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Past studies have revealed that people with traditional gender role views are often involved in dating violence. This study examines both male and female athletes and non-athletes in terms of traditional gender role views and dating violence. Athletes and non-athletes are an important focus because literature is virtually silent on these two populations in terms of dating violence. The researcher surveyed 188 undergraduate students attending Western Michigan University on their attitudes and experiences concerning gender role views, athletic involvement, and history of dating violence, respectively. The results indicate that gender role views and athletic participation appeared to have no significant impact on involvement in dating violence. Conclusions suggest, therefore, more research is needed in order to understand the root of the problem of dating violence.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher wishes to acknowledge and express appreciation to God, her family, and supportive friends. Dr. Susan Caringella-MacDonald, chairperson of her thesis committee for her assistance and advise, also Dr. Lewis Walker and Dr. Thomas Van Valey, thesis committee members, for their support and input. The researcher would also like to express her appreciation to those persons who allowed her to administer her questionnaires in their classes, Dr. Martin Ross, Dr. Thomas Van Valey, Dr. Jody Brylinsky, and graduate student colleagues, Amani Awwad, Deborah Barts, and Sherri DeBoef. Finally, the researcher would like to extend the utmost appreciation to her typist, Lilly Ralkiewicz for her speedy return and objective input on her thesis.

Felicia D. Flowers
INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.
Aggressive dating behavior among college students

Flowers, Felicia D., M.A.
Western Michigan University, 1993
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS................................................................. ii

LIST OF TABLES........................................................................... v

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION/STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM......................... 1

   Objectives................................................................. 3
   Significance of the Study................................................. 4

II. LITERATURE REVIEW......................................................... 5

   Gender-role Socialization------------------------------- 7
   Sex Segregation------------------------------------------- 8
   Traditional Gender Roles and Dating Violence.......... 10
   Sports and Masculinity------------------------------- 13
   Sports, Masculinity, and Dating Violence.............. 15
   Date Rape............................................................. 17
   Athletes and Date Rape................................. 19
   Summary............................................................. 20

III. METHODOLOGY.............................................................. 22

   Operational Definition............................................. 22
   Independent Variables.............................................. 22
   Athletes........................................................... 23
   Independent Demographic Variables...................... 24
   Dependent Variable.................................................. 24
Table of Contents—Continued

CHAPTER

Data Collection Instrument.......................... 25
Data Collection Method.................................. 26
Sample and Subject Characteristics............... 27
Data Analysis Procedures............................ 30

IV. RESULTS.................................................. 32

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.................... 37

Limitations of the Study............................... 40
Suggestions for Future Research..................... 40

APPENDICES.................................................. 42

A. Questionnaire.......................................... 43
B. Script..................................................... 53

BIBLIOGRAPHY.............................................. 55
# LIST OF TABLES

1. Gender of Participants ........................................ 28  
2. Race/Ethnicity of Participants .................................. 28  
3. Participants in Terms of Current Athletic Involvement .......... 29  
4. Involvement in Dating Violence of Participants ................. 29  
5. Males’ Gender Views and Violence ................................ 33  
6. Females’ Gender Views and Violence ............................... 34  
7. Athlete/Non-Athlete Female Participants and Violence ........... 35  
8. Athlete/Non-athlete Male Participants and Violence ............. 36
"Dating violence involves the perpetration or threat of an act of physical violence by at least one member of an unmarried dyad on the other within the context of the dating process" (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989, p. 5). Increases in dating violence on college campuses have been reported across the United States (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989).

The data on dating violence suggest that females are more often victimized than males. It is also important to note that females are more likely to receive serious injuries than males. For example, Makepeace (1986) found that "four times as many females as males report a moderate or severe injury resulting from violent episodes while dating" (cited in Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989, p. 10).

In order to better understand differences in dating violence among males and females, we must look at the underlying factors that may or may not encourage each gender to inflict violence on their dating partners. The reasons given by each gender for inflicting violence on their dating partners vary widely. However, there are two commonly held assumptions: one, males' expression of violence in dating relationships is fostered by their need to maintain power and control over their mate (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989). Two, females who express violence in dating relationships against their male dates are
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only responding to their date's behavior by way of self-protection, self defense, or retaliation (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989). These assumptions are supported by findings revealed by Makepeace (1984), who found that:

Women were over twice as likely as men to have interpreted their own violent behavior as being the result of self-defense and/or retaliation. Men on the other hand were over three times more likely than women to cite intimidation, intention of forcing the other person to do something as their major motive for using violence. (cited in Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989, p. 10)

The expression of violent behavior by males toward females is embedded in our society. It was not until the late 1800s, for example, that wife beating was viewed as illegal and immoral in the United States (Renzetti & Curran, 1989, p. 165). Though wife beating is no longer legal in the United States, "prevalent attitudes remain remarkably similar" to previous times (Renzetti & Curran, 1989, p. 165). Data from a 1980 study provided by a national survey on male and female relationships, for example, support this assumption (Renzetti & Curran, 1989). In this survey, 25% of the male participants and 16% of the female participants approved of husbands beating their wives (Renzetti & Curran, 1989, p. 165). These attitudes not only exist in marital relationships, but they are also very much alive in dating relationships. For example, Flynn conducted a survey in 1987 which indicated that 29% to 36% of high school and college students approved of aggressive behavior, or beating their partners in dating relationships (Renzetti & Curran, 1989).

Thus, this study analyzes the differences, if any, between male and female college students, and between those who are athletes and
non-athletes attitudes towards traditional gender roles and their involvement in dating violence.

Aggressive behavior in dating relationships is a growing problem in the general society, and college campuses are not exempted. College athletes are part of this study because it is believed that sports encourage athletes to be dominant "go-getters," which might be a factor in aggressive behaviors, both on the field as well as in their personal lives. Also, the importance of assessing the attitudes of athletes in terms of gender roles and dating violence is significant because of the limited information on the topic.

Objectives

The purposes of this project were: (a) to assess aggressive dating behavior among students attending Western Michigan University, and to determine the differences, if any, between males and females, and between athlete and non-athlete involvement in dating violence; and (b) to analyze the relationship between gender role orientation and dating violence.

The more specific hypotheses are as follows:

1. Males with traditional gender-role views are more likely to be involved in dating violence than males with non-traditional gender-role views.

2. Females with traditional gender-role views are more likely to be involved in dating violence than females with non-traditional gender-role views.

3. Female athletes are less likely to experience or be involved
in dating violence than female non-athletes.

4. Male athletes are more likely to be involved in dating violence than male non-athletes.

Significance of the Study

The need for this study is two-fold. First, the problem of dating violence does more than threaten relationships; it victimizes students as well as threatens society as a whole. In other words, in order for society to function, men and women must learn how to establish meaningful, trusting, and open relationships with each other, and dating violence hinders this process. Second, there is very little research on the topic of athletes and dating violence. If sports in any way increase the distance between males and females, or make people of either sex more aggressive, we must take a look at the socialization process and experiences that athletes undergo. Therefore, this study is important if we are to more fully appreciate the causes, and therefore, begin to move toward more innovative and/or effective resolutions in relationship to dating violence.
CHAPTER IX

LITERATURE REVIEW

Although many scholars believe that aggression is evoked by inner forces, "an internal motivator cannot possibly account for the marked variation in the incidence of a given behavior in different situations, toward different persons, at different times and in different social roles" (Bandura, 1973, p. 40). The argument here asserts that a person expressing aggressive behavior does so for two reasons. The first reason holds that if a person expressed aggression in one particular situation and received a positive response, that person is encouraged to be aggressive. The second reason suggests that a person is encouraged to be aggressive by observing the expression of aggressive behavior by those with the same or similar role (Bandura, 1973). These assumptions coincide with social-learning theorists' train of thought, which holds that aggressive behavior is acquired through two processes: direct experience and observation (Bandura, 1973).

