ABSTRACT

Title of Dissertation:	THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NON-PHYSICAL DATING VIOLENCE RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT FOR URBAN BLACK YOUNG ADULT MEN
	Brian Winston Gilchrist, Doctor of Philosophy, 2013
Dissertation directed by:	Professor Robin G. Sawyer Department of Behavioral and Community Health

Young urban African American men may be disproportionately affected by dating violence victimization. To date, there are no known reliable and valid measurement instruments that have been developed to assess the risk of dating violence victimization among this population. Furthermore, there is very little research that has been conducted assessing factors related to dating violence victimization specifically among young urban men. The current study developed a valid and reliable non-physical dating violence victimization risk assessment instrument for urban African American males ages 18-25 years old. Focus groups, survey pre-testing, and expert panel review was used to develop an initial set of items included in the new instrument. The survey administration phase of the study used a non-experimental cross-sectional design to collect primary data from participants for psychometric analysis. A new instrument with a total of 9 new scales (83 items) was developed as a result of this study. The new instrument was validated and proven to be psychometrically sound for the target population.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NON-PHYSICAL DATING VIOLENCE RISK
ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT FOR URBAN BLACK YOUNG ADULT MEN

by

Brian Winston Gilchrist

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
2013

Advisory Committee:
Professor Robin G. Sawyer, Chair
Professor Mia Smith-Bynum, Dean's Representative
Professor Donna E. Howard
Professor Joseph B. Richardson, Jr.
Professor Min Qi Wang

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

      Family and relationship violence occurs at all phases of the life cycle, and various forms

of violence have been identified as important social issues in contemporary American society

(Clark, 1994). Child abuse, dating violence, and domestic violence may manifest in different

ways (Clark, 1994) including mental, emotional, psychological, and physical abuse. In addition,

family and relationship violence affects all social classes, ethnicities, age groups, and genders

(Clark, 1994), and since the 1970s, awareness of child, spousal (wife-beating), and elder abuse

has greatly increased, and has become a major public health issue (Ernst, 1997). Currently,

male-to-female abuse is often what is thought of as domestic violence or spousal abuse, and

female-to male abuse is largely unnoticed (Makepeace, 1981; Ernst, 1997). In 1978, Straus was

the first researcher to report that women were just as violent as men in intimate relationships

(Straus, 1978). Subsequently, several other studies have reported that men and women report no

statistically significant difference of intimate partner violence victimization (Ernst, 1997;

Mechem 1999; Houry, 2008). These finding were then, and still are, very controversial due to

the social perceptions that women are always the victims of relationship violence and men are

always the perpetrators (Hamberger, 1994; Houry, 2008). Other researchers have reported

similar findings identifying male victimization within intimate partner violence (IPV) as a

serious social problem (Plass, 1983; Brinkerhoff, 1988; Follingstad, 1991; Stets, 1991; Ernst,

1997; Archer, 2000; Tjaden, 2000; Monson, 2002; Fiebert, 2004; Straus, 2005; Cunradi, 2009).

Despite the evidence that male victimization of IPV is a significant social problem that warrants

empirical study, the majority of IPV studies have focused on women as victims and men as

perpetrators. Little is known about men as victims of IPV and there has been scant media attention on the subject (Ernst, 1997; Mechem, 1999).

To date, most of the dating violence studies have focused on predominately White populations (DeMaris, 1990), and have been no publications found targeting early adult urban Black men in a community setting. Yet, the available evidence regarding general community samples suggests that various socio-demographic characteristics may be risk factors for domestic violence and dating violence including race/ethnicity minority groups, younger age, unemployment or underemployment, low education, low income, and high stress (Plass, 1983; Stets, 1991; Field, 2004; Fox, 2002; Sorenson, 1996) (Cunradi, 2009). Little is known about the factors influencing heterosexual males becoming victims of dating violence, and even less is known about this problem among Black early adult males (DeMaris, 1990; Plass, 1983; Rouse, 1988; Clark, 1994). Since African Americans are disproportionately affected by many of the above mentioned factors (Plass, 1983; DeMaris, 1990), African American as well as other Black Americans may also be at increased risk for experiencing dating violence.

The literature on IPV has established that female victims of IPV suffer more physical consequences than do their male counterparts (Tjaden, 2000), but what is less clear is the emotional and psychological damage caused to men who have been victimized. Perhaps, men who have been victimized by women become more likely to perpetrate violence in future relationships, or maybe suffering in an abusive relationship becomes normalized and the man is never empowered to leave such a relationship. The goal of the current study was not to suggest that women were at less risk for IPV or to minimize the plight of battered women, but rather to uncover the phenomenon of abused men who may get overlooked in this field of study simply because they are men.

<u>Defining Violence among Romantic Couples</u>

    Intimate partner violence (IPV) is the general term used to describe any type of violence experienced by a romantically involved couple. In the current literature, there are two overarching categories that are used to describe intimate partner violence; Intimate/Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple/Bi-Directional Violence (Johnson, 1995; Mulleman, 1998). Intimate partner violence will be used in this document when referring to general violence between couples of any age. Dating violence will be used to describe any category of domestic violence that occurs in younger couples (18-25 years old) that are not married. These couples may or may not have children with their partners.

Intimate or Patriarchal Terrorism

    Intimate or patriarchal terrorism is usually the more severe type of IPV and is often described by terms such as "wife beating" and "battered women". This type of violence is used by one partner to control the other. It is systematic, occurs over time and may include economic subordination (Johnson, 1995; Johnson, 2005; Cunradi, 2009). Intimate or Patriarchal Terrorism is used to describe a relationship where one partner uses abusive actions to intimidate, threaten, and control the other partner. The problem with the term "patriarchal" terrorism, however, is that it assumes the partner committing the terrorist acts is the man in the relationship. Therefore, intimate terrorism may be a more objective term to adopt and will be used throughout this document.

Mutual/Common Couple/Bi-Directional Violence

    As previously stated, common couple or bi-directional violence occurs when both partners in the relationship abuse each other. This type of violence is not necessarily associated with the patriarchal idea that men should control women (Johnson, 1995). In this type of IPV, usually a conflict escalates and gets "out of hand" resulting in some form of minor injury (Johnson, 1995).

In these cases, the perpetration of the abuse may be more equally distributed between the two individuals in the relationship. In other words, the female perpetrates IPV at similar rates as the male. There is evidence from a mixed methods research project that both of these types of IPV may be common in the United States (Johnson, 1995). Since women have just as much power as men to inflict emotional harm in a relationship, it is important to study men's victimization perpetrated by women (Hamberger, 1994). In addition, verbal and psychological abuse in a relationship has been shown to predict physical violence (Murphy, 1989; Vivian, 1994).

Domestic Violence

Domestic violence has been defined in the literature as abuse involving two adults or adolescents involved in an intimate relationship (Ernst, 1997; Mechem, 1999). The types of actions a domestically violent partner may engage in include physical, verbal, emotional, psychological, economic, or sexual abuse including threatening, intimidating, and isolation to victimize their partner (Ernst, 1997; Mechem, 1999; Prospero, 2009).

Below are some other terms that will be used throughout this document:

1. Abuse – a deliberate act by one partner to hurt the other through words or symbolic actions (Lane, 1985). Respondents who "insulted or swore," "did something spiteful," or "threatened to hit or throw something" fell into the abuse category (Lane, 1985).

2. Assault – the most extreme violent acts, such as threatening with a knife or gun, actually using a knife or gun, or beating another person (Lane, 1985).

3. Casual IPV – a relation with a low degree of mutual commitment (Plass, 1983).

4. Conflict –a disagreement in which a respondent did one or a combination of the following: discussed the issue heatedly, sulked or refused to talk about it, stomped away in anger, got drunk, or cried (Lane, 1985).

5. Emotional Abuse (Psychological Abuse) – Aggressive actions that cause the victim to feel degraded, fearful, and/or humiliated. Several types of emotional abuse include coercion, name-calling, public humiliation, ridicule, jealousy, and possessiveness (Follingstad, 1990).

6. Physical aggression - an act that has the intent (or perceived intent) of causing physical harm to another and is synonymous with the term "violence" used in family violence research (Gelles and Straus, 1979) (Stets, 1991).

7. Serious IPV - a relation with a high degree of mutual commitment, and/or see themselves as "in love" in the relation (Plass, 1983).

8. Verbal aggression - a verbal act (or a non-verbal act, for example, refusing to talk about an issue) that symbolically threatens to hurt another person (Straus, 1979) (Stets, 1991).

9. Violence – one partner attempting to hurt or maim the other through physical force (Lane, 1985). An incident involving throwing something, pushing, grabbing, shoving, slapping, kicking, punching, biting, or attempted or actual hitting with something are classified at violent acts (Lane, 1985).

The Problem of Violence among Romantic Couples

IPV is clearly a widespread problem in the United States. In a nationally representative sample of married men and women, 12% of both genders reported using aggression in their intimate relationships during the previous year and 28% of both genders reported using aggression during their marriage (Straus, 1980). After analyzing data from the 1985 National Family Violence Survey, Straus (1995) also reported that among a sample of couples experiencing IPV, men were the sole perpetrator in 25.9% of cases and women were the sole perpetrator in 25.5% of cases.

Clark (1994) found that a significant number of African American males and females were indeed involved in violence in their dating relationships. In one study, more than 33% of African American college students reported experiencing physical violence in their dating relationships compared to 20%-25% of general college student groups (Clark, 1994).

African American men in dating relationships have reported experiencing more violence than their female counterparts and African American husbands have reported being victimized at rates ranging from 13% - 30% (Plass, 1983; Rouse, 1988; Follingstad, 1991; Clark, 1994; Ernst, 1997; Mechem, 1999; Caetano, 2000; Prospero, 2009). African American men are more likely to

be pushed, slapped, or have things thrown at them compared to African American women (Plass, 1988; Rouse, 1988).

More recent data collected in adolescent populations support findings from earlier studies. O'Leary et al. (2008) found that 40% of females and 24% of males reported using physical aggression against a dating partner. Other studies have found that adolescent males experience dating violence victimization at rates ranging from 10% - 32.6% (Howard, 2003; O'Leary, 2008; Sears, 2007; Swahn, 2008, Ali, 2011) of males experienced physical dating violence perpetrated by a girlfriend.

Although there have been studies that have included Black men in the sample, and one study that focused explicitly on a Black college sample, the author has not found a single research study of male dating violence victimization in a community sample, specifically a Black community. In reviewing the literature for this project and making the case for its relevance, a combination of studies using similar populations were identified. The target population of this study was urban Black males aged 18-25. Since there have been no studies targeting this specific population, studies using hospital emergency department samples were reviewed to assess general experiences of Black males as IPV victims (of all ages) and studies using college populations were also reviewed to assess IPV victimization experiences of young adult males (Makepeace, 1981; Cate, 1982; Henton, 1983; Plass, 1983; Lane, 1985; Goldberg, 1984; McKinney, 1986; Arias, 1987; Billingham, 1987; Rouse, 1988; Sugarman, 1989; Riggs, 1990; Follingstad, 1991; Stets, 1991; Roberts, 1993; Clark, 1994; Roberts, 1996; Ernst, 1997; Mulleman, 1998; Shook, 2000; Monson, 2002; Lipsky, 2005; Prospero, 2009; Rhodes, 2009) .

This study adds to the current body of research by establishing an instrument that measures dating violence victimization constructs from the perspective of a sample of urban

Black early adult males which can be used in future studies to better understand the cycle of abuse that occurs in urban Black dating couples.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the this study was to develop a valid and reliable instrument to be used among urban Black male populations aged 18-25 to assess the risk of their dating violence victimization. The instrument was informed by qualitative and quantitative research methods, and face and content validity were established as well as measurement reliability. To date, most intimate partner violence research has focused on women as victims and men as perpetrators since there is substantial evidence in the criminal justice data supporting that concept (Archer, 2000; Greenfeld, 1998; McLeod, 1984; Tjaden, 2000; Henning, 2005; Houry, 2008). Although there may be some concern that recognizing the IPV perpetrated by women will minimize the negative effect IPV has on women victims, there is substantial empirical evidence that suggests both women and men perpetrate a variety of IPV acts on each other at almost equal rates (Straus, 1980, 1986, 1990; Cantos, 1994; Ernst, 1997; Archer, 2000; Caetano, 2005; Rhodes, 2009). Some IPV researchers might also argue that even if women do perpetrate IPV at rates similar or equal to those of men, the situation is not the same as when men perpetrate IPV against women because the IPV perpetrated by women is most often committed in self-defense. However, there is empirical evidence that suggest that women commit IPV against men for reasons other than self-defense (O'Leary, 1989; Straus, 1990; Follingstad, 1991; Cantos, 1994; Henning, 2005). What warrants more in-depth study is the context in which these patterns of violence related to gender occur. Because much of the IPV data is cross-sectional, causality is difficult to infer (Allen, 2009). In order to break the cycles of IPV experienced by couples, it may be advantageous to understand whether or not men's violence precedes women's violence because

if the man commits the violence first, the perception is that the woman's violence is self-defense. In addition, including all types of IPV (verbal, psychological, emotional, and physical) in the study of such cycles is very important. Although IPV research focusing on men as victims may be highly controversial (Straus, 1997; Monson, 2002), in order to fully understand the pathology of IPV, a reliable and valid instrument needed to be developed that included contextual variables and that can be used longitudinally (Allen, 2009).

Relevance of the Study

As previously stated, little is known about the factors influencing heterosexual males becoming victims of dating violence, and even less is known about this problem among Black early adult males (DeMaris, 1990; Plass, 1983; Rouse, 1988; Clark, 1994). There have been only a few studies examining male dating violence victimization in heterosexual couples (Vivian, 1994; Mechem, 1999). Although there has been a decrease in men perpetrating IPV against women, we have seen a slight increase in women perpetrating IPV against men suggesting that public health professionals may be addressing only one part of the problem (Straus, 1976; Straus, 1986; Ernst, 1997). Further research informs us that most of the violence experienced in relationships is bi-directional and not necessarily one person always perpetrating the violence and the other person always defending him/herself from the violence, regardless of gender (Johnson, 1995). In fact, there may be a cultural norm present in elements of contemporary society that allows women in committed relationships to believe they have the right to commit moderate acts of IPV against their male partners (Arias, 1989; Stets, 1990). The problem, however, is that this bi-directional violence which usually consists of "moderate" acts (e.g., pushing, shoving, grabbing, slapping) can escalate into severe acts (e.g., hitting with fists, kicking, using weapons) and sometimes moderate acts perpetrated by women can result in severe

acts committed by men in retaliation or perceived self-defense (Field, 1990; Cunradi, 2009). As previously stated, there is evidence that suggests that physical violence in relationships is often preceded by some form of non-physical abuse. Therefore, it is important to include non-physical acts of dating violence in the spectrum of intimate partner violence studies to develop the most effective interventions to prevent more serious and physically traumatic forms of dating violence for both women and men.

Instrument Availability

There are few psychometrically valid instruments that have been developed to measure factors related to IPV, and no known instruments developed to assess male dating violence victimization among heterosexual men (Henning, 2005), and the author of this research has found no valid or reliable instruments specifically targeting Black males. Although resources that have been committed to studying and eliminating IPV against women, the research to date suggests some attention is necessary for male victims. Women are capable of perpetrating IPV against men for reasons other than self-defense, are capable of injuring men, and through these acts may escalate relationship conflict (Riggs, 1990). Due to the gender differences that may exist regarding IPV perpetration and victimization, understanding the complexities may have implications for assessment and intervention (Monson, 2002).

The empirical evidence suggests that women are at least as violent as men, and yet little attention and scant resources have been committed to addressing this issue or increasing public awareness to prevent this type of relationship violence. Male victimization has not been identified as a real social and public health threat, however the perpetration of dating violence by women should not be ignored simply because of the perception that dating violence is solely perpetrated by men (Steinmetz, 1978; Straus, 1986; Mechem, 1999). The lack of empirical

evidence that may cause public health professionals and policy makers to overlook this issue may lead to an increase in the likelihood that both men and women will become victims of dating violence as well as domestic violence in their cohabitating relationships and marriage and it may be necessary to address equally men and women's perpetration of dating violence (Arias, 1989). Adequately addressing dating violence early may also reduce the negative mental and physical health outcomes associated with dating violence victimization (Coker, 2000; Wolf 2000; Coker, 2002). In order to achieve these goals, DV perpetrated by women against men require further study and since Black men may be at greater risk for becoming victims of DV (Clark, 1994; Mechem, 1999), the current research is valuable. This study adds to the scientific literature by establishing the reliability and validity of a new risk assessment and measurement tools that will be useful in collecting more generalizable data in future studies. This in turn may provide tools that can be used by clinicians, educators, and community gatekeepers to address the problem at various levels of the socio-ecologic model. Finally, as with many other health concerns, Black men seem to be disproportionately affected by dating violence and there has only been one study identified by the author of this research that targets early adult Black Americans, and this study utilizes a college student sample. There have been no publications found targeting early adult urban Black men in a community setting. Researchers and public health professionals are justified in committing time, interest, and resources to attempt to understand and reduce male victimization of DV (Makepeace, 1981; Straus, 1986; Coker, 2002). This research adds to the very few studies that have examined this problem in Black populations and is the first step in a research plan to understand and reduce DV in this population.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW of the LITERATURE

There is limited research addressing intimate partner violence (IPV) among community samples of working class people, and even less addressing IPV victimization among men (Houry, 2008; Cunradi, 2009) and the long-term health consequences of IPV among male victims (Resnick, 1997; Coker, 2002; Coker, 2009). In order to obtain a true picture of men's experiences as victims of IPV and to assess the cycle of bi-directional IPV, it is necessary to collect longitudinal data (Abbott, 1995; Mulleman, 1998; Allen, 2009) and the first step in collecting such data is to develop a valid and reliable measurement instrument. Given that most of what is known about IPV is gleaned from cross-sectional data collection methods (Allen, 2009), it is unclear what types of IPV are being committed and by whom. Also there is almost no information describing what occurs before a severe physically violent act is perpetrated. There may be a "chain of IPV events" that occurs before the development of some final physically violent act that ultimately gets reported. Women are much more likely to be severely hurt and report that final act (Straus, 1980; O'Leary, 1989; Cantos, 1994), but it could be the case that the man who perpetrates that final physically violent act may have suffered several previous acts of IPV from his female partner.

When analyzing data from the National Violence Against Women Survey of women and men aged 18 to 65, Coker et al. (2002) found that a total of 28.9% of women and 22.9% of men had experienced physical, sexual, or psychological IPV during their lifetime. Archer (2000) conducted a meta-analysis and reported that women were more likely than men to use physical aggression (Houry, 2008), while Sorenson et al. (1996) found that married men and women were equally likely to report that they had been hit, been shoved, or had something thrown at them (Houry, 2008). Upon analysis of a national representative sample of persons who date, Stets

(1991) found that women were at least as likely as men to engage in physical disputes and that men were twice as likely as women to report receiving severe aggression (15.7% vs. 8.0%).

Bookwala et al. (2005) reviewed data from the National Survey of Families and Households and found differences in how conflict was handled, both by gender and age (Houry, 2008). Men were more likely to have calmer discussions than women and age was a factor in that younger women were the least likely to have calm discussions (Houry, 2008).

In addition, researchers have reported that Blacks are more likely than Whites to engage in and experience dating violence (Plass, 1983; DeMaris, 1990), and Black females have reported more perpetration of DV than Black males (Clark, 1994). Blacks have reported a higher prevalence than Whites of throwing objects, pushing, grabbing, shoving, slapping, kicking, biting, and hitting with fists (Plass, 1983). Clark (1994) suggests through African American females' self-report, that there is more female-perpetrated dating violence than currently acknowledged in the field, especially in the case of verbal abuse (sulking, insulting, saying spiteful things). Additionally, Houry (2008) found that African Americans reported suffering more than other groups from depressive symptoms, symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder, and IPV victimization.

Although race is often used as a proxy for other socio-demographic characteristics, the point should be emphasized that there is no evidence that African Americans have a biological predisposition for dating violence, or any other type of violence for that matter. Current findings are more than likely a function of social and economic circumstances rather than biological race or ethnicity (DeMaris, 1990) and further study is warranted.

Dating Violence Among Adolescents

Dating violence occurs frequently in adolescent populations in the United States, however, little is known about dating violence compared to other forms of intimate partner violence (Sullivan, 2010; Miller, 2013). Dating violence perpetration and victimization are the most common forms of violence experienced by youth (Swahn, 2008; Ali, 2011). In addition, most studies that have investigated dating violence during adolescence have focused primarily on physical dating violence (Sears, 2007) giving little attention to other forms of dating violence including emotional and psychological forms. Unfortunately, dating violence occurs far too frequently in adolescence (Sullivan, 2010). To add to the complexity of understanding this issue, results from the few studies that have investigated both physical and non-physical forms of dating violence among adolescents have provided some evidence that both these forms of dating violence are connected or inter-related (Sears, 2006 and 2007). In addition, although many experts in the intimate partner violence arena have made the case that when women perpetrated physical dating violence against men, it is often in self-defense, Foshee et al. (2011) reported "the most serious acts described in our in-depth interviews-attacking with a knife, assaulting with a gun, hitting with a bat, slamming a face into cement, and swinging a board – were perpetrated by females". For these reasons, it is important to investigate both physical and non-physical dating violence because research has shown that non-physical forms of dating violence has been a predictor of physical dating violence in both adolescent and young adult populations (Sears, 2007). Lastly, it is important to investigate dating violence in ways that account for various socio-cultural factors including race/ethnicity based on findings reported by Howard et al. (2003) that dating violence may be perceived differently by people based on ethnicity. Furthermore, African American boys may be much less likely to seek help from formal and professional services when they experience dating violence (Martin, 2012) due to their perception that

seeking such help is in some way emasculating (Windle, 2009; Ali, 2011). This further

emphasizes the need for more investigation to understand dating violence in this population and

the most effective ways to minimize its occurrence.

Prevalence of Teen Dating Violence

Based on data from the National Youth Risk Behavior Survey conducted in 1999 and

2005, Howard et al. found that among boys, approximately 10% of the sample reported

experiencing physical dating violence. In the sample from the 1999 data, 12th graders reported

experiencing physical dating violence at a rate of 12.18% and were 1.65 times more likely to

experience physical dating violence than their 9th grade counterparts (Howard, 2003). The rates

reported by boys are very similar to the rates reported by girls in the same samples (Howard,

2008). In an ethnically diverse sample of high school students, O'Leary et al. (2008) found that

40% of females and 24% of males reported physical aggression toward their dating partner, and

approximately 30% of male and females experienced physical victimization in a dating

relationship (O'Leary, 2008). Foshee et al. (2009) reported that prevalence rates for

psychological aggression and victimization within dating experiences are high, finding that

around 40% of adolescents reported perpetrating psychological abuse (Foshee, 2009). Sears et

al. (2007) reported that 47% of girls in a sample of middle and high school students reported

using psychologically abusive behavior in a dating relationship and 28% of girls in the same

sample reported using physically abusive behavior in a dating relationship. Among urban

adolescent samples, rates of dating violence victimization for boys have been reported to be as

high as 32.6% (Swahn, 2008). These urban communities include higher levels of poverty,

unemployment, single-parent households, crime and many non-White adolescents who have

reported higher rates of dating violence (Howard, 2003; Ali, 2011). In 2008, Howard et al.

reported that among a nationally representative sample of adolescents, Black and Hispanic males were approximately 50% more likely to report having experienced dating violence victimization.

Regarding dating violence, especially among adolescent populations, boys report similar experiences as girls and when there is a difference in the rates between boys and girls, boys report victimization more than girls (Archer, 2000; Foshee, 2001; Miller, 2013). Howard et al. (2003) reported that boys receive more hits, slaps, and being physically hurt on purpose by their dating partners than girls. When it comes to psychological dating violence, the general trend has been that girls are perpetrating this type of dating violence more than boys (Foshee, 1996; Sears, 2007). Windle et al. (2009) found that girls were more likely than boys to hold more aggressive attitudes toward dating conflict. It is important to acknowledge and understand the differences that exist in the cognitive processes of boys and girls regarding their acceptance and normative beliefs regarding dating violence (Ali, 2011).

Why Teen Dating Violence Occurs
One of the intrapersonal factors that help to explain why dating violence occurs is the attitude of perpetrators and victims. Based on data from the Youth Violence Survey conducted in 2004, Ali et al. found that among adolescents, both attitudes supporting boys hitting girls and attitudes supporting girls hitting boys were significantly associated with respondents' reports of physical dating violence, even after controlling for high-risk behaviors and experiences, peer environment, family environment, and demographic characteristics (Ali, 2011). In another study, Yonas et al. (2005) reported that general teen violence among girls is motivated by gossip. Therefore, based on information presented later in this section, if a girl even hears gossip that implicates her boyfriend in some sort of "unethical" behavior and she has an attitude that

supports female victimization of dating violence, then she may be at higher risk for perpetrating such violence.

Why Boys Abuse Girls

Among males, Foshee et al. (2011) found that in a sample of high school students, most of the acts of dating violence that were perpetrated by male students were classified as "escalation prevention": violence to prevent the escalation of female physical fighting. These acts included restraining the girl while she was using violence against him, preventing her from harming him with a weapon, or preempting an impending violent act against him. Other reasons cited by boys in this sample included, to stop repeated nagging or bickering by a girlfriend, to retaliate for violence by the girlfriend, in response to a long history of abuse by a girlfriend, and being insulted by the girl in front of others. Although none of these reasons justify a boyfriend committing dating violence acts against his girlfriend, these findings suggest that further study is warranted to investigate the cycles and processes of abuse, especially how non-physical acts of dating violence may increase the risk of an episode escalating to more serious acts of dating violence. Although many intimate partner violence professionals operate under the assumption that when most women use violence against their relationship partner, it is often is self-defense. The findings reported by Foshee et al. (2011) provide some support that boys (and perhaps men) also use violence against a girlfriend in self-defense.

Why Girls Abuse Boys

In the same qualitative study cited above, among a sample of high school students, Foshee et al. (2011) found that the most common type of female perpetrated violence was not in response to "patriarchal terrorism", which is discussed in Chapter One of this document, but was an anger response by the female, or the female attempting to enforce some ethical behavior in the

male (44.2%). The girls in the sample that reported perpetrating violence as a response to

patriarchal terrorism described two primary motives for their violence: 1) self-defense; 2) to let

the boy know that she was fed up with the violence and was not going to take it anymore. For

those girls in the sample that reported perpetrating violence as an anger response, the reasons

cited were because the boyfriend had been cheating on her or because he was talking about

another girl or verbal bantering that started out as play and teasing but went too far, and the

boyfriend said something that made the girl angry.   For those girls who perpetrated dating

violence as "ethical enforcement", the reasons cited were sexual infidelity, flirting with another

girl, drinking too much alcohol or using too many drugs, "talking ugly" to her, walking away

from her in an argument, putting too much pressure on her to have sex, and making too many

social blunders (Foshee, 2011).

Predictors of Teen Dating Violence

As stated previously in this section, most of the research related to teen dating violence

has examined predictors of youths' perpetration of physical dating violence, however, only a few

studies have investigated predictors of adolescents' use of psychological dating violence (Sears,

2007). Childhood exposure to family violence has been reported to disrupt cognitive and social

development and leads to various negative outcomes, including dating violence victimization

(Foshee, 2004; Maas, 2010). Experiencing poverty in childhood is also positively correlated with

family violence as well as violence victimization later in life (Maas, 2010). As a result, targeting

populations in lower socio-economic communities is appropriate. In addition, other

demographic characteristics have been linked to increased risk of experiencing dating violence

victimization. Based on data from the National Youth Risk Behavior Survey conducted in 1999

and 2005, Howard et al. found that boys who had sad or hopeless feelings, engaged in physical

fighting, had carried a gun, had been sexually active in the most recent 3-month period, and had

unprotected sexual intercourse were at greater risk of experience physical dating violence from a girlfriend (Howard, 2003 and 2008). In addition, Howard reported in their 2003 study that boys who had considered suicide were almost three and a half times more likely to report dating violence victimization and boys who had attempted suicide were over six and a half times more likely to report dating violence (Howard, 2003). Although there may be more risk factors yet to be uncovered through further investigation, these findings suggest that boys may need much emotional support to overcome many obstacles associated with their experience of dating violence victimization.

Adolescent Transition to Early Adult

A number of transformational social experiences that define who people become as they emerge into adulthood occur during adolescence. Some of these social experiences include the development of peer groups, emerging romantic interests, and changing norms that support problem behaviors (Miller, 2013). Approximately 75% of adolescents experience at least one dating relationship by their senior year in high school (Carver, 2003; Sullivan, 2010). Dating experiences during adolescence offer a context for young people to learn about interacting and communicating with romantic partners as well as influence patterns of behavior with intimate partners in adulthood (Sullivan, 2010). Adolescents may experience conflicts, emotional distress, and hostility during their romantic relationships (Sullivan, 2010). If early adults, the target population of the current study, experienced these situations in their dating relationships as teens and never learned the skills to effectively address them, they may be at greater risk for experiencing dating violence in their adult relationships. In addition, being the victims of teen dating violence can increase the risk of unhealthy behaviors developing as early adults, including substance use and mental health problems (Fohsee, 2007; Maas, 2010). Experiencing dating

violence as adolescents also increases the risk of dating problems into adulthood including several problems in adult romantic relationships that include difficulty forming reciprocal dating relationships with mutual support. Dating violence perpetration and victimization among teens have been positively associated with low self-esteem as well as deficits in communication and problem solving skills (Carlson, 2007; Sullivan, 2010). It is important to understand the processes by which dating violence occurs so that effective interventions may be developed to address factors that will ultimately reduce the prevalence of this issue in young populations.

Dating Violence Among Men

There is very little research on men's experience with IPV, and the research that has examined men's experience with IPV has done so from the perspective that men are the sole perpetrators of IPV (Hamberger, 1994; Houry, 2008). Due to the work of the battered women's movement, which advocated for the protection of women who were being abused by their male partners, men are often assumed to be the more violent of the genders; therefore education and intervention programs have focused on the violence behavior change factors of men (Hamberger, 1994). There is evidence, however, that IPV occurs bi-directionally; that is women commit IPV perpetration as well as men (Houry, 2008) and perhaps for similar reasons. Women in the United States injure their male partners with weapons and have a higher rate of spousal homicide than other Western nations (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1992; Wilson, 1992) (Mulleman, 1998). One study found that 13%-16% of men experienced IPV from their female partner at some point in their lives, which was nearly equal to that of the women in the sample (Nisonoff, 1979; Morse, 1995; Straus 1977-1978; Straus, 1985; Tjaden, 2000). Men are more likely to experience psychological victimization, isolation, intimidation, threats, and/or economic abuse than women (Harned, 2001) (Prospero, 2009). Based on the National Youth Survey (NYS), Morse (1995) concluded that male-to-female violence ranges from 20%-37% while female-to-

male violence ranges from 28%-48%, and regardless of gender, victims of IPV suffer from negative outcomes associated with their victimization (Vivian, 1994). For both men and women, IPV victimization is associated with overall poor health including, depression, substance use, chronic disease, chronic mental illness, and injury (Coker, 2002). In fact, Rouse (1988) found that among a sample of dating college students, African American/Black men experienced the most physical aggression as well as negative consequences related to dating violence victimization. As a result, African American men may fall into depression, experience high stress, or abuse alcohol (Huang, 2001; Prospero, 2009). Houry (2008) reported that women who endorsed perpetration behaviors were more likely to be African American. As a result, some IPV researchers have concluded that the concept of IPV perpetration as a uniquely male gender issue is not accurate and the social and policy implications of this idea have created a caveat that allows for the minimization of men's experiences as victims of IPV (McNeely, 1987; Hamberger, 1994). This lack of empirical research to address IPV victimization among men supports the need to develop a valid and reliable instrument that can be used to examine factors associated with male IPV victimization, in order to develop interventions that might help to reduce this public health problem.

Among a sample of predominately young single African American men and women who had been convicted of intimate partner abuse, Henning et al. (2005) found that the most common reason cited by men for blaming the current incident on their partner involved the victim being jealous (56.3%) and having poor anger control (56.2%). These same factors also were the most frequently cited items by the female offenders (60.8% and 58.9% respectively), so there appears to be a convergence of the reasons given by both men and women for perpetrating abuse. The men abused the women because the women got out of control with their anger/jealousy and the

women admitted to not being able to control their anger/jealousy leading to them abusing the men. This leaves several questions that need to be examined. How does this scenario of abuse begin? Do the women suspect disrespect/infidelity, question, argue, scream, name call, hit and/or hit first? Does the man hit the woman despite the fact that she calmly questions him? Does the woman's questioning and anger become psychologically or emotionally abusive to the man before he hits her? In order to more fully understand the path of IPV, an instrument needs to be developed to assess not only the frequency of abuse, but more important, the context of the abuse.

<u>Prevalence of Women Abusing Men</u>
Many IPV professionals have worked very hard, and rightly so, to increase public awareness about IPV against women and to advocate for policies and resources to address this public health concern (McNeely, 1987). Unfortunately, in the IPV arena, women are most often seen as victims and men are most often seen as perpetrators, but the story may be much more complicated than we currently acknowledge, hence a lack of public awareness and concern for male victims has been apparent (Straus, 1986; McNeely, 1987; Houry, 2008). When IPV against women became a public concern, IPV seemed to decrease among women and yet increased among men. Specifically, in 1975, 12.1% of all women reported at least one violence incident compared to 11.3% in 1985; however, 11.6% of men reported victimizations in 1975, compared with 12.1% in 1985 (McNeely, 1987). As previously stated, empirical evidence exists supporting the idea that women are similarly violent to men in intimate relationships, and further studies have reported that women are also as equally verbally abusive as men (Clark, 1994). Reinforcing this concept is the fact that women are increasingly being arrested and prosecuted for IPV (Henning, 2004). There is also evidence to suggest that some women who commit IPV

21

may suffer from similar distortions often seen in male perpetrators by falsely using a self-defense argument to justify their perpetration against a partner (Archer, 2000; Henning, 2005). Several studies have found that in some instances, women may be more likely than men to use minor and severe physical aggression, insult, spit, kick, bite, threaten to hit or hit first, threaten to use or use a weapon (O'Leary, 1989; Brush, 1990; Stets, 1991; Straus, 1993; Cantos, 1994; Morse, 1995). This evidence suggests that both men and women are capable of IPV perpetration and victimization, and since women seem to be equally as capable as men to escalate and commit IPV, gender should not be the only factor used to inform IPV research, interventions, and treatment (Riggs, 1990; Houry, 2008). An interesting finding by Tjaden in 2000 revealed that in a community sample from New York State, women averaged more assaults against partners when all types of assaults were considered; however, men were more likely to actually "beat up" their partner. It may be possible that men suffer abuses from women over a longer period of time and when they have finally "had enough", they tend to fight back physically. Unfortunately, due to size and physical strength advantages, when the man does fight back, he tends to physically hurt the woman more severely than when she was assaulting him over a period of time (Saunders 1986; Cantos, 1994 Mulleman, 1998; Mechem, 1999). To further complicate the matter, men and women may perceive IPV differently (Ernst, 1997). Due to the prevalence and complexities related to IPV male victimization, female-to-male IPV deserves further objective study.

Ultimately, since there has been no significant difference found between men and women in regard to IPV, researchers have a responsibility to acknowledge the gender-neutral reality of IPV perpetration and recognize that in order to address this public health concern, it cannot be

assumed that women are always the victims and men are always the perpetrators (Sigelman, 1984; McNeely, 1987; Ernst, 1997).

Determinants of Intimate Partner Violence Victimization

There are several determinants of dating violence victimization among men identified in the existing literature. These determinants range from risky behaviors such as drug and alcohol use to intrapersonal, socio-economic and demographic factors such as attitudes and perceptions of IPV, stress level, self-esteem, education, income, age, race, and household makeup. Ernst reported in 1997 that alcohol use, drug use, and suicidal ideation were risk factors for all types of IPV. Low self-esteem, lack of impulse control, stress, frustration, and dependency have also been associated with IPV risk (Warnken, 1994). In addition, the presence of less violent acts of IPV such as verbal or psychological abuse have been associated with the use of physical violence in relationships (Murphy, 1989; Vivian, 1994).

Significant Determinants found in National Samples

When analyzing data from the National Violence Against Women Survey for women and men aged 18 to 65, Coker et al. found that the strongest risk factor for IPV was being physically assaulted as a child for men and women as well as partners' use of alcohol (Coker, 2002). In another study, Stets et al. found that several risk factors for IPV which included young age, lower socioeconomic status, and those who drink before a conflict (Stets, 1991).

Significant Determinants found in Early Adult and College Samples

There are a number of socio-demographic factors associated with male victimization of dating violence. Poor academic performance has been found to be significantly associated with male dating violence victimization (Makepeace, 1983; Rose, 1985; Arias, 1987). More specific to the emerging adult population based on a study of college students, lack of personal control has been identified as a predictor of verbal and psychological aggression toward a dating partner (Stets,

1991; Clark, 1994). In African American college students, perception of the appropriateness of violence in a dating relationship is a significant predictor (Clark, 1994). In addition, among this population, responding to a partner's violent acts with more violent acts seems to be perceived as an appropriate response (Clark, 1994). Perceptions and attitudes that justify the use of violence in dating relationships may develop as a result of children being exposed to violent relationships in their environment and families (Prospero, 2007). Among a sample of high school and college students, Plass found that those in serious dating relations were consistently more likely to be abused and abusive than those in casual relations (Plass, 1983). Among another sample of college students, Sigelman et al. found that low family income and living with a woman were associated with male perpetration and victimization of IPV (Sigelman, 1984).

Significant Determinants found in African American Emergency Department Samples

After conducting a case-control study and analyzing emergency department records triangulated with police department records of urban men who had been victimized by an intimate female partner, Muelleman et al. found that men who presented to the emergency department with injuries inflicted by their female partners had a high rate of domestic violence perpetration (Mulleman, 1998). Among a sample of single, uninsured, urban African American male emergency department patients aged 18 to 55, Rhodes et al. found that the amount of IPV involvement was associated with increasing proportions of patients reporting moderate/severe mental health symptoms such as depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, and suicidal ideation (Rhodes, 2009). Among another sample of male emergency department patients, Mechem et al. found that victims were more likely to be younger, single, African American, and uninsured (Mechem, 1999).

Urban African American Men's Dating Violence Experience

Urban African American men have been found to be at high risk to have experienced physical aggression from a female intimate partner (Ernst, 1997). Most of the studies that have analyzed IPV victimization among African American men have used data collected in urban emergency departments. Among emergency department samples, 6% to 30% of men have a history of being hit by their female partners (Goldberg, 1984; Roberts, 1993; Roberts, 1996, Ernst, 1997; Mulleman, 1998; Mechem, 1999; Lipsky, 2005; Rhodes, 2009). Interestingly, Mulleman (1998) reported that the majority of men (76%) with an injury in an emergency department due to intimate partner violence reported that the female aggressor was a girlfriend instead of a wife. It was reported that 51% of the cases had arrests for domestic violence perpetration vs. 22% of the controls, while 49% of cases did not have prior domestic violence arrests. Rhodes (2009) et al. reported that 20% of men were victims only of IPV and 11% engaged in bi-directional IPV. Among a sample of urban black inner-city male and female emergency department patients, Ernst (1997) et al. reported that 14% of men and 22% of women had experienced past nonphysical violence; 28% of men and 33% of women had experienced past physical violence;11% of men and 15% of women reported present nonphysical violence; and 20% of men and 19% of women reported present physical violence.

Among a sample of majority African American male emergency department patients, Mechem et al. reported that 12.6% had been victims of domestic violence committed by a female intimate partner within the preceding year. Among this sample, only 19% of victims stated that they had called the police, 14.3% received medical treatment, 11.4% pressed charges or sought a restraining order, and 5.7% sought follow-up professional counseling.

<u>Dating Violence Experience among the College Population</u>

Most of the studies addressing dating violence among the early adult population have utilized college student samples (Stets, 1991). Based on DV studies among the college population, it has been estimated that between 20%-25% of college students may be involved in violent dating relationships (Makepeace, 1981; Riggs, 1990). In some cases, the college age population seems to have interpreted DV as being a typical facet of a relationship, like anger, confusion, love, jealousy, hate, and is not always viewed as harmful (Cate, 1982; Henton, 1983). In fact, for some young couples, violence may serve as an indicator that the relationship is progressing and warrants a greater level of commitment by the partners involved (Billingham, 1987). In addition, violence may exist in a dating relationship because the partners have accepted violence as a legitimate conflict tactic (Billingham, 1987).

Among a sample of college students at a medium size Midwestern university, Makepeace (1981) found that the majority of the students responding (61.5%) had personally known of someone who had been involved in courtship violence, and one-fifth (21.2%) had at least one direct personal experience. In a sample of college students in the Northwestern United States, Cate et al. (1982) found that 22.3% of participants reported they had been victims of DV or they had been violent toward a dating partner. In 68% of the relationships where abuse had occurred, each partner had been both the victim and perpetrator of violent behavior at some point in the relationship. Interestingly, the male was the only perpetrator in 10% of the relationships, while the female was the only perpetrator in 22% of the relationships. Plass (1983) found that females were more likely than males to be aggressors in serious relationships and more males than females reported being victimized in both serious and casual relationships. In both serious and casual relationships, a higher proportion of Black respondents were involved as aggressors. African Americans reported they "threw something at my partner" three times more often than

white respondents, and were involved two times more frequently in pushing, grabbing, and shoving, and were more than twice as likely to report slapping, kicking, biting, or hitting with the fist. As victims in serious relationships, African Americans were twice as likely as whites to report being kicked, bitten, or hit with fists. Sigelman et al. (1984) found that overall, 53.6% of the male respondents and 52.1% of the female respondents reported having committed at least one physically abusive act at some time in a heterosexual relationship and the most common forms of physical violence included pushing, shoving, slapping, and throwing things. Among a random sample of college undergraduates, Lane et al. (1985) found similar proportions of female and male students reporting that they had experienced conflict and abuse during courtship with females being more likely than males to admit having been the perpetrator. Among a sample of college students in a large south central university, McKinney (1986) found that men reported less perpetration of physical abuse (21%) than women (26%), but reported higher rates of being a victim of verbal and physical abuse, and lower rates of sexual abuse compared to women. Arias et al. (1987) reported that more college males than females had reported DV victimization in both past (27% versus 8%, respectively) and current (23% versus 3%, respectively) dating relationships. Thirty percent of males reported engaging in overall physical aggression, while 49% of the women reported a history of engaging in overall physical aggression. Statistically equal percentages of men and women, 30% and 32%, respectively, reported engaging in overall physical aggression against a partner in a current dating relationship. There was a trend for a greater percentage of women (19%) then men (10%) to report engaging in severe physical aggression and a greater percentage of men (50%) than women (38%) to report being victims of overall violence at some point during their dating histories and a significantly greater percentage of men (49%) than women (26%) reported overall violence victimization in their current

relationships. Rouse (1988) found that male students were more likely than female students to report their partners as being possessive, rejecting, sexually pressuring, using moderate physical force, and causing consequences related to DV acts such as needing medical attention as a result of injuries. According to Sugarman (1989) in a review of over forty dating violence studies, almost 40% of female and 33% of male college students had used violence against their dating partner at some point during their dating careers. Also, Sigelman (1984) reported that 54% of the men and 52% of the women in their sample of college students had abused a dating partner. Among a sample of college students involved in courting relationships in the Southeast, DeMaris (1990) found that severe violence against girlfriends was reported by 11% of respondents, while severe violence against boyfriends was reported by 21% of respondents and African American females reported using more violence against boyfriends than African American males reported using against girlfriends. Among a sample of undergraduate college students, Riggs et al. (1990) found that significantly more women (39%) than men (23%) reported that they had engaged in physical aggression against their current (or most recent) partner and concluded that at any one time, more than one-fourth of the students on a college campus may be involved in an abusive relationship. Follingstad et al. (1991) found that 16% of male subjects reported some experience as the recipient of dating violence. Victims in this sample most frequently chose the following four perceived reasons for their partner being abusive: partner wanted to get control or get their own way (20%), wanted to retaliate for being emotionally hurt (20%), was jealous (18%), wanted to show how angry they were (11%). The males in this sample who admitted to perpetrating violence, were more likely to state they used force in retaliation for being hit first which was corroborated by the female victims in this sample. Female victims in this sample also reported that they became victims at the hand of their male counterparts after they themselves

had committed some act of violence against the male. Shook et al. (2000) concluded that no significant gender-based difference was found for verbal aggression in dating relationships; however, females were significantly more likely to report using physical force than were male students. Among their participants, 82% of the sample admitted to having used verbal abuse against a dating partner over the past year, while 21% of the sample reported that they were engaged in physically aggressive behavior. Eighty percent of males and 83% of females reported having engaged in verbal abuse with a dating partner over the past year, whereas, almost twice as many (23.5%) females reported using physical force against their partner compared to males (13.0%). Finally, among a sample of college students at a large mid-western university, Monson et al. (2002) found that women were more likely than men to report perpetration of non-sexual dating violence.

