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ABSTRACT

ROBERTS, KELLY  EILEEN CAHILL, Ph.D., June 2009, Counselor Education

An Evaluation of the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* High School Program (184 pp.)

Director of Dissertation: Thomas E. Davis

The purpose of this study was to determine the efficacy of the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program offered to high school students in one county in the state of Ohio. High school student participants in each treatment group provided demographic information, attitudes, and experiences of teen dating violence (TDV) via a background information form, the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) (Wolfe, Scott, Reitzel-Jaffe, Wekerle, Grasley & Straatman, 2001) and the Attitudes Toward Dating Violence Scales (ATDV) (Price, Byers, & the Dating Violence Research Team, 1999) to determine the effect of the program directly after its completion and its short term effect three full weeks after the program concluded.

Only 141 valid cases were available for analysis using the CADRI, too few to determine statistical significance in immediate and short term effects of the program on participants’ experiences. Two hundred seventy two students provided responses on the ATDV scales to determine effects of the program on participants’ attitudes toward TDV. A Repeated Measures MANOVA analysis resulted in a statistically significant difference between treatment groups’ ATDV scores initially after the program and across time. This suggests that the program did lower participants’ tolerance of TDV initially, and three weeks after the program concluded. In addition, male participants’ scores were
consistently higher than females’ scores, suggesting that males have a consistently higher
tolerance of TDV than females.

This research is the first step toward building an effective teen dating violence
prevention program. With efficacy of the program indicated for the participants in this
study, it is possible that other students in the county would benefit from this program.
Additional research in other areas of the state and country are needed to continue to
determine the efficacy of the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program
for high school students.

Approved: _____________________________________________________________

Thomas E. Davis

Professor of Counseling and Higher Education
for

Velma Farris

a woman of extraordinary bravery, commitment, and faith
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My deepest thanks to Tricia Hufford, Velma Farris, Jenny Morris, Debby Esterline, Lisa Laughton, Joie McArtor, Jessica Luna, Amanda Rechel, and Elyn Tibbs for their dedication to preventing teen dating and domestic violence. Without this selfless group of women, and support from individuals that aided their efforts, this program and project would not have been possible.

My thanks to principals Larry Bevard, Ellis Booth, and Steve Hackett for allowing this study in their schools and to teachers Jason Baker, Melinda Schnorrenberg and Darren Waters for accommodating this study in their classrooms, and supporting efforts to educate students about teen dating violence. My thanks to the parents and participating students for their assistance in this study and interest in helping to prevent teen dating violence.

I thank the Center for New Beginnings and the College of Education for providing necessary funding for program materials and consultation services.

I greatly appreciate the education received by the faculty of the College of Education who helped shape my experience and have supported my efforts. Special thanks to dissertation committee members: Dr. George Johanson, for introducing me to the wonderful world of statistical analysis and encouraging my enthusiasm for the subject; Dr. Yagen Pillay, for his expertise in the field of domestic violence, for helping to reawaken my clinical skills, and for fostering my growth as an instructor; Dr. Anthony Sallar, for his unwavering positive outlook and excellent instruction in program development and evaluation. I also thank Dr. Dana Heller Levitt who provided a great
deal of personal support, and to Dr. Christine Suniti Bhat, who has been a true role model, encouraging incorporation of my past interests into my current work and providing my first opportunities to participate in counseling research.

I thank my parents, John J. Cahill and Janice M. Cahill, who have always provided loving support in all of my efforts to “pursue my passion.” Their encouragement and faith have always helped guide my path and provide direction, especially during this journey. I thank my sister, Karen Amicarelli, my brother, Michael Cahill, my brother-in-law, Vince Amicarelli, my husband’s parents, James and Derreth Roberts, grandparents Jack and MaryAnne Cahill, Jack Kinkopf, Dorice “Grandmama” Roberts, and my many family members for their prayers and for being my biggest fans and cheerleaders.

I thank my friends at Ohio University, especially mentors Jason Dixon and Martha Reynolds-Adkins and mentees Carol Agnew and Rosalyn Brown Beatty. I thank my friends at The Ohio State University at Newark, Licking County Arts, Licking County Players, Mid Ohio Psychological Services, and many more for love, fun, festivities, prayers and breaks from the hard work.

There are hardly words to express my undying love and gratitude for my husband, Dr. J. Andrew Roberts, who lovingly accepted the many challenges presented as I pursued this degree. His support and dedication to my success has never wavered. He has never complained of any of the difficulties I know he must have experienced while I was away at school and he has always placed my well being above his own. I could not have dreamed of a better partner in life and only hope I can return to being the wife he deserves now that this part of the journey is over. I love you Andy. Thank you.
Finally, my thanks to Dr. Tom “Coach” Davis for his constant support, encouragement and belief in my abilities. Coach, you welcomed me to your team of distinguished graduates and have helped instill confidence and a sense of pride in all I have accomplished. I am happy to have had your guidance while in this program, and your positive influence will continue to affect my future endeavors. Thank you for all you have done to coach me through this process, I am forever grateful.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEDICATION</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER I</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence and Teen Dating Violence</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence in a Targeted Midwestern County</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen Dating Violence in the United States</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to Prevent Violence between Couples</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence Program</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Hypothesis</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delimitations</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER II</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITERATURE REVIEW</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief Review of Domestic Violence and Teen Dating Violence</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L: SCATTER PLOT MATRIX OF MEASURES FOR LINEAR RELATIONSHIPS

APPENDIX M: CORRELATION MATRIX AND FACTOR ANALYSIS

APPENDIX N: TABLES FOR REPEATED MEASURES MANOVA ANALYSES FOR NULL HYPOTHESES ONE AND TWO

APPENDIX O: TABLES FOR STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT POST HOC REPEATED MEASURES MANOVA ANALYSES

APPENDIX P: TABLES FOR DEPENDENT T-TEST ANALYSIS
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Demographic Information by Treatment Group ...............................................83
Table 2: Program Evaluation Results: Program Satisfaction .........................................98
Table 3: Program Evaluation Results: Presentation Satisfaction ....................................99
Table 4: Correlations of ATDV Scales and CADRI ....................................................171
Table 5: Factor Analysis: Total Variance Explained .....................................................172
Table 6: Rotated Component Matrix ...........................................................................172
Table 7: Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis One ....................................................173
Table 8: Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two ...................................................173
Table 9: Tests of Between Subjects Effects for Null Hypothesis Two .........................174
Table 10: Univariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two ....................................................174
Table 11: Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Biological Sex ........175
Table 12: Tests of Between Subjects Effects for Null Hypothesis Two Including Biological Sex ..............................................................176
Table 13: Univariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Biological Sex ............177
Table 14: Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Semester ..............178
Table 15: Tests of Between Subjects Effects for Null Hypothesis Two Including Semester ..............................................................179
Table 16: Univariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Semester ..............180
Table 17: Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Race ....................181
Table 18: Tests of Between Subjects Effects for Null Hypothesis Two Including Race ..............................................................182
Table 19: Univariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Race ......................183
Table 20: Program Evaluation Dependent T-Test Samples Statistics .........................184
Table 21: Program Evaluation Dependent T-Test Samples Correlations .....................184
Table 22: Program Evaluation Dependent T-Test Results ...........................................184
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Treatment Group Means of Averaged ATFDV Scores Across Time ..........89

Figure 2: Treatment Group Means of Averaged ATDV Scores by Biological Sex Across Time .................................................................92

Figure 3: Treatment Group Means of Averaged ATMDV Scores by Semester Across Time ...........................................................................94

Figure 4: Treatment Group Means of Average ATMDV Scores by Race Across Time .......................................................................................96

Figures 5: Original Normality Plots and Normal Curves for ATDV and CADRI Measures ........................................................................166

Figures 6: Normality Plots and Normal Curves for ATDV and CADRI Measures from Utilized Data .........................................................168

Figure 7: Scatter Plot Matrix of ATDV Scales .................................................................................................................................170
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents background information for the study including an overview of domestic violence and teen dating violence, data collection and research design, possible significance of the study, anticipated limitations to the study and definitions of terms.

Domestic Violence and Teen Dating Violence

Domestic Violence is a worldwide problem found in intimate relationships (Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Ellsberg, Heise, & Watts, 2006). Garcia-Moreno and colleagues (2006) collected interview data from women living in the ten countries of Bangladesh, Brazil, Ethiopia, Japan, Namibia, Peru, Samoa, Serbia and Montenegro, Thailand, and the United Republic of Tanzania and compared domestic violence rates within and between these countries. The interview data collected from the women showed a prevalence of intimate partner violence. A total of 24,097 women provided their stories for analysis, with an average of 1500 women participating in interviews at each of 15 sites visited within 10 countries. Fifteen to seventy-one percent of the women across these countries reported experiences of physical or sexual violence in at least one intimate relationship throughout the course of their lives. Though some differences within and between countries existed in terms of the types and frequency of the domestic violence experienced, the study bridged cultural discrepancies and contributed to identifying the seriousness of the problem of domestic violence worldwide (Garcia-Moreno et al., 2006).
Studies in other countries have also reported extensive incidence of domestic violence. In Jordan, thousands of reports of domestic violence were made throughout the early 1990s (Kulwicki, 2002). Reports from Spain indicate that 2 - 4% of women over the age of 18 experienced domestic violence in their homes on a daily basis, a rate of incidence that moved the Spanish government to adopt an aggressive plan to combat the problem (Bosch, 2001). Husbands or intimate partners were responsible for 45% of homicides involving female victims in England and Wales and were responsible for 50% of homicides involving female victims in Ireland in 1998 (Garcia Moreno, 1999). In response to the high level of domestic violence in Ireland, the Catholic Church adopted a policy advising victims of domestic violence to leave the marriage or long term relationship, a policy that breaks tradition of the church’s view that divorce is unacceptable despite problems including violence (Birchard, 2000). In India, women’s reports of physical violence range from as low as 5.8 % to as high as 40%, reports of emotional violence ranged from 23-72%, reports of sexual violence ranged from 15 to 50 percent, and 63% of women experienced violence more than three times within the same relationship (World Health Organization, 2008). Reports of domestic violence in Asian American communities were few. It is believed that a combination of traditional cultural beliefs and uncertainty in how to safely report incidences of domestic violence were the cause of low levels of reporting. However, 78% of Vietnamese women and 60% of Korean women living in the United States reported experiences of domestic violence (Kim-Goh & Baello, 2000).
The United States is not immune to this problem. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2006) states that 4.8 million physical assaults or rapes reported by women each year are caused by an intimate partner. Men report 2.9 million occurrences of abuse by their intimate partner per year. Serious health consequences, some of which are fatal, occur due to this type of violence (CDC, 2006). The abuse experienced by men and women occurs repeatedly within the same intimate relationships with the same violent partners (Rand & Saltzman, 2003).

Data from a national survey conducted every 6 months during the years 1992-1999 revealed that on average, 908,000 intimate partner victimizations occurred against women ages 12 or older. Ninety-one percent of women reporting victimization at the hands of their spouse or intimate partner had been victimized five times or less during the previous six months. Two percent reported a frequency of 20 experiences of violence over the previous six month period (Rand & Saltzman, 2003).

The Ohio Domestic Violence Network (ODVN) provides data about incidents of domestic violence collected throughout Ohio to determine the level of domestic violence that occurs in the state every year. The US Census Bureau estimates that Ohio’s 2006 population was 11,478,006 (US Census Bureau, 2008). The numbers of domestic violence and domestic violence related problems or activities for the year 2006 include: 71,946 calls to police due to domestic violence; 38,512 arrests as a result of the calls to police; 427 deaths; 135,624 adults and children served by professionals to aid with issues related to domestic violence; 10,484 adults and children were provided shelter; 75,073 were referred for additional legal, educational, psychological, vocational, financial,
medical or child care services; and 18,219 Civil Protection Orders were issued. All of this occurred in the state of Ohio alone (ODVN, 2008).

**Domestic Violence in a Targeted Midwestern County**

It is important to understand the level of domestic violence in the county in which the study took place. The US Census Bureau estimated that the county’s 2006 population was 156,287, and the 2007 census indicates 24.6% of the population was under the age of 18. The following reports of domestic violence were collected from the targeted county Sherriff’s office. Data from 2006 included 142 calls due to domestic violence. There were also 674 Civil Protection orders served in 2006 (Thorp, 2006).

Domestic violence is often preceded by experiences of abuse in adolescent dating relationships for both males and females (Callahan, Tolman & Saunders, 2003; Smith, White & Holland, 2003). Abuse and violence that occurs within adolescent dating relationships is termed Teen Dating Violence. Teen dating violence, which is also prevalent in the United States, creates experiences of dating that individuals often pattern throughout their dating experiences and into life-partnerships (CDC, 2008; James, West, Deters & Armijo, 2000; Smith et al., 2003). Teens who do not receive information, education and training on dating violence are vulnerable to developing abusive patterns in their dating relationships, and increase the probability that they will experience domestic violence as adults. Anecdotes collected from women seeking shelter from domestic violence revealed that survivors of abuse often experienced abusive relationships in high school (Amar & Alexy, 2005; Weiss, 2000). These experiences of violence early in life set the stage for the women to continue to engage in violent relationships into adulthood,
and lead them to domestic violence shelters to escape their spouses or partners (Callahan et al., 2003; James et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2003).

**Teen Dating Violence in the United States**

According to the Center for Disease Control, Teen Dating Violence is defined as: “the physical, sexual, or psychological/emotional violence within a dating relationship” (CDC, 2008). Twenty five percent of teenagers report having been physically, sexually or emotionally abused by a dating partner every year (CDC, 2008).

The CDC conducted a study to determine the prevalence of physical dating violence among 11-14 year olds in the United States using data from a survey conducted in 2003. They found that 1 in 11 high school students reported physical violence in their dating relationship in the twelve months prior to responding to the survey, which corresponds roughly to 1.5 million high school students nationwide. The prevalence of physical abuse in dating relationships was about equal between males and females as well as among school grade levels (CDC, 2006).

A fact sheet provided by the CDC states that the effects of teen dating violence contribute to teen survivors’ heightened levels of anxiety and depression, increased risk for abusing drugs (including alcohol), increased visits to the emergency room due to partner violence and decreased levels of interest in academic work. Teen victims of physical dating violence in high school are three times more likely to experience abusive relationships in college. Sadly, the abusive relationship pattern formed at an early age can be carried into adulthood unless teens gain knowledge about teen dating violence, how to recognize it, and how to get out of an abusive relationship safely (CDC, 2006).
Data reflecting the incidence of teen dating violence in individual states and counties are difficult to obtain. It can be assumed that since teen dating violence precedes domestic violence, that the rates of domestic violence reported in the state and county in which the proposed study is targeted is representative of the incidence of teen dating violence in that location (Thorp, 2006).

Need to Prevent Violence between Couples

It is clear that there is a high prevalence rate of violence between couples in the Midwestern state and targeted county for the proposed study. A prevention program to help combat the problem of violence in relationships in this region is greatly needed (CDC, 2008; Ferrato, 1991; James et al., 2000; ODVN, 2008; Smith et al., 2003; Suarez, 1994; Weiss, 2000).

Prevention is one of the best ways to educate large numbers of people at one time and begin to battle the potential problem (Conyne, 2004). Primary, secondary and tertiary prevention are described by Conyne (1983) to explain the differences in prevention strategies and target goals. Tertiary prevention includes mental health professionals’ current methods of preventing mental illness. It is the treatment and individual work with a client designed to reduce and prevent future incidences of abuse in relationships. Secondary prevention includes early intervention with an emphasis on reducing the duration and severity of the abuse occurring in the relationship. This type of prevention is often the center of psychoeducational programs. Primary prevention is focused on an at-risk population who have not yet experienced the problem, but are very likely to experience the problem based on current life experiences and situations. Primary
prevention is proactive and occurs before the problem occurs in a population (Conyne, 1983). It is primary prevention that is utilized in many prevention programs, and that which has the greatest chance of truly combating teen dating violence.

Evidence of the need for prevention programs targeted at teen dating violence is clearly presented in literature, in violence prevention and awareness organizations, in personal reports of professionals who interact with those affected by violence, and those who have first hand experience of violence in intimate relationships (CDC, 2008; Ferrato, 1991; James et al., 2000; ODVN, 2008; Smith et al., 2003; Suarez, 1994; Weiss, 2000). The county selected for this proposed study reflects an existing domestic violence problem that needs to be addressed. Victims’ own reports of their experiences, coupled with studies indicating that domestic violence is often preceded by an extensive history of abusive relationships that began in teenage years, indicates that a prevention program targeted at teen dating violence has the best chance of preventing dating violence, and domestic violence, in all age groups (Amar & Alexy, 2005; Callahan et al., 2003; CDC, 2008; James et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2003).

Based on literature and anecdotal information, educating teens about abusive relationships prior to their exposure to violent dating relationships helps them redirect their relationship patterns which can lead to a break in the cycle of violence (CDC, 2008; James et al., 2000; ODVN, 2008; Smith et al., 2003; Suarez, 1994). With education, teens gain knowledge to better recognize and avoid abusive relationships during high school, as well as in the future as adults, and avoid the consequences of domestic violence. If the abusive pattern can be halted at a young age, then teens may be less anxious, less
depressed, and less at risk for drug and alcohol abuse, which may increase their success in school, in relationships, and in life (Ackard & Neumark-Sztainer, 2002; CDC 2008).

Statement of the Problem

The problem that is addressed by this study is that of teen dating violence. Evidence supports the idea that teen dating violence is a precursor to domestic violence, and effects roughly 20% of all teens across the United States (CDC, 2008). It is not unreasonable to assume that teens throughout the world experience dating violence if rates of domestic violence are influenced by victims’ prior experiences of violence as teens. Violence of any kind, in any relationship is unacceptable and must be prevented (Price et al., 1999; Wolfe, Scott, Reitzel-Jaffe, Wekerle, Grasley, & Straatman, 2001). With relationship violence first starting in teenage dating relationships, it makes sense to develop and implement prevention techniques designed to address violence in adolescent relationships, thus targeting prevention efforts at teen dating violence. The overarching question for this study is: Can the incidence of Teen Dating Violence be decreased in high school students?

A variety of prevention programs have been designed to educate and inform a great number of teenagers about teen dating violence. Delivering these programs in schools may be one successful method of combating the problem of teen dating violence. Some studies that were conducted to determine the effects of such teen dating violence prevention programs have demonstrated encouraging results. Some of the programs show great promise in preventing teen dating violence, while others have demonstrated mixed results (Bond, 1995; Glickman Sederoff, 2002; Foshee, Bauman, Arriaga, Helms, Koch,
The focus of this study is in determining the value of one prevention program designed by professionals in the area of domestic violence, through the process of program evaluation. The program, *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence*, is expected to decrease teens’ abusive dating behaviors and to change teens’ attitudes toward abusive dating behaviors, thus, beginning to prevent the phenomenon.

*The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence Program*

In the summer prior to the 2005-2006 school year professionals, working at a domestic violence shelter located in one county of a Midwestern state, developed a program targeted at preventing teen dating violence for both male and female high school teens. The women involved with the development of the program included the shelter’s director, a bachelor level social worker who had eight years of experience working in domestic violence at the shelter, a new employee with a Masters level education in mental health services, and an intern working on her Bachelor’s of social work. It was hoped that the delivery of the program in the schools would help prevent teen dating violence and subsequently prevent domestic violence. It was expected that teens affected by the program would make better dating relationship and life partner decisions as they grew into adulthood. The program was titled *Expect Respect* to immediately identify the healthy attitude the program hoped to convey to all of its teen participants.
The ultimate goals of the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program were to reduce the incidence of teen dating violence in high school students, and thus to reduce the incidence of domestic violence for these teens as they grew to adulthood. To reach these goals the *Expect Respect* program aimed to provide every high school student in the county with information necessary to recognize and safely terminate abusive dating relationships. While solid data were not available to fully understand the number of teens experiencing teen dating violence in the local population, it was expected that teens who were in abusive relationships would recognize the relationship as abusive and take measures to leave the relationship safely after participating in the *Expect Respect* program. It was also expected that teens just beginning to date someone would be able to recognize the signs of abuse and end the relationship. As high school students who were exposed to the program grew older, it was expected that they would avoid abusive relationships, and therefore would not be included among those requesting shelter from the county domestic violence shelter as adults.

The objectives of the *Expect Respect* program were: to present the program in all high schools in the county; to present the program in required courses for high school students; to advertise the program in the community to raise awareness; and to maintain funding for the program through grants and donations. The outcome measure utilized during the program’s first year of implementation suggested that the program was successful and did contribute to decreasing high school students’ tolerance of dating violence. Details of these initial findings are found in the third chapter of this paper.
Research Hypothesis

This study aimed to determine whether the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* prevention program developed by professionals at a domestic violence shelter decreased the incidence of teens’ use of violent behaviors in their relationships and if it altered teens’ attitudes towards teen dating violence. The first null hypothesis for this study was: The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ reports of violence within their dating relationships. The second null hypothesis for this study was: The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence.

