are silent because they wish to maintain the status quo; women are communicative because they have more to gain by being so.

These findings seem to indicate that women would score higher on a measure of maintenance behaviors than would men. In one of the few direct tests of this hypothesis, Cate and Huston (1980) found that men display significantly more maintenance behaviors early in the dating relationship. However, at the time of marriage, women score higher than men on this measure. They suggested that as couples move toward marriage, maintenance behaviors increase, and become more closely tied with gender roles in the relationship. No gender differences are reported for the stage of serious dating, upon which the current study
focuses. Finally, Koval and Lloyd (1986) found that violent dating partners scored higher on maintenance than did a nonviolent comparison group.

Conflict. Raush, Barry, and Hertel (1974) reported that husbands, in role-playing conflict situations in a laboratory setting, more often act to resolve conflict and to restore harmony. Wives on the other hand become cold, rejecting, and use guilt and appeals to fairness. In contrast, Kelley, Cunningham, Grisham, Lefebvre, Sink, and Yablon (1978) reported that men are conflict-avoidant and find dealing with emotions to be uncomfortable and upsetting. Women, on the other hand, are conflict-confrontive and prefer that problems and associated feelings be discussed openly. These authors suggest that Raush and his associates examined how men react when conflict cannot be avoided.

Lloyd (1987) also found that men and women in premarital relationships differ in their perceptions of conflict. For women, the number of conflicts and their resolution had the greatest impact on relationship and communication quality. For men, it was the number and the stability of conflict, especially partner-initiated conflict that had the greatest effect on quality. Kelley et al. (1978) attributed these different approaches to conflict to the different socialization experiences of men and women. Peplau and Gordon (1985), on the other hand,
offered the equally plausible explanation that the findings may reflect the balance of power in the relationship. Men have more to gain (or at least maintain) by avoiding conflict. Conversely, women have more to gain by confronting issues and seeking resolution. Taken together, these studies indicate that men and women differ both in their experience of and approach to conflict.

In a study of premarital relationships that dissolved, Lloyd and Cate (1985) found that women report significantly greater conflict than men. Both groups, however, reported increasingly higher levels of conflict as the relationship moved toward dissolution. Kelly, Huston, and Cate (1985) found that premarital conflict is a precursor of marital conflict. Although not related to feelings of love prior to marriage, conflict was directly related to the lower levels of satisfaction reported by these couples two and a half years later. Consistent with Braiker and Kelley (1978), they suggested that the role of conflict changes throughout the course of relationships.

Koval and Lloyd (1986) compared three dating groups: those in nonviolent relationships, those currently in a violent relationship, and those who had experienced violence but were no longer in that relationship. Individuals who had experienced violence and were still dating that partner, in contrast to the other two groups,
reported a greater level of conflict in their relationships. There were no differences by gender. Based on these studies, it seems likely that there will be a higher level of conflict in violent dating relationships.

**Ambivalence.** Ambivalence measures feelings of confusion and uncertainty about continuing the relationship. Braiker and Kelley (1979) found that ambivalence decreases as dating couples move toward marriage. They concluded that increasing commitment results in reduced levels of ambivalence; or conversely, that a reduction in ambivalence may precede or precipitate a formalized commitment to the relationship. It seems likely that high ambivalence might precede relationship dissolution and indeed, several studies indicate that this is the case. Lloyd and Cate (1985) reported that ambivalence increases as individuals moved from casual dating through more committed stages and finally toward dissolution. In addition, they found that there is a positive relationship between conflict and ambivalence for men at the 'uncertain' phase of the relationship.

Duck (1982) reports that the first stage of dissolution involves a reappraisal of the partner's performance. Implicit in his discussion of the process is the idea of growing ambivalence, or uncertainty about continuing the relationship. This idea of increasing
ambivalence is implicit throughout much of the literature on relationship dissolution.

To summarize, the reviewed literature suggests that men and women differ in their approaches and experiences of intimate dating relationships. Studies also suggest that relationship parameters may differ between violent and nonviolent groups. Study of love, maintenance, conflict and ambivalence will add to the literature and will illuminate relationship differences between violent and nonviolent dating partners. In addition, comparison of differences between male and female respondents will further clarify gender differences on these dimensions.

**Negotiation Styles**

Negotiation is an inherent part of all intimate relationships (Braiker & Kelley, 1979; Lloyd, 1987). Negotiation style refers to a specific set of strategies used to influence shifts or changes in partner behavior in the presence of implicit or explicit opposition (Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980). Direct strategies have to do with overtly asking, stating, telling or discussing. Indirect strategies include negative and positive affect (e.g., being especially sweet or crying), hinting, or withdrawal (Falbo & Peplau, 1980).

Falbo and Peplau (1980) found that men are more likely to use direct strategies, and that in general, people who
perceive themselves as having more power in a relationship, are more likely to use direct strategies. That is, they negotiate from a position of power. They expect to get what they are requesting. Conversely, indirect strategies are more typical of women (Falbo, 1982), and of those who expect non-compliance with their requests. Direct strategies are seen as positive, while indirect strategies are considered evasive and negative. Use of direct strategies is associated with fewer relationship conflicts for both women and men (Lloyd, 1987). In addition, among women, greater reliance on direct strategies is related to a higher rate of conflict resolution (Lloyd, 1987).

In a study of negotiation among violent dating partners, Schladale (1987) found that "Negative Affect," one type of indirect strategy, discriminated between violent and nonviolent college students. However the study did not include an analysis by gender.