The available data clearly indicate that dating violence is a major issue that early adults face as they navigate their interpersonal relationships, and the literature suggests that dating violence may be more prevalent in populations that are younger and have lower SES status (Stets, 1991). Many early adult urban African American men fit into this category. Although there is some evidence in the IPV findings based on hospital emergency department African American samples that many of the male victims are not married to their female perpetrators, most of the dating violence data has been collected in college student samples (Mulleman, 1998; Riggs, 1990; Stith, 1992). Unfortunately, conclusions derived from college student samples and hospital emergency department samples may not be generalizable to community samples of early adults (Riggs, 1990), and especially non-college student urban early adult samples. Generally, the demographic variation that may be found in community samples is not present within college student samples. College students tend to be homogenous with regard to education attainment,

academic aspirations, and occupation, which can be determinants of DV victimization (Stets, 1991). Although findings based on college student samples may give some insight into understanding DV among non-college student urban early adult men, these results may not be sufficient to address the problem in this population (Stets, 1991). At the time of writing, there were no existing studies that had been published addressing DV among non-college student early adult men in a general community setting.

Types of Dating Violent Acts Experienced by Victims

Among a sample of military couples that had been referred to a treatment program for domestic violence being conducted at three military bases, Cantos et al. (1994) found that men's injuries were related to thrown objects, kicks, bites, hits with fists, and threats with knives or guns. Women were more likely to kick, bite, hit with a fist, threaten with a knife or gun, and use a knife or gun on spouses than were men. Among a sample of blue-collar union workers and their spouses or cohabiting partners, Cunradi et al. (2009) found that the most common forms of female perpetrated IPV were pushing or shoving (16%), throwing something that could hurt (12.9%), and grabbing (10.7%).

There have been several studies that have targeted urban African-American samples in emergency departments examining the types of IPV acts experienced by male victims of IPV perpetrated by their female partners. Muelleman et al. (1998) reported that male victims were injured by unarmed fights (31%), cuttings (33%), blunt objects (31%), and bites (5%). A variety of objects had been used in the physical abuse including skillets, beer bottles, lead pipes, fire pokers, bats, vases, statues, phones, plates, table legs, and boards. Seventy-one percent of the men in the sample had lacerations on the face (29%), upper extremities (22%), scalp (13%), back (7%), lower extremities (7%), and penis (2%). Twenty-nine percent of the men had abrasion or contusion on the head (9%), lower extremities (7%), face (4%), trunk (4%), multiple sites (4%),

and upper extremities (2%). Mechem et al. (1999) reported that the most common forms of assault were slapping, grabbing, and shoving (60.6% of victims). These were followed by choking, kicking, biting, and punching (48.6%), or throwing objects at the victim (46.8%). Thirty-seven percent of cases involved a weapon and 7% of victims described being forced to have sex. Rhodes et al. (2009) reported IPV victimization was reported more often than IPV perpetration by the male participants, with emotional and physical victimization being reported more frequently than sexual victimization.

In addition to exploring the types of IPV acts experienced by male victims in the emergency department, there also exists a body of literature that has examined IPV acts experienced by college student victims. Unfortunately, the author of the current study found only a single study that specifically analyzed dating violence victimization among African American early adults outside of the emergency department setting conducted by Clark (1994). Among a sample of African American college students who were dating, Clark et al. (1994) reported that females reported using more physical violence against a dating partner than did males; 92% of males compared to 94% of females had acted out at least once in a verbally aggressive manner toward a dating partner; men were less likely to use physical aggression to resolve conflict within dating relationships; 35% of males compared to 47% of females admitted to taking one physically aggressive action against a dating partner; 91% of males compared to 88% of females had at least one experience with a verbally aggressive partner; and 41% of males compared to 33% of females had been physically abused by a dating partner at least once. This aggression most often took the form of pushing, slapping, or hitting although the use of a gun or knife was reported on occasion. Makepeace (1981) reported that pushing (13.9%) and slapping (12.9%) were most frequently experienced by victims, and the type of violence most observed by participants was

slapping (48.5%), pushing (41.9%), and punching (23.3%). Cate et al. (1982) reported that the most frequent violent acts were pushing or shoving (78%), slapping (61%), kicking, biting, or hitting with the fists (38%), and hitting or trying to hit with something (33%). Plass (1983) found that the most frequently encountered behavior was pushing, grabbing, or shoving, followed by slapping, throwing something, kicking, biting, or hitting with a fist, and hitting or trying to hit with an object. Females slapped their partners three times more than males, kicked, bit, or hit with the fist seven times as often, and hit or tried to hit with an object almost three times more often than males. Almost five times as many males as females reported that their partner threw something at them, and more than twice as many males as females reported being slapped, kicked, bitten, and hit with a fist. Among another sample of college students, Sigelman et al. (1984) found that women reported they had done more kicking, hitting, or biting, and men corroborated this by indicating that they more often than women had been targets of such behavior. More women than men claimed to have thrown things at partners; more men than women reported having had things thrown at them. Lane et al. (1985) found that about 10% more females than males both experienced and inflicted violence, and significantly more females slapped, kicked, bit, or punched or threw something at their partners. Of the male respondents 8% had sex unwillingly due to pressure, and a small fraction of females reported the same forms of sexual aggression as men. Riggs et al. (1990) found that the most frequently reported forms of aggression were slapping, pushing, grabbing, and shoving, and Prospero et al. (2009) found that male respondents reported higher mutual violence in sexual, physical, and verbal DV as well as economic, threatening, and coercive isolation behavior (victimization) compared to their female counterparts. Clearly, DV is all too common on college campuses, and the evidence would strongly suggest that women are at least as involved as men in perpetrating violence.

Effects of Dating Violence on Men

The effects of DV victimization on men have not been studied in depth. There is some evidence, however, that male victims suffer proximal and distal consequences associated with their DV victimization. Vivian (1994) reported that husbands might experience more frequent psychological abuse than their wives. Both spouses in this study sample reported equivalent levels of partner verbal hostility and similar negative impact from the psychological victimization including marital and individual dysfunction. Arias (1989) concluded that the possibility exists that the effects of IPV are more damaging than we currently know, and the effects of IPV victimization may be similar for both men and women. Other effects of experiencing abuse in relationships include fear, anger, finding abusive behavior funny, and depression (Follingstad, 1991). Among a sample of majority African American male emergency department patients, Mechem et al. (1999) found that 49% admitted fearing that a current or former female intimate partner would hurt them physically. Coker et al. (2002) reported that for both men and women, physical IPV victimization was associated with increased risk of current poor health, depressive symptoms, substance use, developing a chronic disease, chronic mental illness, and injury. For men, all forms of physical and psychological IPV were associated with recreational drug use, and being injured. In 2007, Prospero reported that male victims of IPV were just as likely as female victims of IPV to report symptoms of depression and anxiety and reported in 2009 that coercive behavior victimization affected the mental health of Asian American women, African American women, and Latino American men (isolation, economic, and threatening, respectively). There were not enough African American men in the 2009 sample to analyze, supporting the necessity for further study, specifically with this population.

Why Women Perpetrate Dating Violence

There may be many reasons other than retaliation or self-defense of IPV victimization for female perpetration of DV. It is important to reiterate that the purpose of this study is not to diminish female victims of DV, or even to compare women's experiences of DV with men's. It is important, however, to acknowledge why some women perpetrate DV against men when they have not been victims themselves. Makepeace (1981) found that jealousy related to infidelity (27.2%) was the reason most reported as the source of the conflict which led to violent acts being committed by both male and female partners. Riggs et al. (1990) reported several factors that influenced women to use aggression against their male partners: interpersonal aggression, parental aggression experienced as a child, a history of arguing and fighting, a more aggressive personality, having more relationship problems, and poor problem-solving ability. Follingstad et al. (1991) reported that female perpetrators of IPV reported more frequently that they committed violent acts against their male partners in retaliation for feeling emotionally hurt, for wishing to show anger, and in an attempt to gain control. Among a sample of predominately young, single, African American men and women who had been convicted of intimate partner abuse, Henning et al. (2005) found that not being able to control anger (30.8%) was most frequently reported by female perpetrators of IPV, followed by problems with jealousy (25.2%). Male victims in the sample most frequently reported that they perceived their female counterpart's jealousy (56.3%) as the reason for committing violent acts against them, followed by the women not being able to control her anger (56.2%). Characteristics specific to female perpetrators were: their belief that their partner was not committed to the relationship, was unfaithful, and their male partner was insecure in the intimate relationship. Henning also reported that female perpetrators seemed to be more likely than male perpetrators to have long-term psychiatric problems.

One of the largest differences between men and women who report using physical abuse toward their partner is the use of slapping which women are reported to be fifteen times more likely to use than men (Stets, 1991). This may be due to the social messages that women receive reinforcing the idea that if a man gets "out of line", a woman has the right to slap him (Stets, 1991). There is also evidence supporting the idea that perhaps helping couples reduce or eliminate verbal abuse may result in a reduction in physical abuse (Stets, 1991). Results from the use of the proposed instrument may be used to empower men to identify when they are being abused, verbally, mentally, psychologically, emotionally, and physically, and help them to take action steps towards improving or terminating their relationship; similar to the interventions targeting women.

Social Attitudes toward Male Victims of Dating Violence

Male-to-female physical abuse may be less socially acceptable than female-to-male physical abuse (Arias, 1987). Among a sample of undergraduate students, Arias et al. (1989) found that both men and women perceived men's use of physical violence against women more negatively than women's use of physical violence against men. In this sample, use of physical violence by either the male or female in the relationship was perceived to be acceptable when the perpetrator: (1) slapped the partner in self-defense, (2) slapped the partner in order to protect their child, (3) slapped the partner because s/he has been sexually unfaithful, and (4) slapped the partner because s/he hit first. In 1987, Arias also reported that women may feel more justified than men to be physically aggressive in their relationships because they are not concerned about seriously hurting their male partner. Women may also be more successful than men at communicating their non-acceptance of physical abuse from their dating partner thereby creating higher risk for men to be exposed to dating violence victimization from their female partner (Arias, 1987).

Barriers for Men to Identify as Dating Violence Victims

Screening and identifying men who may be victims of DV perpetrated by a female partner is complicated by several factors (Coker, 2002). Due to stigma and fear of social ridicule, men may simply be more reluctant to admit to being victimized by a female (Steinmetz, 1977-78; Makepeace, 1981; Plass, 1983; Mulleman, 1998; Mechem, 1999). In a study conducted by Mechem in 1999, only 14.3% of male victims notified the police about the incident compared to 51% of women reported by the Bureau of Justice (1992-1996) which substantiated findings reported by McNeely (1987). This male reluctance to report may be due to gender role expectations in contemporary Western culture. There is also evidence that when men report to a hospital emergency department, usually no information is collected regarding the perpetrator of the assault, which led to the injury (Mulleman, 1998). Urban African American men are also less likely to report being assaulted by their female partner to the police even when they have been victimized (Ernst, 1997).

Another interesting barrier is that many men may be completely unaware that they are being victimized. Follingstad (1991) reported that some men do not identify as a DV victim, but at the same time report suffering from a variety of violent acts perpetrated by their female partners. Some men have accepted this behavior from women as normal (Stets, 1987 Arias, 1989; Clark, 1994). This situation is complicated by the fact that many men may not experience the same type of fear from women or perhaps not admit to being fearful of a woman. Also, male victims may not admit to or perceive themselves as losing power or control (Houry, 2008). A serious push or hit by a woman may be perceived as play or a joke by the man leading to more acceptance of this type of behavior from females (Henton, 1983; Rouse, 1988; Arias, 1989; Riggs, 1990; Clark, 1994). Both men and women involved in IPV may not always interpret the violence as negative, and alarmingly, many interpret the actions as love (Billingham, 1987) and the literature

demonstrates that both men and women do not consider male victimization of IPV as serious as female victimization (Johnson, 1986; Arias, 1987; Arias, 1989).

The Process of Dating Violence

Most dating violence research has focused only on physical abuse in the relationship. However, Stets (1991) found that verbal abuse may lead to physical abuse, and these abuses are reciprocated between people who share the dating relationship. Verbal abuse was found to predict receiving physical abuse and vice versa (Stets, 1991). It may be a mistake to ignore the other types of abuses (i.e. verbal, psychological, emotional) that are likely to occur in the cycle of dating violence if we are trying to understand the context in which these abuses may occur (Stets, 1991). In addition, these other types of relationship abuses may have very similar effects as physical abuses on victims (Stets, 1990). Very little empirical work has been performed focusing on dating violence acts other than physically violent acts. However, addressing the other forms of abuse previously mentioned may be a necessary component in reducing incidents of physical abuse among dating couples (Stets, 1991; Shook, 2000). IPV professionals' focus only on physical violence and their failure to adequately address the significance of the other types of dating violence has limited the development of interventions and policies that may have proven to be more efficacious in reducing interpersonal problems in intimate partnerships (Shook, 2000).

Sampling Bias in the Literature

Data in the IPV literature have come from two overarching types of samples, clinical samples and general community samples. Results derived from these two samples have yielded conflicting conclusions (Stets, 1990; Canton, 1994). In clinical samples, participants are often recruited from shelters, courts, and medical settings and are frequently victims of intimate

terrorism (Johnson, 1995; Henning, 2004). In these samples, male perpetration of IPV is much higher than female perpetration, the violence tends to be more severe, and when females do perpetrate it is most often in self-defense (Henning, 2004). Based on this body of research, social policies and attitudes have been developed that characterize all men who have perpetrated IPV against their female partners as "intimate terrorists" or antisocial citizens (Henning, 2004). Historically, research that has defined men as the primary IPV perpetrators has been based on crime records, official law enforcement records, or data collected from women in battered women's shelters; but these studies are flawed methodologically because men are less likely to lodge official victimization reports (McNeely, 1987). These victims may differ significantly from the general population and results yielded from these samples cannot be generalized to the larger population (McNeely, 1987). In the general community samples, participants are often recruited from college settings, hospital emergency departments, or data is analyzed from national datasets. The evidence from these samples suggests that women may be initiating aggression at similar rates as men in the same samples (McNeely, 1987; Mills, 1990; Mould, 1990; Cantos, 1994). This has been called common couple or bi-directional violence. In many cases, this type of IPV may be less severe than what we see in clinical samples and usually involves both partners (Henning, 2004). Johnson (1995) concluded that the majority of IPV committed in the United States is actually common couple violence, not intimate terrorism. Professionals in the criminal justice system and battered women's shelters, however, most frequently observe the outcomes of intimate terrorism (Houry, 2008), which has led to the mischaracterization of males as the more violent gender regarding DV.

Linking Dating Violence and Intimate Partner Violence

It is imperative to address IPV (dating violence) in younger populations to decrease the

probability that individuals will be either perpetrators or victims in their future serious and

marital relationships. There is evidence that DV occurs at higher rates than marital violence, and

because dating relationships are precursors to marital/cohabitating relationships, DV behaviors in

young people often lead to marital abuse and may negatively impact relationships trans-

generationally (Makepeace, 1981; Laner, 1982; Roscoe, 1985; Follingstad, 1991; DeMaris,

1990; Clark, 1994). Plass (1983) observed that the types of violence reported in dating couples

is similar to the types of violence reported in marital couples. The acceptance of using violence,

or being abused, in interpersonal relationships may begin in the earlier years of development for

young people (Prospero, 2007).

Among a sample of college students in the Northwestern United States, Cate et al. (1982)

found that 72% of the respondent's first experienced violent behavior after the relationship

became more serious (47% during serious dating and 25% after engagement or cohabitation).

Twenty-eight percent of participants who had experienced premarital violence reported that

violent acts began during casual dating. Cate concluded that violent behavior is more acceptable

when relationships become more serious, and most participants did not perceive the violence to

be destructive in their dating relationships.

Current Instruments Used to Measure Dating Violence

In 1999, Mechem reported that men might be more likely to discuss their experiences as

victims of IPV if data collection tools included questions that examined violence perpetrated by

women. Most of the IPV research has used the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) developed by

Straus in 1979 (Cantos, 1994). Although the CTS does not assess the context in which violence

may have occurred in the relationship (i.e. self-defense vs. control), health outcomes (i.e.

psychological impact or physical injury), or risk, this instrument seems to be the gold standard since it has been used by many researchers to assess the types of violent acts in a relationship and by whom the acts were committed (Laner, 1982; Sigelman, 1984; Lane, 1985; Arias, 1987; Billingham, 1987; Arias, 1989; DeMaris, 1990; Riggs, 1990; Stets, 1991; Cantos, 1994; Clark, 1994; Vivian, 1994; Shook, 2000; Prospero, 2007; Allen, 2009). The CTS, however, was not developed specifically targeting either men or African Americans. Further, the CTS lacks measures that would allow researchers to assess several important concepts: the context of the violence; who in the relationship may have been the initiator of the violence; why the violence was initiated; and the impact of the violence on the victim (e.g., emotional, psychological, mental, injury) (Vivian, 1994). This research examined items from the CTS to inform the development of a new instrument to measure and assess the risk and behavioral outcomes of DV victimization among urban early adult African American men.

Scale Development
Scale development consists of several procedures that have been widely used and refined in social research. Although each individual research project may operationalize the steps of scale development slightly differently due to the complexities and variation in populations, the steps and procedures are fairly standardized. A mixed methods approach is often used in scale development research. The qualitative methods most often used in the literature include focus groups, interviews, and panel reviews. Quantitative methods used to test the psychometric properties include item comparisons based on mathematical equations.

As previously stated, conducting qualitative formative research is imperative in scale development. Results from this phase of the research are used to inform the items that will be included in the final instrument as well as testing the appropriateness of the items in a specific

study population. Brown et al. (2000) examined the validity and reliability of scale items, which they developed from a literature review and focus groups to measure school connection in the population. Focus groups (n=9) were conducted with secondary student participants to determine the content domain of school connection measures from the students' perceptions. Each focus group consisted of six to nine students and this formative research phase, combined with data obtained from the extant literature, informed the survey items on the initial scales. Researchers then enlisted an expert panel to review the initial scale items to establish content validity. The expert panel included teachers, university faculty, and school district staff persons. The researchers also utilized survey cognitive testing methodology in that they allowed focus group participants to complete the initial survey draft and then reviewed each item with the group. Modifications (e.g., language and question format) were made to the survey draft based on the discussion and results from the cognitive testing methods. Oblique rotation was used in the factor analysis procedure to maximize subscale independence. An eigenvalue of 1.0 or greater was used as inclusion criteria and an overall Cronbach's coefficient alpha of .86 was reported. Interns were trained and used as data collection staff, and SPSS (v9.0) was used to analyze the quantitative data.

Not only are scale items identified through literature review, focus groups, and panels, items are also informed by theory. Theoretical constructs may help researchers to increase content validity by ensuring that the content domain of the scale items is adequate. Sellers et al (1997) developed items on the Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity (MIBI) using the theoretical constructs from the Multidimensional Model of Racial Identity (MMRI). Factor analysis procedures were utilized to examine the factor structure of the scales/subscales, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test was used to assess the appropriateness of the factor analysis

procedure based on the correlation of variables in the scales. A KMO value of .60 or greater was used as inclusion criteria in this research. Items with factor loadings of .30 or less were excluded from the scales and Cronbach coefficient alpha scores were used to assess internal consistency of the scales and subscales and ranged from .60 to .79.

New scale items have also been developed by researchers based on their own expertise and knowledge of the subject and the population being studied. Among a sample of undergraduate students, Chen et al. (2001) examined the psychometric properties and validity of a New General Self-Efficacy (NGSE) scale to compare with the existing General Self-Efficacy (SGSE) scale created by Sherer et al. (1983). The authors first developed scale items by retaining items from previous work they had performed as well as generating new items based on their own expertise and experience. The inter-item correlations were calculated for the newly developed scale. One panel of graduate students and one panel of undergraduate students were used to establish content validity of the scale items. Items with high inter-item correlations (n=6) were eliminated from the scale because including these items could inflate the internal consistency score of the scale. Principle component factor analysis was performed to examine the factor structure of the newly developed scale. Cronbach's coefficient alpha scores were obtained to assess the internal consistency of the scale on three separate occasions and yielded highly acceptable results (α=.87, .88, and .85, respectively).

Another important aspect of scale development is the establishment of validity of the items. Snyder et al. (1996) developed and validated the State Hope Scale with a sample of college students. Consistent with conventional scale development methodology, the authors demonstrated concurrent validity by assessing correlation coefficients of the new State Hope Scale and the Dispositional Hope Scale that should measure similar constructs. The correlation

between the State Hope Scale and the dispositional Hope Scale supported the demonstration of concurrent validity. Cronbach's coefficient alpha scores were calculated at pretest and posttest (.79 and .88, respectively) to assess the internal consistency of the scale.

In addition to establishing validity, demonstrating internal consistency of scale items is required. The most widely used indicator in the literature to examine internal consistency is the Cronbach's coefficient alpha. Davis et al. (2010) developed the Black Identity Classification Scale (BICS). As in most of the scale development studies, researchers first defined the content domain of African American identity components by conducting a literature review and consulting a panel of experts on the subject of African American identity formation. Cognitive testing was conducted on the initial survey items in four separate focus groups with target population representatives. Modifications were made to the survey based on cognitive testing results and principal component analysis with a varimax rotation was performed to assess the factor structure of the survey. Cronbach's coefficient alpha scores were obtained to assess the internal consistency of the subscales that were established: Black American (.71), Afrocentric (.78), Bicultural (.74), Multicultural (.70), Cultural Mistrust (.43), and Racial Salience (.78). Due to the low reliability for the Cultural Mistrust scale (.43), researched identified this subscale as have unacceptable internal consistency and reported that further work was needed to increase the internal consistency. They suggested deleting or adding more items to the subscale. Construct validity was assessed by testing the correlation between the newly developed identity components and three survey items hypothesized to vary by each of the newly developed identity components.

After conducting factor analysis procedures of scale items, factor loadings have been examined to determine which items to retain in scales and subscales. In 2002, Oman et al.

developed a survey to measure youth assets in neighborhoods. During the formative phase of this research, five windshield tours were conducted in each target neighborhood to assess socio-demographic factors (e.g., density, physical condition, types of businesses, and availability or lack of community resources/services). Approximately one hundred key informant interviews were conducted with residents and community stakeholders, and twenty-three focus groups were conducted with youth from targeted neighborhoods to assess assets, needs, and content domain of the survey measures. Qualitative research participants were recruited utilizing convenience sampling and snowball sampling methodology. In addition to the qualitative research results, a literature review was also conducted to inform the content domain of the survey items. As in other studies described in this section, researchers also included items based on their own expertise and experience. Two pilot studies were conducted to perform cognitive testing procedures of the newly developed survey. During cognitive testing, survey items were read to the participants and problematic items were discussed in detail with the youth. Modifications (e.g., re-wording questions) were made to the survey based on the results from the cognitive testing procedures. Factor analysis using principle axis factoring with varimax rotation, was conducted to assess the factor structure of the items which were developed through the literature review and formative research phase. Items with a factor loading of .40 or higher were retained as meeting the inclusion criteria set by the researchers. Items that loaded on more than one factor with a factor loading of .40 or higher were eliminated and the analysis was re-run. Scree plots and the eigenvalues were assessed to determine the number of factors that were appropriate for the analysis. Cronbach's coefficient alpha scores were obtained to assess the internal consistency of the scale. Researchers considered an alpha of .70 as preferable, but accepted .60 as the lower limit of acceptability. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS (10.0.7).

In some cases, instruments may already exist that measure factors similar to those factors that a researcher wants to measure with a new instrument. Items from the previously existing instrument may be used to inform some of the items on the newly developed instrument. Seidman and Allen (1995) developed and validated an instrument to assess microsystem-specific transactions appropriate for poor, urban, culturally diverse adolescents. Researchers developed instrument items by modifying existing items that had been widely used in the field. Pilot studies were conducted (although specific methodologies and procedures were not reported in the article) which warranted modifications to the instrument. Exploratory principle axis factor analyses with both orthogonal (varimax) and oblique (oblimin) rotations were conducted to determine which procedure was most appropriate for the data. Ultimately, orthogonal with varimax rotation was performed. Items with factor loading of .30 or higher were retained as meeting the inclusion criteria set by the researchers. Acceptable Cronbach's coefficient alpha scores were obtained (range: .74-.81) to assess the internal consistency of the scale.

Finally, researchers have used scale development methodologies and psychometric assessment procedures to test the validity and reliability of previously established instruments in new populations where psychometric properties have not been examined. Shelton et al. (2010) examined the psychometric properties of the Group-Based Medical Mistrust Scale (GBMMS), which had demonstrated strong validity and reliability in other samples, among a sample of Black men in New York City. Participants completed the self-administered survey. Principle component exploratory factor analysis using promax rotation was conducted to determine the factor structure of the scale in this sample. Construct validity (convergent and discriminant validity) was examined by calculating the correlations between the GBMMS and variables hypothesized to be either positively or negatively associated with the construct of medical

mistrust. Acceptable Cronbach's coefficient alpha scores were obtained to assess the internal consistency of the subscales, total GBMMS (α=.87) and the three sub-scales: Suspicion (.89), Discrimination (.83), Lack of Support (.65).

Based on the extant literature, focus groups, and expert panelists are used to develop survey items and to conduct cognitive testing of survey items. During this process, many modifications may be made to survey drafts. Inter-item correlations are examined to determine the appropriateness of conducting factor analysis procedures. Principle component factor analysis procedures are often conducted to establish the factor structure of scale items using eigenvalues of 1.0 or greater. Cronbach's coefficient alpha scores are calculated to assess the internal consistency of scale items, and scores ranging between .6 and .9 are often acceptable by researchers in the literature. Convergent and discriminant validity is usually demonstrated by assessing the correlation of scales/subscales that theoretically should be positively or negatively associated with variables with which the scales/subscales should be positively or negatively associated.

Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory & the Health Belief Model

The Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory (SSBDV) was developed as a result of the dominant gender-based theories in the IPV arena. This theory attempts to explain varying dimensions of power based on the different psychological and sociological circumstances experienced by different populations and sub-cultures, and in different relationship structures. Although the theory was developed to address domestic violence in homosexual relationships, according to Merrill (1996), IPV is not a gendered or sexual orientation issue, and therefore, it is an appropriate theory to inform the current research by identifying constructs that should be addressed in an instrument to assess men's experience as dating violence victims. Since this

theory has been developed as a gender-neutral framework, the constructs should apply regardless of the gender of the perpetrator and the victim. This theory is also appropriate because the author of the current research does not assume that the patriarchal power dynamic that may be observed in what is considered "traditional" heterosexual relationships, is necessarily the norm in urban early adult African American male populations. Given that many young African American men may be undereducated and underemployed compared to African American women (US Department of Labor, 2011; US Census Bureau, 2010), there may very well be a different power dynamic present in their heterosexual relationships. The Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory includes three phases with each phase comprising several constructs.

Phase I of the theory is learning the behavior. Learning the behavior is comprised of instruction by others to act in a violent way, modeling of violent or controlling behavior, and reward for controlling and threatening behavior. Phase II is opportunity to abuse which is comprised of power and isolation. Finally, phase III; choice to abuse, is comprised of poor communication skills, poor impulse control, distorted ideas about gender, and permissibility of violence.

Based on the extant literature, in addition to the SSBDV, two constructs from the Health Belief Model (HBM) will also be used. Many men may not view themselves as being at risk for dating violence victimization, and may not view dating violence acts committed against them as being very serious (Henton, 1983; Rouse, 1988; Arias, 1989; Riggs, 1990; Follingstad, 1991; Clark, 1994). The HBM constructs of perceived susceptibility and perceived severity will be used to explore these factors identified in the literature.

The constructs of these theories will be used to inform the formative research. The constructs that do not apply to the target population of this research, based on the results of the formative

research, will be eliminated. In addition, any constructs that are not addressed by the theories, but are identified based on the results of the formative research, will be included.

CHAPTER 3
DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

Prior to this study, there were no known reliable and valid measurement instruments that had

been developed to assess the risk of dating violence victimization specifically among this

population. Although there was some research that had been conducted examining dating

violence factors among adolescents (i.e. YRBS), there was very little recent research that had

been conducted to understand or explain factors related to dating violence victimization risk

among community samples of young adult urban Black men. The current study developed a

valid and reliable dating violence risk assessment instrument for urban Black males ages 18-25

years old.

Study Questions:

1. Can valid and reliable scales be developed to measure dating violence victimization risk

factors based on factors identified in the literature, the Same-Sex Battering and Dating

Violence Theory, and the Health Belief Model?

2. What are the psychometric properties, including the factor structure and reliability, of the

newly developed scales to measure dating violence victimization risk factors in a sample of

urban African American males ages 18-25?

Specific Study Aims
Aim 1: To develop a quantitative survey instrument to assess the risk of dating violence
victimization among a sample of inner city males of African descent ages 18-25 years old in a
Northeastern United States city.

Aim 2: To conduct principle component factor analysis of a quantitative dating violence
victimization risk assessment instrument among a sample of inner city males of African descent
ages 18-25 years old in a Northeastern United States city.

Aim 3: To conduct reliability analysis of a quantitative dating violence victimization risk assessment instrument among a sample of inner city males of African descent ages 18-25 years old in a Northeastern United States city.

Aim 4: To assess the validity of a quantitative dating violence victimization risk assessment instrument among a sample of inner city males of African descent ages 18-25 years old in a Northeastern United States city.

Research Design

This study utilized a non-experimental cross-sectional design to collect primary data from participants in order to develop a new dating violence victimization risk assessment instrument among inner city young adult Black men. The formative research phase of the study utilized literature review, focus groups, survey pre-testing, and expert panel review to develop an initial set of items that are included in the new instrument. Pencil-paper survey administration was used to assess the psychometric properties of the instrument including reliability testing. Written consent was obtained from all focus group and survey pre-testing participants. Implied consent was obtained from survey participants.

Study Site

Brooklyn, New York consists of 11 distinct community districts, which include multiple smaller neighborhoods (NYCDOH, 2006). Residents in each neighborhood thrive in their own cultures, religious backgrounds, nationalities, and languages. There is a total of approximately 2.5 million residents living in Brooklyn (NYCDOH, 2006). This study was conducted in the Central Brooklyn community district, which includes the neighborhoods of Bedford-Stuyvesant (Bed-Stuy), Crown Heights, Prospect Heights, and Brownsville.

There are 317,300 people living in Central Brooklyn with 30% being 17 years of age or younger (NYCDOH, 2006). The racial/ethnic makeup of this community is Black/African American (80%), Hispanic (11%), White (5%), Asian (1%) and 29% are foreign born with about 31% of residents living below the poverty level (NYCDOH, 2006). Fifteen percent of residents

in Central Brooklyn over 25 years of have earned a college degree while another 23% completed some college, 29% earned high school diplomas, and 23% did not complete high school (NYCDOH, 2006). One in 20 adults in Central Brooklyn suffers from serious psychological distress including depression, although a large proportion of these mental problems often goes undiagnosed in the community (NYCDOH, 2006). The average annual rate of mental illness hospitalizations (1,131/100,000) was more than 35% higher in Central Brooklyn than in Brooklyn (769/100,000) and New York City (813/100,000) [NYCDOH, 2006]. Fewer than 3 in 10 adults (27%) in Central Brooklyn with multiple sex partners used a condom at last sexual encounter compared with 40% in Brooklyn and 38% in New York City (NYCDOH, 2006). Central Brooklyn has the highest rate of Chlamydia (1020/100,000) and Gonorrhea (397/100,000) in New York City (427/100,000 and 136/100,000 respectively) [NYCDOH, 2006]. In addition, according to the 2009 Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), the prevalence of physical dating violence victimization of boys in New York City (12.2%) was slightly higher than the national average (11.1%).

Due to the health status of the community, Central Brooklyn is one of three communities that has been targeted by the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (NYCDOHM) to receive a variety of health education services and initiatives through the creation of the Central Brooklyn District Public Health Office (DPHO) and Central Brooklyn was the geographic target area of the current study.

Survey Instrument Development

There is an abundance of literature that has been published regarding the processes and procedures for scale development, which is presented in detail in chapter 2 of this document. The new survey instrument that was developed in this study was informed by the formative

research phase which used qualitative methods to develop survey items and pre-test the instrument. Along with a review of the literature (Chapter 2 of this document), the formative research phase consisted of three specific research activities which are discussed in further detail later in the "Formative Research Phase" section of this chapter; (1) focus groups, (2) expert panel review, and (3) instrument pre-testing. Quantitative methods were used to collect and analyze data to explore the psychometric properties of the newly developed instrument. The primary investigator conducted a literature review to determine the initial constructs (see Table 3) that were included in the instrument.

During the first research activity in the formative phase of the study, three focus groups (n=14) were conducted with a representative sample of the population to discuss the significant factors that are measured in the survey and to clarify the concepts related to those factors which were informed by the literature and theory. The focus group results were used to modify the initial set of instrument items that were developed based on the literature (Survey Draft 1). Once the first draft of the survey was developed, an expert panel of reviewers was asked to provide feedback on the appropriateness of scale items (formative research activity 2) and one additional focus group (n=4) was conducted with a representative sample of the population for pre-testing/cognitive testing of the survey and to assess the average time it took for respondents to complete the survey (formative research activity 3). Finally, the data collection phase consisted of administering the final survey draft to participants and the data collected was used to assess the psychometric properties of the scales and subscales in the instrument. Each phase of the study is discussed in further detail in the "Formative Research Phase" and "Data Collection Phase" sections of this chapter.

Table 1. Phases of the Study

Phase	Research Activity	Methodology	Study Application
Formative Phase	Focus Groups (n=3)	Qualitative	Focus groups were used to inform development of the survey instrument and for concept clarification. Results from the focus groups were used to modify instrument items for each of the theoretical constructs.
	Expert Panel Review (n=1)	Qualitative	The expert panel review informed the 2nd draft of the survey instrument and established face/content validity. Experts individually reviewed the first draft and made recommendations for revision.
	Pre-Testing/Cognitive Testing (n=1)	Qualitative	Participants were administered the 2nd draft of the instrument. After completion, participants discussed timing, understandability, and cultural appropriateness of instrument items. Revisions were made based on the results of this phase to finalize the instrument.
Data Collection Phase	Instrument Administration (n=200)	Quantitative	Data collected during this phase was used to assess the psychometric properties of the scales and subscales in the instrument.

FORMATIVE RESEARCH PHASE

The current study used qualitative methodology (focus groups, expert panel review, and instrument pre-testing/cognitive testing) to inform instrument items based on the literature review, Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory (SSBDV), and two constructs (perceived severity and perceived susceptibility) borrowed from the Health Belief Model (HBM). Rationale for use of the SSBDV and HBM is discussed in chapter 2 of this document and an overview of the theoretical constructs and applications can be found in Table 3.

The purpose of the formative research phase was to develop a better understanding of the risk factors associated with men who have experienced dating violence actions perpetrated by their girlfriends and to ensure the feasibility, cultural appropriateness, readability, language, and understandability of the instrument. Results from this phase of the research were also used to decrease the burden of taking the survey for participants (specifically length of the survey and the time it will take to complete the survey). *Since this phase of the study was only to inform the development of the instrument items, and the purpose of the study was to quantitatively examine the psychometric properties of the instrument, an extensive qualitative methodology was not utilized and saturation of information from focus group participants was not sought.*

Formative Research Study Aims

<u>Aim 1:</u> To conduct two focus groups with heterosexual urban Black males ages 18-25 to inform the development of a dating violence victimization risk assessment instrument based on a review of the literature, the Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory, and the Health Belief Model.

<u>Aim 2:</u> To conduct an expert panel review to inform the development of a dating violence victimization risk assessment instrument for heterosexual urban Black males ages 18-25 based on a review of the literature, the Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory, and the Health Belief Model.

<u>Aim 3:</u> To pre-test a dating violence victimization risk assessment instrument based on a review of the literature, the Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory, and the Health Belief Model with heterosexual urban Black males ages 18-25.

Focus Group Guide Development

Focus groups were conducted as two of the three formative research phase activities. The specific purpose of the initial focus groups (n=3) were to identify the important factors of dating violence victimization risk for young urban African American men that are measured in the instrument. The specific purpose of the instrument pre-testing focus group (n=1) was to assess the appropriateness, understandability, and burden of the instrument for participants.

A focus group guide (Focus Group Guide 1, Appendix A) was developed based on the factors identified in the literature (including perceived severity/susceptibility borrowed from the HBM) as well as the constructs of the SSBDV. The primary investigator compiled a list of important risk factors based on the risk factors identified in the literature (knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, age, education level, income/employment level, perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, and behaviors) as well as those risk factors outlined by the SSBDV (learning the behavior, opportunity to abuse, and choice to abuse). A specific set of open-ended discussion questions were developed to address each risk factor on the list. The qualitative research assistants (a description of the research assistants can be found in the "Research Team" section of this chapter) were recruited as an expert panel to review the discussion questions in each section of the focus group guide. The research assistants (RAs) were asked to attend a conference call to provide verbal feedback on the discussion questions to make sure each question was understandable for participants, culturally sensitive toward the population, was worded appropriately (language) for the population, and the number of questions to minimize burden on the focus group participants. Each RA was asked to rank each question as "good" or "not good". If the question was ranked "good" by all RAs, no modification to the question was made. If the question was ranked "not good", the RAs were asked how the question should be modified to be

ranked "good". Once the modification was made, the question was re-read to the RAs and

ranked again. This process was repeated for each question until all questions were either ranked

as good, or the RA team decided that the question would be eliminated. The RA reviewers were

also asked if there were any other questions that needed to be added to the focus group guide to

have a more comprehensive understanding of the risk factors being addressed in the study. The

primary investigator, however, made the ultimate decision regarding revisions to the focus group

guide. A draft of the focus group guide can be found in Appendix A.

Focus Group and Pre-Testing Recruitment

Focus group and pre-testing participants were recruited through word-of-mouth and snowball

sampling. Initial focus group and pre-testing participants were recruited from contacts of the

primary investigator. Former youth group members of the Reality Check Youth Anti-Tobacco

Advocacy program were contacted to be recruited for the study as well as contacts of other

professionals in Brooklyn who had access to the target population. The former youth group

members and participants recruited by other professional contacts were then asked to recruit their

peers who met the eligibility criteria. The sample size for the focus groups and survey pre-testing

was 18 total participants (four in focus group 1, three in focus group 2, seven in focus group 3,

and four in the survey pre-testing group). Focus group and pre-testing participants received ten

dollars cash for participation in the study.

Eligibility Criteria - Inner city males of African descent (Black) who were born in the United

States ages 18-25 years old were recruited to participate in focus groups (n=3), survey pre-

testing/cognitive testing (n=1), and survey phases of the study. Participants in all three groups

were English speakers and English literate. In addition, participants were eligible if they had

experienced at least one form of dating violence victimization (verbal, emotional, psychological,

physical, or dating violence facilitated by technology and social media) from a current or former girlfriend.

   Due to the diversity among Black residents in Central Brooklyn, many people did not identify simply as African American. There were many Black people who have immigrated from various Black countries, primarily Caribbean countries or whose parents immigrated from those countries. As a result, many first and second generation born Black Americans in this community identified with the home country from which their parent(s) immigrated; and instead of identifying as African American, a person may have identified as Haitian or Haitian American (Haiti), Jamaican or Jamaican American (Jamaica), Bajan or Barbadian (Barbados), Vincentian (St. Vincent), St. Lucian (St. Lucia), etc. In addition, there may have been a large representation of people in this community who identified as Black and Latino, or "Blatino" if one parent was Black and the other parent was Latino/Hispanic. To maintain cultural understanding and sensitivity; and for the purposes of this study, "Black" was used to initially screen participants for eligibility. Potential interested participants were screened for eligibility by answering "yes" to the following three questions: (1) Is at least one of your parents Black? (2) Were you born in the United States? (3) Are you between the ages of 18-25 years old? More detailed ethnicity characteristics was collected on the demographic questionnaire once initial eligibility was assessed.

Focus Groups & Pre-Testing Data Collection Methods
   Focus groups were held in a private conference room at a university in Brooklyn which was easily accessible by public transportation and ensured confidentiality. Focus group participants and research team members were reminded to maintain confidentiality expectations. It was explained to participants and research team members that: 1) no names would be

associated with any comments made or reported on as a result of the discussion, 2) all identifying information would be kept in locked files separated from any data collected during the focus groups, 3) only the research team would have access to data files, and 4) all information discussed in the focus groups would remain in the focus groups and participants should not discuss with anyone what was talked about in the focus group once the focus group was over.

Data were collected from focus group participants through a facilitated group interview process by which the moderator asked specific questions and probed for responses from the focus group participants. Observers took notes on the conversation and major themes that emerged during the conversations. A debriefing among the research team occurred after each focus group to discuss the major themes and observations of the groups. The focus groups were digitally audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. All participants provided both written and verbal consent to be audio recorded and the focus groups lasted approximately 90-120 minutes. The primary investigator developed the focus group guide. The guide was informed by the literature and associated theories (discussed in Chapter 2) and sought to assess the appropriateness of the scales of the new instrument and to clarify the concepts that are measured with the instrument. The guide was not pre-tested with the population because key factors addressed in the guide were informed by the literature and theory. However, the volunteer qualitative research team served as an expert panel to review the focus group guide for cultural appropriateness, language, understandability, and length. Each member of the research team had professional and/or personal experience working with the target population and all of the research team members were demographically similar to the target population (i.e. Black, male, urban residents) to increase the likelihood that participants would be comfortable giving there

feedback and opinions in the focus group discussions. Revisions were made to the focus group

guide based on the research team feedback.

Focus Group Data Review Plan

The focus groups were analyzed using a phenomenological transcript-based approach. The

phenomenological method allowed for analysis based on experiences exactly as they were

described by the focus group participants (Phillips-Pula, 2011). The transcriptions served as data

to be analyzed for the focus groups. A modified version of Colaizzi's method for

phenomenological analysis (outlined by Phillips-Pula, 2011) was used to identify factors that are

measured with the new instrument. This method included the following steps: (1) read and reread

participants' descriptions of dating violence, (2) returned to the original transcripts and extracted

significant statements (quotes), (3) sought meanings of significant statements and clustered them,

(4) using those themes, generated overarching meaning, (5) coded those themes according to

topic and develop a description, (6) constructed a statement from that description. The

"statements" constructed during the last step of the analysis were used to identify the factors that

are addressed in the instrument. A matrix (Appendix E) was created to analyze the focus group

data.

Step 1. Read and Re-Read

The primary investigator read all transcripts three times. Two other research assistants who

were not associated with the collection of the qualitative data also read the transcripts. On the

first read through the transcripts, the primary investigator marked/flagged all sections

(paragraphs) that indicated descriptions of the dating violence. On the second pass through of

the transcripts, the investigator flagged additional sections (e.g., paragraphs of text) that

described the dating violence but were missed during the first read through. On the third read

through and as a reliability check, the primary investigator asked a colleague not associated with

the data collection to also review the flagged transcripts to determine a) whether the marked

sections reflected dating violence, and b) note where there were other descriptions of dating

violence that were not flagged, if any. In the case of disagreement between the investigator and

the research assistants, a consensus was sought on the passages that should have been

marked/flagged before proceeding to step 2.

