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IV. Introduction

Overview

There is substantial research on physically abusive relationships. Estimates of physical violence in intimate relationships range as high as 70% (LeJeune & Follette, 1994; Rosenbaum & O’Leary, 1981). Research also suggests that between 33% to 66% of all abusive relationships are mutually violent (LeJeune & Follette, 1994; Lo & Sporakowski, 1989). Additionally, there is a variety of research on risk factors for violent relationships. Risk factors for violent relationships include viewing violence between parents (Tontodonato & Crew, 1992), being a cohabiting couple (Laner, 1990), having poor coping skills (Hockenberry & Billingham, 1993), and having a history of sexual abuse (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988). However, despite the growing literature on physical violence, there are only two studies that assess differences between community women who stay in physically abusive relationships and those who leave physically abusive relationships (Campbell & Soeken, 1999; Lerner & Kennedy, 2000). Campbell and Soeken (1999) found that women who leave abusive relationships are likely to have less stress, have better self-esteem, and have better general health than women who stay in abusive relationships. However, Lerner and Kennedy (2000) found that women who have been out of abusive relationships for less than six months have more stress and difficulties than women who stay in abusive relationships and women who have been out of the abusive relationship for more than six months.

The present study assessed differences in women who were currently in violent relationships and women who have previously been in at least one violent relationship, but were no longer in an abusive dating relationship. The researcher also assessed
differences in women who have been in at least one abusive relationship and women who have never been in a violent relationship. The present study specifically assessed how gender roles, coping strategies, social support, and interpersonal factors (e.g., submissiveness and avoidance of problems) differed between these groups of women.

The present study will be similar to the two previous studies, comparing women who stayed in violent dating relationships to those that left, in that coping skills will also be assessed in this study. It will differ from the two previous studies in that gender roles, social support, interpersonal problems, and co-occurring sexual abuse will also be assessed. This study will also differ from the previous studies because it will assess college women, not community samples or women who typically have to acknowledge the abuse before they get selected for the research study.
Literature Review

Definitions of Abuse

Two-thirds of all the violence committed against women is perpetrated by someone known to the victim such as a friend, family member, intimate partner, or acquaintance (Cardarelli, 1997). Research on nonsexual violence in marriages reports that between 21% and 34% of all women will be abused by their partners at some point in their lifetime. Information about homicide rates in the United States from 1976 to 1987 shows that almost two-thirds of murdered women were killed by their male partners, while approximately 39% of murdered men were killed by their female partners (Monson & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998). Nonsexual abuse consists of physical violence, which is typically defined as the infliction of physical harm on another individual, such as causing bruises, welts, or abrasions. Types of acts typically performed include pushing, slapping, choking, kicking, biting, hitting with a fist, beating up, or using a knife or gun against another person (Brodbelt, 1983; Rich, 2000; Rouse, Breen, & Howell, 1988). Other examples of nonsexual violence include emotional abuse such as threats, monitoring a woman’s activities, belittling comments, discouraging friendships, emotional manipulation, possessiveness, and the exertion of control of one’s partner (Rouse et al., 1988). Emotional abuse is typically conceptualized as the sustained, repetitive, inappropriate emotional response to another individual, such as rejecting, isolating, degrading, terrorizing, and denying emotional responsiveness to the individual (Rich, 2000). Sexual violence includes acts such as forced sexual petting, attempted rape, and rape (Monson & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998).
Frequency of Violence Among Intimates

Physical and/or sexual violence occur in approximately 21 to 45 percent of all dating and marital relationships in the United States (Drieschner & Lange, 1999; Monson & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998). One estimate is that two million women are severely abused by their husbands in the United States each year (Holtzworth-Munroe & Smutzler, 1996). Pregnant women tend to be particularly susceptible to abuse from their partners. The 1995 National Family Violence Survey found that approximately 17% of all pregnant women were victimized by their partners (Monson & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998). Additionally, sexual, physical, and psychological violence typically occur together (Meston, Heiman, & Trapnell, 1999). Research demonstrates that as many as 36% of college students will be victims of physical, sexual, and/or psychological violence while they are dating (Jackson, 1999). Approximately 66% of the college couples in one study reported psychological abuse in their intimate relationships (Mason & Blankenship, 1987). Stith, Jester, and Bird (1992) in a university study reported that 56% of couples suffered only verbal abuse in their intimate relationships. Furthermore, Meston et al. (1999) found that over 70% of women reported that they were subjected to emotional abuse at least once in a dating relationship, and between 25% and 39% reported they were victims of severe emotional abuse. Aizenman and Kelly (1988) found that 22% of college women have been raped by a date or acquaintance and 51% said they have survived an attempted rape.

Rates of physical victimization in dating relationships tend to be approximately the same for males and females. One study found that approximately 37% of men and 33% of women reported that they had inflicted violence on their dating partners and 39%
of men and 32% of women reported sustaining some injury from a dating partner. However, the effects of this physical violence are not equivalent across the sexes. (LeJeune & Follette, 1994). For example, men perpetrate more severe physical, sexual and emotional violence on women (Jackson, 1999). Additionally, approximately 15% of male college students admitted to attempting sexual intercourse with an unwilling female at least once (Drieschner & Lange, 1999; Polaschek, 1997) and data from the 1985 National Family Violence Survey suggested that 12% of men physically abused their wives. These data indicate that approximately 1.8 million women are severely abused each year in the United States (Monson & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998).

Most women who are physically abused in marriage were also physically abused while dating (Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). Billingham and Sack (1986) reported that 32% of the college couples in their study experienced violence in their intimate relationships. Of these couples, over half reported that they perceived the violence as mutual (Billingham & Sack, 1986). Estimates on physical violence in dating relationships range as high as 70% (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Billingham & Sack, 1986; Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985; Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992; Brodbelt, 1983; Gryl, Stith, & Bird, 1991; LeJeune & Follette, 1994; Margolin & Burman, 1993; Rosenbaum, & O’Leary, 1981; Stith et al., 1992; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989; Stets & Straus, 1989; Worth, Matthews, & Coleman, 1990). One study of college students found that 61% of participants reported knowing someone in a violent dating relationship (Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985). Knowing someone in a violent relationship is important because research has shown that this increases one’s chances of being involved in a violent relationship (Tontodonato & Crew, 1992).
Characteristics of Physically Violent Relationships

Mild forms of physical abuse are more common than severe forms of abuse (Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985; Carlson, 1987; Riggs & O’Leary, 1996; Stith et al., 1992; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). The frequency of perpetrating low levels of physical violence in dating relationships is approximately the same for men and women (Bookwala et al., 1992). Mild forms of physical abuse consist of acts such as verbal aggression, slapping, pushing, or grabbing one’s partner. Severe forms of physical violence include choking, beating, raping, and threatening to use or using a weapon against one’s partner (Riggs & O’Leary, 1996). Men and women are almost equally likely to experience mild and moderate violence, but women tend to experience all or most of the severe violence and all types of injuries (Carlson, 1987; Stith et al., 1992). Additionally, even though severe violence occurs in between 1% to 4% of college dating relationships, this still affects a substantial amount of people. An example would be that on the average 10,000 person college campus, 100 to 400 students would be involved in seriously violent relationships (Carlson, 1987). Rich (2000) found that approximately one-fourth of the women in her college sample reported physical violence, and that the majority of the experiences were classified as moderately physically violent. Another study conducted at the same university demonstrated that approximately two-thirds of women who were currently involved in a physically abusive relationship had also been involved in a past abusive dating relationship (Luthra, 2000).

In addition to physical violence, psychological and emotional violence are also concerns in intimate relationships. Most research demonstrates that women are more likely to suffer from physical and psychological violence than men (Rosen & Bezold,
1996; Stets & Straus, 1989), however some research suggests that psychological violence occurs equally in men and women and is often mutual (Hird, 2000). Additionally, more college students are psychologically abused than physically abused (Sharpe & Taylor, 1999), but physical and verbal abuse are positively correlated (Billingham & Sack, 1986; Lo & Sporakowski, 1989; Riggs & O’Leary, 1996). Hird’s (2000) survey found that approximately half of college men and women self-reported that they had experienced emotional abuse in the last year. Women were more likely to report themselves as being victims of psychological and physical aggression than men. In this survey, the most common form of emotional abuse was name-calling, and women were more likely to be victims of name-calling than men (Hird, 2000). Additionally, it has been suggested that emotional abuse can be as traumatic, if not more traumatic, than physical abuse because it can thwart the needs for love, self-esteem, and feelings of belonging (Meston et al., 1999).

Another concern in intimate relationships is sexual violence. Women who are physically abused are more likely to be sexually abused (Billingham & Sack, 1986; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). In general, abusive men are more likely to abuse women both physically and sexually than only physically or sexually (Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). Most sexual violence is perpetrated against women and is perpetrated by a past or present male partner (Cardarelli, 1997). In one college sample of women, it was reported that approximately 96% of the women who were sexually assaulted were victimized by acquaintances. Further, in both adolescence and adulthood, many of the women who were severely physically abused were also rape victims (Rich, 2000).
Generally, violence towards women is socially disapproved of and causes more injury than violence towards men, because women tend to be smaller and easier targets (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Feld & Robinson, 1998). Conversely, when women are violent, their violence is more likely to be viewed as less negative than male violence (LeJeune & Follette, 1994). Mason and Blankenship (1987) gave college men and women various questionnaires to complete about their relationships. Results from these surveys demonstrated that when women are violent, they use psychological abuse against their partners while men tend to use physical violence. Additionally, when a woman hits she usually hits in self-defense or retaliation (Mason & Blankenship, 1987). Increasingly, researchers are studying mutual violence in relationships.

**Mutual Violence**

Research demonstrates that one- to two-thirds of the physical violence and aggression in intimate relationships is mutually perpetrated (Billingham & Sack, 1986; Carlson, 1987; LeJeune & Follette, 1994; Lo & Sporakowski, 1989; Rosen & Bezold, 1996; Stith et al., 1992) and dating couples are slightly more violent than married couples (Rouse et al., 1988). When men and women in dating or marital relationships express approximately the same amount of violence toward each other, women are more likely to be physically and emotionally injured than their male partners. A variety of studies have demonstrated that mutual violence is the most common form of violence, followed by the woman being the sole victim and then the man being the sole victim (Billingham & Sack, 1986; Stets & Straus, 1989; Worth et al., 1990). Reports from men and women, however, suggested that when questioned about abuse, men were more likely to say violence was mutual but women were more likely to say that the man was the sole perpetrator.
(LeJeune & Follette, 1994; Stith et al., 1992; Worth et al., 1990). However, both men and women were more likely to say that their partner’s level of violence was much greater than their own level of violence (LeJeune & Follette, 1994).

Moreover, when men and women agreed that the violence was mutual, they also agreed that men caused more physical harm to women, due to the man’s larger size and strength (Jackson, 1999). Two different literature reviews suggested that violence perpetrated by men is more severe, dangerous, controlling, and frightening for women and, for this reason, men and women downplay violence perpetrated by women since it is less physically damaging (Jackson, 1999; Margolin & Burman, 1993). Statistics suggested that women sustained twice as much injury in violent relationships than did men (Jackson, 1999). Furthermore, Jackson’s (1999) study found that participants viewed male perpetration of violence as more negative and as having the potential to cause more injury than female perpetrated violence.

Although men and women reported using violence in relationships for retaliation, differences occurred in how college couples viewed retaliation (Jackson, 1999; Rosen & Bezold, 1996). College women were more likely to use physical violence when they were emotionally attacked, jealous, retaliating for previous acts of violence by their partners, protecting themselves against current violence (Bookwala et al.; 1992, Jackson, 1999; Stets & Straus, 1989; Stith et al., 1992), feeling helpless, or wanting to physically injure their partners (Stith et al., 1992). College women were more likely to use higher levels of violence, sometimes even lethal violence, to get away from or to stop on-going physical violence (Jackson, 1999). Conversely, men were more likely to be physically violent after
being struck by their partner or when they wanted to control, dominate, or intimidate their partners (Jackson, 1999; Stith et al., 1992).

Effects of Violence on the Victim

Because so many women are involved in violent relationships, it is important to understand the effects that this violence has on them. Women abused by intimate partners suffer from a variety of problems including stress, depression, alcohol abuse, and suicide attempts (Margolin & Burman, 1993; Rosenbaum & O’Leary, 1981). Physical violence causes fear and harms the intimate relationship in which it occurs (Coffey, Leitenberg, Henning, Bennett, & Jankowski, 1996; Margolin & Burman, 1993). Many abused women have emotional difficulties (Carlson, 1987), feel ashamed (Hockenberry & Billingham, 1993), feel powerless, and may no longer recognize warning signs of abuse (Coffey et al., 1996). Some of the psychological problems suffered by abused women include anxiety, paranoia (Mason & Blankenship, 1987), psychosomatic problems (Stith et al., 1992), narcissism (Hockenberry & Billingham, 1993), Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (Arias & Pape, 1999; Coffey et al., 1996), and depression (Arias & Pape, 1999; Coffey et al., 1996; Mason & Blankenship, 1987; Stith et al., 1992). Women generally blame themselves for the violence in their relationships, which is correlated with further violence from their partners or from future partners (Barnett et al., 1996; Coffey et al., 1996).

Coffey et al. (1996) assessed undergraduate women for the presence of physical violence in their intimate relationships after the age of 16. These women were given the Physical Aggression Scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) to assess relationship violence and witnessing violence in the home of origin, the Brief Symptom Inventory (Derogatis & Spencer, 1982) to assess current psychological maladjustment,
the Global Severity Index of the Symptom Checklist (Derogatis & Spencer, 1982) to measure psychological functioning, and the Coping Strategies Inventory (Tobin, Holroyd, & Reynolds, 1984) to assess coping with their violent physical relationships. The researchers demonstrated that women in physically violent relationships were significantly more likely to have poorer psychological adjustment than those individuals who were not in violent relationships (Coffey et al., 1996).

Women who suffered both sexual and nonsexual abuse have more difficulties than those women who are either raped by a stranger or who experience only nonsexual abuse in their intimate relationships (Jackson, 1999). For example, one study demonstrated that women who were sexually violated by their husbands had greater difficulty dealing with the abuse than did women who were sexually violated by dating partners or strangers (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Monson, 1998). These women suffer from greater levels of fear, anxiety, and depression, and they are less likely to enjoy consensual sexual acts with their partner (Monson & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998; Jackson, 1999). Further, women who are victims of both nonsexual and sexual violence in their intimate relationships tend to be more fearful in a variety of circumstances, including simply being home alone, than women who experience only one type of abuse (Jackson, 1998). In one college sample, women who experienced both physical and sexual abuse had lower self-esteem, poorer self-images, and more negative feelings about sexual encounters, marriage, and men in general than women who experienced only physical violence from their intimate partners (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Monson, 1998).
Risk Factors for Physical Violence

It is important to note that there are many risk factors associated with intimate partner violence. Given both the frequency of various forms of violence as well as its aftereffects, identifying risk factors for violence should be a top priority. These risk factors include background factors (e.g. O’Keefe, 1998), characteristics of the relationship (e.g. Stets & Straus, 1989), coping skills (e.g. Gryl et al., 1991), co-occurring sexual abuse (e.g. Aizenman & Kelley, 1988), attitudes and beliefs about violence and the victims of violence (e.g. Jackson, 1998), and the amount of intimacy in the relationship (e.g. Barnett et al., 1996). It is important to consider that these are only risk factors. Risk factor research is correlational, thus causal statements cannot be made from these studies. There are, however, common factors in many violent relationships and these common factors need to be taken into consideration when assessing relationships.

Background Variables

The household in which a person was raised can have a major effect on that individual’s future intimate relationships. For example, a divorce in one’s family of origin is a risk factor for dating violence. Parental divorce has negative effects on the children in the household, especially in relation to future intimate relationships. It is believed that the divorce of one’s parents is related to difficulties with problem-solving skills in intimate relationships and, thus, may lead to the use of physical and verbal violence to solve problems (Billingham & Notebaert, 1993; Tontodonato & Crew, 1992). Further, an individual who experiences violence as a child or views violence between parents is also more likely to be involved in at least one violent relationship as an adult.
(Eisikovits, 1996; Margolin & Burman, 1993; O’Keefe, 1998; Rhodes & McKenzie, 1998; Riggs & O’Leary, 1996; Rosen & Bezold, 1996; Tontodonato & Crew, 1992; Worth et al., 1990). Jackson’s (1998) study of college students demonstrated that those women who witnessed violence in their homes while growing up were more likely to be involved in later violent relationships than women who did not witness violence in their families of origin. Aizenman and Kelley (1988) administered surveys to undergraduate men and women to assess violence in their intimate relationships. The researchers found that when individuals observed violence while growing up they are more likely to accept attitudes of violence, particularly in their intimate dating experiences (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; O’Keefe, 1998). Findings such as the ones reviewed above have often been explained by social learning theory, which indicates that abuse occurs due to learned behaviors, reinforcement, and modeling (Smith & Williams, 1992).

Characteristics of Violent Relationships

Violence among intimates tends to be related to certain relationship variables, however, there is contradictory information about whether cohabiting or marital relationships are more violent (Carlson, 1987; Gryl et al., 1991; Laner, 1990; Mason & Blankenship, 1987; Rhodes & McKenzie, 1998; Stith et al., 1992). For example, generally, as the seriousness of the relationship increases, the general aggression increases (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Worth et al., 1990). In one study, violence tended to occur when high levels of commitment and intimacy were present, when there was a great deal of stress in the relationship, and when a dating relationship was most similar to a marriage (Rouse et al., 1988). Additionally, women are typically more attached to their partners as the relationship progresses and are willing to cope with a lot of difficulties to
keep the relationship intact. Gryl et al. (1991) administered several questionnaires to college men and women, including the violence scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), the Ways of Coping Scale (Folkman, Lazarus, Dunkel-Scetter, Delongis, & Gruen, 1986), the Power Strategies Scale (Falbo & Peplau, 1980) to assess negotiation styles, and the Relationship Dimensions Scale (Braiker & Kelly, 1979) to assess relationship variables such as love, maintenance, conflict, and ambivalence. This study demonstrated that individuals in violent relationships compared to those in non-violent relationships were less likely to want to end the relationship, were more emotionally invested in the relationship, and were more likely to do things to keep the relationship going, including tolerating abuse and using coping mechanisms to deal with the abuse. This study also found that women were likely to negotiate with bargaining and compromise instead of ending the violent relationship. Additionally, violent relationships tended to be characterized by more general conflict than nonviolent relationships (Gryl et al., 1991).