In addition to social learning theorists' beliefs that direct experience and observation encourage aggression is the premise that reinforcers play a significant role in the continuation of aggressive behavior. "A reinforcer is any stimulus that follows a response and increases the probability of its occurrence" (Zanden, 1981, p. 71). There are two kinds of reinforcers; primary, which holds that
aggression is expressed in order to satisfy basic needs, such as food, shelter, and mating (Zillmann, 1979, p. 177), and secondary, which "centers around rewards that, biologically speaking, can only be considered nonessential" (Zillmann, 1979, p. 177). Human aggression is believed to be fostered by secondary reinforcers, which are encouraged by material rewards rather than by necessity. Because human aggression is promoted by secondary reinforcers, it is reasonable to assume that human aggression is largely a product of self-reinforcement. "Self-reinforcement occurs when aggressors, more or less, pat themselves on the back for successful assaults against others, self-administering praise and approval for the completion of such actions" (Baron, 1977, p. 35). This suggests that the mere thought of having control over a woman is sufficient reinforcement for a man to express aggression toward a woman in a dating relationship.

In addition to reinforcers, punishment also plays a significant role in producing aggression in people. Punishment is "a consequence which decreases the frequency of the response that precedes it" (Ritzer, 1988, p. 254), for example "striking a child every time he or she cries" (Ritzer, 1988, p. 254). Punishment can also be viewed as positive or negative. Positive punishment is punishment which suppresses inappropriate behavior by using aversive stimulus (Ritzer, 1988). Negative punishment occurs when the removal or the threat of the removal of a reward is used to suppress inappropriate behavior (Ritzer, 1988). For example, instead of actually striking a child, the person in authority "threatens to remove privileges enjoyed by
the child because he or she is crying" (Ritzer, 1988, p. 254).

Both positive and negative punishment are used to encourage males to be aggressive. For example, "demands that boys conform to social notions of what is manly are frequently enforced harshly by threats and or actual punishment" (Pleck & Sawyer, 1974, p. 7). In other words, if boys are expressing any type of behavior which is defined as traditionally feminine, they are threatened or punished in order to impress upon them the importance of behaving in a more traditionally masculine manner (Pleck & Sawyer, 1974). The following section elaborates on how society defines masculine and feminine behavior, and the overall effects of the gender role socialization process on the mentality of males and females.

Gender-Role Socialization

A person is born into this society male or female. However, only through the socialization process does he or she acquire gender characteristics. Gender refers to "socially generated attitudes and behaviors usually organized dichotomously as masculinity and femininity" (Renzetti & Curran, 1989, p. 12).

Gender-role expectations have built invisible, yet very solid, barriers between males and females. Although a man's and a woman's mental abilities may be similar, society has set very rigid limitations on what a man and a woman are supposed to do and not supposed to do. Many scholars, such as Kimmel and Messner (1989), believe that a large majority of gender-role expectations are acquired during childhood through the child rearing process.
There is evidence suggesting that differentiated treatment of girls and boys occurs as early as infancy. According to Lynn (1969),

The subtle treatment defining him as a male precedes his conscious awareness of distinction, e.g., giving him blue clothes in contrast to pink, and perhaps handling him as though he were a less fragile package than female babies. He may secure subtle treatment reserved for the special role given sons in a male-dominant society. (p. 24)

This indicates that from birth society labels males as the stronger gender. Gender-role expectations are reinforced as children get older, from the toys they play with to the games they play. For example, girls are taught to be more compassionate and are likely to develop primary relationships (Kimmel & Messner, 1989). Girls are encouraged to play with less physical contact games like jump rope, and are given toys like dolls. Boys, on the other hand, develop secondary relationships with their friends. A secondary relationship is "a relationship in which individuals interact formally and expect to profit from each other" (Thio, 1986, p. 568). Boys, unlike girls, are expected to engage in contact sports such as football and hockey. They also tend to exhibit more aggression and ridicule each other in their play (Kimmel & Messner, 1989).

Sex Segregation

Differences in gender-role expectations are so salient during childhood that some scholars, such as Thorne, argue that girls and boys live in two separate worlds (Kimmel & Messner, 1989). Sex-segregation is encouraged unconsciously during childhood in the school system. This assumption is elaborated in Thorne's article, "Girls and Boys Together But Mostly Apart." According to Thorne "Sex
Segregation should be understood not as a given, but as the result of deliberate activity" (Kimmel & Messner, 1989, p. 140). For example, Thorne found in her study that many teachers used gender as a basis to establish teams for such contests such as spelling B's, pitting the girls against the boys. She noticed that gender was also made visible whenever the student body was addressed by the principal, with an opening statement including words such as "girls and boys." An opening statement of this kind suggests that the student body is composed of two different groups.

The above forms of interaction promote distances between male and female children that may someday make it more difficult for them to communicate as adults. Stated differently, the boundaries established between the sexes during childhood tend to carry over into adulthood. In short, males and females are socialized as children to establish separate worlds between themselves. It becomes a struggle when children become adults to understand and connect these two worlds, based upon the fact that they lose so many years of communication due to sex-segregation during childhood.

Sex segregation is also related to sexism. Sexism is found in the beliefs and structure that place men above, beyond, and superior to women. The history of sexism dates back to antiquity. For example, according to 1 Corinthians 11:8-9, "For the man is not of the woman: but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman: but the woman for the man" (New Testament, 1968, p. 338). As is implied here, males and females are expected to behave differently in society and these differences place men superior and women
inferior across society's structures and institutions. "Whether through overt discrimination or traditional gender-role socialization, sexism has brought gender inequalities in education, occupation and politics" (Thio, 1986, p. 247).

In terms of education, women were not allowed to enter many of the colleges and universities until the late 1960s (Thio, 1986). In regard to earnings, according to a study conducted by Featherman and Hauser in 1976, "85 percent of the difference between men's and women's occupation is the result of discrimination" (Thio, 1986, p. 246). Sexism also plays a major role in keeping women off the political scene. For example, "in 1984 women made up 54 percent of the voting population, but they captured only 5 percent of all public offices" (Thio, 1986, p. 249). In addition to sexism promoting inequalities in terms of women's education, occupation and political status, sexism is also believed to foster women's inequality in dating relationships. This is thought to occur because the socialization process teaches females to express submissive behavior and males to express dominant behavior, which is sexist ideology because it argues that males are superior to females.

Traditional Gender Roles and Dating Violence

Is society responsible for the destruction of male/female relationships? It is evident that society instills very different gender-role expectations in males and females. From earlier childhood the male is socialized to be aggressive, and powerful—all values applauded by society but allowable only to men. In a study conducted
by Bernard and Bernard in 1985 using the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI) (1974) to assess attitudes of the sexes, findings indicated that males whose BSRI scores were sex-typed as masculine tended to be more aggressive in dating relationships than their male counterparts whose BSRI scores were only moderately masculine (Bernard & Bernard, 1985).

