

**RISK FACTORS FOR SEXUAL COERCION
IN MALE BATTERERS**

By

Rochna Hazra

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

In

Partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

In

Human Development

Sandra M. Stith, Chairperson

Eric E. McCollum

Karen H. Rosen

April 16, 2002
Blacksburg, Virginia

Key Words: Male Batterers, Marital Rape, Physical Violence, Risk Factor, Sexual Coercion

Copyright 2002, Rochna Hazra

RISK FACTORS FOR SEXUAL COERCION IN MALE BATTERERS

by

Rochna Hazra

Sandra M. Stith, Chairperson

Human Development

(ABSTRACT)

This exploratory study examined risk factors for sexual coercion using data provided by 87 couples that were screened to participate in a couples treatment program for domestic violence. Risk factors examined included: level of alcohol use, anger, beliefs about wife beating, jealousy, dominance, depression, physical and psychological violence. Overall, 46.9% of the women reported that their partners were sexually coercive. Slightly over 46% of the women whose partners were severely violent reported that they also were sexually coercive and slightly less than 46% of the women whose partners engaged in minor aggression reported that their partners were sexually coercive. Almost 23% of the female participants reported that their partners raped them during the past year.

Furthermore, results from correlational analyses indicate that level of male physical violence and male beliefs about wife beating are risk factors for sexual coercion within the context of a violent relationship. Level of alcohol use, anger, male depression, jealousy, dominance and psychological violence do not appear to be risk factors. These results have implications for further understanding and treatment of sexually coercive male batterers.

DEDICATED TO

*To all women and men who have lived in domestic
violence: this is my acknowledgement of your pain and
courage*

And

*To my son, Nikhilesh: your warm smile and ready
laughter keeps me going*

Acknowledgements

To my advisor, Sandi Stith, thank you for teaching me the real meaning of respect and caring. Thank you for the encouragement and enthusiasm that kept me going through the process of writing this thesis and through the entire program.

To my professors, you have been my teachers in the truest sense of the word. To Eric McCollum, your sense of humor in the classroom and the clinic communicated the importance of looking at things in their perspective. To Karen Rosen, you taught me that each task deserved seriousness and effort. To my supervisor, Jerry Gross, your confidence in my work helped me believe in myself. You taught me to look at the big picture. Thank you all. I will be forever indebted to you.

To my family: my father, S.K. Hazra and my mother, Mira Hazra. You are the reason for the person I have grown to be. You have been pillars of strength to me. Thank you for your unconditional love and support. To my sisters, Sagarika Pan and Ratna Ghosh. I thank God every day for you. You are truly my soul mates. To my cousin, Nandini, thank you for your “you can do it attitude”. You got me through many a trying day.

To my dearest friend Sue: you have been like a sister to me. Thank you for being you each and every day. I am so glad you are my friend.

To my friends: MaryAnn, thank you for your insight, compassion and acceptance in our many conversations. Stacy, thank you for believing in me and telling me that I deserved the best. Kacey, thank you for cheering me up when I was down. Thanks for the laughter and the Tuesday lunches. Julie, thank you for your practical advice and for helping me “de-panic”. Thank you for the help with my thesis defense. Brent, thank you, your help and understanding will not be forgotten. OP, thank you for your help in my many emergencies.

To my classmates, Sheila, Ellie, Nikki and Terry. Thanks for our many talks, new ideas. You helped me broaden my horizons. Thank you for your support. To David Ward, thank you for helping me work through all those glitches in my data.

Thank you all for sharing this incredible experience with me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
INDEX OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem and its Setting	1
Rationale for the study	1
Theoretical Framework	3
Research Questions	10
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW	11
Overview	11
Sexual Coercion	11
Biological Variable	16
Substance Abuse	16
Psychological Variables	19
Anger	19
Depression	21
Beliefs about wife beating	23
Social Variables	25
Romantic jealousy	25
Dominance	28
Physical Violence	29
Psychological Violence	31
CHAPTER THREE: METHODS	33
Participants and selection process	33
Procedures	34
Measures	35
Short Michigan Alcoholism Test (SMAST)	36
NOVACO for Couples Anger Index	36
SCL-90 R Depression and Anxiety Subscales	36
Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating	37
Romantic Jealousy Scale	37
Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2)	38
The Dominance Scale	39
Data Analysis	40

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	42
Research question 1	46
Difference in male and female reports	46
Overall disparity	47
Research question 2	49
Research question 3	51
Demographics	53
Summary	55
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	56
Limitations of the study	58
Future research	59
Clinical implications	60
Conclusion	60
REFERENCES	61
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Virginia Tech Intake Cover Page	69
Appendix B: Virginia Tech's Couples Counseling Project	78
Curriculum Vitae	

INDEX OF TABLES	Page
Table 1: Means and Standard deviations of independent and dependent variables	43
Table 2: Difference between male self-report and partner report of sexual Coercion	44
Table 3: Intercorrelations of Risk and Criterion Variables	45
Table 4: Prevalence of sexually coercive male behavior according to male and female partner report	47
Table 5: disparity between male self-report and partner-report of sexual coercion	48
Table 6: Group Differences for sexually coercive behavior between men who use only minor physical aggression and those who use severe physical aggression based on female partner's report	50
Table 7: Group Differences for sexually coercive behavior between men who use only minor physical aggression and those who use severe physical aggression based on male partner's self-report	50
Table 8: Regression analysis summary for risk factor variables predicting male sexual coercion (self-report)	52
Table 9: Regression analysis summary for risk factor variables predicting male sexual coercion (partner report)	53
Table 10: Average age and length of relationship of male and female partners	54
Table 11: Race of male and female partners	54

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Problem and its Setting

This study examines sexual coercion perpetrated by a male partner toward an intimate female partner. It examines the types of coercive events that occur, the differences between the female and male partner's perception of the events, and the relationship between sexual coercion and the perpetrator's level of physical violence. Finally, the study examines sexual coercion within an abusive relationship in the context of substance abuse, anger, depression, beliefs about wife beating, romantic jealousy, dominance and level of psychological and physical violence.

Rationale for the Study

In my work as a mental health therapist in the Fairfax County Women's Shelter, a shelter for victims of domestic violence, I encountered many women who, in addition to physical abuse reported sexual abuse or coercion by their partners. These women appeared to be more severely traumatized (than victims of non-sexual abuse) and often exhibited symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder including humiliation, shame, disjointedness, anger, an inability to concentrate and withdrawal. While these may be the effects of this kind of abuse that these women had undergone, I began to wonder what were the characteristics that the perpetrators displayed which might signal the prevalence of sexual coercion within an already violent relationship. Most of the literature suggests that sexual assault or marital rape becomes a risk factor when there is severe physical abuse. However, in their study, Finkehor and Yllo (1983) examine forced sex in intimate relationships where there is little physical violence. Russell (1990) found that 4% of women in her sample were victims of "force-only" rape, where the husbands use only the

amount of force necessary to coerce their wives and physical abuse is not otherwise a part of their relationship. For this reason, I examined whether sexual coercion only occurs in the context of severe physical abuse or if it is also a risk factor in relationships where there is minor physical abuse only.

It is important to have a better understanding of the characteristics that differentiate these batterers so that they, as well as their victims are more easily identifiable. Victims of intimate sexual violence are often reluctant to talk about this form of abuse (Campbell & Soeken, 1999). Research suggests that marital rape and sexual assault are underreported (Painter & Farrington, 1998). Research has found that survivors of marital rape are less likely to report the incidents to service providers, family members or friends (Mahoney & Williams, 1998). Reporting is complicated by the victim's relationship with the perpetrator. Regarding this aspect, it may be useful to keep in mind that there are only two labels available to most people: "rape" or "not rape". For this reason, many of the women who have been sexually co-coerced by an intimate partner, do not believe that they have been raped and there is no language to define their experience of undesired sex (Basile, 1999). Similarly, sexually aggressive partners may not reveal that their abuse extends to this area as well. Thus, statistical numbers may in fact be lower than actual occurrence. Therefore, I have examined the level of congruence between the perception of sexual coercion between male perpetrators and their partners.

By identifying or at least gaining a clearer understanding of the sexual coercion occurring in intimate relationships and the predictive factors, mental health professionals may be able to identify, assess and treat victims and perpetrators with greater effectiveness. An important aspect of understanding and identifying the factors that

influence this kind of violence is to help develop more effective interventions for the perpetrators as well as support services for the victims. The effects of sexual coercion are traumatic as well as long lasting and may require long term and intensive support services. Another important purpose of this study is to be able to identify perpetrators who pose a greater threat to their victims. Research shows that in sexually violent relationships, women who have been raped are at much greater risk of being killed by their partners than in relationships that are not sexually violent (Bergen, 1996; Campbell & Soeken, 1999).

In conclusion, understanding sexual coercion and the factors associated with sexual coercion will help identify, assess and treat victims and perpetrators, help design effective intervention programs and identify victims that fall in the high risk category in terms of safety as well as mental health issues.

Theoretical Framework

I have used the biopsychosocial theory to confirm my study. The biopsychosocial theory is an attempt to understand how health and sickness are affected by a variety of factors and how each of these factors, in turn, affect each other. McKenry, Julian and Gavazzi (1995) describe the biopsychosocial perspective as “an attempt to understand health and illness through an appreciation of how biological, psychological, and social elements persist in affiliation with one another” (p307). Mc Daniel, Hepworth and Doherty (1992) define biopsychosocial as a way of looking at the impact of biological, psychological and social aspects of health and illness and their reciprocal effect on each other, as cited in McKenry, Julian and Gavazzi (1995). It has been established in various studies that domestic violence is a complex phenomenon that may be caused by a number

of factors or a combination thereof (Riley & Treiber, 1989; Brookoff, 1997). In fact, the biopsychosocial approach fits with the newer federal initiatives toward funding projects on domestic violence (McKenry, Julian & Gavazzi, 1995).

The biopsychosocial theory looks at a phenomenon through three separate lenses: biological, psychological and social. In this study, I examined the risk factors that indicate the possibility of sexual coercion within an already abusive relationship in relation to the biological (substance abuse), psychological (anger, depression, beliefs about wife beating) and social aspects (jealousy, level of physical violence, level of psychological abuse and dominance) within the relationship. All eight of these variables were examined in relation to domestic violence in general, and sexual coercion in particular, to arrive at a better understanding on whether or not they are risk factors in the perpetration of sexual coercion by a male batterer toward his female partner.

Biological Aspects

The biological framework looks at how biological factors such as levels of testosterone and serotonin levels in the body affect violence as well as how they relate to levels of aggression. For the purpose of this study, I examined how the abuse of alcohol affects violence in general and sexual coercion in particular.

Substance Abuse.

Alcohol abuse as well as abuse of other controlled substances, have been linked to domestic violence as well as sexual assault in many research studies (Steele & Josephs, 1990; Leonard & Blane, 1992; Li, 1999; Riggs, Caulfield & Street, 2000; Pope & Shouldice, 2001). In a study comparing patterns in violent and nonviolent couples,

results show that alcohol is the most significant operating factor in violent marriages (Telch & Lindquist, 1984).

Alcohol has also been clearly linked to aggression in general, although a direct link between the two has not been established (McKenry, Julian, & Gavazzi, 1995). In the specific context of sexual violence, Groth and Birnbaum (1979) report that as a group, rapists in general, tend to be relatively heavy drinkers, and in about 50% of the cases, they had been drinking heavily or using other substances prior to the incident. However, Groth and Birnbaum (1979) report that the amount of alcohol or drug use was not significantly greater than what the perpetrator customarily uses. In their study, Marx, Gross, and Juergens (1997) found that male participants who consumed alcohol took significantly longer to determine that the male partner should refrain from further sexual advances. The participants of this study were listening to audio-tapes of interactions from a date rape scenario. For this reason, it is important that this study explore the possibility of substance abuse being a factor associated with sexual coercion.

Psychological Aspects

The psychological factor looks at the levels of anger, depression and beliefs about wife beating. Anger, depression and beliefs about wife beating have been strongly related to physical and sexual violence within an intimate relationship. The study examined how psychological aspects, namely, anger, depression and beliefs about wife beating are associated factors in the perpetration of sexual coercion within an abusive relationship.

Anger.

Anger is an inherent part of any kind of domestic violence. In a study by Beaseley and Stoltenberg (1992) batterers scored significantly higher on the State Anger scale and the Trait Anger scale. According to Lynch and Kilmartin, (1999) men who are unable to express their insecurity and fears in conscious and constructive ways do so in dissociated and destructive ways. In a national sample, it was found that the moderating factors in male aggression were anger and marital satisfaction (Leonard & Blane, 1992).

In sexual coercion within an intimate relationship, anger is very often the reason of abuse. It is a way of expressing and discharging feelings of anger and rage. Often this kind of abuse is accompanied by physical as well as verbal abuse (Groth & Birnbaum, 1979). Thus, it is worthwhile to look at anger as a risk factor in sexually coercive relationships.

Depression.

There is a strong relationship between depression and domestic violence (McKenry, Julian, & Gavazzi, 1995, Cochran & Rabinowitz, 2000). Studies suggest that there is increased depressive symptomatology among domestically violent men, in comparison to generally assaultive men and the nonviolent control group (Maiuro, Cahn, Vitakiano, Wagner, & Zegree, 1988). According to Lynch and Kilmartin (1999), the man who is violent in the home feels unloved and worthless. As noted earlier, this may lead to depression and acting out in violent behavior. This study examined depression as an associated factor in the perpetration of sexual coercion.

Beliefs about wife beating.

Many men believe that in some cases at least, the male partner is justified in using physical force against his wife. According to Hunt (1979), a typical marital rapist believes that husbands are supposed to exert their power over their wives. In forcing her to maintain sexual relations, he actually gains much more than sexual pleasure: he humbles her and reasserts his power in the most effective way (Hunt, 1979). This study explores the relationship, if any, between beliefs about wife beating and partner sexual coercion.

Social Aspects

The social aspects of the biopsychosocial model include aspects of a dyadic relationship as well as outside social systems. This category could include marital satisfaction, dominance, jealousy, etc. For the purpose of this study, I looked into the prevalence of jealousy, dominance and physical and psychological violence that may be risk factors for the prevalence of sexual coercion.

Romantic jealousy.

Jealousy has been linked to domestic violence by researchers (Dutton, van Ginkel, & Landolt, 1994; Barnett, Martinez, & Bluestein, 1995). It was found that jealous partners are more insecure about their relationship, more preoccupied with and dependent upon their partner (Barnett, Martinez, & Bluestein 1995). Research suggest that there is a strong association between jealousy and abusiveness (Dutton, van Ginkel, & Landolt, 1994). This study explored the relationship between romantic jealousy and partner sexual coercion.

Dominance.