Research has demonstrated that violence varies depending on what type of relationship a couple is in, either dating, cohabiting, or marital. In one university sample, Stets and Straus (1989) found that physical violence was experienced by 35% of cohabiting couples, 20% of dating couples, and 15% of married couples. This same study demonstrated that dating couples had the highest rate of females being the only victim of violence, cohabiting couples had the highest rate of mutual violence, and married couples had the highest rate of males being the only victims (Stets & Straus, 1989). Researchers previously believed that violence increased as the relationship got more serious, however, information about cohabiting couples contradicts this assumption, because more violence
and more severe violence appears to occur with cohabiting couples than either dating or married couples (Carlson, 1987; Rouse et al., 1988; Stets & Straus, 1989). Cohabiting couples experience the greatest risk for violence, the most mutual violence, and the most severe types of violence. Research suggests that violence is more likely to occur in cohabiting relationships because couples who cohabit are more likely to be isolated from their family and friends, have more control issues to argue over (Stets & Straus, 1989), and have less secure relationships. At the same time cohabiting couples often have the same pressures married couples have, such as money concerns, without the security of the marriage license (Carlson, 1987; Rouse et al., 1988; Stets & Straus, 1989).

Some risk factors for violence that are specific for violent dating relationships include jealousy, insecurity, having no legal bind, not having children together, and society’s changing norms for what is acceptable sexual behavior in dating relationships (Carlson, 1987). Additionally, when dating couples are sexually active, physical violence is more likely to occur (Rouse et al., 1988). It should also be noted that there is a positive correlation between violence in an individual’s dating relationship and violence in the subsequent marital relationship. Thus, if violence is present before marriage, violence is likely to continue after the couple is married (Lo & Sporakowski, 1989; Rouse et al., 1988).

There are also risk factors more specific to marriages, such as stress and arguments over children, household chores, money, and how to spend free time (Carlson, 1987; Lo & Sporakowski, 1989; Rouse et al., 1988). Both married and dating couples are likely to argue over sex and possessiveness, which can easily lead to violence (Carlson, 1987; Rouse et al., 1988). The fact that a couple is married may also allow one or both
individuals to believe that they are stuck in the marriage no matter what happens, even if severe violence is present (Rouse et al., 1988). Additionally, the longer the relationship lasts, either married or dating, the more difficult it is to end. Thus, the more likely the couple is to solve problems with violence and to tolerate violence (Carlson, 1987).

Men and Women’s Perceptions of Abuse

Another problem with physical abuse is that men and women tend to view their relationships differently, including the amount and intensity of violence in their relationships. Some couples and individuals do not acknowledge their abusive relationship as violent (Laner, 1990). Particularly, men are less likely to acknowledge violence in their relationship, especially if they are the perpetrators (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Stets & Straus, 1989). Jackson (1998) demonstrated that college men were more likely to blame the victims, excuse perpetrators, and were generally more approving of violence toward women than were college women. Additionally, perceptions and experiences of abuse are not always the same. In one college sample, approximately 40% of the men and women in the study perceived their relationship as abusive when sexual and physical abuse were present (Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). Another study found that wives were less satisfied with their marriages and more likely to view themselves as emotionally and psychologically abused when their husbands perceived less violence in their relationship. However, when wives and husbands perceived approximately the same level of violence in the relationship, regardless of the intensity, wives were more satisfied with their marriages and less likely to view themselves as emotionally or psychologically abused (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Vivian, 1994).
Langhinrichsen-Rohling and Vivian (1994) demonstrated how differently men and women view the violence in their marital relationship. College couples were surveyed to examine whether they would respond alike or differently to a survey about violence in their relationship. The results demonstrated that 32% of the couples in the study disagreed about the violence level that the husband perpetrated on the wife. Of these couples, 65% disagreed because the husband said he perpetrated fewer violent acts than reported by his wife and 35% differed because the wife reported being victimized less than the husband reported perpetrating. Furthermore, 31% of the couples disagreed about the violence the wife perpetrated on the husband. Fifty-seven percent of these couples differed in their responses because the wife said she perpetrated fewer violent acts than her husband reported and the remainder differed because the husband reported being victimized less than his wife acknowledged. Besides disagreeing about whether each spouse committed acts of violence against the other, one-third of the couples also disagreed about the amount and intensity of the violence in their relationship. This research also demonstrated that the more the partners agreed on the abuse, the better overall functioning the couples had in their relationship. For example, if the wife acknowledged a great amount of violence and the husband said there was little or no violence, then the couple had more relationship problems and dissatisfaction than a couple who agreed on the overall use of violence (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Vivian, 1994). While it seems possible that a woman may be more likely to tolerate abuse if she does not label it as such, currently this issue has not been empirically assessed.
Coping Skills

Poor coping strategies for working through conflicts (Coffey et al., 1996; Gryl et al., 1991; Hockenberry & Billingham, 1993; Stith et al., 1992) and a general lack of communication skills (Riggs & O’Leary, 1996) are other risk factors for relationship violence. Individuals with less effective coping skills are more likely to avoid problems, be more accepting of the problem, not react emotionally or minimize their reaction to the problem, deny the problem, and have more arguments in general (Gryl et al., 1991). Abusive couples have more difficulty with problem solving and verbal attacks on each other (Margolin & Burman, 1993). Data suggested that young couples in early dating relationships who have poorer communication with each other and difficulty coping with problems were more likely to use violence and more likely to tolerate violence in their relationship (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988).

Further, violence tends to be used when other methods of coping with problems have failed. Research by Gryl et al. (1991) and Stith et al. (1992) suggested that poor coping mechanisms were more likely to lead to arguments and violence. Couples who were able to use good coping and negotiation techniques were less likely to use violence in their dating relationships. The most effective negotiation techniques are problem-focused strategies where the couple believes that they can actively participate in the change process and improve the current problem in their relationship. The more loving, open, and conflict-free relationships are, the more likely and effectively the couple will be able to use coping and negotiation techniques when problems arise. Other good coping mechanisms are efforts to work through problems, willingness to discuss problems, and having a good social support system. Furthermore, having less general conflict in a
relationship leads to fewer violent encounters because there are fewer disagreements. Additionally, the simple fact that a couple wants the relationship to continue will usually lead couples to be more likely and willing to work through problems (Gryl et al., 1991). Conversely, couples who suffer from moderate abuse tend to use less effective coping strategies, such as poor self-control and avoidance, to deal with problems (Gryl et al., 1991; Stith et al., 1992). It is important to keep in mind, however, that this research is correlational in nature. Thus, it is unclear whether poor coping skills prelude or follow the abuse.

In general, men and women deal with conflict differently. Men have more to gain from avoiding conflicts and, thus, try to avoid conflict as much as possible. However, when men are forced to deal with problems, they tend to use direct negotiation styles such as stating the problem and dealing with it directly, which forces the couple to cooperate to work through the problem. Women would rather discuss problems openly. However, many women have the tendency to use indirect negotiation styles such as crying, hinting at the problem, bargaining, and being passive-aggressive, which are poor communication styles that do not force the couple to cooperate (Gryl et al., 1991). Indirect communication styles and avoiding the problem tend to lead to more violent situations. Without dealing directly with the problem, it lingers and is avoided until one of the partners gets angry about the problem. This anger can easily lead to violence, especially in relationships where the couple has generally poor coping and problem-solving skills.
Sexual Abuse

Women who were sexually abused are likely to be physically abused as well (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988). Because of this correlation between sexual and physical abuse, sexual abuse is a risk factor for physical violence in intimate partner relationships. Additionally, it is very uncommon to have a woman who is only sexually abused in an intimate dating relationship and not physically and/or emotionally abused as well. For example, if a woman denies her partner sexual acts, he may force her physically and sexually to comply with his wishes (Carlson, 1987).

One university study by Luthra (2000) demonstrated that approximately one out of five women have been, or currently are, in abusive dating relationships. About half of the women in this study were in at least one past abusive relationship and about half were currently in abusive relationships. This study found that physically abused women reported a greater number of sexual partners and more past sexual victimization than women who were not physically abused (Luthra, 2000). Additionally, Rich (2000) found a marginally significant relationship between women in severely physically violent dating relationships and the experience of rape. Thus, past victimization is another factor related to current sexual abuse.

Previous violence, whether in romantic relationships or not, is a strong predictor for current or future violence (Bookwala et al., 1992; Stith et al., 1992). Women who were previously sexually victimized are 1.5 - 2 times more likely to be revictimized than women who were not previously sexually victimized (Gidycz, Hanson, & Layman, 1995). Women are particularly vulnerable to sexual abuse when they were abused in earlier relationships, had sex at an early age, and have had many sexual partners
Carlson (1987) demonstrated that many college students who have had one violent relationship are likely to have additional physically violent relationships. Additionally, women with past sexual victimization have difficulties perceiving dangerous situations or the risk factors for violent relationships. These women also do not respond as quickly and they tend to not cope well when they are in abusive relationships (Breitenbecher, 1999).

Attitudes and Beliefs

Another risk factor for dating violence is having attitudes that support violence in intimate partner relationships. One example of attitudes that support violence is believing in traditional sex roles, such as the male being dominant and the female being submissive. It has been theorized that the belief in traditional sex roles allows men to believe they have a legitimate reason to use violence against their partners (Jackson, 1998; Neufeld, McNamara, & Ertl, 1999; Sharpe & Taylor, 1999; Tontodonato & Crew, 1992; Worth et al., 1990). The more traditional sex-role beliefs that a person holds, the more likely that person is to be involved in a violent relationship and this is particularly true for women (Bookwala et al., 1992; Gryl et al., 1991). Additionally, violence is especially common when the relationship consists of a stereotypical man and a nonstereotypical woman (Billingham & Sack, 1986).

Examples of attitudes that lead to the acceptance of intimate partner violence are: believing it is normal to be extremely jealousy, using alcohol excessively, and holding positive attitudes towards violence. These attitudes and beliefs are positively correlated with the occurrence of violence in intimate relationships (Billingham & Sack, 1986; Breitenbecher, 1999; Carlson, 1987; Stith et al., 1992). Additionally, individuals with
accepting attitudes of violence are more likely to commit violent acts (O’Keefe, 1998) and those who experience violence, either as the perpetrator or the victim, have a more positive view towards violence (Bookwala et al., 1992). Conversely, couples who have nonviolent relationships tend to be less approving of violence in relationships than are couples who have violent relationships (Tontodonato & Crew, 1992).

Factors Related to Staying in Abusive Relationships

Many women in abusive relationships do not end the relationship after being abused (Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985; Lo & Sporakowski, 1989; Mason & Blankenship, 1987). Instead of leaving the relationship some women reconcile with their abusers while others begin perpetrating violence against their abuser. Some women stay because they accept the violence as part of their relationship and some women view violence as one way to show love (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Carlson, 1987; Laner, 1990). Others view violence as being helpful to the relationship (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988) and some women indicated that their relationships improved after violent episodes (Carlson, 1987). Other women reported feeling closer to their partner after the abusive event, however, it was undetermined if this feeling of closeness was directly related to the abusive incident or not (Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985). Additionally, over one-third of couples in one study expected their violent dating relationship to last until marriage (Lo & Sporakowski, 1989).

Generally, abused women view themselves as having few options for positive intimate relationships outside of their current abusive relationship. Women may stay in abusive relationships because of psychological dependence on the partner or the
relationship, denial of the abuse (Eisikovits, 1996), or feelings of responsibility for the violence (Barnett et al., 1996; Eisikovits, 1996). Other reasons women stay in violent relationships are because they have invested a great deal emotionally into the relationship (Barnett et al., 1996; Lo & Sporakowski, 1989), have economic concerns (Barnett et al., 1996; Byrne et al., 1999; Rhodes & McKenzie, 1998), or love their partner (Gryl et al., 1991). Additionally, many women stay in abusive relationships out of fear. They may fear losing social status, losing health insurance benefits for themselves and their children, and losing their children due to social services getting involved (Eisikovits, 1996). They may also fear losing the companionship of another person, being alone, and being rejected, especially if they have little or no social support (Barnett et al., 1996; Lo & Sporakowski, 1989; Mason & Blankenship, 1987; Rhodes & McKenzie, 1998).

Additionally, with married couples, there are legal and moral commitments between the two individuals (Stith et al., 1992). Many individuals do not want to deal with “the stigma of divorce” and choose to put up with the abuse instead (Mason & Blankenship, 1987). Additionally, women are socialized to stay with their partners no matter what occurs (Rhodes & McKenzie, 1998). Having children together, especially young children, is another major reason why women tolerate abuse (Carlson, 1987; Eisikovits, 1996; Lo & Sporakowski, 1989; Mason & Blankenship, 1987). For example, it is more difficult to terminate the relationship when children are present because the partners will always be connected through the children, such as during holidays and with visitation. Children also bind parents together through their connection to extended family, such as grandparents and other relatives (Carlson, 1987).
However, there are some circumstances that push women to leave abusive relationships. Arias and Pape (1999) found that women were more likely to leave when the abuse was frequent, severe, and when there was a recent violent episode. Women were also more likely to leave when violence suddenly increased, such as when abuse increased from slapping in one argument to hitting with objects in the next argument (Arias & Pape, 1999). Gortner, Berns, Jacobson, and Gottman (1997) conducted a study with married couples and measured several relationship factors using the Million Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-III (Millon, 1987) which has 22 clinical scales from DSM III-R, the Emotional Abuse Questionnaire (Waltz, Rushe, & Gottman, 1994), and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) which assesses global marital satisfaction, consensus, and affect. This study demonstrated that married women who left violent relationships were more likely to be isolated from friends and family, to experience higher levels of emotional abuse, to be more degraded by their husbands, to have less humor toward their husbands, and to experience less neutral affect than women who stayed in violent relationships. Women who left violent relationships were also more intolerant of abuse, more likely to retaliate against violence, unhappy with their marital relationship, assertive against emotional abuse, and emotionally abusive toward their husbands (Gortner et al., 1997). Additionally, “emotional abuse was … the strongest and most consistent predictor of women leaving” abusive relationships (Gortner et al., 1997, p. 350). Emotional abuse was more likely to predict whether women left violent relationships than physical abuse.

Gortner et al. (1997) theorized that violent relationships are generally unstable and that individuals in violent relationships are likely to leave them at some point. His study found that over one-third of women were separated or divorced within two years of
the start of the study and over half were divorced within five years of the beginning of the study. Additionally, in each case where a couple was separated or divorced, the woman initiated the divorce process and no woman in this study returned to her partner after the separation or divorce (Gortner et al., 1997). The findings from Gortner et al.’s (1997) study supported his contention that women are likely to eventually leave violent relationships.

Comparing Women Who Stay Versus Those Who Leave Violent Relationships

Campbell and Soeken (1999) also addressed issues of staying and leaving violent relationships. They assessed the similarities and differences in a community sample of women who stayed in abusive relationships verses those that left abusive relationships. Participants were assessed on three different occasions, each occasion was six to twelve months apart. However, there was no set time frame that all participants were called back for the next segment of the study. Generally, they found that almost half of the women (48%) were still in abusive relationships at the conclusion of the study (Campbell & Soeken, 1999). The researchers found a number of interesting results.

First, women who stayed in abusive relationships had significantly higher scores on the risk for homicide variable, which assessed one’s risk for being murdered by her partner, at the beginning of the study than participants who were no longer in abusive relationships at the end of the study. Individuals who were no longer in abusive relationships at the second follow-up had the lowest scores on the risk for homicide variable at the beginning of the study than participants who were still in abusive relationships at the second session of the study. The women who were still in their abusive relationship at the second follow-up, but were no longer in the abusive
relationship at the third session were in the middle range of the risk for homicide variable. The authors explained this finding by suggesting that women who stay in abusive relationships are likely to stay out of fear (Campbell & Soeken, 1999).

Additionally, women who were only in an abusive relationship at the beginning of the study were generally in better health than those women who were still in their abusive relationship at the end of the study. This research suggested that physical health worsens as abuse continues, particularly if the woman is being physically abused. The study also found that women who leave abusive relationships are better able to take care of themselves and had less self-reported stress in their lives than women who were in abusive relationships throughout the study (Campbell & Soeken, 1999).

Campbell and Soeken (1999) also had many general findings with self-esteem and depression. All participants had lower scores on self-esteem than what has been established as normal, however, causal statements cannot be made about whether the abuse or the low self-esteem came first. All participants at the first and second sessions were in the mild to moderate range for depression. However, those participants who experienced abuse throughout the study, fell in the clinical range on the Beck Depression Inventory (Beck, 1972). The authors suggested that depression worsens as abuse continues, however, all participants in abusive relationships had some level of depression (Campbell & Soeken, 1999). Thus, the main findings of this study were that women who were in abusive relationships at all three occasions were more depressed, had more stress, poorer health, lower self-esteem, and poorer self-care habits than those participants who were not abused throughout the study.
Lerner and Kennedy (2000) also conducted a study of community women comparing women who stayed and those who left abusive relationships. The researchers separated their participants into five groups: women currently in violent relationships, women out of violent relationships for less than six months, women out of violent relationships for six months to one year, women out of violent relationships for one to three years, and women out of violent relationships for more than three years. The women completed questionnaires and a structured interview with 35 questions. The researchers found that women who had only been out of the abusive relationship for six months or less had the most stress, the most sleeping problems, the greatest level of trauma symptoms, and the most general difficulty than any other group in the study. These women also experienced the greatest temptation to return to their abusive relationship. Women who had been out of their abusive relationship for six months or less also tended to use emotion-focused coping strategies more than any other group, as measured by the Ways of Coping Scale (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985). Generally, this study found that women had the most problems immediately after they left their abusive relationship when compared with women still in abusive relationships and women out of abusive relationships for longer than six months (Lerner & Kennedy, 2000).