The "just-world theory" was the basis of Kristiansen and Giulietti's (1990) study. The just-world theory holds that we live in a society where people are responsible for their own fate. In short, regardless of what happens to a person in his or her life, s/he deserves it according to this theory. The results of Kristiansen and Giulietti's study revealed that the male participants who believed in the just-world theory argued that women who experienced violence deserved to be victimized if they did not follow the traditional gender rules set by society. In other words, "cultural and socialization factors regarding attitudes toward women appear to govern men's perceptions of violence toward women" (Kristiansen & Giulietti, 1990, p. 188). This suggests that the males in the study believed that women deserved to be victimized, and they arrived at this perception because of their belief in traditional gender roles, holding, for example, that men should be in control and dominant over women.

Olday and Wesley's (1988) study focused on a comparison between the extent of dating violence among high schoolers and college students. They argued that the different environments played a major role in the dating demeanor of the two groups. They argue that
"miscommunication and differential expectations are likely to create conflict in dating situations, especially for young people with limited dating experiences" (Olday & Wesley, 1988, p. 189). For example, dating violence was found to be slightly higher among high schoolers than college level students. They believed the reason that college level students were less involved in dating violence was associated with them having a broader range of interaction with other people, which enhanced their communication and interaction skills in relationships.

However, in the final analysis, Olday and Wesley concluded that "socialization into traditional female and male roles is a very important part of the explanatory framework of dating violence" (1988, p. 189). This suggests that gender-role differences were the underlying factors behind dating violence in both the relationships of high schoolers and college students.

Aijenman and Kelley (1988) assessed dating violence using 800 undergraduate students at Rutgers University. Findings revealed that long-term relationships tend to manifest a higher level of dating violence than short-term relationships. This is believed to be due to the relationship dealing with more intense issues. For example, 44% of the participants reporting violence described their relationship as a steady one, with 30% stating that their relationship was a dating one, and 26% reporting that their relationship was a casual one (Aijenman & Kelley, 1988, p. 307). These findings also indicated that women were more likely to be the victims of dating violence, while men were more likely to be the aggressors. Aijenman and Kelley
credit this to sex-role stereotyping. Specifically, they argued, "Our culture encourages men to be aggressive, to be a 'real man,' while female sex-role stereotypes establish the expectation that women should be more passive and nonassertive" (Aijenman & Kelley, 1988, p. 310).

The findings from the preceding studies have one salient similarity. While each study was administered to different populations and conducted by different scholars, they jointly reveal consistency regarding the conclusion that traditional gender-role expectations play a significant role in promoting dating violence.

Sports and Masculinity

There are very few studies on the topic of athletes and dating violence. However, there does exist some literature on sports, violence, and masculinity. According to Sabo and Runfola (1980), it is "partly through sports, that boys learn early that a capacity for violence is part and parcel of the adult male identity" (p. 113). Sports appear to be a direct link to teaching males how to be masculine, since masculinity is connected to aggression, and aggression is perhaps the most salient thrust behind sports. This is elaborated by Bianchi, who jointly examined violence, sexism, and aggression.

Bianchi argued that the family is the initial source for learning aggression. He articulates that "males understand from the start that social acceptance of them as men depends on them being dominant towards, and protective of females, while being successfully competitive toward males" (cited in Sabo & Runfola, 1980, p. 118).
Girls, on the other hand, are socialized in a different way. They "are conditioned to suppress their mental and physical potential" (Sabo & Runfola, 1980, p. 118).

Bianchi also noted that this mentality among males and females increases throughout childhood, and that sports serve as a major reinforcer of males' aggressiveness and females' passivity. For example, "in the football spectacle the role of women in our society is clearly defined against the masculine criteria of value. The important action is male-dominated; women can share only at a distance in a man's world" (Sabo & Runfola, 1980, p. 123).

In fact, others like Hoch (1979) go on to argue that sports serve as a school for sexism. "Sexual apartheid in sports originates from more or less the same root as the racial apartheid in sports of South Africa. Both were established on the sports fields of England's all-white, all-boy public schools which originated our kinds of team sports in the 19th century" (cited in Sabo & Runfola, 1980, pp. 9-10). The purpose of these schools was to encourage cohesion among white elite males, while excluding women and blacks (Sabo & Runfola, 1980, p. 10). "Over and above these rationales for the exclusion of women was the general male supremacist and anti-sexual atmosphere of the Victorian era in which the team-sports developed" (Sabo & Runfola, 1980, p. 11).

However, it is important to underscore that these rationales did more than promote team sports. They also, unfortunately, encouraged sexism by socializing males to view themselves as the elite gender. According to Hoch, "the public school teams sports were part of the
socialization process whereby the male Anglo-Saxon elite learned to recognize one another, and use their elite exclusionist sports as a preparation or their more general notions of elitist rule" (cited in Sabo & Runfola, 1980, p. 10). In other words, this male elite mentality has been adopted by many men as the rule of life.

Sports, Masculinity, and Dating Violence

Is sports a training ground for violence toward women? "A primary function of sports is the dissemination and reinforcement of such traditional American values as male superiority, competition, work and success" (Sabo & Runfola, 1980, p. xi). It is through sports that males are taught to be aggressive go-getters, with only one major goal, to win. This superiority ideology instilled into men through sports is believed to cross over to every aspect of their lives; and men's relationships with women are no exception. Therefore, this framework can also be employed to understand violence toward women.

According to Miedjian, "boys are being raised in a culture that discourages nurturing and leads many of them to denigrate and beat women" (cited in Levy, 1991, p. 16). The premise of Miedjian's study was not to degrade the art of sports, but to open our eyes to the negative side effects of sports. For example, "there have been studies that indicate that instead of learning sportsmanship and fair play, boys who are involved in competitive sports demonstrate less of these qualities than boys who are not involved "(Levy, 1991, p. 16). In other words, sports are problematic when they only incorporate the
mentality that holds winning as being more important than "sportsmanship." It is essential to note, however, that as Miedjian argued, not all sports encourage athletes to only be aggressive and self-serving. She states, however, that "research reveals it is frequent enough that it is a serious problem" (cited in Levy, 1991, p. 16).

For example, "in high school football, boys are often taught to 'take out' players from the opposite team. Taking out a player means injuring a player so badly that he can no longer play" (Levy, 1991, p. 16). This suggests that in sporting events men are encouraged and expected to use extreme aggression. However, unfortunately, "what athletes learn on the playing field is often carried on in the outside world" (Levy, 1991, p. 16). In other words, having learned through sports to be aggressive, self-centered, go-getters on the field, it can be expected that many athletes maintain this same behavior within their dating relationships.

One of the few studies conducted by Miedjian in this realm indicated that sports and violence against women are often linked together, and it is cultural norms that appear to constitute the connection. Cultural norms lay the foundation which enables athletes to be dominating, and sports reinforce this aggressive behavior by teaching them to win at any cost. As Miedjian observed, "having learned those kinds of lessons, it is very hard to cut that off when you are in the outside world" (cited in Levy, 1991, p. 16).
Date Rape

A literature review examining aggressive behavior among college
dating couples would not be complete without an assessment of college
date rape. The following poem was taken from a work by Sunday and
Tobach, Violence Against Women: A Critique of the Sociobiology of
Date Rape. The last line of this poem especially holds true if a woman is
raped while on a date (Sunday & Tobach, 1985). Date rape occurs when
a woman is sexually assaulted by a dating partner while on a date.

Rape Poem

There is no difference between being raped
and being pushed down a flight of cement steps
except that the wounds also bleed inside.

There is no difference between being raped
and being run over by a truck
except that afterward men ask if you enjoyed it.

There is no difference between being raped
and being bit on the ankle by a rattlesnake
except that people ask if your skirt was short
and why you were out alone anyhow.