The goal for the study was to answer the questions: Does the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program decrease teens’ abusive behaviors within their dating relationships?; Does the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program change teens’ attitudes toward teen dating violence? Additional variables were considered and included as supplemental analyses.

Significance of the Study

The importance of this study lies in discovering whether the *Expect Respect* program decreased teens’ tolerance of teen dating violence and teens’ abusive behaviors toward their dating partners in the time period given for the study. Due to constraints in school schedules, data was collected on the Friday after the four session program that ran from Monday to Thursday, and again three full weeks later, on the Monday of the fourth
week. This study was the first step in determining if the program could be recognized as a beneficial prevention program.

Delimitations

The majority of the delimitations of the study were centered around the sampling methods and techniques. Consultation with professionals at the domestic violence shelter that sponsors the program resulted in three suggested high schools to contact for the study. These schools were suggested because the personnel were perceived as being the most responsive to having the program as a part of the Health course curriculum, and had a history of responding to phone and email messages in a timely manner. In addition, only five volunteer presenters, including the researcher, were available to present the program in the schools. Only the researcher had previous experience presenting this program. Of the eleven high schools in the targeted county, three high schools suggested by the domestic violence shelter professionals agreed to participate in the study. Having targeted certain high schools in the county for participation in the study was a delimitation that could not be avoided due to the few presenters available for scheduling during the study.

This study may not be generalizable to other high school teens. The targeted county for the study was lacking in diversity. Over 90% of the population is considered white, Caucasian or European American (Sperling’s Best Places, 2008). The county is also lacking in knowledge of incidents of teen dating violence each year. There is no current tracking system that collects data on reports of teen dating violence in this county, therefore, it is possible that the problem is greater or lesser than the national averages.
Due to the many studies conducted to determine the frequency of teen dating violence (CDC, 2003; CDC, 2008), it can be assumed that this county is similar to other counties previously studied and that the general report that 25% of teens experience teen dating violence is applicable in this county. Finally, it is indicated by Ohio County Profiles (2009) that 15.3% of the population over age 25 does not hold a high school diploma. It is important to recognize that teens who have dropped out of school were not reached by the program, nor were they included in the sample, therefore implications of results are limited to students enrolled in high school.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study the following definitions best describe the terms presented:

1. Domestic Violence refers to any acts of physical, emotional or sexual abuse within a marriage, life partnership, or romantic relationship between two adults age 18 or older who share the same home or living space (CDC, 2008).

2. Teen Dating Violence refers to any acts of physical, emotional or sexual abuse within a dating relationship between partners ages 11-17 (CDC, 2008).

3. Physical Abuse includes any behavior that physically hurts or controls another person (Moles, 2001).

4. Sexual Abuse includes any behavior that manipulates, forces or coerces another person into sexual acts (Moles, 2001).

5. Emotional Abuse includes any behavior that emotionally hurts or controls another person (Moles, 2001).
6. Dating Partner refers to any male or female adolescent engaged in any type of dating relationship (Price et al., 1999; Wolfe et al., 2001).

7. Attitudes Toward Dating Violence are a mixture of teenagers’ thoughts, beliefs and values that affect their opinions of examples of violent dating behaviors (Mueller, 1986; Price et al., 1999).

8. Conflict in Dating Relationships refers to any argument or altercation between two teenagers involved in a romantic relationship with one another. Conflicts may result in any of the three forms of dating violence, or may be resolved using healthy communication skills (Wolfe et al., 2001).

Summary

This chapter presented information pertinent to understanding the importance of the research study. A brief discussion of data collection methods and the research design were presented along with the significance of the study, anticipated limitations to the study and definitions of terms.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter presents pertinent literature for better understanding of the problem of teen dating violence, why prevention programs should be implemented and evaluated, an overview of evaluations of existing teen dating violence programs and suggestions from authors to help guide informative future evaluations of teen dating violence programs.

Brief Review of Domestic Violence and Teen Dating Violence

Domestic violence occurs far too often our society today (CDC, 2008; World Health Organization (WHO), 2008). Many women every year in many countries around the world seek shelter, and safety from an abusive life partner and/or lover (Birchard, 2000; Bosch, 2001; CDC, 2008; Garcia-Moreno, 1999; Garcia-Moreno et al., 2006; ODVN, 2008; Kim-Goh & Baello, 2000; Kulwicki, 2002; Rand & Saltzman, 2003; Thorp, 2006; WHO, 2008). Lenore Walker (1979) first discussed the theory of the cycle of violence in the 1970s. She described the first stage of the cycle as the “Tension Building Phase,” when tension builds in the relationship. Sometimes abusive partner shares with the other the reason for the tension, sometimes there does not seem to be a reason for the tension. As it builds, abusive behaviors escalate until the final “Blow Up Phase” where an act of violence is perpetrated on the victim. This is followed by “The Honeymoon Phase” where the abuser may apologize or try to make up for abusive actions. In this phase, the relationship is going well, and the two partners feel content and perhaps feel in love.
Women who have been victims of domestic violence often realize how controlling and cyclic their own relationships were when presented with the cycle of violence and elements of power and control. They are often saddened and angry that this information did not reach them sooner so that they may have avoided the pain and heartache endured as the result of abusive relationships (Ferrato, 1991; Weiss, 2000).

Most partnerships that include domestic violence are the result of years of a couple maintaining the cycle of violence. Oftentimes, this cycle begins as the couple dates in high school. High school students are at risk of developing unhealthy relationships that will lead to violent relationships in adulthood (Callahan et al., 2003; CDC, 2008; James et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2003). Smith, White and Holland (2003) found that adolescents are at the greatest risk for experiencing physical abuse for the first time and that once an adolescent does experience physical abuse in his or her dating relationship, he or she is at even greater risk of experiencing physical abuse in college dating relationships. Also, adolescents who experience sexual abuse are at greater risk of experiencing physical abuse in college dating relationships.

Women who experienced physical abuse by a dating partner during adolescence combined with physical or sexual abuse in childhood are at the greatest risk of re-experiencing abuse and violence in dating relationships. Women who only experienced abuse by a dating partner in adolescence were found to be at a second highest risk for experiencing physical violence by a dating partner in college (Smith et al., 2003).

Experiences of dating violence at any stage (adolescence, first year of college, second year of college, etc.) increased the likelihood of women experiencing dating
violence at the next stage of their lives. Thus, if a woman is victimized as an adolescent, she is more likely to be victimized as a freshman in college. If she is victimized as a freshman in college, she is more likely to be victimized as a sophomore. This finding by Smith and colleagues (2003) reflects that as adolescents experience increasing incidents of dating violence, they are more and more likely to continue to fall into a pattern of violence in their dating relationships into adulthood. As adults, they experience domestic violence, and may join the numbers of women and men seeking safety and shelter from their violent partners (Callahan et al., 2003; CDC, 2008; Lavoie, Robitaille, & Hebert, 2000; Smith et al., 2003). Teens seem to be aware of this pattern; if a girl had been in a violent relationship in the past, teens believed she would most likely enter into other violent relationships (Lavoie et al., 2000).

Teen Dating Violence

*Incidence*

 Teens today are beginning to date at younger and younger ages, some beginning to date as early as 11 years old (CDC, 2008). It is true that these extremely young children experience dating violence in similar ways that adults experience violence in their relationships (CDC, 2008; Ackard & Neumark-Sztainer, 2002). Ackard and Neumark-Sztainer conducted a study in 2002 to discover how often adolescents experience dating violence and rape. Participants included 81, 247 ninth and twelfth grade students. Girls reported experiences of dating violence or rape at a rate of 9% and boys reported these experiences at a rate of 6%. Smith and colleagues (2003) report that 9.7 % of ninth through twelfth grade girls report having been physically abused by a
dating partner, and one in eight college age women experienced physical and/or sexual abuse perpetrated by a dating partner during their first year of college.

Smith, White and Holland conducted a study in 2003 to investigate many aspects of dating violence from high school to college. Female college freshmen from school years beginning in 1990 and 1991 at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro were asked to participate in a longitudinal study. The study asked the women to complete five surveys each focused on different periods of the women’s lives including childhood, teen age years, and each year in college. Retention rate throughout the study was fairly good at 47.9% for the 1990 freshman class and 45.4% of the 1991 freshman class, when only about 55% of female freshmen remained at the college throughout the study. Results relating to the participants reports regarding experiences of teen dating violence reveal 88% of the women indicated at least one experience of physical or sexual abuse, and 63.5% indicated that the incident included both physical and sexual abuse. Of the 77.8% of women who reported experiences of any physical violence, 25.4% reported threats of physical harm, while 5.0% were actually hit. The perpetrators of the violent acts were identified as boyfriends (Smith et al., 2003).

Teens often do not understand which dating behaviors are abusive and which are healthy (Callahan et al., 2003). In addition to teens’ lack of understanding what teen dating violence is and what behaviors are in fact considered abusive and/or violent, teens have difficulty figuring out how to handle abusive behavior when it is recognized in the relationship. For instance, teens oftentimes interpret jealousy as a sign of love (Callahan et al., 2003). Many boys report that their acts of abuse or violence toward their female
partners were in response to their girlfriends antagonizing them by trying to make them jealous (Lavoie et al., 2000). Teenage boys defined abuse in context of the perpetrator’s intent. If the perpetrator reacted abusively toward the victim out of anger or intention to hurt the victim, the boys labeled the behavior as abusive. If the perpetration was considered to be an accident or joke, the behavior was excused by teenage boys. Teenage girls labeled dating behaviors as abusive if they resulted in physical or emotional harm, or if the victim became fearful of the perpetrator (Sears, Byers, Whelan, Saint-Pierre & the Dating Violence Research Team, 2006).

In addition, teens do not readily associate the word violence with the word abuse (Lavoie et al., 2000). The word violence does not reflect for teens the emotional abuse that often begins prior to physical or sexual abuse that might be more readily identified as violence. Also, teens may not realize that emotionally, physically or sexually hurtful or abusive behaviors are in fact wrong in the context of dating relationships. Teens ages 14-19 who were interviewed at a drop-in center reported that consensual violence in sexual relationships was acceptable and appropriate (Lavoie et al., 2000). Studies suggest that teens do not understand what behaviors are abusive or violent when the perpetration originates in a dating partner.

Perpetration

Perpetrators

Some studies found that male and female teens act as abuser and victim in equal numbers (Callahan et al., 2003; Sears et al, 2006), while others find that female adolescents perpetrate abuse at a higher rate than adolescent boys (Schnurr & Lohman,
Schnurr and Lohman (2008) found that females abused males more often than males abused females in categories of physical and emotional abuse, and that perpetration was somewhat equal between male and female abusers in the category of sexual abuse. Teens expressed beliefs that boys are more physically violent towards girls, and girls are more psychologically abusive towards boys. Teens also believed that psychological abuse leads to physical and sexual abuse and that if psychological abuse occurs in a dating relationship, the other forms of abuse will occur if the relationship continues (Sears et al., 2006).

Adelman and Kil (2007) analyzed 92 reports written by 9th grade students in 1997 and 1998 that indicated the primary source of conflict between teen dating partners was related to the perspective that dating partners are owned by one another, that they belong to one another. The researchers also report that teens’ abusive behaviors increased when one partner was threatened by the thought of the other partner leaving the relationship for a new partner. They also made note of how often they found evidence of girls getting into arguments with one another over boys. Jealousy is perhaps the most common cause of teen dating violence (Adelman & Kil, 2007; Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, & Wilcher, 2007; Lavoie et al., 2000; Sears et al., 2006; Wolfe et al., 2001). Many examples were cited of girls fighting over boyfriends, or modifying behavior to please boyfriends. Some of this modified behavior included girls ending friendships with other boys in order to make boyfriends happy. This modified behavior resulted in the girls experiencing relationships with boys only within the context of a romantic relationship. When girls limit their relationships with boys to only one boyfriend, girls are less likely to learn what
dating behaviors are acceptable, normal and permissible, and which are unacceptable, abusive and violent (Adelman & Kil, 2007).

Similarly, anger is strongly related to perpetration of dating violence among adolescents. Girls tend to perpetrate abuse when motivated by anger toward their boyfriends. This anger is not related to being antagonized by boys, or boys’ own abusive behavior. The anger in itself is one of the major reasons girls perpetrate violence on their boyfriends. Girls also perpetrate violence to prove a point, or teach boys lessons. If a girl disagrees with a boy’s behavior or attitude, she may perpetrate violence in order to control him and make him conform to her preferences (Foshee et al., 2007). It had also been found that girls’ perpetration of violence on their male partners could be coupled with the males having been sexually demanding (Lavoie et al., 2000).

Boys state that their first use of violence toward a girlfriend was due to his response to her initiating abusive behaviors toward him. In this case, the authors labeled the male’s response as “escalation prevention” rather than the term “self-defense” that was used for girls. The reason for this difference was that the boys reported that the reason they perpetrated violence on girls was in order to keep the girls from hurting the boys further, and to help the girls realize that they were out of control and needed to calm down. All of the boys that reported using “escalation prevention” also reported an upbringing the included them to be forbidden to hit girls or perpetrate violence against girls (Foshee et al., 2007).

Teenage boys and girls are guilty of perpetrating all types of abuse on one another. The use of psychological abuse is viewed by these teens as methods of gaining
control over their partners. Both boys and girls feel that they must be seen as strong and independent and that they will not tolerate challenge from their partners (Sears et al., 2006). These attitudes only fuel fighting between partners and increase the likelihood of mutual abuse, most common in adolescent relationships (Connelly & Josephson, 2007).

Though both teenage boys and girls perpetrate violence for the same reasons of jealousy and anger, girls are more likely to use violence toward boyfriends to intimidate them and control them while boys are more likely to use violence toward girlfriends as a result of being provoked (Sears et al., 2006). Both females and males use violence to defend themselves against violence initially perpetrated by his or her dating partner (Foshee et al., 2007).

**Causes of Perpetration**

For teens in 7th through 12th grade, prior sexual abuse victimization was the most common experience reported by teens who perpetrated abuse on a dating partner (Banyard, Cross, & Modecki, 2006). Being depressed, male and a child of divorce were the next three most common experiences among self-reported perpetrators of dating violence. Boys were most likely to report perpetrating abuse on a dating partner when they also reported use of drugs and/or alcohol along with experiences of sexual victimization (Banyard et al., 2006). Girls were most likely to report perpetrating abuse on a dating partner when feeling depressed (Banyard et al., 2006; Capaldi, Crosby, & Oregon Social Learning Center, 1997).

Other teens fall into abusive relationships because it is the only type of relationship they experienced at home. Either they witnessed their own parents’ violent
relationship, or they were the recipients of violence in the home. This experience causes the teen to believe that this is the way people in relationships treat one another and express their love. The teen then expects his or her partner to act in an abusive manner toward them, or that they should act in abusive ways toward their partners (Callahan et al., 2003; Foshee, Ennett, Bauman, Benefield & Suchindran, 2005).

Sometimes the region of the country in which a teenager resides plays a role in their experiences of teen dating violence (Marquart et al., 2007). Marquart and colleagues (2007) gathered information from 20,274 high school sophomores, juniors and seniors living in predominantly white, rural regions of the United States and found that 15.8% of the students surveyed had experienced physical abuse and threatening behaviors from their dating partners. Females participating in the study were 3.5 times more likely to experience this type of violence in dating relationships than males of the same ages and grades. As students progressed through high school, his or her chances of experiencing teen dating violence increased. Students living in the South reported more experiences of dating violence than any other region of the United States while the West reported the least. Males in the West experienced dating violence at a rate of one in fifteen, compared to the South where one in ten males reported experiences of dating violence. Females in the West experienced dating violence at a rate of one in four while females in the South experienced teen dating violence at a rate of one in three. The authors suspect that the maintainence of traditional gender roles is more common in the South and is the main contributor to the findings. Overall, one sixth of students in their sophomore through senior year reported experiences of dating violence. In all regions, females reported more

Another factor influencing teens’ abusive dating behaviors are the behaviors of friends. If a teen’s friends are abusive in their dating relationships, the probability of that teen following in his or her friends’ footsteps increased. Peer pressure is a formidable force in high school age teens’ lives, and friends who abuse, tend to propagate abuse within the friendship circle (Connolly & Josephson, 2007).

Media also plays a significant role in influencing teens about dating relationships. Television shows, movies, video games, music and pornographic materials all influence teens’ perceptions of what is acceptable in their dating relationships. Unfortunately, many of the relationships featured in today’s media do not reflect healthy relationships. It may be that unhealthy relationships and dramatic situations are more entertaining, however, teens internalize what they have seen or experienced through media and assume that the behaviors depicted are acceptable and appropriate (Birchard, 2000; Johnson, Adams, & Ashburn, 1995; Lavoie et al., 2000; Manganello, 2008; Rivadeneyra & Lebo, 2008). The media promotes this view in depicting teens aiming to make their partners jealous for a variety of reasons on a variety of television programs and movies often viewed by teens (Manganello, 2008; Rivadeneyra & Lebo 2008).

Victimization

Victims’ Reactions

No matter what the cause of the violence, be it a learned response of the abuser, or vulnerability in the victim, teens’ reactions to violence also plays a part in how it is
interpreted. Teens’ reactions to stories of abuse in dating relationships included many negative perceptions of the abuser. Teens labeled abusers as “stupid, dumb, a jerk, unable to love” and “not respectful” (Lavoie et al., 2000). However, teens who identified as being aggressive in their relationships reported pride in their actions and provided excuses for their actions. Similarly, females who fought back against their abusers were perceived by teens as better off than females who passively accepted the violence in the relationship. The girls who fought back against their partners were viewed in a more positive way than girls who did not fight back (Lavoie et al., 2000).

Males have been cited as reacting to a dating partner’s violence with laughter and indifference (Foshee et al., 2007; Lavoie et al., 2000; Wolfe et al., 2003). Other males simply ignored the physical abuse inflicted (Lavoie et al., 2000). Females reported crying and fighting back most often. Small percentages of females reported laughing at the physical abuse inflicted by a male partner (10%) or ignoring their partners (15%) (Lavoie et al., 2000).

 Teens also experience extreme contrasts in the reactions of others based on the biological sex of the perpetrator and victim. Boys feel that a double standard exists in perceptions of teen dating violence. They state that if boys perpetrate violence on girlfriends, the consequences from friends and authority figures are more severe than those given when girls perpetrate violence on boyfriends. Boys are often dismissed when reporting violence perpetrated by their girlfriends because girls do not often inflict serious physical harm on boys (Sears et al., 2006).
Consequences of Victimization

While both male and female teens perpetrate all three types of abuse on one another in equal numbers, females are more likely to experience severe injury. Females are much more likely to need medical care after physical altercations with boys and to experience poor self-esteem and self-worth as a result of emotional injury. The emotional injury, more than any other injury, is what keeps victims in the abusive relationship. Because victims feel unworthy of a kind partner, they are less likely to seek help and guidance, and are less likely to find a way out of the relationship (Foshee et al., 2007; Wolfe et al., 2003). Teenage victims have the highest probability of becoming victims of domestic violence as adults (CDC, 2008).

Other consequences of teen victimization include the development of eating disorders, suicidal ideation and suicide attempts. The students who reported suicide attempts had experiences of both dating violence and rape (Ackard and Neumark-Sztainer, 2002). Depression, post traumatic stress, dissociation, and anxiety are also results of dating abuse victimization (Callahan et al., 2003; CDC, 2008).

Where do Teens go for Help

Teens disclose a real fear of embarrassment if they were to share their experiences of abuse with parents and trusted adults. They want to be seen as independent and able to control their lives, especially in the eyes of their parents. Due to this, teens are less likely to share incidents of dating violence with parents or other adults than with their friends. It is often friends who first discover or notice warning signs of abuse, and teens will more frequently turn to friends to help them through their problems (Sears et al., 2006).
Because of this, peers need to be knowledgeable about how to handle such serious situations in order to help keep his or her friend safe. Teachers, guidance counselors and parents also must be knowledgeable about the signs and symptoms of teen dating violence in order to best guide likely victims, abusers and their friends to achieve healthy dating relationship behaviors (Adelman & Kil, 2007; Lavoie et al., 2000).

Role of Depression

Banyard and Cross (2008) conducted a study to determine mental health consequences of dating violence. They found that depression did play a role in participants’ experiences of victimization of dating violence, though it was unclear whether the depression was a result of the violence, or was a factor in creating victimization.