Factors related to why some women decided to stay in violent relationships and why others decide to leave are important to the study of violence in intimate partner relationships, however, little research has been conducted on this topic. We know very little about factors that differentiate women who stay verses those who leave violent relationships. Currently there are only two research studies that compare women who stay and those who leave abusive relationships and both of these studies used community
samples of women (Campbell & Soeken, 1999; Lerner & Kennedy, 2000). Campbell and Soeken (1999) defined abusive relationships as “receiv(ed) at least one act of severe violence, two acts of minor physical aggression, or had been forced into sex by her partner in a sexually intimate relationship during the prior year” (Campbell & Soeken, 1999, p. 25). Lerner and Kennedy (2000) defined abusive relationships as “four or more moderate incidents of physical violence (pushing, shoving, slapping, hitting, etc…) or one severe incident of violence (being beat up, or involving a knife or gun) during a 12-month period of the relationship” (Lerner and Kennedy, 2000, p. 219). There are currently no studies that have compared college women who stay and those who leave violent relationships, despite the fact that data suggest that many college students are in abusive relationships and some of these women have had a past history of abusive relationships (Rosen & Bezold, 1996; Worth et al., 1990). The present study will compare women who stay in physically abusive relationships to those who leave those relationships among a sample of college women.

The Present Study

The present study focuses on physical and emotional abuse between intimate dating partners, specifically, the differences between women who have never been in a violent relationship, women who have been in at least one violent relationship but not currently in one, and women who are currently in an abusive relationship. This study will also address risk factors for relationship violence, such as relationship factors, past experiences with violence, coping strategies, co-occurring sexual violence, and background factors.
The study of physical violence in relationships is a relatively new area of investigation. While ample data exist that suggest that many women are abused each year (Drieschner & Lange, 1999; Monson & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1998) and researchers have investigated risk factors and correlates of abuse, limited work has been done to differentiate between women who leave versus those that stay in abusive dating relationships. This is an important area of study since there is little research on the differences and similarities between these two groups.

The goals of the present study are to assess physical violence in the intimate partner relationships of college women. At Ohio University, data suggest that approximately 21% of women have been involved in a physically violent dating relationship and approximately half of these women were in a currently physically violent dating relationship (Luthra, 2000). The present study will assess women in abusive partner relationships and compare them to women who have never been in abusive relationships. This study will also compare women who have left abusive relationships and those who have stayed in abusive relationships.

The present study will benefit the study of intimate partner violence in a variety of ways. First, there are only two previous studies to date that compare women who stay in abusive relationships to women who leave abusive relationships. Thus, new information is needed in this area. Second, most studies only assess physical violence or physical and emotional violence. The present study will also assess the role sexual violence plays in abusive relationships. Third, the present study differs from past studies because it will assess relationship variables, social support, gender roles and attitudes, and interpersonal problems in these groups of women. Fourth, the previous two studies which compared
women who stayed and left abusive relationships (Campbell & Soeken, 1999; Lerner & Kennedy, 2000) used community samples of women who had to acknowledge that they were in abusive relationships. Campbell and Soeken (1999), advertised on bulletin boards and in newspapers for women with “serious problems in an intimate relationship.” Thus, these women had to classify their relationship as abusive to reply to the advertisement. Similarly, Lerner and Kennedy (2000) obtained participants through advertisements asking for abused women. However, they did change their wording on their flyers part of the way through the study to read as “fear and distress in relationships” instead of “violent relationships”. However, the present study recruited a college sample of women who participated through Introductory Psychology courses, not through the advertisements. Thus, the women did not have to consider themselves abused to participate in the study or to be categorized as abused.

**Hypothesis One.** The first hypothesis is that women who stay in a physically abusive dating relationship will experience less violence than women who leave their physically abusive dating relationship. A variety of research supports this hypothesis, including Arias and Pape (1999) who found that women were more likely to leave an abusive relationship when the abuse is frequent and severe. This hypothesis was tested using the dating conflict resolution subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) as the dependent variable.

**Hypothesis Two.** It was hypothesized that women who had been in any physically abusive dating relationship would utilize less effective coping strategies than those women who had never been in physically abusive dating relationships.
Additionally, it was hypothesized that women who stayed in a physically abusive dating relationship would evidence poorer coping strategies than women who left their physically abusive dating relationship. This hypothesis was tested using the Ways of Coping Inventory (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985) as the dependent variable.

This hypothesis is supported by the idea that poor coping strategies were associated with violence in relationships and that violence tends to be used when other methods of coping with problems have failed (Gryl et al., 1991; Stith et al., 1992). Riggs and O’Leary (1996) found that poor coping skills were a risk factor for being in a violent relationship. Additionally, abusive couples have more difficulty with problem solving and verbal attacks on each other (Margolin & Burman, 1993).

**Hypothesis Three.** It was hypothesized that women who stayed in their physically violent dating relationship would have more traditional gender role beliefs than women who left their physically abusive dating relationship and those who have never been in any physically abusive dating relationships. This hypothesis was tested using the Sexual Relationship Scale (Hughes & Snell, 1990) and the Hypergender Ideology Scale (Hamburger, Hoghen, McGowen, & Dawson, 1996) as the dependent variables. This hypothesis is supported by research that found that individuals who hold stereotypic beliefs about gender roles are more likely to be involved in violent relationships (Billingham & Sack, 1986).

**Hypothesis Four.** It was hypothesized that women who had more than one type of violence in an intimate dating relationship (e.g. emotional, physical, sexual) would be less likely to stay in those abusive relationships than women who were only physically abused. This hypothesis was tested using the dating conflict resolution subscale of the
Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) to assess information about physical and verbal abuse and the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982) to assess information about sexual abuse.

Arias and Pape (1999) found that women were more likely to leave their abusive dating relationships when the abuse was frequent, severe, and when there was a recent violent episode. Additionally, abuse tends to be most severe when more than one type of violence is present. Research suggested that women who left violent relationships were more likely to experience higher levels of emotional abuse than women who stayed in violent relationships. Emotional abuse was also a stronger predictor of whether women leave violent relationships than physical abuse (Campbell & Soeken, 1999).

**Hypothesis Five.** It was hypothesized that women who stayed in physically abusive dating relationships would have less social support than those women who left their physically violent dating relationships. Additionally, it was hypothesized that women who had been in any physically violent dating relationship would have less social support than those women who had never been in any physically abusive dating relationships. These hypotheses are supported by research that found having a good social support system is related to having less conflict and violence in intimate relationships (Gryl et al., 1991). These hypotheses were tested using the Social Support Questionnaire-Revised (Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason, 1983) as the dependent variable.

**Hypothesis Six.** It was hypothesized that women who stayed in physically abusive dating relationships would be more likely to be overly-nurturant, unassertive, interpersonally sensitive, and socially-avoidant and less autocratic and hostile than
women who left physically abusive dating relationships and those women who have never been in any physically abusive dating relationship. This hypothesis was tested using the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (Horowitz, Rosenberg, Baer, Ureno et al., 1988) and the Symptoms Checklist-90-Revised (Derogatis, Rickel, & Rock, 1976) as the dependent variables. Gryl et al. (1991) demonstrated that some women are likely to avoid problems to keep their relationships in tact. Sharpe and Taylor (1999) found that women who were more stereotypic, such as being submissive and unassertive, were more likely to be in abusive relationships. A woman with stereotypic behaviors is also more likely to believe that her partner has the right to abuse her (Sharpe & Taylor, 1999), which would lessen her chance of leaving the abusive relationship.

**Hypothesis Seven.** It was hypothesized that women with a history of childhood sexual abuse would be more likely to be in a physically violent dating relationship compared to those women without such a history. Childhood sexual victimization has been associated with having problems in adult interpersonal relationships, particularly dating relationship (Cloitre, 1998). This hypothesis was tested using the Child Sexual Abuse Questionnaire (Finklehor, 1979) and the dating conflict resolution subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) as measures of child sexual abuse and dating violence, respectively.

**Hypothesis Eight.** It was hypothesized that women with a history of physical abuse from at least one parent would be more likely to be in at least one physically violent dating relationship as compared to women with no such history. This hypothesis was tested using the intrafamilial and dating conflict resolution subscales of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) as the dependent variables.
Studies have found that individuals who observed violence in their home while growing up were more likely to have accepting attitudes of violence, particularly in their intimate dating experiences (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; O’Keefe, 1998). Additionally, research has demonstrated that being physically abused by one’s parents as a child is correlated with physical violence in adult dating relationships (Riggs & O’Leary, 1996). Furthermore, research has suggested that children who experience physical violence are likely to normalize the abuse (Smith & Williams, 1992) and, thus, may be more accepting of physical abuse in future dating relationships (O’Keefe, 1998).

V. Methods

Participants

Four-hundred-seventy-eight female undergraduate students from a Midwestern University participated in the study. Participants volunteered through their Introductory Psychology class and received experimental credit points for their participation. A majority of the participants were either 18 or 19 years of age (85.8%), single women who had never been married (99.0%), first year undergraduate students (70.1%), Caucasian (92.7%), and heterosexual (97.7%). Approximately 61% of participants came from families with incomes over $50,000 per year. Approximately 54% of the participants reported dating casually and 34.9% reported being in a long-term, monogamous dating relationship. Demographic data are summarized in Table 1.
Table 1

Demographic Information of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 18</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 19</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 20</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 21</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Over 21</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Single, never married</td>
<td>99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Married</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Separated</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Divorced</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in School</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Freshman</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Sophomore</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Junior</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Senior</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. White, Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. African-American</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Latina</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Other</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Catholic</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Protestant</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Jewish</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. None</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 continued on the following page.
Table 1: continued.

Demographic Information of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. $15,000 or less</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. $15,001 - $25,000</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. $25,001 - $35,000</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. $35,001 - $50,000</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Over $50,000</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dating Status</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. I do not date</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. I date casually</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. I am a monogamous relationship</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. I am engaged</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. I am married</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Heterosexual</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Homosexual</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Bisexual</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

**Demographics Survey.** All participants completed a brief demographic questionnaire consisting of questions assessing the variables of age, race, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic status. (See Appendix A, Section 1).

**Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS).** The CTS (Straus, 1979) is a 72-item scale used to assess intrafamilial and dating conflict resolution strategies. In this study, respondents completed the dating conflict subscale and the intrafamilial subscales of the CTS. Participants recorded their responses on a 7-point scale for frequency of abuse, ranging from A- “Never” to G- “Always”. Each subscale begins with items of less severity such as “Discuss the issue calmly” and progresses to more violent behaviors such as “Kicked, bit or hit with a fist”.

The CTS is supported by factor analyses and internal consistency has been demonstrated (Straus, 1979). Acceptable internal consistency reliability was found for the Violence (.62 to .88) and Verbal Aggression (.77 to .88) scales (Straus, 1979). The present study found internal consistency reliability to range between .89 and .92 for the Verbal Aggression scale and .98 and .99 for the Violence scale. The Reasoning scale (.50 to .76) demonstrated lower reliability. Construct validity was shown to be adequate through a review of studies using the CTS by demonstrating a high correlation between rates of verbal and physical aggression reported on the CTS and reports of verbal and physical violence in individual interviews with women participants (Straus, 1979). (See Appendix A, Section 2).

**Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP).** The IIP (Horowitz et al., 1988) is a measure designed to assess the level of distress associated with interpersonal problems.
The measure is a 127-item self-report scale pertaining to interpersonal functioning. The items fall on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (not at all) to 4 (extremely). The measure has subscales that load onto eight factors measuring various characteristics including: autocratic, competitive, cold, socially avoidant, nonassertive, exploitable, overly-nurturant, and overly-expressive. The present study will only be assessing autocratic, overly-nurturant, nonassertive, and socially avoidant interpersonal styles. The reliability and validity of this measure are very good. The internal consistency of the subscales have scores that range from .72 to .89 in previous research Schedule (Horowitz et al., 1988). The present study had internal consistency of 0.95. The test-retest reliability is between .80 to .90 over a 10-week period. The IIP has demonstrated convergent validity with other similar scales, such as the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (Horowitz et al., 1988). (See Appendix A, Section 3).

**Sexual Experiences Survey.** The SES (Koss & Oros, 1982) is designed to identify victims of sexual assault through a series of 10 sexually explicit questions, in which the respondent assesses past sexual behavior along a variety of dimensions since the age of 14. The respondent simply responds “Yes” or “No” to the items in a self-report format. Items on this measure assess sexual assault experiences by asking about behavioral experiences without using the word rape. The SES is the most frequently used of all similar measures assessing sexually aggressive behavior. The SES has been demonstrated to be valid and reliable. The internal consistency (alpha = .74) for the SES is very good (Koss & Gidycz, 1985). The present study found alpha levels for the SES to range from 0.96 to 0.99. The test-retest reliability of the SES demonstrated a mean item agreement between two administrations of the survey two weeks apart to be 93%. The SES was
shown to have construct validity by correlating the responses on the SES with an interview given months later ($r = .73$, $p < .001$; Koss & Gidycz, 1985). (See Appendix A, Section 4).

**Hypergender Ideology Scale (HGIS).** The HGIS (Hamburger et al., 1996) is a new measure designed to replace the Hyperfemininity Scale (HFS; Murnen & Byrne, 1991) and the Hypermasculinity Inventory (HMI; Mosher & Sirkin, 1984). As an attempt at a combined measure, the HGIS was developed to be suitable for men and women, and thus alleviates the need for two separate scales in assessing extreme, stereotypical gender roles. The measure is a 57-item self-report measure, where responses fall on a 6-point scale ranging from A-”strongly disagree” to F-”strongly agree”. Reliability and validity were supported for this measure. Hamburger et al. (1996) assessed 235 undergraduate students on the HGIS. The internal consistency has been demonstrated to be 0.93 (Hamburger et al., 1996). The present study had internal consistency reliability of 0.88. The HGIS has shown to be correlated with the Hyperfemininity Scale for women ($r(125) = .53$, $p<.001$) and with the Hypermasculinity Inventory for men ($r(106) = .54$, $p<.001$) (Hamburger et al., 1996). (See Appendix A, Section 5).

**Ways of Coping Inventory (Revised).** The Ways of Coping Inventory-Revised (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985) is the most widely used measure of basic coping responses. The Ways of Coping Inventory-Revised is a 66-item measure where each item is rated by the participant on a 4-point scale ranging from “not used” to “used a great deal”. This measure consists of a range of thoughts and acts that individuals use to cope with stressful situations. The subscales of the Ways of Coping are problem-focused coping,
wishful thinking, detachment, seeking social support, focusing on the positive, self-blame, tension reduction, and keeping to oneself. A factor analysis was conducted on the Ways of Coping Inventory to obtain these eight factors. The current study will only assess problem-focused coping, seeking social support, wishful thinking, and self-blame. The Ways of Coping Inventory has good internal consistency, with alphas ranging from 0.61 to 0.79 (Folkman, Lazarus, Dunkel-Schetter, DeLongis, & Gruen, 1986). The present study had internal consistency of 0.90. (See Appendix A, Section 6).

Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R). The SCL-90 (Derogatis et al., 1976) is a self-report measure designed to assess the current global adjustment of the participants. It has subscales assessing somatization, obsessive-compulsive behavior, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoia, and psychoticism. Ninety items are rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 0 (“not at all”) to 4 (“extremely”). In addition to these subscales, there is the Global Severity Index (GSI), which is an overall measure of psychological distress. The GSI reflects the number of symptoms and the intensity of perceived distress across all 90 items and can potentially ranges from 0 to 4. The present study will use the interpersonal sensitivity and hostility subscales.

The SCL-90-R has acceptable reliability and validity. Internal consistency of the subscales range from .77 for the psychotic dimension to .90 for depression; however, symptom subscales are highly correlated (Tennen, Affleck, & Herzberger, 1985). Internal consistency reliability for the present study was 0.75 on the hostility subscale and 0.87 on the interpersonal sensitivity subscale. Test-retest reliability for the SCL-90-R was demonstrated to range from 0.78 to 0.90 between two administrations of the survey one
week apart (Derogatis et al., 1976). There is substantial evidence for the SCL-90’s concurrent, predictive, and construct validity since it has been utilized in numerous studies of psychological symptomatology with clinical and nonclinical populations (Tennen et al., 1985). (See Appendix A, Section 7).

Social Support Questionnaire-Revised. The Social Support Questionnaire-Revised (Sarason et al., 1983) is a six-item instrument designed to measures two dimensions of social support, availability of social support and satisfaction with a social support network. Individuals indicated their responses on a six-point scale, ranging from “very dissatisfied” to “very satisfied”. Validity and reliability are demonstrated to be adequate. College students rated their satisfaction with social support and indicated whom they could turn to when they needed social support. Test-retest reliability over a four-week period was between .83 and .90. Factor analyses demonstrated that each factor loaded highly on either satisfaction or number of social supports (Sarason et al., 1983). Internal consistency reliability for both scales was above 0.85 when tested with 2,537 psychiatric patients and 423 healthy controls (Furnukawa, Harai, Hirai, & Kitamura, 1999). Concurrent validity was demonstrated to be adequate in a study of 40 undergraduate students with significant correlations found between the SSQ-R and the Inventory Schedule for Social Support (Henderson, Byrne, & Duncan-Jones, 1981). (See Appendix A, Section 8).

The Sexual Relationship Scale (SRS). The Sexual Relationship Scale (Hughes & Snell, 1990) is a 54-item instrument that uses a 5-point scale to measure communal and exchange approaches to sexual relationships. Communal relationships are ones where each person in the relationship gives emotionally to the other out of concern for that
person’s welfare, without the anticipation of being reciprocated. Exchange relationships refer to relationships where one person gives emotionally and the other person gives only because there is an emotional debt that must be repaid (Clark & Mills, 1979). Research has shown this scale to have good internal consistency reliability for females ranging between 0.67 to 0.79 (Hughes & Snell, 1990). However, the internal consistency reliability for the present study was 0.59. Factor analyses also support the existence of the two separate subscales (Hughes & Snell, 1990). (See Appendix A, Section 9).

