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The purpose of this study was to describe the nature of dating violence in terms of prevalence; types of violent acts experienced; the number, kind, and severity of injuries sustained; characteristics of violent relationships; behaviors displayed by assailant partners; and quantitative and qualitative differences between male and female victims.

The subjects were a convenience sample of 151 never-married junior college students who completed the Violence Index Schedule (VIS).

Analysis of the VIS indicated that 30.5% of the subjects had been the victim of at least one incident of dating violence, and that the majority of those victims, 67%, reported receiving no injuries. Of those who were injured, bruises and welts were the most common form of injury. Significant differences were found in nonassaultive partner behaviors present in the relationships of the victims and nonvictims of dating violence, \( t = -10.55 \) (149), \( p < .001 \). Chi-square analyses of the Nonassaultive Index items revealed significant differences for 24 of the 25 nonassaultive characteristics. Partners of the victims displayed significantly more jealously, coercive anger, verbal abusiveness, and controlling behaviors than did the
partners of nonvictims.

An analysis of the quantitative and qualitative differences between male and female victims revealed few differences. No significant differences were found in incidence rates, nonassaultive partner behaviors, assaultive behaviors, and overall intensity of violence experienced. Two differences were found; male victims reported receiving significantly more slaps, and female victims reported receiving more injuries.

The discussion focused on the conclusion that dating violence occupies the less aggressive end of a violence continuum experienced in intimate relationships. Furthermore, it was suggested that intervention programs aimed at the prevention and treatment of dating violence could reduce the number of assailants who batter their partners, particularly if intervention occurs before violence receives significant amounts of reinforcement and becomes an established pattern of behavior.

Recommendations for further study included the need to investigate differences between male and female victims of dating violence at more severe levels of aggression and the need to identify nonassaultive predictors of violent incidents.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The problem is to provide a description of the prevalence and characteristics of premarital dating violence that extends the previous work done on dating aggression. The current study provides a profile of dating violence that includes a description of the types and severity of injuries sustained during violent episodes and identifies relationship variables and assailant behavior patterns associated with dating violence. Furthermore, this study examines quantitative and qualitative differences between male and female victims of dating violence. The rate of violence experienced, the type and severity of injuries received, relationship variables, and assailant behavior patterns are also presented.

Background to the Problem

The past three decades have witnessed the emergence of violence in the context of intimate relationships as a major social problem in contemporary society. Psychotherapists, family clinicians, physicians, and other helping professionals have been aware of the existence of family violence for years; however, evidence of such violence went unreported until the early sixties. The beginning of
professional and public interest in family violence came in the wake of an article written by Kempe, Silverman, Steele, Droegemueller, and Silver called "The Battered Child Syndrome" published in The Journal of the American Medical Association in 1962. Prior to that time, the "myth of family nonviolence was preserved; the family was portrayed as a group bound by love and tenderness not a place where violence and abuse were every day occurrences" (Bagarozzi & Giddings, 1983, p. 3). After public recognition of child abuse and the exposure of the violence that accompanied it, interest in and research on other forms of family violence followed as the "myth" of the family as a haven or sanctuary was exploded (Bagarozzi & Giddings 1983; Breines & Gordon, 1983; Gelles, 1980; Martin, 1976; Schechter, 1982, Walker, 1979).

While literature concerning child abuse was prolific in the sixties, research concerning other forms of violence among intimates was limited to nonexistent (Gelles, 1980). However, minimal interest was shown in marital violence directed toward wives (Levinger, 1966).

The decade of the seventies heralded a burst of scholarly work concerning family violence. Spearheaded by the feminist movement, family violence, particularly the battering of women, was catapulted into public awareness. Organizations such as the National Organization of Women (NOW) and other grass roots feminist groups sought to raise public consciousness to the problems of battered wives and began to demand services and shelter for abused women and their children.
No reliable data regarding the incidence of marital violence were available during the early part of the seventies. The early efforts to estimate violence rates used indirect measures of wife abuse such as the percentage of homicides which involved domestic killing, the number of wife abuse calls handled through family courts, the number of domestic disturbance calls received by the police, and the number of battered women reported treated by hospital emergency rooms (Gelles, 1980; Martin, 1976; Walker, 1979). A second major source of data concerning the incidence and severity of marital violence came primarily from the women victims who sought aid at women's shelters and other social service agencies. Specific data were acquired through agency records, questionnaires, and face-to-face interviews with the victims themselves (Gelles, 1972; Martin, 1976; Walker, 1979).

Several carefully researched books provided additional information regarding marital abuse. The majority of the material published identified women as the targets of violence and men as the assailants. Martin's (1976) Battered Wives, Pizzey's (1977) Scream Quietly or the Neighbors Will Hear, Walker's (1979) The Battered Woman, and Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz's (1980) Behind Closed Doors added a wealth of information concerning the incidence of abuse, characteristics of abusive relationships, behavioral characteristics of assailants and victims, the dynamics of abusive relationships, and the probable causes of spouse abuse.

In the midseventies a fourth source provided additional information concerning the nature and prevalence of family violence.
Murray Straus, Susanne Steinmetz and Richard Gelles conducted the first national survey on family violence using a nonclinical, representative sample of American households. The data were collected using the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), a self-report questionnaire developed specifically for the survey. The CTS asked respondents to indicate what methods they had used to settle conflicts within their family setting. In the case of spouse abuse, Straus (1977-1978) found that 16% of the subjects surveyed indicated that they had experienced at least one incidence of marital violence during the year preceding the survey. Twenty-eight percent indicated that they had experienced some form of violence at some point during their marriage. The results of this national survey left no doubt of the presence of marital violence in American families.

As research results concerning violence among individuals involved in intimate relationships became available, it became increasingly clear that violence between heterosexual couples was not limited to marital partners. Reports from women's shelters indicated that women in cohabiting and dating relationships were also seeking services from their facilities and other social service agencies. In Ingam County, Michigan, for example, during 1976, 29% of the 1063 women requesting services were unmarried women who were being beaten. Sixteen percent were women living with their partners, and 12% were involved in dating relationships (Hammer, 1976). Yllo and Straus (1981) provided additional information regarding violence outside of marital relationships. Their research showed that cohabiting couples had a significantly higher rate of violence in their relationships.
than did the married couples in the survey.

In the eighties, the study of violence among those involved in intimate relationships was broadened to include dating couples. The theoretical foundation, rationale, and methodology for this research came from the data available on marital violence and spouse abuse. While borrowing ideas and concepts from victim-based studies, the research on dating violence has followed the Straus model for using nonclinical samples. In addition, these studies have all used a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale for collecting the data.

The incidence and nature of dating violence have been explored in seven studies. Six studies have been conducted on college campuses (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Cate, Henton, Koval, Cristopher, & Lloyd, 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Makepeace, 1981, 1983; Sigelman, 1983), and the other study (Henton, Cate, Lloyd, & Christopher, 1983) used high school students as subjects.

Makepeace (1981) was the first to study the prevalence of premarital dating violence. In his study he found that 21.2% of the 202 respondents indicated that they had been personally involved in at least one incident of dating violence as either an assailant or victim. In addition, 61.5% of the subjects indicated that they knew someone who had been involved in dating violence. In a later study, Makepeace (1983) again found that 20.4% of his sample indicated involvement in at least one incident of dating violence. Another study published in 1982 reported results similar to those found by Makepeace in 1981. Cate et al. (1982) studied a sample of 355 students; 22.3% of the respondents indicated involvement in one or more
incidents of courtship violence. Additionally, Cate et al. (1982) suggested that dating violence occurs with multiple partners because their subjects reported that violence had occurred with an average of 2.71 dating partners.

The remaining three studies on college dating violence reported somewhat higher rates. For example, Laner and Thompson (1982) reported that 35% of their subjects indicated that they had experienced physical violence in a dating relationship. In another study, Bernard and Bernard (1983) indicated that 30% of their sample of 461 students reported being the victim of violence or using violence against a partner. They also reported that violence was reciprocal in a number of the dating relationships. Seventy-seven percent of the female victims and 82% of the male victims reported that they had also been an assailant at some point in their dating relationship (Bernard & Bernard, 1983). Finally, Sigelman (1983) reported the highest incidence of violence among premarital partners. Fifty-three percent of the male subjects in her survey and 52% of the female subjects said that they had been violent with a dating partner. In terms of being the victims of dating violence, 47.8% of the female subjects and 58.9% of the male subjects said that they had been the victim of at least one incident of violence. Sigelman also reported that dating violence was reciprocal in a substantial number of cases but gave no specific frequencies for the occurrences.

The results of these studies have clearly identified the presence of violence in dating relationships and leave little doubt that violence is a part of the dating experience for a significant number.
of dating couples. In fact, Makepeace (1981) has suggested that "violence is a common aspect of premarital heterosexual interaction for some individuals. . . . and that premarital violence may constitute a hidden social problem" (p. 100).

Rationale for Current Study

Previous research has clearly documented the presence of premarital dating violence and has shown that at least one in five college students have been involved in a dating relationship where violence has occurred (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Cate et al., 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Makepeace, 1981, 1983; Sigelman, 1983). In fact, Bernard and Bernard (1983) have suggested that "violence is as much a part of life among college students as it is a part of life in the American marriage" (p. 236). They hypothesized that "patterns of violence are actually established well before couples marry" (p. 236). Thus, dating violence is a substantial problem that involves the potential for physical injury and psychological damage for a significant number of people. Furthermore, Makepeace (1981) has suggested that this damage may not be limited to the victim and the assailant, but may affect future family members as well. He hypothesized that courtship violence may serve as a mediating link in an unbroken chain of violent patterns that are transmitted from one generation to the next. Because of this potential destructive impact of dating violence on a substantial number of people, it is important that this problem be both recognized and understood.
Examination of the literature on dating and marital violence has suggested directions for additional research. Three of these issues are addressed in the current study. The first is the need to create public and professional recognition of the existence of the problem (Laner & Thompson, 1982; Makepeace, 1981, 1983; Sigelman, 1983). Without such recognition, Makepeace (1983) has concluded that the problem will remain hidden. He has suggested that, as in the case of the development of services for victims of child abuse and spouse abuse, treatment and intervention programs for individuals involved in dating violence will be nonexistent until the problem is brought into public awareness. Furthermore, he believes that those individuals involved in dating violence will not seek or be referred to treatment and/or supportive services until the public becomes aware of the incidence of this violence. Additionally, Makepeace (1983) has stated:

Without the development of public awareness, young couples troubled by courting violence may feel that their experiences are unique and unspeakable and may tend to blame themselves for their inability to successfully manage their intimate relationships. Worse, perhaps they may take their experiences for granted and not recognize the urgency of seeking help when it is needed. (p. 107)

Along with the need for recognition of the problem of dating violence, the literature has suggested a need for amplification and further description of the nature and characteristics of violence among intimates. Suggestions for meeting this need have been made by Breines and Gordon (1983), Dobash and Dobash (1979, 1981), Gelles (1980), Schechter (1982), Stacey and Shupe (1983). First, Gelles (1980) has suggested that better descriptive data could be provided.
by an increased diversity of measurement instruments and techniques for data collection. This suggestion is quite applicable to dating violence because all the studies (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Cate et al., 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Makepeace, 1981, 1983; Sigelman, 1983) have used modifications of the Conflict Tactic Scale for collecting data about premarital violence. A major limitation of this instrument lies in the fact that it provides only a frequency count for aggressive acts encountered by the victim or delivered by the respondent (Dobash & Dobash, 1981). This frequency count of aggressive acts is limiting in two major ways. First, there is no context specific information regarding violent incidents, the relationship, or the behavior patterns displayed by the assailant. Breines and Gordon (1983), Dobash and Dobash (1981), and Schechter (1979, 1982) have emphasized the importance of context specific information and its contribution to an accurate understanding of violence among intimates. They have also supported the position that a lack of contextual information can be both limiting and responsible for distortions when describing the problem.

Second, the Conflict Tactics Scale and the modifications used in the previous studies on dating violence have failed to collect data concerning injuries sustained during aggressive episodes. Again, Breines and Gordon (1983), Dobash and Dobash (1981), and Schechter (1979, 1982) have emphasized the likelihood of distortion when reporting incidence rates for violence without describing the injuries sustained. The distortions are particularly acute when the occurrence of aggressive acts reported are dichotomized into the two
categories of having occurred or having not occurred. Therefore, a shove that resulted in no injuries is reported as being equal to a shove that resulted in a broken arm.

The third issue identified as needing additional study involves the question of victimization. That is, who are the targets of dating violence? Are the victims female, male, or both? This question is perhaps the most controversial issue in the study of violence among intimates. Two contradictory positions are supported in the literature. The first overwhelmingly casts women as the victims and men as the assailants (Martin, 1976; Pagelow, 1981; Stacey & Shupe, 1983). The second purports that both men and women are equal or near equal targets of violence in intimate relationships (Steinmetz, 1977-1978; Straus, 1977-1978).

Evidence for the position that women are predominately the targets of violence in marital relationships comes primarily from clinical samples. Victim self-reports, agency reports, emergency room and police files, and research conducted by women's shelter workers have clearly identified women as the victims of marital violence. The position that women are clearly the targets of aggression in marital relationships is also found upon examination of the feminist and some cultural explanations of violence. Patriarchy, the unequal power structure between men and women, society's acceptance and approval of a man's right to physically discipline women, strong reinforcement for violent behavior, and a lack of punishment for assault against women have been identified as the key determinants that potentiate and perpetuate violence against women (Breines & Gordon, 1983; Dobash

On the other hand, data from sociological research present contradictory evidence to the assertion that women are the victims and men are the primary assailants in domestic violence. The position that violence in marital relationships may be mutual, reciprocal, and equally initiated by either men or women is supported primarily by sociological research conducted by Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz in the midseventies. Their study queried a representative sample of American households and asked respondents to indicate what types of behaviors they had used for resolving conflicts within their family. The generalizations that men and women are equally victims of marital violence have come from this study (Straus, 1977-1978).

The current study responds to the need to foster professional and public awareness of the problem of dating violence; the need for information about relationship variables, characteristics of violent relationships, assailant behaviors, and injuries sustained during dating violence; and the need to explore differences between male and female victims of dating violence.

Research Questions

The following questions served as the basis for the investigation of dating violence among never married junior college students. The first four questions investigated the incidence of premarital aggression. Questions 5 through 12 investigated the nature of dating violence. These questions focused on characteristics of dating
relationships where violence occurred, assailant behavior patterns, and the type and severity of injuries that were sustained during violent episodes. Finally, questions 13 through 19 investigated quantitative and qualitative differences in the incidence and severity of violence experienced in dating relationships as reported by male victims and female victims.

1. To what extent have never-married subjects been the victims of violence during a dating relationship?

2. Is the incidence rate for being a victim of dating violence the same or significantly different among the various ethnic groups in the study?

3. How many victims of dating violence have experienced violence with more than one partner?

4. To what extent do subjects have knowledge of others who have been the victims of dating violence?

5. At what stage in the dating relationship does violence occur for the first time?

6. To what extent is violence in dating relationships reciprocal?

7. What types of violent acts are experienced by victims of dating violence?

8. What types of injuries occur during dating violence?

9. How severe are the injuries sustained by the victims of dating violence?

10. Is there a significant difference in the number of nonassaultive behaviors displayed by the partners of the victims and
nonvictims of dating violence?

11. What differences, if any, exist in specific relationship variables and nonassaultive partner behaviors present in the relationships of victims and nonvictims of dating violence?

12. Do male and female subjects report equal or significantly different rates for being the victim of dating violence?

13. Do male and female victims differ in the type of violent acts they experience during dating violence?

14. Is there a difference in the number of male and female victims who have been injured during dating violence?

15. Do male and female victims differ in the types of injuries they receive?

16. Is there a significant difference in the number of nonassaultive behaviors displayed by the partners of the male and female victims?

17. What differences, if any, exist in the relationship variables, nonassaultive characteristics, and partner behaviors present in the dating relationships of the male and female victims?

18. Do male and female victims of dating violence differ in the amount of assaultive and highly intimidating behaviors they experience from their partners?

19. Is there a significant difference in the overall intensity of violence experienced by the male and female victims of dating violence as measured by the Violence Index Schedule?
Definition of Terms

Throughout the literature on violence and aggression among intimates, terms such as physical abuse, battering, domestic violence, battered spouse, battered wives, violent relationships, aggression, violence, and abusive relationships are used in many contexts. Gelles (1980) has indicated that a number of these terms are used interchangeably even though they are not conceptually equivalent. Because there is this inconsistency in the use of the terms found in the literature on violence, the following definitions have been established and are used throughout this study.

Physical Aggression

Physical aggression is defined as "any behavior that inflicts bodily harm or that is intended to inflict bodily harm" on another person (Barnett, Pittman, Ragan, & Salus, 1980, p. 3). Throughout this study the terms violence and aggression are used synonymously.

Expressive Violence

Expressive violence is a spontaneous act of violence that is engaged in without thought or premeditation. It usually involves the acting out of emotions of anger or frustration (Neidig, Friedman, & Collins, 1985).
**Instrumental Violence**

Instrumental violence is intentional, premeditated violence that is used to reach a goal or to assert control over another person (Neidig et al., 1985).

**Verbal Abuse**

Verbal abuse is the deliberate and willful use of words to demean, degrade, and strip the victims of their basic human dignity. It can take the form of cursing, constant criticism, and/or a subtle undermining of the victim's self-esteem.

**Intimate Relationships**

Intimate relationships are relationships that involve caring, mutual trust, and some level of commitment on the part of the partners. The relationships may, but do not necessarily, involve sexual intimacy.

**Physical Abuse**

Physical abuse is the repeated and deliberate use of physical aggression committed by one partner against the other. Physical abuse involves brutality rather than accidental or inconsequential contact and is recurrent (Barnett et al., 1980).
Battering

Battering is repeated physical and verbal assault inflicted upon one partner in a relationship. It can involve emotional abuse, threatened violence, and/or the use of physical force. It is usually accompanied by psychological as well as physical assault directed toward the victim (Barnett et al., 1980).

Battering Cycle

A repeated, identifiable cycle of physical and psychological abuse and/or assault inflicted upon one partner in a relationship (Barnett et al., 1980).

Limitations to the Study

Four potential limitations of this study need to be identified. They are the use of a convenience sample, the small sample size, the sensitive nature of the topic, and the possibility of a social desirability bias on the part of the respondents. First, the use of a convenience sample may have affected the generalizability of the results in a number of ways. The population studied was a sample of never married junior college students attending night classes in a rural community on the Texas-Mexico border. This may have been limiting in the following ways. First, a sample of junior college students may or may not be representative of the general population of young people. In fact, Bernard and Bernard (1983) have suggested that a college sample may underestimate the incidence of violence in dating relationships. Additionally, demographic characteristics of
the subjects, such as the rural nature of the population and the ethnic make-up of the population in a border town may have also served to limit the generalizability of the results.

A second potential limitation to the study was the small sample size that precluded statistical analysis in a number of cases.

A third potential limitation to the study concerns the potential impact of the sensitive nature of the topic. Dating violence can and does trigger strong emotional responses on the part of the participants. These emotions may have affected the responses in a number of ways. First, there may have been a general reluctance on the part of the subjects to reveal their experiences regarding the presence of violence in their dating relationships. Straus (1979) has identified this as a potential problem when using self-report victimization questionnaires. Second, an individual's ability to remember violent episodes involved in dating relationships may have been affected. Selective retention and/or motivated forgetting may have been responsible for distorted or inaccurate answers. This may have been compounded by the fact that the subjects were directed to base their answers on the last dating relationship where violence had occurred. It is possible that the relationship had ended at the time of the survey, and retroactive as well as proactive inhibition may have distorted responses to some of the questions.