Researchers (Deutsch, 1973; Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980) report that coercive negotiation styles may be used when other, more positive strategies fail to achieve desired changes in partner attitudes or behavior. These coercive strategies range from name-calling, pouting, and withdrawing, to use of threats and ultimatums. No gender differences are reported. Conceptually, these tactics are similar to indirect strategies. According to Scanzoni and
Polonko (1980), when coercive strategies also fail, violence may erupt. Further, the use of physical negotiation strategies by one partner is likely to stimulate reciprocal violence on the part of the other. Given this information, it is proposed that violent dating partners will use more indirect negotiation strategies than nonviolent partners. Further study is needed to determine the presence and form of gender differences.

**Coping Strategies**

Coping refers to cognitive, affective and behavioral responses to demanding life situations (Folkman, 1984). It is viewed as a process, rather than a trait, whereby an individual constantly reasseesses the environment in order to respond to it effectively. In essence, coping strategies are all the responses that dating partners use in dealing with relationship conflict.

Folkman and Lazarus (1980), distinguish between "problem-focused" coping, which is directed at managing or altering the problem, and "emotion-focused" coping, which is directed at regulating emotional response to the problem. Typically emotion-focused coping is used when an individual makes an appraisal that nothing can be done to change the problem situation. Conversely, problem-focused strategies are employed when the situation is perceived to be amenable to change. If violence is somehow interpreted
as a form of love, as Henton et al. (1983) suggest, there may be fewer attempts to change the violent interactions (i.e., less problem-focused coping) and more attempts to deal with the anxiety that results (i.e., emotion-focused coping). Examining problem and emotion-focused strategies in violent and nonviolent respondents will provide important information on whether dating partners view their relationship conflicts as amenable to change.

Several studies show that battered women use fewer problem-solving responses and more avoidance strategies (e.g., withdrawal, refusing to talk to others, etc.) in response to episodes of violence (Claerhout, Elder, & Janes, 1982; Mitchell & Hodson, 1986; Walker, 1979). Similarly, Finn (1985) found that battered women scored above the norm in their use of passive appraisal (trying to accept the problem, minimizing emotional reaction to the problem). Schladale (1987) reported that the use of positive social support, a problem-focused response, discriminated between college students in nonviolent as opposed to violent dating relationships.

A number of studies have suggested gender differences in the use of coping strategies. Billings and Moos (1981) found no gender differences in the use of problem-focused coping, while Folkman and Lazarus (1984) found that men were more likely to use problem-focused strategies in
particular situations, such as at work. With respect to emotion-focused coping, Billing and Moos (1981) reported that women scored higher than men. In contrast, Folkman and Lazarus (1984) found no significant differences by gender. Miller and Kirsch (1987) suggest that men are more likely to use problem-focused coping, while women may rely more on emotion-focused coping. The evidence is not clear-cut however, and they conclude that further study is warranted.
Methodology

Sample and Procedure

Data for this study were collected as part of the Adolescent Dating Project conducted on the campus of a mid-Atlantic university in 1987 (Schladale & Bird, forthcoming). Questionnaires were mailed to a representative sample selected randomly from freshmen students living on campus. The sample was constructed in this way in order to reduce age variation, limit the study to adolescent dating relationships, and control for students who might be in cohabiting relationships.

The survey packet consisted of a cover letter explaining the study objectives, a 12-page survey booklet, and a stamped pre-addressed return envelope. A post card and two follow-up letters encouraging and thanking participants for their response, were mailed at two week intervals after the initial mailing following the methods of Dillman (1978).

A response rate of 67% was obtained (N=284). Fifty-six percent (156) of the sample was female and 44% (124) was male. Racially, 94% was white, 2% was black, and 4% reported other backgrounds. Most of the participants (96%) were 18 and 19 years old. Family income was less than $30,000 for 13% of the sample; $30,000 - $80,000 for 70%; and more than $80,000 for 11%.
**Measurement**

The violence subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) with suggested modifications (Walker, 1984) was used to measure violence. Participants responded to 10 items ranging from "pushed, shoved, or grabbed" to "used a lethal weapon" on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (Threatened Only) to 5 (Frequently Done). Studies of scale reliability and validity are reported elsewhere (Bullcroft & Straus, 1975; Steinmetz, 1977; Straus, 1979).

Coping strategy items were from the Ways of Coping Inventory developed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). Respondents were asked to indicate how often each strategy was used after an argument with the dating partner, when nothing was really settled and they were very upset. The seven-point Likert-type response scale ranged from 1 (Never) to 7 (Always). Reliability was reported at .80 using Chronbach's alpha (Folkman & Lazarus, 1980).

Negotiation styles were assessed using the Power Strategies Scale (Falbo & Peplau, 1980) supplemented with items suggested by Scanzoni and Polonko (1980). Respondents were asked to indicate how often each strategy was used when they felt strongly about a situation and were compelled to influence their partner to do things their way. Responses were reported on a seven-point Likert-type scale which ranged from 1 (Never) to 7 (Always).
The relationship factors of love, maintenance, conflict and ambivalence were assessed using the Relationship Dimensions Scale developed by Braiker and Kelley (1979). Participants were asked how often they experienced the thoughts, feelings, or actions described in each item. Responses were reported on a five-point Likert-type scale and ranged from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very Often). The dimension of love measures feelings of closeness, belonging, and attachment and is assessed by 10 items. A five-item maintenance subscale assesses communication, self-disclosure, and problem solving. Conflict is measured by five items and reflects overt behavioral conflict as well as the communication of negative affect. Finally, the five-item subscale for ambivalence taps feelings of confusion, concern over loss of independence, and uncertainty about continuing the relationship. The overall scale was developed as the result of an earlier qualitative study and subscales were determined using factor analysis. Cronbach's alpha for the love subscale is reported at .93 (Lloyd, 1987). Reliability scores for the other subscales are not reported, but are described by Braiker and Kelley as "high" (Braiker & Kelley, 1979, p. 151).