There is no difference between being raped
and going head first through a windshield
except that afterward you are afraid
not of cars
but half the human race.
(Marge Piercy, cited in Sunday & Tobach, 1985)

As the poem indicates, once a woman is raped she is afraid of
half the human race, and being raped by someone she knows and trusts
only intensifies her fear of men (Sunday & Tobach, 1985). In other
words, she begins to believe that if a man who knows her could rape
her, it would be even easier for a complete stranger to do the same
thing. Therefore, a woman who is raped by an acquaintance, has
greater fear of the opposite sex, because she was victimized by a "friend."

Date rape is a very serious problem, one which has hidden in our society for a long time. "An early survey by Kanin (1957) of college students found that 20% to 24% of college women reported experiencing forceful attempts of sexual intercourse while on a date during the year prior to administration of the survey" (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989, p. 1781). The situation has only worsened over the years. For example, Mulklenhard and Linton (1987) reported that 77% of the women and 57% of the men they studied admitted or said that they had been involved in a date rape (Pirog-good & Stets, 1989, p. 170).

"Experts in this field say, clearly, among college students, sexual aggression is rare among strangers and common among acquaintances" (Gordon & Riger, 1989, p. 28). Sexual aggression on college campuses is believed to be so prevalent today because our society as a whole promotes it. "Campus rapists are ordinary males operating in an ordinary social context, not even knowing they are doing something wrong, let alone against the law" (Gordon & Riger, 1989, p. 28). In short, society paints a picture that shows women as indecisive and unstable in terms of their responses to sexual advances, and reinforces the myth that women really mean yes when they say no.

This is illustrated time and time again in movies like Gone With the Wind, "where Rhett sweeps Scarlett up the stairs" (Gibbs, 1991, p. 54). This scene and many similar scenes from any number of movies suggest two things. First, such scenes send out signals to men which suggest that they should be dominant, forceful and never take no for
an answer when in a sexually intimate situation. They also suggest that women enjoy being overpowered by their mates.

These assumptions are instilled in the minds of both sexes at a very young age. They are taught that it is appropriate for men to force their sexual desires on their mates. For example,

a recent survey of sixth to ninth graders in Rhode Island found that a fourth of the boys and a sixth of the girls said it was acceptable for a man to force a woman to kiss him or have sex if he has spent money on her. (Gibbs, 1991, p. 54)

This type of mentality builds a sense of blamelessness in the conscience of men, which makes it easy and even encourages them to be aggressive, violent and even rape their mates and friends. Downplaying the seriousness of date rape is synonymous to making a joke out of a woman's body and her right to say no. Since this project incorporates a focus on athletes, the next segment elaborates the growing issue of athletes and date rape.

Athletes and Date Rape

"Sexual abuse by athletes is manifest at every level high school, college, the pros" (Eskonji, 1990, p. 221). It is thought that many athletes believe that in order to maintain their macho status off the field and outside the locker and dorm room, they must be a "lady's man." Unfortunately, this macho status ideology is often taken to the extreme. In other words, some athletes tend to use sexual violence as a way of proving their masculinity.

The thrust behind the continued increase of athletes' sexual abuse of their dates is believed to be promoted by society's high
appraisal of athletes (Eskenaji, 1990). The "boys will be boys" mentality society holds toward athletes' behavior obviously encourages athletes to express physical and sexual violence toward females. For example, "although communities are outraged by this behavior often the anger is directed at the woman" (Eskenaji, 1990, p. 222). Moreover, "officials of the athletic department use their considerable muscle and prestige to get the player off" (Eskenaji, 1990, p. 222).

In the final analysis, the old cliche "boys will be boys" and the fear of being labeled unmanly because they do not fit the typical "real man" mode, is thought to encourage athletes to be physically and sexually aggressive toward their dates. As Knight observes, "athletes' special place in society's pantheon has allowed him to leapfrog the rules" (Eskenaji, 1990, p. 223).

Summary

Dating violence appears to be a significant problem in our society. The literature suggests there is a relationship between traditional gender roles and dating violence also sports and dating violence. This study will concern itself with the following questions:

1. Males with traditional gender-role views are more likely to be involved in dating violence than males with non-traditional gender views.

2. Females with traditional gender-role views are more likely to be involved in dating violence than females with non-traditional
gender-role views.

3. Female athletes are less likely to experience or be involved in dating violence than female non-athletes.

4. Males athletes are more likely to be involved in dating violence than male non-athletes.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Operational Definition

Independent Variables

Traditional gender roles and athletes are the independent variables which received the most extensive focus in this study. However, independent variables such as age, academic standing, and race/ethnicity are also described. Traditional gender roles are patterns of behavior society expects its members to express because of their gender. For example, females are expected to express passive behavior because they are feminine. Males, on the other hand, are believed to be masculine and are expected to express aggressive behavior.

In order to measure traditional gender role views, a Likert scale was designed. This was developed by assigning point values from 1 to 4 for questions measuring traditionality with 1 signifying highly non-traditional and 4 signifying highly traditional. The question covered dimensions such as educational, "Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters;" economical, "There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted;" political, "Women are too emotional to handle political leadership positions," and social,
"It is insulting to women to have the 'I will honor and obey clause remain in the marriage service." All these questions can be found in Appendix A.

All the traditional gender role question values were added up and divided into four categories. The categories were broken down as follows: 40 through 49 = 1, which signifies strong equality views; 50 through 59 = 2, which signifies mild equality views, 60 through 66 = 3, which signifies mild traditional views; and 67 through 72 = 4, which signifies strong traditional views.

The scale was divided into four categories in order to have a greater distribution of scores, also because the response category in terms of the questions regarding gender role view had four response categories (agree strongly, agree mildly, disagree strongly, and disagree mildly). Therefore the scale was divided into four categories in order to coincide with the responses. The lowest possible score was 19 and the highest possible score was 76. The lower the score the less traditional were the views of the participants and the higher the score suggested the participants' views were more traditional. The scale was developed because it was easier to measure traditional gender role views by using a scale than by using each question individually.

Athletes

Athletes are those self-identified students who were a member of at least 1 of the Western Michigan University (WMU) athletic teams. The teams encountered in this research are as follows: basketball,
gymnastics, tennis and track/cross country are teams in which both males and females participate; volleyball and softball are teams in which only females participate; and baseball, football, hockey and soccer are teams in which only males participate. High school participation on an athletic team was not considered because this study focuses on persons who are currently participating on an athletic team.

Independent Demographic Variables

1. Age in this study ranged from the age 17 to over the age of 24.

2. Academic standing: (a) students in his or her first year of college, (b) a student in his or her second year of college, (c) a student in his or her third year of college, and (d) a student in his or her fourth year of college.

3. Race/ethnicity: (a) Black (self-defined), (b) Hispanic (self-defined), (c) White (self-defined), (d) Asian (self-defined), and other (self-defined).

Dependent Variable

"Dating violence is defined as the perpetration or threat of an act of physical violence by at least one member of an unmarried dyad on the other within the context of the dating process" (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989, p. 5). In other words, dating violence occurs when persons who are dating express violence toward one another.

Dating violence was measured by asking the participants the
following question: Have you ever experienced/been involved in violence on a date with a dating partner? The subjects were provided four answers to select from (1) yes, violence done to me, (2) yes, violence done by me, (3) yes, violence done to me and by me and, (4) no, violence neither done to me, nor by me. The researcher divided the answer categories into two clear-cut responses, yes and no, with "yes" indicating involvement in dating violence, to them, by them, or both, and "no," indicating no involvement in dating violence. The reason the answer categories were divided into two responses was because this study was only concerned with the participant's actual involvement versus noninvolvement in dating violence. Therefore, the frequency or type of violence, although potentially relevant, were beyond the scope of the present study.