The Child Sexual Victimization Questionnaire (CSVQ). The CSVQ (Finkelhor, 1979) is an 18-item self-report measure used to assess sexual victimization before the age of 14. Women answer "yes" or "no" to questions asking whether they had any sexual experiences during childhood. These items increase in severity ranging from "Another person showing his/her sex organs to you" to "Another person had intercourse with you". The participants are also asked in follow-up questions about the age of the other person involved and whether coercion was utilized. (See Appendix A, Section 10).

Procedure

Experimental sessions were held in classrooms in the Department of Psychology and participants were run in groups no larger than 30. A trained female graduate student in the Department of Psychology at Ohio University served as the experimenter. Participants completed the following questionnaires in the order written here: a demographics questionnaire, the Hypergender Ideology Scale, the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems, the Ways of Coping Inventory-Revised, the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised, the Sexual Relationship Scale, the Child Sexual Victimization Questionnaire,
the Intrafamilial subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale, the Dating subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale, the Sexual Experiences Survey, and the Social Support Questionnaire-Revised. Participants were also given consent forms to sign prior to completing their surveys (See Appendix B, Section 1) and debriefing forms at the conclusion of the experimental session (See Appendix C, Section 1). This study compared three groups of women including women with no history of dating violent, those currently involved in a violent relationship, and those who indicated that they had experienced a past violent relationship but were not currently involved in a violent relationship. Women were recruited from the subject pool of introduction psychology undergraduate students until approximately 70 women agreed to participate in each group. A power analysis for a medium effect size was used to determine that a minimum sample of 70 women in the currently abused group and 70 women in the previously abused group were needed for this study. Participants received two experimental credits for their participation.

After all data was collected chi-square and multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) analyses were ran on the data. Five one-way MANOVA analyses were performed on this data and all divided participants into three groups for data analyses. The three groups consisted of those women who have never been in a physically abusive dating relationship, those who have been in at least one physically abusive dating relationship but were not currently in a physically abusive dating relationship, and those currently in a physically abusive dating relationship. These groups were determined by the participants’ answers to behavioral questions on the dating conflict resolution subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) about acts of physical aggression in
their intimate dating relationships since the age of 14. For a woman to be placed in the physically abused category, she had to make at least one positive response acknowledging physical abuse on questions ranging from “He/She threw or smashed or hit or kicked something” to “He/She used a knife or gun against me”. Participants answered separately about past and current dating relationships.

The dependent variables in the first MANOVA were the seeking social support, problem-focused coping, wishful thinking, and self-blame subscales of the Ways of Coping scale (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985), to analyze coping strategies. The second MANOVA was performed to assess differences in social support. This analysis utilized the availability of social support and satisfaction with a social support network subscales on the Social Support Questionnaire-Revised (Sarason, Levine, Basham, & Sarason, 1983). The dependent variables for the third MANOVA were the autocratic, overly-nurturant, non-assertive, and socially-avoidant subscales of the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (Horowitz, Rosenberg, Baer, Ureno et al., 1988), to assess differences in interpersonal factors. The dependent variables for the fourth MANOVA were the interpersonal sensitivity and hostility subscales of the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (Derogatis, Rickel, & Rock, 1976), also to assess differences in interpersonal factors. The dependent variables for the fifth MANOVA were the communal and exchange subscales of the Sexual Relationship Scale (Hughes & Snell, 1990), to analyze gender roles beliefs. Scheffe’s post-hoc tests were conducted on all MANOVAs.

Additionally, a one-way ANOVA was performed on the data to analyze gender roles beliefs. This ANOVA utilized the same three groups for physical abuse as the
MANOVAs, with the dependent variable being the overall score on the Hypergender Ideology Scale (Hamburger, Hogben, McGowen, & Dawson, 1996).

Five chi-square analyses were also conducted on these data. The first chi-square compared the level of violence experienced by women who stayed in their physically violent dating relationship to the level of violence experienced by those women who had left their physically violent dating relationship was performed. These groups were determined by the participants’ answers to behavioral questions on the dating conflict resolution subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), as in the MANOVA analyses. Participants were classified as staying in a physically abusive dating relationship if they were currently in that abusive relationship and as having left a physically abusive dating relationship if they had a past, but not a current, physically abusive dating relationship. Level of violence was also determined by answers on the dating conflict resolution subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979). There were nine behavioral questions that placed a woman in the physically abused category. The first three, “He/She threw or smashed or hit or kicked something”, “He/She threw something at me”, and “He/She pushed, grabbed, or shoved me”, were considered to be mild physical abuse. The second three, “He/She slapped me”, “He/She kicked, bit, or hit me with a fist”, and “He/She hit or tried to hit me with something”, were considered to be moderate physical abuse. The last three, “He/She beat me up”, “He/She threatened me with a knife or gun”, and “He/She used a knife or gun against me”, were considered to be severe physical abuse.

The second chi-square analysis compared those women who had multiple abuse experiences in their relationship(s) to those women who had only experienced physical
abuse in their relationship(s). The women were divided into four groups for this analysis, staying/physical only abuse, leaving/physical only abuse, staying/multiple abuse experiences, and leaving/multiple abuse experiences. Women were classified as experiencing physically abusive dating relationships using the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), as with the previous analysis. Women were also classified into verbally abusive relationships using questions on the Conflict Tactics Scale. Participants who answered positively to at least one act of violence ranging from “He/She sulked or refused to talk about the problem” to “He/She threatened to hit or throw something at me” on the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), were considered to be in a verbally abusive dating relationship. Participants answering positively to questions on the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982), such as forced or coerced sexual petting, kissing, fondling, attempted intercourse, or intercourse, were considered to be in a sexually abusive dating relationship.

A third chi-square analysis investigated the relationship between past history of sexual abuse and involvement in any physically violent dating relationship was performed. These groups were determined by their positive responses on the Child Sexual Victimization Questionnaire (Finkelhor, 1979) to questions ranging from viewing someone else’s sex organs to being fondled or fondling another person to attempted intercourse to intercourse with another person, all before the age of 14. Additionally, the sexual encounters had to occur against the individual’s will or with someone at least five years older than the individual to be considered childhood sexual abuse.

The last two chi-squares separately explored the relationship between past physical abuse perpetrated by the father or mother and current involvement in a
physically violent dating relationship. These groups were determined by the participant’s positive responses to behavioral questions on the intrafamilial subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) ranging from “My father/My mother threw or smashed or hit or kicked something” to “My father/My mother used a knife or gun against me”. Participants were asked about each parent separately.

VI. Results

Frequency of Sexual Abuse

The Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979) indicated that 29.5% of the participants in the present study reported physical violence in at least one past dating relationship. Approximately 14% of the women in the study reported physical violence in their current dating relationship, which indicated that 9.4% had experienced physical violence in only their current relationship and 5% had experienced physical violence in their current and at least one past dating relationship. Of the sixty-nine women who were currently involved in a physically violent dating relationship, 36 involved mild physical abuse (52.2%), 28 involved moderate abuse (40.6%), and 5 involved severe abuse (7.2%). Responses to the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979) indicated that 14.9% of the participants had experienced physical violence only in a past dating relationship. Overall, there were 95 women who had at least one past physically violent dating relationship. Of the women who had experienced violence in a past dating relationship, 50 involved mild physical abuse (52.6%), 35 involved moderate abuse (36.8%), and 10 involved severe abuse (10.5%).
Although, 29.3% of the total sample reported physical violence in at least one intimate dating relationship, when asked directly about physical abuse in their dating relationships, only 49 participants (10.2%) acknowledged being in at least one past abusive relationship, of these, 46 reported being in only one past abusive relationship. Thus, only 49 participants admitted to physical violence in their dating experiences when asked directly, which represents 35% of those who indicated at least one act of physical violence in their dating relationships on the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979). Additionally, only two participants from the entire sample (0.40%) admitted to currently being in a physically abusive dating relationship; however, the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979) indicated that 69 of the participants (14.4%) from the entire sample were currently in a physically abusive dating relationship.

When directly queried about physical violence, only 9% of the entire sample acknowledged ending a past dating relationship because of physical violence used against them by their partners. When asked about the number of relationships that they had ended due to physical abuse, 49 participants (10.2%) answered that they had ended between 1-3 relationships because of physical abuse. Of those participants who answered that they had ended a past relationship due to physical abuse, 95% (N = 47) responded that they had ended only one past abusive relationship because of physical violence. One person admitted to ending two relationships and another admitted to ending three. Thus, many participants did not acknowledge their physically violent dating relationship as abusive. Physical abuse data are summarized in Table 2.

Results from the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982), which had participants acknowledge behaviorally specific items without having to label the acts as
Table 2

Abuse Statistics for Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Abuse*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No physical abuse in any dating relationship</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence in at least one dating relationship</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence in current dating relationship only</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence in current and past dating relationship</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence in at least one past dating relationship</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Abuse**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse in a current dating relationship</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse in a past dating relationship</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse in at least one dating relationship</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse in current dating relationship</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse in at least one past dating relationship</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse in at least one dating relationship</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
*Statistics taken from the violence subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979).
** Statistics taken from the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982).
*** Statistics taken from the verbal aggression subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979).
sexual violence, indicated that 19.1% of participants were currently in a sexually abusive dating relationship and 35.3% were in a past relationship that was sexually abusive. Overall, 44.6% (N = 213) had at least one incident of sexual abuse in an intimate dating relationship. However, when specifically asked about sexual violence only, 15.3% participants (N = 73) acknowledged being in a relationship, either current or past, after the age of fourteen where their partner forced sexual behaviors, such as kissing, petting, or intercourse. Only four participants acknowledged being in a relationship that was currently sexually abusive. Thus, a number of participants did not conceptualize their experiences as sexually abusive. These data are summarized in Table 2.

Verbal abuse was also assessed in the present study. Approximately 54% of the participants indicated verbal abuse in their current dating relationship and 64.4% reported verbal abuse in at least one past dating relationship on the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979). Overall, 83.7% of the entire sample indicated verbal abuse in at least one dating relationship, either current, past, or both. These data are summarized in Table 2.

Many of the participants experienced more than one type of abuse in their dating relationships. Specifically, 70.5% of the entire sample reported at least one incident of physical, sexual, or verbal aggression in a past dating relationship. Of all of the women who had a past dating relationship (96%), only two of the participants experienced only physical abuse in their past abusive dating relationship. Twenty-eight percent of the participants experienced only verbal abuse and 5.9% experienced only sexual abuse in a past abusive dating relationship. Approximately 7% of the participants experienced combined physical and verbal abuse, 16.9% experienced combined sexual and verbal abuse in a past dating relationship, however, no one reported experiencing only combined
physical and sexual abuse in a past dating relationship. Approximately 13% of the participants experienced all three types of abuse in at least one past dating relationship.

When asked about current dating relationships, 73.8% (N = 352) indicated that they had a current partner and approximately 76% of the participants who had a current dating partner reported experiencing at least one incident of physical, verbal, and/or sexual aggression in their current dating relationship. Of those women in a current dating relationship, only one participant experienced only physical abuse. Approximately 30% of the participants experienced only verbal abuse and 2.3% of the participants experienced only sexual abuse in their current dating relationship. One participant experienced combined physical and sexual abuse in their current dating relationship, 7.5% experienced combined physical and verbal abuse in their current dating relationship, and 10.0% experienced combined sexual and verbal abuse in their current dating relationship. Thirty-one of the participants experienced combined physical, sexual, and verbal abuse in their current dating relationship. These data are summarized in Tables 3 and 4.

Participants also answered questions about childhood physical and sexual victimization. Approximately 45% of the participants indicated that they had experienced at least one incident of physical abuse from their fathers and 45.4% of the participants experienced at least one incident of physical abuse from their mothers. Overall, 38.5% of the participants experienced no physical abuse from either parent, 12.8% of the participants experienced at least one incident of physical abuse from their fathers, 13.6% of the participants experienced at least one incident of physical abuse from their mothers, and 31.8% of the participants experienced at least one incident of physical abuse from
Table 3

Percentage of Participants Experiencing Various Combinations of Abuse in Past Dating Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No past abuse in any dating relationship</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one incident of abuse in a past dating relationship*</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>%**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Only physical abuse</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only verbal abuse</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only sexual abuse</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and verbal abuse</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and verbal abuse</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical, sexual, and verbal abuse</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**

*Statistics on physical abuse taken from the violence subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), statistics on sexual abuse taken from the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982), statistics on verbal abuse taken from the verbal aggression subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979).

**Percentages are based on the total sample.**
Table 4

Percentage of Participants Experiencing Various Combinations of Abuse in Current Dating Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No current abuse in their current dating relationship</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one incident of abuse in their current relationship*</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only physical abuse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only verbal abuse</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only sexual abuse</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and verbal abuse</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and verbal abuse</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical, sexual, and verbal abuse</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.
*Statistics on physical abuse taken from the violence subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), statistics on sexual abuse taken from the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982), statistics on verbal abuse taken from the verbal aggression subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979).

**Percentages are based on the total sample.
both parents. Of the women who were physically abused by their fathers, 82 (40.4%) experienced mild physical abuse, 110 (54.2%) experienced moderate physical abuse, and 11 (5.4%) experienced severe physical abuse. Of the women who were physically abused by their mothers, 32 (15.5%) experienced mild physical abuse, 165 (80.0%) experienced moderate physical abuse, and 9 (4.4%) experienced severe physical abuse.

Approximately seven percent of the participants reported at least one incident of child sexual abuse. In all of these sexual encounters, the abuse occurred before the age of 14 and the perpetrator was at least five years older than the victim. All of these sexual encounters occurred in non-dating relationships, such as with friends of the family, parents, or other relatives. These data are summarized in Table 5.

An Analysis of Levels of Physical Violence

The first hypothesis stated that women who stayed in physically abusive dating relationships would experience less violence than women who left their physically abusive dating relationship. A chi-square was performed to analyze whether there was a relationship between level of physical abuse experienced and whether the woman stayed or left their abusive dating relationship. Results indicated no significant differences between level of violence and staying or leaving their physically violent dating relationship, $\chi^2 (2, N = 140) = 0.43, p > 0.05$. These data are summarized in Table 6.

An Analysis of Coping Strategies

The second hypothesis predicted that women who stayed in their physically abusive dating relationship would utilize less effective coping strategies than women who left their physically abusive dating relationship. Additionally, it was hypothesized that
### Table 5

**Frequency of Childhood Physical and Sexual Abuse**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childhood Sexual Abuse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants with at least one incident of childhood sexual abuse</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual encounters with boyfriends or girlfriends</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual encounters with other individuals</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childhood Physical Abuse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants with at least one incident of childhood physical abuse</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants physically abused by mother</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants physically abused by father</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants physically abused by both parents</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.**

* Statistics taken from The Child Sexual Victimization Questionnaire (Finkelhor, 1979).
**Statistics taken from the Intrafamilial subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979).
Table 6

Chi-Square Analyses of Level of Dating Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Current Dating Violence</th>
<th>Past Dating Violence</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: LEVEL = Level of Violence in their dating relationship.
women who have been in any physically abusive dating relationship would utilize less effective coping strategies than women who had never been in a physically violent dating relationship. The dependent variables for this analysis were the social support seeking, problem-focused coping, wishful thinking, and self-blame subscales of the Ways of Coping measure (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985). The overall MANOVA was significant with Wilk’s Lamda, F (8, 926) = 2.72, p < 0.01. Univariate tests revealed that problem-focused coping, F (2, 466) = 5.01, p < 0.01, wishful thinking, F (2, 466) = 3.62, p < 0.03, and self-blame, F (2, 466) = 7.88, p < 0.01, were significantly different for the three groups.

Scheffe’s post-hoc tests indicated three significant results, two of which were in the predicted direction, between women who had been in physically violent dating relationships and women who had never been in any physically violent dating relationship. Participants who were in a current physically abusive dating relationship (M = 26.46, SD = 5.2) utilized more problem-focused coping strategies than those participants who experienced no physical violence (M = 24.49, SD = 5.95) in any dating relationship. This result is opposite of the predicted direction, since problem-focused coping is conceptualized as an effective coping skill. Those women with only past physically abusive relationships (M = 14.72, SD = 3.99) utilized more wishful thinking to solve problems than women with no physical violence (M = 13.32, SD = 4.1) in any of their dating relationships. Women with only past physically violent relationships (M = 8.18, SD = 2.5) utilized more self-blame than women who had never been in a physically abusive relationship (M = 6.98, SD = 2.6). Thus, women in past physically violent dating relationships generally used less effective coping strategies to deal with conflicts in their
relationships than did women who had never been in a physically violent dating relationship. These data are summarized in Table 7.

**An Analysis of Traditional Gender Roles**

The third hypothesis stated that women who stayed in physically violent dating relationships would have more traditional gender role beliefs than women who left physically abusive dating relationships and women who have never been in a physically violent dating relationship. The overall ANOVA for the overall score on the Hypergender Ideology Scale was significant with Wilk’s Lamda, $F (2, 476) = 3.99, p < 0.02$. Scheffe’s post-hoc tests indicated that two results were significant in the predicted direction. Women who stayed in their physically violent dating relationship ($M = 123.10, SD = 23.97$) held more stereotypical gender role beliefs than did women who left ($M = 111.86, SD = 25.47$) their physically abusive relationship. Additionally, women who stayed in their physically violent dating relationship ($M = 123.10, SD = 23.97$) held more stereotypical gender role beliefs than women who have never been in a physically abusive dating relationship ($M = 115.21, SD = 24.79$). The overall MANOVA for the Sexual Relationship Scale was not significant with Wilk’s Lamda, $F (2, 470) = 1.30, p > 0.05$. However, the null finding on the Sexual Relationship Scale could be due to the low internal consistency reliability (0.59) found in the present sample. These data are summarized in Table 8.

