

INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION OF COURTSHIP VIOLENCE: A META-  
ANALYSIS

By

Douglas Bradford Smith

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

MASTER OF SCIENCE  
in  
Family and Child Development

Sandra M. Stith, Chairperson  
Eric E. McCollum  
Karen H. Rosen

July 21, 1999  
Falls Church, Virginia

Key Words: Abuse, Aggression, Courtship, Dating, Family of Origin, Intergenerational  
Transmissions, Meta-Analysis, Violence

Copyright 1999, Douglas B. Smith

# INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION OF COURTSHIP VIOLENCE: A META-ANALYSIS

Douglas Bradford Smith

## (ABSTRACT)

This study examines the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. A meta-analytic approach was used to conduct a quantitative review of the relevant research literature. The results are based on data from 35 studies of dating violence. The gender of respondents, whether family of origin violence was witnessed or experienced, and whether dating violence was perpetrated or received were considered as part of the analysis.

The findings suggest a weak to moderate relationship between violence in the family of origin and dating violence. Separate analysis within and between the male and female subsamples revealed several significant differences. The findings suggest that witnessing interparental violence has a stronger relationship with involvement in a violent dating relationship for males, while experiencing violence as a child has a stronger relationship with involvement in a violent dating relationship for females. The findings also suggest that violence in the family of origin may have a stronger relationship with males perpetrating and females receiving violence in dating relationships.

*To my wife, Cynthia, for your continued love, support, and above all, patience. None of this  
would have been possible without you.*

*To my parents, Connie Cummings, Robert Smith, Joseph Ivers, and Irma Smith, for giving me the  
freedom to make my own choices and teaching me to make them wisely.*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis represents the culmination of a four-year process, during which I received help, support, and encouragement from many people.

To my advisor, Sandra Stith, thank-you for knowing when to push, when to let me go my own way, and for not letting me obsess over the details for too long.

To Sandra, Eric McCollum, Karen Rosen, and Jean Coleman, thank-you for making the time I spent at Virginia Tech one of the best experiences of my life. Each of you have supported me through difficulties, challenged me to expand my thinking about therapy, as well as myself, and created a program that I am honored to be a part of.

The process of coding articles for a meta-analysis is a long and often tedious one. Laurie Howell, Deanna Linville, Lisa Locke, Kristen Lundberg, and Michelle Ward agreed to take on this task in additions to the demands of classes and clinical work. Thank-you for your very significant contribution to this study, I could not have done it without your help.

While many things made my experience in graduate school one I will always cherish, the friends I made are the most important. To Shelby Lake, Lisa Locke, Elise Long, Kirsten Lundeberg, Kristen Lundberg, Kimberly Middleton, and to Bill Sidener, who I have known far longer than I spent in graduate school, I am privileged to have you as friends. Thank-you for your support, understanding, and all the just plain fun. And a special thanks to Lisa for helping me maintain my caffeine addiction and for giving me a hard enough time that I actually sat down and started writing this thing.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
INDEX OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem and Setting	1
Rationale	3
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Dating Violence	4
Gender	4
Patterns of Violence	5
Reporting	6
Sample Populations	7
Link to Marital Violence	7
Risk Factors	8
Conclusion	9
Theoretical Perspective	9
Intergenerational Transmission of Violence	10
Gender of Respondent	11
Gender of Abusive Parent	11
Witnessing vs. Experiencing	12
Race	13
Other Factors	13
Conclusion	13
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	15
Design	15
Strengths	15
Weaknesses	16
Reliability and Validity	16
Purpose	16
Procedure	17
Hypotheses	17
Research Questions	17
Literature Search	19
Inclusion Criteria	19
Coding	20

Data Analysis	22
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	24
Hypothesis One	24
Hypothesis Two	24
Research Question One	25
Research Question Two	25
Research Question Three	26
Male Composite	26
Research Question Four	26
Research Question Five	26
Research Question Six	27
Research Question Seven	27
Female Composite	28
Research Question Eight	28
Research Question Nine	29
Research Question Ten	29
Research Question Eleven	29
Gender Comparisons	29
Research Question Twelve	30
Research Question Thirteen	31
Research Question Fourteen	31
Research Question Fifteen	31
Research Question Sixteen	31
Research Question Seventeen	31
Research Question Eighteen	32
Research Question Nineteen	32
Research Question Twenty	32
Setting	32
Study Quality	33
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	35
Summary of Findings	35
Excluded Studies	36
Explanation of Findings	37
Influence of Gender	38
Study Quality	39
Suggestions for Future Research	39
Clinical Implications	40
Limitations	40
REFERENCES	42
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Guidelines for Effect Sizes	49
Appendix B: Codebook	53

Appendix C: Coding Conventions Used for Data Entry in D-Stat	69
Appendix D: Effect Size Estimates for the Relationship Between Growing Up in a Violent Home and Involvement in Violent Dating Relationships	70
Appendix E: Summary of Findings for Studies with Data on the Relationship Between Family of Origin Violence and Dating Violence Excluded During Coding	73
VITA	75

## INDEX OF TABLES

Table 1	25
<u>Average Effect Sizes for the Relationship Between Family of Origin Violence and Dating Violence</u>	
Table 2	27
<u>Average Effect Sizes for the Relationship Between Family of Origin Violence and Dating Violence for Males</u>	
Table 3	28
<u>Average Effect Sizes for the Relationship Between Family of Origin Violence and Dating Violence for Females</u>	
Table 4	30
<u>Comparison of Effect Sizes Between Gender</u>	
Table 5	33
<u>Comparison of Effect Sizes Between University and High School Samples</u>	
Table 6	33
<u>Descriptive Statistics for Study Quality</u>	
Table 7	34
<u>Comparison of Effect Sizes Between Levels of Study Quality</u>	



## CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

### The Problem and Setting

The study of courtship violence is relatively new. Until recently, the majority of studies investigating violence in intimate relationships have examined the marital relationship. Makepeace (1981) was the first researcher to look exclusively at violence in dating relationships. The study found that one fifth of the sample experienced physical violence in the context of dating. Despite a small sample size and the exploratory nature of the study, numerous studies have found similar rates of violence in college and university samples (Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985; Cate, Henton, Koval, Christopher, & Lloyd, 1982; DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993). Significantly higher rates of courtship violence, some approaching 50%, have been found in other studies (Arias, Samois, & O'Leary, 1987; Pedersen & Thomas, 1992; White & Koss, 1991).

Studies of violence in dating relationships frequently report less severe forms of physical violence, such as pushing and shoving (Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985; Cate et al., 1982; Makepeace, 1981). Despite the prevalence of less severe forms of violence, severe physical violence does occur in dating relationships. Makepeace (1981) found that 1 – 1.5% of his sample had experienced severe physical violence, such as “assaulting with a weapon or object.” Arias et al. (1987) found that 10% of their sample experienced severe forms of violence. This means that at a University with 10,000 dating students, one could expect that 2000 students have experienced physical violence in a dating relationship and 150 – 1000 students have experienced levels of violence that represent an immediate threat to their own or their partners physical safety.

While studies of dating violence frequently draw their samples from university populations, courtship violence is not limited to college students. Studies of courtship in high school populations have found rates of violence disturbingly similar to those found in university samples (Burcky, Reuteran, & Kopsky, 1988; O'Keefe, Brockopp, & Chew, 1986; Roscoe & Kelsey, 1986). In a racially mixed sample of adolescent males and females, drawn from a religiously affiliated suburban high school, Jezl, Molidor, and Wright, (1996) found that over 59% of their sample were physically victimized, at least once, in a dating relationship. More disturbing, they found that over 42% of the sample had experienced one or more types of severe physical violence, including punching, forced sexual contact, choking, and threatening with a weapon.

It is clear that courtship violence is a serious problem. Numerous studies have documented the alarming incidence of dating violence in university and high school populations. While milder forms of violence may be more common, the potential exists for serious injury and death. Given the scope of the problem and the very real possibility of physical and psychological injury, it is vital that researchers and clinicians work to improve our understanding of the causes and consequences of violence in dating relationships. Courtship violence is a complex phenomenon and researchers continue to examine a wide range of precursors and contributing factors.

The focus of this study is the theory of intergenerational transmission of violence, which is based on the tenants of Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977). The intergenerational transmission hypothesis states that because violence is a learned behavior, exposure to violence in the family of origin may lead to violence in later intimate relationships. If the hypothesis is accurate, there are a number of considerations that follow. Clinicians working with violent families should be aware that children might be at increased risk for developing violent relationships later in life. Clinicians working with violence in dating relationships may wish to explore family of origin issues. Researchers should continue to study how family of origin violence is related to dating violence and the variables that mediate or exacerbate the relationship.

An examination of the intergenerational transmission hypothesis is the primary focus or is included as an additional consideration in much of the research on courtship violence. Despite the large and growing body of data, the relationship between violence in the family of origin and violence in dating relationships remains unclear. Studies report conflicting findings over the fundamental applicability of the intergenerational transmission hypothesis to courtship violence. There is even greater disagreement when moderator variables are considered.

There can be little doubt that children are exposed to violence in their families of origin. Studies have found as many as 30% to 50% of children either witness or experience violence in their families (Carlson, 1990; Foo & Margolin, 1995; Marshall & Rose, 1988). Many researchers have found a significant relationship between early exposure to violence and violence in courtship (Alexander, Moore, & Alexander, 1991; Cantrell, MacIntyre, Sharkey, & Thompson, 1995; Foo & Margolin, 1995; Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987; MacEwen, 1994; Marshall & Rose, 1988; O'Keefe, 1997). However, other researchers have found that violence in the family of origin is not related to reports of dating violence (Carlson, 1990).

Studies that find a relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence often disagree about the nature of the relationship. It has been suggested that gender is an important predictor of courtship violence and that family violence may have differential effects on dating violence for males and females (Foo & Margolin, 1995; O'Keefe, 1997; Tontodonato & Crew, 1992). The findings of some studies suggest that family of origin violence may play a greater role in male's, rather than female's, use or experience of violence in dating relationships (Alexander et al., 1991; Foo & Margolin, 1995; Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987; O'Keefe, 1997). Other studies find that family of origin violence is related to both male and female use of violence in dating relationships (Cantrell et al., 1995; MacEwen, 1994).

Understanding the role that family of origin violence plays in later dating relationships is further complicated when the types of family and courtship violence are considered. Marshall and Rose (1988) found that direct childhood experience of physical violence predicted receiving and perpetrating dating violence for males. For females, experiencing physical violence as a child was related only to receiving dating violence. Witnessing inter-parental violence did not predict courtship violence for males or females. In their study, Tontodonato and Crew (1992) found that witnessing inter-parental violence was not a significant predictor of dating violence for males or females. In contrast, Cantrell et al. (1995) found that witnessing inter-parental violence was significantly related to male's and female's use of violence in opposite sex

relationships. O'Keefe (1997) found that witnessing inter-parental violence was significantly related to male's use of violence and that experiencing family violence was not related to either male or female use of violence in dating relationships.

Individual studies have added important information to the growing body of research on the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships. However, the big picture remains unclear. Dating violence is a real problem with serious consequences. Clarifying the role that violence in the home plays in later intimate relationships will improve our ability to conduct meaningful research and our ability to effectively address the problem in clinical settings. A review of the current research will begin to clarify our understanding of how family of origin violence is related to violence in courtship. To this end, there has been only one quantitative review of the research on intergenerational transmission of violence in intimate relationships. Stith et al. (1998) conducted a meta-analysis on the intergenerational transmission of violence in marital relationships. Using their study as a model, this study uses quantitative methods to assess the relationship between family of origin violence and courtship violence.

### Rationale

This study is designed to clarify whether family of origin violence is related to violence in dating relationships. If this is not the case, then research efforts are best spent elsewhere. In addition, this study examines how the moderator variables gender, type of family violence, and type of dating violence are related to the intergenerational transmission of violence. These variables may account for some of the conflicting findings in the research. A clearer understanding of these variables will allow researchers to design more informative studies and help clinicians work with violence in the family of origin as well as, violence in courtship. Finally, this study provides data for comparison with studies on the intergenerational transmission of violence in marital relationships. Such a comparison may help to clarify whether family of origin violence plays similar or distinct roles in the development of violent dating and marital relationships.

This study utilizes meta-analytic techniques to examine the intergenerational transmission hypothesis in dating relationships. Meta-analysis is a quantitative methodology for summarizing findings across a large number of individual studies (Durlack, 1995; Johnson, 1989). Meta-analysis provides a broadly focused picture of a research area (Wampler & Serovich, 1996). A broad focus is precisely what is desired in order to begin understanding the conflicting findings in the research and clarifying the role of intergenerational transmission of violence in courtship.

## CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

### Dating Violence

In the short time since Makepeace's (1981) germinal study on dating violence, hundreds of studies have been conducted that examine violence in dating relationships. Despite the volume of research, it is difficult to draw many firm conclusions about courtship violence. Because dating violence is a complex phenomenon, researchers have studied it using a wide variety of methodologies and examined numerous variables. Even in cases where results are directly comparable, authors often report conflicting results. Due to the volume and variety of studies, this literature review represents only a general overview.

### Gender

As was noted earlier, researchers often find rates of violence ranging from 20% to 30% of those sampled. However, knowing a general rate provides little insight into what is occurring in violent relationships. One of the most hotly contested issues is the influence of gender on receiving and perpetrating dating violence. When the gender of respondents is considered, reported rates of violence are sometimes found to be similar to aggregate rates of dating violence. Thompson (1991) found that 24.6% of the men and 28.4% of women in his sample reported the use of physical aggression against a dating partner during the course of conflict. He also found 27.5% of men and 29.6% of women reported receiving dating violence during the course of a conflict. Overall, there were no significant differences in rates of perpetrating violence for men and women. Men were slightly more likely to report receiving severe violence, but the difference was minor. Other studies support the finding that rates of violence do not differ significantly by gender (Marshall & Rose, 1988; White & Koss, 1991).

Despite the research cited above, there is some evidence to suggest that women are more likely to report using violence in the context of dating relationships than men. Stets and Henderson (1991) found that women in their sample were twice as likely as men to report perpetrating minor physical aggression and six times as likely to report perpetrating severe physical aggression. Men were twice as likely as women to report receiving severe aggression from a dating partner. Other studies sampling university populations have also found that women are more likely than men to report perpetrating dating violence (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992; Clark, Beckett, Wells, & Dungee-Anderson, 1994; Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, & Sebastian, 1991; O'Keefe, 1997). Studies using high school samples have found similar patterns (Foshee, 1996; Plass & Gessner, 1983).

The contention that females are more likely to perpetrate violence in dating relationships is one that must be considered with extreme caution. It may not be reasonable to assume that women are more violent than men are, simply because they report higher rates of perpetrating courtship violence. In their study, Plass and Gessner (1983) found that women were more likely to report being the aggressor. However, males were more likely to report perpetrating severe forms of violence. Arias et al. (1987) also found that a larger percentage of women reported perpetrating violence over the course of their dating history. However, when only the current

dating relationship was considered, the rates of perpetrating dating violence were very similar for men and women.

O'Keefe (1997) found that females perpetrated significantly more dating violence than males. However, while not significant, their data suggest that males are more often the initiators of violence. When reasons for the use of violence were examined, males were significantly more likely to report using violence to get control over their partner. Females were significantly more likely to report using violence to show anger or in self-defense. Olday and Wesley's (1988) study supports the notion that females are more likely than males to indicate self defense as a motive for perpetrating dating violence.

Another important factor to consider is the relative impact of violence. It is safe to assume that in most dating relationships the male is the physically larger and stronger partner. While not discounting the problematic nature of violence perpetrated by either partner in a dating relationship, violence perpetrated by men may pose a greater risk to the physical safety of women than vice versa. Makepeace (1986) found that women reported sustaining mild injury three times as often as men. They reported twice the moderate injury and all of the severe injury. In a more recent study, Foshee (1996) found that women reported sustaining more serious and more frequent injury than men.