Demographic items collected information on age, gender, race, dating status, and the marital, employment and income status of parents.
Analysis of Data

Statistical analyses were conducted using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) (Helwig & Council, 1986). Frequency distributions, means and standard deviations were computed for each variable. In addition, a correlation matrix was generated for preliminary review. Factor analysis using principal factoring with iteration was used to reduce and organize the data on negotiation styles and coping strategies. A 2 X 2 (gender by violence) MANOVA was conducted to test for differences in the dependent measures, relationship dimensions, negotiation and coping.
Results

Incidence of Violence

Thirty-four percent of respondents indicated that they had experienced the use of violence in a serious dating relationship. Tactics used were: pushed, shoved, or grabbed, 16.5%; slapped, 14%; wrestled or pinned down, 8%; threw an object at, 6%; punched with fist, 4%; clawed, scratched or bit, 3%; kicked, 3%; attempted to strangle, 1%; hit with an object, 1%; used a lethal weapon, .4%.

Factor Analysis

A factor analysis was used to reduce and organize responses to the 21 negotiation items. The procedure used was principal factoring with iteration. This method extracts the number of factors with eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1.0. The axis was rotated orthogonally using the varimax technique. Only items which had a loading greater than .40 were considered in the analysis. Five factors were identified and are discussed as styles of negotiation. These are: Direct Appeal, Bargaining/Compromise, Indirect Appeal, Negative Affect, and Ultimate Effort (Table 1).

The same procedure was used for coping. Responses to the 41 items were reduced to eight factors described as coping strategies. These are: Denial/Distancing, Accepting Responsibility, Problem-Solving, Anger/Blaming, Social
Support, Spiritual Belief/Fantasy, Self-Control, and Withdrawal (Table 2).

Tables 1 and 2 About Here

**Multiple Analysis of Variance**

Multiple analysis of variance techniques revealed significant effects for both gender ($F = 3.39, p = .0001$) and violence ($F = 2.90, p = .0002$) (Table 3). There were no significant interaction effects between gender and violence ($F = 1.38, p = .15$). Post hoc univariate tests (ANOVAs) revealed that, in terms of relationship dimensions, men report significantly more conflict in their dating relationships than women ($F = 4.76, p = .03$). No significant differences were found on love, maintenance or ambivalence between male and female respondents. In choice of negotiation style, women report using Ultimate Effort strategies significantly more often than men ($F = 11.03, p = .001$). With respect to coping, men use more Withdrawal techniques after a disagreement ($F = 6.70, p = .01$), while women report greater use of Social Support ($F = 12.34, p = .0005$).

Table 3 About Here
A number of significant differences were found between violent and nonviolent groups. Those in violent relationships report significantly greater conflict ($F = 6.31, p = .01$), and ambivalence ($F = 25.17, p = .0001$) than those in nonviolent relationships. In addition, those in the violent group used significantly more Direct Appeal ($F = 5.11, p = .02$), Negative Affect ($F = 25.17, p = .0001$), Indirect Appeal ($F = 3.86, p = .05$), and Ultimate Effort ($F = 5.94, p = .02$) strategies in negotiating with their partners. Finally, those individuals in violent relationships relied more on Anger/Blaming ($F = 14.58, p = .0002$) techniques and Withdrawal ($F = 7.52, p = .007$) strategies when coping with disagreements in the relationship.
Discussion

Gender

Men report more conflict in their dating relationships than women. According to past research, men find conflict situations uncomfortable, view them as having a negative impact on the relationship, and prefer to avoid them (Kelley et al., 1978; Lloyd, 1987). Women, on the other hand, see these same situations as chances to resolve relationship issues. They want to discuss problems openly and prefer that feelings be shared. For women, resolution leads to higher satisfaction with the relationship (Lloyd, 1987). Because men appear to be more disturbed by relationship conflict, perhaps they are more likely to report higher levels of it. This interpretation fits the characterization by Kelley et al. (1978) of men as conflict-avoidant and women as conflict-confrontive.

This study confirms earlier research (Falbo, 1982; Falbo & Peplau, 1980) in finding that women use more Ultimate Effort strategies in negotiating with their partners. Crying, threatening to break up and appealing to a sense of fairness are strategies that women report using more often than men. For both men and women, the more straightforward strategies of Direct Appeal and Bargaining/Compromise were the most frequently used negotiation styles. The author can only speculate that
Ultimate Effort strategies are used when more direct attempts to influence a dating partner fail. These findings parallel those of Falbo and Peplau (1980) who contend that women and those with less power in the relationship are more likely to use indirect methods in negotiating with partners.

When disagreements occurred in the relationship, and nothing was really settled, men and women used vastly different methods of coping. Women turned outward and mobilized a social support system. They were more likely to seek advice or the sympathy and understanding of a friend. In contrast, men withdrew. They were more likely to avoid being around others, to sleep more than usual and to keep others from knowing how bad things were. This is consistent with descriptions of men as conflict-avoidant, keeping stress inside, and prefering lower levels of verbal communication (Burke & Weir, 1977; Fishman, 1978; Kelley et al., 1978; Peplau & Gordon, 1985). It contradicts several studies in the violence literature where women were found to frequently use withdrawal or avoidance as a coping technique (Claerhout, Elder, & Janes, 1982; Finn, 1985; Walker, 1979).

**Violence**

Respondents described as violent in this study were more likely to use tactics such as pushing, shoving and
slapping. This finding contrasts with more severe forms of violence reported in the marital violence literature (Steinmetz, 1987).