Dominance is a deviation from an egalitarian relationship between two individuals (Hamby, 1995). Male dominance has been strongly linked to violence (Coleman & Straus, 1986). In a study by Ronfeldt, Kimerling and Aria (1998), 156 undergraduate men involved in serious relationships were studied. The study indicated that dissatisfaction with relationship power often resulted in psychological as well as physical violence. Hamby (1995) presented a new concept of dominance in which authority, restrictiveness, and disparagement are examined. Hamby found in her study that dominance was the most important correlate of psychological aggression, physical abuse and injury within a relationship. This study looks at the relationship between dominance (restrictiveness) and sexual coercion.

Psychological violence.

Since psychological violence has oftentimes been reported as having a greater impact than physical violence, it is useful to study psychological aggression as a risk factor for sexual coercion. There has been an ongoing debate regarding the exact definition of psychological abuse. Chang (1996) defines it as a misuse of power by one person to obtain submission from another. Walker (1979) defines it as behavior that is coercive, manipulative and aimed at getting what one person desires while neglecting the other person's needs and desires. Marshall's (1999) definition of psychological abuse emphasized the victim's vulnerability and removed the necessity for the perpetrator's awareness of the impact. In her study on psychological abuse, Marshall (1999) found that psychological abuse had stronger and more consistent associations with the victim's psychological well-being and relationship perceptions than did their experience with

physical or sexual violence. In a study looking at the relationship between the trauma of battery and PTSD symptoms using verbally abused women as the control group, Kemp et al. (1995) found that PTSD symptoms may be seen in victims of non-physical abuse as well as victims of physical abuse. The results of this study indicated that verbal abuse may be an important factor in the etiology of PTSD in domestic violence.

Physical violence.

Physical violence has been linked to sexual coercion in a number of studies (Bidwell & White, 1986; Campbell & Alford, 1989). In a study based on a national survey of physical and sexual violence against wives in Great Britain, Painter and Farrington, (1998) explored the relationship between marital rape and physical violence using a sample of 1007 women. Of the 1007 women, 13.9% had been raped and almost half, 6.1%, had been raped as a result of threatened or actual violence. While studies indicate that physical violence signals a possibility of sexual coercion, there are no studies on how the levels of violence correspond to the occurrence of sexual coercion. The question is, are we safe in presuming that sexual coercion does not occur in relationships that are marked by minor levels of physical violence only? This study looks at the levels of physical abuse as a risk factor in the existence of sexual coercion.

Research Questions

1. What is the prevalence of marital rape and sexual coercion in this sample?
2. What is the level of congruence between male partner's perception of his own sexual coercion and his partner's perception of his sexual coercion?
3. What differences exist between level of sexually coercive behavior exhibited by men who use minor physical aggression only and those who use severe physical abuse?
4. Which of the eight variables or combination thereof (substance abuse, anger, depression, beliefs about wife beating, jealousy, dominance, and psychological and physical violence) can be considered risk factors for sexual coercion?

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I have reviewed the studies describing the prevalence of sexual coercion in an intimate relationship. Next, I have described the various studies that support each variable that I will use in my study. The variables of substance abuse, anger, beliefs about wife beating, depression, jealousy, dominance and level of physical and psychological violence will be explained in relation to domestic violence and sexual coercion with the help of the biopsychosocial framework.

Overview

Research suggests that there is a strong relation between physical violence and sexual violence (Campbell, 1989). Marital rape affects one in eight wives and probably occurs more frequently than all other kinds of rape combined (Bowker, 1983). Finkelhor and Yllo (1980) report that 5% of married women have been forced to have sexual relations and 10% of separated and divorced women reported such experiences in past relationships. Recent statistics suggest that 25% of women have been sexually assaulted during their lifetime in USA (Schwartz, 1991). Also, alcohol, anger, depression, romantic jealousy, dominance, and psychological violence have been found to influence the perpetration of domestic violence (Bergen, 1999; Pope & Shouldice, 2001; Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski and Bartholomew; Julian & McKenry, 1993; Bograd, 1988; Russell, 1982).

Sexual Coercion

There seems to be a difficulty in arriving at a definition of what constitutes sexual violence within an intimate relationship. Various researchers have defined it differently. For example, in her article “Marital Rape”, Bergen (1999) defines marital rape as any

unwanted intercourse or penetration (vaginal, anal, or oral) obtained by force, threat of force, or when a wife is unable to consent. For the purposes of her book, “Rape in Marriage”, Russell (1982), defined wife rape as any level of physical force, including pushing, pinning, or being held down by a partner’s weight to engage in sexual intercourse. Sexual coercion can be defined as all acts aimed toward engaging in nonconsensual sexual relations. For the purpose of this study, I will use the term “sexual coercion” to denote acts included in the CTS2 definition of sexual coercion (“I made my partner have sex without a condom”; “I used force (like hitting, holding down, using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex”; “I used force (like hitting, holding down, using a weapon) to make my partner have sex”; “I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force)”; “I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex”; “I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force)”; “I used threats to make my partner have sex”).

Most studies on this subject have looked at couples that are legally married, separated, divorced, or cohabiting in a long-term relationship. This study examines sexual coercion in married or cohabiting couples only. The literature review covers areas related to sexual coercion such as marital rape, sexual assault and forced sex.

In a study based on a national survey of physical and sexual violence against wives in Great Britain, Painter and Farrington (1998), explored the relationship between marital rape and physical violence using a sample of 1007 women. In this study, marital rape was defined as non-consensual sexual intercourse where violence was threatened or used. Of the 1007 women, 13.9% had been raped and almost half (6.1%) had been raped as a result of threatened or actual violence. Nearly all (94%) of the women who had

experienced marital rape, said that they had been raped while they were living with their husbands. Most of the wives had been raped more than once with 39% being raped 2-5 times and 45.8% raped six times or more. The study found that women who were physically assaulted were disproportionately likely to also be raped by their husbands, even though the prevalence of rape was far lower than the prevalence of marital violence. Considering that half of all rapes involved actual or threatened violence, an association between rape and violence does not come as a surprise. Also, those who had been raped were more likely than not, to be assaulted as well (80.3%) (Painter & Farrington, 1998).

In fact, even the women who had been raped without actual violence or threat, were far more likely than women who had not been raped, to have been assaulted or threatened by their husbands (62.8%) in the course of their relationship. A wife who has been assaulted or threatened sometime in her marriage may easily be coerced into non-consensual sexual intercourse (Painter and Farrington, 1998). These findings illustrate the strong link between physical and sexual violence.

In a population based National Violence Against Women Survey, Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) determined that 7.7% of women in USA (7.75 million) reported that they had been raped (defined as non-consensual sexual intercourse) by an intimate partner (current and former spouses, opposite or same sex cohabitating partners, during dates and by boyfriends) in their lifetime and 0.2 % in the past year (as cited in Campbell and Soeken, 1999).

In a study relating to forced sex, Campbell and Soeken (1999) sampled 159 battered women using the subscales of Index of Spouse Abuse for physical and sexual violence and ISA-NP for non-physical violence. It was found that 45.9% of the battered

women had also experienced forced sex by their intimate partners. Although, the authors do not define the term “forced sex” explicitly, the study termed “rape” as sexual assault committed by a person other than an intimate partner.

In a study by Weingourt (1990) examining prevalence of wife rape in clinical population, the experiences of wife rape in 53 ever-married women currently being treated for depression or anxiety in a psychiatric facility were explored. The study examined the prevalence of raped only and, raped and battered women. Here the term “rape” was limited to attempted or actual vaginal, digital, anal, or oral sexual activity by use of force or threat of force in non-consensual situations. The study found that of the 53 women in the sample, 17 (32%) had been raped by their husbands, and 16 (30%) of the women had been raped and battered. Therefore, 33 (62%) of the women seeking psychiatric treatment for depression or anxiety had been raped by their husbands. Also, except for two of the women, all of them had been raped more than twice. Of the 33 women who had been raped, 19 (56%) had been subjected to physical force, while 14 (42%) had experienced intense psychological pressure, but no physical force.

In a study by Wingood and DiClemente (1997), the authors examine the effects of a physically abusive partner on the use of condom and sexual negotiation practices in African-American women. Researchers interviewed 165 women aged 18-29 in San Francisco, California. It was found that women who had a physically abusive partner were 4.2, 9.2 and 3.7 times more likely to report being verbally abused, threatened with physical abuse, and threatened with abandonment, respectively, as a result of negotiating condom use.

While the above studies report that the prevalence of marital rape is not very uncommon in violent relationships, many authors express the opinion that accurate reporting is a concern. Painter and Farrington, (1998) believe that although the procedures of collecting data for their study was aimed at minimizing inhibitions against admitting victimization, given that concealment is more likely than exaggeration, the results of their study probably under-estimate the prevalence of sexual violence than over-estimate it. This view is echoed by Russell (1982) in describing her study of the prevalence of marital rape in a sample of 930 women in San Francisco in her book “Rape in Marriage”. Russell states, “... some of these women may have failed to mention a rape experience with their husbands at that point because of an unwillingness to disclose it” (p53). Therefore, accuracy of reports regarding this issue may be a valid concern that needs further study.

The effects of sexual coercion by an intimate partner are wide-ranging and traumatic. In fact, according to Finkelhor and Yllo (1983) the marital rape victim suffers greater and longer-term trauma than other rape victims. Raped wives suffer a profound sense of betrayal and entrapment, arising from repeated rapes and long-term anxiety and fear. The more frequently a woman is raped, the more psychosomatic reactions she experiences, and the more likely she is to attempt suicide. In fact, marital rape is more traumatic than stranger rape or rape by other non-intimates (Pagelow, 1988). This is due to the sense of betrayal, the disillusionment and the fact that wife rape is repeated and sometimes continue for years (Russell, 1982) because the perpetrator is the husband, who in social and religious contexts, is designated her protector (Pagelow, 1988).

In addition to psychological effects, sexual coercion can have serious physical health effects as well. These include injuries in the vaginal and anal areas, lacerations, soreness, bruising, torn muscles, fatigue and vomiting (Bergen, 1996). Campbell and Alford (1989) report that vaginal stretching, miscarriages, stillbirths, bladder infections, infertility and the potential contraction of sexually transmitted diseases including HIV are also effects of marital rape.

The above studies establish that sexual assault and marital rape within an intimate relationship, are much more prevalent than was traditionally thought to be and has wide-ranging harmful effects. For this reason, it is worthwhile to look further into the risk factors that may help identify prevalence of sexual coercion within an already abusive relationship.

Biological

Substance abuse.

Alcohol abuse as well as abuse of other controlled substances, have been linked to domestic violence as well as sexual assault in many research studies (Steele and Josephs, 1990; Leonard & Blane, 1992; Li, 1999; Riggs, Caulfield & Street, 2000; Pope & Shouldice, 2001). In the specific area of sexual violence, substance abuse plays an important role. According to the American Academy of Forensic Sciences, one third of the cases of sexual assault take place in the context of alcohol use (Li, 1999). The most common substances reported in cases of sexual assault are alcohol, marijuana and cocaine. All three of these substances share the common effects of CNS depression, impaired judgment, impaired memory, decreased motor control, and decreased inhibition (Pope & Shouldice, 2001).

In the conflict inhibition model, Steele and Josephs (1990) talk about the myopic effects of alcohol, where superficially understood immediate aspects of experience have a disproportionate influence on behavior. The authors claim that the myopic effect of alcohol occurs in situations where strong cues provoke one response that are in conflict with equally strong but opposing cues. More time may be required to understand and process these conflicting cues. However, persons under the influence make take actions without taking the time to understand and process conflicting responses. In their study, Marx, Gross, and Juergens (1997) found that participants who consumed alcohol took significantly longer to determine that the male partner should refrain from further sexual advances. The study also found that women who believed that they had consumed alcohol also took significantly longer to determine that the male partner should refrain. The authors believe that the psychological and pharmacological effects of alcohol diminishes the ability of sexually coercive and non-coercive men to discriminate when a female partner wants to put a stop to sexual advances.

In the context of partner violence, studies indicate that alcohol abuse and drug use to some extent have been associated with marital violence. (Leonard & Blane, 1992; O'Farrell & Murphy, 1995; Pan et al., 1994 as cited in Leonard & Blane). It has also been found that men with identified substance abuse problems are at a greater risk for spouse abuse than men who do not abuse substances (Gondolf & Foster, 1991; Leonard, Bromet, Parkinson, Day, & Ryan, 1985; Stith, Crossman & Bischof, 1991). These studies indicate that men with diagnosable alcohol problems are at a greater risk for spouse abuse than men who do not have issues of alcohol abuse (Riggs, Caulfield & Street, 2000).

In a study comparing patterns in violent and nonviolent couples, results show that alcohol is the most significant operating factor in violent marriages (Telch & Lindquist, 1984). The study examined patterns in nineteen violent couples, seven distressed but nonviolent couples and 24 nonviolent non-therapy couples. The violent couples reported significantly greater drinking problems than the other two groups. In fact, both partners in the violent couple reported alcohol related problems and were significantly different in this area from the non-violent group.

In a study (Brookoff, 1997) examining 62 incidents fitting the legal criteria for domestic assault or other residential disturbances, victims and family members reported that 92% of the perpetrators had used drugs or alcohol during the day of the incident. This was found in a study on domestic violence in Memphis, Tennessee. Two thirds of the incidents were severe in nature. The family members also reported that 67% had used a combination of alcohol and cocaine that results in heightened and prolonged intoxication. Similarly, in another study, over two-thirds of alcoholics had been violent toward a female partner before they went into treatment (O'Farrell, Van Hutton & Murphy, 1999). This study examined the prevalence and frequency of domestic violence during the second year following alcoholism treatment. It was found that alcoholics who had maintained abstinence had significantly lower rates of violence toward their partner on the first year as well as the second year follow up than the alcoholics who had relapsed (first year: 8.1% vs 36.8%; second year: 5.9% vs 29.3%).

In conclusion, the above studies give credence to the fact that substance abuse may have a strong relationship to sexual coercion, particularly in cases where the relationship is already violent.

Psychological

Anger.

Anger describes an emotional state that can vary in intensity from annoyance to rage. On the other hand, hostility refers to an attitudinal state where there is a predisposition to anger, along with aggressive behavior (Riley, Treiber & Woods, 1989).

In a study examining intimacy-anger and insecure attachment in 120 men referred for treatment of wife assault, Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski and Bartholomew (1994) found that men with early attachment problems are more likely to experience anger about intimacy regulation and all things being equal, this increases the probability of aggression toward an intimate partner.

In another study by Mauiro, Cahn, Vitaliano, Wagner & Zegree (1988) comparing anger and hostility in domestically violent versus generally assaultive men and non-violent control subjects, the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory was administered to 129 male participants of which 39 were domestically violent. Six subscales of the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory were used. These include Assault, Indirect, Irritability, Resentment, Suspicion and Verbal. It was found that domestically violent men had significantly higher levels of anger and hostility. Significantly enough, the study also found that the levels of anger in generally assaultive men and that of domestically violent men were not very different at all.