**An Analysis of Multiply Victimized Women**

The fourth hypothesis stated that women who have more than one type of violence in their intimate dating relationships (e.g. emotional, physical, and/or sexual) are
Table 7

MANOVA Results for Four of the Subscales of the Ways of Coping (WOC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No Dating Violence</th>
<th>Current Dating Violence</th>
<th>Past Dating Violence</th>
<th>Univ</th>
<th>Mult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOC</td>
<td>2.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROB</td>
<td>24.49</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>26.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLAME</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>18.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations for the subscales of the WOC (Folkman & Lazarus, 1985): PROB = Problem-focused coping; WISH = Wishful thinking; BLAME = Self-Blame; SOC = Seeking social support.

* p < 0.05  ** p < 0.01
Table 8

MANOVA Results for the Hypergender Ideology Scale (HGIS) and Subscales of the Sexual Relationship Scale (SRS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No Dating Violence</th>
<th>STAYED</th>
<th>LEFT</th>
<th>Univ</th>
<th>Mult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>24.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXC</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>12.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGIS</td>
<td>115.21</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>123.10</td>
<td>23.97</td>
<td>111.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: COM = Communal subscale; EXC = Exchange subscale; STAYED = Stayed in a physically abusive dating relationship; LEFT = Left their physically abusive dating relationship.

*p < 0.05   **p < 0.01
less likely to stay in those abusive dating relationships than women who are only physically abused. A chi-square was attempted to analyze this hypothesis, however, it was unable to be utilized because there were so few participants ($N = 3$) experiencing only physical abuse in their violent dating relationships.

**An Analysis of Social Support**

The fifth hypothesis stated that women who stayed in their physically violent dating relationships would have less social support than those women who left. Additionally, women who have been in any physically violent dating relationship would have less social support than those women who have never been in physically abusive dating relationships. The overall MANOVA was a not significant with Wilks’ Lamda, $F(4, 898) = 2.20, p > 0.05$. These data are summarized in Table 9.

**An Analysis of Interpersonal Variables**

The sixth hypothesis predicted that women who stayed in physically abusive dating relationships would be more likely to be overly-nurturant, unassertive, interpersonally sensitive, and socially-avoidant and less autocratic and hostile than women who left abusive dating relationships and those women who have never been in any physically abusive dating relationship. The overall MANOVA for the subscales of the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems was not significant with Wilk’s Lamda, $F(8, 938) = 1.46, p > 0.05$.

The overall MANOVA for the subscales of the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised was significant with Wilk’s Lamda, $F(6, 940) = 4.42, p < 0.01$. Univariate tests revealed that the hostility, $F(2, 472) = 8.41, p < 0.01$, and interpersonal sensitivity, $F(2, 472) =$
Table 9

MANOVA Results for the Two Subscales of the Social Support Questionnaire (SSQ)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No Dating Violence</th>
<th>Current Dating Violence</th>
<th>Past Dating Violence</th>
<th>Univ</th>
<th>Mult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSQ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVAIL</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATISF</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: SATISF = Satisfaction with general social support; AVAIL = Availability of Social Support Network.

*p < 0.05  **p < 0.01
3.76, p< 0.03, subscale scores on the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised were significantly
different between the three groups. Scheffe’s post-hoc tests indicated three significant
results, one of which was in the predicted direction. Women who stayed in their
physically violent dating relationship (M = 2.04, SD = 0.75) were more interpersonally
sensitive than women who had never been in a physically abusive dating relationship (M
= 1.80, SD = 0.72). This result was in the predicted direction. Results also indicated that
women who stayed in their physically violent dating relationship (M = 1.71, SD = 0.63)
were more hostile than women who had never been in a physically abusive dating
relationship (M = 1.45, SD = 0.46) and women who had left (M = 1.48, SD = 0.62) their
physically abusive dating relationship. These results for hostility were in the opposite
direction from what the hypothesis predicted because those women who stayed in their
physically violent dating relationship were shown to be more hostile than the other
groups assessed. These data are summarized on Table 10.

An Analysis of the Relationship between Childhood Sexual Abuse and Involvement in a
Physically Violent Dating Relationship

The seventh hypothesis stated that women with a history of childhood sexual
abuse were more likely to be in physically violent dating relationships. A chi-square test
was performed on these data. Results indicated that there was no significant relationship
between childhood sexual victimization and subsequent physical violence in intimate
dating relationships, χ²(1, N = 474) = 0.68, p > 0.05. These data are summarized on
Table 11.
Table 10

**MANOVA Results of the Subscales of the Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP) and the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No Dating Violence</th>
<th>Current Dating Violence</th>
<th>Past Dating Violence</th>
<th>Univ</th>
<th>Mult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIP</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURT</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSERT</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOID</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCL-90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSIT</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSTIL</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations for subscales: AUTO = Autocratic; NURT = Overly-Nurturant; ASSERT = Non-Assertive; AVOID = Socially-Avoidant; SENSIT = Interpersonally Sensitive; HOSTIL = Hostility.

*p < 0.05   **p < 0.01
Table 11

Chi-Square Analyses of the Association Between Childhood Abuse and Dating Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No Dating Violence</th>
<th>Dating Violence</th>
<th>χ2</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHILDSEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not abused</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abused</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOMABUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not abused</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abused</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DADABUSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not abused</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abused</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations: LEVEL = Level of Violence in their dating relationship; CHILDSEX = Childhood Sexual Abuse; MOMABUSE = Physical abuse from mom; DADABUSE = Physical abuse from dad.

*p < 0.05    **p < 0.01
An Analysis of the Relationship between Childhood Physical Abuse and Involvement in a Physically Violent Dating Relationship

The final hypothesis stated that women with a history of physical abuse from at least one parent would be more likely to have been in at least one physically abusive dating relationship. One chi-square was performed on these data to assess the relationship between physical abuse from one’s father and being in a physically violent dating relationship in adulthood. The analysis indicated a marginally significant result for the relationship between physical abuse from one’s father and the experience of dating violence, $\chi^2 (1, N = 463) = 3.67, p = 0.055$. Approximately 33% of those women who experienced physical abuse from their fathers had been in at least one physically violent dating relationship in adulthood, compared to 25% of women who never experienced any physical abuse from their fathers. A second chi-square was performed on these data to assess the relationship between physical abuse from one’s mother and being in a physically violent dating relationship. This analysis indicated a significant result for the relationship between physical abuse from one’s mother and the experience of dating violence, $\chi^2 (1, N = 462) = 5.92, p < 0.02$. Approximately 34% of women who experienced physical abuse from their mothers had been in at least one physically violent dating relationship in adulthood, as compared to 24% of women who were never physically abused by their mothers. These data are summarized in Table 11.
VII. Discussion

The purpose of this study was to assess differences between women who stayed in physically violent dating relationships and those women who left physically violent dating relationships. The present study also assessed the differences between women who have never been in a physically violent dating relationship and women who have had at least one physically violent dating relationship.

In this study, abuse measures indicated that 56% (N = 269) of the women sampled, who were in current dating relationships, experienced at least one incident of abuse, either physical, verbal, or sexual, in their current dating relationship. Of the entire sample, 14% (N = 69) experienced at least one incident of physical abuse, 54% (N = 256) experienced at least one incident of verbal abuse, 19% (N = 91) experienced at least one incident of sexual abuse, and 24% (N = 116) experienced multiple abuse in their current dating relationship. The present study also indicated that of those women who had at least one past dating relationship, 71% (N = 337) experienced at least one incident of abuse in a past dating relationship. Approximately fifteen percent (N = 71) of the entire sample experienced at least one incident of physical violence, 65% (N = 308) experienced at least one incident of verbal abuse, 35% (N = 169) experienced at least one incident of sexual abuse, and 36% (N = 173) experienced multiple abuse experiences in a past dating relationship. These findings are comparable to other studies with college students that have found between 12% (Coffey et al., 1996) and 31% (Brodbelt, 1983) of college women reported being in at least one physically abusive dating relationship. Additionally, these findings are comparable to one study that found over 70% of women reported
experiencing emotional abuse at least once in a dating relationship, suggesting that verbal abuse often co-occurs in violent dating relationships (Meston et al., 1999).

However, the majority of women that were involved in abusive relationships did not perceive them as such. The physical violence measure indicated that 69 women from the entire sample were currently in physically abusive dating relationships, however, when asked directly about whether they were in a violent relationship only two participants acknowledged this to be true. Of the 71 individuals from the entire sample who indicted having a past physically violent dating relationship on the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), only 49 acknowledged this to be true when asked directly. Thus, only 2.9% of those women currently in physically abusive dating relationships and 69% of those in a past physically violent dating relationship acknowledged the physical violence when asked directly. Furthermore, when directly queried, only four women acknowledged being in a current sexually abusive dating relationship, however, responses on the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982) indicated that 91 women were currently being sexually abused. When asked directly about past dating relationships, 73 women acknowledged having a past dating relationship where sexual abuse was present, while responses on the sexual abuse measure indicated that 169 women had been in previous dating relationships where sexual abuse was present. Thus, when asked directly, only 4.4% of women in a current sexually violent dating relationship and 43.2% of women in a past sexually abusive dating relationship acknowledged this to be true. These findings are consistent with a previous investigation with a college sample that found only 40% of individuals in their study perceived their violent dating relationship as abusive (Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). Currently, it remains uncertain whether these
women were unwilling to acknowledge their relationships as abusive or unable to perceive their relationships as abusive.

Another interesting aspect of this discrepancy is that the women were less likely to acknowledge abuse occurring in their current dating relationship compared to their past relationships when abuse was present. Specifically, less than 5% of women involved in currently abusive dating relationships acknowledged the abuse. This discrepancy may be due to the fact that women who are currently being abused are more likely to deny the abuse than women who were abused in previous relationships. However, denying the abuse may cause these women to stay in their violent relationships longer because they do not acknowledge that the abuse is present (Eisikovits, 1996).

Of the 95 women in the present study who had at least one past physically violent dating relationship, 53% experienced mild physical abuse, 37% experienced moderate physical abuse, and 11% experienced severe physical abuse. Of the sixty-nine women who were currently involved in a physically violent dating relationship, 52% experienced mild physical abuse, 41% experienced moderate physical abuse, and 7% experienced severe physical abuse. These findings support past research suggesting that low levels of violence are more typical in physically violent dating relationships than more severe levels of violence (Bookwala et al., 1992; Riggs & O’Leary, 1996). However, lower levels of violence have been shown to predict more severe violence later in the dating relationship (Bookwala et al., 1992). Results from the present study indicated no relationship between the level of physical violence experienced by those women who stayed and those who left physically abusive dating relationships. However, this finding contradicts previous research that has suggested women are more likely to remain in
relationships when severe violence is present (Rhodes & McKenzie, 1998). One reason for the failure to detect a relationship between level of violence and staying or leaving physically violent dating relationships might be due to the fact that the present sample assessed college women. College women are likely to have been in their dating relationships for shorter periods of time as compared to clinical or community samples of abused women and typically shorter periods of time than married women. Additionally, mild physical violence is more common in college women than severe physical violence (Stith et al., 1992), thus too few women experienced severe violence in their dating relationships to detect a relationship between the level of abuse and whether women remained in the relationship. Further, it might be speculated that college women may also be more resilient than women in the general population or possibly that more resilient women may choose to attend college.

There were also no differences found in the present study in coping strategies utilized between those women who stayed and those who left physically violent dating relationships. This was an unexpected finding, however, it might be explained by the fact that there are likely to be minimal differences in coping strategies utilized in relationship conflicts between those women who have been in any physically violent dating relationship. This finding could indicate that both groups of abused women utilized less effective coping strategies than women in nonviolent dating relationships. Differences were, in fact, obtained in coping strategies utilized by women who had been in a physically abusive dating relationship compared to those women who never experienced such a relationship.
Specifically, the results indicated that women in past physically abusive dating relationships utilized more wishful thinking and self-blame, which are less effective coping strategies, than women who had never experienced a physically abusive dating relationship. These findings are congruent with past research demonstrating that women in abusive dating relationships utilized poor coping strategies, such as self-blame, more often than women in non-abusive dating relationships (Barnett et al., 1996; Coffey et al., 1996; Rhodes & McKenzie, 1998). It is important to note such findings because they suggest that women in abusive dating relationships have more problems than women in nonviolent dating relationships, as evidenced by the utilization of less effective coping strategies to deal with their problems. Additionally, utilizing less effective coping strategies could possibly lead to increased violence (Gryl et al., 1991; Stith et al., 1992). These findings should be viewed with caution, however, because women who were in current physically violent dating relationships utilized more problem-focused coping strategies, which are typically effective coping strategies, than those women who had never been in a violent dating relationship. From this information it may be speculated that women in any physically violent dating relationship may use more general coping strategies than women in nonviolent dating relationships, however further research is needed in this area.

Findings from the present study also support past research in the area of traditional gender-role beliefs. Results from the present study indicated that women who stayed in physically violent dating relationships held more stereotypical gender-role beliefs than women who left and women who never experienced such relationships. Past research has demonstrated that women who hold stereotypical gender-role beliefs are
likely to experience violence early in their intimate dating relationships, stay in those abusive dating relationships longer (Bookwala et al., 1992), and be generally more accepting of violence than women who do not hold such beliefs (Jackson, 1999). The implications of these findings are that women who hold traditional gender-role beliefs are at a greater risk for experiencing violence in their dating relationships than women who do not hold such beliefs.

A variety of interpersonal variables were also assessed in the present study. Results indicated that women who stayed in physically abusive dating relationships were more hostile than women who left their physically abusive relationship and those women who never experienced such relationships. This finding was not expected because it was in the opposite direction from what was predicted, however previous research has demonstrated that abused women utilized violent behaviors and were more aggressive more often than women who were in nonviolent dating relationships (Barnett et al., 1996). Additional research has demonstrated that more aggressive individuals tend to be involved in violent dating relationships (Riggs & O’Leary, 1996) and that general aggression in a violent dating relationship tends to increase as the relationship progresses (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Worth et al., 1990). One problem with the finding that women who stayed in physically abusive dating relationships were more hostile than the other two groups of women was that we were unable to distinguish if these women were more hostile to begin with or if the violence in their dating relationships caused them to be more hostile than the other groups of women in the present study. Prospective analyses are needed to further explore the relationship between hostility and involvement with a violent relationship.
Additional results on interpersonal variables demonstrated that women who stayed in physically abusive dating relationships were more interpersonally sensitive than those women who had never been in any physically violent dating relationship. This indicates that women who stayed in abusive dating relationships had feelings of inadequacy and inferiority. They also had little self-confidence and believed that others perceived them negatively. This issue of poor self-esteem, may be one reason why these women chose to stay in their abusive dating relationships. They also may not have believed that they were worth being treated any better (Campbell & Soeken, 1999).

However, there were no significant differences between any group of participants on measures of nurturing, unassertive, socially-avoidant, or autocratic behavior, even though previous research has suggested that these behaviors are correlated with physically violent dating relationships. The present study may not have been able to detect any differences between the groups for these variables due to the assessment of a college student population. For example, most college students do not tend to be socially-avoidant, even though this variable has been correlated with having less dating competence (LeSure-Lester, 2001) and being in abusive dating relationships (Feerick & Haugaard, 1999). Thus, the variables of nurturing, unassertiveness, socially-avoidant behavior, and autocratic behavior may not be good predictors of a college woman’s chance of experiencing a physically violent dating relationship, even though these variables are typical risk factors. However, more research in this area needs to be conducted with a college population.

Additionally, the present study found that 38% of women had experienced multiple forms of abuse in past dating relationships and 33% of women had experienced
multiple forms of abuse in current dating relationships. However, differences were not able to be examined between women who experienced multiple forms of abuse in their dating relationships and women who experienced only physical abuse in their dating relationships because there were too few participants that experienced only physical dating violence. However, previous research has demonstrated that women who experience multiple types of abuse in their dating relationships are more likely to leave those relationships than women who experience only physical violence (Arias & Pape, 1999). Previous research by Lo and Sporakowski (1989) support the findings of the present study. Lo and Sporakowski (1989) found that none of the participants in their study experienced only physical dating violence, even though almost 70% of their sample experienced some form of violence in an intimate dating relationship. Finding so few women who experience only physical violence in dating relationships suggests that multiple forms of abuse are present in most violent dating relationships. This finding is important because women who experience abuse in their dating relationships are likely to be coping with many different types of abuse concurrently. Furthermore, women who experience more than one type of abuse tend to have more difficulties coping with the abuse than women who experience only one type of abuse (Jackson, 1999).

There were also no differences between the three groups of women in availability of or satisfaction with social support. The current results for social support did not support previous research findings which suggested that having a good social support system was related to having less conflict and violence in intimate relationships (Gryl et al., 1991). Past research also indicated that women in abusive dating relationships tended to lack social support or perceive themselves as having fewer options for social support
than women in non-abusive dating relationships (Barnett et al., 1996). However, since the present study assessed college women, this population is generally more likely to have social support readily available to them (Dwyer & Cummings, 2001) and they are more likely to utilize their social support system when they are distressed (Brown, 2000). Additionally, a majority of the women in this study rated their satisfaction with their social support network to be “very satisfied” or “fairly satisfied,” which were the two most positive choices available. Thus, it would be difficult to detect differences in satisfaction with social support when most individuals were highly satisfied with their social support networks.