Not surprisingly, individuals in violent relationships report more conflict than their nonviolent counterparts. They argue more, feel angry and resentful toward their partners more often and have more serious disagreements that threaten to lead to a breakup. When negotiating, respondents in violent relationships report greater use of Negative Affect, including being especially disagreeable, becoming cold and silent, and insulting or swearing at partners. They rely more often on Ultimate Effort strategies such as crying and threatening to break up. Further, they are more likely to respond to a disagreement by expressing anger, blaming their partners or withdrawing. Both of these strategies (Anger/Blaming and Withdrawal), are considered to be emotion-focused coping, and may indicate that individuals perceive they can do little to alter the problem situation (Folkman & Lazarus, 1984). Taken together, these findings paint a picture of conflict and negotiation as a painful process for those in violent relationships.

A somewhat surprising finding is greater use of Direct and Indirect Appeal by participants in violent relationships. Simply asking for what one needs, trying to
persuade, using logic and reason (Direct Appeal) and hinting or suggesting, being especially affectionate, or using "sweet talk" (Indirect Appeal) would seem to be more characteristic of nonviolent relationships. When analyzed in combination with the other results however, these findings indicate that violent individuals are using almost every type of negotiation style more often than their nonviolent counterparts. A significantly greater amount of time is being spent in the negotiation process and individuals are relying on a wide range of methods, including direct approaches, in attempting to deal with their partners. We can conclude that negotiation is a more difficult and time-consuming process in violent relationships.

Another interesting finding emerged from analysis of negotiation styles. While there were no interaction effects overall across variables, post hoc analyses showed that there was a significant gender by violence interaction for the negotiation style of Bargaining ($F = 6.27$, $p = .013$). Women used significantly more Bargaining strategies than men when violence was present in the relationship. Additionally, there was a trend for men in violent relationships to use bargaining techniques less than men in nonviolent relationships. These results make sense if interpreted according to the framework presented
by Kelley et al. (1978). Women would rather confront conflict and deal with it openly. Men would rather withdraw. However such an interpretation clashes with the literature on marital violence, where women were found to deal passively with conflict, and use more avoidant and withdrawal coping strategies in response to violent altercations (Claerhout, Elder & Janes, 1982; Finn, 1985; Walker, 1979). The use of more direct strategies by both sexes, and more Bargaining by women in particular, may indicate that these respondents are in an early or transitional stage of the violent relationship. Later on, with increasing violence and as roles become more firmly established, perhaps they will "learn helplessness" as suggested by Walker (1979) and will rely more on indirect approaches.

Additionally, while the framework of "conflict-avoidant men" and "conflict-confrontive women" may be useful in interpreting the behaviors of violent dating partners, it fails to explain the patterns of violence in marital relationships, where men are clearly much more likely to be the aggressor, and women more likely to passively cope with violent interactions (Claerhout, Elder & Janes, 1982; Finn, 1985; Gelles, 1974; Steinmetz, 1977a; Straus et al., 1980; Walker, 1979, 1984). A future avenue of research might be to explore whether violence functions
as a regulator of emotional distance in relationships, thereby protecting or maintaining the withdrawal behaviors of men. The author proposes the addition of a fourth stage to Walker's cycle of violence: emotional and/or physical distance. The revised model would be as follows: Stage 1, Tension Builds; Stage 2, Violence; Stage 3, Emotional and/or Physical Distance; Stage 4, Loving Calm Returns. This proposition warrants further testing, especially since there are so many nonviolent techniques available to maintain needed space in a relationship. In addition, it appears that investigation of conflict resolution strategies that take into account the differing approaches of both men and women is justified.

There is greater partner ambivalence in violent dating relationships. Respondents report more feelings of confusion and uncertainty about continuing the relationship. In addition, they worry more about losing independence and more often indicate feeling trapped or pressured to continue the relationship. Given the greater amount of conflict, and the greater investment of time in negotiating differences, it is no surprise that these individuals are also spending more time wondering about the future of the relationship. What is surprising is that there is no subsequent reduction of love reported by these respondents. In studying relationships that dissolved,
Lloyd and Cate (1985, p. 186) found that conflict and ambivalence increased sharply from the time that individuals felt "100% committed to the relationship" to the time they became "uncertain about the future of the relationship." The intensity of these feelings then leveled off as individuals became "certain" the relationship would end. Feelings of love declined across these same stages. In the current study, higher levels of conflict and ambivalence do not coincide with reduced feelings of love. Rather, increased levels of conflict and ambivalence coexist with feelings of love, belonging and commitment, and with intimate levels of self-disclosure. Eighty percent of violent dating partners indicated that they were seriously dating before violence entered the relationship. Perhaps because respondents are already "in love" when violence usually erupts, they are more likely to accept it as part of the relationship, or to disregard or minimize its impact on the relationship. Although this study and that of Lloyd and Cate (1985) are not directly comparable, a tentative conclusion is that as long as feelings of love and commitment are high, violent dating relationships do not appear to be likely candidates for dissolution.

Further support of this notion is apparent with 85% of respondents reporting that relationships either stayed the
same or improved as a result of violence. Only 15% indicated that violence made things worse. Clearly something compensates for the increased conflict and ambivalence in these relationships.

While feelings of love and attachment remain high in violent relationships, the increased levels of conflict and ambivalence indicate greater turmoil in resolving differences. It is not known whether these violent partnerships will ultimately result in marriage or dissolution. If they end in marriage, it seems likely that high levels of conflict will continue with a subsequent decline in relationship satisfaction (Kelly, Huston, & Cate, 1985). Another outcome is a possible escalation in violence from the lower forms observed in this study to the more severe forms cited in the marital violence literature (Gelles, 1974; Steinmetz, 1977a; Straus et al., 1980; Walker, 1984).

