

A Study of Factors Predicting Dating Violence Perpetration Among Male and Female
College Students

By
Colleen R. Baker

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

Master of Science
In
Human Development

Dr. Sandra Stith
Committee Chair

Dr. Eric McCollum
Committee Member

Dr. Angela Huebner
Committee Member

January 24, 2007
Falls Church, VA

Keywords: dating violence, gender, physical abuse, psychological abuse

A Study of Factors Predicting Dating Violence Perpetration Among Male and Female
College Students

By

Colleen R. Baker

Abstract

Research has found that dating violence is a predictor of marital violence; however, research has been unclear about what predicts dating violence. Past research has been inconclusive. Furthermore, very few studies focus on gender differences in risk factors. This study examines a variety of risk factors for male and female perpetrators of dating violence in college dating relationships. Eight risk factors were used in this study: witnessing parental violence, experiencing childhood violence, problems with alcohol, length of relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills, partner's use of physical aggression, and partner's use of psychological aggression. Correlations and multiple regressions were run for each gender. The study found that for males, partner's use of physical aggression, low anger management skills and high relationship satisfaction were the strongest variables associated with male's use of physical aggression against a dating partner. For the females, partner's use of physical aggression, followed by partner's use of psychological aggression were the most significant variables. The model in this study was a good predictor of male violence, accounting for 81% of the variance, however, it only accounted for 51% of female violence which indicates that other unknown factors are influential in female's use of physical violence.

Keywords: dating violence, gender, physical abuse, psychological abuse

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT.....	ii
CHAPTER I: Introduction.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	1
Rationale and Significance.....	3
Theoretical Framework.....	6
Purpose of Study.....	8
CHAPTER II: Literature Review.....	9
Dating Violence.....	9
Witnessing Parental Violence.....	10
Experiencing Childhood Violence.....	13
Problems with Alcohol.....	14
Length of Dating Relationship.....	15
Relationship Satisfaction.....	17
Anger Management Skills.....	18
Partner’s Use of Physical Aggression.....	19
Partner’s Use of Psychological Aggression.....	20
Summary.....	21
CHAPTER III: Methods.....	23
Participants.....	23
Procedure.....	23
Measures.....	24
<i>Demographics</i>	24
<i>Witness or Experience of Violence in Family of Origin</i>	24
<i>The Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index (RAPI)</i>	24
<i>Length of Dating Relationship</i>	25
<i>Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS)</i>	25
<i>Anger Management Scale</i>	26
<i>The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2)</i>	26
Analysis.....	27
CHAPTER IV: Results.....	29

Demographics.....	29
<i>Males</i>	29
<i>Females</i>	31
Correlation Analyses.....	33
<i>Male Correlations</i>	33
<i>Female Correlations</i>	36
Regression Analyses.....	38
CHAPTER V: Discussion.....	44
Summary of Findings.....	44
Limitations.....	50
Clinical Implications.....	51
Future Research.....	51
Summary.....	52
REFERENCES.....	54
APPENDIX A: Relationship Characteristics Study.....	60
APPENDIX B: Participant Informed Consent.....	71

Index of Tables

Table 1: Male Demographics.....	30
Table 2: Female Demographics.....	32
Table 3: Correlations Between Variables: Males.....	35
Table 4: Correlations Between Variables: Females.....	37
Table 5: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Males as Criterion: Partner Variables Entered First.....	39
Table 6: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Males as Criterion: Self Variables Entered First.....	40
Table 7: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Females as Criterion: Partner Variables Entered First.....	41
Table 8: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Females as Criterion: Self Variables Entered First.....	43

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Dating violence is a significant problem in our society yet researchers have just begun to understand the scope of the problem in the last two decades. According to Jackson (1999) and Lewis and Fremouw (2001), as many as one in three college couples will be involved in at least one incident of violence during their dating relationship. Furthermore, some studies have found prevalence rates of dating violence close to fifty percent (Arias, Samois, O'Leary, 1987; Pederser & Thomas, 1992; White & Koss, 1991). Although prevalence rates widely fluctuate depending on the definition criteria of "dating violence" adopted for a particular study (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001), it is clear that dating violence is a significant issue that needs addressing.

The prevalence rates of dating violence are comparable to violence rates found in marriages. At some point during the course of the relationship, physical violence occurs in 30% to 60% of marriages (O'Leary et al., 1989; Straus & Gelles, 1986). Furthermore, dating violence has been found to be a strong predictor of marital violence (White, Merrill, & Koss, 2001) and not surprisingly, data suggests that dating violence is similar in composition to marital violence (White & Koss, 1991). In fact, many believe that dating during the young adult years provides a training ground for behavior in subsequent long-term relationships. Because violent behavior that begins in the dating context often continues into the marital relationship (O'Leary et al., 1989), it is critical to intervene while couples are dating to stop the cycle of violence.

Creating preventative measures and appropriate treatment is vital for this population because the occurrence of violence does not always lead to a relationship end.

Even though abuse can have extremely damaging consequences, approximately 50% to 80% of married domestic violence victims stay with their abusive partners (Snyder & Fruchtman, 1981). Lo and Sporakowski (1989) found that within dating couples, 76% of those who experienced violence planned to continue in their relationship. This suggests that as the relationships continue, so may the abuse, if not addressed.

Dating violence can have severe physical and psychological consequences. Violence can lead to homicide or suicide in extreme cases (Fishback & Herbert, 1997) as well as emotional symptoms stemming from depression and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) (Holtzworth-Munroe, 1992).

Large financial costs resulting from relationship violence can affect the individual along with society as a whole. These costs can reach billions of dollars each year. Among the major expenses are medical costs, absenteeism from work, law enforcement responses, legal interventions, social work involvement, damaged property and relocation expenses (Edwardson & Morse, 2006).

Children of violent couples are also at risk. Studies have found an alarming 30% to 50% of children either witness or experience violence in their families (Foo & Margolin, 1995; Marshall & Rose, 1988). Several researchers have found a significant relationship between violence in one's family of origin and violence in dating relationships (Alexander, Moore & Alexander, 1991; Foo & Margolin, 1995; Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987; Marshall & Rose, 1988). This suggests that children in violent families are at risk of continuing the cycle of violence when they are older and enter into their own intimate relationships.

According to past literature, dating violence has severe consequences that can continue into marital relationships. Relationship abuse can have drastic effects on individuals involved in violent relationships, children in violent homes and on our entire society. Much of the past literature has focused on prevalence rates to gain insight on the problem. However, only studying prevalence rates ignores what goes on within the individual and between the violent couple. This research attempts to provide insight on violent couples by going back to the very beginning- the factors that increase the risk of becoming violent within a dating relationship. Examining risk factors associated with perpetrating violence can lead to better knowledge for prevention programs and clinical treatment. Both men and women are perpetrators within dating relationships (Kaura & Allen, 2004; O'Keefe, 1997), therefore this study seeks to determine if risk factors differ for males and females. Risk factors of parental violence, childhood abuse, problems with alcohol, length of dating relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills, and partner's use of physical and psychological aggression will be examined.

Rationale and Significance

Gaining an understanding of risk factors can explain why one person becomes violent and another refrains from violence within dating relationships. If clinicians and researchers can identify risk factors for those who perpetrate violence in dating relationships, adequate programs and treatments can be developed to intervene on the individual and couple level, potentially leading to positive effects at the familial and societal levels.

Kaura and Allen (2004) and Mahlstedt and Welsh (2005) describe risk factors of dating violence perpetration that past research has examined. These include number of

previous dating relationships, length and seriousness of the dating relationship, problems with alcohol, jealousy and anger, childhood victimization, parental violence, verbal aggression, relationship conflict, communication problems, gender expectations and attitudes, and partner's physical aggression. However, there are two main problems with previous research on dating violence risk factors. First, the findings of the research are often contradictory, leading to indistinct conclusions on perceived risk factors. For example, Reitzel-Jaffe and Wolfe (2001) found that violence in men's family of origin and their association with negative peers who endorse violence predicted the occurrence of abuse toward their dating partner. However, according to Schissel (2001) as cited in Mahlstedt and Welsh (2005), it was found that the quality of family, friend and peer group relationships were not related to male violence toward women.

Second, there is a lack of data distinguishing differences in risk factors for males and females. The small amount of previous research is contradictory and not inclusive. For example, Kaura and Allen (2004) found parental violence to be the largest predictor of dating violence for men and women but this study only compared it to relationship power dissatisfaction, excluding other potential factors. This study found identical outcomes for men and women. Luthra and Gidycz (2006) however, found that parental violence was only a significant risk factor for women, and this came third in order of significance after partner's use of violence and alcohol use. For men, parental violence was not found to be a major influence in their perpetrating dating violence (Luthra & Gidycz, 2006).

Luthra and Gidycz's (2006) study has been the only research to date that examines gender differences across numerous dating violence risk factors. Luthra and

Gidycz (2006) found that risk factors for perpetrating violence within a dating relationship were different for men and women. However, this study had limitations. The sample size was small (N= 100 men, N=100 women) and only 25% of the women and 10% of the men admitted to perpetrating violence. The results were difficult to generalize and support the need for more research.

This current study is an effort to address these two downfalls of contradictory results and lack of data on gender differences in past research, to better clarify risk factors for those who perpetrate physical violence in dating relationships. This study focused on eight risk factors that have been studied throughout previous literature in the hope of adding to and clarifying the literature. Survey methodology was used to gain information on the selected risk factors. Questionnaires were completed by male and female college students at a large university. College students are studied since these dating relationships often lead to marriage. Research suggests that dating violence is often a precursor to marital violence (Kelly & Loesh, 1983; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985), therefore understanding this first level, the risk of perpetrating dating violence, can be vital to create proper prevention programs and clinical treatment.

Physical and psychological abuse are very important to understand within this population. However, for the purposes of this study, risk factors for physical abuse will only be examined. It will be assumed that if physical abuse is occurring between a couple, then psychological abuse is also occurring (Hamby & Sugarman, 1999; Kasian & Painter, 1992; Murphy & O'Leary, 1989; Ronfeldt, Kimerling, & Arias, 1998; as cited in Harper et al. (2005). According to Tolman (1992), in most cases, psychological abuse co-occurs with physical abuse and often precedes it. Stets (1990) studied verbal and

physical aggression among couples and found that 99% of the women sampled who were physically abused by their partners were also victims of psychological abuse. By focusing on risk factors for physical violence, the study will give an inclusive overview of what is occurring within this population.

Theoretical Framework

Two theoretical frameworks are used to guide this research, feminist theory and ecological theory. Feminist theory addresses gender hierarchy and power (Sprenkel & Moon, 1996). Gordon (1979), as cited in White and Klein (2002) defines feminist theory as “an analysis of women’s subordination for the purpose of figuring out how to change it” (p.177). This view suggests that women are suppressed and overpowered by male dominance. When specifically applied to dating violence, the feminist theory proposes that all forms of abuse are about power and control, embedded in a patriarchal value system (Jackson, 1999). This study addresses gender differences for the perpetration of dating violence, and by doing so from a feminist theory perspective will help to understand the nature of the interaction between males and females. In this study, feminist theory would predict that risk factors would operate differently for men and women due to hierarchy and power in intimate relationships.