In their study "Men Who Rape", Groth and Birnbaum (1979) classifies rape into different categories: power rape, anger rape and sadistic rape. In marital rape, power and anger rape are by far the more common categories. In cases of anger rape, the male partner uses sex as a punishment and final debasement, "teaching her a lesson" (p14).

This kind of assault is usually characterized by physical brutality and far more physical force is used than would be necessary. In this kind of rape, the perpetrator attacks the victim, grabbing her, striking her, knocking her to the ground and tearing off her clothes. The rape experience for the offender is one of rage and conscious anger, his intent is not sex, but to express his anger and contempt and he often uses abusive and profane language to further debase his victim. The question is, if he is not sexually motivated, why does he not confine his attack to battering? Groth and Birnbaum believe that the answer lies in what one perpetrator says of his offence. "I wanted to knock the woman off her pedestal, and I felt rape was the worst thing I could do to her" (p 14). Typically, the perpetrator reports feeling anger, distress, frustration, and *depressed* just prior to the attack.

In the specific area of sexual violence within intimate relations, Frieze (1980) found that sexually coercive partners were more likely to get angry and fight their partners physically or verbally than men who were physically violent but not sexually coercive. However, although this may be true, Russell's study (1982) suggests that although sexually violent men may be more easily angry, anger may not be the primary motivation during a sexually coercive incident.

In the area of general violence, Barbour, Eckhardt, Davison and Kassonove (1998) explored the experience and expression of anger in maritally violent men, using the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory (STAXI) to assess the level of the participant's anger in addition to assessing the various anger expression style (Anger In, Anger Out, and Anger Control). The sample included 31 maritally violent men, 23 maritally dissatisfied non-violent men and 34 maritally satisfied non-violent men. The study found

that in general, maritally violent men experienced significantly higher levels of anger and expressed this emotion more frequently as well as more aggressively. The study also indicated that maritally violent men experienced a moderate level of anger on a regular basis. They were more likely to express their anger in an outwardly aggressive manner and score lower than the other two groups on the Anger Control Scale. Maritally violent men were also more likely to articulate aggressive verbalizations including insults, taunts, verbal put-downs and threats. However, interestingly enough, the study also found that maritally violent men did not directly express their anger using anger-related emotion words, but instead verbalized statements of aggression.

The above studies indicate that there may be a strong relation between the level of anger and the prevalence of sexual coercion within an abusive relationship.

Depression

Researchers are increasingly looking at the relationship between male depression and physical violence toward the partner (Feldbau-Kohn, Heyman & O'Leary, 1998, Julian & McKenry, 1993). Feldbau-Kohn, Heyman and O'Leary, 1998, found increased depressive symptomatology in physically aggressive men. The researchers sampled 89 physically aggressive men volunteering for treatment. Twenty seven percent of the sample had moderate levels of depressive symptomatology, while 9% were severely depressed according to the Beck Depression index. A significant relationship between increased depressive symptomatology and frequency of physical aggression was found.

In another study examining the predictive factors in mild to moderate violence, Pan, Neidig and O'Leary (1994) found that an increase of 20% in depressive symptomatology increased the risk of moderate violence by 30% and the chances of

engaging in severe violence by 74%. The study found that severe physical aggression was strongly related to increased depressive symptomatology.

In a study examining correlation in battering, Hanson, Cadsky, Harris and Lalonde (1997), researchers used the Beck Depression Inventory on 997 men of which 184 were non-abusive and 517 were moderately abusive, while 296 were severely abusive. It was found that both the moderately and the severely abusive men scored higher on the scale than did non-abusive men.

In a study examining the role of anger and hostility in depression, Riley, Treiber and Woods (1989) found that the participants who were depressed reported much higher levels of anger and hostility. In another study regarding the relation between depression and anger and hostility, it was found that the depressed group experienced more hostility and was more likely to express anger than the nondepressed group (Biaggio & Godwin, 1987). This finding is supported by a study examining anger, hostility and depression in a group of domestically violent men in comparison to that of the non-violent control group (Maiuro, Cahn, Vitaiano, Wagner & Zegree, 1988). This study found that while domestically violent men had a median score of 14, the non-violent control group had a median of 3 and even the generally assaultive men had a median score of 5 on the Beck Depression Inventory.

In conclusion, although these studies do not relate to depression and sexual coercion in a violent relationship, they illustrate that there is a strong relationship between depression and partner violence. Thus, studying the variable of depression as an indication of the presence of sexual coercion may be worthwhile.

Beliefs about wife beating.

There has been a good amount of research in the area of examining the attitudes and belief systems of batterers (Walker, 1981; Gondolf & Russell, 1986; Adams, 1986 as quoted in Saunders, Lynch, Grayson and Linz, 1987; and Bograd, 1988) and significant links have been established. In a study examining the differences in socialized attitudes between batterer and non-batterer Israeli men, it was found that attitudes were central to the differentiation between violent and non-violent men (Elsikovits, Edleson, Guttman & Sela-Amit, 1991). The study compared attitudinal differences between 60 violent and non-violent men. The Conflict Tactics Scale, Self- Control Scale, Internal, Powerful Others and Chance Scales and the Inventory of Beliefs About Wife Beating measures were administered. While the two groups of men did not differ significantly on any of the cognitive variables, there were significant differences in the attitudes toward women. Abusive men held less negative attitudes toward wife battering than their non-violent counterparts. The severity of the physical violence also appears to be related in part to positive attitudes about spouse abuse. According to this study, attitudinal differences can play a moderating role in positive prediction and identification of physical violence. In fact, 25% of the variance in men's physical violence was found to be a function of their attitudes toward battering and their rational thinking patterns.

In the particular context of sexual coercion or partner sexual violence, studies indicate that there is a strong relationship between the belief system of the participants and perpetration of sexual violence. A significant amount of research has been done with regards to date rape or acquaintance rape and its connection to belief systems. In their study, Marx, Adams and Juergens, 1999, asked participants to listen to an audiotape of a

scenario for date rape and determine when the male partner should refrain from making further attempts of sexual contact. The study also found that participants with a coercive history reported significantly greater arousal to the audiotape of a scenario of date rape and reported significantly higher endorsement of rape myths. In a study examining courtship violence and sex-typing, a questionnaire exploring abuse between dating partners and the Bem Sex Role Inventory were administered to 171 college students (Bernard, Bernard & Bernard, 1985). It was found that male students who admitted to having been abusive to their partner obtained scores that clearly sex-typed them as more masculine on the Bem Sex Role Inventory and holding more traditionally masculine attitudes. In another study looking at the relationship between the likelihood of battering to attitudes and childhood experiences, 79.1% of the participants reported some hypothetical likelihood of using physical violence in a marital relationship under at least one circumstance (Briere, 1987). The study surveyed 191 male university students administering violent Attitudes Toward Wife Abuse (AWA), conservative Attitudes Toward Women (AWS), Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (AIV). Although the likelihood of battering is not a direct measure of actual wife abuse, it supports the hypothesis that wife abuse is a socially acceptable phenomenon in North American culture (Briere, 1987).

In their study of sexual arousal and judgments made by Sexually Aggressive and Nonaggressive men, Bernat, Calhoun and Adams (1999) screened the participants by using the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES; Koss et al., 1987) and the Calloused Sexual Beliefs scale (CSB of the Hypermasculinity Inventory [HI]; Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). Next, they examined the penile tumescence of the two groups of men in response to an

audiotape of a date rape scenario. The Sexually Aggressive men showed a greater physiological arousal than did the Nonaggressive group of men. The results of this study also suggest that the Sexually aggressive men (those men who scored higher on the SES and CSB) have a lower threshold for arousal to sexual cues in nonconsensual situations and, also that their arousal is not inhibited by cues of forcible sexual advances by the man or the woman's verbal and physical expressions of resistance, fear, pain and humiliation (Bernat, Calhoun & Adams, 1999). Hunt (1979) believes that as far as marital rape is concerned, the perpetrator believes that wives are to be ruled by their husbands.

Considering that research suggests a strong relationship between beliefs and perpetration of sexual coercion, this variable warrants further investigation to determine to what degree it is associated with the occurrence of sexual coercion within a violent relationship.

Social

Romantic jealousy.

The violence that erupts from jealousy is primarily partner violence (White & Mullen, 1989). In fact, according to research as well as reports from clinicians and shelter workers, male batterers usually experience extreme jealousy (Pagelow, 1981). In a study of 122 batterers, Brisson (1981) found that jealousy was an issue in 41% of the violent incidents.

Although violence is caused by a complex combination of factors, jealousy often provides the context in which physical violence occurs. Studies show that jealousy is the precipitating cause of many incidents of marital violence (Gibbens, 1958, West, 1968, as cited in White & Mullen, 1989; Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982). In their study of

violent offenders, Hafner and Boker, 1982 (as cited in White & Mullen, 1989) found jealousy to be the prime motive in 13% of the violent assaults. Jealousy can result in a desire to hurt and thus, it has a strong relation to anger, aggression and domestic violence (Dutton, van Ginkel & Landolt, 1996). This is particularly true for intimate relationships (White & Mullen, 1989). In a study examining 101 battered women, Church (1984) found that 87 of the women reported their partners to be extremely jealous. In a study looking at the forms and intensity of aggression in cases of jealousy, it was found that only 19.4% of the sample had not responded with violence toward their partner while 24% had resorted to threats of killing or maiming (Mullen & Maack, 1985 as cited in White & Mullen, 1989). However, the most common incidents of jealous violence takes on the form of hitting, punching and kicking the partner (White & Mullen, 1989). Jealousy has also been reported in cases of spousal homicide (Daly, Wilson, & Weghorst, 1982).

In addition to physical violence, jealousy prompts husbands to enforce social isolation and other unreasonable demands on the partner in order to prevent chances of infidelity (White & Mullen, 1989). The loss or threat of loss of a romantic partner to a rival leads to depression, anger loss of self-esteem and of course, jealousy (Mathes, Adams, & Davies, 1985). Thus, the danger of violence is very high in couples where one partner experiences extreme forms of jealousy.

In a study by Dutton, van Ginkel and Landolt, (1996), the relationship between jealousy and abusiveness and/or intrusiveness was examined. The sample consisted of 120 court-referred or self-referred physically abusive males as well as a group of non-abusive men as a control group. Various scales regarding family violence, jealousy,

intrusiveness, anger and psychopathology were administered. Abusive men scored significantly higher on the Interpersonal Jealousy Scale than did the males in the control group. In addition, sexually coercive men were also likely to be more jealous of their partners (Frieze, 1980). Another interesting result of the study was that men reported experiencing much lower jealousy than their partners' perceived them to be experiencing.

It is believed that batterers who have been raised in families where the father has used rejection and guilt as a tool for psychological control, are more likely to be jealous (Hindy, 1985). In a study regarding jealousy and romantic attachment in maritally violent and nonviolent men, a sample of 180 men was studied (Barnett, Martinez and Bluestein, 1995). The sample included men who were maritally violent, but had received no counseling, maritally violent men who had received some counseling, unhappily married but nonviolent men and satisfactorily married men. The study found that maritally violent men were no more jealous than unhappily married nonviolent men. However, there was a significant relationship between the levels of jealousy, reasons for staying, marital dissatisfaction and childhood abuse in the two groups of violent men.

As for the predictive factor as to whether a jealous partner will respond with violence or not, previous record of violence is the most predominant indication that violence may reoccur (White & Mullen, 1989). Another predictor is whether the partner displays overt aggressive behavior and also if there has been some violence in the relationship (White & Mullen, 1989). Although threats of violence are common in jealousy, the more emphatic a threat is, the higher is its danger level. Another predictive factor is alcohol or drug abuse. The disinhibiting effect of alcohol may result in both major and minor acts of violence (White & Mullen, 1989). As far as drug abuse is

concerned, amphetamine and cocaine abuse can produce a state similar to paranoid schizophrenia in which delusions of infidelity are common (White & Mullen, 1989).

Although there are no studies examining the role of jealousy in sexual coercion within intimate relationships, since jealousy is often an important factor in partner violence, this variable merits further examination.

Dominance.

Researchers have also found a link between domestic violence and dominance. Ronfeldt, Bartle-Haring & Aria (1998) sampled 156 undergraduate men in serious dating relationships, and measured, through self-report, the degree of physical, psychological, perceptions of power and satisfaction with power. Results indicated that dissatisfaction with relationship power was a predictive factor for physical and psychological violence.

In another study, Coleman and Straus (1986) studied a national sample of 2143 couples. The sample was divided into three groups on the basis of the power structure in the relationship: egalitarian, male-dominant, female-dominant and divided power. The study found that egalitarian relationships had the least amount of conflict, while male-dominant and female-dominant relationships had the highest risk for violence.

Frieze found that perpetrators of intimate sexual violence were especially dominant in their marital relationships (Frieze, 1980). They decided where and with whom the couple would socialize and when and where the partner could go on her own. Groth and Birnbaum (1979), in their study of men who are sexually violent, talk about the different kinds of motivations in rape. One of these kinds is power rape. The authors believe that in power rape, it is not so much the partner's refusal to have sex that is the reason for such assault, but rather how the refusal is perceived by the offender. Here, sex

may be equated with power. In these cases, the perpetrator's motive is not to hurt the victim, but rather to possess her. According to Lynch (1999) men do commit violence because they need to be powerful. They feel powerless and want to counteract this very uncomfortable and usually unnerving experience. Sexuality becomes a means for compensating for underlying feelings of inadequacy and serves to express mastery, strength, control, authority and identity over the victim. This kind of perpetrator may not use physical force at all. He may verbally threaten the victim or threaten her with a weapon. In cases of marital sexual coercion, the perpetrator may need to only imply harm for the partner to capitulate (Groth & Birnbaum, 1979). Hunt believes that a typical marital rapist is one who believes that wives are to be ruled by their husband. In forcing his partner to have sex with him, the offender humbles her and reasserts the fact that he is the ruler and she the subject (Hunt, 1979).

Physical violence.

Physical abuse in relationships has been defined as any act of physical aggression, ranging from minor acts such as slapping to severe acts such as assault with a weapon (Mahoney, Williams & West, 2001). Numerous studies have been conducted to estimate the prevalence of physical violence. The National Family Violence Survey in 1985 estimated that 6.2 million women experience “any” physical violence by a partner of which 1.8 million report “severe” violence (Straus, & Gelles, 1990 as cited in Mahoney, Williams & West, 2001). In a recent study of 8000 women, it was projected that 1.3 million women experience violence every year, and 22 million women experience it in their lifetime (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). It is important to keep in mind that these numbers refer to physical violence only and does not include sexual violence

(Mahoney, Williams & West, 2001). In their study, Stark and Flitcraft (1996) state that 20% to 25% of adult women in the United States have been physically abused at least once in their lifetime by a male intimate.