While all respondents in this sample reported on serious dating relationships, a difference was found in the mean length of relationship between violent and nonviolent groups. Individuals in nonviolent relationships had been dating their partners an average of 14 months, while those in violent relationships had been with their partners for an average of 20 months. Fifty percent of the nonviolent group had begun their relationships prior to their entrance
to college, i.e., their partners were most likely from "back home". In contrast, among the violent group, 70% were involved in a relationship that started prior to college. These differences continue over time: Seventeen percent of the nonviolent group had dated their partners for two years or more, while 30% of the violent group had been with their partners this length of time. Additionally, almost two-thirds of respondents (63%) indicated that violence had first occurred between the ages of 17 and 18.

This pattern suggests a correspondence of increased risk of violence with the life cycle transition from adolescence to adulthood. For some young adults, college means leaving home and leaving one's parents. In other cases, it also means leaving behind a dating partner, and beginning new relationships. For those students who continue to date someone from back home, it may mean balancing new friends, a new lifestyle and new time constraints with an existing commitment to a relationship. For many, the relationship will be renegotiated, for others, it will be terminated. For still others, it appears to be associated with an increased risk of violence in the relationship. Fully 50% of the violent respondents indicated that jealousy was the most common cause of physical arguments in their relationships. Another 7%
indicated that life cycle changes were precipitators: long
distance dating relationships, career plans, and parental
attachments. These figures indicate that at least for
some, violence with a dating partner may be one of the new
experiences accompanying early adulthood.
Conclusions

The current study adds to the literature by examining dating violence within the context of ongoing relationships. Further, it demonstrates the usefulness of relationship dimensions in clarifying differences between violent and nonviolent groups. Analyses by gender appear to be critical to the investigation of close relationships. A framework of "conflict-avoidant men" and "conflict-confrontive women" is used to interpret behavior in violent partnerships. An important finding is that violence often begins with a high school dating partner. It appears that high school audiences could benefit from early intervention efforts, both in the teaching of positive conflict resolution skills, and in discussions of the long term implications of high levels of relationship conflict.

Currently, it is not possible to predict which violent dating relationships will endure, and which will not. A salient need is for research that compares violent partnerships that stay together with those that break up. Additionally, while this study examined various aspects of dating relationships, it did so from the perspective of only one partner. The need for research which gathers dyadic information about violent partnerships must be emphasized. Finally, while most studies have been cross-sectional for practical reasons, it is longitudinal data
that may hold the key for understanding how violence begins, escalates and is maintained in intimate adult relationships.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>be especially disagreeable</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>withdraw; become cold and silent</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Appeal</td>
<td>try to persuade</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simply ask for what I want or need</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargain/Compromise</td>
<td>talk about it; discuss our differences and needs</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>try to negotiate something agreeable to both of us; compromise</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Effort</td>
<td>cry</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say it is in her/his best interest</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Appeal</td>
<td>bring it up in an indirect way; hint or make suggestions</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be especially affectionate; use &quot;sweet talk&quot;</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only the first two items on each factor are included in the table. All items and loadings are available from the authors.

N = 276
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial/</td>
<td>don't let it get to me; refuse to</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distancing</td>
<td>think too much about it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>go on as if nothing had happened</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>wish that I could change what</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>had happened or how I feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>realize I brought the problem on</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>myself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>try to see things from my partner's</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving</td>
<td>point of view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>come up with a couple of different solutions to</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger/Blaming</td>
<td>blame my partner</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>express anger to my partner about</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>how I feel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>ask a relative or friend I respect</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>get sympathy and understanding</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>from someone else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>pray</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief/Fantasy</td>
<td>prepare myself for the worst</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Control</td>
<td>don't do anything I might regret</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>try not to act too hastily</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>avoid being around other people</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sleep more than usual</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only the first two items on each factor are included in the table. All items and loadings are available from the authors.

N = 276
Table 3

Significant Effects for Gender and Violence on Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>VIOLENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Dimensions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>3.71*</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalence</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiation Styles</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Appeal</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining/Compromise</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Appeal</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Effort</td>
<td>2.75***</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coping Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial/Distancing</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting Responsibility</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-Solving</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger/Blaming</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Support</td>
<td>3.98***</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Belief/Fantasy</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.24*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Total N = 267b  
N = 150  117  176  91

*a - mean scores  
b - differences in N size are due to missing responses  
*p < .05.  **p < .01.  ***p < .001.
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This literature review provides further detail on research that helped to shape the design and interpretation of the current study. Only studies specifically related to this investigation have been included.

Theoretical Framework

Violence is defined as a physical altercation with or without injury (Walker, 1984). From a theoretical perspective, this study views violence as a multi-dimensional problem arising from a variety of individual, social-psychological and societal factors. While each of these three levels alone explain some portion of violence, Steinmetz (1987), argues in favor of a tri-level model that recognizes not only the influence of any one level, but of the interaction among all three levels. Other theoreticians (Breines & Gordon, 1983; Gelles & Maynard, 1987; Thompson, 1986) call for essentially the same type of conceptualization. Most studies have focused on only one level of influence. This study investigates factors at both individual and social-psychological (relationship) levels.

Makepeace (1981), was the first to suggest that dating violence may provide the "mediating link" between violence in the family of origin, and violence in later marital and family relationships. Subsequently, other scholars have
suggested that the dating period may serve not only to socialize partners into later marital roles, but as a training ground for spousal violence as well (Deal & Wampler, 1896; Flynn, 1987; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985). If this is true, then a better understanding of dating violence will provide insight into the factors that contribute to and help maintain marital violence. At the same time, an understanding of how violence is initiated and maintained during the dating period, would point the way for early intervention techniques and hopefully the relief of the physical and emotional pain that result from violence in intimate relationships. An underlying frame for this study then, is a view of dating violence as part of a larger construct of relationship violence among adult intimates.

**Dependent Variables**

Braiker and Kelley's (1979) pioneering work on close relationships identified four dimensions useful in investigating dating relationships. In their qualitative study of 20 married couples, a retrospective technique was used to gain information about the developmental progression of dating relationships. They first asked couples to outline or list the salient time periods, or turning points in their relationships. Three stages prior to marriage emerged: casual dating, serious dating and
engagement. Couples then provided open-ended descriptions of these stages. Subsequent content analysis revealed two major themes: conflict/negativity, and love or amount of interdependence. Scale items were constructed, tested and factor analyzed, revealing four clusters of items: love, conflict/negativity, maintenance (communication, self-disclosure, and problem-solving) and ambivalence (uncertainty or confusion about continuing the relationship). The next question concerned how these dimensions change over time as couples move from casual dating toward marriage. Four time frames were studied: casual dating, serious dating, engagement, and six months after marriage. It was determined that love and maintenance behaviors increase gradually from the stage of casual dating through marriage. Conflict increases sharply from the stage of casual to serious dating and then becomes asymptotic. Ambivalence stays the same during casual and serious dating, and then decreases through the time of engagement and marriage.

The delineation of these four dimensions has provided a valuable framework from which to make comparisons of violent and nonviolent relationships. The current study will add to the literature by investigating ongoing relationships rather than relying on retrospective reports.
Kelly, Huston, and Cate (1985) studied 21 newlywed couples to determine if measures of relationship dimensions (love, maintenance, conflict and ambivalence) before marriage would be predictive of these dimensions after marriage. Using a retrospective technique, partners completed instruments for three stages of their relationships: Casual dating, serious dating, and commitment to marriage. In addition, a followup study was conducted in order to determine which of the premarital measures were related to marital satisfaction two and a half years later. Results showed conflict before marriage is a precursor of conflict after marriage. Additionally, although not related to feelings of love prior to marriage, conflict is directly related to lower levels of satisfaction two and a half years after marriage. The results indicate that although feelings of love may not be affected initially, in the long run, high levels of relationship conflict will have a negative impact on the satisfaction and adjustment experienced by marital partners. This study suggests that dating partners who fight premaritally are likely to continue to do so after marriage. Further, relationship conflict is eventually linked with an erosion of marital contentment.

Kelley and his associates (1978), asked young couples how they expected men and women to behave in conflict
situations. Both partners expected women to react by crying, sulking, and criticizing their boyfriends' insensitivity. Both sexes expected men to react with anger, reject woman’s tears, propose a logical and less emotional response to the problem, and to give reasons for delaying the discussion. Partners in actual dating relationships reported that their behaviors were consistent with these stereotypes. Kelley et al. (1978), suggested that men are conflict-avoidant: they find conflict uncomfortable, upsetting, and would prefer not to encounter it. They suggested that women are conflict-confrontive: they are frustrated by avoidance, would rather discuss things openly, and prefer that feelings be considered. These findings suggest a general framework for understanding and interpreting gender differences in conflict situations. This framework can be useful in examining both violent and nonviolent relationships and in making comparison between the two.

Lloyd (1987), in a study of 100 college students, investigated the different effects that conflict have on relationship quality for men and women. Fifty premarital partners completed self-report assessments on the number and characteristics of conflicts over a 14-day period. Significant differences emerged by gender. For men, the number and stability of conflicts, especially partner-
initiated conflict had the greatest impact on relationship satisfaction. For women, it was the resolution of conflict, especially self-initiated conflict that had the greatest influence. Lloyd's findings contributed to the current study by illuminating salient gender differences in perceptions and approaches to conflict.

Studies of negotiation and coping also provide information on how individuals deal with disagreements in their relationships. Falbo and Peplau (1980) studied 100 homosexual and 100 heterosexual university students in order to generate a model of power or negotiation strategies used in intimate relationships. Analyses were conducted to determine differences by gender, sexual orientation, and egalitarianism. A two dimensional model was generated based on data collected from open-ended essays. The two dimensions that emerged were directness and interactivity. Directness indicates the extent to which straightforward methods of negotiation such as telling, asking, or stating needs are used. Interactivity indicates whether individuals consider only themselves (unilateral), or also consider their partners (bilateral) when negotiating. The dimension of directness is relevant to this study. Results showed that women are more likely to use indirect strategies. Also, people who perceived themselves as having more power in relationships,
such as heterosexual men, are more likely to use direct strategies. A second study by Falbo (1982) confirmed these gender differences in negotiation style. Currently it is not known whether negotiation styles differ between violent and nonviolent relationships. This study will add to the literature by examining differences between these two groups and by further exploring differences between male and female respondents.

Folkman and Lazarus (1980) studied how 100 men and women aged 45 to 64 coped with the stressful events of daily life. Interviews were conducted monthly and self-report questionnaires were completed between interviews in response to stressful situations. Analysis of the Ways of Coping checklist indicated that two types, or functions, of coping are used to deal with stressful encounters: problem-focused, directed at altering or removing the problem itself; and emotion-focused, aimed at controlling or alleviating one’s emotional response to the stressful event. The authors indicate that both functions were used in 98% of the situations studied. Individuals do not use one type of coping to the exclusion of the other. Contexts had an important effect on choice of coping strategy. Problem-focused coping is more likely to be used when the individual perceives that something can be done about a problem, or when more information is needed. Conversely,
when a situation does not appear to be amenable to change and must simply be accepted, emotion-focused coping is favored. These findings shape the present study in suggesting a frame for interpreting results: If violent partners use problem-focused coping, it may indicate that they perceive themselves to have the power to change the stressful situation. On the other hand, use of emotion-focused coping in response to disagreements may indicate a belief that violent behavior cannot be altered, and therefore must be accepted as part of the relationship.