Finally, there are a number of studies that directly contradict the finding that women perpetrate more violence in dating relationships. Makepeace (1981) found that 69.2% of the males indicating experience with dating violence reported being the aggressor and 91.7% of the females who had experience with dating violence reported they were the victim. Makepeace (1983) found that men were more likely to perpetrate every specific act on the violence sub-scale of the CTS. Men were found to be 2.5 times as likely to use severe forms of violence and 4.5 times as likely to report assaulting their partner with a lethal weapon. Tontodonato and Crew (1992), found no significant differences between reported use of violence by men and women at the bivariate level. However, their multivariate model indicated that men were more likely to perpetrate dating violence.

### Patterns of Violence

There is strong evidence to suggest that dating violence often occurs within the context of a mutually violent relationship. In a study of 355 university students, Cate et al. (1982) found that in 68% of cases in which violence occurred, each partner had been both the victim and perpetrator of violence. Bookwala and Zdaniuk (1998) found that 55.3% of the undergraduates in their sample reported mutual violence. The pattern appears to be relevant to dating relationships in high school, as well. In a study of 77, sixth to 12<sup>th</sup> grade students, Gray and Foshee (1997) found that 14.3% of their sample reported victimization only, 19.5% reported perpetration only, and 66.2% reported mutually violent relationships. In another study of high school students, O'Keefe (1997) found that 42% of females and 48% of males reported that both partners were equally responsible for initiating violence. The contention that violence in dating relationships is often mutual is further supported by the high correlation between perpetrating dating violence and receiving dating violence found in a number of studies (Cate et al., 1982; Clark et al., 1994; Stets & Henderson, 1991; White & Koss, 1991). In fact, Bookwala et al. (1992) found the

variable most strongly correlated with perpetrating dating violence to be receiving violence from a partner.

Dating violence appears to occur more frequently in relationships of longer duration or in those defined as more serious. Cate et al. (1982) conducted a study of courtship violence in a sample of 355 university students. Of those experiencing violence in a dating relationship, 72% first experienced violence after the relationship became serious. Eighty-three percent of the respondents, who continued dating their partner after the occurrence of violence, indicated the first incident of abuse occurred after the relationship became intimate. A number of other studies support the hypothesis that dating violence is more likely to occur in more committed relationships (Burcky et al., 1988; Olday & Wesley, 1988; Pedersen & Thomas, 1992; Plass & Gessner, 1983). However, it is important to note that Cate et al. found that 28% of those reporting dating abuse indicated the abuse occurred during casual dating.

One of the limitations of many studies on dating violence is their inability to distinguish between isolated incidents of violence and a pattern of continued violence. In many cases this is a result of the way the violence variable is constructed. Often times, no distinction is made between reports of one incident of violence and reports of multiple incidences of violence. It is difficult to say with any certainty whether dating violence is typically restricted to a few isolated incidences or is representative of a pattern of violence. In a study of 1465 university students, Olday and Wesley (1988) found that 16% of the sample reported at least one incident of dating violence. Of these respondents, 37% experienced only one incident of violence, while 63% experienced violence on multiple occasions. The majority, 72%, experienced violence with only one partner. In contrast, Cate et al. (1982) obtained data from 355 university students and found that abuse occurred with an average of 2.71 partners. Burcky et al. (1988) found that 24% of 123 high school girls reported one incident of victimization and 14.6% reported multiple incidents of victimization. Bergman (1992) found a much higher percentage of respondents reporting repeat victimization in a high school sample. The respective percentages for men and women are 40.9% and 45.1%.

### Reporting

Dating violence is a hidden problem. Research consistently indicates that the occurrence of violence in dating relationships is rarely reported to authorities (Burcky et al., 1988; LeJeune & Follette, 1994; Olday & Wesley, 1988; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). Makepeace (1981) found that only 5.1% of respondents who reported experience with dating violence notified the police. In a more recent study of 465 university students, LeJeune and Follette (1994) found that none of the respondents who experienced dating violence told the authorities about the incident. Following an incident of violence, university and high school students are most likely to report the incident to a friend (Burcky et al., 1988; LeJeune & Follette, 1994; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). Most disturbing, it appears that a large percentage of both high school and university students will not report the incident of violence to anyone (Bergman, 1992; LeJeune & Follette, 1994).

### Sample Populations

While there is a growing body of research examining dating violence in high school age populations, the overwhelming majority of studies utilize college and university samples. A much smaller number of studies examine dating violence exclusively in cohabiting couples. High school, university, and cohabiting populations are representative of different life-cycle stages. Very few studies have endeavored to determine if dating violence is a similar or distinct phenomenon across these groups.

Olday and Wesley (1988) sampled 1465 university men and women to obtain information about their experiences with violence in high school and college dating relationships. They found that a greater percentage of respondents reported that violence occurred in a college dating relationship. When gender was considered, they found twice as many women than men reported violence while in college. Half of respondents reporting violence in high school dating relationships were male. Respondents who experienced violence in college were more likely than those who experienced violence in high school to report severe forms of violence. College women were more likely to report suffering injury. Both high school and college women were most likely to indicate self-defense as a motive for perpetrating violence. However, college women were slightly more likely than high school women to report intimidation or intent to injure as a motive.

These results indicate that dating violence was more common in college dating relationships, especially for women. They, also, suggest that violence in college dating relationships is of a more serious nature. In contrast, Plass and Gessner (1983) found that high school students were more involved in dating violence than college students. His sample included both high school and college students.

Magdol, Moffitt, and Caspi (1998) used data from a larger longitudinal study to examine intimate violence in married, cohabiting, and dating couples. He found that respondents who were cohabiting were more likely to use violence in their relationships than either married or dating respondents. He also found that cohabiting respondents used a wider variety of violent tactics than married or dating respondents.

### Link to Marital Violence

There is evidence to suggest that dating violence may be part of a continuum of violence beginning in adolescent dating relationships and continuing through marriage. Despite the absence of many barriers to leaving found in marital relationships, dating relationships often continue after violence occurs. Researches have found that 20% to 80% of respondents in their samples, who report experience with dating violence, remain in the dating relationship following the incident. Some respondents report that the relationship improved following the violence (Bergman, 1992; Burcky et al., 1988; Cate et al., 1982; Olday & Wesley, 1988). Researchers have also found similar patterns of violence in dating and marital relationships (Rouse, Breen, & Howell, 1988).

In a study of 422 university students, Lo and Sporkowski (1989) found that 69.7% of the sample experienced violence in a dating relationship. The high rates of violence reported in their study may be partially accounted for by the inclusion of symbolic acts of violence in the construct dating violence. Of the respondents who experienced violence, 76.8% planned to continue the relationship, 16% expected the relationship to last for a couple of years, and 33.8% expected to marry the person with whom they experienced violence. Lo and Sporkowski's results suggest that whether or not the violence remains private is a significant factor in the decision to continue the relationship. Other factors include the severity of violence, the level of investment in the relationship, and how the partner reacted to the violence.

The finding that over 30% of individuals who experienced dating violence expected to marry the person with whom they experienced violence is supported by other studies. Roscoe and Benaske (1985) sampled 85 women who experienced abuse in their marital relationship. Fifty-one percent of the sample reported victimization in prior dating relationships, 23% reported perpetrating violence in a dating relationship, and 30% eventually married someone who was violent during their dating relationship. Those who reported victimization in dating relationships experienced abuse in an average of 2.45 relationships and remained in the relationships an average of 5.4 years. A comparison of the violence in the respondents dating and marital relationships revealed similar patterns of violence and similarity in the perceived causal factors. As part of a longitudinal study, O'Leary and Arias (1988) collected data from 393 engaged couples. Forty-six percent of the couples reported experience with dating violence in the year prior to the assessment. Thirty-three percent of the men and 42% of the women reported perpetrating dating violence against their partner at least once.

### Risk Factors

In an attempt to better understand dating violence, researchers have examined a wide variety of moderating variables and risk factors. One of these variables, gender, is discussed earlier in this review. A brief acknowledgement of some other variables is warranted because they are important considerations in much of the current literature on dating violence. They are, also, potential mediators of the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence.

The majority of studies on dating violence have utilized samples that are predominantly white. There are relatively few studies that examine race as a factor in dating violence. The lack of studies addressing the impact of race and ethnicity is an obvious gap in the literature on dating violence. Of the studies examining race as a variable, a number find that dating violence is reported more often among African American and Latino respondents (O'Keefe, 1997; Plass & Gessner, 1983) (DeMaris, 1990). However, Clark et al. (1994) found rates of dating violence in an African American sample to be similar to those reported in predominantly white samples.

Billingham and Gilbert (1990) examined the relationship between parental divorce and dating violence. Univariate analysis revealed no relationship. However, in a follow-up study of 1405 university students, Billingham and Notebaert (1993) found that respondents from divorced families reported more perpetration and victimization in dating relationships than respondents from continuously intact families.



The age of respondents has been examined in relation to dating violence (Olday & Wesley, 1988; Reuterman & Burcky, 1989; Stets & Henderson, 1991). Researchers have examined the impact of gender orientation and identification with traditional gender roles on dating violence (Bernard, Bernard, & Bernard, 1985; Reuterman & Burcky, 1989; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987; Thompson, 1991). Studies have addressed the association between the use of alcohol and dating violence (Burcky et al., 1988; LeJeune & Follette, 1994; Makepeace, 1981; Olday & Wesley, 1988; Stets & Henderson, 1991). The influence of socioeconomic status on dating violence has been considered (O'Keefe, 1997; Stets & Henderson, 1991). Other factors of interest include the influence of peers on male use of violence (DeKeseredy, 1988), the influence of stress (DeKeseredy, 1989; Makepeace, 1983), self-esteem (Jezl et al., 1996), geographical location of the sample (Reuterman & Burcky, 1989), situational motives such as jealousy and anger (Bookwala et al., 1992; O'Keefe, 1997), attachment styles (Bookwala & Zdaniuk, 1998), and family of origin violence. Because the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence is the focus of this study, a more detailed discussion of the pertinent literature is contained later in this review.

### Conclusion

Dating violence is a complex phenomenon. The research encompasses a wide variety of approaches and conclusions. Given the complexity of the subject and the disparity of the findings, it is apparent that dating violence cannot be understood or explained in simple terms. However, there are some general conclusions suggested by the research. First, dating violence is prevalent in high school and college populations. It represents a serious problem accompanied by real risk. Second, women may report perpetrating more dating violence than men. However, this cannot be construed to mean that women are more violent than men. Further research is needed to clarify the meanings, motives, and impact of violence, for both men and women, in dating relationships. Third, dating violence is frequently mutual. The old adage that violence begets violence is applicable. Fourth, dating violence is typically mild to moderate in severity. This does not imply that it should not be taken seriously. There is sufficient evidence that severe violence does occur in dating relationships. Furthermore, even moderate levels of violence represent a potential for physical and psychological harm. Fifth, dating violence is more prevalent in relationships defined as committed and those of longer duration. Sixth, Dating violence frequently remains hidden from public awareness. Individuals who experience dating violence rarely report it to authorities. Finally, dating violence is a complex phenomenon, influenced by numerous variables.

### Theoretical Perspective

The assumption of a relationship between violence in the family of origin and violence in dating relationships rests upon the theoretical foundation of Social Learning Theory. By examining whether or not a relationship exists across the current literature, this study tests the applicability of Social Learning Theory to the understanding of dating violence.

Social Learning Theory integrates theoretical perspectives focused on internal determinants of behavior with perspectives focused on external determinants. In Social Learning

Theory, behavior, personal factors, and environmental factors are viewed as interrelated contributors to the learning and performing of behavior (Bandura, 1977).

Central to Social Learning Theory is the idea that human beings are not born with a set of predetermined patterns of behavior. Instead, behavior must be learned. New patterns of behavior are learned by direct experience or by witnessing the behavior of others. Modeling is especially important for learning complex behaviors. Whether behavior patterns are adopted or discarded depends on the interaction of internal and external reinforcements (Bandura, 1977).

Observational learning plays a key role in acquiring new behavior patterns. In order to learn through modeling, the individual must first attend to the behavior. We do not attend to all behaviors equally. Instead, we are most likely to attend to those with whom we frequently associate or persons with greater attraction and power. The patterns of behavior must then be retained through symbolic visual or verbal coding. Mentally rehearsing behavior patterns helps in the retention process. Finally, the behavior is reproduced. However, it is not necessary for the behavior to be reproduced immediately following the observation. People are capable of acquiring complicated patterns of response without immediately reproducing them (Bandura, 1977).

Motivation influences whether behavior will be adopted or abandoned. Behavior is more likely to be adopted if it is rewarded or if it is perceived as effective for others. Observing others engage in threatening or prohibited activities without punishment may lessen inhibitions against the behavior and increase the likelihood it will be reproduced. It is important to note that Social Learning Theory views external reinforcement as a facilitator and not a requirement for observational learning. Anticipation of reinforcement may be sufficient to influence the reproduction of behavior. Finally, through a process of abstract modeling, previously learned patterns of behavior may be adapted and applied in different situations and environments (Bandura, 1977).

Families provide us with our first models of interpersonal relationships. Parents are a powerful and influential presence in the lives of children. For most of childhood they are the only models of behavior in intimate relationships. It is reasonable to assume that the actions of parents leave a lasting impression on children. Children who witness or experience abuse in the home are left with a model for intimate relationships based on violence. Examining how these early models impact later behavior in dating relationships will improve our ability to understand and address the problem.

### Intergenerational Transmission of Violence

Studies examining the intergenerational transmission of violence in courtship can boast of, at least, one point of agreement. The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence is neither simple nor direct. As with dating violence in general, a number of moderating variables factor into our understanding.

### Gender of Respondent

Gender emerges as one of the most important predictor variables (Tontodonato & Crew, 1992). In a study of 289 male and female university students, Gwartney-Gibbs et al. (1987) found that witnessing inter-parental aggression was a significant predictor of perpetrating and receiving dating violence for males. Witnessing more severe forms of aggression in the family of origin was associated with perpetrating more severe forms of violence in dating relationships. The strongest predictors of female aggression were proximal variables including the nature of the dating relationship and having a sexually aggressive peer group. They suggest the development of separate models of dating aggression for males and females and consideration of more proximal variables. The results of Foo and Margolin's (1995) study support the finding that witnessing inter-parental aggression is significant for males, but not for females.

Alexander et al. (1991) sampled 152 male and 228 female college students. They found that family of origin violence was not a significant predictor of dating violence for females and only significant for males when they experienced abuse from their fathers. Family of origin violence had a significant impact on men's and women's attitudes. Men who witnessed inter-parental violence were significantly more conservative in their attitudes towards women. Women who witnessed inter-parental violence were significantly more likely to adopt liberal attitudes. The authors found that when more liberal women were matched with more conservative men, there was an increased chance of violence occurring. The authors suggest a model for dating violence that combines Social Learning Theory with Feminist Theory.

Stith et al. (1998) conducted a meta-analysis on 39 studies that examined the relationship between family of origin violence and marital violence. Their results indicate that gender is an important moderator of the relationship. A stronger relationship was found between family of origin violence and perpetrating marital violence, as well as, between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating marital violence for males. Stronger relationships were found, for females, between family of origin violence and becoming a victim of marital violence, as well as, experiencing abuse as a child and becoming a victim of marital violence.

### Gender of Abusive Parent

The gender of the parent perpetrating abuse in the family of origin may effect the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. MacEwen (1994) sampled 28 undergraduate men and 45 undergraduate women. He found that both maternal and paternal use of aggression predicted male and female use of aggression in dating relationships. Marshall and Rose (1988) produced similar results. These findings do not support the convention that fathers are typically the more powerful models of behavior in the family of origin. However, the results do support the tenant of Social Learning Theory that identification with a model is important. MacEwen found that males who were exposed to high levels of paternal aggression and who identified strongly with their fathers experienced more relationship aggression than males who were exposed to high levels of paternal aggression but scored low on identification with their fathers. The relationship between identification with mothers and relationship aggression could not be analyzed separately due to a limited sample.