In her study on marital rape, Frieze reported that the men who raped their wives were significantly more likely to batter their partners as well (Frieze, 1980). Finkelhor and Yllo (1980) point out that physical force is one of the common ways in which conflicts are resolved in any marriage and sexual conflict is common in marriages. Putting these two factors together, the authors believe that physical force is probably a common manner in which these conflicts are resolved. Finkelhor and Yllo (1980) cite research by Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz who reported that the likelihood of violence in couples who report that they “never” agree on sexual matters was much higher. This leads to the conclusion that physical force is often triggered by these conflicts and it is possible that physical force is sometimes used to coerce sexual activities. In a study on the validity of self-reports of marital violence (Arias & Beach, 1987), researchers looked at self-reports of spousal physical violence and its relation to social desirability. A sample of 82 married men and 90 married women was studied. It was found that the participants who scored higher on the social desirability scale were less likely to report use of physical aggression. Significantly enough, however, the need for social approval was not related to reports of being a victim of spousal physical aggression.

The above studies show that there is a strong relation between physical and sexual aggression in a relationship. Additionally, self-report of physical aggression may not be accurate due to the socially undesirable nature of physical abuse. Thus, it is worth

exploring a possible relationship between sexual coercion and physical violence and the congruence between men's self-report and partner report of violence.

Psychological violence

Psychological violence usually precedes physical violence and oftentimes, result in more serious consequences than physical violence (Murphy & O'Leary, 1989).

Gortner, Gollan, & Jacobson (1997), state that the main purpose of violence is to intimidate and control. Batterers use threats, taunts and ridicule toward this purpose. In a study by Vivian & Langhinrichsen-rohling (1994), couples from a marital therapy clinic reported the impact of physical violence and psychological aggression. Both men and women reported that the impact of psychological aggression was much greater than that of physical violence. In a study looking at the relationship between the trauma of battery and PTSD symptoms using verbally abused women as the control group, Kemp et al. (1995) found that PTSD symptoms may be seen in victims of non-physical abuse as well as victims of physical abuse. The results of this study indicated that verbal abuse may be an important factor in the etiology of PTSD in domestic violence.

In a study looking at shame and trauma symptoms in emotionally abused women, Mullally (2000) found that these symptoms were strongly associated with victims of psychological abuse. Mullally was looking at a sample of 92 women, 81 of whom were in heterosexual relationships.

In a study by Lobnitz (1989), the author found that in a sample of 541 female therapy clients, 33% reported husband-to-wife violence and 26% reported rape experiences. Of the participants who experienced marital rape, 64% were in physically violent relationships, while 37% reported no physical violence. This study indicates that

while the possibility of sexual coercion is higher in physically violent relationship, it may also be present in relationships that are not physically violent. Sexual coercion can also occur in relations that are psychologically violent only. In her study of 930 women in San Francisco for the prevalence of marital rape, Russell (1982) provides transcripts of interviews where women were verbally coerced into sexual activities.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

The study will look at how the male perpetrator's perception of sexual coercion differs from that of his partner. It will also explore the relationship between levels of physical violence and sexual coercion. Lastly, the study will examine the factors associated with sexual coercion. This will be done using the using biological (substance abuse), psychological (depression, anger, beliefs about wife-beating), and social (jealousy, dominance, and psychological and physical violence) variables.

Participants and Selection Process

The NIMH funded study conducted by the faculty at Virginia Tech's Marriage and Family Therapy program will provide the data for this study. The NIMH-funded study was a research and development program to develop a manualized couple's treatment model for perpetrators of domestic violence and their partners. The sample includes 87 matched couples that came in for assessment of suitability for couples treatment in relation to domestic violence. The participants for this study are men who were either court-ordered or self-referred to treatment and their partners.

The larger NIMH-funded study had a number eligibility criteria which are that the perpetrator had to be at least 18 years old, involved in a serious ongoing relationship with the woman he had physically abused, willing to participate in a anger-management program if he had not already done so, and willing to participate in 12 sessions of conjoint couple therapy or multi-couple group therapy with a partner who would also participate in the therapy sessions.

Exclusionary criteria included to ensure the safety of the partners were severe violence, violence by the male partner outside of the home, alcohol or drug-abuse, anti-

social personality disorder, threat of or use of weapons during the violent episodes, possessions of guns in the home and refusal to relinquish these weapons, and refusal to sign a no-violence contract.

Procedures

Referrals to the Anger Management Program/Couples Counseling Project was through one of several ways: participants were referred by a county employee at a domestic violence treatment program, by a probation officer or were self-referred. Participants then called the research office at Virginia Tech, where a Graduate Assistant trained to take these calls asked the caller a number of questions. These questions related mainly to the precipitating incident, level of violence, substance abuse issues, psychiatric issues and referral source. After these questions were answered, if the caller was interested in pursuing treatment and the Graduate Assistant felt that the caller could be a potential participant, an appointment would be made for the caller to come in and fill out intake paperwork. When the potential participant came in, an assigned Graduate Assistant met with him and administered the intake. The intake included getting demographic information about the participant, and a modified Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, Sugarman, 1996) and the SMAST (Selzer, Vinokur & van Rooijen, 1975) were also given out. The participants were also asked if they would be interested in the couples counseling project or the anger management program. The research team then identified participants who would be suitable for either of the two programs (assessed according to the exclusionary criteria). The men who were interested in the couples counseling project were asked if their partner was interested too. If yes, the partner was called and the intake process was explained. An intake appointment was

made if she was interested in coming in. The men were then given the informed consent which included a brief description of the study and explained their right to end participation, if they felt necessary, at any point of time. After filling out the intake information (Appendix A), the men were given the pre-test booklet (see Appendices B). The pre-test booklet took from 30-60 minutes to complete. After it was completed, the pre-test booklet was given to the grant manager. For participants that had trouble reading or writing English, the booklet was read out by the intake administrator. One hundred and twenty nine male intakes have been successfully administered in conjunction with the larger NIMH funded study.

Measures

The study will use data from the larger NIMH funded project, which was gathered through the responses to the pretest booklet and the intake protocol developed with Alexandria County Office on Women and Virginia Tech.

This study will use Sexual Coercion Subscale of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, Sugarman, 1996) to measure sexual coercion. To study the eight predictor variables, the study will use the Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (SMAST) (Selzer, Vinokur & van Rooijen, 1975) the NOVACO Anger Index (Novaco, 1979), Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating Scale (Saunders, Lynch, Grayson & Linz 1987), Romantic Jealousy Scale (White, 1976), the SCL-90 R scale for depression (Derogatis, 1983) and the Psychological Abuse Subscale and the Physical Abuse Subscale of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, Sugarman, 1996) to measure psychological and physical violence.

Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (SMAST)

The SMAST (Selzer, Vinokur & van Rooijen, 1975) contains 13 questions relating to problem-drinking like “Does your wife, husband, a parent or other near relative ever worry or complain about your drinking?” and “Have you ever been arrested, even for a few hours, because of other drunken behavior?” The scale correlates strongly with other indices of alcoholism. Reliability tests have generated coefficient alpha of .93. In this study, the reliability for the men’s report is .99.

NOVACO for Couples Anger Index

This self-report scale is designed to measure the range and intensity of anger responsiveness. It contains brief description of incidents that may provoke anger and the respondents rate their degree of anger on a five-point scale. The scale ranges from Very Little Anger to Very Much Anger asking responses to how much anger the participant would feel in response to a certain incident. Examples of these incidents are, “Struggling to carry four cups of coffee to a table, a co-worker bumps into you” and “You are talking to your partner and he/she does not answer.” In an early study, Saunders and Hanusa (1989) found the internal reliability coefficient to be .89. In this study, the reliability for the men’s self-report was .95.

SCL-90 R Depression and Anxiety Subscales

This measure is part of the SCL-90 R developed by Derogatis (1983). The depression scale consists of 13 self-report questions, and the anxiety subscale consists of 10 self-report questions asking participants to range their distress on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 representing not at all distressed and 5 representing extremely distressed. The reliability for the SCL-90-R was measured by internal consistency of co-efficient alpha

ranging from .77 to .90. In this study, the reliability for the men's report of their own depression was .92. Test-retest coefficients were obtained, hovering from .80 to .90. The measure was correlated with the MMPI and scores ranged from .40 to .68 (Derogatis, 1983). Examples of questions are: "How much were you distressed by loss of sexual interest or pleasure" and "How much were you distressed by feeling hopeless about the future".

Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating

The inventory of beliefs about wife beating has several subscales. It was developed by Saunders, Lynch, Grayson, and Linz (1987) to measure the men's beliefs and attitudes. It contains 31 items in five subscales: Wife beating is justified, wives gain from the abuse, help should be given, the offender is responsible, and the offender should be punished. In this analysis, the first three subscales were combined into a scale of sympathy toward battered women. This study will use the wife beating justified subscale which consists of questions like, "Wives could avoid being battered by their husbands if they knew when to stop talking". The reliability of this subscale for the men's report in the study was .84.

Romantic Jealousy Scale

The Romantic Jealousy Scale developed by White (1976) measures romantic jealousy. The instrument is a six-item scale with high internal reliability and correlates as expected with dependency on relationships (Saunders, 1996). This scale assesses the respondent's view of himself/herself as "jealous or not jealous in the current relationship" by asking 6 Likert-type questions such as "compared to your other romantic relationship, are you more or less jealous in this one?" and "How intense are your feelings of jealousy

in your current relationship?” (White, 1981, p. 301). Reliability tests have generated a coefficient alpha of .83. Other examples of questions are: “How often do you get jealous of your partner’s relationship with members of the opposite sex?” and “How much is your jealousy of your partner a problem in your relationship?” The responses range from 1, not at all jealous to 7, very jealous. The reliability of this scale for this study was .85.

Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2)

Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2) is a modified version of the CTS and was developed by Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman in 1996. The scale has improved measures for physical, psychological and sexual abuse. The internal consistency of the CTS2 ranges from an alpha coefficient of .79 to .95 (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). The instrument asks questions regarding frequency of abuse. If a particular item in the questionnaire did not happen in the last year, the respondent marks a 7, and if it never happened, the respondent marks a 0. The Sexual Coercion Subscale, Physical Violence Subscale and the Psychological Violence Subscale will be used for this study. There are 12 items to measure the level and frequency of physical violence, 7 items measure the level and frequency of psychological abuse, and 7 items that measure sexual coercion. The Sexual Coercion questions range from whether one partner made the other have sex without a condom or if one partner insisted on having oral or anal sex (without the use of physical force) to more direct questions like if there had been use of physical force (like hitting, holding down or using a weapon) in order to have sex. The Sexual Coercion Subscale includes three levels of coercion (insistence, threat of force and actual force) and three types of sexual acts (vaginal, anal, and oral). CTS2 requires only 6th grade reading ability.

The alpha reliability for the men's report of their own sexual coercion is .53 and the reliability for the partners' report is .69. The reliability of the men's report of their own physical violence is .83 and that of their partners' is .84. The reliability of psychological violence for men's report is .83 and that of the partners' report is .84.

The Dominance Scale

The Dominance Scale developed by Hamby (1995), is a 32 Likert-type item scale that examines three forms of dominance, authority, restrictiveness, and disparagement. Authority ("I know what's best for my partner.") relates to the decision-making power in the relationship. Restrictiveness describes when a partner feels the right to intrude upon the other's behavior, even when that behavior does not directly involve them—i.e. "I respect my partner's need for privacy." (Hamby, 1996). Hamby describes Disparagement ("My partner is basically a good person.") as the failure of one partner to equally value the other partner in addition to the overall negative view of their partner's worth. The Restrictiveness Subscale was used in this study. The participants rate each item from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Data from this scale supports the internal validity of each of these three constructs. This scale demonstrates good distributions and internal consistency with alphas of .80, .82, and .73. Respondents are asked how much they agreed or disagreed (on a 4-point scale) with each item. The final scale has a Flesch reading level of grade 7.4. Sample questions are, "My partner often has good ideas", "If my partner and I can't agree, I can usually have the final say", and "My partner should not keep secrets from me". The alpha reliability for the restrictiveness Subscale with this sample was .61.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using the SPSS software package. To answer question one, “How does the batterer’s perception of sexual coercion differ from his partner’s perception?”, the data were analyzed in several ways. First, I conducted frequency tests on all Sexual Coercive items on the CTS2 for the men’s self-report and for his partner’s report of his behavior. To explore the level of congruence between the male partner’s perception of his own sexual coercion and his partner’s perception of his sexual coercion, I conducted chi-square analyses and frequency tests. Next, I ran case summaries to look at the degree of disparity between the responses of male and female partners.

For the second question, which explored the differences between the level of sexually coercive behavior exhibited by men who use minor physical aggression and by those who use severe physical aggression, I ran two t-tests. To answer the question, “How does sexual coercion differ from higher levels of physical violence to lower levels of physical violence?”, the participants were divided into two groups. Any man who either self-reported or his partner reported that he uses any behavior defined as Severe Physical abuse in the CTS2, was placed in the Severe group. Any man who either self-reported or his partner reported that he uses any behavior defined as Minor Physical abuse in the CTS2, but no behavior defined as Severe, was placed in the Minor group. Next, a frequency table is presented which identifies the frequency of sexually coercive acts the men in both groups self-report they used, and the sexually coercive acts their partners report they used. To answer the third research question, “ Which of the eight variables, (substance abuse, anger, beliefs about wife beating, depression, jealousy, dominance, and level of psychological and physical violence), or combination thereof

best predict sexual coercion?”, two regression analyses were conducted: one with the female partner’s report of the male’s physically, psychologically, and sexually abusive behavior and the second using only the male partner’s self-report. Through these analyses, I examined the overall ability of the variables to identify risk factors for sexually coercive behavior.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

In this chapter, I report on results of the study. First, I examined the frequency of sexually coercive behaviors the women experienced. Overall, 46.9% women reported that their partner sexually coerced them. Next, since most of the literature on sexual violence between intimate partners used the term “marital rape”, I calculated the percentage of female partners in this study who reported that their partners had raped them. For the purposes of this study, I defined rape as “forcing a partner to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex or using threats to make a partner have oral, anal or vaginal sex”. To explore the prevalence of “marital rape” in my sample, I conducted frequency tests of the number of women who reported that their partners forced them to have oral or anal or vaginal sex or used threats to make them have oral, anal or vaginal sex. I found that 20 female partners (23%) reported that their male partners had engaged in “marital rape”. Next, to understand the data and the intercorrelations among the data, I present a table with Means and Standard Deviations of each variable included in the subsequent analyses (See Table 1). To compare means for male partner self-report and female partner report of male physical, psychological and sexual violence, I conducted two t-tests (Table 2). Next, a correlation matrix with the dependent and independent variables is presented (See Table 3).

Table 1

Means and standard deviations of independent and dependent variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Male Sexual coercion Female Report	2.49	4.15
Male Sexual coercion Male Report	1.51	2.77
Male Physical violence Female Report	15.01	12.58
Male Physical violence Male Report	9.01	10.31
Male Psychological violence Female Report	20.47	9.42
Male Psychological violence Male Report	17.59	9.17
Male Depression	1.32	0.85
Male Dominance	22.40	4.08
Male Jealousy	15.95	6.87
Male Alcoholism	1.73	3.25
Male Pro-violence attitude	63.91	14.02

As can be seen in Table 1, the male partners' reports of their own violent behaviors are considerably lower than their female partners' reports of the men's behavior. For example, the mean for female report of male sexual coercion is 2.49, while the mean for the male partner's own report of sexually coercive behaviors is 1.51.

To determine if the differences were statistically significant, a series of paired sample t-tests were conducted.

Table 2

Difference between male self-report and partner report of sexual coercion

Pair	Paired Differences				
	N	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>t</u>	df
Male self-report of sexual coercion	79	2.01	3.60	- 1.59	78
Partner report of sexual coercion	79	2.82	4.40		
Male self-report of physical violence	75	8.22	9.52	- 3.74***	74
Partner report of physical violence	75	13.14	11.83		
Male self-report of psychological violence	74	16.41	9.36	-3.54***	73
Partner report of psychological violence	74	20.21	9.36		

*** $p < .005$

Table 3

Intercorrelations of risk and criterion variables

	Sexual coercion	Physical	Psychological	Alcohol	Anger	Depression	Pro-violence	Dominance	Jealousy
Sexual coercion	1	.319**	-.012	-.059	.152	-.102	-.245*	.020	.096
Physical		1	.577**	.057	.109	.170	-.165	.106	.292
Psychological			1	.060	-.031	.189	-.023	-.064	-.048
Alcohol				1	.183	-.032	-.012	.175	.035
Anger					1	.243	-.237	.200	.092
Depression						1	.123	.140	.071
Pro-violence							1	-.195	-.021
Dominance								1	.497**
Jealousy									1

Sexual Coercion: Female report of male sexual coercion

Physical: Female report of male physical violence

Psychological: Female report of male psychological violence

Alcohol: Male self-report of alcohol abuse

Anger: Male self-report of anger

Depression: Male self-report of depression

Pro-violence: Male self-report of pro-violence attitudes toward wife beating

Dominance: Male self-report of dominance

Jealousy: Male self-report of jealousy

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

The correlation analyses found that sexual coercion is significantly correlated with physical violence as well as beliefs about wife beating. In addition, physical violence is significantly correlated to psychological violence and, dominance and jealousy are significantly correlated.

Research question 1

To understand how men and women differed in their report of the level of sexually abusive behavior perpetrated by the male, I examined the data in a number of ways.

Difference in male and female reports.

First, I recoded each item in the CTS Sexual Coercion Subscale into a “yes” or “no” dichotomous format. Next, I conducted a series of chi-square analyses using frequencies of each item of the CTS Sexual Coercion Subscale as the independent variable to see if there were any significant differences between male and female reports on the occurrence of each item in the Sexual Coercion Subscale. Table 4 summarizes the findings.

Table 4

Prevalence of sexually coercive male behavior according to male and female partner report

Behavior	Male self-report (<u>n</u> = 87) (%)	Female partner report (<u>n</u> = 87) (%)	$\chi^2(1)$
Made partner have sex w/o condom	6 (6.8)	10 (11.4)	0.75
Forced oral/anal sex	5 (5.7)	7 (8.0)	0.11
Insisted on oral/anal sex w/o force	6 (6.8)	7 (8.0)	0.01
Forced sex	6 (6.8)	8 (9.1)	0.08
Insisted on sex w/o force	19 (21.8)	27 (31.0)	1.45*
Threats for oral/anal sex	3 (3.4)	5 (5.7)	0.13
Threats for sex	4 (4.5)	9 (10.3)	1.28

As can be seen in Table 4, there were no significant differences between male and female partner reports except that 27 women believed that their partner had insisted (without force) on having sex when they did not want to have sex, while only 19 men admitted to this. Other than that the male and female reports did not differ significantly.

Overall disparity.

To analyze the differences in the male self-report and the partner report, SPSS was used to conduct case summaries. Through this procedure, cases were matched by dyad numbers, and the responses of each couple in the sample were analyzed. In order to determine the disparity of responses of a male partner from his female partner, I

compared at the overall incidence reported by each partner on each item of the Sexual Coercion Subscale (Table 5 summarizes the findings).

Table 5

Disparity between male and female report of sexually coercive male behavior

Behavior	Low M response, High F response	High M response, Low F response	Matched response	Missing M data	Missing F data
Made partner have sex w/o condom	8	6	65	2	6
Insisted on sex w/o force	22	9	56	0	0
Insisted on oral or anal sex w/o force	6	7	73	1	0
Forced oral or anal sex	7	0	79	0	1
Forced sex	7	5	75	0	0
Threats for sex	3	1	83	0	0
Threats for oral or anal sex	10	1	75	1	0

* M = Male, F = Female

As can be seen from Table 5, in most cases, the male and female partner agreed about whether or not the male partner used each type of sexual coercive behavior. When there were disagreements, the women tended to report higher incidence of sexually coercive behavior than their male partner. In only one case, i.e., insisting on having oral or anal sex (without physical force) were the number of men who reported higher responses than their partners greater than the number of women who reported higher response than their partner.

Research question 2

Research question 2 explores the differences that exist between the levels of sexually coercive behavior exhibited by men who use minor physical aggression and by those who use severe physical aggression. First, I conducted a frequency analysis and found that 46.3% of the male partners who were severely violent were sexually coercive as well and 45.7% of the men who engaged in minor aggression were sexually coercive. Next, I conducted two t-tests comparing the scores of the men who used minor physical aggression only with those who used any severe physically aggressive behavior on each item of the Sexual Coercion Subscale. In the first set of t-tests, I used the female partner's report of the male partner's sexually coercive behavior as the dependent variable and her report of the male partner's physically, and psychologically abusive behavior as two of the independent variables. In the second set of t-tests, I used the male partner's report of his own sexually, physically and psychologically abusive behavior as variables. In both t-tests, I compared the two groups (minor violence and severe violence) using Straus' definition of minor and severe violence. The groups (minor and severe) were divided into physical abuse severity categories based on the female partner's report.

Table 6

Group differences for sexually coercive behavior between men who use minor physical aggression only and those who use severe physical aggression based on female partner's report

Group	<u>Minor Physical</u>		<u>Severe Physical</u>		<u>t</u> <u>df</u> = (45.4)
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Sexual Coercion	1.53	2.26	3.22	4.69	-2.06*

As shown in Table 6, according to the female partner's report of the male partner's sexually coercive behavior, men who use severe violence toward their partner, are significantly more likely to engage in sexually coercive behaviors than are men who use only minor physically aggressive behavior.

Table 7

Group differences for sexually coercive behavior between men who use minor physical aggression only and those who use severe physical aggression based on male partner's self-report

Group	<u>Minor Physical</u>		<u>Severe Physical</u>		<u>t</u> <u>df</u> = (49.63)
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	
Sexual Coercion	.81	1.83	2.17	3.79	-2.09*

As shown in Table 7, according to the male partner's report of his own sexually coercive behavior, men who use severe violence toward their partner are significantly more likely to engage in sexually coercive behaviors than are men who use minor physically aggressive behavior only.

Research question 3

In order to determine which of the variables (dominance, jealousy, wife beating justified, depression, alcohol, physical and psychological violence) are risk factors for sexual coercion, two regression analyses were run. In the first analysis, the male self-report of physical and psychological abuse in addition to jealousy, depression, dominance, alcohol abuse and pro-violence attitudes were used as independent variables. The male partner's self report of his own sexually coercive behavior was used as the dependent variable. In the second analysis, the female report of the male's physical and psychological abuse, and the male partner's self report of jealousy, depression, dominance, alcohol abuse, and pro-violence attitudes were used as independent variables. The female partner's report of the male partner's sexually coercive behaviors was used as the dependent variable. The variable, anger, was not included due to missing data.

Table 8

Regression analysis summary for risk factor variables predicting male sexual coercion
(male self-report)

Variable	B	<u>SEB</u>	<u>B</u>
Physical violence	8.12	2.70	0.30
Depression	0.80	0.41	0.27
Psychological violence	-2.72	0.03	-0.98
Dominance	-3.23	0.98	-0.05
Jealousy	5.04	0.05	0.13
Alcoholism	2.83	0.11	0.32
Pro-violence attitude	-1.70	0.02	-0.09

Note: $R^2 = .20$, $N = 59$, $p = ns$

The male partner's report of his own sexual, physical and psychological abuse were used in a regression analysis. According to the male self-report, the model does not predict sexual coercion. No other variable was significantly associated with sexual coercion in this analysis.

Table 9

Regression analysis summary for risk factor variables predicting male sexual coercion as reported by the female partner

Variable	B	<u>SEB</u>	<u>B</u>
Physical violence	0.15	0.06	.46
Depression	0.13	0.65	0.27
Psychological violence	-4.74	0.07	-0.10
Dominance	-0.11	0.16	-0.10
Jealousy	-1.04	0.09	-0.17
Alcoholism	5.27	0.18	0.04
Pro-violence attitude	-3.88	0.04	-0.13

Note. $R^2 = .195$ $N = 59$, $p = ns$

Next, the female partner's report of the male's sexual, physical and psychological abuse were used in a regression analysis. According to the female partner's report, the model does not predict sexual coercion.

Demographics

The participants for this study were 87 couples seeking couples treatment for domestic violence. Tables 10 and 11 present the demographics of the sample. All of the male partners reported at least one incident of physical violence perpetrated toward an intimate partner in the past year. The average age of the male partner was 35.96 and the

average age of the female partner was 35.5. The average length of the relationship was 65.42 months as reported by the male partner and 66.64 as reported by the female partner. As far as race is concerned, 47.1% (n = 41) of the men were Caucasians and 32.2% (n = 28) were African Americans.

Table 10

Average age and length of relationship of male and female partners

	Male Partner	Female Partner
Age	35.96	33.50
Length of relationship	65.42 mos.	66.64 mos.

Table 11

Race of male and female partners

	Male Partner (%) N = 86	Female Partner N = 87
Caucasian	41 (47.1)	46 (53.5)
African American	28 (32.2)	21 (24.4)
Hispanic	8 (9.2)	9 (10.5)
Other	10 (11.4)	10 (11.7)

Summary

In summary, the results of this study indicate that 23% of the women in this study reported that they had experienced an act that we labeled as rape from their husband or cohabitating partner. In most items (of the CTS2 Sexual Coercion Subscale) the reports of the male partner of his own sexually coercive behavior and the female partner of her partner's behavior matched. However, in all but one item where the responses did not match, the female partner reported a higher incidence of sexually coercive behaviors than the male partner's self-report. Also, there was a wide range of disparity in the responses of male and female partners. The study supported findings of earlier studies that relationships marked with severe physical violence were more likely to be sexually violent as well than relationships marked by only minor violence. Finally, results of this study indicated that according to male self-report, sexual coercion is most significantly predicted by the men's level of physical violence.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This is the first study to look at couples' report of sexual coercion. The study includes women' reports of their male partner's physical, psychological and sexual violence as well as the male partner's own report of the same in addition to his self-report of his alcohol abuse, depression, dominance, anger, jealousy and beliefs about wife beating.

Results indicate that 47% of the women reported that their partner had engaged in sexually coercive behaviors. Since most of the literature in this area (Russell, 1982; Painter and Farrington, 1998; Bergen, 1999; Campbell and Soeken, 1999) looks at "marital rape" or "forced sex", I wanted to be able to compare the data in this study with data presented earlier. For the purpose of this study, the term "marital rape" was defined as "forcing a partner to have oral, anal or vaginal sex or using threats to make a partner have oral, anal or vaginal sex. The study found that in the sample of 87 couples, 23% of female partners reported that their partners had perpetrated "marital rape". Since this sample consisted of couples in which both partners voluntarily sought counseling to improve their relationships, this number supports previous studies (Weingourt, 1990; Campbell and Soeken, 1999; Bergen 1999) in their conclusion that sexual violence within intimate relationships is much more prevalent than was traditionally thought to be.

This study also supported previous research by Campbell (1989), Painter and Farrington (1998) and others in finding a relationship between male batterers' levels of physical violence and their perpetration of sexual coercion. As found in previous studies, I found that the more physically violent men were also more sexually coercive.

Substance abuse, anger, beliefs about wife beating, romantic jealousy, dominance and level of psychological violence were not significantly related to sexual coercion in the regression analyses. However, beliefs about wife beating were correlated with sexual coercion in the correlation analyses. This relationship supports previous research where attitudes toward wife beating have been strongly associated with physical as well as sexual violence (Elsikovits, Edleson, Guttman & Sela-Amit, 1991; Marx, Adams, & Juergens, 1999; Bernat, Calhoun, & Adams 1999).

As for level of congruence between male partner's perception of his own sexual coercive behaviors and his partner's perception of the same, I found no significant differences between male and female reports except for on one item. (Twenty-seven women said that their partner had insisted on having sex when they did not want to (without the use of physical force) while only 19 men said that they had done this). It was also found that while most partners agreed on the frequency of sexually coercive behavior, when they did differ in their reports, there was a wide range of disparity in reporting the frequency of sexually coercive behaviors with the male partner reporting a much lower incidence than his female partner. For example, the disparity ranged from the male partner reporting that a particular behavior had never been perpetrated while his partner reported that it had occurred more than 20 times in the past year. This disparity raises concern regarding the overall accuracy of reports on sexual coercion because previous research suggests that even female partners tend to under-report sexually violent behaviors perpetrated on them (Painter and Farrington, 1998).

As far as the differences in reporting of sexual, physical, and psychological violence is concerned, it was found that there were significant differences between the male self-report and female partner report of these behaviors.

This study found that physical violence and prevalence of sexual coercion were strongly associated. This supports previous research that indicates a relationship between physical violence and sexual coercion (Bergen 1999; Russell, 1982; Painter and Farrington, 1998). However, while sexual coercion was more frequent in cases of severe physical violence, it could not be ruled out in relationships marked by only minor violence since 45.7% of the women who experienced minor violence only reported that they had been sexually coerced by their male partner. Sexually coercive behavior, while more frequent in the severely violent relationships, occurred in relationships marked by minor violence as well. This finding supports previous research by Finkelhor and Yllo (1980) and, by Painter and Farrington (1998).

Finally, I found that the factors examined in this study (men's physical and psychological violence as well as men's depression, dominance, anger, jealousy and beliefs about wife beating) predicted less than 20% of the variance in men's use of sexually coercive behavior. Obviously other factors must account for most of the variance in sexual coercion. Future research needs to be conducted to determine what these factors are.

Limitations of the Study

A number of issues reduced the generalizability of this study. First, this study was conducted with a sample of couples in which the female partner voluntarily sought to come in and complete the intake with the possibility of participating in couples treatment.

Therefore, the results might not be applicable to couples in which the woman would not be interested in attempting to improve the relationship. In addition, since the questionnaires were written at a sixth grade level, only those couples who had a sixth-grade level knowledge of the language could participate. Lastly, several of the scales had lower reliability for this study.

Future Research

In addition to the suggestion made above that research needs to continue to explore risk factors, a number of other suggestions are made for future research. First, qualitative research could enhance our understanding of these results. Interviewing the participants of the study would facilitate a better understanding of the impact of sexual coercion and help understand what men and women perceive sexual coercion to be and how they differ in their perceptions. Follow up research could be done to find out if relationships in which sexual coercion has been occurring were more likely to go through separation/divorce or to stay together, than those couples in which sexual coercion was not occurring. Since 1/3 of the couples in this study underwent treatment, it would be interesting to know if the level of sexual coercion changed as a result of treatment (especially since the emphasis of treatment was mainly on physical and psychological violence). Since this study found that almost 47% of the women had been sexually coerced and 23% of the women had experienced “marital rape” in the current relationship within the past year, it would be interesting to see how these women differed from the women who had not experienced sexual coercion and/or marital rape (in terms of depression, self-esteem, PTSD, etc.).

Clinical Implications

Since this study found that 47% of the women who came to this research project wanting to participate in marital therapy had been sexually coerced and 23% of the women had experienced “marital rape”, family therapists need to be aware that even couples who seek treatment voluntarily may have experienced sexual coercion. It is essential to do a thorough assessment for these issues and ask questions describing particular behaviors. Also, the study found beliefs about wife beating to be correlated to sexual coercion in the correlation analysis. This factor should be taken into consideration during assessment and treatment.

Conclusion

The present study has shown that almost half (47%) of the women who came in seeking couples counseling had experienced sexual coercion and a considerable number (23%) of female victims of domestic violence experience “marital rape”. Also, while sexual coercion is more common in relationships marked by severe violence, it cannot be ruled out in relationships marked characterized by only minor violence since almost half of the women in both groups reported sexual coercion. Lastly, beliefs about wife beating (in the male partner) was also found to be linked to sexual coercion. Thus, it is useful to assess for and treat all the above factors while treating perpetrators or victims of domestic violence.

References

Basile, K.C. (1999). Rape by Acquiescence: The ways in which women "Give in" to unwanted sex with their husbands. Violence Against Women5, 9, September, 1999

Beaseley, R., & Stoltenberg, C.D. (1992). Personality Characteristics of Male Spouse Abusers. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice 23(4), 310-317.

Bergen, R.K. (1999). Marital Rape [on line].

Available : www.vaw.umn.edu/Vawnet/mrape.htm

Bergen, R.K. (1996) Wife Rape: Understanding the Response of Survivors and Service Providers. Violence Against Women, 2, 93-109. Bernard, J.L., Bernard, S.L., & Bernard, M.L., (1985). Courtship violence and sex-typing. Family Relations, 34, 573-576.

Biaggio, M.K. & Godwin, W.H. (1987). Relation of depression to anger and hostility constructs. Psychological Reports, 1987, 61, 87-90.

Bidwell, L. & White, P. (1986). The family context of marital rape. Journal of Family Violence, 1, 3, pp 277-287.

Black, D.A., Heyman, R.E., Smith Slep, A.M. (2001). Risk factors for male-to-female partner sexual abuse. Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6, 269-280

Bowker, L.H. (1983). Marital rape: A distinct syndrome. Social Casework: Journal of Contemporary Social Work ,64, 347-352.

Brisson, N.J. (1981). Battering Husbands: A survey of abusive men. Victimology: An International Journal, I, 338-344.

- Brookoff, D.,(1997). Drugs, alcohol, and domestic Violence in Memphis. Summary of a Presentation. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice
- Campbell, J.C. (1989). Women's responses to sexual abuse in intimate relationships. Women's Health Care International, 8, 335-347.
- Campbell, J.C. & Alford, P. (1989). The dark consequences of marital rape. American Journal of Nursing, 89, 946-949.
- Campbell, J.C., Soeken, K.L. (1999). Forced sex and intimate partner violence: effects on women's risk and women's health. Violence Against Women, 5, 9, 1017-1035.
- Chang, V.N.(1996). I Just Lost Myself. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group Inc.
- Church, J. (1985). Violence Against Wives: Its causes and Effects. New Zealand: Christchurch
- Cochran, S.V. & Rabinowitz, F.E. (2000). Men and Depression: Clinical and Empirical Perspectives. California: Academic Press.
- Coleman, D.H., & Strauss, M.A. (1986). Marital power, conflict and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. Violence and Victims, 1 (2), 141-157.
- Daly, M., Wilson, M, & Weghorst, S.J. (1982). Male sexual jealousy. Ethnology and Sociology, 3, 11-27
- Derogatis, L.R. (1983). SCL-90-R : Administration, Scoring, & Procedures Manual II (2nd Edition). Towson, MD: Clinical Psychometric Research.

Dutton, D.G., van Ginkel, C., & Landolt, M.A. (1996). Jealousy, intimate abusiveness, and intrusiveness. Journal of Family Violence, 11, 4, 411-423

Dutton, G.D., Saunders, K., Starzmoski & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Intimacy-anger and insecure attachment as precursors of abuse in intimate relationships. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1994, 24, 15, 1367-1386.

Elsikovits, Z.C., Edleson, J.L., Guttman, E. & Sela-Amit, M. (1991) Cognitive Styles and Socialized Attitudes of Men Who Batter: Where Should We Intervene, Family Relations, 40, 72-77

Feldbau-Kohn, S., Heyman, R.E., & O'Leary, K.D. (1998). Major depressive disorder and depressive symptomatology as predictors of husband to wife physical aggression, Violence and Victims, Vol. 13, 4, 347-360

Finkelhor, D. & Yllo, K. (1980). Forced sex in marriage: report on the pre-test. Durham, New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire, Department of Sociology, 1980.

Finkelhor, D. & Yllo, K. (1983). Rape in marriage: a sociological view. In

Finkelhor, D. , Gelles, R.J., Hotaling, G.T., & Straus, M.A. (eds.), The Dark Side of Families (p 119-130). CA: Sage Publications

Frieze, I. (1980). Causes and consequences of marital rape. A paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meeting, Montreal, Canada, September 1980, p 1-30.

Gortner, E.T., Gollan, J.K., & Jacobson, N.S. (1997). Psychological aspects of perpetrators of domestic violence and their relationships with the victims. Anger, Aggression, and Violence, 20, 337-354.

Groth, N., & Birnbaum, J.H. (1979). Men Who Rape: The Psychology of the Offender. New York : Plenum Press

Hamby, S.L. (1995). The Dominance Scale: Preliminary Psychometric Properties. Paper presented at the 4th International Family Research Conference, Durham, NH.

Hanson, R.K., Cadsky, O., Harris, A., & Lalonde, C. (1997). Correlations of battering among 997 men: family history, adjustment, and attitudinal differences. Violence and Victims, 12, 3, 191-209.

Hindy, C.G. (1985). Individual differences in three facets of “lovesickness”: Tendency toward anxious romantic attachments, sexual jealousy and heterosexual depression. Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 961 B.

Hunt, M. (1979): Legal Rape, Family Circle, January, 38.

Julian, T.W., & McKenry, P.C. (1993). Mediators of male violence toward female intimates. Journal of Family Violence, 8, 39-56.

Kemp, A., Green, B.L., Hovanitz, C., & Rawlings, E.I. (1995). Incidence and correlates of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in Battered Women. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10, (1), 43-55.

Lobnitz, G.S. (1989). Forced marital sex in a clinical sample of married or formerly married women. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 12, June 1990, 4115 A.

Lynch, J. & Kilmartin, C. (1999). The Pain Behind the Mask: Overcoming Masculine Depression. New York : The Haworth Press.

Mahoney, P., Williams, L.M., & West, C.M. (2001). Violence against women by intimate relationship partners. In (Eds.) Renzetti, C.M., Edleson, J.L. & Bergen, R.K.

(2001). Sourcebook on Violence Against Women. Sage Publications: CA

Mahoney, P. & Williams, L. (1998). Sexual assault in marriage: Prevalence, consequences and treatment for wife rape. In Jasinski, J. & Williams, L.M. (Eds.),

Partner Violence: A Comprehensive Review of 20 years of research. CA: Sage Publications.

Maiuro, R.D., Cahn, T.S., Vitaliano, P.P., Wagner, B.C., & Zegree, J.B. (1988). Anger, hostility, and depression in domestically violent versus generally assaultive men and nonviolent control subjects. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, 17-23.

Marshall, L.L., (1999). Effects of men's subtle and overt psychological abuse on low-income women. Violence and Victims, 14, (1), 69-88.

Marx, B.P., Gross, A.M., & Juergens, J.P. (1997). The effects of alcohol consumption and expectancies in an experiemntal date rape analogue. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 19, 4, p 281-302.

Marx, B.P., Gross, A.M., & Adams, H.E. (1999). The effect of alcohol on the responses of sexually coercive and noncoercive men to an experimental rape analogue. Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research and Treatment, 11, 2, p 131-145.

Mathes, E.W., Adams, H.E., & Davies, R. M. (1985) Jealousy: loss of relationship rewards, loss of self-esteem, depression, anxiety and anger. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 6 1552-1561

McKenry, P.C., Julian, T.W., & Gavazzi, S.T. (1995). Toward a biopsychosocial model of domestic violence. Journal of Marriage and the Family 57, 307-320.

Mullally, S. (2000). Shame and trauma symptom correlates of emotional abuse among women in partnered relationships: A dissertation. Presented to the Faculty of The California School of Professional Psychology of Alameda.

Novaco, R.W. (1979). The cognitive regulation of anger and stress. In P.C. Kendall & Hollon, S.D. (Eds.) Cognitive—Behavioral Interventions: Theory, Research, and Procedures. New York : Academic Press.

O'Farrell, T.J., Van Hutton, V., & Murphy, C.M., 1999. Domestic violence before and after alcoholism treatment: A two year longitudinal study. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 317-321.

Pagelow, M. (1981). Woman-Battering: Victims and their Experiences. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Pagelow, M.D. (1988). Marital Rape. In Van Hasselt, V.B., (Ed.). The Handbook of Family Violence, 207-232

Riley, Treiber, & Woods (1989). Anger and hostility in depression. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 177, 11, 668-674.

Riggs, D.S., Caulfield, M.B. & Street, A.E. (2000) Risk for Domestic Violence: Factors Associated with Perpetration and Victimization, Journal of Clinical Psychology, 56(10), 1289-1316

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

- Russell, D.E.H. (1982). Rape in Marriage. New York: Macmillan.
- Saunders, D.G., Lynch, A.B., & Linz, D. (1987) The Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating: The construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. Violence and Victims, 2, 39-57
- Schuller, R.A. & Stewart, A. (2000) Police Responses to Sexual Assault Complaints: The Role of Perpetrator/Complainant Intoxication, Law and Human Behavior, 24, 5, 535-551
- Seltzer, M.L., Vinokur, A., & van Rooijen, L. (1975). A self-administered Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (SMAST). Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 36, 117-126.
- Stark, E. & Flitcraft, A. (1996). Women at risk: Domestic Violence and women's Health. Sage Publications: CA
- Steele, C.M., & Josephs, R.A. (1990). Alcohol Myopia: Its Prized and Dangerous Effects. American Psychologist, 45, 921-933
- Stith, S.M., Crossman, R.K., & Bischof, G.P. (1991). Alcoholism and marital violence: A comparative study of men in alcohol treatment program and batterer treatment programs. Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly, 8, 2, p 3-20.
- Straus, M.A., Hamby, S.L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D.B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. Journal of Family Issues, 17, 1-15.
- Telch, C.F., & Lindquist, C.U., 1984. Violent versus nonviolent couples: A comparison of patterns. Psychotherapy, 21, 2, 242-249.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). Prevalence, incidence and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NCJ Publication No. 172837). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice

Vivian, D. & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1994). Are bi-directionally violent couples mutually victimized? A gender sensitive comparison. Violence and Victims, 9, 107-124

Vivian, D. & Malone, J. (1997). Relationship factors and depressive symptomatology associated with mild to severe husbands-to-wife physical aggression. Violence and Victims 12, 1, 3-19.

Walker, L.(1979). The Battered Woman. New York: Harper & Row.

White, G.L., & Mullen, P.E. (1989) Jealousy: Theory, Research and Clinical Strategies. The Guilford Press: New York

Weingourt, R. (1990). Wife rape in a sample of psychiatric patients. IMAGE: Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 22,3, p 144-147.

Wingood, G.M., & DiClemente (1997). The Effects of an Abusive Primary Partner on the Condom Use and Sexual Negotiation Practices of African-American Women. American Journal of Public Health, 87, 6, p1016-1018.

APPENDIX A: VIRGINIA TECH INTAKE

Virginia Tech Intake Cover Page

Date: _____

CLIENT INFORMATION:

Name: _____ SSN: _____

Address: _____

Phone (H): _____ (W): _____

Children's names/DOB: _____

PARTNER INFORMATION:

Name: _____ Relationship:

Address: _____

Phone (H): _____ (W): _____

Children's names/DOB: _____

Virginia Tech Couples Counseling Program Intake

Part One

1. Client's age _____ DOB: _____
2. Client's gender:
 - 1 Male
 - 2 Female
3. Race (circle number):
 - 1 Asian
 - 2 Black
 - 3 Hispanic
 - 4 Native American
 - 5 White
 - 6 Other
 - 7 Mixed race
4. Employment status/job title _____:
 - 1 Full-time
 - 2 Part-time
 - 3 Student
 - 4 Stay at home with kids
 - 5 Unemployed
5. Partner's age _____ DOB: _____
6. Partner's race:
 - 1 Asian
 - 2 Black
 - 3 Hispanic
 - 4 Native American
 - 5 White
 - 6 Other
 - 7 Mixed race
7. Partner's employment status/job title _____:
 - 1 Full-time
 - 2 Part-time
 - 3 Student
 - 4 Stay at home with kids
 - 5 Unemployed
8. Still together?
 - 1 Yes
 - 2 No

9. How long (length of relationship)? _____ years _____ months

10. When you have an argument what usually happens? Last time? Have you ever touched each other in anger? Are you ever scared?

11. Were you using any alcohol or drugs at the time of the incident?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

11a. What percentage of the time would you say the violence in your relationship has been associated with the use of alcohol or other drugs?

(0% - 100%) _____

12. Is there a Protective Order issued?

1 Yes

2 No

13. Are you taking any medications?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

14. Do you currently have any medical problems?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

15. Have you ever had therapy/counseling?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

16. Do you have a history of substance abuse and/or treatment?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

17. Does your partner have a history of substance abuse and/or treatment?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

18. What is your history of abuse/violence towards others (both relationship partners and others)?

Please explain: _____

18a. In the past 2 years, have you been violent toward anyone outside of the home -- a friend, a stranger, etc.