It has been hypothesized that the role of depression contributes to a type of feedback loop for those involved in dating or domestic violence. Studies have indicated that individuals who experience depression may seek negative or neutral feedback, which contributes to remaining in a violent relationship (Pineles, Mineka, & Zinbarg, 2008). This idea of seeking negative feedback as it relates to depression and victimization seems to be related to the concept of learned helplessness, which is also viewed as a factor in dating and domestic violence (Bargai, Ben-Shakhar & Shalev, 2007). It seems that all of these factors are related in many different ways and play multiple roles when combined with dating violence (Alloy, Abramson, Peterson & Seligman, 1984). Research on these topics continues to be needed to help clarify the roles of these factors in relationships that include violence.
Prevention

Teens do not want to experience violence in their dating relationships. Teens do not want to experience domestic violence as adults. They want to learn how to begin and maintain healthy dating relationships and gain the skills necessary to recognize abuse and end the abusive cycle or the relationship safely (Sears et al., 2006). Data supporting the problem of teen dating violence coupled with teens’ desire to combat the problem makes it clear that a prevention program is desperately needed (Wolfe et al., 2003). Smith, White and Holland (2003) believe that if a prevention program could be implemented for adolescents, dating violence in college would decrease, or be prevented, thus preventing domestic violence in adulthood.

The most important elements of teen dating violence that should be taught to potential victims, abusers, friends, teachers, parents and counselors, include the types of violence, how violence is introduced to the relationship, how victims often misinterpret and misunderstand initial violence as a sign of love, how and why violence is tolerated in teen dating relationships by the victim, and how to achieve healthy dating relationships (Adelman & Kil, 2007; Foshee et al., 2007; James et al., 2000; Josephson & Proulx, 2008; Lavoie et al., 2000; Sears et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2003; Wolfe et al., 2003).

These elements should be taught to teens as early in their dating experiences as possible to help them avoid developing attitudes and beliefs that contribute to maintaining abusive relationships throughout their lives. Adolescents’ first dating experiences help frame future dating experiences. The sooner adolescents learn healthy dating behaviors, the sooner they can develop healthy relationship expectations from
future partners (Banyard et al., 2006). Dating violence can be difficult for a teen to understand. Providing a prevention program can enable teens to ask questions about the topic and learn how to better determine healthy and unhealthy dating behaviors (Lavoie et al, 2000). Finally, providing teen dating violence prevention to teens in high school can best derail paths to domestic violence as adults (Marquart et al., 2007).

**Prevention Programs in the Schools**

It is imperative that young teens receive information regarding teen dating violence as early in their high school education as possible. The best way to deliver such content is through presentations in the schools. These presentations often focus on preventing the problem by educating students about the problem and its consequences if students fall victim to the problem. Teens have asked for this type of curriculum to be delivered in their schools (Sears et al., 2006). and preventing teen dating violence curriculum does meet the national health education standards for public schools in the United States (Bronson et al., 2007). When teen dating violence prevention programs are offered in school classrooms, all students receive information and are expected to participate, which avoids labeling targeted teens as “at-risk” or “in need of treatment” (Wolfe et al., 2003). In addition, though some factors in teens’ lives may create a higher probability of perpetrating or experiencing teen dating violence, in reality any teenager is at risk of falling into an abusive relationship. For instance, issues of jealousy within dating relationships are extremely common among teen relationships and how one partner deals with his or her jealousy often falls into a category of teen dating violence (Callahan et al., 2003; Lavoie et al., 2000; Sears et al., 2006). Schools wishing to provide
teen dating prevention curriculum should be knowledgeable about teen dating violence prevention programs, and the results of evaluations of the programs to determine if the program will be effective for their students.

Evaluating Teen Dating Violence Prevention Programs

Lavoie and colleagues (1995) were among the first to conduct an evaluation to determine if the short or long form of a teen dating violence program would be more effective for a small group of sophomore high school students. The authors concede that their first attempt at evaluating the two forms of the program included many limitations. The measure they used did not have previously determined reliability and validity for accurate reporting of results, nor did they use a control group to determine if differences between pre and post tests were in fact caused by the program. They did find positive changes in students’ awareness of teen dating violence, especially for female students. Overall, students who participated in the shorter version of the program produced higher scores on knowledge and awareness than students who participated in the longer version, though both programs increased males’ and females’ scores on knowledge and awareness from pretest to posttest measures (Lavoie et al., 1995).

Foshee and a team of researchers from 1998 to 2004 studied one preventing teen dating violence program in Canada called “Safe Dates.” One thousand eight hundred and eighty six 8th and 9th grade students from 14 schools randomly assigned to control and treatment groups participated in collection of baseline measurements, and 1700 participated in the follow-up collection. Results indicated that the control and treatment group students’ responses on the measures were statistically equivalent, however,
outcome measures did indicate less reports of abusive behaviors in the experimental group after the program. This result indicated promise for the ability of the Safe Dates program to prevent teen dating violence (Foshee et al., 1998).

In 2000, one year follow-up data was presented from the Safe Dates program. The researchers discovered that students’ behaviors returned to baseline, but their post-test scores relating to conflict management skills and knowledge of teen dating violence community services were upheld. Issues of design contamination when students were combined onto four high schools may have contributed to the results in addition to the use of a statistical analysis that did not allow for discovery of significant findings in both positive and negative tails of the normal curve. The Safe Dates program also implemented a shortened form of the program as a “booster intervention” to determine if this would aid students in maintaining original program effects on behavior as well as awareness and knowledge of teen dating violence (Foshee et al., 2000).

In 2004, the Safe Dates program was again evaluated to determine long-term effects of the program and if the booster session aided in maintaining effects achieved at post-test. Results discovered that up to four years after the delivery of the original program, students reported significantly less dating violence than students in the control group that did not receive the program. The booster sessions were found to have no effect on the students, and it is therefore recommended that programs do not employ such methods in attempts to maintain effects of prevention programs (Foshee et al., 2004).

Wolfe and colleagues (2003) conducted a randomly assigned controlled study to determine the development of dating violence with 158 fourteen to sixteen year old at
risk students in an alternative high school and if a prevention program would be helpful to them. The students were considered to be “at risk” for experiencing teen dating violence due to their previous experiences of abuse as younger children. The students in the study had been removed from their homes by Children Protective Services (CPS), which made them ideal candidates to test the theory that individuals who experience violence as children are more likely to either become abusers or victims of abuse later in life. The program the participants were exposed to included information about dating violence as well as elements of establishing and maintaining healthy relationships.

It was hypothesized that if the program helped the students, they would report less experiences of perpetrating or receiving violence in dating relationships and that their abilities to handle conflict in relationships in a healthy way would increase. The program included elements of education on teen dating violence, issues of power and control, developing healthy communication skills, and advocating for healthy relationship experiences for others. The teens participated in the program through CPS agencies and were contacted periodically over a four year period to determine effects of the ongoing program.

The teens responded to the Childhood Trauma Questionnaire, The Short Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test, the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory, the Trauma Symptom Checklist-40, and the Adolescent Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire. A nested design and growth curve analysis revealed that all teens decreased perpetration and receipt of abusive behaviors over time and that girls’ behaviors decreased at a greater rate than boys. Teens who reported higher levels of
interest and involvement in the program had greater decreases in their experiences of
physical abuse than other teens. It seemed most important to the success of this program
that the elements of the program encouraged the teens to participate, practice healthy
communication skills, and become active advocates for developing healthy relationships
for themselves and others.

Evaluations of teen dating violence prevention programs are also found in
unpublished dissertations. Glickman Sederoff (2002), from York University in Canada,
evaluated an existing teen dating violence program, the Youth Relationships Project,
delivered to 49 students with mild intellectual abilities from eighth grade to high school.
She used the Attitudes Toward Dating Violence (ATDV) scales and the Conflict in
Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) as pre and post tests to determine
effects on students’ attitudes and behaviors after exposure to the program (Price et al.,
1999; Wolfe et al., 2001). She reports that initial scores on the measures indicated a low
tolerance of dating violence prior to the program implementation, though students in high
school were more tolerant of dating violence than eighth graders. At post-test, males
demonstrated a greater tolerance of violence perpetrated by both males and females.
Female students’ attitudes toward dating violence with female perpetrators changed in a
positive direction, and the overall sample of students became less tolerant of female
perpetration in dating violence (Glickman Sederoff, 2002).

In 1998, Jay Silverman, from the University of Georgia, evaluated a school-based
curriculum aimed at preventing teen dating violence by comparing measures from 325
ninth and tenth grade students at pre test, post test, and three month follow up. Results
indicated that students’ knowledge about and attitudes toward teen dating violence improved from pre test to post test, but that the improvements were not maintained three months later.

Turner (2006), from the University of Delaware, aimed to discover whether peer-lead teen dating violence prevention programs would effectively improve students’ knowledge on the subject. Using only pre and post tests, results found a positive change in students’ knowledge of teen dating violence, causing the author to conclude that using peers in prevention strategies for teen dating violence is helpful for conveying information to teens.

*Guidelines to Conducting Informative Evaluations*

Pittman, Wolfe and Wekerle (2000) provide guidelines for conducting evaluations of prevention programs for teen dating violence that can best assess the value of these programs. They insist that at absolute minimum, evaluations of teen dating violence programs should include collection of data on pre and post test measures, that effects should be determined in comparison between experimental and control groups, and that follow-up measures must be taken. They encourage use of multiple established measures designed specifically for adolescents and a large sample size that represents the targeted population of teens as well as extensive interview-style qualitative studies to increase understanding of teen dating violence phenomenon. It is believed that if the minimum standards are followed, future evaluations will better contribute to the literature on the subject, and prevention programs can be better compared for efficacy and value (Pittman et al., 2000).
Hickman, Jaycox and Aronoff (2004) reviewed eight studies, including the peer-reviewed published studies designed to evaluate teen dating violence prevention programs. Their discoveries reflect many pertinent issues in evaluation. They found that very few programs have been properly evaluated. They determined qualities of poorly designed evaluations and contrasted them with well designed evaluations, resulting in suggestions for improvement of future evaluation designs.

They found the most common faults in design were in small sample sizes, biased samples of teens interested in the subject matter, poorly established measures and instruments, lack of comparison or control groups, conducted in only one site and follow-up measures were taken after brief periods. Better designed studies included comparison or control groups, established measures and instruments to determine the effect of the programs, use of more than one measure, inclusion of a variety of test sites, and long-term as well as short-term follow-up periods. Most of the programs involved up to five sessions to convey information about teen dating violence to students in the classroom setting. Most often, classroom teachers were the presenters of the information, and in one study, professionals from community organizations made short presentations for the last day of the curriculum (Hickman et al., 2004).

Overall, the studies suggest that multiple-session programs were most effective in increasing students’ knowledge about teen dating violence, but that results are inconclusive regarding lasting effects of the programs and their abilities to change teens’ behavior within dating relationships. The authors acknowledge that difficulties in conducting well-designed evaluations of these programs exist, especially considering that
these studies include minors’ experiences of violence. The authors make a few suggestions to aid future researchers in appropriately evaluating programs to help increase the literature on this topic. Authors suggest making responses to measures and instruments anonymous in order to avoid legal and ethical responsibility to report incidents of violence in minors’ relationships. They also suggest longitudinal studies to help determine effects of programming into students’ adult years. If longitudinal studies can be completed, the effects of programming in people’s teen years can truly be determined (Hickman et al., 2004).

Current Research Study

The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program offered in the high schools of one county in the state of Ohio responds to the problem of teen dating violence. The program includes many of the elements identified in professional literature as essential for inclusion in a prevention program; the cycle of violence, issues of power and control, signs of abuse, how to get out of an abusive relationship safely and how to establish and maintain healthy relationships. In order to determine whether or not this program is valuable to the community and the teens it was designed to serve, a well-designed evaluation was conducted (Hickman et al., 2004; Pittman et al., 2000).

Previous evaluations have failed in providing accurate results due to small sample sizes, inappropriate use of measures, lack of control or comparison groups and lack of random assignment of students to control or treatment groups (Hickman et al., 2004; Pittman et al., 2000). This study’s evaluation design improves upon the weaknesses found in previous evaluation studies and is discussed at greater length in Chapter 3. The
results of this evaluation not only contribute to literature on the value of this particular teen dating violence program, but also provide the affected community and state with information necessary to determine if the program should continue.

_The Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationship Inventory_

The Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) (Wolfe et al., 2001) also addresses teen dating behaviors but from the first person experience. The CADRI asks participants about how they have handled specific conflict situations with their dating partners and how dating partners have handled the conflicts with them in a given time frame. The responses correspond to the number of times the described situation occurred. The higher the number of incidents indicated on the CADRI, the greater the likelihood that a participant has experienced teen dating violence.

The CADRI was developed after two studies were conducted to determine which items should be included in the final measure (Wolfe et al., 2001). A third study was designed to determine the reliability of the CADRI. Seventy students in grades 9 – 11 engaged in a test-retest reliability study. The participating students were 52% female, 48% male and were predominantly Caucasian. The two week test-retest reliability was found to range from 0.68 to 0.75, which the authors considered to be acceptable levels of reliability for the overall scale. Twenty four students engaged in a partner agreement test of the measure. The 24 couples who agreed to participate in the partner agreement test had been dating for at least one month prior to their responses to the CADRI. The results of the partner agreement study indicated that male and female partners shared levels of agreement on the scales (Wolfe et al., 2001).
The fourth study was conducted to determine the construct validity of the CADRI. Twenty six adolescent couples who had been dating for roughly six months participated in videotaped discussions regarding instances of conflict within the relationship, and how each partner handled the conflict. Two research assistants with inter-rater agreement of 0.85 coded the tapes and the authors compared the coded instances with the CADRI items. Correlations between the coded situations and actual CADRI items indicated that the instrument had construct validity.

Other studies have used the CADRI scales in determining the value of other teen dating violence prevention programs. In 2003, Wolfe and his colleagues used the scale to determine if an intervention presented in a control group would change the violent dating behaviors of 158 14-16 yr olds with a history of maltreatment. Sherer & Sherer (2008) used the CADRI to determine reciprocal behaviors of teen couples. A total of 1357 students in grades 9-12 from 8 Arab and 8 Jewish high schools participated in Sherer & Sherer’s study. A one year long study involving 1317 students from 10 high schools used the CADRI to help form a structural model describing the relationships between trauma, maltreatment and experiences of teen dating violence (Wolfe, Wekerle, Scott, Straatman & Grasley, 2004). A comparison of 125 high school students’ reports of teen dating violence was conducted with the CADRI as the primary measure. It was used to determine if students’ reports differed when asked to reflect on a two week time period, or a two month time period (Jouriles, McDonald, Garrido, Rosenfield & Brown, 2005). In all the above studies, the CADRI maintained acceptable levels of reliability, and its
continued use in multiple studies suggest that validity of the measure is continually supported.

The CADRI has also been translated for use in other languages. Fernandez-Fuertes and colleagues (2006) examined the reliability and validity in Spanish version of CADRI with 572 15-19 yr olds. They found that the reliability was statistically equivalent to English version, though the “threatening subscale” was not valid in Spanish version. Therefore, the CADRI was found to be reliable and valid overall for Spanish speaking populations, but that some of the items should be adjusted to better measure experiences of this culture. Schiff & Zeira (2005) determined that the Hebrew version of the CADRI was valuable for determining frequencies of dating violence among 105 at-risk 11th and 12th graders. They used the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) for “co-validity” since CTS in Hebrew form was validated in previous studies. The correlations between the CTS and CADRI were positive and strong, therefore the authors chose to continue analysis with the CADRI scale to determine frequencies and relationships to teen dating violence in this Israeli population.

The CADRI scale’s reliability and growing validity has been established with participants similar to the sample of participants in this study. Therefore, the CADRI was an appropriate scale used in this study to determine whether students’ own behaviors, or the behaviors of their partners, changed as result of exposure to the Expect Respect program.
The Attitudes Towards Dating Violence Scales

The Attitudes Toward Dating Violence (ATDV) Scales (Price et al, 1999) present a variety of situations to the participant, worded to include both male and female perpetrators and victims. The participant indicates on a “Strongly Disagree” to “Strongly Agree” Likert scale his or her agreement with a variety of statements regarding a variety of behaviors that may occur within the context of a dating relationship. The higher the scores on the ATDV scales, the more participants agree that violence is acceptable in dating relationships.

The ATDV scales are made of two separate scales each designed to address psychological, physical, and sexual violence perpetrated by males (Attitudes Towards Male Dating Violence – ATMDV) and by females (Attitudes Towards Female Dating Violence – ATFDV). The ATMDV consists of 15 items to address psychological violence, 12 items to address physical violence and 12 items to address sexual violence. The ATFDV consists of 13 items to address psychological violence, 12 items to address physical violence and 12 items to address sexual violence.

Examples of ATMDV items that address psychological/emotional, physical and sexual violence are: “A guy should not insult his girlfriend; Sometimes guys just cannot stop themselves from punching girlfriends;” and “Guys do not own their girlfriends’ bodies” (Price et al., 1999, p358). Examples of ATFDV items that address psychological/emotional, physical and sexual violence are: “A girl should not control what her boyfriend wears; A girl usually does not slap her boyfriend unless he deserves
it;” and “To prove his love, it is important for a guy to have sex with his girlfriend” (Price et al., 1999, p 360-361).

The measure was tested for reliability and validity during a study involving 823 Canadian students in grades 7, 9 and 11, ranging in age from 11 to 20 years. The sample included participants that were 54% male, 46% female, and 82% reported having begun to date. Overall, the majority of the students were Caucasian, and the mean age was 14.5 years. Participating students responded to the ATDV scales being tested along with the established Attitude Toward Women Scale for Adolescents (AWSA), the Conflict Tactics Scale – Revised (CTS-R), the Sexual Experiences Survey – Revised (SES-R), and the Peer Use of Physical and Sexual Violence measures.

Once data was collected, the sample was split in two for separate factor analyses used to compare one group’s results with the other to strengthen the results of the analyses. The factor loadings for both groups were significantly similar for the ATMDV and ATFDV scales, indicating strength of the measure in obtaining accurate data. The reliability coefficients for the ATMDV and ATFDV psychological, physical and emotional violence scales ranged from 0.75 to 0.87. Evidence of construct validity was gathered by checking correlations between the ATDV scales and the established AWSA, and CTS-R measures. The correlations between the measures were statistically significant, thus pointing toward construct validity, yet the correlations were not so high that the measures addressed the exact same constructs. Criterion validity was suggested in the comparison between the ATDV scales and the SES-R and the Peer Use of Physical and Sexual Violence Measures. Students’ scores on the SES-R and the Peer Use of
Physical and Sexual Violence Measures were significantly correlated with the ATDV, and could be used to predict scores on the ATDV (Price et al., 1999).

The major strengths of the ATDV scales include: they were tested for reliability and validity with an adolescent population including the youngest and oldest adolescent ages; they address all three types of dating violence – psychological, physical and sexual; and they measure teens’ attitudes towards the three types of dating violence both when the perpetrator is male and when the perpetrator is female. In addition to these characteristics, the majority of the students who participated in the study were Caucasian, and had already begun dating. The sample population available for this study fell within the age range, racial makeup and dating status of the student participants in the study that determined the value of the ATDV scales, therefore use of the ATDV scales in this study was appropriate.

Josephson and Proulx (2008) used the ATDV scales in a study to test a structural equation model used to predict dating violence. Both the ATMDV and ATF DV scales were used and reliability coefficients were 0.85 and 0.82 respectively. The scales seemed to perform well in the study, supporting hypotheses that girls are less accepting of violence perpetrated by males and females, and presenting as better predictors of other attitudes related to gender than hypothesized (Josephson & Proulx, 2008). Luthra & Gidycz (2006) used the ATDV scales to aid them in determining through multiple regression analysis the best predictors of dating violence perpetration. Sears and colleagues (2007) used the ATDV scales in their study to determine the relationship between risk factors and perpetration of violence in male and female adolescents. Both
studies gathered data from the ATDV scales that aided in answering their research questions and in providing valuable data for analysis (Luthra & Gidycz, 2006; Sears, Byers, & Price, 2007).

Summary

This chapter presented additional information on the problem of teen dating violence, how teens perpetrate dating violence against one another, consequences of experiencing teen dating violence and why prevention programs are needed. Literature on prevention, preventing teen dating violence programs and evaluations of these programs was also presented. Finally, the goal of the research study was reviewed and the measures utilized in the study were introduced.
CHAPTER III

METHODODOLOGY

This chapter introduces study protocol and data collection methods. Information gathered from the pilot study, along with levels of power and effect size that helped in designing the current study. Measures utilized and experimental design is introduced and sample size is presented as it relates to data analysis.

Review of the Problem

The problem of Teen Dating Violence is evident and prevention is desperately needed in order to help teens learn about and avoid dating violence during high school (CDC, 2008; James et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2003) and into their adult lives. Previously established and tested prevention programs have shown promise in preventing the phenomenon (Bond, 1995; Glickman Sederoff, 2002; Foshee et al., 1998; Foshee et al., 2000; Foshee et al., 2004; Lavoie et al., 1995; Silverman, 1998; Turner, 2006; Wolfe et al., 2003). This particular study is designed to determine whether one existing teen dating violence prevention program, *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* offered through a domestic violence shelter in one county in the state of Ohio in the United States, decreases teens’ report of abusive behaviors within their dating relationships and changes their attitudes towards dating violence by increasing their awareness and decreasing tolerance of abusive behaviors.