Ecological theory is a sociocultural view that consists of five environmental systems ranging from direct interactions with a social figure to broad-based inputs of culture (Santrock, 1999). The systems are identified as microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem. Each system influences the individual and their development.

This theory is used to explain the eight risk factors examined in this study, emphasizing that each risk factor is a part of one of these five systems that interacts with the individual. Each variable was placed in a level based on its relationship to the individual. The microsystem involves the direct interactions of the individual with significant others in their life (White & Klein, 2002). Therefore, anger management skills, relationship satisfaction, witnessing parental violence and the experience of childhood abuse would be explained by this level. The mesosystem consists of interrelations of two or more microsystems (White & Klein, 2002). This level includes partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression since these both incorporate how the partner's actions influence the individual. The exosystem does not have direct interactions with the individual; however it does impact the person's microsystem and/or mesosystem, therefore incorporating the length of a dating relationship as a possible influential factor. The macrosystem involves the culture in which one lives by adhering to or being influenced by patterns and beliefs. Problems with alcohol may occur in this system if drinking is viewed as acceptable within the culture. Lastly, the chronosystem involves the patterning of environmental events and transitions over the course of time (Santrock, 1999). No variables representing the chronosystem were selected for this study. These systems and risk factors all potentially affect each other and the individual. Looking at a variety of factors from different ecological levels allows for a multifaceted view of what influences someone to become violent within a dating relationship.

Together, ecological theory and feminist theory provide a clear view in which to guide this research.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this research is to gain insight into the factors that put college men and women at risk of using physical violence against their dating partners. This study attempted to add to and clarify past research findings on risk factors relating to male versus female violence.

The eight risk factors examined include parental violence, childhood abuse, problems with alcohol, length of dating relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills and partners use of physical and psychological aggression. Two predictive models were tested, one for males and one for females, to determine if risk factors operate differently for men versus women.

Through this research I hope to add another piece of the puzzle to the literature of dating violence and enhance what is known about gender differences. With this knowledge, appropriate therapeutic and prevention programs can be created or adjusted accordingly in order to address gender differences.

CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents a review of dating violence literature. It will address the variables related to the current study including: witnessing parental violence, experiencing childhood violence, problems with alcohol, length of dating relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills, partners use of physical aggression, and partners use of psychological aggression. Research that addresses gender differences for each variable will also be presented.

Dating Violence

Dating violence prevalence rates have been highly studied with percentages ranging from approximately 20% to 50% (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001). While several characteristics of dating violence have been examined, the finding that dating violence often continues into marriage (O'Leary et al., 1989) is crucial in the cycle of violence. Violent marriages expose children to violence which in turn may increase their likelihood of being in a violent dating relationship (Foo & Margolin, 1995).

Research has found that there is a higher risk of abuse with the increase of relationship duration (O'Keefe, 1997) and even though violence occurs most individuals will not end the relationship (Lo & Sporkowski, 1989). This may explain the connection between dating violence and marital violence which finds that couples who reported aggressive behavior before marriage, continued to be violent during their marital relationship (O'Leary et al., 1989). Since violence often begins in the dating context and continues into the marital relationship, it is critical to intervene at this initial stage to stop the cycle of violence.

Dating violence can take the form of physical and/or psychological aggression, both of which have drastic effects on the victim. Physical abuse causes not only physical harm but also emotional harm including strong feelings of anger, fear, anxiety and sadness (Coffey, 1996). Furthermore, these victims experience a higher level of depression and a lower self-esteem. Likewise, psychological abuse has been positively associated with depression and linked to poor mental health outcomes (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001).

While most dating violence has focused on prevalence rates and effects on the victims, little is known about the perpetrators and the factors which increase the risk of perpetration. Furthermore, since research has found that women perpetrate violence as often or more than men (Jackson, 1999), there is a growing need to understand gender differences behind the perpetration. This will allow for more appropriate treatment and interventions within clinical settings.

The remaining of this chapter reviews dating violence literature in more detail, specifically focusing on the eight risk factors examined in this study.

Witnessing Parental Violence

Violence is perceived as a learned behavior that becomes a vicious cycle potentially passed down through the generations. As children develop, they learn behaviors from those around them, especially their parental figures. Millions of children are likely to be exposed to parental violence because marital violence is so common (Carlson, 1990). This causes alarm that these children may experience negative affects while they are being exposed and further long-term effects, such as choosing to engage in this learned violent behavior in their future intimate relationships. Furthermore,

Alexander, Moore and Alexander (1991) suggest that children who witness violence between their parents learn powerful messages about gender hierarchy and power that could influence their relationships later in life.

Witnessing violence as a child has also been linked with increased feelings of shame and guilt (Wagar & Rodway, 1995). Shame can have the effect of causing the person to feel inferior, defective, and helpless and is associated with high anger arousal, all of which are characteristics of domestically abusive adults (Kernsmith, 2006). Kernsmith (2006) studied a sample of men and women (n=100) from batterer intervention programs and found that 74% had witnessed parental violence. This adds to the research supporting the cycle of intergenerational violence.

Although many have hypothesized that witnessing parental violence will continue the cycle of violence in later dating relationships, findings are inconsistent. For example, the relationship of witnessing parental violence and dating violence has been found significant in several studies (Foo & Margolin, 1995; Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987; Marshall & Rose, 1988; O'Keefe, 1997). However, the research is very contradictory on differences between the genders. An association between witnessing parental violence and dating aggression was found to be stronger for males than females in several studies (Foo & Margolin, 1995; Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001). For example, Foo and Margolin (1995) collected data from 111 male and 179 female college students and found that witnessing parental abuse accounted for 13% of the variance for male physical aggression (out of a total 41% model variance) when included in a multiple regression with sexual abuse, alcohol use, socioeconomic status, childhood abuse, humiliation and self defense. For the females witnessing parental abuse was not

significant. Similarly, Gwartney-Gibbs et al. (1987) found that in a sample of 130 male and 159 female college students, the likelihood of physical abuse by males was positively and significant related to witnessing parental violence when tested with parent, peer and personal violence. On the contrary, Luthra and Gidycz (2006) found parental violence to not be a major influence in male's perpetration of violence, yet a strong factor for females. Despite this study's inclusion of a variety of variables including parent-child aggression, prior use of aggression, length of relationship, substance use, partner's aggression, and problems solving skills, it had a small sample (n = 100 males, n = 100 females) with only 25% of women and 10% of men who admitted to perpetrating violence against a dating partner making these findings not as valuable. Furthermore, Kaura and Allen (2004) found witnessing parental violence to be the largest predictor of dating violence for both sexes. However, this study only compared witnessing parental violence and one other variable, dissatisfaction with level of power in the relationship, therefore giving a skewed interpretation of the prediction of dating violence since several potential variables were excluded.

Despite the inconsistency in results regarding the effect of witnessing parental violence on males versus females, these studies still suggest a potential connection between witnessing parental violence and perpetrating dating violence. But to further blur the overall picture, Carlson (1990) and Alexander, Moore and Alexander's (1991) findings contradict the previously mentioned research. Carlson (1990) found that in a sample with frequent and severe exposure to parental violence (n = 101) collected from residential treatment agencies, there was not an association with perpetrating dating violence in males or females. Alexander, Moore and Alexander (1991) found that in a

sample of 152 males and 228 females, witnessing violence between one's parents was not predictive of physical abuse in dating relationships for either gender. As evident, research findings are inconsistent and not conclusive.

While most studies support that there is a connection between witnessing parental violence and perpetrating dating violence, more research still needs to be done to truly understand the relationship, especially differentiating effects for males and females. The difference in results could be due to sample size and the inclusion of different variables which may affect the findings.

Experiencing Childhood Violence

Witnessing and experiencing violence in childhood has seldom been differentiated in the literatures (Marshall & Rose, 1990). According to Alexander et al. (1991), a history of abuse, whether witnessed or experienced, is related to later involvement in an abusive relationship. However, studies that do differentiate between the two have found inconsistent results on the connection between childhood violence and perpetrating dating violence.

Several studies confirm a strong connection between childhood violence and perpetrating dating violence, however, results vary by gender. Alexander et al. (1991) found that in a sample of 152 males and 228 females, having been abused as a child predicted later use of physical violence in a dating relationship for males, but not for females. These results are consistent with several other researchers (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; O'Leary & Curley, 1986) which suggest that males are more likely to replicate the abusive behaviors compared to females. Furthermore, O'Keefe (1997) found that out of 385 males and 554 females, males were more likely to experience

parent-child violence, which may explain their greater likelihood of perpetrating in dating relationships. The only study that contradicts the previous finding was by Luthra and Gidycz (2006) who found that women are more likely to perpetrate violence in their dating relationships after experiencing abuse as a child. This study may differ from others because it included the influences of several other potential risk factors that may have produced different final results. The studies that found males to perpetrate violence in their dating relationships after experiencing abuse as a child only examined the relationship between experiencing abuse and perpetrating it in later relationships. The study by Luthra and Gidycz (2006) shows that the inclusion of other variables may provide a more accurate assessment since more factors are accounted for. More research needs to be completed to make any conclusions within this literature.

Problems with Alcohol

Research has supported that alcohol use is associated with an increased risk of perpetrating dating violence (O'Keefe, 1997; Stets & Henderson, 1991). The risk is thought to be due to impaired judgment and lowered inhibition caused by intoxication, which are strong contributors to the decision to engage in partner abuse (Gorney, 1989). Makepeace (1981) found that alcohol was involved in roughly one third of violent incidents among dating couples. Furthermore, perpetrators and victims of violence report higher levels of alcohol consumption when compared to nonviolent dating relationships (Luthra & Gidycz, 2006).

A recent study by Luthra and Gidycz (2006) examined significant risk factors for males and females who perpetrate violence. They found that alcohol use for women was the second strongest predictor following partner's use of violence and for men alcohol

was found to be the number one factor predicting dating violence perpetration. Men and women who reported alcohol use were both five times more likely to perpetrate violence against their dating partner.

These findings suggest that alcohol plays a crucial role in dating violence perpetration.

Length of Dating Relationship

The length of dating relationships has been studied in regards to dating violence to understand if there is a connection between the time of commitment and the probability of perpetration. Like most risk factors presented on dating violence perpetration, length of dating relationship research results have been inconsistent. However, most findings suggest a positive relationship, indicating that the longer the relationship the more likely physical violence will occur.

For example, Alexander et al. (1991), found that length of dating relationship was significantly related to the amount of verbal abuse within the relationship, however, was not significantly related to physical abuse. Studies have found that violence occurs during the serious dating phase of a relationship which leads researchers to conclude that a longer relationship can be associated with a higher risk for physical dating violence (Cate, et al., 1982; Henton, Cate, Koval, & Christopher, 1983; O'Keefe, 1997). Likewise, O'Leary and Arias (1988) collected data from 393 engaged couples of which 46% reported experience with dating violence in the prior year. This emphasizes that during this serious phase of the relationship, violence is prevalent and may be increased compared to shorter dating length relationships.