Cantrell et al. (1995) studied 144 college age women and 112 college age men. They found witnessing moderate levels of father to mother and mother to father violence were associated with the occurrence of violence in dating relationships. When respondents witnessed severe inter-parental violence, only father to mother violence was significantly related to dating violence. Alexander et al. (1991) found that men are more likely to report involvement in dating violence as both perpetrators and victims, if they experienced severe levels of abuse from their father. The relationship did not hold for abuse inflicted by mothers. It is possible that for respondents in these samples, fathers were more powerful models for the use of intimate violence.

There are studies suggesting that mothers are also powerful models for relationship aggression. Breslin, Riggs, O'Leary, and Arias (1990) studied 405 university men and women. They found that witnessing inter-parental aggression was related to both male and female's use of violence in dating relationships. However, only witnessing maternal aggression was significant for males. For females, witnessing neither paternal nor maternal aggression alone was significantly related to the use of violence in dating relationships.

### Witnessing vs. Experiencing

Studies suggest that whether family of origin violence is witnessed or experienced will moderate the relationship with dating violence. Researchers have found varying amounts of support for the relative relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and dating violence. While not conclusive, it appears there is a trend towards finding direct experience of violence in the family of origin is a stronger predictor of dating violence than witnessing inter-parental violence (Alexander et al., 1991; Marshall & Rose, 1988; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Reuterman & Burcky, 1989).

In their meta-analysis on the relationship between family of origin violence and marital violence, Stith et al. (1998) found the type of family violence to be a significant moderator of the relationship between family of origin violence and marital violence. Specifically, they found witnessing inter-parental violence, rather than experiencing violence as a child, to have a stronger relationship with perpetrating marital violence. Experiencing violence as a child, rather than witnessing inter-parental violence, was found to have a stronger relationship with receiving marital violence. Some studies have found that experiencing abuse in the family of origin may play a particularly important role in women's later victimization and men's perpetration of violence in dating relationships (Marshall & Rose, 1988; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Reuterman & Burcky, 1989).

Understanding the relative influence of witnessing versus experiencing violence in childhood is complicated by the finding that the two variables are often interrelated. MacEwen (1994) found a high degree of multi-collinearity between witnessing and experiencing parental aggression. Their results suggest that the two variables may not be distinct constructs. The authors suggest that children who witness and experience family violence may be at greater risk for involvement in violent dating relationships than children who experience either type of family violence alone.

## Race

As stated earlier, studies of the impact of race on dating violence are under-represented in the literature. This is especially true for studies of the impact of race on the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships. DeMaris (1990) conducted one of the few studies examining race of the respondents. He sampled 921 university students in an effort to compare the impact of family violence on white and African American students' dating relationships. Experiencing harsh childhood punishment, defined as non-normative aggression, was not a significant predictor of dating violence for African American or white respondents. Witnessing inter-parental aggression was not significant when results were averaged across race. However, when race was considered, witnessing inter-parental aggression emerged as a significant predictor of violence against African American girlfriends and a significant deterrent to the use of violence against white girlfriends. The legitimacy accorded to parental use of violence did not differ by race.

## Other Factors

Utilizing a sample of 232 high school students who reported exposure to high levels of inter-parental violence, O'Keefe (1998) examined factors that mediate the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships. The variables included, witnessing inter-parental violence, experiencing child abuse, acceptance of dating violence, exposure to community and school violence, self-esteem, success in school, alcohol/drug use, and socio-economic status.

Five variables differentiated males exposed to inter-parental violence that perpetrated violence in dating relationships from males who were not violent. Those variables were lower socioeconomic status, exposure to community and school violence, acceptance of dating violence, and experiencing child abuse. Self-esteem emerged as an important protective factor for males. Three variables differentiate females exposed to high levels of inter-parental violence that perpetrated dating violence from females who were not violent. Those variables were exposure to community and school violence, poor school performance, and experiencing child abuse. Success in school emerged as a protective factor for females (O'Keefe, 1998).

MacEwen (1994) studied the influence of family violence and the perceived impact of family violence on dating violence. They found the perceived impact of family aggression to be a significant moderator of the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships. Respondents who reported high levels of family aggression and high levels of perceived negative impact on the family reported significantly more dating violence than respondents who reported exposure to high levels of family violence and low levels of perceived negative impact.

## Conclusion

As with dating violence in general, the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships is a complex phenomenon. The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence is unclear. The research does suggest some consensus. However, for every point of consensus outlined below, there are studies with conflicting findings. First, family of origin violence does appear to play a role in dating violence. The exact nature of this

role is yet to be defined. Second, gender is an important variable in understanding intergenerational transmission of violence. Third, direct experience of family violence may have a stronger relationship with dating violence than witnessing inter-parental violence. Fourth, the gender of the parent perpetrating violence in the family of origin may moderate the relationship with dating violence. Finally, a large number of personal, inter-personal, and proximal variables interact with experience of family violence to predict violence in dating relationships. Increasing our understanding of the individual variables will add to our understanding of the larger phenomenon of dating violence.

## CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

### Design

This study uses meta-analytic techniques to review the literature on the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships. Meta-analysis is a statistical method for reviewing multiple studies across the relevant research literature. A meta-analysis may be descriptive or explanatory. The goal of a descriptive meta-analysis is to summarize findings across a research area. Explanatory meta-analyses seek to explain inconsistencies in the results of separate studies by examining the relationship between study outcomes and characteristics of the individual studies (Durlack, 1995). This review contains aspects of both descriptive and explanatory meta-analyses.

Comparison of separate studies is made possible through the use of effect sizes. The effect size is a statistical representation of the magnitude of the relationship between two variables. Statistical procedures standardize the data from each individual study. The standardized data are reported as an effect size. Because results have been transformed to a common metric, the magnitude of effect sizes from different studies may be compared. During analysis, the effect sizes become the dependent variable and study features become the independent variables. Examples of study features include the unique characteristics of subjects in a sample, the types of measures used, year of publication, and study quality (Durlack, 1995).

Several assumptions are made when conducting a meta-analysis (Wampler & Serovich, 1996). First, the topic under study has been sufficiently researched to provide data for analysis. Second, quantifying the phenomenon under study will provide a meaningful representation of the findings. Third, integrating findings across a large number of studies will provide a better understanding of the issue than any one study. Finally, the individual studies that comprise the analysis have produced meaningful results. If the individual studies do not contain valid research then the meta-analysis will yield results with equally questionable validity.

### Strengths

Meta-analyses have several strengths (Durlack, 1995; Johnson, 1989). First, since meta-analyses represent a variety of statistical methods and not a theory, they may be used in conjunction with any theoretical perspective. Second, meta-analyses are able to summarize the findings from a large number of studies and present them in a way that is easily understood. Third, inconsistencies between the findings of individual studies can be explained through examination of study characteristics. Meta-analyses have a lower probability of type II error than many other types of literature reviews. Type II error occurs when analysis fails to find a relationship, despite its existence. Traditional literature reviews may fail to find a significant relationship as a result of study artifacts, such as different sample sizes, different populations sampled, and different measures used. Hunter and Schmidt (1990) suggest that “conflicting results in the literature” may be the result of such artifacts. Fourth, meta-analytic reviews often highlight gaps in the research literature and indicate areas for future research.

## Weaknesses

Meta-analyses are not without drawbacks. It is virtually impossible to locate and include every relevant study in a research area (Durlack, 1995). In addition, meta-analyses exclude qualitative studies (Wampler & Serovich, 1996). Studies that are overlooked or excluded from analysis may contain results that would significantly effect the outcome. Furthermore, it has been suggested that studies reporting significant findings are more likely to be published. This “publication bias” could effect the outcome of a meta-analysis. Because meta-analyses include data from studies using different methodologies, there is a risk that the analyses may be comparing results based on separate constructs (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990). Johnson (1989) suggests that while meta-analyses offer improved methodological rigor over traditional narrative reviews, the best literature reviews contain elements of both.

## Reliability and Validity

The term meta-analysis refers to a type of research not one specific statistical method. The exact procedures and statistical methods employed in a meta-analysis are up to the researcher. However, the procedures will impact the validity and reliability of the study and should be carefully considered (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990; Johnson, 1989; Wampler & Serovich, 1996). The study should include clear guidelines for retrieval of relevant articles and for the inclusion or exclusion of studies (Johnson, 1989). The coding system should accurately reflect the constructs under study. The reliability and validity of the study will be improved if independent coders are used (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990; Johnson, 1989). Analysis of data should include an examination of heterogeneity (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990). Essentially, tests of heterogeneity indicate whether the variation in effect sizes is significantly greater than expected by chance. A heterogeneous sample suggests the existence of two or more distinct groups within the sample and indicates the need for analyses of sub-groups. Results based on heterogeneous samples are difficult to interpret. However, researchers should be aware that examining large numbers of relationships within a small sub-sample could result in reduced statistical power.

A second threat to the reliability and validity of a meta-analysis lies within the individual studies included in the review (Hunter & Schmidt, 1990; Wampler & Serovich, 1996). It is possible the findings of less methodologically rigorous studies could be a result of the study’s design rather than the relationship between variables. If there are questions as to the reliability and validity of studies included in the meta-analysis, efforts should be made to determine if a relationship exists between study quality and effect sizes (Durlack, 1995).

## Purpose

The primary purpose of this study is to provide a descriptive overview of the current research on the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships. Specifically, does the research support the existence of a relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence? A secondary goal of this study is to explain some of the inconsistency in study findings through an examination of moderator variables. Specifically, how do gender of the respondent, witnessing versus experiencing family violence, and perpetrating versus receiving



dating violence effect the strength of the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence.

### Procedure

The first step of any meta-analysis is to formulate the research questions that will guide the study (Durlack, 1995; Johnson, 1989; Wampler & Serovich, 1996). The meta-analysis conducted by Stith et al. (1998) provided the model for this study and the initial point of reference for the development of research questions. A review of the dating violence literature (see Chapter Two) provided the information necessary for the development of hypothesis and research questions specific to the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships.

### Hypotheses

*Hypothesis One: Family of origin violence will be significantly related to involvement in violent dating relationships.*

The fundamental assertion of the intergenerational transmission hypothesis is that violence in the family of origin is related to the development of violent relationships later in life. There is disagreement as to the strength of the relationship and disagreement about how other variables influence the relationship. However, the results of many studies support the hypothesis that a relationship exists between family of origin violence and violence in dating relationships (Alexander et al., 1991; Breslin et al., 1990; Cantrell et al., 1995; Foo & Margolin, 1995; Killian & Busby, 1992; MacEwen, 1994). Therefore, the first hypothesis is that family of origin violence will be significantly related to dating violence.

*Hypothesis Two: There will be a stronger relationship between experiencing violence as a child and dating violence than between witnessing inter-parental violence and dating violence.*

Whether violence is witnessed or experienced in the family of origin is one of the variables that may moderate the strength of the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. Having been abused as a child may result in more powerful modeling of violent behavior than witnessing inter-parental violence. According to Social Learning Theory, more powerful modeling increases the likelihood that a behavior will be reproduced (Bandura, 1977). Several studies find the experience of violence in childhood to predict dating violence, while no relationship is found for witnessing inter-parental violence (Alexander et al., 1991; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987). Therefore, the second hypothesis is that a stronger relationship will be found between experiencing violence as a child, rather than witnessing inter-parental violence, and involvement in violent dating relationships.

### Research Questions

The review of the dating violence literature reveals a number of variables that influence the relationship between violence in the family of origin and dating violence (see Chapter Two). However, it is often difficult to determine, with confidence, the direction or extent of the influence. Therefore, the specific contribution of gender, witnessing versus experiencing family

violence, and perpetrating violence versus victimization in dating relationships will be addressed through the following research questions:

1. Does coming from a violent home have a stronger relationship with perpetrating dating violence or victimization by a dating partner?
2. Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with perpetrating dating violence?
3. Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships?
4. Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with involvement in violent dating relationships for males?
5. Does family of origin violence have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships or perpetrating dating violence for males?
6. Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with perpetrating violence in dating relationships for males?
7. Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships for males?
8. Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with involvement in violent dating relationships for females?
9. Does family of origin violence have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships or perpetrating dating violence for females?
10. Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with perpetrating violence in dating relationships for females?
11. Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships for females?
12. Is the relationship between family of origin violence and involvement in a violent dating relationship stronger for males or females?
13. Is the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in violent dating relationship stronger for males or females?
14. Is the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and involvement in a violent dating relationship stronger for males or females?
15. Is the relationship between family of origin violence and victimization in dating relationships stronger for males or females?
16. Is the relationship between family of origin violence and perpetrating dating violence stronger for males or females?
17. Is the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating violence in dating relationships stronger for males or females?

18. Is the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating violence in a dating relationship stronger for males or females?
19. Is the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and victimization in dating relationships stronger for males or females?
20. Is the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and victimization in dating relationships stronger for males or females?

### Literature Search

The next step in a meta-analysis is to search the research literature for studies to include in the analysis. The most common methods for searching the literature are examining the reference lists of previous literature reviews, computer database searches, manual searches of relevant journals, examining the reference lists of studies identified for inclusion in the meta-analysis, and references from colleagues (Durlack, 1995; Johnson, 1989). While all of these methods were employed in this study, computer database searches were the primary method of identifying studies. The following computer databases were searched for studies conducted between 1980 and 1998: Dissertation Abstracts Online, ERIC, Sociological Abstracts, Medline, PsychLit, Social Sciences Abstracts, and the Social Sciences Citation Index. The key words used in the search were dating and violence, courtship and violence, dating and abuse, courtship and abuse, dating and aggression, and courtship and aggression. The literature review revealed that inclusion of data on family of origin violence is secondary to the primary focus of many studies. Therefore, to capture the most studies with data on family of origin violence, the key words were chosen to identify all studies of dating violence.

The literature search identified over 240 studies for possible inclusion in this meta-analysis. However, it was impossible to obtain all of the identified studies. Unpublished master's thesis and doctoral dissertations made up the majority of studies that could not be retrieved. Obtaining these studies would have required purchasing them at a cost beyond the resources available for this study. Of the studies identified in the literature search, 163 were obtained for consideration in this meta-analysis.

### Inclusion Criteria

The inclusion of studies in this meta-analysis was based on the following criteria (Johnson, 1989; Stith et al., 1998; Wampler & Serovich, 1996). The study must examine the relationship between witnessing or experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating or experiencing violence in dating relationships. The study must include data on physical violence. Studies that focus solely on psychological, emotional, verbal, or sexual abuse were excluded. The study must contain data on courtship violence among heterosexual couples. Each study must include the quantitative data necessary for the calculation of at least one effect size. Finally, each study must use an original sample. It is not uncommon for more than one study to report results based on data obtained from the same sample. Results from separate studies using the same sample were included only if they reported data that could be used to calculate distinct effect sizes.

Two other considerations are important when determining if studies are to be included in a meta-analysis. The first is whether to include data from unpublished studies in the analysis. It has been suggested that a “publication bias” exists in the research literature. The bias is a result of the increased likelihood of studies that report significant findings to be accepted for publication (Durlack, 1995). Because non-significant findings are as important as significant findings in a meta-analysis, this study included data from published and unpublished sources.

A second consideration is whether to include studies of lesser methodological quality (Durlack, 1995). The findings from studies of poorer quality may be unreliable and could effect the reliability of the meta-analysis. However, less rigorous methods do not mean that a study will obtain results that are significantly different from more rigorous studies. Therefore, in this meta-analysis, no attempt was made to exclude studies based on study quality. Instead, study quality was considered as part of the coding process and included as part of the analysis.