To begin to determine the efficacy of the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program, a pilot study was conducted during the 2005-2006 school year. Though many problems with methodology in the pilot were present, the results of a
dependent t-test indicated statistically significant differences between Pre and Post Test scores \( t = 3.542; \ df = 325; \ p < 0.001 \), suggesting the possibility that the program effectively decreased students’ tolerance of teen dating violence. The pilot indicated a small effect size (Cohen’s \( d = 0.20 \)) and held more than appropriate power (\( \beta = 0.97 \)) with 326 students responding to the measure. The major limitations of the pilot study included the use of a measure that was not established as valid or reliable, and lack of a control group to provide data on measures. These elements were improved upon in the current study and are discussed below.

Identification of Population

The target population included both male and female high school students at three high schools located in one county in the state of Ohio in the United States. The reason for choosing high school students as the target population was based in the fact that many individuals who experience violence in their relationships had their first abusive relationship experiences in high school (Arbeau, Galambos, & Jansson, 2007; Banyard et al., 2006; Marquart et al., 2007; Smith et al., 2003; Weiss, 2000). Abusive dating experiences teens have in high school set the pattern, or cycle, of violence in individuals’ lives. To prevent violence in teen dating relationships, it seemed reasonable to educate teens about abusive relationships, how to recognize abuse and how to avoid or stop abuse in relationships prior to the first incident of abuse in a romantic relationship (Foshee et al., 1998; Wolfe et al., 2003). Most teens begin one on one dating in high school (Connolly, Craig, Goldberg, & Pepler, 2004), therefore providing the program for high school students was most appropriate.
The director and child advocate from the domestic violence shelter sponsoring the program suggested targeting three particular high schools based on the administrations’ previous support of the program. The number of high schools invited to participate in the study was small in order to make the protocol manageable for volunteer presenters. The three participating high schools were High School A, High School B, and High School C.

High School A enrollment included 538 total students in grades 9-12. High School A students were 46% male, 54% female, 93% white, 1% black, Hispanic and Asian respectively, and 4% were of a non-identified racial background. Eight percent of the students were eligible for the Free Lunch program, and 2% were eligible for the Reduced Lunch program. High School A reports a graduation rate of 89%, and they employ 27 teachers. The surrounding community is populated by approximately 14,766 people with the average age being 38 years old. The median household income is $41,758 and 20% of the population holds a college degree (publicschoolreview.com retrieved September 13, 2008).

High School B included 697 total students in grades 9-12. High School B students were 54% male, 46% female, 99% white, and 1% were of a non-identified racial background. Eighteen percent of the students were eligible for the Free Lunch program, and 5% were eligible for the Reduced Lunch program. High School B reports a graduation rate of 96%, and they employ 49 teachers. The surrounding community is populated by approximately 5,875 people with the average age of 39 years old. The median household income is $41,642 and 17% of the population holds a college degree (publicschoolreview.com retrieved September 13, 2008).
High School C totaled 1003 students in grades 9-12. High School C students were 49% male, 51% female, 69% white, 27% black, 1% Hispanic and 3% were of a non-identified racial background. Nineteen percent of the students were eligible for the Free Lunch program, and 6% were eligible for the Reduced Lunch program. High School C reported a graduation rate of 90%, and they employ 61 teachers. The surrounding community is populated by approximately 19,468 people with the average age being 36 years old. The median household income is $56,755 and 27% of the population holds a college degree (publicschoolreview.com retrieved September 13, 2008).

Sampling Plan

The sampling plan included recruiting high school students enrolled in Health classes from the three participating high schools located in one county in the state of Ohio after obtaining permission from school principals and Health classroom teachers. The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program was traditionally delivered in the high schools’ Health classes, which are typically populated by freshmen and sophomores, since these classes are required for all students. The strategy for the shelter delivering the program in required Health classes was to maximize the number of students reached within each school each year. In addition, the program helped teachers address elements of the national standards required in high school Health course curriculum (Bronson et al., 2007; Ohio Department of Education, 2008).

To determine how many students needed to be recruited for the study, many factors were taken into consideration. In order to maintain appropriate power ($\beta = 0.80$) for a Repeated Measures MANOVA analysis when alpha is held at 0.05, Warner (2008)
recommended planning no less than 20 cases for each cell in order to best meet the assumptions required to effectively run MANOVA procedures. In this study there were eight cells; four cells for each of the four measures for each of the two groups. This resulted in an estimate of $20(8) = 160$ total students required. The pilot data suggested that the effect of the program would most likely be small ($d = 0.20$) and therefore, greater numbers of participants were needed in order for the statistical analysis to detect a small effect. The total number of students enrolled in the Health classes of the three high schools included 293 students enrolled in the Fall semester and 228 in the Spring semester resulting in 531 students who were approached for participation. A total of 334 students gained parental consent and gave assent to participate. This number was expected to be more than adequate to gain useful data to run analysis.

The response rate for the current study was expected to decrease from the pilot study response rate of 72% due to the need for parental consent and the dependence on the students to carry the forms home and return them to school. High school teachers indicated concern with response rate and suggested the possibility of attaching extra credit to returning Parental Consent, Student Assent, and Dissent forms. Extra credit was given, and a greater response rate than expected was achieved at 64% (Edwards, Roberts, Clarke, DiGuiseppi, Pratap, Wentz, & Kwan, 2002; Porter, 2004). An additional letter from the teachers was sent home explaining the extra credit opportunity for students returning the forms whether or not students and their parents agreed to participation in the study.
The Measures

The participants were asked to respond to two measures, a program evaluation and a background information form which were used to determine whether the two null hypotheses would be rejected or if failure to reject was indicated. The measures were the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI) (Wolfe et al., 2001), and the Attitudes Toward Dating Violence Scales (ATDV) (Price et al., 1999). The CADRI was used to determine the result of the first null hypothesis: The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ reports of violence within their dating relationships. The ATDV scales were used to determine the result of the second null hypothesis: The second null hypothesis for this study was: The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence.

The *Expect Respect* Program Evaluation assessed students’ overall opinions about the program and the background information form provided demographics of each student. The test-retest reliability of the CADRI ranged from 0.68 to 0.75 when first tested (Wolfe et al., 2001) and ranged from 0.881 to 0.928 in the current study. The reliability of the ATDV scales ranged from 0.75 to 0.87 when first tested (Price et al., 1999) and ranged from 0.890 to 0.956 in the current study. Since the established measures, CADRI and ATDV scales, increase the reliability and validity of the results, causal statements about the program were better supported because the measures more accurately reported phenomenon. (Appendices E, F, G and H)
The CADRI first asked participants if they had begun dating. If participants had not yet begun dating, they did not complete the CADRI. If participants had begun dating, they answered a series of questions about their current or most recent past relationship that occurred in the month prior to each data collection. Finally, the participants responded to a series of statements describing how they reacted during conflicts and how their partners reacted during conflicts. These two sets of questions were grouped into individuals’ behaviors (CADRI-Ind) and partners’ behaviors (CADRI-Ptnr). Participants endorsed how often they and their partners reacted in the ways described on the CADRI on a scale of “Never” to “Often” (Wolfe et al., 2001).

The ATDV scales consisted of two scales, the Attitudes Toward Female Dating Violence (ATFDV) and the Attitudes Toward Male Dating Violence (ATMDV). These scales presented statements describing behaviors a female may exhibit in a dating relationship and then behaviors males may exhibit in a dating relationship. In each of the two scales were three subscales. These subscales related to the use of physical abuse, emotional abuse and sexual abuse. Participants read the statements and selected a continuum of agreement about the statements from “strongly agree,” to “strongly disagree.” The ATDV was designed to determine adolescents’ attitudes towards teen dating violence perpetrated both by males and females utilizing physical, emotional and sexual abuse (Price et al., 1999).

Study Protocol

Many systems needed to be coordinated for the study to be approved and conducted. First, the director of domestic violence shelter, Tricia Hufford, LSW, was
contacted to determine interest in supporting the study. Ms. Hufford also serves as the Executive Director of The Woodlands, the domestic violence shelter’s parent agency. Since the program is owned and operated by the The Woodlands, and supported by the shelter, permission from Ms. Hufford to conduct this study was essential. She granted permission to analyze pilot data, the results of which increased her interest in continuing to plan for this study. Ms. Hufford and the current program presenter, the Child Advocate, suggested high schools to contact as potentially agreeable sites for the study. The suggested high schools had the program delivered in their Health classrooms in the past, and their principals and Health teachers were familiar with and supportive of the program.

To determine whether or not the study would have been welcome in the schools, school principals from each suggested high school were contacted to set up meetings with the researcher to explain the details of the study and to gain permission to recruit their students for the study. Once permission from the three high school principals was obtained, the Health teachers were contacted to schedule follow up meetings to determine if the teachers were willing and able to accommodate the randomized assignment of control and experimental group classes. Since the control group classes did not receive the program during the study, this proposed research design required the teachers to develop two different lesson plans for each semester; one to accommodate the experimental group, one to accommodate the control group. Once high school Health teachers agreed to accommodate the study protocol, letters of support were requested from the principals and teachers that were included with the IRB proposal for the
university. Letters of support were collected in person by the researcher from each of the participating high schools, and from the director of the domestic violence shelter.

Upon approval from the IRB and Doctoral Committee, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software was used to randomly assign each teachers’ classes into experimental and control groups, and the schools were contacted to schedule the program. Once scheduling was secured, the Parental Consent, Student Assent and the letter from the teachers was delivered to the teachers to distribute to their students. The letter from the teachers described the study and explained how each student may have gained extra credit for returning the letter, signed by parents, indicating whether or not they granted permission for their children to participate in the study. The researcher collected all of these forms from the classroom teacher once they were returned by students. Once forms were collected, the program was delivered in the experimental group classrooms.

**Presenter Training Protocol**

In the midst of meeting with principals and teachers, obtaining IRB and Doctoral Committee approval, and scheduling the program in the participating high schools, presenters were recruited to be trained to present the program for the study. The presenter employed by the shelter to deliver the program, the Child Advocate, was unavailable to present this 2008-2009 school year due to obligations for completion of her own graduate study. Due to this, the researcher and Ms. Hufford recruited four women who volunteered to be trained to present the program. Two of the women were non-traditional Masters of Social Work students entering their first and second years of coursework. One woman
was a non-traditional Bachelors of Social Work student. The fourth woman, a traditional undergraduate student in her junior year in a psychology program, volunteered to aid in administrative tasks, and then joined in presenting the program when none of the other women were available.

All presenters were trained by the researcher who had previous experience presenting the *Expect Respect* program. Two separate two hour trainings were held at The Woodlands for the women to learn the program and study protocol. The women were provided with program materials students would receive and each session’s power point presentation was delivered to them as if they were students in a high school Health classroom. This aided them in not only learning the material to be delivered and the presentation style that best conveys the information to high school students, but also in experiencing the effects of the program first hand. The women were given the power point slides on USB travel drives for them to keep throughout the duration of the study. Additionally, the women visited the domestic violence shelter to tour the building and gather additional information from shelter staff. To complete their training, the women observed presentations delivered in High School A conducted by the researcher and Ms. Hufford.

The women then signed up for scheduled presentations in each of the three high schools as their personal schedules permitted. The researcher presented the program in morning slots that were inconvenient for other presenters to attend. Oftentimes, two women signed up to present together, one taking lead during one class period and the other leading the next class period. When pairing with the women, the researcher was
able to witness their presentation styles in the classrooms and all women seemed to present the program in a similar way. In addition, the researcher provided the women with Presenter’s Checklists (Appendix I) designed to report whether essential topics were covered during the program. All the women indicated presenting the essential elements of the program during their presentations. Informal classroom teachers’ feedback also indicated consistency in program delivery.

The Role of Deception

A possible threat to the validity of the study called the John Henry effect was anticipated (Saretsky, 1977). This effect names the phenomenon when subjects in research studies who are aware of their placement in control or experimental groups in order to test a treatment may alter their true scores on measures in order to out-perform the other group. This problem may have been a significant threat due to control and experimental groups being housed within each school. To help combat this problem in this study deception was planned to decrease students’ potential curiosity about the program schedules (Ohlund & Yu, 1999).

Throughout the study period, it was planned that if students asked any questions about why some classes were receiving the program and other classes were not receiving the program, students would have been reminded that the program was planned to be delivered at two separate times during the semester as determined by lottery. This was the explanation given in the Parental Consent and Student Assent and students were to be redirected to these forms as a reminder if necessary. The control group students would have been reassured that they would receive the same programming at a later date. It was
thought that if students were told that they were in control and experimental group classrooms, they may have been tempted to discuss the program outside of the classroom. This deception was not reported to have been utilized by presenters, and was not utilized by the researcher, as students did not question them about the different schedule. It is possible that the classroom teachers utilized this deception if questioned.

To continue to determine the possibility of students having shared information between treatment groups, a question was added to the background information form asking students if they had discussed what they were learning in Health class with students outside their classes. The questions were phrased simply, asking only if the students shared information. Questions did not address whether or not the participant talked to others about their classroom experiences, or received information about others’ classroom experiences. The results of this question are discussed in Chapter IV. Students did not learn of their official standing as participants of control or experimental groups until the conclusion of the study.

*The Four Sessions*

On the first day of the program, students received their program folders and program materials that were previously prepared by the undergraduate volunteer. A white label was placed on the lower back cover of the folder where students wrote their names. This way, students were sure to receive their own folders and program materials at the start of each session. The classroom teacher kept the folders safe from others throughout the delivery of the program. Once all students received their program materials, session one of the program began. All sessions lasted for one full class period. Class periods
ranged in time from 42 to 51 minutes except during special circumstances such as
delayed start of school due to weather or staff meetings. These special circumstances
reduced class periods to 35 minutes and occurred twice in High School C during the
study. Minor changes to the program were made to accommodate the reduction in time.
These minor changes occurred during session three and are discussed below.

Session one included a discussion regarding the concept of respect, identified and
defined the three different types of abuse: physical, sexual and emotional/psychological,
and offered a video clip of abusive behaviors within a teen dating relationship. The
students then engaged in discussion about the video clip, identified the abuser and the
behaviors that occurred that identified the character as the abuser.

The following day, Session Two was presented. Upon arrival to the classroom,
students collected their folders. Session Two began with a review of the three types of
violence and then the definition of Teen Dating Violence from the Center for Disease
Control (CDC, 2008) was provided. The session continued with a look at the teen version
of the Power and Control wheel (Moles, 2001). Discussion included a worksheet
describing different scenarios that were matched to the type of power and control used by
the abuser. A video clip depicting real life situations involving power and control was
shown and discussed. Once issues of power and control were understood, the students
were educated about the Cycle of Violence utilizing another worksheet by Moles (2001).
Situations relating to teens’ experiences were used as examples in describing the cycle of
violence. Photographs from a neighboring county’s sheriff’s office of a woman who had
been abused over the course of three months were shown, and another video clip depicting the cycle of violence was shown and discussed.

For session three, the students were introduced to Velma Farris, a woman who is a survivor of teen dating violence and domestic violence. Velma met her abuser when she was a senior attending one of the three participating high schools in 1982. She met her abuser on a blind date, as he attended one of the other two high schools that participated in the study. Velma was given the entire class period to tell her story of dating this boy in high school who she eventually married. She shared her experiences of violence and described how violence was the center of her relationship with him until she found the strength and courage to get out of the relationship. She left time at the end of her story to encourage students to ask her questions about her experience, openly responding to them without hesitation. Oftentimes, students approached Velma after class to share their own stories of dating violence or having been witnesses of domestic violence, and to thank her for sharing her story. This visit from her was the most frequently listed “most important part” of the program in the program evaluation. The minor changes made to the program on the two shortened class period days in High School C occurred during this session. During these two 35 minute class periods, Velma simply condensed her story to essential elements which did not seem to change the students’ reactions to her story, nor did it seem to lessen the impact of her story.

Session four opened with a review of the power and control wheel and the cycle of violence. Students were encouraged to discover examples of how Power and Control and the Cycle of Violence were present in Velma’s life. Once this review was complete,
students were reminded of how Velma survived the abuse and is in a healthy relationship with her current husband. This reminder of Velma’s success in escaping the cycle of violence and establishing a healthy relationship with her current husband provided transition from the focus on abusive relationships to healthy relationships.

This last session focused on healthy relationships, how to recognize healthy relationships, how to maintain healthy behaviors within relationships and how to maintain one’s sense of self within the relationship. The first discussion on healthy relationships involved popular culture and how teens are influenced by the media. The students then learned some of the differences between unhealthy and healthy relationships, revisited popular media and assessed how often they saw examples of positive, healthy relationships and how often they saw examples of negative, unhealthy relationships. Students learned how to identify their support system outside of their dating relationship, and how to balance their own interests with their partner’s interests and joint interests. Other handouts were included in students’ program materials that provided additional information and worksheets about healthy and unhealthy relationships, but were not explicitly discussed during the session due to time.

Data Collection

For this study, the researcher returned to the school on the Friday after session four to collect post test data from both the experimental and control group classrooms. For the post test, the students with permission to participate in the study were asked to complete the ATDV scales (both the ATMDV and ATFDV), the CADRI scales (both the CADRI-Ind and CADRI-Ptnr), the Background Information Sheet and the Expect
Respect Program Evaluation (Price et al., 1999; Wolfe et al., 2001). Students without permission to participate, and those who finished the measures early were asked to remain silent until all research materials were collected. Once all the students responded to the research measures and the measures were collected, the first part of the study was complete. Reliability rates for the ATDV scales were determined to range from 0.75 to 0.87 when first tested (Price et al., 1999), and in the current study, reliability rates for the ATDV scales ranged from 0.890 to 0.956. Wolfe and colleagues in 2001 found reliability rates of 0.68 to 0.75 for the CADRI, and in the current study, reliability rates for the CADRI ranged from 0.881 to 0.928.

Three full weeks from the date of the post test, the researcher reentered the control and experimental group classrooms on the Monday of the fourth week and collected data on all measures again. This follow-up collection of data helped determine short term effects of the program on students’ attitudes towards teen dating violence and if there were any changes in students’ behaviors within their dating relationships. Once the follow-up data were collected, the control group classes had the debriefing statement explaining their role in the study read aloud by the researcher. The control group classes were also told when they would receive the program since they might also have benefitted from the program. At the end of the debriefing period, students were invited to ask questions of the researcher about the study and their role in the study. None of the students indicated questions about their role in the study. Once all follow up data were collected from all experimental and control group classrooms from all three high schools, the study concluded.
This process occurred in both the Fall and Spring semesters of the high schools’ 2008-2009 school year in 24 classrooms in the three participating high schools. Data was entered after the follow-up collection in each high school and analyzed once all data was entered. The researcher will provide findings to the principal and school counselors indicating the incidence of teen dating violence in their schools as reported by their students and how effective the program was for their sample of students who participated in the study as well as overall effects.

Data Analysis

For analysis of the data, measures were compared within and between the control and experimental groups resulting in a Repeated Measures Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) design. This analysis allowed for discovery of possible differences in mean scores on the battery of measures of the CADRI to determine whether the program aided in decreasing participants’ reports of abusive behaviors within their relationships. This analysis was also implemented with the ATDV scales to determine if the program aided in changing participants’ attitudes toward teen dating violence. The Repeated Measures MANOVA determined differences in means both within and between the treatment groups.

Assumptions for Repeated Measures Multiple Analysis of Variance

Warner (2008) provides a list of assumptions that the data must have met to determine appropriate use of Repeated Measures MANOVA. Prior to collecting and analyzing data, the first assumption was that data was collected from independent sources. To best meet this assumption, the researcher and the classroom teacher explained
the importance of remaining silent while participating classmates completed the measures. Classes were reminded of this importance as needed during collection and overall, classes did remain quiet during data collection.

The second assumption was that measures used for analysis were quantitative. All four dependent variables: CADRI-Ind, CADRI-Ptnr, ATFDV, and ATMDV, were scored in a Likert scale manner. The CADRI-Ind and CADRI-Ptnr were scored as a range of four scores from “Never Happened” = 0 to “Often Happened” = 3. The ATFDV and ATMDV were scored as a range of five scores from “Strongly Agree” = 5 and “Strongly Disagree” = 1. Once all raw Likert scale data were collected and entered, the raw scores of the scales were reverse scored on positively phrased items. On the CADRI scales, a lower score indicated lower incidence of violent behaviors within the participants’ dating relationships. On the ATDV scales, a lower score indicated a lower tolerance of violence in dating relationships. Both the CADRI and ATDV scales were averaged to create overall scores on each of the four dependent variables, resulting in continuous scales of average scores appropriate for parametric analysis.

The third assumption required the data to follow a normal distribution curve. To determine normality, the average scores were converted to z-scores as outliers and inappropriate data were more easily discovered in standard form. Histograms with superimposed normal curves, and P-P line plots were generated to determine normality. Seven cases were removed from the data due to average scores exceeding +3 or -3 on the standardized normal curve. Histograms and P-P line plots from original data are available in Appendix J followed by the histograms and P-P line plots from data appropriate for
analysis in Appendix K. That all measures were represented by similar linear patterns was the fourth assumption met by examination of scatterplot matrices of dependent variables, included in Appendix L.