Step 2. Extract Significant Statements

Upon completion of step 1, the investigator reread the marked passages in the transcripts and

bracketed individual statements or sets of statements within the passage that specifically

reflected dating violence.

Step 3. Seeking Meaning in and Clustering Statements

In this step, the statement(s) extracted in step 2 were read to identify aspects and dimensions

of the description using constructs in the literature (knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, perceived

susceptibility, perceived severity, and behaviors) and constructs from the SSBDV Theory

(learning the behavior, opportunity to abuse, choice to abuse). These constructs were also used

to cluster the statements. Note that the same statement might have had multiple codes (e.g.,

describe the sex of perpetrator and victim as well as the type of violence), so multiple labels may

have been applied. Statements were clustered depending on their meanings.

Step 4. Themes/Overarching Meaning

Each set of clustered statements was read to generate common or recurring themes. For

example, some descriptions might have included instances where the man was the victim of

abuse through technology or social media, and another cluster might have included instances

where the male had been victimized but perceived his experience to be non-serious, and some

descriptions might have clustered around the theme of physical abuse or verbal abuse experienced by participants.

Step 5. Code Segments and Develop Exhaustive Description
Once all themes were identified in step 4, the investigator developed a comprehensive description, or definition, of each theme. These comprehensive descriptions included detailed explanations of the themes generated by the participants.

Step 6. Construct a Statement from Description
Finally, a single simplified statement was constructed to describe each theme uncovered through the formative research. These final statements were used to validate the constructs that are measured in the instrument.

If the focus groups uncovered factors that were not identified in the literature or informed by the theory, scale items to measure those additional factors were added to the instrument. Specific scale items, based on the focus group results, were developed for many of the constructs in the instrument to increase the validity and reliability of the scales and subscales in the target population. These specific items are discussed in detail in the Results Chapter (chapter 4) of this document.

Expert Panelists
An expert panel was recruited to review the first draft of the dating violence risk assessment instrument. Potential panelists were contacted via phone and e-mail to inquire about their interest and to ask for their agreement to participate as an expert reviewer. Panelists were considered experts in their specific area if they met any one of the following criteria: 1) had more than five years experience working with the target population in community health, intervention, or developmental programs, 2) had conducted academic research on dating violence, 3) had

conducted academic research with the target population or 4) had developed and published

research on measurement and scale development.

Expert panelists were asked to give feedback on each item in the instrument, however not all

experts gave feedback on each specific item. Some experts commented only on items that they

felt needed to be modified. Expert reviewer comments are discussed in detail in the Results

Chapter (chapter 4) of this document. Each expert panelist was recruited to offer feedback on

the instrument based on their own individual set of skills and expertise (see Table 2). Each

expert panelist was provided a set of questions and a response sheet by which they were to

determine an overall rating (see Table 2) for appropriateness of each item. The response sheet

also provided space for the reviewer to provide specific qualitative feedback on each item,

especially if that item received a low appropriateness score. Items that received an average

score of "highly appropriate" (A) were retained without change. Items that received an average

score of "adequately appropriate" (B) were modified based on the qualitative feedback from

reviewers. Items that received an average score of "inappropriate" (C) were considered for

elimination, although the primary investigator made the ultimate decision on item

inclusion/elimination and revisions for the preliminary draft of the instrument. An electronic

version of the instrument draft and response sheet was e-mailed to expert panelists and panelists

e-mailed their comment and response sheets back to the primary investigator.

Table 2. Expert Panelists

Area of Expertise	Expert Name and Title	Consideration of Appropriateness	Overall Appropriateness Rating Format
Urban Emerging Adult Men	**Mr. Irwin Royster** – Planned Parenthood, Washington, DC. Expertise: African American urban adolescent and young adult sexual health and relationship programming. **Dr. Joseph Richardson** – Professor of African American Studies, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. Expertise: Race and poverty, specifically issues that impact the lives of African-American men. These areas include: poverty, employment, education, violence, the criminal justice system, health and fatherhood.	1) Are the questions culturally appropriate for this population? 2) Will the questions possibly offend participants? 3) Are the questions using appropriate language and vernacular for this population? 4) Will the questions cause men who take the survey to feel uncomfortable about honestly responding to the items?	A = Highly Appropriate B = Adequately Appropriate C = Inappropriate
Measurement and Scale Development	**Dr. Kenneth Beck** – Professor of Behavioral and Community Health, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. Expertise: Determinants of threat perception, and risk taking, including alcohol misuse and impaired driving. His research has dealt with adolescents and parents, as well as multiple DWI offenders. He has extensive experience is scale development. **Dr. Mia Smith-Bynum** – Professor of Family Science, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. Expertise: African American family processes, parenting in ecological context, African American mental health, adolescent mental health, racial identity, racism and health, risk and resilience in African American youth, and she has extensive experience in scale development **Dr. Min Qi Wang** - Professor of Behavioral and Community Health, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland. Expertise: Public Health Biostatistics.	1) Are the items in each scale adequate to accurately measure each construct addressed by that scale? 2) Is the response format for each item appropriate?	A = Highly Appropriate B = Adequately Appropriate C = Inappropriate

Pre-Testing the Instrument

Once the instrument draft was revised based on expert panelist feedback, it was pre-tested

with a sample from the target population. The purpose of pre-testing the instrument was to

minimize the presence of confusing questions, to make sure that participants were likely to

answer each question honestly, to ensure each question was worded using the appropriate

language and vernacular for the population, and to assess the burden of completing the survey (Babbie, 2001). Eligibility for participants in this research activity is discussed in the "Focus Group and Pre-Testing Eligibility" section of this chapter. In a focus group setting, participants were given the instrument to complete. Participants were encouraged to make notes on their survey if they didn't understand something or had a concern about a specific question. The observer documented how long it took for each participant to complete the instrument. Once all participants completed the instrument, the primary investigator moderated a group discussion to explore the appropriateness of each question. Participants were asked to re-read the questions in a specific section of the instrument. Once all participants re-read the questions in a section, they were asked to respond to the following questions: 1) Was there anything about these questions that you didn't understand? 2) Should any of these questions be changed in any way? 3) How can this set of questions be changed to make sure someone is comfortable enough to answer them honestly? Participants were then asked to refer back to any notes they made about the questions in that specific section and share with the group. Participants were also asked to share their thoughts about the overall instrument.

Revisions were made to create the final instrument draft based on the feedback from the pre-testing procedures. Items for which participants had no questions or concerns were retained in the instrument without change. Items for which participants had concerns were modified based on specific suggestions from the group and a consensus from the group participants was sought to approve the final items after revisions. Specific revisions that were made based on all focus group and pre-testing results are discussed in detail in the Results chapter (chapter 4). The final instrument draft was used in the data collection phase of the study.

DATA COLLECTION PHASE

Subway Stop Recruitment

Survey participants were recruited through street intercept outside a subway station in Bed-Stuy, a Central Brooklyn neighborhood. Non-random purposive sampling methods were used to recruit study participants to complete the survey. There are four primary New York City Metropolitan Transit Authority (NYCMTA) subway lines that run directly through Central Brooklyn (A,C, 3, and 4 Trains). The A and C trains run along the same line and diverge at a certain point as does the 3 and 4 trains. In addition, the A and 4 trains are express trains and stop only at the busiest stops throughout Central Brooklyn and the rest of the city. Two of the busiest stops in Central Brooklyn are at the intersections of Utica Avenue and Fulton Street (A/C Trains) and Utica Avenue and Eastern Parkway (3/4 Trains). Street intercept survey administration was conducted at the A/C Train subway stop at the intersection of Utica Avenue and Fulton Street. The 3/4 Train stop at the intersection of Utica Avenue and Eastern Parkway was selected as a back-up location or second location if the first location yielded a low response rate, however, it was not necessary to collect data at the back-up location. The A/C Train stop has an open area on the sidewalk where various vendor, health education, and general information dissemination tables are set up regularly to access the neighborhood residents. In addition, both of these subway stops are major connection points for commuters to transfer to buses and taxis. Both the New York City Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) and the New York City Police Department (NYPD) were contacted to inquire about any city permits that were required to conduct the data collection, but since the project was a community service and no merchandise was being sold no permits were required.

The research team (a detailed description of the research team can be found in the "Research Team" section of this chapter) set up a portable table at the subway stop to recruit potential study

participants. Participants were approached by a member of the research team and screened for

eligibility and interest to participate in the study. Eligible and interested participants were given

the survey on a clipboard and pen. Once a participant had completed a survey, the research team

member checked the survey for completion and gave the incentive to the participant (further

details discussed in the Data Collection Methods of this section). In addition to approaching

young men entering/exiting the subway station, members of the research team also canvassed the

residential blocks radiating from the subway station to recruit potential participants who may

have been willing to compete the survey.

Data Collection Eligibility Criteria

Inner city Black males who were born in the United States ages 18-25 years old were

recruited to participate in the instrument data collection phase of the study. Participants were

English speakers and English literate. The sample size for this phase of the study was 148 total

participants. Detailed results regarding the sample size and sampling adequacy is discussed in

the Results chapter (chapter 4). Each survey participant received a round-trip NYCMTA

MetroCard ($4.50 actual value) for participation in the study.

As explained in the Focus Group and Pre-Testing Eligibility section of this chapter, to

maintain cultural understanding and sensitivity, "Black" as the description of race/ethnicity was

used to initially screen participants for eligibility. Potential interested participants were screened

for eligibility by answering "yes" to the following three questions: (1) Is at least one of your

parents Black? (2) Were you born in the United States? (3) Are you between the ages of 18-25

years old? More detailed ethnicity characteristics was collected on a demographic questionnaire

once initial eligibility was assessed.

Study Survey Data Collection Methods

A total of 148 participants were recruited to complete the survey instrument. The survey was paper-pencil and administered by the primary investigator and trained volunteer research assistants. There was a data collection table set up with signs for potential participants to approach to inquire about the study and take the survey. RAs had clipboards and data collection materials in order to administer the survey to eligible participants. Once a participant completed the survey, the RA or primary investigator gave him the incentive (round trip MTA Metrocard) and thanked him for his participation in the project. There was no separate consent form given to the participants to sign. The following statement was at the beginning of the survey that granted implied consent.

"Thank you for agreeing to take this survey. It will take about 10 minutes

for you to answer all of the questions. By answering the questions on this

survey, you are giving consent of your participation in this project. You

do not have to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable with

answering. You can stop taking the survey at any time. Please do not

write your name on this survey because your answers are confidential.

You will receive a round trip MetroCard for completing this survey."

The survey was approved by the UMD-IRB.

All written data have been stored under lock and key and all digital audio-recorded data have been stored in locked electronic files. Only the primary investigator has access to the data associated with this research project. All research activities were approved by the University of Maryland, College Park IRB.

Research Team

    A volunteer research team was recruited by the primary investigator to assist with participant recruitment and data collection activities associated with the study. The research team consisted of volunteers with diverse academic and professional backgrounds. General eligibility criteria for the formative (qualitative) research team included: 1) Black race/ethnicity of male gender , 2) from, worked, lived, and/or attended a university in an urban environment, 3) expressed interest in learning qualitative and quantitative research methods, and 4) expressed interest in or concern about men's experiences with dating violence victimization. General eligibility criteria for the quantitative research team were identical to the eligibility criteria for the qualitative research team except for the male gender requirement. Specific credentials of each research team member are discussed below.

Qualitative Data Collection Research Assistants

    The qualitative research team consisted of professional Black male community stakeholders who were from, worked, or lived in Brooklyn, New York and who volunteered to serve as research assistants (RAs). Members who were recruited to participate as RAs included a health policy and health administration degreed professional who worked with men re-entering society from the criminal justice system and a public health undergraduate student in the City of New York (CUNY) university system. The qualitative research assistants worked with the primary investigator in all focus groups and the survey pre-testing (cognitive testing) group discussion. In the focus groups and cognitive testing, the primary investigator served as the moderator. Research assistants performed the other roles in the qualitative data collection process (greeter and observer). The moderator was responsible for administering the group interview questions, facilitating the group discussions, and operating the digital audio recorder. The greeter was responsible for welcoming all participants, making sure all consent forms and incentive receipt

forms were completed, and distributing incentives. The observer was responsible for taking

notes on major themes of discussion, monitoring and making note of participant non-verbal

communication (long pauses, body language, facial expressions), and keeping track of time

during the discussions. All research assistants assisted with the set up and break down of the

venue (i.e. re-arranging chairs, tables, etc.). Only male RAs were used during this phase of data

collection because the male participants may have been less likely to speak openly and honestly

about their relationship experiences if females were present.

Quantitative Data Collection Research Assistants
    The quantitative research team consisted of all members of the qualitative research team as

well as one undergraduate female from Temple University public health program, one female

graduate student from Johns Hopkins epidemiology program and one recent graduate female

from the University of Maryland School of Public Health Behavioral and Community Health

program. Responsibilities of the quantitative research team included recruiting, screening, and

distributing the survey to participants using street intercept methods. Since the survey was self-

administered by participants, and confidential, gender of the research assistants was less likely to

impact the results. Therefore, female assistants were utilized during this phase of data collection.

In addition, due to the larger sample size (n=148), more assistants during this phase were needed

to recruit the appropriate number of participants.

Research Assistant Training
    All volunteer RAs were trained by the primary investigator and obtained Collaborative

Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) certification. RAs were required to successfully complete

the eleven modules of the Social and Behavioral Research Investigators track of the CITI, which

was required by the University of Maryland Institutional Review Board (IRB). The qualitative

RAs were trained on qualitative data collection methods, specifically focus group data collection. All RAs were trained on pencil/paper survey data collection methods. All training and CITI certification was conducted prior to data collection by the primary investigator.

Measures

Measures were based on the literature review, theories applied in the study, and formative research phase results. The Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory (Table 3) is discussed in chapter 2 of this document.

Learning the Behavior

Learning the behavior is phase I of the Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory (SSBDV). The factor associated with learning the behavior of dating violence that is measured in the new survey instrument is "reward for controlling and threatening behavior". This factor may explain how male victim's actions (or inactions) could potentially lead the female aggressor to feel entitled to perpetrate various DV actions (Merrill, 1996). Men may have directly or indirectly taught their girlfriends that the perpetration of DV acts against him are acceptable. For example, men may have conformed to the wishes of a woman who has yelled at him or to avoid being yelled at by his girlfriend (reward).

Opportunity to Abuse

Opportunity to abuse is phase II of the SSBDV. The factors associated with opportunity to abuse are (1) power and (2) isolation. A woman may have had a certain type of "power" to perpetrate DV actions against her boyfriend due to sexist attitudes (Merrill, 1996) that may exist making certain acts (i.e. verbal abuse, slapping, etc.) more acceptable for women to commit compared to men. In addition, some women may also have had economic power over their boyfriends, especially if their education level is higher than that of their boyfriend. Women who

may be able to isolate their boyfriend from family and friends are less likely to be caught and more likely to escalate conflict (Merrill, 1996).

Choice to Abuse

Choice to abuse is phase III of the SSBDV. The factors associated with choice to abuse include (1) poor communication skills and (2) distorted ideas about gender. Not having effective communication skills or not being able to recognize when a girlfriend has poor communication skills could increase the risk of men becoming DV victims. Also, a man not recognizing the seriousness of a woman committing DV actions simply because she is a woman, and accepting these acts from a woman believing he should "take it" because he is a man, could increase his risk for DV victimization.

Perceived Susceptibility

Perceived susceptibility is a construct that was borrowed from the Health Belief Model (HBM). It is defined as one's belief regarding the chance of getting a condition (Glantz, 2002). For the purposes of this study, the construct of perceived susceptibility was used to measure a male participant's perception of his risk for becoming a victim of dating violence perpetrated by his girlfriend.

Perceived Severity

Perceived severity was also taken from the HBM and is defined as one's belief of how serious a condition and its sequelae are (Glantz, 2002). In this study, perceived severity was used to measure a male participant's belief about how serious various dating violence acts committed by his girlfriend toward him may be considered.

Knowledge and Attitudes

Results from this study were also used to develop scales to measure the knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs of men representing the target population regarding their dating violence experiences. Knowledge was measured by the respondents' factual knowledge about dating violence acts committed against male victims. Attitudes were measures by how positively or negatively respondents viewed DV acts committed by their girlfriends.

Behavior Measures

The new instrument also identifies and quantifies some specific types of dating violence acts experienced by male victims (including verbal, mental, and technology/social media based aggressions) and the actions they may engage in as a result of being victimized by their girlfriend. Behavioral measures include the actions taken by male respondents when they have experienced different types of dating violence acts and dating violence acts they themselves may have committed against a girlfriend.

General Demographics and SES measures

In addition to the above mentioned measures, demographic characteristics of all study participants were measured and included the following factors: gender, age, race/ethnicity, parent's country of origin, first language spoken, education level, previous and current relationship status, income, household composition, employment status, level/type of employment.

Quantitative Analysis Plan

Principle component factor analysis was used to construct a survey by establishing the psychometric characteristics of the scales and/or subscales of the survey in the target population. Although many researchers use the term factor analysis to describe this process, factor analysis

uses a mathematical model which estimates factors, whereas principal component factor analysis

uses actual data to separate variables into different factors (Dunteman, 1989 in Field pg 638).

Principle component factor analysis was used because principle component analysis is

psychometrically sound, less complex, and the results are comparable to factor analysis

(Guadagnoli, 1988; Stevens 2002 in Field pg 638). Ultimately, the major difference between

principle component analysis and factor analysis are mathematical calculations.

Preliminary Analysis

The assumption of normality was tested. Pearson's correlation coefficient was assessed for

each item in a correlation matrix. Any variables that did not correlate with any other variables

were eliminated (Field, 2009). Variables that had correlation coefficients between .3 and .9

remained for further analysis because it was desirable for variables to somewhat correlate with

other variables. Special attention was also paid to variables that correlated highly with each

other. Variables that correlated highly with each other may have posed a problem due to

multicollinearity. One or more of the multicollinear variables would have been removed as well.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was examined for the overall

model as well as for each individual item in the survey to determine the adequacy of the sample

size for the principle component analysis (Field, 2009 pg 659). The KMO statistic ranges

between 0-1. The greater the KMO statistic, the more appropriate the sample size. Kaiser

(1974-Field pg 647) recommends that a KMO of .5 or greater is acceptable with .7-.8 being

good, 8.-.9 being great, and .9 or greater as superb. Variables with a KMO statistic <.5 was

removed and the analysis was re-run. The primary investigator determined whether or not to

ultimately eliminate the variable(s) in question based on the results of the analysis with the

variable(s) removed (Field, 2009 pg 659).

Bartlett's test of sphericity was examined to assess whether or not coefficients in the original correlation matrix and R-matrix were identical. If these values were identical, it would mean that there were no correlations between variables in the survey. Since some correlation between variables was necessary for the analysis, Bartlett's test of sphericity needed to be significant which would have indicated that the original correlation matrix and R-matrix were sufficiently statistically different from each other (Field, 2009 pg 660).

Factor Extraction

Eigenvalues of the R-matrix were calculated and examined to determine the number of factors that were extracted in the analysis. The eigenvalue represents the variance explained in the data for each item in the survey (Field, 2009 pg 660). There is debate among experts regarding the most appropriate method of determining the appropriate eigenvalue criteria. Kaiser (1960 in Field pg 640) recommends accepting factors with an eigenvalue of 1 or greater. Kaiser's criterion is the default in PASW (formerly SPSS) and although not perfect, it seems to be widely accepted in the literature. Joliffe (1972 and 1986 in Field pg 641) recommends accepting factors with an eigenvalue of .7 or greater. A third option presented by Field (2009) is to conduct a scree plot analysis to determine the eigenvalue criteria. Kaiser's criterion may be adequate if there are less than 30 variables in the survey and the communalities values after extraction are all greater than 0.7; or when the sample size is greater than 250 and the average communality value is greater than 0.6. Field (2009) suggests using scree plot analysis in any other circumstances as long as the sample size is greater than 200. Although parallel analysis is a more complex procedure (Field, 2009), it may be the best procedure to determine the eigenvalue criteria due to a more rigorous mathematical formula used to calculate each eigenvalue (Horn, 1965; Zwick,

1986 in Field pg 641). Since the sample size for this study was 148 and none of the new scales that were developed consisted of more than 30 items, Kaiser's criterion was used.

Factor rotation is a procedure through which when variables are plotted, factor axes are rotated in such a way that each cluster of variables will be as evenly distributed around the axis as possible. This procedure maximizes the factor loadings of each variable on one specific individual factor. There are two general options for factor rotation, orthogonal and oblique. Orthogonal rotation is used when variables in the survey are to be considered independent ensuring that the variables remain independent in the analysis. Oblique rotation is used when variables in the survey are to be considered related to each other allowing the variables to correlate in the analysis. Although the type of rotation used can be decided prior to analysis based on whether or not variables are theoretically believed to be related, Field (2009) suggests running the analysis using both types of rotations. If oblique rotation reveals correlations between variables in the survey, the orthogonal rotated analysis should not be used (Pedhazu, 1991 in Field pg 643).

Within orthogonal rotation, there are three methods that may be used; varimax, quartimax, and equamax. Varimax should be used when loading a smaller number of variables from the survey highly onto each factor is desirable. Quartimax should be used when loading as many possible variables highly onto one factor is desirable. Equamax is a combination of varimax and quartimax, however it is reported to not be reliable (Tabachnick, 2007 in Field pg 644) and will not be used in this analysis. If the analysis warrants the use of orthogonal rotation, the varimax method will be used because it is a good general approach and simplifies the interpretations of the factors (Field, 2009). Orthogonal rotation was not used in the analysis.

With oblique rotation, there are two methods that may be used; direct oblimin and promax. The two methods of oblique rotation have to do with the degree to which the variables from the survey are allowed to correlate in the analysis. In the direct oblimin method, the degree to which correlation between variables is determined by function of a constant (delta) and a corresponding value that can be set by the researcher. The corresponding value can range from -0.8 (low correlated factors) – 0.8 (highly correlated factors). The default value in PASW is set at 0, and is sensible for most analysis (Field, 2009 pg 644). Field (2009) does not recommend changing the value from 0. The direct oblimin rotation method was used with delta set at 0 because it ensured that factors were not be highly correlated with each other while not being too restrictive in identifying factors. Promax was not used because it is designed for very large data sets.

Factor loading values were examined and a critical value was set to determine which variables in the survey were retained and which were eliminated. Factor loading values range from -1 to 1. Variables with factor loading values below the critical value were eliminated. The critical value of factor loadings depended on sample size (Field, 2009) and Stevens (2002 in Field pg 644) recommends a critical value of 0.364 for a sample of 200 participants and critical values of 0.4 as a general rule of thumb. Since the sample size of this study is 148, the critical value of 0.364 was rounded up to 0.4 for simplicity of interpretation and to comply with Steven's general rule of thumb.

Reliability

Reliability refers to how consistent a measure is when it is used to measure a specific variable at different times (Field, 2009 pg 673; Babbie, 2001 pg 140). A reliable measure will give the same result each time a factor is measured as long as the factor being measured does not change (Trochim, 2005 pg 60). The most common measure of scale reliability is Cronbach's alpha

(Field, 2009). Cronbach's alpha was used to assess reliability of scales and/or subscales developed in this study. Cronbach's alpha scores range from 0 to 1. Among most texts and peer reviewed journal articles, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.7 to 0.8 is considered acceptable (Field, 2009 pg 675). Substantially low scores indicate an unreliable scale (Field, 2009 pg 675). In the current study, a Cronbach's alpha score of 0.7 – 0.8 was considered acceptable; 0.8 – 0.9 was considered good; and > 0.9 was considered excellent.

Although test-retest reliability is another measure often used to assess internal consistency of scale items, this method requires that an instrument be administered to the same participants at two different time points. Since this study design was cross-sectional and the survey was only administered once to a community sample on the street, test-retest methods were not used in this study.

Validity

According to Trochim (2005), there are two general types of measurement validity; translation validity and criterion-related validity. Translation validity relates to how well the factors being measured are converted into questions on a survey that will measure those factors and is divided into two subtypes; face and content validity. Criterion-related validity relates to how well the questions on the survey measure what they are intended to measure (Trochim, 2005 pg 51). Criterion-related validity is divided into several subtypes; predictive, convergent, and discriminant validity. Because this study proposes to develop a new instrument and because there are no other known scales that have been developed to assess the risk factors associated with male DV victimization, only face and content validity were assessed. In order to have assessed predictive validity, longitudinal data would have needed to be collected in the population and this study used a cross-sectional design. Furthermore, convergent validity would

have required the use of existing scales that theoretically measure similar constructs to the new scales that were developed. Since the author of this research knew of no existing similar scales the assessment of convergent validity was inhibited.

Face Validity

Face validity addresses whether or not the questions on the survey appear (on its face) to measure what they are intended to measure. Face validity is highly subjective and, alone, is likely the weakest form of validity (Trochim, 2005 pg 51). Face validity was established by recruiting a panel of experts to assess whether or not the survey questions appeared to measure what they were intended to measure.

Content Validity

Content validity addresses whether or not the questions on the survey address all relevant factors of the subject, dating violence in this case. Content validity was established by including all relevant factors identified through existing literature, focus groups with the representatives of the target population, and feedback from an expert panel.

Sample Size

There is little consensus among researchers regarding the appropriate sample size for assessing the psychometric properties of instrument scales. Comrey (1992) suggests 300 participants to be "good" and 500 to be "very good". Nunnally (1978) however suggests that there be at least 10 subjects for every one item on the survey. The total number of instrument items did not exceed twenty questions. The maximum number of items on any scale in the instrument was fifteen. The Nunnally rule was adopted and the sample size for this study was 148 participants. Sample size adequacy was also assessed for each item and is explained in further detail in the data analysis section of this chapter.

Data Management

Data was assessed for missing values prior to any statistical analyses. Each variable was assessed for missing values. Missing data was excluded from the analysis (Babbie, 2001) using pairwise deletion. Pairwise deletion was used because this method preserved all collected data by only excluding the specific missing value. All other values representing a case were included in the main statistical analyses.

PROTECTION OF HUMAN SUBJECTS

Risks to the subjects
Human Subjects Involvement and Characteristics

Men above the age of 18 years old, identify as Black, and reside in Brooklyn, New York were eligible to participate in the study. Participants were asked to participate in a focus group or complete a survey about their experiences with relationship dating violence.

Sources of Research Material

Sources of research material included the focus group guide and the study survey, which was completed by study participants. Study participants also provided demographic data, which was collected on a demographic form at the focus group or on the study survey.

Potential Risks

Confidentiality - Study participants may have suffered from various social and economic consequences if their confidentiality was breeched. Participants offered sensitive information related to their relationship experiences during the study. A breech in confidentiality could have resulted in negative consequences related to family, friends, significant others.

Focus group and survey questions may have elicited negative emotional feelings. Study participants were asked certain questions about dating violence victimization they may have experienced. These types of questions may have caused participants to become upset, angry, or depressed.

Adequacy of protection against risks

Recruitment and Informed Consent

It was made clear both verbally and by written communication (consent form) that participation in the study was completely voluntary and that participants had the right to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Confidentiality

All data collected has been kept under lock and key. All electronic data has been kept in security encrypted computer files and were only accessed by research staff. All data collected by paper has been stored in locked filing cabinets and were only accessed by research staff. All personal identifiers (i.e. name, address, phone numbers, etc) have been removed from data files and replaced with a participant identification number. All forms with personal identifiers have been kept separately from all data files.

Negative Emotional Feelings

All men who participated in focus groups were given information about where they could receive help related to unhealthy relationships and dating violence victimization. Any participant who expressed negative emotional feelings as a result of survey questions was referred to the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene Mental Health Clinic.

Potential benefits of the proposed research to the subjects and others

There were no direct benefits to focus group and study survey participants. Subjects who displayed negative emotional feelings during the focus group or survey were referred for mental health services. Knowledge from the research may help inform future research in the understanding, prevention, and treatment of urban Black male dating violence victimization at a variety of socio-ecological levels.

CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to develop a survey to assess the risk and experiences of non-physical dating violence perpetrated by women against their boyfriends. This study utilized qualitative methods (focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel review) to develop questions to include on the survey. Quantitative methodology was used to assess the psychometric properties of the items that were created during the formative phase of the study. Although the primary focus of this study was to assess the psychometric properties of the survey, this chapter reports the results from both the formative and survey administration phases.

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

Demographics

Frequency distribution analysis procedures were conducted to analyze the focus group demographic variables of the study sample. Analysis was conducted using PASW (SPSS) version 21.0.

Focus Group Demographics

A total of 26 males participated in one of the four focus groups. Frequency distributions were generated on all demographic variables. The mean age of the sample was 22 years, ranging from 18-25 years old. Three racial/ethnic groups were represented in the sample; Black (n = 16; 88.9%), Black mixed with Latino (n = 1; 5.6%), and Black mixed with a race other than Latino (n = 1; 5.6%). The majority of participants identified their nationality as American (n = 12; 66.7%) while others identified themselves as Caribbean American from an English speaking country (n = 3; 16.7%), Black American from an African country (n = 1; 5.6%), and Caribbean American from a French speaking country (n = 2; 11.1%). Most of the participants (n = 16; 88.9%) were born in the United States with English as their first language (n = 17; 94.4 %) and

the majority of their mothers (n = 11; 61.1%) and fathers (n = 9; 50.0%) were born in the United

States. Most of the participants identified their relationship status as single and dating/sexing

one girl (n = 6; 33.3%) while others were single and not currently dating/sexing (n = 2; 11.1%),

faithful to one girl (n = 1; 5.6%), have one girlfriend and also dating/sexing other girls (n = 4;

22.2%), or single and dating/sexing more than one girl (n = 5; 27.8%). The majority of

participants reported their education level as completed high school or less (n = 12; 66.7%) while

the rest of the sample reported earning a two-year associates degree (n = 1; 5.6%), or a four-year

college degree (n = 4; 22.2%). Most of the participants were employed part-time (n = 6; 35.3%),

earn between $0-19,000 (n = 13; 76.5%), and live with a parent or guardian (n = 14; 82.4%).

See Table 1 for complete focus group demographic results.

Table 1. Focus Group Demographics

Variable	N	%
Race		
Black	16	88.9
Black & Latino	1	5.6
Black mixed with race other than Latino	1	5.6
Nationality		
American	12	66.7
Caribbean American (English Speaking Country)	3	16.7
Caribbean American (French Speaking Country)	2	11.1
Black American from and African Country	1	5.6
Mother Born		
USA	11	61.1
Caribbean	6	33.3
Don't Know	1	5.6
Father Born		
USA	9	50.0
Caribbean	6	33.6
Africa	1	5.6
Don't Know	1	5.6
You Born in USA	16	88.9
English is First Language	17	94.4
Relationship Status		
Single and not currently dating/sexing	2	11.1
Single and dating/sexing 1 girl	6	33.3
Single and dating/sexing more than 1 girl	5	27.8
Faithful to 1 girlfriend	1	5.6
Have a girlfriend, and also dating/sexing other girls	4	22.2
Time Since Last Girlfriend		
Less than 1 Month	2	11.8
1-3 Months	1	5.9
3-6 Months	2	11.8
6 Months – 1 Year	4	23.5
More than 1 year	8	47.1
Education Level		
High School or less	12	66.7
Associates (2-year) Degree	1	5.6
College Degree	4	22.2
Don't Know	1	5.6
Employment Status		
Employed Full-Time	1	5.9
Employed Part-Time	6	35.3
Employed Full-Time and Attend School	1	5.9
Employed Part-Time and Attend School	3	17.6
Attend School Only	2	11.8
Unemployed	4	23.5
Income Level per Year		
Less than $10,000	13	76.5
$10,000-19,000	2	11.8
$20,000-29,000	1	5.9
More than $60,000	1	5.9
Live With		
Live Alone	1	5.9
Live with parent or guardian	14	82.4
Live with roommate(s)	2	11.8

Focus Group Results

As previously stated, the purpose of this phase of the study was to simply inform the items on the survey. During the focus groups, participants were asked some general questions (i.e. "What terms do you use to describe different dating relationships", "What comes to mind when I say dating violence", and "What are some examples of dating violence") as "icebreakers" and to prepare the men to discuss the questions on the survey. Below are the results from the general icebreaker questions from the focus groups. Again, the purpose of these questions was not to provide in-depth understanding of the processes or effects of dating violence victimization for men. Future studies may be able to utilize results from the survey instrument developed in the current study to guide further, more in-depth investigations of these factors.

Terms Used to Describe Dating Relationships

Participants identified various terms they use to describe the girls that they date as well as several types of relationships they may have with these girls. The terms included spook, hoe, fling, girlfriend, wifey, main chick, slut, skank, one night stand, sidepiece (side bitch or shorty on the side), cuffing, talking or talking to, going out with, chickenhead, bird, cougar, smut, sloar, and bitch. Below, these terms are described based on the definition and context provided by focus group participants.

> **Participant Quote:** *"You have the chickenhead, a bird, you have like a cougar, you have…all types of animals."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"Hos, smut, sloar, hoar, there's words that are out there."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"Some of those terms may be adjectives, most of them may mean the same thing, just different terms…"*

The Hoe

A hoe may also be called a spook, chickenhead, bird, smut, or sloar. A hoe is a girl that a guy will have sex with outside of a relationship. This young woman may not be valued as much more than a sexual object. Once a girl is placed into the "hoe" category, it is very difficult for her to be considered anything else by a guy. Girls in other categories (fling, cuffing, sidepiece), however, may be able to move into the girlfriend position if the guy becomes single or decides he is ready for a committed relationship.

> **Participant Quote:** "*I call a short term relationship a spooky situation cuz you know its not gonna last long, I call her a spook. I'm just trying to "spook" and keep it moving.*"

> **Participant Quote:** "*Oh no, she's categorized and once she's in that box, ain't no promotion out of that. You categorized her as a spook or a hoe or a slut, a skank, or whatever for that reason. There are different morals or beliefs she may have or the way she carries herself that you don't necessarily agree with. So for those reasons she won't make the cut. She's disqualified.*"

> **Participant Quote:** "*Yeah, like there was something she did and she just fucked up. She's at a point of no return. I just feel like that girls who are spooky or hoe or whatever, they have done too many things to be labeled and although she is beautiful and we live in a society where she should grow past those labels but she just cannot.*"

The Bitch

In many cases, the term "bitch" is be used to refer to any girl that is the subject of conversation among a group of guys and perhaps even when guys are talking to other girls. It may also be used as a slur when talking negatively to or about a girl, but often, it is just a general term used to refer to any girl.

> **Participant Quote:** "*I guess we would also have to use the term bitch. Call a female a bitch when she gets out of pocket like you yell at a dog when a dog gets out of pocket.*"

Participant Quote: *"Some people use it so loosely that it does not seem negative to them, it's just a female. If I'm talking about a female, I'm talking about a bitch, not cuz I'm mad at them. Some people use it like that."*

The Sidepiece

The sidepiece may also be referred to as the "side bitch" or "shorty on the side". A sidepiece is a girl that is kept on the side when there is a girlfriend already in place. She may be used as a type of "stress reliever" when the girlfriend is getting on the guy's nerves (becoming annoying to the guy in some way). She usually has a specific one-dimensional role. It may or may not be a sexually specific role, but often a role that the girlfriend does not fulfill (i.e. give oral sex, have a more fun/exciting personality, may be convenient – available when your girlfriend is busy).

Participant Quote: *"When your girlfriend is stressing you out, that's like a stress reliever (the sidepiece)."*

Participant Quote: *"She (the sidepiece) may have a specific task that that main relation doesn't have."*

Participant Quote: *"She (the sidepiece) might give you head and your girlfriend might not give you head. She does things that your girlfriend might not do."*

Participant Quote: *"It could be other than sexual but it would have to be an excitement thing, like she's fun or she's good to be around. Like if you smoke with her, she's down to do anything."*

Participant Quote: "*Your girlfriend could be in school, this girlfriend could possibly be a cougar, she could be older. She might just be the one providing you with money and your girlfriend is a college student, she's not able to work for you right now. That could be the thing that she does".*

Participant Quote: *"The first stage of a side girl (sidepiece) is basically she gets 100% or 99% of what your real girlfriend gets, like she can take off her shoes at your crib, she can sleep over, you can talk to her most of the time but then when it comes to the 2nd level, she gets half of what the first person gets. The 3rd, I'm just calling you to come here and fuck and that's it."*

The Girlfriend, Main Chick, Wifey

The girlfriend (main chick or wifey) is the main girl that a guy is committed to in some way, even though that commitment may or may not be monogamous. She is perceived to be more "respectable" than a girl who is considered to be a hoe, slut, skank, or spook.

> **Participant Quote:** *"She's everything I'm thinking about morning til night. Like, is everything okay with her, is everything okay with us."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"It's (a girlfriend) somebody I would bring to my mother, somebody I would gladly show off in public. She would be on my arm. We would go shopping together, We would cuddle."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"You bring her around to your parents, you show her off to everybody. She comes through, spends the night, she can take your clothes and wear them. Your shades, scarves, stuff like that. Spend seasons together. Take her to her friends or her friends get to know you. Basically like part of the family. A side chick, she's there to do one thing and one thing only."*

The Baby Mama

The "baby mama" was mentioned only once by a focus group participant, however, it is important to acknowledge this type of relationship among this population since many Black children are born outside of marriage. A "baby mama" is a girl with whom a guy has a child. She is always connected to him in a way that no other girl may be even though the relationship can be tumultuous. The "baby mama" may exhibit behaviors of possessiveness even though they may not be together (i.e. call you, stalk you, saying who's your next girlfriend, checks the instagram, Facebook).

> **Participant Quote:** *"Baby mama. When you have a baby with a girl. That always connects you to her for some reason instead of the baby and she likes to call you, stalk you, saying who's your next girlfriend. It's ridiculous. She checks the Instagram, Facebook."*

Talking To or Going Out With

"Talking to" or "going out with" may refer to a relationship that includes going out on dates, talking to learn more about each other, and sometimes sex, but she has not yet become a

girlfriend. It may be the period of time one is getting to know a potential partner before the actual full relationship begins; a "getting to know you" phase.

> **Participant Quote:** *"Well for one, when a young man is talking to a female, nowadays, they usually consider the word "talking" rather than "dating". For example, if I was to have intercourse or go out with a certain female and somebody asked me our relationship status, I would say that I'm going out with her or I'm talking to her. Talking is basically the process before a relationship if it gets that far. It's like dating, but we don't say dating. We just say "I'm talking to that person."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"Talking to a girl is like you go out with here once in a while and you just talk to her by internet or mobile."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"It's different levels of talking. It could be like I just met a girl so I'm talking to here or I've been talking to her for a long time. For example, I had a relationship where I wasn't going out with the female but I was talking to her for like a year and a half. Everybody considered be cuffing her because I was talking to her for such a long period of time. I was with her like everyday so that kind of talking and cuffing would be considered the same thing. There's different levels to it."*

Cuffing

Cuffing is very broad and may describe several levels or types of relationships. Participants describe "cuffing" as having sex with a girl and perhaps going out on dates with her but she has not yet become a girlfriend and she may never actually become a girlfriend. Cuffing is usually viewed negatively because the young man does not want to publically acknowledge his interactions with the young lady for some reason or another, or he does not want to be known for "cuffing" anyone. In general "talking to" happens first, then the relationship either progresses into cuffing or the interactions terminate. Cuffing season is used to refer to a time of year when young men are looking for a girl to "cuff" for a short period of time. For example, winter months may be referred to as cuffing season.

Participant Quote: *"Talking is just like, "yeah, we're conversing back and forth", we might go at it a couple of times back in the crib but that could end anytime. But cuffing gives you more consistency and you can develop emotions and feelings because even if you cut her off she might gonna get a 2nd round or a 3rd. That eventually does happen. That's the reason why she got that cuffing type of title."*

Participant Quote: *"Cuffing is when you really like a girl and you're not with her but you spend a lot of time with her, you may have sex with her, you may go out with her but that's not your girl. But in your bro's eyes, you're cuffing. That's not a good thing."*

Participant Quote: *"Cuffing is when you with a girl at least 5 or 6 out of the 7 days. Like if you spend a lot of time with her, if you do a lot of activities with her, or social websites, your friends are asking about her, and you claiming here, stuff like that".*

Participant Quote: *"The real difference between talking and cuffing; talking doesn't have a negative part to it, cuffing does. Talking is like cuffing but the negative part of cuffing is certain times you don't want people to know you're cuffing this person. Instead of you saying I talk to this person so cuffing is either hiding it or not letting it be known."*

Participant Quote*: "Because say I cuffed a girl that he had sex with and I don't want it to be known, but your homeboy knows so he would say like "ah damn, you cuffing her?" Instead of saying you talking to her, that's like on a positive note."*

Participant Quote: *"Or when you're talking to somebody, you can pick the stage of talking during that talking situation. If I'm talking to her to the point that it gets more serious, she can have that cuffing stage."*

Participant Quote: *"But it goes like 3 stages of talking and 3 stages of cuffing and that could eventually go to girlfriend."*

Butter

The term "butter" is used to describe a girl who is very attractive, or perhaps has

attractive physical features. For example, "butter face" means that she is very pretty.

Participant Quote: *"Like she's a butter, like she looks mad good, like butter face."*

Participant Quote: *"Butter is like everything's good but her face."*

Participant Quote: *"Butter pecan like she's Puerto Rican or Italian"*

Participant Quote: *"From my side of town, butter means she's smooth, she's ready to go. I don't know about the whole Puerto Rican thing. I understand where you're coming from with that. My Spanish friends speak like that but as a black male, myself, she's smooth and she's ready to go, she's butter. Just like butter on bread."*

Table 2. Dating Categories and Terms

	Categories		
	Sex-Only Partners	**Sex Companions**	**Relationship Partners**
Terms	Hoe	Fling	Girlfriend
	Slut	Sidepiece	Wifey
	Skank	Shorty on the Side	Main Chick
	Sloar (slut & whore)	Bitch on the Side	
	Chickenhead	Talking or Talking to	
		Cuffing	

Definitions and Examples of Dating Violence

Participants were asked "What comes to mind when I say dating violence" and "Can you think of any examples of dating violence". Participants identified several types of characteristics or situations that included domestic violence, long-term relationship, outside the home, an incident, physical, psychological, and mental abuse. Although the term domestic violence was used by some of the participants, there seemed to be a distinction made between dating violence and domestic violence. Some participants felt that domestic violence was something that happened specifically inside the home and dating violence was something that occurred outside of the home or between people who are not living together. Another distinction that was made by participants was that domestic violence was something that was ongoing in a relationship and dating violence was seldom and random.

Participant Quote: *"It sounds to me like a hybrid, like it's close to domestic violence but it can't be categorized as domestic violence because they not married and it's not in the home so it would be a little more casual; at the dating level. It would be like domestic violence but domestic means "home" or "in the home" but because dating usually happens outside the home then it's dating violence."*

Participant Quote: *"An incident. Like for me, if it occurs, it's an incident. It's not no ongoing everyday we fighting. It's like something sparked that, something happened that changed the course of the relationship."*

Participant Quote: *"Dating violence, when I think of it, I don't think of it as something….you not married, you dating, when I think of it, I think of it as something caused it to occur, sporadic basically."*

Participant Quote: *"Yeah, I think for the most part when it happens, for most people, it's not something that happens every day."*

Participants also identified specific examples of dating violence which included:

Physical Dating Violence
- Hitting
- Beating
- Getting hit upside my head
- Backing a guy up against the wall

Emotional Dating Violence
- Numerous arguments
- Negatively talking to a male in an attacking way Damaging property
- Imprisonment - Preventing a guy from leaving a space such as a house or apartment by standing in front of the door.
- Using pregnancy to get money from a guy or to try to make him get closer to her
- Interrogating questioning
- Girls trying to make plans for the guy's time; they think that everything that is his is theirs, especially his time.
- Consistent nagging
- A girl trying to belittle a man, questioning his manhood. In some cases, girlfriends will make jokes or accuse the guy of being a homosexual because he wants to hang out with his male friends.
- Possessiveness
- Refusing to get out of his car when he is asking her to get out
- Putting him in a position where he has to physically touch her to get his property back from her (i.e. phone) or to leave a space such as an apartment or house.