Finally, the existence of a social desirability bias may have been present. Cate et al. (1982) and Makepeace (1981) have both recognized the potential for this bias when subjects have self-reported incidents of violence. Makepeace (1981) noted that there may be a
tendency for a subject to "describe self in a relatively favorable way and the others in a relatively negative way" (p. 81). Hudson and McIntosh (1981) addressed the issue of socially desirable responses relative to interpersonal violence in the construction of the Index of Spouse Abuse. They cautioned that a self-report measure dealing with violence and abuse "can be easily and deliberately distorted so the that a client or respondent can make herself appear to be as abused or as free of abuse as she likes" (p. 884).

Organization of the Content

Chapter II contains a review of the literature relevant to violence among those involved in intimate relationships. It presents a summary of the findings from the previous studies on dating violence, a discussion of the theoretical explanations of violence among intimates, a description of the myths that surround domestic violence, and a description of assailant behaviors present in violent relationships. Chapter III presents the method used for completing the research. It describes the procedures used for data collection, the subjects, the instrument, and the methods used for analyzing the data. Chapter IV reports the statistical results of the study, and Chapter V presents the summary, discussion, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The review of the literature is presented in four sections. The first section summarizes the seven previous studies on dating violence. Sections two and three provide a framework for understanding violence among those involved in intimate relationships. Section two presents the theoretical explanations for interpersonal violence among heterosexual couples. The myths that surround and in some ways support violence among intimates are identified and refuted in section three. The last section identifies characteristics and behavior patterns of those individuals who use violence against their partners.

Previous Studies on Dating Violence

Research on courtship violence is a relatively new area of study, and the number of studies on dating violence is limited. A comprehensive review of the literature using the DIALOG computerized data base that searched Psychological Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, Dissertation Abstracts, and Cumulative Index of Journals in Education from January 1970 through December 1985, revealed only seven studies that dealt with dating violence. The first study was
published in 1981 by Makepeace. Since that time, six additional studies have been published. Five were conducted on college campuses (Bernard & Bernard, 1982; Cate et al., 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1983; Makepeace, 1983; Sigelman, 1983); the other study (Henton et al., 1983) surveyed high school students and replicated the earlier study done by Cate et al. (1982). The material that follows summarizes the findings of the previous research.

**Incidence of Dating Violence**

The problem of dating violence among college students has been documented in six studies conducted on college campuses since 1981. Table 1 presents a summary of the incident rates reported in those studies. Comparison of the results of these studies is somewhat possible because all of them have surveyed similar populations, have used similar data collection procedures, and have used the Aggression Scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) for collecting data about the rate of violence in dating relationships.

It can be seen from Table 1 that there is some variation in the violence rates reported in the previous studies on dating violence. However, all the studies have reported that at least 20% of the subjects had been involved in dating violence as either a victim or an assailant.

In addition, Makepeace (1981) found that 61.5% of the subjects indicated that they knew others who had been victims of dating violence.
Table 1
Percentage of College Subjects Reporting Involvement in Dating Violence: Previous Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author of Study</th>
<th>Victims or Assailants</th>
<th>Male and Female Victims</th>
<th>Female Victims</th>
<th>Male Victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 1981</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cate et al. 1982</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laner &amp; Thompson 1982</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard &amp; Bernard 1983</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makepeace 1983</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigelman 1983</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^Percentages for these categories were not reported.

Nature of Dating Violence

How Early Does Violence Begin

The first occurrence of violence has been reported at every stage of the dating relationship, from casual dating to cohabitation. However, the studies show that violence is more likely to occur for the first time in serious rather than casual relationships (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Cate et al., 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Sigelman, 1983). These findings support Laner and Thompson's (1982) hypothesis that the potential for violence is greater for those couples who share some level of commitment.
Reciprocal Violence

There is some evidence to suggest that violence among dating couples is reciprocal. Cate et al. (1982) reported that 68% of the victims in their study indicated that they had been both a victim and an assailant at some point in the relationship. Bernard and Bernard (1983) reported that in relationships where violence was involved, 77% of the male victims and 82% of the female victims said that violence in their relationships was mutual. However, no determination as to whether the violence was self-defensive, retaliatory, mutually combative, or self-initiated was made.

Types of Violence Experienced

All forms of violence, from verbal threats to life-threatening assaults have been experienced to some degree by dating couples. Milder forms of physical aggression such as pushing and slapping were reported more often than the more serious forms of aggression such as punching, hitting with fist, threatening with and/or using a weapon (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Cate et al., 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Makepeace, 1981, 1983; Sigelman, 1983). In addition, Laner and Thompson (1982) reported that verbal abuse was also common among couples involved in dating violence.

Causes and Meaning of Violence in Dating Relationships

Both Cate et al. (1982) and Makepeace (1981) questioned respondents regarding the probable cause for or the meaning of violence in
their dating relationships. In the Makepeace study, jealousy over the real or perceived involvement of the partner with another member of the opposite sex was the most frequently cited reason for the violence. Conflict over drinking behavior and anger over sexual denial were also given as reasons for conflicts involving violence.

Cate et al. (1982) also asked victims of violence to specify or tell what meaning they attached to the violent behavior of their partners. They reported the following results:

The individuals were allowed to identify more than one meaning for the behaviors from a list of interpretations. (love, hate, anger, confusion, scared, sadness, other). The most frequent meaning attached to the violent behavior was "anger" (reported in 73% of the cases), followed by "confusion" (49%) as the second most frequently mentioned. Further, it is interesting to note that a substantial number of individuals (29%) had at some time believed abusive behavior to signify "love," while only a few (8%) had ever interpreted these behaviors as "hate." (p. 84)

These findings led them to hypothesize that dating violence may be expressive violence, that is, violence that is an expression of strong emotion such as fear, anger or frustration rather than instrumental or goal directed (Neidig et al., 1985).

Effects of Violence on Dating Relationships

There is evidence to support the hypothesis that a violent episode in a dating relationship is not necessarily destructive to that relationship (Cate et al., 1982; Makepeace, 1981). Makepeace (1981) reported that only 55.3% of the relationships involving violence had ended at the time of his survey, and of the remaining subjects who were still involved with their violent partners, 28.9% of
those indicated that their relationship had deepened. Makepeace (1981) noted that more than 55% of the victims may have continued their relationship with the assailant for a period of time following the violent incident because he did not ask subjects to indicate at what point the relationship terminated, but asked if the subjects were still involved with the abusive partners at the time of the survey. Cate et al. (1982) reported similar results. Their data showed that 53% of the respondents involved in abusive relationships were still dating their violent partners at the time of the survey.

Moreover, it appears violence may not always have a negative effect on dating relationships. In the Cate et al. study (1982), of those subjects who reported violence with their dating partners, 37% said that their relationship had improved following the violence, 41% reported no change, and only 22% said that their relationship had worsened.

**Hypotheses Investigated**

The majority of the research conducted on dating violence has been descriptive research. However, limited hypothesis testing has been done. Bernard and Bernard (1983) and Sigelman (1983) tested the hypothesis that traditional attitudes toward women were related to higher instances of dating violence. Both used the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, and both found no relationship between scores on the Attitudes Towards Women Scale and increased involvement in dating violence.
In another study, Makepeace (1983) investigated the role of stress and dating violence. He found that male assailants experienced significantly more negative life-changes than did the nonassailants. He found no significant differences among the females.

Finally, Bernard and Bernard (1983) investigated the effect of having experienced and/or witnessed violence in the family of origin and the use of aggression in dating relationships. They found no significant differences for women. However, for the men in their study, they found a significant relationship between the type of violence seen at home between their parents and the type of violence used against their dating partner. Bernard and Bernard (1983) have suggested that early childhood experience with violence has an impact upon aggression displayed as an adult, especially when assailants are male and observe parental violence.

Theoretical Explanations of Violence

Relationship Between Marital and Premarital Violence

Studies in the 1980s have clearly documented the existence of violence among dating couples, and the need for an explanation for such phenomena has made itself known. No theory on dating violence was found in the review of the literature; however, the literature did suggest that explanations of marital violence could also apply to dating aggression. Yllo and Straus (1981) have supported this idea. In their study they compared the incidence of violence between married and cohabiting couples and found that cohabiting couples in
general showed higher rates of violence in their relationships than did the married couples. They concluded:

Violence, rather than being a function of marriage itself, simply reflects the potential for intense conflict in any intimate relationship. ... overall, the findings indicate that the same variables which explain spousal violence in marriage, explain violence among cohabiters. (Yllo & Straus, 1981, p. 346)

In addition, support for the hypothesis that the dynamics of spouse abuse and dating violence are similar, if not the same, can be found in the literature. In their work on domestic violence, authors Barnett et al. (1980), Ganley (1981), Schechter (1982), and Stacey and Shupe (1983) have clearly indicated that even though they use the terms wife-battering, battered wife, or spouse abuse they extend these definitions to include all adults who are the victims of, or involved in violent relationships.

Researchers on dating violence have also supported this idea. Laner and Thompson (1982) have suggested that dating and married couples share many of the characteristics identified by Straus (1977-1978) as setting the stage for conflict and violence. Laner and Thompson (1982) make the following comparisons:

Courting couples of the more serious variety share at least the following characteristics with married pairs, as compared with other dyads: greater time at risk; greater presumed range of activities and interests; greater intensity of involvement; an implied right to influence one another; sex differences that potentiate conflicts; roles and responsibilities based on sex rather than on interests and competencies; greater privacy seeking (associated with low social control); exclusivity of organization; involvement of personal, social, and perhaps material commitments; stress resulting from developmental changes; and, finally, extensive knowledge of one another's social biographies, which include vulnerabilities, fears, and other aspects of each others' lives that can be used for purposes of attack. (p. 231)
Furthermore, they have pointed out that though there are meaningful structural and functional differences between married and dating couples, the similarities are strong enough to suggest that the theories describing marital violence are also applicable to dating violence.

Theoretical Explanations of Violence

The study of marital violence and spouse abuse is a relatively new discipline dating from the late sixties, and the theoretical explanations of violence reflect this youth. The reality of marital violence and its destruction to human lives has somewhat precluded comprehensive theory development. Much of the energy and money generated by the interest in marital abuse has been channeled into the provision of services and programs for the victims and their families. Systematic theory building, for the most part, has been a secondary concern.

The early theories of violence took a singular approach to theory building. Empirical evidence rather than hypothesis testing provided the basis for theoretical suppositions. Explanations of violence were dependent upon the individual or professional orientation of the authors (Rounsaville, 1978). Psychological theories such as Walker's (1979) learned helplessness, sociological theories such as Straus' (1972) structural theory which described violence as an inherent element in family structures, and the feminist explanations of patriarchy (Dobash & Dobash, 1979) and male domination (Schechter, 1982) were diverse, often contradictory, and lacking in integration.
Rounsaville (1978) expressed the need for a comprehensive theory on interpersonal violence. He described the single determinant theories as being of limited value because they failed to consider the complexity of violence and interpersonal behavior patterns. He stated, "No single determinant is either necessary or sufficient to explain all cases" (p. 28) of violence.

In the eighties, theories on family violence have shifted from the single determinant theories and have moved toward multifactorial or systems theories (Bern, 1982). Finkelhor, Gelles, Hotaling, and Straus (1983) have endorsed a systems approach to theory building and have identified three broad categories of factors that are associated with the origin and perpetuation of violence in intimate relationships. These are individual factors, situational factors, and societal factors. Finkelhor et al. (1983) consider all three to be necessary elements of any comprehensive theory on violence. They have stated that multifactorial explanations may, "at first seem contradictory. . . . More likely, they are complementary. In the long run, they will probably turn out to be interlocking pieces in a larger picture" (p. 29).

The following section discusses each of the three factors identified by Finkelhor et al. (1983). Other authors have identified similar factors; but, in the opinion of this researcher, the terminology of Finkelhor et al. provides the best framework for organizing the existing theories and information on the causes and origins of interpersonal violence. It should also be noted that most of the theories and information that are presented in the sections that follow have
been generated from the perspective that males are the assailants and females are the victims in domestic violence.

**Individual Factors**

Personal traits and characteristics of the assailant (Walker, 1983) and the assailant's past learning experiences with violence (Fagan, Stewart, & Hansen, 1983) have been identified as two critical individual factors associated with the use of violence in intimate relationships.

The personal traits and characteristics identified as being present among abusive individuals are extreme emotional dependence upon the partner, a lack of assertiveness, the tendency to express all distressing emotions as anger, low self-esteem, a high need for nurturance, a need to control others, extreme jealousy and possessiveness, traditional ideas concerning male and female roles, failure to accept responsibility for problems, and the tendency to project blame on the partner for all problems (Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Walker, 1983; Wetzel & Ross, 1983).

Another individual factor associated with violent behavior is a learned predisposition for violence (Barnett et al., 1980). Considerable support for the theory that violence is learned behavior is found in the literature (Barnett et al., 1980; Fagan et al., 1983; Neidig et al., 1985; Ponzetti, Cate, & Koval, 1982; Serum, 1982; Wetzel & Ross, 1983). Serum (1982) has concluded:

*Wife-battering, like other kinds of violence, is learned behavior. Individuals who are violent have learned at what time, in what place, under which circumstances, at whom, and in what way*
to act violently. They have learned their patterns of violence from observing others and from their own trial and error experiences. . . . The man who batters has learned a complex set of behaviors, attitudes, and beliefs which facilitate his violence. (p. 22)

Scholars of family violence have hypothesized that the learned predisposition for violence results from childhood exposure to violence in the family of origin (Bernard & Bernard; 1983; Fagan et al., 1983; Fitch & Papantanio, 1983) and reinforcement for the use of violence and aggression (Schechter, 1982; Serum, 1982).

Violence during childhood has been identified as an important antecedent to adult violence (Rounsaville, 1978). Research has consistently shown that violent and abusive individuals have experienced violence in the family of origin. The findings of Fitch and Papantanio (1983) are typical of these research results. They reported that 77% of the male batterers in their study had witnessed violence between their parents, and 49% had experienced abuse themselves. In fact, Walker (1983) reported that, "the best predictor of future violence was a history of past violent behavior. This included witnessing, receiving and committing violent acts in the childhood home" (p. 37).

Violence in the family of origin plays an important role in the transmission of violence from one generation to the next (Elbow, 1982). Abusers may model violent behaviors seen or experienced in the home (Bernard & Bernard, 1983), learn that it is acceptable to hit the one you love if it is considered to be for their own good (Straus, 1977-1978), and learn that violence is an acceptable and legitimate way to solve problems and/or deal with stress.
Another important element of the learning experience regarding violence is the amount of reinforcement an individual receives for violent acts. Serum (1982) reported that assailants often receive tremendous amounts of reinforcement for their aggression. For example, "An aggressive person generally receives less criticism about his actions... one simply does not tell the truth to someone who is literally or figuratively holding a gun" (Serum, 1982, p. 20). In addition, partners of aggressors often placate and accommodate their partner in order to avoid violent incidents. Assailants can also be reinforced for violent behavior by a renewed sense of closeness and intimacy that often follows a violent incident (Walker, 1979). Finally, assailants receive powerful reinforcement when they receive no criticism, sanctions, or punishment for the violent behavior they display (Ganley, 1981).

Situational Factors

Chronic and acute stress have been identified as important situational factors related to episodes of violence (Barnett et al., 1980; Ponzetti et al., 1982; Wetzel & Ross, 1983). Stress is not the cause of violent episodes, but it can precipitate or escalate domestic assault. For many assailants, violence is a learned behavior used for dealing with stress. Barnett et al. (1980) have summarized the chronic and transitory stress factors most often associated with violent incidents. They are geographic isolation resulting from frequent moves; social isolation resulting from the inability to form gratifying personal relationships; economic stress resulting from
unemployment or inadequate economic resources; changing family structures resulting from the addition of children, the developmental stages of the children, and/or the need to care for aging parents; medical problems or family members with special needs resulting from chronic physical illnesses, mental retardation, hyperactivity, or other similar problems; inadequate parenting skills; and drug and alcohol use and/or dependence.

Societal Factors

A number of societal influences support and help perpetuate violence in intimate relationships. They are the patriarchal and sexist organization of society (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Schechter, 1979, 1982; Straus, 1977-1978), cultural norms that legitimize the use of violence (Barnett et al., 1980; Straus, 1977-1978), and a general cult of violence that is pervasive in our society (Ganley, 1981; Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Straus, 1977-1978).

The Sexist Organization of Society. The patriarchal and sexist nature of society have been identified as contributing to the use of violence against women (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978; Leghorn, 1977; Schechter, 1979, 1982). Schechter (1982) has asserted that violence against women is the, "Historical expression of male domination manifested within the family and currently reinforced by the institutions, economic arrangements and sexist division of labor within a capitalist society" (p. 209). Dobash and Dobash (1977-1978) have suggested that the roots of male domination in the United States is
the remaining expression of a patriarchal organization of society that originated in colonial America. The American colonies adapted much of the English law and incorporated it into their own legal structure. With this came the right of men to control their wives, control that included the right to chastise, beat, or otherwise discipline their wives to gain obedience or compliance with their wishes. In fact, a husband's right to chastise his wife was part of the law, and his right to chastise his wife was upheld by the Supreme Court of Mississippi in 1824 (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978).

Furthermore, Dobash and Dobash (1979) have explained violence against women from this perspective:

Legal, religious, and cultural legacies . . . have supported a marital hierarchy, subordinated women in marriage and legalized violence against them. Most ideologies and social arrangements which formed the underpinnings of violence against women still exist and are inextricably intertwined in our present legal, religious, political and economic practices. (p. 426)

In addition, Straus (1977-1978) has indicated that the sexist structure of the family and society contribute to the victimization of women. He cited economic constraints; restricted job opportunities; unequal pay structures; and the presumptions that the husband is the head of the family, that masculinity is identified with violence, that women are primarily responsible for the success of the marriage, and that women have primary responsibility for child care as being factors that contribute to the use of violence against women. He further noted that these factors severely limit women's opportunities for independence and impair their ability to leave if they become involved in abusive relationships.
Societal Norms That Legitimize Violence. There are a number of norms that operate to legitimize the use of aggression in our society. "The use of physical force under certain circumstances is sanctioned by society, particularly in the name of protection, law and order, self-defense, and the national interest" (Barnett et al., 1980, p. 5). Societal attitudes sanctioning the use of physical force and violence extend to family interactions as well. In fact, "the family is the setting in which most people first experience physical violence, and also the setting which establishes the emotional context and meaning of violence" (Straus, 1977-1978, p. 454). Physical punishment is usually the child's first experience with violence. It is an acceptable and approved method for disciplining children. As such, it becomes a primary vehicle for socializing individuals into the use and acceptance of violence. The use of physical punishment as a disciplinary measure can accomplish several things. It can teach a lesson about what is appropriate and inappropriate behavior, but it can have unintended consequences as well. Straus (1977-1978) has identified three unintended consequences of physical punishment.

The first of these unintended consequences is the association of love with violence. Physical punishment typically begins in infancy with slaps to correct and teach... The child therefore learns that those who love him or her the most, are also those who hit.

Second, since physical punishment is used to train the child or to teach about dangerous things to be avoided, it established [sic] the moral rightness of hitting other family members.
The third unintended consequence is the lesson that when something is really important, it justifies the use of physical force.