The fifth and final assumption that was that of equal variances found in the variance/covariance matrices of each measure. This assumption was tested at the start of each analysis and was determined by the Box’s M value. Box’s M is sensitive to violations of this assumption when a data set is represented by a large number of participants. Due to this, Box’s M was judged to determine the homogeneity of variance/covariance matrices at $\alpha = 0.001$, rather than the traditional $\alpha = 0.05$ since the number of participants included in the study exceed the number required to achieve the appropriate power.

Summary

This chapter presented the proposed methodology for this study including a review of the problem, improvements learned from mistakes made in the pilot study, the measures and research design implemented in this study, descriptions of the sample population and the statistical analysis. This study greatly improved upon the pilot study, utilizing established measures and implementing an experimental design that included both control and experimental groups. Students in both treatment groups responded to a set of measures designed to assess teens’ abusive behavior patterns within their dating relationships and another set of measures to assess their attitudes toward teen dating violence.
The experimental group classrooms received the program during Health class from Monday to Thursday, with post-test data collection on Friday from both control and experimental groups. After a period of three weeks had passed, data was again collected from both experimental and control classrooms on the Monday of the fourth week. The control group then received the program from Tuesday to Friday. There were post-test and follow up measures to determine the immediate and short-term effects of the Expect Respect program on participants. A Repeated Measures Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effects of the program within and between the control and experimental groups for each of the two null hypotheses.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine the efficacy of the Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence High School Program in one county in the state of Ohio. High school students’ behaviors within dating behaviors as reported on the CADRI scales and attitudes toward dating violence as reported on the ATDV scales were gathered to determine whether the program changed students’ attitudes and behaviors of teen dating violence.

This chapter includes analysis conducted to determine results of null hypothesis testing. Demographics describing the participants, response rate, reliability analyses, and descriptive data are included prior to statistical analysis of the null hypothesis. In addition, other aspects of potential interest are presented.

Description of Participants

A total of 521 students from 24 Health classes held in 3 high schools were invited to participate in the study. Of these 521 students, 332 students indicated interest in participating in the study by signing and returning Parental Consent and Student Assent forms prior to data collection, resulting in a response rate of 64%. Of the 332 student participants, 7 cases were identified as outliers by examining z-scores and histograms with the normal curves superimposed. Analyses were run with and without the outliers and since similar results were obtained, the 7 were removed from the data set for analysis. For the CADRI scales, only 141 cases were included in analyses due to incomplete data, or students indicating that they had not behaved in a dating relationship.
within the month prior to collection. In addition, only 272 cases were included in analyses on the ATDV scales also due to incomplete data, or as a result of selecting pairwise deletion in the statistical software to exclude unpaired data during analysis.

**Demographic Characteristics**

With control and experimental groups combined, 170 participants were female (51%) and 162 were male (49%). The majority of the 332 students identified as freshmen (207, 62%). Of participants, 98 (30%) were from High School A, 107 (32%) were from High School B, and 127 (38%) were from High School C. The majority of participants self identified as “white or European American” (262, 79%) and “black or African American” (37, 11%). Other categories of “Hispanic or Latino,” “Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander,” “Asian,” “American Indian or Alaska Native,” and “Other” described the remaining 30 participants (10%), the largest of these was “Other” (23, 6.9%) and seemed to describe participants who wrote in “Biracial” or “black/white” most often as the descriptive.

One hundred ninety of all participants (57%) enrolled in Health class during the Fall semester, and 142 (43%) enrolled during the Spring semester of the 2008-2009 school year. One hundred ninety four participants (58%) indicated they had not shared what they were learning in Health class while 138 (42%) indicated that they had shared information learned in Health class with others. The overall sample was divided into treatment groups. The control group included 165 students (49%) and the experimental group included 167 students (50%). Table 1 displays the above reported demographic data split into control and experimental groups.
### Demographic Information by Treatment Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Control ($N = 165$)</th>
<th>Experimental ($N = 167$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>$%$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biological Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2008</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/European American</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Shared</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>61.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dating Experience

When asked about dating status, 64 (19%) participants indicated that they had not yet begun dating while 247 (74%) participants indicated having begun to date and 21 (7%) participants did not answer. Of the 247 (74%) participants who indicated they have begun dating, categories of dating experiences were presented and participants were encouraged to check one or more categories that described their dating experiences. One hundred thirty two of the 247 participants (53%) reported experience “going out in male/female groups,” 122 (49%) reported experience “dating different people,” 109 (44%) reported experience “dating one person without any definite commitment,” 135 (55%) reported experience “dating one person exclusively,” and 4 (2%) reported experience being “engaged.” When asked at what age participants began dating, 239 of the 247 responded, indicating an age range of 6 to 16 years, and a mean age of 12 years.

Since they began dating, 228 participants most often reported having dated 4 partners, and provided a range of dating one to 30 partners. Two hundred and four participants responded to questions related to dating in their Freshman year. These participants most often reported dating one partner (102, 50%) in their Freshman year, followed by dating two (56, 27%) and three (25, 12%) partners. The longest Freshman relationships were reported to last an average of 23 weeks, or about 6 months, and the shortest to last an average of 4 weeks, or one month. Sixty eight participants responded to dating questions related to their sophomore year. These participants most often reported dating one partner (44, 65%), followed by dating two partners (18, 26%). The longest sophomore relationships were reported to last an average of 25 weeks, or one week over
6 months and the shortest to last an average of 5 weeks, just over one month. Results of
dating experiences in junior and senior years are not included due to the extremely small
sample size of 3 participants in each of these categories.

Of the 100 students who indicated having a current dating partner, reports provide
the following information: participants most often engage in exclusively dating one
partner at a time (based on 97 responses) with an average relationship duration of 23
weeks (based on 98 responses), an average of 16 hours spent alone together (based on 97
responses), an average of having 5 arguments per week (based on 93 responses), and
describing the relationship as “Very Important” (based on 99 responses).

Of the 119 students who indicated having an ex-dating partner, reports provide
the following information: participants most often engaged in exclusively dating one
partner at a time (based on 115 responses) with an average relationship duration of 25
weeks (based on 117 responses), an average of 14 hours spent alone together (based on
111 responses), an average of having 4 arguments per week (based on 108 responses),
and describing the relationship as “Important” (based on 119 responses).

Knowledge of Violence in Relationships

Participants were also asked about their knowledge of others who have
experienced domestic and teen dating violence. When asked “Do you know an adult (20
years or older) who has been a victim of domestic violence?” 167 (50.3%) responded
“No” and 165 (49.7%) responded “Yes.” When asked “Do you know an adult (20 years
or older) who has been a batterer/abuser of a partner?” 211 (63.6%) responded “No” and
121 (36.4%) responded “Yes.” When asked “Do you know a teenager (13 – 19 years old)
who has been a victim of dating violence?” 201 (60.7%) responded “No” and 130 (39.3%) responded “Yes.” When asked “Do you know a teenager (13 – 19 years old) who has been a batterer/abuser of a dating partner?” 250 (75.5%) responded “No” and 81 (24.5%) responded “Yes.”

Examination of the Measures

Once the data set for analysis was established, the measures were examined for reliability and then association utilizing a correlation matrix. Reliability for the CADRI-Ind at Post Test was 0.881 and at Follow Up was 0.928. The correlation between the CADRI-Ind at Post Test and Follow Up collections was 0.498. Reliability for the CADRI-Ptnr at Post Test was 0.886 and at Follow Up was 0.926. The correlation between the CADRI-Ptnr at Post Test and Follow Up collections was 0.462. Reliability for the ATFDV scale at Post Test was 0.890 and at Follow Up was 0.935. The correlation between the Post Test ATFDV collection and the Follow Up ATFDV collection was 0.794. Reliability for the ATMDV scale at Post Test was 0.930 and at Follow Up was 0.956. The correlation between the Post test ATMDV collection and the Follow Up ATMDV collection was 0.828.

It was noted that the CADRI-Ind and CADRI-Ptnr scales were well correlated with one another at 0.889 for Post Test and 0.957 for Follow Up collections. Also, the ATFDV and ATMDV scales were well correlated with one another at 0.796 at Post Test and 0.871 at Follow Up. However the overall CADRI and ATDV scales were poorly correlated with one another with correlations all below 0.250. Due to this finding, a factor analysis was conducted to determine how these measures best group together to define
how data would best be analyzed. The factor analysis suppressed weak correlations between measures and revealed that the CADRI and ATDV scales were not related in a manner that would facilitate appropriate analysis if combined. Therefore, the CADRI scales were analyzed separately from the ATDV scales and are reported as such below (Appendix M).

Hypothesis Testing Using Repeated Measures MANOVA Analyses

The research hypotheses for this study were: 1.) The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ reports of violence in their dating relationships, and 2.) The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence.

Analyses conducted to answer these two research questions utilized the General Linear Model (GLM) Repeated Measures MANOVA analysis. This procedure allowed for examination of differences in mean scores between treatment groups (control and experimental), within each group and across time from the Post Test data collection to the Follow Up data collection and if any interactions occurred between treatment group and time (if one group’s scores were lower than the other group’s at time one, but were greater at time two). The results were compared with the traditional $\alpha = 0.05$, and Pillai’s Trace was used to determine the results as it is robust to violations of normality. The original SPSS tables of the analyses are available for review (Appendices M, N and O).
Statistical Testing of the First Hypothesis

To address the first hypothesis: The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program will have no effect on teen participants’ reports of violence within their dating relationships, the CADRI scales were analyzed. The result of the Repeated Measures MANOVA was to fail to reject the null hypothesis. Statistically significant differences were not found between treatment groups, Pillai’s Trace = 0.019; $F(2, 138) = 1.320, p = 0.270$, nor from Post Test to Follow Up, Pillai’s Trace = 0.003; $F(2, 138) = 0.188, p = 0.829$, and no significant interaction was found between treatment group and time, Pillai’s Trace = 0.013; $F(2, 138) = 0.884, p = 0.416$. Additional analyses of CADRI scales ceased since this first hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Statistical Testing of the Second Hypothesis

To address the second hypothesis: The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence, the ATDV scales were analyzed. The result of this Repeated Measures MANOVA analysis was to reject the null hypothesis. Statistically significant differences were found in ATDV scores between treatment groups, Pillai’s Trace = 0.049; $F(2, 269) = 6.925, p = 0.001$ with a Partial Eta Squared ($\eta^2$) of 0.049, suggesting that 5% of the variance in scores are attributed to which group participants were assigned. The results were also statistically significant within groups from Post Test to Follow Up, Pillai’s Trace = 0.061; $F(2, 269) = 8.687, p < 0.001$ with a Partial $\eta^2$ of 0.061, suggesting that 6% of the variance in scores is attributed to the time between collections. No significant
interaction of treatment group and time was found, Pillai’s Trace = 0.012; $F(2, 269) = 1.656, p = 0.193$.

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects post-hoc analyses revealed that the significance found in the Repeated Measures MANOVA analysis between treatment groups was due to differences in scores on the ATFDV scales, $F(1, 270) = 5.297, p = 0.022$ (Partial $\eta^2 = 0.019$). The univariate post-hoc analyses indicated that differences in scores from Post Test to Follow Up across time was also due to the ATFDV scale, $F(1, 270) = 9.083, p = .003$ (Partial $\eta^2 = 0.033$). The control group had significantly higher average scores on the ATFDV scale than the experimental group across time. Also, the control group’s average scores on the ATFDV scale was significantly lower on Follow Up. Figure 1 illustrates this finding.

**Figure 1.** Mean of averaged ATFDV scores ($\pm SE$) for control group ($n = 165$) and experimental group ($n = 167$) across time. Lower scores indicate lower tolerance of female perpetration of violence in a teen dating relationship.
Post Hoc Statistical Testing of Additional Hypotheses

Post Hoc null hypotheses for this study were: i) The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on male or female teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence; ii) The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence by grade level; iii) The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence by High School; iv) The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence even if they shared information about the program with one another; v) The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence; vi) The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on white/European American, black/African American or Other Racial Group participants’ attitudes toward dating violence.

Since differences in means on the ATDV scales were found to be significant, these additional analyses were conducted with the ATDV scales. Also, since differences in between treatment groups and within groups across time have been tested and determined to be statistically significant overall, these effects were also statistically significant in the following analyses. Due to this, only the results pertaining to the effects of the additional between subjects factors are discussed. (Appendix O).
Post Hoc Statistical Testing of Hypothesis Including Biological Sex

The null hypothesis: The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program will have no effect on male or female teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence, was tested by adding biological sex as another between-subjects factor in the Repeated Measures MANOVA conducted earlier to test hypothesis two. The result of this analysis was to reject the null hypothesis. Significant differences were found between mean scores on the ATDV scales for male and female participants, Pillai’s Trace = 0.130; $F(2, 267) = 19.949, p < 0.001$ (Partial $\eta^2 = 0.130$). Univariate analyses determined that the significance was caused by male and female participants’ scores on both the ATFDV, $F(1, 268) = 39.586, p < 0.001$ (Partial $\eta^2 = 0.129$), and the ATMDV, $F(1, 268) = 33.389, p < 0.001$ (Partial $\eta^2 = 0.111$). Male participants’ scores were significantly higher than female participants’ scores on the ATFDV and the ATMDV regardless of treatment group assignment. Figure 2 illustrates this finding.

Post Hoc Statistical Testing of Hypothesis Including Grade Level

The null hypothesis: The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence by grade level, was tested by adding grade level as another between-subjects factor in the original Repeated Measures MANOVA conducted earlier to test hypothesis two. The result of this analysis was to fail to reject the null hypothesis. No significant differences were found between grade levels, Pillai’s Trace = 0.010; $F(2, 261) = 1.336, p = 0.265$, nor in interactions with treatment group and time.
Figure 2. Means of averaged ATDV scores (+SE) for scores on the ATFDV and ATMDV for control group \(n = 165\) and experimental group \(n = 167\) by biological sex across time. Lower scores indicate lower tolerance of perpetration of violence in a teen dating relationship.

*Post Hoc Statistical Testing of Hypothesis Including High School*

The null hypothesis: The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence by High School, was tested by adding High School as another between-subjects factor in the original Repeated Measures MANOVA conducted earlier to test hypothesis two. The result of this analysis was to fail to reject the null hypothesis. No significant differences were found between High Schools, Pillai’s Trace = 0.018; \(F(4, 532) = 1.237, p = 0.294\), nor in interactions with treatment group and time.
Post Hoc Statistical Testing of Hypothesis Including Shared Information

The null hypothesis: The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence even if they shared information about the program with one another, was tested by adding Shared Information as another between-subjects factor in the original Repeated Measures MANOVA conducted earlier to test hypothesis two. The result of this analysis was to fail to reject the null hypothesis. No significant differences were found between students who shared information and those who did not, Pillai’s Trace = 0.009; $F(2, 267) = 1.152, p = 0.318$, nor in interactions with treatment group and time.

Post Hoc Statistical Testing of Hypothesis Including Semester

The null hypothesis: The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program will have no effect on Fall 2008 or Spring 2009 teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence, was tested by adding Semester as another between-subjects factor in the original Repeated Measures MANOVA conducted earlier to test hypothesis two. The result of this analysis was to reject the null hypothesis. No significant differences were found between students in Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 semesters, Pillai’s Trace = 0.001; $F(2, 267) = 0.168, p = 0.846$, however a significant interaction was found in the three way interaction of Time x Treatment Group x Semester, Pillai’s Trace = 0.032; $F(2, 267) = 4.422, p = 0.013$ (Partial $\eta^2 = 0.032$). Upon further univariate analysis, it was determined that the significant interaction occurred on the ATMDV scale, $F(1, 268) = 8.845, p = 0.003$ (Partial $\eta^2 = 0.032$). In Fall 2008, control group scores on the ATMDV increased, suggesting increased tolerance of male perpetration in dating relationships.
over time while experimental group scores decreased, indicating decreased tolerance of male perpetration over time. In Spring 2009, the control group scores on the ATMDV statistically did not change, however the experimental group scores on the ATMDV increased, indicating an increase in tolerance of male perpetration of violence in dating relationships. Figure 3 below illustrates this finding.

![Figure 3](image)

*Figure 3*. Mean average ATMDV scores (+SE) for control group (n = 165) and experimental group (n = 167) by semester across time. Lower scores indicate lower tolerance of male perpetration of violence in a teen dating relationship.

**Post Hoc Statistical Testing of Hypothesis Including Race**

The null hypothesis: The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on white/European American, black/African American or Other Racial Group teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence, was tested by adding Race as another between-subjects factor in the original Repeated Measures MANOVA conducted earlier to test hypothesis two. The result of this analysis was to
reject the null hypothesis. No statistically significant differences were found between students based on race, Pillai’s Trace = 0.007; $F(4, 532) = 0.445, p = 0.776$. Statistically significant interactions were found in Time x Treatment Group x Race, Pillai’s Trace = 0.038; $F(4,532) = 2.581, p = 0.007$ (Partial $\eta^2 = 0.019$). Upon further univariate analysis, it was determined that the significant interaction between Time, Treatment Group and Race was due to statistically significant effects in the ATMDV scale, $F(2, 266) = 4.984, p = 0.007$ (Partial $\eta^2 = 0.036$).

On the ATMDV scale, for white/European American participants, the experimental group scores were lower than control group scores across time. For black/African American participants at Post Test, the control group scores were lower than experimental group scores. By Follow Up, the control group scores increased with statistical significance while the experimental group scores decreased. For participants of other racial groups, the control group scores remained lower than experimental group scores across time, with the largest difference between scores at Post Test. Figure 4 illustrates these findings.

**Bonferroni Corrections**

Bonferroni corrections were not implemented for these final analyses as they were conducted for exploratory purposes only. Typically, when running more than one analysis in a data set, oftentimes a Bonferroni correction is utilized to reduce the risk of Type I error. To implement Bonferroni corrections, the initial alpha level ($\alpha = 0.05$) is divided by the number of analyses run. In the case of this set of analyses, the ATDV scales were analyzed on more than one occasion. The first analysis was completed on the
Figure 4. Mean average ATMDV scores (+SE) for control group (n = 165) and experimental group (n = 167) by Race across time. Lower scores indicate lower tolerance of male perpetration of violence in a teen dating relationship.

overall ATDV scales data, with follow up univariate tests to determine the underlying factors causing significance. Six supplemental analyses were run, some including univariate tests to determine underlying factors. This results in a Bonferroni correction of at least $\alpha = 0.003$ to determine significance in the analyses. When this correction is applied to the analyses described, significance continues to be established in many of the tests. However, if the Bonferroni correction was applied, and the $p$ values were no longer statistically significant, the interpretations on main effects or interactions would have been excluded. The interpretation of statistically significant findings in the Repeated Measures MANOVA analyses would have been that the combination of the ATFDV and ATMDV scores contributed to the change.
Results of the Program Evaluation

The results of the program evaluation were tabulated by frequencies and percentages. One hundred fifty eight participants provided responses on the program evaluation at Post Test, reflected in the frequencies and percentages reported in Tables 2 and 3. The questions pertaining to the program overall are found in Table 2. The questions pertaining to the presentation style are found in Table 3. Nine of the 10 questions indicated that the majority of participants “agreed” with positive statements about the program. One question regarding Velma’s story indicated that the majority of participants “strongly agreed” that they valued hearing her story.

To determine if participants’ approval of the program extended from Post Test to Follow Up, the participants were again asked to respond to the Program Evaluation at Follow Up. These 10 questions were then averaged together to create two sets of mean scores to be compared using a dependent t-test. One hundred thirty nine participants provided valid responses to the Program Evaluation at both collection times for inclusion in this analysis. The mean of the Post Test Program Evaluation was 4.17. The mean of the Follow Up Program Evaluation was 4.07. The correlation was $r = 0.802$.

The null hypothesis for this analysis was: The mean scores on the Program Evaluation at Post Test are equal to the mean scores on the Program Evaluation at Follow Up. The results of the dependent t-test reject the null hypothesis ($t = 3.097; df = 138; p = 0.002$). This analysis indicates a statistically significant drop in program evaluation scores across time. (Appendix P)
Table 2.

**Program Evaluation Results: Program Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel as though I benefited from the EXPECT RESPECT Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The program helped my understanding of teen dating violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I valued hearing from a victim of teen dating/domestic violence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The information provided is important for teenagers to know about dating relationships.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am better able to recognize violence in a teen dating relationship because of this program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.