Dating relationships are one of the social contexts within which violence occurs. To date, the relationships themselves have not been the subject of study. Investigation of relationship dimensions, negotiation and coping, will add to the literature by allowing for the description of intimate dating relationships among college students. Further, it is hoped that a better understanding of the differences between violent and nonviolent close relationships may provide information on how and why violence begins and is maintained.
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This section provides further detail on the pilot study, and the design and analyses used in this project. A pilot study was conducted in April of 1987 in order to test the usefulness and clarity of the survey instrument. Fifteen undergraduate students were asked to read the questionnaire and identify any words or items that were confusing. In addition, the pilot study was used to determine if the response choices provided adequate item variance and to obtain overall feedback on the questionnaire. Responses were collected and several changes in terminology were made.

The cover included a graphic design, the title of the project and its sponsorship by the Department of Family & Child Development at Virginia Tech. Blue printing on gray paper was used to create an image of professionalism and to underscore the importance of the study.

Data was coded and entered onto a computer disc. Each questionnaire was coded twice in order to facilitate the location of coding errors. Negatively worded items were reversed and coded in a positive direction. Multiple analysis of variance techniques (MANOVA) were used to determine whether there were differences by gender and between violent and nonviolent groups for each of the research variables.
APPENDIX C

Correspondence and Instruments
This questionnaire is designed to obtain information from people who have been involved in a dating relationship within the last two years. You have received this questionnaire because your name was randomly selected from the freshman class at Virginia Tech so that a realistic portrayal of dating relationships among university women and men is possible.

However, we want to be sure that you should fill out the questionnaire. Please circle the number in front of the statement that best describes your current dating status.

1. Casually dating; have not had a serious dating partner within the past two years.

2. Casually dating; have had a serious dating partner within the past two years.

3. Seriously dating one person.

4. Engaged.

IF YOU CIRCLED NUMBER 2, 3, OR 4, PLEASE FILL OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND RETURN IT IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE.

IF YOU CIRCLED NUMBER 1, PLEASE RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE (WITHOUT ANSWERING ANY OF THE QUESTIONS) TO US IN THE SELF-ADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE.
May 1, 1987

Dear Student:

You have been selected, at random, from the freshman undergraduates living in dormitories at Virginia Tech to participate in an important study that will represent university students as a whole. This study is designed to find out more about student attitudes and behaviors in regard to dating relationships. Your answers will help develop an understanding of how these issues affect today's college students. Please take the opportunity to make this a successful research project.

You may be aware that research studies involving students are quite common. However, many studies conveniently choose students from specific courses or only obtain volunteers. Both of these methods result in a limited view of university students. This study is different. You have been randomly selected so that a realistic portrayal of university women and men is possible.

You may be sensitive to the fact that some of the questions are personal and private. We hope that you will share these important aspects of yourself in order to insure that the results depict a sincere and correct picture of college students. Your responses will be recorded by the questionnaire number located on your study booklet. However, your name and identifying information will NEVER be linked to your response in reporting the data. The research findings will report group trends and not individual responses. All your answers will be held in strict confidence. Please take the time, now, to complete the enclosed questionnaire.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this research project, please call the number below. After you complete the questionnaire, put it in the stamped, return envelope and mail it back. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and we extend, in advance, thanks for your time, effort, and openness.

Sincerely yours,

Joann Schladale
Project Director
953-2758.
Dear Student:

You were recently contacted about participating in the Dating Relationship Research Project here at Virginia Tech. We want you to know that each response is extremely important to the success of the study. If we have not received your response, we hope you will take the time to complete and return the questionnaire.

The large number of questionnaires returned is very encouraging. However, our ability to correctly describe college students' feelings about dating relationships depends on you. You may have different, yet equally important, perspectives than those who have already returned the questionnaire. Your unique contribution to this study is critical.

In the event that you did not receive a questionnaire, or it was misplaced, please call the number below (evenings and weekends) and we will put another one in the mail to you. Also, if you have any questions or concerns regarding this research project, please call. We would be happy to talk with you. We understand your need for privacy and assure you of complete confidentiality.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Joann Schladale
Project Director
953-2758
Dear Student:

Spring is here, finals are approaching, and we know your time is limited; however, we are depending upon you to guarantee a successful outcome for the Dating Relationship Research Project.

Dating relationships are undergoing changes from the traditional image that we have grown up with. Young people are now dating for longer periods before marriage and are facing different issues and decisions than previously. This project is one of only a few studies addressing this topic and your response will provide valuable information.

We have enclosed a questionnaire and ask that you return it at your earliest convenience. Each response is vital and we appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Joann Schladale
Project Director
Part A  (RELATIONSHIP DIMENSIONS SCALE)

First, it is important that we gain a greater understanding of the nature of your dating relationship, (i.e., how you feel about the relationship, what you discuss with each other). Circle numbers to the right and left of each of the items to indicate how often both you and your dating partner do the following things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Often Do You</th>
<th>How Often Does Your Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Talk about the quality of the relationship (how good it is, how satisfying, how to improve it)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Discuss how much each person gives to the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Tell the other what is wanted, or needed from the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Talk about how close you feel to the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Tell the other how special this relationship is, compared with others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Talk about feeling that what happens to one also affects the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Say that there is a sense of &quot;belonging&quot; with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Express feelings of commitment to the relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Spend time discussing and trying to work out problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Say how much the other is needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Disclose very intimate things to the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Tell the other how much in love you are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Try to change behavior to help solve problems between you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RELATIONSHIP DIMENSIONS SCALE (CONT.)