These indirect lessons are not confined to providing a model for later treatment of one's own children. Rather, they become such a fundamental part of an individual's personality and world view that they are generalized to other social relationships, and especially to the relationship which is closest to that of parent and child: that of husband and wife. (p. 454)

Finally, violence is not learned solely in the family of origin. Our culture as a whole reinforces the use and acceptance of violence (Ganley, 1981). Stacey and Shupe (1983) have described what they believe to be a cult of violence that permeates the entire society and see the media as the primary vehicle of the cult. They have suggested that the media plays multiple roles in the perpetuation of violence. First, it glorifies violence and makes it exciting, and in some cases sexually stimulating, as evidenced in the "slice and dice" movies such as Friday the 13th (Cunningham, 1980) and Halloween (Hill & Carpenter, 1978). Second, the media has a powerful impact on the definition of masculinity and its association with violence. Ganley (1981) has reported, "Aggressive behavior is a symbol of 'manliness.' . . . many of the heroes in the dominate American culture are 'shooters' (John Wayne, Clint Eastwood, etc.) or 'hitters' (football heroes, boxers, etc.)" (p. 24). These heroes come alive in the media. In addition, Stahly (1977-1978) has these comments concerning the media and violence.

The stereotypes of violence are reinforced for children and adults through social interaction and mass media. The image of the tough male presents masculinity as a highly valued character trait and then repeatedly presents the ability and willingness to use physical violence as the primary measure of masculinity. (p. 596)
In conclusion, Straus (1977-1978) has illustrated the extent of our indoctrination into the cult of violence with these remarks, "Violence is truly built into the very fabric of society, and into the personality beliefs, values, and behavioral scripts of most of our population" (p. 456). This cult of violence that permeates American society is not the cause of violence; however, Stacey and Shupe (1983) believe that but for some individuals the cult facilitates the use and continuance of violence. It also contributes to a generalized tolerance and acceptance of violence in the family and a reluctance on the part of the general public to become involved (Stacey & Shupe, 1983).

**Myths Concerning Violence**

It is important to examine the myths surrounding violence among intimates and spouse abuse. The myths shape public opinion and influence the public response to domestic violence. A lack of awareness or understanding on the part of the public is detrimental to the prevention and treatment of violence. Myths are partly responsible for the perpetuation of violence because erroneous beliefs surrounding violence stymies the political and social action necessary to eliminate it.

The myths and facts discussed in the section that follows were taken from *Myths and Facts about Domestic Assault* (The Council Against Domestic Assault, 1981).
**Myth:** Domestic violence is not a big problem ("Myths and Facts," 1981, p. 1).

**Fact:** Marital violence is a significant problem. Straus (1977-1978) reported that the results of his national survey using a representative sample of American households indicated that 16% of the respondents had been involved in at least one incident of violence in the year preceding the survey. Twenty-eight percent of the sample indicated that they had experienced violence at some point in their relationship. Stacey and Shupe (1983) have reported, "FBI statistics estimate that a wife is beaten every 30 seconds in this country (or 2,880 women are beaten every day, or 1,051,200 every year)" (p. 2). In addition, they have pointed out that, "husband beating or male spouse abuse is still a very camouflaged social problem" (p. 4), and there are no reliable estimates of its occurrence.


**Fact:** Research has indicated that violence cuts across all socioeconomic levels and is not just a problem of the lower class (Barnett et al., 1980; "Myths and Facts," 1981; Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Teske & Parker, 1983). Violence is often mistaken as a problem of the lower class because it is not as visible in the middle and upper class. It is the lower class women who turn to public agencies for assistance. Upper and middle class women often have other resources available to them.

**Myth:** Women provoke the beatings and even enjoy abusive treatment ("Myths and Facts," 1981, p. 1).
Fact: The "blaming the victim" bias is very pervasive in domestic violence. The sentiment that women deserve to be beaten because they nag, are verbally abusive, or engage in other provocative behavior is very common. "The idea that women enjoy being punched in the face, kicked in the stomach, thrown against the refrigerator, having bones broken, lips split open and eyes swollen shut it ridiculous" ("Myths and Facts," 1981, p. 1).

Myth: If a woman really wants to avoid abuse, she can just leave ("Myths and Facts," 1981, p. 2).

Fact: This a particularly vicious myth that helps perpetuate the belief that women like beatings, why else would she stay? The economic reality for many women is bleak. Many have small children and few resources. In addition even for those who possess sufficient resources to leave, the psychological abuse that accompanies the physical assault often impairs the ability to make major life changes (Barnett et al., 1980).


Fact: Unemployment has been identified as a major stressor associated with violence (Barnett et al., 1980), but it is not the cause of domestic violence. Men in every socioeconomic class beat their wives irrespective of their financial positions.


Fact: Studies have indicated that domestic assault is related to alcohol use in 40-80% of the cases. Alcohol use is not the cause
of violence. Alcohol may be used to justify or excuse the violence. Many husbands and wives drink without becoming violent. "The problem is uncontrolled aggression, not alcohol" (Walker, 1983, p. 35).


Fact: The majority of men who beat women are not psychologically unbalanced. They are men who have learned to be violent and use violence to control their partners.

Assailant Behavior Patterns

In addition to using overt violence against their partners, assailants engage in a number of other characteristic nonassaultive behaviors. Walker (1983) reported "Most of the batterers being described by the women [in her study] sounded like they all went to the same training school" (p. 38). The review of the literature has identified four major categories of nonassaultive behaviors that accompany violence. They are verbal abusiveness, extreme jealousy, the coercive use of anger, and behaviors used to control the partner. The sections that follow identify behaviors associated with each of these broad categories of nonassaultive behaviors.

Verbal Abusiveness

Verbal abusiveness may be expressed by a number of behaviors. It may take the form of embarrassing and humiliating remarks made in front of others; constant criticism of the partner's choice of clothes, personal grooming, or activities; belittling comments...
concerning the partner's intelligence; and general derogatory and/or demeaning remarks made to the partner. Often times the verbal abuse can do more psychological damage than the physical injuries sustained during violent incidents (Barnett et al., 1980).

**Extreme Jealousy**

Assailants often exhibit extremely jealous and possessive behaviors. They often accuse their partner of being interested in, or having affairs with members of the opposite sex. They are often suspicious of other men and women and often limit the amount of time their partners spend away from their supervision. Assailants are often possessive of their partners. They often resent and undermine the social life of their partners and discourage their partner from making or keeping friends. They may even limit the amount of time their partner spends with his or her family (Stacey & Shupe, 1983).

**Coercive Use of Anger**

Anger is often a predominant behavior pattern among assailants. They often have difficulty expressing emotions other than anger (Barnett et al., 1980) and have learned to "respond to all emotionally distressing cues with angry and violent behavior" (Walker, 1983, p. 32). Assailants often display explosive tempers (Wetzel & Ross, 1983) and use anger to maintain control of a situation. The partners of assailants go to great lengths to avoid conflict and other situations that might provoke angry outbursts (Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Walker, 1979). Assailants also use anger in conjunction with sexual
coerciveness (Walker, 1979). They also display what Wetzel and Ross (1983) and Bernard and Bernard (1984) describe as Jekyll and Hyde behaviors. When they are not angry, they are amicable and loving; when they are angry they are mean and violent.

Need for Control

Assailants often have a high need for control. This need is often expressed in behaviors that regulate and limit the lives of their partners. Assailants go to extremes to control their partner's time and social life. They may accompany them on errands or take them to and from work. They may make them account for how they spend their time. They may also exercise financial control. In some cases, assailants use force to isolate their partners, and they curtail all but assailant approved social activities.
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Introduction

Chapter III consists of four sections: a description of the procedures for collecting the data, a description of the subjects investigated, a description of the instrument utilized for data collection, and a description of the methods used in analyzing the data.

Procedures for Data Collection

Data for the current research project were collected at a junior college on the Texas-Mexico border. The survey instrument (Appendix A) was administered during the sixth week of the 1985 fall semester. Students in twenty classes were selected to participate in the survey. Examination of the official class rolls indicated that the selected classes yielded the largest number of subjects with the least duplication in class attendance. The classes selected were representative of the total course offerings and included classes in English, history, government, science, math, psychology, sociology, economics, typing, shorthand, child development, computer science, speech, and Spanish. Each faculty member was responsible for administering the survey instrument in his/her classroom on the night of data collection.
Every effort was made to illicit the support of the faculty members participating in the research project. The researcher contacted each instructor, explained the research project, identified the data collection date, and invited them to participate in the project prior to the beginning of the fall term 1985. A brief overview of the project was given by the researcher during the fall faculty meeting. The faculty supervisor at the junior college where the data were collected discussed the research project and encouraged participation and cooperation on the part of the faculty members. One week prior to the data collection date, each instructor received a letter (Appendix B) identifying the procedures to be used for data collection. In addition, the researcher contacted each instructor the day before the surveys were to be administered, asked if they had any questions, and notified them that the instruments would be delivered the following evening. On the night specified for data collection, the survey package was delivered to the selected classrooms by the researcher. Each instructor received the survey instruments, a large collection envelope, and a set of printed instructions to follow in administering the questionnaire and printed instructions to read to the class (Appendix C). The oral instructions to the students explained the purpose of the survey, introduced the questionnaire, encouraged student participation, and invited them to pick up a copy of the survey results at the college office. On the second night of data collection, the oral instructions were modified (Appendix D) to reflect the fact that some of the students had already participated in the survey. Their participation was recognized, and those students were
thanked for their cooperation. Instructors were given a list of those students enrolled in previously surveyed classes, and they did not administer an additional survey to these individuals. The survey was conducted during the first forty-five minutes of the regularly scheduled class meeting. Each student received a questionnaire and an envelope in which to place his/her completed instrument. When all participants had finished, the instructor directed the students to seal their envelopes and put them into the collection envelope. This envelope was then sealed by the instructor and placed outside the classroom door where a volunteer collected it.

The Subjects

Subjects were 151 junior college students who filled out a questionnaire on a voluntary, anonymous, and confidential basis. All students present in the selected classes on the night of data collection were surveyed. Only those questionnaires indicating that the subject was single and had never been married were included in the tabulations and data analysis. No attempt was made to survey students absent when the data were collected.

The subjects were a convenience sample selected from a population of students attending night school classes at a junior college located in a rural community of 30,034. The community is located 150 miles from any large urban area. The surrounding area is predominantly ranch land. A military training base is located in the area and a number of students are active duty military personnel. The demographic characteristics of the sample are summarized in Table 2.
Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of the Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>60.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Membership:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, nonHispanic</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, nonHispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Status:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Duty</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>88.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Distribution:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limitations of the Sample

Because a convenience sample was used, it is recognized that the generalizability of the results may be limited in the following ways. First, the sample cannot be considered representative of the entire junior college population within the United States. The rural
location of the college and the fact that the college is primarily a
night school may serve to limit the generalizability of the results
to other junior college populations, particularly those located in
urban areas.

Another potential limitation to the generalizability of the
results may be due to distinctive regional characteristics. Due to
the proximity of the college to the Mexican border, the Hispanic cul­
ture is much in evidence throughout the city and consequently among
the college students. Hispanic cultural characteristics of conserva­
tism, machismo in dating practices, and reluctance to discuss per­
sonal problems outside the family need to be considered when applying
the results to other populations.

Finally, caution needs to be used when applying the results to
young adults in general. There is a need to recognize that different
rates of violence may exist for young people who do not attend col­
lege. College students may have violence rates that are higher or
lower than the general population. Bernard and Bernard (1983) have
suggested that there is reason to believe college samples may under­
estimate the rate of violence among young people. In fact, when
Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) reported the violence rates for
various segments of the married population, they indicated that the
most violent husbands were those who had graduated from high school,
and the least violent were grammar school dropouts and men with some
college. Fagan et al. (1983) have also reported that 70% of the as­
sailants in their study had no more than a high school education.
Consequently, the data collected from college students may
underestimate the prevalence of violence among dating couples in the general population.

The Data Collection Instrument

Description of the Instrument

The survey instrument consisted of six sections. The first section was a letter of transmittal (Appendix E) that was given to the subjects along with the questionnaire. The letter was typed on the junior college letter head and was signed by the researcher and Dr. Thelma Urbick, the dissertation chairperson.

The second section, questions one through seven, requested demographic information. The subjects identified their gender, marital status, ethnic membership, employment status, military status, age range, and the number of people they had dated.

The third section consisted of five questions. This section was designed to determine if the subject had been a victim of dating violence. Subjects were asked if any of their dating partners had ever pushed, slapped, thrown something at them, kicked, bit, hit them with their fists, beat them up, threatened them, or injured them with an object or weapon. It also directed the subject to identify a specific dating relationship on which to base the answers to the remaining questions. Those subjects who indicated that they had experienced violence in a dating relationship were asked to answer the remaining questions based on their most recent relationship where they had experienced any violence. Those subjects who reported that they had
not been a victim of dating violence were directed to use their current or their most recent dating relationship when answering the rest of the questionnaire.

The fourth section, questions 13 through 37, was the Nonassaultive Index of the Violence Index Schedule. It concerned nonassaultive behaviors and other relationship variables that the literature had indicated to be present in abusive relationships. Subjects were asked to describe the frequency with which their partner displays or had displayed such behaviors as jealousy, anger, possessiveness, and/or verbal abusiveness. Other questions in this section asked if the partner had talked about being abused as a child or had talked about seeing his/her parents use violence against each other. It also asked the subject if their partner has or had traditional ideas about the role of men and women in society. Finally, it asked questions concerning some of the subject's reactions and feelings toward their partner's behaviors.

The fifth section, questions 38 through 59 was the Assaultive Index of the Violence Index Schedule. This section asked questions directly related to assaultive and other highly intimidating behaviors displayed by the dating partner. Subjects were asked to indicate the type and number of times they had experienced a particular violent act, the kind of injuries they had received, and the number of times they had treated their injuries with first aid or medical attention. In addition, subjects responded to questions pertaining to their partner's use of symbolic violence (i.e., violence directed toward animals or objects), violence toward others, threats the
partner has or had made against the life of the subject, and threats that the partner makes/has made on his or her own life.

The sixth and final section consisted of four questions. Subjects indicated how long they had dated the partner described in the questionnaire. They reported the current status of that relationship. Subjects indicated whether they had committed any specific acts of violence toward the partner they had described in the survey. Finally, the subjects indicated if they knew any friends, relatives, or acquaintances who had experienced violence during a dating relationship.

**Construction of the Violence Index Schedule**

The Violence Index Schedule, questions 13 through 59 on the current survey instrument, is a modification of the Center for Social Research Abuse Index (Stacey & Shupe, 1983) found in Appendix F. The CSR Abuse Index was chosen for data collection because of the four instruments identified through a review of the literature, its format and content were the most appropriate for meeting the objectives of this research project. The CSR Abuse Index met four important criteria related to these objectives. First, the CSR Abuse Index provided information concerning the prevalence of dating violence. Second, it provided context specific information regarding relationship variables and assailant behavior patterns present in relationships troubled by violence. Third, it provided a substantial data base for comparing quantitative and qualitative differences between male and female victims of courtship violence. Finally, the CSR Abuse Index
had the ability to reflect the potential for or the intensity of abuse occurring in the relationship described by the subject.

The GSR Abuse Index was designed by Stacey and Shupe at the University of Texas at Arlington and was published in their data-based book, *The Family Secret: Domestic Assault in America* (1983). The instrument consists of 27 questions concerning assaultive and nonassaultive relationship variables and assailant behavior patterns that are common in domestic violence. Each question is based upon patterns and characteristics of violence that have been substantiated in the literature or by direct experience from working with victims of domestic violence and their families (Stacey & Shupe, 1983). Questions 1 through 14 on the GSR Abuse Index concern nonassaultive characteristics of abusive relationships. Subject responses to these questions are scored on a scale from zero to three. Responses are scored 0 for *never*, 1 for *rarely*, 2 for *sometimes*, and 3 for *frequently*. Questions 15 through 27 are items directly related to assaultive behaviors and high levels of intimidation on the part of the partner. These responses are scored 0 for *never*, 4 for *rarely*, 5 for *sometimes*, and 6 for *frequently*. The point values for questions 1 through 27 are summed to yield an abuse index score. The respondent is then assigned to one of the following four categories dependent upon the total score. A respondent is assigned to the dangerously abusive category for scores between 120 and 94, to the seriously abusive category for scores between 93 and 37, to the moderately abusive category for scores between 36 and 15, and to the nonabusive category for scores between 14 and 0.
The differential weighting system used for the nonassaultive and assaultive portions of the measurement instrument reflects the intensity of abuse in the relationship by assigning higher point values to overt acts of aggression and intimidation. Similar weighting systems are used in the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) and the Index for Spouse Abuse (Hudson & McIntosh, 1981). The CSR Abuse Index was developed and is used in the field and has not been standardized. No reliability or validity data were found.

The content and format of the CSR Abuse Index Scale served as the basis for the Violence Index Schedule (questions 13-59 on the current survey instrument). The response categories of never, rarely, sometimes, and frequently were maintained as well as the question score values. Score values of 0, 1, 2, and 3 were assigned to items that were nonassaultive in nature. Score values of 0, 4, 5, and 6 were assigned to items that involved violence or intimidation on the part of the dating partner. Therefore, the Violence Index Schedule retained the ability of the CSR Abuse Index to reflect the potential for, or intensity of abuse present in the relationship described by the respondent.

The CSR Abuse Index was modified in a number of ways. First, it was necessary to change the wording of the questions so that they were applicable to past as well as present relationships. The original CSR Abuse Index was written in present tense and was not appropriate for all of the subjects because the subjects may have described relationships that had terminated. The wording of the questions was also changed so that they were appropriate for both male and
female respondents. The original CSR Abuse Index was developed for use by women and used masculine pronouns throughout the instrument when describing the assailants. The following is an example of how the wording was changed to reflect both the verb tense and the pronoun changes. The original CSR Abuse Index question, "Is he ever rude to your friends?" was changed to "Is/was your partner ever rude to your friends?". The other questions were changed in a similar manner.

Another modification to the original CSR Abuse Index involved the addition of several questions relevant to dating relationships. During the verification of the content of the CSR Abuse Index, the review of literature indicated other relationship variables and assailant characteristics associated with violent relationships. Those items that were substantiated by the review of the literature were added to the survey instrument. In this manner, ten questions were added to the Nonassaultive Scale and four additional items were added to the Assaultive Scale.

An additional modification to the item content concerned the questions about specific acts of violence. On the original instrument, all acts of violence were combined in one question. For example, question 15 on the CSR Abuse Index read, "Does he ever strike you with his hands or feet (slap, punch, kick, etc.)?" (Stacey & Shupe, 1983, p. 222). The content of this question was separated into eight questions, and each form of violence was addressed as a separate question. These categories were also used in question seven on the current survey instrument. In addition, respondents were
asked to indicate what, if any, type of injuries they had received from a specific act of violence. These questions were written in the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2 or 3</th>
<th>4 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>times</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>times</td>
<td>abrasions</td>
<td>welts</td>
<td>bruises</td>
<td>cuts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>burns</td>
<td>black eye</td>
<td>broken bones</td>
<td>other serious injuries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Does/did your partner ever shove or push you during an argument, disagreement or conflict?

---What injuries occurred?