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain, including date of violent incident:

19. Do you have any DV arrests/dispositions:

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

20. Time served: _____ years _____ months _____ days

21. Have you ever had counseling specifically related to any violent behavior?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

22. How many times have police been called to home? _____

23. Other arrest/dispositions (assault, battery, disturbing the peace, etc.):

24. Time served: _____ years _____ months _____ days
25. Are you on probation?
1 Yes
2 No
If yes, please explain: _____

- P.O. Name: _____
- If yes, where? (Name of town, state): _____
26. Have you every served in any branch of the military?
1 Yes 2 No
If yes, please explain: _____

27. How many children were in the family in which you were raised? _____
28. What is your birth order in relation to your siblings? _____ of _____ children
(i.e.: 2nd of 5 children)
29. Who were you raised by?
1 Mother and Father 4 Grandparents
2 Mother only 5 Grandmother only
3 Father only 6 Foster parent(s)
7 Step parent(s)
8 Other _____
9 All of the above
30. Was there ever physical violence between parents (or whoever raised you)?
1 Yes 2 No
If yes, please explain: _____

31. How were you disciplined as a child? (circle all that apply)
1 Verbal, non-abusive (e.g. grounding, time-out, withholding privileges, etc.)
2 Physical, mild (e.g. spanking)
3 Verbal, abusive (e.g. insulting, swearing, humiliating, etc.)
4 Physical, severe (e.g. hitting, punching, slapping, beating, etc.)
5 Other _____
32. How do you discipline your children?
1 Verbal, non-abusive (e.g. grounding, time-out, withholding privileges, etc.)
2 Physical, mild (e.g. spanking)
3 Verbal, abusive (e.g. insulting, swearing, humiliating, etc.)
4 Physical, severe (e.g. hitting, punching, slapping, beating, etc.)

5 Other _____
8 No children

33. Is there a history of substance abuse in your family?

1 Yes 2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

34. How were you referred?

1 Court/police

2 Partner

3 Self

4 Other _____

35. Why are you here? _____

36. Do you read and write English?

1 Yes 2 No

37. What is your first language?

1 English

2 Spanish

3 Other _____

38. Do you currently have access to firearms, sporting knives (such as for fishing or hunting) or any other kinds of weapons?

1 Yes

2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

39. Would you be willing to remove these weapons from your home while you participate in this program?

1 Yes 2 No

If yes, please explain: _____

39a. Are you willing to sign a contract to not use violence in your relationship?

1 Yes 2 No

Part Two

Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test (MAST; Selzer, 1971)

Please respond YES or NO to the following questions about your drinking habits **in the last six months.**

- | | | |
|--|-----|----|
| 1. Do you feel you are a normal drinker (by <i>normal</i> we mean you drink <i>less than</i> or <i>as much as</i> most other people)? | YES | NO |
| 2. Does your wife, husband, a parent, or other near relative ever worry or complain about your drinking? | YES | NO |
| 3. Do you ever feel guilty about your drinking? | YES | NO |
| 4. Do friends or relatives think you are a normal drinker? | YES | NO |
| 5. Are you able to stop drinking when you want to? | YES | NO |
| 6. Have you ever attended a meeting of Alcoholics Anonymous (AA)? | YES | NO |
| 7. Has drinking ever created problems between you and your wife, husband, a parent, or other near relative? | YES | NO |
| 8. Have you ever gotten into trouble at work because of drinking? | YES | NO |
| 9. Have you ever neglected your obligations, your family, or your work for two or more days in a row because you were drinking? | YES | NO |
| 10. Have you ever gone to anyone for help about your drinking? | YES | NO |
| 11. Have you ever been in a hospital because of drinking? | YES | NO |
| 12. Have you ever been arrested for drunken driving, driving while intoxicated, or driving under the influence of alcoholic beverages? | YES | NO |
| 13. Have you ever been arrested, even for a few hours, because of other drunk behavior? | YES | NO |

1. What was your approximate individual income last year? (circle one)

- 1 None, I was unemployed
- 2 Less than \$20,000
- 3 \$20,000 - \$39,999
- 4 \$40,000 - \$59,999
- 5 \$60,000 - \$79,999
- 6 \$80,000 - \$99,999
- 7 \$100,000 or more

2. What is your level of education? (circle one)

- 1 Less than high school
- 2 GED
- 3 High school diploma
- 4 Vocational/technical school
- 5 Some college
- 6 Bachelor's degree
- 7 Some graduate credits
- 8 Master's degree
- 9 Doctoral degree

Intake counselor: _____ Intake date: _____

By signing below, I am indicating that all of the information that I have given is true to the best of my knowledge.

Client signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX B: VIRGINIA TECH COUPLES COUNSELING PROJECT

Although the following three items refer to marriage, please think of your relationship with your current partner, **whether you are married or not**, as you answer the questions.

CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER

(A) How satisfied are you with your current marriage or relationship?

Extremely <u>D</u> issatisfied	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely Satisfied
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

(B) How satisfied are you with your relationship with your spouse or partner?

Extremely <u>D</u> issatisfied	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely Satisfied
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

(C) How satisfied are you with your partner as a spouse or partner?

Extremely <u>D</u> issatisfied	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Extremely Satisfied
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	------------------------

Communication Patterns Questionnaire

This questionnaire asks you to describe how you and your partner work out problems and disagreements that arise between the two of you. Please indicate how likely you are to use each of these strategies.

How do the two of you handle problems when they first come up?

1. We discuss the problem together.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely					Very likely			

2. We both avoid talking about the problem.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely					Very likely			

3. I try to start a discussion, but my partner tries to avoid discussion.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely					Very likely			

4. My partner tries to start a discussion, but I try to avoid discussion.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely					Very likely			

5. Blame each other for the problem.

6. Verbally threaten each other.

7. Negotiate a solution together.

8. Your partner makes a demand, and you withdraw.

9. You make a demand, and your partner withdraws.

10. Your partner criticizes you, and you defend yourself.

11. You criticize your partner, and he/she defends himself/herself.

12. You get emotional, and your partner gets logical.

80

13. Your partner gets emotional, and you get logical.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

14. Your partner threatens you and you back down.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

15. You threaten your partner, and he/she backs down.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

16. You get verbally aggressive.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

17. Your partner gets verbally aggressive.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

18. You get physically aggressive.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

19. Your partner gets physically aggressive.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

How likely is the discussion of a problem to end with ...

20. Mutual understanding.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

21. Mutual withdrawal.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

22. Mutual resolution.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

23. Mutual withholding of affection.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

24. Mutual reconciliation.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

25. You feeling guilty, your partner feeling hurt.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

26. Your partner feeling guilty, you feeling hurt.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

27. Your partner trying to make up, you withdrawing.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

28. You trying to make up, and your partner withdrawing.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>
Very unlikely							Very likely	

Although the following three items refer to marriage, please think of your relationship with your current partner, **whether you are married or not**, as you answer the questions.

CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER

(1) How satisfied are you with your marriage or relationship?

Very <u>Dissatisfied</u>	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very Satisfied
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

(2) How satisfied are you with your relationship with your children?

Very <u>Dissatisfied</u>	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very Satisfied
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

If you do not have children please check here ⇒ _____

(3) How satisfied are you with your children's relationship with each other?

Very <u>Dissatisfied</u>	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very Satisfied
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

If you have no children, or just one child, please check here ⇒ _____

(4) Overall, how satisfied are you with your current family relationships?

Very <u>Dissatisfied</u>	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	Very Satisfied
-----------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	-------------------

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences.

Please circle how many times you did each of the following things in the past year, and how many times your partner did them in the past year.

If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before, circle “7.”

How often did this happen?

“0” = No, this has never happened

“1” = Once in the past year

“2” = Twice in the past year

“3” = 3 - 5 times in the past year

“4” = 6 - 10 times in the past year

“5” = 11 - 20 times in the past year

“6” = More than 20 times in the past year

“7” = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

1. I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. My partner explained his or her side of a disagreement to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I insulted or swore at my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I threw something at my partner that could hurt	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I twisted my partner's arm or hair	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. My partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I made my partner have sex without a condom	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I pushed or shoved my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. My partner pushed or shoved me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I used force (like hitting, holding down, using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I used a knife or a gun on my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner during a fight	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I called my partner fat or ugly	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. My partner called me fat or ugly	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please circle how many times you did each of the following things in the past year, and how many times your partner did them in the past year.

If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before, circle “7.”

How often did this happen?

“0” = No, this has never happened

“1” = Once in the past year

“2” = Twice in the past year

“3” = 3 - 5 times in the past year

“4” = 6 - 10 times in the past year

“5” = 11 - 20 times in the past year

“6” = More than 20 times in the past year

“7” = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

27. I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. I destroyed something belonging to my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. My partner went to a doctor because of a fight with me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. I choked my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. I shouted or yelled at my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. I slammed my partner against a wall	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39. I said that I was sure we could work out a problem	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40. My partner was sure that we could work it out	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41. I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner, but I didn't	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42. My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with me, but didn't	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43. I beat up my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45. I grabbed my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
46. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49. I stomped out of the room or house or yard because of a disagreement with my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51. I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force)	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52. My partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please circle how many times you did each of the following things in the past year, and how many times your partner did them in the past year.

If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before, circle “7.”

How often did this happen?

“0” = No, this has never happened

“1” = Once in the past year

“2” = Twice in the past year

“3” = 3 - 5 times in the past year

“4” = 6 - 10 times in the past year

“5” = 11 - 20 times in the past year

“6” = More than 20 times in the past year

“7” = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

53. I slapped my partner	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
54. My partner did this to me			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
55. I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
56. My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
57. I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
58. My partner did this to me			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
59. I suggested a compromise to a disagreement			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
60. My partner suggested a compromise	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
61. I burned or scalded my partner on purpose			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
62. My partner did this to me			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
63. I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force)			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
64. My partner did this to me			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
65. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
66. My partner accused me of this			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
67. I did something to spite my partner			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
68. My partner did this to me			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
69. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
70. My partner did this to me			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
71. I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of fight we had			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
72. My partner still felt physical pain the next day because of a fight we had			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
73. I kicked my partner			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
74. My partner did this to me			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
75. I used threats to make my partner have sex			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
76. My partner did this to me			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
77. I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7
78. My partner agreed to try a solution I suggested			0	1	2	3	4	5	6 7

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer the following sets of statements describing the relationship between you and your partner. Please circle the number that best describes **HOW OFTEN** the following statements happen between you and your partner.

NEVER = 1

ALMOST NEVER = 2

SOMETIMES = 3

ALMOST ALWAYS = 4

ALWAYS = 5

Me:

1. I show respect for my partner's viewpoints.	1 2 3 4 5
2. I respond to my partner's feelings as if they have no value.	1 2 3 4 5
3. I demonstrate respect for my partner's privacy.	1 2 3 4 5
4. I tell my partner what he/she should be thinking.	1 2 3 4 5
5. I respond to my partner's feelings in an understanding way.	1 2 3 4 5
6. I tell my partner that he/she doesn't mean what he/she is saying.	1 2 3 4 5
7. I show a lack of concern for my partner's feelings.	1 2 3 4 5
8. I encourage my partner to express his/her feelings, bad or good.	1 2 3 4 5
9. I discount my partner's thoughts and opinions.	1 2 3 4 5
10. I show understanding when my partner does not wish to share his/her feelings.	1 2 3 4 5
11. I allow my partner to speak for him/herself.	1 2 3 4 5

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer the following sets of statements describing the relationship between you and your partner. Please circle the number that best describes **HOW OFTEN** the following statements happen between you and your partner.

NEVER = 1

ALMOST NEVER = 2

SOMETIMES = 3

ALMOST ALWAYS = 4

ALWAYS = 5

My partner:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. My partner shows respect for my viewpoints. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. My partner responds to my feelings as if they have no value. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. My partner demonstrates respect for my privacy. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. My partner tells me what I should be thinking. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. My partner responds to my feelings in an understanding way. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. My partner tells me that I don't mean what I am saying. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. My partner shows a lack of concern for my feelings. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. My partner encourages me to express my feelings, bad or good. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. My partner discounts my thoughts and opinions. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. My partner shows understanding when I do not wish to share my feelings. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 11. My partner allows me to speak for myself. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

People have many different ways of relating to each other. The following statements are all different ways of relating to or thinking about your partner. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree with it.

(CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER)

Strongly Disagree = 1

Disagree = 2

Agree = 3

Strongly Agree = 4

1.	My partner has good ideas.	1	2	3	4
2.	I try to keep my partner from spending time with opposite sex friends.	1	2	3	4
3.	If my partner and I can't agree, I usually have the final say.	1	2	3	4
4.	It bothers me when my partner makes plans without talking to me first.	1	2	3	4
5.	My partner doesn't have enough sense to make important decisions.	1	2	3	4
6.	I hate losing arguments with my partner.	1	2	3	4
7.	My partner should not keep any secrets from me.	1	2	3	4
8.	I insist on knowing where my partner is at all times.	1	2	3	4
9.	When my partner and I watch TV, I hold the remote control.	1	2	3	4
10.	My partner and I generally have equal say about decisions.	1	2	3	4
11.	It would bother me if my partner made more money than I did.	1	2	3	4
12.	I generally consider my partner's interests as much as mine.	1	2	3	4
13.	I tend to be jealous.	1	2	3	4
14.	Things are easier in my relationship if I am in charge.	1	2	3	4
15.	Sometimes I have to remind my partner of who's boss.	1	2	3	4
16.	I have a right to know everything my partner does.	1	2	3	4
17.	It would make me mad if my partner did something I had said not to.	1	2	3	4

People have many different ways of relating to each other. The following statements are all different ways of relating to or thinking about your partner. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree with it.

(CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER)

Strongly Disagree = 1

Disagree = 2

Agree = 3

Strongly Agree = 4

18.	Both partners in a relationship should have equal say about decisions.	1	2	3	4
19.	If my partner and I can't agree, I should have the final say.	1	2	3	4
20.	I understand there are some things my partner may not want to talk about with me.	1	2	3	4
21.	My partner needs to remember that I am in charge.	1	2	3	4
22.	My partner is a talented person.	1	2	3	4
23.	It's hard for my partner to learn new things.	1	2	3	4
24.	People usually like my partner.	1	2	3	4
25.	My partner makes a lot of mistakes.	1	2	3	4
26.	My partner can handle most things that happen.	1	2	3	4
27.	I sometimes think my partner is unattractive.	1	2	3	4
28.	My partner is basically a good person.	1	2	3	4
29.	My partner doesn't know how to act in public.	1	2	3	4
30.	I often tell my partner how to do something.	1	2	3	4
31.	I dominate my partner.	1	2	3	4
32.	I have a right to be involved with anything my partner does.	1	2	3	4

Instructions: Following are a number of statements about violence toward wives which some people agree with and others disagree with. There are no right or wrong answers.