Analyses on childhood sexual abuse in the present study also indicated no relationship between childhood sexual abuse and experiencing subsequent adult physical violence in a dating relationship. However, this result is not supported by previous research. Breitenbecher (1999) found that women with a history of past sexual victimization had difficulties perceiving dangerous situations, they did not recognize risk factors that were present in others, and they did not respond as quickly when they were in violent relationships. These difficulties in perception are factors that could lead to these women experiencing future violent dating relationships. A significant relationship may not have been able to be detected in this sample because so few women experienced childhood sexual abuse. Additionally, since violent dating relationships are relatively common on college campuses, it may be difficult to detect correlates, such as a history of childhood sexual abuse, that are common risk factors for experiencing physical violence in the general population.
However, analyses on childhood physical abuse indicated that there was a significant relationship between experiencing physical abuse from one’s mother and experiencing physical violence in a subsequent dating relationship. There was also a marginally significant relationship between experiencing physical abuse from one’s father and experiencing physical violence in a future dating relationship. These findings are consistent with previous research that has demonstrated that childhood physical violence from parents is correlated with physical violence in adult dating relationships (Riggs & O’Leary, 1996). Previous research has also demonstrated that experiencing childhood physical abuse is related to being more accepting of physical abuse in future dating relationships (O’Keefe, 1998), normalizing the abuse as a common coping strategy and as normal behavior in relationships, and possibly justifying later dating violence (Smith & Williams, 1992). It is important to be cognizant of the relationship between childhood physical violence and subsequent adult physical violence because women abused in childhood may need to be educated in ways to protect themselves from experiencing additional abuses in adulthood.

One of the major implications of this research is that it is the first to assess differences in college women who stay and those who leave physically violent dating relationships. Research has been conducted in the past to assess differences in the general population of women on variables that may correlate with staying and leaving physically violent dating relationships (Campbell & Soeken, 1999; Lerner & Kennedy, 2000), however, no one has assessed college women separately. Some of the variables assessed in the present study, such as social support, unassertiveness, and level of violence, which are common risk factors for experiencing physically violent dating relationships, did not
demonstrate any between group differences in the present study. Perhaps, different variables may be important when assessing college students. Further research needs to be conducted to assess whether these variables, and other risk factors for experiencing physically violent dating relationships in the general population, are risk factors for college women also. Additionally, it might be interesting to assess similarities and differences between college women and women from the general population who experience physically violent dating relationships.

VIII. Summary

The purpose of the present study was to assess differences between women who stayed in physically abusive dating relationships and women who left physically abusive dating relationships. The major findings from this research suggested that women who stay in physically violent dating relationships tended to hold more stereotypical gender-role beliefs and were more hostile than women who left their physically abusive dating relationships.

The present study also assessed differences between women who have been in at least one physically violent dating relationship and women who have never had a physically violent dating relationship. Results indicated that women in past physically abusive dating relationships utilized poorer coping strategies than women who have never been in a physically abusive dating relationship.

Analyses on childhood abuse found that there was no relationship between childhood sexual abuse and being in an adult physically violent dating relationship in the present study. However, there was a relationship between women who were physically
abused by their mothers and the experience of physical abuse in a future dating relationship. There was also a marginally significant relationship between the experience of physical abuse from one’s fathers and subsequent dating violence.

Analyses of differences between women who experience multiple forms of abuse and only physical abuse in dating relationships were unable to be conducted in this study because too few women experienced only physical violence in their dating relationships. This is important to note because this finding demonstrates that most women who experience physical violence in their dating relationships are likely to also experience sexual and/or verbal abuse as well.

All of these findings are important for the areas of prevention and education. The present study was able to demonstrate correlates of physical violence for college women. Women need to be aware that factors in their lives, such as past physical abuse as a child or holding stereotypical gender role beliefs, may put them at a greater risk for experiencing physically violent dating relationships. Additionally, women should know that experiencing a physically violent dating relationship may also put them at risk for being sexually or verbally abused as well, since the present study found so few women to be only physically abused. Being educated about the risk factors for experiencing a physically violent dating relationship can help women be more cognizant of their risks and help them take steps to not be involved in abusive dating relationships or to leave mildly abusive dating relationships before the abuse escalates.
IX. Limitations of the Present Study and Directions for the Future

There are a few limitations of the present study that need to be addressed. The first limitation is that this study utilized self-report measures to collect data. This is a problem because self-report measures are only able to obtain information that the participant is willing to acknowledge. However, some of the forms used, such as the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979), asked questions about specific behaviors and incidents in the dating relationship and not whether abuse occurred in the relationship. This format allowed the women to indicate abuse in their dating relationships without having to label the acts or the relationship as abusive.

A second limitation with the present study is that a convenience sample of college students was utilized. Using a college sample limits the generalizability of the results of this project to the college population (Jackson, 1999). Additionally, the present study was limited to college students in psychology courses who chose to volunteer for this project to receive course credit for their participation. However, using a college population was also a benefit for this area of research because none of the previous studies investigating correlates of staying and leaving violent dating relationships have focused on college women.

A third limitation for the present study is that it was retrospective in design. The major difficulty in using retrospective designs is that participants are forced to recall events that have happened years earlier, which may cause them to forget certain events or parts of events or to recall the events incorrectly. Thus, the present study may not encompass the full extent to which physically, verbally, and sexually violent dating relationships affect the college population.
One area for future research might be to assess physical violence in homosexual and bisexual dating relationships, since only approximately 2% of the present study consisted of homosexual and bisexual women. None of the homosexual women indicated any physical violence on the abuse measures, however, five of the nine bisexual women indicated experiencing physical abuse in at least one intimate dating relationship. It might be interesting to assess how violence is a part of these intimate relationships.

Since violence in a previous dating relationship has been demonstrated to be a good predictor for violence in subsequent dating relationships (Bookwala et al., 1992), it is important to educate women on how to lessen their risk for experiencing violence in a future dating relationship. Information obtained from correlational studies, like the present study, could be utilized to educate women about risk factors for experiencing physical violence in future dating relationships, such as utilizing ineffective coping strategies and holding traditional gender-role beliefs. This type of prevention programming is already being conducted in the area of sexual assault revictimization (Breitenbecher, & Gidycz, 1998; Cloitre, 1998) and the format could easily be adapted for domestic violence issues. Finally, prospective investigations of violence within college students’ relationships would be useful to better understand the correlates of violence among intimates.
X. References


Appendix A, Section 1a

Demographics Questionnaire

1. What is your age? (Choose one)
   A. 18
   B. 19
   C. 20
   D. 21
   E. Over 21

2. What is your marital status? (Choose one)
   A. Single, never married
   B. Married
   C. Separated
   D. Divorced

3. What class are you in? (Choose one)
   A. Freshman
   B. Sophomore
   C. Junior
   D. Senior
   E. Graduate student

4. What is your race or ethnic background? (Choose one)
   A. White, Non-Hispanic
   B. Black
   C. Hispanic
   D. Asian or Pacific Islander
   E. American Indian or Alaska Native

5. In what religion were you raised? (Choose one)
   A. Catholic
   B. Protestant
   C. Jewish
   D. Other
   E. None
6. What is your best guess of your family’s income last year? (Choose one)  
   A. $15,000 or less  
   B. $15,001 - $25,000  
   C. $25,001 - $35,000  
   D. $35,001 - $50,000  
   E. Over $50,000  

7. What is your current dating status? (Choose one)  
   A. I do not date.  
   B. I date casually.  
   C. I am involved in a long-term monogamous relationship (6 months or more)  
   D. I am engaged  
   E. I am married  

8. What best describes your sexual orientation? (Choose one)  
   A. Heterosexual  
   B. Homosexual  
   C. Bisexual
Appendix A, Section 1b

Demographics Questionnaire

TO BE GIVEN AFTER ALL OTHER QUESTIONNAIRES HAVE BEEN FILLED OUT

1. How many different exclusive/almost exclusive relationships have you been in since the age of 14? ____________________

2. How many of these relationships involved your partner in using physical force (eg. Hitting, slapping, pushing etc…) against you? __________________

3. How many of these relationships involved your partner in using force in sexual behaviors (eg. Forced kissing, petting, sexual intercourse etc…)?

4. Are you currently in a relationship where your partner uses physical force (eg. Hitting, slapping, pushing etc…) against you? YES  NO

5. Are you currently in a relationship where your partner uses force in sexual behaviors (eg. Forced kissing, petting, sexual intercourse etc…)? YES  NO

6a. Have you ever ended a relationship because your partner used physical force (eg. Hitting, slapping, pushing etc…) against you? YES  NO

6b. How many relationships have you ended because your partner used physical force (eg. Hitting, slapping, pushing etc…) against you? ____________________
Appendix A, Section 2a
Conflict Tactics Scale—Dating Subscale

1. Are you currently in an exclusive/almost exclusive dating relationship?  
   YES   NO

   ****If you answered “NO” to Question 1, skip the rest of this questionnaire*****

2. How long has this exclusive/almost exclusive relationship been going on? 
   ____________

3. Is the person you are exclusively/almost exclusively involved with a man or woman? 
   MAN   WOMAN

4. How often do you see the person you are exclusively/almost exclusively involved with: 
   A. Everyday  
   B. 2-6 times per week  
   C. Approximately once a week  
   D. Approximately once every two weeks  
   E. Approximately once every three weeks  
   F. Approximately once a month  
   G. Approximately once every two months  
   H. Approximately once every three months  
   I. Approximately once every six months  
   J. Approximately once a year  
   K. Other ________________

5. Are you sexually intimate with the person you are exclusively/almost exclusively involved with?  
   YES   NO

6. Do you currently live with the person you are exclusively/almost exclusively involved with?  
   YES   NO
No matter how well people get along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have spats or fights because they’re in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They may also use different ways of trying to settle their differences. Listed below are some things that one or more of the people you dated or been intimately involved with might have done when you had a dispute. Try and remember what went on when you had a disagreement. Please fill in the appropriate circle on your scantron to show approximately how often the person you are CURRENTLY dating did these things to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Almost Never</td>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>About half of the time</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Almost all the time</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. He/She discussed the issue calmly.
2. He/She got information to back up his side of things.
3. He/She brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things.
4. He/She insulted or swore at me.
5. He/She sulked or refused to talk about it.
6. He/She stomped out of the room or house.
7. He/She cried.
8. He/She did or said something to spite me.
9. He/She threatened to hit or throw something at me.
10. He/She threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.
11. He/She threw something at me.
12. He/She pushed, grabbed, or shoved me.
13. He/She slapped me.
14. He/She kicked, bit, or hit me with a fist.
15. He/She hit or tried to hit me with something.
16. He/She beat me up.
17. He/She threatened me with a knife or gun.

18. He/She used a knife or gun against me.

Please fill in the appropriate circle on your scantron sheet to show how often YOU did these things to the people you are CURRENTLY DATING.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td>About half of the time</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Almost all</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. I discussed the issue calmly.

20. I got information to back up my side of things.

21. I brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things.

22. I insulted or swore at him.

23. I sulked or refused to talk about it.

24. I stomped out of the room or house.

25. I cried.

26. I did or said something to spite him.

27. I threatened to hit or throw something at him.

28. I threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.

29. I threw something at him.

30. I pushed, grabbed, or shoved him.

31. I slapped him.

32. I kicked, bit, or hit him with a fist.

33. I hit or tried to hit me with something.

34. I beat him up.
35. I threatened him with a knife or gun.

36. I used a knife or gun against him.
Appendix A, Section 2b
Conflict Tactics Scale—Dating Subscale

I want you to think about past relationships that you have had, EXCLUDING YOUR CURRENT RELATIONSHIP.

1. Since the age of 14, have you been in any exclusive, almost exclusive dating relationship? YES NO

****If you answered “NO” to Question 1, skip the rest of this questionnaire*****

No matter how well people get along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have spats or fights because they’re in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They may also use different ways of trying to settle their differences. Listed below are some things that one or more of the people you dated might have done when you had a dispute. Try and remember what went on when you had a disagreement.

Please fill in the appropriate circle on your scantron to show approximately how often a person/people you dated FROM THE AGE OF 14 ON (EXCLUDING YOUR CURRENT RELATIONSHIP) did these things to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Some of</td>
<td>About half</td>
<td>Most of</td>
<td>Almost all</td>
<td>Always</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>of the time</td>
<td>of the time</td>
<td>of the time</td>
<td>of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. He/She discussed the issue calmly.

2. He/She got information to back up his side of things.

3. He/She brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things.

4. He/She insulted or swore at me.

5. He/She sulked or refused to talk about it.

6. He/She stomped out of the room or house.

7. He/She cried.
8. He/She did or said something to spite me.

10. He/She threatened to hit or throw something at me.

10. He/She threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.

11. He/She threw something at me.

12. He/She pushed, grabbed, or shoved me.

13. He/She slapped me.

14. He/She kicked, bit, or hit me with a fist.

15. He/She hit or tried to hit me with something.

16. He/She beat me up.

17. He/She threatened me with a knife or gun.

18. He/She used a knife or gun against me.
Please fill in the appropriate circle on your scantron sheet to show how often YOU did these things to one or more of the people you dated FROM THE AGE OF 14 ON (EXCLUDING YOUR CURRENT RELATIONSHIP).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Almost</td>
<td>Some of</td>
<td>About half</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Almost all</td>
<td>Always the time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. I discussed the issue calmly.

20. I got information to back up my side of things.

21. I brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things.

22. I insulted or swore at him.

23. I sulked or refused to talk about it.

24. I stomped out of the room or house.

25. I cried.

26. I did or said something to spite him.

2. I threatened to hit or throw something at him.

28. I threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.

29. I threw something at him.

30. I pushed, grabbed, or shoved him.

31. I slapped him.

32. I kicked, bit, or hit him with a fist.

33. I hit or tried to hit me with something.

34. I beat him up.

35. I threatened him with a knife or gun.

36. I used a knife or gun against him.
Appendix A, Section 2c
Conflict Tactics Scale—Intrafamily subscale

DIRECTIONS: No matter how well parents and their children get along, there are
times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the
other person does, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or
tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle
their differences. Listed below are some things that your parents might have done
when they had a dispute with you. Try and remember what went on when your
parents had a disagreement with you.

Please fill in the appropriate circle on your scan-tron sheet to show approximately
how often your FATHER/STEP-FATHER did these things to you.

A Never  
B Almost Never  
C Some of the time  
D About half of the time  
E Most of the time  
F Almost all of the time  
G Always

81. My father discussed the issue calmly.  
82. My father got information to back up his side of things.  
83. My father brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things  
84. My father insulted or swore at me.  
85. My father sulked or refused to talk about it.  
86. My father stomped out of the room or house.  
87. My father cried.  
88. My father did or said something to spite me.  
89. My father threatened to hit or something at me.  
90. My father threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.  
91. My father threw something at me.  
92. My father pushed, grabbed, or shoved me.  
93. My father slapped me.  
94. My father kicked, bit, or hit me with a fist.  
95. My father hit or tried to hit me with something.  
96. My father beat me up.  
97. My father threatened me with a knife or gun.  
98. My father used a knife or gun against me.
DIRECTIONS: No matter how well parents and their children get along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences. Listed below are some things that your parents might have done when they had a dispute with you. Try and remember what went on when your parents had a disagreement with you.

Please fill in the appropriate circle on your scan-tron sheet to show approximately how often your MOTHER/STEP-MOTHER did these things to you.

A Never
B Almost Never
C Some of the time
D About half of the time
E Most of the time
F Almost all of the time
G Always

99. My mother discussed the issue calmly.
100. My mother got information to back up her side of things.
101. My mother brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things.
102. My mother insulted or swore at me.
103. My mother sulked or refused to talk about it.
104. My mother stomped out of the room or house.
105. My mother cried.
106. My mother did or said something to spite me.
107. My mother threatened to hit or throw something at me.
108. My mother threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.
109. My mother threw something at me.
110. My mother pushed, grabbed, or shoved me.
111. My mother slapped me.
112. My mother kicked, bit, or hit me with a fist.
113. My mother hit or tried to hit me with something.
114. My mother beat me up.
115. My mother threatened me with a knife or gun.
116. My mother used a knife or gun against me.
Appendix A, Section 3

Inventory of Interpersonal Problems

Here is a list of problems that people report in relating to other people. Please read the list below, and for each item, consider whether that problem has been a problem for you with respect to any significant person in your life. Then select the number that describes how distressing that problem has been, and circle that number.

For example:

How much have you been distressed by this problem?

It is hard for me to: Not at all A little bit Moderately Quite a bit Extremely
0 1 2 3 4

00. Get along with my relatives.

It is hard for me to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little bit</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. trust other people
2. say “no” to other people
3. join in on groups
4. keep things private from other people
5. let other people know what I want
6. tell a person to stop bothering me
7. introduce myself to new people
8. confront people with problems that come up
9. be assertive with another person
11. let people know when I’m angry
12. Make a long term commitment to another person
12. be another person’s boss
13. be aggressive towards others when the situation calls for it
14. Socialize with other people
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. show affection to other people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. get along with other people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. understand another’s point of view</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. express my feelings to other people directly</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. be firm when I need to be.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Experience a feeling of love for another person</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. set limits on other people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. be supportive of another person’s goals in life</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. feel close to other people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. really care about another person’s problems</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. argue with another person</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. spend time alone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. give a gift to another person</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. let myself feel angry at somebody I really like</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. put someone else’s needs before my own</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. stay out of other people’s business</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. take instructions from people who have authority over me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. feel good about another person’s happiness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. ask other people to get together socially with me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. feel angry at other people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. open up and tell my feelings to another person</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. forgive another person after I’ve been angry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. attend to my own welfare when someone else is needy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. be assertive without worrying about hurting another person’s feelings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. be self-confident when I am with other people</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are things you do too much
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. I fight with other people too much</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41. I feel too responsible for solving other people’s problems 0 1 2 3 4
42. I am too easily persuaded by other people 0 1 2 3 4
43. I open up to people too much 0 1 2 3 4
44. I am too dependent 0 1 2 3 4
45. I am too aggressive toward other people 0 1 2 3 4
46. I try to please other people too much 0 1 2 3 4
47. I clown around too much 0 1 2 3 4
48. I want to be noticed too much 0 1 2 3 4
49. I trust other people too much 0 1 2 3 4
50. I try to control other people too much 0 1 2 3 4
51. I put other people’s needs before my own too much 0 1 2 3 4
52. I try to change other people too much 0 1 2 3 4
53. I am too gullible 0 1 2 3 4
54. I am overly generous to other people 0 1 2 3 4
55. I am too afraid of other people 0 1 2 3 4
56. I am too suspicious of other people 0 1 2 3 4
57. I manipulate other people too much to get what I want 0 1 2 3 4
58. I tell personal things to other people too much 0 1 2 3 4
59. I argue with other people too much 0 1 2 3 4
60. I keep other people at a distance too much 0 1 2 3 4
61. I let other people take advantage of me too much 0 1 2 3 4
62. I feel embarrassed in front of other people too much 0 1 2 3 4
63. I am affected by another person’s misery too much 0 1 2 3 4
64. I want to get revenge against other people too much 0 1 2 3 4
Appendix A, Section 4a
Sexual Experiences Scales

Please answer the following questions about your sexual experiences from age 14 on (besides those that occurred in your current relationship).