In your relationship with your dating partner,

How Often Do You:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Get confused about how you feel</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Think or worry about losing some of your independence</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Feel unsure about continuing the relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feel that your dating partner demands or requires too much time and attention</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Argue with each other</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Try to change things about your partner that bother you</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Feel &quot;trapped&quot; or pressured to continue the relationship</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Feel angry or resentful toward your dating partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Communicate negative feelings (anger, dissatisfaction, frustration) toward your partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Have serious disagreements about problems that threaten to lead to a breakup</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How long have you been in this dating relationship? ____________________________

(months/years)

Part B (NEGOETIATION STYLES SCALE)

In close relationships most people experience instances where both partners feel very strongly about a situation. Each feels compelled to influence the other to do what he/she wants. When you want to influence your partner to do things your way, to what extent do you use the following strategies? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Simply ask for what I want or need</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Try to persuade</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Repeatedly make my point until he/she gives in</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use logic and reason; give all the reasons my way is best</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEGOTIATION STYLES SCALE (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Bring it up in an indirect way; hint or make suggestions</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Say how very important my request is; how much it means to me</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Say it is in her/his best interest</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Talk about it; discuss our differences and needs</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Use my expertise; claim I have a lot of experience in such matters</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Be especially affectionate; use “sweet talk”</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Appeal to a sense of fairness; say it is the only fair and right thing to do</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Try to negotiate something agreeable to both of us; compromise</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Do some “fast talking”</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lie</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Withdraw; become cold and silent</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Be especially disagreeable</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Discuss the issue heatedly</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Insult or swear at</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Leave the room, house, etc.</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Cry</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Threaten to break up</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5  6  7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part C (Coping Strategies Scale)

After an argument with your dating partner, when nothing is really settled and you feel very upset, to what extent do you: (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPING STRATEGIES SCALE (cont.)</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. Avoid being around other people. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
24. Don't let it get to me; refuse to think too much about it. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
25. Ask a relative or friend I respect for advice. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
26. Keep others from knowing how bad things are. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
27. Make light of the situation; refuse to get too serious about it. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
28. Blame my partner. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
29. Make a promise to myself that things will be different next time. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
30. Come up with a couple of different solutions to the problem. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
31. Accept it, since nothing can be done. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
32. Wish that I could change what had happened or how I feel. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
33. Vow to change something about myself. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
34. Daydream or imagine a better time in our relationship. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
35. Wish that the situation would go away or somehow be over with. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
36. Pray. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
37. Prepare myself for the worst. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
38. Go over in my mind what I will say or do. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
39. Try to see things from my partner's point of view. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
40. Remind myself that things could be worse. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
41. Exercise to relieve tension. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
Part D (VIOLENT TACTICS SCALE)

When other means of communication don't work, physical arguments may result. The following list describes things that dating partners have sometimes done during such an argument. Please indicate whether you or your partner have done any of the following. (See example below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threatened Only</th>
<th>Never Done</th>
<th>Rarely Done</th>
<th>Occasionally Done</th>
<th>Frequently Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Your Partner   | 1          | 2           | 3                 | 4               | 5               |
|----------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| 1              | 2          | 3           | 4                 | 5               | 5               |
| 2              | 3          | 4           | 5                 | 5               | 5               |
| 3              | 4          | 5           | 5                 | 5               | 5               |
| 4              | 5          | 5           | 5                 | 5               | 5               |
| 5              |            |             |                   |                 |                 |

Part H (DEMOGRAPHICS)

Finally, we would like to request some general information needed to help interpret the results of the study.

1. How old are you? __________ (years)

2. Which one of the following best describes your racial or ethnic identification?
   1. Black
   2. White (Caucasian)
   3. Other (specify) ______________

3. What is your sex? (Circle number)
   1. Female
   2. Male

4. To what extent do your parents support you financially?
   1. 100% Supported By My Parents
   2. They Mostly Support Me, But I Have Some Income Of My Own
   3. About 50% Supported By My Parents
   4. I Am Mostly Independent, But I Receive Some Support
   5. 100% Financially Independent

5. How many brothers and sisters do you have? (Brothers) (Sisters)
DEMIGRAPHICS (cont.)

6. What is the employment status of your parents? (Circle number for each)

Mother
1. Employed Full-Time (more than 35 hrs/week)
2. Employed Part-Time (less than 35 hrs/week)
3. Not Employed Outside The Home
4. Retired
5. Other

Father
1. Employed Full-Time (more than 35 hrs/week)
2. Employed Part-Time (less than 35 hrs/week)
3. Not Employed Outside The Home
4. Retired
5. Other

7. Where are your parents employed? (Leave blank if not employed)

Mother

Father

8. What are your parents occupations? (Leave blank if not employed)

Mother

Father

9. What is the marital status of your parents (Circle number for each parent)

Mother
1. Married (first marriage)
2. Remarried
3. Separated
4. Divorced
5. Widowed
6. Other (please specify)

Father
1. Married (first marriage)
2. Remarried
3. Separated
4. Divorced
5. Widowed
6. Other (please specify)

10. What are the education levels of your parents? (Circle number for each parent)

Mother
1. Some high school
2. High school degree
3. Vocational/technical school
4. Some college
5. Bachelor’s degree
6. Some graduate credits
7. Master’s degree
8. Doctoral degree

Father
1. Some high school
2. High school degree
3. Vocational/technical school
4. Some college
5. Bachelor’s degree
6. Some graduate credits
7. Master’s degree
8. Doctoral degree

11. What was the approximate income of your family last year?

1. Less Than $20,000
2. $20,000 - $29,999
3. $30,000 - $39,999
4. $40,000 - $49,999
5. $50,000 - $59,999
6. $60,000 - $69,999
7. $70,000 - $79,999
8. $80,000 - $89,999
9. $90,000 - $99,999
10. $100,000 Or More
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