*Program Evaluation Results: Presentation Satisfaction*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The presenters were easily understood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The handouts were helpful to my understanding of the material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The presenters answered mine and my classmates’ questions effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of Power Point as presentation style was helpful to my understanding of the material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The coordinators of the program were organized and the program went smoothly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to these results, students were encouraged to write comments about the program following prompts. Seemingly common responses to the prompt “Things I learned that changed my perceptions of teen dating violence were:” included descriptions of the three types of violence, issues of power and control, having learned that males can be victims of violence in dating relationships, having learned what really can happen to teens, and how to keep safe from teen dating violence. By far the most common response to the prompt “The most valuable parts of the program to me were:” referred to Velma sharing her story with the students and encouraging them to prevent violence in their romantic relationships. When responding to “Things on which I would improve in the program were:” responses referred most to the power point slides, introducing more activities, and asking more survivors to attend class and share their stories. Finally, an opportunity for open feedback was presented as “Please provide any additional feedback to the presenters for future presentations:” and most often resulted in statements of encouragement and thanks for providing the education and caring for the students’ well-being.

Summary

Results of the analyses were reported in this chapter. The Repeated Measures MANOVA results failed to reject the first null hypothesis that the Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence will have no effect on teen participants’ reports of violence within their dating relationships. The second null hypothesis that the Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence, was rejected. It was determined that
participants’ average scores on the Attitudes Toward Teen Dating Violence scales were significantly different between treatment groups and across time. A set of subsequent univariate analyses revealed that the Attitudes Toward Female Dating Violence scale significantly explained 2% of the variance in scores between treatment groups and 3% of the variance in scores over time.

Additionally, biological sex was also found to have had a statistically significant effect when added to the original analysis. Male participants’ average scores were significantly higher than female participants’ scores on both the Attitudes Toward Female Dating Violence and Attitudes Toward Male Dating Violence scales across time. Biological sex of respondent significantly explained 13% of the variance in scores on both ATDV scales overall. Interactions with time, treatment group and semester were found as were interactions with time, treatment group and race.

Finally, the Program Evaluation indicated overall approval of the program, though dependent t-test results determined that approval scores decreased significantly across time. A discussion of these results is presented in the next chapter along with limitations, implications, and directions for future research.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This study was conducted to determine the efficacy of the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program for high school students. A discussion of the results commences in this chapter including topics of limitations, implications and suggestions for future research.

Participants

*Demographics*

The results of randomization of classrooms into control and experimental groups provided nearly equal numbers of students in the control and experimental groups, as well as somewhat equal numbers of males and females within control and experimental groups. Though the only randomization factor utilized was class period, other factors were represented nearly equally by chance. Racial groups were almost perfectly distributed between control and experimental groups, the vast majority of both treatment groups represented by white/European Americans. Other categories were fairly well equal between both treatment groups, with the exception of how many participants were from each of the three high schools, and how many participated per semester.

Taking into account the reported demographics of the area in which the participants lived, demographics of the sample of participants were representative of the population. In each high school, there were nearly equal numbers of male and female students, the vast majority of which were white/European Americans.

(publicschoolreview.com retrieved September 13, 2008)
**Dating Experiences**

Data and statistics on teens’ experiences of dating and dating violence is not widely known or reported (ODVN, 2009). It is possible that studies are difficult to conduct due to involvement of minors, and requirements to gain permission from parents or guardians for underage participants. Gaining permission to participate in a study about teens that experience abuse in dating relationships requires teens to talk about their experiences with parents or guardians, which literature suggests teens are not likely to do. Oftentimes if teens are in violent relationships, if they talk to anyone about it, it will most likely be friends rather than parents or other trusted adults who might help report the phenomenon (Adelman & Kil, 2007; Lavoie et al., 2000; Sears et al., 2006). Because of this, the data gathered in this study regarding teens’ dating experiences is unique and a valuable addition to professional literature on teen dating violence.

Participants were asked about their dating experiences as part of the CADRI-Ind and CADRI-Ptnr scales. While analysis of the CADRI scales were not found to be statistically significant, the information gathered from questions regarding students’ dating behaviors was informative. Most of the participants reported having begun dating prior to exposure to the program, and at an average age of 12 years. This finding supports studies indicating that dating begins around the age of 12 (CDC, 2008; Rand & Saltzman, 2003; Sears et al., 2007; Shearer & Shearer, 2008) and suggests that the *Expect Respect* program is not in fact reaching teens prior to their first dating experiences. Previous studies indicated that teens begin dating in high school (Adelman & Kil, 2007; Connolly et al, 2004) which is why the program has been delivered only in high schools.
It is possible that participants who began dating prior to exposure to the program, had existing knowledge of teen dating violence. This may be one explanation for the fairly low tolerance toward violence in relationships suggested on the ATDV scale scores provided by the control group overall. The relatively low tolerance for violence in relationships in control groups was not unexpected as other authors have discovered similar phenomenon (Glickman Sederoff, 2002; Joseph & Proulx, 2008; Wolfe et al., 2003). It is interesting that the participants indicate a low tolerance for teen dating violence when presented with statements about dating violence from the third person, yet national statistics indicate that 25% of teens experience teen dating violence. Perhaps there is a disconnect for high school students in understanding what is and is not acceptable in relationships when presented with statements about others’ relationships, and their own decision making within their own relationships.

Overall, participants who had begun dating prior to exposure to the program reported that they most often dated one partner exclusively for about six months. Participants reported spending time alone with their partners an average range of 14 – 16 hours per week and described their relationships as “important” or “very important” to them. Shearer & Shearer (2008) also found similar reports from the CADRI on their sample of Arab and Jewish teen participants.

Knowledge of Relationship Violence

Students were also asked questions about their knowledge of individuals who have experienced domestic and teen dating violence. This is an area of unique contribution to the professional literature. For these questions on relationship violence,
the term “teen” was defined as a person between the ages of 13 and 19 years and “adult” as 20 years old or older. These age groups were defined as such in order to encompass the age of high school students as “teens.” While legally 18 and 19 year olds are considered adults, teens of these ages may be in high school, and this way, participants could quickly estimate if they have known a “teen” who has experienced dating violence simply by deciding if he or she has known a high school student who has had these experiences. When initially asked, the majority of students reported not knowing an adult who has perpetrated violence on a partner nor a teen who has experienced violence as a victim or perpetrator. However, half of participants reported knowing a victim of domestic violence.

Statistical Analyses

Statistical Testing of Hypothesis One

The first hypothesis was: The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program will have no effect on teen participants’ reports of violence in their dating relationships. Repeated Measures MANOVA Analyses of the CADRI scales indicated no significant results, failing to reject the null hypothesis. Other studies had difficulty detecting statistical significance when utilizing the CADRI in MANOVA and Regression analyses (Bentley, Galliher, & Ferguson, 2007; Schiff & Zeira, 2005; Simon, Kobeilski, & Martin, 2008). It is likely that low numbers of participants responding to the CADRI scales resulted in a power level too low to detect the possibly minute changes in participants’ scores. The low number of participants responding to the CADRI may have
been due to the restrictions outlined for response, or success in teens’ recognition of abuse in their relationships and ending them.

Participants had to have experienced dating in the month prior to the data collection to respond to the CADRI scales. Though many of the participants indicated that they had begun dating, not many indicated having dated within the month prior to data collection at either of the two collection times. It is also possible that if the Expect Respect program had achieved its goal to help teens recognize teen dating violence so that teens would leave abusive relationships, then participants may have responded to the CADRI during the first data collection and described an abusive relationship, and by the second collection, have ended the relationship and thus did not respond to the CADRI at the second collection. If this occurred and participants had been dating a partner at one time, but not another, pairwise deletion in SPSS eliminated the data during analysis.

All of this considered, it is most likely the low number of participants (141) in this study that responded to the CADRI that caused lack of power to detect statistically significant changes in scores between treatment groups and within groups across time. Sherer and Sherer (2008) were successful in utilizing the CADRI to find statistical significance in ANOVA and MANCOVA analyses, however their sample size was in excess of one thousand participants. This relatively large number of participants likely aided in achieving power great enough to detect the possibly minute changes in scores that would indicate statistical significance. The effect sizes found by Sherer and Sherer (2008) ranged from $\eta^2 = 0.006$ to $\eta^2 = 0.150$, indicating small effects that would require a large sample size to detect statistically significant changes in CADRI scores.
Statistical Testing of Hypothesis Two

The second hypothesis for this study was: The *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program will have no effect on teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence. The Repeated Measures MANOVA analysis found statistical significance between scores produced by participants in control and experimental groups on the ATDV scales. Statistical significance was also found on the ATDV scales across time, therefore the null was rejected. This suggests that the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program did initially change participants’ attitudes toward teen dating violence, and maintained an effect three weeks after exposure to the program.

Upon further analysis, it was discovered that the ATFDV scales, those describing behaviors of female perpetrators, explained 2% of the variation in participants’ scores between groups and 3% of the variation in participants’ scores from the first collection to the second. Though literature supports an equal likelihood of females and males perpetrating and experiencing violence in adolescent dating relationships (Callahan et al., 2003; CDC, 2006; Connelly & Josephson, 2007; Sears et al., 2006), in the classrooms it seemed that participants were less aware of the fact that females also perpetrate violence which may explain the significance found between the groups’ attitudes specifically toward female perpetration.

Since it is most likely the *Expect Respect* program that affected the initial change in scores between groups, the finding suggests that the *Expect Respect* program initially decreases tolerance of female perpetration in adolescent dating relationships. Since the effect continued across time, it is possible that teens’ experiences in the three weeks
between data collections supported material presented and taught during the *Expect Respect* program that reinforced a continued low tolerance in the experimental group participants. Glickman Sederoff (2002) also found significant changes in scores on the ATFDV scales during her study. Perhaps lack of knowledge of female perpetration is common in teens and should continue to be a topic of focus for future presentations of this program and other teen dating prevention programs.

The fact that the ATMDV scales, focused on male perpetration of violence in a dating relationship, were not significantly different between groups, or across time, is good news. This indicates that participants were at least somewhat aware of violent behaviors males exhibit as perpetrators in violent relationships dominated by violence and that participants’ knowledge remains across time. Perhaps part of the reasoning for participants’ knowledge of male perpetration prior to the *Expect Respect* program lies in exposure to statistics of domestic violence. While male and female adolescents tend to experience teen dating violence as victims and perpetrators equally, by adulthood reports demonstrate that most often females are victims and males are abusers (Birchard, 2000; Bosch, 2001; CDC, 2008; Garcia-Moreno, 1999; Garcia-Moreno et al., 2006; ODVN, 2008; Kim-Goh & Baello, 2000; Kulwicki, 2002; Rand & Saltzman, 2003; Thorp, 2006; WHO, 2008).

Television programs, movies and news reports about domestic violence as well as personal experiences with domestic violence may have helped teen participants recognize the dangers and signs of potentially abusive male dating partners (Birchard, 2000; Johnson et al., 1995; Lavoie et al., 2000; Manganello, 2008; Rivadeneyra & Lebo, 2008).
Despite the lack of statistical significance, the experimental group’s average ATMDV scores were consistently lower than control group’s ATMDV scores even when statistical significance was not found. Therefore, a trend was established that suggests that the Expect Respect program may help to decrease participants’ tolerance of male perpetration of dating violence as well.

Effects of Other Variables on Overall Findings

The Effect of Biological Sex

The null hypothesis including biological sex as a variable was: The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program will have no effect on male or female teen participants’ attitudes toward dating violence. Repeated Measures MANOVA resulted in statistical significance between male and female participants’ scores. Results were also statistically significant for males’ and females’ ATDV scores across time. Thirteen percent of the variance in ATDV scores among participants was attributed to participants’ biological sex. Upon closer inspection of the data utilizing univariate follow-up analyses, differences between male and female participants’ scores from control and experimental groups and across time were due again to the ATFDV scale, as in the overall model.

In addition, differences between male and female participants’ scores regardless of treatment group assignment were significantly different from one another. Male participants’ ATDV scores were consistently higher than female participants’ ATDV scores, on both the female perpetrator scales (ATFDV) and the male perpetrator scales (ATMDV). Other studies have also found this effect (Glickman Sederoff, 2002;
Josephson & Proulx, 2008). Also, a significant interaction was detected across time
between male and female participants’ scores on the ATMDV.

It was not surprising that male participants’ scores were consistently higher than
female participants’ scores. Literature suggests that male adolescents often have a higher
tolerance of violence (Glickman Sederoff, 2002; Joseph & Proulx, 2008; Wolfe et al.,
2003). It is important to note that in this study, there was an unbalanced number of males
and females in the control and experimental groups. The control group was represented
by a majority of females, and the experimental group was represented by a majority of
males. It is possible that the effect of biological sex had an overall effect on the outcome
of each statistical test. In future research, biological sex as a covariate may aid in
determining main effects of treatment.

While there was a significant trend established for both male and female
participants to continue to indicate low tolerance of female perpetration in dating
relationships on the ATFDV scale over time, male participants’ ATMDV scores indicated
an increased tolerance of male perpetration in dating relationships over the three week
period between data collection. Any number of factors may have caused male
participants in both control and experimental groups to increase tolerance of male
perpetration over time. Perhaps an increased testosterone level, common for males of this
age group to experience, affected their tolerance of violence (Kaiser & Powers, 2006;
Mazur, 2006; Ramirez, 2003), perhaps a new video game or movie was released that
advocated violent behaviors (Manganello, 2008), perhaps a major sporting event occurred
that somehow affected them (Mazur, 2006), or perhaps it is simply a random effect in the
data collected from male participants.

What seems to be important to the trend found in the results is that though male
participants’ tolerance of male perpetration increased over time, the males in the
experimental group consistently maintained a lower level of tolerance than the control
group as seen in Figure 2.

*The Effect of Semester*

For the interaction with treatment group, time and semester, Fall semester control
group ATMDV scores increased over time while experimental group ATMDV scores
deresased over time. This is viewed positively in light of the research study. Though
control group participants’ tolerance of male perpetration in dating violence continued to
increase, the experimental group participants’ tolerance of male perpetration in dating
violence continued to decrease. The more puzzling interaction occurred in Spring
semester.

In Spring, for the first time, participants’ scores in the experimental group were
higher than the participants’ scores in the control group across time. Also of interest was
that the control group’s scores indicated a decreased tolerance of male perpetration over
time while the experimental group’s scores indicated an increased tolerance of male
perpetration over time.

When descriptive data were examined, it was noted that the Fall 2008 semester
had more participants in the experimental group (109, 57%) and the Spring 2009
semester had more participants in the control group (84, 59%). When the control and
experimental groups were equally distributed overall were separated into Fall 2008 and Spring 2009 semesters, the numbers of participants in each group were no longer equally distributed. This may be the cause of the interaction noticed in the separate semesters. Perhaps by random chance the groups with more participants included participants with less tolerance for male perpetration of dating violence.

Also, since biological sex was found to be a statistically significant factor, it may have had an effect on each semester’s results, especially if male and female participants were not equally distributed between treatment groups by semester. Since it has been suggested that males tend to have a higher tolerance of dating violence, and there were more males in the control group in Fall 2008 and in the experimental group in Spring 2009, it is possible that the cause for the increase in scores in these groups is due to the effect of biological sex. Other studies have also found that biological sex had a statistically significant effect on results of analyses (Glickman Sederoff, 2002; Joseph & Proulx, 2008; Wolfe et al., 2003), which supports the likelihood of biological sex playing a role in this interaction in semester.

It is also possible, that the historical effect of two popular R&B artists’ publicized dating violence experiences that came to public attention during the Spring 2009 portion of the study affected scores (Birchar, 2000; Johnson et al., 1995; Lavoie et al., 2000; Manganello, 2008). Perhaps participants in the experimental group identified with the male music star, Chris Brown, who admittedly perpetrated violence against his female music star girlfriend, Rihanna. Survey results reported by The Boston Globe indicated that of 200 teen respondents, 46% said that Rihanna was to blame for the violence
perpetrated by Brown (Valencia & Nierstedt, 2009). The Boston Public Health Commission (2009) conducted the survey and included additional statistics from the survey in a media release including “52% [of respondents] said both individuals were to blame for the incident, despite knowing at the time that Rihanna had been beaten badly enough to require hospital treatment,” and that males and females were equally likely to have responded in favor of Brown.

These reports indicate that it is possible that an increase in tolerance of male perpetration of violence could have resulted from this story in the media and affected participants’ scores on the ATMDV scale. Details of the incident unfolded during the Spring semester through a variety of media, between Post Test and Follow Up data collections in High Schools A and B and during the time the Expect Respect program was being delivered in the experimental group classrooms of High School C. Based on reports of teens’ reactions to this specific story, and media influence in general, it is highly likely that the violence perpetrated on Rihanna by Chris Brown affected scores on the ATDV scales (Birchard, 2000; Johnson et al., 1995; Lavoie et al., 2000; Mackey, 2009; Manganello, 2008; Rivadeneyra & Lebo, 2008; Wolchover, 2009).

The Effect of Race

For the statistically significant interaction with treatment group, time and race, participants who identified as white/European American differed between treatment groups on the ATMDV, the experimental group scores demonstrating a lower tolerance of male perpetration than in control group scores across time.
Initially, participants who identified as black/African American and were in the control group had lower scores than those who identified as black/African American in the experimental group on the ATMDV scales. By the second data collection, participants who identified as black/African American in the control group demonstrated a higher tolerance for male perpetration than participants in the experimental group. Participants who identified with another racial background in the control group also initially had ATMDV scores that were lower than experimental group, but by the second data collection, participants who identified as another race scored equally between control and experimental groups. These differences in scores by non-white/European American students are most likely due to random error produced from the low sample sizes representing non-white/European American groups.

Though these trends and possible reasons for these trends can be considered, the numbers of participants representing black/African American participants (37, 11%) and participants of other racial backgrounds was extremely low (33, 10%), so any explanation for the trends are purely speculation. Additional investigation into how non-white/European American students respond to the Expect Respect program would have to be conducted in order to speculate about true tolerance of dating violence for these groups.

In 2005, Foshee and colleagues conducted a study to determine if associations existed between a number of predictive factors of teen dating violence and race and socioeconomic status. The results suggested that factors such as whether or not a teen came from a single parent or two parent home, use of parental corporal punishment, and
living in an urban or rural setting did have a positive statistically significant correlation with experiences of dating violence for black teens. However, the sample of participants was only 16% black, causing the same limitation in findings as this study; too few black participants to determine true effects. In addition, it was noted that inter-racial differences existed that made definitive statements difficult, therefore only trends were illustrated (Foshee et al., 2005).

Weisz and Black (2008) found that young African American adolescents experienced difficulty in determining when or if they should intervene if presented with a friend’s or acquaintance’s experience of teen dating violence. Perhaps confusion existed in black/African American participants in this study about how to respond to the ATDV scales since they were all worded in third person perspective.

It has been found that black/African American females are at a higher risk than white females to experience dating violence (Howard et al., 2007). It has also been found that perpetration of violence in a dating relationship increases reciprocal perpetration (Luthra & Gidycz, 2006), and the more black/African American adolescents are exposed to dating violence by experience, as a witness, or through the media, the more likely they are to tolerate violence in their dating relationships (Foshee et al., 2005; Johnson et al., 1995). If this is true for the black/African American participants in this study, then they may have developed a higher tolerance to dating violence as it was presented and discussed during the program. Perhaps discussion outside of class influenced their tolerance, or reactions of students in class challenging the accuracy of the material presented lead them to disregard the warnings and signs presented.
Finally, Bougere, Rowley and Lee (2004) conducted a survey of white/European American college students and black/African American students to determine differences in experiences of dating violence. They found no statistically significant differences between the racial groups’ reported experiences. They conclude their article stating that race is not a statistically significant factor or predictor for dating violence and that efforts to demonstrate such differences wastes time and resources that could better be used to determine the true elements that propagate violence in dating relationships.

Limitations

The limitations of this study include: a potentially biased sample of participants, possible violation of independent responses, low power for detecting changes in CADRI scores and racial subgroups, and effect of history.

Issues of Bias

Participants agreed to respond to measures used to determine the efficacy of the Expect Respect program from three targeted high schools in one county in the state of Ohio. Participants were required to gain parental consent and give assent in order to participate in the study. This situation alone may have caused bias in the sample participants studied. During the pilot study, parental consent was not required, while the current study required students to carry a letter of explanation, consent and assent forms home for parental review, obtain parent signature(s) indicating consent or dissent and then returning forms to the classroom teacher prior to the start of the study.

It is possible that this requirement of students to take such an active role in obtaining permission from parents, and leaving them with all responsibility for returning
forms may have affected the response rate. It is possible that the students who did gain permission from parents and gave assent to participate were more responsible in handling forms, and may have had better opportunities to discuss the study with parents to obtain permission. This may also be true for students whose parents actively dissented permission for their teens to participate in the study.

Students who did not turn in forms for participation or lack thereof may have been less responsible in handling forms, or may not have had opportunities to discuss the study with parents, such as teens in foster care or teens whose life experiences may have made it difficult to gain permission to participate. For example, two teens from two of the high schools shared that they were unable to participate in the study due to being in foster care. Foster parents are not able to give consent for foster children to participate in such studies in the state of Ohio. One of these students stated that the reason for removal from biological parents was due to domestic violence perpetrated by the teen’s father toward the teen’s mother. The other student shared that removal from the home was due to physical and emotional abuse perpetrated by the teen’s father toward the teen.