Data Collection Instrument

The questionnaire used in the research was an 84-item question self-report instrument (see Appendix A). The first part of the questionnaire asked the subjects to respond to questions pertaining to their most violent experience in a dating relationship, in terms of the type of violence done "to them" or "by them," or "both." These questions were taken and/or revised from a previous instrument constructed by Hasnishfeger, Caringella-MacDonald, and Wiener (1988). The second part of the questionnaire asked the subjects to answer questions regarding their opinions of traditional gender-role expectations set by society. These questions were taken and or revised from the Spence-Halmreich Attitudes Toward Women Scale.
(Spence & Helmreich, 1972). The elements for selection of responses were as follows: "agree strongly, agree mildly, disagree mildly, and disagree strongly." The instrument was used to assess the attitudes of the participants toward traditional gender roles set by society. By disagreeing with statements such as "sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters," participants indicated their attitudes were more traditional. The questions also covered social, economical, and political dimensions.

It is also important to note that an assessment of athletes involvement in dating violence was a focus of this study. Therefore, the first part of the instrument asked questions pertaining to athletic participation.

**Data Collection Method**

The participants in this study were selected by a non-random sampling technique. A total of 200 questionnaires were distributed in six undergraduate sociology classes and one undergraduate physical education class. The researcher selected mostly undergraduate sociology classes because she is a sociology graduate student and therefore access to undergraduate sociology classes was very convenient. The sociology classes were all 200 and 300 level classes, and the physical education class was a 200 level class.

The questionnaires were distributed during the weeks of February 16 through 22, and February 23 through 29, of 1992. The researcher entered the physical education classroom and provided the professor with one of the questionnaires. The professor introduced the
researcher to the class and the researcher explained the premise of the study. The researcher then distributed the questionnaires and asked the participants to place the questionnaire face-down on a desk at the front of the room upon completion. This was the only physical education class that coincided with the researcher's open time because of work schedule and class time.

The distribution of the questionnaires in the sociology classes was handled quite differently. The researcher provided the professors of the six undergraduate sociology classes with the instrument and a script, which explained how it should be administered (see Appendix B). In terms of the return rate, the researcher received 94% of the questionnaires that were passed out in all classes. All 12 of the questionnaires administered in the undergraduate physical education class were returned, which means 176 questionnaires from the undergraduate sociology classes were returned. A total of 188 questionnaires were therefore completed and returned.

Sample and Subject Characteristics

All of the subjects who participated in this study were undergraduate college students attending Western Michigan University, ranging from the ages of 17 to over 24. In terms of the students' participation by gender, more than 50% of the subjects were female (see Table 1).
Table 1

Gender of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding class standing, 47 were seniors, 52 of the subjects were juniors, 47 were sophomores, and 42 were freshmen. In terms of the subjects' racial composition, 86% of the subjects were self-identified White, 9% of the subjects were self-identified Black, 4% of the subjects were self-identified Asian, and .5% of the subjects were self-identified Hispanic (see Table 2).

Table 2

Race/Ethnicity of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since this study also focuses on athletes' involvement in dating violence, it is important to note that 24 out of 188 of the subjects
stated they were members of at least one Western Michigan University athletic team at the time of the survey. This indicates that over 10% of the participants in this study were members of an athletic team (see Table 3).

Table 3
Participants in Terms of Current Athletic Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding involvement in dating violence, 11.8% of the males reported "yes, violence to me," 7.1% of the males reported "yes, violence by me," 23.5% reported "yes, violence by me and to me," and 57.6% reported "no involvement in dating violence." On the other hand, 27.2% of the females reported "yes, violence to me," 5.8% reported "yes, violence by me," 16.5% reported "yes, violence to me and by me," and 50.5% reported "no involvement in dating violence" (see Table 4).
Table 4

Involvement in Dating Violence of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Yes, to me</th>
<th>Yes, by me</th>
<th>Yes, to me and by me</th>
<th>No, done to me nor by me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10 (11.8%)</td>
<td>6 (7.1%)</td>
<td>20 (23.5%)</td>
<td>49 (57.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28 (27.2%)</td>
<td>6 (5.8%)</td>
<td>17 (16.5%)</td>
<td>52 (50.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38 (20.2%)</td>
<td>12 (6.4%)</td>
<td>37 (19.7%)</td>
<td>101 (53.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis Procedures

The researcher used the VAX computer system at Western Michigan University. The statistical package selected to analyze the data is one of the most commonly used: The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, 1970). The analytic procedures included frequencies which are the number of cases in any category; for example, the number of athletes and non-athletes who participated in the study (see Table 3). In addition, the crosstab procedure was used to produce bivariate tables to analyze the independent variables (males and females, athletes and non-athletes, and traditional and non-traditional gender role view) in relationship to the dependent variable (dating violence).

In order for the researcher to test the hypotheses, the chi square test was used. The chi square is a nonparametric test of hypothesis and one of the most used in the social sciences (Healey, 1990, p. 209). Nonparametric tests are a test of hypothesis which "do not require the assumption of a normally shaped population.
distribution" (Healey, 1990, p. 192). In other words, with non-parametric tests such as the chi square, the researcher did not need to know the exact distribution in the population.

The advantages of the chi square test lie in its ability to reveal the significance of the relationship between what is observed and what is expected (Champion, 1981). Independence in terms of chi square holds that "two variables are independent if for all cases in the sample, the classification of a case into a particular category of one variable has no effect on the probability that the case will fall into any particular category of the second variable" (Healy, 1990, p. 209). For example, traditional gender roles and dating violence are unrelated to one another if traditional gender roles have no effect beyond what would be expected by chance alone on dating violence. It is also important to note that the significance would be determined at the .05 level, which is standard for the social sciences.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter presents the statistical findings in terms of the four hypotheses that were used to examine the gender views of male and female athletes and non-athletes in regard to the impact of these variables on involvement in dating violence. The hypotheses are discussed below and their significance was determined by the use of the chi square.

Hypothesis 1. Males with traditional gender views are more likely to be involved in dating violence than males with non-traditional gender views.

Table 5 shows that of males with traditional gender views, 29% reported involvement in dating violence, while 71% reported no involvement in dating violence. In terms of non-traditional views, 46% of the males reported involvement in dating violence and 54% reported no involvement in dating violence. There is no significant relationship between gender views and dating violence among males. In other words, the likelihood of males with traditional gender views being involved in dating violence is no greater than males with non-traditional gender views. The direction of the relationship between the variables is not addressed because there is no significant relationship between the two variables. Thus, Hypotheses 1 was rejected by these data. Though there was no significant relationship between
the two variables, the percentage indicates that dating violence is a significant problem. The percentages also suggest the total opposite of the hypothesis. In other words, instead of involvement in dating violence being higher for males with traditional gender-role views it is higher for males with non-traditional gender-role views.

Table 5
Males' Gender Views and Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Views</th>
<th>Violence Yes</th>
<th>Violence No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>8 (29%)</td>
<td>20 (71%)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional</td>
<td>25 (46%)</td>
<td>29 (54%)</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33 (40%)</td>
<td>49 (60%)</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = obtained 2.414
Critical value = 3.841

Hypothesis 2. Females with traditional gender views are more likely to be involved in dating violence than females with non-traditional gender views.

