University of Northern Iowa
UNI ScholarWorks

Dissertations and Theses @ UNI | Student Work

1996

Another look at social learning theory and dating violence

Samantha Smith O'Hara

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1996 Samantha Smith O'Hara
Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd

 Part of the Sociology Commons

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

ANOTHER LOOK AT SOCIAL LEARNING THEORY AND DATING VIOLENCE

A Thesis

Submitted

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Samantha Smith O'Hara

University of Northern Iowa

December 1996

This Study by: Samantha Smith O'Hara

Entitled: Another Look at Social Learning Theory and Dating Violence

has been approved as meeting the thesis requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts.

Date	Dr. B. Keith Crew, Thesis Committe Chair
Date	Dr. Michael J. Leiber, Thesis Committee Member
Date	Dr. William R. Downs, Thesis Committee Member
Date	Dr. John W. Somervill, Dean, Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to thank the following:

Dr. B. Keith Crew, thesis committee chair, for his guidance and support throughout this project as well as my graduate career at the University of Northern Iowa.

Dr. Michael J. Leiber and Dr. William R. Downs for their helpful suggestions and contributions to the final version of this paper.

My husband, Jim, for his patience, encouragement and support during this process as well as to my sister Patti Smith for her unfailing belief in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Interpersonal violence is a common social problem in American society. Heightened interest in the topic of domestic violence has been sweeping the country as a result of conscience-raising efforts by the feminist movement and others in the late 1960s and early 1970s (White & Koss, 1991). The "closed door" that has protected the secret of violence in the home has slowly begun to open (O'Keefe, Brockopp, & Chew, 1986).

Research of dating violence is a logical outgrowth of domestic violence studies, and consequently has received much attention in the 1980s and 1990s (Riggs, 1993). Dating violence is very similar to marital violence, and it becomes more likely the closer the dating relationship approximates marriage (Little, 1995). Many have agreed that premarital experiences with relationship violence have serious implications for marital violence (White & Koss, 1991). Researchers have estimated that up to 80% of men and women engage in some form of verbal aggression and 35-37% of men and women have inflicted and sustained physical aggression in their dating relationships (White & Koss, 1991). As many as 20% of female victims of dating violence report physical injuries such as bruises, scratches, and cuts resulting from

the physical aggression (Riggs, 1993). Based on such findings, in our country dating violence could be characterized as ubiquitous. Furthermore, these high levels of verbal and physical aggression suggest the American family will continue to be plagued by violence (White & Koss, 1991).

Until the 1980s, little attention was given to the negative aspects of dating relationships, until the works of Makepeace (1981), Koss and Oros (1982) and others became known. Subsequently, much work on physical and emotional violence and rape in dating relationships can be found in the literature in the last 15 years (Cate & Lloyd, 1992). Now, many studies suggest a number of variables are instrumental in dating violence. Some research has emphasized psychological variables, such as the abuser's mental abilities or shortcomings and anger responses, while others have focused upon situational variables, such as if alcohol or drug consumption has occurred and to what degree. Still other research has focused on sociological variables, that include how dating violence is learned and transmitted in our society.

Sociological variables seem to be the most promising to date (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992; DeKeseredy, 1990; DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1995; Riggs & O'Leary, 1989;

Tontodonato & Crew, 1992). As noted previously, there are good studies on dating violence in the literature; however, only a handful address these sociological variables. Hence, there is a gap in the literature, a need to get beyond prevalence studies and those not incorporating theory and research. This study investigates dating violence from a theoretical framework, namely social learning theory. Here, social learning theory is be discussed in terms of development and application to the deviance issue of dating violence.

Theory

Social learning theory has its roots in two distinct areas: psychology and sociology. One specific strain of social learning theory will be addressed for the purpose of this study. The noted sociologist, Ronald Akers (1977), discussed deviant behavior and the social learning approach to its study.

Akers has described his theory as an integration of Edwin Sutherland's "processual" theory of behaving in violation of social and legal norms with the broader principles of modern learning theory (Akers, 1977). Sutherland's "differential association" theory of criminal and delinquent behavior is discussed below. The present topic of deviance, dating violence, can be substituted for

the phrase "criminal behavior" in the following excerpt.

Sutherland proposed these nine statements:

1. Criminal behavior is learned.
2. Criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication.
3. The principle part of the learning of criminal behavior occurs within intimate personal groups.
4. When criminal behavior is learned, the earning includes techniques of committing the crime and the specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations and attitudes.
5. The specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favorable or unfavorable.
6. A person becomes delinquent because of an excess of definitions favorable to violation of law over definitions unfavorable to violations of law.
7. Differential associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority and intensity. 8.
8. The process of learning criminal behaviors by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns involves all of the mechanisms that are involved with any other learning.
9. While criminal behavior is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by those general needs and values since non-criminal behavior is the expression of the same needs and values. (Sutherland and Cressey, 1970:75-77)

Most important is the sixth statement, as it is seen that one commits criminal acts because his/her accepted definitions of the laws as something to violate and in excess of his accepted definitions of the law that can, must, or should be obeyed (Sutherland & Cressey, 1970).

Akers incorporated Sutherland's theory, and

collaborated with sociologist Robert Burgess to formulate a theory they termed "differential association-reinforcement" (Akers, 1977:41). Akers and Burgess use a set of principles called operant conditions (Akers, 1977). The idea of operant conditions is largely attributed to the work of B. F. Skinner. These powerful behavior principles of learning can be extended to and be tested in complex social situations (Akers, 1977).

Social learning theory is a broad theory comprised of both differential association and differential reinforcement. People learn how to behave and derive their ideas and beliefs from others. In a word, humans are socially created. Simply stated, social learning theory explains human behavior by focusing on the role that familial, communal, social and cultural aspects of the environment play in influencing individual behavior (Miedzian, 1991).

Intergenerational Transmission of Violence Theory

The intergenerational transmission of violence theory addresses issues relating to violence and what is learned in the family of origin. This theory proposes that the family experience is by far the most important component in the socialization process for the individual, more so than the other social institutions. Logically, then, as the family

is the most important socializing factor, studies must look into the outcomes of differing family types. So, in order to investigate the propagation of violence, the family of origin must be addressed, and some research has determined that perhaps certain types of families are more likely to perpetuate violent means of conflict skills.

Sex role Socialization

According to social learning theory, sex role socialization occurs in the same manner as all other learning--through observation and rewards and punishments (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Children watch their same sex-models to determine how they ought to behave and imitate these models, and they also watch opposite-sex models to determine how not to behave (Perry & Bussey, 1979). Essentially "man" and "woman" are learned social roles, or positions that carry a particular set of expectations (Farley, 1992). Sex roles, referred to as "gender roles" by some, are social constructs; they contain psychological traits, self-concepts, as well as family, occupational, and political roles assigned dichotomously to each sex (Zinn and Eitzen, 1987). In the vast majority of the time, humans are socialized to adhere to one of these two roles.

The phrase "sex role socialization" refers to the ways in which females and males are socialized to adhere to

particular roles, expectations, or sets of beliefs which govern their behavior (Farley, 1992). Sex role development, or sex typing, is the process whereby children come to adopt the attitudes, feelings, behaviors, and motives that are culturally defined as appropriate for their sex (Perry & Bussey, 1979). For example, we are socialized in many ways of the differences in males and females: baby girls wear pink, boys blue. Lindsay (1995) states that the colors of pink and blue are among the first indicators used by a society to distinguish male from female. As these babies grow, other cultural artifacts will assure that the distinction remains intact (Lindsay, 1995). Later, little girls play house and have tea parties, little boys play with army men and climb trees, and so on.

Social learning theory suggests that children are responsive to whatever pattern of rewards or punishments that exists. Males are likely to be rewarded for masculine behaviors and punished for feminine ones, while reverse is true for females (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Little girls come to learn that their parents approve of them playing with dolls, mimicking household chores, while boys tinker with their toy trucks and play "rough and tumble," and learn that those behaviors are just fine for them. Families who model differing rewards and behaviors will have children

that exhibit these differing behaviors (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). For example, if little Billy learns from Dad that only "sissies" like to cook, Billy probably will not pursue his interest. If his parents or father is supportive of his interest in cooking, Billy may decide to continue to do so, and later become a gourmet chef or the line cook in a local chain.

Lindsay (1995) clearly feels the family is by far the most significant agent of socialization. It is here within the family the child learns the language of the group, gains a sense of self, and begins to understand the ways of interaction with those around them--family, peers and others. Research has shown that the sex-typing of infants by parents begin the day of the child's birth (Lindsay, 1995). Parents describe their baby girls as delicate, soft, and awkward, while baby boys are described as strong, firm and alert although the infants did not differ in any health-related aspects, such as length or weight (Lindsay, 1995). Most boys are taught to play sports and be competitive, girls too are sometimes encouraged to do so. But for the most part, society differentiates individuals on the basis of sex, and nowhere is this more evident than in the family. For the majority, girls are assigned particular housekeeping chores, while the boys' chores may require quite different

tasks, such as taking out the garbage or mowing the lawn. Throughout most people's lives, society by way of the family, encourages such gender role differentiation. This socialization continues on throughout childhood and into adult years, when the individual socialized in turn will socialize their offspring.

Educational institutions are also very important socializing agents. Certainly even schools themselves are not immune to gender role stereotyping. Students learn how to act appropriately from their peers, educators, and other individuals. At times, though, boys and girls learn that some behaviors are acceptable for one sex but not for the other. Studies have shown that boy have excelled in the mathematics and sciences, while the girls have high aptitudes in the languages and social sciences. Some have suggested that these results may be the outcome of expected pressure to succeed in these areas that seem so gender-specific. Caring, respect, honesty, and other values are taught in the school system. In addition to such admirable undertakings, schools also are given the responsibility of creating future productive, healthy, law-abiding citizens.

Lindsay (1995) writes that educational institutions are given the responsibility for ensuring that children are trained in the ways of society so that they can eventually

assume the positions necessary for the maintenance of society. Most of us learn what "we want to be when we grow up" with in school or during the following years, or as a result of such attendance. Schools advance the American culture's ideals of competition, initiative, independence, and individualism (Lindsey, 1995). Until very recently in some areas, youth were focused into "acceptable" occupations for their sex. Somewhere in junior high or high school, guidance counselors or others make presentations and encourage imaginations, attempting to point young minds forward into successful careers. They administer aptitude tests and make course suggestions, so that our potentials may be fully realized. However, these counselors and teachers only advocate careers that are fitting for the times or conditions. For example, women weren't even admitted into medical school until the 19th century. Other teachers, advocates or counselors and the like may have embraced more enlightened ideas about equality in occupations, and encouraged both girls and boys to enter professions which may be non-traditional for their sexes. Ideally, educators need not to limit the student's potential, but encourage new openness of appropriate gender roles.

Researchers have put forth the idea that the social institutions impart important differences between the sexes. One critical outcome in gender socialization is that females and males have different attitudes about sex and sexual behavior (Feltey, Ainslie, & Geib, 1991). Double standards abound. As evidence, girls are taught the ideal of chastity, while boys are encouraged to "sow their wild oats". Girls are taught that they should always say no to boys' advances, in order to be the "good girls." Then, girls are told that they say "no" when they really mean "yes," and boys should help to "encourage" their date in order that they may "score." Females are told that males who rape are crazy, deranged, lunatics escaped from the penitentiary, and not the guy from Physics class. These and other beliefs about gender-appropriate behavior contribute to some of the problems which arise in dating relationships.

Specific gender stereotypical beliefs have been linked to aggressive and violent behavior by research. Individuals assimilate the culturally supported beliefs, and those beliefs are the framworks which guide people's actions. Cultural anthropology courses teach that different societies weave different patterns of culture, and that the different threads--religion, music, sports, children's games, drama, work, relations between the sexes, and so on--that make up

the cultural web of a society are usually related (Miedzian, 1991). For example, Miedzian writes:

> If a tribe's songs and dramas are centered on violence and warfare, if its young boys play war games and violently competitive sports from the earliest age, if its paintings, sculptures and pottery depict fights and scenes of battle, it is a pretty sure bet that this in not a peaceful, gentle tribe. (1991:173)

If one is to apply this analogy to America, it can be seen that the nation fits the pattern of a violent one. In fact, Miedzian suggests that America *is* a culture of violence (1991).