These two cases illustrate the potential bias in the sample since teens who may have been labeled “at risk” may not have been able to gain permission to share their responses. The two teens illustrated were able to share their stories, however teens who were experiencing violence in the home during the study may not have felt safe in asking parents for permission to participate. Students who experience violence in the home are more likely to experience teen dating violence (Callahan et al., 2003; Foshee et al., 2005).
Therefore, this sample may not have been representative of at-risk students, and should be viewed as a general sample of teens in one county of Ohio.

To help combat the effect of this potential bias, the three high school teachers offered extra credit for students who gained parental consent or dissent for participation. This equal opportunity for gaining extra credit regardless of participation status may have been a contributing factor in the fairly high response rate of 64%. This response rate is lower than that of the pilot study response rate (72%), as expected due to the extensive consent/assent process.

The issues of bias in the sample were discussed in opening paragraphs to illustrate the lack of generalizability of this study. The results can only be generalized to the groups represented by the sample, high school students from predominantly white/European American communities enrolled in Health class in high schools located in one county in the state of Ohio.

**Independent Responses**

It is also possible that data was not entirely representative of individual responses. At times, students needed to be reminded by classroom teachers and the researcher to remain silent while participants responded to measures. It is possible that some of the chatter that occurred during collection influenced participants’ responses. In addition, some participants’ responses seemed suspicious. During data entry, it was noted when participants’ responses seemed to follow a pattern, rather than a seemingly valid set of responses. Satisficing also seemed to play a role here as well as when participants responded with “neutral” as their only responses on measures, or on a long series of
questions within the measures. Though seemingly suspicious data was coded as suspicious and eliminated from the data set, it is possible that data that should have been removed was not discovered during entry or analysis of normality and outliers and affected results.

*Inadequate Power for Statistical Testing of Hypothesis One*

Low numbers of participants in answering the CADRI scales lead to an inability to discover the effect of the *Expect Respect* program on participants’ experiences of violent behavior within their dating relationships using the Repeated Measures MANOVA analysis. In addition to the low number of participants responding to this scale, the structure established to qualify a participant’s ability to respond may have been too restrictive. Since participants were only to answer the CADRI scales if they had been dating someone during the month prior to data collection, many participants were unable to provide useful information on this scale.

*Unequal Representation of Racial Groups*

Another effect of low numbers of participants occurred when trying to differentiate efficacy of the program by racial group. The vast majority of students identified as white/European American and control between this group of participants and other racial groups of participants leads to misinterpretation of the results. Only with equal numbers of participants in each group can control between racial groups be determined. Therefore, the description of results found by racial group should be viewed only in context of a possible trend, not a definitive control of efficacy of the program by racial group.
Effect of History

Finally, an effect of history occurred during the study period, specifically during the Spring semester that may have had an effect on participants’ responses to the measures. After two schools’ experimental group classrooms received the Expect Respect program and the first data set was collected from these schools, a male R&B music artist allegedly was arrested for perpetrating physical and emotional violence on his R&B music artist girlfriend. The day after release of this information to the public, the Expect Respect program began in the experimental classrooms of the third school. Presenters in that school report that the students were very much interested in discussing the story in light of program material. New details about the situation were revealed daily as the program continued through that week, and at the end of that week the first set of data was collected from this school. All three schools’ second data collection occurred after this publicity and this story may have had an effect on participants’ responses, and may help explain the differences detected in participants scores by semester and racial group.

Overly Broad Questions

Some questions on the background information form were intended to determine students’ understanding and knowledge of others experiences of domestic and teen dating violence prior to exposure to the program. These questions did not allow for additional information such as whether or not the individual the student reported knowing as a victim or perpetrator of violence was male or female. It would be helpful to know if students have a preconceived idea about biological sex and experiences of domestic or teen dating violence. Also, students were asked if they shared information about their
classroom experiences with other students. The question was not specific enough to determine whether or not the students were telling others about their classroom experiences, or were receiving information about others’ classroom experiences. Delineating this would be helpful in determining if control group participants received information from experimental group participants, rather than a general understanding of participants talking about classroom experiences.

Implications

Despite the limitations discussed, this study reveals important implications for the community served by this program as well as the state of Ohio. Overall, the results of data analysis suggest that the Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program for high school students lowered participants’ scores on the Attitudes Towards Dating Violence scales initially and across a three week time period. Specifically, significant changes occurred on scales addressing female perpetration of violence in dating relationships, as also found in Glickman Sederoff’s 2002 study using the ATDV scales to determine changes in participants’ attitudes.

Participants’ scores on items addressing male perpetration were low, indicating the possibility of participants having prior knowledge and/or understanding of male perpetration of violence in dating relationships. However, average scores from the control group remained higher than those for the experimental group on the male perpetration items, indicating that though tolerance for male perpetration was initially low, the program may have continued to lower tolerance for male perpetration in teen dating relationships as well. The lack of a significant difference in male perpetration scores
between groups may also indicate that the program needs to increase focus on male perpetration, its signs and consequences, or provide advanced material regarding male perpetration since it seems that participants entered into the study with previous knowledge of male perpetration.

Since experimental group participants’ scores were lower than control group participants’ scores across time on the ATDV scales, the data suggests that the Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program for high school students helps to decrease participants’ tolerance of dating violence. Other high school students in the county in which the study was conducted may have equal benefit as participants, therefore it may be beneficial for other high schools to schedule the program for their students.

In addition to the potential benefit to other high school students in the county in which the study was conducted, high school students state-wide may benefit from this program. Currently, Ohio House Representatives are considering two bills directed toward measures to help victims of teen dating violence and to support teen dating violence prevention programs in schools. House Bill 10 is related to legislation to allow teens to obtain orders of protection from other teens, much like protection orders adults obtain when seeking protection from domestic violence. House Bill 19 is related to legislation to require schools to adopt teen dating violence prevention programs to be offered to grades 7 – 12 (Ohio House Bill 10, 2009; Ohio House Bill 19, 2009).

A recent driving force for both bills was the result of a failing grade on a report card given by the “Break the Cycle” organization (www.breakthecycle.org) dedicated to
ending domestic violence. This organization recently reviewed policies of every state in
the nation to evaluate states’ abilities to protect teens experiencing dating violence. The
state of Ohio received a grade of “F” due to the inability of teens to obtain protection
orders against another teen (Break the Cycle, 2009).

Ohio Attorney General Richard Cordray has spoken publicly about this situation
and supports both Bills currently being considered (Harding, 2009). This push for teen
dating violence legislation has been noticed nationally and reported by MSNBC’s
Today’s Show (Associated Press, 2009). Clearly, the state of Ohio is in need of
legislation to help protect teens, and is also in need of an evidence based, empirically
supported teen dating violence prevention program. The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen
Dating Violence program for high school students has now been empirically evaluated
and results suggest promising effects for participants. These results will be valuable for
legislators to examine and may aid in the passing of House Bills 10 and 19.

Suggestions for Future Research

The majority of participants reported that they had begun dating prior to exposure
to the Expect Respect program. Since it is the goal of the program to educate young teens
about dating violence prior to dating, it would be valuable to present the program in
junior high schools to determine efficacy with younger participants. Perhaps another
version of the program could be developed and junior high students would receive the
earlier version of the program, and then the current version in high school. Data on the
efficacy of the program for junior high students would be beneficial.
This study should be repeated in other communities representing a variety of students from a variety of backgrounds to determine whether the program would be beneficial to other groups of high school students. Additional questions could be asked of participants to determine participants’ previous knowledge of teen dating and domestic violence prior to exposure to the Expect Respect program that may help make sense of some of the marginal differences in scores on the ATDV scales between groups.

For this study, only female presenters were available to provide the program in the high schools. It may be interesting to discover whether male presenters would elicit different responses from students, or if a male/female pair of presenters would be optimal. Also, only a female survivor of teen dating and domestic violence shared her story during the program, perhaps having a male survivor speak in addition to, or instead of, the female survivor would elicit different responses. These factors were dependent upon convenience for presenters, perhaps another research group would be better able to control for random assignment of female and male presenters to programs delivered to control and experimental groups.

Conclusion

This study was designed to determine the efficacy of the Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program for high school students delivered in three high schools of one county in Ohio. The results indicate statistical significance in participants’ ATDV scores between treatment groups and across time. This suggests that the program may have been a key factor in reducing tolerance of teen dating violence for experimental group participants when compared to control group participants. This
finding will help the sponsoring domestic violence shelter provide evidence to support continuing the program in the high schools so that other students may benefit from the program. In addition, the results may aid the state of Ohio in passing important legislation to help protect teens from abusive dating partners and to help prevent teen dating violence overall. This study also contributes to literature regarding teen dating violence prevention programs and may aid other communities and organizations in evaluating their own programs for the benefit of preventing teen dating violence.
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Dear Parent or Guardian,

In past school years, the *Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence* program has been presented in our Health classes. This program is offered through The Center for New Beginnings Domestic Violence Shelter and The Woodlands and helps students learn more about teen dating violence and how to keep violence out of their own dating relationships. In the past, students have demonstrated appreciation for the program and some have made life-changing decisions about ending dating relationships when they learned that their boyfriends or girlfriends were abusive toward them.

This year, we welcome the program back into our Health class along with Mrs. Kelly Roberts, a doctoral student at Ohio University who is evaluating the program for her dissertation work. In order for students to participate in the research study, they must have their parents’ permission. Parental consent (permission) forms are included with this letter along with a student assent form for your child to sign.

Students who return signed forms by *(Due Date)* will earn *(X)* extra credit points in this class. If your child does not turn in signed form(s) by *(Due Date)*, he or she will not be permitted to participate in the study and will not receive extra credit. All students regardless of permission to participate in the study will receive the *Expect Respect* program as it is a part of the Health class curriculum.

If you give permission for your child to participate in the research study:

- □ Sign the bottom of this letter to indicate your permission
- □ Sign the Blue Parental Consent Form
- □ Have your child sign the Yellow Student Assent form if they wish to participate
- □ Return this letter, the Blue Parental Consent and Yellow Student Assent SIGNED forms to me through your son or daughter by *(Due Date)* so they may earn their bonus points for returning the forms on time.

If you do not give permission for your child to participate in the study:

- □ Sign the bottom of this letter to indicate that you do not give permission
- □ Return this letter to me through your son or daughter by *(Due Date)* so they may earn their bonus points for returning this form on time.

Sincerely,
(Health Teacher)

I give permission for _____________________________ to participate in the program evaluation study. *(child’s name)*

I do not give permission for _____________________________ to participate in the program evaluation study. *(child’s name)*

______________________________________________________            ________________
Parent/Guardian Signature            Date

______________________________________________________
Parent/Guardian Printed Name
APPENDIX D: PARENTAL CONSENT AND STUDENT ASSENT

Ohio University
Parent/Guardian Consent Form

Title of Research
An evaluation of the Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence high school program.

Researchers
Kelly E. Roberts, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Counselor Education
Ohio University

Thomas E. Davis, Ph.D.
Secretary to the Board of Trustees and Professor,
Department of Counselor Education
Ohio University

Your child is being asked to participate in a research study. For you and your child to be able to decide about participation in this project, you and your child should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your child’s personal information will be used and protected. Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to sign it. This will allow your child to participate in this study. You will receive a copy of this document after it is returned to the researcher.

Explanation of Study
The study your son or daughter is asked to participate in is designed to evaluate the Center for New Beginnings Domestic Violence Shelter’s Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program. Expect Respect is a one-week long program for high school students and will be presented twice during the semester. The program will be presented during two separate weeks during the school year. Health classes will receive the study during one of these two weeks as determined by lottery. The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program is a part of the Health class curriculum, but only students whose parents or guardians consent and who give consent will be asked to respond to two surveys, a background information sheet, and a program evaluation. One survey asks students to respond whether they agree or disagree with statements describing behaviors that may occur in teen dating relationships. The other survey asks students who have dated, or are currently dating, to report the number of times they have experienced healthy and abusive dating behaviors described in statements on the survey. The background information asked of students includes information such as biological sex and age, as well as if they have ever known an adult or peer who has been in an abusive relationship. If the student has known someone who has been in an abusive relationship, he or she is asked to name the adult or teen on the survey. The program evaluation asks general questions about the quality of the program and invites students to write comments for presenters to help improve the next program. The information collected will help determine if the student remembered important information and the possible effects of the information on his or her dating relationships. Students do not need to have dated in the past, or have a current boyfriend or girlfriend to participate in the study. Students without parental consent and student consent are still expected by (High School Name) to attend Health class and be present for the Expect Respect program.

Risks and Discomforts
Students may experience discomfort when responding to questions on the research surveys due to the questions involving descriptions of dating abuse. The code key sheets linking students’ names to their research codes will be destroyed prior to examining and entering all data collected. Therefore individual students’ responses will not be identifiable. School counselors will be available to any student requesting their assistance subject to the school’s resources and policies.

Benefits
Student participants may benefit from knowing that they helped researchers find out if the Expect Respect program trains teens how to recognize and avoid teen dating violence, if the program should continue to be presented to other high school students, and if the program helps prevent teen dating violence in our community.
Confidentiality and Records
Code sheets will be created to link students with their research materials since students will be asked to respond to research materials at two separate times during the semester. Students with permission to participate in the research study will have individual code numbers at the top of research packets, not their names. The code numbers will be used instead of students’ names for data entry. Students’ names will never be entered with survey responses in any computer or paper file. Code numbers will be kept with the researchers until all (High School Name) data are collected. Research materials and code numbers will be removed from the classroom so no one at the school can match students’ names with the research materials. Researchers will keep research materials in secured offices for data entry and analysis. Code number sheets will be destroyed by the researcher after all data from both collection times have been gathered. Data will not be examined by researchers or entered into statistical software until after the code sheets are destroyed on (Date of the second wave of collection). Only aggregate data combined at the classroom and school levels will be provided to (Principal’s Name) and (High School Name) counselors.

Additionally, while every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:
* Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility it is to protect human subjects in research
* Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU

Compensation
Study participants will not receive any compensation for participation in this study. The presenters may share small tokens that are in no way connected to this research study or targeted to student participants.

Contact Information
If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Mrs. Kelly E. Roberts, by email at krl02806@ohio.edu or by phone at (740) 258-2740 or Dr. Tom Davis by email at davist@ohio.edu or by phone at (740) 593-4460.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

By signing below, you are agreeing that:
- you and your child have read this consent form (or it has been read to you and your child) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions.
- known risks to your child have been explained to your satisfaction.
- you and your child understand that Ohio University has no policy or plan to pay for any injuries your child might receive as a result of participating in this research protocol.
- you are 18 years of age or older.
- your permission and your child’s participation in this research is given voluntarily.
- you may change your mind and stop your child’s participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which you may otherwise be entitled.

Signature ______________________ Date ______________________

Printed Name ______________________

Version Date: 10/05/08
Title of Research
An evaluation of the Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence high school program.

Researchers
Kelly E. Roberts, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
Department of Counselor Education
Ohio University

Thomas E. Davis, Ph.D.
Secretary to the Board of Trustees and
Professor, Department of Counselor Education
Ohio University

You are being asked to participate in a research study. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected. Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to sign it. This will allow your participation in this study. You should receive a copy of this document to take with you.

Explanation of Study
The study you are asked to participate in is designed to evaluate the Center for New Beginnings Domestic Violence Shelter’s Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program. Expect Respect is one week long, for high school students and will be presented in (High School Name)’s Health classes twice during the semester. The program will be presented during two separate weeks during the school year. Health classes will receive the study during one of these two weeks as determined by lottery. The Expect Respect: Preventing Teen Dating Violence program is a part of the Health class curriculum, but only students whose parents or guardians consent and who give assent, will be asked to respond to two surveys, a background information sheet, and a program evaluation. The survey asks you to respond whether you agree or disagree with statements describing behaviors that may occur in teen dating relationships. The other surveys asks you, if you have dated, or are currently dating to report the number of times you have experienced healthy and abusive dating behaviors described in statements on the survey. The background information asked of you includes items such as biological sex and age, as well as if you have ever known an adult or teen who has been in an abusive relationship. If you have known someone who has been in an abusive relationship, you are not to name the adult or teen on the survey. The program evaluation asks general questions about the quality of program and invites you to write comments for presenters to help improve the next program. The information collected will help determine if you remembered important information and the possible effects of the information on your dating relationships. You do not need to have dated in the past, or have a current boyfriend or girlfriend to participate in the study. Students without parental consent and student assent are still expected by (High School Name) to attend Health class and be present for the Expect Respect program.

Risks and Discomforts
You may experience discomfort when responding to questions on the research surveys due to the questions involving descriptions of dating abuse. The code key sheets linking your name to your research code will be destroyed prior to examining and entering all data collected at (High School Name), therefore your individual responses will not be identifiable. School counselors will be available to any student requesting their assistance subject to the school’s resources and policies.

Benefits
You may benefit from knowing that you helped researchers find out if the Expect Respect program trains teens how to recognize and avoid teen dating violence, if the program should continue to be presented to other high school students, and if the program will help prevent teen dating violence in our community.
Confidentiality and Records
Code sheets will be created to link you with your research materials since you will be asked to respond to research materials at two separate times during the semester. If you have permission to participate in the research study you will have an individual code number at the top of your research packets, not your name. The code number will be used instead of your name for data entry. Your name will never be entered with survey responses in any computer or paper file. Code numbers will be kept with the researchers until all (High School Name) data are collected. Research materials and code numbers will be removed from the classroom so no one at the school can match your name with the research materials. Researchers will keep research materials in secured offices for data entry and analysis. Code number sheets will be destroyed by the researcher after all data from both collection times have been gathered. Data will not be examined by researchers or entered into statistical software until after the code sheets are destroyed on (Date of the second wave of collection). Only aggregate data combined at the classroom and school levels will be provided to (Principal's Name) and (High School Name) counselors.

Additionally, while every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:
* Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility it is to protect human subjects in research
* Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU

Compensation
You will not receive any compensation for participation in this study. The presenters may share small tokens that are in no way connected to this research study or targeted to student participants.

Contact Information
If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Mrs. Kelly E. Roberts, by email at kr102806@ohio.edu or by phone at (740) 258-2740 or Dr. Tom Davis by email at davist@ohio.edu or by phone at (740) 593-4460.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Eller Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

By signing below, you are agreeing that:
- your parent has signed an Ohio University Parent/Guardian Consent Form and you have signed the Ohio University Student Assent Form
- you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and you have been given the opportunity to ask questions
- known risks to you have been explained to your satisfaction.
- you understand Ohio University has no policy or plan to pay for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this research protocol
- your participation in this research is given voluntarily
- you may change your mind and stop participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which you may otherwise be entitled.

Signature __________________________ Date __________________________

Printed Name __________________________ Version Date: 10/05/08
Please take a moment to complete this survey regarding Attitudes Toward Female Dating Violence. To complete this survey, simply read the statement listed and select whether you Strongly Agree with the statement, Agree with the statement, are Neutral about the statement, Disagree with the statement or Strongly Disagree with the statement. The word “partner” refers to any dating partner a female may have as a teenager.

Your responses will be confidential. Reported data will only reflect the general results, never individual cases.