The literature search yielded a large number of studies for possible inclusion in the meta-analysis. This was due, in part, to the decision to use a broadly defined search. The author of this study conducted a preliminary review of the studies. The purpose of the review was to eliminate studies that did not contain data on family of origin violence. Of the 163 studies obtained, 106 studies were eliminated from consideration because examination of family of origin violence was not part of their design. Fifty-seven studies were retained for coding.

### Coding

The codebook used in this study was based on the one used by Stith et al. (1998). Initial changes were made to the design of their codebook based on discussions with the authors. Further changes were made, based on the review of the dating violence literature, to reflect the research questions addressed in this study. The codebook is designed to capture bibliographical information, sample characteristics, types of measures used, study quality, and data for the calculation of effect sizes from each of the studies included in the meta-analysis. An example of the guidelines for coding effect sizes and an example of the codebook are contained in Appendix A and Appendix B.

A specific consideration in the development of the codebook was what to use as the unit of analysis. There are three choices (Durlack, 1995). One option is to include data for the calculation of effect sizes based on each dependent measure in each study. A limitation of this approach is that studies containing data for the calculation of multiple effect sizes would be over represented in the analysis. A second choice is to calculate a single effect size for each study. However, this approach may obscure unique differences within the individual studies. The third option is to calculate an effect size for each construct under examination and is the approach used in this study. The following is a list of the constructs defined in the codebook.

1. Experienced abuse as a child & dating violence
2. Witnessed abuse as a child & dating violence
3. Experienced or witnessed abuse & dating violence
4. Experienced abuse as a child & victimized

5. Experienced abuse as a child & perpetrated
6. Witnessed inter-parental abuse as a child & victimized
7. Witnessed inter-parental abuse as a child & perpetrated
8. Experienced or witnessed abuse as a child & victimized
9. Experienced or witnessed abuse as a child & perpetrated
10. Both experienced & witnessed abuse as a child & victimized
11. Both experienced & witnessed abuse as a child & perpetrated
12. Witnessed father abusing mother & victimized
13. Witnessed father abusing mother & perpetrated
14. Witnessed mother abusing father & victimized
15. Witnessed mother abusing father & perpetrated
16. Experienced father's abuse as a child & victimized
17. Experienced father's abuse as a child & perpetrated
18. Experienced mother's abuse as a child & victimized
19. Experienced mother's abuse as a child & perpetrated
20. Experienced both parent's abuse as a child & victimized
21. Experienced both parent's abuse as a child & perpetrated

Each of the constructs was considered separately for data based on exclusively male samples, exclusively female samples, and mixed gender samples. Therefore, there are a total of 63 possible constructs in the codebook. All of the constructs are not mutually exclusive. For instance, the construct "witness abuse as a child and perpetrate dating violence" encompasses the construct "witnessed father abusing mother and perpetrated". In all cases, effect sizes were calculated for the most specific applicable construct.

A team of six graduate students coded studies. The six students were divided into pairs. Each pair was responsible for coding a number of studies. The first five studies were coded by the entire coding team as well as the faculty advisor. This was done to develop a consistent approach to the coding process. After the first five studies, there was no duplication of studies between pairs. The individual members of a pair independently coded each of the studies assigned to them. The coding team met once a week so that each pair of coders could compare their codebooks. In all cases, the occurrence of a disagreement in coding was recorded in the codebook. The average rate of coder agreement was 94.9%. When discrepancies occurred, the coding pair was encouraged to discuss the issue and make a joint decision as to how the particular item should be coded. Discussion took place in a group setting so that all of the coders could benefit. Any discrepancies or questions that could not be resolved by the coding pair were

brought to the author of this study. Again, the issue was discussed until a consensus was reached. If questions or discrepancies remained, the issue was discussed with the faculty advisor.

The coding process identified more studies to be excluded from the analyses. Of the 57 studies coded, 22 were excluded from the analyses because they did not meet the criteria for inclusion. Ten studies reported results from types of analyses that could not be transformed into effect sizes by the statistical approach used in this study. Eight studies did not report all the data necessary for the calculation of an effect size. Two studies were excluded because the characteristics of the sample did not meet the inclusion criteria. One study was excluded because pages were missing and the complete study could not be obtained. One dissertation was excluded because the data and results were replicated in a published journal article included in the study. The results reported in this meta-analysis are based on the data from 35 studies. The individual studies contained data for the calculation of 118 effect sizes.

### Data Analysis

Data entry and analyses were done using the "D-Stat" statistical package (Johnson, 1989). The program is designed specifically for use in conducting a meta-analysis. D-Stat is capable of computing effect sizes from means, standard deviations, t-tests, F-tests (ANOVA), r-values, chi-square, significance levels, proportions, and frequencies. D-Stat reports effect sizes as d-values, g-values, and r-values. G-values are a numerical representation of the relationship between two variables expressed in standard deviation units. The value may be positive or negative, with the sign indicating the direction of the relationship. A value of 0.00 indicates no relationship. D-values are g-values that have been corrected for sample size. R-values represent the relationship between two variables expressed as point-biserial correlations or Pearson's *r*. D-Stat also reports a 95% confidence interval for each effect size. In addition, D-Stat allows the entry of study variables for each effect size. The study variables entered were gender of respondents, type of family of origin violence, type of dating violence, sample setting, mean age of respondents, and study quality. A complete description of the coding conventions used for data entry is contained in Appendix C.

Data from each study were entered and effect sizes were calculated. Many of the studies reported data on several constructs and produced multiple effect sizes. Two studies did not include specific data or levels of significance. Instead, the author's reported that findings were significant or non-significant. In such cases, a significance level of 0.05 was entered in D-Stat for findings reported as significant and a significance level of 0.5 was entered for findings reported as non-significant (Amato & Keith, 1991). Two studies presented results in a table that identified a range for the sample size. In both cases, the sample size was large and the range was small. Mean substitution was used to calculate the *N*'s for entry in D-Stat. One study reported separate r-values for whites, African Americans, and Latinos. The r-values were averaged using z-transformations to produce a single effect size. One study reported separate r-values for minor and severe violence. Again, the r-values were averaged, using z-transformation, to produce a single effect size.

When this study was first conceptualized, it was hoped that consideration of the gender of the parent perpetrating family of origin violence could be included as a variable in the analyses.

However, not enough of the included studies reported the necessary data. Instead the constructs that included gender of the abusive parent were considered as part of more general constructs. For example, data coded for the construct “experience mother’s abuse and perpetrated” were included in the analysis of the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating dating violence.

Once data entry was complete. A composite effect size was calculated for the overall sample and for each of the constructs defined in the codebook (Durlack, 1995; Johnson, 1989; Wampler & Serovich, 1996). The composite effect size is a representation of the relationship between two variables across all the included studies. Because the constructs used in this study were not all mutually exclusive, it was necessary to generate a single effect size for each construct within each study. Otherwise, studies producing multiple effect sizes would be over represented in the analysis. For example, many of the studies reported data that allowed the calculation of separate effect sizes for males and females. To calculate the composite effect size for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in a violent dating relationship, it was necessary to combine effect sizes within a study that produced separate effect sizes for males and females that witnessed inter-parental violence. D-Stat has a function that allows r-values to be averaged using z-transformations. The average r-value and the total sample size were entered into D-Stat and a single effect size was calculated for each construct within each study. These effect sizes were used to calculate the composite effect size for the overall sample and for each construct.

D-Stat reports a Q statistic for each composite effect size calculated. The Q statistic is a measure of the homogeneity of the sample of individual effect sizes comprising the composite effect size. A significant Q-value indicates that there is greater variation in the sample of effect sizes than would be expected by chance alone (Durlack, 1995). One explanation for a significant Q-value is that the effect sizes in the sample represent the relationship between more than two variables. In other words, there are sub-groups within the sample.

After the calculation of composite effect sizes, model testing was conducted to answer the research questions by evaluating sub-groups within the larger sample. D-Stat allows the comparison of effect sizes based on specific qualities coded for each study. For instance, the magnitude of effect sizes for males can be compared to the magnitude of effect sizes for females. D-Stat computes a composite effect size for each group and then compares the two groups. A measure of homogeneity within each group ( $Q_W$ ) is reported. In addition, a measure of homogeneity between groups ( $Q_B$ ) is reported (Johnson, 1989). A significant between group  $Q_B$ , indicates that the magnitude of effect sizes is significantly different for each group in the analysis.

## CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

The results reported in this chapter are based on the analysis of 35 studies containing data on the relationship between growing up in a violent home and involvement in dating violence. The 35 studies yielded 118 individual effect sizes. A complete list of the studies, effect sizes, source of data, type of childhood violence, type of dating violence, sample size, gender, and sample type is contained in Appendix D.

### Hypothesis One

*Family of origin violence will be significantly related to involvement in violent dating relationships.*

The composite effect size represents the overall relationship between exposure to violence in the family of origin and violence in dating relationships. A single effect size was calculated for each study, producing 35 effect sizes. The individual effect sizes were weighted by sample size and then combined to produce the composite effect size. The results are presented in Table 1. The composite effect size indicates a significant relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence (mean  $r = .129$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

The test of within category homogeneity for the composite effect size was significant ( $Q_w(34) = 149.245$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The significant  $Q_w$  indicates greater variation in the sample of effect sizes than would be expected by chance alone and suggests the presence of sub-samples within the larger sample. The results of the sub-sample analysis are presented in Table 1. The significant measure of within category homogeneity ( $Q_w$ ) for each of the sub-samples below indicates greater variation among effect sizes than would be expected by chance alone.

### Hypothesis Two

*There will be a stronger relationship between experiencing violence as a child and dating violence than between witnessing inter-parental violence and dating violence.*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in dating violence (mean  $r = .110$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between experiencing violence as a child and involvement in dating violence (mean  $r = .124$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The between category test of homogeneity ( $Q_B$ ) represents the degree of variation between two groups of effect sizes.

A significant between category test of homogeneity indicates that the effect sizes in each of two or more sub-groups are significantly different and represent distinct groups. Scores on the between category test of homogeneity for the sub-sample analysis are presented in Table 1. Although the composite effect size for the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and involvement in dating violence is larger than the effect size for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in dating violence, the measure of between group homogeneity ( $Q_B$ ) is not significant. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the magnitude of effect sizes between the two groups.



Table 1

Average Effect Sizes for the Relationship Between Family of Origin Violence and Dating Violence

Variable	k	Mean r	Within Category Test of Homogeneity Q(W)	Between Category Test of Homogeneity Q(B)
<b>Total Sample</b>				
Overall	35	.129 <sup>****</sup>	149.245 <sup>****</sup>	
<b>Sub-Samples</b>				
Witness	28	.110 <sup>****</sup>	93.318 <sup>****</sup>	1.500
Experience	22	.124 <sup>****</sup>	75.675 <sup>****</sup>	
Victimized	17	.119 <sup>****</sup>	91.560 <sup>****</sup>	.060
Perpetrated	25	.122 <sup>****</sup>	89.597 <sup>****</sup>	
Wit & Perp	22	.111 <sup>****</sup>	70.337 <sup>****</sup>	.770
Exp & Perp	15	.122 <sup>****</sup>	47.933 <sup>****</sup>	
Wit & Vict	14	.099 <sup>****</sup>	70.186 <sup>****</sup>	1.090
Exp & Vict	13	.115 <sup>****</sup>	87.696 <sup>****</sup>	

k = Number of effect sizes

\* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.005, \*\*\*\* p<.001

Research Question One

*Does coming from a violent home have a stronger relationship with perpetrating dating violence or victimization by a dating partner?*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between violence in the family of origin and receiving violence in a dating relationship (mean  $r = .119$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between violence in the family of origin and perpetrating dating violence (mean  $r = .122$ ,  $p < .001$ ). No significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) was found.

Research Question Two

*Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with perpetrating dating violence?*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating dating violence (mean  $r = .111$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating dating violence (mean  $r = .122$ ,  $p < .001$ ). No significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) was found.

### Research Question Three

*Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships?*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and receiving dating violence (mean  $r = .099$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between experiencing violence as a child and receiving dating violence (mean  $r = .115$ ,  $p < .001$ ). No significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) was found.

### Male Composite

Because gender has been identified as an important predictor of dating violence, separate analyses were conducted on male and female sub-samples. The results for the male sub-sample are presented in Table 2. The male composite effect size is based on data from 19 studies. A significant relationship was found between violence in the family of origin and dating violence for males (mean  $r = .118$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The significant within category test of homogeneity suggests the presence of greater variation among effect sizes than expected by chance alone ( $Q_W(18) = 40.39$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Although the within category test of homogeneity remains significant, the male sub-sample is more homogenous than the overall sample. Sub-sample analyses were conducted within the male sub-sample. The results are presented in Table 2.

### Research Question Four

*Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with involvement in violent dating relationships for males?*

A composite effect sizes was calculated for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in a violent dating relationship (mean  $r = .129$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between experiencing violence as a child and involvement in a violent dating relationship (mean  $r = .098$ ,  $p < .001$ ). No significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) was found.

### Research Question Five

*Does family of origin violence have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships or perpetrating dating violence for males?*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between family of origin violence and received dating violence (mean  $r = .055$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between family of origin violence and perpetrating dating violence (mean  $r = .137$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The two groups were significantly different ( $Q_B(1) = 9.95$ ,  $p < .01$ ). For males, there is a stronger relationship between family of origin violence and perpetrating dating violence.

Table 2

Average Effect Sizes for the Relationship Between Family of Origin Violence and Dating Violence for Males

Variable	k	Mean r	Within Category Test of Homogeneity Q(W)	Between Category Test of Homogeneity Q(B)
<b>Male Sample</b>				
Overall	19	.118****	40.392***	
<b>Sub-Samples</b>				
Witnessed	17	.129****	46.046***	2.68
Experienced	11	.098****	17.415	
Victimized	4	.055****	2.571	9.95**
Perpetrated	18	.137****	35.353**	
Wit & Perp	16	.145****	44.304****	3.25
Exp & Perp	10	.110****	16.512	
Wit & Vict	4	.064**	1.894	.36
Exp & Vict	4	.044	6.960	

k = Number of effect sizes

\* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.005, \*\*\*\* p<.001

Research Question Six

*Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with perpetrating violence in dating relationships for males?*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating dating violence (mean  $r = .145$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating dating violence (mean  $r = .110$ ,  $p < .001$ ). No significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) was found.

Research Question Seven

*Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships for males?*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and receiving dating violence (mean  $r = .064$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and between experiencing violence as a child and receiving dating violence (mean  $r = .044$ ). The relationship between experiencing violence as a child and receiving dating violence was not significant for males. No significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) was found between the two groups.

## Female Composite

Table 3 presents the results for the analysis of the female sub-sample. The female composite effect size is based on data from 21 studies. Overall, a significant relationship was found between violence in the family of origin and dating violence for females (mean  $r = .115$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The significant test of within group homogeneity indicates greater variation among the effect sizes than would be expected by chance alone ( $Q_W(20) = 65.25$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Table 3 also presents the results of the sub-sample analysis within the female sub-sample.

Table 3

### Average Effect Sizes for the Relationship Between Family of Origin Violence and Dating Violence for Females

Variable	k	Mean r	Within Category Test of Homogeneity Q(W)	Between Category Test of Homogeneity Q(B)
<b>Female Sample</b>				
Overall	21	.115****	65.246****	
<b>Sub-Samples</b>				
Witness	18	.091****	52.653****	6.04*
Experience	15	.129****	50.656****	
Victimized	12	.120****	66.183****	.48
Perpetrated	15	.108****	41.090****	
Wit & Perp	14	.085****	40.201****	7.19**
Exp & Perp	11	.130****	30.454****	
Wit & Vict	10	.103****	56.944****	.67
Exp & Vict	10	.120****	65.374****	

k = Number of effect sizes

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*\*  $p < .001$

### Research Question Eight

*Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with involvement in violent dating relationships for females?*

A composite effect sizes was calculated for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in dating violence (mean  $r = .091$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between experiencing violence as a child and involvement in dating violence (mean  $r = .129$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The two groups were significantly different ( $Q_B(1) = 6.04$ ,  $p < .05$ ). For females, there is a

stronger relationship between experiencing violence as a child and involvement in dating violence.