**Have you had any of these experiences from the age of 14 on (besides those that occurred in your current relationship)?**

1. Have you ever given in to sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn’t want to because you were overwhelmed by a man’s continual arguments and pressure? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  
   b. Yes

2. Have you ever had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn’t want to because a man used his authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor) to make you? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  
   b. Yes

3. Have you ever had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn’t want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down etc.)? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  
   b. Yes

4. Have you had a man attempt sexual intercourse (get on top of you, attempt to insert his penis) when you didn’t want to by threatening or using some degree of force (twisting your arm, holding you down etc.) but intercourse did not occur? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  
   b. Yes

5. Have you had a man attempt sexual intercourse (get on top of you, attempt to insert his penis) when you didn’t want to by giving you alcohol or drugs, to prevent you from resisting, but intercourse did not occur? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  
   b. Yes
6. Have you given in to sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to because you were overwhelmed by a man’s continual arguments and pressure? (From age 14 on)
   a. No b. Yes

7. Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to because a man used his position of authority (boss, teacher, counselor, supervisor)? (From age 14 on)
   a. No b. Yes

8. Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to because a man gave you alcohol or drugs to prevent you from resisting? (From age 14 on)
   a. No b. Yes

9. Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down etc.) to make you? (From age 14 on)
   a. No b. Yes

10. Have you had sexual acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) when you didn’t want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down etc) to make you? (From age 14 on)
    a. No b. Yes

11. Look back at questions 1-10. What is the highest question number to which you answered “yes”?
    a. 1 f. 6
    b. 2 g. 7
    c. 3 h. 8
    d. 4 i. 9
    e. 5 j. 10
***For the following questions, refer to the highest question number to which you answered “yes”. If you have had this experience with more than one person on different occasions, refer to the most significant time this occurred.

12. How many men did this experience involve?
   a. One man (1)
   b. Two men (2)
   c. Three or more men

13. What was your relationship to the man/men at the time? (If more than one man was involved, what was your relationship to the most significant one?)
   a. Stranger
   b. Non-romantic acquaintance (friend, neighbor, ex-husband etc.)
   c. Romantic acquaintance (steady date, boyfriend, lover)
   d. Husband
   e. Father
   f. Step-father
   g. Uncle
   h. Brother

14. How well did you know him/them?
   a. Didn’t know at all
   b. Slightly acquainted
   c. Moderately acquainted
   d. Very well acquainted
   e. Extremely well acquainted

15. How many times has he/they done this to you?
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5 or more

16. How long ago did it happen?
   a. Less than 3 months
   b. 3-6 months
   c. 6 months to a year
   d. 1-2 years
   e. 3-5 years
   f. Over 5 years
Appendix A, Section 4b
Sexual Experiences Scales

Please answer the following questions about your sexual experiences with your current partner.

Have you had any of these experiences with your current partner?

1. Have you ever given in to sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn’t want to because you were overwhelmed by a man’s continual arguments and pressure? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  b. Yes

2. Have you ever had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn’t want to because a man used his authority (boss, teacher, camp counselor, supervisor) to make you? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  b. Yes

3. Have you ever had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn’t want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down etc.)? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  b. Yes

4. Have you had a man attempt sexual intercourse (get on top of you, attempt to insert his penis) when you didn’t want to by threatening or using some degree of force (twisting your arm, holding you down etc.) but intercourse did not occur? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  b. Yes

5. Have you had a man attempt sexual intercourse (get on top of you, attempt to insert his penis) when you didn’t want to by giving you alcohol or drugs, to prevent you from resisting, but intercourse did not occur? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  b. Yes
6. Have you given in to sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to because you were overwhelmed by a man’s continual arguments and pressure? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  
   b. Yes

7. Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to because a man used his position of authority (boss, teacher, counselor, supervisor)? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  
   b. Yes

8. Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to because a man gave you alcohol or drugs to prevent you from resisting? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  
   b. Yes

9. Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn’t want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you? (From age 14 on)
   a. No  
   b. Yes

10. Have you had sexual acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) when you didn’t want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you? (From age 14 on)
    a. No  
    b. Yes

11. Look back at questions 1-10. What is the highest question number to which you answered “yes”?
   f. 1  
   g. 2  
   h. 3  
   i. 4  
   j. 5

   f. 6  
   g. 7  
   h. 8  
   i. 9  
   j. 10
***For the following questions, refer to the highest question number to which you answered “yes”. If you have had this experience with more than one person on different occasions, refer to the most significant time this occurred.

12. How many men did this experience involve?
   d. One man (1)
   e. Two men (2)
   f. Three or more men

13. What was your relationship to the man/men at the time? (If more than one man was involved, what was your relationship to the most significant one?)
   i. Stranger
   j. Non-romantic acquaintance (friend, neighbor, ex-husbandetc.)
   k. Romantic acquaintance (steady date, boyfriend, lover)
   l. Husband
   m. Father
   n. Step-father
   o. Uncle
   p. Brother

14. How well did you know him/them?
   d. Didn’t know at all
   e. Slightly acquainted
   f. Moderately acquainted
   d. Very well acquainted
   e. Extremely well acquainted

12. How many times has he/they done this to you?
   d. 1
   e. 2
   f. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5 or more

16. How long ago did it happen?
   d. Less than 3 months
   e. 3-6 months
   f. 6 months to a year
   d. 1-2 years
   e. 3-5 years
   f. Over 5 years
### Hypergender Ideology Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>somewhat disagree</td>
<td>slightly disagree</td>
<td>slightly agree</td>
<td>somewhat agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I think it’s gross and unfair for men to use alcohol and drugs to convince a woman to have sex with them.
2. Physical violence never solves an issue.
3. Most women need a man in their lives.
4. I like to see a relationship in which the man and woman have equal power.
5. Using alcohol or drugs to convince someone to have sex is wrong.
6. Gays sicken me because they are not real men.
7. Sex should never be used as a bargaining tool.
8. A real man fights to win.
10. A true man knows how to command others.
11. When a man spends a lot of money on a date, he should expect to get sex for it.
12. The only thing a lesbian needs is a good, stiff cock.
13. I like relationships in which both partners are equals.
14. Sometimes it doesn’t matter what you do to get sex.
15. Women should show off their bodies.
16. Men should be ready to take any risk, if the payoff is large enough.
17. A woman can be complete with or without a partner.
18. No wife is obliged to provide sex for anybody, even her husband.
19. Most women use their sexuality to get men to do what they want.
20. Most women play hard-to-get.
21. Women should break dates with female friends when guys ask them out.
22. Lesbians have chosen a particular lifestyle and should be respected for it.
23. Men have to expect that most women will be something of a prick-tease.
24. A real man can get any woman to have sex with him.
25. Women should be flattered when men whistle at them.
26. It is important that my partner and I are equally satisfied with our relationship.
27. Some gay men are good people, and some are not, but it has nothing to do with their sexual orientation.
28. Women instinctively try to manipulate men.
29. Most women will lie to get something they want.
30. Men shouldn’t measure their self-worth by their sexual conquests.
31. Get a woman drunk, high, or hot and she’ll let you do whatever you want.
32. Men should be in charge during sex.
33. If you’re not prepared to fight for what’s yours, then be prepared to lose it.
34. It’s okay for a man to be a little forceful to get sex.
35. Women don’t mind a little force in sex sometimes because they know it means they must be attractive.
36. Homosexuals can be just as good at parenting as heterosexuals.
37. Any man who is a man can do without sex.
38. Gays and lesbians are generally just like everybody else.
39. Pickups should expect to put out.
40. Some women are good for only one thing.
41. Women often dress provocatively to get men to do them favors.
42. If men pay for a date, they deserve something in return.
43. It’s natural for men to get into fights.
44. Effeminate men deserve to be ridiculed.
45. All women, even feminists, are worthy of respect.
46. If a woman goes out to a bar for some drinks, she’s looking for a real good time.
47. I do what I have to do to get sex.
48. Any man who is a man needs to have sex regularly.
49. Masculinity is not determined by sexual success.
50. Homosexuality is probably the result of a mental imbalance.
51. Nobody should be in charge of a romantic relationship.
52. Real men look for danger and face it head on.
53. A gay man is an affront to real men.
54. He who can, fights; he who can’t, runs away.
55. Gay men often have masculine traits.
56. Women sometimes say “no” but really mean “yes”.
57. I believe some women lead happy lives without having male partners.
Appendix A, Section 6
Ways of Coping-Revised

Briefly describe the **most serious** relationship problem which you’ve experienced. Please state who was involved, where it took place, and what happened.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please read each item below and indicate, by using the following rating scale, to what extent you used it in the situation you have just described.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Used Somewhat</th>
<th>Used Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Used A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Just concentrated on what I had to do next – the next step.
2. I tried to analyze the problem in order to understand it better.
3. Turned to work or substitute activity to take my mind off things.
4. I felt that time would make a difference – the only thing to do was to wait.
5. Bargained or compromised to get something positive from the situation.
6. I did something which I didn’t think would work, but at least I was doing something.
7. Tried to get the person responsible to change his or her mind.
8. Talked to someone to find out more about the situation.
9. Criticized or lectured myself.
10. Tried not to burn my bridges, but leave things open somewhat.
11. Hoped a miracle would happen.
12. Went along with fate; sometimes I just have bad luck.
13. Went on as if nothing had happened.
14. I tried to keep my feelings to myself.
15. Looked for the silver lining, so to speak; tried to look on the bright side of things.
16. Slept more than usual.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Used Somewhat</th>
<th>Used Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Used A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. I expressed anger to the person(s) who caused the problem.
18. Accepted sympathy and understanding from someone.
19. I told myself things that helped me to feel better.
20. I was inspired to do something creative.
21. Tried to forget the whole thing.
22. I got professional help.
23. Changed or grew as a person in a good way.
24. I waited to see what would happen before doing anything.
25. I apologized or did something to make up.
26. I made a plan of action and followed it.
27. I accepted the next best thing to what I wanted.
28. I let my feelings out somehow.
29. Realized I brought the problem on myself.
30. I came out of the experience better than when I went in.
31. Talked to someone who could do something concrete about the problem.
32. Got away from it for a while; tried to rest or take a vacation.
33. Tried to make myself feel better by eating, drinking, smoking, using drugs or medication etc.
34. Took a big chance or did something very risky.
35. I tried not to act too hastily or follow my first hunch.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Used Somewhat</th>
<th>Used Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Used A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 36. Found new faith.
- 37. Maintained my pride and kept a stiff upper lip.
- 38. Rediscovered what is important in life.
- 39. Changed something so things would turn out all right.
- 40. Avoided being with people in general.
- 41. Didn’t let it get to me; refused to think too much about it.
- 42. I asked a relative or friend I respected for advice.
- 43. Kept others from knowing how bad things were.
- 44. Made light of the situation; refused to get too serious about it.
- 45. Talked to someone about how I was feeling.
- 46. Stood my ground and fought for what I wanted.
- 47. Took it out on other people.
- 48. Drew on my past experiences; I was in a similar situation before.
- 49. I knew what had to be done, so I doubled my efforts to make things work.
- 50. Refused to believe that it had happened.
- 51. I made a promise to myself that things would be different next time.
- 52. Came up with a couple of different solutions to the problem.
- 53. Accepted it, since nothing could be done.
- 54. I tried to keep my feelings from interfering with other things too much.
- 55. Wished that I could change what had happened or how I felt.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Used</th>
<th>Used Somewhat</th>
<th>Used Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Used A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. I changed something about myself.
57. I daydreamed or imagined a better time or place than the one I was in.
58. Wished that the situation would go away or somehow be over with.
59. Had fantasies or wishes about how things might turn out.
60. I prayed.
61. I prepared myself for the worst.
62. I went over in my mind what I would say or do.
63. I thought about how a person I admire would handle this situation and used that as a model.
64. I tried to see things from the other person’s point of view.
65. I reminded myself how much worse things could be.
66. I jogged or exercised.
Appendix A, Section 7
Symptom Checklist-90-Revised

During the past 7 days including today how much were you distressed by:
1. headaches
2. nervousness and shakiness inside
3. repeated unpleasant thoughts that won’t leave your mind
4. faintness or dizziness
5. loss of sexual interest or pleasure
6. feeling critical of others
7. the idea that someone else can control your thoughts
8. feeling others are to blame for most of your troubles
9. trouble remembering things
10. worried about sloppiness or carelessness
11. feeling easily annoyed or irritated
12. pains in heart or chest
13. feeling afraid in open spaces or on the streets
14. feeling low in energy or slowed down
15. thoughts of ending your life
16. hearing voices that other people do not hear
17. trembling
18. feeling that most people cannot be trusted
19. poor appetite
20. crying easily
21. feeling shy or uneasy with the opposite sex
22. feelings of being trapped or caught
23. suddenly scared for no reason
24. temper outbursts that you could not control
25. feeling afraid to go out of your house alone
26. blaming yourself for things
27. pains in lower back
28. feeling blocked in getting things done
29. feeling lonely  
30. feeling blue  
31. worrying too much about things  
32. feeling no interest in things  
33. feeling fearful  
34. your feelings being easily hurt  
35. other people being aware of your private thoughts  
36. feeling others do not understand you or all unsympathetic  
37. feeling that people are unfriendly or dislike you  
38. having to do things very slowly to insure correctness  
39. heart pounding or racing  
40. nausea or upset stomach  
41. feeling inferior to others  
42. soreness of your muscles  
43. feeling that you are watched or talked about by others  
44. trouble falling asleep  
45. having to check and double-check what you do  
46. difficulty making decisions  
47. feeling afraid to travel on buses, subways, or trains  
48. trouble getting your breath  
49. hot or cold spells  
50. having to avoid certain things, places, or activities because they frighten you  
51. your mind going blank  
52. numbness or tingling in parts of your body  
53. a lump in your throat  
54. feeling hopeless about the future  
55. trouble concentrating  
56. feeling weak in parts of your body  
57. feeling tense or keyed up  
58. heavy feelings in your arms or legs  
59. thoughts of death or dying  
60. overeating  
61. feeling uneasy when people are watching or talking about you  
62. having thoughts that are not your own
63. having urges to beat, injure, or harm someone
64. awakening in the early morning
65. having to repeat the same actions such as touching, counting, or washing
66. sleep that is restless or disturbed
67. having urges to break or smash things
68. having ideas or beliefs that others do not share
69. feeling very self-conscious with others
70. feeling uneasy in crowds, such as shopping or at a movie
71. feeling everything is an effort
72. spells of terror or panic
73. feeling uncomfortable about eating or drinking in public
74. getting into frequent arguments
75. feeling nervous when you are left alone
76. others not giving you proper credit for your achievements
77. feeling lonely even when you are with other people
78. feeling so restless you couldn’t sit still
79. feelings of worthlessness
80. the feeling that something bad is going to happen to you
81. shouting or throwing things
82. feeling afraid you will faint in public
83. feeling that people will talk advantage of you if you let them
84. having thoughts about sex that bother you a lot
85. the idea that you should be punished for your sins
86. thoughts and images of a frightening nature
87. the idea that something serious is wrong with your body
88. never feeling close to another person
89. feelings of guilt
90. the idea that something is wrong with your mind
Appendix A, Section 8
Social Support Questionnaire-Revised

The following questions ask about people in your environment who provide you with help or support. Each question has two parts. For the first part, list all the people you know, excluding yourself, whom you can count on for help or support in the manner described. Give the person’s initials, their relationship to you (see example). Do not list more than one person next to each of the numbers beneath the question.

For the second part, circle the corresponding number to identify how satisfied you are with the overall support you have.

For the second part, circle the corresponding number to identify how satisfied you are with the overall support you have.

If you have had no support for a question, check the words “No one,” but still rate your level of satisfaction. Do not list more than nine people per question.

Please answer all the questions as best you can. All your responses will be kept confidential.

EXAMPLE:

Who do you know whom you can trust with information that could get you in trouble?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1) T.N. (brother)</th>
<th>2) L.M. (friend)</th>
<th>3) R.S. (friend)</th>
<th>4) T.N. (father)</th>
<th>5) L.M. (employer)</th>
<th>6)</th>
<th>7)</th>
<th>8)</th>
<th>9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6-very satisfied</th>
<th>5-fairly satisfied</th>
<th>4- a little satisfied</th>
<th>3-a little dissatisfied</th>
<th>2-fairly dissatisfied</th>
<th>1-very dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1a. Whom can you really count on to be dependable when you need help?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1)</th>
<th>4)</th>
<th>7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>5)</td>
<td>8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>6)</td>
<td>9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1b. How satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6-very</th>
<th>5-fairly</th>
<th>4-a little</th>
<th>3-a little</th>
<th>2-fairly</th>
<th>1-very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2a. Whom can you really count on to help you feel more relaxed when you are under pressure or tense?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1)</th>
<th>4)</th>
<th>7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>5)</td>
<td>8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>6)</td>
<td>9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2b. How satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6-very</th>
<th>5-fairly</th>
<th>4-a little</th>
<th>3-a little</th>
<th>2-fairly</th>
<th>1-very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3a. Who accepts you totally, including both your worst and your best points?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1)</th>
<th>4)</th>
<th>7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td>2)</td>
<td>5)</td>
<td>8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>6)</td>
<td>9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3b. How satisfied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6-very</th>
<th>5-fairly</th>
<th>4-a little</th>
<th>3-a little</th>
<th>2-fairly</th>
<th>1-very</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4a. Whom can you really count on to care about you, regardless of what is happening to you?