Research by Comins (1984), as cited in Arias et al. (1987), also supported this conclusion that physical aggression appears to be more prevalent among relationships of longer duration. However, researchers concluded that it is unclear if the violence began in the early stages of the relationship and continued or whether the longer the duration of these relationships simply increased the probability of violence. This differentiation would be important to understand so that appropriate interventions could be implemented. However, a study done by Lo and Sporkowski (1989) found that knowing the onset of abuse was not needed in order to find that most individuals planned to extend the length of the relationship despite perpetrating and/or receiving abuse. Specifically they found that 76.8% (n = 422) of college students who experienced dating violence planned to continue the relationship, and of those, 16% expected the relationship to last a couple years and 33% expected to marry the abuser. This shows that the length of the relationship may grow, despite physical abuse, and may even enable further perpetration as the relationship gets more serious. This is consistent with research that supports that dating violence continues into marital relationships (O'Leary et al., 1989).

Although few studies have differentiated findings between genders, research has been fairly consistent in that length of relationship had similar effects on male and female use of physical aggression. The study mentioned above by O'Leary and Arias (1988) focused on couples who were in a long relationship and were in a serious phase indicated by being engaged. It was found that 33% of the men and 42% of the women reported perpetrating dating violence against their partner at least once within the prior year. Similarly, Arias et al. (1987) found that for both males and females engaging in physical

aggression towards their dating partners, the violence was positively related to the length of their relationship.

Only one study reported a difference between males and females. Luthra and Gidycz (2006) found that length of relationship was a significant predictor of male, but not female, perpetration of violence. For every 6-month increase in relationship length, men became twice as likely to perpetrate violence. This finding suggests that more research needs to be done to assess for gender differences.

Relationship Satisfaction

Research has found that individuals in violent dating relationships report lower levels of relationship satisfaction than do individuals in non-violent dating relationships (Bookwala, Frieze, & Grote, 1994; Follette & Alexander, 1992; as cited in Lewis & Fremouw, 2001). However, according to Lewis and Fremouw (2001), findings on the connection between dating violence and relationship satisfaction show they are bidirectional: low satisfaction may preexist, leading to violence or low satisfaction may be an outcome of dating violence. Low relationship satisfaction preexisting violence would suggest that other factors influence satisfaction such as low self-esteem or depression (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001). Low relationship satisfaction following abuse may be due to the emotional impact of the violence (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001). Understanding which link occurs most has not been highly researched; however it could be a continual cycle of low relationship satisfaction and physical aggression.

The occurrence of low relationship satisfaction not only is associated with physical aggression, but also those who report low relationship satisfaction indicate a decreased attraction to their partner (Arias et al., 1987). This may lead to the end of the

relationship. Rusbult and Martz (1995), found that one's choice to remain in an abusive relationship was strongly related to his or her level of satisfaction in the relationship.

Therefore, if relationship satisfaction is low, one is likely to end the relationship.

Research on dating violence and relationship satisfaction has not focused on gender differences. More research needs to be done.

Anger Management Skills

Anger is strongly associated with violence. According to Eckhardt, Jamison and Watts (2002) violent individuals report higher levels of anger and possess a lower ability to calm angry feelings compared to nonviolent individuals. This reactivity can have an impact on intimate relationships. In a study done by O'Keefe (1997) respondents (n = 385 males; n = 554 females) were asked to indicate two main reasons for their use of dating violence. Among males, the most frequently chosen reason for use of violence was anger followed by the desire to control their partner. Similarly, females most frequently chose anger for their use of violence followed by self-defense. Anger is found to be an important variable associated with dating violence for both males and females.

It is valuable to note however, that not all individuals who experience anger respond by engaging in abusive behavior. According to Harper et al. (2005), it depends on an individual's ability to deal effectively with his or her emotional responses. Wolf and Foshee (2003) studied anger expression styles in relation to dating violence. They examined participants based on three anger expression styles: constructive (example- "I told the person why I was angry"), destructive direct (example- "I threw something at the person I was mad at") and destructive indirect (example- "I fantasized about telling the person off"). The researchers found that constructive anger expressions were not

associated with dating violence perpetration for males or females; however the other two expressions were positively associated.

Furthermore, Lundeberg, Stith, Penn and Ward (2004) studied how witnessing or experiencing violence as a child, levels of impulsivity, problems with alcohol, satisfaction with life, anger management skills, and relationship satisfaction effect college men's perpetration of violence. The researchers differentiated the males by three groups based on their self reported violence toward their dating partner: physical and psychological abuse, psychological abuse only and non-abusive. Lundeberg et al. (2004) found that the level of anger management skills was the only variable to differentiate all three groups. The non-abusive males had significantly higher anger management skills than the other two groups. Furthermore, the psychologically abusive group of males had higher anger management skills than males who were in the physical and psychological abuse group. This would suggest that men with less effective anger management skills are more likely to perpetrate dating violence.

Research supports that the experience of anger is prevalent among dating violence perpetrators. There is a need to learn more about how anger management skills impact dating violence.

Partner's Use of Physical Aggression

The impact of partner's use of physical aggression as a risk factor for the perpetration of violence has been studied in several studies. To gain an overall picture of this phenomenon, the prevalence of physical aggression in one gender to the other must be examined. Most dating violence research that uses the Conflict Tactic Scale reports womens' perpetration of violence at the same or higher level compared to men (Jackson,

1999). In addition, significant correlations between a partner's use of physical aggression and one's own perpetration were found for both males and females (Marshall & Rose, 1990; White & Koss, 1991) which suggests that one's violence is associated with a partner's violence. However, this does not conclude that one causes the other. A study done by Alexander et al. (1991), went into further detail and found that both males and females reported physical violence to be reciprocal in their relationship but whether they see themselves as fighting back or equally responsible for the violence is unclear. Self-defense has been shown to be an important motivator of women's aggression since they are at a higher risk for injury even with less severe types of physical aggression (Saunders, 1988). Makepeace (1986) found that 69.9% of women in his study gave self-defense as the reason for their physical aggression. Furthermore, Foo and Margolin (1995) found that 59% of women and 11% of men report that dating aggression is justifiable when the partner hits first.

While research shows that dating violence is often reciprocal, the reason behind use of physical aggression in response to received violence may vary by gender. As previously stated, partner's use of physical aggression seems to be a higher predictor for perpetration of violence for women due to self-defense data than for men. Even though findings indicate a correlation between partner's use of physical aggression and perpetration of violence for men, the motivation behind it is not yet understood. Studies may be excluding influential factors which would explain this occurrence. More research needs to be done to understand perpetration of violence in response to a partner's use of aggression.

Partner's Use of Psychological Aggression

Psychological aggression is even more prevalent than physical abuse since it often accompanies physical abuse (White & Koss, 1991). Lo and Sporkowski (1989) found that 69.7% (n=422) of their sample experienced some kind of violence. Of these, 56% experienced psychological aggression and 44% experienced both psychological and physical aggression. Of those who experienced abuse, 56% reported that violence was equally initiated. Interestingly, Alexander et al. (1991), found that males report being verbally abusive to their partners more than females, however both genders reported that their own level of psychological aggression was similar to their partners. Several studies have found that respondents report psychological abuse to be more detrimental than physical abuse (Follingstad et al., 1990; Marshall, 1992).

The effects of psychological abuse on victims and prevalence rates have been the focus of most research studies addressing psychological abuse. However, partner's use of psychological aggression as a predictor for physical dating violence perpetration has not been examined. Since partner's use of physical aggression is related to perpetration of violence, one would hypothesize that partner's use of psychological aggression, which research states is more detrimental than physical abuse, would similarly be related to perpetration of violence against one's partner. This study will attempt to address this relationship.

Summary

Literature on risk factors of violence perpetration in dating relationships has been inconclusive and inconsistent. This may be due to the fact that many studies do not account for the influence of several risk factors, therefore leaving out influential variables that may affect violence perpetration. Furthermore, there is a lack of information on

gender differences within dating violence, specifically in relation to those who perpetrate violence. This is surprising considering that both genders perpetrate violence. This study attempts to fill the gaps in the literature by examining numerous risk factors of violence perpetration discussed in the literature and further differentiating these factors between males and females.

CHAPTER III: METHODS

Participants

This study used secondary data collected in 1998 by faculty and graduate teaching assistants. The participants were 474 undergraduate college students at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. The convenience sample consisted of 132 males and 342 females who voluntarily agreed to participate in completing a survey packet for research purposes (see Appendix A).

Procedure

The survey was distributed by faculty and graduate teaching assistants in human development, business, accounting, engineering and Reserve Officer Training Cadet (ROTC) classes consisting of undergraduate students. Students were provided with the informed consent (see Appendix B) which provided details about the research being conducted, the survey packet and two scantron sheets. Students were asked to voluntarily participate and were assured there would be no negative consequences for not participating. Students were told to put no identifying information on the survey packet or on their scantron so responses would remain anonymous.

Three batches of surveys were mailed to Blacksburg for distribution to students over the course of the 1998-1999 school year. Approximately 500 surveys were sent in the early fall semester followed by another 500 in the early spring semester. An additional batch of 250 surveys were mailed for distribution in the middle of the spring semester due to the high number of uncompleted surveys previously received. As surveys were returned, answer sheets were penciled with numerical codes then sent to the Western Psychological Association which scanned the surveys and saved the data to a

disk. The cleaned data set consisted of 474 completed surveys, out of approximately 800 that were successfully distributed. This generates a 59% return rate.

Measures

The measures used in this study consist of the following: demographic questions; whether or not the subject witnessed or experienced violence in ones family of origin; The Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index (RAPI); length of relationship; the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS); the Anger Management Scale; and the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2).

Demographics

Demographic information such as gender, education level, age, race, parents' education levels, family income, and parents' marital status was requested for background data (see Appendix A, Q. 1-8; pp. 65-66).

Witness or Experience of Violence in Family of Origin

Following the demographic questions, two questions were asked regarding abuse in ones family of origin (see Appendix A, Q. 9-10; pp.66). One question addressed whether or not the participant witnessed physical parental violence. This question was scored as either "yes" to witnessed violence (specifying between father to mother violence, mother to father violence, or mutual) or "no" if no violence was witnessed. The second question addressed the participant's experience of abuse as a child within their family of origin. It asked participants to select the most severe discipline received as a child across a continuum of mild to severe verbal and physical abuse.

The Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index (RAPI)

The Rutgers Problem Alcohol Index (White & Labouvie, 1989) is a 23-item self-report measure used to assess drinking consequences in adolescents and young adults. It has an internal consistency of .92. The instrument instructions ask, “How many times did the following things happen to you while you were drinking alcohol or because of your alcohol use during the past six months?” Items are rated by frequency of occurrence on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (more than ten times). An example of one question is “how many times have you missed out on other things because you spent too much money on alcohol?” (See Appendix A, Q. 34-57; p. 68).

A high frequency of drinking consequences suggests a high risk for problems with alcohol. This study used this measure to assess if there is a relationship between problems with alcohol and the perpetration of physical violence.

Length of Dating Relationship

Questions were asked regarding participant’s dating status and general relationship information (see Appendix A, Q. 58-64; pp. 69). The first question (#58) asked participants to continue only if they respond that they are currently in a relationship lasting at least one month or have previously been in a relationship lasting at least one month. The following questions were to be answered on their current or most recent partner. Question 61 specifically asked “how long have you been in this relationship (or how long did the most recent relationship last)?” and allowed for participants to choose between 10 different time lengths such as “less than one month”, “three to five months” “four years or more”.

Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS)

Busby, Christensen, Crane and Larson (1995) created the Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS) which is a 14-item instrument based on Spanier's (1976) original 32-item, Dyadic Adjustment Scale. The 32-item instrument measures components of marital and nonmarital dyadic relationships including consensus, satisfaction, cohesion and affectional expressions. Spanier's instrument was found valuable in that it can be used in its entirety or by subscales without losing any validity or reliability (Busby et al., 1995). The Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale includes the consensus, satisfaction and cohesion subscales. In assessing for internal consistency, it was found that the RDAS had a Cronbach Alpha of .90, a Guttman Split-Half of .94 and a Spearman-Brown Split-Half of .95. This measure will be used to see if a relationship exists between level of relationship satisfaction and perpetration of physical dating violence. (See Appendix A, Q. 65-78; pp. 70-71).

Anger Management Scale

The Anger Management Scale, developed by Stith and Hamby (2002), assesses specific behaviors and cognitions which can increase or decrease anger in intimate partner violence. It consists of four subscales: escalating strategies, negative attributions, self-awareness and calming strategies. It has an overall reliability of .87. Statements such as, "when my partner picks a fight with me, I fight back", are rated on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to a 4 (strongly agree). (See Appendix A, Q. 79-104 & 1-22; pp.71-72).

The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2)

The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996) assesses the frequency an individual perpetrates physical, sexual and/or emotional

abuse against their partner and the frequency of experiencing physical, sexual and/or emotional abuse from their partner. The instrument shows whether an individual is in a mutually violent relationship or if violence is being perpetrated in one direction. The instrument also shows severity of abuse experienced and/or perpetrated based on the items. When previously assessed based on a sample of 317 undergraduates, the internal consistency reliability of the CTS2 ranged from .79 to .95. Respondents are asked to mark how many times they did each item in the past year and how many times their partner did each in the past year. Response choices range in frequency from 1 (no, this has never happened) to 7 (more than 20 times in the past year). If a respondent has experienced one of the items listed but not within the past year, they were to mark "8". An example of an item is "I threw something at my partner that could hurt". (See Appendix A, Q. 37-114; pp. 75-79).

The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale was used in this study to examine whether there is a relationship between an individual perpetrating physical violence and their partner's use of physical and/or psychological aggression.

Analysis

The data was analyzed by gender. First the data from the independent variables collected from the males (witnessing parental violence, experiencing childhood abuse, problems with alcohol, length of dating relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills, partner's use of physical aggression, and partner's use of psychological aggression) was correlated with male aggression to determine the univariate relationships between each independent variable and male violence. The same correlation analysis was done with the female data collected from the eight independent

variables. This indicate which independent variables have the strongest and weakest relationships with male and female violence when examined individually.

Next the independent variables were examined as a whole to understand how they predict male and female violence. The strength of each individual independent variable in predicting perpetration may change based on the inclusion of other variables. To understand the relationship between the independent variables and male and female aggression within the entire model, two multiple regression analyses were conducted. The dependent variable in the first analysis was male report of his own physical aggression. The dependent variable in the second analysis was female report of her own physical aggression. In each analysis the independent variables were witnessing parental violence, experiencing childhood abuse, problems with alcohol, length of dating relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills, partner's use of physical aggression, and partner's use of psychological aggression. The purpose of the analyses was to determine the percent of variance accounted for in the entire model and relational strength of each independent variable in the model for male and female violence.

CHAPTER IV: RESULTS

Demographics*Males*

There were 132 undergraduate males in the present study. Of those, 118 reported that they were presently in or had been in a relationship that lasted one month or more, and therefore were eligible for inclusion in the study. Of these 118, 3% (n=4) were freshman, 23% (n=27) were sophomores, 32% (n=38) were juniors, 39% (n=46) were seniors and 3% (n=3) represented missing data. In terms of ethnicity, 86% (n=100) were Caucasian, 5% (n=6) were African American, 2% (n=2) were Asian and the remaining 9% (n=10) were Latin American, Native American (American Indian, Samoan, or Hawaiian), other or missing data. There was a range of reported family income by the respondents, however the majority (48%; n=56) reported having family incomes of \$80,000 or more. Of the 118 males, 31.8% (n=35) reported being physically violent to their partner at least once in the past year. Of the 118 males, the most frequently used forms of abuse reported include grabbing a partner (n=23), shoving a partner (n=17), throwing an object at a partner (n=10), and twisting a partners arm or hair (n=10). (*See Table 1*)

Table 1: Male Demographics**Year in School**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Freshman	4	3.4	3.5	3.5
Sophomore	27	22.9	23.5	27.0
Junior	38	32.2	33.0	60.0
Senior	46	39.0	40.0	100.0
Total	115	97.5	100.0	
Missing Data	3	2.5		
Total	118	100.0		

Age

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
18	3	2.5	2.5	2.5
19	15	12.7	12.7	15.3
20	28	23.7	23.7	39.0
21	37	31.4	31.4	70.3
22-24	30	25.4	25.4	95.8
25-29	4	3.4	3.4	99.2
30-39	1	.8	.8	100.0
Total	118	100.0	100.0	

Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Asian	2	1.7	1.7	1.7
African American	6	5.1	5.1	6.8
Caucasian	100	84.7	85.5	92.3
Native American	1	.8	.9	93.2
Latin American	2	1.7	1.7	94.9
Other	6	5.1	5.1	100.0
Total	117	99.2	100.0	
Missing Data	1	.8		
Total	118	100.0		

Types of Physical Violence Used on a Partner

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Threw an object	10	8.7 (N = 115)
Twisted arm or hair	10	8.7 (N = 115)
Shoved	17	14.8 (N = 115)
Used a knife or gun	5	4.3 (N = 115)
Punched	4	3.5 (N = 115)
Choked	5	4.3 (N = 115)
Slammed against wall	4	3.5 (N = 115)
Beat up	4	3.5 (N = 115)
Grabbed	23	20.5 (N = 112)
Slapped	3	2.7 (N = 112)
Burned	3	2.6 (N = 114)
Kicked	2	1.8 (N = 112)

Females

There were 342 respondents who were females in this study. Of those, 321 reported that they were presently in or had been in a relationship that lasted one month or more, and therefore were eligible for inclusion in the study. The female respondents (n=321) consisted of 3% (n=8) freshman, 38% (n=123) sophomores, 38% (n=122) juniors and 21% (n=68) seniors. In terms of ethnicity, 89% (n=286) were Caucasian, 4% (n=14) were Asian, 4% (n=12) were African American and the remaining 3% (n=9) were Latin American, Native American (American Indian, Samoan, or Hawaiian), other or missing data. Similar to the males, 44% (n=140) of the females reported their family income was \$80,000 or more. Of the 321 females, 41.4% (n=130) reported being physically violent towards their partner. Of the 321 females, the most frequently used forms of abuse reported include shoving (n=86), grabbing (n=80), throwing an object at a partner (n=42) and slapped a partner (n=41). (*See Table 2*)

Table 2: Female Demographics**Year in School**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Freshman	8	2.5	2.5	2.5
Sophomore	123	38.3	38.3	40.8
Junior	122	38.0	38.0	78.8
Senior	68	21.2	21.2	100.0
Total	321	100.0	100.0	

Age

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
18	6	1.9	1.9	1.9
19	98	30.5	30.5	32.4
20	127	39.6	39.6	72.0
21	63	19.6	19.6	91.6
22-24	25	7.8	7.8	99.4
25-29	2	.6	.6	100.0
Total	321	100.0	100.0	

Ethnicity

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Asian	14	4.4	4.4	4.4
African American	12	3.7	3.7	8.1
Caucasian	286	89.1	89.1	97.2
Native American	1	.3	.3	97.5
Latin American	4	1.2	1.2	98.8
Other	4	1.2	1.2	100
Total	321	100.0	100.0	

Types of Physical Violence Used on a Partner

	Frequency	Valid Percent	
Threw an object	42	13.2	(N = 319)
Twisted arm or hair	27	8.5	(N = 319)
Shoved	86	27.0	(N = 319)
Used a knife or gun	5	1.6	(N = 319)
Punched	32	10.0	(N = 319)
Choked	7	2.2	(N = 319)
Slammed against wall	14	4.4	(N = 319)
Beat up	5	1.6	(N = 319)
Grabbed	80	25.2	(N = 318)
Slapped	41	12.9	(N = 317)
Burned	6	1.9	(N = 318)
Kicked	22	7.0	(N = 315)

Correlation Analyses

The data was analyzed by gender. Correlations were run between all variables for the male data and then for the female data. These results can be seen in Table 3 and Table 4. First, the correlations show the strength of relationship between the independent variables. The highest intercorrelation among independent variables was .64 for the females and .54 for the males, both of which were between partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression. Therefore, it does not appear that multicollinearity was a problem within the independent variables for males or females. Secondly, the correlation data determined the univariate relationship between each independent variable and male and female violence.

Male Correlations

Partner's use of physical aggression ($r = .88$) partner's use of psychological aggression ($r = .46$) and alcohol problems ($r = .43$) were all significantly correlated with male aggression at the 0.001 level. Anger management skills were also significantly related to male aggression ($r = -.40$, $p < .001$), however, the relationship was negative

which indicates that the less anger management skills a person has, the more likely they will use physical violence against a dating partner. These relationships indicate that lower anger management skills, partner's use of physical violence, partner's use of psychological violence, and problems with alcohol are all positively associated with men using physical violence in their dating relationships. Experience of childhood violence was significantly correlated with male aggression at the 0.05 level, however, the relationship was weak ($r = .21$). Witnessing parental violence ($r = .08$, $p = .22$), relationship satisfaction ($r = -.11$, $p = .13$) and length of relationships ($r = -.03$, $p = .36$) were not significantly correlated with men's use of physical violence. (*See Table 3*)

Table 3: Correlations Between Variables: Males

	Wit. Abuse	Exp. Abuse	Alcohol Prob.	Rel. Length	Rel. Satsf.	Anger Skills	P. Use of Phys.	P. Use of Psy.
Wit. Abuse	1.00***							
Exp. Abuse	.31***	1.00***						
Alcohol Prob.	-.01	.15	1.00***					
Rel. Length	-.00	-.12	-.15	1.00***				
Rel. Satsf.	-.05	-.17*	-.29***	-.04	1.00***			
Anger Skills	.07	-.05	-.30***	-.14	.49***	1.00***		
P. Use of Phys.	.15	.20*	.43***	-.05	-.18*	-.32***	1.00***	
P. Use of Psy.	.05	.26**	.27**	.13	-.18*	-.38***	.54***	1.00***
Self Use of Phys.	.08	.21*	.43***	-.03	-.11	-.40***	.88***	.46***

N = 109; * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Wit. Abuse = Witness of Parental Violence

Exp. Abuse: Experience of Childhood Abuse

Alcohol Prob.: Problems with Alcohol

Rel. Length: Length of Dating Relationship

Rel. Satsf.: Relationship Satisfaction

Anger Skills: Anger Management Skills

P. Use of Phys.: Partner's Use of Physical Aggression

P. Use of Psyc.: Partner's use of Psychological Aggression

Self Use of Phys.: Use of Physical Aggression on Partner

Female Correlations

Partner's use of physical aggression ($r = .68$), partner's use of psychological aggression ($r = .56$), and alcohol problems ($r = .28$) were all significantly correlated with female violence at the 0.001 level. Furthermore, anger management skills ($r = -.39$) and relationship satisfaction ($r = -.35$) were also significant at the 0.001 level, but negatively correlated, indicating that low anger management skills and low relationship satisfaction are related to use of physical aggression against a dating partner. Therefore, these relationships indicate that partner's use of physical violence, partner's use of psychological violence, lower anger management skills, low relationship satisfaction, and alcohol problems are all positively associated with females using physical violence in their dating relationship. Witnessing parental violence was significantly correlated with female violence at the 0.05 level, however the relationship was weak ($r = .11$). Experience of childhood abuse ($r = .08$, $p = .10$) and length of relationship ($r = .08$, $p = .08$) were not significantly correlated with female aggression. (*See Table 4*)