Stalking Behaviors
- Repeated phone calls to his phone
- Violating personal space
- Violating privacy by going through his phone, wallet, and other personal belongings

One participant identified a girl hitting her boyfriend upside his head with his phone and another identified a girl putting bleach on his clothes, cutting up his clothes or slashing his tires. Others identified perhaps more subtle forms of dating violence acts such as going through his wallet and phone.

> **Participant Quote:** *"Well I had this girl who put her lipstick on my car saying that you don't take care of me, you're a deadbeat, you're and asshole. I was like, okay, why'd you have to tag my car like that. And then, another girl was talking to me. She was a stalker. She would call my phone; curse out my mother telling her "where the fuck is your son", a whole bunch of bullshit. I was just mad."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"Well the physical part of it was every time I would see her when she's angry, she would throw something like her phone, she'll get mad and just start cursing. She has something made of glass and she would throw it at the wall. Not trying to hit me, but trying to scare me and get me mad."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"Trying to insight anger out of the male so you wanna react a certain kind of way so you're gonna say negative hurtful things to an individual and you're trying to tear him down and you want to hurt his feelings because for some reason, whatever it may be that you think, so that leads to you saying things about the apple doesn't fall far from the tree or he's no good or he's not good in bed and a couple of other things that I can't remember right now but things of that nature."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"Oh yeah, calling him a drop out from school if he's not doing too well in school or didn't finish. Bringing your past up trying to say a lot of negative things to try to hurt your feelings."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"A young lady actually went through my phone which she should not have done. I was sleeping and she woke me up by pouring water onto me. That is dating violence because what happened after that was not me hitting her which is normally what happens after somebody does something. I said, "okay, I'm leaving", but I was in another state at the time*

so it was like 2 or 3 in the morning and I wasn't gonna get to the bus station, I'm just gonna sleep here but by the door. I'm ready to leave; I'm trying to go. She went back with the phone so I can't leave without my phone so a physical thing ensued without no punching or pushing or shoving but kind of pulling, a tug of rope kind of thing which ended with her sleeping with a knife and her saying she was gonna cut me. So it got pretty bad to where she was actually gonna harm me."

Participant Quote: *" My ex when I was in high school had me believe she was taking pills like she was going to kill herself just to stay with me. Had me messed up, I thought "she's trying to kill herself because she loves me" but at the same time she played me with like 10 people but because she would say "I'm gonna kill myself if you leave me" had me messed up in the head like she really does love me. And I was just going back and forth in my head with that "does she love me, but she's playing me, but she's gonna kill herself". Then at one point, she took a bottle of 30 prescription pills right in front of me and it just, my head just blew up, like "did she really just do this?" I had to call my best friend who is an EMT and he came over with the ambulance. She had to go to the hospital and I had to stay overnight with her and get her stomach pumped. There was a lot going on with her. This is my ex by the way; I got out of that relationship."*

Participant Quote: *"And your sex, your time and your sex is theirs. Both of those things are mine and if I choose to share them with you....they always want you to account for your time. I think that that's abuse."*

Below, Table 3 displays the main topics that were discussed in the focus groups, the words and themes associated with those topics, and the focus groups in which they were discussed. Therefore, if there is a "check mark" in the focus group one (FG1), focus group two (FG2), and focus group three (FG3) column those words and themes were discussed in all three focus groups.

Table 3. Focus Group Results Table

Topic	Words & Themes	FG1	FG2	FG3
Names used to describe girls and types of dating relationships	Promiscuous girls (hoe, slut, skank, sloar, chickenhead, etc.)	✓	✓	
	Wifey, Main Chick, Girlfriend	✓	✓	✓
	Sidepiece/Fling	✓	✓	✓
	Talking/Talking to			✓
	Cuffing			✓
Types of dating violence and dating violence examples	Psychological/Mental	✓	✓	✓
	Physical	✓	✓	✓
	Verbal	✓	✓	
	Domestic Violence	✓	✓	
Examples of dating violence	Hitting, Beating, Getting Hit	✓	✓	✓
	Violating Personal Time & Space	✓	✓	✓
	Stalking Behaviors (phone, internet, following)	✓	✓	✓
	Imprisonment	✓	✓	
	Damaging Property		✓	✓
	Arguments		✓	

Using the words "Abused", "Battered", or "Victim"

When asked "what men think about using the words abused, battered, or victim to describe themselves in relationships with women", it seems that men would definitely not consider themselves "battered" by women or a victim of a woman. The word "abused" might be just a bit more acceptable, but not much. Some men would prefer to just say they had a particular experience, episode, or incident with a woman without labeling it as abuse, battery, or victimization. Unfortunately, some men feel that they are expected to just accept the situation and move on because they are men.

> **Participant Quote:** *"I wouldn't say battered or victim, I would say abused."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"I wouldn't want to be called a victim."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"My head would be down and stuff like that because I'm a victim cuz I let a girl beat on me."*

> **Participant Quote:** *"Nah, I wouldn't say that I was a victim."*

Participant Quote: *"Just say mentally abused, don't call yourself a victim."*

Participant Quote: *"I wouldn't say victim. I wouldn't call myself a victim of a female. No way!"*

Participant Quote: *"I would just say this and that happened to me, I wouldn't say "oh, I'm a victim". I would say I was in an incident with a female."*

Participant Quote: *"....yeah, I was in an altercation with a female where she mentally abused me. I wouldn't say I was a victim."*

Participant Quote: *"It's the pride men carry, we wouldn't call ourselves victims."*

Participant Quote: *"Yeah. If it happens to a girl she's in love with that guy, blah blah blah, she's gonna stay in that relationship. But for guys, if this stuff happens, then I'm gonna be like, you know what. I will keep it moving on to the next one."*

Participant Quote: *"I don't think…well society from the way we group up, it's not mentally abused. It's just something that happens. It happens and whatever happens at that moment, you get over it where as opposed to if it was a woman, a woman would dwell on it and it would be like a whole experience leading up to conflict and another conflict and another issue. For guys, it's different, it's just it happens and whatever, just move on."*

Seeking Help

When asked "What do men think about seeking help for getting out of a relationship where his girlfriend commits dating violence against him," participants explained that there are no professional services that they know of to help men who may be experiencing dating violence victimization from their girlfriend, and men most likely would not attend a program or group to seek help if they were in an unhealthy relationship. They may discuss these types of situations and experiences with their friends, but they probably would not seek any type of professional or clinical help. Media campaigns such as television/radio commercials, billboards, and signs on

city buses and subways may be the most efficacious interventions to educate men about abuse perpetrated by women.

Participant Quote: *"There is no professional help like that for males."*

Participant Quote: *"Males don't have that. Females have Dr. Phil and Steve Harvey. Males don't have that. Some churches, they have marriage counseling and relationship counseling and that's it. But there are many males that don't go to church so there's really nothing."*

Participant Quote: *"Even if there were, I don't think men would go there because we don't have that emotional status like females usually have emotional status. We don't have that, we have too much pride to go the next man to get different type of...you're basically teaching me how to stop getting beat by my wife."*

Participant Quote: *"I think it would be valuable to have programs or commercials or something to let guys know but at the same time, as guys, they won't really take advantage of that. It won't really make a difference I thing."*

Specific Modification Suggestions based on Focus Group Results

Below are the lists of changes that were suggested by focus group participants for each individual scale. Please see the Scale Development Tables phases one, two, and three in Appendix C to view the specific modifications made to each scale throughout the formative phase of this project. These tables show every question in each scale from origin, through the revision process, and the final scales. Below, however, are the specific suggested modifications made by focus group participants throughout the formative phase of the project. Although these are the suggestions made by participants, the final modification decisions made prior to survey administration were decided by the primary investigator.

Knowledge Scale

- Change the terms "turn a blind eye" to "ignore", "act like you don't see it", "or pretend they don't see it"
- Change the term "coercion" to "try to force you to do something".

- In the response options, add a middle option such as "maybe" or "sometimes" instead of only "yes and no".
- Add questions about making plans for your time without your permission, not letting you leave when you want, demanding access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, Twitter, using sex as a bargaining chip, using your past mistakes (guilt) as a bargaining chip.

Behaviors Scale

- Change the term "swore at you" to "curse at you".
- Change the term "shouted at you" to "yelled or screamed at you".
- Change the term "did something to spite you" to "did something to get back at you" or "did something to get revenge on you".
- Add the statement "when she is upset with you" at the end of each question to make it clear that she is not doing these things as a part of her normal character.
- Change the statement "accuse you of being a lousy lover" to "accuse you of being bad in bed" or "bad sex performance".
- On the top of this section of questions, add "In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did your girlfriend to the following to you when she was upset with you?"
- Add questions about following the guy, imprisonment, repeated calls on the phone, demanding to go through your phone, breaking into your phone, lying about being pregnant, accusing you of cheating, harassing friends and family members, going through your personal property, showing up at your home or work unannounced, threatening to get you fired from your job, making false reports to the police.

Attitudes Scale

- Change the statement "please his girlfriend" to "do what his girlfriend wants him to do"
- Change question 3 to "a guy should ask his girlfriend first before going out with his friends" or "a guy should ask his girlfriend for permission before going out with his friends".
- Change the response options to a Likert scale.

Perceived Susceptibility Scale

- Incorporate the changes and added questions that were suggested for the behaviors scale.

Perceived Severity Scale

- Incorporate the changes and added questions that were suggested for the behaviors scale.
- Change response options from "yes/no" to "good/bad".
- Instead of writing the question at the top of the section and writing only the stems in the scale, write out the entire question for each item.

Reward for Controlling Behavior Scale

- Incorporate the changes and added questions that were suggested for the behaviors scale.
- Change the term "retaliate" to "get back at".
- In this set of questions, show the consistency of the question, like this is not a one-time issue. Put the urgency or intensify the question. Say always or all the time (i.e. consistent nagging).

Power Scale

- Change question 1 to "most of the time my girlfriend and I do what she wants us to do" or "we do what my girlfriend wants us to do."
- Change the response options to "all of the time, none of the time, and sometimes".
- Change "I am always quiet" to "when my girlfriend and I are together, she does most of the talking".

Isolation Scale

- Change to "I only spend time with people my girlfriend approves of".
- Add questions "my girlfriend gets upset when I spend time with anyone other than her or outside of her", "my girlfriend assumes that all of my free time should be spent with her", "my girlfriend sees no purpose outside of work, church, or time with her", "my girlfriend imposes herself", my girlfriend invites herself over when I didn't invite her".

Communication Skills Scale

- Remove questions 72, 74, 81, 85, 91, 100
- Change "great deal" in question 94 to "my girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her".
- Change question 95 to "If my girlfriend does not like my behavior, she insults me."
- Change question 96 from "rather strong" to "she will lose her temper" and "will say mean things."
- Change question 97 to "my girlfriend makes fun of me if I do things she things are dumb in order to make me think".

Poor Impulse Control

- Change question 101 from making "snap judgments" to "quick judgments".

Distorted Ideas About Gender

- Add question, "If a man does pay for everything, she owes him something."
- Move this up to make it the first section.

Permissibility of Violence Scale

- Add questions that include "if I'm not fulfilling my role as a man", "if I'm not supportive", "if I'm not making as much money as I should" or "if I'm not keeping her sexually satisfied", "if she pays the bills", "if you're not taking care of the kids the way you're supposed to", "you're cheating on her", "she has something on me that I did in the past", "you feel indebted to her or I owe here something", "she has been loyal to me", "she has forgiven me a lot in the past".

Cognitive Testing Results

The final version of the survey was given to a small group of participants (n=4) who

represented the target population. The time it took for participants to complete the entire survey

ranged from 10:22 minutes – 14:08 minutes (m = 12.10 minutes).   Below are the suggestions

and feedback participants gave about the survey length and the proposed incentive for

completing the survey.

- Cut down the survey to 50-75 total questions.
- Just tell people it will take about 10 minutes and don't tell them the total number of questions.
- Just tell guys it will be only 6 sections and re-start the numbering in each section so no one gets discouraged by the total number of questions on the survey.
- The metrocard is a great incentive. It will get the attention of the guys to complete the survey; however, the survey is long and should be shortened.

Participant Quote: "*I think you would get more if it was shorter. I think a lot of people really won't have the patience just walking if ya'll are outside. That's probably it.***"**

Participant Quote: *"Yeah, I think if you cut it down to like 5 minutes that would be able to hold people's attention than if you were to tell them it's a 10 minute survey. A lot of people won't want to take the time out to take it and be there for 10 minutes to take it."*

Participant Quote: *"I agree, I think that you would have to shorten the survey but I do think the metrocard would be a value to peak everybody's interest."*

Expert Panel Review Results

General Comments

A total of 6 expert panelists were recruited to review the instrument. A detailed description of the expert panelists and recruitment methods is discussed in Chapter Three of this document. Overall, expert panelists approved of the survey with a few suggested changes to the scales and subscales. The survey is long and expert reviewers suggested reducing the length of the overall survey. One reviewer suggested that questions be added to assess the potential outcomes of a man who may have experienced dating violence from his girlfriend. Another reviewer thought it might be interesting to investigate whether or not young men were afraid to break up with a girl because he did not want to risk being victimized by her or if breaking up with a girl caused him to be victimized. Although both of these suggestions are appropriate topics to investigate, they were rejected in this study due to the length of the overall survey and they are both beyond the scope of the current study. Several reviewers gave specific suggestions about which items and scales may be eliminated to reduce the length of the overall survey which is reported in detail below. In addition, almost all reviewers pointed out the inconsistent use of the terms mental dating violence, emotional dating violence, and psychological dating violence. They suggested that one term be used consistently. As a result, the term "mental dating abuse" was adopted because the term "mental abuse" seemed to be better understood by the target population versus "psychological abuse". Please refer to the Expert Panel Review Table in Appendix D to see all comments made by the expert panelists. In addition, the Scale Development Tables Rounds 1, 2, and 3 in Appendix C show the specific modifications made to each item on the survey at each round of major revisions.

Distorted Ideas About Gender Scale

One modification was made to the Distorted Ideas about Gender scale based on results from the expert panel review. Reviewers suggested that a total of three items be eliminated from this scale; v3 (In a dating relationship, the guy and girl should have about equal power), v4 (On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses), and v5 (It is all right for a girl to ask a guy on a date). One reviewer suggested that items v4 and v5 be eliminated because to that reviewer, they seemed to "tap into different types of ideas about gender, not just distorted views". Even though this suggestion was valid, these items were not eliminated because it was felt that the factor analysis process would help to determine if these items were measuring one or more aspects of ideas about gender. Another reviewer suggested the elimination of v3; however, no specific reason was given therefore the item was not eliminated. Another suggestion from two reviewers was to increase the number of response options. One reviewer stated "I think you should use a 5-point Likert scale for these items. This will help with giving you a better Cronbach's alpha than a 3-item response option-especially for a small number of items". As a result and for the reason stated by the reviewer, the response options were modified accordingly.

Knowledge Scale

Several modifications were made to the Knowledge scale based on expert feedback. Reviewers suggested a total of one item be eliminated from this scale; v9 (Is it dating violence if a girlfriend calls you bad names) and one item be either eliminated or re-worded v16 (Is it dating violence if a girlfriend does not letting you leave when you want). No reason was given to explain why item v9 should be eliminated, therefore the item was retained. Item v16, however, was retained but re-worded based on the reviewer's comments. The same reviewer suggested that some of the individual items could be combined. For example, items 10 and 11 ("Is it dating

violence if a girlfriend keeps calling your phone over and over again?" and "Is it dating violence if a girlfriend keeps texting you over and over again?") could be combined to form one question ("Is it dating violence if a girlfriend keeps calling or texting your phone over and over again?"). This suggestion was accepted because the context of the questions being combined was very similar. Combining them would not cause any confusion for survey participants, and this suggestion also helped to reduce the total number of survey items. This suggestion was made for the companion items in all scales of the survey. Therefore, wherever there were two separate items on the survey asking about phones and texting, they were combined to form one question as described above. One reviewer suggested that perhaps this scale could be completely eliminated and the "perceived severity" scale could be used as a proxy to assess participants' knowledge. This suggestion was rejected because since the idea of male victimization of dating violence is very new for many people (or at least thinking about the actions of girlfriends as abusive), it was important to have a direct knowledge measure to investigate whether or not it is necessary to educate the population about what dating violence is for male victims before we address other interpersonal factors such as perceived severity. Finally, a reviewer suggested adding an item about women using "threats" to get what they want from a boyfriend. This suggestion was accepted to increase the face and content validity based on expert feedback.

Attitudes Scale

Two modifications were made to the Attitudes scale based on expert panelists' comments. Reviewers suggested a total of two items be eliminated from this scale; v35 (It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if she has been loyal to me) and v36 (It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if she has forgiven me for a lot in the past). No reason was

102

given to explain why these items should be eliminated, therefore they were retained. The same reviewer suggested that the items about phones and texting be combined. These items were the companion items that were explained above in the knowledge scale. Two reviewers pointed out that the response option "sometimes" did not fit with the questions and suggested that instead of "sometimes" a more appropriate option might be "unsure" or to remove the word "ever" from the questions which would make the response option "sometimes" more appropriate. This suggestion was accepted and the word "ever" was removed from each question.

Perceived Susceptibility and Perceived Severity Scales

Only one modification was made to both the Perceived Susceptibility and Perceived Severity scales based on expert panelist's comments. One reviewer suggested one item be eliminated from each of these scales; v49 (How bad would it be if your girlfriend called you bad names). No reason was given to explain why this item should be eliminated, therefore it was retained. The same reviewer suggested that the items about phones and texting be combined. It was suggested that item v45 and v56 ("How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will not let you leave when you want?" and "How bad would it be if your girlfriend did not let you leave when you wanted?") include a definition of where the participant would be leaving from such as a house or apartment. This suggestion was accepted because it would make the question clearer to survey participants. Items v45 (How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will) and v56 (How bad would it be if your girlfriend stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will) were modified based on expert feedback.

Reward for Controlling and Threatening Behavior

Only minor modifications were made to the Reward for Controlling and Threatening Behavior scale. It was suggested that the name of this scale be changed from "Reward for Controlling and Threatening Behavior" to "Consequences for Controlling and Threatening Behavior". In addition, one reviewer suggested that the response options be combined. The original response options were: 1) do nothing, 2) ignore her, 3) do what she wants me to do, 4) do to her what she did to me, 5) get back at her in some other was, 6) break up with her. The reviewer suggested that more appropriate response options might be: 1) do nothing or ignore her, 2) comply, 3) retaliation-do what she did to me or get back at her in some other way, and 4) end the relationship. This suggestion was rejected because the original response options were developed by focus group participants and clearly understood by men in the focus groups. Modifying the options further may have resulted in confusion for survey participants. Another reviewer pointed out that the response options might not be appropriate for the questions, but removing "always" from the questions or changing "always" to "frequently" may be more appropriate. This suggestion was accepted and the word "always" was changed to "often".

Power Scale

Three items were eliminated from the Power Scale based on the expert panel reviewers. One reviewer suggested a total of three items be eliminated from this scale; v71 (Did you feel trapped or stuck in your relationship), v72 (Did your girlfriend demand to know where you were), and v74 (Did your girlfriend get a bad attitude if you did something you liked to do when you were spending time together). The reviewer stated that "this scale seems to address more than one topic and is not necessarily just about power". After looking at the items again based on the reviewer's comment, this suggestion was accepted because the items did not seem to fit

well with the intended measurement. One reviewer suggested that the power and isolation scales be combined although this suggestion was rejected because the factor analysis process would help to determine if these items were measuring one or more factors. Once the data was collected, the scales could be combined in the factor analysis procedure, therefore, it would not be necessary to combine them on the survey.

Isolation

There were no modifications made to the Isolation scale resulting from the expert panel review. With the exception of what was stated above, all reviewers approved of the contents of this scale.

Poor Communication Skills

Several modifications were made to the Poor Communication Skills scale based on reviewer comments. It was suggested that the "poor" be eliminated from the title of the scale and the new name be "Communication Skills". This suggestion was accepted because "poor" in the title of the scale implies a negative expectation which could introduce bias in the results. The scale is intended to measure communication skills that may be good or poor. It was suggested that three items be removed from this scale; either v81 (When my girlfriend asks me a question that I don't understand, she will carefully explain what she means without yelling or screaming) or v83 (When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without yelling or screaming) because "they appear to be redundant". Item v81 was eliminated and v83 was retained. In addition, items v84 (My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her) and v86 (My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her) were suggested to be eliminated. However no reason was given for the suggestion and they were retained. A 5-point Likert scale

was also developed based on reviewer feedback. Reviewers also suggested that item v90 (When nothing seems to work in trying to influence me, my girlfriend will yell and scream in order to get some movement from me) was unclear and changing the word "movement" to "reaction" might make the question clearer; this suggestion was accepted. Finally, it was suggested that a general question about the overall quality of communication between a participant and his girlfriend be added to the scale, but this suggestion was rejected in an effort to minimize the overall number of items on the survey.

Behaviors Scale

There were only two comments from one reviewer regarding the behaviors scales (Girlfriend Behaviors and Self-Behaviors). One reviewer suggested that a specific timeframe be defined for these sets of questions. For example, adding "one year" or "6 months" may be appropriate. This suggestion was rejected because the question already specified the participant's current or most recent relationship. Adding the time frame may have been more confusing for participants to respond accurately. In addition, the same reviewer suggested separating items for the past versus the current relationship. Again, this would increase the overall length of the survey and potentially confuse survey participants.

QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

Demographics

Frequency distribution analysis procedures were conducted to analyze the survey administration demographic variables of the study sample. Analysis was conducted using PASW (SPSS) version 21.0.

Survey Administration Demographics

A total of 148 male participants completed the survey. Frequency distributions were conducted on all demographic variables. The average age of the sample was 22 years ranging from 18-25 years old. Three racial/ethnic groups were represented in the sample; Black (n = 127; 85.8%), Black mixed with Latino (n = 14; 9.5%), and Black mixed with a race other than Latino (n = 7; 4.7%). The majority of participants identified their nationality as American (n = 110; 74.3%) while others identified themselves as Caribbean American from an English speaking country (n = 17; 11.5%), Black American from an African country (n = 13; 8.8%), Caribbean American from a Spanish speaking country (n = 5; 3.4%), and Caribbean American from a French speaking country (n = 3; 2.0%). Most of the participant's (n = 137; 92.6%) were born in the United States with English as their first language (n = 139; 93.9 %) and the majority of their mothers (n = 111; 75.0%) and fathers (n = 104; 70.3%) were born in the United States. Most of the participants identified their relationship status as single and not currently dating/sexing (n = 51; 34.5%) while others were single and dating/sexing one girl (n = 38; 25.7%), faithful to one girl (n = 28; 18.9%), have one girlfriend and also dating/sexing other girls (n = 16; 10.8%), or single and dating/sexing more than one girl (n = 14; 9.5%). The majority of participants reported their education level as completed high school or less (n = 91; 61.5%) while the rest of the sample reported earning a two-year associates degree (n = 24; 16.2%), a four-year college degree (n = 15; 10.1%), or completing trade/vocational school (n = 13; 8.8%). Most of the participants

were employed either full-time or part-time (n = 49; 33.1% and n=28; 18.9% , respectively), and

earn between \$0-19,000 (n = 88; 64.2%). See Table 4 for complete survey administration

demographic results.

Table 4 Survey Administration Demographics

Variable	N	%
Race		
Black	127	85.8
Black & Latino	14	9.5
Black mixed with race other than Latino	7	4.7
Nationality		
American	110	74.3
Caribbean American (English Speaking Country)	17	11.5
Caribbean American (Spanish Speaking Country)	5	3.4
Caribbean American (French Speaking Country)	3	2.0
Black American from and African Country	13	8.8
Mother Born		
USA	111	75.0
Caribbean	27	18.2
Africa	2	1.4
Other	8	5.4
Father Born		
USA	104	70.3
Caribbean	30	20.3
Africa	5	3.4
Other	6	4.1
Don't Know	2	1.4
You Born in USA	137	92.6
English is First Language	139	93.9
Relationship Status		
Single and not currently dating/sexing	51	34.5
Single and dating/sexing 1 girl	38	25.7
Single and dating/sexing more than 1 girl	14	9.5
Faithful to 1 girlfriend	28	18.9
Have a girlfriend, and also dating/sexing other girls	16	10.8
Time Since Last Girlfriend		
Less than 1 Month	29	19.6
1-3 Months	18	12.2
3-6 Months	15	10.1
6 Months – 1 Year	19	12.8
More than 1 year	49	33.1
Education Level		
High School or less	91	61.5
Trade/Vocational School	13	8.8
Associates (2-year) Degree	24	16.2
College Degree	15	10.0
Master's Degree	2	1.4
Doctoral Degree	2	1.4
Don't Know		
Employment Status		
Employed Full-Time	49	33.1
Employed Part-Time	28	18.9
Employed Full-Time and Attend School	4	2.7
Employed Part-Time and Attend School	6	4.1

Attend School Only	15	10.1
Unemployed	38	25.7
Income Level per Year		
Less than $10,000	64	43.2
$10,000-19,000	24	16.2
$20,000-29,000	28	18.9
$30,000-39,000	12	8.1
$40,000-49,000	6	4.1
$50,000-59,000	2	1.4
More than $60,000	1	0.7
Live With		
Live Alone	37	25.0
Live alone with your child or children	10	6.8
Live with parent or guardian	64	43.2
Live with roommate(s)	10	6.8
Live with girlfriend/dating partner	17	11.5

To establish evidence of appropriate face and content validity, it was important that the focus group participants in the formative phase of the study were as similar as possible to the survey participants in the survey administration phase of the study. Therefore, chi-square analysis was conducted on demographic variables to examine any differences there may have been between the men in the focus groups and the men who took the survey at the subway stop. There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups of men on any of the demographic variables. Table four below displays the results of the chi-square analysis of the demographic variables between the focus group participants and survey administration participants.

Table 5. Comparison between Focus Group Demographics and Survey Administration Demographics

Variable	χ^2	df	P-value
Race	.450	4	.978
Nationality	9.727	12	.640
Mother Born	2.132	4	.712
Father Born	7.000	12	.858
You Born in USA	1.800	1	.180
English is First Language	.142	2	.932
Relationship Status	14.946	16	.529
Time Since Last Girlfriend	13.125	12	.360
Education Level	6.867	9	.651
Employment Status	20.424	20	.432
Income Level per Year	6.443	12	.892
Live With	3.238	8	.919

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Exploratory principle component factor analysis procedures were conducted to assess the psychometric properties of all newly developed scales on the survey in the target population. All eigenvalues were set at 1 and absolute values were suppressed at .4. In addition, Cronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for each scale to assess reliability. Below are the results. All analyses were conducted using SPSS (v21).

Distorted Ideas About Gender Scale

The Distorted Ideas About Gender Scale was developed from the Gender Stereotyping Scale. Results from the focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel review indicate that this scale demonstrated that the face and content validity were adequate, although, focus group participants suggested one question be added (If a man does pay for everything, she owes him something). There were no other suggestions of items to add to the scale. Expert panelists suggested that a total of three items be removed and focus group participants suggested that this scale be moved to the beginning of the survey because they thought these questions would capture the interest of the target population. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that a total of three items be eliminated from the scale after one round of the factor analysis procedure. The scale began with 11 items, however, after psychometric analysis, only two items were retained. Since there should be at least three items in a measurement scale, this scale was eliminated from the final survey instrument and further work is needed to develop this measure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Distorted Ideas About Gender Scale were measured with a five point Likert type scale with the following response options; 0 = Totally Disagree, 1 = Kind of Disagree, 2 = Not Sure, 3 = Kind of Agree, 4 = Totally Agree. Response option scores ranged from 0 – 4. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated.   Mean scores ranged from 1.99 – 1.02. In addition, the standard deviation values ranged from 1.171 – 1.340. Responses for items v4 (If a guy pays for everything on a date, the girl owes him something; skew = 1.136; ses = .203) and v5 (; skew = .782; ses = .201) were skewed towards low distorted ideas about gender. Please refer to Table 6.1 for complete results.

Table 6.1 Item Analysis for Distorted Ideas About Gender Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
v1	In a dating relationship, girls can't be trusted	145	1.79(1.269)	3
v2	In a dating relationship, girls are always trying to manipulate guys	146	1.99(1.171)	2
v3	On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses	142	1.77(1.340)	6
v4	If a guy pays for everything on a date, the girl owes him something	143	1.02(1.253)	5
v5	If a girl offers sex to a guy, he should not say no	145	1.22(1.210)	3

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. Although all items were not correlated at a magnitude of least .3, all items were at least moderately correlated with all other items in the scale (r > .2) except item v3 (; r < .17). Since the project was exploratory in nature and all items were moderately correlated, all items were retained for further psychometric analysis. Please refer to Table 6.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 16 and the scale mean was 7.77 indicating moderate variability of responses from study participants. Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .012-.330 with items v3 (On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses; r = . 079) and v5 (If a girl offers sex to a guy, he should not say no; r = .012) having extremely low correlation coefficients. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if item deleted ranged from .199 - .480. Again, items v3 and v5 would cause the largest increase in the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if they were deleted (.448 and .480 respectively). Please refer to table 6.3 for complete results.

Table 6.2 Correlation Matrix of the Distorted Ideas About Gender Scale Items

Item	v1	v2	v3	v4	v5
v1	1.00	.534	.102	.238	-.037
v2		1.00	.167	.146	-.130
v3			1.00	-.026	-.048
v4				1.00	.242
v5					1.00

Table 6.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Distorted Ideas About Gender Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
v1	In a dating relationship, girls can't be trusted	5.98	.381	.199
v2	In a dating relationship, girls are always trying to manipulate guys	5.79	.330	.251
v3	On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses	5.99	.079	.448
v4	If a guy pays for everything on a date, the girl owes him something	6.73	.257	.305
v5	If a girl offers sex to a guy, he should not say no	6.58	.012	.480

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Distorted Ideas About Gender Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the

Cronbach's alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in the scale. One round of factor analysis was conducted on the Distorted Ideas About Gender scale. The results are presented in detail below.

First Round

Only two items (v1 and v2) were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. Therefore, items v3 (On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses), v4 (If a guy pays for everything on a date, the girl owes him something), and v5 (If a girl offers sex to a guy, he should not say no) were eliminated. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.544). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) <.600 except item v3 (; MSA = .667). Barletts Test of Sphericity [χ^2 (10) = 69.028, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 58.9%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .401. Two components were extracted, however since only two items were found to be viable after analysis of the correlation matrix and at least three items are required to comprise a measurement scale, this scale was eliminated from the survey instrument. Further research needs to be conducted to further develop this scale among the target population.

Knowledge Scale

The Knowledge Scale was developed from the VicHealth's 2006 Community Attitudes to Violence Against Women Survey and the Knowledge About Relationship Violence Survey. The scale began with 22 items and the final scale included 7 items. Results from the focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel review indicate that this scale demonstrated that the face and content validity of the scale needed to increase. Therefore, items were added to the scale based on focus group and expert panel feedback

(specific modifications are discussed earlier in the focus group and expert panel review sections of this Chapter). In addition, some of the wording in the questions and response options were confusing for focus group participants and edits were made based on their feedback. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that a total of two items be eliminated from the scale after three rounds of the factor analysis procedure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Knowledge Scale were measured with a three point Likert type scale with the following response options; 0 = No, 1 = Not Sure, and 2 = Yes. Response option scores ranged from 0 – 2 and the total possible score ranges from 0 - 18. A higher total score indicates higher knowledge about dating violence. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated. Mean scores ranged from .88 – 1.23 although the response range was 0-2. In addition, all of the standard deviation values were < 1. Responses for items v4 (; skew = 1.136; ses = .203) and v5 (; skew = .782; ses = .201) were skewed towards low distorted ideas about gender. Please refer to Table 7.1 for complete results.

Table 7.1 Item Analysis for Knowledge Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
v6	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend acts jealous over you?	148	1.05(.898)	0
v7	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend calls you bad names?	148	1.07(.931)	0
v8	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend keeps calling your phone or texting you over and over again?	148	1.14(.933)	0
v9	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend demands to look through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter?	147	1.08(.947)	1
v10	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend demands to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	147	1.12(.925)	1
v11	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend stops you from leaving someplace or corners you against your will?	147	.88(.940)	1
v12	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses sex to get you to do what she wants?	147	.95(.878)	1
v13	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses guilt to get you to do what she wants?	147	1.23(.892)	1
v14	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses threats to get you to do what she wants?	148	.88(.932)	0

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. All items were correlated at a magnitude of least .3, indicating the appropriateness of retaining all items for further psychometric analysis. Please refer to Table 7.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 18 and the scale mean was 9.38 (SD = 5.25) indicating moderate variability of responses from study participants. Responses for item13 (Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses guilt to get you to do what she wants; skew = -.474; ses = .200) were significantly left skewed towards high knowledge regarding dating violence. Please refer to Table 7.3 for complete results.

Table 7.2 Correlation Matrix of the Knowledge Scale Items

Item	v6	v7	v8	v9	v10	v11	v12	v13	v14
v6	1.00	.114	.424	.143	.310	.046	.011	.068	.038
v7		1.00	.263	.383	.264	.410	.415	.334	.467
v8			1.00	.538	.390	.314	.168	.241	.177
v9				1.00	.493	.494	.402	.377	.331
v10					1.00	.437	.203	.319	.344
v11						1.00	.383	.304	.506
v12							1.00	.519	.533
v13								1.00	.475
v14									1.00

Table 7.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Knowledge Scale Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
v6	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend acts jealous over you?	8.35	.216	.827
v7	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend calls you bad names?	8.31	.520	.792
v8	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend keeps calling your phone or texting you over and over again?	8.26	.493	.795
v9	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend demands to look through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter?	8.28	.634	.777
v10	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend demands to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	8.26	.545	.789
v11	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend stops you from leaving someplace or corners you against your will?	8.49	.576	.785
v12	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses sex to get you to do what she wants?	8.43	.516	.793
v13	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses guilt to get you to do what she wants?	8.16	.516	.793
v14	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses threats to get you to do what she wants?	8.51	.566	.786

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Knowledge Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the Cronbach's alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in the scale. A total of three rounds of factor analysis was conducted on the Knowledge Scale. The results of each round are presented in detail below.

First Round

All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.801). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.729 except item v6 (; MSA = .551) which was eliminated. Barletts Test of Sphericity [χ^2 (36) = 400.029, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 57.2%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .812. Two components were extracted. Item v9 () loaded on both

components but was retained for the second round of the factor analysis since removing item v6 would potentially alter the psychometric results for item v9 in the second round of analysis.

Second Round

After removing item v6, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.831). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.794. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (28) = 360.900, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 60.3% and the Cronbach's alpha was .827. Two components were extracted. Itemsv11 () loaded on both factors and was eliminated.

Third Round

The analysis was run again without v6 and v11. All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.797). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.753. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (21) = 287.141, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 62.5%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .800. Two components were extracted.

Component One

Component one consisted of items v7, v12, v13, and v14. Component one seemed to measure "knowledge about manipulative dating violence behaviors". Factor loadings for component one ranged from .867 - .620 with v7 having the lowest factor loading. Since all items seemed to measure some aspect of the same construct, all items on component two were retained.

Component Two

Component two consisted of items v8, v9, and v10. Component two seemed to measure "knowledge about possessive or stalking dating violence behaviors". Factor loadings for

component two ranged from .893 - .718. Since all items seemed to measure some aspect of the same construct, all items on component two were retained.

Table 7.4 Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Knowledge Scale (N=148)

Item	Variable	Component (Rotated Factor Loadings)	
		1	2
v12	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses sex to get you to do what she wants?	.867	
v14	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses threats to get you to do what she wants?	.829	
v13	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend uses guilt to get you to do what she wants?	.717	
v7	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend calls you bad names?	.620	
v8	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend keeps calling your phone or texting you over and over again?		.893
v9	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend demands to look through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter?		.737
v10	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend demands to know where you are or who you are with at all times?		.718
	Eigenvalues	3.201	1.177
	% of Variance	45.73	16.82
	α	.766	.722

Overall Model α = .800; Overall Model Explained Variance = 62.55%; Factor Loading Cut Off = .4; Direct Oblimin Rotation; KMO=.797; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = χ^2 (21) = 287.141, p =.000

Attitude Scale

The Attitude Scale was developed from the Attitude Toward Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale. The scale began with fifteen items and the final scale comprised twelve items. Results from the focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel review indicate that this scale demonstrated that the face and content validity were adequate because there was no suggestion of items to add to the scale. In fact, one expert panelist suggested that two items be removed. Another reviewer suggested that some of the items in the scale could be combined to form one question instead of two separate questions. These suggestions were adopted to reduce the number of items on the instrument. In addition, some of the wording in the questions and response options were confusing for

focus group participants and edits were made based on their feedback to increase cultural appropriateness and understandability among the target population. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that a total of four items be eliminated from the scale after four rounds of the factor analysis procedure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Attitude Scale were measured with a three point Likert type scale with the following response options; 0 = No, 1 = Not Sure, and 2 = Yes. Response option scores ranged from 0 – 2 and the total possible score ranges from 0 - 18. A higher total score indicates a more positive attitude toward dating violence victimization. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated. All means were < .5 although the response range was 0-2. In addition, most of the standard deviation values were < .6 with the exception of v20 (Is it okay for your girlfriend to accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance; SD = .831) and v28 (Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you committed dating violence against her first; SD = .711). Responses for all items in this scale were significantly right skewed towards having negative attitudes toward dating violence. Skew values ranged from (skew = .757, ses = .201) – (skew = 3.649, ses = .203). Please refer to Table 1 for complete results. Please refer to Table 8.1 for complete results.

Table 8.1 Item Analysis for Attitude Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
v15	Is it okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at you?	147	.41 (.595)	1
v16	Is it okay for your girlfriend to yell or scream at you?	148	.48(.622)	0
v17	Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to hit or throw something at you?	148	.28(.569)	0
v18	Is it okay for your girlfriend to destroy something of yours?	148	.24(.599)	0
v19	Is it okay for your girlfriend to call you bad names?	148	.39(.612)	0
v20	Is it okay for your girlfriend to accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance?	145	.64(.831)	3
v21	Is it okay for your girlfriend to follow you?	148	.43(.651)	0
v22	Is it okay for your girlfriend to stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will?	148	.38(.643)	0
v23	Is it okay for your girlfriend to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter?	148	.30(.646)	0
v24	Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue?	142	.12(.421)	6
v25	Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten your friends or family members?	144	.15(.458)	4
v26	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you cheated on her?	144	.22(.508)	4
v27	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental about against you if you didn't answer the phone when she called?	145	.17(.505)	3
v28	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you committed dating violence against her first?	144	.39(.711)	4
v29	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental about against you if she is not sexually satisfied?	145	.22(.559)	3
v30	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if she has forgiven you for a lot in the past?	145	.31(.651)	3

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. All items were correlated at a magnitude of least .3, indicating the appropriateness of retaining all items for further psychometric analysis. Please refer to Table 8.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 18 and the scale mean was 4.99 (SD = 5.00) indicating limited variability of responses from study participants. Corrected item-total

correlations ranged from .235-.583. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if item

deleted ranged from .801 - .823. These results indicate that all items appropriately

retained for further analysis. Please refer to table 8.3 for complete results.

Table 8.2 Correlation Matrix of the Attitude Scale Items

Item	v15	v16	v17	v18	v19	v20	v21	v22	v23	v24	v25	v26	v27	v28	v29	v30
v15	1.00	.315	.191	.265	.488	.265	.220	.313	.220	.371	.235	.220	.274	.100	.108	.119
v16		1.00	.219	.078	.419	.134	.152	.152	.185	.031	.122	.088	.008	.076	.142	-.101
v17			1.00	.517	.429	.303	.409	.364	.375	.120	.392	.218	.352	.036	.199	.134
v18				1.00	.329	.245	.306	.481	.305	.058	.401	.329	.430	.064	.299	.258
v19					1.00	.338	.333	.345	.375	.096	.162	.146	.339	.166	.280	.201
v20						1.00	.318	.163	.127	.152	.214	.058	.314	-.004	.216	.158
v21							1.00	.373	.458	.073	.187	.176	.361	.102	.275	.242
v22								1.00	.338	.222	.307	.127	.220	.157	.260	.241
v23									1.00	.032	.024	.097	.090	.064	.052	.091
v24										1.00	.441	.087	.297	-.056	.103	.029
v25											1.00	.488	.463	.161	.477	.293
v26												1.00	.327	.416	.405	.274
v27													1.00	.184	.427	.349
v28														1.00	.382	.388
v29															1.00	.323
v30																1.00

Table 8.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Attitude Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
v15	Is it okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at you?	4.57	.457	.809
v16	Is it okay for your girlfriend to yell or scream at you?	4.52	.254	.822
v17	Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to hit or throw something at you?	4.72	.536	.804
v18	Is it okay for your girlfriend to destroy something of yours?	4.80	.548	.804
v19	Is it okay for your girlfriend to call you bad names?	4.60	.583	.801
v20	Is it okay for your girlfriend to accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance?	4.34	.368	.818
v21	Is it okay for your girlfriend to follow you?	4.56	.517	.805
v22	Is it okay for your girlfriend to stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will?	4.62	.508	.806
v23	Is it okay for your girlfriend to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter?	4.68	.364	.815
v24	Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue?	4.89	.235	.820
v25	Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten your friends or family members?	4.86	.522	.808
v26	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you cheated on her?	4.77	.417	.812
v27	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental about against you if you didn't answer the phone when she called?	4.82	.547	.805
v28	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you committed dating violence against her first?	4.60	.270	.823
v29	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental about against you if she is not sexually satisfied?	4.76	.488	.807
v30	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if she has forgiven you for a lot in the past?	4.68	.372	.815

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Attitude Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the Cronbach's alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in the scale. A total of five rounds of factor analysis was conducted on the Attitude Scale. The results of each round are presented in detail below.

First Round

All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.765). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.647 except item v24 (Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue; MSA = .545) which was eliminated. Barletts Test of Sphericity [χ^2 (120) = 670.239, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 57.4%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .821. Four components were extracted. Item v19 (Is it okay for your girlfriend to call you bad names) loaded on both components one and four but was retained for the second round of the factor analysis because eliminated item v24 would potentially alter the psychometric properties of item v19 in the second round of analysis.

Second Round

After removing item v24, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.781). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.619. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (105) = 618.750, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 58.9% and the Cronbach's alpha was .820. Four components were extracted. Items v17 (Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to hit or throw something at you) and v18 (Is it okay for your girlfriend to destroy something of yours) both loaded on two factors (factors one and four) requiring them to be eliminated.

Third Round

The analysis was run again without v17, v18, and v24. All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.759). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.642. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (78) = 462.909, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was

61.2%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .784. Four components were extracted. Item v29 () loaded on both factors one and four and was eliminated.

Fourth Round

The analysis was run again without items v17, v18, v24, and v29. All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.730). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.606. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (66) = 393.365, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 62.5%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .762. Four components were extracted.

Component One

Component one consisted of items v21, v22, and v23. Component one seemed to measure "attitude towards stalking behavior". Factor loadings for component one ranged from .835 - .582. Since all items seemed to measure some aspect of the same construct, all items on component two were retained.

Component Two

Component two consisted of items v26, v28, and v30. Component two seemed to measure "attitude towards permissibility of mental dating violence". Factor loadings for component two ranged from .834 - .453. Since all items seemed to measure some aspect of the same construct, all items on component two were retained.