Some researchers believe that if people see violence everyday and used in a variety of circumstances, soon people will learn to adapt to this way of dealing with their problems. Like a cycle, people learn to be violent which in turn may encourage those around them to use violence as a conflict resolution technique. Recently, some attention has been focused on the mass entertainment industry: action-packed "adventure" movies, slasher movies, and other types of films. Violence seems to be the norm in these movies, with little footage spent concentrating on the aftereffects of such violence: superheros continue everlastingly on. Critics have suggested similar implications of the World Wrestling Federation antics. Researchers have suggested that this fragmented view of the reality of violence is

detrimental to its viewers. Some segments of current music has very violent lyrics. In specific sporting events like hockey, football, basketball, and football, which some would suggest are violent in themselves, it is rare when fights among either the participants or the fans do not break out. Children receive play guns and other weapons for use as toys. One author has suggested that all of these things, which seem harmless taken separately may contribute to this culture of violence (Miedzian, 1991).

Miedzian (1991) states that this society has a long tradition of raising boys to be emotionally detached, deeply competitive, tough and concerned with dominance. "Their basest, most destructive tendencies are reinforced from the youngest age to the detriment of their altruistic, pro-social tendencies," Miedzian explains (1991:179). The solution, Miedzian suggests, is to encourage equal parenting and egalitarian partnerships, where violence and violent behavior are never modeled for the children. Furthermore, Miedzian states research has found that a male role model is crucial for the development of well-adjusted young men (1991). Single-parent mothers are not being singled out as the cause of their son's violence, but some have suggested that a little something may be lacking in the children's experience and a male role model provides it.

In our society, the schools, the home and time with peers are all arenas in which sex roles are taught. At home, children tend to be treated differently by their parents depending on their sex: girls may be more cuddled and "mothered," and taught to be passive and nurturing, while the boys are more encouraged to be tough, adventurous, and aggressive (Farley, 1992). For much of their formative years, boys and girls play separate games, and rewards and punishments for sex role conformity are especially strong among peers during the school years (Farley, 1992). As they advance further in their education, boys and girls are encouraged to think and behave differently (Farley, 1992). Girls are more likely to be encouraged to specialize in areas requiring verbal, artistic, or domestic skills whereas boys are pointed toward science or math, or perhaps mechanical areas. Throughout individuals' lives, gender roles are flung onto them by society, and these supposed ideals are continually reinforced as the "right" way to act or be.

Male Peer Support Theory

According to social learning theory, individuals are socialized by their peers, schools, family and other sources (Farley, 1992). Men have controlled the largest social institution to the samlles unity, the family, during much of

human history. DeKeseredy (1990) has suggested that the link between socialization and male dominance in society is a very important one. This author proposed in a 1990 work that males who have a support system of peers who engage in or condone vilence are more likely to hold non-egalitarian or abusive views toward women. DeKeseredy realizes the importance of the peer group and its socializing influences, and sets to test his theory empirically.

Analysis of patriarchal society, such as that which can be found in the United States, has found that male peer groups can find suport for their sexually aggressive and and/or exploitive attitudes toward women (DeKeseredy, 1990; DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1995). DeKeseredy has suggested that one's male peer group may be a more important socializing factor than what happened in the family of origin or in the school. His recent works (1990, 1995) seem to offer confirmatory data for DeKeseredy's male peer support theory.

Conflict Skills

Conflict resolution skills, or how individuals choose to solve or respond to problems, are learned from a variety of sources. Social learning theory proposes that the family, the schools, the peers, and other social institutions are the most important agents from which individuals learn to handle unpleasant situations.

People react to different situations in ways that they have been taught. For instance, individuals who have learned that avoiding the situation is a viable will continue to exercise that option in future experiences. Social learning theorist, and especially proponents of the intergenerartional transmission of violence theory, have suggeted that we use what skills we have, and so if all an individual knows are violent techniques, then violent tactics are the methods they will utilize.

The following section more fully illustrates the degree to which dating violence is currently a social problem, explain how social learning theory has been used to study dating violence, and highlight some common variables found in the literature associated with the societal issue.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Dating violence has been identified as an important phenomenon itself as well as a precursor to future domestic violence, and therefore must be studied (Alexander, Moore, & Alexander III, 1991). Violence which occurs at an early stage of interpersonal development is a strong indication of the possibility of violence in later adult relationships (O'Keeffe et al., 1986). It is asserted that dating is, in effect, the training ground for developing skills necessary to maintain a marriage and family (Clark, Beckett, Wells, & Dungee-Anderson, 1994; Miller & Simpson, 1991). In other words, pre-marital relationships provided the context in which individuals are socialized into later marital roles, and these socialization experiences may be positive or negative (White & Koss, 1991).

Social learning theorists indicate that aggression is learned through early life experiences (Pirog-Good, 1992). The theory has been used as a model in order to examine the effects of either experiencing abuse oneself as a child or witnessing abusiveness between one's parents (Alexander et al., 1991). According to social learning theory, in adulthood, violence emerges between intimates as a result of repeating behaviors that one has observed or experienced

when young (Pirog-Good, 1992). In other words, violence that occurs at an early stage of interpersonal development in the family is a strong indication of the possibility of violence in later adult relationships (O'Keeffe et al., 1986). Lastly, behavior learned in the family or from peers may not manifest itself until years later (Miedzian, 1991). Of course, this relationship is not absolute, but people from these kinds of families are more likely to incur violence in their later experiences. Some individuals do break the cycle, and certainly is the topic for many other studies.

Intergenerational transmission of violence theory

The intergenerational transmission of violence theory proposes that the family experience is by far the most important comonent in the socialization process for the individual, mor so than other social institutions. Some evidence on the intergenerational transmission of violence has focused on two main antecedents of dating and marital abuse: the experience of growing up in an abusive home and the assimilation of patriarchal values (Alexander et al., 1991). Social learning theory has been used as a model to examine the effects of either experiencing abuse oneself as a child or witnessing abusiveness between one's parents (Alexander et al., 1991). One component of social learning

theory, the intergenerational transmission of violence theory, indicates that the individuals have learned that violence happens at home, between those whom they love and look to for modeling. They learn that those that love them, hit them or each other, and so that behavior mustn't be that bad (Little, 1995). This theory suggests that if a child sees mother and father together or singularly engaging in violence, then this child is more likely than other children from nonviolent families to use violence or condone its usage.

Violence that occurs at an early stage of interpersonal development is a strong indication of the possibility of violence in later adult realtionships, O'Keeffe et al. have asserted (1991). Some researchers have confirmed a link for those in abusive dating relationships with a family background of marital violence (Worth, Matthews, & Coleman, 1990; Folingstad, Kalichmand, Cafferty, & Vormbrock, 1992; Alexander et al., 1991), while another suggests that the modeling of violent behavior in the family of origin is not sufficient to explain later violence in dating relationships (Follette & Alexander, 1992). Further research has failed to clarify the importance of this theory. For instance, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) have learned that a high proportion of abusers experienced or witnessed violence in

the home. Other studies have found no support of the hypothesis that women who had witnessed physical abuse between parents and experienced violence as a child would be more likely to inflict and sustain abuse (Pirog-Good, 1992). On the contrary, Miller and Simpson (1991) found that among females, exposure to parental violence and mild violence within their own relationships decreases the likelihood of terminating the relationship. Related research has indicated that there is a significant correlation between individuals with knowledge of child abuse in the homes of others with violent relationships of their own (O'Keeffe et al., 1986).

Citing numerous studies, Miedzian argues that the presence of a caring, involved father has been found to decrease the chance of a son being violent (Miedzian, 1991). Additionally, paternal control (Clark et al., 1994) and severe abuse by his father was found to predict a man's violence behavior, and some researchers have also found that past exposure to violence is more likely to make its effects felt among males than females (Alexander et al., 1991; Miller & Simpson, 1991). Researchers discovered that having parents who practiced restrictive parenting styles is another variable believed to be a potential risk factor for dating violence (Clark et al., 1994). Along similar lines,

it was suggested that the break-up of parental marital status affects male and female children differently, in terms of future dating violence (Tontodonato & Crew, 1992).

Sex Role Socialization

Inconsistencies between the role expectations of women and men have resulted in misunderstandings, misperceptions, conflicts, and violence in the relationship (Clark et al., 1994). Research has suggested that some specific aspects of sex role identity may be associated with abusive interactions of men. According to some studies, adversarial sexual beliefs emerged as a predictor of dating violence for males (Bookwala et al., 1992; Cate and Lloyd, 1992). Burt (1980) created scaling measures to identify respondent's degrees of acceptance of certain particular stereotypical myths relating to women and rape. In her Rape Myth Scale, one of her most famous constructs, Burt (1980) includes the following types of questions:

> If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape. In any rape case one would have to question whether the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation. Even though the woman may call it rape, she probably enjoyed it (and so forth, see Appendix A).

These and similar questions comprise Burt's Rape Myth Scale.

Another result of her work with rape has been the creation of a scale which measures the degree of belief in

adversarial views concerning the sexes. "Men and women are generally out to use each other," "most people are pretty devious and manipulative when they are tying to attract someone of the opposite sex," and "men and women can not really be friends" are some of the examples of items that comprise the Adversarial Beliefs Scale (Burt, 1980).

Continued review of the literature shows that previous research has been conducted on attitudes towards aggression and dating violence (Cate & Lloyd, 1992). It has been found that individuals who have experienced aggression in a dating relationship tend to hold less negative attitudes toward dating violence (Bookwala et al., 1992). This fact is central to the ideas of social learning theory; if one sees or experiences violence, one is more likely to condone, excuse, or perpetrate the acts. Furthermore, male perpetrators of dating violence have been found to have a greater acceptance of violence (Bookwala et al., 1992). So, it appears that those who engage in dating violence tend to hold less negative views of such violence in general, and dating violence specifically.

Research has revealed that more traditional attitudes towards women's roles tend to be associated with early onset of force in a relationship (Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, & Sebastian, 1991). For example, a more masculine and/or less

feminine gender orientation was a strong predictor of men and women's involvement in courtship violence (Worth et al., 1990; Thompson, 1991). Additionally, Thompson (1991) has found that a more masculine and/or less feminine gender orientation and variations in relationship seriousness proved to be the two strongest predictors of both men's and women's involvement in courtship violence (Thompson, 1991). Likewise, Worth et al. (1990) discovered that men who participated in abusive interactions had lower femininity scores than did men without such interactions. Finally, empirical evidence points to more traditional sex role attitudes significantly predicting male infliction of violence (Bookwala et al., 1992).

It has been suggested that the problem of violence lies in the imposition of rigid sex roles: if our ideas of what constitutes acceptable male and female behavior were more fluid, boys raised by mothers would not have to act "hyper-masculine" in order to prove that they are real men, for it would be acceptable for them to be empathetic, caring, and emotionally connected (Miedzian, 1991). For the most part, however, it appears that it is the feminine orientation, with the affiliated qualities of empathizing, listening, and the like, which acts as an inhibitor to individuals to act out violence. One study found that females were less

likely to think force could be justifiable in a dating relationship (Follingstad et al., 1991).

Related to problems arising from role expectations is the issue of sexual abuse or sexual aggression, which often occurs in the context of dating relationships. Some contradictions can be observed in the literature. Studies have investigated adolescents' and college students' beliefs about date rape and other forced sexual behaviors within specific social contexts to determine how these attitudes are affected by gender and other variables (Feltey et al., 1991). Obviously, the most consistent finding on sexual aggression is that females are the victims and males are the perpetrators, during the vast majority of the cases (Feltey et al., 1991). The researchers also found that the extent of rape and other forms of sexual abuse and coercion is much greater than generally believed (Feltey et al., 1991).

The study conducted by Vogel and Himelein (1995) revealed that experiencing early childhood sexual assault and possessing adversarial sexual beliefs were related to increased levels of sexual victimization including date rape. Fischer and Chen (1992) found that prior victimization, either as a child, teenager, or adult neither identified forcible sex offenders nor verbally coercive offenders. Thus, prior victimization as a risk factor for

both victims and perpetrators has had varying results. Additional study is suggested by the literature, as social learning theory would suggest that individuals who were sexually victimized as children would be more likely to encounter such actions in later relationships, perhaps not labeling such actions as sexual assault due to their previous experiences.