1. Some girls have to pound their partners to make them listen.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

2. A girl should not hit her partner regardless of what he/she has done.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

3. A teen who is dating a girl and goes into her bedroom is agreeing to sex.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

4. A teen should break up with a girl when she slaps him/her.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

5. It is O.K. for a girl to bad mouth her partner.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

6. It is never O.K. for a girl to slap her partner.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

7. There is nothing wrong with a partner changing his/her mind about having sex.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
8. It is O.K. for a girl to say she loves her partner to get him/her to have sex.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

9. It is understandable when a girl gets so angry that she yells at her boyfriend.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

10. A girl should not touch her partner unless he/she wants to be touched.
     Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

11. It is important for a teen to always dress the way his/her girlfriend wants.
     Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

12. Girls have a right to tell their partner how to dress.
     Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

13. After a couple is going steady, the girl should not force her partner to have sex.
     Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

14. There is never a good enough reason for a girl to swear at her partner.
     Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

15. There is never a reason for a teen to get slapped by his/her girlfriend.
     Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

16. Sometimes girls just cannot stop themselves from punching their partners.
     Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

17. Sometimes a girl must hit her partner so that he/she will respect her.
     Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

18. Girls should never get their partners drunk to get them to have sex.
     Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
19. If a teen says “yes” to sex while drinking, he/she is still allowed to change his/her mind.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

20. Sometimes girls have to threaten their partners so that they will listen.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

21. To prove his/her love, it is important for a teen to have sex with his/her girlfriend.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

22. A teen should always ask his/her girlfriend first before going out with his/her friends.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

23. A girl usually does not slap her partner unless he/she deserves it.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

24. Some partners deserve to be slapped by their girlfriends.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

25. A teen should break up with his/her girlfriend if she has forced him/her to have sex.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

26. Sometimes girls just can’t help but swear at their partners.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

27. Girls should never lie to their partners to get them to have sex.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

28. There is no excuse for a girl to threaten her partner.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

29. It is alright for a girl to force her partner to kiss her.

Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
30. A girl should only touch her partner where he/she wants to be touched.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

31. A girl should not control what her partner wears.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

32. It is O.K. for a girl to slap her partner if he/she deserves it.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

33. Pulling hair is a good way for a girl to get back at her partner.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

34. It is no big deal if a girl shoves her partner.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

35. Girls have a right to tell their partners what to do.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

36. A teen should always do what his/her girlfriend tells him/her to do.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

37. If a girl yells and screams at her partner it does not really hurt him/her seriously.

   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
Attitudes Towards Male Dating Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guys do not own their partners’ bodies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes jealousy makes a guy so crazy that he must slap his partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After a couple is going steady, the guy should not force his partner to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is alright to pressure a partner to have sex if he/she has had sex in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the past.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To prove his/her love, it is important for a partner to have sex with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his/her boyfriend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important for a teen to always dress the way his/her boyfriend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A guy should not tell his partner what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is never a reason for a guy to yell and scream at his partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your responses will be confidential. Reported data will only reflect the general results, never individual cases.
9. A teen should break up with a guy when he hits him/her.
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
10. There is no good reason for a guy to slap his partner.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
11. It is never O.K. for a guy to hit his partner.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
12. It is O.K. for a guy to bad mouth his partner.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
13. Sometimes guys just cannot stop themselves from punching partners.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
14. A guy should not insult his partner.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
15. There is never a good enough reason for a guy to swear at his partner.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
16. A guy should not touch his partner unless he/she wants to be touched.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
17. Sometimes a guy cannot help hitting his partner when he/she makes him angry.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
18. Teens who cheat on their boyfriends should be slapped.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
19. There is never a reason for a guy to threaten his partner.
    | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Neutral | Agree | Strongly Agree |
20. Often guys have to be rough with their partners to turn them on.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

21. When guys get really sexually excited, they cannot stop themselves from having sex.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

22. A teen should always change his/her ways to please his/her boyfriend.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

23. A teen should not see his/her friends if it bothers his/her boyfriend.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

24. A teen who is dating a guy and goes into his bedroom is agreeing to sex.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

25. A guy usually does not slap his partner unless he/she deserves it.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

26. Guys should never get their partners drunk to get them to have sex.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

27. It is alright for a guy to force his partner to kiss him.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

28. Sometimes love makes a guy so crazy that he hits his partner.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

29. It is understandable when a guy gets so angry that he yells at his partner.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

30. A guy does not need to know his partner’s every move.
   Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
31. Sometimes guys just can’t help but swear at their partners.
   - Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

32. Relationships always work best when teens please their boyfriends.
   - Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

33. It is O.K. for a guy to slap his partner if he/she deserves it.
   - Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

34. It is no big deal for a guy to pressure a partner into having sex.
   - Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

35. There is no good reason for a guy to push his partner.
   - Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

36. Some partners deserve to be slapped by their boyfriends.
   - Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

37. A teen should ask his/her boyfriend first before going out with his/her friends.
   - Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

38. When a guy pays on a date, it is O.K. for him to pressure his partner for sex.
   - Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree

39. A teen should always do what his/her boyfriend tells him/her to do.
   - Strongly Disagree  Disagree  Neutral  Agree  Strongly Agree
APPENDIX F: THE CONFLICT IN ADOLESCENT DATING RELATIONSHIPS INVENTORY

The Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory

Introductory Dating Questions

Please check the statement that best applies to you.

☐ I have not yet begun dating. (Stop here and Turn this packet in to the Researcher.)
☐ I have begun dating and/or had a dating partner.

Please check all the boxes below that describe the kinds of dating relationships you are currently experiencing and those you have experienced in the past:

☐ Going out in male/female groups
☐ Dating different people
☐ Dating one person without any definite commitment
☐ Dating one person exclusively
☐ Engaged

If you have ever been in a dating relationship or been going out with someone, please answer the following questions:

At what age did you start going out/having dating partners? _______________________

How many dating partners have you had (not including childhood crushes)? __________

How many dating partners did you have/have you had in:

**Grade 9**
Number of partners: _____ Longest Relationship: _____ Shortest Relationship: _____

**Grade 10**
Number of partners: _____ Longest Relationship: _____ Shortest Relationship: _____

**Grade 11**
Number of partners: _____ Longest Relationship: _____ Shortest Relationship: _____

**Grade 12**
Number of partners: _____ Longest Relationship: _____ Shortest Relationship: _____
The next few pages ask you to answer questions thinking about your current or recent dating partner. Please check which person you will be thinking of when you answer these questions:

☐ I am thinking of somebody that is my dating partner right now. (Go to part A)

☐ I am thinking of a recent ex-dating partner (within the past month). (Go to part B)
Part A: If this is your current dating partner:

How long have you been dating/going out? ____________________________________

How often do you see each other? (Circle the best response below)

- Every day at school
- Every day at school & every day out of school
- 2-3 times per week
- Once per week or less

How much time do you spend alone together?

__________________ hours per day OR __________________ hours per week

What kinds of things do you do together? ______________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

How often do you argue or disagree?

__________________ times per day OR __________________ times per week

What kinds of things do you argue or disagree about? ____________________________
_______________________________________________________________________

How old is your dating partner? _____________________________

Is your dating partner male or female? ________________________

How important is this relationship to you? (Circle one of the responses below)

Not very important Somewhat important Important Very important

Please check one of the following five categories that best describes the dating partner you are thinking of when completing this questionnaire:

- Going out in male/female groups
- Dating different people
- Dating one person without any definite commitment
- Dating one person exclusively
- Engaged
**Part B: If this is your ex-dating partner:**

How long did you go out together? _____________________________________________

How often do you see each other? *(Circle the best response below)*

- Every day at school
- Every day at school & every day out of school
- 2-3 times per week
- Once per week or less

How much time did you spend alone together?

_______________ hours per day OR ________________ hours per week

What kinds of things did you do together? ______________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________

When did you stop going together/seeing each other? ____________________________

Why did you stop going out with him/her? _____________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

How often did you argue or disagree?

_______________ times per day OR ________________ times per week

What kinds of things did you argue or disagree about? ____________________________

________________________________________________________________________

How old was your dating partner? _____________________________

Was your dating partner male or female? ________________________

How important was this relationship to you? *(Circle one of the responses below)*

- Not very important
- Somewhat important
- Important
- Very important

Please check one of the following five categories that best describes the dating partner you are thinking of when completing this questionnaire:

- [ ] Going out in male/female groups
- [ ] Dating different people
- [ ] Dating one person without any definite commitment
- [ ] Dating one person exclusively
- [ ] Engaged
The Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory

The following questions ask you about things that may have happened to you with your dating partner while you were having an argument. Check the box that is your best estimate of how often these things have happened with your current or ex-dating partner in the past year. Please remember that all answers are confidential. If the researchers determine that your responses indicate serious abuse in your relationships, your teacher, parents and principal may be contacted to help you receive guidance from your school counselor or a counseling professional.

As a guide use the following scale:

| Never: This has never happened in your relationship |
| Seldom: This has happened only 1-2 times in your relationship. |
| Sometimes: This has happened about 3-5 times in your relationship. |
| Often: This has happened 6 times or more in your relationship. |

### During a conflict or argument with my dating partner in the past month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I gave reasons for my side of the argument.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner gave reasons for his/her side of the argument.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I touched my partner sexually when he/she didn’t want me to.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner touched me sexually when I didn’t want him/her to.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I tried to turn his/her friends against him/her.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner tried to turn my friends against me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I did something to make him/her feel jealous.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did something to make me feel jealous.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I destroyed or threatened to destroy something he/she valued.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner destroyed or threatened to destroy something I valued.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I told him/her that I was partly to blame.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner told me that he/she was partly to blame.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I brought up something bad that he/she had done in the past.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner brought up something bad that I had done in the past.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I threw something at my partner.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner threw something at me.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I said things just to make my partner angry.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner said things just to make me angry.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I gave reasons why I thought he/she was wrong.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner gave reasons why he/she thought I was wrong.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Never: This has never happened in your relationship  
Seldom: This has happened only 1-2 times in your relationship.  
Sometimes: This has happened about 3-5 times in your relationship.  
Often: This has happened 6 times or more in your relationship.

### During a conflict or argument with my dating partner in the past month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. I agreed that he/she was partly right.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner agreed that I was partly right.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. I spoke to my partner in a hostile or mean tone of voice.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner spoke to me in a hostile or mean tone of voice.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. I forced my partner to have sex when he/she didn’t want to.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner forced me to have sex when I didn’t want to.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. I offered a solution that I thought would make us both happy.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He/she offered a solution that he/she thought would make us both happy.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. I threatened my partner in an attempt to have sex with him/her.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner threatened me in an attempt to have sex with me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. I put off talking until we calmed down.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner put off talking until we calmed down.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. I insulted my partner with put-downs.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner insulted me with put-downs.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. I discussed the issue calmly.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He/she discussed the issue calmly.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. I kissed my partner when he/she didn’t want me to.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He/she kissed me when I didn’t want him/her to.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. I said things to his/her friends about him/her to turn them against him/her.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner said things to my friends about me to turn them against me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. I ridiculed or made fun of my partner in front of others.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner ridiculed or made fun of me in front of others.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. I told my partner how upset I was.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He/She told me how upset he/she was.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. I kept track of who my partner was with and where he/she was.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner kept track of who I was with and where I was.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. I blamed my partner for the problem.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner blamed me for the problem.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. I kicked, hit or punched my partner.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My partner kicked, hit or punched me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Never:** This has never happened in your relationship  
**Seldom:** This has happened only 1-2 times in your relationship.  
**Sometimes:** This has happened about 3-5 times in your relationship.  
**Often:** This has happened 6 times or more in your relationship.

### During a conflict or argument with my dating partner in the past month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. I left the room to cool down.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He/She left the room to cool down.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I gave in, just to avoid conflict.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He/She gave in, just to avoid conflict.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I accused my partner of flirting with another person.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner accused me of flirting with another person.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I deliberately tried to frighten my partner.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner deliberately tried to frighten me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I slapped my partner or pulled his/her hair.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner slapped me or pulled my hair.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I threatened to hurt my partner.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He/she threatened to hurt me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I threatened to end the relationship.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He/she threatened to end the relationship.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I threatened to hit him/her or throw something at him/her.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner threatened to hit or throw something at me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I pushed, shoved or shook my partner.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He/She pushed, shoved or shook me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I spread rumors about my partner.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner spread rumors about me.</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: BACKGROUND INFORMATION FORM

Background Information Form
(Control Group Version)

Name of School: _________________________________________________________

Please circle that which best describes you:

Health Class Period:  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Biological Sex:  Male  Female

Grade:    9 10 11 12

Race: White or European American  Black or African American
      Hispanic or Latino       Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
      Asian                  American Indian or Alaska Native

Other (Please Describe): _____________________________________________

Do you know an adult (20 years old or older) who has been a victim of domestic violence?

Yes   No

Do you know an adult (20 years old or older) who has been a batterer/abuser of a partner?

Yes   No

Do you know a teenager (13-19 years old) who has been a victim of dating violence?

Yes   No

Do you know a teenager (13-19 years old) who has been a batterer/abuser of a dating partner?

Yes   No

Have you talked to a member of another Health Class about what they're learning in class?

Yes   No
Background Information Form  
(Experimental Group Version)

Name of School: _________________________________________________________

Please circle that which best describes you:

Health Class Period:  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

Biological Sex:  Male  Female

Grade:    9  10  11  12

Race:  White or European American  Black or African American
       Hispanic or Latino  Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
       Asian  American Indian or Alaska Native

Other (Please Describe): ___________________________________________________

Do you know an adult (20 years old or older) who has been a victim of domestic violence?

Yes  No

Do you know an adult (20 years old or older) who has been a batterer/abuser of a partner?

Yes  No

Do you know a teenager (13-19 years old) who has been a victim of dating violence?

Yes  No

Do you know a teenager (13-19 years old) who has been a batterer/abuser of a dating partner?

Yes  No

Have you talked to a student in another Health Class about what you learned from the Expect Respect Program?

Yes  No
APPENDIX H: PROGRAM EVALUATION

EXPECT RESPECT:

Preventing Teen Dating Violence

Program Evaluation

Name of School:____________________________________________________

Please answer the following questions with regard to the EXPECT RESPECT Program.

1. I feel as though I benefited from the EXPECT RESPECT Program.
   Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree

2. The program helped my understanding of teen dating violence.
   Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree

3. The presenters were easily understood.
   Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree

4. The handouts were helpful to my understanding of the material.
   Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree

5. The presenters answered mine and my classmates’ questions effectively.
   Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree

6. The use of Power Point as presentation style was helpful to my understanding of the material.
   Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree

7. The coordinators of the program were organized and the program went smoothly.
   Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree

8. I valued hearing from a victim of teen dating/domestic violence.
   Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree

9. The information provided is important for teenagers to know about dating relationships.
   Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree

10. I am more able to recognize violence in a teen dating relationship because of this program.
    Strongly Disagree          Disagree          Neutral          Agree       Strongly Agree
Things I learned that changed my perceptions of teen dating violence were:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

The most valuable parts of the program to me were:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Things I would improve in the program were:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Please provide any additional feedback to the presenters for future presentations:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

Thank You!

Property of The Woodlands
Created by T. Hufford, K. Roberts and J. Morris
APPENDIX I: PRESENTER’S CHECKLIST

Presenter’s Checklist

Presenter’s Name:_________________________________________________________

High School:_____________________________________________________________

Class Period:_____________________________________________________________

Session 1: Three Types of Abuse
   □ Overview of The Center for New Beginnings
   □ What is Respect: Discussion
   □ Experience – Paper
   □ Types of Abuse
   □ Physical Abuse
   □ Sexual Abuse
   □ Emotional Abuse
   □ Video Clip (7 minutes long)

Session 2: Power and Control Wheel and Cycle of Violence
   □ Review of Session 1
   □ Power and Control Wheel
      □ Handout Matching Exercise
      □ Real Life, TV or Movie Example or Act-Out
      □ Video
   □ Cycle of Abuse
      □ 4 Photos
      □ Story with 4 Photos
      □ Video

Session 3: Handouts and Survivor of TDV and DV Speaks
   □ Handouts
   □ Velma Farris

Session 4: Healthy Relationships
   □ Review of Session 2 in light of Velma’s Life Experiences
   □ TV and Movie Discussion of Healthy and Unhealthy Relationships
   □ My Support Map
   □ Balance in Relationships
   □ Equality Wheel
      □ Handout Matching Exercise
      □ Real Life, TV or Movie Example or Act-Out
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### Table 4

**Correlations of ATDV Scales and CADRI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T1 ATFD</th>
<th>T2 ATFDV</th>
<th>T1 ATMDV</th>
<th>T2 ATMDV</th>
<th>T1 CADRI AvgInd</th>
<th>T2 CADRI AvgInd</th>
<th>T1 CADRI AvgPtnr</th>
<th>T2 CADRI AvgPtnr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1ATFDV</strong></td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.794**</td>
<td>.796**</td>
<td>.751**</td>
<td>.145*</td>
<td>.157*</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>316</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T2ATFDV</strong></td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
<td>.794**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.754**</td>
<td>.871**</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.184*</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1ATMDV</strong></td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
<td>.796**</td>
<td>.754**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.828**</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T2ATMDV</strong></td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
<td>.751**</td>
<td>.871**</td>
<td>.828**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.163*</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1CADRI AvgInd</strong></td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
<td>.145*</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td>.889**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvgInd</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T2CADRI AvgInd</strong></td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
<td>.157*</td>
<td>.184*</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.163*</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.467**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvgInd</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T1CADRI AvgPtnr</strong></td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.889**</td>
<td>.467**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvgPtnr</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>188</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T2CADRI AvgPtnr</strong></td>
<td>Pearson r</td>
<td>.171*</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>.957**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvgPtnr</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tail). *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tail)**

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 5

*Factor Analysis: Total Variance Explained*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Variance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.738</td>
<td>46.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.680</td>
<td>33.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td>10.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>3.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>3.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>1.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Table 6

*Rotated Component Matrix*<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T2ATMDVAvg</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2ATFDAvg</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1ATMDVAvg</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1ATFDAvg</td>
<td>.901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2CADRIAvgInd</td>
<td></td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2CADRIAvgPtnr</td>
<td></td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1CADRIAvgInd</td>
<td></td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1CADRIAvgPtnr</td>
<td></td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

<sup>a</sup> Rotation converged in 3 iterations
APPENDIX N: TABLES FOR REPEATED MEASURES MANOVA ANALYSES FOR NULL HYPOTHESES ONE AND TWO

Table 7

*Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis One*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>263.723</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>1.320</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Within Subjects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*TmtGp</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.884</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Box’s M = 25.344; F = 2.455; p = 0.006; Control Group N = 75; Experimental Group N = 66*

Table 8

*Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>6.925</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Within Subjects*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>8.687</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*TmtGp</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>1.656</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Box’s $M = 18.194; F = 1.790; p = 0.057$; Control Group $N = 138$; Experimental Group $N = 134$

Table 9

*Tests of Between Subjects Effects for Null Hypothesis Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between Subjects</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>5.297</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

*Univariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within Subjects</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>9.083</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>1.436</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*TmtGrp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O: TABLES FOR STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT POST HOC REPEATED MEASURES MANOVA ANALYSES

Table 11

*Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Biological Sex*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>4047.055</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>10.800</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Sex</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>19.949</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group*Bio Sex</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.690</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>7.832</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*TmtGp</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*BioSex</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>2.761</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time<em>TmtGp</em>BioSex</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.209</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box’s M = 60.871; F = 1.971; p = 0.001; Control Group N = 138 (86 Males, 52 Females); Experimental Group N = 134 (53 Males, 81 Females)
Table 12

Tests of Between Subjects Effects for Null Hypothesis Two Including Biological Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between Subjects</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>4.180</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.180</td>
<td>14.549</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.453</td>
<td>3.805</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bio Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>11.372</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.372</td>
<td>39.586</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>12.748</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.748</td>
<td>33.389</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group*Bio Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.098</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.260</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13

Univariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Biological Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within Subjects</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.282</td>
<td>7.636</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>1.688</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*TmtGrp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>1.028</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*BioSex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>2.199</td>
<td>0.139</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>5.289</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time<em>TmtGrp</em>BioSex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14

*Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Semester*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between Subjects</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.965</td>
<td>3652.076</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>5.857</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.168</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.846</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group*Semester</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>1.687</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within Subjects</th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>8.814</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*TmtGp</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Sem</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time<em>TmtGp</em>Sem</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>4.422</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Box’s M = 62.210; F = 2.015; p = 0.001; Control Group N = 138 (73 in Fall 2008, 65 in Spring 2009); Experimental Group N = 134 (86 in Fall 2008, 48 in Spring 2009)*
**Table 15**

*Tests of Between Subjects Effects for Null Hypothesis Two Including Semester*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type III</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>3.529</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group*Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>3.370</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>2.801</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

*Univariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Semester*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within Subjects</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>7.831</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>2.404</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*TmtGrp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>2.405</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>6.050E-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.050E-5</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time<em>TmtGrp</em>Semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>2.232</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>8.845</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

*Multivariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Race*

### Between Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>1638.239</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>2.572</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>0.776</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group*Race</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>0.724</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Within Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillai’s Trace Value</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Hypothesis df</th>
<th>Error df</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>7.658</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*TmtGp</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>2.621</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Race</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time<em>TmtGp</em>Race</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>2.581</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Box’s M = 84.196; F = 1.513; p = 0.011; Control Group N = 138 (106 white/EA, 16 black/AA, 16 Other); Experimental Group N = 134 (109 white/EA, 15 black/AA, 10 Other)
Table 18

Tests of Between Subjects Effects for Null Hypothesis Two Including Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between Subjects</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.975</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.296</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.639</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.406</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tmt Group*Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.850</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19

Univariate Tests for Null Hypothesis Two Including Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within Subjects</th>
<th>Type III</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>8.733</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*TmtGrp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.199</td>
<td>4.808</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time*Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>2.841</td>
<td>0.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time<em>TmtGrp</em>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATFDV</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>2.184</td>
<td>0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATMDV</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>4.984</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX P: TABLES FOR DEPENDENT T-TEST ANALYSIS

Table 20

*Program Evaluation Dependent T-Test Samples Statistics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>AvgEval1</td>
<td>4.1706</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.59018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AvgEval2</td>
<td>4.0654</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.66310</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21

*Program Evaluation Dependent T-Test Samples Correlations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1</td>
<td>AvgEval1 &amp; AvgEval2</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

*Program Evaluation Dependent T-Test Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AvgEval2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>