Component Three

Component three consisted of items v15, v16, and v19. Component two seemed to measure "attitude towards permissibility of verbal dating violence". Factor loadings for

component two ranged from .856 - .555. Since all items seemed to measure some aspect of the same construct, all items on component two were retained.

Component Four

Component four consisted of items v20, v25, and v27. Component two seemed to measure "attitude towards permissibility of retaliatory dating violence". Factor loadings for component two ranged from (-.742) – (-.639). Since all items seemed to measure some aspect of the same construct, all items on component two were retained.

Table 8.4 Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Attitude Scale (N=148)

Item	Variable	Component (Rotated Factor Loadings)			
		1	2	3	4
v23	Is it okay for your girlfriend to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter?	.835			
v21	Is it okay for your girlfriend to follow you?	.734			
v22	Is it okay for your girlfriend to stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will?	.582			
v28	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you committed dating violence against her first?		.834		
v26	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you cheated on her?		.738		
v30	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if she has forgiven you for a lot in the past?		.453		
v16	Is it okay for your girlfriend to yell or scream at you?			.856	
v15	Is it okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at you?			.615	
v19	Is it okay for your girlfriend to call you bad names?			.555	
v27	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental about against you if you didn't answer the phone when she called?				-.742
v20	Is it okay for your girlfriend to accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance?				-.684
v25	Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten your friends or family members?				-.639
	Eigenvalues	3.551	1.699	1.141	1.108
	% of Variance	29.59	14.16	9.51	9.23
	α	.644	.612	.667	.542

Overall Model α = .762; Overall Model Explained Variance = 62.49%; Factor Loading Cut Off = .4; Direct Oblimin Rotation; KMO=.730; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = χ^2 (66) = 393.365, p =.000

Perceived Susceptibility and Perceived Severity Scales

The original Perceived Susceptibility and Perceived Severity scales were developed from the Susceptibility to Marital Problems and Susceptibility to Marital Problems Scales, respectively. The "experience items" discussed above were added to these scales. One expert panelist suggested that one item be removed from this scale; however, this suggestion was rejected. Another expert panelist also suggested that a place be added to provide context for two of the items (i.e. "How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will not let you leave a **house or apartment** when you want?"). This suggestion was rejected because the focus group participants suggested an option that may have been more understandable and relevant for the target population. Below, the perceive susceptibility and perceived severity scales are discussed separately.

Perceived Susceptibility Scale

The original Perceived Susceptibility scale was developed from the Perceived Susceptibility to Marital Problems scale. The perceived susceptibility scale began with 3 items and the final scale included 9 items. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that no items be eliminated from the scale after one round of the factor analysis procedure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Perceived Susceptibility Scale were measured with a five point Likert type scale ranging from 1 – 5; 1 = Not Likely and 5 = Very. Response option scores ranged from 1 – 5 and the total possible score ranges from 9 - 45. A higher total score indicates low perceived susceptibility of dating violence victimization. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated. Mean scores ranged from 2.20 – 3.17. In addition, the standard deviation values ranged from 1.125 – 1.402. Responses for items v32 (How

likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names; skew = .644; ses = .200), v36 (How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will; skew = .536; ses = .201), v37 (How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use sex to get you to do what she wants; skew = .431; ses = .200) and v39 (How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use threats to get you to do what she wants; skew = .749; ses = .201) were significantly right skewed towards low perceived susceptibility of dating violence victimization. Please refer to Table 9.1 for complete results.

Table 9.1 Item Analysis for Perceived Susceptibility Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
v31	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will act jealous over you?	147	3.17(1.284)	1
v32	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names?	147	2.30(1.125)	1
v33	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call your phone or text you over and over again?	146	3.02(1.284)	2
v34	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts?	146	2.65(1.402)	2
v35	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	146	2.79(1.345)	2
v36	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will?	145	2.24(1.174)	3
v37	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use sex to get you to do what she wants?	147	2.51(1.310)	1
v38	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use guilt to get you to do what she wants?	147	2.55(1.320)	1
v39	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use threats to get you to do what she wants?	146	2.20(1.301)	2

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. All items were correlated at a magnitude of least .3, indicating the appropriateness of retaining all items for further psychometric analysis. Please refer to Table 9.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 36 and the scale mean was 23.56 (SD = 7.71) indicating moderate variability of responses from study participants. Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .342-.666. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if item deleted ranged from .813 - .848. These results indicate that all items appropriately retained for further analysis. Please refer to table 9.3 for complete results.

Table 9.2 Correlation Matrix of the Perceived Susceptibility Scale Items

Item	v31	v32	v33	v34	v35	v36	v37	v38	v39
v31	1.00	.211	.477	.218	.328	.232	.199	.201	.039
v32		1.00	.246	.424	.394	.404	.315	.397	.254
v33			1.00	.481	.521	.363	.263	.407	.216
v34				1.00	.513	.451	.359	.442	.407
v35					1.00	.576	.313	.442	.279
v36						1.00	.437	.567	.480
v37							1.00	.525	.476
v38								1.00	.533
v39									1.00

Table 9.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Perceived Susceptibility Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
v31	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will act jealous over you?	20.36	.342	.848
v32	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names?	21.26	.488	.832
v33	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call your phone or text you over and over again?	20.52	.559	.825
v34	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts?	20.90	.620	.818
v35	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	20.75	.634	.817
v36	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will?	21.31	.666	.815
v37	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use sex to get you to do what she wants?	21.04	.536	.828
v38	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use guilt to get you to do what she wants?	21.01	.666	.813
v39	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use threats to get you to do what she wants?	21.37	.496	.832

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Perceived Susceptibility Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the Cronbach's alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in the scale. One round of factor analysis was conducted on the Perceived Susceptibility Scale. The results are presented in detail below.

First Round

All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.851). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.749. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (36) = 433.702, p =.000. The overall explained variance was 58.8%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .842. Two components were extracted.

Component One

Component one consisted of items v32, v34, v36, v37, v38, and v39. Component one seemed to measure "perceived susceptibility of manipulative or possessive dating violence victimization". Factor loadings for component one ranged from .873 - .483. Item v32 (How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names) had the lowest factor loading and does not seem to measure perceived susceptibility of manipulative or possessive dating violence victimization and may need to be eliminated.

Component Two

Component two consisted of items v31, v33, and v35. Component two seemed to measure "perceived susceptibility of stalking behavior dating violence victimization". Factor

loadings for component two ranged from .839 - .552. Since all items seemed to measure some aspect of the same construct, all items on component two were retained.

Table 9.4 Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Perceived Susceptibility Scale (N=148)

Item	Variable	Component (Rotated Factor Loadings)	
		1	2
v39	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use threats to get you to do what she wants?	.873	
v38	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use guilt to get you to do what she wants?	.786	
v37	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use sex to get you to do what she wants?	.748	
v36	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will?	.706	
v34	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts?	.538	
v32	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names?	.483	
v31	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will act jealous over you?		.839
v33	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call your phone or text you over and over again?		.760
v35	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand to know where you are or who you are with at all times?		.552
	Eigenvalues	4.050	1.246
	% of Variance	45.00	13.84
	α	.818	.710

Overall Model α = .842; Overall Model Explained Variance = 58.84%; Factor Loading Cut Off = .4; Direct Oblimin Rotation; KMO=.851; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = χ^2 (36) = 433.702, p =.000

Perceived Severity Scale

The original Perceived Severity scale was developed from the Perceived Severity to Marital Problems scale. The perceived severity scale began with four items and the final scale included eight items. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that a total of one item be eliminated from the scale after two rounds of the factor analysis procedure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Perceived Severity Scale were measured with a five point Likert type scale ranging from 1 – 5; 1 = Very Bad and 5 = Not Bad At All. Response option scores

ranged from 1 – 5 and the total possible score ranges from 9 - 45. A higher total score indicates low perceived severity of dating violence victimization. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated.   Mean scores ranged from 2.37 – 2.7. In addition, the standard deviation values ranged from 1.252 – 1.308. Responses for all items were significantly right skewed towards high perceived severity of dating violence victimization except v40 (How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you; skew = .570; ses = .203), and v42 (How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again; skew = .124; ses = .203). Please refer to Table 10.1 for complete results.

Table 10.1 Item Analysis for Perceived Severity Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
v40	How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you?	142	2.78(1.300)	6
v41	How bad would it be if your girlfriend called you bad names?	143	2.37(1.254)	5
v42	How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again?	142	2.71(1.252)	6
v43	How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts?	142	2.38(1.335)	6
v44	How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	143	2.43(1.308)	5
v45	How bad would it be if your girlfriend stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will?	142	2.18(1.228)	6
v46	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used sex to get you to do what she wanted?	142	2.14(1.158)	6
v47	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used guilt to get you to do what she wanted?	143	2.18(1.254)	5
v48	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used threats to get you to do what she wanted?	143	2.03(1.313)	5

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. All items were correlated at a magnitude of least .3, indicating the appropriateness of retaining all items for further psychometric analysis. Please refer to Table 10.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 36 and the scale mean was 21.14 (SD = 7.124) indicating moderate variability of responses from study participants. Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .331-.578. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if item deleted ranged from .775 - .807. These results indicate that all items appropriately retained for further analysis. Please refer to table 10.3 for complete results.

Table 10.2 Correlation Matrix of the Perceived Severity Scale Items

Item	v40	v41	v42	v43	v44	v45	v46	v47	v48
v40	1.00	.184	.399	.254	.243	.256	.246	.090	.059
v41		1.00	.327	.264	.218	.334	.103	.230	.169
v42			1.00	.391	.477	.354	.302	.190	.201
v43				1.00	.520	.371	.275	.363	.306
v44					1.00	.393	.414	.339	.259
v45						1.00	.369	.422	.385
v46							1.00	.434	.468
v47								1.00	.735
v48									1.00

Table 10.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Perceived Severity Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
v40	How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you?	18.38	.331	.807
v41	How bad would it be if your girlfriend called you bad names?	18.77	.353	.803
v42	How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again?	18.44	.527	.782
v43	How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts?	18.75	.549	.778
v44	How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	18.72	.573	.775
v45	How bad would it be if your girlfriend stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will?	18.99	.578	.775
v46	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used sex to get you to do what she wanted?	18.99	.517	.783
v47	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used guilt to get you to do what she wanted?	19.00	.559	.778
v48	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used threats to get you to do what she wanted?	19.12	.503	.785

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Perceived Severity Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the Cronbach's alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in the scale. A total of two rounds of factor analysis was conducted on the Perceived Severity Scale. The results of each round are presented in detail below.

First Round

All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.796). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.699. Barletts Test of Sphericity [χ^2 (36) = 368.432, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 55.0%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .805. Two components were extracted. Item v45 (How bad would it be if your girlfriend stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will) loaded on both components and was eliminated.

Second Round

After removing items v45, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.743). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.647. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (28) = 314.106, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 56.8% and the Cronbach's alpha was .771. Two components were extracted.

Component One

Component one consisted of items v40, v41, v42, v43, and v44. Component one seemed to measure "perceived severity of stalking or possessive dating violence victimization". Factor loadings for component one ranged from .820 - .529. Item v41 (How bad would it be if your

133

girlfriend called you bad names) had the lowest factor loading and does not seem to measure perceived severity of stalking or possessive dating violence victimization and may need to be eliminated.

Component Two

Component two consisted of items v46, v47, and v48. Component two seemed to measure "perceived severity of manipulative dating violence victimization". Factor loadings for component two ranged from (-.928) – (-.581). Since all items seemed to measure some aspect of the same construct, all items on component two were retained.

Table 10.4 Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Perceived Severity Scale (N=148)

Item	Variable	Component (Rotated Factor Loadings)	
		1	2
v42	How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again?	.820	
v40	How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you?	.702	
v44	How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	.617	
v43	How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts?	.596	
v41	How bad would it be if your girlfriend called you bad names?	.529	
v48	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used threats to get you to do what she wanted?		-.928
v47	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used guilt to get you to do what she wanted?		-.904
v46	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used sex to get you to do what she wanted?		-.581
	Eigenvalues	3.135	1.406
	% of Variance	38.18	17.58
	α	.708	.783

Overall Model α = .771; Overall Model Explained Variance = 56.76%; Factor Loading Cut Off = .4; Direct Oblimin Rotation; KMO=.743; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = χ^2 (28) = 314.106, p =.000

Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior Scale

The Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior scale was developed from the Perceived Negative Sanctions Scale. The scale began with 3 items and the final scale included 8 items. Results from the focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel review indicate that this scale demonstrated that the face and content validity were adequate once

the "experience items" discussed above were added to this scale. Some of the wording in the questions and response options were confusing for focus group participants and edits were made based on their feedback to increase cultural appropriateness and understandability among the target population. One expert panelist suggested that the name of this scale be changed. Two other expert panelists suggested that the response options be modified. These suggestions were incorporated. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that all items be retained in the scale after one round of the factor analysis procedure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Attitude Scale were measured with a five point Likert type scale with the following response options; 0 = Do Nothing or Ignore Her, 1 = Do what she wants me to do, 2 = Do to her what she did to me, 3 = Get back at her in some other way, and 4 = Break up with her. Response option scores ranged from 0 – 4 and the total possible score ranges from 0 - 36. A higher total score indicates low reward for threatening and controlling behavior. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated. Mean scores ranged from .74 – 1.43 and the response range was 0-4. In addition, the standard deviation values ranged from 1.109 – 1.591. Responses for all items in this scale were significantly right skewed towards doing nothing or ignoring a woman who committed dating violence act against him. Skew values ranged from (skew = .612, ses = .204) – (skew = 1.641, ses = .203). Please refer to Table 11.1 for complete results.

Table 11.1 Item Analysis for Threatening and Controlling Behaviors Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
v49	What would you do if your girlfriend often acted jealous over you	142	.74(1.109)	6
v50	What would you do if your girlfriend often called you bad names	140	1.11(1.392)	8
v51	What would you do if your girlfriend often called your phone or texted you over and over again	139	1.13(1.329)	9
v52	What would you do if your girlfriend often demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts	142	1.17(1.358)	6
v53	What would you do if your girlfriend often demanded to know where you are or who you are with	138	1.20(1.393)	10
v54	What would you do if your girlfriend often stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will	140	1.41(1.545)	8
v55	What would you do if your girlfriend often used sex to get you to do what she wants	141	1.43(1.395)	7
v56	What would you do if your girlfriend often used guilt to get you to do what she wants	141	1.26(1.491)	7
v57	What would you do if your girlfriend often used threats to get you to do what she wants	129	1.28(1.591)	19

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. All items were correlated at a magnitude of least .3, indicating the appropriateness of retaining all items for further psychometric analysis. Please refer to Table 11.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 36 and the scale mean was 11.01 (SD = 9.04) indicating moderate variability of responses from study participants. Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .431-.701. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if item deleted ranged from .846 - .869. These results indicate that all items appropriately retained for further analysis. Please refer to table 11.3 for complete results.

Table 11.2 Correlation Matrix of the Threatening and Controlling Behavior Scale Items

Item	v49	v50	v51	v52	v53	v54	v55	v56	v57
v49	1.00	.370	.368	.316	.283	.310	.265	.326	.265
v50		1.00	.428	.337	.251	.399	.369	.318	.351
v51			1.00	.586	.477	.403	.453	.493	.409
v52				1.00	.587	.481	.498	.553	.355
v53					1.00	.609	.517	.510	.413
v54						1.00	.468	.616	.522
v55							1.00	.594	.280
v56								1.00	.456
v57									1.00

Table 11.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
v49	What would you do if your girlfriend often acted jealous over you	10.18	.431	.869
v50	What would you do if your girlfriend often called you bad names	9.87	.489	.866
v51	What would you do if your girlfriend often called your phone or texted you over and over again	9.81	.644	.852
v52	What would you do if your girlfriend often demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts	9.76	.665	.850
v53	What would you do if your girlfriend often demanded to know where you are or who you are with	9.78	.657	.850
v54	What would you do if your girlfriend often stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will	9.64	.691	.847
v55	What would you do if your girlfriend often used sex to get you to do what she wants	9.58	.614	.854
v56	What would you do if your girlfriend often used guilt to get you to do what she wants	9.72	.701	.846
v57	What would you do if your girlfriend often used threats to get you to do what she wants	9.74	.539	.862

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the Cronbach's alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in the scale. One round of factor analysis was conducted on

the Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior Scale. The results are presented in detail below.

First Round

All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.868). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.821. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (36) = 418.231, p =.000. The overall explained variance was 49.3%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .869. One component was extracted.

Component One

Component one consisted of items v49 - v57 which were all items in the original scale. Factor loadings for component one ranged from .789 - .522.

Table 11.4 Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior Scale (N=148)

Item	Variable	Component (Rotated Factor Loadings)
		1
v56	What would you do if your girlfriend often used guilt to get you to do what she wants?	.789
v54	What would you do if your girlfriend often stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will?	.775
v52	What would you do if your girlfriend often demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts?	.763
v53	What would you do if your girlfriend often demanded to know where you are or who you are with?	.755
v51		.736
v55	What would you do if your girlfriend often used sex to get you to do what she wants?	.716
v57	What would you do if your girlfriend often used threats to get you to do what she wants?	.636
v50	What would you do if your girlfriend often called you bad names	.581
v49	What would you do if your girlfriend often acted jealous over you?	.522
	Eigenvalues	4.443
	% of Variance	49.37
	α	.869

Overall Model α = .869; Overall Model Explained Variance = 49.37%; Factor Loading Cut Off = .4;; KMO=.868; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = χ^2 (36) = 418.231, p =.000

Power Scale Analysis

The Power Scale was developed from the Sexual Relationship Power Scale, Relationship Control Subscale. The scale began with 16 items and the final scale included 2 items. Although there were no items suggested by the focus group participants to be added, the content validity of this scale may not be adequate and more scientific exploration may be required to increase the validity of this measure because there were only two items developed for this scale. Some of the wording in the questions and response options were confusing for focus group participants and edits were made based on their feedback to increase cultural appropriateness and understandability among the target population. No

Psychometric analysis was conducted on this scale because a minimum of three items are required to create a measure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Power Scale were measured with a five point Likert type scale with the following response options; 0 = None of the Time, 1 = Some of the Time, 2 = Half of the Time, 3 = Most of the Time, and 4 = All of the Time. Response option scores ranged from 0 – 4. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated. Mean scores for items v58 and v59 were 1.46 and 1.79 respectively. In addition, the standard deviation values for items v58 and v59 were 1.134 and 1.199 respectively. Responses for item v58 (In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did you do what your girlfriend wanted to do instead of doing what you wanted to do when you were spending time together; skew = .636; ses = .208) were significantly right skewed towards the woman having low power in the relationship. Please refer to Table 12.1 for complete results.

Table 12.1 Item Analysis for Power Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
v58	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did you do what your girlfriend wanted to do instead of doing what you wanted to do when you were spending time together?	136	1.46(1.134)	12
v59	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did you come to an agreement together about what you were going to do when you were spending time together?	135	1.79(1.199)	13

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. Although the two items were significantly correlated at a magnitude of .384, further psychometric analysis was not conducted. Please refer to Table 12.2 for complete results.

Table 12.2 Item-Total Correlations for the Power Scale Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
v58	Is it okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at you?	1.79	.384	---
v59	Is it okay for your girlfriend to yell or scream at you?	1.46	.384	---

Isolation Scale

The development of the Isolation Scale began with items generated by the primary investigator. The scale began with 2 items and the final scale included 5 items. Results from the focus group indicate that this scale demonstrated that the face and content validity of the scale needed to increase. Therefore, items were added to the scale based on focus group feedback. In addition, the wording in one of the questions was confusing for focus group participants and edits were made based on their feedback. There were no suggestions from expert panelists regarding this scale. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that all items be retained in the scale after one round of the factor analysis procedure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Attitude Scale were measured with a five point Likert type scale with the following response options; 0 = None of the Time, 1 = Some of the Time, 2 = Half of the Time, 3 = Most of the Time, and 4 = All of the Time. Response option scores ranged from 0 – 4 and the total possible score ranges from 0 - 20. A higher total score indicates high isolation. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated. Mean scores ranged from .90 – 1.67. In addition, the standard deviation values ranged from 1.137 – 1.386. Responses for all items were significantly right skewed towards experiencing low

141

isolation in his relationship except item v63 (; skew = .329; ses = .209). Please refer to

Table 13.1 for complete results.

Table 13.1 Item Analysis for Isolation Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
v60	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend tell you who you could hang out with?	136	.93(1.188)	12
v61	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did you only hang out with people your girlfriend approved of instead of who you wanted to hang out with?	136	.90(1.137)	12
v62	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend get upset when you spent time with people that she did not approve of?	134	1.52(1.386)	14
v63	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend want all of your free time to be spent with her?	135	1.67(1.338)	13
v64	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend invite herself along when you made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited?	136	1.04(1.198)	12

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total

score of all the other items in the scale. All items were correlated at a magnitude of least .3,

indicating the appropriateness of retaining all items for further psychometric analysis.

Please refer to Table 13.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 20 and the scale mean was 6.01 (SD = 5.00)

indicating moderate variability of responses from study participants. Corrected item-total

correlations ranged from .439-.632. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if item

deleted ranged from .674 - .745.   These results indicate that all items appropriately

retained for further analysis. Please refer to table 13.3 for complete results.

Table 13.2 Correlation Matrix of the Isolation Scale Items

Item	v60	v61	v62	v63	v64
v60	1.00	.555	.447	.323	.503
v61		1.00	.377	.162	.364
v62			1.00	.477	.331
v63				1.00	.328
v64					1.00

Table 13.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Isolation Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
v60	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend tell you who you could hang out with?	5.12	.632	.674
v61	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did you only hang out with people your girlfriend approved of instead of who you wanted to hang out with?	5.14	.482	.726
v62	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend get upset when you spent time with people that she did not approve of?	4.48	.566	.696
v63	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend want all of your free time to be spent with her?	4.34	.439	.745
v64	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend invite herself along when you made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited?	4.94	.512	.715

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Isolation Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the Cronbach's alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in the scale. One round of factor analysis was conducted on the Isolation Scale. The results are presented in detail below.

First Round

All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.741). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.693. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (10) = 162.032, p =.000. The overall explained variance was 51.3%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .755. One component was extracted.

Component One

Component one consisted of items v60, v61, v62, v63, and v64 which are all items in the original scale. Factor loadings for component one ranged from .812 - .614.

Table 13.4 Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Isolation Scale (N=148)

Item	Variable	Component (Rotated Factor Loadings)
		1
v60	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend tell you who you could hang out with?	.812
v62	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend get upset when you spent time with people that she did not approve of?	.737
v64	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend invite herself along when you made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited?	.708
v61	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did you only hang out with people your girlfriend approved of instead of who you wanted to hang out with?	.694
v63	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend want all of your free time to be spent with her?	.614
	Eigenvalues	2.563
	% of Variance	51.26
	α	.755

Overall Model α = .755; Overall Model Explained Variance = 51.26%; Factor Loading Cut Off = .4; KMO=.741; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = χ^2 (10) = 162.032, p =.000

<u>**Communication Skills Scale**</u>

The Communication Skills Scale was developed from the Interpersonal Communication Inventory and the Verbal Aggressiveness Scales. The scale began with sixty-four items and the final scale included eight items. Results from the focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel review indicate that this scale demonstrated that the face and content validity were adequate because there were no suggestion of items to add to the scale. In fact, focus group participants and expert panelists suggested that a total of six items be removed. Some of the wording in the questions was confusing for focus group participants and edits were made based on their feedback to increase cultural appropriateness and understandability among the target population. One expert panelist suggested that the name of the scale me modified from "poor communication skills" to "communication skills". This suggested was incorporated as to not place any value or direction in the title of the scale. The same reviewer also suggested that a question be added about the overall quality of communication between a participant and his girlfriend. This suggestion was rejected, however, because the primary investigator did not want to increase the total number of overall items on the instrument. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that all items be retained in the scale after one round of the factor analysis procedure.

<u>**Item Analysis**</u>

Items on the Attitude Scale were measured with a five point Likert type scale with the following response options; 0 = None of the Time, 1 = Some of the Time, 2 = Half of the Time, 3 = Most of the Time, and 4 = All of the Time. Response option scores ranged from 0 – 4 and the total possible score ranges from 1 - 30. A higher total score indicates poorer

communication skills. Items v65, v67, and v70 should be reverse coded because these items are worded in the positive direction and all other items are worded in the negative direction. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated. Mean scores ranged from 1.21 – 1.68. In addition, the standard deviation values ranged from 1.203 – 1.457. Responses for all items were significantly right skewed towards poor communication skills except v69 (My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her; skew = .371; ses = .209). Please refer to Table 14.1 for complete results.

Table 14.1 Item Analysis for Communication Skills Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
v65	When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the time to explain to her exactly how I feel	137	1.66(1.457)	11
v66	When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she puts words in my mouth	137	1.66(1.274)	11
v67	When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without yelling or screaming	135	1.47(1.321)	13
v68	My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her	135	1.55(1.238)	13
v69	My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her	134	1.68(1.313)	14
v70	My girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say	135	1.51(1.286)	13
v71	If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things	135	1.21(1.266)	13
v72	My girlfriend will yell and scream at me to get me to do what she wants	135	1.26(1.203)	13

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. All items were correlated at a magnitude of least .3, indicating the appropriateness of retaining all items for further psychometric analysis. Please refer to Table 14.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 29 and the scale mean was 14.69 (SD = 6.19) indicating moderate variability of responses from study participants. Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .056-.501 with item v65 (r =. 056) having an extremely low

146

correlation coefficient. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if item deleted ranged

from .515 - .650. Again, item v65 would cause the largest increase in the Cronbach's alpha

coefficient if deleted (.650). Please refer to table 14.3 for complete results.

Table 14.2 Correlation Matrix of the Communication Skills Scale Items

Item	v65	v66	v67	v68	v69	v70	v71	v72
v65	1.00	-.025	.438	-.062	-.171	.345	-.178	-.150
v66		1.00	-.008	.501	.473	-.069	.603	.349
v67			1.00	-.094	-.078	.484	-.102	-.028
v68				1.00	.475	.006	.469	.300
v69					1.00	-.094	.610	.445
v70						1.00	-.197	-.052
v71							1.00	.483
v72								1.00

Table 14.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Communication Skills Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
v65	When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the time to explain to her exactly how I feel	10.43	.056	.650
v66	When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she puts words in my mouth	10.44	.501	.515
v67	When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without yelling or screaming	10.59	.173	.613
v68	My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her	10.54	.430	.538
v69	My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her	10.41	.440	.532
v70	My girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say	10.56	.122	.626
v71	If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things	10.88	.451	.531
v72	My girlfriend will yell and scream at me to get me to do what she wants	10.82	.354	.561

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Communication Skills

Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the Cronbach's

alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in

the scale. One round of factor analysis was conducted on the Communication Skills Scale. The results are presented in detail below.

First Round

All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.771). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy MSA >.605. Barletts Test of Sphericity [χ^2 (28) = 283.571, p =.000. The overall explained variance was 59.6%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .605. Two components were extracted.

Component One

Component one consisted of items v66, v68, v69, v71 and v72. Component one seemed to measure "negative communication skills". Factor loadings for component one ranged from .828 - .655.

Component Two

Component two consisted of items v65, v67, and v70. Component two seemed to measure "positive communication skills". Factor loadings for component two ranged from .831 - .737. Since all items seemed to measure some aspect of the same construct, all items on component two were retained.

Table 14.4 Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Communication Skills Scale (N=148)

Item	Variable	Component (Rotated Factor Loadings)	
		1	2
v71	If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things.	.828	
v66	When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she puts words in my mouth.	.791	
v69	My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her.	.789	
v68	My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her.	.726	
v72	My girlfriend will yell and scream at me to get me to do what she wants.	.655	
v67	When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without yelling or screaming.		.831
v70	My girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say.		.780
v65	When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the time to explain to her exactly how I feel.		.737
	Eigenvalues	3.006	1.766
	% of Variance	37.57	22.07
	α	.817	.687

Overall Model α = .605; Overall Model Explained Variance = 59.65%; Factor Loading Cut Off = .4; Direct Oblimin Rotation; KMO=.771; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = χ^2 (28) = 283.571, p =.000

Behaviors Scales

The original behaviors scale was developed from the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale. Two separate scales were created from this original scale; Girlfriend Behaviors and Self-Behaviors. Focus group participants suggested that several words be changed throughout the scales to increase cultural appropriateness and understandability among the target population. One expert panelist also suggested that a time frame be included in the question such as "in the past 6 months" or "in the past year". This suggestion was rejected because the question asked about the current or most recent relationship of the participant. The same reviewer also suggested that separate items be created for "current

149

relationship" and "past relationship". This suggestion was rejected because the primary investigator felt that the instrument was already very long and creating more items would increase the burden on participants. Although the experiences that were asked about on each of the scale were the same, it was important to identify which of the behaviors the men had experienced and which of the behaviors the men had perpetrated. Collecting this information would provide data to analyze risk in future studies. In addition, the "experience items" discussed above were added to these scales. Below, the "Girlfriend Behaviors" and "Self-Behaviors" scales will be reported separately.

Girlfriend Behaviors Scale

The Girlfriend Behaviors scale began with 8 items and the final scale included twelve items. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that all items be retained in the scale after one round of the factor analysis procedure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Girlfriend Behaviors Scale were measured with a five point Likert type scale ranging from 0 – 4; 0 = 0 Times, 1 = 1 Time, 2 = 2 Times, 3 = 3 Times, and 4 = More Than 3 Times. Response option scores ranged from 0 – 4 and the total possible score ranges from 0 - 48. A higher total score indicates high dating violence perpetration. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated. Mean scores ranged from .71 – 2.22. In addition, the standard deviation values ranged from 1.566 – 1.658. Responses for items v75 (Threaten to hit or throw something at you; skew = .724; ses = .204), v76 (Destroy something of yours; skew = 1.027; ses = .203) v78 (Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance; skew = 1.383; ses = .201) v79 (Follow you; skew = .954; ses = .203) v80 (Prevent you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will; skew =

.710; ses = .201) v83 (Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue; skew = 1.608; ses = .201) and v84 (Threaten your friends or family members; skew = 1.501; ses = .201) were skewed towards low dating violence victimization. Please refer to Table 15.1 for complete results.

Table 15.1 Item Analysis for Girlfriend Behaviors Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did your girlfriend do the following to you			
v73	Insult or curse at you	144	2.20(1.628)	4
v74	Yell or scream at you	145	2.22(1.566)	3
v75	Threaten to hit or throw something at you	141	1.33(1.496)	7
v76	Destroy something of yours	143	1.06(1.339)	5
v77	Call you bad names	144	1.90(1.557)	4
v78	Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance	146	.77(1.214)	2
V79	Follow you	143	1.22(1.516)	5
V80	Prevent you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will	146	1.38(1.491)	2
v81	Go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter	146	1.74(1.653)	2
v82	Demand to know where you are or who you are with	146	1.94(1.637)	2
v83	Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue	145	.76(1.260)	3
v84	Threaten your friends or family members	146	.71(1.226)	2

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. All items were correlated at a magnitude of least .3, indicating the appropriateness of retaining all items for further psychometric analysis. Please refer to Table 15.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 48 and the scale mean was 16.85 (SD = 16.00) indicating wide variability of responses from study participants. Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .380-.701. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if item

deleted ranged from .887 - .901. These results indicate that all items appropriately retained

for further analysis. Please refer to table 15.3 for complete results.

Table 15.2 Correlation Matrix of the Girlfriend Behaviors Scale Items

Item	v73	v74	v75	v76	v77	v78	v79	v80	v81	v82	v83	v84
v73	1.00	.764	.452	.371	.696	.206	.321	.329	.417	.485	.260	.222
v74		1.00	.394	.391	.659	.032	.335	.368	.412	.477	.226	.178
v75			1.00	.605	.467	.374	.599	.533	.433	.376	.550	.420
v76				1.00	.427	.391	.564	.528	.462	.339	.542	.561
v77					1.00	.162	.483	.381	.527	.595	.355	.278
v78						1.00	.361	.382	.158	.097	.478	.501
v79							1.00	.620	.523	.435	.566	.563
v80								1.00	.407	.376	.569	.470
v81									1.00	.660	.466	.402
v82										1.00	.352	.307
v83											1.00	.705
v84												1.00

Table 15.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Girlfriend Behaviors Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did your girlfriend do the following to you			
v73	Insult or curse at you	14.61	.610	.892
v74	Yell or scream at you	14.60	.579	.894
v75	Threaten to hit or throw something at you	15.54	.681	.888
v76	Destroy something of yours	15.81	.673	.889
v77	Call you bad names	14.94	.686	.888
v78	Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance	16.17	.380	.901
v79	Follow you	15.69	.701	.887
v80	Prevent you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will	15.52	.641	.890
v81	Go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter	15.11	.649	.890
v82	Demand to know where you are or who you are with	14.94	.607	.892
v83	Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue	16.15	.646	.891
v84	Threaten your friends or family members	16.26	.580	.894

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Girlfriend Behaviors

Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the Cronbach's

alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in the scale. One round of factor analysis was conducted on the Girlfriend Behavior Scale. The results are presented in detail below.

First Round

All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.875). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.796. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (66) = 868.584, p =.000. The overall explained variance was 63.5%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .900. Two components were extracted.

Component One

Component one consisted of items v75, v76, v78, v79, v80, v83, and v84. Component one seemed to measure "intimidation acts of dating violence victimization". Factor loadings for component one ranged from .856 - .578.

Component Two

Component two consisted of items v73, v74, v77, v81, and v82. Component two seemed to measure "verbal and possessive dating violence victimization". Factor loadings for component two ranged from (-.902) – (-.558). These items seemed to measure two different aspects of dating violence, therefore, more scientific exploration is necessary to clarify this factor.

Table 15.4 Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Girlfriend Behaviors Scale (N=148)

Item	Variable	Component (Rotated Factor Loadings)	
		1	2
	In your current of most recent relationship, how many times did your girlfriend do the following to you when she was upset with you?		
v84	Threaten your friends or family members	.856	
v83	Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue	.842	
v78	Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance	.777	
v79	Follow you	.678	
v76	Destroy something of yours	.659	
v80	Prevent you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will	.653	
v75	Threaten to hit or throw something at you	.578	
v74	Yell or scream at you		-.902
v73	Insult or curse at you		-.860
v77	Call you bad names		-.836
v82	Demand to know where you are or who you are with		-.711
v81	Go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter		-.558
	Eigenvalues	5.789	1.835
	% of Variance	48.24	15.29
	α	.880	.864

Overall Model α = .900; Overall Model Explained Variance = 63.53%; Factor Loading Cut Off = .4; Direct Oblimin Rotation; KMO=.875; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = χ^2 (66) = 868.584, p =.000

Self-Behaviors Scale

The Self-Behaviors scale began with eight items and the final scale included twelve items. Psychometric analysis of the scale required that a total of one item be eliminated from the scale after two rounds of the factor analysis procedure.

Item Analysis

Items on the Self-Behaviors Scale were measured with a five point Likert type scale ranging from 0 – 4; 0 = 0 Times, 1 = 1 Time, 2 = 2 Times, 3 = 3 Times, and 4 = More Than 3 Times. Response option scores ranged from 0 – 4 and the total possible score ranges from

0 - 48. A higher total score indicates high dating violence victimization. The mean and standard deviation of each item was calculated.   Mean scores ranged from .45 – 1.68. In addition, the standard deviation values ranged from .920 – 1.532. Responses for all items significantly right skewed toward low perpetration of dating violence. Skew values ranged from (skew = .468, ses = .201) – (skew = 1.990, ses = .202). Please refer to Table 16.1 for complete results.

Table 16.1 Item Analysis for Self-Behaviors Scale

Item	Question	N	Item Mean(SD)	Missing
	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did you do the following to your girlfriend			
v85	Insult or curse at her	145	1.53(1.532)	3
v86	Yell or scream at her	146	1.68(1.471)	2
v87	Threaten to hit or throw something at her	143	.79(1.233)	5
v88	Destroy something of hers	146	.57(.968)	2
v89	Call her bad names	145	1.21(1.444)	3
v90	Accuse her of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance	146	.66(1.176)	2
v91	Follow her	146	.64(1.230)	2
v92	Prevent her from leaving or corner her against her will	144	.70(1.177)	4
v93	Go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without her permission or demand to go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter	145	.91(1.241)	3
v94	Demand to know where she is or who she is with	145	1.16(1.403)	3
v95	Threaten to get her fired or go to her job to argue	144	.58(1.204)	4
v96	Threaten her friends or family members	145	.45(.920)	3

Item-Total Correlations

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the total score of all the other items in the scale. All items were correlated at a magnitude of least .3, indicating the appropriateness of retaining all items for further psychometric analysis. Please refer to Table 16.2 for complete results.

The overall scale range was 0 – 48 and the scale mean was 10.55 (SD = 9.99) indicating limited variability of responses from study participants. Corrected item-total correlations ranged from .494-.695. In addition, the Cronbach's alpha coefficient if item

deleted ranged from .867 - .878. These results indicate that all items appropriately

retained for further analysis. Please refer to table 16.3 for complete results.

Table 16.2 Correlation Matrix of the Self-Behaviors Scale Items

Item	v85	v86	v87	v88	v89	v90	v91	v92	v93	v94	v95	v96
v85	1.00	.669	.458	.286	.604	.194	.227	.336	.303	.271	.222	.181
v86		1.00	.427	.263	.591	.218	.190	.256	.286	.452	.081	.161
v87			1.00	.511	.533	.430	.412	.496	.457	.332	.533	.523
v88				1.00	.325	.353	.388	.391	.455	.333	.560	.577
v89					1.00	.254	.323	.376	.299	.403	.343	.326
v90						1.00	.437	.341	.357	.252	.482	.532
v91							1.00	.621	.365	.308	.581	.706
v92								1.00	.464	.378	.548	.611
v93									1.00	.524	.564	.474
v94										1.00	.354	.308
v95											1.00	.739
v96												1.00

Table 16.3 Item-Total Correlations for the Self-Behavior Scale

Item	Question	Scale Mean if Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did you do the following to your girlfriend			
v85	Insult or curse at her	9.03	.528	.878
v86	Yell or scream at her	8.88	.513	.878
v87	Threaten to hit or throw something at her	9.78	.695	.867
v88	Destroy something of hers	9.99	.584	.874
v89	Call her bad names	9.38	.614	.871
v90	Accuse her of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance	9.93	.494	.878
v91	Follow her	9.99	.588	.873
v92	Prevent her from leaving or corner her against her will	9.87	.638	.870
v93	Go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without her permission or demand to go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter	9.65	.605	.872
v94	Demand to know where she is or who she is with	9.41	.531	.877
v95	Threaten to get her fired or go to her job to argue	10.04	.645	.870
v96	Threaten her friends or family members	10.15	.668	.871

Principle Component Factor Analysis

Principle component factor analysis was conducted on the Self-Behavior Scale. Correlation coefficients, KMO, MSA, Bartlett's Test of Sphericity, the Cronbach's alpha, and factor structure was assessed to determine the appropriateness of each item in the scale. A total of two rounds of factor analysis was conducted on the Self-Behavior Scale. The results of each round are presented in detail below.

First Round

All items were correlated with at least one other item with a magnitude between .3-.9. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =.868). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.731. Barletts Test of Sphericity [χ^2 (66) = 841.699, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 60.6%, and the Cronbach's alpha was .883. Two components were extracted. Item v87 () loaded on both components and was eliminated.

Second Round

After removing items v87, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin verified sampling adequacy (KMO =848). All items had Measures of Sampling Adequacy (MSA) >.706. Barletts Test of Sphericity was adequate [χ^2 (55) = 749.906, p =.000]. The overall explained variance was 61.2% and the Cronbach's alpha was .867. Two components were extracted.

Component One

Component one consisted of items v88, v90, v91, v92, v93, v95, and v96. Component one seemed to measure "manipulative and possessive dating violence perpetration". Factor loadings for component one ranged from .944 - .599.

Component Two

Component two consisted of items v85, v86, v89, and v94. Component two seemed to measure "verbal dating violence perpetration" with the exception of item v94. Factor loadings for component two ranged from .932 - .469. Item v94 does not seem to measure verbal dating violence perpetration and therefore may need to be eliminated.

Table 16.4 Summary of Exploratory Factor Analysis Results for the Self-Behaviors Scale (N=148)

Item	Variable	Component (Rotated Factor Loadings)	
		1	2
	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did you do the following to your girlfriend when you were upset with her?		
v96	Threaten her friends or family members	.944	
v95	Threaten to get her fired or go to her job to argue	.907	
v91	Follow her	.810	
v92	Prevent her from leaving someplace or corner her against her will	.691	
v90	Accuse her of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance	.640	
v88	Destroy something of hers	.636	
v93	Go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without her permission or demand to go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter	.599	
v86	Yell or scream at her		.932
v85	Insult of curse at her		.861
v89	Call her bad names		.750
v94	Demand to know where she is or who she is with		.469
	Eigenvalues	4.958	1.775
	% of Variance	45.08	16.13
	α	.872	.798

Overall Model α = .867; Overall Model Explained Variance = 61.21%; Factor Loading Cut Off = .4; Direct Oblimin Rotation; KMO=.848; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity = χ^2 (55) = 749.906, p =.000

Overall Characteristics of Scales

Below, the overall characteristics of the scales are presented. The results of each

scale are discussed in detail above and this table is meant to provide an overview of the

overall instrument.

Table 17. Scale Characteristics

Scale	Number of Items	Min, Max	Mean(SD)	Skewness	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Score
Knowledge	9	0, 18	9.38 (5.252)	-.117	.800	Sum
Attitude	16	0, 18	4.99 (5.001)	1.035	.762	Sum
Perceived Susceptibility	9	9, 45	23.56 (7.708)	.247	.842	Sum
Perceived Severity	9	9, 45	21.14 (7.124)	.485	.771	Sum
Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior	9	0, 36	11.01 (9.035)	.988	.869	Sum
Isolation	5	0, 20	6.01 (4.444)	.813	.755	Sum
Communication Skills	8	1, 30	14.69 (6.188)	.124	.605	Sum
Girlfriend Behaviors	12	0, 48	16.85 (12.211)	.560	.900	Sum
Self-Behaviors	12	0, 48	10.55 (9.992)	1.018	.867	Sum

Chapter Five
DISCUSSION

This chapter will focus on discussing the themes and overall interpretations of the results. The formative research phase will be discussed first followed by the quantitative results discussion. A discussion regarding the value of the newly developed scales will be presented followed by the study strengths, limitations, and implications. Due to the fact that the purpose of this study was to develop valid and reliable scales to assess factors associated with DV victimization among men, there were no analytical tests conducted to explore any correlation, risk, or potential causal relationships between variables. The final scales were developed based primarily on the calculations generated during the factor analysis and reliability testing, however, suggestions about specific items are discussed as well as the utility of each scale based on the expertise of the primary investigator.

FORMATIVE RESEARCH PHASE

The formative phase of the study was to inform the questions on the survey and to get feedback on the specific survey questions. Below, the themes that emerged during the formative phase of the study are discussed.

Terms used to describe dating relationships

Participants in this study were very descriptive when explaining the terms they identified that they use to describe the various types of women they date. Although the social parameters that separate these categories are somewhat unclear, they could be categorized into three basic groups; (1) sex-only partners, (2) sex-companions, and (3) relationship partners.

Sex-only partners may be called a hoe, slut, skank, sloar (slut and whore), or chickenhead. Young men see these women as being good for only one thing, sexual activities. A guy may never go out in public with a girl in this category. Women who are placed into the sex-only category rarely, if ever, move out of that category into one of the other two categories.