Circle all that apply:
1. none
2. abrasions
3. welts
4. burns
5. black eye
6. broken bones
7. cuts
8. other serious injuries

The final modification was the division of the Violence Index Schedule into the Nonassaultive Index Scale and the Assaultive Index Scale. These scores were not a part of the original CSR Abuse Index; however, the assaultive and nonassaultive items were readily distinguishable because of the scoring procedures. Those items which were nonassaultive in nature were scored 0, 1, 2, or 3, and those items related to direct acts of violence and high levels of intimidation were scored 0, 4, 5, or 6. Hudson and McIntosh (1981) have provided the rationale for describing these two dimensions of abuse. In the construction of their Index of Spouse Abuse, a factor analysis of their instrument revealed two distinct dimensions of abuse: nonphysical abuse and physical abuse. These two categories are represented on the current measurement instrument by the Nonassaultive Index Scale and the Assaultive Index Scale.
Though the CSR Abuse Index was modified in a number of ways, the current survey instrument followed the content and format of the original instrument. The major modification was the additional of 14 content items relevant to dating couples that was verified by a review of the literature. The researcher believes that this modification and the others that were made did not compromise the integrity of the CSR Abuse Index to the point where it could no longer be used to measure the intensity of abuse or violence in any given relationship.

**Scoring the Instrument**

Each subject received three scores on the survey instrument: an overall Violence Index score, a Nonassaultive Index score and an Assaultive Index score.

**The Nonassaultive Index Score**

A Nonassaultive Index score was calculated for each subject. The score was based upon subject responses to questions 13 through 37 on the survey instrument (Appendix A). The questions concerned relationship variables and partner behaviors characteristic of abusive relationships and abusive partners. It did not include questions concerning the partner's use of violence. Responses to each question were scored using the procedure outlined in the CSR Abuse Index (Stacey & Shupe, 1983). A never response was scored 0, a response of rarely was scored 1, a response of sometimes was scored 2, and a response of frequently was scored 3. The total score values for each...
subject were added together to yield the Nonassaultive Index score. The score value could have ranged from 0 to 75.

**Assaultive Index Score**

An Assaultive Index score was calculated for each subject. The score was based upon subject responses to questions 38 through 59 on the survey instrument (Appendix A). The questions consisted of items directly related to symbolic violence and assaultive or highly intimidating behaviors displayed by the dating partner described in the questionnaire. These items were scored 0 for never, 4 for acts that occurred one time, 5 for acts that occurred 2 or 3 times, and 6 for acts occurring 4 or more times. The total score values for each subject were added together to yield the Assaultive Index score. The score value could have ranged from 0 to 126.

**The Violence Index Score**

An overall Violence Index score was calculated for each subject to determine the potential for or the extent of violence and/or abuse being experienced in the relationship described in the questionnaire. The Violence Index score was based upon subject responses to items 13 through 59 on the survey instrument and included all the items from the Nonassaultive Index and the Assaultive Index scales. The scoring procedures incorporated the weighting systems used in the CSR Abuse Index (Stacey & Shupe, 1983). Responses to each item were scored in the following manner. The Nonassaultive scale items, questions 13 through 37, were scored 0 for a response of never, 1 for a response
of rarely, 2 for a response of sometimes, and 3 for a response of frequently. Those items dealt with relationship variables and partner behaviors that are nonviolent in nature but are characteristic of abusive relationships and abusive partners. The Assaultive Index scale, questions 38 through 59, consisted of items directly related to the results and the use of symbolic violence and assaultive and/or highly intimidating behaviors on the part of the dating partner. These items were scored 0 for never, 4 for acts that occurred one time, 5 for acts that occurred 2 or 3 times, and 6 for acts that occurred 4 or more times. By assigning score values based upon the frequency of the behaviors displayed and by giving differential weights to questions concerning nonassaultive and assaultive acts, this scoring system allowed the total score to reflect the intensity of the violence and/or abuse being experienced in the relationship. A Violence Index score was calculated for each subject. The total score values for questions 13 through 59 were added together to yield the Violence Index score. The score value could have ranged from 0 to 192.

Content Validity of the Violence Index Schedule

Because no information concerning the validity of the CSR Abuse Index was provided, the researcher validated the content of the questionnaire items in the following manner. A list of the current literature describing characteristics of assailants and abusive relationships was completed. As each article was reviewed, characteristics of abusive relationships or assailant behaviors that were
described in the article were written on a 3x5 index card along with the author, title, source and date. Each characteristic or assailant behavior was written on a separate card. Next, each question on the original CSR Abuse Index was listed. The characteristics written on the index cards were compared with the original questions on the CSR Abuse Index. As the characteristics of assailant behaviors and abusive relationships matched individual questions on the CSR Abuse Index, the author and date of the article describing that characteristic was written beside that question. During this reviewing process if an additional characteristic was described, it was listed at the bottom of the original questionnaire items. As additional citations were found that duplicated the characteristic, the author and date was written beside that characteristic. In order for an item to be included in the current survey instrument, it had to have been verified by at least five of the source articles. Using this process, all the original CSR Abuse Index questions were verified. All but two were included in the current survey instrument. An item concerning raising children and one concerning working wives were eliminated because the researcher believed they were not relevant to dating relationships. Ten additional items were added to the Nonassaultive Index and four items were added to the Assaultive Index.

Analysis of the Data

The following procedures were utilized in preparing the data for tabulation and statistical analysis. The questionnaires were numbered consecutively as they were removed from the envelopes and checked
to see if they were in a usable form. Three of the questionnaires were eliminated because the subjects had failed to complete the survey instrument. The data were then entered directly from the questionnaires into a TRS-80 Model 4 microcomputer.

Data tabulations and statistical analysis were completed using researcher developed BASIC programs for the TRS-80 Model 4 (Appendix G). The data were verified by comparing the frequency counts and statistics obtained from analyzing a sample of twenty questionnaires using both the BASIC programs and hand calculations. Because identical results were produced, the researcher believes that the BASIC computer software programs produced accurate results.

The frequencies and percentages for the responses for each of the research questions were tabulated. Chi-square analyses were performed where appropriate to determine if the obtained results were due to chance or to the operation of a specific variable.

A t-test for independent means was used to test for significant differences in the mean scores between the victims and the nonvictims on the Nonassaultive Index scale of the survey instrument. A t-test for independent means was also used to determine if there were significant differences in the mean scores on the Nonassaultive Index scale; the Assaultive Index scale; and the Violence Index scale on the survey instrument between the male and the female victims of dating violence.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter presents the data tabulations and data analysis for the research questions under study. The chapter is presented in three sections. Section one documents the prevalence of violence in dating relationships as reported by victims. The second section provides a profile of the nature of dating violence. It includes a description of relationship variables and assailant behaviors associated with violent relationships. It also describes the kinds of violent acts that are experienced and the type and severity of injuries that are received by the victims. The final section presents an analysis of the quantitative and qualitative differences in the incidence, nature, and severity of violence experienced in dating relationships as reported by the male and the female victims. Quantitative differences are described by differences in the reported rate of victimization between male and female victims. Qualitative differences are described by differences in the types of violent acts experienced; the number, kind, and severity of injuries sustained; and differences in assailant behaviors displayed by the partners of the victims.
Prevalence of Dating Violence

Incidence

Research Question 1: To what extent have never-married subjects been the victims of violence during a dating relationship?

To determine if the subjects had been the victim of dating violence, they were asked the following question:

Have any of your dating partners ever done any of the following acts to you during an argument, conflict or disagreement: (a) thrown an object at you; (b) pushed or shoved you; (c) slapped you; (d) kicked, bit, or hit you with their fist; (e) hit or tried to hit you with an object; (f) beat you up; (g) threatened you with a gun, knife, or other weapon; (h) injured you with a gun, knife, or other weapon?

Those respondents answering yes were classified as victims of dating violence; those respondents answering no were counted as non-victims. Table 3 presents the frequencies and percentages for the subjects reporting to be victims or nonvictims of dating violence.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonvictim</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data reported in Table 3 indicate that 30.5% of the subjects had been a victim of at least one incident of dating violence. Therefore, at least 3 out of 10 individuals surveyed had experienced acts of aggression with at least one dating partner. This incidence rate is similar to the rate reported by Bernard and Bernard (1983) and Laner and Thompson (1982). For a summary of reported incidence rates from the other studies on violence among college students, see Table 1 on page 21.

Research Question 2: Is the incidence rate for being a victim of dating violence the same or significantly different among the various ethnic groups in the study?

Because the questionnaire surveyed a markedly bicultural sample of white, non-Hispanic, and Hispanic subjects, the researcher believed it necessary to determine if the two ethnic groups had reported equal or different rates of dating violence. It was decided that if the victimization rates were equal for the white, non-Hispanic, and the Hispanic subjects, the data from the remaining survey items would be tabulated, analyzed, and presented as a combined group. However, if the ethnic groups showed significantly different rates of dating violence, the results would be presented in two groups using ethnic membership as a break down variable.

Ethnic membership for the subjects was determined in the following manner. Subjects indicated their ethnic origin by checking one of the following categories: white, non-Hispanic; Hispanic; Black, non-Hispanic; Asian or Pacific Islander; American Indian; or other. These categories were chosen to represent ethnic origins because they
were the categories used on the application for admission to the junior college where the data was collected. For the purposes of analysis, three ethnic categories were established. Those categories were white, nonHispanic; Hispanic; and other. Four subjects indicated an ethnic origin different from white, nonHispanic or Hispanic. Those four subjects were assigned to the "other" category.

A chi-square analysis of ethnic membership relative to reported rates for being a victim or nonvictim of dating violence was computed to determine if the rate of victimization was equal or significantly different among the ethnic groups. The following statistical hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

\[ H_0: P_1 = P_2 = P_3 \]
\[ H_A: P_1 \neq P_2 \neq P_3 \]

where \( P_1 \) is equal to the proportion of white, nonHispanic subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence, \( P_2 \) is equal to the proportion of Hispanic subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence, and \( P_3 \) is equal to the proportion of other subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence.

Table 4 reports the findings of the chi-square analysis for ethnic membership relative to victim status for the total sample. The table is presented in cross tabular format with totals for the subjects reporting to victims and nonvictims for each of the three ethnic groups. The corrected chi-square value, degrees of freedom, probability, and the \( X^2 \) critical value are also reported.
Table 4
Chi-square Analysis of the Ethnic Composition of Subjects Reporting to be Nonvictims and Victims: Total Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Membership</th>
<th>Non Victim</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>row %</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, nonHispanic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>row %</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>row %</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected $X^2 (1, N = 151) = .097^a$, $p = .755$

Not significant at $p = .05$, $df = 1$, and $X^2$ critical = 3.841.

The results of the $X^2$ analysis reported in Table 4 indicate that the obtained result, corrected $X^2 = .097$ did not exceed the $X^2$ critical value of 3.841 at the .05 level of significance with one degree of freedom. The null hypothesis, that there are no differences in victimization rates for dating violence among the three ethnic groups, was accepted.

The possibility that different rates for victimization could exist between ethnic groups as a function of gender was also considered to be important. A chi-square analysis of ethnic membership relative to being a victim or nonvictim of dating violence was computed for both the male and the female subjects. The following statistical hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance.
\[ H_0: P_1 = P_2 = P_3 \]
\[ H_A: P_1 \neq P_2 \neq P_3 \]

where \( P_1 \) is equal to the proportion of white, non-Hispanic female subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence, \( P_2 \) is equal to the proportion of Hispanic female subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence, and \( P_3 \) is equal to the proportion of other female subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence.

Table 5 presents the findings for the chi-square analysis. The information is presented in cross-tabular format with totals for the female subjects reporting to be victims and nonvictims of dating violence for each of the ethnic groups. The corrected chi-square value, degrees of freedom, probability, and the \( X^2 \) critical value are also reported.

The results of the chi-square analysis reported in Table 5 indicate that the obtained result, corrected \( X^2 = .288 \) did not exceed the .05 level of significance with one degree of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis, that there were no significant differences among the female subjects with respect to being a victim or nonvictim of dating violence as a function of ethnic membership, was accepted.
Table 5

Chi-square Analysis of the Ethnic Composition of the Sample Reporting to be Nonvictims and Victims: Female Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Membership</th>
<th>Non Victim</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>count: 44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %: 72.1</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, nonHispanic</td>
<td>count: 18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %: 66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>count: 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %: 66.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected $\chi^2 (1, n = 91) = .288^a, \chi^2 = .592$

^aNot significant at $p = .05$, df = 1, and $\chi^2$ critical = 3.841.

A chi-square analysis was also calculated for the male subjects. The following statistical hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

$$H_0: P_1 = P_2 = P_3$$
$$H_A: P_1 \neq P_2 \neq P_3$$

where $P_1$ is equal to the proportion of white, nonHispanic male subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence, $P_2$ is equal to the proportion of Hispanic male subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence, and $P_3$ is equal to the proportion of other male subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence.

Table 6 presents the findings for the chi-square analysis. The information is presented in cross tabular format with totals for the
male subjects reporting to be victims and nonvictims of dating violence for each of the ethnic groups. The corrected chi-square value, degrees of freedom, probability, and the $\chi^2$ critical value are also reported.

Table 6

Chi-square Analysis of the Ethnic Composition of the Sample Reporting to be Nonvictims and Victims: Male Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Membership</th>
<th>Non Victim</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, nonHispanic</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected $\chi^2 (1, n = 60) = 1.378^a$, $p = .240$

---

$^a$Not significant at $p = .05$, $df = 1$, and $\chi^2$ critical = 3.841.

The results of the chi-square analysis reported in Table 6 indicate that the obtained result, corrected $\chi^2 = 1.378$ did not exceed the .05 level of significance with one degree of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis, that there were no significant differences among the male subjects with respect to being a victim or nonvictim of dating violence as a function of ethnic membership, was accepted.
Because the subjects in the different ethnic groups did not show proportionally different rates for being victims of dating violence, ethnic membership was not used as a break down variable for the subsequent data analysis.

Research Question 3: How many victims of dating violence have experienced violence with more than one partner?

Table 7 reports the number and percentage of victims who reported having experienced violence with one or more partners.

Table 7

Number of Victims Experiencing Violence With More Than One Partner: Frequencies and Percentages by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>1 Partner</th>
<th>2 Partners</th>
<th>More Than 2 Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 7, the majority of victims, 73.9%, had experienced violence with only one partner. Less than 2 out of 10 subjects had been involved in two relationships involving courtship violence. Five victims indicated that they had been involved in three or more relationships where violence was present.
Research Question 4: To what extent do subjects have knowledge of others who have been the victims of dating violence?

Subjects were asked to indicate if they knew friends, relatives, or acquaintances who had experienced dating violence. Table 8 presents the frequency and percentage of subjects who knew others who had been the victims of dating violence.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects who knew victims of dating violence</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects who did not know victims of dating violence</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>151</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from Table 8 that 68.9% of the subjects knew someone who had been the victim of dating violence. It appears that the presence of dating violence is common knowledge among single subjects. More than 6 out of 10 subjects knew someone who had been the victim of dating aggression. These findings are similar to the figures reported by Makepeace (1981). In his study he indicated that 61.5% of his subjects knew others who had been a victim of dating violence.
Nature of Dating Violence

The nature of violent dating relationships is described by an analysis and presentation of the responses to research questions 5 through 11. The description is based upon the following data: the stage of the dating relationship when violence occurred for the first time, the incidence of reciprocal violence, the types of violent acts experienced by the victims, and the types and severity of injuries sustained.

Additionally, the Nonassaultive Index scale on the measurement instrument is analyzed and presented. The Nonassaultive Index includes items related to partner behaviors and characteristics of relationships which the literature has shown to be present in violent relationships. The mean scores on the Nonassaultive Index for the victims and the nonvictims are compared using a t-test for independent means. In addition, the results of chi-square analyses for the individual items on the Nonassaultive Index is presented. The analyses compare the number of victims and nonvictims who answered "yes" a particular characteristic or behavior that was present in their dating relationship with those victims and nonvictims who answered "no" to the presence of that particular characteristic or behavior.

Relationship variables

Research Question 5: At what stage in the dating relationship does violence occur for the first time?
Respondents were asked to indicate at what point in their dating relationship violence had occurred for the first time. They selected one of the following four categories: casual dating, serious dating, engaged, or living together. Casual dating and serious dating were not operationally defined. Subjects used their own judgement to determine what constituted casual or serious dating.

Table 9 presents the frequencies and percentages for victimization relative to the relationship stage when violence occurred for the first time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Stage at the First Incident of Violence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual Dating</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Dating</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Together</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data presented in Table 9 suggest that dating couples are vulnerable to violence at all stages of the dating relationship. Nearly one third of the victims experienced the first act of aggression during what they defined to be casual dating. However,
the majority of dating violence (56.5%) began during serious dating.

Research Question 6: To what extent is violence in dating relationships reciprocal?

Table 10 presents the frequency of reciprocal violence among the subjects reported by gender. Reciprocal violence in a relationship is where both partners have been a victim and have acted as an assailant.

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Assailant</th>
<th>Victim Only</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 indicates that a substantial amount of dating violence is reciprocal. That is, the victims have also acted as an assailant at some point in the relationship. The data show that over one-half of the female victims (55.6%) and nearly one-third of the male victims (31.8%) had also committed a violent act toward their partner. These findings suggest that mutual violence is not uncommon in dating relationships where violence is present.
Characteristics of Violence

Research Question 7: What types of violent acts are experienced by victims of dating violence?

Questions 38 through 46 on the measurement instrument asked subjects to indicate what kind, if any, forms of violent acts they had experienced during a dating relationship. Subjects indicated if they had ever been shoved, slapped, kicked, punched, burned, hurt sexually, beaten-up, choked, and/or struck with an object or weapon. Subjects indicated the number of times they had experienced each form of violence by checking one of the following categories. Subjects checked never if the form of violence had never happened to them, rarely if it had happened one time, sometimes if it had happened two or three times, and frequently if it had happened four or more times. These questions were written in the following format:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>one</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Does/did your partner ever shove or push you during an argument, disagreement or conflict?
— What injuries occurred?
Circle all that apply
1 none  4 abrasions  7 burns
2 welts  5 black eye  8 broken bones
3 bruises 6 cuts  9 other serious injuries

For the purposes of data tabulation and analysis, the responses concerning the frequency of violence experienced were dichotomized. Those subjects who answered never made up one category, and those subjects who answered rarely, sometimes, or frequently made up the
other. Table 11 presents a summary of the occurrences of specific acts of violence as reported by victims of dating violence.

Table 11

Types of Violent Acts Experienced by Victims of Dating Violence: Frequencies and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent Acts</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence</th>
<th>% of Victims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoved</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapped</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicked</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punched</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt Sexually</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten Up</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choked</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck With Object</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Subjects may have reported experiencing multiple forms of violence.*

Table 11 shows the types of violent acts that occurred during dating violence as reported by the victims. It can be seen that each form of violence was reported at least once. The violent acts that occurred ranged from shoving to potentially life-threatening acts of choking or being struck with an object. Inspection of the table reveals that shoving was the most common form of aggression with 67.4% of the victims indicating that they had experienced that form of violence. Slapping was the second most common form of violence with more than four out of ten victims having reported being slapped. The other, more serious and potentially more harmful, forms of violent
acts were reported less frequently. Yet, one in five victims reported having been beaten-up, one in five kicked, 15% had been choked, 13% had been hurt sexually, and 17% had been struck with an object. These forms of violence, even the less serious ones of shoving and slapping, carry with them the potential for physical harm that is related to the amount of force that is used. Even the act of shoving can cause considerable injury if the victim is shoved into an object or falls over an obstruction.