Table 4: Correlations Between Variables: Females

	Wit. Abuse	Exp. Abuse	Alcohol Prob.	Rel. Length	Rel. Satsf.	Anger Skills	P. Use of Phys.	P. Use of Psy.
Wit. Abuse	1.00***							
Exp. Abuse	.35***	1.00***						
Alcohol Prob.	-.08	.05	1.00***					
Rel. Length	.07	.00	-.23***	1.00***				
Rel. Satsf.	.04	-.01	-.26***	-.01	1.00***			
Anger Skills	-.02	-.12*	-.33***	-.12*	.58***	1.00***		
P. Use of Phys.	.11*	.10*	.28***	.08	-.31***	-.33***	1.00***	
P. Use of Psy.	.02	.05	.31***	.22***	-.40***	-.47***	.64***	1.00***
Self Use of Phys.	.11*	.08	.28***	.08	-.35***	-.39***	.68***	.56***

N = 291; * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Wit. Abuse = Witness of Parental Violence

Exp. Abuse: Experience of Childhood Abuse

Alcohol Prob.: Problems with Alcohol

Rel. Length: Length of Dating Relationship

Rel. Satsf.: Relationship Satisfaction

Anger Skills: Anger Management Skills

P. Use of Phys.: Partner's Use of Physical Aggression

P. Use of Psyc.: Partner's use of Psychological Aggression

Self Use of Phys.: Use of Physical Aggression on Partner

Regression Analyses

The correlation analyses showed that partner's use of physical and psychological aggression both had the strongest relationships for male and female's use of aggression. Therefore, it was anticipated that these two partner variables would account for most of the variance within the model in predicting male and female aggression. In order to test this hypothesis, two regression analyses were conducted for each gender. In the first regression analysis partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression were entered first followed by the other six variables (witnessed parental abuse, experienced childhood abuse, anger management skills, relationship satisfaction, problems with alcohol, and length of relationship). In the second regression, the six variables were entered first, followed by the partner variables. This showed how significance levels of variables in each block changed based on the inclusion of other variables. It also showed how much variance the partner variables accounted for compared to the rest of the variables.

For the males, when the two partner variables were entered first into the regression they accounted for 77% of the variance for male aggression within the model. Partner's use of physical aggression was significant at the 0.001 level ($\beta = .89$), however, partner's use of psychological aggression was not significant. When the rest of the six independent variables were entered, the total model predicted 81% of male aggression. Partner's use of physical violence remained significant ($\beta = .85, p < .001$), and now anger management skills ($\beta = -.22, p < .001$) and relationship satisfaction ($\beta = .16, p < .01$) were significant. (See Table 5)

Table 5: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Males as Criterion: Partner Variables Entered First

Step and predictor variable	R^2	ΔR^2	β	p
Step 1	.77	.77		
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.89	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			-.03	.63
Step 2	.81	.05		
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.85	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			-.10	.08
Witnessed Parental Violence			-.06	.24
Experienced Childhood Violence			.09	.06
Anger Management Skills			-.22	.00
Relationship Satisfaction			.16	.00
Problems with Alcohol			.06	.26
Length of Dating Relationship			.01	.76

Note. $F = 53.52$, ($N = 109$, $p < .001$)

In the second analysis for the males, the six independent variables were entered first, which predicted 33% of the variance in male violence. Anger management skills ($\beta = -.40$, $p < .001$), problems with alcohol ($\beta = .35$, $p < .001$) and relationship satisfaction ($\beta = .22$, $p < .05$) were the only significant variables out of the six entered. When the partner variables were added into the model, changes occurred due to the high significance of partner's use of physical violence ($\beta = .85$, $p < .001$). Anger management skills remained significant ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .001$), relationship satisfaction became more

significant ($\beta = .16, p < .001$), and problems with alcohol became no longer significant ($\beta = .06, p = .26$). When partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression were added in the regression after the six variables, the model predicted 81% of male aggression. (See Table 6)

Table 6: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Males as Criterion: Self Variables Entered First

Step and predictor variable	R^2	ΔR^2	β	p
Step 1	.33	.33		
Witnessed Parental Violence			.07	.40
Experienced Childhood Violence			.15	.10
Anger Management Skills			-.40	.00
Relationship Satisfaction			.22	.02
Problems with Alcohol			.35	.00
Length of Dating Relationship			-.01	.88
Step 2	.81	.49		
Witnessed Parental Violence			-.06	.24
Experienced Childhood Violence			.09	.06
Anger Management Skills			-.22	.00
Relationship Satisfaction			.16	.00
Problems with Alcohol			.06	.26
Length of Dating Relationship			.01	.76
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.85	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			-.10	.08

Note. $F = 53.52, (N = 109, p < .001)$

The first regression for the female data included just the partner's use of physical aggression ($\beta = .54, p < .001$) and partner's use of psychological aggression ($\beta = .22, p < .001$) which were both significant and accounted for 49% of the variance. When the rest of the six variables were added to the model, the total model predicted 51% of the variance. Partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression both remained significant, however the significance level for partner's use of psychological aggression changed ($\beta = .15, p < .05$). No other variables were significant in the model. (*See Table 7*)

Table 7: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Females as Criterion: Partner Variables Entered First

Step and predictor variable	R^2	ΔR^2	β	p
Step 1	.49	.49		
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.54	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			.22	.00
Step 2	.51	.02		
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.51	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			.15	.02
Witnessed Parental Violence			.05	.23
Experienced Childhood Violence			-.02	.74
Anger Management Skills			-.10	.08
Relationship Satisfaction			-.07	.17
Problems with Alcohol			.05	.34
Length of Dating Relationship			.01	.97

Note. $F = 36.67, (N = 290, p < .001)$

The second regression for the female data first included the six independent variables (witnessed parental abuse, experienced childhood abuse, anger management skills, relationship satisfaction, problems with alcohol, and length of relationship). These accounted for only 22% of the variance within the model. Problems with alcohol ($\beta = .20, p < .001$), anger management skills ($\beta = -.21, p < .01$), relationship satisfaction ($\beta = -.19, p < .01$) and witnessing parental abuse ($\beta = .12, p < .05$) were all significant. However, when the partner variables were added to the model, the six previous variables were no longer significant. Only partner's use of physical aggression ($\beta = .51, p < .001$) and partner's use of psychological aggression ($\beta = .15, p < .05$) were significant out of all eight variables which means these two variables are good predictors of dating violence perpetration. When the partner variables were added to the model, the total model then accounted for 51% of the variance. (*See Table 8*)

Table 8: Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Females as Criterion: Self Variables Entered First

Step and predictor variable	R^2	ΔR^2	β	p
Step 1	.22	.22		
Witnessed Parental Violence			.12	.04
Experienced Childhood Violence			-.00	.95
Anger Management Skills			-.21	.00
Relationship Satisfaction			-.19	.00
Problems with Alcohol			.20	.00
Length of Dating Relationship			.09	.10
Step 2	.51	.29		
Witnessed Parental Violence			.05	.23
Experienced Childhood Violence			-.02	.74
Anger Management Skills			-.10	.08
Relationship Satisfaction			-.07	.17
Problems with Alcohol			.05	.34
Length of Dating Relationship			.00	.97
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.51	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			.15	.02

Note. $F = 36.67$, ($N = 290$, $p < .001$)

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

Of the 118 undergraduate males in this study who were in or had previously been in a dating relationship lasting one month or more, 31.8% (n=35) reported being physically violent towards their partner in the past year. Furthermore, 41.4% (n=130) of the females who were in or had been in a relationship (n = 321) reported being physically violent towards their partner in the past year. These findings correspond with previous research that has found prevalence rates of college dating violence to range between 20% and 50% (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001). Furthermore, this study found a higher percentage of violence perpetration among females which is consistent with several other research findings (Bookwala et al., 1992; Burke et al., 1988; Riggs, O'Leary & Breslin, 1990; White & Koss, 1991) that found women perpetrate violence as often or more than men.

Interestingly, both males and females had the same four variables in the same order of relationship strength that were significantly correlated in the univariate analyses with male and female physical aggression. In order of significance, these included partner's use of physical aggression, partner's use of psychological aggression, problems with alcohol and anger management skills. The genders differed in that for males, experience of childhood violence was also significant and for females, relationship satisfaction and witnessing of parental violence were significant. Length of relationship was not significantly correlated with one's use of physical violence for males or females, therefore possibly suggesting that abuse can occur at any stage of a college dating relationship. Interestingly, length of relationship was significantly correlated ($r = .22, p < .001$) with partner's use of psychological aggression for females. Therefore, the longer

the relationship, the more likely a man may become psychologically aggressive towards his partner. These findings are similar to research results by Alexander et al. (1991) who found that length of dating relationship was significantly related to the amount of verbal abuse within the relationship but was not significantly related to physical abuse.

The correlations give a good view of how each independent variable relates to male or female aggression when looked at individually. However, the multiple regressions showed that when the independent variables are collectively examined as a whole to predict male and female violence, the relationship strength of each individual independent variable changed based on the inclusion of other variables. Partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression were entered as a block into the regressions for two reasons. First, they both had the strongest correlated relationship with male and female aggression, when compared to all other variables, suggesting that these two variables play a large part in the prediction of violence perpetration. Entering the variables in a block showed how much variance they accounted for in the model. Secondly, these two variables are associated with the partner's actions, unlike the rest of the six variables. Therefore, clinical implications may differ if the partner variables were to show a higher importance in the model.

For both males and females, the partner variables indeed did predict the most variance in the model, 77% and 49% respectively. The total model variance for males was 81% and 51% for females. For both genders, partner's use of physical aggression was a highly significant predictor of one's own use of physical violence. Interestingly though, partner's use of psychological aggression was not a significant predictor for males, but was significant for females. Therefore, men's use of psychological aggression

has a much stronger impact on a woman's likelihood of using physical aggression than does women's use of psychological aggression on male violence. These findings connect to society's view of what is acceptable behavior for each gender. Traditionally, if a man says something offensive or belittling to a woman and a woman uses physical violence as a response, for example by slapping him, society is much more accepting than if it were the man using physical violence against a woman for something she said. This fits with feminist theory which suggests there are different factors that predict dating violence perpetration for males and females.

The regression showed how variables changed with the influence of the partner variables. For example, for the males, when the six independent variables were input into the regression first, anger management skills, relationship satisfaction and problems with alcohol were all significant. However, when partner's use of physical and psychological aggression were added, problems with alcohol became no longer significant. Similarly for females, when the six variables were input into the regression first, witness of parental violence, anger management skills, relationship satisfaction and problems with alcohol were all significant. However, all of these became insignificant when the partner variables were added to the model. This provides insight on how influential these two partner variables are on other variables and in the prediction of dating violence perpetration.