The sex-companion category describes women who are used for sexual activities as well as for some other gratification for the man. Although sex is a major role for a woman in this category, men also value her for some other reason. She may have and attractive attitude or other personality characteristics. She may enjoy some of the same leisure activities as the man or she may be fun to be around. The man may or may not feel comfortable being seen in public with a woman in this category. A woman may fall into this category when the man is already in a relationship with another woman or when a man is getting to know her before making her his girlfriend. Terms used to describe women in this category include fling, side piece (shorty on the side or bitch on the side), talking or talking to, and cuffing. It is possible for a woman to move out of this category into either one of the other categories; sex-only partner or relationship partner.

The relationship partner category describes what is thought of as the traditional boyfriend/girlfriend relationship. Women in this category are considered the actual girlfriend and terms used to describe her include wifey, main chick, and girlfriend. A woman in this category will be introduced to his family and friends, he will be genuinely concerned about her well-being, and he will share his property and possessions with her. Placing a woman in this this category does not necessarily mean he will be monogamous. However, it is likely that she will be the highest on his priority list. To this woman, the man will be most attentive and most committed.

Definitions and Examples of Dating Violence

Based on the results from the qualitative phase of this study, men seemed to be very clear that there are various types of dating violence. They were able to list physical, psychological/mental, and verbal abuses as types of dating violence. Many men used the term "mental" instead of "psychological" therefore the term "mental dating violence" was used on the survey and the two terms have been merged for reporting purposes.

Men were also able to describe personal experiences they had in the various forms of dating violence they listed. Participants described being hit with objects (physical), having women threaten suicide, and emasculation techniques (psychological/mental), and name calling, yelling, and screaming (verbal).

The issues that seemed to upset men the most in this sample, however, were possessiveness and stalking behaviors. In the focus groups, the men vehemently expressed their irritation with stalking behaviors that included women stealing/breaking into/going through cell phones, e-mail accounts, and social media pages such as Facebook and Twitter, and the newest website, Instagram. Some men talked about women harassing their friends and family members to get information about them; in some cases even before officially meeting them. Others discussed the repeated back-to-back phone calls and text messages they would receive when a woman was not satisfied with their availability to her.

The other main factor related to possessiveness was time expectation. Based on what was reported by the focus group participants, many women place unfair or unrealistic expectations on how men should spend their free time. Men described incidents of women making plans for their time without asking them first, inviting herself along on outings when she was not invited by the man, being upset if he does not plan to spend all of his available free time

with her, being upset when he spends his time attending to obligations such as work or school, or spending time with his male friends. In some cases, women use questions about his sexuality as a tactic to manipulate him into spending time with her instead of his male friends. It was reported that women will suggest that their boyfriend "wants to kiss his homeboys goodnight" instead of her. She may insinuate that he is romantically involved with his friends because he spends so much time with them.

Another unique finding was the idea of "imprisonment". Imprisonment occurs when one person refuses to allow another person to leave a place. In many cases, men described being victims of some form of imprisonment perpetrated by a woman. One case that was described was of a man who was not able to leave a woman's home because she would not get out of his car. Another case was when a woman stood in front of the door and refused to move out of the way so the man could exit the premises. One of the reasons that imprisonment is such an interesting phenomena is because there seems to be a shift in the power dynamic, at least socially. Based on data collected during the focus groups, men in the sample expressed that they had been taught to never touch a woman in conflict or anger. Their perception was that no matter what was occurring, if they touched the woman, they could be accused of domestic violence. Therein lays the social power dynamic; the woman is perceived as having the power. The man and the woman are aware of her power in this situation. She knows that he most likely will not touch her, so she is able to stand in front of the doorway as long as she wants and he is trapped.

Using Abused, Battered, and Victim

Feedback from the focus groups made it clear that among this sample, the words "battered" and "victim" should not be used. Men in this sample did not like to think of

themselves as battered by a female, and they did not like to think of themselves as victims of anything, including a girlfriend. This is not surprising and is consistent with the existing masculinity literature (Steinmetz, 1977-78; Makepeace, 1981; Plass, 1983; Mulleman, 1998; Mechem, 1999). What is a little different, however, is that it was not really clear in this sample that using the word "abused" to describe their experiences with women is as taboo as previously thought (Stets, 1987; Arias, 1989; Clark, 1994). This is not to say that men are open to the idea of labeling themselves as "abused men", but it may be acceptable at some point to label an action against them perpetrated by a girlfriend as an "abuse" or an "abusive action". In other words, a man who gets called a bad name by his girlfriend may not consider himself to be "abused", but he may say that his girlfriend was "abusive" towards him or that his girlfriend "verbally abused" him. Much more in-depth investigation needs to be done to fully understand the complex perceptions and interpretations that men may have regarding "abuse" as a term used to describe their experiences with girlfriends.

Seeking Help
While men in this sample acknowledge that women perpetrating dating violence against them may be a larger problem than they previously thought, certain types of prevention interventions may be effective for them. There are several hotlines, web-based, and clinical-based services for men in Brooklyn which include the NYC Domestic Abuse Hotline, the NYC Online Resource Directory for Domestic Violence, The Brooklyn Center for Psychothrapy, HELP USA, and Safe Horizons. Even though these services exist, participants reported that there was a lack of professional services available to them if they decided they wanted to seek help if they were in relationship with a woman who repeatedly perpetrated dating violence towards them. But they also said that even if they needed those types of services (i.e.

professional counseling, telephone help line, support group) and those services were accessible

to them, they probably would not use them. Further investigation is needed to understand why

men wouldn't use these types of services and what types of characteristics these types of

programs would need to have to make it more likely for men to seek help. In the meantime,

however, men did agree that perhaps general media campaigns to educate them and raise

awareness about the issue may be a good place to start addressing this issue. Although there

were no media campaigns identified in New York that specifically addressed men as victims,

several web-based campaigns included the New York State Teen Dating Violence Awareness

and Prevention Campaign, the Day One NY Stop Teen Dating Violence Campaign. These

campaigns did not specifically address women perpetrating dating violence against men and they

were web-based which may limit the number of Black men who are reached by these efforts.

Therefore, developing media messaged specifically for this target population and placing ads on

subways, buses, and billboards may be appropriate. Television and radio commercials may also

be viable options for health promotion campaigns to reduce dating violence against these men.

DISCUSSION OF QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The quantitative phase of the study was to investigate the psychometric characteristics of the survey items. Below, the univariate, bivariate, and factor analysis results are discussed.

Distorted Ideas About Gender Scale

Univariate Item Analysis

The Distorted Ideas About Gender scale was intended to measure men's ideas about how men and women should behave in dating relationships. A final set of five items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel feedback. Mean scores for items ranged from 1.02 – 1.99 and standard deviations ranged from 1.17 – 1.34. Responses for two of the five items were significantly right skewed towards having low distorted ideas about gender. Participants did not believe that a woman owed him something if he paid for everything on a date nor did they believe that they should accept sex from a woman just because she may offer it to them. Overall, the sample reported having lower distorted ideas about gender based on univariate results of each item although further research is required to conduct empirical investigations of the prevalence of distorted ideas about gender among the sample.

Bivariate Item Analysis

Correlation analysis of the items indicated that only two of the five items were at least moderately correlated with at least one other item on the scale ($r > .3$) and only two of the five items were only moderately correlated with the total scale ($r > .3$). To ensure the internal consistency and homogeneity of the scale, item-total correlations values should be $> .3$ (Sousa, 2010). Since a scale should have at least three items to be considered stable (Costello, 2005), these results indicated that the scale did not meet the preliminary requirements because only two items were retained after univariate and bivariate analysis. The low item-total correlations

166

indicated that this scale might have measured multiple dimensions that were unrelated to each other (Sousa, 2010).

Factor Structure

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was not conducted on this scale because a minimum of three items are necessary to compromise a scale and the distorted ideas about gender scale was comprised of only two items after univariate and bivariate analysis.

Knowledge Scale

Univariate Item Analysis

The Knowledge scale was intended to measure men's knowledge about various types of mental dating violence that may be perpetrated by women. A final set of nine items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel feedback. Mean scores for items ranged from .88 – 1.23 and standard deviations ranged from .88 – .95. Responses for one of the nine items were significantly left skewed towards having high knowledge about a woman using guilt to get a man to do what she wanted him to do. Participants knew that a woman who uses guilt to get a man to do what she wants is a form of dating violence. Overall, approximately equal proportions of the sample reported having high knowledge of dating violence and low knowledge of dating violence based on univariate results of each item. Further research is required, however, to conduct empirical investigations of how knowledgeable the sample is regarding dating violence.

Bivariate Item Analysis

Correlation analysis of the items indicated that all items were at least moderately correlated with at least one other item on the scale (range: r = .304 – r = .538), however not all items were moderately correlated with the total scale. All items were moderately correlated with the total scale (range: r = .493 – r = .634) except item v6 (; r = .216). To ensure the internal

consistency and homogeneity of the scale, item-total correlations values should be > .3 (Sousa, 2010). These results indicated that the scale met the preliminary requirements, and although item v6 was not correlated with the total scale at a magnitude of at least .3, item v6 was retained for further psychometric analysis since the investigation was exploratory in nature.

Factor Structure

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the knowledge scale. After three rounds of EFA, results provided evidence that there were two underlying factors being measured by the knowledge scale. The two factors were labeled: (1) knowledge about manipulative dating violence behaviors (α = .766) and (2) knowledge about possessive or stalking dating violence behaviors (α = .722). All of the items that loaded onto factor one seemed clearly measure some aspect of the same construct, however, the items that loaded on factor two were less clear. Items v8 (Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend keeps calling your phone or texting you over and over again) and V10 (Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend demands to know where you are or who you are with at all times) seem to have measured some form of what could be interpreted "stalking" behaviors and item v9 (Is it mental abuse in your relationship if your girlfriend demands to look through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter) could be interpreted as a "possessive" behavior. The questions may need to be worded a bit clearer. Two of the three questions ask if the girlfriend "demands" something instead of asking if she actually committed an action. A participant may have answered the question based on a girlfriend actually committed in the action instead of demanding to commit the action. This may be a reason for the confusion in the interpretation of the factor.

The overall knowledge scale demonstrated high reliability (α = .800). The two underlying factors also demonstrated very acceptable reliability coefficients (α = .766 and .722,

respectively). Based on the analysis results, the knowledge about dating violence scale should be administered using all items or the items that loaded only on factor one. Items that loaded on factor two should not be used as a separate subscale. Further research is necessary to clarify the structure of the items on factor two. Confirmatory factor analysis procedures should be conducted on the knowledge scale in future studies to confirm the psychometric feasibility of the scale and to provide further evidence for the reliability of the scale. The final scale consisted of a total of seven items.

Attitude Scale
Univariate Item Analysis
The Attitude scale was intended to measure how men feel about different types of dating violence that may be perpetrated by women. A final set of sixteen items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel feedback. Mean scores for items ranged from .12 – .64 and standard deviations ranged from .42 – .71. Responses for all items were significantly right skewed towards having negative attitudes toward dating violence. Overall, the sample reported having very negative attitudes toward dating violence based on univariate results of each item. Further research is required; however, to conduct empirical investigations of how positive or negative the attitudes are among the sample regarding dating violence.

Bivariate Item Analysis
Correlation analysis of the items indicated that all items were at least moderately correlated with at least one other item on the scale (range: r = .303 – r = .517), however not all items were moderately correlated with the total scale. All items were moderately correlated with the total scale (range: r = .364 – r = .583) except item v16 (; r = .254), v24 (; r = .235), v28 (; r = .270). To ensure the internal consistency and homogeneity of the scale, item-total correlations values should be > .3 (Sousa, 2010). These results indicated that the scale met the preliminary

169

requirements, and although items v16, v24, and v28 were not correlated with the total scale at a magnitude of at least .3, those items were retained for further psychometric analysis since the investigation was exploratory in nature.

Factor Structure

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the attitude scale. After four rounds of EFA, results provided evidence that there were four underlying factors being measured by the attitude scale. The four factors were labeled: (1) attitude towards stalking behaviors (α = .644), (2) attitude toward permissibility of mental dating violence (α = .612), (3) attitude toward permissibility of verbal dating violence (α = .667), and (4) attitude toward permissibility of retaliatory dating violence (α = .542). All of the items that loaded onto each factor seemed clearly measure some aspect of the same construct.

The overall knowledge scale demonstrated very acceptable reliability (α = .762). Three of the four underlying factors (factors one, two, and three) demonstrated minimally acceptable reliability coefficients (α = .644, .612 and .667, respectively). Factor four, however, demonstrated an unreliable alpha coefficient (α = .542). Based on the analysis results, the attitude about dating violence scale should be administered using all items. Due to the low reliability values, items that loaded onto the four factors should not be used as separate subscales. Further research is necessary to increase the reliability of the subscales. Confirmatory factor analysis procedures should be conducted on the attitude scale in future studies to confirm the psychometric feasibility of the scale and to provide further evidence for the reliability of the scale. The final scale consisted of a total of twelve items.

Perceived Susceptibility Scale
Univariate Item Analysis

        The Perceived Susceptibility scale was intended to measure how likely men perceive

themselves to be at risk for experiencing various types of dating violence perpetrated by a

woman. A final set of nine items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and

expert panel feedback. Mean scores for items ranged from $2.20 - 3.17$ and standard deviations

ranged from $1.13 - 1.40$. Responses for four of the nine items were significantly right skewed

towards having low perceived susceptibility of dating violence victimization. Participants did

not believe that they were at serious risk for experiencing certain types of dating violence

perpetrated by women. Overall, the sample reported having moderately low perceived

susceptibility regarding dating violence victimization based on univariate results of each item.

Further research is required, however, to conduct empirical investigations of how susceptible the

sample perceives they are to dating violence victimization.

Bivariate Item Analysis

        Correlation analysis of the items indicated that all items were at least moderately

correlated with at least one other item on the scale (range: $r = .313 - r = .576$) and with the total

scale (range: $r = .342 - r = .666$). To ensure the internal consistency and homogeneity of the

scale, item-total correlations values should be $> .3$ (Sousa, 2010). These results indicated that the

scale met the preliminary requirements, and all items were retained for further psychometric

analysis.

Factor Structure

        Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the perceived susceptibility scale. After

one round of EFA, results provided evidence that there were two underlying factors being

measured by the knowledge scale. The two factors were labeled: (1) perceived susceptibility of

manipulative or possessive dating violence victimization ($\alpha = .818$) and (2) perceived susceptibility of possessive or stalking behavior dating violence victimization ($\alpha = .710$). All of the items that loaded onto factor one seemed to clearly measure some aspect of the same construct except v34 (How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts) and v32 (How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names). Item v34 seemed that it would fit better with factor two and item v32 seemed to measure verbal dating violence and didn't seem to belong in either factor. The items that loaded onto factor two were also unclear. Item v31 (How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will act jealous over you) seemed to measure possession which was different from the other two items that loaded onto the factor which seemed measure some aspects of stalking behavior. These questions may need to be worded a bit clearer. As in the previous scale, asking if the girlfriend "demands" something instead of asking if she actually committed an action may have been confusing to participants. A participant may have answered the question based on a girlfriend actually committed in the action instead of demanding to commit the action. This may be a reason for the confusion in the interpretation of the factor.

The overall perceived susceptibility scale demonstrated high reliability ($\alpha = .842$). The two underlying factors also demonstrated very acceptable reliability coefficients ($\alpha = .818$ and .710, respectively). Based on the analysis results, the perceived susceptibility to dating violence victimization scale should be administered using all items. Due to the ambiguity of items that loaded onto the two separate factors, none of the items should be used as separate subscales. Further research is necessary to clarify the structure of the items on the two factors. Confirmatory factor analysis procedures should be conducted on the perceived susceptibility

scale in future studies to confirm the psychometric feasibility of the scale and to provide further

evidence for the reliability of the scale. The final scale consisted of a total of nine items.

Perceived Severity Scale
Univariate Item Analysis

The Perceived Severity scale was intended to measure how serious men perceive various

types of dating violence perpetrated by a woman. A final set of nine items was developed based

on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel feedback. Mean scores for items ranged

from 2.37 – 2.70 and standard deviations ranged from 1.25 – 1.31. Responses for all items were

significantly right skewed towards having high perceived severity of dating violence

victimization except v40 (How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you) and v42

(How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again).

Participants believed that experiencing dating violence victimization would be very bad.

Overall, the sample reported that they believed that experience dating violence victimization

perpetrated by a woman would be very bad based on univariate results of each item. Further

research is required, however, to conduct empirical investigations of how bad the sample

perceives it would be to experience dating violence victimization.

Bivariate Item Analysis

Correlation analysis of the items indicated that all items were at least moderately

correlated with at least one other item on the scale (range: r = .302 – r = .735) and with the total

scale (range: r = .331 – r = .578). To ensure the internal consistency and homogeneity of the

scale, item-total correlations values should be > .3 (Sousa, 2010). These results indicated that the

scale met the preliminary requirements, and all items were retained for further psychometric

analysis.

Factor Structure

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the perceived susceptibility scale. After two rounds of EFA, results provided evidence that there were two underlying factors being measured by the knowledge scale. The two factors were labeled: (1) perceived severity of stalking or possessive dating violence victimization ($\alpha = .818$) and (2) perceived severity of manipulative dating violence victimization ($\alpha = .710$). All of the items that loaded onto factor one seemed to clearly measure some aspect of the same construct except v42 (How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again). Item v42 seemed to measure a stalking behavior, however, it has the highest factor loading (.820) on the factor. The other items that loaded onto factor one seemed to measure some aspect of possessive behaviors. All of the items that loaded onto factor two seemed clearly measure some aspect of the same construct

The overall perceived susceptibility scale demonstrated high reliability ($\alpha = .842$). The two underlying factors also demonstrated very acceptable reliability coefficients ($\alpha = .818$ and .710, respectively). Based on the analysis results, however, the perceived severity of dating violence victimization scale should be administered using all items or only the items that loaded onto factor two as a subscale. Due to the ambiguity of items that loaded onto factor one, that factor should be used as separate subscales. Further research is necessary to clarify the structure of the items on factor one. Confirmatory factor analysis procedures should be conducted on the perceived severity scale in future studies to confirm the psychometric feasibility of the scale and to provide further evidence for the reliability of the scale. The final scale consisted of a total of eight items.

Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior Scale

Univariate Item Analysis

The Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior scale was intended to measure how men may respond to women who may have perpetrated dating violence against him. A final set of nine items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel feedback. Mean scores for items ranged from .74 – 1.43 and standard deviations ranged from 1.11 – 1.59. Responses for all of the items were significantly right skewed towards doing nothing or ignoring a woman who committed a dating violence act against him. Further research is required, however, to conduct empirical investigations regarding the prevalence of rewarding threatening and controlling behavior in dating relationships.

Bivariate Item Analysis

Correlation analysis of the items indicated that all items were at least moderately correlated with at least one other item on the scale (range: $r = .310 – r = .616$) and with the total scale (range: $r = .431 – r = .701$). To ensure the internal consistency and homogeneity of the scale, item-total correlations values should be $> .3$ (Sousa, 2010). These results indicated that the scale met the preliminary requirements for all items to be retained for further psychometric analysis in the investigation.

Factor Structure

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the reward for threatening and controlling behavior scale. After one round of EFA, results provided evidence that there were no underlying factors being measured and this scale measured only reward for threatening and controlling behavior. All of the items that loaded onto factor one seemed clearly measure some aspect of the same construct.

175

The overall reward for threatening and controlling behavior scale demonstrated high reliability ($\alpha = .869$). Confirmatory factor analysis procedures should be conducted on the reward for threatening and controlling behavior scale in future studies to confirm the psychometric feasibility of the scale and to provide further evidence for the reliability of the scale. The final scale consisted of a total of eight items.

Power Scale
Univariate Item Analysis
The Power scale was intended to measure whether or not power in a relationship was distributed equally between the man and woman. A final set of two items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel feedback. Mean scores for items v58 and v59 were 1.46 and 1.79, respectively. The standard deviation values were 1.13 and 1.20, respectively. Responses for item 58 (In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did you do what your girlfriend wanted to do instead of doing what you wanted to do when you were spending time together) were significantly right skewed towards women having low power in the relationship.

Bivariate Item Analysis
Correlation analysis of the items indicated that the two items were moderately correlated with each other ($r = .384$). Since a scale should have at least three items to be considered stable (Costello, 2005), these results indicated that the scale did not meet the preliminary requirements there were only two items that were developed during the formative phase of the project. As a result, no further psychometric investigation was conducted for the power scale.

Isolation Scale
Univariate Item Analysis

The Isolation scale was intended to measure how much a woman attempted to isolate a man from other people with whom he may have interpersonal relationships such as friends and family members. A final set of five items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel feedback. Mean scores for items ranged from .74 – 1.43 and standard deviations ranged from .90 – 1.67. Responses for all of the items were significantly right skewed towards experiencing low isolation in his relationship except item v63 (In your current or most recent past relationship, how often did your girlfriend want all of your free time to be spent with her). Further research is required, however, to conduct empirical investigations regarding the prevalence of isolation in dating relationships.

Bivariate Item Analysis

Correlation analysis of the items indicated that all items were at least moderately correlated with at least one other item on the scale (range: r = .323 – r = .555) and with the total scale (range: r = .482 – r = .632). To ensure the internal consistency and homogeneity of the scale, item-total correlations values should be > .3 (Sousa, 2010). These results indicated that the scale met the preliminary requirements for all items to be retained for further psychometric analysis in the investigation.

Factor Structure

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the isolation scale. After one round of EFA, results provided evidence that there were no underlying factors being measured and this scale measured only isolation in a dating relationship. All of the items that loaded onto factor one seemed clearly measure some aspect of the same construct.

The overall isolation scale demonstrated good reliability ($\alpha = .755$). Confirmatory factor analysis procedures should be conducted on the isolation scale in future studies to confirm the psychometric feasibility of the scale and to provide further evidence for the reliability of the scale. The final scale consisted of a total of five items.

Communication Skills Scale
Univariate Item Analysis

The Communication Skills scale was intended to measure how positively or negatively a woman may communicate with her male relationship partner. A final set of eight items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel feedback. Mean scores for items ranged from $1.21 - 1.68$ and standard deviations ranged from $1.20 - 1.46$. Responses for all items were significantly right skewed towards poor communication skills except item v69 (My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her). Overall, the sample reported that women have moderately poor communication skills based on univariate results of each item. Further research is required, however, to conduct empirical investigations of the prevalence of poor communication skills demonstrated by women.

Bivariate Item Analysis

Correlation analysis of the items indicated that all items were at least moderately correlated with at least one other item on the scale (range: $r = .300 - r = .610$), however not all items were moderately correlated with the total scale. All items were moderately correlated with the total scale (range: $r = .354 - r = .501$) except item v65 (; $r = .056$), v67 (; $r = .173$), and v70 (; $r = .122$). To ensure the internal consistency and homogeneity of the scale, item-total correlations values should be $> .3$ (Sousa, 2010). These results indicated that the scale met the preliminary requirements, and although items v65, v67, and v70 were not correlated with the

178

total scale at a magnitude of at least .3, these items were retained for further psychometric

analysis since the investigation was exploratory in nature.

Factor Structure
Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the communication skills scale. After one

round of EFA, results provided evidence that there were two underlying factors being measured

by the knowledge scale. The two factors were labeled: (1) negative communication skills (α =

.818) and (2) positive communication skills (α = .710). All of the items that loaded onto both

factors one and two seemed to clearly measure some aspect of two different constructs.

The overall communication skills scale demonstrated minimally adequate reliability (α =

.817). Although factor two demonstrated minimally adequate reliability ((α = .687), factor one

demonstrated high reliability ((α = .605). Since the overall scale, and factor one, demonstrated a

minimally acceptable reliability coefficient (Woods-Groves, 2011), the communication skills

scale should be administered using all items. Both factors one and two may also be used as

separate subscales. Further research is necessary, however, to increase the reliability of factor

one and the overall scale. Confirmatory factor analysis procedures should be conducted on the

communication skills scale in future studies to confirm the psychometric feasibility of the scale

and to provide further evidence for the reliability of the scale. The final scale consisted of a total

of eight items.

Girlfriend Behaviors Scale
Univariate Item Analysis
The Girlfriend Behaviors scale was intended to measure the types and frequency of

various types of mental dating violence acts perpetrated by women and experienced by men. A

final set of twelve items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert

panel feedback. Mean scores for items ranged from .71 – 2.22 and standard deviations ranged

from 1.57 – 1.66. Responses for all items v75 (Threaten to hit or throw something at you), v76 (Destroy something of yours), v78 (Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance), v79 (Follow you), v80 (Prevent you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will), v83 (Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue), and v84 (Threaten your friends or family members) were significantly right skewed towards low dating violence victimization. Overall, the sample reported moderately low amounts of victimization of some dating violence behaviors based on univariate results of each item. Further research is required, however, to conduct empirical investigations of the prevalence dating violence victimization experienced by men in the sample.

Bivariate Item Analysis

Correlation analysis of the items indicated that all items were at least moderately correlated with at least one other item on the scale (range: r = .307 – r = .764) and with the total scale (range: r = .380 – r = .701). To ensure the internal consistency and homogeneity of the scale, item-total correlations values should be > .3 (Sousa, 2010). These results indicated that the scale met the preliminary requirements for all items to be retained for further psychometric analysis since the investigation.

Factor Structure

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the girlfriend behaviors scale. After one round of EFA, results provided evidence that there were two underlying factors being measured by the knowledge scale. The two factors were labeled: (1) intimidation acts of dating violence victimization (α = .818) and (2) verbal or possessive dating violence victimization (α = .710). All of the items that loaded onto factor one seemed clearly measure some aspect of the same construct, however, the items that loaded on factor two were less clear. Items v74 (Yell or

scream at you), v73 (Insult or curse at you), and v77 (Call you bad names) seem to have measured some form of what could be interpreted "verbally" violent behaviors and items v81 (Go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter) and v82 (Demand to know where you are or who you are with) could be interpreted as a "possessive" behaviors. As in previous scales, the questions may need to be worded a bit clearer. These questions ask if the girlfriend "demands" something instead of asking if she actually committed an action. A participant may have answered the question based on a girlfriend actually committed in the action instead of demanding to commit the action. This may be a reason for the confusion in the interpretation of the factor.

The overall girlfriend behaviors scale demonstrated high reliability ($\alpha = .900$). The two underlying factors also demonstrated high reliability coefficients ($\alpha = .880$ and .864, respectively). Based on the analysis results, the girlfriend behaviors scale should be administered using all items or the items that loaded only on factor one. Items that loaded on factor two should not be used as a separate subscale. Further research is necessary to clarify the structure of the items on factor two. Confirmatory factor analysis procedures should be conducted on the girlfriend behaviors scale in future studies to confirm the psychometric feasibility of the scale and to provide further evidence for the reliability of the scale. The final scale consisted of a total of twelve items.

Self-Behaviors Scale
Univariate Item Analysis
The Self-Behaviors scale was intended to measure the types and frequency of various types of mental dating violence acts perpetrated by men and experienced by women. A final set of twelve items was developed based on focus groups, cognitive testing, and expert panel

feedback. Mean scores for items ranged from .45 – 1.68 and standard deviations ranged from .92 – 1.53. Responses for all of the items were significantly right skewed towards low perpetration of dating violence. Further research is required, however, to conduct empirical investigations regarding the prevalence of dating violence behaviors perpetrated by participant in this sample.

Bivariate Item Analysis

Correlation analysis of the items indicated that all items were at least moderately correlated with at least one other item on the scale (range: $r = .303 – r = .739$) and with the total scale (range: $r = .494 – r = .695$). To ensure the internal consistency and homogeneity of the scale, item-total correlations values should be $> .3$ (Sousa, 2010). These results indicated that the scale met the preliminary requirements for all items to be retained for further psychometric analysis since the investigation.

Factor Structure

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the self-behaviors scale. After two rounds of EFA, results provided evidence that there were two underlying factors being measured by the self-behaviors scale. The two factors were labeled: (1) manipulative and possessive dating violence perpetration ($\alpha = .818$) and (2) verbal dating violence perpetration ($\alpha = .710$). On factor one, items v96 (Threaten her friends or family members), v95 (Threaten to get her fired or go to her job to argue), and v90 (Accuse her of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance) seemed to measure some aspect of manipulative dating violence. Items v92 (Prevent her from leaving or corner her against her will) and v93 (Go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without her permission or demand to go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter) seemed to measure some aspect of possessiveness. On factor two, all items seemed to measure some aspect of verbal dating violence except item v94 (Demand to know where she is

or who she is with) which seemed to measure a possessive act of dating violence. Neither factor

one or two seemed to clearly measure any specific dimension of dating violence perpetration.

The overall self-behaviors scale demonstrated high reliability ($\alpha = .867$). The two

underlying factors also demonstrated high reliability coefficients ($\alpha = .872$ and $.798$,

respectively). Based on the analysis results, however, the self-behaviors scale should be

administered using all items. Due to the ambiguity of items that loaded onto both factors one

and two, they should not be used as separate subscales. Further research is necessary to clarify

the structure of the items on factors one and two. Confirmatory factor analysis procedures

should be conducted on the self-behaviors scale in future studies to confirm the psychometric

feasibility of the scale and to provide further evidence for the reliability of the scale. The final

scale consisted of a total of eleven items.

VALUE TO DATING VIOLENCE RESEARCH

Knowledge Scale

The knowledge scale was developed from the VicHealth's 2006 Community

Attitudes to Violence Against Women Survey and the Knowledge About Relationship

Violence Survey (Macgowan, 1997). The scale began with twenty-two items and the final

scale included seven items. The VicHealth Community Attitudes to Violence Against

Women Survey was developed and used by the Victoria, Australia Department of Health

(VicHealth). No published psychometric data or results were found related to the

VicHealth survey. The Knowledge About Relationship Violence scale was developed by

Macgowan et al. (1997) as a part of a larger Attitudes About Relationship Violence

Questionnaire. The questionnaire utilized a 4-point Likert like scale and was administered

to students at a predominantly Black middle school in the Miami, Florida area.

Psychometric analysis of the questionnaire was outside the scope of the Macgowan study, however, reliability for the questionnaire was assessed (α = .73; N=379). No reliability or psychometrics was reported for the Knowledge About Relationship Violence scale.

Items derived directly from the VicHealth and Macgowan instruments were confusing for many of the focus group participants. Many of the questions were interpreted with multiple meanings by men in the sample and they felt there were multiple ways to answer the items. Items on the newly developed knowledge scale were simplified to reduce confusion for men in the target population and to increase clarity of the questions being asked. In addition, items on the new knowledge scale included direct experiences of the target population which increases content validity.

Attitude Scale

The attitude scale was developed from the Attitude Toward Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale (Price, 1999). The scale began with fifteen items and the final scale included nine items. The Attitude Toward Male Psychological Dating Violence was developed by Price et al. (1999). The scale utilized a 5-point Likert scale and was administered to English speaking and French speaking Canadian high school students. Overall, mean scores were low indicating that students in this sample had negative attitudes toward male psychological dating violence. Reliability for this scale among male participants was very good (α = .85; N=442).

The new measure was created specifically for urban Black men. Items and wording were developed specifically to increase cultural appropriateness for this population. Several items were added in the new scale to reflect the direct experiences of men in this population regarding their attitudes about dating violence perpetrated by a woman. The

184

new measure also includes items regarding the use of various technological tools that may be used to perpetrate certain types of dating violence that may not have been of concern when the Attitude Toward Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale was developed.

Perceived Susceptibility and Perceived Severity Scales

The original Perceived Susceptibility Scale was developed from the Perceived Susceptibility to Marital Problems Scale and the original Perceived Severity Scale was developed from the Perceived Severity to Marital Problems scale (Sullivan, 2004). The Perceived Susceptibility Scale began with three items and the final scale included nine items. The Perceived Severity Scale began with four items and the final scale included six items. Both the Perceived Susceptibility to Marital Problems and Perceived Severity to Marital Problems scales were developed by Sullivan et al. (2004) as a part of a larger premarital prevention program using constructs from the Health Belief Model. All items on the instrument utilized a 5-point Likert scale and were administered to newly married couples between the ages of 20 – 54 years old. A total of seventy-six couples (76 men) completed the survey, of which 3.6% were African American men. Reliability was reported to be very good ($\alpha = .84$) for both the Perceived Susceptibility to Marital Problems and Perceived Severity to Marital Problems scales. No other psychometrics were reported.

Both the Perceived Susceptibility to Marital Problems and Perceived Severity to Marital Problems scales were very general and neither measured any specific marital problems or relationship violence acts. The newly develop perceived susceptibility and perceived severity scales were much more comprehensive than the original measures. Both included specific dating violence acts and included specific experiences identified by men who represented the target population.

185

Reward for Threatening & Controlling Behavior Scale

The reward for controlling behavior scale was developed from the Perceived Negative Sanctions Scale (Foshee, 2001). The scale began with three items and the final scale included eight items. The Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior Scale was developed by Foshee et al. (2001) as a part of a larger longitudinal study examining the predictors of adolescent dating violence. The scale utilized a 4-point Likert like scale and was administered to students in a predominantly rural area. Psychometric analysis of the survey was outside the scope of the Foshee study, however, reliability for the survey was assessed (α = .55; N=300). No other psychometrics was reported for the Reward for Threatening and Controlling Behavior Scale.

Similar to the perceived susceptibility and perceived severity scales, the Perceived Negative Sanctions scale developed by Foshee was extremely general and demonstrated low reliability. The new reward for controlling behavior scale is a much more comprehensive unidimensional measure and demonstrated considerably more reliability (α = .87) in the study sample.

Communication Skills Scale

The communication skills scale was developed from the Interpersonal Communication Inventory (Bienvenu, 1971) and the Verbal Aggressiveness Scale (Infante and Wigley, 1986). The scale began with sixty-four items and the final scale included six items. The Verbal Aggressiveness Scale was developed by Infante and Wigley (1986). The scale utilized a 5-point Likert scale and was administered to a sample of students attending a large Midwestern university. The average mean score for the scale was 49.10; however the range was not reported. It is assumed, however that the range was 20-100 based on

the response options and total number of items on the scale. Reliability for this scale

among the sample was good (α = .81; N=209). In addition, factor analysis of this scale

provided evidence of a two-factor solution. All items that loaded on the first factor were

worded positively and the factors that loaded on the second factor were worded negatively.

The researchers concluded that the scale was unidimensional and the latent variable being

measured was due to wording of the items.

The Interpersonal Communication Inventory (fourty items) and the Verbal

Aggressiveness Scale (twenty items) are long, especially if they are used with other

measures in data collection methodology. The new Communication Skills Scale includes

only 6 items which reduces participant burden and makes it feasible to use with other

measures in a study. In addition, the Interpersonal Communication Inventory was

developed to measure one's own communication type, characteristics, patterns, and style

(Pfiefer, 1974). The Verbal Aggressiveness Scale also measures characteristics of one's

own communication characteristics. The new Communication Skills Scale was developed

to measure the communication characteristics that one experiences from another person,

specifically the communication characteristics a man experiences from a woman. In

addition, the new Communication Skills Scale measures two latent communication skills

variables; positive communication skills and negative communication skills.

Girlfriend Behaviors and Self-Behaviors Scales
The "Girlfriend Behaviors" scale began with eight items and the final scale included

twelve items. The "Self-Behaviors" scale began with eight items and the final scale included

eleven items. The original behaviors scale was developed from the Revised Conflict Tactics

Scale (CTS-R) which is a shorter version of the original Conflict Tactics Scale. The Conflict

Tactics Scale (CTS) was developed by Strauss (1979) to measure the frequency of abuse experiences by couples (Price, 1999) and has been considered a "gold standard" instrument for measuring the frequency of some forms of relationship violence. Straus reported varying reliability (α range from .77 - .88) for the verbal abuse subscale.

Although the CTS has been regarded as the gold standard measure for relationship abuse, the newly developed girlfriend behaviors and self-behaviors scales add to the domestic violence arena. First, the new measures were created specifically for urban Black men. Items and wording were developed specifically to increase cultural appropriateness for this population. Several items were added in the new scales to reflect the direct experiences of men in this population regarding non-physical dating violence victimization which increases the content validity of the measure. Finally, the new measure also includes the use of various technological tools that may be used to perpetrate certain types of non-physical dating violence that may not have been of concern when the CTS was developed.

STUDY STRENGTHS

There are several strengths associated with the study. Before this study, there were no known evaluation tools that had been developed to specifically address dating violence victimization risk among young urban Black males between the ages of 18-25. This is the first research of its kind, as there are no known studies specifically targeting a community sample of urban Black young adult males outside of hospital emergency departments.

The current gold standard instrument (CTS) used to assess dating violence factors only measures the types of violent acts committed in a relationship and the frequency of those acts

(Cantos, 1994). The CTS does not measure any of the contextual factors that may be associated with DV and does not assess the risk for becoming a DV victim.

The new instrument may be used to not only identify the types and frequency of DV acts committed by woman against their boyfriends, but also measure some of the risk factors associated with male victimization of DV (i.e. attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, behaviors, acceptability). This study provides preliminary evidence of the adequate reliability of the instrument and its ability to assess the risk of urban black men becoming victims of DV perpetrated by their girlfriends which is a unique contribution to this area of study.

Another strength of the study is that a community sample of Black men were recruited to assess the psychometric properties of the instrument. Previous studies that analyzed DV factors that included some African American male respondents recruited samples from emergency departments or colleges (Mulleman, 1998; Mechem, 1999; Rhodes, 2009). Results from emergency department samples only capture data from men who have been physically hurt enough to seek medical attention from the emergency department, and results from college samples only captures data from men who have the financial resources and academic attainment qualities to seek higher education (Mechem, 1999). Although the findings from these bodies of research are valuable, they are less generalizable to the population. Using a community sample from central Brooklyn may ultimately increase the external validity of the findings and the results can more confidently be generalized to other Black males from this area of New York City.

Finally, this study used qualitative and quantitative methodology to develop and assess the psychometric properties of the instrument items. Face and content validity of the instrment may have been increased during the formative (qualitative) phase of the study by utilizing

189

responses from a representative sample of community members and expert panelists to ensure that the appropriate risk factors and behaviors were addressed and measured with the instrument. Qualitative data were also used to ensure that the instrument was culturally appropriate in tone, language, understandability, and to assess the burden (time) of taking the survey. The quantitative phase of the study ensured that the scales and subscales of the instrument were statistically appropriate and reliable measures to use in this population.

STUDY LIMITATIONS

There were several limitations associated with the study. Only very limited resources were available to conduct this study and the primary (student) investigator funded the project from personal financial resources. The limitation of resources greatly affected the number of participants who were recruited to participate in all phases of the study.

This instrument focuses only on mental DV and does not address any physical abuse that men may suffer from girlfriends. Due to limited resources, only two general focus groups and one instrument pre-test (cognitive testing) focus group to inform the factors that should be measured with the instrument were conducted. As a result, the primary investigator is not confident that the qualitative data collected reached saturation and some important factors that should be assessed may not have been captured in the study.

In addition, there was no triangulation of data collected during the formative phase of the study. As a result, some of the data collected from individual participants during the focus groups may have been influenced by the group dynamics. One-on-one interviews with participants would have been an appropriate method to demonstrate triangulation, however, limited time and resources for the project prevented these activities. Sampling bias during the formative phase may have also affected the focus group and cognitive testing results.

Participants were recruited through convenience sampling methodology. Many of the young men who were recruited during this phase of the study used to be members of an anti-tobacco youth program coordinated by the primary investigator four years ago. These young men also recruited other participants following a snowball sampling protocol. Since these men may have had some similar experiences during their adolescent devolvement, they may not fully represent the variability in the population of men who live in central Brooklyn, especially men who did not participate in any developmentally enriching experiences during their teen years.

Results of the quantitative phase of the study are based on self-reported data. Self-reported data may be biased due to participants giving socially desirable responses or failing to accurately remember information about which they are being asked. Results may not be generalizable to Black men in other parts of New York City, other cities, in rural locations, or men in general who do not identify as Black or African American. Therefore, the new tool is not valid or reliable among populations that are not represented in the study sample. Future studies will need to be conducted among various samples of men to assess validity and reliability for other populations.

Finally, the internal consistency of scale items was assessed by only one measure, the Cronbach's coefficient alpha. Although this measure is widely used in scale reliability techniques, many researchers also use test-retest reliability assessment. Due to the study design and sampling procedures, test-retest was not possible in this research and may be addressed in future studies.

STUDY IMPLICATIONS

The current study was the first step in developing a set of valid and reliable psychometrically sound measures that can be used to measure the experiences and risk of dating violence victimization among urban Black young adult males. As previously stated, results from the current study provide preliminary evidence of the reliability of nine new measures. In the next phases of the development of these measures, data will be collected from Black men in other areas of New York City including Manhattan (Harlem), Queens (Jamaica), and the Bronx. In addition to other Black male populations, data will be collected from men of other ethnicities (i.e. Latino and Caucasian) in New York City. Confirmatory factor analysis procedures will be conducted to increase evidence of the stability, validity, and utility of the newly developed measures. The ultimate goal for this instrument is the general use among urban American men regardless of racial/ethnic background.

The long-term goal of the primary investigator's research trajectory is to reduce DV victimization and increase positive relationship experiences among young men. In order to embark on this research path, there needed to be some tools to measure key factors associated with male victimization of DV, of which there were none previous to the current research project. An instrument was needed that captured the factors essential to understanding men's experiences with DV perpetrated by their girlfriends. The logical order of a body of research includes observational, relational, and causal studies (Trochim, 2008). In order to establish evidence of a causal relationship among factors (causal study), we need to know which factors are related to each other. In order to establish which factors are related to each other (relational study), we need to know the key factors of a phenomena (observational study). In order to establish the key factors, we need a valid and reliable measurement instrument.

In the case of male victimization of DV perpetrated by a girlfriend, there was no known measurement instrument. In order for the primary investigator to embark on this research path, it was necessary to develop the measurement instrument. Now that an instrument has been developed, observational and relational studies can be conducted. Results from the observational and relational studies can be used to develop translational research projects to ultimately reduce DV victimization among men. More specifically, the instrument developed from this research may be used by professionals working with urban African American young adults to: 1) assess the risk of DV victimization, 2) understand the behaviors associated with DV victimization, and 3) prevent DV victimization through tailored interventions and policy.

The new instrument may be used to study the incidence and prevalence of dating violence victimization among Black men in central Brooklyn for NYCDOHMH epidemiologists and other domestic violence and relationship professionals. It may also be used as a risk assessment screening tool for professionals who work in the IPV arena, in medical facilities, in community-based and faith-based organizations that serve the central Brooklyn community. Since most of the research in this field has been conducted under the assumption that the male is always the perpetrator, this instrument may be used by researchers, educators, and interventionists to more objectively assess the characteristics of male victims of dating violence (Hamberger, 1994; Houry, 2008). Some researchers have suggested that it may be necessary to develop interventions and policies specifically for men who are victims of DV and currently, there are no treatment or referral recommendations published to address male victims of DV perpetrated by their girlfriends (Follingstad, 1991; Coker, 2002; Rhodes, 2009). This instrument may be used to identify the key factors to be addressed in health promotion programs and interventions targeting men who may be victims of DV.

In addition, the instrument may be used by medical professionals to assess risk of male patients who present injuries consistent with dating violence. It may also be modified for individual men to self-administer and assess their own risk of DV victimization using social media and web-based technologies. These men may be able to take the survey, tally their score, and make healthier relationship decisions based on the results. This may allow men to identify potential problems with partners early in the relationship (i.e. jealousy, poor anger control, stalking behaviors, possessiveness, relationship insecurity) so that they can reduce their risk of victimization by not getting too deeply involved with women who display these characteristics. This tool may also be modified to be tested and used with adolescent boys, men representing other socio-demographic populations, and women/girls who may be at risk for becoming DV perpetrators.

Lastly, this instrument may allow us to determine some of the intrapersonal factors associated with men who allow themselves to be subjected to these unhealthy relationship characteristics. If it is true that men are at increased risk to perpetrate abuse when faced with these relationship dynamics, perhaps one way to reduce the incidence and prevalence of unidirectional male-to-female IPV (where women tend to suffer more significant physical injuries) and bi-directional IPV, is to help men end these relationships before IPV develops. Since a man has a greater risk of physically harming a female partner (when she does not have a weapon), it could be argued that he has the greater responsibility to identify IPV risk and intervene appropriately.