Table 6 indicates that of the females with traditional gender views, 52% reported involvement in dating violence and 48% reported no involvement in dating violence. While of the females with non-traditional gender views, 60% reported involvement and 40% reported no involvement. There is no significant relationship between gender views and dating violence among females. In other words, females with non-traditional gender views are just as likely as females with traditional gender views to be involved in dating violence. The
direction of the variables was not discussed because there was no relationship between the two variables. Hence, Hypothesis 2 was rejected. It is important to note that the percentages indicate that a significant number of females are involved in dating violence. The percentages also suggest that females with non-traditional gender-role views were more involved in dating violence than females with traditional gender-role views.

Table 6

Females' Gender Views and Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Views</th>
<th>Violence Yes</th>
<th>Violence No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>51 (52%)</td>
<td>47 (48%)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Traditional</td>
<td>3 (60%)</td>
<td>2 (40%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54 (52%)</td>
<td>49 (48%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .116
Critical value= 3.841

Hypothesis 3. Female non-athletes are more likely to experience or be involved in dating violence than female athletes.

Table 7 indicates that of the female athletes, 25% reported involvement in dating violence and 75% reported no involvement in dating violence. In terms of female non-athletes, 52.9% reported involvement in dating violence and 48% reported no involvement in dating violence. There is no significant relationship between participation in athletics and dating violence among females. In short, whether a female participates or does not participate on an athletic
team has no impact on their involvement in dating violence. It is
important to note that the direction was not discussed because there
was no significant relationship between the two variables. Thus,
Hypothesis 3 was rejected. The percentages suggest, however, that a
significant number of both female athletes and non-athletes were
involved in dating violence.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Violence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>2 (25%)</td>
<td>6 (75%)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>49 (52%)</td>
<td>46 (48%)</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51 (50%)</td>
<td>52 (50%)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = 2.08
Critical value = 3.841

Hypothesis 4. Male athletes are more likely to be involved in
dating violence than male non-athletes.

Table 8 indicates that of the male athletes, 50% reported in-
volvement in dating violence and 50% also reported no involvement in
dating violence. In terms of non-athletes, 41% reported involvement
in dating violence and 59.4% reported no involvement in dating vio-
ence. There is no significant relationship between participation on
an athletic team and dating violence. Males who participate on an
athletic team were no more likely to be involved in dating violence
than male non-athletes. The direction of relationship between the variables was not elaborated on because there was no significant relationship between the two variables. Thus, hypothesis 4 was rejected. The percentages suggest that a significant number of male athletes and non-athletes were involved in dating violence.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Violence Yes</th>
<th>Violence No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletes</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>8 (50%)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Athletes</td>
<td>28 (41%)</td>
<td>41 (59%)</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 (42%)</td>
<td>49 (58%)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi square = .46
Critical value = 3.841
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study reaffirms the fact that dating violence exists. Although none of the hypotheses were supported, the percentages indicate that a great number of the participants were involved in dating violence. For example, 50% of the female participants reported involvement in dating violence. Regarding male participants, 42% of them reported involvement in dating violence. However, the results suggest that neither participation on an athletic team, nor having traditional gender role views, play a significant role in whether or not a person has been involved in dating violence.

The foundation of this research was based on Bandura's social learning role theory which holds that aggression is learned. The theory was the base for understanding gender roles, and the literature on gender was the base for understanding sex segregation. According to the literature review, traditional gender roles promote sex segregation and sex segregation produces dating violence because of lack of communication.

One of the studies by Bernard and Bernard (1985) regarding traditional gender role views, which were examined for the literature review, suggested that the more masculine type gender views a male has the greater the chance that he will be involved in dating violence. However, findings in this study did not replicate the
findings disclosed by Bernard and Bernard. Traditional gender roles had no impact on males' involvement in dating violence. Also, the findings regarding females' gender role views and involvement in dating violence fail to replicate the findings of the studies discussed in the literature review.

Instead, findings from this study suggest simply being a female puts a person at risk of being involved in dating violence. This assumption was arrived at because 50% of the females reported involvement in dating violence as opposed to 42% of the males. It is also important to note that 27.2% of the females reported "yes, violence to me" as compared to 11.8% of males.

Other factors, some of which were identified in Chapter 2, must then influence dating violence. Examples of such factors include the age of the person in the relationship and self-esteem. In terms of the later, it is possible that self-esteem could influence both the infliction of, and the submission to, violence in a dating relationship. For example, a person who inflicts or submits to dating violence because of low self-esteem, does so because of fear of being alone. In terms of the former, in some cases, young couples are not mature enough to talk the problem out so they turn to fighting as a solution.

In terms of male athletic participation and involvement in dating violence, this study does not support past research (Miedjian, 1991). In other words, this study suggests that participating on an athletic team does not promote involvement in dating violence. It is important to note that this study differs from other studies in the
attempt to examine female athletes and involvement in dating violence. As indicated with males, participation on an athletic team did not play a significant role in whether or not a female was involved in dating violence.

The literature review also discussed Sobo and Runfola's (1980) work which provided many short essays addressing sports masculinity and violence. The essays argued that the foundation of sports is aggression and if sports teach boys how to be masculine, then they are likely to express aggression as a way of expressing masculinity. The researcher speculates that if there had been a greater representation of athletes, then the chance of there being a relationship between athletic participation and dating violence would have perhaps been different. On the other hand, the findings could suggest that athletes have a very strong sense of self or ego, which could suggest that they walk away from the relationship as opposed to fighting with a dating partner because of their belief in their ability to easily find another partner.

In conclusion, data from this study illustrate two important factors regarding involvement in dating violence. First, that males, regardless of participation on an athletic team, or traditional gender role beliefs, were involved in dating violence. In fact, a total of 42% of the males reported involvement in dating violence. Second, with females, regardless of their gender views or participation on an athletic team, were involved in dating violence. In terms of the female participants, 50% reported involvement in dating violence. Although none of the hypotheses formulated as the base of
this study were supported. It is clear that dating violence is a problem which should no longer be taken lightly.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to consider concerning this study. One, there should have been a pilot study conducted in order to identify the flaws in the research. Second, the study should have had a greater number of athletes (males and females) in order to have a greater representation. Third, whether or not the faculty followed the instructions provided in the script cannot be determined. Fourth, whether or not the students read the instructions and followed the instructions correctly on the instrument most similarly remain a question. Fifth, failure to include past athletic participation in the study could have influenced the research results. Sixth, the study only examined the participants' involvement in dating violence and did not go beyond this to consider such things as level and frequency of violent episodes. Different and perhaps significant results may well have been observed had such dimensions been addressed.

Suggestions for Future Research

Those who may pursue this avenue of research in the future might productively examine a number of factors such as those listed above. Since this study found that of the females, 50% were involved in dating violence, regardless of their gender role views or participation on an athletic team. Therefore, looking at the females' life
from a psychological and economic approach would perhaps provide a
greater understanding of their involvement in dating violence. For
example, the female could be suffering from financial insecurities.
In addition, a focus on males who grew up in a household without male
role models would be an interesting assessment because it is believed
that many males who grow up in this type of environment overcompens-
sate in terms of their masculinity which sometimes lead to violence.
It would also, perhaps, be beneficial to examine athletic participa-
tion, starting at the high school level in regards to the socializa-
tion process because socialization begins well before a person enters
college. For example, of the participants in this study who parti-
cipated on an athletic team in the past, 17% reported violence done
to them or by them.