These results show the importance of including all possible variables when examining risk factors for dating violence. Past research findings possibly contradicted one another because not all influential factors were included, therefore leading to

different results. This study attempted to account for these contradictions by including a broader range of variables and examining how they influence one another.

The results showed that for males, in order of significance, partner's use of physical aggression, low anger management skills and a high relationship satisfaction were the strongest variables associated with male's use of physical aggression against a dating partner. The findings of partner's use of physical aggression and low anger management skills are consistent with past research (Marshall & Rose, 1990; White & Koss, 1991; Lundberg et al., 2004). However, the result indicating a high relationship satisfaction relates to high use of male physical aggression does not correspond to past research findings. One potential explanation for this is the use of different analysis methods. Lundberg et al. (2004) concluded that for males, higher relationship satisfaction was associated with less physical aggression towards their dating partner, however, this finding was only concluded by running correlations. Interestingly, when correlations were run in this study the same result was found, that the higher the relationship satisfaction was then the lower the likelihood that a male will use physical aggression. Relationship satisfaction was not found to be a significant variable when correlated with male aggression. But when all eight variables were included in the multiple regression, relationship satisfaction came out significant with the opposite result of the correlation. This may be attributed to the influence of other variables and demonstrates the need for the use of multiple regressions when examining the prediction of violence perpetration. In any event, although relationship satisfaction was significant, the beta weight shows that the relationship is small.

For females, partner's use of physical aggression, followed by partner's use of psychological aggression were the strongest variables associated with female's use of physical aggression against a dating partner. Since the model only predicted 51% of female violence, this indicates that other unknown factors are influential in female's use of physical violence. Since the model in this study predicted 81% of male violence, the unknown variables associated with female violence may be variables specific to only females. Therefore, more research needs to be conducted in order uncover female variables to close this gap. Since anger management was not a predictor for female violence this suggests that for females a more emotional factor may be playing a part such as self-esteem issues or possibly jealousy.

Although, experiencing childhood violence was correlated with male violence and witnessing parental violence was correlated with female violence, it was surprising that these variables did not have a larger influence on one's likelihood of using physical violence against a dating partner. Although past research has found different results for each gender, most findings support that these variables do indeed play a part in the continuing cycle of violence. This study however showed that with the inclusion of a variety of variables, witnessing and experiencing violence do not significantly predict male or female physical aggression. Therefore, growing up in a violent home does not necessarily mean that an individual will be violent in later relationships.

Another surprising finding was how problems with alcohol was significant for both genders until the partner variables were added to the model, in which case it became no longer significant for both genders. Most research results suggest that problems with alcohol play a crucial role in dating violence perpetration. This study found that it

significantly correlates to dating violence however it is not a strong predictor when placed in a model with other influential variables. This is another example of how the inclusion of a variety of variables gives a clearer view of the phenomenon occurring.

This research was guided by two theoretical frameworks, feminist theory and ecological theory. Feminist theory predicted that risk factors would operate differently for men and women due to hierarchy and power in intimate relationships. This prediction is supported by the results found in this study. Men and women did have different risk factors that predicted their use of violence, except for the common risk factor of partner's use of physical aggression. What is most notable is that for females, partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression were the only significant predictors of female violence even when included with all other potential variables. This shows that women's use of physical violence is dependent on men's behaviors, suggesting that men have the upper hierarchy and power. If a man uses physical violence or psychological aggression, results show that a woman would likely retaliate with physical aggression, in which case the man would likely reciprocate the physical aggression and possibly injure her since men are typically physically stronger. Furthermore, low anger management skills was found to predict male physical aggression towards their dating partner, which leaves females again at the mercy of male behavior. Feminist theory shows the importance of examining gender differences in dating violence perpetration.

Ecological theory guided the research by providing a framework to view the eight variables used in the study. Ecological theory is a sociocultural view of development that shows how different systems influence the individual and their development. The

mesosystem level seemed most important in regards to predicting dating violence since it included partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression which accounted for most of the variance in the prediction models for both males and females. This shows that partner's actions have a large influence on whether one uses physical aggression against their dating partner or not. Through this theory, a variety of risk factors were examined allowing for a multifaceted view of what influences someone to become violent within a dating relationship.

Although Systems Theory was not used to guide this research, the results support that dating violence occurs within a system since the primary prediction is based on interactional variables, partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression. Viewing the interactions between males and females in dating violence through Systems Theory may provide insight into the cycles that are occurring.

Limitations

This study is limited in its ability to generalize the results. First, 86% of the men in the sample and 89% of the women were Caucasian, making the results difficult to generalize to other racial groups. Secondly, the sample consisted of only currently enrolled undergraduate college students. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized to non-college populations. Lastly, the shortcoming of survey methodology and quantitative research is that we don't know the meaning and process behind the statistical data. For example, this study found that partner's use of physical aggression is a major risk factor for one's own use of physical aggression against a dating partner in both genders. However, the data does not tell us the meaning behind the use of physical violence or an explanation of who hits who first.

Clinical Implications

Research suggests that dating violence is often a precursor to marital violence (Kelly & Loesh, 1983; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985), therefore understanding this first level, the risk of perpetrating dating violence, can be vital to create proper prevention programs and clinical treatment. Gender differences should be largely considered in prevention programs and clinical treatment since this study shows that men and women differed in risk factors predicting violence perpetration. For males, partner's use of physical violence, low anger management skills and high relationship satisfaction were associated with male's use of physical violence. This suggests that a psychoeducational component on anger management skills could be valuable for men. For females, partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression were strongly associated with female's use of physical violence. Addressing partner's use of physical aggression in prevention programs and clinical treatment would be useful for both genders. This could be done by teaching positive ways to respond to partner abuse, such as not using physical aggression in retaliation and getting help. The results from this study help make the connection between the gender differences in dating violence perpetration, which can give light into what cycle may be occurring between a couple, allowing for proper intervention to break the cycle. For example, if a man is psychologically abusive to his partner, this may provoke a woman to become physically violent which in turn may create risk that the man will also use physical aggression, and the cycle continues.

Future Research

Previous literature exemplified contradiction within the results of dating violence perpetration research. This is the first study that addresses numerous risk factors for the perpetration of dating violence across genders, attempting to fill a gap in the literature. However, this study cannot be generalized to all populations, therefore more studies should be conducted in order to make the results conclusive. The results from this study suggest that there are still important variables missing from the female model of risk factors, therefore more research should be done to uncover these missing pieces. Furthermore, this study did not explore possible subgroups of individuals. We know from the research on marital violence, that violence is not a unitary phenomena. It is possible that for one group of individuals, anger management skills may be more important, and for another group, childhood experiences may be most important. This study considered all the females as one group and all the males as another group, but did not look for subgroups within the larger group of females or males. Future studies looking at subgroups increase our knowledge of factors related to dating violence perpetration. Lastly, a qualitative component could add to the understanding of dating violence perpetration, especially to gain insight on why males who have a higher relationship satisfaction are likely to be more violent towards their partner.

Summary

The present study examined risk factors of dating violence perpetration across gender. The eight risk factors examined in this study include parental violence, childhood abuse, problems with alcohol, length of dating relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills and partners use of physical and psychological aggression. It was found that partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological

aggression account for the most variance within both the male and female models, 77% and 49% respectively. When all eight variables are included, the model predicts 81% of male violence and 51% of female violence. For males, the most significant variables associated with male aggression towards a dating partner were partner's use of physical aggression, low anger management skills and high relationship satisfaction. For females, partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression were found to be most significant. This information can be helpful to clinicians and educators who work with college populations. Appropriate therapeutic and prevention programs can be created to incorporate these gender differences. By intervening at the early dating relationship phase, further physical violence may be prevented therefore breaking the cycle of violence that often continues into marital relationships.

References

- Alexander, P. C., Moore, S., & Alexander, E. R., III. (1991). What is transmitted in the intergenerational transmission of violence? *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53(3), 657-667.
- Arias, I. Samois, M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2(1), 82-90.
- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. & Grote, N. (1994). Love, aggression, and satisfaction in dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 11, 625-632.
- Burke, P., Stets, J., & Pirog-Good, M. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 272-285.
- Busby, D., Christensen, C., Crane, D. & Larson, J. (1995). A revision of the dyadic adjustment scale for use with distressed and nondistressed couples: Construct hierarchy and multidimensional scales. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy*, 21(3), 289-308.
- Carlson, B. (1990). Adolescent observers of marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 5(4), 285-299.
- Cate, R. Henton, L., Koval, J., Christopher, S., & Lloyd, S. (1982). Premarital abuse: A social psychological perspective. *Journal of Family Issues*, 3, 79-80.
- Coffey, P. Leitenberg, H., Henning, K., Bennett, R., & Jankowski, M. (1996). Dating violence: The association between methods of coping and women's psychological adjustment. *Violence and Victims*, 11, 227-238.
- Eckhardt, C., Jamison, T. & Watts, K. (2002). Anger experience and expression among male dating violence perpetrators during anger arousal. *Journal of Interpersonal*

- Violence, 17(10)*, 1102-1114.
- Edwardson, E. & Morse, D. (2006). Intimate partner violence resource materials. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21(8)*, 971-981.
- Fischbach, R. L. & Herbert, B. (1997). Domestic violence and mental health: Correlates and conundrums within and across cultures. *Social Science and Medicine, 45(8)*, 1161-1176.
- Follette, V. & Alexander, P. (1992). Dating violence: Current and historical correlates. *Behavioral Assessments, 14*, 39-52.
- Foo, L., & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence, 10(4)*, 351-377.
- Gorney, B. (1989). Domestic violence and chemical dependency: Dual problems, dual interventions. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 21*, 229-238.
- Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A., Stockard, J., & Bohmer, A. (1987). Learning courtship aggression: The influence of parents, peers, and personal experiences. *Family Relations, 36(3)*, 276-282.
- Harper, F., Austin, A., Cercone, J., & Arias, I. (2005). The role of shame, anger and affect regulation in Men's perpetration of psychological abuse in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20(12)*, 1648-1662.
- Henton, J., Cate, R., Koval, J., Christopher, S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues, 4*, 467-482.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1992). Social skill deficits in martially violent men: Interpreting the data using a social information processing model. *Clinical Psychology Review, 12*, 605-617.

- Jackson, S. M. (1999). Issues in the dating violence research: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 4*(2), 233-247.
- Kaura, S. & Allen, C. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence perpetration by men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(5), 576-588.
- Kernsmith, P. (2006). Gender differences in the impact of family of origin violence on perpetrators of domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 21*(2), 163-171.
- Lewis, S. F. & Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review, 21*(1), 105-127.
- Lo, A. W. & Sporkowski, M. J. (1989). The continuation of violent dating relationships among college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 30*, 432-439.
- Lundberg, K., Stith, S., Penn, C. & Ward, D. (2004). A comparison of nonviolent, psychologically violent and physically violent male college daters. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(10), 1191-1200.
- Luthra, R. & Gidycz, G. (2006). Dating violence among college men and women: Evaluation of a theoretical model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*(6), 717-731.
- Mahlstedt, D. & Welsh, L. (2005). Perceived causes of physical assault in heterosexual dating relationships. *Violence Against Women, 11*(4), 447-472.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. *Family Relations, 30*, 97-102.
- Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1990). Premarital violence: The impact of family of origin violence, stress and reciprocity. *Violence and Victims, 5*(1), 51-64.
- Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1988). Family of origin violence and courtship abuse.