APPENDIX A

Thank you for agreeing to take this survey. It will take about <u>10 minutes</u> for you to answer all of the questions. By answering the questions on this survey, <u>you are giving consent</u> of your participation in this project. You do not have to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable with answering. You can stop taking the survey at any time. Please <u>do not write your name</u> on this survey because your answers are confidential. You will receive a round trip MetroCard for completing this survey.

1. **What is your gender?** ☐ $_0$ Male ☐ $_1$ Female ☐ $_3$ Transgender

2. **What is your date of birth?** _____/_____/_____
   (mm)   (dd)   (yyyy)

3. **What is your Race?** ☐ $_0$ Black ☐ $_1$ Black & Latino ☐ $_2$ Black mixed with race other than Latino

4. **What is your Nationality? (the country that you consider your home country)**

   ☐ $_0$ American   ☐ $_1$ Caribbean American (English Speaking Country)

   ☐ $_2$ Caribbean American (Spanish Speaking Country)   ☐ $_3$ Caribbean American (French Speaking Country)

   ☐ $_4$ Black American from an African Country

5. **Where was your mother born?** ☐ $_0$ USA ☐ $_1$ Caribbean ☐ $_2$ Africa ☐ $_3$ Other ☐ $_4$ I don't know

6. **Where was your father born?** ☐ $_0$ USA ☐ $_1$ Caribbean ☐ $_2$ Africa ☐ $_3$ Other ☐ $_4$ I don't know

7. **Were you born in the United States?** ☐ $_0$ No   ☐ $_1$ Yes

8. **Is English your first language?** ☐ $_0$ No   ☐ $_1$ Yes

9. **What is your relationship status?**

   ☐ $_0$ Single and not currently dating/sexing ☐ $_1$ Single and dating/sexing 1 girl ☐ $_2$ Single and dating/sexing more than 1 girl

   ☐ $_3$ Faithful to 1 girlfriend   ☐ $_4$ Have a girlfriend, and also dating or sexing other girls

10. **How long has it been since you had a girlfriend or dating relationship?**

    ☐ $_0$ Less than 1 Month   ☐ $_1$ 1-3 Months ☐ $_2$ 3-6 Months ☐ $_3$ 6 Months-1 Year ☐ $_4$ More and a Year ☐ $_4$ I have at least 1 girl/dating partner

14. **What is your highest level of education?**

    ☐ $_0$ High School or less
    ☐ $_1$ Trade School/Vocational School
    ☐ $_2$ Associates Degree (2-year program)
    ☐ $_3$ College Degree (4-year program)
    ☐ $_4$ Master's Degree
    ☐ $_5$ Doctoral Degree (MD, JD, PhD, EdD, DDS)

15. **What is your employment status?**

    ☐ $_0$ Employed full time
    ☐ $_1$ Employed part time
    ☐ $_2$ Employed full time and attend school
    ☐ $_3$ Employed part time and attend school
    ☐ $_4$ Attend school only

16. **What is your income level per year?**

    ☐ $_0$ Less than $10,000
    ☐ $_1$ $10,000 – 19,999
    ☐ $_2$ $20,000 – 29,999
    ☐ $_3$ $30,000 – 39,999
    ☐ $_4$ $40,000 – 49,999
    ☐ $_5$ $50,000 – 59,000
    ☐ $_6$ More than $60,000

17. **Who do you live with?**

    ☐ $_0$ Live alone
    ☐ $_1$ Live alone with your child or children
    ☐ $_2$ Live with parent or guardian
    ☐ $_3$ Live with roommate(s)
    ☐ $_4$ Live with girlfriend/dating partner

Please **CIRCLE the answer** that best describes how you feel or what you think about each statement or question on this survey. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers.

Section 1

This set of questions asks about your knowledge about mental abuse in a dating relationship.

	Is it mental abuse in your relationship if…..			
1	Your girlfriend acts jealous over you?	No_0	Not $Sure_1$	Yes_2
2	Your girlfriend calls you bad names?	No_0	Not $Sure_1$	Yes_2
3	Your girlfriend keeps calling your phone or texting you over and over again?	No_0	Not $Sure_1$	Yes_2
4	Your girlfriend demands to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	No_0	Not $Sure_1$	Yes_2
5	Your girlfriend stops you from leaving someplace or corners you against your will?	No_0	Not $Sure_1$	Yes_2
6	Your girlfriend uses sex to get you to do what she wants?	No_0	Not $Sure_1$	Yes_2
7	Your girlfriend uses guilt to get you to do what she wants?	No_0	Not $Sure_1$	Yes_2
8	Your girlfriend uses threats to get you to do what she wants?	No_0	Not $Sure_1$	Yes_2

Section 2

Now, we would like to ask about how you feel about mental abuse in a dating relationship and how likely you think you will experience it.

1	Is it okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at you?	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
2	Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to hit or throw something at you?	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
3	Is it okay for your girlfriend to destroy something of yours?	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
4	Is it okay for your girlfriend to accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance?	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
5	Is it okay for your girlfriend to follow you?	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
6	Is it okay for your girlfriend to stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will?	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
7	Is it okay for your girlfriend to go through your phone e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter?	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
8	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you it you cheated on her.	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
9	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you didn't answer the phone when she called.	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
10	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you committed dating violence against her first.	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2
11	Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if she is not sexually satisfied.	No_0	$Sometimes_1$	Yes_2

		Not Likely Likely				Very
1	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will act jealous over you?	1	2	3	4	5
2	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names?	1	2	3	4	5
3	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call your phone or text you over and over again?	1	2	3	4	5
4	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts?	1	2	3	4	5
5	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	1	2	3	4	5

6	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will?	1	2	3	4	5
7	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use sex to get you to do what she wants?	1	2	3	4	5
8	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use guilt to get you to do what she wants?	1	2	3	4	5
9	How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use threats to get you to do what she wants?	1	2	3	4	5

		Very Bad Bad				Not At All
1	How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you?	1	2	3	4	5
2	How bad would it be if your girlfriend called you bad names?	1	2	3	4	5
3	How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again?	1	2	3	4	5
4	How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts?	1	2	3	4	5
5	How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded to know where you are or who you are with at all times?	1	2	3	4	5
6	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used sex to get you to do what she wanted?	1	2	3	4	5
7	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used guilt to get you to do what she wanted?	1	2	3	4	5
8	How bad would it be if your girlfriend used threats to get you to do what she wanted?	1	2	3	4	5

Section 3

In this section of questions, we would like to ask you what you think you would do if you experienced mental abuse and what types of mental abuse you may have experienced in dating relationships.

	What would you do if your girlfriend:					
1	Often acted jealous over you	Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$
2	Often called you bad names	Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$
3	Often called your phone or texted you over and over again	Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$

197

#		Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$
4	Often demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts	Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$
5	Often demanded to know where you are or who you are with	Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$
6	Often stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will	Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$
7	Often used sex to get you to do what she wants	Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$
8	Often used guilt to get you to do what she wants	Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$
9	Often used threats to get you to do what she wants	Do Nothing or Ignore her$_0$	Do what she wants me to do$_1$	Do to her what she did to me$_2$	Get back at her in some other way$_3$	Break up with her$_4$

	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often:					
1	Did you do what your girlfriend wanted to do instead of doing what you wanted to do when you were spending time together?	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
2	Did you come to an agreement together about what you were going to do when you were spending time together?	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
3	Did your girlfriend tell you who you could hang out with?	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
4	Did you only hang out with people your girlfriend approved of instead of who you wanted to hang out with?	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
5	Did your girlfriend get upset when you spent time with people that she did not approve of?	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
6	Did your girlfriend want all of your free time to be spent with her?	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
7	Did your girlfriend invite herself along when you made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited?	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$

Section 4

The next set of questions asks about how you think your current girlfriend or ex-girlfriend (if you are single) communicates with you.

#						
1	When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the time to explain to her exactly how I feel	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
2	When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she puts words in my mouth	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
3	When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without yelling or screaming	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
4	My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
5	My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
6	My girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
7	If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$
8	My girlfriend will yell and scream at me to get me to do what she wants	None of the Time $_0$	Some of the Time$_1$	Half of the Time$_2$	Most of Time$_3$	All of Time$_4$

The next set of questions asks about your experiences with mental dating abuse.

	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did your girlfriend do the following to you when she was upset with you?					
1	Insult or curse at you	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
2	Yell or scream at you	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
3	Threaten to hit or throw something at you	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
4	Destroy something of yours	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
5	Call you bad names	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
6	Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performa	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
7	Follow you	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
8	Prevent you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
9	Go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
10	Demand to know where you are or who you are with	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
11	Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
12	Threaten your friends or family members	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times

	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did you do the following to your girlfriend when you were upset with her?					
1	Insult or curse at her	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
2	Yell or scream at her	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
3	Threaten to hit or throw something at her	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
4	Destroy something of hers	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
5	Call her bad names	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
6	Accuse her of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performa	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
7	Follow her	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
8	Prevent her from leaving or corner her against her will	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
9	Go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without her permission or demand to go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
10	Demand to know where she is or who she is with	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
11	Threaten to get her fired or go to her job to argue	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times
12	Threaten her friends or family members	0 Times	1 Time	2 Times	3 Times	More than 3 Times

**Urban Black Male's Perceptions and Experiences with
Dating Violence Perpetrated by their Girlfriends**

<u>FOCUS GROUP GUIDE</u>

A.   Introduction (5 minutes)

Good Afternoon, my name is _____, and I'll be your moderator today. Thank you for agreeing to participate and welcome to our focus group discussion. A focus group is a small group discussion that centers on a particular topic in depth. Today we will be talking about the dating violence experiences of young urban Black men such as you. I'm not an expert in the topic we'll be discussing and we are not here to give you information. We are here to listen to your ideas and thoughts on these issues.

In a focus group, there are no right or wrong answers, only opinions, and we would like to hear from each of you equally. It's important that we hear what each of you thinks, because your thoughts may be similar to the thoughts of other young men who aren't here in this room today. Your ideas are extremely important to us, and we're interested in your comments and opinions. Please feel free to speak up even if you disagree with someone else here. It's OK to disagree, because it's helpful for us to hear different points of view. We are also interested in any questions you may have as we go along. We have a lot of ground to cover in the next couple of hours, so just to keep us on schedule; I may jump ahead to the next topic from time to time, but please stop me if you want to add anything.

We are digitally audio-recording our discussion. Everything you say is important to us and we want to make sure we don't miss any of your comments. Later, we'll go through the audio-recording and our notes and use them to create a survey for young urban men who may be at risk for experiencing dating violence behaviors from their girlfriend. Later, we may use the information we learn from you to write general reports, but no names will be used in any reports we may write. We want to assure you, however, that all of your comments are confidential and will be used only for research purposes. Nothing you say will be connected with your name and if you prefer you can use a different name from your real name. We will only be using first names during our discussion. Also if there are any questions you would prefer not to answer, please feel free not to respond to them.

As I mentioned, we will be taping this discussion. I will start the tape recorder now. Just to confirm that you are all aware that we are recording this and we have your permission to do so, let's go around the circle and each person say their first name ONLY, or the name you would like to go by in the group. Immediately after you say your first name, say "I agree to be audio-recorded" and we can begin the discussion.

[BEGIN AUDIO RECORDER]

Ice Breaker
Before we begin with the questioning, ask you all a few questions to get us thinking about dating relationships and dating violence. I would like to just go around the group and first have you all tell me all of the names that you use to describe dating relationships and the difference between each one.

Probe: We have heard terms like girlfriend, wifey, main chick. Are there others?

Now, I would like for you all to tell me what comes to mind when I say "dating violence"?

How about dating violence that girlfriends commit against their boyfriends?

Probe: Ask the group what types of dating violence do girlfriends commit in the following categories: verbal dating violence, emotional dating violence, physical dating violence, dating violence with cell phones and/or with social media (i.e. Facebook and Twitter).

Now that we have a better idea of what we mean by "dating relationships" and dating violence, I would like for you to keep these terms in mind as we go through the rest of our discussion. Today, I will be asking you all to help us develop a new survey for young Black men to find out what types of verbal and emotional dating violence experiences they may have had with a current girlfriend or ex-girlfriend. This new survey is going to be given to young Black men in Brooklyn at subway stops. We have handed out to you all a rough draft of the list of questions and now we will discuss the list of questions section by section. In each section, I will read each question aloud as you read along on your paper. I will give you all a few minutes to review each section silently and then I will be asking you how we can better ask each question so that young men like you will best understand the question. I will also be asking you all to suggest any additional questions that might help us better understand dating relationships. There may also be some questions that make no sense at all, and you may suggest that they should be removed.

B.   Knowledge and Beliefs about Dating Violence
In this section of the survey, we want to get a sense of what the men know and believe about dating violence they may have experienced from their girlfriends.

The moderator will read all of the questions aloud in the "Knowledge and Beliefs about Dating Violence" section of the survey rough draft. The Moderator will ask the following questions once the participants have had a moment to silently review the section for themselves.

1.   What questions in this section need to be re-worded and how should we re-word them?
2.   What questions in this section are hard to understand and how can we make them more understandable?
3.   What questions should be added to this section to make sure we get all of the important points regarding what young men may know or believe about dating violence committed by girlfriends?
4.   What questions should be eliminated and why?

C.   **Attitudes about men's dating violence experiences**
      The next section of the survey will ask men about what they think or feel about verbal and emotional dating violence.

      The moderator will read all of the questions aloud in the "Attitudes about Men's Dating Violence Experiences" section of the survey rough draft. The Moderator will ask the following questions once the participants have had a moment to silently review the section for themselves.

   5.   What questions in this section need to be re-worded and how should we re-word them?
   6.   What questions in this section are hard to understand and how can we make them more understandable?
   7.   What questions should be added to this section to make sure we get all of the important points regarding what young men may think or feel about dating violence committed by girlfriends?
   8.   What questions should be eliminated and why?

   9.   What do men think about using the word "abused", "battered", "victim" to describe themselves in relationships with women?

   10.   What do men think about seeking help for getting out of a relationship where his girlfriend commits dating violence against him?

D.   **Types of dating violence men experience from their girlfriends (Behaviors)**
      Next, we would like to know exactly what types of verbal and emotional dating violence actions girls commit against their boyfriends.

      The moderator will read all of the questions aloud in the "Types of Dating Violence Behaviors" section of the survey rough draft. The Moderator will ask the following questions once the participants have had a moment to silently review the section for themselves.

   11.   What questions in this section need to be re-worded and how should we re-word them?
   12.   What questions in this section are hard to understand and how can we make them more understandable?
   13.   What questions should be added to this section to make sure we understand all of the types of dating violence young men may experience from their girlfriends?
   14.   What questions should be added to this section to make sure we understand all of the ways young men react when they experience dating violence from their girlfriends?
   15.   What questions should be added to this section to make sure we understand all of the ways young men seek help when they experience dating violence from their girlfriends?
   16.   What questions should be eliminated and why?

E. **The likelihood that you will experience dating violence from a girlfriend (susceptibility)**
In this section, we would like to know how likely it is for young men to experience dating violence from their girlfriends.

The moderator will read all of the questions aloud in the "Likelihood You Will Experience Dating Violence" section of the survey rough draft. The Moderator will ask the following questions once the participants have had a moment to silently review the section for themselves.

17. What questions in this section need to be re-worded and how should we re-word them?
18. What questions in this section are hard to understand and how can we make them more understandable?
19. What questions should be added to this section to make sure we get all of the important points regarding what young men may think about how likely it is they will experience dating violence committed by their girlfriends?
20. What questions should be eliminated and why?

F. **How negative dating violence experiences are for young men (severity)**
The next set of survey questions are about how negative or dangerous men think it is to experience dating violence from their girlfriends.

The moderator will read all of the questions aloud in the "How Severe Dating Violence is for Young Men" section of the survey rough draft. The Moderator will ask the following questions once the participants have had a moment to silently review the section for themselves.

21. What questions in this section need to be re-worded and how should we re-word them?
22. What questions in this section are hard to understand and how can we make them more understandable?
23. What questions should be added to this section to make sure we get all of the important points regarding what positive or negative consequence young men may have if they experience dating violence committed by their girlfriends?
24. What questions should be eliminated and why?

G. **How men have learned to become victims of dating violence perpetrated by their girlfriends (Learning the Behavior)**
These survey questions will ask about all the ways men may have learned to experience dating violence from their girlfriends.

The moderator will read all of the questions aloud in the "Learning the Behavior" section of the survey rough draft. The Moderator will ask the following questions once the participants have had a moment to silently review the section for themselves.

25. What questions in this section need to be re-worded and how should we re-word them?
26. What questions in this section are hard to understand and how can we make them more understandable?
27. What questions should be added to this section to make sure we get all of the ways and from whom young men may learn to experience dating violence committed by their girlfriends?
28. What questions should be added to this section to make sure we get all of the ways young men may reward their girlfriends when she commits dating violence against him?
29. What questions should be eliminated and why?

H. How girlfriends have the opportunity to abuse their boyfriends
These questions will ask about things that may increase the opportunity for girlfriends to commit dating violence acts against their boyfriends.

The moderator will read all of the questions aloud in the "How Girlfriends have the Opportunity to Abuse" section of the survey rough draft. The Moderator will ask the following questions once the participants have had a moment to silently review the section for themselves.

30. What questions in this section need to be re-worded and how should we re-word them?
31. What questions in this section are hard to understand and how can we make them more understandable?
32. What questions should be added to this section to make sure we get all of the important ways girlfriends have power over their boyfriends or keep their boyfriends from his family or friends?
33. What questions should be eliminated and why?

I. Things that affect a girlfriend's choice to abuse her boyfriend or a boyfriend's choice to be abused by his girlfriend
We also know that there are lots of things that influence a girlfriend's choice to commit dating violent acts and lots of things that influence a boyfriend's choice to stay in a relationship where he is experiencing dating violence from his girlfriend. The next set of questions asks about some of those things.

The moderator will read all of the questions aloud in the "Girlfriends Choice to Commit Dating Violence" section of the survey rough draft. The Moderator will ask the following questions once the participants have had a moment to silently review the section for themselves.

34. What questions in this section need to be re-worded and how should we re-word them?
35. What questions in this section are hard to understand and how can we make them more understandable?
36. What questions should be added to this section to make sure we get all of the ways girlfriends:
   A) Communicate with their boyfriends when they have a problem?
   B) Lose control when there is a problem in the relationship?
37. What questions should be added to this section to make sure we understand all of the ways young men feel about:
   A) Girls who commit dating violence against their boyfriends?
   B) Other men who may be abused by their girlfriends?
38. What questions should be added to this section to make sure we understand when it would be okay for a girlfriend to commit dating violence against her boyfriend?
39. What questions should be eliminated and why?

Gentlemen, this concludes our discussion today. Before we wrap up, I would like to ask you two more questions:

40. Is there anything about verbal and emotional dating violence that you think is important that we did not ask you here today? If so, what?

41. Is there anything else you think we should be concerned about regarding young men's experiences with dating violence?

Thank you so much for your time and participation.

APPENDIX C
Scale Development Table (Detailed) Round 1

Scale	Original Items	BG Items	Modifications After FG 1
Knowledge 1	**VicHealth's 2006 Community Attitudes to Violence Against Women Survey (pg16)** 1. Domestic violence is a criminal offense 2. Most people who experience domestic violence are reluctant to go to the police 3. Most people turn a blind eye to, or ignore domestic violence 4. It's hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships 5. Domestic violence is more likely to occur in migrant families 6. Domestic violence is a private matter to be handled in the family 7. Domestic violence rarely happens in wealthy neighborhoods 8. Police now respond more quickly to domestic violence calls than they did in the past 9. Domestic violence can be excused if it results from people getting so angry that they temporarily lose control 10. Domestic violence can be excused if THE VICTIM is heavily affected by alcohol 11. Domestic violence can be excused in THE OFFENDER is heavily affected by alcohol 12. Most women could leave a violent relationship if they really want to 13. In domestic situations where one partner is physically violent towards the other it is entirely reasonable for the violent person to be made to leave the family home 14. Domestic violence can be excused if, afterwards, the violent person genuinely regrets what they have done 15. Women going through custody battles often make up or exaggerate claims of domestic violence in order to improve their case **Knowledge About Relationship Violence (pg17)** 1. Parents who were abused as children are more likely to abuse their own children 2. Victims of abusive relationships may be male or female 3. Poor people are more abusive in relationships than other groups 4. Abusive behavior between dating partners usually ends when they get married 5. Popular and successful people are not as likely to abuse their own children 6. A dating partner who always wants to be in charge and make all the decisions might become abusive 7. If you make up after being abused, it won't happen again	1. Most people turn a blind eye to, or ignore domestic violence. 2. It's hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships. 3. Psychological dating violence is more likely to happen to females rather than males. 4. Domestic violence rarely happens in wealthy neighborhoods. 5. Most women could leave a violent relationship if they really want to. 6. Victims of abusive relationships may be male or female. 7. Poor people are more abusive in relationships than other groups. 8. Abusive behavior between dating partners usually ends when they get married. 9. Popular and successful people are not as likely to abuse their own children. 10. A dating partner who always wants to be in charge and make all the decisions might become abusive.	1. Do you think most people pretend not to see domestic violence? 2. Do you think it's hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships? 3. Do you think psychological dating violence is more likely to happen to females rather than males? 4. Do you think domestic violence rarely happens in wealthy neighborhoods? 5. Do you think Victims of abusive relationships can be male? 6. Do you think most women could leave a violent relationship if they really want to? 7. Do you think most men could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to? 8. Do you think poor people are more abusive in relationships than other groups? 9. Do you think abusive behavior between dating partners usually ends when they get married? 10. Do you think popular and successful people are not as likely to abuse their own children? 11. Do you think a dating partner who always wants to be in charge and make all the decisions might become abusive?

Knowledge 2	BWG	The following actions that a girlfriend does to her boyfriend are types of psychological dating violence:
		   11. Jealousy
		   12. Coercion
			The following actions that a girlfrien her boyfriend
			Are types of psychological dating vio
			12. Acting jealous over you

206

		13. Name calling 14. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls 15. Repeated or back-to-back text messages 16. Demanding access to your e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 17. Demanding to know where you are at all times 18. Demanding to know who you are with at all times	13. Making you feel guilty about something 14. Calling you bad names 15. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls 16. Repeated or back-to-back text messages 17. Demanding access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 18. Demanding to know where you are at all times 19. Making plans for your time without asking you first 20. Demanding to know who you are with at all times 21. Not letting you leave when you want 22. Using sex to get you to do what she wants 23. Using guilt to get you to do what she wants
Behaviors	The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2): Development and Preliminary Psychometric Data. Straus 1996. Journal of Family Issues May 1996: 17: 283 Self-Report of Perpetration of Psychological Aggression Scale ($\alpha = .79$) 1. Insulted or swore at partner 2. Shouted at partner 3. Stomped out of room 4. Threatened to hit or throw something at partner 5. Destroyed something of partners 6. Did something to spite partner 7. Called partner fat or ugly 8. Accused partner of being a lousy lover	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did your girlfriend 19. Insulted or swore at you 20. Shouted at you 21. Stomped out of room 22. Threatened to hit or throw something at you 23. Destroyed something of yours 24. Did something to spite you 25. Called you fat or ugly 26. Accused you of being a lousy lover In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did you do the following to your girlfriend? 27. Insulted or swore at her 28. Shouted at her 29. Stomped out of room 30. Threatened to hit or throw something at her 31. Destroyed something of hers 32. Did something to spite her 33. Called her fat or ugly 34. Accused her of being a lousy lover	**In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did your girlfriend:** 1. Insulted or cursed at you 2. Yelled or screamed at you 3. Stomped out of the room 4. Threatened to hit or throw something at you 5. Destroyed something of your 6. Did something to get revenge on you 7. Called you fat or ugly 8. Accused you of being bad in bed or bad sex performance 9. Followed you 10. Prevented you from leaving or cornered you against your will 11. Gone through your phone or demanded to go through your phone 12. Stolen your phone or broken into your phone 13. Threatened to get you fired or come to your job to argue 14. Threatened your friends 15. Called the police on you to make a false report

			In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did you do the follow[...] your girlfriend
			16. Insulted or cursed at her
			17. Yelled or screamed at her
			18. Stomped out of the room
			19. Threatened to hit or throw something at her
			20. Destroyed something of hers
			21. Did something to get revenge on her
			22. Called her fat or ugly
			23. Accused her of being bad in bed or bad sex performance
			24. Prevented her from leaving or cornered her against her will
			25. Gone through her phone or demanded to go through her phone
			26. Stolen her phone or broken into her phone
			27. Threatened to get her fired or gone to her job to argue
			28. Called the police on her to make a false report
			29. Threatened her friends
Attitudes	**Attitude Toward Male Psychological Dating Violence Scale (pg15)** 1. A guy should not insult his girlfriend 2. A guy should not tell his girlfriend what to do 3. A girl should ask her boyfriend first before going out with her friends 4. Relationships always work best when girls please their boyfriends 5. There is never a reason for a guy to threaten his girlfriend 6. Sometimes guys just can't help but swear at their girlfriends 7. A girl should always change her ways to please her boyfriend 8. A girl should always do what her boyfriend tells her to do 9. A guy does not need to know his girlfriends every move 10. There is never a good enough reason for a guy to swear at his girlfriend 11. It is understandable when a guy gets too angry that he yells at his girlfriend 12. It is O.K. for a guy to bad mouth his girlfriend 13. There is never a reason for a guy to yell and scream at his girlfriend 14. A girl should not see her friends if it bothers her boyfriend 15. It is important for a girl to always dress the way here boyfriend wants	35. A girlfriend should not insult her boyfriend. 36. A girlfriend should not tell her boyfriend what to do. 37. A guy should ask his girlfriend first before going out with his friends. 38. Relationships always work best when guys please their girlfriends. 39. A guy should always change his ways to please his girl girlfriend. 40. A guy should always do what his girlfriend tells him to do. 41. A girlfriend does not need to know her boyfriend's every move. 42. It is abusive for a girl to yell at her boyfriend, even if she doesn't hit him.	1. It is okay for a girlfriend to insult her boyfriend 2. It is okay for girlfriend to tell her boyfriend what to do 3. A guy should ask his girlfriend first before going out with his friends 4. A guy should do what his girlfriend wants even if he does not want to do it 5. A guy should change his ways to please his girlfriend 6. A guy should do what his girlfriend tells him to do 7. A girlfriend should know her boyfriend's every move 8. It is okay for a girlfriend to yell at her boyfriend as long as she doesn't hit him

Perceived Susceptibility	**Susceptibility to Marital Problems (Sullivan, 2004)**
	
	1. Think you may have problems later on
	2. Likelihood that you will have marital problems
		How likely is it that you will experience the following from your current girlfriend or a future girlfriend?
		   43. Jealousy
		   44. Coercion
			How Likely is it that you will experience the following from your current girlfriend or a future girlfriend?

	3. How well could you handle problems	45. Name calling 46. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls 47. Repeated or back-to-back text messages 48. Demanding access to your e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 49. Demanding to know where you are at all times 50. Demanding to know who you are with at all times	1. Acting jealous over you 2. Making you feel guilty about something 3. Calling you bad names 4. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls 5. Repeated or back-to-back text messages 6. Demanding access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 7. Demanding to know where you are at all times 8. Demanding to know who you are with at all times 9. Making plans for your time without asking you first 10. Not letting you leave when you want 11. Using sex to get you to do what she wants 12. Using guilt to get you to do what she wants
Perceived Severity	**Severity to Marital Problems (Sullivan, 2004)** 1. How bad would it be if you experienced marital problems 2. How bad would it be if you had problems communicating 3. How bad would it be if you had a lot of conflict/arguments 4. How bad would it be if you had trouble in your marriage	How bad would it be if you experienced the following from your current girlfriend or a future girlfriend? 51. Jealousy 52. Coercion 53. Name calling 54. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls 55. Repeated or back-to-back text messages 56. Demanding access to your e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 57. Demanding to know where you are at all times 58. Demanding to know who you are with at all times	**How bad would it be if you experienced the following from your current girlfriend or a future girlfriend?** 1. Acting jealous over you 2. Making you feel guilty about something 3. Calling you bad names 4. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls 5. Repeated or back-to-back text messages 6. Demanding access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 7. Demanding to know where you are at all times 8. Demanding to know who you are with at all times 9. Making plans for your time without asking you first 10. Not letting you leave when you want 11. Using sex to get you to do what she wants 12. Using guilt to get you to do what

209

			she wants

Reward for Controlling and Threatening Behavior	**Perceived Negative Sanctions (pg18)**
	1. If I hit a dating partner he/she would break up with me
	2. Bad things happen to people who are violent to their dating
	3. If I hit a dating partner I would be arrested
		If your current or future girlfriend committed the following acts, what would you do?
		    59. Jealousy
		    60. Coercion
		    61. Name calling
		    62. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls
		    63. Repeated or back-to-back text messages
		    64. Demanding access to your e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts
		    65. Demanding to know where you are at all times
		    66. Demanding to know who you are with at all times
			If your current or future girlfriend committed the following acts, what would you do?
			1. Acted jealous over you
			2. Made you feel guilty about something
			3. Called you bad names
			4. Called you repeatedly over and over again
			5. Texted you repeatedly over and over again
			6. Demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts
			7. Demanded to know where you are at all times
			8. Demanded to know who you are with at all times
			9. Made plans for your time without asking you first
			10. Did not let you leave when you wanted to
			11. Used sex to get you to do what she wants
			12. Used guilt to get you to do what she wants

Power	**Sexual Relationship Power Scale – Relationship Control Subscale (pg12-13)** 1. If I asked my partner to use a condom, he would get violent 2. If I asked my partner to use a condom, he would get angry 3. Most of the time, we do what my partner wants to do 4. My partner won't let me wear certain things 5. When my partner and I are together, I'm pretty quiet 6. My partner has more say than I do about important decisions that affect us 7. My partner tells me who I can spend time with 8. If I asked my partner to use a condom, he would think I'm having sex 9. with other people 10. I feel trapped or stuck in our relationship 11. My partner does what he wants, even when I do not want him to 12. I am more committed to our relationship than my partner is 13. When my partner and I disagree, he gets his way most of the time 14. My partner gets more out of our relationship than I do 15. My partner always wants to know where I am 16. My partner might be having sex with someone else	67. Most of the time, we do what my girlfriend wants to do. 68. When my girlfriend and I are together, Im pretty quiet. 69. My girlfriend has more say than I do about important decisions that affect us. 70. I feel trapped or stuck in our relationship. 71. When my girlfriend and I disagree, she gets her way most of the time. 72. My girlfriend always wants to know where I am. 73. My girlfriend and I come to agreement together about what we want to do.	1. We do what my girlfriend wants to do 2. My girlfriend has more say than I do about important decisions that affect us 3. I feel trapped or stuck in our relationship 4. We come to agreement together about what we want to do 5. My girlfriend wants to know where I am 6. When my girlfriend and I disagree, she ends up getting her way 7. If we do something I like, my girlfriend gets a bad attitude
Isolation	BWG	74. A guy should not see his friends if it bothers his girlfriend.	1. My girlfriend tells me who I can spend time with

210

		75. My girlfriend tells me who I can spend time with.	2. I only hang out with people my girlfriend approves of 3. My girlfriend gets upset when I spend time with other people 4. My girlfriend assumes all of my free time should be spent with her 5. My girlfriend invites herself along when I have made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited
Poor Communication Skills	1. Attitudes About Dealing with Violence in Relationships (pg18). 2. When you are upset, it is best to tell the other person how you feel 3. If you believe you are being abused, or you are abusing someone else, you should talk to an adult who you think will help you 4. The first step in ending an abusive relationship is to tell yourself that you're going to make a change **Interpersonal Communication Inventory** 1. Do your words come out the way you would like them to in conversation 2. When you are asked a question that is not clear, do you ask the person to explain what he means 3. When you are trying to explain something, do other persons have a tendency to put words in your mouth 4. Do you merely assume the other person knows what you are trying to say without your explaining what you really mean 5. Do you ever ask the other person to tell you how he feels about the point you may be trying to make 6. Is it difficult for you to talk with other people 7. In conversation, do you talk about things which are of interest to both you and the other person 8. Do you find it difficult to express your ideas when they differ from those around you 9. In conversation, do you try to put yourself in the other person's shoes 10. In conversation, do you have a tendency to do more talking than the other person 11. Are you aware of how your tone of voice may affect others 12. Do you refrain from saying something that you know will hurt others or make matters worse 13. Is it difficult to accept constructive criticism from others 14. When someone has hurt your feelings, do you discuss this with him 15. Do you later apologize to someone whose feelings you may have hurt 16. Does it upset you a great deal when someone disagrees with you 17. Do you find it difficult to think clearly when you are angry with someone 18. Do you fail to disagree with others because you are afraid they will get angry 19. When a problem arises between you and another person, can you	76. When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the opportunity to explain to her exactly how I feel. 77. If I tell my girlfriend something and she does not understand what I said, she will ask me to explain. 78. When my girlfriend asks me a questions that I don't understand, she will carefully explain what she means. 79. When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she has a tendency to put words in my mouth. 80. My girlfriend assumes I know what she is trying to say without explaining what she really means. 81. My girlfriend asks me to tell her how I feel about the point she may be trying to make. 82. When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without getting verbally aggressive. 83. My girlfriend accepts constructive criticism from me. 84. My girlfriend later apologizes to me when she hurts my feelings. 85. My girlfriend gets upset a great deal when I disagree with her. 86. I don't disagree with my girlfriend because I don't want her to get angry. 87. When a problem arises between me and my girlfriend, she discusses it without getting angry. 88. My girl will pout, sulk, or get an attitude for a long time if I upset her. 89. In conversation, my girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say. 90. My girlfriend does not pay attention when I talk to her. 91. My girlfriend does not seem to listen to me when I am talking. 92. My girlfriend does not understand my feelings. 93. When my girlfriend is wrong about something, she admits it. 94. When my girlfriend is trying to influence my decision, she will attack my character.	1. When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the opportunity to explain to her exactly how I feel 2. If I tell my girlfriend something and she does not understand what I said, she will ask me to explain 3. When my girlfriend asks me a question that I don't understand, she will carefully explain what she means 4. When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she has a tendency to put words in my mouth 5. My girlfriend asks me to tell her how I feel about the point she may be trying to make 6. When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without getting verbally aggressive 7. My girlfriend accepts constructive criticism from me 8. My girlfriend later apologizes to me when she hurts my feelings 9. My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her 10. I don't disagree with my girlfriend because I don't want her to get angry 11. When a problem arises between me and my girlfriend, she discusses it without getting angry 12. My girl will, pout, sulk, or get an attitude for a long time if I upset her 13. In conversation, my girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say 14. My girlfriend does not pay attention when I talk to her 15. My girlfriend does not

211

discuss it without getting angry
20. Are you satisfied with the way you settle your differences with others
21. So you pout and sulk for a long time when someone upsets you
22. Do you become very uneasy when someone pays you a compliment
23. Generally, are you able to trust other individuals
24. Do you find it difficult to compliment and praise others
25. Do you deliberately try to conceal your faults from others
26. Do you help others to understand you by saying how you think, feel, and believe
27. Is it difficult for you to confide in people
28. Do you have a tendency to change the subject when your feelings enter into a discussion
29. In conversation, do you let the other persons finish talking before reacting to what he says
30. Do you find yourself not paying attention while in conversations with others
31. Do you ever try to listen for meaning when someone is talking
32. Do others seem to be listening when you are talking
33. In a discussion is it difficult for you to see things from the other person's point of view
34. Do you pretend you are listening to others when actually you are not
35. In conversation, can you tell the difference between what a person is saying and what he may be feeling
36. While speaking, are you aware of how others are reacting to what you are saying
37. Do you feel that other people wish you were a different kind of person
38. Do other people understand your feelings
39. Do others remark that you always seem to think you are right
40. Do you admit that you are wrong when you know that you are wrong about something

Verbal Aggressiveness Scale
1. I am extremely careful to avoid attacking individuals' intelligence when I attack their ideas
2. When individuals are very stubborn, I use insults to soften their stubbornness
3. I try very hard to avoid having other people feel bad about themselves when I try to influence them
4. When people refuse to do a task I know is important, without good reason, I tell them they are unreasonable
5. When others do things I regards as stupid, I try to be extremely gentle with them
6. If individuals I am trying to influence really deserve it, I attack their character
7. When people behave in ways that are in very poor taste, I insult them in order to shock them into proper behavior
8. I try to make people feel good about themselves even when their ideas are stupid
9. When people simply will not budge on a matter of importance I lose

95. If my girlfriend thinks I am behaving in a way that is in poor taste, she will insult me in order to shock me into proper behavior.
96. If I will not budge on a matter of importance, my girlfriend will lose her temper and say rather strong things to me.
97. My girlfriend likes poking fun at me if I do things that she thinks are stupid in order to stimulate my intelligence.
98. When my girlfriend tries to influence me, she makes a great effort not to offend me.
99. When nothing seems to work in trying to influence me, my girlfriend will yell and scream in order to get some movement from me.
100. When my girlfriend is not able to refute my position, she will try to make me feel defensive in order to weaken my position.

understand my feelings
16. When my girlfriend is wrong about something, she admits it
17. If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things
18. When my girlfriend tries to influence me, she makes a great effort not to offend me
19. When nothing seems to work in trying to influence me, my girlfriend will yell and scream in order to get some movement from me

	my temper and say rather strong things to them 10. When people criticize my shortcomings, I take it in good humor and do not try to get back at them 11. When individuals insult me, I get a lot of pleasure out of really telling them off 12. When I dislike individuals greatly, I try not to show it in what I say or how I say it 13. I like poking fun at people who do things that which are very stupid in order to stimulate their intelligence 14. When I attack a person's ideas, I try not to damage their self concepts 15. When I try to influence people, I make a great effort not to offend them 16. When people do things which are mean and cruel, I attack their character in order to help them correct their behavior 17. I refuse to participate in arguments when they involve personal attacks 18. When nothing seems to work in trying to influence others, I yell and scream in order to get some movement from them 19. When I am not able to refute others' positions, I try to make them feel defensive in order to weaken their positions 20. When an argument shifts to personal attacks, I try very hard to change the subject		
Poor Impulse Control	**Problem Solving Inventory – Impulse Style Scale** 1. When confronted with a problem, I tend to do the first thing that I can think of to solve it 2. Sometimes I do not stop and take time to deal with my problems, but just kind of muddle ahead 3. When deciding on an idea or possible solution to a problem, I do not take time to consider the chances of each alternative being successful 4. I generally go with the first idea that comes to mind 5. When I try to think up possible solutions to a problem, I do not come up with very many alternatives 6. Even though I work on a problem, sometimes I feel like I am groping or wandering, and am not getting down to the real issues 7. I make snap judgments and later regret them 8. When confronted with a problem, I do not usually examine what sort of external things in my environment may be contributing to my problem 9. Sometimes I get so charged up emotionally that I am unable to consider many ways of dealing with my problem	101. My girlfriend makes snap judgments and later regrets them. 102. My girlfriend becomes terribly upset and miserable when things are not the way she would like them to be.	1. My girlfriend makes quick judgments and later regrets them 2. My girlfriend becomes terribly upset and miserable when things are not the way she would like them to be
Distorted Ideas about Gender	**Gender Stereotyping (pg19)** 1. Most women can't be trusted 2. In a dating relationship the boy should be smarter than the girl 3. Girls are always trying to manipulate boys 4. In a dating relationship, the boy and girl should have about equal power 5. Swearing is worse for a girl then for a boy 6. On a date, the boy should be expected to pay all expenses 7. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in	103. Most girls can't be trusted. 104. In a dating relationship, the guy should be smarter than the girl. 105. Girls are always trying to manipulate guys. 106. In a dating relationship, the guy and girl should have about equal power. 107. Swearing is worse for a girl than for a guy. 108. On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses.	1. Most girls can't be trusted in a dating relationship the guy should be smarter than the girl 2. Girls are always trying to manipulate guys 3. In a dating relationship, the guy and girl should have about equal power 4. Swearing is worse for a girl then

	making family decisions 8. It is all right for a girl to ask a boy on a date 9. It is more important for boys than girls to do well in school 10. If both husband and wife have jobs, the husband should do a share of the house-work such as washing dishes and doing the laundry 11. Girls should have the same freedom as boys	109. It is all right for a girl to ask a guy on a date. 110. It is more important for guys than girls to do well in school. 111. Girls should have the same freedom as boys.	for a guy 5. On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses 6. It is all right for a girl to ask a guy on a date 7. It is more important for guys than girls to do well in school 8. Girls should have the same freedom as boys 9. If a guy pays for everything on a date, the girl owes him something 10. A guy should never say no to sex from a girl

Permissibility of Violence	**Acceptance and Expectation of Sexual Aggression Scale (Cook, 1995)**
	Justification Scale (Follingstad, 1988)
	(will need to focus group to develop a complete list, the complete list of 22 items not in the article)
	
	1. A boyfriend might use physical force against a girlfriend due to
	2. Loss of temper
	3. Mental illness
	4. Discipline
	5. Boyfriend's unhappiness about other aspects of his life
	6. Intoxication
		It would be acceptable for my girlfriend to commit psychological dating violence:
		    112. Under any circumstances
		    113. If I cheated
		    114. If I came home late
		    115. If I didn't answer the phone when she calls
		    116. If she believed I cheated
		    117. If I commit psychological dating violence against her
		    118. If she can't help it because she just lost her temper
		    119. Is she has a mental illness
		    120. If she is trying to discipline me
		    121. If she is unhappy about other aspects of her life
		    122. If she is drunk or high
			It would be acceptable for my girlfriend to commit psychological dating violence. Examples of dating violence might be texting or calling too much, going through my phone or e-mails, or disrespecting me in some other way.
			1. If I cheated
			2. If I came home late
			3. If I didn't answer the phone when she calls
			4. If she believed I cheated
			5. If I commit psychosocial dating violence against her
			6. If she can't help it because she just lost her temper
			7. If she has a mental illness
			8. If she is just trying to discipline me
			9. If she is unhappy about other aspects of her life
			10. If she is drunk or high
			11. If I don't make enough money
			12. If she is not sexually satisfied
			13. If I am unemployed
			14. If she has been a loyal girlfriend to me
			15. If she has forgiven me a lot for things I have done in the past

214

Scale Development Table (Detailed) Round 2

Scale	Modifications After FG 1	Modifications After FG 2	Modifications After Expert Panel Review
Knowledge 1	1. Do you think most people pretend not to see domestic violence? 2. Do you think it's hard to understand why women stay in violent relationships? 3. Do you think psychological dating violence is more likely to happen to females rather than males? 4. Do you think domestic violence rarely happens in wealthy neighborhoods? 5. Do you think Victims of abusive relationships can be male? 6. Do you think most women could leave a violent relationship if they really want to? 7. Do you think most men could leave a violent relationship if they really wanted to? 8. Do you think poor people are more abusive in relationships than other groups? 9. Do you think abusive behavior between dating partners usually ends when they get married? 10. Do you think popular and successful people are not as likely to abuse their own children? 11. Do you think a dating partner who always wants to be in charge and make all the decisions might become abusive?	1. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend acts jealous over you 2. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend calls you bad names 3. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend keeps calling your phone over and over again 4. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend keeps texting you over and over again 5. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend demands to look through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 6. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend demands to know where you are at all times 7. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend demands to know who you are with at all times 8. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend makes plans for your time without asking you first 9. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend does not letting you leave when you want 10. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend uses sex to get you to do what she wants 11. Is it dating violence if a girlfriend uses guilt to get you to do what she wants	**Is it mental abuse in your relationship if** 1. Your girlfriend acts jealous over you 2. Your girlfriend calls you bad names 3. Your girlfriend keeps calling your phone or texting you over and over again 4. Your girlfriend demands to look through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 5. Your girlfriend demands to know where you are or who you are with at all times 6. Your girlfriend stops you from leaving someplace or corners you against your will 7. Your girlfriend uses sex to get you to do what she wants 8. Your girlfriend uses threats to get you to do what she wants 9. Your girlfriend uses guilt to get you to do what she wants
Knowledge 2	**The following actions that a girlfriend does to her boyfriend** **Are types of psychological dating violence:** 12. Acting jealous over you 13. Making you feel guilty about something 14. Calling you bad names 15. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls 16. Repeated or back-to-back text messages 17. Demanding access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 18. Demanding to know where you are at all times 19. Making plans for your time without asking you first 20. Demanding to know who you are with at all times 21. Not letting you leave when you want 22. Using sex to get you to do what she wants 23. Using guilt to get you to do what she wants		