This research may serve to contribute to the research literature
by perhaps raising more questions and/or dimensions than answers.
Dating violence is widespread, and must continue to be researched as
it constitutes an important social problem. It is only through
greater understanding that we, as a society, can enhance the effec-
tiveness of solutions to the problem of dating violence.
Appendix A

Questionnaire
June 4, 1991

Dear Student:

This is a study of dating relationships of athletes and non-athletes attending Western Michigan University. It is in partial fulfillment of my masters program in Sociology, supervised by Dr. Caringella-MacDonald, Dr. Sonnad, and Dr. VanValey of the Sociology Department.

Both male and female athletes and non-athletes are invited to participate in this research project, which examines the dating violence that occurs in the relationships of students attending Western Michigan University. Although this survey may appear long, I have found that it takes approximately 10-15 minutes to complete all responses. I am aware that dating violence is a very sensitive topic, but it is vital that you answer all questions as honestly as possible. The information you provide can be very useful in finding the reasons for this problem. However, if you exercise your option to refrain from participating, you will not be penalized by your professor, or, in other words, your standing in this class will not be affected. You are also at liberty to withdraw from the project at any time without any adverse effects.

In this study I am interested in a description of the factors surrounding an actual aggressive interaction between you and your dating partner, when you encountered your most violent episode in a dating relationship - either in terms of violence done TO YOU or BY YOU. I am also interested in your opinion of female gender-role expectations set by society. If you have never experienced any violence in a dating relationship, please fill out the questionnaire anyway.

It is important that I duly emphasize that all subjects who participate in this project will remain completely anonymous. Also, all material will be destroyed when this study is completed.

If you have any personal concerns about this topic and would like to talk to someone about it, contact your resident advisor or the following services.

Counseling Center 387-1850
Public Safety 387-5555
Women's Center 387-2990

Thank you very much for your cooperation and effort.

Sincerely,

Felicia Flowers

Dr. Caringella-MacDonald
DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THIS FORM

Using a Number Two lead pencil, please mark all answers on the mark sense sheets provided, by completely filling in the numbered circle that corresponds with your answer.

1. What is your sex?
   1. Male  2. Female

2. What is your age?
   1. Under 17  4. 19  7. 22
   2. 17       5. 20  8. 23
   3. 18       6. 21  9. 24 or over

3. What is your class standing?
   1. Freshman  3. Junior
   2. Sophomore  4. Senior

4-10. Please indicate as many of the following student organizations that you belong to by either marking "yes" (1) or "no" (2) for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student government organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic honorary societies and departmental clubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social fraternities or sororities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Minority and special interest organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other student organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Are you currently a member of an athletic team?

   1 = Yes  2 = No

11. Have you ever been a member of an athletic team in the past?

   1 = Yes  2 = No

12. If you are, or have been a member of an athletic team, please indicate which team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle</th>
<th>Sport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>gymnastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>football</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>soccer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>baseball</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. When did you first participate on an athletic team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>earlier than middle/junior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>middle/junior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>freshman year in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>sophomore year in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>junior year in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>senior year in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I never participated on an athletic team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. For how many years (total) have you been a member of any athletic team? (All experiences totaled)
   1. 1
   2. 2
   3. 3
   4. 4 or more
   5. 0

15. What is your race/ethnicity?
   1. White
   2. Hispanic
   3. Black
   4. Asian
   5. Other (specify) ____________________________

16. What is your current living situation?
   1. Traditional type dorm, sex-segregated.
   2. Traditional type dorm, co-ed.
   3. Apartment type dorm.
   4. Apartment, supervised/maintained by the university.
   5. Apartment or house not affiliated with university.
   6. Fraternity or sorority house.
   7. Parents or relatives.
   8. Other (specify) ____________________________

17. Have you ever gone out/been on a date with a person of the opposite sex?
   1 = Yes
   2 = No

Before answering the questions which follow, read this whole paragraph.

The following questions, 16-61, refer to the extent or number of times possible aggressive acts were inflicted or received by you in a dating relationship. However, I am only concerned with the extent to which these acts occurred during your worst incident of violence with a dating partner. "Worst incident" refers to the single incident which in your judgment involved the highest level of violence or physical/emotional injury whether done by you or to you. For the remaining questions, partner refers to the person involved in the worst incident. "Acts" refer to physical actions done with harmful intent or for self-defense. IF YOU CAN THINK OF NO DATING RELATIONSHIPS IN WHICH YOU HAVE PARTICIPATED IN WHICH THERE WAS VIOLENCE, ANSWER THE REMAINING QUESTIONS IN TERMS OF YOUR MOST RECENT RELATIONSHIP, EVEN IF YOU HAVE NEVER EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE IN A RELATIONSHIP.

18. Are you responding to the following questions on the basis of the worst incident or the most recent relationship?
   1 = Worst
   2 = Most recent

19. Have you ever experienced/been involved in violence on a date with a dating partner?
   1. Yes, violence done to me
   2. Yes, violence done by me
   3. Yes, violence done to me, and, by me
   4. No, violence neither done to me, nor by me
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20-28. Using a 0-4 scale, please indicate the number of times any of the following acts were done TO YOU by your dating partner when you experienced your worst incidence of violence. (If violence has never been done TO YOU, please color in "4" on your sheet indicating "Not Applicable," for each of the following questions 18-26.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Twice</th>
<th>Three or More Times</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Threatened to hit or throw something</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Pushed or shoved</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Slapped or spanked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Punched, kicked, or bit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Struck with an object</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Used threat of forced sexual contact</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Actual use of forced sexual contact.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Threatened with potentially harmful weapon.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Assaulted with harmful weapon.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29-31. If any violence was done TO YOU in this incident, please speculate which of the following were reasons for this violence. For each reason, indicate either a (1) "Yes," (2) "No," or (3) "NA" if not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Yes</th>
<th>2 = No</th>
<th>3 = NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Self defense.</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td>3 = NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Intent to harm or injure.</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td>3 = NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. To &quot;retaliate&quot; or &quot;get even.&quot;</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td>3 = NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. To force the other person to give you something or do something.</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td>3 = NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. To show the other person &quot;who's boss.&quot;</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td>3 = NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. To teach the other person a lesson.</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td>3 = NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. To frighten or intimidate</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td>3 = NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Uncontrolled anger (outburst)</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td>3 = NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Other (specify)</td>
<td>1 = Yes</td>
<td>2 = No</td>
<td>3 = NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Using the same scale as above (0-4 scale), please indicate the number of times any of the following acts were done by you to your dating partner when you experienced your worst incident of violence. (If violence has never been done by you, please color in “4” on your sheet indicating “Not Applicable,” for each of the following questions 36-44).

38. Threatened to hit or throw something. 0 1 2 3 4
39. Pushed or shoved. 0 1 2 3 4
40. Slapped or spanked. 0 1 2 3 4
41. Punched, kicked, or bit. 0 1 2 3 4
42. Struck with an object. 0 1 2 3 4
43. Used threat of forced sexual contact. 0 1 2 3 4
44. Actual use of forced sexual contact. 0 1 2 3 4
45. Threatened with potentially harmful weapon. 0 1 2 3 4
46. Assaulted with harmful weapon. 0 1 2 3 4

If any violence was done BY YOU in this incident, please speculate which of the following were reasons for your use of violence. For each reason, indicate either a (1) "Yes," (2) "No," or "NA" if not applicable.