#### Research Question Nine

*Does family of origin violence have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships or perpetrating dating violence for females?*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between family of origin violence and receiving dating violence (mean  $r = .120$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between family of origin violence and perpetrating dating violence (mean  $r = .108$ ,  $p < .001$ ). No significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) was found.

#### Research Question Ten

*Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with perpetrating violence in dating relationships for females?*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating dating violence (mean  $r = .085$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating dating violence (mean  $r = .130$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The two groups were significantly different ( $Q_B(1) = 7.19$ ,  $p < .01$ ). For females, there is a stronger relationship between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating dating violence.

#### Research Question Eleven

*Does witnessing inter-parental violence or experiencing violence as a child have a stronger relationship with victimization in dating relationships for females?*

A composite effect size was calculated for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and receiving dating violence (mean  $r = .103$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and between experiencing violence as a child and receiving dating violence (mean  $r = .120$ ,  $p < .001$ ). No significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) was found.

#### Gender Comparisons

Using the effect sizes calculated for the within gender comparisons, a series of comparisons were performed to determine if effect sizes for the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence were significantly different for the male and female sub-samples. Table 4 presents the results of the analysis comparing the male and female sub-samples.

Table 4

Comparison of Effect Sizes Between Gender

Variable	k	Mean r	Within Category Test of Homogeneity Q(W)	Between Category Test of Homogeneity Q(B)
Male	19	.118****	40.392***	.05
Female	21	.115****	65.246****	
Male Wit	17	.129****	46.046****	5.39*
Female Wit	18	.091****	52.653****	
Male Exp	11	.099****	17.415	2.92
Female Exp	15	.130****	50.656****	
Male Vict	4	.055****	2.571	5.86*
Female Vict	12	.120****	66.183****	
Male Perp	18	.137****	35.353**	3.07
Female Perp	15	.108****	41.090****	
M Wit & Perp	16	.145****	44.304****	12.54****
F Wit & Perp	14	.085****	40.201****	
M Exp & Perp	10	.110****	16.512	1.09
F Exp & Perp	20	.130****	30.454****	
M Wit & Vict	4	.064****	1.894	2.10
F Wit & Vict	10	.103****	56.944****	
M Exp & Vict	4	.044	6.960	7.90**
F Exp & Vict	10	.120****	65.374****	

k = Number of effect sizes

\* p&lt;.05, \*\* p&lt;.01, \*\*\* p&lt;.005, \*\*\*\* p&lt;.001

Research Question Twelve

*Is the relationship between family of origin violence and involvement in a violent dating relationship stronger for males or females?*

The comparison of male (mean  $r = .118$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and female (mean  $r = .115$ ,  $p < .001$ ) effect sizes for the relationship between family of origin violence and involvement in dating violence revealed no significant difference between the two groups. However, an examination of the type of family violence and the type of dating violence revealed several gender differences.

### Research Question Thirteen

*Is the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in violent dating relationship stronger for males or females?*

The comparison of male (mean  $r = .129$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and female (mean  $r = .091$ ,  $p < .001$ ) effect sizes for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in dating violence found a significant difference between the two groups ( $Q_B(1) = 5.39$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The relationship was stronger for males.

### Research Question Fourteen

*Is the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and involvement in a violent dating relationship stronger for males or females?*

The comparison of male (mean  $r = .099$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and female (mean  $r = .130$ ,  $p < .001$ ) effect sizes for the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and involvement in dating violence found no significant difference between the two groups.

### Research Question Fifteen

*Is the relationship between family of origin violence and victimization in dating relationships stronger for males or females?*

The comparison of male (mean  $r = .055$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and female (mean  $r = .120$ ,  $p < .001$ ) effect sizes for the relationship between family of origin violence and receiving dating violence found a significant difference between the two groups ( $Q_B(1) = 5.86$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The relationship was stronger for females.

### Research Question Sixteen

*Is the relationship between family of origin violence and perpetrating dating violence stronger for males or females?*

The comparison of male (mean  $r = .137$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and female (mean  $r = .108$ ,  $p < .001$ ) effect sizes for the relationship between family of origin violence and perpetrating dating violence found no significant difference between the two groups.

### Research Question Seventeen

*Is the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating violence in dating relationships stronger for males or females?*

The comparison of male (mean  $r = .145$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and female (mean  $r = .085$ ,  $p < .001$ ) effect sizes for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating

dating violence found a significant difference between the two groups ( $Q_B(1) = 12.54, p < .001$ ). The relationship was stronger for males.

#### Research Question Eighteen

*Is the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating violence in a dating relationship stronger for males or females?*

The comparison of male (mean  $r = .110, p < .001$ ) and female (mean  $r = .130, p < .001$ ) effect sizes for the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating dating violence found no significant difference between the two groups.

#### Research Question Nineteen

*Is the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and victimization in dating relationships stronger for males or females?*

The comparison of male (mean  $r = .064, p < .001$ ) and female (mean  $r = .103, p < .001$ ) effect sizes for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and receiving dating violence found no significant difference between the two groups.

#### Research Question Twenty

*Is the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and victimization in dating relationships stronger for males or females?*

The comparison of male (mean  $r = .044$ , not significant) and female (mean  $r = .120, p < .001$ ) effect sizes for the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and receiving dating violence found a significant difference between the two groups ( $Q_B(1) = 7.90, p < .01$ ). The relationship was stronger for females.

#### Setting

Twenty-five of the studies included in this meta-analysis utilized university samples. High school samples were used in five studies. Of the remaining five studies, three utilized a community sample, one utilized an elementary school sample, and one sampled women in a shelter for abused women. The research on dating violence appears to sample university and high school populations more frequently than other populations. For this reason, the effect sizes for studies using university and high school samples were compared to determine if the effect sizes differed by setting. The results are presented in Table 5. No significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) was found between the effect sizes generated from university samples (mean  $r = .137, p < .001$ ) and those from high school samples (mean  $r = .137, p < .001$ ).



Table 5

Comparison of Effect Sizes Between University and High School Samples

Variable	k	Mean r	Within Category Test of Homogeneity Q(W)	Between Category Test of Homogeneity Q(B)
University	25	.137****	124.150****	.01
High School	5	.137****	9.000	

k = Number of effect sizes

\* p<.05, \*\* p<.01, \*\*\* p<.005, \*\*\*\* p<.001

Study Quality

The codebook used in this study (see Appendix B) contains six questions designed to assess study quality. The first five questions require the coder to indicate (0 = No, 1 = Yes) whether or not the study met a specific criteria. The sixth question required the coder to rate the study on a subjective five point scale (1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = neither good, nor poor; 4 = good; 5 = very good). The responses to the six questions were used to calculate a quality score for each study. The quality score was calculated using the following formula:

$$Quality = (sum\ of\ questions\ 38 - 42) + \left( \frac{response\ to\ question\ 43}{2.5} \right)$$

The formula assigns the response to the subjective rating question twice the weight of each of the other five questions. This was done because the subjective rating could reflect aspects of the study not included in the responses to the five questions addressing specific criteria. Using this formula, the quality score for each study has a possible range of zero to seven. Table 6 presents the descriptive statistics for study quality. Based on the study quality score, a categorical value of low (1), medium (2), or high (3) was entered into D-Stat for each effect size. Studies scoring between 0 – 2.3 were coded as low. Studies scoring between 2.4 – 4.6 were coded as medium and studies scoring between 4.7 – 7.0 were coded as high.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Study Quality

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Study Quality	35	.40	7.00	4.77	1.74

A composite effect size was calculated for studies coded as low quality (mean r = .267, p < .001), studies coded as medium quality (mean r = .119, p < .001), and studies coded as high quality (mean r = .110, p < .001). Table 7 presents the results of the comparisons by study

quality. The results are based on study quality ratings for 34 studies. One study was not assigned a quality score because there were missing pages and the information used to calculate study quality could not be accurately coded. A significant difference was found among effect sizes by study quality ( $Q_B(2) = 46.24, p < .001$ ). A second comparison showed no significant difference ( $Q_B$ ) between the effect sizes for studies coded as medium quality and those coded as high quality. Therefore, studies coded as low quality reported significantly different and larger effect sizes than studies coded as medium or high quality.

Table 7

Comparison of Effect Sizes Between Levels of Study Quality

Variable	k	Mean r	Within Category Test of Homogeneity Q(W)	Between Category Test of Homogeneity Q(B)
Low	4	.267****	17.114****	46.24****
Medium	13	.119****	28.276**	
High	17	.110****	57.390****	
Medium	13	.119****	28.276**	.36
High	17	.110****	57.390****	

k = Number of effect sizes

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .005$ , \*\*\*\*  $p < .001$

## CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

The findings of this meta-analysis are based on data from 35 studies that produced 118 individual effect sizes. The individual effect sizes ranged from  $r$ -values of  $-.071$  for males who experienced violence as a child and perpetrated dating violence to  $.750$  for females who witnessed inter-parental violence and were victimized in a dating relationship. The composite effect sizes generated in this study ranged from  $.044$  for males who experienced violence and were victimized in a dating relationship to  $.145$  for males who witnessed inter-parental violence and perpetrated dating violence.

### Summary of Findings

The results of this meta-analysis support the first hypothesis. A significant relationship was found between family of origin violence and involvement in violent dating relationships. In addition, significant composite effect sizes were found between family of origin violence and dating violence in 25 of the 26 sub-samples analyzed. The significant positive effect sizes ranged from  $r$ -values of  $.064$  ( $p < .01$ ) to  $.145$  ( $p < .001$ ). The single non-significant composite effect size had an  $r$ -value of  $.044$  and approached significance ( $p = .07$ ).

Durlack (1995) suggests that effect sizes of  $.20$  represent a weak relationship, effect sizes of  $.50$  represent a moderate relationship, and effect sizes of  $.80$  represent a strong relationship. However, this convention does not represent a hard and fast rule. Instead, interpretation of effect size is partially dependent on familiarity with the area of research. This study reports  $r$ -values because it was assumed they would be familiar to most readers. However, Durlack's convention refers to effect sizes representing the standardized difference between group means, reported as  $d$ -values or  $g$ -values. The  $d$ -value for the composite effect size ( $d = .261$ ,  $p < .001$ ) in this study represents a weak to moderate relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence.

The second hypothesis was not supported when effect sizes for males and females were analyzed together. No significant difference was found between effect sizes for witnessing inter-parental violence versus experiencing violence as a child and involvement in dating violence. In fact, none of the sub-sample comparisons, within the overall sample, revealed any significant differences. The significant within group test of homogeneity ( $Q_w$ ) for the overall sample and each of the sub-samples indicated the need to examine smaller sub-samples.

The data were divided into male and female sub-samples and gender emerged as an important moderator variable. The composite effect sizes for the overall male sample and seven of eight sub-samples support the finding of a relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. The composite effect size for the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and receiving dating violence approached significance for males. The effect sizes for males who came from violent homes and received dating violence were significantly different than the effect sizes for males who came from violent homes and perpetrated dating violence. For males, family of origin violence was found to have a stronger relationship with perpetrating dating violence.

The composite effect sizes for the overall female sample and all of the sub-samples support a significant relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. Two significant between group differences were found for sub-samples within the female sample. First, a stronger relationship was found between experiencing violence as a child and involvement in violent dating relationships than between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in dating violence. Second, a stronger relationship was found between experiencing violence as a child and perpetrating dating violence than between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating dating violence. These findings lend partial support to the second hypothesis.

The effect sizes from the male and female sub-samples were compared to determine if gender differences existed. The between gender comparisons yielded four significant findings. First, The relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in a violent dating relationship was stronger for males. Second, the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating dating violence was stronger for males. Third, the relationship between family of origin violence and victimization in a dating relationship was stronger for females. Fourth, the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and victimization in a dating relationship was stronger for females.

Study setting and study quality were examined to determine if these variables had an impact on effect sizes for the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. No significant difference was found between effect sizes from studies using university samples and studies using high school samples. A significant difference was found among effect sizes from studies of different quality. Studies coded as low quality produced larger effect sizes than studies coded as medium or high quality.

### Excluded Studies

During the coding process, 22 studies were excluded from inclusion in this meta-analysis. Of these studies, 18 contained some type of data on the relationship between family of origin violence and violence in dating relationships. Appendix E contains a complete list of the 18 excluded studies and a summary of their findings.

Fourteen studies found some type of relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. Five studies did not conduct separate analysis for males and females. Of these, three found a relationship and two did not. Two of these studies only examined the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and involvement in a violent dating relationship. Six studies found a relationship for males. Seven found some relationship for females. Four studies found some relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence for males but not females.

The relationship between experiencing family of origin violence and perpetrating dating violence was generally supported by the excluded studies. Three of the four studies with data on males found a significant relationship (DeMaris, 1987; Follette & Alexander, 1992; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Smith & Williams, 1992). Four of the five studies with data on females found a

significant relationship (DeMaris, 1987; Follette & Alexander, 1992; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Smith & Williams, 1992; White & Humphrey, 1994).

The excluded studies present mixed results for the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and receiving violence in a dating relationship. For males, two of the three studies with data found a significant relationship (DeMaris, 1987; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987). For females, one of the three studies with data found a significant relationship (DeMaris, 1987; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987).

The findings for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating dating violence suggest that witnessing inter-parental violence is an inconsistent predictor of perpetrating dating violence. For males, three of the seven studies with data found a significant relationship (DeMaris, 1987; DeMaris, 1990; Follette & Alexander, 1992; Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987; Malik, Sorenson, & Aneshensel, 1997; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987). For females, two of the nine studies with data found a significant relationship (DeMaris, 1987; DeMaris, 1990; Follette & Alexander, 1992; Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987; Maker, Kemmelmeier, & Peterson, 1998; Malik et al., 1997; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987; White & Humphrey, 1994).

The findings for the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and receiving dating violence also suggest an inconsistent relationship. For males, two of the four studies with data found a significant relationship (DeMaris, 1987; Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987; Malik et al., 1997; Marshall & Rose, 1990). For females, two of the five studies with data found a significant relationship (DeMaris, 1987; Follingstad, Rutledge, Polek, & McNeill-Hawkins, 1988; Maker et al., 1998; Malik et al., 1997; Marshall & Rose, 1990).

The majority of the excluded studies found some type of relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. Overall, they suggest that gender is an important moderator of the relationship. They provide some evidence to suggest that experiencing violence as a child has a stronger relationship with dating violence than witnessing inter-parental violence. However, differences in sample size, sample populations, measures used, and definitions of constructs make it difficult to draw conclusions with confidence.

### Explanation of Findings

The findings of this meta-analysis suggest a weak to moderate relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. Effect sizes in the weak to moderate range were not unexpected. Viewed in conjunction with the significant variation in effect sizes, they support the contention that the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence is neither simple nor direct. The literature review revealed that many variables moderate the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships. O'Keefe (1998) suggests that proximal variables, including stressors and resources, are important considerations in the understanding of intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships.

In their meta-analysis on the intergenerational transmission of violence in marital relationships, Stith et al. (1998) found composite effect sizes of similar magnitude. They also

found significant variation among effect sizes within their sample. Their sample of effect sizes was divided into perpetrators and victims of marital violence. The composite effect sizes for perpetrators and victims of marital violence were .18 and .17 (r-values) respectively. While slightly larger than the composite effect size reported in this meta-analysis, their magnitude appears consistent with the findings of this study.

In an effort to explain some of the variability in effect sizes, comparisons were conducted within and between effect sizes for males and females. The comparisons revealed that gender was an important moderator of the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. This finding is consistent with the findings of other studies on dating violence (O'Keefe, 1998; Tontodonato & Crew, 1992). Stith et al. (1998) found stronger effect sizes for the relationship between family of origin violence and males perpetrating marital violence and between family of origin violence and females receiving marital violence.