Behaviors	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did your girlfriend:	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did your girlfriend do the following t[...]	In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did your girlfriend [...] following to you
	1. Insulted or cursed at you 2. Yelled or screamed at you 3. Stomped out of the room 4. Threatened to hit or throw something at you 5. Destroyed something of your 6. Did something to get revenge on you 7. Called you fat or ugly 8. Accused you of being bad in bed or bad sex performance 9. Followed you 10. Prevented you from leaving or cornered you against your will 11. Gone through your phone or demanded to go through your phone 12. Stolen your phone or broken into your phone 13. Threatened to get you fired or come to your job to argue 14. Threatened your friends 15. Called the police on you to make a false report **In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did you do the following to your girlfriend** 16. Insulted or cursed at her 17. Yelled or screamed at her 18. Stomped out of the room 19. Threatened to hit or throw something at her 20. Destroyed something of hers 21. Did something to get revenge on her 22. Called her fat or ugly 23. Accused her of being bad in bed or bad sex performance 24. Prevented her from leaving or cornered her against her will 25. Gone through her phone or demanded to go through her phone 26. Stolen her phone or broken into her phone 27. Threatened to get her fired or gone to her job to argue 28. Called the police on her to make a false report 29. Threatened her friends	1. Insult or curse at you 2. Threaten to hit or throw something at you 3. Yell or scream at you 4. Destroy something of yours 5. Call you bad names 6. Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad sex performance 7. Follow you 8. Prevent you from leaving or corner you against your will 9. Go through your phone without your permission or demand to go through your phone 10. Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue 11. Threaten your friends or family members **In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did you do the following to your girlf[...]** 1. Insult or curse at her 2. Yell or scream at her 3. Threaten to hit or throw something at her 4. Destroy something of hers 5. Call her bad names 6. Accuse her of being bad in bed or bad sex performance 7. Follow her 8. Prevent her from leaving or corner her against her will 9. Go through her phone without her permission or demand to go through her phone 10. Threaten to get her fired or go to her job to argue 11. Threaten her friends or family members	1. Insult or curse at you 2. Yell or scream at you 3. Threaten to hit or throw something at you 4. Destroy something of yours 5. Call you bad names 6. Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance 7. Follow you 8. Prevent you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will 9. Go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 10. Demand to know where you are or who you are with 11. Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue 12. Threaten your friends or family members **In your current or most recent past relationship, how many times did you do the follow[...] your girlfriend** 1. Insult or curse at her 2. Yell or scream at her 3. Threaten to hit or throw something at her 4. Destroy something of hers 5. Call her bad names 6. Accuse her of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance 7. Follow her 8. Prevent her from leaving or corner her against her will 9. Go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without her permission or demand to go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 10. Demand to know where she is or who she is with

216

			11. Threaten to get her fired or go to her job to argue 12. Threaten her friends or family members
Attitudes	1. It is okay for a girlfriend to insult her boyfriend 2. It is okay for girlfriend to tell her boyfriend what to do 3. A guy should ask his girlfriend first before going out with his friends 4. A guy should do what his girlfriend wants even if he does not want to do it 5. A guy should change his ways to please his girlfriend 6. A guy should do what his girlfriend tells him to do 7. A girlfriend should know her boyfriend's every move 8. It is okay for a girlfriend to yell at her boyfriend as long as she doesn't hit him	1. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at you 2. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to yell or scream at you 3. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to threaten to hit or throw something at you 4. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to destroy something of yours 5. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to call you bad names 6. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to accuse you of being bad in bed or bad sex performance 7. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to follow you 8. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to prevent you from leaving or corner you against your will 9. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to go through your phone without your permission or demand to go through your phone 10. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue 11. Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to threaten your friends or family members 12. It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if I cheated on her 13. It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if I didn't answer the phone when she called 14. It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if I committed dating violence against her first 15. It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if she is drunk or high 16. It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if she is not sexually satisfied 17. It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if she has been loyal to me 18. It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if she has forgiven me for a lot in the past	1. Is it okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at you 2. Is it okay for your girlfriend to yell or scream at you 3. Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to hit or throw something at you 4. Is it okay for your girlfriend to destroy something of yours 5. Is it okay for your girlfriend to call you bad names 6. Is it okay for your girlfriend to accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance 7. Is it okay for your girlfriend to follow you 8. Is it okay for your girlfriend to stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will 9. Is it okay for your girlfriend to go through your phone e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 10. Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue 11. Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten your friends or family members 12. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you didn't answer the phone when she called 13. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you committed dating violence against her first 14. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you it you cheated on her 15. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating

			abuse against you if she is not sexually satisfied 16. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if she has forgiven you for a lot in the past
Perceived Susceptibility	**How Likely is it that you will experience the following from your current girlfriend or a future girlfriend?** 1. Acting jealous over you 2. Making you feel guilty about something 3. Calling you bad names 4. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls 5. Repeated or back-to-back text messages 6. Demanding access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 7. Demanding to know where you are at all times 8. Demanding to know who you are with at all times 9. Making plans for your time without asking you first 10. Not letting you leave when you want 11. Using sex to get you to do what she wants 12. Using guilt to get you to do what she wants	1. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will act jealous over you 2. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names 3. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call your phone over and over again 4. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will text you over and over again 5. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 6. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand to know where you are at all times 7. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand to know who you are with at all times 8. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will make plans for your time without asking you first 9. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will not let you leave when you want 10. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use sex to get you to do what she wants 11. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use guilt to get you to do what she wants	1. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will act jealous over you 2. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names 3. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call your phone or text you over and over again 4. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 5. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand to know where you are or who you are with at all times 6. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will 7. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use sex to get you to do what she wants 8. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use guilt to get you to do what she wants 9. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use threats to get you to do what she wants
Perceived Severity	**How bad would it be if you experienced the following from your current girlfriend or a future girlfriend?** 1. Acting jealous over you 2. Making you feel guilty about something 3. Calling you bad names 4. Repeated or back-to-back phone calls 5. Repeated or back-to-back text messages 6. Demanding access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 7. Demanding to know where you are at all times 8. Demanding to know who you are with at all times	1. How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you 2. How bad would it be if your girlfriend called you bad names 3. How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone over and over again 4. How bad would it be if your girlfriend texted you over and over again 5. How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts	1. How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you 2. How bad would it be if your girlfriend called you bad names 3. How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again 4. How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts

	9. Making plans for your time without asking you first 10. Not letting you leave when you want 11. Using sex to get you to do what she wants 12. Using guilt to get you to do what she wants	6. How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded to know where you are at all times 7. How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded to know who you are with at all times 8. How bad would it be if your girlfriend made plans for your time without asking you first 9. How bad would it be if your girlfriend did not let you leave when you wanted 10. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used sex to get you to do what she wanted 11. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used guilt to get you to do what she wanted	5. How bad would it be if your girlfriend stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will 6. How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded to know where you are or who you are with at all times 7. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used sex to get you to do what she wanted 8. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used guilt to get you to do what she wanted 9. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used threats to get you to do what she wanted
Reward for Controlling and Threatening Behavior	**If your current or future girlfriend committed the following acts, what would you do?** 1. Acted jealous over you 2. Made you feel guilty about something 3. Called you bad names 4. Called you repeatedly over and over again 5. Texted you repeatedly over and over again 6. Demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 7. Demanded to know where you are at all times 8. Demanded to know who you are with at all times 9. Made plans for your time without asking you first 10. Did not let you leave when you wanted to 11. Used sex to get you to do what she wants 12. Used guilt to get you to do what she wants	**What would you do if your girlfriend:** 1. Always acted jealous over you 2. Always called you bad names 3. Always called your phone over and over again 4. Always texted you over and over again 5. Always demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 6. Always demanded to know where you are at all times 7. Always demanded to know who you are with at all times 8. Always made plans for your time without asking you first 9. Always did not let you leave when you wanted to 10. Always used sex to get you to do what she wants 11. Always used guilt to get you to do what she wants	**What would you do if your girlfriend:** 1. Often acted jealous over you 2. Often called you bad names 3. Often called your phone or texted you over and over again 4. Often demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 5. Often demanded to know where you are or who you are with 6. Often stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will 7. Often used guilt to get you to do what she wants 8. Often used sex to get you to do what she wants 9. Often used threats to get you to do what she wants
Power	1. We do what my girlfriend wants to do 2. My girlfriend has more say than I do about important decisions that affect us 3. I feel trapped or stuck in our relationship 4. We come to agreement together about what we want to do 5. My girlfriend wants to know where I am 6. When my girlfriend and I disagree, she ends up getting her way 7. If we do something I like, my girlfriend gets a bad attitude	**In your current or most recent past relationship, how often:** 1. Did you do what your girlfriend wanted to do when you were spending time together 2. Did you feel trapped or stuck in your relationship 3. Did your girlfriend demand to know where you were 4. Did you come to an agreement together about what you were going to do when you were spending time together 5. Did your girlfriend get a bad attitude if you did something you liked to do when you were spending	**In your current or most recent past relationship, how often:** 1. Did you do what your girlfriend wanted to do instead of doing what you wanted to do when you were spending time together 2. Did you come to an agreement together about what you were going to do when you were spending time together

		In your current or most recent past relationship, how often:	In your current or most recent past relationship, how often:
		time together	
Isolation	1. My girlfriend tells me who I can spend time with 2. I only hang out with people my girlfriend approves of 3. My girlfriend gets upset when I spend time with other people 4. My girlfriend assumes all of my free time should be spent with her 5. My girlfriend invites herself along when I have made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited	**In your current or most recent past relationship, how often:** 1. Did your girlfriend tell you who you could hang out with 2. Did you only hang out with people your girlfriend approved of 3. Did your girlfriend get upset when you spent time with other people 4. Did your girlfriend want all of your free time to be spent with her 5. Did your girlfriend invite herself along when you made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited	**In your current or most recent past relationship, how often:** 1. Did your girlfriend tell you who you could hang out with 2. Did you only hang out with people your girlfriend approved of instead of who you wanted to hang out with 3. Did your girlfriend get upset when you spent time with people that she did not approve of 4. Did your girlfriend want all of your free time to be spent with her 5. Did your girlfriend invite herself along when you made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited
Poor Communication Skills	1. When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the opportunity to explain to her exactly how I feel 2. If I tell my girlfriend something and she does not understand what I said, she will ask me to explain 3. When my girlfriend asks me a question that I don't understand, she will carefully explain what she means 4. When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she has a tendency to put words in my mouth 5. My girlfriend asks me to tell her how I feel about the point she may be trying to make 6. When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without getting verbally aggressive 7. My girlfriend accepts constructive criticism from me 8. My girlfriend later apologizes to me when she hurts my feelings 9. My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her 10. I don't disagree with my girlfriend because I don't want her to get angry 11. When a problem arises between me and my girlfriend, she discusses it without getting angry 12. My girl will, pout, sulk, or get an attitude for a long time if I upset her 13. In conversation, my girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say 14. My girlfriend does not pay attention when I talk to her 15. My girlfriend does not understand my feelings 16. When my girlfriend is wrong about something, she admits it 17. If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things 18. When my girlfriend tries to influence me, she makes a great effort not to offend me 19. When nothing seems to work in trying to influence me, my girlfriend will yell and scream in order to get some movement from me	1. When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the opportunity to explain to her exactly how I feel 2. When my girlfriend asks me a question that I don't understand, she will carefully explain what she means without yelling or screaming 3. When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she has a tendency to put words in my mouth 4. When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without yelling or screaming 5. My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her 6. I don't disagree with my girlfriend because I don't want her to get angry 7. My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her 8. In conversation, my girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say 9. When my girlfriend is wrong about something, she admits it 10. If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things 11. When nothing seems to work in trying to influence me, my girlfriend will yell and scream in order to get some movement from me	1. When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the time to explain to her exactly how I feel 2. When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she puts words in my mouth 3. When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without yelling or screaming 4. My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her 5. My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her 6. My girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say 7. If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things 8. My girlfriend will yell and scream at me to get me to do what she wants

220

Poor Impulse Control	1. My girlfriend makes quick judgments and later regrets them 2. My girlfriend becomes terribly upset and miserable when things are not the way she would like them to be		
Distorted Ideas about Gender	1. Most girls can't be trusted in a dating relationship the guy should be smarter than the girl 2. Girls are always trying to manipulate guys 3. In a dating relationship, the guy and girl should have about equal power 4. Swearing is worse for a girl then for a guy 5. On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses 6. It is all right for a girl to ask a guy on a date 7. It is more important for guys than girls to do well in school 8. Girls should have the same freedom as boys 9. If a guy pays for everything on a date, the girl owes him something 10. A guy should never say no to sex from a girl	1. In a dating relationship, most girls can't be trusted 2. In a dating relationship, girls are always trying to manipulate guys 3. In a dating relationship, the guy and girl should have about equal power 4. On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses 5. It is all right for a girl to ask a guy on a date 6. If a guy pays for everything on a date, the girl owes him something 7. A guy should never say no to sex from a girl	1. In a dating relationship, girls can't be trusted 2. In a dating relationship, girls are always trying to manipulate guys 3. On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses 4. If a guy pays for everything on a date, the girl owes him something 5. If a girl offers sex to a guy, he should not say no
Permissibility of Violence	It would be acceptable for my girlfriend to commit psychological dating violence. Examples of dating violence might be texting or calling too much, going through my phone or e-mails, or disrespecting me in some other way. 1. If I cheated 2. If I came home late 3. If I didn't answer the phone when she calls 4. If she believed I cheated 5. If I commit psychosocial dating violence against her 6. If she can't help it because she just lost her temper 7. If she has a mental illness 8. If she is just trying to discipline me 9. If she is unhappy about other aspects of her life 10. If she is drunk or high 11. If I don't make enough money 12. If she is not sexually satisfied 13. If I am unemployed 14. If she has been a loyal girlfriend to me 15. If she has forgiven me a lot for things I have done in the past		

Scale Development Table (Detailed) Round 3

Scale	Modifications After Expert Panel Review	Modifications After Psychometric Analysis
Knowledge 1	**Is it mental abuse in your relationship if** 1. Your girlfriend acts jealous over you 2. Your girlfriend calls you bad names 3. Your girlfriend keeps calling your phone or texting you over and over again 4. Your girlfriend demands to look through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 5. Your girlfriend demands to know where you are or who you are with at all times 6. Your girlfriend stops you from leaving someplace or corners you against your will 7. Your girlfriend uses sex to get you to do what she wants 8. Your girlfriend uses threats to get you to do what she wants 9. Your girlfriend uses guilt to get you to do what she wants	**Is it mental abuse in your relationship if** 1. Your girlfriend acts jealous over you 2. Your girlfriend calls you bad names 3. Your girlfriend keeps calling your phone or texting you over and over again 4. Your girlfriend demands to know where you are or who you are with at all times 5. Your girlfriend stops you from leaving someplace or corners you against your will 6. Your girlfriend uses sex to get you to do what she wants 7. Your girlfriend uses threats to get you to do what she wants 8. Your girlfriend uses guilt to get you to do what she wants
Behaviors	**In your current or most recent past relationship,** **how many times did your girlfriend do the following to you** 1. Insult or curse at you 2. Yell or scream at you 3. Threaten to hit or throw something at you 4. Destroy something of yours 5. Call you bad names 6. Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance 7. Follow you 8. Prevent you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will 9. Go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 10. Demand to know where you are or who you are with 11. Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue 12. Threaten your friends or family members **In your current or most recent past relationship,** **how many times did you do the following to your girlfriend** 1. Insult or curse at her 2. Yell or scream at her 3. Threaten to hit or throw something at her 4. Destroy something of hers 5. Call her bad names 6. Accuse her of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance 7. Follow her 8. Prevent her from leaving or corner her against her will 9. Go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without her permission or demand to go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 10. Demand to know where she is or who she is with 11. Threaten to get her fired or go to her job to argue 12. Threaten her friends or family members	**In your current or most recent past relationship,** **how many times did your girlfriend do the following to you** 1. Insult or curse at you 2. Yell or scream at you 3. Threaten to hit or throw something at you 4. Destroy something of yours 5. Call you bad names 6. Accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance 7. Follow you 8. Prevent you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will 9. Go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 10. Demand to know where you are or who you are with 11. Threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue 12. Threaten your friends or family members **In your current or most recent past relationship,** **how many times did you do the following to your girlfriend** 1. Insult or curse at her 2. Yell or scream at her 3. Threaten to hit or throw something at her 4. Destroy something of hers 5. Call her bad names 6. Accuse her of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance 7. Follow her 8. Prevent her from leaving or corner her against her will 9. Go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without her permission or demand to go through her phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 10. Demand to know where she is or who she is with 11. Threaten to get her fired or go to her job to argue 12. Threaten her friends or family members
Attitudes	1. Is it okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at you 2. Is it okay for your girlfriend to yell or scream at you 3. Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to hit or throw something at you	1. Is it okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at you 2. Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to hit or throw something at you 3. Is it okay for your girlfriend to destroy something of yours

	4. Is it okay for your girlfriend to destroy something of yours 5. Is it okay for your girlfriend to call you bad names 6. Is it okay for your girlfriend to accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance 7. Is it okay for your girlfriend to follow you 8. Is it okay for your girlfriend to stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will 9. Is it okay for your girlfriend to go through your phone e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 10. Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten to get you fired or go to your job to argue 11. Is it okay for your girlfriend to threaten your friends or family members 12. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you didn't answer the phone when she called 13. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you committed dating violence against her first 14. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you it you cheated on her 15. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if she is not sexually satisfied 16. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if she has forgiven you for a lot in the past	4. Is it okay for your girlfriend to accuse you of being bad in bed or bad in sexual performance 5. Is it okay for your girlfriend to follow you 6. Is it okay for your girlfriend to stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will 7. Is it okay for your girlfriend to go through your phone e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter without your permission or demand to go through your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter 8. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you it you cheated on her 9. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you didn't answer the phone when she called 10. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if you committed dating violence against her first 11. Is it okay for your girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating abuse against you if she is not sexually satisfied
Perceived Susceptibility	1. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will act jealous over you 2. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names 3. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call your phone or text you over and over again 4. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 5. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand to know where you are or who you are with at all times 6. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will 7. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use sex to get you to do what she wants 8. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use guilt to get you to do what she wants 9. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use threats to get you to do what she wants	1. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will act jealous over you 2. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call you bad names 3. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will call your phone or text you over and over again 4. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 5. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will demand to know where you are or who you are with at all times 6. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will stop you from leaving someplace or corner you against your will 7. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use sex to get you to do what she wants 8. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use guilt to get you to do what she wants 9. How likely is it that your current or future girlfriend will use threats to get you to do what she wants
Perceived Severity	1. How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you 2. How bad would it be if your girlfriend called you bad names 3. How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again 4. How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 5. How bad would it be if your girlfriend stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will 6. How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded to know where you are or who you are with at all times 7. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used sex to get you to do what she wanted	1. How bad would it be if your girlfriend acted jealous over you 2. How bad would it be if your girlfriend called you bad names 3. How bad would it be if your girlfriend called your phone or texted you over and over again 4. How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 5. How bad would it be if your girlfriend stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will 6. How bad would it be if your girlfriend demanded to know where you are or who you are with at all times 7. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used sex to get you to do what she wanted

	8. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used guilt to get you to do what she wanted 9. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used threats to get you to do what she wanted	8. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used guilt to get you to do what she wanted 9. How bad would it be if your girlfriend used threats to get you to do what she wanted
Reward for Controlling and Threatening Behavior	**What would you do if your girlfriend:** 1. Often acted jealous over you 2. Often called you bad names 3. Often called your phone or texted you over and over again 4. Often demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 5. Often demanded to know where you are or who you are with 6. Often stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will 7. Often used guilt to get you to do what she wants 8. Often used sex to get you to do what she wants 9. Often used threats to get you to do what she wants	**What would you do if your girlfriend:** 1. Often acted jealous over you 2. Often called you bad names 3. Often called your phone or texted you over and over again 4. Often demanded access to your phone, e-mail, Facebook, or Twitter accounts 5. Often demanded to know where you are or who you are with 6. Often stopped you from leaving someplace or cornered you against your will 7. Often used guilt to get you to do what she wants 8. Often used sex to get you to do what she wants 9. Often used threats to get you to do what she wants
Power	**In your current or most recent past relationship, how often:** 1. Did you do what your girlfriend wanted to do instead of doing what you wanted to do when you were spending time together 2. Did you come to an agreement together about what you were going to do when you were spending time together	Eliminated (a scale requires at least 3 items)
Isolation	**In your current or most recent past relationship, how often:** 1. Did your girlfriend tell you who you could hang out with 2. Did you only hang out with people your girlfriend approved of instead of who you wanted to hang out with 3. Did your girlfriend get upset when you spent time with people that she did not approve of 4. Did your girlfriend want all of your free time to be spent with her 5. Did your girlfriend invite herself along when you made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited	1. Did your girlfriend tell you who you could hang out with 2. Did you only hang out with people your girlfriend approved of instead of who you wanted to hang out with 3. Did your girlfriend get upset when you spent time with people that she did not approve of 4. Did your girlfriend want all of your free time to be spent with her 5. Did your girlfriend invite herself along when you made plans to hang out with other people even when she was not originally invited
Poor Communication Skills	1. When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the time to explain to her exactly how I feel 2. When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she puts words in my mouth 3. When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without yelling or screaming 4. My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her 5. My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her 6. My girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say 7. If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things 8. My girlfriend will yell and scream at me to get me to do what she wants	1. When I am upset, my girlfriend gives me the time to explain to her exactly how I feel 2. When I am trying to explain something to my girlfriend, she puts words in my mouth 3. When my girlfriend is upset, she explains the problem to me without yelling or screaming 4. My girlfriend gets very upset when I disagree with her 5. My girlfriend will get an attitude for a long time if I upset her 6. My girlfriend lets me finish talking before reacting to what I say 7. If I stand my ground with my girlfriend, she will lose her temper and say mean things 8. My girlfriend will yell and scream at me to get me to do what she wants
Distorted Ideas about Gender	1. In a dating relationship, girls can't be trusted 2. In a dating relationship, girls are always trying to manipulate guys 3. On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses 4. If a guy pays for everything on a date, the girl owes him something 5. If a girl offers sex to a guy, he should not say no	Eliminated (a scale requires at least 3 items)

Expert Panel Review Table

	Beck	Smith-Bynum	Richardson	Royster	Sawyer	Wang
General Comments	Consider adding a couple of items regarding whether they ever experienced any significant emotional trauma or reaction (e.g., rage, depression, anger, sorrow, etc) from an abusive relationship with a girlfriend.	The scale is long. There does seem to be a fair amount of overlap in the some of the content of some scales. I wasn't sure if you wanted to know more about their actual experiences with it, their attitudes about dating violence generally, and/or their vulnerability to it.	Just your thoughts on asking has the person ever broken up with current girlfriend and experienced mental violence or would like to break up but fear mental violence? I'm sure some young men would like to break up with girlfriends but may fear mentally violent repercussions or may have broken up with girlfriend and actually experienced some form of mental violence and may have ultimately been intimidated to get back with her.		I think that the individual items you've developed look very good. Obviously the survey is currently rather long. I'm not sure that there are individual items you could take out that would effectively substantially reduce the overall number.	The response format looks fine to me. In fact, these are typical scales used in the public health studies.
Distorted Ideas About Gender	I think you should use a 5-point Likert scale response options for these items. This will help with giving you a better Cronbach's alpha, than a 3-item response option - especially for a small number of items. I would eliminate items 3 & 5 and reword item	On a date, the guy should be expected to pay all expenses C It is all right for a girl to ask a guy on a date C A guy should never say no to sex from a girl B	In a dating relationship, most girls can't be trusted ("most girls" is not consistent with the wording of the other questions)	"A" rating for all items	I think you should add another response category of "sometimes" – would add a touch more specificity. "A" rating for all items	225

	7. The concept of 7 is clear, but I think you could make the items grammatically clearer.	Some of these items seem to tap different types of ideas about gender, not just distorted views				
Knowledge	In the preference you use the word mental but in the next section you use the word emotional violence - be consistent.

Also, these items seems more like abuse than violence, as no physical trauma has occurred.

I would eliminate item 9, you could combine 10 & 11 (... calling or texting...), combine 13 & 14 ((... know where you are or who you are with...), I would eliminate or at least reword 16 ("...does not let you leave ...) and define leave where (her apartment, house?).

Finally you have items that refer to using sex and guilt to get what the women want.   What about adding an item such as using threats? | How are they interpreting "mental dating violence"?

I would move the stem of the item up to the top of the scale ("Is it dating violence…)

Keep the wording consistent in the instructions and down below in the actual items to help the respondent keep the same response frame all the way through.

(How's mental different from emotional dating violence). | | "A" rating for all items | The Knowledge section basically asks the respondent to define dating violence. Could you maybe omit this section and utilize the items in the "perceived severity" section as a proxy of the definition issue. In other words if a student answers that an item "is not bad at all" could we not infer that the subject probably wouldn't define that item as being dating violence?

"A" rating for all items | |
| Attitudes | Be consistent mental vs. emotional violence vs abuse (see if you need to | Consider deleting "ever" since you give them response options | Is it ever okay for your girlfriend to insult or curse at | "A" rating for all items | The response option of "sometimes" | |

	reword items 30 & 31). I think you can eliminate items 35 & 36. I would eliminate 38 (all bad names) and its companion items throughout the survey Combine 39 & 40. Eliminate 45 or define where are you leaving from.	that let them select the frequency of the appropriateness of the behavior. It would be okay for my girlfriend to commit some type of mental dating violence against me if I committed dating violence against her first. [mental or emotional?]	you? ("your girlfriend" here is not consistent with "a girlfriend" in the previous section)		doesn't really fit with "ever" in the items. Maybe go with "unsure" instead? Or maybe better, remove "ever" from each item, then your responses would fit more effectively. (Changed to "psychological for questions 30-36 instead of mental/emotional)	
Perceived Susceptibility	As in section 3, add an item about the use of threats (along with sex and guilt) Eliminate 49 Combine 51 & 52 Eliminate 56 or define where leaving from Add an item on threats	"A" rating for all items		"A" rating for all items	"A" rating for all items	
Perceived Severity	(Incorporated suggestions from Perceived Susceptibility scale)	"A" rating for all items		"A" rating for all items	"A" rating for all items	
Reward for Controlling & Threatening	I would rename this Consequences.	"A" rating for all items		"A" rating for all items	"Always" in each item seems too strong and	

Behavior	I am not sure you have an interval or even an ordinal response scale for these items. I think you have 4 different types of responses (1) do nothing or ignore her, (2) comply, (3) retaliation - do what she to me or get back at her in some other way, and (4) end the relationship. As previously, I would combine				somewhat unrealistic. How about "frequently" which might get you a better range of responses, and seems more realistic? "A" rating for all items	
Power	Power and Isolation sections strike me as belonging together. I recommend using a 5-point Likert scale for these items. Item 70 - reword "... girlfriend want to do **rather than what you wanted to do** when you were ..." Item 76 reword in similar fashion **rather than who you wanted** Item 77 reword "... with other people **than she approved of**"	This scale seems to address more than one topic and is not necessarily just about power. Did you do what your girlfriend wanted to do when you were spending time together?B Did you feel trapped or stuck in your relationship? [C – not sure if this is power or controlling] Did your girlfriend demand to know where you were? C [seems redundant] Did your girlfriend get a bad attitude if you		"A" rating for all items	"A" rating for all items	

		did something you liked to do when you were spending time together? C				
Isolation		"A" rating for all items		"A" rating for all items	"A" rating for all items	
Poor Communication Skills	I would eliminate the word Poor from the title - Just make it Communication Skills. Use a 5-point Likert scale for all items. Eliminate 81 or 83, they appear to be redundant. I recommend eliminating 84 & 86. Item 90 - define what you mean by 'some movement". I would add a general question about the overall quality of communication between me a my girlfriend is good or harmonious.	"A" rating for all items	When nothing seems to work in trying to influence me, my girlfriend will yell and scream in order to get some movement from me (reaction may be a better word here instead of "movement")	"A" rating for all items	"A" rating for all items	
Behaviors	I think you will need to define the time frame for a recent past relationship - one year, 6 months. You might consider separate items for past versus current relationship. How will you know which	"A" rating for all items		"A" rating for all items	"A" rating for all items	

	relationship the participant is referring to? I think you could condense the response options to 4 categories (1) never, (2), once, (3) twice, (4) three times or more. Eliminate items 95 & 106 - Call bad names. Reword 96 - '... being bad in bed or **having a** bad sex performance"				

References

1. Abbott J, Johnson R, Koziol-McLain J. (1995). Domestic Violence Against Women: Incidence and Prevelance in an Emergency Department Population. *Journal of American Medical Association*, 273, 1763-1777.
2. Allen CT, Swan SC, Raghavan C. (2009). Gender Symmetry, Sexism, and Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(11), 1816-1834.
3. Archer J. (2000). Sex Differences in Aggression Between Heterosexual Partners: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychology Bulletin*, 126(5), 651-680.
4. Arias I, Samios M, O'Leary K. (1987). Prevalance and Correlates of Physical Aggression During Courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2(1), 82-90.
5. Arias I, Johnson P. (1989). Evaluations of Physical Aggression Among Intimate Dyads. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4(3), 298-307.
6. Babbie E. (2001). *The Practice of Social Research (9th ed.)*. Wadsworth.
7. Billingham RE. (1987). Courtship Violence: The Patterns of Conflict Resolution Strategies Across Seven Levels of Emotional Commitment. *Family Relations*, 36, 283-289.
8. Bookwala J, Sobin J, Zdaniuk B. (2005). Gender and Aggression in Marial Relationships: A Life-Span Perspective. *Sex Roles*, 52, 797-806.
9. Brinkerhoff M, Lupri E. (1988). Interspousal Violence. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 13, 407-435.
10. Brown R, Leigh G, Barton K. (2000). The School Connection Scale: A Factor Analysis. *Psychological Reports*, 87, 851-858.
11. Brush L. (1990). Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Survey of Families and Households. *Gender and Society*, 4, 56-67.
12. Burt MR. (1980). Cultural Myths and Supports for Rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.
13. Cantos AL, Neidig PH, O'Leary KD. (1994). Injuries of Women and Men in a Treatment Program for Domestic Violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 9(2), 113-124.
14. Cate R, Henton J, Koval J, Christopher F, Lloyd S. (1982). Premarital Abuse: A Social Psychologial Perspective. *Journal of Family Issues*, 3(1), 79-90.
15. Caetano R, Cunradi CB, Schafer J, Clark CL. (2000). Intimate Parnter Violene and Drinking Patterns among White, Black, and Hispanic Couples in the US. *Journal of Subsance Abuse*, 11, 123-138.
16. Chen G, Gully S, Eden D. (2001). Validation of a New General Self-Efficacy Scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62-83.
17. Clark ML, Beckett J, Wells M, Dungee-Anderson D. (1994). Courtship Violence among African American College Students. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 20, 264-281.
18. Coker AL, Davis KE, Arias I, Desai S, Sanderson M, Brandt HM, Smith PH. (2002). Physical and Mental Health Effects of Intimae Partner Violence for Men and Women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicince*, 23(4), 260-268.
19. Comery, AL, Lee HB. (1992). *A First Course in Factor Analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ; Lawrence Erlbaum

20. Cunradi CB, Bersamin M, Ames G. (2009). Agreement of Intimate Partner Violence Among a Sample of Blue-Collar Couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(4), 551-568.

21. Davis R, Alexander G, Calvi J, Wiese C, Greene S, Nowak M, Cross W, Resnicow K. (2010). A New Audience Segmentation Tool for African Americans: The Black Identity Classification Scale. *Journal of Health Communication*, 15, 532-554.

22. DeMaris A. (1990). The Dynamics of Generational Transfer in Courtship Violence: A Biracial Exploration. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 219-231.

23. Ernst AA, Nick TG, Weiss SJ, Houry D, Mills T. (1997). Domestic Violence in an Inner-City ED. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 30(2), 190-197.

24. Fiebert MS. (2004). References Examining Assaults by Women on their Spouses or Male Partners: An Annotated Bibliography. *Sexuality and Culture*, 8, 140-177.

25. Field A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS (3rd ed.).* Sage Publications.

26. Follinstad DR, Rutledge LL, Berg BJ, Hause ES, Polek DS. (1990). The Role of Emotional Abuse in Physically Abusive Relationships. *Journal of Family Violecnce,* 5(2), 107-121.

27. Follingstad DR, Wright S, Lloyd S, Sebastian JA. (1991). Sex Differences in Motivations and Effects in Dative Violence. *Family Relations*, 40, 51-57.

28. Goldberg WG, Tomlanovich MC. (1984). Domestic Violence Victims in the Emergency Department. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 251(24), 3259-3264.

29. Hamberger LK, Potente T. (1994). Counseling Heterosexual Women Arrested for Domestic Violence: Implications for Theory and Practice. *Violence and Victims*, 9(2), 125-137.

30. Harned MS. (2001). Abused Women or Abused Men? An Examination of the Context and Outcomes of Dating Violence. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 269-285.

31. Henning K, Feder L. (2004). A Comparison of Men and Women Arrested for Domestic Violence: Who Presents the Greater Threat? *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(2), 69-80.

32. Henning K, Jones AR, Holdford R. (2005). "I didn't do it, but if I did I had a good reason": Minimization, Denial, and Attributions of Blame Among Male and Female Domestic Violence Offenders. *Journal of Family Violence*, 20(3), 131

33. Henton J, Cate R, Koval J, Lloyd S, Christopher S. (1983). Romance and Violence in Dating Relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 4(3), 467-482.

34. Houry D, Rhodes KV, Kemball RS, Click L, Cerulli C, McNutt L, Kaslow NJ. (2008). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(8), 1041-1055.

35. Johnson MD. (1995). Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence Against Women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 57, 283-294.

36. Lane K, Gwartney-Gibbs P. (1985). Violence in the Context of Dating and Sex. *Journal of Family Issues*, 6(1), 45-59.

37. Laner MR, Thompson J. (1982). Abuse and Aggression in Courting Couples. *Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 3, 229-244.

38. Lipksy S, Caetano R, Field CA, Bazargan S. (2005). The Role of Alcohol Us and Depression in Intimate Partner Violence among Black and Hispanic Patients in an Urban Emergency Department. *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 31(2), 225-242.

39. Makepeace JM. (1981). Courtship Violence among College Students. *Family Relations*, 30, 97-102.

40. McKinney K. (1986). Measures of Verbal, Physical, and Sexual Dating Violence by Gender. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 14(1), 5-60.
41. McNeely RL, Robinson-Simpson G. (1987). The Truth about Domestic Violence: A Falsely Framed Issue. *Social Work*, 32, 485-490.
42. Mechem CC, Shofer FS, Reinhard SS, Hornig S, Datner E. (1999). History of Domestic Violence among Male Patients Presenting to an Urban Emergency Department. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 6, 786-791.
43. Merrill G. (1996). Ruling the Exceptions: Same-Sex Battering and Domestic Violence Theory. *Journal of Gay and Lesbian Social Services*, 4(1), 9-22.
44. Miller SL. (2001). The Paradox of Women Arrested for Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 7(12), 1339-1376.
45. Mills ME. (1990). The New Heretics: Men. *American Psychologist*, 45, 675-676.
46. Monson CM, Langhinrichsen-Rohling J. (2002). Sexual and Nonsexual Dating Violence Perpetration: Testing an Integrated Perpetrator Typology. *Violence and Victims*, 17(4), 403-428.
47. Morse B. (1995). Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scale: Assessing Gendre Differnces in Partner Violence. *Violence and Victims*, 10, 251-272.
48. Mould DE. (1990). Data Base or Data Bial? American Psycholosit, 45, 676.
49. Muelleman R, Burgess P. (1998). Male Victims of Domestic Violence and Their History of Perpetrating Violence. *Academic Emergency Medicine*. 5(9), 866-870.
50. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygeine. (2008). Brooklyn Commmunity Health Profiles. Retreived September 12, 2008 from: http://home2.nyc.gov/html/doh/html/data/data.shtml
51. Nisonoff L, Bitman I. (1979). Spouse Abuse: Incidence and Relationship to Selected Demographic Variables. *Victimology*, 4, 131-140.
52. Nunnally, JC. (1978). *Psychometric Theory (2nd ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
53. O'Leary KD, Barling J, Arias I, Rosenbaum A, Malone J, Tyree A. (1989). Prevalance and Stability of Physical Aggression between Spouses: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 263-268.
54. Oman R, Velely S, McLeroy K, Harris-Wyatt V, Aspy C, Rodine S, Marshall L. (2002). Reliability and Validity of the Youth Asset Survey (YAS). *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 31, 247-255.
55. Plass M, Gessner J. (1983). Violence in Courtship Relations: A Souhern Sample. *Free Inquiry in Creative Psycholgy*, 11(2), 198-202.
56. Prospero M, Vohra-Gupta S. (2007). Gender Differences on Perceptions of Dating Relationships among Victims of Partner Violence. *Violence and Victims*, 22, 489-502.
57. Prospero M, Kim M. (2009). Mental Health Symptoms Among Female and Male Victims in Four Racial/Ethnic Groups. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(12), 2039-2056.
58. Phillips-Pula L, Strunk J, Pickler R. (2011). Understanding Phenominological Approaches to Data Analysis. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care,* 25, 67-71.
59. Renzetti CM. (1994). On Dancing With a Bear: Refelctions of Some of the Current Debates Among Domestic Violence Theorists. *Violence and Victims*, 9(2), 195-200.
60. Resnick HS, Acierno R, Kilpatrick DG. (1997). Health Impact of Interpersonal Violence 2: Medical and Mental Health Outcomes. *Behavioral Medicine*, 23, 65-78.

61. Rhodes KV, Houry D, Cerulli C, Straus H, Kaslow N, McNutt L. (2009) Intimate Partner Violence and Comorbid Mental Health Conditions Among Urban Male Patients. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 7(1), 47-55.

62. Roberts GL, O'Toole BI, Lawrence JM, Ashby R. (1996). Prevelance Study of Domestic Violence Victims in an Emergency Department. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 27, 747-753.

63. Roscoe B, Bensake N. (1985). Courtship Violence Experienced by Abused Wives: Similarities in Patterns of Abuse. *Family Relations*, 34, 419-424.

64. Riggs DS, O'Leary KD, Breslin FC. (1990). Multiple Correlates of Physical Aggression in Dating Couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 61-73.

65. Rouse L. (1988). Abuse in Dating Realtionships: A Comparison of Blacks, Whites, and Hispanics. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29, 312-319.

66. Saunders D. (1986). When Battered Women Use Violenc: Husbane Abuse or Self-Defense. *Violence and Victims*, 1, 47-60.

67. Seidman E, Allen L, Aber J, Mitchell C, Feinman J, Yoshikawa H, Comtois K, Golz J, Miller R, Ortiz-Torres B, Roper G. (1995). Development and Validation of Adolescent-Perceived Microsystem Scales: Social Support, Daily Hassles, and Involvement. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23(3), 355-388.

68. Sellers R, Rowley S, Chavous T, Shelton J, Smith, M. (1997). Multidimensional Inventory of Black Identity: A Preliminary Investigation of Reliability and Construct Validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(4), 805-815.

69. Shelton R, Winkel G, Davis S, Roberts N, Valdimarsdottir H, Hall S, Thompson H. (2010). Validation of the Group-Based Medical Mistrust Scale Among Urban Black Men. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 25(6), 549-555.

70. Shook NJ, Gerrity DA, Jurich J, Segrist AE. (2000). Courtship Violence Among College Students: A Comparison of Verbally and Physically Abusive Couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, 1-22.

71. Sigelman CK, Berry CJ, Wiles KA. (1984). Violence in College Students' Dating Relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Pschology*, 5(6), 530-548.

72. Sorenson SB, Upchurch DM, Shen H. (1996). Violence and Injury in Marital Arguments: Risk Patterns and Gender Differences. *American Journal of Public Health*, 86, 35-40.

73. Snyder C, Sympson S, Ybasco F, Borders T, Babyak M, Higgins R. (1996). Development and Validation of the State Hope Scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(2), 321-335.

74. Sorenson SB, Upchurch DM, Shen H. (1996). Violence and Injury in Marital Arguments: Risk Patterns and Gender Differences. *American Journal of Public Health*, 86, 35-40.

75. Steinmetz SK. (1977). The Battered Husband Syndrome. *Victomology*, 2, 499-509.

76. Stets JE, Pirog-Good MA. (1987). Violence in Dating Relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 237-246.

77. Stets JE, Pirog-Good MA. (1990). Interpersonal Control and Courtship Agression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7,371-394.

78. Stets JE, Henderson DA. (1991). Contextual Factors Surrounding Conflict Resolution While Dating: Results from a National Study. *Family Relations*, 40, 29-36.

79. Stith SM, Jester SB, Bird GW. (1992). A Typology of College Students Who Use Violence in Their Dating Relationships. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 411-421.
80. Straus MA. (1976). Sexual Inequality, Cultrual Norms, and Wife-Beating. *Victimology*, 1, 54-76.
81. Straus MA. (1979). Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 41, 75-87.
82. Straus MA, Gelles RJ, Steinmetz SK. (1980). *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*, Anchor Press, New York.
83. Straus MA, Gelles RJ. (1986). Societal Change and Change in Family Violence from 1975 to 1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 465-479.
84. Straus MA. (1990). The Confilct Tactics Scale and Its Critics: An Evaluation and New Data on Validity and Reliability. In Straus M, and Gelles RJ (eds), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations in 8145 Families*, Transaction Books, New Brunswick, NJ.
85. Straus M. (1993). Physical Assaults by Wives: A Major Social Problem. In Gelles, R and Loseke, D. (eds.), *Current Controverises on Family Violence*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA, pp 67-87.
86. Tjaden P, Thoennes N. (2000). Prevalance and Consequences of Male-to-Female and Female-to-Male Intimate Partner Violence as Measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence Against Women*, 6(2), 142-161.
87. Trochim W. (2005). *Research Methods: The Concise Knowledge Base*. Atomic Dog Publishing.
88. United States Census Bureau. Educational Attainment in the US, 2010. Black Only Table. www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/2010/tables.html.
89. United States Department of Labor, US Bureau of Labor Statistics, August 2011. Report 1032, 2-3.
90. Vivian D, Langhinrichsen-Rohling J. (1994). Are Bi-Directionally Violent Couples Mutually Victimized? A Gender Sensitive Comparison. *Violence and Victims*, 9(2), 107-124.
91. Warnken WJ, Rosenbaum A, Fletcher KE, Hoge SK, Adelman SA. (1994). Head-Injured Males: A Population at Risk for Relationship Aggression? *Violence and Victims*, 9(2), 153-166.
92. Wilson MI, Daly M. (1992). Who Kills Whom in Spousal Killings? On the Exceptional Sex Ratio of Spousal Homicides in the United States. *Criminology*, 30, 189-215.
93. Wolf ME, Hold VL, Kernic MA, Rivara FP. (2000). Who Gets Protection Orders for Intimate Partner Violence? *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 19, 286-291.