- Journal of Counseling and Development*, 66(9), 414-418.
- O'Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12(4), 546-568.
- O'Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbau, A., Malone, J. & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57(2), 263-268.
- O'Leary, K. D. & Arias, I. (1988). Prevalence, correlates and development of spouse abuse. In R.D. Peters & R.J. McMahon (Eds.). *Social Learning and Systems Approaches to Marriage and the Family* (p. 104-127). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Pedersen, P & Thomas, C. (1992). Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a Canadian-university sample. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 24(4), 490-501.
- Reitzel-Jaffe, D. & Wolfe, D. (2001). Predictors of relationship abuse among young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16(2), 99-115.
- Riggs, D., O'Leary, K. & Breslin, F. (1990). Multiple correlates of physical aggression in dating couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 61-73.
- Rosenbaum, A. & O'Leary, K. (1981). Marital violence: Characteristics of abusive couples, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 49, 63-71.
- Rusbult, C. & Martz, J. (1995). Remaining in an abusive relationship: An investment model analysis of non-voluntary dependence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 558-571.
- Santrock, J. W. (1999). *Life-Span Development*, 7th Ed. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

- Saunders, D. (1988). Wife abuse, husband abuse, or mutual combat? A feminist perspective on the empirical findings. In Yllo, K. and Bograd, M. (eds.), *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*. Sage Publications: Newbury Park, pp. 90-113.
- Sigelman, C., Berry, C., & Wiles, K. (1984). Violence in college students' dating relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 5*, 530-548.
- Snyder, D. & Fruchtmann, L. (1981). Differential patterns of wife abuse: A data-based typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49*(6), 878-885.
- Spanier, G. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38*(1), 15-28.
- Sprenkle, D. & Moon, S. (1996). *Research methods in family therapy*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41*, 75-88.
- Stets, J.E. (1990). Verbal and physical aggression in marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52*, 501-514.
- Tolman, R.M. (1992). Psychological abuse of women. In R.T. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Assessment of Family Violence: A Clinical and Legal Sourcebook* (pp. 231-310). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wagar, J. & Rodway, M. (1995) An evaluation of a group treatment approach for children who have witnessed wife abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 10*(3), 295-306.
- White, J. & Klein, D. (2002). *Family theories (2nd Ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- White, J. & Koss, M. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students. *Violence and Victims, 6(4)*, 247-256.
- White, J., Merrill, L. & Koss, M. (2001). Predictors of premilitary courtship violence in a navy recruit sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16(9)*, 910-927.
- Wolf, K. & Foshee, V. (2003). Family violence, anger expression styles, and adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 18(6)*, 309-316.

Appendix AFall 98 Testing
Form L**RELATIONSHIP
CHARACTERISTICS STUDY**

Thank you for giving us your time.

What we are doing

We are a group of researchers at the Virginia Tech's Northern Virginia Campus. We are trying to develop tests that ask people about their current or past relationships and about their attitudes towards relationships. We want to find out some new, better ways to identify the strengths and weaknesses in people's relationships. Eventually, we hope these tests will be used to help people with relationship problems.

Participation

You may choose not to participate in this study without any penalty whatsoever. Simply turn the unanswered survey into the project coordinator.

Confidentiality

ALL of your responses will be completely confidential and anonymous. We will NOT ask you for your name, and the answers to these questions will never be associated with you in any way. PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

You can help us most by answering every question on the questionnaire, but you may omit any questions or discontinue at any time.

Your comments

You can write on the questionnaires - in fact, we hope that you will have lots of suggestions and comments on them! But PLEASE do not make any extra marks on the answer sheets, because otherwise we won't be able to computer score them.

More information about the study

We will give you an information sheet when you are finished with the questionnaire. You can also contact us at the Northern Virginia Center. The contact person is Sandra Stith, Ph.D., 703-538-8462; SSTITH@vt.edu.

**PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE OR
THE ANSWER SHEETS. PLEASE USE A #2 PENCIL**

Background Information

I. PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER TO THE FOLLOWING 2 QUESTIONS IN THE SPACES PROVIDED ON THE LEFT OF THE ANSWER SHEET.

DO NOT MARK YOUR NAME ON ANY OF THE FORMS.

1. **FORM:** Under Name on Answer Sheet 1, please mark the letter L and fill in the matching bubble in that column. Please do not put any other information under Name.

II. PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ON THE RIGHT SIDE OF THE ANSWER SHEET 1 (STAMPED IN RED INK), FOR ITEMS #1-104.

1. What is your sex? Bubble in the number 1 or the number 2 in item 1 on Answer Sheet 1
 - 1=Male
 - 2=Female

2. What is your year at the university?
 - 1=Freshman
 - 2=Sophomore
 - 3=Junior
 - 4=Senior

3. How old are you?
 - 1=18 6=25-29
 - 2=19 7=30-39
 - 3=20 8=40-49
 - 4=21 9=50 or Older
 - 5=22-24

4. What is your racial or ethnic identity?
 - 1=Asian
 - 2=African American (Black)
 - 3=Caucasian (White)
 - 4=Native American (American Indian, Samoan, or Hawaiian)
 - 5=Latin American
 - 6=Other

5. What is your father's highest level of education?

1=less than high school	5=four-year college graduate
2=high school graduate	6=some graduate school
3=some college	7=graduate school
4=two-year college graduate (for example, community college)	

6. What is your mother's highest level of education?

1=less than high school	5=four-year college graduate
2=high school graduate	6=some graduate school
3=some college	7=graduate school

- 4=two-year college graduate (for example, community college)
7. What is your family's yearly income? (Make your best estimate)
- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1=Under \$9,999 | 6=\$50,000 to \$59,999 |
| 2=\$10,000 to \$19,999 | 7=\$60,000 to \$69,999 |
| 3=\$20,000 to \$29,999 | 8=\$70,000 to \$79,999 |
| 4=\$30,000 to \$39,999 | 9=\$80,000 or more |
| 5=\$40,000 to \$49,999 | |
8. What is your parent's current marital status?
- 1=married to each other
 - 2=separated
 - 3=divorced
 - 4=never married to each other
 - 5=one or both parents have died
9. While you were growing up, was there ever any physical violence between your parents (or whoever raised you?)
- 1=No
 - 2=Yes: Father to mother violence
 - 3=Yes: Mother to father violence
 - 4=Yes: mutual violence between father and mother
 - 5=Yes: other
10. How were you disciplined as a child (please bubble in the most severe along this continuum. For example, if both 1 and 2 apply to you, bubble in 2)?
- 1=Verbal, mild (i.e. grounding, time-out, withholding privileges, etc.)
 - 2=Physical, mild (i.e. spanking)
 - 3=Verbal, severe (i.e. insulting, swearing, humiliating, etc.)
 - 4=Physical, severe (i.e. hitting, punching, slapping, beating, etc.)
 - 5=Other

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

- | | Strongly
Disagree | | | Strongly
Agree |
|---|----------------------|---|---|-------------------|
| 11. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE OF QUESTIONS. STAY ON ANSWER SHEET 1 (STAMPED IN RED INK).

	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	
16. There have been times when I have felt like rebelling against people of authority even though I knew they were right.	1	2	3	4
17. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.	1	2	3	4
18. No matter who I am talking to I am always a good listener.	1	2	3	4
19. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I have thought too little of my ability.	1	2	3	4
20. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.	1	2	3	4
21. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.	1	2	3	4
22. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	1	2	3	4
23. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.	1	2	3	4

Please answer these questions in terms of your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

	Agree	Disagree
24. I usually act on the spur of the moment.	1	2
25. My interest shifts quickly from one thing to another.	1	2
26. I enjoy planning work carefully before carrying it out.	1	2
27. I rarely think things out in detail before I act.	1	2
28. I am impulsive about most things.	1	2

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 – 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item and bubble in the appropriate number on your answer sheet. Please be open and honest in your responding.

	Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree	
29. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. The conditions of my life are excellent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I am satisfied with my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

<p>PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE OF QUESTIONS. STAY ON ANSWER SHEET 1 (STAMPED IN RED INK) .</p>

Different things happen to people when they are *drinking alcohol* or as a *result of their alcohol use*. Some of the things are listed below. Please indicate *how many times each has happened to you during the past six months while you were drinking alcohol or as the result of your alcohol use*.

How many times did the following things happen to you while you were drinking alcohol or because of your alcohol use during the past six months?

1=NEVER

2=ONE TO TWO TIMES

3=THREE TO FIVE TIMES

4=SIX TO TEN TIMES

5=MORE THAN TEN TIMES

34. Not able to do your homework or study for a test?	1	2	3	4	5
35. Got into fights, acted bad, or did mean things?	1	2	3	4	5
36. Missed out on other things because you spent too much money on alcohol?	1	2	3	4	5
37. Went to work or school high or drunk?	1	2	3	4	5
38. Caused shame or embarrassment to someone?	1	2	3	4	5
39. Neglected your responsibilities?	1	2	3	4	5
40. Relative avoided you?	1	2	3	4	5
41. Felt that you needed more alcohol than you used to use in order to get the same effect?	1	2	3	4	5
42. Tried to control your drinking by trying to drink only at certain times of the day or certain places?	1	2	3	4	5
43. Had withdrawal symptoms, that is, felt sick because you stopped or cut down on drinking?	1	2	3	4	5
44. Noticed a change in your personality?	1	2	3	4	5
45. Felt you had a problem with alcohol?	1	2	3	4	5
46. Missed a day (or part of a day) of school or work?	1	2	3	4	5
47. Tried to cut down or quit drinking?	1	2	3	4	5
48. Suddenly found yourself in a place that you could not remember getting to?	1	2	3	4	5
49. Passed out or fainted suddenly?	1	2	3	4	5
50. Had a fight, argument or bad feelings with a friend?	1	2	3	4	5
51. Kept drinking when you promised yourself not to?	1	2	3	4	5
52. Felt you were going crazy?	1	2	3	4	5
53. Had a bad time?	1	2	3	4	5
54. Felt physically or psychologically dependent on alcohol?	1	2	3	4	5
55. Was told by a friend or neighbor to stop or cut down drinking?	1	2	3	4	5
56. Drove shortly after having more than 2 drinks?	1	2	3	4	5
57. Drove shortly after having more than 4 drinks?	1	2	3	4	5

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE OF QUESTIONS. STAY ON ANSWER SHEET 1 (STAMPED IN RED INK) .

58. Indicate which of the following applies to you.

1=I am currently in a relationship that has lasted at least one month.

2=I have been in a relationship that has lasted at least one month, but I am not in one now.

Answer the rest of the questions about your most recent relationship (that lasted one month or more).

3=I have never been in a relationship that has lasted at least one month.

If you answered 3, thank you very much for responding to the previous questions. Because the remaining questions refer to dating relationships, we do not need your responses to the remainder of the survey. Please give your surveys to the project coordinator. Thank you very much for participating.

The words “partner” and “your partner” refer to the person in the relationship you will describe on the next questions. Answer every question for your current partner or most recent partner (and always answer about the same person).