No one  1)    4)   7)  
2)  5)   8)  
3)  6)   9)  

4b. How satisfied?

6-very  5-fairly  4- a little  3-a little  2-fairly  1-very 
satisfied  satisfied  satisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied  

5a. Whom can you really count on to help you feel better when you are feeling generally down-in-the dumps?

No one  1)    4)   7)  
2)  5)   8)  
3)  6)   9)  

5b. How satisfied?

6-very  5-fairly  4- a little  3-a little  2-fairly  1-very 
satisfied  satisfied  satisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied  

6a. Whom can you count on to console you when you are very upset?

No one  1)    4)   7)  
2)  5)   8)  
3)  6)   9)  

6b. How satisfied?

6-very  5-fairly  4- a little  3-a little  2-fairly  1-very 
satisfied  satisfied  satisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied  dissatisfied
Appendix A, Section 9
The Sexual Relationship Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: Listed below are several statements that concern the topic of sexual relationships. Please read each of the following statements carefully and decide to what extent it is characteristic of you. Some of the items refer to a specific relationship. Whenever possible, answer the questions with your current partner in mind. If you are not currently dating anyone, answer the questions with your most recent partner in mind. If you have never had a relationship, answer in terms of what you think your responses would most likely be. Then, for each statement fill in the response on the answer sheet that indicates how much it applies to you by using the following scale:

A = Not at all characteristic of me.
B = Slightly characteristic of me.
C = Somewhat characteristic of me.
D = Moderately characteristic of me.
E = Very characteristic of me.

NOTE:
Remember to respond to all items, even if you are not completely sure. Your answers will be kept in the strictest confidence. Also, please be honest in responding to these statements.

1. It would bother me if my sexual partner neglected my needs.
2. When I make love with someone I generally expect something in return.
3. If I were to make love with my sexual partner, I’d take that person’s needs & feelings into account.
4. If a sexual partner were to do something sensual for me, I’d try to do the same for him/her.
5. I’m not especially sensitive to the feelings of a sexual partner.
6. I don’t think people should feel obligated to repay an intimate partner for sexual favors. (R)
7. I don’t consider myself to be a particularly helpful sexual partner.
8. I wouldn’t feel all that exploited if an intimate partner failed to repay me for a sexual favor. (R)
9. I believe sexual lovers should go out of their way to be sexually responsive to their partner.
10. I wouldn’t bother to keep track of the times a sexual partner asked for sensual pleasure. (R)
11. I wouldn’t especially enjoy helping a partner achieve their own sexual satisfaction.
12. When a person receives sexual pleasures from another, s/he ought to repay that person right away.
13. I expect a sexual partner to be responsive to my sexual needs and feelings.
14. It’s best to make sure things are always kept “even” between two people in a sexual relationship.
15. I would be willing to go out of my way to satisfy my partner.
16. I would do a special sexual favor for an intimate partner only if that person did some special sexual favor for me.
17. I don’t think it’s wise to get involved taking care of a partner’s sexual needs.
18. If my sexual partner performed a sexual request for me, I wouldn’t feel that I’d have to repay him/her later on. (R)
19. I’m not the sort of person who would help a partner with a sexual problem.
20. If my sexual partner wanted something special from me, s/he would have to do something sexual for me.
21. If I were feeling sexually needy, I’d ask my sexual partner for help.
22. If my sexual partner became emotionally upset, I would try to avoid him/her.
23. People should keep their sexual problems to themselves.
24. If a sexual partner were to ignore my sexual needs, I’d feel hurt.
The Child Sexual Victimization Questionnaire

Many people have sexual experiences as children either with friends or with people older than themselves. The following questions ask about any experiences you may have had before the age of 14.

Answer no or yes to whether or not you have had each of these experiences before age 14.

Then answer the questions below each experience referring to the most significant time this occurred.

1. Another person showed his/her sex organs to you
   a. YES   b. NO
   (If you answered no, skip to question #11)

2. How many people (not including you) were involved?
   a. one (1) d. four (4)
   b. two (2)  e. more than four
   c. three (3)

***If one person was involved, please answer the following questions referring to that person, however, if more than one person was involved, answer the following questions referring to the oldest person.

3. How many times did it happen with this person?
   a. once (1) d. four times (4)
   b. twice (2)  e. five times (5)
   c. three times (3) f. six or more times

4. How old were you the first time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5 d. 10-11
   b. 6-7 e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

5. How old were you the last time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5 d. 10-11
   b. 6-7 e. 12-13
   c. 8-9
6. Who was this person?
   a. stranger
   b. older person you knew such as a neighbor, teacher or friend of your parents
   c. friend of your brother or sister, or person about your age (not boyfriend)
   d. aunt or uncle
   e. grandparent
   f. brother, step-brother; sister, or step-sister
   g. step-father or step-mother
   h. father or mother
   i. boyfriend or girlfriend
   j. other

7. How emotionally close were you to this person?
   a. not at all               d. quite a bit
   b. a little bit              e. extremely
   c. moderately

8. Was the person who did this male or female?
   a. Male               b. Female

9. Approximately how much older than you was the person?
   a. the person was younger than me or about my same age
   b. the person was 1-4 years older than me
   c. the person was 5-9 years older than me
   d. the person was 10 or more years older than me

10. How did the person get you to participate?
    a. I was a willing participant
    b. other person gave me gifts, money, candy etc.
    c. other person used his/her authority
    d. other person threatened to hurt or punish me
    e. other person used physical force

11. Someone older than you asked you to do something sexual    a. YES    b. NO
    (If you answered no, skip to question #21)

12. How many people (not including you) were involved?
    a. one (1)    d. four (4)
    b. two (2)    e. more than four
    c. three (3)
***If one person was involved, please answer the following questions referring to that person, however, if more than one person was involved, answer the following questions referring to the oldest person.

13. How many times did it happen with this person?
   a. once (1)               d. four times (4)
   b. twice (2)              e. five times (5)
   c. three times (3)       f. six or more times

14. How old were you the first time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5                    d. 10-11
   b. 6-7                    e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

15. How old were you the last time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5                    d. 10-11
   b. 6-7                    e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

16. Who was this person?
   a. stranger
   b. older person you knew such as a neighbor, teacher or friend of your parents
   c. friend of your brother or sister, or person about your age (not boyfriend)
   d. aunt or uncle
   e. grandparent
   f. brother, step-brother; sister, or step-sister
   g. step-father or step-mother
   h. father or mother
   i. boyfriend or girlfriend
   j. other

17. How emotionally close were you to this person?
   a. not at all               d. quite a bit
   b. a little bit            e. extremely
   c. moderately

18. Was the person who did this male of female?
   a. Male                   b. Female
19. Approximately how much older than you was the person?
   a. the person was younger than me or about my same age
   b. the person was 1-4 years older than me
   c. the person was 5-9 years older than me
   d. the person was 10 or more years older than me

20. How did the person get you to participate?
   a. I was a willing participant
   b. other person gave me gifts, money, candy etc.
   c. other person used his/her authority
   d. other person threatened to hurt or punish me
   e. other person used physical force

21. You showed your sex organs to another person at his/her request
    a. YES  b. NO
    (If you answered no, skip to question #31)

22. How many people (not including you) were involved?
    a. one (1)                four (4)
    b. two (2)                more than four
    c. three (3)

***If one person was involved, please answer the following questions referring to that person, however, if more than one person was involved, answer the following questions referring to the oldest person.

23. How many times did it happen with this person?
    a. once (1)               d. four times (4)
    b. twice (2)             e. five times (5)
    c. three times (3)      f. six or more times

24. How old were you the first time it happened with this person?
    a. 0-5  d. 10-11
    b. 6-7  e. 12-13
    c. 8-9

25. How old were you the last time it happened with this person?
    a. 0-5  d. 10-11
    b. 6-7  e. 12-13
    c. 8-9
26. Who was this person?
   a. stranger
   b. older person you knew such as neighbor, teacher, or friend of your parents
   c. friend of your brother or sister, or person about your age (not boyfriend)
   d. aunt or uncle
   e. grandparent
   f. brother, step-brother; sister, or step-sister
   g. step-father or step-mother
   h. father or mother
   i. boyfriend or girlfriend
   j. other

27. How emotionally close were you to this person?
   a. not at all               d. quite a bit
   b. a little bit             e. extremely
   c. moderately

28. Was the person who did this male or female?
   a. Male               b. Female

29. Approximately how much older than you was the person?
   a. the person was younger than me or about my same age
   b. the person was 1-4 years older than me
   c. the person was 5-9 years older than me
   d. the person was 10 or more years older than me

30. How did the person get you to participate?
   a. I was a willing participant
   b. other person gave me gifts, money, candy etc.
   c. other person used his/her authority
   d. other person threatened to hurt or punish me
   e. other person used physical force

31. Another person fondled you in a sexual way a. YES b. NO
   (If you answered no, skip to question #41)

32. How many people (not including you) were involved?
   a. one (1)               d. four (4)
   b. two (2)               e. more than four
   c. three (3)
If one person was involved, please answer the following questions referring to that person, however, if more than one person was involved, answer the following questions referring to the oldest person.

33. How many times did it happen with this person?
   a. once (1)   d. four times (4)
   b. twice (2)  e. five times (5)
   c. three times (3)  f. six or more times

34. How old were you the first time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5   d. 10-11
   b. 6-7  e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

35. How old were you the last time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5   d. 10-11
   b. 6-7  e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

36. Who was this person?
   a. stranger
   b. older person you knew such as a neighbor, teacher, or friend of your parents
   c. friend of your brother or sister, or person about your age (not boyfriend)
   d. aunt or uncle
   e. grandparent
   f. brother, step-brother; sister, or step-sister
   g. step-father or step-mother
   h. father or mother
   i. boyfriend or girlfriend
   j. other

37. How emotionally close were you to this person?
   a. not at all   d. quite a bit
   b. a little bit  e. extremely
   c. moderately

38. Was the person who did this male or female?
   a. Male  b. Female
39. Approximately how much older than you was this person?
   a. the person was younger than me or about my same age
   b. the person was 1-4 years older than me
   c. the person was 5-9 years older than me
   d. the person was 10 or more years older than me

40. How did the person get you to participate?
   a. I was a willing participant
   b. other person gave me gifts, money, candy etc.
   c. other person used his/her authority
   d. other person threatened to hurt or punish me
   e. other person used physical force

41. Another person touched or stroked your sex organs   a.YES   b.NO
(If you answered no, skip to question #51)

42. How many people (not including you) were involved?
   a. one (1)   d. four (4)
   b. two (2)   e. more than four
   c. three (3)

***If one person was involved, please answer the following questions referring to that
person, however, if more than one person was involved, answer the following question
referring to the oldest person.

43. How many times did it happen with this person?
   a. once (1)   d. four times (4)
   b. twice (2)   e. five times (5)
   c. three times (3)   f. six or more times

44. How old were you the first time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5   d. 10-11
   b. 6-7   e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

45. How old were you the last time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5   d. 10-11
   b. 6-7   e. 12-13
   c. 8-9
46. Who was this person?
   a. stranger
   b. older person you knew such as neighbor, teacher, or friend of your parents
   c. friend of your brother or sister, or person about your age (not boyfriend)
   d. aunt or uncle
   e. grandparent
   f. brother, step-brother; sister, or step-sister
   g. step-father or step-mother
   h. father or mother
   i. boyfriend or girlfriend
   j. other

47. How emotionally close were you to this person?
   a. not at all
   b. a little bit
   c. moderately
   d. quite a bit
   e. extremely

48. Was the person who did this male or female?
   a. Male
   b. Female

49. Approximately how much older than you was the other person?
   a. the person was younger than me or about my same age
   b. the person was 1-4 years older than me
   c. the person was 5-9 years older than me
   d. the person was 10 or more years older than me

50. How did the person get you to participate?
   a. I was a willing participant
   b. other person gave me gifts, money, candy etc.
   c. other person used his/her authority
   d. other person threatened to hurt or punish me
   e. other person used physical force

51. You touched or stroked another person’s sex organs at his/her request
   a. YES
   b. NO
(If you answered no, skip to question #61)

52. How many people (not including you) were involved?
   a. one (1)
   b. two (2)
   c. three (3)
   d. four (4)
   e. more than four
***If one person was involved, please answer the following questions referring to that person, however, if more than one person was involved, answer the following questions referring to the oldest person.

53. How many times did it happen with this person?
   a. once (1)       d. four times (4)
   b. twice (2)      e. five times (5)
   c. three times (3)

54. How old were you the first time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5           d. 10-11
   b. 6-7           e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

55. How old were you the last time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5           d. 10-11
   b. 6-7           e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

56. Who was this person?
   a. stranger
   b. older person you knew such as neighbor, teacher, or friend of your parents
   c. friend of your brother or sister, or person about your age (not boyfriend)
   d. aunt or uncle
   e. grandparent
   f. brother, step-brother; sister, or step-sister
   g. step-father or step-mother
   h. father or mother
   i. boyfriend or girlfriend
   j. other

57. How emotionally close were you to this person?
   a. not at all       d. quite a bit
   b. a little bit     e. extremely
   c. moderately

58. Was the person who did this male or female?
   a. Male           b. Female
59. Approximately how much older than you was the other person?
   a. the person was younger than me or about my same age
   b. the person was 1-4 years older than me
   c. the person was 5-9 years older than me
   d. the person was 10 or more years older than me

60. How did the person get you to participate?
   a. I was a willing participant
   b. other person gave me gifts, money, candy etc.
   c. other person used his/her authority
   d. other person threatened to hurt or punish me
   e. other person used physical force

61. Another person attempted intercourse (got on top of you, attempted to insert penis but penetration did not occur) a. YES b. NO
   (If you answered no, skip to question #71)

62. How many people (not including you) were involved?
   a. one (1) d. four (4)
   b. two (2) e. more than four
   c. three (3)

***If one person was involved, please answer the following questions referring to that person, however, if more than one person was involved, answer the following questions referring to the oldest person.

63. How many times did it happen with this person?
   a. once (1) d. four times (4)
   b. twice (2) e. five times (5)
   c. three times (3)

64. How old were you the first time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5 d. 10-11
   b. 6-7 e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

65. How old were you the last time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5 d. 10-11
   b. 6-7 e. 12-13
   c. 8-9
66. Who was this person?
   a. stranger
   b. older person you knew such as neighbor, teacher, or friend of your parents
   c. friend of your brother or sister, or person about your age (not boyfriend)
   d. aunt or uncle
   e. grandparent
   f. brother, step-brother; sister, or step-sister
   g. step-father or step-mother
   h. father or mother
   i. boyfriend or girlfriend
   j. other

67. How emotionally close were you to this person?
   a. not at all 
   b. a little bit
   c. moderately
   d. quite a bit
   e. extremely

68. Was the person who did this male or female?
   a. Male
   b. Female

69. Approximately how much older than you was the other person?
   a. the person was younger than me or about my same age
   b. the person was 1-4 years older than me
   c. the person was 5-9 years older than me
   d. the person was 10 or more years older than me

70. How did the person get you to participate?
   a. I was a willing participant
   b. other person gave me gifts, money, candy etc.
   c. other person used his/her authority
   d. other person threatened to hurt or punish me
   e. other person used physical force

71. Another person had intercourse (oral, anal, or vaginal) with you, (any amount of penetration--ejaculation not necessary)
   a. YES
   b. NO

72. How many people (not including you) were involved?
   a. one (1)
   b. two (2)
   c. three (3)
   d. four (4)
   e. more than four
***If one person was involved, please answer the following questions referring to that person, however, if more than one person was involved, answer the following questions referring to the oldest person.

73. How many times did it happen with this person?
   a. once (1)    d. four times (4)
   b. twice (2)   e. five times (5)
   c. three times (3)

74. How old were you the first time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5    d. 10-11
   b. 6-7    e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

75. How old were you the last time it happened with this person?
   a. 0-5    d. 10-11
   b. 6-7    e. 12-13
   c. 8-9

76. Who was this person?
   a. stranger
   b. older person you knew such as neighbor, teacher, or friend of your parents
   c. friend of your brother or sister, or person about your age (not boyfriend)
   d. aunt or uncle
   e. grandparent
   f. brother, step-brother; sister, or step-sister
   g. step-father or step-mother
   h. father or mother
   i. boyfriend or girlfriend
   j. other

77. How emotionally close were you to this person?
   a. not at all    d. quite a bit
   b. a little bit   e. extremely
   c. moderately

78. Was the person who did this male or female?
   a. Male    b. Female
79. Approximately how much older than you was the other person?
   a. the person was younger than me or about my same age
   b. the person was 1-4 years older than me
   c. the person was 5-9 years older than me
   d. the person was 10 or more years older than me

80. How did the person get you to participate?
   a. I was a willing participant
   b. other person gave me gifts, money, candy etc.
   c. other person used his/her authority
   d. other person threatened to hurt or punish me
   e. other person used physical force
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Appendix C, Section 1
Debriefing Form

DEBRIEFING FORM

Thank you for your participation in this research project. This study was designed to investigate how attitudes and experiences are related to women and their dating behaviors. Specifically, the study will investigate whether involvement in a physically violent intimate relationship is related to one’s coping skills, social support, interpersonal factors, and past experiences. The information provided by these questionnaires will help psychology researchers and clinicians learn more about the relationship between these different constructs and women’s dating experiences.

As a reminder, all of your questionnaire responses will remain strictly confidential. If you have any further questions regarding the nature of this study or would like to request details of the results of the study, please feel free to contact one of the following:

Graduate Researcher: Melissa Lueken
Porter Hall - Office 44-K
589-2242

Faculty Researcher: Christine A. Gidycz
Porter Hall - Room 231
593-1092

In addition, if you are concerned about the study materials used or questions asked and wish to speak with a professional, or if you would like more information or reading material on this topic, please contact one of the following resources:

Ohio University Counseling and Psychological Services: 593-1616

Tri-County Mental Health Services: 592-3091

Careline (24-hr Hotline): 593-3344