Many writers have suggested that American society is a "rape culture," a society in which sexual violence is supported by specific cultural characteristics (Brownmiller, 1975). These cultural characteristics have been described as the different myths or stereotyped beliefs about gender, the sexes and sexual contexts. For example, Burt (1980) defines myths as prejudicial, stereotyped or false beliefs about rape, rape victims, and rapists. Some examples of such rape myths are the following: good girls don't get raped; they secretly wanted it; they enjoyed it eventually; rapists rape out of extreme sexual hunger and so forth.

Many Americans do believe many rape myths (Burt, 1980). Usually, the degree to which Americans believe these myths are surprising when discovered by means of a survey on the topic. It has been found that these rape attitudes are strongly connected to other deeply held attitudes such as sex role stereotyping, distrust of the opposite sex

(adversarial sexual beliefs) and acceptance of interpersonal violence (Burt, 1980). Indeed, empirical work has suggested that rape-supportive attitudes are among the few variables that discriminate sexually aggressive college men from other men (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995).

Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) note that the essential characteristic of a myth is not necessarily the degree to which it represents an empirical fact, but the particular cultural function which is served by the belief or attitude. In addition, these authors argue that rape mythology serves to justify particular cultural practices, namely the widespread victimization of women manifested by the beliefs that women are not to be trusted or believed, are lesser individuals in a variety of ways, along with other such ideas (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Such ideas are related to the Hostility Toward Women Scale (Check & Malamuth, 1985), Adversarial Heterosexual Beliefs Scale (Burt, 1980), and Attitudes Toward Violence Scale (Velicer, Huckel, & Hansen, 1989).

The Hostility Toward Women scale is comprised of the following types of statement: other women are responsible for my troubles; when it comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful; and I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them (Check & Malumuth, 1985,

see Appendix A). Items included in Attitudes Toward Violence scale range from opinions on child rearing, to adult relationships, to general ideas of violence. For example, "giving mischievous children a quick slap is the best way to end trouble; it is all right for a partner to slap the other if insulted or ridiculed; war is often necessary," and so on (Velicer et al., 1989; see Appendix A).

As discussed earlier, the Adversarial Heterosexual Beliefs Scale was developed by Burt (1980) in her research on rape and rape myths. This scale assesses the extent to which respondents expect relationships to be fundamentally exploitive. Koss and Gidycz found that sexually aggressive men hold more adversarial sexual beliefs (1985).
Two other researchers discovered that Adversarial Beliefs Scale appears to be related to victimization, and it is possible that adversarial attitudes develop after victimization has occurred and may not be a predictor (Vogel & Himelein, 1995). They conclude tentatively that it may be impossible to determine which occurred first, the beliefs then the victimization, or vice versa (Vogel & Himelein, 1995).

Another area of dating violence that had much attention in the literature is the question of who instigates or

primarily perpetrates the violence in the dating relationship. Evidence from the literature indicates that the types of violence and the incidence of injuries are not evenly distributed across men and women; men are two to four times as likely to use the more severe forms of violence, and women are three to four times as likely to report injuries resulting from the violence (Makepeace, 1983; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1989). Physical size alone may contribute to the greater percentage of injuries that women are likely to report to authorities when victimized by men (Clarke et al., 1994). Further research has investigated the reciprocity of dating violence, and the prevalence of such behavior in greater detail elsewhere.

Male peer support theory

The link between socialization and male dominance in a patriarchal society is critical in understanding the nature of woman abuse (DeKeseredy, 1990). According to social learning theory, individuals are socialized by their peers, schools, family, and other sources (Farley,1992). Men have controlled our largest institutions down to our smallest unit, the family, for a long time in the majority of places and times. In order to clearly vie the present, the past must be thoroughly examined, and power

relationships that dictate the operation of society also must be addressed.

Male peer groups that support sexually aggressive and exploitive attitudes towards women can find cultural support for their view in larger society (Feltey et al., 1991). Some examples of these groups are sports teams, fraternities, the military, and other civic or service clubs, as well as casual associations of a group of male friends. Feltey et al. (1991) wrote that insensitivity to women's feelings and pro-rape attitudes are supported by these male peer groups. Some have argued that these groups are smaller replicas of the larger patriarchal society.

DeKeseredy (1990) reported many men experience stress in college dating relationships, and suggested a link between men's social support network and the perpetration of dating violence. Some examples of dating life stressors are minor arguments, sexual problems, dating partners' disapproval of alcohol or drugs, and challenges to patriarchal authority (DeKeseredy, 1990). The author suggests that some men turn to their male peers looking for social support and from them receive views condoning dating violence (DeKeseredy, 1990). In this study, social support refers to attachment to male peers and the resources these men provide to their friends which encourage and legitimate

dating violence, and this advice and guidance appears to influence men to abuse female intimates (DeKeseredy, 1990).

In his 1990 study, DeKeseredy found support for the following three hypotheses:

1. The more stress men experience, the more likely they will be to abuse their dating partners.
2. The more stress men experience, the more likely they will seek social support.
3. The more social support men receive from abusive subcultures, the more likely they are to abuse their dating partners (1990:328).

DeKeseredy and Kelly (1995) later confirmed these findings in a replication study, and further refined the concept of male peer support theory. Here, three variants of male peer support were measured. The first variation of male peer support theory was that of informational support, referring to the guidance and advice that influence men to sexually, physically, and psychologically assault their dating partners (DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1995). Attachment to abusive male peers comprised the second index of the theory, while the last male peer support index measured male peer pressure to have sex (DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1995). It was found that an increase in male peer support increases the probability of pre-marital woman abuse (DeKeseredy, 1990). DeKeseredy is not suggesting that these male peer groups are detrimental in and of themselves, but only when they support

sexist, sexually aggressive or exploitive attitudes toward women.

In a similar vein, Worth et al. (1990) found an association between abusive experiences and fraternity or sorority affiliation. Why the sorority affiliation maybe important has not yet been satisfactorily answered in the literature yet. Tontodonato and Crew (1992) discovered that knowledge of use of dating violence by others is predictive of one's own use of violence for females, but not however, for males. These two studies do not measure male peer support theory, as laid out by DeKeseredy, but nonetheless the findings are important to this theory. Collaborative support for male peer support theory, as outlined by DeKeseredy, has not yet been reported in the literature.

Conflict Skills

Conflict theorists have asserted that conflict is an inevitable part of all human association (Straus, 1979). It has been suggested by social learning theorists that behavior is learned through direct experience and observational learning and so would indicate that conflict resolutions skills are learned from relationships within the family of origin as well as from peers (Stephan & Stephan, 1985).

Theories of both marital and dating aggression identify conflict as an important causal factor leading to aggression between partners (Riggs, 1993). Furthermore, the context surrounding aggressive incidents reveals that verbal aggression may be the seed of physical aggression (Stets & Henderson, 1991). Billingham (1987) found that nonabusive dating subjects reported lower levels of verbal aggression than subjects who had used violence. Bookwala et al. (1992) found that for women, verbal aggression was predictive of expressed violence. Researchers theorize that the modeling of aggression in intimate relationships, the acceptance of aggression as a response to conflict, and the consequences of aggression play a role in determining who is likely to use dating violence (Riggs & O'Leary, 1989).

Violence can take many forms. Some differentiate violence in terms of mode of expression; for example, physical, verbal and emotional abuse (Cate & Lloyd, 1992). Researchers have defined physical violence in courtship as "the use or threat of physical force or restraint carried out with the intent of causing pain or injury to another," (Cate & Lloyd, 1992:14). Verbal and emotional abuse can be harder to differentiate; self-reported surveys designed to measure this type of abuse usually focus on how the individual interacts during a conflict. Verbal aggression

has sometimes been operationalized as insulting, swearing, or screaming at the other person; sulking or refusing to talk about a topic, saying something to spite the other, and so forth (Straus, 1979). Generally, violence has been operationalized as the number of times in the past year the premarital partners have engaged in pushing, shoving, slapping, kicking, biting, hitting with fists, trying to hit with an object, beatings, and threats/use of weapons (Cate & Lloyd, 1992).

To measure the different conflict tactics couples use, Straus developed a scale entitled the "Conflict Tactics Scale," commonly known as the CT Scale (Straus, 1979). This scale is a standard measure of levels of violence in relationships; it measures different strategies people use to resolve conflicts with their partners (Bookwala et al., 1992). Three modes of dealing with conflict were focused upon in this scale, namely the use of rational discussion, argument and reasoning, the use of verbal and nonverbal acts which symbolically hurt the other or the use of threats to hurt the other, and the use of physical force against another person as a means of resolving the conflict (Straus, 1979). Straus refers to these three as the Reasoning sub scale, the Verbal Aggression sub scale, and the Violence sub scale (Straus, 1979). Countless researchers in the field of

domestic and dating violence have since used and validated this important measurement device.

Drawing upon social learning theory and ideas associated with conflict resolution skills, Worth et al. developed resource theory to describe when individuals use violence as a resource to resolve conflictual interactions when all other non-violent sources have failed or are perceived to have failed (1990: 413). For example, Riggs (1993) found that the relatively more severe and larger number of problems reported by individuals in aggressive relationships may be the result of a tendency to elevate any disagreement to a problem or conflict.

Next explored is the hypothesis that marital dissolution is a measure of the subjects exposure to conflict and conflict-resolution techniques and that subjects whose parents' marriage has dissolved will report greater use of dating violence than subjects from intact families (Tontodonato & Crew, 1992). Additionally, Billingham and Notebaert (1993) found that college students who are from divorced families reported they use violence as a strategy in conflict resolution significantly more than their counterparts from intact families. These noteworthy results suggest that individuals from intact families differ from their peers of divorced families in ability to resolve

conflict within their relationships (Billingham & Notebaert, 1993).

Implications for the Current Research

Past research has shown conflicting results when testing components of social learning theory : support has been found in some studies, while refuted in others (see Worth et al., 1990; Follingstad et al., 1992; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Pirog-Good, 1992; Alexander et al., 1991; Miller & Simpson, 1991).

Socialization is one specific aspect of social learning theory that has generated much discussion. Research has suggested that certain aspects of sex role identity may be associated with abusive interactions. Some suggest that a more masculine and/or less feminine gender orientation was a strong predictor of men and women's involvement in courtship violence (Worth et al., 1990; Thompson, 1991) while others (Clark et al., 1994) have found that women and men who describe themselves as feminine were as likely to inflict violence on their partner. In addition, adversarial sex role beliefs have found to be important when relating to dating violence (see Bookwala et al., 1992; Cate & Lloyd, 1992). Other beliefs scales, such as Hostility Toward Women scale, Attitudes Toward Violence scale, Rape Myths scale and others could have important prediction value in

determining who are most likely to engage in or condone dating violence (Burt, 1980; Follingstad et al., 1992). Researchers have tentatively stated that a variety of personality traits may be linked with abusive behaviors (Follingstad et al.,1992). Additional study of the effects sex role socialization on dating violence is needed.

DeKeseredy's male peer support theory is also derived from social learning theory (1990; DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1995). This theory takes into account the sex typing and gender role socialization relating to males and male peer groups, while demonstrating the link to dating violence. Further verification or rebuttal data is needed in order to give credibility to this emerging theory.

Conflict resolution skills is another component of social learning theory that needs closer attention. Current literature indicates that different types of families do in fact transmit differing abilities to resolve conflict (See Billingham & Notebaert, 1993; Riggs, 1993; Worth et al., 1992). In this work, conflict resolution skills, namely if violence or threats of violence are intimated, will be the focal point of the dependent constructs.

Dating violence and social learning theory with its related components of the intergenerational transmission of violence theory, sex role socialization, male peer support

theory, with the dependent constructs derived from conflict resolution skills, are all truly important topics needing further investigation.

CHAPTER 3

DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

In order to research and test the implications of components of social learning theory and the violence of the male subjects, a survey study was undertaken, based on a convenience sample of college students. Before the disbursement of the survey instrument, proper approval was obtained from the University of Northern Iowa Human Subjects Review Board. Upon approval, this questionnaire was distributed to students at the University of Northern Iowa during introductory-level sociology courses prior to the end of spring semester 1996 (see Appendix B for instrument). Sections from the courses Principles of Sociology, Social Problems, and Social Deviance and Control were included in the convenience sample.