47. Self defense. 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = NA
48. Intent to harm or injure. 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = NA
49. To "retaliate" or "get even." 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = NA
50. To force the other person to give you something or do something. 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = NA
51. To show the other person "who's boss." 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = NA
52. To teach the other person a lesson. 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = NA
53. To frighten or intimidate. 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = NA
54. Uncontrolled anger (outburst). 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = NA
55. Other (specify). 1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = NA

At the time of the "worst incident," what was your age?
1. 12 or Younger 6. 21
2. 13-15 7. 22
3. 16 or 17 8. 23 or over
4. 18 or 19 9. Not applicable
5. 20

Was more than one person involved in this incident?
1. Yes 2. No 3. Not applicable

What was the approximate age of your partner at that time?
1. 12 or Younger 6. 21
2. 13-15 7. 22
3. 16 or 17 8. 23 or over
4. 18 or 19 9. Not applicable
5. 20
59. Who do you feel was the main victim and who was the main aggressor in the incident?
1. You were the victim - other was aggressor.
2. Other was victim - you were aggressor.
3. Both about equally aggressive and equally victimized.
4. Neither you nor the other were aggressive/victimized (for the worst violent incident).

60. Overall, how often did violence occur in this particular relationship?
1. always
2. sometimes
3. infrequently
4. never

61. Who actually started the violence?
1. You did.
2. Other did.
3. Both equally responsible.
4. Neither you nor the other (for "worst violent incident")

62. Now describe the nature of your relationship with your dating partner in the worst incident (or most recent) dating partner.
1. Not really dating, but knew the person socially on first date.
2. Casually dating this person and dating others.
3. Casually dating this person but dating this one person in particular.
4. Engaged.
5. Living with partner.
6. Other (Please specify here ____________________________).

63. How long did you remain in this relationship after you experienced your worst incident of violence with your dating partner?
1. We are still in the relationship.
2. It ended more than a year after the worst incident.
3. It ended roughly one year after.
4. It ended roughly six months after.
5. It ended a few weeks after.
6. It ended immediately after the worst incident.
7. Not applicable.

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the roles of women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (A) agree strongly, (B) agree mildly, (C) disagree mildly, or (D) disagree strongly with the statement.

64. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
65. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. It is insulting to women to have the "I will honor and obey" clause remain in the marriage service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. A woman should be as free as a man to ask someone of the opposite sex out for a date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. If a child gets sick, the mother is responsible for caring for him or her even if it means she has to take time off work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Strongly 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
72. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.

Agree  Agree  Disagree  Disagree
Strongly Mildly Mildly Strongly
1 2 3 4

73. It is societal forces rather than women's innate abilities that force women to work low status jobs.

Agree  Agree  Disagree  Disagree
Strongly Mildly Mildly Strongly
1 2 3 4

74. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.

Agree  Agree  Disagree  Disagree
Strongly Mildly Mildly Strongly
1 2 3 4

75. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.

Agree  Agree  Disagree  Disagree
Strongly Mildly Mildly Strongly
1 2 3 4

76. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.

Agree  Agree  Disagree  Disagree
Strongly Mildly Mildly Strongly
1 2 3 4

77. Economic and social freedom are worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men.

Agree  Agree  Disagree  Disagree
Strongly Mildly Mildly Strongly
1 2 3 4

78. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.

Agree  Agree  Disagree  Disagree
Strongly Mildly Mildly Strongly
1 2 3 4
79. It is not acceptable behavior for a woman to start up a conversation with a male stranger.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Mildly</th>
<th>Disagree Mildly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80. It is unmanly behavior for men to cry in public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Mildly</th>
<th>Disagree Mildly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81. It is reasonable for men to receive higher wages than women for working identical jobs because men are expected to be the breadwinners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Mildly</th>
<th>Disagree Mildly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82. Women are too emotional to handle political leadership positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Mildly</th>
<th>Disagree Mildly</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83. Were you participating on an athletic team at the time you experienced your worst violent incident in a dating relationship?

1 = Yes  2 = No  3 = No applicable

84. Have you ever experienced violence by a dating partner other than the dating partner you experienced your worst incident with?

1 = Yes  2 = No

Thank you very much for your participation in this project. If you have any comments about your worst incident or aggressive dating behavior in general, please, make them at this time.
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Appendix B

Script
I am here today to invite you to participate in a survey regarding aggressive dating behavior. The completion of this questionnaire will take you approximately 10 to 15 minutes. The purpose of my thesis project is to assess the involvement of undergraduate students attending Western Michigan University. Your participation in this project is non-mandatory and totally voluntary. However, it is greatly needed to understand the thrust behind this growing problem.

It is important that I inform you that all participants will remain completely anonymous and this material will be destroyed at the close of the project. For students who wish to participate please remain in your seats, and for those who select not to participate may leave at this time. To ensure that your responses will remain anonymous, after I distribute the questionnaires, I will leave the classroom for the 15 minutes desired to finish the survey. To seal the confidentiality of your participation, please DO NOT put your name on this questionnaire, and upon completion, place the questionnaire face down on the professor's desk.
Appendix C
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You must seek reapproval for any change in this design. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

xc: Susan Caringella-MacDonald, Sociology
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Research involves subjects who are (check as many as apply)

1. ____ Children (any subject under the age of 18) Approximate age ____
2. ____ Mentally retarded persons
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   ____ Check if institutionalized
4. ____ Prisoners
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ABSTRACT: Briefly describe the purpose, research design, and site of the proposed research activity.

This is a criminological study which assesses perceptions, attitudes and behavioral aspects of the dating patterns among male/female athletes and non-athletes attending Western Michigan University. The data for this study will be collected by use of questionnaires, which will be distributed in various sociology classrooms and cross-section athletic practices.

BENEFITS OF RESEARCH: Briefly describe the expected benefits of the research.

Dating violence has become a tremendous problem on college campuses across the United States. Through this research project I hope to gain a better perception of the thrust behind the dating violence that occurs among students attending Western Michigan University. For only through better understanding can we devise preventative programs.

CHARACTERISTICS OF SUBJECTS: Briefly describe the subject population (e.g., age, sex, prisoners, people in mental institutions, etc.). Also indicate the source of subjects.

The survey population will encompass undergraduate male and female athletes and non-athletes attending Western Michigan University. Those who opt to participate in the survey will range from age 18-25.

SUBJECT SELECTION: How will the subjects be selected? Approximately how many subjects will be involved in the research? (Attach advertisement for subjects.)

Questionnaires will be distributed in various sociology classes to the non-athletes and in terms of the athletes the questionnaire distribution will be determined by a consensus between a cross-section of athletic directors and the researcher. I anticipate receiving 200 questionnaires completed.
RISKS TO SUBJECTS: Briefly describe the nature and likelihood of possible risks (e.g., physical, psychological, social) as a result of participation in the research.

Dating violence is a very sensitive topic. Therefore, in my cover letter, I urge the participants to contact their resident adviser or the counseling center if they have any personal concerns.

PROTECTION FOR SUBJECTS: Briefly describe measures taken to protect subjects from possible risks, if any.

All participants who take part in this research project will remain anonymous. Participants will also be provided informed consent and information on available resources that provide support on the topic.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA: Briefly describe the precautions that will be taken to ensure the privacy of subjects and confidentiality of information. Be explicit if data is sensitive.

As indicated, all participants will remain anonymous and data will be analyzed aggregately. It is also important to note that all data will be destroyed at the end of this project.

INSTRUMENTATION: If questionnaires, interview schedules, data collection instruments, other than standardized instrumentation on file with the HSIRB, or advertisements for subjects are used, please identify them and attach a copy of what will be used in the project.

Please see attached

INFORMED CONSENT: For further information on writing consents (assents not covered), see the book Informed Consent by T. M. Grundner, on reserve at Waldo Library. Attach a copy of the informed consent and assent (if applicable). Each subject should also be given a copy.

See Cover Letter
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