### Influence of Gender

Social learning theory posits that behavior is more likely to be reproduced if the person or persons modeling the behavior have greater attraction or power (Bandura, 1977). One possible explanation for the differential effects of gender is that very specific gender modeling is occurring in the families of individuals involved in violent dating relationships. Males and females that identify strongly with their same sex parent and come from violent families may internalize this model for intimate relationships and reproduce it in their dating relationships. Assuming that fathers are more often the perpetrators of family violence, same-sex modeling would help to explain the stronger relationships found for males perpetrating, rather than receiving dating violence and females, rather than males, receiving dating violence. It would also help to explain why the relationship between witnessing inter-parental violence and perpetrating dating violence was stronger for males, while the relationship between experiencing violence as a child and receiving dating violence was stronger for females. However, since most of the studies included in this meta-analysis did not report the gender of the abusive parent, it was not possible to test this hypothesis.

MacEwen (1994) found identification with a parent to moderate the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence. Males who were exposed to high levels of inter-parental aggression and who identified strongly with their fathers scored significantly higher on measures of current relationship aggression than males who scored lower on measures of identification with their father. Alexander et al. (1991) suggest a model for dating violence that incorporates elements of Social Learning Theory and Feminist Theory. They found that women who witnessed or experienced family of origin violence were at increased risk for perpetrating and receiving dating violence if the gender role orientation of their partners mirrored conservative attitudes found in their family of origin. It may be that violence in the family of origin and enculturation of patriarchal attitudes leads to an increased acceptance of males perpetrating and females receiving dating violence.

Understanding whether same-sex modeling occurs in the families of individuals involved in violent dating relationships will require more research examining the gender of the abusive parent. Furthermore, same-sex modeling does little to explain the differential effects of

witnessing inter-parental violence versus experiencing violence as a child found for males and females in this study. One might assume that the direct experience of violence as a child would represent a more powerful model for relationship violence than witnessing inter-parental violence. The findings of this study only support the assumption for females.

No significant difference in effect sizes was found for males who witnessed inter-parental violence versus males who experienced violence as a child and involvement in a violent dating relationship. Both relationships were significant. However, a significant difference was found between females who witnessed inter-parental violence versus females who experienced violence as a child and involvement in a violent dating relationship. While both relationships were significant, it appears that direct experience of violence in the family of origin may be more important to the understanding of female, rather than male, involvement in violent dating relationships. The results of several studies indicate that separate models may be needed to explain male and female involvement in violent dating relationships (Alexander et al., 1991; Foo & Margolin, 1995; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996).

### Study Quality

Four studies producing effect sizes for inclusion in this meta-analysis were coded as low quality. The analysis of effect sizes by study quality revealed that the low quality studies produced larger effect sizes for the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence than medium or high quality studies. The common denominator among the four excluded studies was the use of measures without established validity and reliability. One study used a measure with a single question to identify each type of family and dating violence. Two studies used measures that defined dating violence in broad terms. The choice of measures and the definition of dating violence used in these studies may have resulted in more of the sample being identified as involved in a violent dating relationship. The reported rates of dating violence in the studies ranged from 30% to 75% of those sampled (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Marshall & Rose, 1988; McKinney, 1986; Sappington et al., 1997).

The difference in effect sizes for lower quality studies highlights one of the limitations of literature reviews on dating violence. There is no single definition of family of origin or dating violence in the research. Studies define the constructs in many ways. Therefore, whether conducting meta-analysis or a traditional narrative review, it is important to ensure that comparisons are conducted among studies that use similar definitions of constructs. Furthermore, it is important for researchers to present clear definitions of the constructs used in their research.

### Suggestions for Future Research

This meta-analysis highlights several gaps in the research on dating violence and the intergenerational transmission of dating violence. First, there are very few studies that examine the impact of ethnicity on intergenerational transmission of violence (see DeMaris, 1990). Second, a number of studies have examined the relative influence of the gender of the parent perpetrating or experiencing violence in the family of origin (Alexander et al., 1991; Breslin et al., 1990; MacEwen, 1994; Marshall & Rose, 1988). However, more research is needed to clarify how gender of the abusive parent influences the intergenerational transmission of violence.

Third, researchers should continue to examine variables that mediate and or moderate the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence for males and females. Fourth, the majority of studies on dating violence use college and university samples. More research using samples obtained from high school, intermediate school, clinical, and community populations will increase our understanding of dating violence. Furthermore, comparisons among different sample populations will help to determine if dating violence is a similar or distinct phenomenon in these different populations.

A number of studies examining the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence were excluded from this meta-analysis. In many cases, this occurred because insufficient data was reported to calculate an effect size. In other cases, the type of data reported could not be used to calculate an effect size. However, some studies used statistical approaches that required the calculation of intermediate data, such as correlations, that were not reported in the final results. Because meta-analytic techniques are becoming more common in the social science research literature, it is important that researchers include as much data in their publications as possible.

### Clinical Implications

The results of this meta-analysis have several implications for clinical practice. First, the literature review clearly shows that violence occurs with alarming frequencies in the dating relationships of university students (Pedersen & Thomas, 1992; White & Koss, 1991). Some studies suggest that the violence may occur as early as high school or even elementary school (Gray & Foshee, 1997; O'Keefe, 1997). Clinicians should be aware of the prevalence of dating violence and not assume that intimate violence is limited to marital relationships. Second, family of origin violence has a relationship, albeit a weak one, with dating violence. Clinicians working with violent couples may wish to examine family of origin influences. In addition, clinicians working with violent families should recognize the potential for children to develop violent relationships later in life. Early intervention may help to overcome the influence of family of origin violence. Finally, clinicians need to recognize that the relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence is moderated by many variables. In fact, the majority of individuals that grow up in violent homes do not become involved in violent intimate relationships.

### Limitations

The validity of any meta-analysis rests, in part, on the inclusion of a representative sample of studies. Eighteen studies containing data on the intergenerational transmission of violence in dating relationships were excluded from this meta-analysis. Despite efforts to include as many studies as possible, other studies containing data were undoubtedly overlooked in the literature search. It is possible that studies not included in this meta-analysis could have significantly altered the results.

The data from studies included in this meta-analysis were based entirely on retrospective reports of family of origin violence. The passage of time and the individual's interpretation of



events may effect the accuracy of their recollections. However, due to the nature of the subject under study, it is often impractical or unethical to obtain data through other means.

Inclusion criteria were used to screen studies for this meta-analysis. However, a large number of studies did not specify the marital status or the sexual orientation of respondents. It is very likely that in large university samples, some of the respondents may have been married or reporting on violence in homosexual relationships. Removing all the studies that failed to report the marital status or sexual orientation of respondents would have left almost no studies for inclusion. Therefore, data from studies using large university samples were included as long as they reported data specifically on dating violence.

The majority of studies included in this meta-analysis used a university or college sample. Only nine of 35 studies sampled other populations. Therefore, the results reported here might not be applicable to other populations. Further research comparing intergenerational transmission of violence in separate populations is required to determine whether findings can be generalized across populations.

## REFERENCES

- \*Alexander, P. C., Moore, S., & Alexander, E. R., III. (1991). What is transmitted in the intergenerational transmission of violence? Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53(3), 657-667.
- Amato, P. R., & Keith, B. (1991). Parental divorce and adult well-being: A meta-analysis. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53, 43-58.
- \*Arias, I. (1984). A social learning theory explanation of the intergenerational transmission of physical aggression in intimate heterosexual relationships. Unpublished Ph.D., State University of New York, Stony Brook.
- Arias, I., Samois, M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2(1), 82-90.
- \*Arnold, S. (1997). Childhood maltreatment as a risk factor for dating violence. Unpublished manuscript, University of New Hampshire.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- \*Barnes, G. E., Greenwood, L., & Sommer, R. (1991). Courtship violence in a Canadian sample of male college students. Family Relations, 40(1), 37-44.
- Bergman, L. (1992). Dating violence among high school students. Social Work, 37(1), 21-27.
- Bernard, J. L., Bernard, S. L., & Bernard, M. L. (1985). Courtship violence and sex-typing. Family Relations, 34(4), 573-576.
- \*Bernard, M. L., & Bernard, J. L. (1983). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. Family Relations, 32(2), 282-286.
- Billingham, R. E., & Gilbert, K. R. (1990). Parental divorce during childhood and use of violence in dating relationships. Psychological Reports, 66(3 Pt 1), 1003-1009.
- Billingham, R. E., & Notebaert, N. L. (1993). Divorce and dating violence revisited: Multivariate analyses using Straus's conflict tactics subscores. Psychological Reports, 73(2), 679-684.
- Bogal-Allbritten, R. B., & Allbritten, W. L. (1985). The hidden victims: Courtship violence among college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 26(3), 201-204.
- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. Violence and Victims, 7(4), 297-311.
- Bookwala, J., & Zdaniuk, B. (1998). Adult attachment styles and aggressive behavior within dating relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 15(2), 175-190.

\*Breslin, F. C., Riggs, D. S., O'Leary, K. D., & Arias, I. (1990). Family precursors: Expected and actual consequences of dating aggression. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5(2), 247-258.

\*Brown, N. C. (1998). A study of household and dating violence among a sample of African-Americans in Tallahassee Florida. Unpublished manuscript, University of Florida at Gainesville.

Burcky, W., Reuterman, N., & Kopsky, S. (1988). Dating violence among high school students. School Counselor, 35(5), 353-358.

Cantrell, P. J., MacIntyre, D. I., Sharkey, K. J., & Thompson, V. (1995). Violence in the marital dyad as a predictor of violence in the peer relationships of older adolescents/young adults. Violence and Victims, 10(1), 35-41.

\*Capaldi, D. M., & Clark, S. (1998). Prospective family predictors of aggression towards female partners for at-risk young men: A comparison of mediational hypothesis. Developmental Psychology, 34, 1175-1188.

Carlson, B. E. (1990). Adolescent observers of marital violence. Journal of Family Violence, 5(4), 285-299.

\*Caskey, N. H. (1987). Attitudinal and personality correlates of male courtship and partner violence. Unpublished Ph.D., University of California, Los Angeles.

Cate, R. M., Henton, J. M., Koval, J., Christopher, F. S., & Lloyd, S. (1982). Premarital abuse: A social psychological perspective. Journal of Family Issues, 3(1), 79-90.

Clark, M. L., Beckett, J., Wells, M., & Dungee-Anderson, D. (1994). Courtship violence among African American college students. Journal of Black Psychology, 20(3), 264-281.

\*Cohen, P. M. (1988). The influence of viewing marital violence, perceived lack of parental care, and current courtship victimization on depression, anxiety, and aggression. Unpublished Ph.D., Syracuse University.

\*Comins, C. A. (1984). Violence between college dating partners: Incidence and contributing factors. Unpublished Ph.D., Auburn University.

DeKeseredy, W., & Kelly, K. (1993). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in Canadian university and college dating relationships. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 18(2), 137-159.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (1988). Woman abuse in dating relationships: The relevance of social support theory. Journal of Family Violence, 3(1), 1-13.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (1989). Dating life events stress, informational support and premarital woman abuse: A test of the buffering hypothesis. International Journal of Sociology of the Family, 19(1), 85-93.

DeMaris, A. (1987). The efficacy of a spouse abuse model in accounting for courtship violence. Journal of Family Issues, 8(3), 291-305.

DeMaris, A. (1990). The dynamics of generational transfer in courtship violence: A biracial exploration. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52(1), 219-231.

Durlack, J. A. (1995). Understanding meta-analysis. In G. L. Grimm & P. R. Yarnold (Eds.), Reading and Understanding Multivariate Statistics (pp. 319-352). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Follette, V. M., & Alexander, P. C. (1992). Dating violence: Current and historical correlates. Behavioral Assessment, 14(1), 39-52.

\*Follingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. I., McNeill-Harkins, K., & Polek, D. S. (1992). Factors related to physical violence in dating relationships. In E. C. Viano & et al. (Eds.), Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives (Vol. xxiii, pp. 121-135). New York, NY: Hemisphere Publishing Corp.

Follingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. L., Polek, D. S., & McNeill-Hawkins, K. (1988). Factors associated with patterns of dating violence toward college women. Journal of Family Violence, 3(3), 169-182.

Follingstad, D. R., Wright, S., Lloyd, S., & Sebastian, J. A. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. Family Relations, 40(1), 51-57.

\*Foo, L., & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. Journal of Family Violence, 10(4), 351-377.

Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types, and injuries. Health Education Research, 11(3), 275-286.

Gray, H. M., & Foshee, V. (1997). Adolescent dating violence: Differences between one-sided and mutually violent profiles. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12(1), 126-141.

Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A., Stockard, J., & Bohmer, S. (1987). Learning courtship aggression: The influence of parents, peers, and personal experiences. Family Relations, 36(3), 276-282.

\*Hollis, H. M. (1988). Toward an understanding of male perpetrators of courtship violence. Unpublished Ph.D., Auburn University.

Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1990). Methods of Meta-Analysis. (1st ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Jezl, D. R., Molidor, C. E., & Wright, T. L. (1996). Physical, sexual and psychological abuse in high school dating relationships: Prevalence rates and self-esteem issues. Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal, 13(1), 69-87.

Johnson, B. T. (1989). DSTAT: Software for the Meta-Analytic Review of Literature [Computer Software]. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Killian, K. D., & Busby, D. M. (1992). Physical violence in premarital couples: Systemic Considerations. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council on Family Relations, Orlando, FL.

LeJeune, C., & Follette, V. (1994). Taking responsibility: Sex differences in reporting dating violence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9(1), 133-140.

Lo, W. A., & Sporkowski, M. J. (1989). The continuation of violent dating relationships among college students. Journal of College Student Development, 30(5), 432-439.

\*MacEwen, K. E. (1994). Refining the intergenerational transmission hypothesis. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9(3), 350-365.

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., & Caspi, A. (1998). Hitting without a license: testing explanations for differences in partner abuse between young adult daters and cohabitators. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60(1), 41-55.

Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. Family Relations, 30(1), 97-102.

Makepeace, J. M. (1983). Life events stress and courtship violence. Family Relations, 32(1), 101-109.

Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. Family Relations, 35(3), 383-388.

Maker, A. H., Kemmelmeier, M., & Peterson, C. (1998). Long-term psychological consequences in women of witnessing parental physical conflict and experiencing abuse in childhood. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13(5), 574-589.

Malik, S., Sorenson, S. B., & Aneshensel, C. S. (1997). Community and dating violence among adolescents: Perpetration and victimization. Journal of Adolescent Health, 21(5), 291-302.

\*Malinosky-Rummell, R. R. (1993). Relationship of childhood physical abuse with college women's self-reported interpersonal behavior and ratings of assertiveness, passiveness, and aggressiveness in heterosexual interactions. Unpublished Ph.D., West Virginia University.

\*Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1988). Family of origin violence and courtship abuse. Journal of Counseling and Development, 66(9), 414-418.

Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1990). Premarital violence: The impact of family of origin violence, stress, and reciprocity. Violence and Victims, 5(1), 51-64.

\*McKinney, K. (1986). Measures of verbal, physical and sexual dating violence by gender. Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 14(1), 55-60.

\*O'Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12(4), 546-568.

\*O'Keefe, M. (1998). Factors mediating the link between witnessing interparental violence and dating violence. Journal of Family Violence, 13(1), 39-57.

O'Keefe, N. K., Brockopp, K., & Chew, E. (1986). Teen dating violence. Social Work, 31(6), 465-468.

\*O'Leary, K. D., & Arias, I. (1988). Prevalence, correlates, and development of spouse abuse. In R. D. Peters & R. J. McMahon (Eds.), Social Learning and Systems Approaches to Marriage and the Family (pp. 104-127). New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Olday, D., & Wesley, B. (1988). Dating violence: A comparison of high school and college subsamples. Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 16(2), 183-190.