Research Question 8: What types of injuries occur during dating violence?

This question is addressed by recording and tabulating the number of times a specific injury resulted from any of the violent acts described in questions 38 through 46 in the questionnaire. Below each question concerning a particular form of violence, the subjects circled any injuries they had received as a result of that act. Subjects indicated whether they had ever received welts, bruises, abrasions, black eyes, cuts, burns, broken bones, and/or other serious injuries. Respondents may have circled more than one injury per violent act; however, inspection of the raw data indicated that this was the case in only five instances. In those five cases the multiple injuries were welts and bruises. An example of the format for these questions can be found on page 72.
Table 12
Types and Number of Injuries Received for Particular Forms of Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violent Act</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>No Injury</th>
<th>Welts</th>
<th>Bruises</th>
<th>Cuts</th>
<th>Burns</th>
<th>Broken Bones</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoved</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapped</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicked</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punished</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexually Beaten-Up</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choked</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck With Object</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1(^a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. No subjects reported receiving a black eye.

Subjects may have reported multiple injuries resulting from one violent act.

\(^a\)This injury was an abrasion.

The data presented in Table 12 identify the number and types of injuries received by the victims of dating violence relative to the types of violent acts experienced. Overall, few injuries were reported by the victims of dating violence, and most of those were relatively minor. The majority of injuries received by the 46 victims in this study were bruises and welts that resulted from being shoved or beaten-up. Though these injuries can be painful, they aren't usually life-threatening. A few subjects did report serious injuries. One person received a broken bone, one person was burned, and
two subjects indicated that they had received bruises from being choked.

Research Question 9: How severe are the injuries sustained by the victims of dating violence?

To assess the severity of injuries received during dating violence, respondents were asked to indicate if they had ever received any bruises or welts as a result of dating violence, whether any injuries they had received needed first aid, and whether they had needed to seek medical attention for their injuries. The responses were dichotomized. The subjects who answered never made up one category, and those subjects who answered rarely, sometimes, or frequently made up the other. Table 13 describes the severity of injuries received by victims of dating violence. The injuries were represented by three levels of severity. Those consisting of bruises and welts, those requiring first aid, and those requiring medical treatment.

Table 13
Severity of Injuries Received by Victims of Dating Violence:
Frequencies and Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Severity of Injury</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Injury</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruises and Welts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed First Aid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed Medical Attention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from Table 13, the severity of injuries sustained during dating violence was relatively minor. Thirty one of the 46 victims reported that they had received no injuries. Fifteen or 32.6% of the victims received bruises and welts. Four of the 46 victims reported that they had treated their injuries with first aid, and only two victims indicated that they had treated their injuries with medical attention. Overall the severity of injuries experienced by victims of dating violence was minor in terms of life-threatening potential.

Assailant Characteristics

Research Question 10: Is there a significant difference in the number of nonassaultive behaviors displayed by the partners of the victims and nonvictims of dating violence?

To answer this question a t-test for independent means was calculated for the victims and the nonvictims of dating violence on the Nonassaultive Index. The following statistical hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

\[ H_0: M_1 = M_2 \]
\[ H_A: M_1 \neq M_2 \]

where \( M_1 \) is equal to the mean score on the Nonassaultive Index for the subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence, and \( M_2 \) is equal to the mean score on the Nonassaultive Index for the subjects reporting to be nonvictims. The means, standard deviations, sample size, t value and, probability level for the subjects reporting to be victims and nonvictims of dating violence for the Nonassaultive Index...
are reported in Table 14.

Table 14 shows the mean for the victims of dating violence on the Nonassaultive Index was 28.8 with a standard deviation of 13.1. The mean for the nonvictims on the Nonassaultive Index was 10.8 with a standard deviation of 7.6. The calculated $t$ value was $-10.554$. The null hypothesis, that the means of the two groups were equal was rejected because the calculated $t$ value of $-10.554$ exceeded the critical value of 1.655 at 149 degrees of freedom, the value expected at the .05 level of significance. Therefore, it appears that there are significant differences in the amount of nonphysical abuse and/or the nonassaultive behaviors displayed by the partners of the victims and nonvictims of dating violence.

Table 14

$t$-test Results for Victims and Nonvictims of Dating Violence on the Nonassaultive Index of the Violence Index Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonvictim</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t(149, N = 151) = -10.554^*, p < .001$

*Significant at $p = .05$, df = 149, and $t$ critical = 1.655.

Research Question 11: What differences, if any, exist in specific relationship variables and nonassaultive partner behaviors present in the relationships of victims and nonvictims of dating violence?
This question was answered by doing an item by item analysis of the questions on the Nonassaultive Index using a chi-square statistic. Each question on the Nonassaultive Index represented a behavioral characteristic or relationship variable associated with violent relationships. Twenty-two of the 25 items described partner behaviors that could be considered nonphysical abuse if carried to the extreme. Two response categories were established for the analysis. The "yes" category included those subjects who indicated the presence of the characteristic by checking, rarely, sometimes, or frequently. The "no" category included those subjects who reported the absence of the characteristic by checking never.

Table 15 presents frequencies, percentages, probabilities, and chi-square value for the individual questions on the Nonassaultive Index. To conserve space on the table, the questions were abbreviated as much as possible. A list of the original questions can be found in Appendix A. The questions are listed on the table according to magnitude of their chi-square value.

Table 15
Chi-square Analysis of the Items on the Nonassaultive Index for Victims and Nonvictims of Dating Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Nonvictim</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Corrected Chi-square/ Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 partner angry if you say no sex yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Nonvictim f</th>
<th>Nonvictim %</th>
<th>Victim f</th>
<th>Victim %</th>
<th>Chi-square/Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 partner embarrasses you in front of others  yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>35.609 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 partner verbally abusive yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>34.878 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 afraid of partner when he/she is angry yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>33.619 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 partner's possessiveness is a problem yes</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>22.280 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 partner verbally abusive when drinking yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22.902 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 partner pressures you for sex yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>22.902 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 partner critical of the daily things you do yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>18.511 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 partner demands an account of money yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>18.351 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 partner extremely jealous yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>16.719 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Nonvictim</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Corrected Chi-square/Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 you quarrel over time you spend with your friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 partner rude to your friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 partner discourages new friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 partner tells you that you are dumb and stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 partner like Jekyll and Hyde when angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 partner has traditional ideas about men/women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 you quarrel over financial matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 not making partner angry is a major part of your life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Nonvictim</th>
<th></th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th></th>
<th>Corrected Chi-square/Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 partner wants to control your time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>9.817*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 partner gets angry when you do not follow advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>7.657*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 partner keeps tabs on you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>5.733*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 partner talks about being abused as a child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.979*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 partner threatens to use weapons when angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.244*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 partner talks about seeing violence between parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>4.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 you feel isolated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>2.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p = .05, df = 1, and $X^2$ critical = 3.841.

The results of an item by item chi-square analysis on the Nonassaultive Index reported in Table 15 reveal that there are significant differences between the victims and nonvictims of dating violence in
regard to the number of nonassaultive behaviors displayed by their partners. Twenty-four of the 25 items describing nonassaultive partner behaviors had corrected \( \chi^2 \) values that exceeded the \( \chi^2 \) critical value of 3.841 at one degree of freedom, the value associated with the .05 level of significance. Only one item, "Do you feel isolated and alone," showed no significant difference in occurrence between the victims and nonvictims.

The characteristics that showed the greatest differences between the victims and nonvictims were partner's anger over sexual denial, corrected \( \chi^2 = 38.654, p < .001 \); partner's embarrassing subject in front of others, corrected \( \chi^2 = 35.609, p < .001 \); partner's verbal abusiveness, \( \chi^2 = 34.878, p < .001 \); and subject's fear of the partner when the partner was angry, corrected \( \chi^2 = 33.619, p < .001 \). When summarizing the differences between behaviors displayed by the partners of the victims and nonvictims of dating violence, it appears that assailants in dating relationships show significantly greater amounts of jealousy; coercive anger; verbal abusiveness; and the desire to control and limit their partners' time, money, and relationships with others.

Quantitative and Qualitative Differences Between Male and Female Victims of Dating Violence

This section presents quantitative and qualitative differences in dating violence as reported by male and female victims. Quantitative differences are considered to be differences in the actual occurrence of violence in dating relationships as reported by male
and female victims. The analysis of the qualitative differences is based upon differences in the type, number, and severity of injuries sustained and differences in the nonassaultive characteristics and partner behaviors reported by the male and female victims.

**Incidence**

Research Question 12: Do male and female subjects report equal or significantly different rates for being the victim of dating violence?

To answer this question, the number of male subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence was compared with the number of female subjects who reported to be victims. The following hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

\[
H_0: P_1 = P_2 \\
H_A: P_1 \neq P_2
\]

where \( P_1 \) is equal to the proportion of male subjects reporting to be the victims of dating violence, and \( P_2 \) is the proportion of female subjects reporting to be the victim of dating violence.

Table 16 reports the findings of the chi-square analysis for the male and female subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence. The corrected chi-square value, degrees of freedom, probability, and the \( X^2 \) critical value are also reported.

It can be seen from Table 16 that 29.7% of the female subjects and 31.7% of the male subjects indicated that they had been the victims of dating violence. The findings for the chi-square analysis indicate that the obtained result, corrected \( X^2 = .006 \), shows no significant
difference in the proportion of females who reported being the victims of dating violence from the proportion of males who reported being victims. Because the calculated value of $X^2$ did not exceed 3.841, the value associated with the .05 level of significance, the null hypothesis, that there is no difference in the rate of victimization between the male and female subjects, was accepted.

Table 16
Number of Nonvictims and Victims of Dating Violence: Frequencies, Percentages, and Chi-square Analysis by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nonvictim</th>
<th>Victim</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>count 64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row % 70.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>count 41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row % 68.3</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected $X^2 (1, N = 151) = .006^a$, $p = .938$

$^a$Not significant at $p = .05$, df = 1, and $X^2$ critical = 3.841.

Characteristics of Violence

Research Question 13: Do male and female victims differ in the type of violent acts they experience during dating violence?

Table 17 presents a summary of the type of violent acts experienced by the male and female victims of dating violence.

Inspection of Table 17 reveals that both men and women have had a variety of violent acts directed towards them by a dating partner. The most common acts were shoving and slapping with 70.4% of the
female victims and 63.2% of the male victims reporting being shoved. More male victims (68.4%) than female victims (29.6%) reported being slapped. A higher percentage of female victims reported being kicked, punched, burned, beat-up, and choked; while male victims more often reported being slapped and hurt sexually. Females were more often victims of more potentially harmful acts.

Table 17
Violent Acts Experienced by Female and Male Victims: Frequencies, Percentages and Chi-square Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violent Act</th>
<th>Number of Female Victims</th>
<th>% of Female n= 27</th>
<th>Number of Male Victims</th>
<th>% of Males n= 19</th>
<th>Chi Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shoved</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapped</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>5.291*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicked</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punched</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt Sexually</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaten Up</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>1.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choked</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck With Object</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at p = .05, df = 1, and $X^2$ critical = 3.841.

A chi-square analysis for those violent acts where the expected cell frequencies for male and female victims exceeded or were equal to five was calculated. This criterion for expected cell frequencies being equal to or exceeding five was chosen because "when $f_e$ is quite small, the distribution of $f_{o}$'s tends to be skewed, and the theoretical chi-square model will not be adequate ... all $f_e$'s should equal
or exceed five when df = 1" (Minium, 1978, p. 437). The categories of violent acts that met the criterion of $f_e$ equal to or exceeding five were shoved, slapped, kicked, and beaten-up.

As can be seen from Table 17, there were no significant differences in the number of male and female victims who reported being shoved, corrected $X^2 = .038$, $p = .845$; kicked, corrected $X^2 = .001$, $p = .975$; and beaten-up, corrected $X^2 = 1.404$, $p = .236$. A significant difference was found between the number of male victims and female victims who reported being slapped. Males reported significantly more slaps, corrected $X^2 = 5.291$, $p = .021$, than did the female victims.

Research Question 14: Is there a difference in the number of male and female victims who have been injured during dating violence?

To answer this question the number of male victims and female victims reporting to have been injured during dating violence were compared using a chi-square statistic. The following hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

$H_0: \pi_1 = \pi_2$

$H_A: \pi_1 \neq \pi_2$

where $\pi_1$ is equal to the proportion of female victims who were injured during dating violence, and $\pi_2$ is equal to the proportion of male victims who were injured during dating violence.

Table 18 presents the findings for the chi-square analysis. The information is presented in cross tabular format with totals for the female and male victims who reported being injured and not injured.
The corrected chi-square value, degrees of freedom, probability, and the $X^2$ critical value are also reported.

Table 18 shows that 15 of the 46 female victims and 16 of the 19 male victims indicated that they had not been injured during an incident of dating violence. The finding for the chi-square analysis indicates that the obtained result, $X^2 = 2.965$, shows no significant difference in the proportion of females who reported being injured from the proportion of males who reported being injured. Because the calculated value of $X^2$ did not exceed 3.841, the value associated with the .05 level of significance at one degree of freedom, the null hypothesis, that there was no difference in the number of male and female victims who were injured, was accepted.

Table 18
Chi-square Analysis by Gender for Victims Injured and Not Injured During Dating Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Injured</th>
<th>Not Injured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Corrected $X^2 (1, n = 46) = 2.965^a$, $p = .085$

$^a$Not significant at $p = .05$, $df = 1$, and $X^2$ critical = 3.841.
Research Question 15: Do male and female victims differ in the types of injuries they receive?

Table 19 presents a summary of the number and types of injuries received by the male and female victims relative to the specific acts of violence experienced.

Table 19

Types and Number of Injuries Received by Male and Female Victims for Particular Forms of Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violent Act</th>
<th>Welts</th>
<th>Bruises</th>
<th>Abrasions</th>
<th>Cuts</th>
<th>Burns</th>
<th>Broken Bones</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female Victims</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoved</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punched</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt Sexually</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat-Up</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck With Object</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male Victims</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoved</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slapped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punched</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurt Sexually</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat-Up</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choked</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struck With Object</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspection of Table 19 reveals that most of the victims of dating violence were not physically injured. However, of those victims reporting injuries, females were injured more often than male victims. The largest difference was in the amount of bruises received by the female victims. Female victims reported four times as many bruises as did the males. Female victims also received more serious injuries than did the male victims.

Assailant Characteristics

Research Question 16: Is there a significant difference in the number of nonassaultive behaviors displayed by the partners of the male and female victims?

To answer this question, a t-test for independent means was calculated for the male and female victims for the Nonassaultive Index scale of the Violence Index Schedule. The following statistical hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

\[ H_0: M_1 = M_2 \]
\[ H_A: M_1 \neq M_2 \]

where \( M_1 \) is equal to the mean score on the Nonassaultive Index for the female subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence, and \( M_2 \) is equal to the mean score on the Nonassaultive Index for the male subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence.

The means, standard deviations, sample size, t value, and probability level for male and female subjects reporting to be victims of dating violence on the Nonassaultive Index are reported in Table 20.
Table 20
$t$-test Results for Female and Male Victims on the Violence Index Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Scale</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.858$a$</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonassaultive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.585$a$</td>
<td>.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaultive</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.787$a$</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$a$Not significant at $p = .05$, $df = 44$, and $t$ critical = 1.680.

Table 20 shows that the mean for the female victims of dating violence on the Nonassaultive Index was 30.3 with a standard deviation of 13.6. The mean for the male victims was 26.8 with a standard deviation of 12.2. The calculated $t$ value was .858. The null hypothesis, that the means of the two groups were equal, was accepted because the calculated $t$ value of .858 did not exceed 1.680, the value associated with the .05 level of significance at 44 degrees of freedom. Therefore, it appears there is no difference in the amount of nonassaultive behaviors displayed by the partners of the male and female victims of dating violence.

**Research Question 17:** What differences, if any, exist in the relationship variables, nonassaultive characteristics, and partner behaviors present in the dating relationships of the male and female victims?
Table 21 presents the frequencies, percentages, corrected chi-square values, and probability levels for the individual questions on the Nonassaultive Index. To conserve space on the table, the questions were abbreviated as much as possible. A list of the original questions can be found in Appendix A.

Table 21

Chi-square Analysis of the Items on the Nonassaultive Index for Male and Female Victims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Corrected Chi Value/ Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 partner keeps tabs on you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>( p = .752 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 partner wants to control your time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>( p = .877 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 partner extremely jealous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>2.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>( p = .597 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 you quarrel over time you spend with your friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>( p = .525 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 partner rude to your friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>1.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>( p = .185 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 partner discourages new friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>( p = .964 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Chi Value/Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>partner critical of the daily things you do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7 p = .008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3 p = .929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>partner's possessiveness is a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>94.7 p = 2.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.3 p = .591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>partner tells you that you are dumb and stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4 p = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6 p = 1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>partner embarrasses you in front of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7 p = 1.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3 p = .235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>partner verbally abusive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63.2 p = .045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8 p = .832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>you feel isolated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7 p = .072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3 p = .788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>partner demands an account of money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4 p = .427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6 p = .513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>partner like Jekyll and Hyde when angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>73.7 p = .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.3 p = .975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>partner has traditional ideas about men/women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78.9 p = .024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.1 p = .877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Corrected Chi Value/ Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 partner gets angry when you do not follow advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 partner verbally abusive when drinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 partner pressures you for sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 partner angry if you say no sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 you quarrel over financial matters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 afraid of partner when he/she is angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 not making partner angry a major part of your life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 partner threatens to use weapons when angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Corrected Chi Value/Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 partner talks about seeing violence between parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 partner talks about being abused as a child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at p = .05, df = 1, and $X^2$ critical = 3.841.

The results of an item by item analysis of the Nonassaultive Index Scale for the male and female victims of dating violence are presented in Table 21. It shows that there were no significant differences between male victims and female victims with respect to specific nonassaultive characteristics present in their relationships for 24 of the 25 characteristics described in the Nonassaultive Index Scale. The corrected chi-square values for 24 of these items failed to exceed 3.841, the value associated with the .05 level of significance at one degree of freedom. Only one characteristic, "Are you afraid of your partner when he/she is/was angry," showed a significant difference ($X^2 = 8.418$, df = 1, p = .004) in occurrence in the relationships of the male and female victims. A significantly greater number of female victims answered, "yes," they were afraid of their partner when he/she is/was angry than did the male victims.
Research Question 18: Do male and female victims of dating violence differ in the amount of assaultive and highly intimidating behaviors they experience from their partners?

To answer this question the mean scores on the Assaultive Index Scale of the Violence Index Schedule for the male and female victims were compared using a t-test for independent means. The Assaultive Index Scale is made up of 21 items that are directly related to the partner's use of assault, symbolic violence, and other highly intimidating forms of behaviors.

To determine if male or female victims experienced equal or significantly different amounts of violence or highly intimidating behaviors in their dating relationships, the following statistical hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance

\[ H_0: M_1 = M_2 \]
\[ H_A: M_1 \neq M_2 \]

where \( M_1 \) is equal to the mean score on the Assaultive Index Scale for the female victims of dating violence, and \( M_2 \) is equal to the mean score on the Assaultive Index Scale for the male victims of dating violence.

Table 20 (page 91) reported the means, standard deviations, t value, and probability level for male and female victims on the Assaultive Index Scale of the Violence Index Schedule. It can be seen from Table 20 that the mean score for the female victims was 23.0 with a standard deviation of 19.6, and the mean score for the male victims was 19.5 with a standard deviation of 18.5. The calculated t value was .585. Because the calculated t value of .585 did not
exceed 1.680, the value associated with the .05 level of significance at 44 degrees of freedom, the null hypothesis, that there is no difference in the amount of assaultive and highly intimidating behaviors experienced by the female and male victims of dating violence, was accepted.

**Research Question 19:** Is there a significant difference in the overall intensity of violence experienced by the male and female victims of dating violence as measured by the Violence Index Schedule?

A Violence Index score was calculated for each victim of dating violence. It reflected the overall intensity of violence in the relationship by summing the responses on the Nonassaultive and Assaultive of the Violence Index Schedule. The Violence Index score reflected the intensity of violence in the relationship as a result of nonphysical abuse, physical violence, and highly intimidating behavior. The mean scores for the overall Violence Index Scale for the male and female victims were compared using a $t$-test for independent means. The following statistical hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

$$H_0: \bar{M}_1 = \bar{M}_2$$

$$H_A: \bar{M}_1 \neq \bar{M}_2$$

where $\bar{M}_1$ is equal to the mean score on the Violence Index Scale for the female victims, and $\bar{M}_2$ is equal to the mean score on the Violence Index Scale for the male victims of dating violence. Table 20 (page 91) reports the means, standard deviations, $t$ value, and probability level for male and female subjects on the Violence Index Scale of the Violence Index Schedule. It can be seen from Table 20 that the mean
score for the female victims was 53.2 with a standard deviation of 29.2; the mean score for the male victims was 46.4 with a standard deviation of 27.3. The calculated $t$ value was .787. Because the calculated $t$ value of .787 did not exceed 1.680, the value associated with the .05 level of significance at 44 degrees of freedom, the null hypothesis, that there is no difference in the amount of overall intensity of violence experienced in the dating relationships of the male and female victims, was accepted.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of Chapter V are to summarize the study, draw conclusions from the results, and make recommendations concerning the need for additional research.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the incidence and the nature of dating violence among never-married junior college students. The study documented the incidence rate of violence as reported by the victims. It described the nature of dating violence in terms of the types of violent acts experienced; the number, kind, and severity of injuries sustained; the relationship variables present in violent relationships; and the behaviors displayed by the assailant partners. In addition, the study investigated the quantitative and qualitative differences between male and female victims. Quantitative differences were described by differences in the reported rates of victimization. Qualitative differences were described by differences in the types of violent acts experienced; the number, kind, and severity of injuries sustained; and differences in assailant behaviors displayed by the partners of the victims. The research responded to three identified needs for additional study: the need to

99
foster professional and public awareness of the problem; the need for information about the relationship variables, characteristics of violent relationships, assailant behaviors, and injuries sustained; and the need to explore differences between male and female victims of violence.

The review of selected literature included four sections: a summary of the previously published studies on dating violence, an overview of the theoretical explanations of violence, a discussion of the myths that surround and support domestic violence, and a description of assailant characteristics.

Previous research on dating violence showed that violence was present in at least 20% of the dating relationships studied. It was more common in relationships that involved some degree of commitment, was reciprocal in at least 50% of the relationships, and did not necessarily signal the end of the relationship. The studies reported that the milder forms of aggression, slapping and shoving, were more common than more serious forms of aggression such as punching, choking, or using a weapon.

A systematic theory describing dating violence was not found in the literature; however, Laner and Thompson (1982) have suggested that theories describing marital violence could also apply to dating violence. Theory construction in the area of domestic violence is still in the novice state. The theories of the 70s were, for the most part, based upon empirical findings rather than hypothesis testing, and they focused on a single determinant as an explanation for interpersonal violence. Rounsaville (1978) has pointed out that
single determinant theories of violence have failed to give adequate consideration to the complexity of interpersonal violence. Current scholars (Barnett et al., 1980; Finkelhor et al., 1983) have advocated a systems approach to theory building based upon a multifactorial explanation of violence. Finkelhor et al. (1983) have identified three major factors that need to be included and explained in a comprehensive theory of violence. They are individual factors, situational factors, and societal factors. The major individual factors include the psychological make-up of the assailant and their previous learning experiences with violence. The situational factor most often associated with violence is stress resulting from financial problems, unemployment, pregnancy, and/or social isolation. The major societal factors identified with causing or perpetuating violence are the patriarchal and sexist nature of society, our socialization into use and acceptance of violence in family interaction, and a general cult of violence that accepts and even glorifies the use of violence.

Seven myths surrounding domestic violence were identified and refuted. The most common myths were: domestic violence is not a big problem, domestic violence is only a problem of the lower class, women provoke and even enjoy abuse, women can leave if they really want to avoid abuse, abuse is caused by unemployment, abuse is caused by drunkenness, and only sick and evil men beat women.

The final section in the review of the literature identified behaviors used by people who abuse their partners. Assailants were described as displaying extremely jealous and possessive behaviors; trying to control the time, relationships, and money of their
partners; having a volatile temper; blaming the partner for problems in the relationship; being verbally abusive; and having an impaired ability to express emotions other than anger.

The subjects for the study were a convenience sample of 151 never-married students attending night classes at a junior college on the Texas-Mexico border. The survey was administered during the first 45 minutes of a regularly scheduled class period. Each instructor administered the survey to his or her own class. Participation was voluntary, and all instruments were completed anonymously.

A researcher modified version of the CSR Abuse Index, called the Violence Index Schedule, was used for collecting the data. A review of the current literature on interpersonal violence verified the original 27 items on the CSR Abuse Index and provided the rationale for adding 14 additional items related to dating violence. The Violence Index Schedule consisted of an overall Violence Index and two subscales.

The Nonassaultive Index described relationship variables and partner behaviors common to violent relationships. A t-test for independent means was calculated to compare the scores on the Nonassaultive Index scale for the victims and nonvictims of dating violence. A chi-square analysis was done for each question on the Nonassaultive Index to determine if there were significant differences in nonassaultive behaviors displayed by the partners of the victims and nonvictims. A summary of assailant behaviors present in violent dating relationships was developed based upon the results of these analyses.
The Assaultive Index measured the intensity of physical violence experienced in the relationship described by the subject. The Assaultive Index asked questions directly related to the use of violence on the part of a dating partner. Subjects indicated what types of violent acts they had experienced, what injuries they had received, and what other violent or other highly intimidating behaviors their partners had displayed. In addition, a t-test for independent means was also used to compare the intensity of violence experienced by the male and female victims.

Conclusions resulting from the data tabulations and analyses for the 19 research questions under study are presented in the discussion section of this chapter. Two general conclusions from the study are also presented.

The final section of this chapter provides recommendations for additional research.

Discussion

The discussion is presented in three sections: the prevalence of dating violence, the nature of violence, and the quantitative and qualitative differences between male and female victims.

Prevalence

The findings of the study have revealed that dating violence is a common occurrence among dating partners. The presence of violence among dating couples was substantiated by the fact that 68.9% of the subjects reported knowing persons who had been the victim of dating
violence; 30.5% of the total sample had, themselves, been victims; and 19% of those victims had experienced violence with more than one partner. Thus dating violence is a problem of some magnitude. If the reported incident rate of 30.5% is typical of the number of dating relationships where violence occurs, at least 3 out of 10 dating relationships are at risk.

These findings support Makepeace's (1981) hypothesis that dating violence may be a social problem. In addition, dating violence has a number of negative consequences that go beyond the physical injury and psychological damage experienced by the victims. A number of young people are reinforced for using violence to solve their problems or for dealing with their frustrations. As this violence continues unchecked, the negative consequences multiply. Left untreated, it has the potential for escalating into serious battering episodes.

There is an acute need for high school and college counselors, parents, and others who come into contact with young people to be aware of the presence and dynamics of dating violence. In addition, serious consideration needs to be given to establishing prevention and treatment programs for the victims and assailants of dating violence.

Nature of Dating Violence

Relationship Variables

The study presented data concerning two relationship variables
that were not included on the Nonassaultive Index. These were the stage of the relationship when violence first occurred and the amount of reciprocal violence present in the dating relationships described in the study.

**Relationship Stage.** The survey indicated that 30.4% of the victims experienced the first incident of violence during what they considered to be casual dating, 56.5% during serious dating, 4.4% while engaged, and 8.7% during cohabitation. Consequently, it appears that dating couples are vulnerable to violence at all stages of dating relationships.

The findings of this study suggest that the majority of dating violence begins after some degree of commitment is established between the dating partners, a finding that is substantiated in the literature (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Cate et al., 1982). Laner and Thompson (1982) have suggested that courtship violence is a function of the dating relationship. This implies that victims are in some way responsible for the violence they experience and suggests that the "blaming the victim" bias is also present in dating violence. The finding that nearly one third of the violence began during casual dating suggests another possible explanation. Rather than being a function of the relationship, dating violence may be a function of the individual characteristics and behavior patterns of the assailant that are potentiated in dating relationships. This explanation is not meant to negate the importance of relationship dynamics in the continued occurrence and/or treatment of dating violence, but is
meant to illustrate the fact that responsibility for using violence lays with the assailant.

These findings concerning the beginning of violence in dating relationships have implications for prevention and treatment programs. It is suggested that prevention programs focus on three targets: the public, potential victims, and potential assailants. The public needs to be aware of the problem so that professional services for the victims and the assailants can be developed. Potential victims need to be aware of the possibility of experiencing violence in dating relationships so that they can be prepared to deal with it, by either leaving the relationship or taking steps to assure that the behavior is not repeated. It is common for victims of violence to overlook or excuse the first violent incident and for the couple to pretend that it never happened. These behaviors set the stage for more violence.

Prevention programs directed toward potential assailants need to provide activities that increase interpersonal competencies. Units on communication skills, assertiveness, problem solving skills, conflict resolution, and constructive ways for dealing with anger could be included in high school or college curriculums.

Second, because the majority of dating violence occurs in relationships involving some degree of commitment and not all couples terminate their relationships following a violent incident (Cate et al., 1982; Makepeace, 1981), treatment programs need to include both couple and individual counseling.
Reciprocal Violence. The results of the study indicated that violence was reciprocal in 45% of the dating relationships where violence occurred. It appears that mutual aggression may be one way couples resolve conflicts in dating relationships. More females victims (55.6%) reported having used violence against their partners than did the male victims (31.8%). Bernard and Bernard (1983) have also found this to be the case. It may be that female victims feel more freedom to defend themselves or retaliate in kind when they are assaulted during a disagreement. Males, on the other hand, may be reluctant to return violence because tradition dictates that they "don't hit ladies" or they don't use their strength against the "weaker sex." However, these explanations are speculative because the dynamics of reciprocal violence was not investigated. It is not known how much of the reciprocal violence was mutually combative, self-defensive, retaliatory, or self-initiated. The dynamics of reciprocal violence is an area that warrants further investigation. Another question of importance is whether relationships that involve reciprocal violence are different from relationships where there is just one victim and one assailant.

Characteristics of Violence

Dating violence, for the most part, was characterized by relatively low levels of aggression as evidenced by the type of violent acts experienced and the number and kinds of injuries sustained. Victims of dating violence reported being shoved, slapped, kicked, punched, burned, beaten-up, hurt sexually, choked, and struck with
objects. However, slapping and shoving were the most common forms of violent acts reported. These forms of violence have a relatively low potential for serious injuries. Examination of the data also revealed that few injuries were sustained by the victims in the study. In fact, 67.4% of the victims received no injuries at all. Of those who were injured, the majority of victims received injuries that were minor. Fifteen victims received bruises and welts, four treated their injuries with first aid, and two treated their injuries with medical attention. Based upon the types of violence experienced and the injuries sustained, little evidence was found to support the presence of battering and severe abuse among dating couples.

However, there is some evidence to suggest that the severity of dating violence can and does escalate. Support for this position comes from the fact that some severe forms of violence were reported by the victims in the study. Ten of the 46 victims were beaten-up, 7 of 46 victims were choked, and 8 of 46 victims were struck with an object. A few serious injuries were reported. One victim reported a broken bone, and three of the seven victims who were choked received bruises.

Assailant Characteristics

A $t$-test for independent means indicated that there was a significance difference in the amount of nonassaultive behaviors displayed by the partners of the victims and nonvictims of dating violence, $t = -10.554(149), p < .001$. Chi-square analyses of the items on the Nonassaultive Index revealed significant differences between
the assailant and nonassailant partners on 24 of the 25 nonassaultive characteristics. Assailants exhibited significantly more jealousy, coercive anger, verbal abusiveness, and controlling behaviors than did the nonassailants. In addition, assailants were more likely to have talked about witnessing or being the victim of violence during childhood.

The findings indicated that the assailants in dating violence exhibited a number of behaviors that are characteristic of spouses who batter their partners. This finding suggests that dating violence may be part of a larger pattern of violence that exists among individuals involved in intimate relationships.

Finally, Stacey and Shupe (1983) have suggested that the presence of certain nonassaultive behaviors in relationships can predict the likelihood of physical violence. The presence of these characteristics was measured on the Nonassaultive Index of the Violence Index Schedule. It is possible that the presence of extreme jealousy, coercive anger, verbal abusiveness, and controlling behaviors in dating relationships may be predictors of violent incidents. The presence of these characteristics were confirmed in the present study, but no determination was made as to whether they occurred prior to or after the violent incident. Identification of nonassaultive behaviors that could predict the likelihood of violence in intimate relationships would be very valuable to prevention efforts, and their development warrants further investigation.
Quantitative and Qualitative Differences Between Male and Female Victims of Dating Violence

Analysis of the Violence Index Schedule revealed no significant differences between male and female victims with respect to the incidence of victimization, the amount of nonassaultive characteristics displayed by assailant partners, the amount of violent and other highly intimidating behaviors experienced, and the overall intensity of violence.

Few differences were found between male and female victims for the individual items of the Assaultive Index scale. It should be noted that the small frequencies reported for a number of the items precluded statistical analysis, particularly in the types of violent acts experienced and the kind of injuries received. The majority of the generalizations in the sections that follow are based upon reported frequencies and percentages.

In regard to the violent acts experienced, male and female victims reported nearly equal rates for having been shoved, kicked, and punched. Only one violent act, being slapped, showed significantly different rates of occurrence between male and female victims. Significantly more male victims reported being slapped, \( \chi^2 = 5.291(1), p < .05 \), than did female victims. It may be that females delivered more slaps because face slapping is believed to be a socially permissible way of expressing anger over unwanted sexual advances or particularly insulting remarks. Examples of men being slapped by offended women are commonplace in the media. Likewise, a greater percentage of men reported being hurt sexually. Again, this violence
may be an acceptable behavior on the part of women. A knee to the 
groin is often used in self-defense or to repel unwanted sexual ad-
vances. It may also have been used by women assailants to equalize 
the power differential. In regard to the other violent acts experi-
enced, more female victims (29.6%) reported having been beaten-up 
than did the male victims (10.5%), and more female victims (22.2%) 
than male victims (5.3%) reported being choked. It would appear that 
female victims are more often the target of more severe forms of vio-
 lent acts.

A chi-square analysis indicated that the number of male and 
female victims who were injured during a violent incident was not 
significantly different. However, inspection of the reported frequen-
cies for injuries received, indicated that female victims received 
more injuries than did the male victims, and those injuries were more 
severe. Twelve of 27 female victims and 3 of 19 male victims receiv-
ed injuries as a result of dating violence. Male injuries were lim-
ited to welts and bruises. Female injuries included welts, bruises, 
a broken bone, a burn, a cut, and an abrasion. The meaning of these 
differences is unclear. It is not known if the differences in the 
types of violent acts experienced and the injuries sustained were due 
to size and strength differential between male and females, a func-
tion of the small sample size, or actual differences in the behavior-
al dynamics of the assailants.

The assumption, made in the literature, that males are predomi-
nately the assailants and display more violent behaviors toward their 
partners than do the females was not substantiated by the results of
this study. This conclusion is based upon the fact that there were no significant differences in the reported rate of victimization. Furthermore, there were no significant differences in the overall intensity of violence experienced between male and female victims as measured by the Violence Index Schedule. It appears that male and female victims share more similarities than differences when dating violence is characterized by relatively low levels of aggression. The differences between male and female victims at more severe levels of aggression warrants further investigation.

Conclusions

A major conclusion of this study is that dating violence may occupy the less aggressive end of a violence continuum experienced by couples involved in intimate relationships. This conclusion is based upon the following rationale.

First, the researcher believes that dating violence is a part of an overall pattern of violence among couples involved in intimate relationships. Not only do dating assailants use physical force in their relationships, they also display nonassaultive behavior patterns that are characteristic of those who do batter their partners. Both exhibit significantly more jealousy, verbal abusiveness, controlling behaviors, and coercive anger than do the partners of non-victims. In the case of marital assailants, the presence of these characteristics have been verified in the literature. In the case of dating assailants, the presence of these characteristics was substantiated by a significant difference in the mean scores for the victims
and nonvictims on the Nonassaultive Index of the Violence Index Schedule, \( t = -10.554(149), p < .001 \).

Second, the idea that violence can be represented by a continuum is suggested in the literature. Violence is described as beginning with relatively low levels of aggression (Stacey & Shupe, 1983). The aggression escalates in severity and frequency as the violence is reinforced (Neidig et al., 1985; Walker, 1979). Then, violence takes on instrumental properties or becomes goal directed as it progresses from violent incident to chronic battering (Bern, 1982).

Finally, the idea that dating violence is associated with low levels of aggression is supported by the fact that the majority of violent acts experienced by the victims in the study consisted of shoving and slapping. Shields and Hanneke (1983) and Straus (1979) have categorized these acts as mild acts of aggression on a scale that includes mild, moderate, and severe acts of violence. Additional evidence that dating violence involves low levels of aggression is supported by the fact that less than 33% of the victims experienced injuries during violent incidents. The injuries that were sustained by the victims were relatively minor, and were, for the most part, limited to bruises and welts.

Another major conclusion is that if dating violence can be prevented and/or stopped by intervention and treatment programs, there could be a significant reduction in the number of persons who batter and abuse their partners. For most assailants, dating violence represents the first time they have used violence in an intimate relationship. It is the ideal time for intervention and treatment.
because:

The abuser's behavior is more fluid early in the process, but as he progresses from violent incident to chronic battering syndrome it becomes progressively more difficult to intervene effectively. The abusive behavior becomes defined as part of self, and receives reinforcement from a variety of factors. (Bern, 1982, p. 45)

It is recognized that not all assailants in dating relationships will become batterers, but the potential is there. It is important to stop violent behaviors before they are reinforced and become part of established behavior patterns.

Intervention and treatment of dating violence is critical for another reason. There is support for the hypothesis that violence is learned in the family of origin and is passed on to the family of procreation (Makepeace, 1981) through the modeling and reinforcement of violent behaviors (Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Teske & Parker, 1983; Walker, 1983). Makepeace (1981) has suggested that dating violence may be a link in this unbroken chain of violence that extends from one generation to the next. If dating violence can be prevented and/or stopped, a link in the chain could be broken, and the transmission of violent behaviors from one generation to the next could be reduced.

Recommendations

1. Research should be undertaken to assess the nature of reciprocal dating violence. An investigation should be made to determine if there is a difference in the relationships involving reciprocal violence as opposed to relationships where there is only one victim
and one assailant.

2. Research should be undertaken to identify nonassaultive behaviors that can be used to predict the likelihood of violence in intimate relationships. This study has suggested that the nonassaultive behaviors described on the Nonassaultive Index of the Violence Index Schedule may be able to predict the possibility of dating violence; however, the study did not investigate whether the characteristics were present before or after the violent incident. This is an area that still needs investigation.

3. Research should be undertaken to investigate more fully the differences between male and female victims of dating violence. A larger sample is needed so that statistical tests can be used to determine if significant differences exist for the variables under study. Also, additional comparisons of male and female victims involved in dating relationships that involve high or severe levels of aggression should be made.
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Survey Instrument
Survey Instrument

PLEASE CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER TO EACH QUESTION THAT FOLLOWS.

1. Gender code  
   1 = female  
   2 = male

2. Marital status  
   1 = single, never married  
   2 = married  
   3 = divorced  
   4 = separated  
   5 = widow/widower

3. Ethnic code  
   1 = Hispanic  
   2 = White non-Hispanic  
   3 = Black non-Hispanic  
   4 = Asian or Pacific Islander  
   5 = American Indian  
   6 = other

4. Employment status  
   1 = employed full time  
   2 = employed part time  
   3 = unemployed

5. Military status  
   1 = active duty  
   2 = retired  
   3 = spouse of military personnel  
   4 = civilian

6. Age code  
   1 = 16-20  
   2 = 21-25  
   3 = 26-30  
   4 = 31-35  
   5 = 36-40  
   6 = 41-45  
   7 = 46-50  
   8 = 51-55  
   9 = 56-60  
   10 = 61-65  
   11 = 66-70  
   12 = 71 and over

7. How many people have you dated?  
   1 = 1-3  
   2 = 4-6  
   3 = 7-9  
   4 = 10-12  
   5 = 13-15  
   6 = 16-18  
   7 = 19-21  
   8 = 22-25  
   9 = 26 and over
Have any of your dating partners ever done any of the following acts to you during an argument, conflict or disagreement: (a) thrown an object at you; (b) pushed or shoved you; (c) slapped you; (d) kicked, bit, hit you with their fists; (e) hit or tried to hit you with an object; (f) beat you up; (g) threatened you with a gun, knife or other weapon; (h) injured you with a gun, knife or other weapon?

Circle yes or no on the line that follows, then answer the questions that apply to you.

8.  YES  NO

If you circled YES to question 8, answer questions 9 and 10.

If you circled NO to question 8, answer questions 11 and 12.

9. With how many of your dating partners have any of these acts happened?
Write in the number __________

11. With how many of your dating partners has there been enough conflict where these acts might have occurred?
Write in the number __________

10. Based on your current or the most recent relationship where any of these acts occurred, when did these acts first happen?

1 = casual dating
2 = serious dating
3 = engaged
4 = living together
5 = married

Answer the questions that follow. Base your responses on your current or most recent dating relationship where any of the acts described in question 8 occurred.

TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE AND BEGIN.

Answer the questions that follow. Base your responses on your current or most recent dating relationship. If you are married base your answers on your marital partner.

TURN TO THE NEXT PAGE AND BEGIN.
13. Does/did it seem that your partner wants/wanted you to account for how you spend/spent your time; for example, does/did your partner "keep tabs" on you or want to know where you are/were all of the time?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

14. Does/did it seem that your partner wants/wanted to exercise control over how you spend/spent your time; for example, does/did your partner want to make decisions about how you spend/spent your time or do/did they want you with them even though it's inconvenient for you?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

15. Is/was your partner jealous to the point of accusing you of having affairs, being interested in, or flirting with other people?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

16. Do/did you and your partner quarrel over the amount of time you spend/spent with your friends?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

17. Is/was your partner ever rude to your friends?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

18. Does/did your partner discourage you from starting or maintaining friendships with others?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

19. Does/did your partner criticize the daily things you do/did; for example, your clothes, your appearance, your friends, how you choose to spend your time?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

20. Is/was your partner's possessiveness a problem in your relationship?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

21. Does/did your partner tell you how incompetent, stupid, or dumb you are/were?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

22. Does/did your partner embarrass or humiliate you in front of others by his/her put downs or critical remarks?

frequently  sometimes  rarely  never
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23. Does/did you feel that your partner is/was verbally abusive to you?
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

24. Do/did you ever feel isolated and alone, as if there is/was nobody close to you in whom you can confide?
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

25. Does/did your partner demand an account of how you spend/spent your money?
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

26. Does/did your partner seem like another person when he/she becomes angry, that is, do they seem like two people, a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde?
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

27. Does/did your partner voice strong traditional ideas about what a man should be and do and what a woman should be and do?
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

28. Does/did your partner get angry when you do/did not follow his/her orders or advice?
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

29. Does/did your partner become verbally abusive when he/she drinks/drank?
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

30. Does/did your partner pressure you for sex more often than you would like?
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never
      no sexual involvement

31. Does/did your partner become angry if you don't/didn't want to go along with his/her request(s) for sex?
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never
      no sexual involvement
32. Do/did you and your partner quarrel over financial matters?
   
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

33. When your partner gets/got angry, are/were you afraid he/she may/might hurt you?
   
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

34. Do/did you find that not making your partner angry has become/became a major part of your life?
   
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

35. Does/did your partner threaten to use weapons, guns or knives when he/she is/was angry?
   
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

36. Does/did your partner talk about having witnessed violence between his/her parents?
   
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

37. Does/did your partner talk about having been abused as a child?
   
   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never

For questions 38-59 use the following frequencies for determining your responses:
   Check never if this has never happened with this partner.
   Check one time if this has happened one time with this partner.
   Check 2 or 3 times if this has happened two or three times with this partner.
   Check 4 or more times if this has happened four or more times with this partner.

   frequently  sometimes  rarely  never
   4 or more  2 or 3  one  0
   times      times      time

38. Does/did your partner ever shove _ _ ___ ___ __________
or push you during an argument, disagreement or conflict?
   
   — What injuries occurred? Circle all that apply
   1 none  4 abrasions  7 burns
   2 welts  5 black eye  8 broken bones
   3 bruises  6 cuts  9 other serious injuries
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frequently | sometimes | rarely | never
--- | --- | --- | ---
4 or more times | 2 or 3 times | one time | 0

39. Does/did your partner ever slap you during a conflict? — What injuries occurred? Circle all that apply
1 none 4 abrasions 7 burns
2 welts 5 black eye 8 broken bones
3 bruises 6 cuts 9 other serious injuries

40. Does/did your partner ever kick you during a conflict? — What injuries occurred? Circle all that apply
1 none 4 abrasions 7 burns
2 welts 5 black eye 8 broken bones
3 bruises 6 cuts 9 other serious injuries

41. Does/did your partner ever punch you with closed fist during a conflict? — What injuries occurred? Circle all that apply
1 none 4 abrasions 7 burns
2 welts 5 black eye 8 broken bones
3 bruises 6 cuts 9 other serious injuries

42. Does/did your partner ever burn you during a conflict? — What injuries occurred? Circle all that apply
1 none 4 abrasions 7 burns
2 welts 5 black eye 8 broken bones
3 bruises 6 cuts 9 other serious injuries

43. Does/did your partner ever hurt you sexually or make you have intercourse against your will? — What injuries occurred? Circle all that apply
1 none 4 abrasions 7 burns
2 welts 5 black eye 8 broken bones
3 bruises 6 cuts 9 other serious injuries
44. Does/did your partner ever beat up on you?
   — What injuries occurred? Circle all that apply
   1 none 4 abrasions 7 burns
   2 welts 5 black eye 8 broken bones
   3 bruises 6 cuts 9 other serious injuries

45. Does/did your partner ever choke or try to choke you?
   — What injuries occurred? Circle all that apply
   1 none 4 abrasions 7 burns
   2 welts 5 black eye 8 broken bones
   3 bruises 6 cuts 9 other serious injuries

46. Does/did your partner ever strike you with an object or hurt you with a weapon?
   — What injuries occurred? Circle all that apply
   1 none 4 abrasions 7 burns
   2 welts 5 black eye 8 broken bones
   3 bruises 6 cuts 9 other serious injuries

47. Does/did your partner become physically abusive towards you when he/she drinks/drank?

48. Have you ever had bruises or welts as a result of your partner’s violence?

49. Have you ever had to treat with first aid any injuries from your partner’s violence?

50. Have you ever had to seek professional aid for any injury at a medical clinic, doctor's office or hospital emergency room as a result of your partner's violence?

51. Does/did your partner ever threaten you with an object or weapon?

52. Does/did your partner ever threaten to kill himself/herself?
53. Does/did your partner ever threaten to kill you?

54. Do/did you ever see or hear your partner talk about being violent toward animals?

55. Is/was your partner ever violent or cruel toward children and/or other people?

56. Does/did your partner ever throw objects or break things when he/she is/was angry?

57. Has/had your partner ever been in trouble with the police?

58. Do/did you want to break up with your partner but don't/didn't because you are/were afraid he/she may or might hurt you?

59. Have you ever called, tried to call, or wanted to call the police because you felt you were in danger from your partner?

60. How long have you been dating or did you date the partner described in questions 13 through 59? (write in the length of time, months and years) _____yr/_____mo

61. At what stage is your relationship with the partner you described in questions 13 through 60? (Check the answer that applies)

   _____ 1 no longer dating  _____ 4 engaged  _____ 7 divorced
   _____ 2 casual dating  _____ 5 living together  _____ 10 separated
   _____ 3 serious dating  _____ 6 married
   _____ 8 married, but the violence occurred before the marriage
   _____ 9 divorced, but the violence occurred before the marriage
62. In the relationship you have described in questions 13-61 check any of the following acts you have done to your partner

___ thrown an object at partner
___ pushed or shoved partner
___ lapped partner
___ kicked, bit or hit partner with fists
___ hit or tried to hit with an object
___ beat up partner
___ threatened partner with a gun or knife
___ injured partner with a gun, knife or other weapon
___ none of these

63. Do you know of any friends, relatives or acquaintances who have experienced any of the acts described in question 62 during a dating relationship?

___ yes  ___ no

Thank you for your participation in this research project. Please fold your questionnaire, place it in the envelope and seal it. Your instructor will collect the instrument when every one has finished.
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Letter Mailed to Faculty Prior to Survey
September 26, 1985

Dear Mr. Love,

Thank you for your willingness to participate in my dissertation project. Data will be collected in your classroom on Tuesday, October 1, 1985. The materials, including a duplicate set of directions for administering the questionnaire will be delivered to your classroom around 5:50 on the night of data collection. You will need to read the direction sheet to your students and pass out and collect the questionnaires when your students have finished. I estimate that the process should take approximately twenty-five minutes or less.

I ask that you please limit your comments to the printed directions if at all possible. It is important that the administration of the questionnaire be the same in all of the classes. Please do not encourage any student discussion of the survey either before or after its completion.

Again let me express my appreciation for your willing participation in this project. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call me.

Sincerely,

Nancy Masterson

Nancy Masterson
Appendix C

Instructions for Administering the Survey Instrument
Instructions for administering the survey instrument.

1. Please do not comment or encourage your students to make comments concerning the questionnaire. It is important that discussion be kept to a minimum. Student and/or instructor comments could affect a student's willingness to answer the questions.

2. Read the following instructions to your students.

DIRECTIONS TO BE READ TO THE STUDENTS:

Today you will have the opportunity to participate in a survey that is part of a research project conducted by Nancy Masterson, the counselor at the Del Rio Study Center of Southwest Texas Junior College. I am now going to read the following directions from Mrs. Masterson.

Dear Students,

I would like to invite you to participate in a research project concerning dating relationships. This project is part of my doctoral dissertation, and your participation will be greatly appreciated. Your answers are very important to the outcome of this study. Please be assured that your answers will remain strictly anonymous. Even I will not know how particular students answer the questions. If you choose not to participate in this survey, please place your unanswered questionnaire in your envelope. You may also discontinue your participation at any point.

If you are interested in finding out the results of the survey, a written report will be available after the first of December.

I thank you for your participation in my study.

Sincerely,

Nancy Masterson

3. Distribute the questionnaires.

4. When all students have finished, have students put their sealed envelopes into the data collection envelope. Please collect all questionnaires at one time so that those students who require more time to complete the instrument will not be disturbed by the noise or singled out.
Appendix D

Modified Instructions for Administering the Survey Instrument
Modified instructions for administering the survey instrument.

1. Please do not comment or encourage your students to make comments concerning the questionnaire. It is important that discussion be kept to a minimum. Student and/or instructor comments could affect a student's willingness to answer the questions.

2. Read the following instructions to your students.

DIRECTIONS TO BE READ TO THE STUDENTS:

Tonight you will have the opportunity to participate in a survey for a research project conducted by Nancy Masterson, the counselor at Southwest Texas Junior College. I am now going to read the following directions from Mrs. Masterson.

Dear Students,

I would like to invite you to participate in a research project concerning dating relationships. This project is part of my doctoral dissertation and your participation will be greatly appreciated. Your answers are very important to the outcome of this study. Please be assured that your answers will remain strictly anonymous. Even I will not know how particular students answer the questions. If you choose not to participate in this survey, please place your unanswered questionnaire in your envelope. You may also discontinue your participation at any point.

Some of you may have already completed a survey in another class. If your name appears on the class list where data has already been collected, your instructor will not give you an additional survey. For those of you have already participated, again thank you for your time and cooperation.

If you are interested in finding out the results of the survey, a written report will be available at the center office after the first of December. I will also be happy to discuss the project with anyone at that time.

I thank you for your participation in my study.

Sincerely,

Nancy Masterson
3. Distribute the questionnaires to those individuals listed on the sheet provided with the surveys. Then ask anyone who has not answered the questionnaire in a previous class to raise their hand. Then give them a survey to complete.

4. When all students have finished, have students put their sealed envelopes into the data collection envelope. Please collect all questionnaires at one time so that those students who require more time to complete the instrument will not be disturbed by the noise or singled out.

5. After you have collected the questionnaires, seal the data collection envelope and place it outside your classroom door.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
Appendix E

Letter of Transmittal
Dear Student,

We would like to invite you to participate in a research project that deals with the ways couples settle arguments, disagreements, and conflicts. No matter how well couples get along, there are times when people disagree. They get annoyed about something the other person does, they have fights because they are in a bad mood, or they get angry over any number of other things. Conflict is a normal process among people involved in close relationships. While some couples use discussion or compromise, a number of others use physical means to resolve conflicts. In fact, researchers conservatively estimate that one in five individuals experience at least one incident involving physical force during dating relationships.

The questionnaire that follows asks you to describe some of your dating experiences. Your participation in this survey is very important. Your thoughtful and honest answers will enable the researchers to better understand conflict among dating couples. It is important to understand more about relationships where physical force is used to settle conflicts and those relationships where it is not.

Your answers to these questions will be strictly confidential. The questionnaire is not numbered, and you should not write your name on it. When you are finished, fold the questionnaire, put it in the envelope, and seal it. In this way, once you have sealed the envelope, your responses will remain strictly anonymous. Your instructor will collect your envelope when everyone has finished.

Thank you very much for your help with this study. Your time and cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Nancy Masterson, M.A.
Counselor
Southwest Texas Junior College

Thelma Urbick, Ph.D.
Department of Counseling & Personnel
Western Michigan University

An Equal Educational Opportunity Institution
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Appendix F

Center for Social Research Abuse Index
CENTER FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH ABUSE INDEX
ARE YOU IN AN ABUSIVE SITUATION?

This questionnaire is designed to help you decide if you are living in an abusive situation. There are different forms of abuse, and not every woman experiences all of them. Below are various questions about your relationship with a man. As you can see, each possible answer has points assigned to it. By answering each question and then totaling these points as directed, you can compare your score with our Abuse Index. You will know if you are living in a potentially violent situation, and if you are abused, you will have some estimate of how really dangerous that abuse is.

DIRECTIONS: Circle the response to each question that best describes your relationship.

1. Does he continually monitor your time and make you account for every minute (when you run errands, visit friends, commute to work, etc.)?
   - frequently
   - sometimes
   - rarely
   - never

   3 2 1 0

2. Does he ever accuse you of having affairs with other men or act suspicious that your are?
   - frequently
   - sometimes
   - rarely
   - never

   3 2 1 0

3. Is he ever rude to your friends?
   - frequently
   - sometimes
   - rarely
   - never

   3 2 1 0

4. Does he ever discourage you from starting friendships with other women?
   - frequently
   - sometimes
   - rarely
   - never

   3 2 1 0

5. Do you ever feel isolated and alone, as if there was nobody close to you to confide in?
   - frequently
   - sometimes
   - rarely
   - never

   3 2 1 0
6. Is he overly critical of daily things, such as your cooking, your clothes, or your appearance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Does he demand a strict account of how you spend money?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do his moods change radically, from very calm to very angry, or vice versa?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Is he disturbed by you working or by the thought of your working?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Does he become angry more easily when he drinks?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Does he pressure you for sex much more often than you'd like?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Does he become angry if you don't want to go along with his requests for sex?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Do you quarrel much over financial matters?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Do you quarrel much about having children or raising them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>score</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Does he ever strike you with his hands or feet (slap, punch, kick, etc.)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Does he ever strike you with an object?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Does he ever threaten you with an object or weapon?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Has he ever threatened to kill either himself or you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Does he ever give you visible injuries (such as welts, bruises, cuts, lumps on head)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Have you ever had to treat any injuries from his violence with first aid?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Have you ever had to seek professional aid for any injury at a medical clinic, doctor's office, or hospital emergency room?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Does he ever hurt you sexually or make you have intercourse against your will?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Is he ever violent toward children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>frequently</th>
<th>sometimes</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. Is he ever violent toward other people outside your home and family?

- frequently
- sometimes
- rarely
- never

25. Does he ever throw objects or break things when he is angry?

- frequently
- sometimes
- rarely
- never

26. Has he ever been in trouble with the police?

- frequently
- sometimes
- rarely
- never

27. Have you ever called the police or tried to call them because you felt you or other members of your family were in danger?

- frequently
- sometimes
- rarely
- never

To score your responses simply add up the points directly below each question's circled answer. This sum is your Abuse Index Score. To get some idea of how abusive your relationship is, compare your Index Score with the following chart:

- 120-94 dangerously abusive
- 93-37 seriously abusive
- 36-15 moderately abusive
- 14-0 nonabusive

A woman with a score of 0-14 lives in a nonabusive relationship. The sort of strains she experiences are not unusual in modern homes, and she and the man deal with them nonviolently. A woman with a score in the 15-36 range, however, definitely does live in a home where she has experienced some violence at least once in a while. It may be that this is a relationship where the violence at least once in a while. It may be that this is a relationship where the violence is just beginning, or perhaps for whatever reason it has stopped at this. But, in a new relationship there is good reason to expect it will eventually escalate into more serious forms and may occur more frequently.

Women with scores in the 37-93 range are in a seriously abusive situation that can, under outside pressures, or with the sudden strain of a family emergency, move into the dangerously severe range. In a seriously abusive situation serious injury is quite probable if
it has not already occurred. Much of this abuse is assault, pure and simple, by a violent man. A woman here needs to consider finding counseling, talking the man into counseling if he will accept the idea, or sorting things out after going to a shelter. She should seriously consider getting help, even leaving. Women with scores in the top range of 94-120 need to consider even more seriously the option of leaving the relationship at least temporarily (and possibly soon). The violence will not "take care of itself" or miraculously disappear. Over time the chances are very good that the woman's life will literally be in jeopardy more than once.

