

ABSTRACT

Title: AN EXAMINATION OF A TYPOLOGY OF INTIMATE PARTNER PSYCHOLOGICAL AGGRESSION USING THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL EMOTIONAL ABUSE SCALE (MDEAS).

Alexandra P. Goerl, Master of Science, 2005

Directed By: Assistant Professor Jaslean LaTaillade
Family Studies Department

This study investigated a typology of abuse using the Multi Dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale (MDEAS) in order to determine the utility of using the MDEAS with a diverse, clinical sample. Respondents were 242 couples seeking couples therapy at a university-based clinic. Factor analyses were conducted on both women's and men's reports of partners' psychologically abusive behaviors as indicated on the self-report questionnaire. Analyses yielded four-factor models for both groups, although there were some differences in item retention between the groups. Forced two-factor analyses were also performed, and results indicated that a four-factor model better conceptualized the nature of psychological abuse when using the MDEAS. Finally, associations between types of psychological abuse and relationship factors were examined. All factors of psychological abuse were significantly associated with physical abuse and relationship satisfaction; factors differed in their associations with attachment styles. The clinical implications of the findings and suggestions for future research are provided.

AN EXAMINATION OF A TYPOLOGY OF INTIMATE PARTNER
PSYCHOLOGICAL AGGRESSION USING THE MULT-DIMENSIONAL
EMOTIONAL ABUSE SCALE (MDEAS).

By

Alexandra P. Goerl

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science
2005

Advisory Committee:
Assistant Professor Jaslean LaTaillade, Chair
Professor Norman Epstein
Instructor Carol Werlinich

© Copyright by
Alexandra P. Goerl
2005

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the following people for their contributions to this project:

Thank you to my advisor, Dr. Jaslean LaTaillade, for the time, energy, and effort you devoted to helping advise and guide me through this process.

Thank you to my committee, Dr. Norm Epstein and Dr. Carol Werlinich, for your thoughtful suggestions and guidance.

Thank you to Mrs. Sherry Starr, for listening and providing reassurance when times were tough.

Thank you to my fellow May-theses grads, Sarah and Lindsey, who provided necessary humor, sympathy and companionship through it all. We did it!

Thank you to my friends at the Family Service Center and beyond, for the support, motivation, and comic relief that was essential for the completion of this project.

Thank you to my family, Paget, Hans, Sue, Elizabeth, Kirsten, T.Jay, and Orion, who have encouraged me every step of the way.

Thank you to my fiancé, Matthew, who has provided constant support, optimism, encouragement, inspiration, and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem.....	1
1.2 Purpose.....	1
1.3 Review of the Literature	2
1.3.1 Defining Psychological Abuse.....	3
1.3.2 Models of Psychological Abuse.....	5
1.3.3 Psychological Abuse: A Problem that Deserves Focus	8
1.3.4 Limitations of Past Research	15
1.3.5 Addressing Past Limitations	17
1.3 Hypotheses	18
Chapter 2: Methods.....	21
2.1 Participants.....	21
2.2 Procedures.....	22
2.3 Measures	22
2.3.1 Psychological Abuse.....	22
2.3.2 Physical and Psychological Abuse.....	24
2.3.3 Attachment Style.....	25
2.3.4 Relationship Satisfaction	26
Chapter 3: Results.....	28
3.1 Hypothesis 1: Associations among MDEAS Subscales	28
3.2 Hypothesis 2: A Four-Factor Model of Psychological Abuse	28
3.3 Hypothesis 3: A Forced Two-Factor Model of Psychological Abuse	32
3.4 Hypothesis 4: Psychometric Properties of the MDEAS	33
3.5 Hypothesis 5: Association between Psychological Abuse and Physical Abuse	34
3.6 Hypothesis 6: Association between Psychological Abuse and Attachment Style	36
3.7 Hypothesis 7: Association between Psychological Abuse and Relationship Satisfaction.....	36
Chapter 4: Discussion	37
4.1 A Four-Factor Model of Psychological Abuse	37
4.2 Association between Psychological Abuse and Physical Abuse	39
4.3 Association between Psychological Abuse and Attachment Style	40
4.4 Association between Psychological Abuse and Relationship Satisfaction.....	41
4.5 Clinical Implications	42
4.6 Limitations	45
4.7 Suggestions for Future Research	47

Appendices	
5.1 Appendix A: Tables	48
5.2 Appendix B: Measures.....	69
References.....	76

Chapter 1: Introduction

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Although physical abuse is a commonly studied problem in both clinical and academic literature, psychological abuse does not receive the same level of study and interest for reasons to be discussed in later sections. In literature that does examine psychological abuse, different typologies are used to conceptualize this form of aggression. The lack of consensus in the field leads to research that does not build and expand on past findings, but that rather examines different aspects of psychological abuse. It is difficult to integrate findings and make conclusions because there are inconsistencies regarding the models used to study intimate partner psychological aggression. The current research project aims to address this problem by testing an existing typology of psychological abuse, thereby supplementing previous and future research that employs this typology.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to contribute to psychological abuse research and literature by examining an existing typology of this form of abuse. Factor analysis was conducted on the Multi-Dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale (MDEAS; Murphy & Hoover, 2001), a measurement of psychological abuse, to determine whether the typology was replicated when using a clinical sample that was diverse in its demographic characteristics. More specifically, this research expanded upon previous study by Murphy and Hoover (2001) through examining the psychometric properties of the MDEAS in a larger sample in which the participants were more

diverse in demographic factors such as age, relationship status, length of relationship, and ethnicity. Furthermore, men's reports of experiencing psychological abuse were examined to test whether the typology was accurate for both genders. Finally, this study investigated the relationships between psychological abuse and other relationship factors, namely physical abuse, relationship satisfaction, and attachment styles. The current research project was intended to supplement abuse literature by a) examining the psychometric properties and underlying typology of a measure of psychological abuse created by Murphy and Hoover (2001) and b) building on previous findings regarding the relationships between psychological abuse and other relationship factors by using an existing model.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In recent decades, research has indicated that intimate partner violence (IPV) is a serious public health issue that plagues many relationships and affects partners both physically and emotionally (Margolin, John, & Foo, 1998; O'Leary, Malone, & Tyree, 1994). The National Violence Against Women Survey reported that each year an estimated 1.3 million women experience IPV physical assaults (National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2003). These assaults result in adverse psychological and physical effects for women and their families. IPV is responsible for over 18.5 million mental health care visits per year, and IPV victimizations are cited for causing 1,300 deaths and almost 2 million injuries (National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2003).

National surveys, media, law, and social policy have addressed the topic, resulting in greater public interest and awareness. Yet, the common understanding of

IPV is not complete because researchers often give inadequate attention to the more psychologically abusive behaviors, such as verbal threats, ridicule, name-calling, social isolation, economic isolation, and damage of personal property, that have been shown to occur in the majority of violent couples (Arias, 1999; Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, & Polek, 1990; Loring, 1994; Schumacher, Slep, & Heyman, 2001). Psychological abuse is an important area to examine since this form of abuse has been reported by some victims as having a more severe impact than physical aggression (Follingstad et al., 1990). Such effects include but are not limited to experience of clinical disorders such as depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, and related anxiety disorder (Cascardi, O'Leary, & Schlee, 1999; Follingstad et al., 1990; Katz & Arias, 1999).

Defining Psychological Abuse

Psychological abuse may receive less attention in research and literature due to the difficulties associated with defining, quantifying, conceptualizing, and operationalizing such behavior (Katz & Arias, 1999; Murphy & Cascardi, 1999; Vitanza, Vogel, & Marshall, 1995). First, study of psychological abuse is complicated by the fact that even victims themselves have trouble identifying when psychological abuse has occurred (Loring, 1994). Victims' reports are a necessary element in studying psychological abuse, and their difficulty recognizing it makes research in this area problematic. Next, there is great variation in the terminology used to describe abuse that is not physical in nature. The following terms have been used: nonphysical abuse, indirect abuse, emotional abuse, verbal aggression,

psychological aggression, psychological maltreatment, mental or psychological torture, and, finally, psychological abuse (Loring, 1994; Marshall, 1996; Tolman, 1989). Finally, just as there are a variety of terms utilized to describe psychological abuse, there are several definitions and conceptual models developed to operationalize psychological abuse. The variation in terms, definitions, and models results in confusion and an inability to integrate findings.

As the variation in terminology suggests, there are multiple divergent definitions for psychological abuse used by researchers and clinicians. For example, Loring (1994) defines ‘emotional abuse’ as “an ongoing process in which one individual systematically diminishes and destroys the inner self of another” (p. 1); this definition places emphasis on the repeated pattern of behaviors. Tolman (1992) focuses on the behavior and its effect on the victim; he uses the term ‘psychological maltreatment’ to denote behaviors that are unintentionally or intentionally harmful to the partner’s well-being. Finally, Murphy and O’Leary (1989) explain that ‘psychological aggression’ consists of coercive verbal and nonverbal behaviors, such as insults or door slamming. Each of these definitions describes or focuses on different aspects of what constitutes ‘psychological abuse’, the more commonly used term that will be used for the purposes of the current study.

Even among professionals who use the term psychological abuse, definitions and conceptualizations vary (Follingstad & DeHart, 2000). First, Straus (1979) defines psychological abuse as consisting of verbal and nonverbal behaviors that are intended to hurt the partner. Similar to the conceptualization of psychological maltreatment by Tolman (1989), O’Leary (2001) defines psychological abuse as “acts

of recurring criticism and/or verbal aggression toward a partner, and/or acts of isolation and domination of a partner” (p.23). Marshall (1994) elaborates on the factors of intent and awareness; in her understanding, the common, everyday interactions that cause harmful effects constitute psychological abuse regardless of whether the perpetrator intends for the actions to be harmful or whether the victim is aware of the effects. Finally, Murphy and Cascardi (1999) incorporate behavior, intent, and effect into their definition; they argue that psychological abuse involves coercive or aversive behaviors that a partner directs at the victim’s sense of self in order to bring about emotional harm. For the purposes of this paper, psychological abuse is defined as verbal or nonverbal nonphysical behaviors that control or harm the partner through restricting the victim from leaving, degrade the victim’s sense of self, and/or bring about emotional or psychological harm.

Models of Psychological Abuse

Just as terms and definitions differ among researchers, so do the models used to describe, measure, and understand psychological abuse. Tolman (1989) proposed a two-factor model that separated psychological aggression into a dominance-isolation factor and an emotional-verbal factor. The dominance-isolation factor includes behaviors that isolate the victim from resources, demand subservience, and require observing traditional sex roles, whereas the emotional-verbal factor includes demeaning or attacking verbal behavior and the withholding of emotional resources. This model was proposed after the development of the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI), a 58-item measure of psychological abuse that revealed

these distinct forms (Tolman, 1989). Subsequent research that utilized the PMWI has provided support for this two-factor model of psychological abuse (Brown, O'Leary, & Feldbau, 1997; Hegarty, Sheehan, & Schonfeld, 1999; Katz & Arias, 1999; Sackett & Saunders, 1999; Tolman, 1989; Tolman, 1992).

In contrast, Marshall (1994; 2001) argues that much has been neglected due to the focus on overt acts of psychological abuse and proposes that psychological abuse consists of obvious, overt, and subtle acts. Obvious forms include verbally aggressive acts or statements that are dominating or controlling; when overt abuse occurs, outside observers can identify the potential for harm and the victim can recognize the act and can describe resulting feelings (Marshall, 2001). In contrast, subtle abuse is described as that which can be delivered in loving ways and is difficult for outsiders and victims to identify (Marshall, 2001).

Research has also used cluster analyses to develop ways of understanding the complexities of psychological abuse. Aguilar and Nightingale (1994) found two types of abuse, emotional/controlling and sexual/emotional, when examining the effect of abuse on the victim's self-esteem. Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, and Polek (1990) found six types of psychologically abusive behaviors when studying a sample of physically abused women. These types included: threats of abuse, ridicule, jealousy, threats to change marriage, restriction, and damage to property (Follingstad et al., 1990). In their study, jealousy, ridicule, and restriction were the most commonly reported, and ridicule was commonly rated by female victims as the most negative type of psychological abuse.

Finally, Murphy and Hoover (2001) presented a four-factor model for studying and conceptualizing psychological abuse that was developed after a review of previously proposed models. The four factors are as follows: Dominance/Intimidation, Restrictive Engulfment, Denigration, Hostile Withdrawal. Dominance/Intimidation is the category for behaviors that are intended to create fear or submission through aggression. Restrictive Engulfment includes coercive behaviors that the abuser uses to isolate and restrict their partner, such as showing jealousy and possessiveness or restricting the partner's activities and social groups. Denigration includes actions or verbal attacks that humiliate or degrade in order to negatively impact the partner's self-esteem. Finally, Hostile Withdrawal consists of behaviors, such as withholding emotional contact, that are intended to punish the partner or increase their anxiety or insecurity. In a sample of women in dating relationships, the different types of abuse were associated with various individual and relationship factors. For example, Denigration and Dominance/Intimidation were most strongly associated with physical violence; Hostile Withdrawal was associated with interpersonal problems such as being vindictive and domineering; Restrictive Engulfment was significantly associated with anxious/insecure attachment styles (Murphy & Hoover, 2001). This model is the basis of the Multi-Dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale (MDEAS), the primary measure for psychological abuse used in this study.

The various models described have been created after analyses that have shown different factors of psychological abuse. As such, these models are limited by the conceptual factors that guided the researchers in creating and selecting items

following analysis. Therefore, efforts to determine a typology of psychological abuse have resulted in various factors and ways of understanding psychological abuse reflective of the multiple conceptualizations and item analysis conducted by the researchers.

Psychological Abuse: A Problem that Deserves Focus

Relationship between Psychological and Physical Abuse

Previous research has determined that a positive relationship exists between psychological and physical abuse; specifically, there is high prevalence of psychological abuse among couples identified as physically abusive. Margolin, John, and Foo (1998) reported that 89% of men who were physically aggressive also exhibit emotionally abusive behaviors. Furthermore, in a sample of women who had been involved in physically abusive relationships, 99% reported experiencing psychological abuse (Follingstad et al., 1990). This suggests that psychological abuse is present in virtually all violent relationships. The co-occurrence of physical and psychological abuse is well established, and recent research usually addresses both forms, regardless of which is the main focus.

Psychological Abuse as a Risk Factor or Predictor of Physical Violence

In addition to the co-occurrence of physical and psychological abuse, research indicates that psychological abuse is an important antecedent to physical violence (Arias, 1999; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Murphy & Hoover, 2001; Murphy & O'Leary, 1989; O'Leary, 2001; O'Leary, Malone, & Tyree, 1994). O'Leary, Malone, and Tyree (1994) identified psychological aggression as a precursor to physical

aggression in a longitudinal study of couples that began prior to the couples' marriages and continued at 18 and 30 months post-marriage. Pre-relationship variables, such as personality characteristics and violence in the family of origin, predicted engagement in psychologically abusive behaviors, which in turn, predicted physical aggression (O'Leary et al., 1994). In addition, men who were emotionally abusive, as compared to men who exhibited no emotionally abusive behaviors, were more hostile and held attitudes that condoned marital aggression (Margolin et al., 1998). Therefore, psychological abuse is a key factor in the emergence of physical violence in intimate relationships. The predictive quality of psychological abuse is an important finding for clinicians since it suggests that treatment of psychologically abusive couples may be effective in preventing physical aggression.

Relationship between Different Types of Psychological Abuse and Physical Violence

Research has shown that certain kinds of psychological abuse are associated with different severity levels of physical violence. Tolman (1989) found that behaviors of the dominance-isolation type, such as demanding subservience or restricting access to resources like the car or telephone, were related to moderate and severe levels of physical violence, whereas behaviors classified as emotional-verbal abuse, such as ridiculing and calling the victim degrading names, were associated with distressed, but not necessarily physically abusive, relationships. Murphy, Hartman, Muccino, and Douchis (1995) found a similar pattern in college dating relationships; domination and intimidation behaviors were most highly correlated

with physical violence. Murphy and Hoover (2001) found that forms of psychological abuse were associated with physical violence in varying degrees. Behaviors in the Restrictive Engulfment and Hostile Withdrawal types of psychological abuse were only moderately associated with physical aggression, but Denigration and Dominance/Intimidation types were more highly associated with physical abuse. These findings are similar to that of Tolman (1989) in that the domination-intimidation subtype was most strongly related to physical aggression.

Psychological Abuse Independent of Physical Violence

Clearly there is a strong association between physical and psychological abuse, and in the majority of physically abusive relationships, psychological abuse is also present. However, psychological abuse can and does occur in relationships that are characterized as nonviolent (Arias, 1999). Margolin et al. (1998) studied a volunteer sample of men for which abusiveness was not a criterion for inclusion; of men who were identified as psychologically abusive, only 46% exhibited any physical violence, meaning that the majority (54%) of verbal abusers were not physically abusive. When this is compared to the finding that 89% of physically abusive men use emotional forms of abuse, it suggests that it is more frequent that psychological abuse occurs independently of physical abuse than vice versa. Furthermore, Marshall (1994) calls for psychological abuse to be examined in its own right because research has so commonly reviewed it as it relates to physical abuse. The relationship between psychological and physical abuse is an important one, but it

is also essential to understand that psychological abuse does occur in relationships that lack a physically abusive component.

Researchers who focused on the relationship between physical and psychological forms of abuse further analyzed their data to reveal that psychological abuse also has effects in the absence of any physical violence (Aguilar & Nightingale, 1994; Arias & Pape, 1999; Henning & Klesges, 2003; Sackett & Saunders, 1999). For example, Henning and Klesges (2003) found that psychological abuse was associated with victims' perceived threat and increased desire to end the relationship even in the absence of physical violence. Additionally, Arias and Pape (1999) revealed that after controlling for the effects of physical abuse, the effects of psychological abuse on symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) were significant. Thus, psychological abuse in and of itself is associated with a variety of detrimental individual and interpersonal effects, and therefore, it should be examined both in relation to and independent of physical abuse.

Effects of Psychological Abuse as Compared to Physical Violence

Given the amount of research dedicated to physical abuse as compared to that of psychological abuse, one might assume that physical abuse has the most detrimental effects on the victim. However, research indicates that psychologically abusive behaviors are responsible for psychological effects that are as severe, if not more severe, than those attributed to physical violence (Follingstad et al., 1990; O'Leary, 2001; Marshall, 1994; Walker, 1984). Also, the psychological effects are likely to be more lasting because effects of psychological abuse can continue and

intensify even if the physical abuse that accompanies it comes to an end (Margolin et al., 1998). Marshall (1992) examined the perceived impact of psychologically and physically abusive behaviors by asking a sample of women to rate how much emotional harm each act would cause. The sample rated threats of moderate and serious physical abuse, which is considered a type of psychological abuse, as having comparable negative emotional impacts as the actual carrying out of moderate or serious physically abusive acts. Although the implications of the study are limited because the sample was rating hypothetical situations rather than past experiences, it does reveal that even women who are not in abusive relationships identify that psychological abuse is just as emotionally harmful as physical aggression. In addition, research has shown that the psychological effects of psychological abuse may be more harmful than those of physical abuse. Follingstad et al. (1990) found that 72% of women in the research sample ($n=234$) reported that they experienced a more severe impact from the psychologically abusive acts than from physical violence. Therefore, although the effects of psychological abuse may be more difficult for couples and outsiders to identify and recognize, it is clear that victims experience psychological abuse as having detrimental effects comparable to or exceeding those of physical abuse.

Effects of Psychological Abuse on Mental Health

Psychological abuse also has effects on mental health. Studies have consistently found relationships between psychological abuse and negative mental health outcomes for female victims. Psychological abuse has been associated with

symptoms of traumatic stress (Arias & Pape, 1999; Cascardi et al., 1999; Dutton & Painter, 1993; Kemp, Green, Hovanitz, & Rawlings, 1995; Saunders, 1994; Street & Arias, 2001), lower levels of self-esteem (Aguilar & Nightingale, 1994; Jezl, Molidor, & Wright, 1996; Pipes & LeBov-Keeler, 1997; Sackett & Saunders, 1999), and depressive symptoms (Arias, Lyons, & Street, 1997; Cascardi et al., 1999; Christian-Herman, O'Leary & Avery-Leaf, 2001; Katz & Arias, 1999; Murphy & Cascardi, 1999). However, studies regarding the association between psychological abuse and mental health outcomes have employed different typologies with different subtypes of psychological abuse. For example, Sackett and Saunders (1999) studied the relationship between four kinds of psychological abuse (ridiculing of traits, criticizing behavior, ignoring, and jealous control) and various negative mental health outcomes for women, such as depression, self-esteem, and fear. Ignoring and ridiculing were most strongly associated with these outcomes; ignoring was correlated with depression and low self-esteem and ridiculing of traits was related to depression, low self-esteem, and fear.

Researchers have also used Tolman's (1989) classification of psychological abuse to examine effects of the two types, emotional-verbal and dominance-isolation. Dutton and Painter (1993) reported that male partners' use of dominance-isolation was associated with trauma and low self-esteem in female partners six months after abuse occurred. Similarly, Cascardi et al. (1999) found that the frequency of men's use of dominance-isolation was significantly associated with fear of one's partner and predicted the development of PTSD. Men's use of dominance-isolation has also been related to increases in symptoms of depression among female partners. Katz and

Arias (1999) found that both forms of abuse were related to increases in depressive symptoms among female victims. Yet, women who experienced emotional-verbal abuse showed a short-term emergence of depressive symptoms while those living with dominance-isolation abuse reported more long-term depressive effects.

Effects of Psychological Abuse on Relationship Satisfaction and Commitment

Research has shown that experiencing psychological abuse in an intimate relationship affects the victim's relationship satisfaction and commitment (Aguilar & Nightingale, 1994; Arias, 1999; Arias, Lyons, & Street, 1997; Arias & Pape, 1999; Dutton & Painter, 1993; Henning & Klesges, 2003; Katz, Arias, & Beach, 2000, Murphy & Cascardi, 1999). There are various hypotheses about why victims do not end physically abusive relationships despite decreased satisfaction; the presence of psychological abuse is one such explanation. Murphy and Cascardi (1999) argue that a partner experiencing psychological abuse may experience low self-esteem and increased dependency on the abuser as a result of the abuse. Aguilar and Nightingale (1994) found that controlling/emotional abuse, which includes behaviors that isolate or control the partner's actions, was significantly associated with low self-esteem; the authors suggest that the abuse may lead to powerless or hopeless feelings, which may contribute to the difficulty in ending the relationship. Therefore, victims of psychological abuse may not feel able to terminate the relationship since separating from an abusive partner requires an ego strength that psychological abuse serves to decrease.

Further research connects psychological abuse and the development of PTSD to relationship commitment. Arias and Pape (1999) found that PTSD, an effect of

psychological abuse, interfered with intentions to leave the relationship. There was an association between psychological abuse and intent to terminate the relationship in women with low levels of PTSD symptoms; however, for women with greater PTSD symptoms, no significant association was found. Thus, one of the effects of psychological abuse, PTSD, can have an effect on the victims' desire and ability to end the abusive relationship.

In contrast, psychological abuse may also precipitate terminating an abusive relationship. For example, Arias (1999) found that psychological abuse was a significant predictor of intent to terminate the relationship, with higher amounts of psychological abuse being associated with higher determination to leave the partner. In addition, Henning and Klesges (2003) reported an association between psychological abuse that is dominating or isolating in nature and increased dissatisfaction and desire to end the relationship. These findings do appear to contradict the research above. However, this difference may be attributed to the different models and measures of psychological abuse that were used in the studies cited, as well as differences in whether research examines the intent or desire to leave versus the actual termination of the relationship.

Limitations of Past Research

Past research has provided valuable information regarding psychological abuse, yet there are several limitations. One such limitation is that there are inconsistencies in defining psychological abuse. This leads to research that measures different kinds or types of psychological abuse, and the findings cannot be easily

integrated. As a result, there is much useful information regarding a variety of aspects of psychological abuse that unfortunately cannot be consolidated to build on past or recent findings.

Another limitation is that in a substantial number of studies, the samples primarily consist of individuals or couples in treatment for abuse or anger management issues. Those who are considered in the majority of studies are those whose physical violence has escalated to a level that merited intervention. Thus, results are limited in their ability to generalize to individuals who are in relationships that are not yet considered physically abusive, but are conflictual and at risk for becoming abusive. Since there are relationships that are primarily psychologically abusive in nature, it is important to examine a sample that is varied in its level of conflict and abuse.

In addition, several studies relied on samples that were homogeneous in nature. For example, partners in dating relationships, physically abused women living in shelters, and female college students have served as samples (e.g., Murphy & Hoover, 2001; Straight, Harper, & Arias, 2003; Street & Arias, 2001). Findings from such samples are limited in their ability to generalize to persons in committed relationships (i.e., marriage) that may be at particular risk for the detrimental effects of psychological abuse. Furthermore, research has focused on female partners' reports of male partners' psychological abuse. Empirical information is lacking in regard to women's use of psychological aggression against their male partners.

Addressing Past Limitations

The current research addresses these limitations in a variety of ways. First, limitations in defining and explaining the nature of psychological abuse are addressed in this study because it examines an existing four-factor typology developed by Murphy and Hoover (2001). While much research on the effects of psychological abuse has used Tolman's (1989) model using the MMPI, there is little research using Murphy and Hoover's (2001) model because the MDEAS is a relatively new measure. This research aims to provide evidence that supports or suggests modifications to this model by using it as the primary measure for analysis.

In addition, the sample used in this study consisted of self-referred couples who were seeking couple therapy. The participants were neither identified as nor recruited because of their levels of violence. Some couples did indicate aggression as a presenting problem, yet many others did not indicate it as a specific concern in the relationship. Couples were seeking help for a variety of issues, meaning that some wanted counseling for anger management or abuse, while others were not physically abusive and were seeking help for different issues, such as poor communication or infidelity. Therefore, a range of physical and psychological abuse was present in the study's couples.

The participants in the present study were also diverse in terms of age, race, socioeconomic status, marital status, and length of relationship, thus allowing findings to be applied to a variety of different individuals and couples. Additionally, while the literature on psychological abuse commonly reports women's accounts of

men's abuse, this research also examined women's use of psychological abuse, as reported by their male partner.

HYPOTHESES

Hypothesis 1: Positive Associations among MDEAS Subscales

The goal of the present study was to test an existing model of psychological abuse by replicating or contradicting results of previous research using the same measure, the Multi-Dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale (MDEAS), with a different, more diverse sample. It was hypothesized that the subscales of the MDEAS would be positively associated with each other.

Hypothesis 2: A Four-Factor Model of Psychological Abuse

It was hypothesized that factor analysis of female partners' reports of male partners' psychological abuse on the MDEAS would reveal factors similar to those in the four-factor model proposed by Murphy and Hoover (2001). An additional goal of this research was also to explore the nature of male partners' experience of psychological abuse. Male partners' experience of psychological abuse was examined on an exploratory basis.

Hypothesis 3: A Forced Two-Factor Model of Psychological Abuse

A third hypothesis of this research was that a factor structure similar to that developed by Tolman (1989) would result when two factors were forced in factor analysis. Tolman's emotional-verbal factor is similar to Murphy and Hoover's (2001)

Denigration and Hostile Withdrawal factors and, thus, it was hypothesized that when forcing a two-factor model, one of the two factors would consist of items classified as Denigration and Hostile Withdrawal. Similarly, we expected the other factor to consist of items that were classified as Restrictive Engulfment and Dominance/Intimidation in Murphy and Hoover's (2001) typology, as these items conceptually fall into Tolman's (1989) dominance-isolation factor.

Hypothesis 4: Psychometric Properties of the Multi-Dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale

The fourth hypothesis was that the Multi-Dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale would show reliability in a more diverse sample. We expected that the MDEAS would have greater reliability for the women's group than for the men's group because this scale was developed and tested using a female sample. Convergent validity was also hypothesized and tested using correlations of the MDEAS subscales and the psychological abuse subscale on the Conflict Tactics Scale.

Hypothesis 5: Association between Psychological Abuse and Physical Abuse

Significant associations between forms of psychological abuse and physical abuse were expected. Specifically, significant positive associations were expected between physical abuse and the Denigration and Dominance/Intimidation subscales in the women's group. For the men's group, associations between psychological and physical abuse were examined on an exploratory basis.

Hypothesis 6: Association between Psychological Abuse and Attachment Styles

It was hypothesized that types of psychological abuse would be differentially associated with partner attachment styles. First, victims' reports of receiving the Restrictive Engulfment type of psychological abuse was expected to be significantly positively associated with partners' self-report of all types of anxious/insecure attachment styles, which would replicate findings by Murphy and Hoover (2001). The anxious/insecure attachment styles were classified as dismissing, preoccupied, and fearful. The dismissing style is characterized by an aversion to dependency and lack of interest in intimacy; the fearful style is characterized by fear of intimacy and difficulty establishing close relationships; the preoccupied style is characterized by a desire to be emotionally close and difficulty in doing so (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). Also, negative correlations were expected between a partner's secure attachment style and all psychological abuse subscales. The secure attachment style is characterized by comfort with both intimacy and autonomy. It was expected that individuals' reports of comfort with close relationships and ability to be autonomous would not be associated with victims' reports of all types of psychological abuse.

Hypothesis 7: Association between Psychological Abuse and Relationship

Satisfaction

It was also hypothesized that all four forms of psychological abuse would be related to low relationship satisfaction for both women and men. A significant negative correlation was expected between partners' MDEAS reports of partner abuse and Dyadic Adjustment Scale scores.

Chapter 2: Methods

PARTICIPANTS

The sample consisted of 242 heterosexual couples who sought therapy at the Family Service Center (FSC) at the University of Maryland from November, 2000 to February, 2005. The FSC is an outpatient clinic that serves individuals, couples, and families in the communities surrounding the University. Clients served at the FSC are referred to the clinic by many sources, including but not limited to schools, the court system, youth and family services agencies, and past or current FSC clients. Although participants were couples, the sample was split according to gender and analyzed separately. The average age of women ($n=242$) included in this study was 31.91 and the average age of male partners ($n=242$) was 33.50. Fifty-four percent of the couples were married and living together, 10% were married and separated, 17% were not married and living together, and 19% were not married and not living together. The average length of the relationships was 6.89 years. The following percentages reflect the racial diversity of women in our sample: 43% African American, 42% Caucasian, 6% Hispanic, 5% Other, 1% Asian/Pacific Islander. The following percentages reflect the racial classifications of men in our sample: 44% African American, 38% Caucasian, 9% Hispanic, 6% Other, 3% Asian/Pacific Islander (see Table 1).

PROCEDURES

All couples who sought therapy at the FSC between November, 2000 and February, 2005 were included in this study, which used data from their initial clinical assessment session. Couples typically called the FSC to request therapy services. They completed a brief phone interview with a staff therapist during which the therapist gathered information about the caller, the presenting problems, family members identified as associated with the problems, current use of substances, and current level of physical violence. If one or both partners had an untreated substance abuse problem or if the couple was ordered by the court system to receive therapy, the couple was not included in this study. This telephone information was recorded on an intake form, which was provided to staff therapists. Therapists then selected cases in co-therapy teams based on their availability.

During the first appointment at the FSC, couples participated in an assessment session during which both partners completed a set of self-report questionnaires and were interviewed individually by the therapist. All of the measures for this study were included and completed in this standard assessment session. The data used in this study was not collected for the purposes of this research. This study is a secondary analysis of pre-existing data collected at the FSC.

MEASURES

Psychological Abuse

Psychological abuse in the relationship was measured using the Multi-dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale (MDEAS; Murphy, Hoover, & Taft, 1999). The

MDEAS is a 28-item measure with four subscales: Hostile Withdrawal (e.g. “Sulked or refused to talk about an issue”), Dominance/Intimidation (e.g. “Threatened to throw something at the other person”), Denigration (e.g. “Called the other person worthless”), and Restrictive Engulfment (e.g. “Asked the other person where s/he had been or who s/he had been with in a suspicious manner”). Each subscale consisted of seven items. Restrictive Engulfment consisted of items 1-7; Denigration consisted of items 8-14; Hostile Withdrawal consisted of items 15-21; Dominance/Intimidation consisted of items 22-28 (See Appendix B).

This measure was created following analyses of a variety of items that assessed for different destructive relationship behaviors. First, factor analysis of 34-item set was conducted on a sample of female college students in dating relationships. Some items were discarded and others were added, resulting in a 54-item measure with four subscales that were created on a rational, a priori basis. The measure was then given to a different sample of female college students in dating relationships. Factor analysis was conducted on the 54-item set. Items were eliminated if they did not meet retention criteria, and analysis revealed the predicted four factor model. The 28 items that were retained from this analysis are those that appear on the MDEAS and the four subscales of the MDEAS measure the four factors in the authors’ model of psychological abuse (Murphy & Hoover, 2001).

Participants rated each item for how often they have used the behavior and how often their partner has used the behavior within the past four months on a scale from 0 (never) to 6 (more than 20 times). In the current study, only participants’ reports of their partners’ behavior was used in both the male and female groups. Each

subscale was scored; a minimum subscale score is 0 and a maximum score is 42. A total score was determined through the sum of the numerical ratings assigned to each point along the scale; total scores range from 0 to 168. Lower scores indicated lower levels of psychologically abusive behaviors in the relationship.

Physical and Psychological Abuse

The Conflict Tactics Scale-Revised (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) is a 39-item self-report measure used to assess the level of psychological and physical abuse as well as the use of negotiation during conflict between intimate partners (See Appendix B). The CTS2 is a revised version of the CTS; revisions and additions were made in order to enhance content validity and reliability, improve clarity of questions and format, and increase the measurement's ability to assess both severity of violence and additional factors. The CTS2 consists of five subscales: physical assault (e.g. "Kicked, bit, or punched partner"), psychological aggression (e.g. "Insulted or swore at partner"), negotiation (e.g. "Said could work out a problem"), injury (e.g. "Partner went to doctor for injury"), and sexual coercion (e.g. "Used force to make partner have sex"). The physical assault subscale (items 7, 10, 18, 22, 28, 34, 38, 44, 46, 54, 62, and 74) and the psychological aggression subscale (items 6, 26, 30, 36, 50, 66, 68, and 70) were used for the present study. All items were rated on a 7-point scale that ranges from 0 (Not in the past four months, but it did happen before) to 6 (More than 20 times in the past four months); there was also an additional response to indicate that the item listed has never happened. Total scores can range from 0 to 234; scores for the physical abuse

and psychological abuse subscales can from 0 to 72 and 0 to 48, respectively. The CTS2 subscales show good internal consistency; the internal consistency reliability of the psychological aggression subscale is .79 and the internal consistency reliability of the physical assault subscale is .86. Straus et al. (1996) reported evidence of discriminant validity and construct validity. The authors found that the CTS2 subscales were not correlated with irrelevant variables and that the CTS2 was significantly correlated with other variables with which it was theoretically expected to be associated (Straus et al., 1996).

Attachment Style

The Relationship Questionnaire (RQ, Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Hazan & Shaver, 1987) is a four-item self-report measurement of adult attachment style. This scale was first developed by Hazan and Shaver (1987) to measure adult attachment based on Ainsworth's (1982) three patterns of childhood attachment, secure, avoidant, and anxious. Bartholomew (1990) reviewed attachment research and argued that there were two distinct forms of avoidant attachment, fearful and dismissing; fearful avoidance was characterized by a fear of rejection and dismissing was characterized by maintenance of self-sufficiency at the expense of close relationships. The RQ contains four paragraphs, each of which describes one of the four attachment styles: secure (e.g. "It is relatively easy for me to be emotionally close to others"), preoccupied (e.g. "I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like"), dismissing (e.g. "It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient,

and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me”), and fearful (e.g. “I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them”). Participants rated each description on a scale from 0 (not at all like me) to 7 (very much like me). The four-category model of attachment used by this measure has shown criterion validity in that each of the four categories was differentially associated with other variables, such as interpersonal problems. The model also shows construct validity through its association with a semi-structured interview using the same four-category model of attachment (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Relationship Satisfaction

The Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976) is a 32-item self-report scale with four subscales: Dyadic Cohesion, Dyadic Satisfaction, Dyadic Consensus, and Affectional Expression. It was administered to examine a variety of issues relevant to relationship satisfaction and to measure the amount of agreement or disagreement between partners. The DAS has demonstrated construct validity through its significant positive association with another marital adjustment scale; it has also demonstrated criterion validity because married and divorced samples differed significantly in their mean scores. The DAS is also a reliable measure of relationship satisfaction, as evidenced by its total scale coefficient alpha of .96 (Spanier, 1976). While the subscales can be used separately, the total scale score was used in the current study as an overall measure of relationship adjustment. Scores can

range from 0-151; lower total scores represent lower relationship adjustment. A total score below 100 reflects clinically significant discord.

Chapter 3: Results

HYPOTHESIS 1: ASSOCIATIONS AMONG MDEAS SUBSCALES

All of the items of the MDEAS assess a single construct, psychological abuse, and as such, it was expected that the four subscales would be significantly associated. Analyses did support this hypothesis in both the men's and women's groups; all of the subscales of the MDEAS were significantly positively associated with each other in both groups ($p < .001$; see Table 2).

HYPOTHESIS 2: A FOUR-FACTOR MODEL OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine the factor structure of participants' responses to the MDEAS. Exploratory factor analysis is used when the intent of research is to summarize data by grouping variables according to their degree of correlation (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). Since past research of intimate partner violence appears to have used analytic methods that were not best suited for the purposes of the research, an analytic strategy was carefully determined in order to best fit the sample and goals of the current study (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999; MacCallum, 1998). Analyses that follow the common factor model estimate the pattern of correlations among the variables and acknowledge the likelihood of random error, which is usually involved in psychological research (Fabrigar et al., 1999). Of the common factor models, principal axis factoring is most appropriate for the purposes of this study because it accounts for correlations among the variables and allows for the specification of hypotheses about the data (Fabrigar et

al., 1999; Borjesson, Aarons, & Dunn, 2003). The promax oblique method of rotation was chosen because, in contrast to orthogonal methods, it permits variables to be correlated; this provides a more accurate depiction of how constructs are related (Tabachnik & Fidell, 1996). Thus, after considering the purposes of this research and the nature of the data, principal axis factoring with promax oblique rotation was used.

Women's reports of men's use of psychological abuse were analyzed separately from men's reports of women's psychological abuse. Only reports of the partner's abusive behaviors were used because reports of abuse by the self may be more biased and have less variance (Murphy & Hoover, 2001).

First, the scree plots were visually examined. Women's reports suggested a four or five factor model and men's reports suggested a four factor model. Next, the Kaiser criterion, or computing the eigenvalues to determine how many are greater than 1.000, was used to determine the number of factors (Fabrigar et al., 1999). Both male and female sets indicated five factors with eigenvalues greater than 1.000, accounting for 65% of the variance in the women's group and 64% of the variance in the men's group.

However, both of the abovementioned methods of determining an appropriate number of factors have been criticized. The examination of scree plots is highly subjective. The use of a mechanical rule like the Kaiser criterion can be arbitrary because it shows a factor with a 1.01 eigenvalue as a 'major factor' while a factor with a 0.99 value is not (Fabrigar et al., 1999). To address these concerns, item loadings on the pattern matrix were examined.

In both the women's and men's group, item loadings on the five factors were examined. Those items that did not meet the following predetermined criteria were eliminated. An item must have loaded at least .4 on a primary factor, but no more than .3 on any other factor in order to be retained. After applying these criteria, items 15 and 16 were eliminated from the women's group and items 1, 2, and 11 were eliminated from the men's group. Table 21 lists the means and standard deviations of participants' responses to these items.

After excluding items that did not meet the specified criteria, there were no longer items loading greater than .4 on the fifth factor in the women's group. In the men's group, the deletion of items resulted in only one item, item 27, loading greater than .4 on the fifth factor and not greater than .3 on all other factors. Upon further investigation, 92% of men reported that the behavior described in this item, a partner driving recklessly to frighten the other, had never occurred within the past 4 months (See Table 21). Therefore, this item likely did not account for any correlations among measured variables and is classified as a unique factor (Fabrigar et al., 1999). As such, this item was eliminated from further analysis in the male sample, and only four factors remained.

The items that did not meet the criteria were eliminated, which resulted in some subscales being revised for further analyses regarding associations of types of psychological abuse and other variables. In the women's group, Hostile Withdrawal factor was the only factor that was changed following factor analysis; this factor without the two eliminated items was termed Hostile Withdrawal, Revised. In the men's group, three subscales were modified due to the elimination of items; these

scales were termed Restrictive Engulfment, Revised, Denigration, Revised, and Dominance/Intimidation, Revised. All future analyses in this study that involve the factors of psychological abuse used the revised subscales.

The factor loadings for items on the MDEAS in the women's group are presented in Tables 3-6. Factor loadings in the men's group are presented in Tables 7-10. After the elimination of items, all remaining items had their highest loadings on the predicted factor in both groups. All items loaded on factors that directly corresponded to the factors originally proposed by Murphy and Hoover (2001) for both groups.

It is notable that in both women's and men's groups, those items originally classified into the Hostile Withdrawal category accounted for a large percentage of the variance (37% for women; 35% for men). The percentage of variance accounted for by each factor is presented in Table 15 for the women's group and Table 16 for the men's group. The total of the four factors accounted for 61% of the variance in the women's group and 59% of the variance in the men's group. Eigenvalues also differed among the factors and the gendered groups. The Hostile Withdrawal factor had the highest eigenvalue in both groups (10.45 for women; 9.90 for men). The eigenvalues for each factor are presented in Table 15 for women and Table 16 for men.

HYPOTHESIS 3: A FORCED TWO-FACTOR MODEL OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE

An exploratory factor analysis was repeated for the original MDEAS to examine the factor loadings of items when two factors were forced by the analysis. For the both groups, it was hypothesized that items would divide equally into factors, one that would consist of items in the original MDEAS Denigration and Hostile Withdrawal subscales and another that would consist of items in the original MDEAS Restrictive Engulfment and Dominance/Intimidation factor. In both women's and men's groups, this hypothesis was not supported. With few exceptions, items from the original Hostile Withdrawal subscale formed one factor while items from the other subscales loaded into the other factor. Factor loadings for the women's group are presented in Table 17 and Table 18; factor loadings for the men's group are presented in Table 19 and Table 20. For women, the first factor had an eigenvalue of 10.45 and accounted for 37% of the variance; the second factor had an eigenvalue of 2.64 and accounted for 9% of the variance. For men, the first factor had an eigenvalue of 9.9 and accounted for 35% of the variance; the second factor had an eigenvalue of 2.76 and accounted for 10% of the variance.

The two factors can be understood conceptually in that the first factor, those behaviors that were characterized as Hostile Withdrawal, are behaviors a partner uses to get away, withdraw, or avoid contact and interaction with their partner. The behaviors described in the second factor, which consisted of items originally classified into the Restrictive Engulfment, Denigration, and Dominance/Intimidation subscales, are all actions directed toward their partner. Therefore, the two factors do

describe different types of behaviors, and the distinction between them concerns how the psychologically abusive behaviors are directed toward the victim.

The results suggest that a two-factor model does not assess psychological abuse as accurately when using the MDEAS measurement. While items did not load into two factors as hypothesized, it was expected that a four-factor model would better fit the items because we employed a measure from which a four-factor model was devised by the original scale developers and because we did not test the measure developed by Tolman (1989) that revealed a two-factor model. The two-factor models accounted for less variance in both the women's and men's groups than did the four-factor model. Also, the two-factor model was not as clinically useful because it does not provide as much information regarding the types of problematic behaviors that are in need of intervention. While the two-factor model can be an accurate model for assessing psychological abuse, it is not the best model according to the results.

HYPOTHESIS 4: PSYCHOMETRIC PROPERTIES OF THE MDEAS

The reliability and validity of the revised version of the MDEAS were examined. First, analysis of the subscales showed notable differences in the means of the psychological abuse subscales between women and men. For the Hostile Withdrawal category, men's reports of experiencing this type of abuse from their partners were significantly higher than women's ($p < .01$; see Table 11). Women reported experiencing significantly higher amounts of behaviors classified into the Dominance/Intimidation type than did men ($p < .01$; see Table 11).

Subscale reliabilities were examined. The internal consistency coefficients were high among the women (Restrictive Engulfment, $\alpha = .88$; Denigration, $\alpha = .86$; Hostile Withdrawal, Revised, $\alpha = .90$; Dominance/Intimidation, $\alpha = .88$) and among the men (Restrictive Engulfment, Revised, $\alpha = .85$; Denigration, Revised, $\alpha = .83$; Hostile Withdrawal, $\alpha = .90$; Dominance/Intimidation, Revised, $\alpha = .90$). Also, retained items on the MDEAS demonstrated inter-item reliability in both the women's group ($\alpha = .93$) and the men's group ($\alpha = .92$).

Additionally, analyses revealed significant positive associations between the MDEAS subscales and the psychological abuse subscale of the CTS-2. In both women's and men's groups, all MDEAS subscales were positively associated with the CTS2 psychological abuse subscale ($p < .001$; see Table 12 and Table 13). Therefore, the revised version of the MDEAS maintained convergent validity.

HYPOTHESIS 5: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE AND PHYSICAL ABUSE

Analyses were conducted to examine the association between types of psychological abuse and physical violence. Results supported the hypotheses. In the women's group, reports of partner's physical abuse on the Conflict Tactics Scale were significantly positively associated with the Denigration ($r(240) = .44$, $p > .001$) and Dominance/Intimidation ($r(240) = .65$, $p > .001$) subscales. In addition, physical abuse was significantly positively associated with the Restrictive Engulfment subscale ($r(240) = .28$, $p > .001$) and the Hostile Withdrawal, Revised subscale

($r(236)=.23$, $p > .001$; see Table 12). For men, the original Hostile Withdrawal subscale ($r(239)=.30$, $p > .001$) and the Restrictive Engulfment, Revised ($r(223)=.30$, $p > .001$), Denigration, Revised ($r(233)=.33$, $p > .001$), and Domination/Intimidation, Revised ($r(235)=.70$, $p > .001$) subscales were significantly associated with physical abuse (see Table 13).

The significance between the correlations was tested to determine if the correlations between types of psychological abuse and physical abuse differed significantly in magnitude. For women, the correlation of physical aggression with Dominance/Intimidation was significantly higher ($p < .01$) than the correlations with the other types of psychological abuse. In addition, the association between physical abuse and Denigration was significantly higher ($p < .05$) than the associations between physical abuse and Restrictive Engulfment and Hostile Withdrawal. For men, there were also significant differences in the magnitude of correlations with physical abuse. The correlation of physical abuse with Dominance/Intimidation was significantly higher ($p < .01$) than the correlation with Denigration, Restrictive Engulfment, and Hostile Withdrawal. In summary, Dominance/Intimidation and Denigration had stronger associations with physical abuse than the other types of psychological abuse for women; for men, the association between physical abuse and Dominance/Intimidation was stronger than the associations between physical abuse and all other types of psychological abuse.

HYPOTHESIS 6: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE AND ATTACHMENT STYLE

Results provided little support for the hypotheses regarding psychological abuse and attachment style. Women reported that the preoccupied style described them significantly more than the men did (See Table 14). Relationships between attachment styles and psychological abuse type were varied. For women, only the Denigration type was significantly negatively associated with partners' secure attachment style ($r(233) = -.14, p < .05$). The only other significant relationship for women occurred between the Hostile Withdrawal type of psychological abuse and partner dismissing attachment style ($r(227) = .16, p < .05$). In the men's group, results showed no significant relationships between psychological abuse and partner attachment style. For both groups, our hypothesis regarding the Restrictive Engulfment type was not supported; there were no significant relationships between this type of abuse and anxious/insecure attachment (see Table 11 and Table 12).

HYPOTHESIS 7: ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE AND RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION

Analyses revealed negative associations between psychological abuse and relationship satisfaction as reported on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale for both women and men. In both groups, all subscales of the MDEAS were significantly associated ($p < .001$) with scores on the DAS (see Table 12 and Table 13). Relationship satisfaction differed significantly between the gender groups; women were significantly less satisfied in their relationships than men (see Table 14).

Chapter 4: Discussion

The main goal of this study was to replicate an existing typology of psychological abuse in a clinical sample using the Multi-Dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale, the measurement on which the typology is based (Murphy & Hoover, 2001). In addition, the relationships between types of psychological abuse and physical violence, attachment style, and relationship satisfaction were examined. Analyses supported the hypothesized four-factor model, and findings supported the use of this measurement and its accompanying typology in both assessing and conceptualizing psychological abuse.

A FOUR-FACTOR MODEL OF PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE

Factor analysis of both women's and men's responses yielded four factors that were consistent with those produced by previous research using the MDEAS (Murphy & Hoover, 2001). This supports the notion of psychological abuse as a multi-factorial construct. These four factors were conceptually similar to the original subscales and so the original descriptions and terminology were supported.

When forcing a two-factor solution, items did not load as predicted. Although the items did not fall into two factors that were conceptually different in terms of dominating-isolating and emotional-verbal qualities, the two factors did have conceptually useful differences. One factor consisted of behaviors that were acted out on the partner, such as insulting, threatening, or asking suspiciously about where the partner had been. The other factor consisted of behaviors that involved acting away from the partner or withdrawing, such as sulking or refusing to talk about an

issue. The two factors that emerged for both groups are useful when trying to understand or measure the different ways that psychological abuse can be delivered.

When using unforced factor analysis, the items did load as predicted into a four factor model; however, there were some notable findings that were not consistent with the originally typology. First, there were two items that did not load significantly onto any of the four factors in the women's sample, item 15 (My partner became so angry that he was unwilling to talk) and item 16 (My partner acted cold or distant when angry). These items were originally classified into the Hostile Withdrawal category, as these were argued to be behaviors that deny the partner one's emotional resources. However, the behaviors described in items 15 and 16 appeared to be less characteristic of psychological abuse per se, and rather indicative of problematic communication behaviors characteristic of distressed couples. In a sample consisting of self-referred couples seeking therapy, it is likely that these behaviors occurred as a part of the ongoing conflict or issue that brought them to treatment rather than as a part of a systemic process to degrade the partner's self and bring about psychological harm.

In men's reports of psychological abuse, there were four items that differed from the original MDEAS classifications. Three items did not meet the criteria and were eliminated because they appeared to be poor indicators of types of psychological abuse. However, item 27 (My partner drove recklessly to frighten me) loaded as its own significant factor. The low level of variance for this item could account for the way that this item loaded in factor analysis. This behavior was reported as having occurred less frequently than any other item, with 92% of men reporting it had never

happened in the past four months. This may mean that a) men are not frightened by their partner's driving, b) women do not frequently use driving as a way to frighten a partner, or c) men do not believe their partner's driving is intended to frighten them, even if it has that effect. Findings suggest that this is not a useful item to include when assessing psychological abuse of men by their female partners.

As stated above, results indicate that there are gender differences in the experience of psychological abuse. Since the MDEAS was originally created for and tested on female samples, perhaps the MDEAS is not as accurate of an assessment tool for men as it is for women. Just as there were different items excluded for the male and female groups in the current study following factor analysis, there may have been items that were originally excluded when analyzing the MDEAS with a female sample, but that may have been retained when using a male sample. Therefore, a factor analysis of all items originally appearing on the MDEAS using a male sample is needed. Perhaps male and female versions of the MDEAS are most appropriate for assessing this construct.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL ABUSE

Results supported the hypothesis that psychological abuse was significantly related to physical abuse. There were significant positive correlations between all types of psychological abuse and physical abuse for both women and men, and the size of the correlations reflected a modest association between these variables. Also, results of the women's group were consistent with previous research that indicated that the Dominance/Intimidation type of psychological abuse had higher associations

with physical violence than other types. This also remained true in the men's group. This suggests that individuals in relationships with high amounts of Dominance/Intimidation behaviors likely also experience physically abusive behaviors. While the analyses cannot determine causality or direction, this finding suggests that partners experiencing this form of psychological abuse are most at risk for being physically abused. Physically abusive partners may be more inclined to threaten or dominate than to use other kinds of psychological abuse.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE AND ATTACHMENT STYLE

Results concerning the relationship between psychological abuse and partner attachment style did not support the hypotheses. Very few correlations were significant, suggesting the relationship between psychological abuse experienced by the victim and perpetrator's attachment style is weak. The only significant relationships that occurred in the women's group were a negative association between the Denigration type of psychological abuse and partners' secure attachment style and a positive association between the Hostile Withdrawal type and partners' dismissing style. These findings suggest that: a) a male partner who is comfortable with emotional closeness and unconcerned with being alone or rejected is less likely to degrade his partner's appearance or abilities and b) a male partner who is comfortable without close relationships and avoids emotional dependence is more likely to use behaviors that deny emotional resources or prevent emotional dependence.

It is notable that men's experience of psychological abuse was not related to their partner's identified relationship style. This indicates that there is not a strong relationship between female partner's use of psychological abuse and their attachment style. It may also indicate an issue of measurement accuracy. First, as already discussed, the MDEAS may not assess men's experience of psychological abuse as accurately as it does for women. In addition, the identification of one's attachment style is not only biased, as all self-report measures are, but notions of social desirability may also influence responses. It is suggested that further research investigating this association involve a measurement that uses behavioral indicators for relationship styles in order to avoid social desirability bias and offer a more definitive interpretation of results.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE AND RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION

This research strongly supports the notion that psychological abuse in a relationship is negatively related to partners' satisfaction. Results show that both male and female partners feel less satisfied in relationships that involve psychologically abusive behaviors. It is not surprising that dissatisfaction would accompany relationships in which there is isolation, degradation, fear, intimidation, and emotional distance. Although men and women differed significantly in their levels of dissatisfaction, it is clear that psychological abuse negatively impacts the relationship for both genders.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study have clear and important implications for clinical work with couples. First, the MDEAS is currently used as a tool to assess psychological abuse within a relationship. Results do support the notion that psychological abuse is a multi-factorial construct. Four factors, Restrictive Engulfment, Denigration, Hostile Withdrawal, and Dominance/Intimidation, can be used to conceptualize the different types of psychological abuse that commonly occur in intimate relationships. The MDEAS is structured in a way that the partners' amount of experienced psychological abuse can be deconstructed to understand what type of abuse is most prevalent in the relationship. This information is useful for clinicians working to decrease or end destructive relationship behaviors because it enables them to quickly determine which kind of psychologically abusive behaviors are most common and in need of intervention.

Also, results do indicate that this measure is reliable and valid, but they also suggest that modifications are called for if using this tool with couples who are seeking therapy and who are varied in relationship status and length. Minor changes appear necessary to improve the MDEAS for use with women, yet more significant changes may be in order if using the MDEAS for men. A possible modification to the MDEAS would be the deletion of items 15 and 16, since these items did not load into a factor and appear to be more indicative of problematic communication patterns rather than psychological abuse. However, these items are relevant to clinicians assessing for various kinds of destructive behaviors. Therefore, while they should arguably be eliminated for the use of the MDEAS as a measure of psychological

abuse in clinical research, they should remain a part of the MDEAS when using the measure to gather information about destructive behaviors in therapy-seeking couples.

Clinicians need to be aware that this tool may be more accurate when assessing for women's experience than for men's. The MDEAS was created and revised using female samples, so it is not surprising that the results of the analyses in the current study show that items on the MDEAS should be eliminated when assessing for men's experience of psychological abuse. There are likely behaviors that women use to psychologically abuse their partners, but that men do not use; these behaviors are not included on the MDEAS due to the nature of its creation using a female sample. It is recommended that a separate measure be created to assess for men's experience of psychological abuse. A similar process of testing many items on a male sample, and then refining the measure to include those items that accurately assessed psychological abuse would result in a measure that more accurately assesses men's experience of psychologically abusive behaviors.

In addition to the recommended deletion of items for both women and men and the addition of items to create a more accurate assessment of men's experiences, the measure would be improved by the addition of items relevant to couples of varying relationship status and relationship length. Since the MDEAS was created and tested using a dating sample, it does not include items for psychologically abusive behaviors that would likely only occur in cohabiting or marital relationships that have lasted for varying lengths of time. It does not include items regarding economic isolation, harm of children, or threats to end the relationship. These

behaviors do qualify as psychological abuse and, as such, should be included on a measure assessing psychological abuse. It is recommended that items be created and tested on a clinical couples sample in order to enhance the MDEAS for use with couples whose relationships vary in length and status.

There are also significant implications of the findings regarding psychological abuse as it relates to relationship satisfaction, physical abuse, and relationship style. First, it can be assumed that most, if not all, couples seeking therapy are dissatisfied with the relationship. Assessing for the occurrence of psychological abuse can aid clinicians in determining possible causes and effects of the relationship dissatisfaction. It can also guide clinicians in forming treatment as the subscales can help determine which kinds of behaviors in each partner are most important to address in order to improve the relationship.

Also, findings supporting the relationship between psychological abuse and physical abuse have important implications for the therapeutic process. The analyses in this study cannot be used to determine causality, but it is clear that couples who have high levels of psychological abuse also have high levels of physical violence. In addition, this indicates that when there is mild or moderate physical abuse present in the relationship, psychological abuse is likely occurring. When considering previous reports that psychological abuse has detrimental psychological effects comparable to those of physical abuse, it is important for clinicians to consider that both forms of abuse affect partners (Follingstad et al., 1990; O'Leary, 2001; Marshall, 1994; Walker, 1984). This is not to say that physical abuse should not be the primary focus when this is needed, for physical abuse has devastating consequences. However, in

couples who are exhibiting mild to moderate amounts of both forms of abuse, this study suggests that both forms of abuse should be foci of intervention.

Finally, this study compared male and female reports of psychological abuse and found that men and women have comparable experiences with psychological abuse. This has important implications for future research as studies have commonly focused on women as the victims of psychological abuse. Findings indicate that future research should consider both men and women when exploring the nature of psychological abuse and when developing a model of psychological abuse.

LIMITATIONS

The research study and its results should be considered with the following limitations in mind. First, factor analysis findings are limited due to the measurements used. We analyzed the 28-item version of the MDEAS instead of the original 54-item tool that was modified after initial factor analysis (Murphy & Hoover, 2001). Items were eliminated in this research, but no items could be added. This is particularly limiting for findings regarding the men's group since we used the version that was modified to suit women's responses. In addition, the items included on the MDEAS were originally tested using a dating sample and not a sample involving couples with different relationship lengths and status (i.e., married, cohabiting, separated). Therefore, there may be psychologically abusive behaviors that are unique to different kinds of relationships and/or family situations and, as such, are not included in the MDEAS. For example, behaviors such as controlling finances or threatening to harm children are not included in this measurement; these behaviors arguably classify as psychologically abusive, but they are not assessed

because they would be unlikely in dating relationships. The measurement did show reliability and validity with the diverse sample we used, but this study is limited in its ability to support a four-factor model of psychological abuse across different kinds of relationships. More research is needed to determine whether different versions of the MDEAS would be more accurate for assessing and conceptualizing psychological abuse as it occurs in relationships of various forms.

Next, support found for a four-factor model of psychological abuse is limited by the fact that we used the MDEAS, which is itself based on a four-factor model, and did not use assessment tools for other typologies, such as the PMWI (Tolman, 1989). A true comparison, rather than comparing a forced two-factor analysis, of both the MDEAS and the PMWI could address this limitation and is suggested.

It is also important to consider that the analyses used to establish the relationship between psychological abuse and physical abuse, relationship satisfaction, and relationship style cannot be used to establish causality. While there are many significant correlations between these variables, findings do not indicate direction of the relationship.

Finally, the findings in this study can only be generalized to a population of couples who are seeking couples therapy. The couples included in this study were diverse in terms of age, race, length of relationship, and relationship status, but they were all common in their identified need and desire for therapeutic intervention. Therefore, findings can be useful for other researchers and clinicians working with or studying couples in treatment, but more research is needed in order to support a four-

factor model of psychological abuse as well as its associations to other relationship and individual factors for a general public of intimate partners.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

As previously discussed, it is suggested that analysis be conducted on the original 54-item MDEAS using a sample of both women and men who range in age and relationship status. Furthermore, as suggested by Murphy and Hoover (2001), results of a confirmatory factor analysis of the MDEAS would greatly enhance clinicians' and researchers' ability to use and interpret this measurement.

Also, a comparison of different measures that assess psychological abuse, such as the MDEAS and the PMWI, could offer more in terms of supporting a typology of psychological abuse. Comparing these two typologies and their measurement tools remains an important area of further research. Adding to the ability to conceptualize this construct will enhance the ability to further study and assess it so that clinicians can better help couples end the pattern of abuse.

Appendix A: Tables

Table 1
Demographics by Gender

Variable	Women <i>n</i> =242	Men <i>n</i> =242
Mean age of partner (in years)	33.50 (9.42)	31.91 (8.90)
Mean length of relationship (in years)	6.80 (7.04)	6.97 (7.07)
Relationship Status		
Married, living together	53.9%	53.9%
Married, not living together	9.5%	9.5%
Not married, living together	17.3%	17.3%
Not married, not living together	19.3%	19.3%
Race		
African-American	42.6%	44.2%
Caucasian	42.1%	38.0%
Hispanic	5.8%	8.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.5%	2.9%
Native American	1.2%	0.0%
Other	5.0%	5.8%

Table 2
Correlations of Original MDEAS Subscales as a Function of Gender (women above the diagonal, men below the diagonal)

Subscale	Hostile Withdrawal	Domination/ Intimidation	Denigration	Restrictive Engulfment
Hostile Withdrawal	-	.45**	.51**	.38**
Dominance/ Intimidation	.41**	-	.66**	.49**
Denigration	.52**	.59**	-	.48**
Restrictive Engulfment	.37**	.46**	.50**	-

Note: ** $p < .001$

Table 3
Items loading > .4 on Factor 1 (Hostile Withdrawal) in the Women's Group

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
17. Refused to have any discussion of a problem	.818	.002	-.027	.008	.142
18. Changed the subject on purpose when the other person was trying to discuss a problem	.815	.029	.158	-.032	-.137
19. Refused to acknowledge a problem that the other person felt was important	.718	.087	.106	.011	-.062
20. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue	.741	-.067	.119	-.056	.199
21. Intentionally avoided the other person during a conflict or disagreement	.732	-.004	-.168	.109	.184

Table 4
Items loading > .4 on Factor 2 (Restrictive Engulfment) in the Women's Group

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
1. Asked the other person where s/he had been or who s/he was with	.017	.798	-.037	.019	-.025
2. Secretly searched through the other's belongings	.016	.601	.072	.031	.075
3. Tried to stop the other person from seeing certain friends of family members	-.077	.600	.122	.154	-.182
4. Complained that the other person spends too much time with friends	-.056	.818	-.085	.040	-.001
5. Got angry because the other person went somewhere without telling him/her	.114	.733	-.116	.074	.023
6. Tried to make the other person feel guilty for not spending enough time together	.101	.685	.027	-.175	-.023
7. Checked up on the other person by asking friends where s/he was or who s/he was with	-.101	.690	.126	-.069	.048

Table 5
Items loading > .4 on Factor 3 (Dominance/Intimidation) in the Women's Group

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
22. Became angry enough to frighten the person	.086	.033	.459	.158	.204
23. Put her/his face right in front of the other person's face to make a point more forcefully	-.018	.128	.498	.240	.160
24. Threatened to hit the other person	.029	-.091	.765	.064	.086
25. Threatened to throw something at the other person	.012	-.090	.755	.020	-.180
26. Threw, smashed, hit, or kicked something in front of the other person	.023	-.044	.767	.029	-.010
27. Drove recklessly to frighten the other person	.012	.097	.647	-.183	-.101
28. Stood or hovered over the other person during a conflict or disagreement	-.058	.159	.763	-.085	.106

Table 6
Items loading > .4 on Factor 4 (Denigration) in the Women's Group

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
8. Said or implied that the other person was stupid	.199	-.013	.072	.552	-.092
9. Called the other person worthless	-.055	-.104	.250	.658	.002
10. Called the other person ugly	-.177	-.020	-.033	.887	.020
12. Called the other person a loser, failure, or similar term	.166	.014	-.225	.812	-.097
13. Belittled the other person in front of other people	.170	.069	-.144	.512	.208
14. Said that someone else would be a better girlfriend or boyfriend	-.060	.137	.015	.668	-.006

Table 7
Items loading > .4 on Factor 1 (Hostile Withdrawal) in the Men's Group

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
15. Became so angry that s/he was unable or unwilling to talk	.670	.012	.038	.022	-.070
16. Acted cold or distant when angry	.767	.045	.022	-.053	.027
17. Refused to have any discussion of a problem	.848	-.114	-.090	.068	-.042
18. Changed the subject on purpose when the other person was trying to discuss a problem	.613	-.029	-.018	.131	.108
19. Refused to acknowledge a problem that the other person felt was important	.789	.082	-.028	-.061	.084
20. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue	.766	.108	.015	-.036	-.120
21. Intentionally avoided the other person during a conflict or disagreement	.741	.017	-.105	-.062	.153

Table 8
Items loading > .4 on Factor 2 (Dominance/Intimidation) in the Men's Group

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
22. Became angry enough to frighten the person	.189	.485	.029	.122	.063
23. Put her/his face right in front of the other person's face to make a point more forcefully	-.092	.444	.079	.306	.190
24. Threatened to hit the other person	.010	.905	-.131	.048	-.035
25. Threatened to throw something at the other person	.050	1.006	.066	-.125	-.117
26. Threw, smashed, hit, or kicked something in front of the other person	-.006	.860	.102	-.083	-.057
28. Stood or hovered over the other person during a conflict or disagreement	-.045	.418	.020	.269	.262

Table 9
Items loading > .4 on Factor 3 (Restrictive Engulfment) in the Men's Group

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
3. Tried to stop the other person from seeing certain friends of family members	.055	-.125	.513	.151	.175
4. Complained that the other person spends too much time with friends	-.007	.008	.933	-.006	-.250
5. Got angry because the other person went somewhere without telling him/her	-.085	.141	.745	-.031	.052
6. Tried to make the other person feel guilty for not spending enough time together	-.119	.027	.805	.005	-.022
7. Checked up on the other person by asking friends where s/he was or who s/he was with	.005	.045	.652	-.077	.178

Table 10
Items loading > .4 on Factor 4 (Denigration) in the Men's Group

Items	Factors				
	1	2	3	4	5
8. Said or implied that the other person was stupid	.106	.092	.127	.557	-.087
9. Called the other person worthless	-.007	-.117	-.065	.916	.078
10. Called the other person ugly	-.084	.123	-.085	.432	.278
12. Called the other person a loser, failure, or similar term	-.062	.107	-.101	.859	-.040
13. Belittled the other person in front of other people	.200	.018	.133	.458	-.145
14. Said that someone else would be a better girlfriend or boyfriend	.204	-.196	.278	.499	-.219

Table 11

Means, Standard Deviations, and Results of T-tests for MDEAS Subscales following Exclusion of Items

Note: ** $p < .01$

Scale	Women	Men	t (df)
Hostile Withdrawal	12.70 (9.26)	15.48 (11.24)	-3.05 (235) **
Dominance/Intimidation	6.46 (8.40)	4.41 (7.37)	3.25 (234) **
Denigration	6.07 (8.48)	5.55 (7.32)	.88 (233)
Restrictive Engulfment	7.99 (9.35)	6.57 (7.37)	1.96 (223)

Table 12

Correlations of Women's Reports of Psychological Abuse (MDEAS) and Relationship Satisfaction (DAS), Physical and Psychological Aggression (CTS2), and Men's Self-classified Attachment Style (RQ).

	Restrictive Engulfment	Denigration	Hostile Withdrawal Revised	Dominance/ Intimidation
DAS	-.34**	-.43**	-.44**	-.38**
CTS2 – Physical Abuse	.26 **	.43**	.23**	.65**
CTS2 – Psychological Abuse	.35**	.66**	.61**	.64**
RQ – Secure	-.07	-.14*	-.09	-.08
RQ – Fearful	.06	.03	.10	.02
RQ – Preoccupied	-.03	-.03	-.07	-.01
RQ – Dismissing	.08	.07	.16*	.02

Note: DAS – Dyadic Adjustment Scale; CTS2 – Conflict Tactics Scale; RQ – Relationship Questionnaire; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Table 13

Correlations of Men's Reports of Psychological Abuse (MDEAS) and Scores on Measurements of Dyadic Adjustment (DAS), Physical and Psychological Aggression (CTS2), and Women's Self classified Attachment Style (RQ).

	MDEAS – Restrictive Engulfment Revised	MDEAS – Denigration Revised	MDEAS – Hostile Withdrawal	MDEAS – Dominance/ Intimidation Revised
DAS	-.29**	-.39**	-.35**	-.26**
CTS2 – Physical Abuse	.30**	.33**	.30**	.70*
CTS2 – Psychological Abuse	.42**	.62**	.55**	.55**
RQ – Secure	-.07	-.05	-.08	.06
RQ – Fearful	.07	.06	.09	-.01
RQ – Preoccupied	.10	-.00	-.03	-.05
RQ – Dismissing	-.04	.04	.02	.01

Note: DAS – Dyadic Adjustment Scale; CTS2 – Conflict Tactics Scale; RQ – Relationship Questionnaire; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Table 14
Means, Standard Deviations, and Results of t-tests for Relationship Scales

Scale	Women	Men	t (df)
DAS	84.74 (23.13)	91.21 (20.57)	5.17 (241)**
CTS2 – Physical Abuse	2.60 (5.62)	2.70 (6.20)	.23 (238)
CTS2 – Psychological Abuse	9.65 (7.38)	9.18 (7.12)	-.90 (239)
RQ – Secure	4.18 (2.08)	4.44 (1.98)	1.54 (227)
RQ – Preoccupied	4.27 (2.14)	3.55 (2.01)	-3.84 (228)**
RQ – Dismissing	3.01 (2.03)	2.95 (1.98)	-.31 (228)
RQ – Fearful	3.07 (2.02)	3.37 (1.92)	1.66 (227)

Note: DAS – Dyadic Adjustment Scale; CTS2 – Conflict Tactics Scale; RQ – Relationship Questionnaire; ** $p < .001$

Table 15
*Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance Accounted for by Each Factor on MDEAS
 Following Factor Analysis of Women's Responses*

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance
Hostile Withdrawal	10.45	37.31
Dominance/Intimidation	2.48	8.85
Denigration	1.56	5.59
Restrictive Engulfment	2.64	9.43

Table 16
*Eigenvalues and Percentage of Variance Accounted for by Each Factor on MDEAS
 Following Factor Analysis of Men's Responses*

Factor	Eigenvalue	Percent of Variance
Hostile Withdrawal	9.90	35.36
Dominance/Intimidation	2.76	9.87
Denigration	1.49	5.33
Restrictive Engulfment	2.50	8.92

Table 17
Items loading > .4 on Factor 1 in the Women's Group following Forced 2-Factor Analysis of MDEAS

Items	Factors	
	1	2
1. Asked the other person where s/he had been or who s/he was with in a suspicious manner	.608	-.022
2. Secretly searched through the other person's belongings	.584	.008
3. Tried to stop the other person from seeing certain friends of family members	.692	-.146
4. Complained that the other person spends too much time with friends	.604	-.080
5. Got angry because the other person went somewhere without telling him/her	.536	.093
6. Tried to make the other person feel guilty for not spending enough time together	.428	.029
7. Checked up on the other person by asking friends where s/he was or who s/he was with	.627	-.133
8. Said or implied that the other person was stupid	.441	.254
9. Called the other person worthless	.630	.053
10. Called the other person ugly	.624	-.018
12. Called the other person a loser, failure, or similar term	.638	.114
14. Said that someone else would be a better girlfriend or boyfriend	.637	.032
22. Became angry enough to frighten the person	.577	.158
23. Put her/his face right in front of the other person's face to make a point more forcefully	.756	.045
24. Threatened to hit the other person	.641	.062
25. Threatened to throw something at the other person	.557	-.037
26. Threw, smashed, hit, or kicked something in front of the other person	.644	.017
27. Drove recklessly to frighten the other person	.487	-.064
28. Stood or hovered over the other person during a conflict or disagreement	.748	-.060

Table 18

Items Loading >.4 on Factor 2 Following Forced 2-Factor Analysis of Women's Responses on MDEAS

Items	Factors	
	1	2
15. Became so angry that s/he was unable or unwilling to talk	-.012	.634
16. Acted cold or distant when angry	-.084	.731
17. Refused to have any discussion of a problem	-.082	.891
18. Changed the subject on purpose when the other person was trying to discuss a problem	.054	.748
19. Refused to acknowledge a problem that the other person felt was important	.100	.696
20. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue	-.041	.819
21. Intentionally avoided the other person during a conflict or disagreement	-.120	.834

Table 19
Items Loading >.4 on Factor 1 Following Forced 2-Factor Analysis of Men's Responses on MDEAS

Items	Factors	
	1	2
1. Asked the other person where s/he had been or who s/he was with in a suspicious manner	.493	.110
2. Secretly searched through the other person's belongings	.498	.100
3. Tried to stop the other person from seeing certain friends of family members	.441	.175
5. Got angry because the other person went somewhere without telling him/her	.612	-.006
6. Tried to make the other person feel guilty for not spending enough time together	.508	.006
7. Checked up on the other person by asking friends where s/he was or who s/he was with	.534	.057
8. Said or implied that the other person was stupid	.458	.275
9. Called the other person worthless	.494	.255
10. Called the other person ugly	.558	-.016
11. Criticized the other person's appearance	.457	.036
12. Called the other person a loser, failure, or similar term	.550	.159
22. Became angry enough to frighten the person	.593	.139
23. Put her/his face right in front of the other person's face to make a point more forcefully	.829	-.096
24. Threatened to hit the other person	.717	-.113
25. Threatened to throw something at the other person	.752	-.102
26. Threw, smashed, hit, or kicked something in front of the other person	.742	-.138
27. Drove recklessly to frighten the other person	.480	-.052
28. Stood or hovered over the other person during a conflict or disagreement	.794	-.066

Table 20
Items Loading >.4 on Factor 2 Following Forced 2-Factor Analysis of Men's Responses on MDEAS

Items	Factors	
	1	2
13. Belittled the other person in front of other people	.238	.436
14. Said that someone else would be a better girlfriend or boyfriend	.078	.498
15. Became so angry that s/he was unable or unwilling to talk	-.056	.705
16. Acted cold or distant when angry	-.006	.746
17. Refused to have any discussion of a problem	-.220	.874
18. Changed the subject on purpose when the other person was trying to discuss a problem	.041	.693
19. Refused to acknowledge a problem that the other person felt was important	.034	.739
20. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue	-.042	.741
21. Intentionally avoided the other person during a conflict or disagreement	-.024	.688

Table 21
Means and Standard Deviations for MDEAS Items that Did Not Load into the Predicted Factor

Variable	Women n=242	Men n=242
1. Asked the other person where s/he had been or who s/he was with in a suspicious manner	1.84 (2.06)	2.19 (2.32)
2. Secretly searched through the other person's belongings	1.04 (1.78)	1.18 (1.81)
11. Criticized the other person's appearance	1.04 (1.77)	.95 (1.72)
15. Became so angry that s/he was unable or unwilling to talk	2.54 (2.10)	2.42 (2.01)
16. Acted cold or distant when angry	3.26 (1.99)	3.07 (1.99)
27. Drove recklessly to frighten the other person	.56 (1.37)	.19 (.77)

Appendix B: Measures

Multi-Dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale (MDEAS)

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason.

Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please circle how many times you did each of these things **IN THE PAST 4 MONTHS**, and how many times your partner did them in the **IN THE PAST 4 MONTHS**. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past 4 months, but it happened before that, circle 0.

- (0) *Not in the past four months, but it did happen before* (4) *6-10 times*
 (1) *Once* (5) *11-20 times*
 (2) *Twice* (6) *More than 20 times*
 (3) *3-5 times* (9) *This has never happened*

How often in the last 4 months?

1. Asked the other person where s/he had been or who s/he was with in a suspicious manner.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
2. Secretly searched through the other person's belongings.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
3. Tried to stop the other person from seeing certain friends or family members.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
4. Complained that the other person spends too much time with friends.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
5. Got angry because the other person went somewhere without telling him/her.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
6. Tried to make the other person feel guilty for not spending enough time together.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
7. Checked up on the other person by asking friends where s/he was or who s/he was with.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
8. Said or implied that the other person was stupid.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
9. Called the other person worthless.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
10. Called the other person ugly.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
11. Criticized the other person's appearance.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9
12. Called the other person a loser, failure, or similar term.	You: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 Your partner: 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	9 9

Never in past 4 months	Once	Twice	3-5	6-10	11-20	20+	Never in relationship
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

How often in the last 4 months?

13. Belittled the other person in front of other people.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
14. Said that someone else would be a better girlfriend or boyfriend.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
15. Became so angry that s/he was unable or unwilling to talk.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
16. Acted cold or distant when angry.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
17. Refused to have any discussion of a problem.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
18. Changed the subject on purpose when the other person was trying to discuss a problem.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
19. Refused to acknowledge a problem that the other felt was important.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
20. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
21. Intentionally avoided the other person during a conflict or disagreement.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
22. Became angry enough to frighten the other person.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
23. Put her/his face right in front of the other person's face to make a point more forcefully.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
24. Threatened to hit the other person.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
25. Threaten to throw something at the other person.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
26. Threw, smashed, hit, or kicked something in front of the other person.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
27. Drove recklessly to frighten the other person.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
28. Stood or hovered over the other person during a conflict or disagreement.	You:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
	Your partner:	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

Coding Key

0 (Never in relationship) = coded as '0'	3 (3-5) = coded as '3'	6 (20+) = coded as '6'
1 (once) = coded as '1'	4 (6-10) = coded as '4'	9 (Never in past 4 months) = coded as '9'
2 (twice) = coded as '2'	5 (11-20) = coded as '5'	

Subscales

Restrictive Engulfment = items 1-7
Denigration = items 8-14
Hostile Withdrawal = items 15-21
Dominance/Intimidation = items 22-28

Conflict Tactics Scale – Revised (CTS2)

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please circle how many times you did each of these things **IN THE PAST 4 MONTHS**, and how many times your partner did them **IN THE PAST 4 MONTHS**. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past 4 months, but it did happen before that, circle “0”.

How often did this happen?

0 = Not in the past 4 months, but it did happen before	4 = 6-10 times in the past 4 months
1 = Once in the past 4 months	5 = 11-20 times in the past 4 months
2 = Twice in the past 4 months	6 = 20+ times in the past 4 months
3 = 3-5 times in the past 4 months	9 = This has never happened

1. I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
2. My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
3. I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
4. My partner explained his/her side of a disagreement to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
5. I insulted or swore at my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
6. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
7. I threw something at my partner that could hurt him/her.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
8. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
9. I twisted my partner’s arm or hair	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
10. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
11. I has a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with my partner	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
12. My partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
13. I showed respect for my partner’s feelings about an issue.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
14. My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
15. I made my partner have sex without a condom.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
16. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
17. I pushed or shoved my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
18. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
19. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
20. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
21. I used a knife or gun on my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
22. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
23. I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner in a fight with me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
24. My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
25. I called my partner fat or ugly.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
26. My partner called me fat or ugly.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
27. I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
28. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
29. I destroyed something belonging to my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
30. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
31. I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
32. My partner went to a doctor because of a fight with me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
33. I choked my partner.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
34. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
35. I shouted or yelled at my partner	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9
36. My partner did this to me.	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 9

How often did this happen?

0 = Not in the past 4 months, but it did happen before
 1 = Once in the past 4 months
 2 = Twice in the past 4 months
 3 = 3-5 times in the past 4 months

4 = 6-10 times in the past 4 months
 5 = 11-20 times in the past 4 months
 6 = 20+ times in the past 4 months
 9 = This has never happened

37. I slammed my partner against a wall.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
38. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
39. I said I was sure we could work out a problem.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
40. My partner was sure we could work it out.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
41. I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner, but I didn't.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
42. My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with me, but didn't.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
43. I beat up my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
44. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
45. I grabbed my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
46. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
47. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
48. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
49. I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
50. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
51. I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
52. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
53. I slapped my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
54. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
55. I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
56. My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
57. I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
58. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
59. I suggested a compromise to a disagreement.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
60. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
61. I burned or scalded my partner on purpose.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
62. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
63. I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force).	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
64. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
65. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
66. My partner accused me of this.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
67. I did something to spite my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
68. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
69. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
70. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
71. I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight with my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
72. My partner still felt physical pain the next day because of a fight we had.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
73. I kicked my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
74. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
75. I used threats to make my partner have sex.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
76. My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
77. I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9
78. My partner agreed to try a solution I suggested.	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	9

Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS)

Most persons have disagreements in their relationship. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list. Place a checkmark (✓) to indicate your answer.

	<i>Almost</i>			<i>Almost</i>	
<i>Always</i>	<i>Always</i>	<i>Occasionally</i>	<i>Frequently</i>	<i>Always</i>	<i>Always</i>
<i>Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>

1. Handling family finances
2. Matters of recreation
3. Religious matters
4. Demonstration of affection
5. Friends
6. Sex relations
7. Conventionality
(correct or proper behavior)
8. Philosophy of life
9. Ways of dealing with
parents and in-laws
10. Aims, goals, and things
believed important in life
11. Amount of time spent
together
12. Making major decisions
13. Household tasks
14. Leisure time interests and
activities
15. Career decisions

<i>All the time</i>	<i>Most of the time</i>	<i>More often than not</i>	<i>Occasionally</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
-------------------------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------	---------------	--------------

16. How often do you discuss or
have you considered divorce,
separation or terminating
your relationship?
17. How often do you or your
partner leave the house after
a fight?
18. In general, how often do you
think that things between you
& your partner are going well?
19. Do you confide in your
partner?

All the time Most of the time More often than not Occasionally Rarely Never

20. Do you ever regret that you married (or lived together?)
21. How often do you or your partner quarrel?
22. How often do you and your partner "get on each other's nerves"?

HOW OFTEN WOULD YOU SAY THE FOLLOWING EVENTS OCCUR BETWEEN YOU AND YOUR MATE? CIRCLE YOUR ANSWER.

23. Do you kiss your partner?
 EVERYDAY ALMOST EVERYDAY OCCASIONALLY RARELY NEVER
24. Do you and your partner engage in outside interests together?
 ALL OF THEM MOST OF THEM SOME OF THEM VERY FEW OF THEM NONE OF THEM
25. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas?
 NEVER LESS THAN ONCE OR TWICE ONCE OR TWICE ONCE A DAY MORE OFTEN
 ONCE A MONTH A MONTH A WEEK
26. Laugh together?
 NEVER LESS THAN ONCE OR TWICE ONCE OR TWICE ONCE A DAY MORE OFTEN
 ONCE A MONTH A MONTH A WEEK
27. Calmly discuss something?
 NEVER LESS THAN ONCE OR TWICE ONCE OR TWICE ONCE A DAY MORE OFTEN
 ONCE A MONTH A MONTH A WEEK
28. Work together on a project?
 NEVER LESS THAN ONCE OR TWICE ONCE OR TWICE ONCE A DAY MORE OFTEN
 ONCE A MONTH A MONTH A WEEK

THESE ARE SOME THINGS ABOUT WHICH COUPLES SOMETIMES AGREE OR DISAGREE. INDICATE IF EITHER ITEM BELOW CAUSES DIFFERENCES OF OPINION OR HAVE BEEN PROBLEMS IN YOUR RELATIONSHIP DURING THE PAST FEW WEEKS. CHECK "YES" OR "NO."

29. Being too tired for sex. Yes _____ No _____
30. Not showing love. Yes _____ No _____

31. The dots on the following line represent different degrees of happiness in your relationship. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness of most relationships. Please circle the dot which best describes the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

.

EXTREMELY UNHAPPY	FAIRLY UNHAPPY	A LITTLE UNHAPPY	HAPPY	VERY HAPPY	EXTREMELY HAPPY	PERFECT
----------------------	-------------------	---------------------	-------	---------------	--------------------	---------

32. Which of the following statements best describes how you feel about the future of your relationship? Check the statement that best applies to you.

6. I want desperately for my relationship to succeed, and would go to almost any length to see that it does.
5. I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do all I can to see that it does.
4. I want very much for my relationship to succeed, and will do my fair share to see that it does.
3. It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I can't do much more than I am doing now to help it succeed.
2. It would be nice if my relationship succeeded, but I refuse to do any more than I am doing now to keep the relationship going.
1. My relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going.

Relationship Questionnaire (RQ)

1. The following are descriptions of four general relationship styles that people often report. Please circle the letter corresponding to the style that best describes you or is closest to the way you are in your relationships with **PEOPLE IN GENERAL.**
 - A. It is relatively easy for me to be emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on others and having others depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.
 - B. I am somewhat uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I sometimes worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.
 - C. I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, and I sometimes worry that others don't value me as I value them.
 - D. I am comfortable without close relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.
2. Now please rate each of the relationship styles above according to the extent to which you think each description corresponds to your general relationship styles.

	Not at all like me	Somewhat like me	Very much like me				
Style A.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style B.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style C.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Style D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Coding Key:

1 = coded as 1	5 = coded as 5
2 = coded as 2	6 = coded as 6
3 = coded as 3	7 = coded as 7
4 = coded as 4	

Styles:

Style A: Secure
 Style B: Fearful
 Style C: Preoccupied
 Style D: Dismissing

References

- Aguilar, R.J. & Nightingale, N.N. (1994). The impact of specific battering experiences on the self-esteem of abused women. *Journal of Family Violence, 9*, 35-46.
- Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1982). Attachment: Retrospect and prospect. In C. M. Parkes & J. Stevenson-Hinde (Eds.), *The place of attachment in human behavior* (pp. 3-30). New York: Basic Books.
- Arias, I. (1999). Women's response to physical and psychological abuse. In X.B. Arriaga & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Violence in intimate relationship* (pp.131-161). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Arias, I., Lyons, C.M., & Street, A.E. (1997). Individual and marital consequences of victimization: Moderating effects of relationship efficacy and spouse support. *Journal of Family Violence, 12*(2), 193-210.
- Arias, I., & Pape, K.T. (1999). Psychological abuse: Implications for adjustment and commitment to leave violent partners. *Violence and Victims, 14*, 55-67.
- Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7*, 147-178.
- Bartholomew, K. & Horowitz, L.M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 226-244.
- Beck, A.T. (1967). *Depression: Causes and treatment*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Beck, A. T.& Ward, C. H., & Mendelson, M. (1961). An Inventory of measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4*, 561-571.
- Beck, A.T., Steer, R.A., & Garbin, M.G. (1988). Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory: Twenty-five years of evaluation. *Clinical Psychology Review, 8*, 77-100.
- Briere, J., Elliott, D. M., & Harris, K. (1995). Trauma Symptom Inventory: Psychometrics and association with childhood and adult victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10*, 387-401.
- Brown, P.D., O'Leary, K.D., & Feldbau, S.R. (1997). Dropout in a treatment

- program for self-referring wife abusing men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12, 365-387.
- Cascardi, M., O'Leary, K.D., & Schlee, K.A. (1999.) Co-occurrence and correlates of posttraumatic stress disorder and major depression in physically abused women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 227-249.
- Christian-Herman, J.L., O'Leary, K.D., & Avery-Leaf, S. (2001). The impact of severe negative marital events in marriage on depression. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 20(1), 24-40.
- Dutton, D.G., & Painter, S. (1993). Emotional attachment in abusive relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 8, 105-120.
- Fabrigar, L.R., Wegener, D.T., MacCallum, R.C., & Strahan, E.J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods*, 4(3), 272-299.
- Follingstad, D.R. & DeHart, D.D. (2000). Defining psychological abuse of husbands towards wives. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 891-920.
- Follingstad, D.R., Rutledge, L.L., Berg, B.J., Hause, E.S. & Polek, D.S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationship. *Journal of Family Violence*, 5, 107-120.
- Hegarty, K., Sheehan, M., Schonfeld, C. (1999). A multidimensional definition of partner abuse: Development and preliminary validation of the composite abuse scale. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 399-415.
- Henning, K.. & Klesges, L.M. (2003.) Prevalence and characteristics of psychological abuse reported by court-involved battered women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 857-871.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Conceptualizing romantic love as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Jezl, D.R., Molidor, C.E., & Wright, T.L. (1996). Physical, sexual and psychological abuse in high school dating relationships: Prevalence rates and self-esteem issues. *Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 13(1), 69-87.
- Katz, J. & Arias, I. (1999). Psychological abuse and depressive symptoms in dating women: Do different types of abuse have differential effects. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 281-295.
- Katz, J., Arias, I., & Beach, S. (2000). Psychological abuse, self-esteem, and

- women's dating relationship outcomes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 349-357.
- Kemp, A., Green, B.L., & Hovanitz, C. (1995). Incidence and correlates of posttraumatic stress disorder in battered women: Shelter and community samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10, 43-55.
- Loring, M.T. (1994). *Emotional abuse*. New York: Lexington Books.
- MacCallum, R. (1998). Commentary on quantitative methods in I-O research. *The Industrial Organizational Psychologist*, 35, 19-30.
- Margolin, G., John, R.S., & Foo, L. (1998). Interactive and unique risk factors for husbands' emotional and physical abuse of their wives. *Journal of Family Violence*, 13, 315-341.
- Marshall, L.L. (1994). Physical and psychological abuse. In W.E. Cupach & B.H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp.281-311). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Marshall, L.L. (1996). Psychological abuse of women: Six distinct clusters *Journal of Family Violence*, 11, 379-410.
- Marshall, L.L. (2001). Effects of men's subtle and overt psychological abuse on low-income women. In K.D. O'Leary, & R.D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations* (pp.153-175). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Murphy, C.M., & Cascardi, M. (1999). Psychological abuse in marriage and dating relationships. In R.L. Hampton (Ed.), *Family violence prevention and treatment* (2nd ed., pp.198-226). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Murphy, C., Hartman, J., Muccino, L., & Douchis, K. (1995, November). *Dependency characteristics and abusive behavior in dating relationships*. Presented at the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, Washington, D.C.
- Murphy, C.M., & Hoover, S.A. (2001). Measuring emotional abuse in dating relationship as a multifactorial construct. In O'Leary, K.D., & Maiuro, R.D. (Eds.), *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations* (pp. 29-46). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Murphy, C.M., Hoover, S.A., & Taft, C.T. (1999). Multi-Dimensional Emotional Abuse Scale.
- Murphy, C.M. & O'Leary, K.D. (1989). Psychological aggression predicts

- physical aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 579-582.
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (2003). *Costs of Intimate partner violence against women in the United States*. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- O'Leary, K.D. (2001) Psychological abuse: A Variable deserving critical attention in domestic violence. In O'Leary, K.D., & Maiuro, R.D. (Eds.), *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations* (pp. 3-28). New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- O'Leary, K.D. Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1994). Physical aggression in early marriage: Prerelationship and relationship effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62, 594-602.
- Pipes, R.B. & LeBov-Keeler, K. (1997). Psychological abuse among college women in exclusive heterosexual dating relationships. *Sex Roles*, 36, 585-603.
- Saunders, D.G. (1994). Posttraumatic stress symptom profiles of battered women: A comparison of survivors in two settings. *Violence & Victims*, 9, 31-44.
- Sackett, L.A. & Saunders, D.G. (1999). The impact of different forms of Psychological abuse on battered women. *Violence and Victims*, 14, 105-116.
- Schumacher, J.A., Slep, A.S., & Heyman, R.E. (1998). Risk factors for family violence. *Aggression & Violent Behavior*, 6, 255-268.
- Spanier, G.B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 38, 15-28.
- Straus, M. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, 79, 75-89.
- Strauss, M.A., Hamby, S.L, Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D.B. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17, 283-316.
- Straight, E.S., Harper, F.W.K., & Arias, I. (2003). The impact of partner psychological abuse on health behaviors and health status in college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 1035-1054.
- Street, A.E. & Arias, I. (2001). Psychological abuse and posttraumatic stress

disorder in battered women: Examining the roles of shame and guilt. *Violence & Victims, 16*, 65-78.

Tabachnik, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

Tolman, R.M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims, 4*, 159-178.

Tolman, R.M. (1992). Psychological abuse of women. In R.T. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Assessment of family violence* (pp. 291-310). New York: Wiley.

Vitanza, S., Vogel, L.C.M., & Marshall, L.L. (1995). Distress and symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder in abused women. *Violence and Victims, 10*, 23-34.

Walker, L.E. (1984). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer Publishing Co.

Weiss, R.L. & Cerreto, M.C. (1980). Marital Status Inventory: Development of a measure of dissolution potential. *American Journal of Family Therapy, 8*(2), 80-85.