“Beating” is used to mean repeated hitting intended to inflict pain.

(PLEASE CIRCLE ANSWERS)

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE TO RATE YOUR ANSWERS:

Strongly Agree = 1

Agree = 2

Slightly Agree = 3

Neither Agree Nor Disagree = 4

Slightly Disagree = 5

Disagree = 6

Strongly Disagree = 7

1.	Social agencies should do more to help battered women.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	There is no excuse for a man beating his wife.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Wives try to get beaten by their husbands in order to get sympathy from others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	A woman who constantly refuses to have sex with her husband is asking to be beaten.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Wives could avoid being battered by their husbands if they knew when to stop talking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	Episodes of a man beating his wife are the wife's fault.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	Even when women lie to their husbands they do not deserve to get a beating.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Women should be protected by law if their husbands beat them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	Wife-beating should be given high priority as a social problem by government agencies.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Sometimes it is OK for a man to beat his wife.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	Women feel pain and no pleasure when beat-up by their husbands.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	A sexually unfaithful wife deserves to be beaten.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Cases of wife-beating are the fault of the husband.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	Battered wives try to get their partners to beat them as a way to get attention from them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Instructions: Following are a number of statements about violence toward wives which some people agree with and others disagree with. There are no right or wrong answers.

“Beating” is used to mean repeated hitting intended to inflict pain.

(PLEASE CIRCLE ANSWERS)

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE TO RATE YOUR ANSWERS:

Strongly Agree = 1

Agree = 2

Slightly Agree = 3

Neither Agree Nor Disagree = 4

Slightly Disagree = 5

Disagree = 6

Strongly Disagree = 7

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 15. | Husbands who batter should be responsible for the abuse because they should have foreseen that it would happen. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 16. | If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, it would be best that I do nothing. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 17. | Battered wives are responsible for their abuse because they intended it to happen. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 18. | If a wife is beaten by her husband, she should divorce him immediately. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 19. | Husbands who batter are responsible for the abuse because they intended to do it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 20. | The best way to deal with wife-beating is to arrest the husband. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 21. | Even when a wife's behavior challenges her husband's manhood, he's not justified in beating her. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 22. | How long should a man who has beaten his wife spend in prison or jail? (circle one)
0 1 mo. 6 mos. 1 yr. 3 yrs. 5 yrs. 10 yrs. Don't know | | | | | | | | |
| 23. | When a wife is beaten it is caused by her behavior in the weeks before the battering. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 24. | A wife should move out of the house if her husband beats her. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 25. | Wives who are battered are responsible for the abuse because they should have foreseen it would happen. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 26. | A husband has no right to beat his wife even if she breaks agreements she has made with him. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 27. | Occasional violence by a husband toward his wife can help maintain the marriage. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 28. | A wife doesn't deserve a beating even if she keeps reminding her husband of his weak points. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 29. | Most wives secretly desire to be beaten by their husbands. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 30. | If I heard a woman being attacked by her husband, I would call the police. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
| 31. | It would do some wives some good to be beaten by their husbands. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |

On the next page is a list of problems and complaints that people sometimes have. Please read each one carefully. After you have done so, please circle one of the numbers to the right that best describes **HOW MUCH DISCOMFORT THAT PROBLEM HAS CAUSED YOU DURING THE PAST WEEK INCLUDING TODAY.**

(PLEASE CIRCLE ANSWERS)

Not at All = 0

A Little Bit = 1

Moderately = 2

Quite a Bit = 3

Extremely = 4

HOW MUCH WERE YOU DISTRESSED BY:

1.	Loss of sexual interest or pleasure.	0	1	2	3	4
2.	Feeling low in energy or slowed down.	0	1	2	3	4
3.	Thoughts of ending your life.	0	1	2	3	4
4.	Crying easily.	0	1	2	3	4
5.	Feelings of being trapped or caught.	0	1	2	3	4
6.	Blaming yourself for things.	0	1	2	3	4
7.	Feeling lonely.	0	1	2	3	4
8.	Feeling blue.	0	1	2	3	4
9.	Worrying too much about things.	0	1	2	3	4
10.	Feeling no interest in things.	0	1	2	3	4
11.	Feeling hopeless about the future.	0	1	2	3	4
12.	Feeling everything is an effort.	0	1	2	3	4
13.	Feelings of worthlessness.	0	1	2	3	4
14.	Nervousness or shakiness inside.	0	1	2	3	4
15.	Trembling.	0	1	2	3	4
16.	Suddenly scared for no reason.	0	1	2	3	4
17.	Feeling fearful.	0	1	2	3	4
18.	Heart pounding or racing.	0	1	2	3	4
19.	Feeling tense or keyed up.	0	1	2	3	4
20.	Spells of terror or panic.	0	1	2	3	4
21.	Feeling so restless you couldn't sit still.	0	1	2	3	4
22.	The feeling that something bad is going to happen to you.	0	1	2	3	4
23.	Thoughts and images of a frightening nature.	0	1	2	3	4

(PLEASE CIRCLE ANSWER)

1. How jealous do you get of your partner's relationship with members of the opposite sex?

not at all jealous 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very jealous

2. In general, how jealous of a person do you think you are?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 very jealous

3. Have you ever seriously thought about breaking up with your partner because of his/her attraction to someone else of the opposite sex?

never	rarely	sometimes	occasionally	often
1	2	3	4	5

4. My relationship with my partner has made me (much less to much more) jealous than I usually am.

much less 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much more

5. How often do you get jealous of your partner's relationships with members of the opposite sex?

never	rarely	sometimes	occasionally	often
1	2	3	4	5

6. How much is your jealousy of your partner a problem in your relationship?

not at all 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 much more

The following is a list of things that couples do not always agree on. For each of them, please tell how often you and your partner agreed during the past year.

(PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER)

Always = 1

Almost Always = 2

Usually = 3

Sometimes = 4

Never = 5

1. Managing the money.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Cooking, cleaning, or repairing the house.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Social activities and entertaining.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Affection and sex relations.	1	2	3	4	5
5. If applicable, things about the children.	1	2	3	4	5

Instructions: Following are a number of statements about violence toward husbands which some people agree with and others disagree with. There are no right or wrong answers.

(PLEASE CIRCLE ANSWERS)

PLEASE USE THE FOLLOWING SCALE TO RATE YOUR ANSWERS:

Strongly Agree = 1

Agree = 2

Slightly Agree = 3

Neither Agree Nor Disagree = 4

Slightly Disagree = 5

Disagree = 6

Strongly Disagree = 7

1. There is no excuse for a woman hitting her husband. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2. | A man who constantly insults his wife is asking to be slapped. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. | Husbands could avoid being slapped by their wives if they knew when to stop talking. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. | Episodes of a woman hitting her husband are the husband's fault. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. | Even when men lie to their wives they do not deserve to get hit. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. | Sometimes it is OK for a woman to beat her husband. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 7. | A sexually unfaithful husband deserves to be hit. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 8. | If a husband is beaten by his wife, he should divorce her immediately. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 9. | A husband should move out of the house if his wife hits him. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 10. | Husbands who are hit are responsible for the abuse because they should have foreseen it would happen. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 11. | A wife has no right to hit her husband even if he breaks agreements he has made with her. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 12. | It would do some husbands some good to be slapped by their wives. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

The following statements are about you or the relationship between you and your partner.
Please read each statement and decide how much you *agree* with it.

(PLEASE CIRCLE ANSWER)

	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree
1. When my partner picks a fight with me, I fight back.	1	2	3	4
2. When my partner won't give in, I get furious.	1	2	3	4
3. I often take what my partner says personally.	1	2	3	4
4. My partner believes I have a short fuse.	1	2	3	4
5. I can feel my blood rising when I start to get mad at my partner.	1	2	3	4
6. Taking a break from my partner is a good way for me to calm down.	1	2	3	4
7. When my partner is around, I feel like a bomb waiting to explode.	1	2	3	4
8. I prefer to get out of the way when my partner hassles me.	1	2	3	4
9. It is my partner's fault when I get mad.	1	2	3	4
10. When my partner is nice to me I wonder what my partner wants.	1	2	3	4
11. No matter how angry I am, I am responsible for my behavior toward my partner.	1	2	3	4
12. When my partner provokes me, I have a right to fight back.	1	2	3	4
13. I can feel in my body when I'm starting to get mad at my partner.	1	2	3	4
14. My partner does things just to annoy me.	1	2	3	4
15. There is nothing I can do to control my feelings when my partner hassles me.	1	2	3	4
16. My partner is rude to me unless I insist on respect.	1	2	3	4
17. My partner likes to make me mad.	1	2	3	4
18. When my partner annoys me, I blow up before I even know that I am getting angry.	1	2	3	4
	Strongly			Strongly

	Disagree			Agree
19. I recognize when I am beginning to get angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
20. I am able to remain calm and not get angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
21. I can usually tell when I am about to lose my temper at my partner.	1	2	3	4
22. I take time out as a way to control my anger at my partner.	1	2	3	4
23. I take a deep breath and try to relax when I'm angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
24. I can set up a time out period during an argument with my partner.	2	3	4	
25. When I feel myself getting angry at my partner I try to tell myself to calm down.	1	2	3	4
26. I often think of something pleasant to keep from thinking about my anger at my partner.	1	2	3	4
27. When I'm angry at my partner, I try to handle my feelings so no one gets hurt.	1	2	3	4
28. If I keep thinking about what made me mad, I get angrier.	1	2	3	4
29. When arguing with my partner, I often raise my voice.	1	2	3	4
30. I do something to take my mind off my partner when I'm angry.	1	2	3	4
31. When I'm mad at my partner, I say what I think without thinking of the consequences.	1	2	3	4
32. When my partner's voice is raised, I don't raise mine	1	2	3	4
33. My partner thinks I am very patient.	1	2	3	4
34. I can calm myself down when I am upset with my partner.	1	2	3	4
35. When I feel myself starting to get angry at my partner, I try to stick to talking about the problem.	1	2	3	4
36. I am even tempered with my partner.	1	2	3	4

Attitudes and Behaviors Survey

Please indicate how much you disagree or agree with each of the following statements. Base your responses on you're feeling and acting NOW. Please answer using a 5-point scale with 1= Strongly disagree to 5= Strongly agree.

1 = Strongly disagree

2 = Disagree

3 = No opinion

4 = Agree

5 = Strongly agree

1. There's nothing I can do to end the violence in my relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I'm beginning to see that the violence in my relationship is a problem.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Although I haven't been violent in a while, I know it's possible for me to be violent again.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I'm actively working on ending the violence in my relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I wish I had more ideas about how to end the violence in my relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
6. I'm actually doing something to stop my violent behavior, not just thinking about it.	1	2	3	4	5
7. The violence in my relationship isn't a big deal.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I've ended the violence, but sometimes still struggle with the old urges that allowed the violence to happen in the first place.	1	2	3	4	5
9. It's OK to use violence as long as you don't hurt anyone.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I'm at a point in my life where I'm beginning to feel the harmful impact of my violent behavior.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I've made some changes and ended the violence, but I'm afraid of going back to the way I was before.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Although at times it's difficult, I'm working on ending my violent behavior in my relationship.	1	2	3	4	5
13. More and more I'm seeing how my violence hurts my partner.	1	2	3	4	5
14. I'm finally doing something to end the violence.	1	2	3	4	5
15. There's no way I can control my violent impulses.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I've been pretty successful in leading a violence-free life, but there are still times when I'm tempted to resort to violence.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I'm making important changes and ending the violence in my life.	1	2	3	4	5
18. More and more I'm realizing that my violence is wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Although I've made the changes necessary to lead a violence-free life, there are still times when I'm tempted to use violence.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I don't see the point of focusing on the violence in my relationship.	1	2	3	4	5

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER

1. In general, how certain are you that YOUR PARTNER will **not** be physically violent (push, shove, hit or worse) toward you at some point in the future?

Not at all	A little bit	A moderate amount	A great deal
1	2	3	4

2. In general, how certain are you that YOUR PARTNER will **not** be psychologically abusive (put downs, name calling, threats of harm) to you at some point in the future?

Not at all	A little bit	A moderate amount	A great deal
1	2	3	4

3. In general, how certain are you that YOU will **not** be physically violent toward your partner at some point in the future?

Not at all	A little bit	A moderate amount	A great deal
1	2	3	4

4. In general, how certain are you that YOU will **not** be psychologically abusive (put downs, name calling, threats of harm) toward your partner at some point in the future?

Not at all	A little bit	A moderate amount	A great deal
1	2	3	4

5. In general, how confident are you that the counseling process will be helpful?

Very confident	Somewhat confident	Not very confident	Not at all confident
1	2	3	4

ROCHNA HAZRA
20874 Ivymount Terrace
Ashburn, VA 20147
(703) 726-0154
rhazra@vt.edu

Education: MS, Marriage and Family Therapy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Northern Virginia Campus, Falls Church, VA. Thesis: Risk Factors for Sexual Coercion in Male Batterers. Five hundred direct client contact hours accumulated from this accredited program.

Clinical Experience:

Mental Health Therapist, Fairfax County Women's Shelter, Community Services Board, Fairfax County and City of Falls Church, Virginia. December 2000 to present. Provide crisis intervention, counseling and therapy to women and families fleeing domestic violence. Responsibilities include assessment, treatment planning and counseling and other case management issues. Maintain a caseload of at least one client. Also, facilitator for domestic violence groups.

Therapist Intern, Center for Family Services, Falls Church, VA. August, 2000-present. Maintain a caseload of four clients a week under the supervision of Licensed Marriage and Family Therapists. Work systemically with individuals, couples and families. Over 500 hours of practical counseling experience accumulated.

Relief Counselor, Fairfax County Women's Shelter, Community Services Board, Fairfax County and City of Falls Church, Virginia. March 2000 to December 2000. Provide crisis intervention, counseling and therapy to women and families fleeing domestic violence. Responsibilities include assessment, treatment planning and counseling and other case management issues.

Co-Facilitator, Group for Children of Domestic Violence, Fairfax County Women's Shelter, Community Services Board, Fairfax County and City of Falls Church, Virginia. February 2000 to September 2000. Co-facilitate bi-weekly groups for children of victims of domestic violence.

Co-Facilitator, Anger and Domestic Abuse: Prevention and Treatment group, Community Services Board, Fairfax County and City of Falls Church, Virginia. March 1999 to June 1999. Co-Facilitated 16-week psycho-educational group for court-ordered and self-referred male and female perpetrators of domestic violence.

Hotline Counselor, Fairfax County Women's Shelter, Community Services Board, Fairfax County and City of Falls Church, Virginia. January 1999 to December 1999. Responsibilities included crisis intervention, screening for eligibility and referrals.