59. Are you living with your partner (or were you before the relationship ended)?

1=no

2=yes

60. What is your relationship with your partner (or what was it while you were together)?

1=Dating

2=Engaged

3=Married

61. How long have you been in this relationship (or how long did the most recent relationship last)?

1=Less than one month

2=About 1 month

3=About 2 months

4=Three to five months

5=Six months to eleven months

6=About a year

7=More than a year, but less than 2 years

8=About 2 years

9=More than 2 years, but less than 4 years

10=Four years or more

62. How long ago did this relationship end?

1=It has not ended

2=Less than one month ago

3=About 1 month ago

4=About 2 months ago

5=Three to five months ago

6=Six months to eleven months ago

7=About a year ago

8=More than a year but less than 2 years ago

9=About 2 years ago

10=More than 2 years ago

63. What is (was) your partner's gender?

1=male

2=female

64. Is (was) sex a part of your relationship?

1=no

2=yes

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE OF QUESTIONS. STAY ON ANSWER SHEET 1 (STAMPED IN RED INK).

Most people have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

If you are currently in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more*, answer about that relationship.

If you have been in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more (but are not now)*, answer about the most recent relationship.

1=ALWAYS DISAGREE

2=ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE

3=FREQUENTLY DISAGREE

4=OCCASSIONALLY DISAGREE

5=ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE

6=ALWAYS AGREE

65. Religious matters	1	2	3	4	5	6
66. Demonstrations of affection	1	2	3	4	5	6
67. Sex Relations	1	2	3	4	5	6
68. Making major decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6
69. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	1	2	3	4	5	6
70. Career decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6

Most people have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below how often the following things occur (or occurred).

1=NEVER

2=RARELY

3=OCCASSIONALLY

4=MORE OFTEN THAN NOT

5=MOST OF THE TIME

6=ALL THE TIME

71. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?	1	2	3	4	5	6
72. How often do you regret that you are dating?	1	2	3	4	5	6
73. How often do you and your partner quarrel?	1	2	3	4	5	6
74. How often do you and your partner "get on each other's nerves"?	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Every day	Almost every day	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
75. Do you and your partner engage in outside interests together?	1	2	3	4	5

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE OF QUESTIONS. STAY ON ANSWER SHEET 1 (STAMPED IN RED INK).

How often would you say the following events occur (or occurred) between you and your partner?

1=NEVER

2=LESS THAN TWICE A MONTH

3=ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH

4=ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK

5=ONCE A DAY

6=MORE OFTEN

76. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas?	1	2	3	4	5	6
77. Calmly discuss something	1	2	3	4	5	6
78. Work together on a project	1	2	3	4	5	6

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.

If you are currently in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more*, answer about that relationship.

If you have been in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more* (but are not now), answer about the most recent relationship.

	Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree
79. I know my partner cares for me, even when we disagree	1	2	3	4
80. It drives me crazy when my partner is more than a few minutes late.	1	2	3	4
81. When my partner picks a fight with me, I fight back.	1	2	3	4
82. When my partner won't give in, I get furious.	1	2	3	4
83. I often take what my partner says personally.	1	2	3	4
84. My partner believes I have a short fuse.	1	2	3	4
85. I am responsible when I lose my temper with my partner.	1	2	3	4
86. I can feel my blood rising when I start to get mad at my partner.	1	2	3	4
87. Taking a break from my partner is a good way	1	2	3	4

	for me to calm down.				
88.	When my partner is around, I feel like a bomb waiting to explode.	1	2	3	4
89.	I often use exercise to calm down when I'm angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
90.	I prefer to get out of the way when my partner hassles me.	1	2	3	4
91.	It is my partner's fault when I get mad.	1	2	3	4
		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree
92.	When my partner is nice to me I wonder what my partner wants.	1	2	3	4
93.	No matter how angry I am, I am responsible for my behavior toward my partner.	1	2	3	4
94.	When my partner provokes me, I have a right to fight back.	1	2	3	4
95.	I can feel in my body when I'm starting to get mad at my partner.	1	2	3	4
96.	My partner does things just to annoy me.	1	2	3	4
97.	When my partner criticizes me I remind myself that I am a good person.	1	2	3	4
98.	There is nothing I can do to control my feelings when my partner hassles me.	1	2	3	4
99.	My partner is rude to me unless I insist on respect.	1	2	3	4
100.	When my partner gets angry at me, I think my partner had a bad day.	1	2	3	4
101.	When I feel myself getting angry at my partner, I am able to take steps to calm down.	1	2	3	4
102.	My partner likes to make me mad.	1	2	3	4
103.	When my partner annoys me, I blow up before I even know that I am getting angry.	1	2	3	4
104.	I try not to assume the worst or jump to conclusions when my partner and I disagree.	1	2	3	4

STOP! PLEASE SWITCH TO ANSWER SHEET 2 (STAMPED IN RED INK AT THE TOP OF THE ANSWER SHEET) WHEN ANSWERING THE REST OF THESE QUESTIONS.

		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree
1.	Before I let myself get really mad at my partner I think about what will happen if I lost my temper	1	2	3	4
2.	I recognize when I am beginning to get angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
3.	I am able to remain calm and not get angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
4.	I can usually tell when I am about to lose my temper at my partner.	1	2	3	4
5.	I take time out as a way to control my anger at my partner.	1	2	3	4
6.	I take a deep breath and try to relax when I'm angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| 7. I can set up a time out period during an argument with my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8. It is important for me to act on my feelings of anger at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. When I feel myself getting angry at my partner I try to tell myself to calm down. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. I often think of something pleasant to keep from thinking about my anger at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. I find it impossible to take a deep breath and count to ten when I'm really upset at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. When I'm angry at my partner, I try to handle my feelings so no one gets hurt. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 13. If I keep thinking about what made me mad, I get angrier. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 14. When arguing with my partner, I often raise my voice. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 15. I do something to take my mind off my partner when I'm angry. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 16. I am even tempered with my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 17. When I'm mad at my partner, I say what I think without thinking of the consequences. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 18. As long as I keep my cool, I am able to keep from getting angry at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 19. When my partner's voice is raised, I don't raise mine | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 20. My partner thinks I am very patient. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 21. I can calm myself down when I am upset with my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 22. When I feel myself starting to get angry at my partner, I try to stick to talking about the problem. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

If you are currently in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more*, answer about that relationship.

If you have been in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more (but are not now)*, answer about the most recent relationship.

1=NEVER

2=RARELY

3=OCCASIONALLY

4=FREQUENTLY

5=VERY FREQUENTLY

6=NOT APPLICABLE

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23. I called my partner names. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 24. I swore at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 25. I yelled and screamed at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 26. I treated my partner like an inferior. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 27. I monitored my partner's time and made him/her account for his/her whereabouts. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 28. I used my partner's money or made important financial decisions without talking to my partner about it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE OF QUESTIONS. STAY ON ANSWER SHEET 2 (STAMPED IN RED INK).

1=NEVER

2=RARELY

3=OCCASIONALLY

4=FREQUENTLY

5=VERY FREQUENTLY

6=NOT APPLICABLE

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 29. I was jealous or suspicious of my partner's friends. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 30. I accused my partner of having an affair with another man/woman. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 31. I interfered in my partner's relationships with other family members. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 32. I tried to keep my partner from doing things to help him/herself. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 33. I restricted my partner's use of the telephone. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 34. I told my partner that his/her feelings were irrational or crazy. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 35. I blamed my partner for my problems. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 36. I tried to make my partner feel crazy. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |

RELATIONSHIP BEHAVIORS

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 mark how many times you did each to these 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 that, mark a "8" on your answer sheet for that question. If it never happened, mark an "1" on your answer sheet.

THE REVISED CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE IS AVAILABLE FROM WESTERN PSYCHOLOGICAL PRESS

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY

Appendix B

Participant Informed Consent

Title of the Study: College Student Dating Relationships: A Quantitative Analysis of Male Perpetrators of Physical and Emotional Abuse

Investigators: This is a two-part study, the first part is being conducted by Dr. Sandra Stith, and the second part is being conducted by Kirsten Lundeberg, a candidate for a master's degree in the Marriage and Family Therapy at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Her advisor is Dr. Stith. Ms. Lundeberg can be reached at (703) 538-8470.

I. Study Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the factors that differentiate individuals who are neither physically or emotionally abusive from those who are physically abusive and from those who are emotionally abusive (but not physically abusive). This study will be made available to those undergraduate male and female students at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg whose professors allow a class period to be devoted to the administration of the instrument packet.

II. Procedures

In agreeing to participate in this study, you have given your consent to the researchers named above to allow us to administer a questionnaire related to your dating relationships. The researchers and a research assistant may be present during the class session in order to briefly explain the study and the logistics of participation. The anonymity and confidentiality of the study will be clearly explained, as well as the fact that participation is completely voluntary, so that even after you begin the questionnaire, you may choose to withdraw from participation at any time. Participants will remain in the classroom while the questionnaire is being completed, which should take approximately 45 minutes.

III. Risks

Because of the personal nature of some of the questions, we have included a list of resources in the Blacksburg area, as well as contact information for both investigators, should you have any concerns or questions as a result of your participation in this study.

IV. Benefits of the Project

By participating in this study, you are helping us to develop an instrument to assess individuals' anger management skills. In addition, you are helping us to understand some of the complex issues involved in dating relationships, which may help us when working in a clinical setting with couples involved in dating relationships.

V. Confidentiality

All information that you provide to us through this study is completely anonymous and confidential. We ask that you do NOT put your name or any other identifying

information on the answer forms or the questionnaire. The only people who will have access to your anonymous responses will be the investigators named above, the organization that electronically scores your answer sheets, and a graduate research assistant in Northern Virginia.

VI. Compensation

There will be no monetary compensation or other guarantee of benefits for your participation in this study.

VII. Freedom to Withdraw

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from participation at any time without penalty, and you may choose not to participate at all without any penalty.

VIII. Approval of Research

This research has been approved, as is required, by the Institutional Review Board for projects involving human subjects at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

XI. Participant's Responsibilities

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

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

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Should I have any questions about this research, I will contact:

Dr. Sandra Stith
Principal Investigator/
Research Advisor
(703) 538-8460

Kirsten Lundeberg
Investigator
(703) 538-8470

Dr. H.T. Hurd, Chair,
IRB Research Division
(540) 231-9359

VITA**COLLEEN R. BAKER**

EDUCATION:

Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Falls Church, VA
M.S., Human Development, Spring 2007

Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Blacksburg, VA
B.S., Human Development, Minor in Psychology, May 2004

CLINICAL EXPERIENCE:

Family Therapist Intern *September 2006 - December 2006*
Girls Probation House, Fairfax County Juvenile & Domestic Relations Court
Fairfax, VA

Performed individual, group and family therapy at a residential treatment facility for court-ordered adolescent girls. Wrote monthly status reports for the court system on therapeutic goals and therapeutic progress.

Family Therapist Intern *May 2005 - August 2006*
Center for Family Services, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Falls Church, VA

Performed therapy under AAMFT Approved Supervisors to individuals, couples and families with a variety of presenting problems. Have obtained over 500 client contact hours and over 300 hours of live supervision.

Student Intern *January 2003 - May 2003*
Marriage and Family Therapy Center, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University
Blacksburg, VA

Observed therapy sessions and other center activities under supervision.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:

Student Member

American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy