

Abstract

Title of Thesis: GENDER AND DATING VIOLENCE

Amber M. Foltz, Master of Arts, 2006

Thesis directed by: Assistant Professor Laura Dugan
Department of Criminology and Criminal Justice

This paper will analyze the impact of gender on dating violence offending patterns in a sample of college students in heterosexual dating relationships. Logistic regressions are utilized to examine the relationships between gender and predictors of dating violence and determine if male and female offenders should be studied separately. Logistic regressions identify differences in male and female reports of anger problems, problem-solving skills, and relationship commitment and satisfaction. This study reflects very clear differences between male and female offenders of dating violence; however, it does not provide conclusive support for gendered research.

GENDER AND DATING VIOLENCE

By

Amber M. Foltz

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Master of Arts
2006

Advisory Committee:
Professor Laura Dugan, Chair
Professor Hanno Petras
Professor Doris MacKenzie

© Copyright by

Amber M. Foltz

2006

Table of Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	iii
Chapter 1: Intimate Partner Violence: What We Know	1
<i>Intimate Partner Violence and Gender Symmetry</i>	1
<i>Violence in Dating, Cohabitation, and Marriage</i>	3
<i>Dating Violence Definitions</i>	6
<i>Gender and Prevalence of Dating Violence</i>	7
Chapter 2: Offending Differences by Gender: What do we know?	9
<i>Gender and Offender Typologies</i>	9
<i>Typologies of Male and Female Perpetrators of Spousal Violence</i>	9
<i>Typologies of Male and Female Perpetrators of Dating Violence</i>	12
<i>Gender and Correlates of Dating Violence</i>	14
<i>Research Questions</i>	21
Chapter 3: Methodology	
<i>Sample and Procedure</i>	26
<i>Data Analysis</i>	27
<i>Measures</i>	28
<i>Measures of Offending</i>	28
<i>Independent Variables</i>	30
<i>Control Variables</i>	33
<i>Limitations</i>	33
Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion	36
<i>Prevalence</i>	36
<i>Logistic Regressions</i>	37
<i>Conclusions and Implications for Future Research</i>	41
Appendix A.....	54

List of Tables

Table 1: Hypotheses

Table 2: Respondents by Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Age, and Income

Table 3: Dating Violence Predictor Variables

Table 4: Prevalence of Dating Violence by Gender

Table 5: Logistic Regression Significant Associations to Psychological, Physical, and Sexual Offending by Gender (N=371)

Table 6: Logistic Regression Significant Associations to Physical and Sexual Offending by Gender (N=371)

Table 7: Gender and Dating Violence, Hypotheses, and Findings

Intimate Partner Violence: What We Know

Violence in relationships is not limited to adults in marriages. In fact, dating violence among young people is as prevalent as spousal violence (Bachman and Saltzman, 1995). Studies of both dating violence and violence in more committed relationships, such as marriage and cohabitation, have demonstrated a lack of consistency in determining the correlates to perpetration of intimate partner violence. A possible explanation is that not all offenders are the same. In this research, I examine a sample of university males and females in heterosexual dating relationships who perpetrate violence against their dating partners. I will perform analyses to identify the predictors of dating violence on which male and female perpetrators differ and will establish whether female and male offenders should be studied using a gendered approach.¹

Intimate Partner Violence and Gender Symmetry

The widely held understanding of dating violence is largely based on efforts by the women's movement. In the 1970s, researchers began to study the issue of domestic violence largely due to feminist movement efforts which brought violence against women into the public sphere through the development of shelter, counseling, and advocacy programs. Prior to this research, domestic violence was considered a minor issue, affecting few women; however, out of that early research came the staggering statistic that one in four women will be abused in her lifetime (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1979). More recent research has suggested that over 1.8 million women suffer beatings at the hands of their intimate partners each year (Tjaden and Thoennes, 1998). The early

¹ Although the term "sex" may be a more accurate sociological term in reference to biological differences between males and females, the term "gender" reads better when referring to this approach; therefore, the term "gender" will be used in this paper to refer to the sex of an individual.

research and much of the later research was also inspired by the feminist movement and is built on feminist theoretical constructs; therefore, much of the research focuses on women as victims and men as abusers.

Multiple studies using convenience samples of women in shelters, as well as court, police and emergency room data, demonstrated that men use physical and emotional abuse to dominate and control their partners.² These studies also show that men are more likely than women to kill their partners and, therefore, support feminist theorists who cite the patriarchal structure and culture as the root of domestic violence (Johnson, 1995). Other research using small samples, as well as two random National Family Violence surveys (1975, 1985) have found similar patterns of perpetration for females and males. This research has often shown that women participate in abuse as often, if not more often, than their male partners (Straus and Gelles, 1995). They take the family violence theoretical perspective, arguing that domestic and dating violence results from the stresses and problems in relationships and are perpetrated by both women and men (Johnson, 1995). Dobash et al. (1992) critique the methodology used in these studies, citing problems with their primary instrument, the Conflict Tactics Survey (CTS), because it measures only the frequency of violence. They argue that type, severity, context, motives, and outcomes of violent acts make females' violence different from males' violence (Johnson and Ferraro, 2000). The variation in the previous research on intimate partner violence suggests that perhaps not all partner abuse is the same and that variation exists among abusers as well.

² See: Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Dobash and Dobash, 1992; Martin, 1981; Roy, 1976; Walker, 1984.

In a meta-analysis of intimate partner violence, Archer (2000) indicated that women are slightly but significantly more likely to engage in physical violence against their male partners and that women use aggression more frequently. In his second meta-analysis, Archer (2002) found that although both women and men reported using both mild and serious violence against their partners, overall women committed lower levels of violence, and men were more likely to use serious violence against partners. Many other researchers have found that mutual violence is the most common style in violent dating relationships, (Billingham, 1987, Bookwala et al, 1992, and Gray and Foshee, 1997) thus supporting the concept of gender symmetry. Young daters are likely to both sustain and perpetrate violence (O'Keefe, 1997, and Gray and Foshee, 1997).

Further, research has also found gendered differences in violent outcomes. For example, Makepeace (1986) found that male abusers were responsible for greater emotional and physical injury than female abusers. Molidor and Tolman (1998) found that males used more severe violence against females, while females used moderate levels of violence against their partners. In fact, many young men considered the violence committed against them as laughable, while the young women experienced both physical and emotional reactions to the violence. Felson and Cares (2005) explain this by suggesting that the size and physical ability to harm makes male violence more serious than that of females.

Violence in Dating, Cohabitation, and Marriage

In 1981, Makepeace's seminal article on dating violence was published, citing for the first time that violence is present in dating relationships and is thus not limited to marriages. Prior to this time, all research on intimate partner violence focused

exclusively on married couples. Although similarities between abuse of spouses and cohabiting partners and dating violence exist, the types of relationships and circumstances therein are distinct enough to warrant studies focused separately on each issue.

Dating is distinct from both marriage and cohabitation. Although persons in all three relationship types develop strong emotional bonds with their partners and spend considerable amounts of time together, dating relationships do not have the financial dependencies found in both marriage and cohabitation. In addition, both living together and parenting make spousal and cohabitating violence different phenomena from dating violence (Carlson, 1987). In fact, research has identified levels of intimate partner violence higher among cohabiters than the levels among married or dating couples, suggesting that cohabitation presents a different set of stressors than dating or marriage (Moffitt et al., 1998, Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985, Sigelman, Berry, and Wiles, 1984, Stets and Straus, 1990). Magdol and Moffitt (1998) found that cohabiters engage in more partner abuse than daters, that they experience greater conflict in their relationships, and that their current relationships had longer duration than daters.

In a study of intimate partner homicide, Dugan, Rosenfeld, and Nagin (2003) presented that not only do homicide rates differ between married and unmarried couples, but the effects of aggressive domestic violence arrest policies also impact married and unmarried partners differently. In addition, the legal and moral issues that exist for married couples are not pertinent issues for daters, as divorce may introduce frustrations resulting from bureaucratic and slow legal systems, economic obstacles, custody battles, religious alienation, and social stigma.

Follingstad et al. (1999) point out that much of the early literature emphasized dating violence as a precursor to violence in the marital relationship. Later research has revealed that while dating violence often serves as a precursor to spousal violence, it is as serious as spousal violence in terms of prevalence, injury, and psychological harm to the victim, thus it should be studied as an independent research topic (O'Leary et al., 1989). This consideration is especially important because couples are marrying later in life and are therefore spending more time in dating relationships (Magdol and Moffitt, 1998).

Thus, while early researchers neglected the topic of dating violence, assuming that it was rare and inconsequential or that dating violence could be understood under the umbrella of spousal violence, current research on dating violence suggests otherwise. In an analysis of data from the National Crime Victimization Survey (1993-1998), Rennison and Welchans (2000) found people who never marry have higher rates of intimate partner victimization than married or widowed couples (only divorcees reported higher rates), reflecting a correlation between relationship type and victimization risk. Prevention, treatment, and advocacy programs based on married adult populations may not be appropriate for younger (adolescent and college age) dating populations (Wekerle and Wolfe, 1999 and Nightingale and Morrissette, 1993). Dugan, Rosenfeld, and Nagin (2003) report that interventions into violent relationships impact homicide rates in different ways, depending on the type of relationship. In particular, they found that aggressive arrest policies are associated with lower homicide rates for unmarried partners.

Changes associated with adolescence, the sexual intensity of that time period, and inexperience with intimate relationships put young daters at risk for violent relationships

(Gamache, 1998). Perhaps the ephemeral nature of dating relationships (one partner can be replaced by another with relative ease) as well as the exploratory nature of adolescence and the college years moderate some of the differences between marital and dating relationships. These differences suggest value in specifically researching young daters apart from cohabiting or married adults.

Dating Violence Definitions

While great variation in the definition of dating or courtship violence exists, many researchers have adopted a narrow definition, such that dating violence is “the use or threat of physical force or restraint carried out with the intent of causing pain or injury,” toward a dating partner (Sugarman and Hotaling, 1989, p 5). While this definition simplifies the issue of studying dating violence, it fails to include psychological abuse, including types of emotional and verbal abuse such as isolation, jealousy, insults, and name-calling. Although those offenses do not constitute criminal behavior, they are serious offenses because many victims are harmed by emotional abuse, sometimes even more than by physical violence. Clearly, violence in relationships consists of many components; therefore, to adequately assess and understand violence in dating relationships, these non-physical forms of violence must also be considered (Wekerle and Wolfe, 1999).

This research defines dating violence as the use of physical, sexual, or psychological abuse that one non-cohabiting partner³ directs toward his or her partner. Physical abuse includes using or threatening to use violence to cause fear, pain, or injury toward one’s dating partner. Sexual abuse encompasses such behaviors as coerced sexual activity, use of threats to gain sexual access, and forced sexual activity against a dating

³ In this paper, partner is defined as a person with whom one shares an intimate relationship.

partner. Psychological abuse includes a continuum of behaviors ranging from name-calling and insulting, excessive jealousy, isolation to subtle forms of control, manipulation, and domination of one's dating partner.

In this study, I use previous research on spousal and dating violence to help select offender characteristics to examine gender differences and similarities and determine whether distinctions exist between male and female perpetrators. This study focuses exclusively on young people in dating relationships and includes perpetrators of all types of dating violence, psychological abuse, sexual abuse, and physical abuse.

Gender and Prevalence of Dating Violence

Numerous studies have explored the issue of whether or not males and females similarly perpetrate dating violence (Lewis and Fremouw, 2001, O'Keefe and Treister, L, 1998, Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987). One of the overwhelming problems in this research is that it relies heavily on the use of convenience samples. Most studies of dating violence draw their samples from schools and colleges, because they provide easy access to young daters. Since there is no similar source that accesses older daters, the literature on abuse in their relationships is limited. These findings, therefore, can only be safely generalized to young daters who attend high school or college. As the present study also relies on a sample of university students, its findings can only be generalized to young university daters.

There is substantial evidence that males and females similarly participate in intimate partner violence of all types. In their longitudinal study of health and development, Moffitt and Caspi (1999) found that 37% of women and 22% of males perpetrated physical violence against their dating partners or spouses. In their study of

university daters, Straus and Medeiros (2002) found that during the proceeding twelve month period, 22% of both males and females had used some form of minor violence against their dating partners and 10% of males and 11% of females had used some form of severe violence against a partner. Lifetime prevalence rates of psychological abuse in dating relationships suggest that young people view these behaviors as normative in their relationships. Jackson, Cram, and Seymore (2000) conducted a study of lifetime prevalence of both psychological and physical violence used in dating relationships. They found a victimization rate for psychological violence of 81.5% for females and 76.3% for males. Harned's (2001) findings suggest similarly symmetrical and equally high rates of psychological abuse among dating partners at 82% for women and 87% for men.

The victimization rates of physical violence in dating relationships are lower than psychological abuse but are great enough to raise concern. The rates range from a low of 17.5% for females and 13.3% for males (Jackson, Cram, and Seymore, 2000), to a high of 22% for females and 21% for males (Harned, 2001).

Sexual assault between dating partners has not been as thoroughly researched as other forms of dating violence. Much of the research to date has focused on female victimization and male perpetration, and those that cover both male and female victimization fail to distinguish by relationship type. No study to date has directly compared the rates of sexual violence in dating relationship by gender. Considering what is unknown about sexual violence and the evidence of high rates of lifetime prevalence of psychological and physical dating violence, continued research into the topic remains necessary.

Offending Differences by Gender: What do we know?

Gender and Offender Typologies

Johnson (1995) explains that the reported rate of partner abuse differs greatly depending on the population under investigation, the methodologies used in the research, and the theoretical perspective on which the research is based. This realization has led some researchers to begin to use a typology approach to clarify and understand different types of abuse and how and why abusers differ. These typologies help us to better understand dating violence.

To date, only four typologies that include both males and females have been developed. Two of those typologies are based on married adult females and males (Johnson and Ferraro, 2000 and Swan and Snow, 2002), and the other two are based on male and female offenders in dating relationships (Monson and Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2002 and Stith, Jester, and Bird, 1992). In addition, most intimate partner violence typologies are based on male adults, the majority of whom are in married or cohabiting relationships. Monson and Langhinrichsen-Rohling (2002) and Stith, Jester, and Bird (1992) developed the two typologies based on young, college-age adults representing both male and female abusive persons in dating relationships.

Typologies of Male and Female Perpetrators of Spousal Violence

In their studies of gender and spousal abuse, Johnson (1995) and Johnson and Ferraro (2000) approach intimate partner violence typologies differently from other research by focusing more on the type of offense, rather than the type of offender. They do, however, acknowledge that males and females participate in different forms of abuse. Johnson explored the debate between researchers who take the feminist perspective,

verses those who advocate the family violence perspective. The feminist perspective theorizes that patriarchy is the overriding cause of domestic violence, while the family violence perspective cites stress and the acceptance of the use of some forms of violence in families. Johnson noted that the conclusions drawn from this research may be a consequence of the samples used. Feminist researchers have heavily relied on shelter samples, whereas family violence researchers relied on random samples from the general population. On average the respondents in those samples experience drastically different forms of domestic violence.

While each side of the domestic violence debate has criticized the flaws of the other's methodology,⁴ Johnson noted that both may be accurate. He argues that the battering cited by the shelter samples is *patriarchal terrorism*. In these cases, men are the primary source of abuse, and women are violent, only to defend themselves. He further argues that, while in some cases the physical abuse is quite severe, resulting in injury, it need not be. This type of batterer feels that it is his right to control *his* woman, and he will thus use any method necessary to gain control. This supposition means that in some relationships, physical violence may be rare, as the batterer terrorizes and controls his partner using other tactics, all of which may escalate over time.

Family violence researchers have identified a different form of domestic violence from their broad-based surveys. Johnson refers to this as *common couple violence*. Here, women are as likely as men to participate in mutual, low-level violence. The violence may be triggered by stress and conflict within the relationship. It does not appear to be

⁴ Feminist research often uses convenience samples of women in shelters and data from court, police, and emergency room data and feminist researchers critique the family violence perspective for its failure to measure the severity, context, motives, and outcomes of intimate partner violence. Family violence research often relies on the Conflict Tactics Survey which measures frequency of violence and these researchers often criticize feminist research for bias generated from the use of convenience samples.

spawned by the need or desire to control one's partner and may be less severe and less likely to escalate.

Five years later, Johnson and Ferraro (2000) further developed this typology by renaming *patriarchal terrorism* to *intimate terrorism*. They also added two additional types: *violence resistance* and *mutual violent control*. The *violence resistance* type includes those people who use violence as a means of self-defense rather than for other means. While violence resistance has not been well researched, with the exception of women who kill their batterers, it seems to be mainly perpetrated by women. *Mutual violent control* includes relationships where both partners are both controlling and violent. A seemingly rare relationship, this type requires much more extensive research in order to be better understood.

Swan and Snow (2002) developed a typology of the relationships of female and male perpetrators of intimate partner violence. Their sample consists of 108 female perpetrators recruited through court-ordered domestic violence programs, an inner-city health clinic, a family court division, and a local domestic violence shelter. The women reported both on their own and their partner's use of violence. Swan and Snow found four types of relationships: *victim type*, *aggressor type*, and two mixed types. In the *victim type*, although the women do engage in violence against their partners, their partners perpetrate more severe violence against them. In the *aggressor type*, the women used more severe violence and coercion against their partners. In *mixed-male coercive* relationships, the males are more coercive overall, but the females commit severe violence at rates greater than or equal to their partners' violence. In *mixed-female*

coercive relationships, the females are the coercive partners, and the males commit as much or more violence than their female partners.

They found similar levels of violence in the victim and aggressor types of relationships. These types were the most violent relationships overall. The mixed type relationships demonstrated statistically similar levels of physical violence and emotional abuse. However, these relationships did have statistically different levels of coercive control. Coercive men used many more coercive tactics than coercive women. The mixed-female coercive relationships were the least violent of all the relationship types.

Typologies of Male and Female Perpetrators of Dating Violence

To date, two studies have generated typologies based on dating violence offenders. From a sample of 673 college students, Monson and Langhinrichsen-Rohling (2002) developed a typology of perpetrators of dating violence. Their study included both male and female dating partners, and from it, they identified three types of offenders: the *relationship-only* type, the *generally violent/antisocial* type, and the *histrionic/preoccupied* type. The *relationship-only* type perpetrated less severe forms of violence against their partners and was minimally violent outside of the relationship. Male abusers and female abusers were equally represented in this type. The *generally violent/antisocial* type perpetrated more severe violence outside of the relationship, was more likely to have an arrest record, exhibited higher levels of antisocial and schizoid personality characteristics, was more likely to have experienced and witnessed violence within their family of origin, and exhibited more signs of alcohol abuse. Overall, males were more represented than females in this type. Finally, the *histrionic/preoccupied* type was primarily characterized by dependent and histrionic personality characteristics of the

offender. This type of offender also reported experiencing more sexual violence within the family of origin and was more likely to use sexual violence against a partner. The histrionic/preoccupied type consisted of more females than males.

Although Monson and Langhinrichsen-Rohling included both male and female daters, their typology focused largely on the psychopathology of offenders. Their study did include both physical and sexual offending but did not factor in the psychological offending patterns of the abusers.

Stith, Jester, and Bird (1992) developed the other typology created for perpetrators of dating violence. They collected a sample of 479 college students, distributing the survey on two occasions. Approximately half were first-year students randomly sampled in residence halls; collected in the first distribution, and the other half was a convenience sample of undergraduates in introductory social sciences classes collected in the second distribution. The second distribution was completed to make the sample more representative of the student body, as the dorms held younger students. They developed their typology based on the 97 females and 69 males who reported using physical violence against their partner. While they included both males and females in their typology, they did not analyze them separately.

The type of abuser labeled *stable minimizer* is most likely to be male and to stay in long-term relationships. While these abusers report mid-range levels of conflict in their relationships, they try to use self-control and avoidance-type coping mechanisms. When those coping mechanisms are unsuccessful, they sometimes become violent and emotionally abusive. The *hostile disengaged abusers* are found in both sexes and tend to be ambivalent in their relationships and less loving toward their partners. They cope with

the high conflict; in the relationship by using physical violence. *Hostile pursuers* use high levels of emotional abuse when faced with often extremely high levels of relationship conflict, however, they also engage in more relationship maintenance activities than many other groups. Hostile pursuers are also likely to be found in both sexes. The final type, the *secure lovers*, are more loving toward their partners, exhibit less conflict, and when conflict arises, use healthy forms of coping and conflict negotiation. They use less severe violence and use violence less frequently than in their relationships the other types and are more often female.

These typologies explain more about intimate partner offending than those only using a sample of male batterers because they take into account female offender patterns. It is important to include females in typologies because of the number of studies that found gender symmetry in the perpetration of intimate partner violence. Studies that include women in their samples help to close the gap in the knowledge about intimate partner violence. They also develop a base of information to help create appropriate treatment strategies for female offenders.

Gender and Correlates of Dating Violence

To understand whether there are differences in male and female perpetration of violence, one must consider other characteristics besides the frequency and severity of violence. Dynamics from the family of origin (experiencing child abuse and witnessing parental spousal violence), personal characteristics (substance use and abuse and impulsivity), relationship experiences (problem-solving and communication skills and relationship commitment), and motivational factors (anger management, control issues, and placement of blame) may help to characterize the complex nature of dating violence.

Researchers have debated considerably about the relevance of the dynamics in the family of origin to determine later perpetration of dating violence. Some have argued that no relationship exists between child abuse and dating violence (O'Keefe, Brockopp, and Chew, 1986, and Foo and Margolin, 1995). Others have found significant effects that differ across gender. In some studies, previous experiences of child abuse predict females' perpetration of dating violence, but not males (Follette and Alexander, 1992, O'Keefe, 1998, and Tontodonato and Crew, 1992). Moffitt and Caspi (1999) found that female offenders had a history of harsh family conditions including having received harsh discipline from parents. This finding is of specific value because it comes out of their longitudinal Dunedin study, and therefore does not rely on respondent's memory of past events, nor is it constrained by limits of being a school, criminal justice system, or clinical sample. Straus and Medeiros (2002) found that female daters with a history of neglect were at higher risk of committing forms of minor violence against a partner. In contrast, others have found an effect for males, but not females (Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987, Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good, 1988) including, Straus and Medeiros (2002) who found a relationship between male victims of child sexual abuse and later perpetration of dating violence.

The research regarding the effects of witnessing interparental spousal violence on later dating violence perpetration is also conflicting. Some research found no association (Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987, Riggs et al., 1990 and Tontodonato and Crew, 1992), while other studies identified relationships, although they did not distinguish between genders (Bernard and Bernard, 1983, Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987 and O'Keefe, Brockopp, and Chew, 1986). Other research using relatively strong models has displayed a relationship

only for male perpetrators (Foo and Margolin, 1995, Marshall and Rose, 1987, and O'Keefe, 1997). Still other research has shown that witnessing interparental violence is salient for females and not males (Follette and Alexander, 1992 and Riggs and O'Leary, 1996, Moffitt and Caspi, 1999). In several studies, the relationship between child abuse and later offending is most apparent when the individual has had the dual misfortune both to suffer child abuse and to witness parental spousal violence (Riggs, O'Leary, and Breslin, 1990, and Tontodonato and Crew, 1992).

Personal characteristics can also influence whether a young dater perpetrates dating violence. In general criminological literature cites substance use as a frequent correlate to crime; therefore, it should come as no surprise that this factor has also been found to be an important predictor of dating violence (Lewis and Fremouw, 2001, and O'Keefe, 1997). In their study of intimate partner violence (dating, cohabiting, and married participants), Moffitt and Caspi (1999) found a relationship between male commission of severe physical violence and extreme levels of polydrug use. Caetano et al. (2001) found that in community samples of married and cohabiting adults, males were more likely than females to have been drinking during intimate partner violence incidents (30-40% for males and 4-24% for females). Langan and Dawson (1995) found a significant relationship between male substance abuse at the time of intimate partner homicide. Other studies of domestic violence, many of which have only looked at male abusers have found evidence that the use and abuse of alcohol is a risk factor for partner abuse (Cunradi et al, 1999, Leonard, 2000, and Kantor and Straus 1990).

Poor impulse control has been raised as a contributing factor in spousal violence (Gondolf 1988, Holtzworth-Munroe, 1992), but has not been studied explicitly in a dating

population (Stith and Hamby, 2002). In their typology of male offenders, Holtzworth-Munroe et al. (2000) found that two types of offenders, generally violent/antisocial and borderline-dysphoric batterers, demonstrated significantly greater levels than the other type of batterer, family only.

Often, impulsivity in the form of sensation seeking or novelty seeking has also been linked to general aggressiveness (Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994, Zucherman, 1991, and Fowles, 1987). One study found a link between male impulsivity and delinquency, but no link between female impulsivity and delinquency (Colder and Stice, 1998). Another found a relationship between impulsiveness and aggressiveness for male parolees, but not for females (Cherek and Lane, 1998). Studies of personality have found that men tend to engage in significantly more risk-taking and impulsive sensation seeking than women (Zuckerman and Kuhlman, 2000).

One's problem-solving and communication skills can provide him or her with an alternative to perpetrating violence against a dating partner. Previous work has shown that deficits in these important relationship skills may lead both males and females to engage in violence to resolve conflict (Riggs et al., 1990, Barnett, et al., 1997, O'Keefe and Treister, 1998, Straus and Medeiros, 2002). According to these studies, a lack of healthy communication skills and problem-solving skills translates into the use of verbal and/or physical aggression. Furthermore, a breakdown in communication patterns may even predict when a violent incident will occur (Follingstad et al. 1991). Both male and female respondents in the Follingstad et al. (1999) study reported that they abused their partners when they did not know how to express themselves verbally. Other work has found a relationship between the lack of problem-solving and communication skills for

males only—not females (Follette and Alexander, 1992). Dutton and Browning (1988), and Holtzworth-Munroe (1991) compared male abusers' responses to enactments of marital conflicts to those of non-aggressive males and found that the abusers consistently used less constructive reasoning and favored verbal and physical aggression. Anglin and Holtzworth-Munroe (1997) found that both abusive husbands and wives demonstrated greater skill deficits in dealing with marital conflicts, as well as with those involving friends, bosses, parents, or other relatives. Several marital violence researchers (Babcock et al., 1993 and Infante, Chandler and Rudd, 1989) have investigated the impact of a lack of problem-solving skills during violent incidents.

Research has also found that male perpetrators of dating violence reported an inability to resist or inhibit their expressions of anger (Follingstad et al., 1999). Yet another study found that men who were more expressive, by showing more emotion or dependency on others, engaged in more dating violence (Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987). Lewis and Fremouw (2001) found that the inability to address relationship problems without violence, compounded by an inability to articulate requests for help or understand available resources, impacted male and females equally.

Other studies have researched the impact on partner violence of more commitment to the relationship and satisfaction with the relationship. Some studies show that increases in relationship commitment and increases in relationship violence are related (Billingham, 1987). O'Keefe and Treister (1998) found that both male and female offenders perpetrate abuse in more committed relationships. A pattern for male abuse in more committed relationships has been established in many studies (Arias, Samios, and O'Leary, 1987, Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good, 1988, Marshall and Rose,

1987, and Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987). The same pattern has been seen for females in two studies (Arias, Samios, and O’Leary, 1987, and Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good, 1988).

Intuitively, one would expect that relationship commitment and satisfaction would be highest in healthy relationships and lowest in abusive relationships; however, research often contradicts intuition. Billingham has theorized that partners may use violence against one another to test the “relative safety of a relationship before movement to a greater emotional commitment is risked” (p. 288). He also states that often the first instance of relationship violence is used once the relationship becomes more serious and committed. It is likely that violence used too early in the development of the relationship or in too casual a relationship results in dissolution of the partnership before it reaches a higher level of commitment. Victims of abuse may be less likely to abandon the abusive relationship if they have already emotionally committed themselves to the relationship.

Several studies have found that males and females use violence for different reasons. For instance females use physical violence to strike back for emotional hurts. Further, they also reported being motivated to use aggression to control their partner (Follingstad et al., 1991). In contrast, Sugarman and Hotaling (1998) found that males were more likely to use violence to “intimidate, frighten, or force the other to give [them] something” (p 107). Ronfeldt and Kimerling (1998) found that for males, both physical and psychological abuse resulted from low levels of satisfaction with relationship power. However, their sample excluded females, providing no indication of whether this relationship exists for female daters as well. Follingstad et al. (1991) also found that males used violence to show their jealousy. Other studies have found that females, but

not males, use violence to express their jealousy (Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987, Harned, 2001, Sugarman and Hotaling, 1998).

In their 2000 study, Jackson, Cram, and Seymore report that, when asked about their motivations for perpetrating emotional violence and physical violence, males and females responded similarly for emotional abuse with only one significantly different response for physical abuse—males were more likely to respond that they used physical violence to express their anger. Compared with non-abusive males, Eckhardt, Jamison, and Watts (2002) found that abusive males experience anger hyperarousal which places their partners at great risk for abuse. Follingstad et al. (1991) also found that males used violence as a means to express their anger. A wealth of literature has been compiled on anger and hostility as a correlate to male perpetrated spousal abuse.⁵

Sugarman and Hotaling, 1998 found that females, but not males, use violence to express their anger. Yet other studies reported that males and females were equally likely to use violence to express their anger (Dye and Eckhardt, 2000, and Cascardi and Vivian 1995). Lavoie (2000) found that often both young men and women agree that there are some topics that should not be discussed and some actions that should not be taken in relationships to avoid angering their partners and therefore prevent abuse.

A lack of anger management skills further complicates the issue. Dye and Eckhardt (2000) found that males demonstrated less control over their anger than females. They also found that both violent males and females had more difficulty calming down after a violence incident than non-violent individuals. In a study of male anger and dating violence, Eckhardt et al. (2002) found that escalation in anger among dating violence perpetrators was associated with an inability to “directly and assertively

⁵ See Stith and Hamby (2002) for a review of the literature.

communicate their level of anger” (p. 1111). Non-violent men did not reflect the same association. Straus and Medeiros (2002) found a lack of anger management skills was correlated to both male and female dating violence. Anger as a motivation for spousal violence is so well established that numerous domestic violence treatment and prevention programs use anger management curricula (Stith and Hamby, 2002).

Research Questions

Ultimately the goal of this paper is to recommend a gender appropriate method for studying dating violence. Numerous researchers approach their study of dating violence offending in different methods. Some focus only on either male or female offenders. Others conduct research of both male and female offenders but do not analyze gender differences. Still others consistently assess gender differences in all of their research. This paper will research and examine male and female prevalence of offending behaviors, prevalence of victimization, and predictors of dating violence. The clear evidence in the research of spousal violence, violence between cohabiting partners, and dating violence for the concept of gender symmetry begs the question: if females and males perpetrate similar amounts of violence, are they alike in other ways? The answer to that question will guide recommendations for whether male and female offenders differ enough to recommend a gendered research approach.

Collectively, the research on dating violence seems to suggest that family of origin dynamics affect whether males or females perpetrate dating violence. Social learning theory may explain some dating violence offending (Lewis and Fremouw, 2001). The effects of social learning, the lack of role models to teach healthy conflict resolution, and the cumulative effect of experienced and witnessed abuse in childhood

may explain the similarity of findings when the bulk of the research is considered (Lewis and Fremouw, 2001). Social structural theory may also play a role in the impact of family of origin variables on dating violence. Children who grow up in homes where situational stress is present in the form of child abuse or witnessing severe interparental strife may be socialized to view the violence as an appropriate way to deal with certain situations (Gelles, 1972).

Differences in socialization between boys and girls may explain the differences that are found in the research. As girls are socialized to focus on relationships, nurturing, and bonding inside and outside of the family, they may suffer a life-lasting impact when abused by a parent (Foshee, 1999); therefore, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 1: Females who experienced child abuse are more likely to perpetrate dating violence than males.

As males are not socialized in the same way, their bonding primarily forms inside of the family unit (Foshee, 1999). This socialization may increase the salience of witnessing interparental abuse, thus, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 2: Witnessing interparental abuse will be more salient for male batterers than female batterers.

Substance abuse, both alcohol and other drugs, plays a role in both general crime and in intimate partner violence. Some individuals who use alcohol do so because they perceive that it will help them “loosen up.” The experience of “loosening up” leads to a decrease in inhibitions. It is natural to assume that a decrease in inhibitions may translate into a higher propensity for violence. Studies have found that alcohol increases levels of male aggression, but not females (Gussler-Burkhardt and Giancola, 2005) and disrupts

ones ability to make complex decisions, especially if it requires an analysis of costs and benefits (Abbey et al., 2006). Culturally, violence as a result of drugs or alcohol is more socially acceptable for males than females (Scott et. al., 1999), in fact, Peralta and Cruz (2006) found that alcohol-related violence was interpreted by college students as an expression of masculinity. For these reasons, I hypothesize that:

Hypotheses 3: Substance abuse will be more strongly related to the dating partner offending of men than of women.

Impulsivity may be an element in an individual's low self-control which may be a predictor of both general crime as well as partner violence (Moffitt et al., 2000). When doing a comparison of respondents' general violence and their intimate partner violence, Moffitt et al. (2000) found weak constraint of both male and female abusers was only associated with their general crime and not their relationship violence. Females may experience higher levels of empathy and guilt, which serve as a protective factor, making them less likely to engage in delinquent acts (Zhan-Waxler et al., 1991). As research has tied impulsivity to both spousal violence and general aggressiveness, it seems reasonable to surmise that it may be related to dating violence as well. Because a relationship between impulsivity and dating violence has not been established, I am interested in whether or not impulsivity will predict dating violence. Since impulsivity is often associated with male aggressiveness, I hypothesize that:

Hypotheses 4: Impulsivity will be more closely correlated with the dating violence perpetration of men than that of women.

Vera et al. (2004) concluded that the ability to solve relationship problems constructively, using positive communication styles and without resorting to violence out

of anger or frustration, does not seem to be rooted in gender, as females may shy away from direct confrontation and males may avoid resolution style communication, preferring insults instead. Possessing the skills necessary to avoid violence, relieve stress, and solve relationship conflicts is necessary for the maintenance of a healthy relationship. Numerous studies have found a relationship between both communication skills and problem-solving skills; however, there has been no consistency in the findings regarding gender. The ability to manage conflict in a direct and non-violent manner is essential for both partners in a relationship; therefore, I hypothesize that:

Hypotheses 5-6: The lack of problem-solving skills and communication skills will predict batterers of both sexes equally.

Though counter-intuitive, the findings of an association between increased levels of relationship satisfaction and commitment and dating violence seem sound. Once relationships are established, commitments made, and mutual dependencies developed, one may be less likely to abandon them. Relationships need not be healthy to be comfortable. As relationships become more comfortable, individuals may use more abusive behaviors to control their partners and keep the relationship constant. This leads me to hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 7: Reporting greater relationship satisfaction and commitment will relate to both female and male use of partner violence.

Clearly, a relationship between anger and dating violence has been established in the literature. The relationship of gender to anger has yet to be clarified in the dating violence literature. Overall, violent expressions of anger and aggression are often excused as expected, if not socially acceptable, forms of behavior for males. This same social

acceptance does not apply as freely to females. Because of this, and since there is some literature supporting an association between male dater's use of partner violence and problems with anger, I hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 8: Males will more often use violence to project their anger than females.

Additionally, while there is literature on the topic of anger-management and spousal abuse, there is little available on the impact of anger-management skills on dating violence. I will explore influence on anger management skills on dating violence and hypothesize that:

Hypothesis 9: The possession and use of anger-management skills will serve as a protective factor for males.

Table 1 summarizes the hypotheses. The methods will be discussed below.

Insert Table 1 about here

Methodology

Sample and Procedure

The data used in this study come from the Dating Violence Study conducted by Stith and Hamby (2002). The sample is of students who attend a large mid-Atlantic university in the United States. Undergraduate students in human development, accounting, business, engineering and ROTC classes were sampled. Students were recruited to participate on a voluntary basis. Of the 474 surveys distributed, males represented 28% or 132 students and females represented 72% or 342 students. Of those students, 62.9% reported on a current dating relationship and 37.1% reported on a previous relationship. The relationship length varied with most participants reporting relationship duration of between 3 months and 2 years.

This research looks exclusively at violent dating relationships. Due to the differences between the dynamics of dating and those of cohabitation and marriage, those participants who reported that they live with their partner 10.8% (48) or were married to their partner 1.3% (6) were omitted from the analysis. Due to the low response of members of same-sex relationships (7 respondents—less than 2% of respondents), those participants were also dropped from the sample. Nineteen participants were dropped from the sample because of incomplete surveys or a failure to correctly code the answer sheets. The final sample for this study included 394 students (28% male and 72% female).

Overall, the respondents are young adults, an average age of 20, and white (87.8%), with upper-middle class backgrounds (56.2% had a family income of over \$70,000). Most students reported on a current relationship (62.9%), while 37.1%

reported on their most recent relationship. Table 2 summarizes the demographic breakdown of respondents.

Insert Table 2 about here

Data Analysis

To analyze the impact of gender on dating violence offending, I examine the predictors of dating violence using logistic regressions and test for differences between male and female offenders. To assess differences between male and female perpetrators on the correlates of dating violence, I run two logistic regressions and use a Chow test to detect whether any of the estimates differ across gender. I then test for gender differences across each coefficient, using the Paternoster et al (1998) test for the equality of regression coefficients, which is “used to test for the difference between two regression coefficients across independent samples” (p. 859)⁶. For each regression, I compute Odds Ratios to interpret the findings.

The first logistic regression is run on the dependent variable, Psychological, Psychological/Physical/Sexual Offending (PPS), having engaged in physical, sexual, or psychological violence against one’s dating partner. The second logistic regression is run on the dependent variable, Physical/Sexual Offending (PS), having engaged in physical or sexual violence against one’s dating partner. The use of two regressions run on different dependent variables should reflect overall offender differences between genders as well as differences between the less and more serious offenders. In both models, the cumulative logistic function:

⁶ The equation, $Z = \frac{b_1 - b_2}{\sqrt{SEb_1^2 + SEb_2^2}}$ is used to perform the Paternoster et al. test.

$$P(\text{Offending} = 1) = \frac{\exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 FO + \beta_2 PC + \beta_3 RE + \beta_4 MI)}{1 + \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 FO + \beta_2 PC + \beta_3 RE + \beta_4 MI)}$$

estimates the likelihood that a person perpetrates dating violence.

FO (family of origin) variables include the respondent's experience of child abuse and experience of witnessing interparental abuse and the interaction of experiencing both. The FO variables address the effects of the dynamics of one's family of origin on his/her later relationships. PC (personal characteristics) variables such as substance abuse and impulsivity have long been associated with commission of offending behaviors. RE (relationship experiences) variables, including problem-solving skills and communication skills, provide daters the skills to avoid using violence as a relationship conflict technique. An additional RE variable, relationship commitment/satisfaction, is often associated with dating violence. Finally, the MI (motivational issues) variables, problems with anger and anger management skills, offer insight into the context of dating violence. The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, race, and one's satisfaction with life are also used as control variables in the logistic regressions.

Measures

Measures of Offending

Conflict Tactics Scale, Revised (CTS2). The CTS2 is a revised version of Straus's original Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), which is used to measure perpetration of and victimization by intimate partner violence. The Conflict Tactics Scale has been used in numerous clinical and national studies and has been used abroad to document the prevalence of intimate partner violence (Elliot et al., 1985, Straus and Gelles, 1986, Straus et al., 1980, Magdol et al., 1997). The CTS2 includes five scales designed to measure negotiation (6 items), psychological aggression (8 items), physical assault (12

items), sexual coercion (7 items), and injury (6 items). Respondents were asked to report on the frequency of engaging in each behavior in the previous year: not at all, once, twice, 3-5 times, 6-10 times, 11-20 times, more than 20 times, or not in the past year (Straus et al., 1996).

I constructed two measures of offending. One includes the offending patterns of abusers who used psychological, physical, or sexual violence against a partner and the other includes only those who used physical or sexual violence. To generate the two dependent variables for the two logistic regressions and to isolate offenders for the principal components analysis, anyone who responded having used an abusive behavior in a dating relationship, was included in the variable. The severe subscale of the psychological aggression scale, and the injury, physical assault, sexual coercion scales served as the criteria for an abusive person's inclusion in the variable, Psychological/Physical/Sexual Offending (PPS). This process resulted in a binary response variable of 209 (74%) female abusers and 75 (26%) male abusers who had committed psychological, physical, and/or sexual abuse against a partner. The psychological aggression subscale was dropped from the sample, and the same analysis was also run on students who met the threshold of being physically or sexually violent toward their partners, creating the binary response variable, Physical/Sexual Offending (PS), resulting in a variable of 121 (73%) female and 45 (27%) male physical and/or sexual offenders.

The Conflicts Tactics Scale is one of the most commonly used to measure intimate partner violence. Straus and Hamby (1996) report that the internal consistency reliability of the CTS2 scales ranges from .79 to .95. There is also evidence of construct

validity in samples of college students. Cronbach's alpha reliability for participants in this study ranged from .78 -.85. The items used in the CTS2 can be found in Appendix A, instrument pages 11-14.

Tolman's Psychological Abuse Scale. Tolman's scale measures verbal and emotional abuse as well as domination and isolation in relationships. It consists of fourteen statements, including "I interfered with my partner's relationships with other family members" (Tolman, 1989, p. 164). Response options range from *never* to *very frequently* with an option of *not applicable*. Respondents who reported that they had engaged in any of the psychologically abusive behaviors in this scale occasionally, frequently, or very frequently were also included in the PPS variable along with those identified by the CTS2. The internal consistency coefficients for the scale were high for males and females $\alpha=.91$ - $\alpha=.94$, however the intracouple scores were not consistent. The Cronbach's alpha reliability for this sample is .84. The items used from Tolman's psychological abuse scale are found in Appendix A, instrument page 9. Tolman's scale has not been widely used in intimate partner violence literature, but has been used to validate other studies including the Propensity for Abusiveness Scale (Dutton, 2001)

Independent Variables

Most of the independent variables were generated from previously developed and tested scales and indexes. A description of each variable is provided in Table 2 and the construction of each variable is described in Table 3. For the purpose of this analysis, the Scale Reliability Coefficient's for each variable were generated using Cronbach's alpha.

Insert Table 3 about here

The RE variables are generated using the Revised-Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS), which measures relationship satisfaction to distinguish between distressed and adjusted relationships. It is a 14-item revised version (Busby et al., 1995) of Spanier's (1976) 32-item Dyadic Adjustment Scale. In the current study, this scale measures relationship skills and satisfaction and commitment of the perpetrator of dating violence, using questions such as, "How often do you regret that you are dating?" (Busby et al., 1995, p. 269). Questions from this scale (see Appendix A instrument pages 5-6 for questions and response choices) are used to create the independent variables *relationship satisfaction/commitment* (questions 31-36), *problem-solving skills* (questions 37-41) and *communication skills* (questions 42-44). The RDAS demonstrates both a high level of reliability overall (Cronbach's alpha=.90) and acceptable levels of construct validity (Busby et al., 1995). Cronbach's alphas for participants in this study are as follows: *relationship satisfaction commitment* (.75), *problem-solving skills* (.80), and *communication* (.72).

PC variables are generated using both the Impulsiveness Scale and Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index (RAPI). The purpose of the Impulsiveness Scale is to measure the respondent's level of impulsivity. Borgotta (1965) designed a five statement scale, including such questions as, "I usually act on the spur of the moment" (p.453), to which the respondent may agree or disagree (see Appendix A instrument page 6). This scale was used to create the independent variable *impulsivity*. Cronbach's alpha for *impulsivity* in this sample was .63. Since a reliability coefficient of .70 is preferred in social sciences, it should be noted that the reliability for this sample is low. The RAPI measures the use and/or abuse of alcohol among young adults and adolescent populations. It is

designed to measure their acute and chronic problems with alcohol. Questions regarding driving under the influence, effects of alcohol on school or work, and effects of alcohol on relationships are used to measure alcohol problems (White and Labouvie, 1989). Response choices range from never, rarely, occasionally, frequently, very frequently to not applicable. The RAPI reflected an internal consistency of .92 in early measurements (White and Labouvie, 1989). This index generated the independent variable *problems with alcohol*, and this sample had a Cronbach's alpha of .92. See Appendix A, instrument pages 9-10 for a list of questions.

The Anger Management Scale is used to generate the MI variables. It is designed to measure the respondent's anger management skills. It focuses on the respondent's escalating strategies, negative attributions (blaming a partner for their anger), self-awareness, and calming strategies. It consists of 47 statements to which respondents can strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree regarding their anger management skills, for example, "When my partner provokes me, I have a right to fight back" (Stith and Hamby, 2002, p. 390). Preliminary psychometric data based on a sample of university students indicate a high level of internal consistency. Significant associations with psychological, physical, and sexual violence indicate construct validity (Stith and Hamby, 2002). This scale was used to create the independent variables *anger problems* and *anger management*. This sample's Cronbach's alpha for *anger problems* was .77 and for *anger management* was .68 (slightly below the .70 recommendation). The anger management scale is located in Appendix A in the instrument, pages 6-8.

To generate the FO variables, respondents were asked two questions to determine whether they experienced severe verbal or physical abuse as a child and whether they

witnessed physical violence between their parents or guardians. From these questions, the independent variables *experience child abuse* and *witness interparental abuse* were generated. See the instrument page 4 located in Appendix A for questions.

Control Variables

The Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale is used to detect response bias among participants who feel the need to respond with socially desirable answers, rather than providing honest answers. It contains 33 true-false statements to assess the participant's unwillingness to admit negative traits. The scale includes statements like, "I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way," and, "I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings" (p. 357). It is used to control for students who will answer with socially desirable responses on other questions on the survey (Crowne and Marlowe, 1960). This scale was used to create the variable, *social desirability*.

Additional variables were utilized to control for the effects of race and satisfaction with life. The variable *white* is a binary response variable that indicates whether a respondent is Caucasian or of another race or ethnicity. The variable *satisfaction with life* is generated from the Diener et al. (1985) Satisfaction with Life Scale. This scale is designed to capture an individual's overall judgment of his or her life as a measure of life satisfaction. The scale includes statements like, "In most ways, my life is close to ideal," and "If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing" (p. 72).

Limitations

One of the most serious limitations to the study involves the non-random design of the study and rather low response rate of males which may result in selection bias. Despite the fact that the student body of the University is more populated by men than

women, in 2000 there were 12,690 male students compared to 8718 female students, the low proportion of male participants (28%) suggests that some males may have selected out of the sample. If this selection bias did happen, it raises serious concerns for the generalizability of these findings. If more violent male daters selected themselves out of the study, the selection bias may result in a profile of less serious batterers.

Since the concept of “violence against women” has been used to educate about intimate partner violence and has been utilized in prevention efforts, males may have a belief that many of the topics covered in the survey are “women’s issues.” This perspective may have discouraged men from participating in this study. Males may not have been interested in participating in such a study and the voluntary nature of the study gave them a legitimate means to opt out. Because the reasons for the low response rate of males in the study cannot be known, extreme caution should be used when comparing this research to others on the topic.

While this data offers many excellent variables to study dating violence, it has some inherent problems. Abusers who are college students are unlikely to represent other abusers, and thus we can only generalize findings to college students. As an example, we know that the students in this sample are younger and come from more affluent families than the population as a whole. Also, because this research excludes homosexual dating partners, the findings will only attest to dating violence within heterosexual relationships.

This study provides a wide range of variables for use in the generation of a typology that are reasonably associated with dating violence; however, it omits two important variables: a measure of violence outside of the relationship (generality) and a measure of self-defense. Fortunately, the study includes data on both male and female

dating violence, allowing for gendered and gender-neutral analyses. The use of a university sample rather than a clinical group or a criminal justice system sample enables the Dating Violence Study to contribute to the knowledge base regarding gender and dating violence among this group.

Findings and Discussion

Prevalence

The prevalence of dating violence is calculated two ways in the study to provide information on prevalence on both victimization and offending behaviors. Respondents in this study report exceptionally high rates of victimization in every form of abuse. One hundred percent of the respondents (394 students in dating relationships) have experienced some form psychological abuse by a partner. When focusing on more severe forms of psychological abuse, 27% of females and 19% of males report victimization. For both physical and sexual abuse, 100% of female and male respondents have experienced at least one form of physical violence and at least one form of sexual violence at the hands of a partner. These statistics are shocking in light of the previous research on dating violence, and they suggest that dating violence is more commonplace in relationships than previously expected.

Prevalence data generated from the Dating Violence Study also reflect surprisingly high rates of dating violence perpetration as shown in Table 4. Ninety-two percent of research participants report that they have used psychological violence against their partner. Almost 93% of female respondents and almost 91% of male respondents state that they have used psychological abuse against their partner at least one time in the past year. Forty percent of the respondents in this study report having used some form of physical violence (mild to severe) against their partners (36% of males and 42% of females reported having used physical violence against their partners). Twenty-five percent report using sexual violence against their partner. When broken out into gender

37% of males and 20% of females report having used sexual violence against their partner in the past year. Table 4 includes both victimization and perpetration data.

Insert Table 4 about here

Logistic Regressions

I ran a series of logistic regressions to examine gender differences in predictors of offending for females and males. The first regression was run on Psychological/Physical/and Sexual Offending (PPS), and the second was run on Physical/and Sexual Offending (PS). I ran both the PS and PPS models separately for males and females. Due to the low number of males in the sample, the analysis of these models may suffer a loss of statistical power. Testing for equality of coefficients across samples however, it is still preferred over an interaction model. Because of the large number of variables, the interaction model would be difficult to interpret.

Results of the first set of regressions are found in Table 5. The Chow Test indicated at least one significant difference between male and female offending. Several important differences exist between the men and women in the model that included psychologically abusive behaviors (PPS). Some of the variables in the study are significantly related to both female and male offending, and other variables are significantly related to either female or male offending. In this model problems with alcohol and problems with anger were significantly related to both female and male offending. Females with a lack of healthy problem-solving skills are at greater risk than males for offending behaviors (OR = 1.337). High levels of relationship commitment and satisfaction are mildly associated with a greater risk of offending for males (OR = 1.17). The analysis also indicates that male respondents displayed high levels of socially

desirable responses. The odds of a male respondent answering in a socially desirable manner are 1.16 times greater than for female respondents.

To test those findings for statistically significant differences between male and female offending, I used the Paternoster et al. (1998) test for the equality of regression coefficients. The test indicated that male and female respondents differed significantly on only one variable: *problem-solving skills*.

Insert Table 5 about here

When the logistic regression was run once again on the PS offenders (those respondents who had crossed the threshold of physical abuse, eliminating those who were psychologically abusive), the Chow test indicated at least one significant difference in female and male offending, and several significant relationships were discovered. These findings are available in Table 6. In this model both male and female respondents' problems with alcohol are significantly related to their offending. Female offending is also significantly related to a lack of healthy problem-solving skills (OR = 1.24). This finding is consistent in both models for females. Risk factors associated with male offending in this analysis of more severe offenders include problems controlling anger and high levels of relationship satisfaction. The odds of a male with an anger control problem abusing his partner are 1.31 times higher than for females. As in the analysis that included psychologically abusive behaviors, males who reported high levels of relationship satisfaction and commitment are 1.23 times more likely than females to abuse a partner. Two variables which decrease the likelihood of male offending include possessing anger management skills (OR = .89) and having witnessed interparental abuse (OR = .37).

For these analyses, the Paternoster et al. (1998) test indicated three significant differences between female and male offenders. Females and males differed significantly on problems with anger, relationship commitment/satisfaction, and witnessing interparental abuse.

Insert Table 6 about here

Some of the above findings uncover unexpected gender associations. Of the two hypotheses based on family of origin dynamics, neither is corroborated by the logistic regressions results. Hypothesis 1 is unsupported by the data: females victimized by child abuse appear to be no more likely to perpetrate dating violence than males. In fact, having experienced child abuse is not significantly associated with either female or male offending in either analysis. Hypothesis 2 is unsupported. In fact, the data show a relationship in an unexpected direction. Witnessing child abuse is salient for male offenders, but it serves as a protective factor, reducing the likelihood that a male will engage in dating violence. These findings are equally surprising given the breadth of literature suggesting that family of origin factors play an important role in the socialization of children.

This study produces interesting findings among the personal characteristics associated with dating violence. Hypothesis 3, a well documented relationship between male offending and alcohol is met. However, alcohol use is also associated with female offending. The association is found in both the analysis that included less serious offenders (PPS) and the analysis that focused on the more serious offenders (PS). That the sample is a university sample may be impacting these findings. Alcohol is readily available on college campuses and its use is part of the social norm, therefore an impact

of alcohol on relationships is understandable. Hypothesis 4 is unsupported, suggesting that impulsivity is not associated with male or female offending behaviors in either of the logistic regressions.

Hypotheses predicting an association between relationship experiences and dating violence met with mixed results. Hypothesis 5, predicting an association between a lack of problem-solving skills and dating violence, is only partially met. The female offenders in both analyses indicate that they lacked effective problem-solving skills; however, male offending is never associated with a lack problem-solving skills. Hypothesis 6, the relationship between offending and the lack of communication skills, is completely unsupported by the data. Communication skills have no significant association with offending for either gender. A relationship between one's interpersonal skills and the health of her or his relationships has been demonstrated in previous research on dating violence. This intuitive and previously supported association is not well supported by these results.

Hypothesis 7, predicting that relationship satisfaction and commitment is risk factor for both females and males is only partially met. A high level of relationship satisfaction and commitment is associated with male abuse, both severe behaviors and more broadly defined abusive behaviors. Although the *relationship satisfaction and commitment* variable is insignificant for females in both models, the Paternoster test reflects no significant differences for males and females. This finding supports the literature that suggests that abuse within a relationship increases as the commitment levels of that relationship increase.

Additionally, the findings regarding the motivational variables for offending are inconsistent. Hypothesis 8, stating that males will more often use violence to project their anger than females is partially met. In the model predicting psychological, physical, and sexual offending, both female and male offending are associated with anger problems. However, when only the physical and sexual abuse is analyzed, a significant gender difference is found and anger problems are only associated with male offending. The expectation that the possession of anger management skills would serve as a protective factor for males, Hypothesis 9, is met in the PS analysis. Anger management skills significantly reduce a male's likelihood of abusing a partner. These data demonstrate a clear relationship between anger control problems and dating violence and the use of anger management tools as a risk reduction technique. Table 7 describes the hypotheses and important findings.

Insert Table 7 about here

Conclusions and Implications for Future Research

I began this research to discern whether male and female offenders differ significantly to warrant separate gendered research. The findings from the logistic regressions suggest some important similarities and distinctions between male and female offenders. These findings should be tempered; however, in the light of a limited generalizability both because of the college sample and due to the low response rate for males.

The prevalence rates in this sample are exceptionally high. This finding is surprising considering that this study focuses on abusive acts that have taken place within the past year, while most previous work on dating violence provides lifetime rates.

Because of the low response rate of male participants and the potential for selection bias, one would have expected underreporting of offending behaviors; however, the opposite was found. The expectation was that the most abusive men may have selected out of the study, and although it is unlikely, it could be that violent men could identify with the topic or were more interested in violence as a whole.

Although the prevalence data are generated using the CTS2, which is the most common instrument used to research dating violence, slight differences in utilization make it difficult to compare across studies (Follingstad et al, 1999). Additionally, Tolman's Psychological Abuse scale is used in addition to the CTS2 to generate the prevalence data for mild psychological abuse, and encompasses more abusive behaviors than the CTS2 alone. This provides a greater likelihood of higher prevalence and limits the ability for comparison across mild psychological violence.

Two of the most interesting findings in this study revolve around male offending. The finding that having witnessed interparental domestic violence served as a protective factor reducing the likelihood that a male would abuse his partner was surprising. Much of the previous research has found a "role-model" effect suggesting that male children are socialized to behave like their fathers. The findings in this study suggest the opposite may be true—that males who witness domestic violence use that experience as a motivation not to become abusive and support Stets and Pirog-Good's (1987) speculation that people who experienced or witnessed abuse as children may be more likely to refrain from dating violence and conflict.

Another counterintuitive finding is that male dating violence is associated with high levels of relationship and commitment. Billingham (1987) has suggested that some

abusers do not initiate abuse until the relationship is secure and it is “safe” for abuse to take place. This finding may support his theory.

Impulsivity had been expected to predict male use of dating violence; however, a relationship was not found. The lack of an association could give support to the power and control theory that suggests intimate partner violence is not random; rather it is used as a tool to dominate and control.

Regardless of gender, associations between dating violence and both problems with alcohol and anger problems are strong. These findings support a treatment-based approach as a means of reducing dating violence. Appropriate interventions designed to either address an abuser’s substance abuse problems or counsel abusers through their anger issues may impact offending for both women and men.

It appears that men who lack effective anger management skills offend more than those who possess those skills. While this finding did not hold true for psychologically abusive men or for women, approaches designed to equip male offenders with anger management skills may produce success. Along those same lines, females who lack problem-solving skills may also be at high risk for offending behaviors and therefore may benefit from targeted services.

Nine hypotheses were examined in this research. These hypotheses were based on fairly consistent findings from previous studies of gender and dating violence. Most of the hypotheses that were partially or fully unsupported by the analyses suggesting that some of the gender differences found in other studies may be less universal than suggested. While it is clear that gender differences exist, the full impact of those

differences on the context, motives, and outcomes of violence still requires further investigation.

This research is important because it adds to our understanding of the impact of gender on dating violence. The goal of this analysis was to question the premise that male and female offenders of dating violence are inherently different from one another. Overall, this work suggests that males and females have different risk and protective factors; however, the offender's gender seems to explain fewer offending differences than one may expect. Clearly, additional work needs to be completed to gain a more complete picture of the gender influence on dating violence. This work must involve comparisons between predictors of both receiving and perpetrating dating violence, the contexts of the violence and its impacts on the victims and relationships.

In an effort to further understanding of gender and dating violence, research should continue to explore the relationship between offending and gender. Although a significant body of research demonstrating gender symmetry in dating violence exists, research on only one gender or the other continues to be completed. That research may provide insight into dating violence; however, the empirical data on symmetry remains necessary and will play a valuable role in implementing interventions and in creating gender appropriate prevention strategies (Straus, 2005).

Persons conducting studies of this issue will want to design their inquiries to include several variables in addition to those available in this study. First, the ability to control for self-defense is crucial to a full understanding of dating violence. The literature on dating violence strongly suggests that a part of female and perhaps even male offending may in fact be defensive behavior. With this said, studies of dating

violence should include measures for defensive behaviors. Much of the previous research, including that of Johnson and Ferraro (2000), emphasizes that self-defense exists as the true motive behind some portion of female offending.

Further research on gender and dating violence should also ascertain the generality of offending behaviors. A perpetrator of dating violence may violently victimize non-intimate partners, and this tendency may differ for males and females. Moffitt and Caspi (1999) found that one of the greatest predictors of male intimate partner violence was a record of “physically aggressive delinquent offending” earlier than the subject’s fifteenth birthday. Although the generality of violence is not often included in gendered research of dating violence at this point, it is frequently used as a variable of interest in research on marital violent offenders. Moffitt et al (2000) found a moderate relationship between partner violence and general crime, although they found significant differences as well, suggesting that partner violence and general crime are driven by different propensities.

Additionally, studies on the impact of gender on offending patterns in dating relationships should also incorporate other motivational components frequently associated with dating violence, including power dynamics, control dynamics, and attitudes regarding gender-roles. Future research on gender and dating violence should also strive for a larger number of respondents as a larger sample might produce more significant findings.

In an effort to understand the relationship between gender and dating violence, researchers should move beyond the typical convenience samples of secondary school students and university students. To be thorough, studies should focus on all groups of

young people including high school dropouts and young adults who fail to pursue a college education. These studies would ideally also provide a source of incentive to participants to capture those who may typically choose to opt out of the study.

As discussed in the literature review, research is investigating the impact of gender on dating violence in multiple ways. Much of the research delves into prevalence, symmetry, consequences, and predictors of dating violence. There is a need for additional insight into the context and motivations of dating violence. Domestic violence research has incorporated many of these areas into typologies of offenders. To date, few dating violence studies have yielded typological structures for daters. To develop a complete understanding of the phenomenon of dating violence, research should consider differences among offenders. When presented in a typology, a better understanding of the impact of gender and other variables related to dating violence can be formed, and that understanding can and should be used to implement and guide development of interventions, prevention programs, and public policies.

Table 1: Hypotheses

Hypothesis #	<u>Impact of Gender on Offending Patterns</u>
Hypothesis 1	Females victimized by child abuse will have a greater association to the perpetration of dating violence than males
Hypothesis 2	Witnessing interparental abuse will be more salient for male batterers than female batterers
Hypothesis 3	Substance abuse will be more strongly related to the intimate partner violence offending of men than of women
Hypothesis 4	Impulsivity will be more correlated with the dating violence perpetration of men than of women
Hypothesis 5	The lack of problem-solving skills will affect batterers of both sexes equally
Hypothesis 6	The lack of communication skills will affect batterers of both sexes equally
Hypothesis 7	Reporting greater relationship satisfaction and commitment will correlate with female and male use of partner violence
Hypothesis 8	Males will more often use violence to project their anger than females
Hypothesis 9	The possession and use of anger-management skills will serve as a protective factor for males

Table 2: Respondents by Gender, Race/Ethnicity, Age, and Income

Demographics			
	<u>Percentage</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	27.9	.449	0-1
Female	72.0		
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>			
Asian	3.3	.681	1-7
African-American	4.8		
Caucasian/White	87.8		
Native American/ American Indian/Samoan	.3		
Latin American	1.5		
Other	2.0		
<u>Age</u>			
18	2.3	1.040	1-6
19	26.9		
20	36.3		
21	22.1		
22-24	11.9		
25-29	.5		
<u>Family Income</u>			
under \$9,999	0.5	1.973	1-9
\$10,000 to \$19,999	1.8		
\$20,000 to \$29,999	2.1		
\$30,000 to \$39,999	7.8		
\$40,000 to \$49,999	6.3		
\$50,000 to \$59,999	12.5		
\$60,000 to \$69,999	13.0		
\$70,000 to \$79,999	10.5		
<u>Sex Part of relationship</u>			
Yes	26.34	.455	1-2
No	73.40		
Predictors			
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>S.D.</u>	<u>Range</u>
Witness Interparental Abuse	0.08	0.277	0-1
Experience Child Abuse	.09	0.285	0-1
Problems with Alcohol	34.42	11.810	24-94
Impulsivity	8.09	1.343	5-14
Relationship	28.46	4.855	7-36
Satisfaction-Commitment			
Problem-solving Skills	8.70	2.708	4-20
Communication Skills	11.94	2.811	3-18
Anger Problems	16.69	4.383	9-32
Anger Management	29.31	4.287	17-40

Table 3: Dating Violence Predictor Variables

Variable	Measure	Possible Values	Missing Values
<i>Family of Origin</i>			
Witness Interparental Abuse	An indicator variable identifying whether or not a respondent witnessed physical violence between parents or guardians	0, 1	0
Experience Child Abuse	An indicator variable identifying how the respondent was disciplined as a child	0, 1	3
<i>Personal Characteristics</i>			
Problems with Alcohol	An index that sums consequences that result from alcohol consumption	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	4
Impulsivity	An index that sums the respondents inclinations toward impulsiveness	1, 2	1
<i>Relationship Experiences</i>			
Relationship Satisfaction-Commitment	An index that increases by one increment to measure an individual's level of relationship satisfaction and commitment	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	6
Problem-solving Skills	An index that increases by one increment to measure decrease in an individual's lack of problem-solving skills	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	6
Communication Skills	An index that increases by one increment to measure a decrease in an individual's lack of communication skills	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	4
<i>Motivational Factors</i>			
Anger Problems	An index that increases by one increment for each increase in anger problems	1, 2, 3, 4	4
Anger Management	An index that increases by one increment to measure an individual's lack of anger management skills	1, 2, 3, 4	12

Table 4: Prevalence of Dating Violence by Gender

	<u>N</u>	<u>Male</u> <u>Prevalence</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Female</u> <u>Prevalence</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Prevalence</u>
Victimization						
All psychological Abuse	110	100	284	100	394	100
Psychological Abuse (Severe)	26	23.64	54	19.01	80	20.30
Physical	110	100	284	100	394	100
Sexual	110	100	284	100	394	100
Offending						
Psychological (CTS/Tolman)	100	90.91	264	92.96	364	92.39
Physical	40	36.36	119	41.90	159	40.36
Sexual	41	37.27	57	20.07	98	24.87

Table 5: Logistic Regression Significant Associations to Psychological, Physical, and Sexual Offending by Gender (N=371)

	<u>Odds Ratios for Combined Gender</u>	<u>Odds Ratios for Females</u>	<u>Odds Ratio for Males</u>
<u>Family of Origin</u>			
Witness Interparental Abuse	1.003 (.240)	1.000 (.287)	.935 (.557)
Experience Child Abuse	1.098 (.215)	1.288 (.313)	.701 (.288)
<u>Personal Characteristics</u>			
Problems with Alcohol	1.051*** (.017)	1.052** (.024)	1.072*** (.029)
Impulsivity	1.077 (.118)	1.055 (.154)	1.121 (.217)
<u>Relationship Experiences</u>			
Relationship Satisfaction- Commitment	1.021 (.031)	.984 (.040)	1.095* (.058)
Problem-solving Skills ^a	1.192** (.090)	1.337*** (.131)	.923 (.135)
Communication Skills	.999 (.051)	.995 (.060)	.983 (.114)
<u>Motivational Factors</u>			
Anger Problems	1.167*** (.055)	1.128** (.065)	1.303** (.142)
Anger Management	.989 (.031)	.993 (.038)	.962 (.064)
<u>Controls</u>			
Social Desirability	1.028 (.038)	.990 (.045)	1.165* (.096)
Satisfaction with Life	.985 (.022)	.981 (.027)	.975 (.048)
White	.772 (.339)	1.118 (.570)	.137 (.175)

NOTE: * $p \leq .10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$ and *** $p \leq 0.01$, all two tailed tests. Standard errors are in parentheses.

^a Denotes significantly different coefficients between females and males ($p < 0.05$, two tailed tests).

Table 6: Logistic Regression Significant Associations to Physical and Sexual Offending by Gender (N=371)

	<u>Odds Ratios for Combined Gender</u>	<u>Odds Ratios for Females</u>	<u>Odds Ratio for Males</u>
<u>Family of Origin</u>			
Witness Interparental Abuse ^a	1.025 (.215)	1.360 (.326)	.366* (.213)
Experience Child Abuse	1.310 (.219)	1.239 (.245)	1.471 (.625)
<u>Personal Characteristics</u>			
Problems with Alcohol	1.051*** (.012)	1.061*** (.017)	1.060** (.024)
Impulsivity	1.111 (.102)	1.085 (.132)	1.266 (.221)
<u>Relationship Experiences</u>			
Relationship Satisfaction- Commitment ^a	1.039 (.030)	.970 (.033)	1.233*** (.098)
Problem-solving Skills ^a	1.172*** (.068)	1.242*** (.089)	1.059 (.148)
Communication Skills	1.044 (.048)	1.018 (.055)	1.149 (.138)
<u>Motivational Factors</u>			
Anger Problems ^a	1.090** (.039)	1.025 (.045)	1.306*** (.118)
Anger Management	.937** (.026)	.957 (.031)	.889** (.063)
<u>Controls</u>			
Social Desirability	.973 (.033)	.973 (.039)	.950 (.078)
Satisfaction with Life	1.018 (.021)	1.031 (.025)	.965 (.046)
White	.549 (.202)	.484 (.221)	.332 (.286)

NOTE: * $p \leq .10$, ** $p \leq 0.05$ and *** $p \leq 0.01$, all two tailed tests. Standard errors are in parentheses.

^a Denotes significantly different coefficients between females and males ($p < 0.05$, two tailed tests).

Table 7: Gender and Dating Violence, Hypotheses and Findings

Hypothesis #	Type	Impact of Gender on Offending Patterns	Result	Findings
Hypothesis 1	Family of Origin	Females victimized by child abuse will have a greater association to the perpetration of dating violence than males	PPS: Unsupported PS: Unsupported	Not significant for males or females in either model.
Hypothesis 2	Family of Origin	Witnessing interparental abuse will be more salient for male batterers than female batterers	PPS: Unsupported PS: Unsupported	Found that it is a protective factor for males only in the PS model. The Paternoster test confirmed a significant difference between male and female offenders.
Hypothesis 3	Personal Characteristics	Substance abuse will be more strongly related to the intimate partner violence offending of men than of women	PPS: Unsupported PS: Unsupported	Universally associated with male and female offending in both the PPS and PS models.
Hypothesis 4	Personal Characteristics	Impulsivity will be more correlated with the dating violence perpetration of men than of women	PPS: Unsupported PS: Unsupported	Not significant for males or females in either model.
Hypothesis 5	Relationship Experiences	The lack of problem-solving skills will affect batterers of both sexes equally	PPS: Unsupported PS: Unsupported	Associated with female offending in both the PPS and PS models. The Paternoster test verified that females differ significantly from males.
Hypothesis 6	Relationship Experiences	The lack of communication skills will affect batterers of both sexes equally	PPS: Unsupported PS: Unsupported	Never significant for either males or females in either model.
Hypothesis 7	Relationship Experiences	Reporting greater relationship satisfaction and commitment will correlate with female and male use of partner violence	PPS: Unsupported PS: Unsupported	Associated with male offending in both the PPS and PS models. The Paternoster test only confirmed a significant gender difference in the PS model.
Hypothesis 8	Motivational Issues	Males will more often use violence to project their anger than females	PPS: Unsupported PS: Supported	In the PPS model problems controlling anger were associated with both male and female offending. In the PS model, anger problems were associated only with male offending. The gender difference in the PS model was confirmed by the Paternoster test.
Hypothesis 9	Motivational Issues	The possession and use of anger-management skills will serve as a protective factor for males	PPS: Unsupported PS: Supported	Anger management skills are a protective factor for males only in the PS model. The Paternoster test did not reveal a significant difference between males and females.

**RELATIONSHIP
CHARACTERISTICS STUDY**

Thank you for giving us your time.

What we are doing

We are a group of researchers at the Virginia Tech's Northern Virginia Campus. We are trying to develop tests that ask people about their current relationships and about their attitudes towards relationships. We want to find out some new, better ways to identify the strengths and weaknesses in people's relationships. Eventually, we hope these tests will be used to help people with relationship problems.

Confidentiality

ALL of your responses will be completely confidential and anonymous. We will NOT ask you for your name, and the answers to these questions will never be associated with you in any way. PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE.

You can help us most by answering every question on the questionnaire, but you may omit any questions or discontinue at any time.

Your comments

You can write on the questionnaires - in fact, we hope that you will have lots of suggestions and comments on them! But PLEASE do not make any extra marks on the answer sheets, because otherwise we won't be able to computer score them.

More information about the study

We will give you an information sheet when you are finished with the questionnaire. You can also contact us at the Northern Virginia Center. The contact person is Sandra Stith, Ph.D., 703-538-8462; SSTITH@vt.edu.

**PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE OR THE
ANSWER SHEETS. PLEASE USE A #2 PENCIL**

Background Information

I. PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER TO THE FOLLOWING 2 QUESTIONS IN THE SHADED SPACES PROVIDED ON THE LEFT OF THE ANSWER SHEET.

DO NOT MARK YOUR NAME ON ANY OF THE FORMS.

1. **FORM:** Under Name on Answer Sheet 1, please mark the letter L and fill in the matching bubble in that column. Please do not put any other information under Name.
2. **ID NUMBER:** Write the 4-digit code that is stamped at the top of your answer sheets in the boxes and bubbles under **IDENTIFICATION NUMBER**. Please do this now on BOTH of your answer sheets. This is the only information that needs to go in the shaded are of Answer Sheet 2.

II. PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ON THE RIGHT (UNSHADED) SIDE OF THE ANSWER SHEET 1, STARTING WITH ITEM # 1.

1. What is your sex? Mark the number 1 or the number 2 in item 1 on Answer Sheet 1
1=Male
2=Female
2. What is your year at the university?
1=Freshman
2=Sophomore
3=Junior
4=Senior
3. How old are you?
1=18 6=25-29
2=19 7=30-39
3=20 8=40-49
4=21 9=50 or Older
5=22-24
4. What is you racial or ethnic identity?
1=Asian
2=African American (Black)
3=Caucasian (White)
4=Native American (American Indian, Samoan, or Hawaiian)
5=Latin American
6=Other
5. What is your father's highest level of education?
1=less than high school
2=high school graduate
3=some college
4=two-year college graduate (for example, community college)
5=four-year college graduate
6=some graduate school
7=graduate school

6. What is your mother's highest level of education?
- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1=less than high school | 5=four-year college graduate |
| 2=high school graduate | 6=some graduate school |
| 3=some college | 7=graduate school |
| 4=two-year college graduate (for example, community college) | |
7. What is your family's yearly income? (Make your best estimate)
- | | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1=Under \$9,999 | 6=\$50,000 to \$59,999 |
| 2=\$10,000 to \$19,999 | 7=\$60,000 to \$69,999 |
| 3=\$20,000 to \$29,999 | 8=\$70,000 to \$79,999 |
| 4=\$30,000 to \$39,999 | 9=\$80,000 or more |
| 5=\$40,000 to \$49,999 | |
8. What is your parent's current marital status?
- 1=married to each other
 - 2=separated
 - 3=divorced
 - 4=never married to each other
 - 5=one or both parents have died
9. Indicate which of the following applies to you.
- 1=I am currently in a relationship that has lasted at least one month.
 - 2=I have been in a relationship that has lasted at least one month, but not now.
- Answer the rest of the questions about your most recent relationship (that lasted one month or more).
- 3=I have never been in a relationship that has lasted at least one month. If you answer 3, skip to question #16.

The words "partner" and "your partner" refer to the person in the relationship you will describe on the next questions. Answer every question for your current partner or most recent partner (and always answer about the same person).

10. Are you living with your partner (or were you before the relationship ended)?
- 1=no
 - 2=yes
11. What is your relationship with your partner (or what was it while you were together)?
- 1=Dating
 - 2=Engaged
 - 3=Married
12. How long have you been in this relationship (or how long did the most recent relationship last)?
- | | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 1=Less than one month | 6=About a year |
| 2=About 1 month | 7=More than a year, but less than 2 years |
| 3=About 2 months | 8=About 2 years |
| 4=Three to five months | 9=More than 2 years, but less than 4 years |
| 5=Six months to eleven months | 10=Four years or more |

13. How long ago did this relationship end?
 1=It has not ended 6=Six months to eleven months ago
 2=Less than one month ago 7=About a year ago
 3=About 1 month ago 8=More than a year but less than 2 years ago
 4=About 2 months ago 9=About 2 years ago
 5=Three to five months ago 10=More than 2 years ago
14. What is (was) your partner's gender?
 1=male
 2=female
15. Is (was) sex a part of your relationship?
 1=no
 2=yes
16. While you were growing up, was there ever any physical violence between your parents (or whoever raised you?)
 1=No
 2=Yes: Father to mother violence
 3=Yes: Mother to father violence
 4=Yes: mutual violence between father and mother
 5=Yes: other
17. How were you disciplined as a child (please bubble in the most severe along this continuum. For example, if both 1 and 2 apply to you, bubble in 2)?
 1=Verbal, mild (i.e. grounding, time-out, withholding privileges, etc.)
 2=Physical, mild (i.e. spanking)
 3=Verbal, severe (i.e. insulting, swearing, humiliating, etc.)
 4=Physical, severe (i.e. hitting, punching, slapping, beating, etc.)
 5=Other

The following statements are about you or the relationship between you and other people. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree with it.

	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	
	1	2	3	4
18. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	1	2	3	4
19. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.	1	2	3	4
20. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.	1	2	3	4
21. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	1	2	3	4
22. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	1	2	3	4
23. There have been times when I have felt like rebelling against people of authority even though I knew they were right.	1	2	3	4
24. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.	1	2	3	4
25. No matter who I am talking to I am always a good listener.	1	2	3	4
26. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I have thought too little of my ability.	1	2	3	4

	Strongly Disagree		Strongly Agree	
27. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.	1	2	3	4
28. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.	1	2	3	4
29. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.	1	2	3	4
30. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.	1	2	3	4

Most people have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your partner for each item on the following list.

If you are currently in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more*, answer about that relationship. If you have been in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more (but are not now)*, answer about the most recent relationship.

- 1=ALWAYS DISAGREE
- 2=ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE
- 3=FREQUENTLY DISAGREE
- 4=OCCASSIONALLY DISAGREE
- 5=ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE
- 6=ALWAYS AGREE

31. Religious matters	1	2	3	4	5	6
32. Demonstrations of affection	1	2	3	4	5	6
33. Sex Relations	1	2	3	4	5	6
34. Making major decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6
35. Conventionality (correct or proper behavior)	1	2	3	4	5	6
36. Career decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6

Most people have disagreements in their relationships. Please indicate below how often the following things occur.

- 1=NEVER
- 2=RARELY
- 3=OCCASIONALLY
- 4=MORE OFTEN THAN NOT
- 5=MOST OF THE TIME
- 6=ALL THE TIME

37. How often do you discuss or have you considered divorce, separation, or terminating your relationship?	1	2	3	4	5	6
38. How often do you regret that you are dating?	1	2	3	4	5	6
39. How often do you and your partner quarrel?	1	2	3	4	5	6
40. How often do you and your partner "get on each other's nerves"?	1	2	3	4	5	6

	Every day.	Almost every day	Occasionally	Rarely	Never.
41. Do you and your partner engage in outside interests together?	1	2	3	4	5

How often would you say the following events occur between you and your partner?

1=NEVER

2=LESS THAN TWICE A MONTH

3=ONCE OR TWICE A MONTH

4=ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK

5=ONCE A DAY

6=MORE OFTEN

42. Have a stimulating exchange of ideas?	1	2	3	4	5	6
43. Calmly discuss something	1	2	3	4	5	6
44. Work together on a project	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please answer these questions in terms of your agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

	Agree	Disagree
45. I usually act on the spur of the moment.	1	2
46. My interest shifts quickly from one thing to another.	1	2
47. I enjoy planning work carefully before carrying it out.	1	2
48. I rarely think things out in detail before I act.	1	2
49. I am impulsive about most things.	1	2

The following statements are about you or the relationship between you and your partner. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree with it.

If you are currently in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more*, answer about that relationship. If you have been in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more (but are not now)*, answer about the most recent relationship.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
50. I know my partner cares for me, even when we disagree	1	2	3	4
51. It drives me crazy when my partner is more than a few minutes late.	1	2	3	4
52. When my partner picks a fight with me, I fight back.	1	2	3	4
53. When my partner won't give in, I get furious.	1	2	3	4

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE OF QUESTIONS. STAY ON ANSWER SHEET 1.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
54. I often take what my partner says personally.	1	2	3	4
55. My partner believes I have a short fuse.	1	2	3	4
56. I am responsible when I lose my temper with my partner.	1	2	3	4
57. I can feel my blood rising when I start to get mad at my partner.	1	2	3	4
58. Taking a break from my partner is a good way for me to calm down.	1	2	3	4
59. When my partner is around, I feel like a bomb waiting to explode.	1	2	3	4
60. I often use exercise to calm down when I'm angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
61. I prefer to get out of the way when my partner hassles me.	1	2	3	4
62. It is my partner's fault when I get mad.	1	2	3	4
63. When my partner is nice to me I wonder what my partner wants.	1	2	3	4
64. No matter how angry I am, I am responsible for my behavior toward my partner.	1	2	3	4
65. When my partner provokes me, I have a right to fight back.	1	2	3	4
66. I can feel in my body when I'm starting to get mad at my partner.	1	2	3	4
67. My partner does things just to annoy me.	1	2	3	4
68. When my partner criticizes me I remind myself that I am a good person.	1	2	3	4
69. There is nothing I can do to control my feelings when my partner hassles me.	1	2	3	4
70. My partner is rude to me unless I insist on respect.	1	2	3	4
71. When my partner gets angry at me, I think my partner had a bad day.	1	2	3	4
72. When I feel myself getting angry at my partner, I am able to take steps to calm down.	1	2	3	4
73. My partner likes to make me mad.	1	2	3	4
74. When my partner annoys me, I blow up before I even know that I am getting angry.	1	2	3	4
75. I try not to assume the worst or jump to conclusions when my partner and I disagree.	1	2	3	4
76. Before I let myself get really mad at my partner I think about what will happen if I lost my temper	1	2	3	4
77. I recognize when I am beginning to get angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
78. I am able to remain calm and not get angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
79. I can usually tell when I am about to lose my temper at my partner.	1	2	3	4
80. I take time out as a way to control my anger at my partner.	1	2	3	4

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
81. I take a deep breath and try to relax when I'm angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
82. I can set up a time out period during an argument with my partner.	1	2	3	4
83. It is important for me to act on my feelings of anger at my partner.	1	2	3	4
84. When I feel myself getting angry at my partner I try to tell myself to calm down.	1	2	3	4
85. I often think of something pleasant to keep from thinking about my anger at my partner.	1	2	3	4
86. I find it impossible to take a deep breath and count to ten when I'm really upset at my partner.	1	2	3	4
87. When I'm angry at my partner, I try to handle my feelings so no one gets hurt.	1	2	3	4
88. If I keep thinking about what made me mad, I get angrier.	1	2	3	4
89. When arguing with my partner, I often raise my voice.	1	2	3	4
90. I do something to take my mind off my partner when I'm angry.	1	2	3	4
91. I am even tempered with my partner.	1	2	3	4
92. When I'm mad at my partner, I say what I think without thinking of the consequences.	1	2	3	4
93. As long as I keep my cool, I am able to keep from getting angry at my partner.	1	2	3	4
94. When my partner's voice is raised, I don't raise mine	1	2	3	4
95. My partner thinks I am very patient.	1	2	3	4
96. I can calm myself down when I am upset with my partner.	1	2	3	4
97. When I feel myself starting to get angry at my partner, I try to stick to talking about the problem.	1	2	3	4

Below are five statements with which you may agree or disagree. Using the 1 – 7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item and bubble in the appropriate number on your answer sheet. Please be open and honest in your responding.

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
98. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
99. The conditions of my life are excellent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
100. I am satisfied with my life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
101. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
102. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

PLEASE TURN TO ANSWER SHEET #2

STOP!
USE ANSWER SHEET #2 FOR THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS

If you are currently in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more*, answer about that relationship.
 If you have been in a relationship that has lasted *one month or more (but are not now)*, answer about the most recent relationship.

- 1=NEVER
 2=RARELY
 3=OCCASIONALLY
 4=FREQUENTLY
 5=VERY FREQUENTLY
 6=NOT APPLICABLE

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. I called my partner names. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 2. I swore at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 3. I yelled and screamed at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 4. I treated my partner like an inferior. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 5. I monitored my partner's time and made him/her account for his/her whereabouts. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 6. I used my partner's money or made important financial decisions without talking to my partner about it. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 7. I was jealous or suspicious of my partner's friends. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 8. I accused my partner of having an affair with another man/woman. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 9. I interfered in my partner's relationships with other family members. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 10. I tried to keep my partner from doing things to help him/herself. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 11. I restricted my partner's use of the telephone. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 12. I told my partner that his/her feelings were irrational or crazy. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 13. I blamed my partner for my problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 14. I tried to make my partner feel crazy. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Different things happen to people when they are *drinking alcohol* or as a *result of their alcohol use*. Some of the things are listed below. Please indicate *how many times* each has happened to you *during the past six months* while you were drinking alcohol or as the result of your alcohol use.

How many times did the following things happen to you while you were drinking alcohol or because of your alcohol use during the past six months?

- 1=NEVER
 2=ONE TO TWO TIMES
 3=THREE TO FIVE TIMES
 4=SIX TO TEN TIMES
 5=MORE THAN TEN TIMES

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. Not able to do your homework or study for a test? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Got into fights, acted bad, or did mean things? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. Missed out on other things because you spent too much money on alcohol? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

1=NEVER

2=ONE TO TWO TIMES

3=THREE TO FIVE TIMES

4=SIX TO TEN TIMES

5=MORE THAN TEN TIMES

18. Went to work or school high or drunk?	1	2	3	4	5
19. Caused shame or embarrassment to someone?	1	2	3	4	5
20. Neglected your responsibilities?	1	2	3	4	5
21. Relative avoided you?	1	2	3	4	5
22. Felt that you needed more alcohol than you used to use in order to get the same effect?	1	2	3	4	5
23. Tried to control your drinking by trying to drink only at certain times of the day or certain places?	1	2	3	4	5
24. Had withdrawal symptoms, that is, felt sick because you stopped or cut down on drinking?	1	2	3	4	5
25. Noticed a change in your personality?	1	2	3	4	5
26. Felt you had a problem with alcohol?	1	2	3	4	5
27. Missed a day (or part of a day) of school or work?	1	2	3	4	5
28. Tried to cut down or quit drinking?	1	2	3	4	5
29. Suddenly found yourself in a place that you could not remember getting to?	1	2	3	4	5
30. Passed out or fainted suddenly?	1	2	3	4	5
31. Had a fight, argument or bad feelings with a friend?	1	2	3	4	5
32. Kept drinking when you promised yourself not to?	1	2	3	4	5
33. Felt you were going crazy?	1	2	3	4	5
34. Had a bad time?	1	2	3	4	5
35. Felt physically or psychologically dependent on alcohol?	1	2	3	4	5
36. Was told by a friend or neighbor to stop or cut down drinking?	1	2	3	4	5
37. Drove shortly after having more than 2 drinks?	1	2	3	4	5
38. Drove shortly after having more than 4 drinks?	1	2	3	4	5

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS. STAY ON ANSWER SHEET 2

RELATIONSHIP BEHAVIORS

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 mark how many times you did each to these things **in the past year**, and how many times your partner did them **in the past year**. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, mark a "8" on your answer sheet for that question. If it never happened, mark an "1" on your answer sheet.

HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

1 = NO, THIS HAS NEVER HAPPENED

2 = ONCE IN THE PAST YEAR

3 = TWICE IN THE PAST YEAR

4 = 3 - 5 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

5 = 6 - 10 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

6 = 11 - 20 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

7 = MORE THAN 20 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

8 = NOT IN THE PAST YEAR, BUT IT DID HAPPEN BEFORE

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 39. I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 40. My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 41. I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 42. My partner explained his or her side of a disagreement | | | | | | | | |
| to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 43. I insulted or swore at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 44. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 45. I threw something at my partner that could hurt. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 46. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 47. I twisted my partner's arm or hair. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 48. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 49. I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight | | | | | | | | |
| with my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 50. My partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because | | | | | | | | |
| of a fight with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 51. I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 52. My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 53. I made my partner have sex without a condom. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 54. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 55. I pushed or shoved my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 56. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

1 = NO, THIS HAS NEVER HAPPENED

2 = ONCE IN THE PAST YEAR

3 = TWICE IN THE PAST YEAR

4 = 3 - 5 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

5 = 6 - 10 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

6 = 11 - 20 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

7 = MORE THAN 20 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

8 = NOT IN THE PAST YEAR, BUT IT DID HAPPEN BEFORE

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 57. I used force (like hitting, holding down, using a weapon) make my partner have oral or anal sex. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 58. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 59. I used a knife or a gun on my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 60. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 61. I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner during a fight. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 62. My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 63. I called my partner fat or ugly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 64. My partner called me fat or ugly. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 65. I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 66. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 67. I destroyed something belonging to my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 68. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 69. I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 70. My partner went to a doctor because of a fight with me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 71. I choked my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 72. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 73. I shouted or yelled at my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 74. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 75. I slammed my partner against a wall. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 76. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 77. I said that I was sure we could work out a problem. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 78. My partner was sure that we could work it out. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 79. I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner, but I didn't. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 80. My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with me, but didn't. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 81. I beat up my partner. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 82. My partner did this to me. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

PLEASE GO ON TO THE NEXT SET OF QUESTIONS. STAY ON ANSWER SHEET 2

HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

1 = NO, THIS HAS NEVER HAPPENED

2 = ONCE IN THE PAST YEAR

3 = TWICE IN THE PAST YEAR

4 = 3 - 5 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

5 = 6 - 10 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

6 = 11 - 20 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

7 = MORE THAN 20 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR BEFORE

8 = NOT IN THE PAST YEAR BUT IT DID HAPPEN BEFORE

83. I grabbed my partner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
84. My partner did this to me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
85. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
86. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
87. I stomped out of the room or house or yard because of a disagreement with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
88. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
89. I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
90. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
91. I slapped my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
92. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
93. I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
94. My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
95. I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
96. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
97. I suggested a compromise to a disagreement.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
98. My partner suggested a compromise.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
99. I burned or scalded my partner on purpose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
100. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
101. I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
102. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
103. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
104. My partner accused me of this.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
105. I did something to spite my partner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
106. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
107. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
108. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
109. I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight we had.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
110. My partner still felt physical pain the next day because of a fight we had.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?

1 = NO, THIS HAS NEVER HAPPENED

2 = ONCE IN THE PAST YEAR

3 = TWICE IN THE PAST YEAR

4 = 3 - 5 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

5 = 6 - 10 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

6 = 11 - 20 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

7 = MORE THAN 20 TIMES IN THE PAST YEAR

8 = NOT IN THE PAST YEAR BUT IT DID HAPPEN BEFORE

111. I kicked my partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
112. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
113. I used threats to make my partner have sex.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
114. My partner did this to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
115. I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
116. My partner agreed to try a solution I suggested.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY

References

- Abbey, A., Saenz, C., Buck, P., Parkhill, M., and Hayman, L.
2006 The effects of acute alcohol consumption, cognitive reserve, partner risk, and gender on sexual decision making. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 67: 113-122.
- Anglin, K, and Holtzworth-Munroe, A.
1997 Comparing the responses of maritally violent and nonviolent spouses to problematic marital and nonmarital situation: Are the skill deficits of physically aggressive husbands and wives global? *Journal of Family Psychology*. 11: 301-313.
- Arias, I., Samios, M., and O'Leary, K.
1987 Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2: 82-90
- Archer, J.
2000 Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*. 126: 651-680.
- Archer, J.
2002 Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behaviors*. 7: 313-351.
- Bachman, R. and Saltzman, L.
1995 National Crime Victimization Survey: Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey (Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report NCJ-154348). Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Barnett, O., Lee, C., and Thelen, R.
1997 Gender differences in attributions of self-defense and control in interpartner aggression. *Violence Against Women*. 3: 462-481.
- Billingham, R.
1987 Courtship violence: The patterns of conflict resolution strategies across seven levels of emotional commitment. *Family Relations*. 36:283-289.
- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I., Smith, C., and Ryan, K.
1992 Predictors of Dating Violence: A Multivariate Analysis. *Violence and Victims* 7: 297-311.
- Borgotta, E.
1965 A short test of personality: The S-ident form. *Journal of Educational Research*. 58: 453-456.

- Burke, P., Stets, J., and Pirog-Good, M.
1988 Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*. 51: 272-285.
- Busby, D. Christensen, C., Crance, D., and Larsen, J
1995 A revision of the dyadic adjustment scale for use with distressed and nondistressed couples: Construct hierarchy and multidimensional scales. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*. 21: 289-308.
- Busey, T.
1993 Treatment of women defendants. *The Catalyst*. Spring 1993. 3-7.
- Cadsky, O., and Crawford, M.
1988 Establishing batterer typologies in a clinical sample of men who assault their female partners. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*. 7: 119-127
- Caesar, P.
1986 Men who batter: A heterogeneous group. In L.K. Hamberger (Chair), *The Male Batterer: Characteristics of a Heterogeneous Populations*. Symposium conducted at the 94th annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.
- Caetano, S. and Cunradi, C.
2001 Alcohol-related intimate partner violence among white, black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. *Alcohol Resources*. 25: 58-65.
- Carlson, B.
1987 Dating violence: A research review and comparison with spouse abuse. *Social Casework*. 68: 16-23.
- Cascardi, M., and Vivian, D.
1995 Context for specific episodes of marital violence: Gender and severity of violence differences. *Journal of Family Violence*. 10: 265-293.
- Cauffman, E., Feldman, S., Jensen, L., Arnett, J.
2000 The (Un)acceptability of violence against peers and dates. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 15: 652-674.
- Chase, K., O'Leary, D., and Heyman, R.
2001 Categorizing partner-violent men within the reactive-proactive typology model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 69: 567-572.
- Cherek, D., and Lane, S.
1998 Laboratory and psychometric measurements of impulsivity among violent and nonviolent female parolees. *Biological Psychiatry*. 46: 273-280.