Pedersen, P., & Thomas, C. D. (1992). Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a Canadian-university sample. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 24(4), 490-501.

\*Peterson, S., & Olday, D. E. (1992). "How was your date last night?" Intimate relationship violence among high school students. Human Services in the Rural Environment, 16(2), 24-30.

Plass, M. S., & Gessner, J. C. (1983). Violence in courtship relations: A southern sample. Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 11(2), 198-202.

Reuterman, N. A., & Burcky, W. D. (1989). Dating violence in high school: A profile of the victims. Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior, 26(4), 1-9.

\*Riggs, D. S., & O'Leary, K. D. (1996). Aggression between heterosexual dating partners: an examination of a causal model of courtship aggression. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11(4), 519-540.

\*Riggs, D. S., O'Leary, K. D., & Breslin, F. C. (1990). Multiple correlates of physical aggression in dating couples. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5(1), 61-73.

\*Ronfeldt, H. M., Kimerling, R., & Arias, I. (1998). Satisfaction with relationship power and the perpetration of dating violence. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60(1), 70-78.

\*Roscoe, B., & Benaske, N. (1985). Courtship violence experienced by abused wives: similarities in patterns of abuse. Family Relations, 34(3), 419-424.

\*Roscoe, B., & Callahan, J. (1985). Adolescents' self-report of violence in families and dating relations. Adolescence, 20(79), 545-553.

Roscoe, B., & Kelsey, T. (1986). Dating violence among high school students. Psychology: A Quarterly Journal of Human Behavior, 23(1), 53-59.

\*Rouse, L. P. (1988). Abuse in dating relationships: A comparison of blacks, whites, and hispanics. Journal of College Student Development, 9(4), 312-319.

Rouse, L. P., Breen, R., & Howell, M. (1988). Abuse in intimate relationships: A comparison of married and dating college students. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3(4), 414-429.

\*Sappington, A. A., Pharr, R., & Tunstall, A. (1997). Relationships among child abuse, date abuse, and psychological problems. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 53(June), 319-329.

\*Sigelman, C. K., Berry, C. J., & Wiles, K. A. (1984). Violence in college students' dating relationships. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 14(6), 530-548.

\*Silverman, J. G., & Williamson, G. M. (1997). Social ecology and entitlements involved in battering by heterosexual college males: Contributions of family and peers. Violence and Victims, 12(2), 147-164.

Smith, J. P., & Williams, J. G. (1992). From abusive household to dating violence. Journal of Family Violence, 7(2), 153-165.

Stets, J. E., & Henderson, D. A. (1991). Contextual factors surrounding conflict resolution while dating: Results from a national study. Family Relations, 40(1), 29-36.

Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1987). Violence in dating relationships. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50(3), 237-246.

Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1989). Patterns of physical and sexual abuse for men and women in dating relationships: A descriptive analysis. Journal of Family Violence, 4(1), 63-76.

\*Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1990). Interpersonal control and courtship aggression. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7(3), 371-394.

Stith, S. M., Rosen, K. H., Middleton, K. A., Busch, A. L., Lundeberg, K., & Carlton, R. P. (1998). The intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse: A meta-analysis. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Thompson, E. H., Jr. (1991). The maleness of violence in dating relationships: An appraisal of stereotypes. Sex Roles, 24(5-6), 261-278.

\*Tontodonato, P., & Crew, B. K. (1992). Dating violence, social learning theory, and gender: A multivariate analysis. Violence and Victims, 7(1), 3-14.

Wampler, K. S., & Serovich, J. M. (1996). Meta-analysis in family therapy research. In D. H. Sprenkle & S. M. Moon (Eds.), Research Methods in Family Therapy (pp. 286-306). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

White, J. W., & Humphrey, J. A. (1994). Women's aggression in heterosexual conflicts. Aggressive Behavior, 20(3), 195-202.

White, J. W., & Koss, M. P. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students. Violence and Victims, 6(4), 247-256.

\*Wolfe, D. A., Wekerle, C., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., & LeFebvre, L. (1998). Factors associated with abusive relationships among maltreated and nonmaltreated youth. Developmental Psychopathology, 10(1), 61-85.

\*Worth, D. M., Matthews, P. A., & Coleman, W. R. (1990). Sex role, group affiliation, family background, and courtship violence in college students. Journal of College Student Development, 31(3), 250-254.



## Appendix A

### **GUIDELINES For Effect Sizes**

★★★ The total number of effect sizes should be equal to the number of research questions totaled at the bottom of page 7.

★★ Include page numbers for each reported statistic.

★ If you are unable to identify the required statistics as outlined below, please include as much information as you can.

#### **Correlation, r-values**

---

##### Within Group Design

N – Total N in group

r – r-value for the group

##### Between Group Design

n – n for each group

r – r-value for the comparison

#### **z-Values**

---

##### Within Group Design

N – Total N in group

z – z-value for the group

##### Between Group Design

n – n for each group

z – z-value for the comparison

#### **Significance Levels, p-values (use when other statistics are not reported)**

---

##### Within Group Design

N – Total N for the group

p – p-value for the group

Between Group Design

**p** – p-value for the comparison

**n** – n for each group

★ Indicate if the p-value represents a one or two tailed test.

## Chi-Squares

---

### Within Group Design

**N** – Total N for the group

**X** – Chi-square statistic for the group

### Between Group Design

**n** – n for each group

**X** – Chi-square for the comparison

## t-Tests

---

### Within Subjects Design

**#** - number of pairs in the comparison

**t** – t-value for the comparison

### Between Subjects Design

Equal N Between Subjects

**N** – Total N in test

**t** – t-value for the test

**or**

Unequal n Between Subjects

**n** – n for each group

**t** – t-value for the comparison

## Means & Standard Deviations, m & S.D.

---

**m** – mean for each group

**n** – number of subjects in each group

**S.D.** – the standard deviation

## **ANOVA, F**

---

### **Between Subject Design**

Equal Group N

Unequal Group N

N – Group N

n – n for each group

F – F-value for the comparison

F – F-value for the comparison

### **Within Subject Design**

# - number of pairs in the comparison

F – within subjects F-value

### **Frequencies (e.g. 75 out of 100) (use when other statistics not reported)**

---

No. – number of subjects meeting criteria in each group (i.e. out of 100 subjects who experienced childhood violence, 25 perpetrated in dating relationships)

N – Total N for the group (i.e. out of **100** subjects who experienced childhood violence, 25 perpetrated in dating relationships)

### **Proportions, % (use when other statistics not reported)**

---

% - proportion for each group

n – number of subjects for each group

# **Code-Sheet(a)**

## **Dating Violence Meta-Analysis**

### **General Information**

#### **Coder**

01) Coder ID Number \_\_\_\_\_

02) Date Coded \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_ (mm/dd/yy)

#### **Study**

03) Study ID Number \_\_\_\_\_

04) Author(s) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

05) Year of Publication \_\_\_\_\_

06) Form of Publication \_\_\_\_ (#)

1. Journal Article
2. Book Chapter
3. Dissertation
4. Conference Presentation
5. Other Unpublished Source
6. Other \_\_\_\_\_

07) Journal/Book Title \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

08) Article/Chapter Title \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Sample Information

09) Description of Subject Group \_\_\_\_\_

---

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

10) Analysis by Gender? \_\_\_\_ (#) Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

1. Male Only
2. Female Only
3. Mixed Sample (male & female)
4. Male & Female Analyzed Separately
5. Unspecified

11) Setting \_\_\_\_ (#) Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

1. University
2. High School
3. General Community
4. Inpatient
5. Shelter
6. Outpatient Mental Health
7. Batterer Treatment Group
8. Other \_\_\_\_\_
9. Not Reported

12) Setting \_\_\_\_ (#) Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

1. University
2. High School
3. General Community
4. Inpatient
5. Shelter
6. Outpatient Mental Health
7. Batterer Treatment Group

8. Other \_\_\_\_\_

9. Not Reported

13) Scope of Sample \_\_\_\_\_ (#)

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

1. Local
2. State
3. Regional
4. National
5. Not Sure

14) Sampling \_\_\_\_\_ (#)

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

1. Random
2. Convenience
3. Not Sure

15) Relationship Type \_\_\_\_\_ (#)

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

1. Dating
2. Cohabiting
3. Other \_\_\_\_\_

16) Average Age \_\_\_\_\_

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_



## Method Information

17) Technique \_\_\_\_\_ (#)

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

1. Mail
2. Telephone
3. Interview
4. Survey, Not Mailed
5. Survey & Interview
6. Other \_\_\_\_\_
7. Not reported

18) Instrument to measure childhood violence \_\_\_\_\_

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

1. CTS
2. CTS Adapted (describe how adapted) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Other (name & author of scale) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. CTS & Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. CTS Adapted & Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

19) Instrument to measure dating violence \_\_\_\_\_

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

1. CTS
2. CTS Adapted (describe how adapted) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. Other (name & author of scale) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. CTS & Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. CTS Adapted & Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Research Questions Addressed

**Males Only (0 = No; 1 = Yes)**

- 20Ma) **Experienced** abuse as a child & **dating violence** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 20Mb) **Witnessed** abuse as a child & **dating violence** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 20Mc) **Experienced or witnessed** abuse & **dating violence** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 20M) **Experienced** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 21M) **Experienced** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 22M) **Witnessed** interparental abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 23M) **Witnessed** interparental abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 24M) **Experienced or witnessed** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 25M) **Experienced or witnessed** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 26M) **Both experienced & witnessed** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 27M) **Both experienced & witnessed** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 28M) **Witnessed father** abusing mother & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 29M) **Witnessed father** abusing mother & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 30M) **Witnessed mother** abusing father & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_

- 31M) **Witnessed mother** abusing father & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 32M) **Experienced father's** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 33M) **Experienced father's** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 34M) **Experienced mother's** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 35M) **Experienced mother's** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 36M) **Experienced both** parent's abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 37M) **Experienced both** parent's abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_

**Females Only (0 = No, 1 = Yes)**

- 20Fa) **Experienced** abuse as a child & **dating violence** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 20Fb) **Witnessed** abuse as a child & **dating violence** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 20Fc) **Experienced or witnessed** abuse & **dating violence** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 20F) **Experienced** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 21F) **Experienced** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 22F) **Witnessed** interparental abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 23F) **Witnessed** interparental abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 24F) **Experienced or witnessed** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 25F) **Experienced or witnessed** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 26F) **Both experienced & witnessed** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 27F) **Both experienced & witnessed** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 28F) **Witnessed father** abusing mother & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 29F) **Witnessed father** abusing mother & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 30F) **Witnessed mother** abusing father & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 31F) **Witnessed mother** abusing father & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_

- 32F) **Experienced father's** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 33F) **Experienced father's** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 34F) **Experienced mother's** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 35F) **Experienced mother's** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 36F) **Experienced both** parent's abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 37F) **Experienced both** parent's abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_

**Gender Not Specified (0 = No, 1 = Yes)**

- 20Ua) **Experienced** abuse as a child & **dating violence** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 20Ub) **Witnessed** abuse as a child & **dating violence** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 20Uc) **Experienced or witnessed** abuse & **dating violence** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 20U) **Experienced** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 21U) **Experienced** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 22U) **Witnessed** interparental abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 23U) **Witnessed** interparental abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 24U) **Experienced or witnessed** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 25U) **Experienced or witnessed** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 26U) **Both experienced & witnessed** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 27U) **Both experienced & witnessed** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 28U) **Witnessed father** abusing mother & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 29U) **Witnessed father** abusing mother & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 30U) **Witnessed mother** abusing father & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 31U) **Witnessed mother** abusing father & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_

- 32U) **Experienced father's** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 33U) **Experienced father's** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 34U) **Experienced mother's** abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 35U) **Experienced mother's** abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 36U) **Experienced both** parent's abuse as a child & **victimized** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 37U) **Experienced both** parent's abuse as a child & **perpetrated** [0 or 1] \_\_\_\_  
Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Table(s)/Chart(s) \_\_\_\_\_

**Total Number of Questions Answered** (pgs. 5-10) \_\_\_\_\_

## Study Quality

38) Did the researcher discuss limitations? \_\_\_\_\_ (0 = No, 1 = Yes)

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

39) Did the instrument , measuring dating violence, have established validity and reliability (e.g. CTS, CTS adapted)? \_\_\_\_\_ (0 = No, 1 = Yes)

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

40) Did the instrument, measuring family of origin violence, have established validity and reliability? \_\_\_\_\_ (0 = No, 1 = Yes)

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

41) Were sampling techniques clearly described? \_\_\_\_\_ (0 = No, 1 = Yes)

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

42) Was the sample clearly described? \_\_\_\_\_ (0 = No, 1 = Yes)

Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_

43) Your subjective rating of overall study quality \_\_\_\_\_

1. Very Poor
2. Poor
3. Neither Poor, Nor Good
4. Good
5. Very Good



**EFFECT SIZE \_\_\_\_\_**

(enter corresponding # for research question)

---

**EFFECT SIZE \_\_\_\_\_**

(enter corresponding # for research question)

**EFFECT SIZE \_\_\_\_\_**

(enter corresponding # for research question)

---

**EFFECT SIZE \_\_\_\_\_**

(enter corresponding # for research question)

**EFFECT SIZE \_\_\_\_\_**

(enter corresponding # for research question)

---

**EFFECT SIZE \_\_\_\_\_**

(enter corresponding # for research question)

**EFFECT SIZE \_\_\_\_\_**

(enter corresponding # for research question)

---

**EFFECT SIZE \_\_\_\_\_**

(enter corresponding # for research question)

## Appendix C

### Coding Conventions Used for Data Entry in D-Stat

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Label</b>	<b>Type</b>
<b>Gender</b>	1	Male	Categorical
	2	Female	Categorical
	3	Undefined	Categorical
<b>Child Violence</b>	1	Witnessed	Categorical
	2	Experienced	Categorical
	3	Witnessed Mother	Categorical
	4	Witnessed Father	Categorical
	5	Experienced Mother	Categorical
	6	Experienced Father	Categorical
	7	Undefined	Categorical
<b>Date Violence</b>	1	Undefined	Categorical
	2	Victimized	Categorical
	3	Perpetrated	Categorical
<b>Setting</b>	1	University	Categorical
	2	High School	Categorical
	3	Other	Categorical
<b>Age</b>			Continuous
<b>Study Quality</b>	1	Low	Categorical
	2	Medium	Categorical
	3	High	Categorical
<b>Study Score</b>			Continuous

## Appendix D

### Effect Size Estimates for the Relationship Between Growing Up in a Violent Home and Involvement in Violent Dating Relationships

Study	r	Type	Child	Date	n	Sex	Site
Alexander, Moore, & Alexander, 1991	-.003	Jour	Wit	Vict	152	M	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	.064	Jour	Wit	Perp	152	M	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	.105	Jour	Exp	Vict	152	M	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	.117	Jour	Exp	Perp	152	M	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	-.012	Jour	Exp	Vict	152	M	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	-.071	Jour	Exp	Perp	152	M	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	.039	Jour	Wit	Vict	228	F	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	.045	Jour	Wit	Perp	228	F	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	-.024	Jour	Exp	Vict	228	F	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	.000	Jour	Exp	Perp	228	F	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	.016	Jour	Exp	Vict	228	F	Univ
Alexander, et al., 1991	.078	Jour	Exp	Perp	228	F	Univ
Arias, 1984	.138	Diss	Wit	Perp	369	M	Comm
Arias, 1984	.062	Diss	Wit	Perp	369	F	Comm
Arnold, 1997	.230	Diss	Exp	Vict	258	F	Univ
Barnes, Greenwood, & Sommer, 1991	.200	Jour	Wit	Perp	202	M	Univ
Bernard & Bernard, 1983	.401	Jour	EorW	Perp	168	M	Univ
Bernard & Bernard, 1983	.295	Jour	EorW	Perp	293	F	Univ
Breslin, Riggs, O'Leary, & Arias, 1990	.141	Jour	Wit	Perp	125	M	Univ
Breslin, et al., 1990	.103	Jour	Wit	Perp	280	F	Univ
Brown, 1998	.750	Manu	Wit	Vict	25	F	Comm
Brown, 1998	.490	Manu	Wit	Perp	25	F	Comm
Brown, 1998	.636	Manu	Wit	Vict	25	F	Comm
Brown, 1998	.338	Manu	Wit	Perp	25	F	Comm
Brown, 1998	-.051	Manu	Exp	Perp	25	F	Comm
Brown, 1998	.389	Manu	Exp	Vict	25	F	Comm
Capaldi & Clark, 1998	.160	Jour	Wit	Perp	77	M	Elem
Caskey, 1987	.190	Diss	Exp	Perp	177	M	Univ
Caskey, 1987	.118	Diss	Wit	Perp	177	M	Univ
Cohen, 1988	.308	Diss	Wit	Vict	170	F	Univ
Comins, 1984	.040	Diss	Wit	Vict	141	F	Univ
Comins, 1984	-.050	Diss	Wit	Perp	141	F	Univ
Comins, 1984	.010	Diss	Exp	Vict	141	F	Univ
Comins, 1984	.070	Diss	Exp	Perp	141	F	Univ
Comins, 1984	.060	Diss	Exp	Vict	141	F	Univ
Comins, 1984	.070	Diss	Exp	Perp	141	F	Univ
Follingstad, Rutledge, McNeill-Harkins, & Polek, 1992	.120	Chap	Wit	Vict	210	F	Univ
Follingstad et al., 1992	.080	Chap	Exp	Vict	210	F	Univ
Foo & Margolin, 1995	.150	Jour	Exp	Perp	111	M	Univ
Foo & Margolin, 1995	.450	Jour	Wit	Perp	111	M	Univ
Foo & Margolin, 1995	.170	Jour	Exp	Perp	179	F	Univ
Foo & Margolin, 1995	.060	Jour	Wit	Perp	179	F	Univ
Hollis, 1988	.140	Diss	Exp	Perp	223	M	Univ
MacEwen, 1994	.270	Jour	Exp	Perp	73	U	Univ
MacEwen, 1994	.390	Jour	Wit	Perp	73	U	Univ

Study	r	Type	Child	Date	n	Sex	Site
Malinosky-Rummell, 1992	.183	Diss	Exp	Vict	139.5	F	Univ
Malinosky-Rummell, 1992	.193	Diss	Exp	Perp	139.5	F	Univ
Malinosky-Rummell, 1992	.091	Diss	Wit	Vict	139.5	F	Univ
Malinosky-Rummell, 1992	.139	Diss	Wit	Perp	139.5	F	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1988	.240	Jour	Exp	Vict	330	U	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1988	.160	Jour	Exp	Perp	330	U	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1988	.100	Jour	Wit	Vict	330	U	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1988	.150	Jour	Wit	Perp	330	U	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1988	.110	Jour	Wit	Vict	330	U	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1988	.140	Jour	Wit	Perp	330	U	Univ
McKinney, 1986	.340	Jour	EorW	Vict	163	U	Univ
McKinney, 1986	.310	Jour	EorW	Vict	163	U	Univ
O'Keefe, 1997	.100	Jour	Exp	Vict	385	M	HS
O'Keefe, 1997	.160	Jour	Exp	Perp	385	M	HS
O'Keefe, 1997	.200	Jour	Exp	Vict	554	F	HS
O'Keefe, 1997	.220	Jour	Exp	Perp	554	F	HS
O'Keefe, 1997	.090	Jour	Wit	Vict	385	M	HS
O'Keefe, 1997	.210	Jour	Wit	Perp	385	M	HS
O'Keefe, 1997	.180	Jour	Wit	Vict	554	F	HS
O'Keefe, 1997	.170	Jour	Wit	Perp	554	F	HS
O'Keefe, 1998	.100	Jour	Wit	Vict	232	U	HS
O'Keefe, 1998	-.020	Jour	Wit	Perp	232	U	HS
O'Leary & Arias, 1988	.123	Chap	Wit	Perp	393	M	Comm
O'Leary & Arias, 1988	.000	Chap	Wit	Perp	393	F	Comm
Peterson & Olday, 1992	.085	Jour	Exp	Genr	676	M	HS
Peterson & Olday, 1992	.105	Jour	Exp	Genr	655	F	HS
Peterson & Olday, 1992	.047	Jour	Wit	Genr	677	M	HS
Peterson & Olday, 1992	.075	Jour	Wit	Genr	673	F	HS
Riggs & O'Leary, 1996	.240	Jour	Wit	Perp	113	M	Univ
Riggs & O'Leary, 1996	-.060	Jour	Wit	Perp	113	M	Univ
Riggs & O'Leary, 1996	.050	Jour	Exp	Perp	113	M	Univ
Riggs & O'Leary, 1996	-.010	Jour	Exp	Perp	113	M	Univ
Riggs & O'Leary, 1996	.070	Jour	Wit	Perp	232	F	Univ
Riggs & O'Leary, 1996	.170	Jour	Wit	Perp	232	F	Univ
Riggs & O'Leary, 1996	.110	Jour	Exp	Perp	232	F	Univ
Riggs & O'Leary, 1996	.110	Jour	Exp	Perp	232	F	Univ
Riggs, O'Leary, & Breslin, 1990	.190	Jour	Exp	Perp	120.5	M	Univ
Riggs et al., 1990	.200	Jour	Wit	Perp	120.5	M	Univ
Riggs et al., 1990	.190	Jour	Exp	Perp	266	F	Univ
Riggs et al., 1990	.110	Jour	Wit	Perp	266	F	Univ
Ronfeldt, Kimerling, & Arias, 1998	.020	Jour	Wit	Perp	156	M	Univ
Roscoe & Benaske, 1985	.082	Jour	EorW	Vict	82	F	Shel
Roscoe & Callahan, 1985	.138	Jour	Exp	Genr	185	U	HS
Rouse, 1988	.211	Jour	Exp	Vict	120	U	Univ
Rouse, 1988	.000	Jour	Wit	Vict	98	U	Univ
Sappington, Pharr, Tunstall, & Rickert, 1997	.359	Jour	Exp	Vict	133	F	Univ
Sappington et al., 1997	.031	Jour	Wit	Vict	133	F	Univ
Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984	.080	Jour	Exp	Vict	104	M	Univ
Sigelman et al., 1984	.130	Jour	Exp	Perp	104	M	Univ
Sigelman et al., 1984	.200	Jour	Exp	Vict	359.5	F	Univ
Sigelman et al., 1984	.170	Jour	Exp	Perp	359.5	F	Univ
Sigelman et al., 1984	.060	Jour	Wit	Vict	104	M	Univ
Sigelman et al., 1984	.050	Jour	Wit	Perp	104	M	Univ
Sigelman et al., 1984	.140	Jour	Wit	Vict	359.5	F	Univ

Study	r	Type	Child	Date	n	Sex	Site
Sigelman et al., 1984	.140	Jour	Wit	Perp	359.5	F	Univ
Silverman & Williamson, 1997	.200	Jour	Wit	Perp	193	M	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990	-.040	Jour	Exp	Vict	303	M	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990	.020	Jour	Exp	Perp	335	M	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990	.065	Jour	Wit	Vict	303	M	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990	.095	Jour	Wit	Perp	335	M	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990	-.055	Jour	Exp	Vict	442	F	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990	.035	Jour	Exp	Perp	448	F	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990	-.030	Jour	Wit	Vict	442	F	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990	-.035	Jour	Wit	Perp	448	F	Univ
Tontodonato & Crew, 1992	.100	Jour	Exp	Perp	347	M	Univ
Tontodonato & Crew, 1992	.110	Jour	Wit	Perp	347	M	Univ
Tontodonato & Crew, 1992	.100	Jour	Exp	Perp	500	F	Univ
Tontodonato & Crew, 1992	.090	Jour	Wit	Perp	500	F	Univ
Wolfe, Wekerle, Reitzel-Jaffe, & Lefebvre, 1998	.130	Jour	Exp	Vict	132	U	HS
Wolfe et al., 1998	.030	Jour	Exp	Perp	132	U	HS
Wolfe et al., 1998	.330	Jour	Wit	Vict	132	U	HS
Wolfe et al., 1998	.210	Jour	Wit	Perp	132	U	HS
Worth, Matthews, & Coleman, 1990	.172	Jour	EorW	Genr	109	U	Univ

Jour = Published journal article; Diss = Dissertation; Chap = Book chapter; Manu = Unpublished manuscript; Wit = Witnessed inter-parental violence; Exp = Experienced child abuse; Vict = Victimized in dating relationship; EorW = Either experienced or witnessed violence in the family of origin; Perp = Perpetrated violence in dating relationship; Vict = Victimized in dating relationship; Genr = Undefined violent dating relationship; M = Male; F = Female; U = Mixed or undefined sample; Univ = University; HS = High School; Comm = Community; Shel = Shelter; Elem = Elementary School



## Appendix E

### Summary of Findings for Studies with Data on the Relationship Between Family of Origin Violence and Dating Violence Excluded During Coding

Study	Type	Sex	Child	Date	Finding	Site
Carlson, 1990	Jour	M	Genr	Genr	N	Shel
Carlson, 1990	Jour	F	Genr	Genr	N	Shel
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	M	Exp	Perp	Y	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	M	Exp	Vict	Y	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	Y	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	M	Wit	Vict	Y	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	M	Wit	Vict	N	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	F	Exp	Perp	N	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	F	Exp	Vict	N	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	F	Wit	Vict	N	Univ
DeMaris, 1987	Jour	F	Wit	Vict	N	Univ
DeMaris, 1990	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
DeMaris, 1990	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Follette & Alexander, 1992	Jour	F	Exp	Perp	Y	Univ
Follette & Alexander, 1992	Jour	F	Exp	Perp	N	Univ
Follette & Alexander, 1992	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Follette & Alexander, 1992	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Follette & Alexander, 1992	Jour	M	Exp	Perp	N	Univ
Follette & Alexander, 1992	Jour	M	Exp	Perp	N	Univ
Follette & Alexander, 1992	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Follette & Alexander, 1992	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Follingstad, Rutledge, Polek, & McNeill-Hawkins, 1988	Jour	F	Wit	Vict	Y	Univ
Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	Y	Univ
Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987	Jour	M	Wit	Vict	Y	Univ
Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Killian & Busby, 1992	Conf	U	Genr	Genr	Y	Comm
Lawler, 1989	Diss	U	Wit	Perp	N	HS
LeJeune, 1992	Diss	U	Wit	Genr	N	Univ
Maker, Kemmelmeier, & Peterson, 1988	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	Y	Univ
Maker et al., 1988	Jour	F	Wit	Vict	Y	Univ
Malik, Sorenson, & Aneshensel, 1997	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	Y	HS
Malik et al., 1997	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	N	HS
Malik et al., 1997	Jour	M	Wit	Vict	N	HS

Study	Type	Sex	Child	Date	Finding	Site
Malik et al., 1997	Jour	M	Wit	Vict	Y	HS
Malik et al., 1997	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	HS
Malik et al., 1997	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	HS
Malik et al., 1997	Jour	F	Wit	Vict	N	HS
Malik et al., 1997	Jour	F	Wit	Vict	N	HS
Marshall & Rose, 1990	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1990	Jour	M	Exp	Perp	Y	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1990	Jour	M	Wit	Vict	N	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1990	Jour	M	Exp	Vict	N	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1990	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1990	Jour	F	Exp	Perp	Y	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1990	Jour	F	Wit	Vict	N	Univ
Marshall & Rose, 1990	Jour	F	Exp	Vict	Y	Univ
O'Keefe, 1986	Jour	U	Wit	Genr	Y	HS
Polek, 1982	Diss	U	Wit	Perp	Y	Comm
Polek, 1982	Diss	U	Wit	Perp	Y	Comm
Reuterman & Burcky, 1989	Jour	F	Exp	Vict	Y	HS
Smith & Williams, 1992	Jour	M	Exp	Perp	Y	HS
Smith & Williams, 1992	Jour	F	Exp	Perp	Y	HS
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987	Jour	M	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987	Jour	M	Exp	Vict	Y	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	N	Univ
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987	Jour	F	Exp	Vict	N	Univ
White & Humphrey, 1994	Jour	F	Wit	Perp	Y	Univ
White & Humphrey, 1994	Jour	F	Exp	Perp	Y	Univ

Jour = Journal Article; Diss = Dissertation; Conf = Conference proceedings; M = Male; F = Female; U = Undefined or mixed sample; Wit = Witnessed inter-parental violence; Exp = Experienced violence as a child; Genr = Undefined family of origin violence or dating violence; Perp = Perpetrated dating violence; Vict = Received dating violence; Y = found significant relationship; N = found no significant relationship; Univ = University sample; HS = High school sample; Comm = Community sample; Shel = Shelter.

## **DOUGLAS B. SMITH**

5707 F Woodlawn Green Circle  
Alexandria, VA 22309  
(703) 619-0293

---

### **EDUCATION:**

**M. S., Family and Child Development, 1999**  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Falls Church, Virginia

**B. S., Family and Child Development, (Minor: Sociology), 1992**  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
Blacksburg, Virginia

### **CLINICAL EXPERIENCE:**

#### **FAMILY THERAPIST**

*June 1997 – present*

*Virginia Tech Couples Counseling Project*

*Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Falls Church, VA*

- Conduct individual and group therapy for couples participating in an NIMH funded study to develop a couples treatment model for domestic violence
- Facilitate anger management groups for male batterers

#### **CONTRACT CLINICIAN**

*May 1999 – present*

*Northern Virginia Family Services, Dale City, VA*

- Provide counseling for families, individuals, adolescents, and children
- Lead an anger management group for men and women

#### **GROUP FACILITATOR**

*May 1998 – present*

*Northern Virginia Family Services, Falls Church, VA*

- Co-facilitate an anger management group
- Develop and implement anger management group curriculum

#### **GROUP FACILITATOR**

*May 1998 – February 1999*

*Alexandria Office on Women, Alexandria, VA*

- Lead 18 weak anger management groups for male batterers

#### **MENTORING TRAINER**

*September 1997 - June 1998*

*Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University  
Falls Church, VA*

- Work with the faculty of George Mason High School to provide training for peer mentors
- Develop training curriculum
- Lead training units

**FAMILY THERAPY INTERN***September 1996 – June 1998*

*Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University  
Falls Church, VA*

- Completed 500 hour supervised clinical practicum
- Provide counseling for families, couples, and individuals in a walk-in mental health clinic

**SENIOR COUNSELOR***May 1994 - August 1996*

*Community Residences Inc., Arlington, VA*

- Oversee the operation of a 12 bed residential intermediate care facility for dually diagnosed MR/MH clients
- Coordinate services with Medicaid and the Virginia Department of Housing
- Manage the finances for the facility
- Oversee the finances of residents and ensure compliance with local, state, and federal regulations
- Manage scheduling and staff development
- Provide individual case management for two residents

**RELIEF COUNSELOR***February 1994 - May 1994*

*Fairfax County Juvenile Detention Center, Fairfax, VA*

**COUNSELOR/TEACHER***October 1992 - January 1994*

*Eckerd Family Youth Alternatives Inc., Candor, NC*

- Provide 24hr live in supervision of 10 – 15 emotionally disturbed youth
- Develop and implement individual and group therapeutic programs
- Coordinate with family workers to meet the individual needs of clients
- Facilitate group therapy sessions

**PRESENTATIONS:****POSTER PRESENTATION***October 1999*

“Intergenerational Transmission of Courtship Violence: A Meta-Analysis”  
57<sup>th</sup> Annual AAMFT Convention, Chicago, IL

**PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:****STUDENT MEMBER***1998 - present*

American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy

**STUDENT MEMBER***1998 - present*

Virginia Association for Marriage and Family Therapy