Some researchers have suggested that the adherence to particular socially learned attitudes and influences is related to the propagation of dating violence (Burt, 1980; Koss & Oros, 1985). For example, this researcher hypothesizes that individuals who score higher on the Rape Myths scales, Hostility Toward Women scales and the Adversarial Heterosexual Beliefs scale, as well as other measures will be more likely to engage in or condone dating violence. Furthermore, the effects of violence within the

family of origin are investigated, in order to detemine if and how well the intergenerational transmission of violence theory predicts dating violence. Lastly, it is hypothesized that men who spend more time in male social groups who condone the perpetration of dating abuse will hold more favorable attitudes towards dating violence (DeKeseredy, 1990).

A set of social influences and socially learned attitudes comprise the independent variables for this study, including intergenerational transmission of violence theory, traditional sex role beliefs and male peer support theory. Violence will be measured by using the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) and the Sexual Experience Scale (Koss & Oros, 1982), as both have been often used and validated, and considered standards for this topic of study. The approximately twelve page questionnaire included the following scales and constructs: Adversarial Heterosexual Beliefs scale, Attitudes Towards Violence scale, Rape Myths scale, a modified version of the Conflict Tactics scale, Sexual Experience scale, and other related items (Burt, 1980; Check & Malamuth, 1985; Lonsay & Fitzgerald, 1995; Fischer & Chen, 1994; Pan, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994; Mertin, 1992; Koss & Oros, 1982; Straus, 1979). DeKeseredy's (1990) male peer support theory is also investigated.

Data

The survey instrument was distributed among both male and female students at the University of Northern Iowa during introductory and mid level sociology courses prior to the end of spring semester 1996. Data were collected over a one week period during the first week in May, 1996. Sections from the courses of Principles of Sociology (two sections), Social Problems (two sections), and Social Deviance and Control(one section) were utilized for this convenience sample. Furthermore, a snowball sample was derived from the Social Deviance and Control class (n = 121) by giving one extra credit point for every completed survey, with a limit of four surveys per person. It was ascertained that all five sections had briefly covered the topics of dating violence or domestic violence. Instructors of the Introduction to Sociology and Social Problems courses covered the material via the textbook, but class time was not devoted to interpersonal violence. The professor for the Social Deviance and Control course covered interpersonal violence in a unit, both with materials from the text and in lecture. The total sample size was 322 students, including 123 males. Males' behavior was chosen to be focused upon for the dependent variable in this study, specifically their

sexually abusive or violent behavior, and so female responses were not included in the current analyses.

Although college students are not appropriate for many studies, it was felt that their use could be justified for this research project. For example, college-age students are in the high-risk age and occupational group for reported rape and dating violence (Koss & Gidycz, 1985). The purpose of this study was to ascertain generalizable findings to the male college-aged population in the Midwest, and due to its limited scope, specifically to those in the social sciences.

Variables

Independent

Nine independent variables or constructs deemed most important by past research were chosen for study. The surveys, approximately 20 minutes in length, were distributed during class time, and requested information from both males and females. Analyses only concentrated on the males' responses in order to investigate the proposed hypotheses. Frequency distributions of the variables are presented in Table 1.

The following variables are constructs comprised of multiple questions (see Appendix A for constructs and individual questions). Key concepts derived from the dating

Table 1

Distribution of Key Variables (n=123 males)

Variables	X	Range	SD
Divorce (0 = no, 1 = yes)	.24	0-1	.43
Attachment to Parents (low = attached, high = not attached)	8.85	4-14	1.87
Parents Use of Force (0 = no, 1 = yes)	.24	0-1	.43
Adversarial Beliefs (low = adversarial, high = not adversarial)	27.52	4-40	6.62
Attitudes Toward Violence (low = yes attitude, high = no attitude)	25.78	12-41	6.61
Hostility Toward Women (low = hostile, high = not hostile)	16.12	0-24	3.94
Date Rape Acceptance (low = accept rape, high = do not accept)	28.15	2-32	6.16
Rape Myths (low = believe, high = do not believe)	48.98	5-64	10.11
Male Peers (low = many neg peers, high = not many neg peers)	11.56	3-17	1.98
Partner Violence (0 = no, 1 = yes)	.33	0-1	.47

Note. Questions making up these scales are presented in Appendix A.

violence literature were included in the questionnaire (see Appendix B for the survey instrument). The scales were then initially identified by means of an orthogonal (Varimax) factor analytic solution of a number of items related to each concept that are included in the self-report instrument. Once the factor analysis indicated which variables clustered together, additive computation of the raw scores was used to create individual scales. Reliability tests were also performed for construct validity. Items were either omitted if they detracted from the internal consistency of the scale or added if it made theoretical or empirical sense to do so (see Appendix A). The individual questions for each scales used in the analysis, the factor loadings, and Kronbach's alpha are presented in Appendix A. Responses to individual questions were answered on a five point Likert scale.

The intergenerational transmission theory of violence focuses on two main antecedents of interpersonal violence: the experience of growing up in an abusive home and the assimilation of patriarchal values (Alexander et al., 1991). The first independent variable is "Divorce," the only non-scale variable of the study. In the survey, the respondents were asked if their family had ever been impacted by divorce or death of a parent. Approximately 23% of the sample

answered in the affirmative for the question. The next two independent variables were operationalized to measure the levels of the respondents' attachment to their parents and violence that occurs between parents in the family of origin.

"Attachment to Parents" is a construct comprised of four questions from the questionnaire (see Appendix A for factor loadings and alpha levels). Here the questions ask the respondent if they share their thoughts and feelings with their parents, and if they would like to be a similar sort of person their parents are (a = .62). Here, a low number signifies that the respondent is attached to the parents, while a higher number signifies the respondent is not very attached to the parents. The range of Attachment to Parents was 4 and 14, while the mean was 8.9. The next construct, "Parents Use of Force" (a = .72), is made up of two questions from the survey. The questions inquire as to the respondents' observation of physical force between their parents. This construct was dichotomized due to low variability into no/yes categories. Roughly 24% of the respondents agreed to their parents using some physical force upon each other. With a range of 0 to 1, the mean for Parents Use of Force was .24, with a standard deviation of .43. Two questions from the survey asking about the

respondent's experiences of physical force from their parents were not utilized, due to a very low alpha (a = .45), and so only violence between the respondents' parents were included in this analysis.

The independent belief variables are comprised of questions with a five point Likert scale response. Options range from strongly agree (coded as 0) to strongly disagree (coded as 4). Each scale is coded low to high, so low scores on the sex role beliefs scales mean the respondent does believe or believe very strongly in the selected myths. Contrarily, if a resondent scores high on the belief scaling constructs, then the respondent does not believe in the myths. Ideally, a researcher would hope for higher schores on the scales, indicating a high level of disbelief in the sexist/abusive scales. The variable of male peer support is coded in a similar way, with a low number signifying a high rate of negative male peer support, and a high number signifying a lower rate of negative male peer support. Again, ideally the researcher would hope for higher scores on the scale, indicating that the respondents did not have a negative male peer group.

These five independent variables are all indices that measure different attitudes and beliefs, and have been used very successfully in previous literature. The first of the

constructs, "Adversarial Beliefs" (Burt, 1980) includes a total of 10 items, with an alpha of .87. These questions investigate how strongly the respondent agrees with beliefs that men and women are very adversarial towards one another, hold non-egalitarian views, and so forth. For instance, some of the following are statements to which the respondents agreed or disagreed: "men and women can't really be friends"; "in all societies it is inevitable that one sex is dominant;" and "when women enter the work force they are taking jobs away from men"(Burt, 1980). This construct's range was between 4 and 40, with a mean of 27.5.

"Attitudes Toward Violence", the second belief construct, measures the respondents' beliefs (degree of agreement) about the use and acceptance of violence (Burt, 1980). Comprised of 11 items from the questionnaire, the alpha is .79. "A child's habitual disobedience should be punished physically;" "it is okay for a partner to hit the other if they flirt with others;" war is often necessary;" and "violent crimes should be punished violently" are some of the questions included in this construct (Burt, 1980). The mean for Attitudes Toward Violence was found to be 25.8, with a range from 12 to 41.

The third construct is that of "Hostility Toward Women" (Check & Malamuth, 1985). This scale is an attempt to

isolate particular anti-women beliefs held by the respondents. Six items from the questionnaire make up the scale, and an alpha of .80 was found. Some samples of the types of questions are, "Other women are responsible for most of my troubles" and "When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful" (Check & Malamuth, 1985). A range of 0 to 24 was found for the construct Hostility Toward Women, with a mean of 16.1.

Next, a rape scenario was printed in the questionnaire, and a series of questions were then proposed, in order to determine the acceptance of various date rape misconceptions (Fischer & Chen, 1994). The "Date Rape Acceptance" construct included eight questions from the questionnaire, and had an alpha of .95. For instance, after being presented with the scenario, respondents were asked for their degree of agreement to questions such as the following: "It was okay if they had dated each other for a long time;" "It was okay if he was so sexually excited he couldn't stop;" and "It was okay if she led him on" (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). Careful attention was paid to the wording in the scenario and in the following questions to avoid the word "rape" or "date rape." In this case, the range for the variable was from 2 to 32, with a mean of 28.2.

The last of the belief constructs relate to specific rape myths and the respondents' degree of agreement (Burt, 1980). The "Rape Myths" construct included 16 questions from the survey, with an alpha of .92. The purpose of the scale is to measure the individual's level of agreement with stereotypical sexual beliefs about the phenomena of rape. The following are some of the included questions: "If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape; "In any rape case one would have to question whether the victim is promiscuous; and "When men rape, it is because of their strong desire for sex." The range for Rape Myths was found to be 5 to 64, with a mean of 48.9.

The final independent construct is that of "Male Peers," derived from male peer support theory. The six items comprising the construct (a = .83) are derived from DeKeseredy and Kelly (1995). Based on DeKeseredy's male peer support theory (1990), these items ascertain how influential one's male friends are, specifically relating to the use of violence or abuse toward one's dating partner. DeKeseredy and Kelly (1995) terms this informational support, meaning the guidance and advice that influence men to sexually, physically, and psychologically assault their dating partners. The questions ask how many the subjects' friends..."would approve of slapping their date if she

insults him in public;" "have told that your girlfriends or date should have sex with you when you want;" and "have told that it is alright for a min to hit his date or girlfriend in certain situations." The range for this variable was 3 to 17, and a mean of 11.6, with an alpha of .83.

Dependent

Two dependent constructs were decided upon after consulting the literature. The first construct is derived of items from Koss and Oros (1982) and their Sexual Experiences Scale. This scale investigates the respondents' experiences relating to sexual coercion, sexual abuse, and sexual assault (Koss & Oros, 1982). For this study, five questions from the 11 question Sexual Experiences Scale were used to create a Date Rape construct (see Appendix A for factor loadings and alpha scores). Some examples of types of questions are the following: "Have you ever...obtained sexual intercourse by saying things you didn't really mean; had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to, because you threatened physical force if she didn't cooperate; and had sexual intercourse or other sex acts with a woman who may have not wanted to, but was too drunk or stoned to say anything about it at the time." Chronbach's alpha was found to be acceptable (a=.91). The mean for this construct was found to be .1 with a range of 0 to 6.

However, after dichotomizing this variable, approximately 5 out of the 123 males (4%) admitted to actions that are defined as sexual abuse. Due to the extremely low variability, this dependent variable was removed from further correlation and regression analyses. Even though 4% may seem to be a small percentage of males admitting to sexual abuse, it is still disturbing.

The second dependent construct assesses male's violence toward their partners (furthermore this will be the variable referred to as the dependent variable of this study) Straus's (1979) Conflict Tactics Scale was used in the questionnaire, and requested information both about the respondents' use of violence as well as their partner's usage. The CT Scale has been used in many studies of dating and marital violence, and has been found to have high reliability, concurrent and construct validity (Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1981). Straus (1977) divided up his scale to measure three concepts: the use of rational discussion, argument, and reasoning, the use of verbal and nonverbal acts which symbolically hurt the other, and the use of physical force against another person as a means of resolving the conflict. Here, only the last section was investigated, that is, the violence component of the Conflict Tactics Scale. Twelve items from the 22 item

Conflict Tactics Scale were utilized in this study to form the variable Parnter Violence. Presented her are some examples of the type of questions included in the construct: "in the last 18 months of your relationship, have you ever: threw, smashed, or kicked something; hit or tried to hit with something; threatened with a knife, gun or other weapon" and so forth. The alpha for the 12 questions was very satisfactory, a = .95. Again, due to low variability, the "Partner Violence" construct was dichotomized into no/yes categories. It was found that 33% of the sample admitted to some form of aggression.

Analyses Procedures

After the data from the questionnaire were entered and cleaned, reliability tests and confirmatory factor analyses were run on the scales. They were determined to be reliable (alpha scores ranged from .62 to .95) and factor analysis suggested that the independent items clustered in ways consistent with the theoretical constructs and with previous studies.

Zero-order correlations between the nine independent and dependent variable were completed. Then, Partner Violence, the dependent variable, was regressed on the nine independent variables, using the logistic regression

procedure in the SPSS package. These results are presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The dependent variable, Partner Violence, was associated with several of the independent variables. Zero-order correlation results are presented in Table 2.

The intergenerational transmission of violence theory was operationalized as three concepts, Divorce, Attachment to Parents and Parents' Use of Force, relating to reported dating violence. Parents Use of Force and Attachment to Parents were found to be significantly related (r = .28, p<.01). The literature described an association between parents' use of force and attachment to parents, and this study offers confirmatory data. Partner Violence was not found to be significantly related to Parents Use of Force, Attachment to Parents or the Divorce variable. These findings shed some doubt upon the intergenerational transmission of violence theory, which has otherwise generated much support in the literature (Worth et al., 1990; Follette & Alexander, 1992; Alexander et al., 1991). In addition, Parents Use of Force ws found to be significantly correlated with both Date Rape Acceptance and Male Peers (r = -.24, p<.01 and r = -.19, p<.05 respectively).

Table 2

Zero-Order Correlations Among Variables (n=123)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
(5) Independent Variables					
(1) Divorce	1.00				
(2) Attachment to Parents	.14	1.00			
(3) Parents Use Force	.18	.28**	1.00		
(4) Adversarial Beliefs	.10	.06	-.10	1.00	
(5) Attitudes Violence	.20*	.12	-.14	.35**	1.00
(6) Hostility To Women	.05	.00	-.10	.61**	.53**
(7) Date Rape Acceptance	-.00	.01	-.24**	.40**	.17
(8) Rape Myths	.18	.03	-.10	.51**	.32**
(9) Male Peers	.02	-.10	-.19*	.32**	.04
Dependent Variable					
(10) Partner Violence	.01	.07	.12	-.20*	-.03

	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Independent Variables					
(6) Hostility To Women	1.00				
(7) Date Rape Acceptance	.53**	1.00			
(8) Rape Myths	.71**	.65**	1.00		
(9) Male Peers	.22*	.26**	.21*	1.00	
Dependent Variable					
(10) Partner Violence	-.23*	-.07	-.10	-.27**	1.00

*p<.05
**p<.01

Previous research has suggested the break-up of parental marital status affects the children in terms of future dating violence (Tontodonato & Crew, 1992). Related to the intergenerational transmission of violence theory, the variable of whether the respondents' parents had divorced, were added to the analyses. It was found that if parents were not divorced, the respondents held less favorable attitudes toward violence (r = .20, p<.05). Conversely then, if the respondents parents had divorced, these respondents were more likely than others to hold more favorable views toward violence. These findings seems to show premliminary support of the intergenerational transmission of violence theory. However, Divorce was not found to be significantly correlated with the dependent variable.

The five independent beliefs constructs will be discussed next. Traditional or stereotypical sex role beliefs have been operationalized by the creation of these measures. It has been hypothesized that individuals who adhere to these ideas are more likely to engage in various forms of dating violence (Burt, 1980). Adversarial beliefs was found to be significantly correlated with the attitude constructs. Attitudes Toward Violence (r = .35, p<.01), Hostility Toward Women (r = .61, p<.01), Date Rape

Acceptance (r = -.40, p<.01), and Rape Myths (r = .51, p<.01) were all significantly associated with the Adversarial Beliefs construct. Furthermore, the Adversarial Beliefs variable was significantly correlated with the independent variable Male Peers (r = .32, p<.01) as well as with the dependent variable Partner Violence (r = -.20, p<.05).

The construct of Attitudes Toward Violence was found to be significantly related to two other variables. A correlation was found with the Hostility Toward Women construct, with r = .53, p<.01. Next, the data revealed that the construct was related to Rape Myths, r = .32, p<.01. Lastly, no correlation was found to exist between the Attitudes Toward Violence variable and Partner Violence.

The variable Hostility Toward Women was found to be significantly related to a number of other variables. For example, this construct was found to be statistically related to the Date Rape Acceptance construct, Rape Myth construct, and the Male Peer Support construct(r = .53, r = .71, p<.01 respectively; r = .22, p<.05). Hostility Toward Violence and the Partner Violence variable were found to be weakly associated, r =-.23, p<.05.

Next, the independent construct of Date Rape Acceptance was investigated. Date Rape Acceptance was found to be

significantly correlated to the two of the previously mentioned attitude scales (Adversarial Beliefs and Hostility Toward Women constructs). In addition, the Date Rape Acceptance scale was found to be significantly correlated to the Rape Myth construct (r = .65, p<.01) as well as with the Male Peer construct (r = .26, p<.01). The Date Rape Acceptance belief construct was not found to be correlated with the dependent variable Partner Violence.

Rape Myths were found to be significantly correlated with the four previous beliefs constructs. For example, the data revealed that the correlation between Rape Myths and Adversarial Beliefs were significant, as well as with the variable Attitudes Toward Violence, r = .51, p<.01 and r = .32, p<.01, respectively. Extensive research has found that the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (which portions of are used in the present study) and the Adversarial Sexual Beliefs scales are closely related (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1995). In addition, the data revealed that the correlation between Rape Myths and Hostility Toward Women were statistically significant to the .01 level, r = .71. Lonsway and Fitzgerald (1995) appears to have determined that rape myths may be assessing a basic hostility toward women, and so it is not surprising that these constructs are related, as they both may possibly be tapping the same

concept in different ways. The construct of Rape Myths was found to be significantly related to Date Rape Acceptance, $r = .65$, $p<.01$. Again, this relationship may be explained upon a closer examination of the constructs; possibly they both may be tapping the same concept only in slightly different ways. Additionally, the construct of Rape Myths was found to be significantly correlated with the independent variable of Male Peers ($r = .21$, $p<.05$). This finding is interesting, as male peers may be where the males pick up rape myths. Yet, for all of these associations, Rape Myths were not found to be significantly correlated with Partner Violence.

Six of the independent variables entered into the analysis were found to be significant for the Male Peers construct. A correlation for the data revealed that Male Peers and Adversarial Beliefs were significantly related, $r = .32$, $p<.01$. Theoretically, there is a link here. DeKeseredy (1990) suggests that a small number of studies show that patriarchal discourses and practices related to sexual assault are integral components of some all-male groups. Furthermore, it is asserted that members of "these homosocial collectives often engage in compulsive masculine behaviors" (DeKeseredy, 1995:48). For some all-male groups, victimization is closely related to group secrecy,

conformity, homophobia, and the sexual objectification of women (DeKeseredy, 1995). With this information in mind, it is not surprising to find Male Peers and Adversarial Beliefs to be significantly correlated. There were also significant associations between Male Peers and Parents Use of Force (r = -.19, p<.05), and Hostility Toward Women (r = .22, p<.05). Significant correlations were additionally found with the Date Rape Acceptance construct (r = .26, p<.01) and with Rape Myths (r = .21, p<.05).

The dependent construct of Partner Violence was found to be significantly related to three of the variables. Correlation analysis revealed that Partner Violence was not significantly related to any of the three variables operationalized from the intergenerational transmission of violence theory, Divorce, Attachment to Parents, and Parents Use of Force. These findings can be then interpreted as no or questionable support for the intergenerational transmission theory of violence.

Partner Violence appears to be significantly related to two out of the five dependent belief measures (Adversarial Beliefs, r = -.20, p<.05; Hostility Toward Women, r = -.23, p<.05). The correlation between Parner Violence and Male Peers was found to be statistically significant to the .01 level, r = -.27. Theoretically, these associations are

logical, in that these scales have been designed by other researchers in order to predict individuals who would be more likely to engage in some forms of dating violence. These findings lend support to the scales of Adversarial Beliefs and Hostility Toward Women. Future research may want to investigate why the other beliefs scales, Attitudes Toward Violence, Date Rape Acceptance, and Rape Myths were not significantly correlated with Partner Violence.

In order to assess the effect of the independent variables upon the variable Partner Violence, a multivariate analysis employing logistic regression was selected. When the dependent variable is dichotomous in nature, it is preferred to use a non-linear logit regression model where it is the log of the odds of falling into one rather than the other category that is under investigation. The distribution is of a log linear form of the probability of success. These results are presented in Table 3.

The initial model consists of nine independent variables regressed against the dichotomous Partner Violence variable. Here, the aim was to identify the best predictors of Partner Violence and to evaluate the overall predictability of the model. Preliminary runs included formulating a number of models in which the order and number of variables entered were varied. The chi-square for the

Table 3

Initial Model: Variables Predicting Violence (Logistic Regression)

Variables	B
Family of Origin	
Divorce	-.09[a]
	(.53)
Attachment to Parents	.02
	(.19)
Parents Use of Force	.53
	(.53)
Sex Role Beliefs	
Adversarial Beliefs	-.02
	(.04)
Attitudes To Violence	.03
	(.04)
Hostility Toward Women	-.18**
	(.09)
Date Rape Acceptance	.04
	(.05)
Rape Myths	.03
	(.03)
Male Peer Support	
Male Peers	-.24**
	(.12)
-2 Log Liklihood	137.90**
Model Chi-Square	16.47
Goodness of Fit	125.27

*p<.10
**p<.05
***p<.01
Note. [a] regression coefficient, ( ) standard error

initial model (16.47, $p<.05$) indicates that the model is only a slightly efficient predictor of the probability of partner violence. Not all the variables in the model make a significant contribution to the model; only two variables out of the nine independent constructs were statistically significant. This raised the possibility of identifying a model which does an equal or better job of predicting partner violence while employing less independent variables.

In Table 4, the reduced model consisting of only two independent variables is displayed. These variables make a significant contribution to the model, which has a chi-square of 14.68($p<.01$). The next step in the analysis is to compare initial model and the reduced model to determine if the reduced model show improvement in predicting the dependent variable of partner violence over the initial model.

The possibility that the effect of divorce on dating violence is conditional upon other factors is explored. The sample is split into the two categories of divorce, no and yes. First, the intial model with all nine independent variables are tested, and Hostility Toward Women and Male Peers were again statistically significant. When investigating the yes category of the Divorce sample, there are only about 30 cases, and to remove some of the static

Table 4

Reduced Model: Variables Predicting Violence (Logistic Regression)

Variable	B
Sex Role Beliefs	
Hostility Toward Women	-.16**[a] (.07)
Male Peer Support	
Male Peers	-.30*** (.13)
-2 Log Liklihood	102.27***
Model Chi-Square	14.68
Goodness of Fit	98.00

*p<.10
**p<.05
***p<.01
Note. [a] regression coefficient, ( ) standard error

from the equation, the reduced model was employed. Both are shown in Table 5. Results indicate that perhaps the influence of divorce on dating males is negligible.

Several important implications for predicting partner violence emerge from the above analyses. Divorce has been ruled out as an intervening variable. The reduced model is very comparable to the original model when looking at the chi-square values. Overall, the results of the logistic analyses suggest that a higher level of hostility toward women-type beliefs along with a higher degree of involvement with abusive male peers are important in predicting who is most likely to engage in partner violence. Specific components of the intergenerational transmission of violence theory as well as the majority of the sex role beliefs construct were not found to be statistically significant.

Table 5

Variables Predicting Violence with a Split Divorce Sample (Logistic Regression)

	Initial Model		Reduced Model	
	Divorce		Divorce	
Variables	No	Yes	No	Yes
Family of Origin				
Attachment to Parents	.01	.03		
	(.15)	(.25)		
Parents Use of Force	.73	.35		
	(.64)	(1.29)		
Sex Role Beliefs				
Adversarial Beliefs	-.05	.17		
	(.05)	(.14)		
Attitudes To Violence	.02	.12		
	(.04)	(.14)		
Hostility Toward Women	-.20*	.57*	-.16**	-.01
	(.11)	(.32)	(.07)	(.11)
Date Rape Acceptance	-.02	.43		
	(.05)	(.28)		
Rape Myths	.04	-.00		
	(.04)	(.09)		
Male Peer Support				
Male Peers	-.25*	-.57	-.30***	-.16
	(.14)	(.40)	(13)	(.26)
-2 Log Liklihood	99.16	26.71	102.27***	36.84
Model Chi-Square	17.80	10.66	14.68	.52
Goodness of Fit	96.56	23.56	99.00	28.91

*p≤.10
**p≤.05
***p≤.01
Note. [a] regression coefficient, ( ) standard error

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Mixed support was found for the hypothesis that components of social learning theory, including intergenerational transmission theory of violence, traditional sex role beliefs, and male peer support theory is causally related to dating violence. Support for the intergenerational transmission theory was not found within this sample.

Upon bivariate comparison, none of the three operationalized constructs from the intergenerational transmission of violence theory were found to be significantly associated with Partner Violence. For this work, the theory was broken down simply into a few constructs, one pertaining to the level of attachment to the parent the respondent felt, and the second one related to the occurrence or level of violence experienced in the respondent's home between the parents. As the literature has suggested children of divorce have different conflict resolution styles, the variable of whether the respondents' parents had divorced was added into the analyses. Zero-order correlations found that Divorce was significantly related to Attitudes Toward Violence. Respondents that experienced divorce were more likely to hold positive

attitudes toward the use of violence, and so confirmed findings reported in the literature. A significant correlation were observed between Parents Use of Force and Attachment to Parents. Not being very attached to one's parents and parents use of force between themselves were associated upon bivariate comparison. Additionally, Date Rape Acceptance and Male Peers were found to be significantly related to Parents Use of Force. It does seem that children (in this case, males) of divorce may hold more condoning views of date rape, and have more negative peers than their counterpart from intact families. In the logistic regression, none of the three intergenerational transmission of violence theory variables were found to be statistically significant.

This study's mixed and very slight support only adds to the inconclusive literature on the intergenerational transmission of violence theory. Perhaps the theory needed to have been operationalized differently. Other studies have suggested that both witnessing and experiencing violence may affect the ability to remember the event accurately (Follette & Alexander, 1992). Additionally, it is possible that the subjects' reports of familial violence may represent some justification of their own behavior. Regardless, future studies should continue to investigate

this, one of the most crucial components of social learning theory, to determine if and how well intergenerational transmission theory of violence can predict male dating violence.

Of the five independent variables relating differing aspects of traditional sex role beliefs, only two were found to be significantly related to Partner Violence upon bivariate comparison (Adversarial Beliefs and Hostility Toward Women). The correlations indicate that the more adversarial or sexist views are associated with engaging in partner violence. So, scoring a low number (indicating high incidence or agreement) on these scales is associated males' dating violent behavior. Further research is needed to investigate the theoretical links between these two scaling instruments. Intuitively, the connection makes sense: an individual who holds non-egalitarian or adversarial views toward women or the sexes in general are more likely to incur dating violence on their partner.

Upon logistic regression analysis, Adversarial Beliefs was not found to be significant; however, Hostility Toward Women remained significant in the regression analyses. As a result of this replication study, additional degrees of support has been found for these two scaling measures in prediction of the Partner Violence construct.

Two standards in the dating violence literature, the Date Rape Acceptance construct and the Rape Myth construct (derived from Burt, 1980) were not found to be significant in either the correlation matrix or the logistic regression model with the dichotomous dependent variable of Partner Violence. On the whole, however, the five belief scales did tend to be significantly associated with each other, confirming similar previous findings in the literature. Implications of why this is so needs to be addressed by additional research.

By far, the most important finding of this study is the importance of the variable Male Peers in predicting males' dating violent behavior. In both bivariate analysis and multivariate logistic regression analysis, the variable of Male Peers was significantly associated to Partner Violence. Additionally, four out of the five independent belief variables were found to be significantly correlated with the male peer support variable. This indicates that males who hold adversarial, hostile or sexually busive views towards females also have a larger number of negative male peers. Future research will need to investigate whether it is in this male peer group that males learn these negative views of the sexes, or if men who hold sexist, non-egalitarian views cluster together to form these groups.

As DeKeseredy's male peer support theory is a relatively new concept, only published in 1990 and more recently in various journals, there are not many replication studies of male peer support theory yet available in the literature. This study lends itself to the support of DeKeseredy's male peer support theory. Yet, further testing of DeKeseredy's ideas is needed, as these analyses focused only on two components of his theory, that of informational support and attachment to abusive peers (DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1995). The last component, peer pressure to have sex, was included in the survey instrument, but not included in the male peer support construct due to very low factor loadings and Chronbach's alpha (a = .45). The number of variables included in the logistic regression analysis had to be limited due to the small sample size (n=123 males)of the current study, and so this component of DeKeseredy's male peer support theory was removed. A larger convenience sample of male college students would certainly be ideal for future studies investigating DeKeseredy's theory.

In her book Boys Will Be Boys, Miedzian writes that she interviewed psychologist Eleanor Maccoby in 1987. Maccoby expressed her conviction to Miedzian that male peer groups are a more important influence on males' behavior than their

families (1991). This research project appears to support Maccoby's assertions: involvement in negative male peer groups *is* more important in predicting their violent dating behavior than components of the intergenerational transmission of violence theory.

With a self-report measure of sexual behavior and behavior in one's dating relationship, there is always a concern with the veracity of the responses, or with social desirability issues. In addition, this researcher was not able to contact the partners of the respondents, to check for reporting accuracy. Furthermore, these data provided evidence of only the amount of dating violence experienced in an 18 month time frame, rather than total life experiences. White and Koss (1991) suggested that a researcher cannot determine the lifetime prevalence of dating violence. In addition, as many of college students have only recently begun dating, some have suggested that researchers will observe low reports of dating violence. Straus also noted that under-reporting on his Conflict Tactics Scale was not unusual, which suggests that for the present study the estimates of perpetrators should be considered conservative (1987). Lastly, the ability to generalize these findings are limited by the location and the nature of the sample, and by the size of the sample of

males. In future studies, generalizibility of the findings should be extended by employing a more varied population.

In summary, very strong support has been found for male peer support theory and its association with males' violence against their partners. This theory when operationalized was found to be significantly associated with the Partner Violence construct, and held its significance across models to a large degree. Mixed support was found for the sex role beliefs scales, with significant findings for Adversarial Beliefs and Hostility Toward Violence. Additional research is needed to confirm or rebut these findings.

REFERENCES

Akers, R. 1977. Deviant behavior: A social learning approach. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Alexander, P., S. Moore, & E. Alexander III. 1991. What is transmitted in the intergenerational transmission of Violence? Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53, 657-668.

Billingham, R. 1987. Courtship Violence: The Pattern of Conflict Resolution Strategies Across 7 Levels of Emotional Commitment. Family Relations, 40, 59-74.

Billingham, R., & N. Notebaert. 1993. Divorce and dating violence revisited: Multi variate analyses using Straus's Conflict Tactics subscores. Psychological Reports, 73, 679-684.

Bookwala, J., I. Frieze, C. Smith, & K. Ryan. 1992. Predictors of dating violence: A Multi variate analysis. Violence and Victims,7, 297-311.

Brownmiller, S. 1975. Against our will: Men, women, and rape. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Burt, M. 1980. Cultural Myths and Support for Rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38(2), 217-230.

Cate, R. & S. Lloyd. 1992. Courtship. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Check, J., & N. Malamuth. 1985. An empirical assessment of some feminist hypotheses about rape. International Journal of Women's Studies, 8, 414-423.

Clark, M., J. Beckett, M. Wells, & D. Dungee-Anderson. 1994. Courtship violence among African-American college students. Journal of Black Psychology, 20(3), 264-281.

DeKeseredy, W. 1990. Woman abuse in dating relationships: The contributions of male peer support. Sociological Inquiry, 60(3),236-243.

DeKeseredy, W., & K. Kelly. 1995. Sexual abuse in Canadian university and college dating relationships: The contribution of male peer support. Journal of Family Violence, 10(1), 41-53.

Farley, J. 1992. American Social Problems. Princeton, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Feltey, K., J. Ainslie, & A. Geib. 1991. Sexual coercion attitudes among high school students: The influences of gender and rape education. Youth and Society, 23(2) 229-250.

Fischer, G., & J. Chen. 1994. The attitudes toward forcible date rape scale: Development of a measurement model. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 16 (1), 33-51.

Follette, V., & P. Alexander. 1992. Dating violence: Current and historical correlates. Behavior Assessment, 14, 39-52.

Follingstad, D., S. Wright, S. Lloyd, & J. Sebastian. 1991. Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. Family Relations, 40, 51-57.

Follingstad, D., S. Kalichman, T. Cafferty, & J. Vormbrock. 1992. Aggression levels following frustration of abusive versus non-abusing college males. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7(1), 3-16.

Himelein, M., R. Vogel, & D. Wachowiak. 1994. Nonconsensual sexual experiences in precollge women: Prevalence and risk factors. Journal of Counseling and Development, 72, 411-415.

Hotaling, G., & D. Sugarman. 1986. An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1,(2), 101-124.

Koss, M., & C. Oros. 1982. Sexual experiences survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50(3), 455-457.

Koss, M., & C. Gidycz. 1985. Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and Validity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53(3), 422-423.

Lindsey, L. 1995. Culture determines gender roles. In J. Petrikin, (Ed.), Male/Female Roles(42-57). San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, Inc.

Little, C. 1995. Deviance and Control. Itasca, IL: Peacock Publishers, Inc.

Long, V. 1991. Gender role conditioning and women's self-concept. Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 30, 19-29.

Lonsway, K., & L. Fitzgerald. 1995. Attitudinal antecedents of rape myth acceptance: A theoretical and empirical examination. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 4, 704-711.

Makepeace, J. 1981. Courtship violence among college students. Family Relations, 30, 97-102.

Mertin, P. 1992. An adaptation of the Conflict Tactics Scale. Australian Journal of Marriage and the Family, 13(3), 166-169.

Miedzian, M. 1991. Boys will be boys: Breaking the link between masculinity and violence. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Miller, S., & S. Simpson. 1991. Courtship violence and social control: Does gender matter? Law and Society Review, 25(2), 335-385.

O'Keeffe, N., K. Brockopp, & E. Chew. 1986. Teen dating violence. Social Work, 31, 465-468.

Pan, H., P. Neidig, & K. O'Leary. 1994. Male-female and aggressor-victim differences in the factor structure of the modified Conflict Tactics scale. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9(3), 366-382.

Perry, D., & K. Bussey. 1979. The social learning theory of sex differences: Imitation is alive and well. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1699-1712.

Pirog-Good, M. 1992. Sexual abuse in dating relationships. In E. Viano (Ed.), Intimate violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives (124-148). Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.

Riggs, D. 1993. Relationship problems and dating aggression. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8(1), 18-35.

Riggs, D., & K. O'Leary. 1989. A theoretical model of courtship aggression. In M. Pirog-Good and J. Stets (Eds.), Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues (168-189). New York: Praeger.

Stephan, C., & W. Stephan. 1985. Two social psychologies. Chicago: Dorsey Press.

Stets, J., & D. Henderson. 1991. Contextual factors surrounding conflict resolution while dating: Results from a national study. Family Relations, 40, 29-36.

Straus, M. 1979. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 2, 75-86.

Straus, M., R. Gelles, & S. Steinmetz. 1981.Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

Sutherland, E., & D. Cressey. 1970. Criminology. Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott.

Thompson, E., Jr. 1991. The maleness of violence in dating relationships: An appraisal on stereotypes. Sex Roles, 24 (5/6), 261-278.

Tontodonato, P., & B. Crew. 1992. Dating violence, social learning theory, and gender: A multi variate analysis. Violence and Victims, 7(1), 3-14.

Velicer, W., L. Huckel, & C. Hansen. 1989. A measurement model for measuring attitudes toward violence. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 15, 349-364.

Vogel, R., & M. Himelein. 1995. Dating and sexual victimization: An analysis of risk factors among precollege women. Journal of Criminal Justice, 23(2), 153-162.

White, J., & M. Koss. 1991. Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students. Violence and Victims, 6(4), 247-256.

Worth, D., P. Matthews, & W. Coleman. 1990. Sex role, group affiliation, family background, and courtship violence in college students. Journal of College Student Development, 31, 250-254.

APPENDIX A

INDEPENDENT AND DEPENDENT CONSTRUCTS

INDEPENDENT CONSTRUCTS

Questions	Factor Loadings
Attachment to Parents	
1. Do you share your thoughts/feelings with your mother?	.72
2. Do you share your thoughts/feelings with your father?	.69
3. Would you like to be the kind of person your mother is?	.72
4. Would you like to be the kind of person your father is?	.60
Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)=.62	
Parents use of physical force	
1. Did your father ever use physical force against your mother?	.88
2. Did your mother ever use physical force against your father?	.88
Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)=.72	
Adversarial Beliefs (Burt, 1980)	
1. Sex is like a game where one person "wins" and the other "loses."	.79
2. In dating relationships, people are mostly out to take advantage of each other.	.75
3. Men and women are generally out to use each other.	.75
4. When it comes to sex, most people are just trying to use the other person.	.74
5. If you don't show who is boss in beginning of the relationship, you will be taken advantage of later.	.70
6. Most people are pretty devious and manipulative when they are trying to attract someone of the opposite sex.	.65
7. Men and women cannot really be friends.	.62
8. In the work force any gain by one sex means a loss for the other.	.61
9. When women enter the work force they are taking jobs away from men.	.57
10. It is natural for one spouse to be in control of the other.	.53
Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)= .87	

Attitudes Toward Violence (from Velicer et al., 1989)

1.	Children should be spanked for temper tantrums.	.74
2.	Giving mischievious children a quick slap is the best way to quickly end trouble.	.72
3.	Child's habitual disobedience should be punished physically.	.71
4.	It is okay for a partner to hit the other if they flirt with others.	.64
5.	Punishing children physically when they deserve it will make them responsible and mature adults.	.63
6.	Violent crimes should be punished violently.	.56
7.	It is all right for a partner to slap the other if insulted or ridiculed.	.55
8.	The death penalty should be part of every penal code.	.50
9.	It is all right for a parnter to slap the other if they are unfaithful.	.47
10.	Our country should be aggressive with its military internationally.	.40
11.	War is often necessary.	.31

Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)=.79

Hostility Toward Women (from Check et al., 1985)

1.	Other women are responsible for most of my troubles.	.76
2.	I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them.	.72
3.	Any woman who teases a man sexually and doesn't finish what she started realistically deserves anything she gets.	.70
4.	I am sure I get a raw deal from the other women in my life.	.69
5.	When women talk and act sexy, they are inviting rape.	.69
6.	When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful.	.68

Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)=.80

Date Rape Acceptance (Fischer and Chen, 1994)

1.	Ok if she led him on.	.92
2.	Ok if she was going to have intercourse with him and then changed her mind.	.92
4.	Ok if she let him touch her breasts.	.91
3.	Ok if she had intercourse with other males.	.91

5.	Ok if they had dated each other for a long time.	.89
6.	Ok if she had gotten him sexually excited.	.88
7.	Ok if he was so sexually excited he could not stop.	.88
8.	Ok if he had spent a lot of money on her.	.63

Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)=.95

Rape Myths (Burt, 1980)

1.	Even though the woman may call it rape, she probably enjoyed it.	.77
2.	If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape.	.74
3.	In some cases, the woman actually wanted it to happen.	.73
4.	When a woman allows petting to get to a certain point, she is implicitly agreeing to have sex.	.72
5.	Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.	.72
6.	A rape probabaly didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.	.70
7.	Rape mainly occurs on the bad side of town.	.70
8.	If a woman is raped, often it is because she didn't say "no" clearly enough.	.69
9.	It is just a part of human nature for men to take sex from women who let their guard down.	.69
10.	When a woman is raped, she usually did something careless to put herself in that situation.	.68
11.	If a husband pays all the bills, he has the right to sex with his wife whenever he wants.	.63
12.	Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.	.62
13.	Many rapes happen because women lead men on.	.61
14.	In any rape case one would have to question whether the vitim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.	.60
15.	A rapist is more likely to be black or hispanic than white.	.48
16.	When men rape, it is because of their strong desire for sex.	.36

Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)=.92

Male Peers (DeKeseredy 1990;1995)

1.	Friends would approve of slapping date if she insults him in public.	.86
2.	Friends would approve of slapping date if she won't do what he tells her to do.	.77
3.	Friends have told that it is all right for a man to hit date or girlfriend in certain situations.	.69
4.	Friends have told that should respond to your dates' or girlfriends' challenges to your authority by using physical force.	.69
5.	Friends have told that your girlfriends or dates should have sex with you when you want.	.63
6.	Friends would approve of a man slapping his date or girlfriend if she hits him first when they are having an argument.	.60

Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)=.83

DEPENDENT CONSTRUCTS

Question	Factor Loadings
Date Rape (Koss and Oros, 1982)	
1. Had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to, because you used some degree of physicalforce?	.96
2. Had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to, because you threatened to use physical force if she didn't cooperate?	.96
3. Been in a situation where you tried to get sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by using or threatening to use physical force if she did not cooperate?	.94
4. Had sexual intercourse or other sex acts with a woman who may not have wanted it, but was too drunk or stoned to say anything at the time?	.83
5. Obtained sexual intercourse by saying things you didn't really mean?	.60
Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)=.91	
Partner Violence (Straus, 1979)	
In the last 18 months in your relationship(s), have you ever:	
1. Threw, smashed, hit or kicked something.	.37
2. Threw something at the other person.	.88
3. Pushed, grabbed, held or shook the other.	.74
4. Slapped or spanked in anger.	.92
5. Pulled hair.	.83
6. Kicked or hit with a fist.	.85
7. Scratched or bit in anger or with intent to hurt.	.90
8. Hit or tried to hit with something.	.91
9. Choked or smothered.	.73
10. Beat up (gave a sustained beating to)the other.	.78
11. Threatened with a knife, gun or other weapon.	.87
12. Injured the other with a knife, gun, or other weapon.	.78
Cronbach's Alpha (standardized)=.95	

APPENDIX B

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Do **not** put your name or student i.d. number on this survey. Please read the questions carefully, and answer to the best of your ability. If any questions are upsetting, you may refrain from answering.

1. What is your gender?
   A. Male
   B. Female

2. How old are you? __ __

3. What is your classification at UNI?
   A. Freshman
   B. Sophomore
   C. Junior
   D. Senior
   E. Graduate Student

4. With what racial group do you identify?
   A. White
   B. Black
   C. Hispanic
   D. American Indian
   E. Asian
   F. Other (please list) _____

5. How would you describe your surroundings during the majority of your childhood years?
   A. Farm-Rural
   B. Small town setting-under 10,000
   C. Medium town setting-10,000 to 40,000
   D. Urban setting-50,000 or more

Dating can refer to a wide range of relationships and activities between people, form a casual conversation at a party or bar to engagement to be married. This next set of questions asks about your dating relationships in the last 18 months.

6. About how many different people have you dated in the last 18 months? ____

7. Are you currently "seeing" someone in a "steady" relationship? yes no

8. How seriously or committed is your current dating relationship (check the answer that comes closest)?
currently not in a serious relationship with one person ___
casual, we are both free to date other people___
somewhat exclusive, neither of us dates other people___
committed, engaged, living together___

9. How many times have you broken up with someone in the past 18 months?___

The next series of questions asks about your experience with drinking alcoholic beverages.

10. Have you drunk alcohol in the last 18 months?
1 Yes 2 No (If no, skip to question #14)

11. In a typical week, how many days do you have at least one drink? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. When you drink, how many drinks do you usually have? Keep in mind that one drink equals one 12 ounce beer, one glass of wine, one shot of hard liquor, or one mixed drink.

1. One	5. Five
2. Two	6. Six
3. Three	7. Seven
4. Four	8. Eight or more

13. How often do you have more than three drinks in a day?
1. Never
2. Less than once a month
3. At least once a month, but less than once a week
4. At least once a week, but less than four times a week
5. More than four times a week

The next series of questions asks for your attitudes, opinions, and experiences with your parents.

14. During the majority of your childhood to age 18, which best describes your family of origin?
1. Biological mother and father
2. Single parent-mother
3. Single parent-father
4. Raised by adoptive parents

5. Raised by relatives
6. Raised in a "step" family (stepmother or stepfather)
7. Other (please specify)_____

15. Has your family been impacted by divorce or death of a parent(s)?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    If so, at what age?____

	In every way	most	some	not at all
16. Would you like to be the kind of person your mother is?	1	2	3	4
17. Would you like to be the kind of person your father is?	1	2	3	4

	Often	Sometimes	Never
18. Do you (did) share you thoughts and feelings with your mother?	1	2	3
19. Do you (did) share your thoughts and feelings with your father?	1	2	3

20. Did your mother (or stepmother) ever use physical force against your father (or stepfather)?
(1) no, never (2) once or twice (3) occasionally
(4) frequently (5) don't know (6) doesn't apply

21. Did your father (or stepfather) ever use physical force on your mother (or stepmother)?
(1) no, never (2) once or twice (3) occasionally
(4) frequently (5) don't know (6) doesn't apply

22. Did your parents ever use force on you harsher than spanking (such as slapping, hitting, hitting you with an object, etc.) when you were a child (up to age 12)?
(1) no, never (2) once or twice (3) occasionally
(4) frequently (5) don't know (6) doesn't apply

23. Did you parents ever use physical force on you when you were age 13 or older?
(1) no, never (2) once or twice (3) occasionally
(4) frequently (5) don't know (6) doesn't apply

24. What is the highest level of education attained by your parents?
(Place an X in one space for each parent)

Mother	Father	Education
[ ]	[ ]	less than high school
[ ]	[ ]	high school graduate
[ ]	[ ]	some college or trade school
[ ]	[ ]	college graduate
[ ]	[ ]	graduate or professional degree

25. What is was your parents' occupation? Place a check by the one line that best describes what each parent did to earn a living, when you were sixteen and living at home. (place an X in one space for each parent)

Mother	Father	Occupation (their work was most like:)
[ ]	[ ]	Did not work for wages; took care of house and children; was disabled
[ ]	[ ]	Unskilled or semi-skilled laborer: i.e.janitor, delivery truck driver; waiter,clerk
[ ]	[ ]	Skilled labor or trade, such as a machine operator, plumber, welder
[ ]	[ ]	Owned own farm
[ ]	[ ]	Owned or managed a small business
[ ]	[ ]	Semi-professional; school teacher, sales person, accountant, mid-level manager
[ ]	[ ]	Professional such as doctor, dentist, manager of a large store or company
[ ]	[ ]	Other (please give a brief description):

The following questions refer to your opinions about dating and relationships. Please choose the statement which best fits your response for the following questions, and write the letter that corresponds to your choice next to each question:

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Neither

D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree.

26. In dating relationships, people are mostly out to take advantage of each other.

___ 27. If you don't show who's boss in the beginning of a relationship, you will be taken advantage of later.

___ 28. It is natural for one spouse to be in control of the other.

___ 29. It's impossible for men and women to truly understand one another.

___ 30. When women enter the work force they are taking jobs away from men.

___ 31. Men and women are generally out to use each other.

___ 32. In the work force any gain by one sex necessitates a loss for the other.

___ 33. Men and women cannot really be friends.

___ 34. Sex is like a game where one person "wins" and the other "loses.

___ 35. Most people are pretty devious and manipulative when they are trying to attract someone of the opposite sex.

___ 36. Men and women share more similarities than differences.

___ 37. In all societies it is inevitable that one sex is dominant.

___ 38. It is possible for a man and a woman to be "just friends."

___ 39. It is possible for the sexes to be equal in society.

___ 40. When it comes to sex, most people are just trying to use the other person.

___

The next section refers to your opinions regarding childrearing and other familial interactions. Again, please choose the selection that best fits your response, and write the letter of the response next to each question:

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Neither
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

41. Violent crimes should be punished violently.

42. ___ The death penalty should be part of every penal code.

43. ___ War is often necessary.

44. ___ Our country should be aggressive with its military internationally.

45. ___ Children should be spanked for temper tantrums.

46. ___ Punishing children physically when they deserve it will make them responsible and mature adults.

47. ___ Giving mischievous children a quick slap is the best way to quickly end trouble.

48. ___ It is all right for a partner to hit the other if they are unfaithful.

49. ___ It is all right for a partner to slap the other if insulted or ridiculed.

50. ___ It is okay for a partner to hit the other if they flirt with others.

51. ___ A child's habitual disobedience should be punished physically.

Again, please choose the letter that best fits your response, and write that letter of the response next to each question:

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Neither
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

52. I feel that many times women flirt with men just to tease them or hurt them.

___

53. I usually find myself agreeing with other women.

___

54. When it really comes down to it, a lot of women are deceitful.

___

55. I believe most women tell the truth.

___

56. I am sure I get a raw deal form the other women in my life.

___

57. Other women are responsible for most of my troubles.

___

58. When women talk and act sexy, they are inviting rape.

___

59. Any woman who teases a man sexually and doesn't finish what she started realistically deserves anything she gets.

___

The next section of questions asks you to describe yourself. For each of the following statements, write the number as shown below that indicates how well the statement describes you.

1= not at all like you 2=a little like you 3= like you
4= very much like you 5=exactly like you

60. I share what I have with others.
61. I feel good if I help someone.
62. I cheer up a friend who is sad.
63. I look at people when they are speaking.
64. I tell people they look nice.
65. I am sensitive and understanding.
66. I am not ver good at controlling my emotions.
67. I am not concerned about what others think of my actions.
68. It is easy for me to give a comforting hug or touch to someone who is upset.
69. I often interrupt when someone else is speaking.
70. I would describe myself as gentle.
71. I am sensitive to other people's feelings.
72. I am competitive.

A male and female college student go out on a date. Afterward, they go to his apartment and sit in front of the fireplace for a while and sip a glass of wine. He kisses her and, even though she resists his advances, uses his strength to force her to have sexual intercourse.

For each of the conditions in questions #73-80 below, please indicate how acceptable you consider the male's behavior in the above example:

A. Definitely acceptable
B. Mildly acceptable
C. Not sure
D. Mildly unacceptable
E. Definitely unacceptable

73. If he had spent a lot of money on her.

___

74. If she had gotten him sexually excited.

___

75. If she let him touch her breasts.

___

76. If they had dated each other for a long time.

___

77. If she was going to have intercourse with him and then changed her mind.

___

78. If she had intercourse with other males

___

79. If she led him on.

___

80. If he was so sexually excited he couldn't stop.

___

The following section asks questions about rape. Please choose the response that best fits your opinion, and write the letter of the response next to each question:

A. Strongly agree
B. Agree
C. Neither
D. Disagree
E. Strongly disagree

81. Many rapes happen because women lead men on.

___

82. Even thought the woman may call it rape, she probably enjoyed it.

___ 83. If a woman is raped, often it's because she didn't say "no" clearly enough.

___ 84. When men rape, it is because of their strong desire for sex.

___ 85. A rapist is more likely to be Black or Hispanic than White.

___ 86. Men don't usually intend to force sex on a woman, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.

___ 87. When a woman is raped, she usually did something careless to put herself in that situation.

___ 88. In some cases, the woman actually wanted it to happen.

___ 89. When a woman allows petting to get to a certain point she is implicitly agreeing to have sex.

___ 90. Women tend to exaggerate how much rape affects them.

___ 91. A rape probably didn't happen if the woman has no bruises or marks.

___ 92. Rape mainly occurs on the "bad" side of town.

___ 93. If a husband pays all the bills, he has the right to sex with his wife whenever he wants.

___ 94. In any rape case one would have to question whether the victim is promiscuous or has a bad reputation.

___ 95. If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say that it was a rape.

___ 96. It is just part of human nature for men to take sex from women who let their guard down.

___

For the next series of questions, continue on if you are male. Please skip to question #116 if you are female.

MALES: These items ask about your experiences with disagreements, misunderstandings, or conflicts about sex that sometimes occur in dating relationships.

97. In the last 18 months, have you ever:
(Circle Y for Yes and N for No)

a. Had a woman misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired? Y N

b. Gotten into an argument or fight because you wanted sex and your date did not? Y N

c. Been in a situation where you became so sexually aroused that you could not stop yourself even though the woman didn't want to have sex? Y N

d. Had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't really want to, because you pressured her by your continual arguments? Y N

e. Had sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't really want to, because you had threatened to end your relationship otherwise? Y N

f. Obtained sexual intercourse by saying things you didn't really mean? Y N

g. Been in a situation where you tried to get sexual intercourse with a woman when she didn't want to by using or threatening to use physical force (such as twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)if she didn't cooperate? Y N

h. Been in a situation where you used some degree of physical force (twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)to try to make a woman engage in sex play (kissing or petting)when she didn't want to? Y N

I. Had sexual intercourse (or other sex acts, such as oral or anal sex) with a woman when she didn't want to, because you threatened to use physical force (such as twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.) if she didn't cooperate? Y N

j. Had sexual intercourse (or other sex acts, such as oral or anal sex) with a woman when she didn't want to, because you used some degree of physical force (such as twisting her arm, holding her down, etc.)? Y N

k. Had sexual intercourse or other sex acts with a woman who may not have wanted to, but was too drunk or stoned to do or say anything about it at the time? Y N

The next series of questions asks you about your *male* friends. Please circle y for yes and n for no.

Have any of your male friends ever told you that:

98. You should respond to your dates' or girlfriends' challenges to your authority by using physical force, such as hitting or slapping?
Y N

99. It is all right for a man to hit his date or girlfriend in certain situations?
Y N

100. Your girlfriends or dates should have sex with you when you want?
Y N

101. Because spends money on a date, she should have sex with him in return?
Y N

102. You should respond to your dates' or girlfreinds' challenges to your authority by insulting them or putting them down?
Y N

103. If is all right for a man to phsycially force a woman to have sex with him under certain conditions?
Y N

104. How many of your male friends would approve of a man slapping his date or girlfriend if:

a. She won't do what he tells her to do. 1.Most 2.Some 3.None
b. She insults him in public. 1.Most 2.Some 3.None
c. He finds out that she is dating another man. 1.Most 2.Some 3.None
d. She hits him first when they are having an argument. 1.Most 2.Some 3.None

To the best of your knowledge, how many of your male friends (circle the appropriate number, 1= one friend, 5+=five or more friends):

105. Have ever tried to physically force sexual activity with women they were dating which were disagreeable or offensive enough that the woman responded in an offended manner such as crying, fighting, screaming or pleading?
1 2 3 4 5+

106. Have ever used physical force, such as hitting or beating, to resolve conflicts with their girlfriends or dating partners?
1 2 3 4 5+

107. Insulted their dating partners and/or girlfriends, swear at them, or put them down in front of friends of family?
1 2 3 4 5+

Please circle the appropriate number:

108. How much pressure have your male friends placed on you to have sex with your dating partners or girlfriends?
1. A great deal 2. Considerable
3. Moderate 4. A little 5. None

109. Would you like be the kind of person your best male friends are?
1. In most ways 2. In some ways 3. Not at all
4. I have no best male friends

110. Do you respect you best male friends' opinions about the important things in life?
1. In most ways 2. In some ways 3. Not at all
4. I have no best male friends

111. Would you best friends stick by you if you got into really bad trouble?
1. Certainly 2. Probably 3. I doubt it
4. I don't' know 5. I have no best male friends

112. Who do you spend most of your free time with (circle only one response)?
1. By yourself 5. With your family
2. With your male friends 6. With female friends
3. With your girl friends 7. Other
4. With a mixed group of male friends

113. Do you belong to or participate in any all-male organizations such as (circle all that apply):
   1. Fraternities (Greek)
   2. Sports teams
   3. Service clubs (e.g., Lions, Rotary)
   4. Other (please write in)
   5. Multiple involvements

114. In a typical week, how often do you spend time in activities with other men (such as going to sporting events, exercising or playing sports, going to movies, meals, studying, etc.)?
   1. Daily or more often
   2. Two to six times a week
   3. About once a week
   4. Less than once a week

Males please skip to question #116.

FEMALES: In dating relationships, sometimes disagreements, misunderstandings, or conflicts about sex sometimes occur. Look at each of the following and indicate how many times it happened in the last 18 months. Circle "0" if it did not happen, "5+" if it happened five or more times, etc.

115. In the last 18 months, have you ever:

A.	Had a partner misinterpret the level of sexual intimacy you desired?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
B.	Gotten into an argument or fight because your date wanted sex and you did not?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
C.	Been in a situation where a man became so sexually aroused that you felt it was useless to stop him even though you didn't want to have sex?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
D.	Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn't really want to, because you felt pressured by his continual arguments?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
E.	Had sexual intercourse with a man when you didn't really want to, because he had threatened to end your relationship otherwise?	0 1 2 3 4 5+

F.	Been in a situation where a man used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to try to make you engage in sex play (kissing or petting) when you didn't want to?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
G.	Been in a situation where a man tried to have sexual intercourse with you when you didn't want to by using or threatening to use physical force if you didn't cooperate, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
H.	Been in a situation where a man used some degree of physical force to try to get you to have sexual intercourse when you didn't want to, but for various reasons sexual intercourse did not occur?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
I.	Had sexual intercourse (or other sex acts, such as oral or anal sex) with a man when you didn't want to, because he threatened to use physical force if you didn't cooperate?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
J.	Had sexual intercourse (or other sex acts) with a man when you didn't want to, because he used some degree of physical force?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
K.	Participated in sexual acts such as oral or anal intercourse with a man when you didn't want to because he used threats or physical force?	0 1 2 3 4 5+
L.	Had sexual intercourse or other sex acts with a man when you may have not wanted to, but was too drunk or stoned to do or say anything about it at the time?	0 1 2 3 4 5+

Both males and females please go on to answer the last question, #116.

No matter how well a couple gets along, sometimes they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or have arguments, spats or fights. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences. Below is a list of things that people sometimes do when they have arguments, spats, or fights, and that may have happened between you and a dating partner (or partners) in the last 18 months. Remember, we will refer to others as "dating partners" even if your relationship with that person was as brief as one date or attempted date. Look at each item, then indicate by circling the appropriate number how many times in the last 18 months you did that action. Then indicate by circling the appropriate number how many times a dating partner did that action to you in the last 18 months. Include events that happened during a break-up or after you quit dating that person.

116. Use the following scale when answering these items:

never=0	3=3 to 5 times
once=1	4=6 to 10 times
twice=2	5=more than 10 times

		YOU	YOUR DATING PARTNER(S)
a.	Discussed an issue calmly	012345	012345
b.	Got information to back up your/her side of things	012345	012345
c.	Brought in someone else to help settle things	012345	012345
d.	Insulted, swore, or screamed at the other person	012345	012345
e.	Sulked or refused to talk about an issue	012345	012345
f.	Stomped out of the room or house or yard	012345	012345
g.	Cried	012345	012345
h.	Did or said something to spite the other	012345	012345
i.	Threatened to hit or throw something at the other person	012345	012345
j.	Threw, smashed hit or kicked something	012345	012345

k.	Threw something at the other person.	012345	012345
l.	Pushed, grabbed, held, or shook the other	012345	012345
m.	Slapped or spanked (in anger)	012345	012345
n.	Pulled hair	012345	012345
o.	Kicked or hit with a fist	012345	012345
p.	Scratched or bit (in anger or with intent to hurt)	012345	012345
q.	Hit or tried to hit with something	012345	012345
r.	Choked or smothered	012345	012345
s.	Beat up (gave a sustained beating to) the other	012345	012345
t.	Threatened with knife, gun or other weapon	012345	012345
u.	Injured the other with a knife, gun or other weapon	012345	012345

Thank you for your participation.