Appendix G

BASIC Program for Data Analyses
'The BASIC Program for the data analyses
20 DEFSTR D, E: DEFINT C, I, Q, R, T, Y: DEFDBL B: DIM T(63), T1(9), T2(9), T3(9), T4(9), T5(9), T6(9), T7(9), T8(9), T9(9): P1$ = "###"; P2$ = " "; P3$ = " "
30 CLS: PRINT "SELECT OPTION": PRINT "DO COMPS (1)"; PRINT "CHISQ (2)"; PRINT "QUIT (3)"
40 GOSUB 70: Y = VAL(Y$)
50 ON Y GOTO 1000, 2500, 60
60 CLOSE: END
70 Y$ = INKEY$: IF Y$ = "" THEN 70 ELSE RETURN
80 NVSFN = NVSFN + CA: NVSFN = NVSFN + CN: NVSFN = NVSFN + CT: NVSFN = NVSFN + CT
90 BVSFN = BVSFN + CA: BVSFN = BVSFN + CN: BVSFN = BVSFN + CT: BVSFN = BVSFN + CT
100 GOTO 1550
110 VSFA = VSFA + CA: VSFA = VSFA + CN: VSFA = VSFA + CT: VSFA = VSFA + CT
120 BVSFN = BVSFN + CA: BVSFN = BVSFN + CN: BVSFN = BVSFN + CT: BVSFN = BVSFN + CT
130 GOTO 1550
140 VSFA = VSFA + CA: VSFA = VSFA + CN: VSFA = VSFA + CT: VSFA = VSFA + CT
150 BVSFN = BVSFN + CA: BVSFN = BVSFN + CN: BVSFN = BVSFN + CT: BVSFN = BVSFN + CT
160 GOTO 1550
170 VSFA = VSFA + CA: VSFA = VSFA + CN: VSFA = VSFA + CT: VSFA = VSFA + CT
180 BVSFN = BVSFN + CA: BVSFN = BVSFN + CN: BVSFN = BVSFN + CT: BVSFN = BVSFN + CT
190 GOTO 1550
200 BMX = BX / BNX: BMX = BY / BNY: BT = (BMX - BMY) / SQRT((1 / BNX + 1 / BNY) * ((BX^2 - BX^2 / BNX) + (BY^2 - BY^2 / BNY))) / (BNX + BNY - 2))
210 BT = (INT((BT + 0.0001) * 1000) / 1000)
220 BSDX = SQRT((BX^2 - BX^2 / BNX) / BNX)
230 BSY = SQRT((BY^2 - BY^2 / BNY) / BNY)
240 PRINT BT, BSDX, ABDY, BT, BX BY BMX BMY BNX BNY BX2 BY2
250 RETURN
270 BX = 389: BY = 442: BNX = 10: BNY = 10: BX2 = 15245: BY2 = 19610: RETURN
280 BX = 506: BY = 442: BNX = 10: BNY = 10: BX2 = 26972: BY2 = 19610: RETURN
500 OPEN "D", 1, "INST00/DAT", 154: RETURN
600 FIELD 1, 1 AS D0, 1 AS D1, 1 AS D2, 1 AS D3, 1 AS D4, 1 AS D5, 1 AS D6, 1 AS D7, 1 AS D8, 1 AS D9, 1 AS DA, 1 AS DC, 1 AS DD, 1 AS DE, 1 AS DF, 1 AS DG, 1 AS DH, 1 AS DI, 1 AS DJ
610 FIELD 1, 20 AS EX, 1 AS DK, 1 AS DL, 1 AS DM, 1 AS DN, 1 AS D0, 1 AS DP, 1 AS DQ, 1 AS DR, 1 AS DS, 1 AS DT, 1 AS DU, 1 AS DV, 1 AS DW, 1 AS DX, 1 AS DY, 1 AS DZ, 1 AS E0, 10 AS E1, 10 AS E2, 10 AS E3
620 FIELD 1, 67 AS EY, 10 AS E4, 10 AS E5, 10 AS E6, 10 AS E7, 10 AS E8, 10 AS E9, 10 AS EA, 10 AS EB, 10 AS EC, 10 AS ED, 10 AS EE, 10 AS EF, 10 AS EG, 10 AS EH, 10 AS EI, 10 AS EJ, 10 AS EL, 10 AS EM, 10 AS EN
630 FIELD 1, 143 AS EZ, 10 AS E0, 10 AS EQ, 10 AS ER, 10 AS ES, 10 AS ET, 10 AS EU, 10 AS EV, 10 AS EW, 10 AS EX, 10 AS EY, 10 AS EZ, 10 AS EA, 10 AS EB, 10 AS EC, 10 AS ED, 10 AS EE, 10 AS EF, 10 AS EG, 10 AS EH, 10 AS EI, 10 AS EJ, 10 AS EL, 10 AS EM, 10 AS EN
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1 M

720 T(34)=VAL(DX):T(35)=VAL(DY):T(36)=VAL(DZ):T(37)=VAL(E0):T(38)=
VAL.LEFT$(E1,1)):T(39)=VAL.LEFT$(E2,1)):T(40)=VAL.LEFT$(E3,1)):T(41)=
VAL.LEFT$(E4,1)):T(42)=VAL.LEFT$(E5,1)):T(43)=VAL.LEFT$(E6,1)):T(44)=
VAL.LEFT$(E7,1)):T(45)=VAL.LEFT$(E8,1))

730 FOR I=1 TO 9:T0(I)=VAL(MID$(E1,I+1,1)):NEXT I

740 FOR I=1 TO 9:T1(I)=VAL(MID$(E2,I+1,1)):NEXT I

750 FOR I=1 TO 9:T2(I)=VAL(MID$(E3,I+1,1)):NEXT I

760 FOR I=1 TO 9:T3(I)=VAL(MID$(E4,I+1,1)):NEXT I

770 FOR I=1 TO 9:T4(I)=VAL(MID$(E5,I+1,1)):NEXT I

780 FOR I=1 TO 9:T5(I)=VAL(MID$(E6,I+1,1)):NEXT I

790 FOR I=1 TO 9:T6(I)=VAL(MID$(E7,I+1,1)):NEXT I

800 FOR I=1 TO 9:T7(I)=VAL(MID$(E8,I+1,1)):NEXT I

810 FOR I=1 TO 9:T8(I)=VAL(MID$(E9,I+1,1)):NEXT I

820 T(46)=VAL.LEFT$(E9,1)):T(47)=VAL(EA):T(48)=VAL(EB):T(49)=VAL(EC):
T(50)=VAL(ED):T(51)=VAL(EF):T(52)=VAL(EH):T(53)=VAL(EI):T(54)=VAL(EJ):
T(55)=VAL(EM):T(56)=VAL(EN):T(57)=VAL(E0)

830 FOR I=1 TO 9:T9(I)=VAL(MID$(EP,I,1)):NEXT I:T(63)=VAL(EQ):RETURN

1000 GOSUB 500:GOSUB 600

1010 FOR R=1 TO LOF(1):GET 1,R:GOSUB 700

1020 FOR Q=13 TO 59:IF T(Q)=8 THEN T(Q)=0

1030 NEXT Q

1040 CN=0:CA=0:CT=0

1050 FOR Q=13 TO 37:CN=CN+T(Q):CT=CT+T(Q):NEXT Q

1060 FOR Q=38 TO 59:CA=CA+T(Q):CT=CT+T(Q):NEXT Q

1070 CATOT=CATOT+CM:CATOT=CATOT+CN:CTTOT=CTTOT+CT

1080 R1=R1+1:PRINT R R1

1090 ON T(1) GOTO 1110,1330

1100 GOTO 1350

1110 ON T(2) GOTO 1130,1550,1550,1550,1550

1120 GOTO 1550

1130 ON T(3) GOTO 1150,1180,1210,1240,1270,1300

1140 GOTO 1550

1150 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1170

1160 NVHSF=NVHSF+1:GOTO 80

1170 VHSF=VHSF+1:GOTO 110

1180 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1200

1190 NVWSF=NVWSF+1:GOTO 80

1200 VWSF=VWSF+1:GOTO 110

1210 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1230

1220 NVASF=NVASF+1:GOTO 80

1230 VASF=VASF+1:GOTO 110

1240 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1260

1250 NVBSF=NVBSF+1:GOTO 80

1260 VBSF=VBSF+1:GOTO 110

1270 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1290

1280 NVISF=NVISF+1:GOTO 80

1290 VISF=VISF+1:GOTO 110

1300 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1320

1310 NVOSF=NVOSF+1:GOTO 80

1320 VOSF=VOSF+1:GOTO 110

144
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1330 ON T(2) GOTO 1350,1550,1550,1550,1550
1340 GOTO 1550
1350 ON T(3) GOTO 1370,1400,1430,1460,1490,1520
1360 GOTO 1550
1370 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1390
1380 NVHSM=NVHSM+1;GOTO 140
1390 VHSM=VHSM+1;GOTO 170
1400 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1420
1410 NVWSM=NVWSM+1;GOTO 140
1420 VWSM=VWSM+1;GOTO 170
1430 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1450
1440 NVBSM=NVBSM+1;GOTO 140
1450 VBSM=VBSM+1;GOTO 170
1460 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1480
1470 NVASM=NVASM+1;GOTO 140
1480 VASM=VASM+1;GOTO 170
1490 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1510
1500 NVISM=NVISM+1;GOTO 140
1510 VISM=VISM+1;GOTO 170
1520 IF T(8)<0 THEN 1540
1530 NV0SM=NV0SM+1;GOTO 140
1540 V0SM=V0SM+1;GOTO 170
1550 NEXT R
1560 CLOSE
1570 PRINT
2000 LPRINT "OVERALL":LPRINT "ATOT MEAN NTOT MEAN TTOT MEAN COUNT":LPRINT CATOT/(NVSFOUNT+VSFOUNT+NVSMOUNT+VSMOUNT)" "CNTOT/( NVSFOUNT+VSFOUNT+NVSMOUNT+VSMOUNT)" "CTTOT/(NVSFOUNT+VSFOUNT+
NVSMOUNT+VSMOUNT)
2010 LPRINT NVSFOUNT+VSFOUNT+NVSMOUNT+VSMOUNT:LPRINT "SCORES":LPRINT CATOT CNTOT CTTOT:LPRINT
2020 LPRINT ATOT NTOT TTOT COUNT":LPRINT:
LPRINT"SINGLE FEMALE NV/V MEAN"
2030 LPRINT NVSF/(NVSFOUNT+VSFOUNT) NVSN/(NVSFOUNT+VFSN) NVSF/(NVSFOUNT+VSFOUNT) VSFS RF/(VSFSRF+VFRF+VFSRF)
2040 LPRINT SCORES":LPRINT WSFAS NVFSW NVSNW NVSF:+VSF+VSM:
2050 LPRINT SINGLE MALE NV/V MEAN"
2060 LPRINT NVMS/NVSMOUNT NVSMN/NVSMOUNT NVSM/NVSMOUNT LPRINT "SCORES":LPRINT NVMS NVSMN NVSM:
2070 LPRINT SINGLE MALE NV/V MEAN"
2080 LPRINT "NV/V MEAN"
2090 LPRINT (NVSFAS+NVMSA)/(NVSFOUNT+NVSMOUNT) (NVSNF+NVSMN)/( NVSFOUNT+NVSMOUNT) (NVFSF+NVSMT)/(NVSFOUNT+NVSMOUNT) " "NVSFOUNT
+NVSMOUNT
2100 LPRINT (VFSAS+VMSA)/(VFSMOUNT+VSMOUNT) (VFSN+F+VSMN)/(VFSF+VSMOUNT) (VFSF+VSMOUNT)/(VFSF+VSMOUNT) " "VFSF+VSMOUNT
2110 LPRINT "SCORES":LPRINT NVSFAS+N VSFAS NVSNW NVSNW NVSFAS N
2120 BX=NVSFN+NVSMN:BY=VSNF+VSMN:BNX=NVSFOUNT+NVSMOUNT:BNY=VFSF+VSMOUNT
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VSMOUNT : BX2 = BNVSFN + BNVSMN : BY2 = BVSFN + BVSMN : GOSUB 200 : LPRINT BT " IS THE t VALUE FOR NTOT VICTIMS / NON-VICTIMS AND "
2130 LPRINT BSDX " IS THE SD FOR THE NV AND " BSDY " IS THE SD FOR THE V " :
LPRINT
2140 BX = VSFN : BY = VSMN : BNX = VSMOUNT : BNY = VSMOUNT : BX2 = BVSFN : BY2 = BVSMN :
GOSUB 200 : LPRINT BT " IS THE t VALUE FOR NTOT VICTIMS FEMALE / MALE AND "
2150 LPRINT BSDX " IS THE SD FOR THE FEMALES AND " BSDY " IS THE SD FOR THE MALES :
LPRINT
2160 BX = VSFA : BY = VSMA : BNX = VSMOUNT : BNY = VSMOUNT : BX2 = BVSFMA : BY2 = BVSMMA :
GOSUB 200 : LPRINT BT " IS THE t VALUE FOR ATOT VICTIMS FEMALE / MALE AND "
2170 LPRINT BSDX " IS THE SD FOR THE FEMALES AND " BSDY " IS THE SD FOR THE MALES :
LPRINT
2180 BX = VSFT : BY = VSMT : BNX = VSMOUNT : BNY = VSMOUNT : BX2 = BVSFMT : BY2 = BVSMMT :
GOSUB 200 : LPRINT BT " IS THE t VALUE FOR TTOT VICTIMS FEMALE / MALE AND "
2190 LPRINT BSDX " IS THE SD FOR THE FEMALES AND " BSDY " IS THE SD FOR THE MALES :
LPRINT
2200 CLOSE : END
2500 DEFDBL A-Z : COR = .5
2510 CLS : INPUT " VICTIM / NON-VICTIM / TOTAL /1x2/2x3/GENERAL V / N / T / 1 / 2 / G " ; I$
2520 IF I$ = " V " THEN 3000
2530 IF I$ = " N " THEN 3200
2540 IF I$ = " T " THEN 3400
2550 IF I$ = " 1 " THEN 3600
2560 IF I$ = " 2 " THEN 3800
2570 IF I$ = " Q " THEN CLOSE : END
2600 INPUT " A " ; A
2610 INPUT " B " ; B
2620 INPUT " C " ; C
2630 INPUT " D " ; D
2640 N = A + B + C + D
2650 X = INT ( N * ( A * D - B * C ) - N / 2 ) / ( ( A + B ) * ( C + D ) * ( A + C ) * ( B + D ) ) + .0005
2660 X1 = INT ( A * D - B * C ) - N / 2 ) / ( ( A + B ) * ( C + D ) * ( A + C ) * ( B + D ) )
2670 PRINT " CHI SQUARE = X " X1 = " X1
2680 PRINT A C A + C : PRINT B D B + D : PRINT A + B C + D N
2690 PRINT PRINT ( A / ( A + B ) ) * 100, ( C / ( C + D ) ) * 100 : PRINT ( B / ( A + B ) ) * 100,
( D / ( C + D ) ) * 100
2700 PRINT : INPUT " NEXT " ; I$
2710 IF I$ = " Q " THEN 2510
2720 GOTO 2600
3000 INPUT " A " ; A
3010 B = 27 - A
3020 INPUT " C " ; C
3030 D = 19 - C
3040 N = A + B + C + D
3050 X = INT ( N * ( A * D - B * C ) - N / 2 ) / ( ( A + B ) * ( C + D ) * ( A + C ) * ( B + D ) ) + .0005
* 1000 ) / 1000 )
3060 X1=N*(ABS(A*D-B*C)-N/2)^2/ ((A+B)*(C+D)*(A+C)*(B+D))
3070 PRINT"CHI SQUARE = "X1 = "X1
3080 PRINT A C A+C:B D B+D:PRINT A+B C+D N
3090 PRINT:PRINT A/27,B/19:PRINT C/27,D/19(N
3100 PRINT:INPUT"NEXT";I$
3110 IF I$="Q" THEN 2510
3120 GOTO 3000
3200 INPUT"A";A
3210 B=64-A
3220 INPUT"C";C
3230 D=41-C
3240 N=A+B+C+D
3250 X=(INT((N*(ABS(A*D-B*C)-N/2)^2/ ((A+B)*(C+D)*(A+C)*(B+D))+.0005) *1000)/1000)
3260 X1=N*(ABS(A*D-B*C)-N/2)^2/ ((A+B)*(C+D)*(A+C)*(B+D))
3270 PRINT"CHI SQUARE = "X1 = "X1
3280 PRINT A B A+B:C D C+D:PRINT A+C B+D N
3290 PRINT:INPUT"NEXT";I$
3300 IF I$="Q" THEN 2510
3310 GOTO 3200
3400 INPUT"SFV";E
3410 INPUT"SMV";F
3420 B=46-E-F
3430 A=46-B
3440 INPUT"SFNV";G
3450 INPUT"SMNV";H
3460 D=105-G-H
3470 C=105-D
3480 N=A+B+C+D
3490 X=(INT((N*(ABS(A*D-B*C)-N/2)^2/ ((A+B)*(C+D)*(A+C)*(B+D))+.0005) *1000)/1000)
3500 X1=N*(ABS(A*D-B*C)-N/2)^2/ ((A+B)*(C+D)*(A+C)*(B+D))
3510 PRINT"CHI SQUARE = "X1 = "X1
3520 PRINT A B A+B:C D C+D:PRINT A+C B+D N
3530 PRINT:INPUT"NEXT";I$
3540 IF I$="Q" THEN 2510
3550 GOTO 3400
3600 INPUT"A";A
3610 INPUT"SAMPLE n";B
3620 C=B-A
3630 F=B/2
3640 X=(INT(((ABS(A-F)-COR)^2)/F)+((ABS(C-F)-COR)^2)/F)+.0005) *1000/1000)
3650 X1=((ABS(A-F)-COR)^2)/F)+((ABS(C-F)-COR)^2)/F)
3660 X2=((ABS(F)^2)/F)+((ABS(F)^2)/F)
3670 PRINT"CHI SQUARE = "X1 = "X1
3680 PRINT X2" UNCORRECTED"
3690 PRINT:PRINT A,C
3700 PRINT:PRINT(A/B)*100,(C/B)*100
3710 PRINT:INPUT"NEXT";I$
3720 IF I$="Q" THEN 2510
3730 GOTO 3600
3800 INPUT"A";A:INPUT"B";B:INPUT"C";C
3810 INPUT"D";D:INPUT"E";E:INPUT"F";F
3820 R1=A+B+C:R2=D+E+F:C1=A+D:C2=B+E:C3=C+F:N=A+B+C+D+E+F
3830 P1=C1/N:P2=C2/N:P3=C3/N
3850 X1=((A-F1)^2)/F1+((B-F2)^2)/F2+((C-F3)^2)/F3+((D-F4)^2)/F4+((E-F5)^2)/F5+((F-F6)^2)/F6
3860 X=(INT((X1+.0005)*1000)/1000)
3870 PRINT:PRINT A, B, C, R1:PRINT D, E, F, R2:PRINT C1, C2, C3, N:
 PRINT:PRINT "CHI SQUARE = "X1 = "X1:PRINT
3880 PRINT P1 P2 P3:PRINT:PRINT F1 F2 F3:PRINT F4 F5 F6
3890 PRINT:INPUT"NEXT";I$
3900 IF I$="Q" THEN 2510
3910 GOTO 3800
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