- Colder, C. and Stice, E.
1998 A longitudinal study of the interactive effects of impulsivity and anger on adolescent problem behavior. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 27: 255-275.
- Crown, D. and Marlowe, D.
1960 A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24: 349-354.
- Cunradi, C, Caetano, R., Clark, C, and Schafer, J.
1999 Alcohol-related problems and intimate partner violence among white, black, and Hispanic couples in the U.S. *Alcoholism Clin*. 23: 1492-1510.
- Dobash, R. and Dobash, R.
1979 *Violence against Wives*. New York: MacMillan Free Press.
- Dobash, R., Dobash R., Wilson, M., and Daly, M.
1992 The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*. 39:71-91.
- Dugan, L., Rosenfeld, R., and Nagin, D.
2003 Exposure reduction or retaliation? The effects of domestic violence resources on intimate-partner homicide. *Law & Society Review* 37:169-198.
- Dutton, D. and Browning, J.
1988 Concern for power, fear of intimacy, and aversion stimuli for wife assault. In G. Hotaling et al (Eds.) *Family Abuse and its Consequences: New Directions in Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dutton, D
2001 Validation of the Propensity for abusiveness scale. *Journal of Family Violence*. 16:59-73.
- Dye, M., and Eckhardt, C.
2000 Anger, irrational beliefs and dysfunctional attitudes in violent dating relationships. *Violence and Victims*. 15: 337-347.
- Eckhardt, C., Jamison, T., and Watts, K.
2002 Anger experience and expression among male dating violence perpetrators during anger arousal. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 17: 1102-1114.
- Elbow, M.
1977 Theoretical considerations of violent marriages: Personality characteristics of wife abusers. *Social Casework*. 58:515-526
- Elliot, D., Huizinga, D. and Morse, B.
1985 *The dynamics of delinquent behavior: A national survey progress report*. Boulder: Institute of Behavioral Sciences, University of Colorado.

- Felson, R., and Cares, A.
2005 Gender and the seriousness of assaults on intimate partners and other victims. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 67.5: 1182-1196.
- Flournoy, P., and Wilson, F.
1991 Assessment of MMPI profiles of male batterers. *Violence and Victims*. 6: 309-320.
- Follette, V., and Alexander P.
1992 Dating Violence: Current and Historic Correlates. *Behavioral Assessment* 14: 39-52.
- Follingstad, D., Bradley, R., Laughlin, J., and Burke, L.
1999 Risk factors and correlates of dating violence: the relevance of examining frequency and severity levels in a college sample. *Violence and Victims*. 14: 365-378.
- Follingstad, D., and Wright, S.
1991 Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. *Family Relations*. 40: 51-58.
- Foshee, V.
1999 Family violence and the perpetration of adolescent dating violence: Examining social learning and social control processes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 61: 331-342.
- Foo, L., and Margolin, G.
1995 A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*. 4:351-377.
- Fowles, D.
1987 Application of a behavioral theory of motivation to the concepts of anxiety and impulsivity. *Journal of Personal Research*. 21: 417-435
- Gamache, D.
1998 Domination and Control: The social context of dating violence. In B. Levy (Ed.) *Dating Violence: Young Women in Danger*. Seattle: Seal Press.
- Gelles, R.
1972 *The Violent Home: A Study of the Physical Aggression between Husbands and Wives*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Gibbons, D.
1965 *Changing the Lawbreaker: The treatment of delinquents and criminals*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

- Gibbons, D.
1981 Changing the Lawbreaker: The treatment of delinquents and criminals. Montclair: Allanheld, Osmun & Co.
- Gibbons, D.
1994 Talking about Crime and Criminals: Problems and issues in theory development in criminology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Gondolf, E.
1988 Who are these guys? Toward a behavioral typology of batterers. *Violence and Victims*. 3:187-203.
- Gray, H., and Foshee, V.
1997 Adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 12:126-142.
- Gussler-Burkhardt, N. and Giancola, P.
2005 A further examination of gender differences in alcohol-related aggression. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 66: 413-423.
- Hamberger, L., and Hastings, J.
1985 Personality correlates of men who abuse their partners: Some preliminary data. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Personality Assessment. Berkeley, CA.
- Hamberger, L., and Hastings, J.
1986 Personality correlates of men who abuse their partners: A cross validation study. *Journal of Family Violence*. 1: 323-341.
- Hamberger, L., Lohr, J., Bonge, D., and Tolin, D.
1996 A large sample empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse. *Violence and Victims*. 11: 277-292.
- Healey, K., Smith, C., and O'Sullivan, C.
1998 Batterer Intervention: Program Approaches and Criminal Justice Strategies. National Institute of Justice: Issues and Practices. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., and Stuart, G.
1991 The competency of responses given by martially violent versus nonviolent men to problematic marital situations. *Violence and Victims*. 6:257-269.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J., Herron, K., and Stuart, G.
1999 A typology of male batterers: An initial examination. In X. B. Arriaga and S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Violence in Intimate Relationships*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Holtzworth-Munroe, A.
1992 Social skills deficits in maritally violent men: Interpreting the data using a social informational processing model. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 12: 605-617.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., and Stuart, G.
1994 Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin* 16: 476-497.
- Jackson, S., Cram F., and Seymore, F.
2000 Violence and sexual coercion in high school students dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence* 15:23-36.
- Johnson, M.
1995 Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Family Violence*. 57: 283-295.
- Johnson, M., and Ferraro, K.
2000 Research on domestic violence in the 1990's: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 62: 948-963.
- Kantor, G. and Straus, M
1987 The "drunken bum" theory of wife beating. In: Straus M. and Gelles, R. (Eds.) *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to violence in 8,145 Families*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Lane, K., and Gwartney-Gibbs, P.
1985 Violence in the context of dating and sex. *Journal of Family Issues*. 6: 45-59.
- Langan, P. and Dwason, J.
1995 Spouse murder defendants in large urban counties. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Huss, M., and Ramsey S.
2000 The clinical utility of batterer typologies. *Journal of Family Violence*. 15: 37-53.
- Leonard, K.
2000 Domestic violence and alcohol: What is known and what do we need to know to encourage environmental interventions. Paper presented at a meeting of the National Crime Prevention Council (Alcohol and Crime: Research and Practice for Prevention). Washington DC.
- Lewis, S., and Fremouw, W.
2001 Dating violence: A critical review of the literature. *Clinical Psychological Review*. 21: 105-127.

- Lie, G., Schilit, R., Bush, J., Montagne, M., and Reyes, L.
 1991 Lesbians in currently aggressive relationships: How frequently do they report aggressive past relationships? *Violence and Victims*. 6: 121-135.
- Magdol, L., Moffitt, T., Caspi, A, and Denise, L.
 1997 Gender differences in partner violence in a birth cohort of 21-year-olds: Bridging the gap between clinical and epidemiological approaches. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 65:67-78.
- Magdol, L., and Moffitt, T.
 1998 Hitting without a license: Testing explanations for differences in partner abuse between young adult daters and cohabiters. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 60: 41-56.
- Makepeace, J.
 1981 Courtship Violence among College Students. *Family Relations*, 32: 97-102.
- Makepeace, J.
 1986 Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. *Family Relations*. 35: 383-388.
- Marshall L., and Rose P.
 1987 Gender, Stress, and Violence in Adult Relationships of a Sample of College Students. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 4:299-316.
- Martin, D.
 1981 Battered wives. Volcano, CA: Volcano Press.
- Molidor, C., and Tolman, R.
 1998 Gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence. *Violence Against Women*. 4: 180-195.
- Moffitt, T. and Caspi, A
 1999 Findings about partner violence from the Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study: Research in Brief. National Institute of Justice.
- Moffitt, T. Krueger, R., Caspi, A, and Fagan, J
 2000 Partner abuse and general crime: How are they the same? How are they different? *Criminology*. 38: 199-232.
- Monson, C. and Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J.
 2002 Sexual and nonsexual dating violence perpetration: Testing an integrated perpetrator typology. *Violence and Victims*. 17: 403-429.
- Nightingale, H., and Morrissette, P.

- 1993 Dating violence: Attitudes, myths, and preventive programs. *Social Work in Education*. 15: 225-233.
- O'Keefe, M.
1997 Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 12: 546-568.
- O'Keefe, M.
1998 Factors mediating the link between witnessing interparental violence and dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence*. 13: 39-57.
- O'Keefe, M., Brockopp, L., and Chew, E.
1986 Teen Dating Violence. *Social Work* 31:456-468
- O'Keefe, M. and Treitster, L.
1998 Victims of dating violence amongst high school students. *Violence Against Women* 4: 195-224.
- O'Leary, K., Barling, J., Aria, I., Rosenbaur, A., Malone, J., and Tyree, A.
1989 Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 57: 263-268.
- Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., Piquero, A.
1998 Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology*. 36: 859-866.
- Peralta, R., and Cruz, M.
2006 Conferring meaning onto alcohol-related violence: an analysis of alcohol use and gender in a sample of college youth. *Journal of Men's Studies*. 14: 109-126.
- Price, L., Byers, S., and the Dating Violence Research Team
1999 The attitudes towards dating violence scales: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Family Violence*. 14: 351-375.
- Rennison, C., and Welchans, S.
2000 Intimate partner violence. Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report. U.S. Department of Justice.
- Riggs, D., and O'Leary, K.
1996 Aggression between Heterosexual Dating Partners: An Examination of a Causal Model of Courtship Aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 11: 519-540.
- Riggs, D., O'Leary, K., and Breslin, F.
1990 Multiple predictors of physical aggression in dating couples. *Journal of interpersonal Violence*. 5: 61-73.

- Ronfeldt, H., and Kimerling, R.
 1998 Satisfaction with relationship power and the perpetration of dating violence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 60: 70-79.
- Roy, M. (Ed.)
 1976 *Battered women: A psychosocial study of domestic violence*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Saunders, D.
 1992 A typology of men who batter: Three types derived from cluster analysis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 62: 264-276.
- Scott, K., Schafer, J., and Greenfield, T.
 1999 The role of alcohol in physical assault perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 60: 528-540.
- Sigelman, C., Berry, C. and Wiles, K.
 1984 Violence in college students' dating relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. 14: 530-548.
- Simonelli, C., Mullis, T., Elliott, A., and Pierce, T.
 2002 Abuse by siblings and subsequent experiences of violence within dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 17: 103-121.
- Snyder, D., and Fruchtman, L.
 1981 Differential patterns of wife abuse: A data-based typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 49: 878-885.
- Spanier, G.
 1976 Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 38:15-28.
- Stets, J., and Pirog-Good, M.
 1987 Violence in Dating Relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly* 50: 237-246.
- Stets, J., and Straus, M.
 1990 The marriage license as a hitting license: A comparison of assaults in dating, cohabiting, and married couples. In M.A. Straus and R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Stith, S., Jester, S., and Bird, G.
 1992 A typology of college students who use violence in their relationships. *Journal of College Student Development* 33: 411-421.
- Stith, S., and Hamby, S.

- 2002 The anger management scale: Development and preliminary psychometric properties. *Violence and Victims*. 17: 383-402.
- Straus, M.
1979 Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 36:13-29.
- Straus, M., and Gelles, R.
1995 *Physical violence in American Families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick: London.
- Straus, M., Hamby, S., Boney-McCoy, S., and Sugarman, C.
1996 The revised conflict tactics scale (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*. 17: 283-316.
- Straus, M., and Gelles, R.
1986 Societal change and change in violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 465-479.
- Straus, M., Gelles, R. and Steinmetz S.
1980 *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Straus, M. and Medeiros, R.
2002 Gender differences in risk factors for physical violence between dating partners by university students. Presented at 2002 American Society of Criminology Meeting. Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire.
- Straus, M.
2005 Future research on gender symmetry in physical assaults on partners. Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire.
- Sugarman, D. B., and Hotaling, G. T.
1989 Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In M. A. Pirog-Good and J. E. Stets (eds.), *Violence in Dating Relationships: Emerging Social Issues*. New York: Praeger.
- Swan, S., and Snow, D.
2002 A typology of women's use of violence in intimate relationships. *Violence against women*. 8: 286-319.
- Tjaden, P., and Thoennes, N.
1998 Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence against Women Survey (NCJ 172837). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

- Tjaden, P., and Thoennes, N.
2000 Full Report of the Prevalence, Incidence, & Consequences of Violence Against Women. Part 6. National Institute of Justice.
- Tolman, R.
1989 The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims*. 4: 159-177.
- Tontodonato, P. and Crew, B.
1992 Dating violence, social learning theory, and gender: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims*. 7: 3-14.
- Tweed, R., and Dutton, D.
1998 A comparison of impulsive and instrumental subgroups of batterers. *Violence and Victims*. 13: 217-230.
- Vera, E., Shin, R., Montgomery, G., Mildner, C., and Speight, S.
2004 Conflict resolution styles, self-efficacy, self-control, and future orientation of urban adolescents. *Professional School Counseling*. 8: 73-81.
- Walker L.
1984 *The battered women syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Waltz, J., Babcock, J., Jacobson, N., and Gottman, J.
2000 Testing a typology of batterers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 68: 658-669.
- Wekerle, C., and Wolfe, D.
1999 Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 19: 435-456.
- White, H., and Labouvie, E.
1989 Towards the assessment of adolescent problem drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 50: 30-38.
- White, R., and Gondolf, E.
2000 Implications of personality profiles for batterer treatment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 15: 467-489.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Cole, P., and Barrett, K.
1991 Guilt and empathy: Sex differences and implications for the development of depression. In Garber, J. and Dodge K (Eds.) *The Development of Emotion Regulation and Dysregulation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zucherman, M.

1991 A biological theory of sensation seeking. In M. Zucherman (Ed.) *Biological Bases of Sensation Seeking, Impulsivity, and anxiety*. Hillside: Erlbaum.

Zuckerman, M. and Kuhlman, D

2000 Personality and risk-taking: Common Biosocial Factors. *Journal of Personality*. 68:6.