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ABSTRACT

The current study used a Post-positivist paradigm and was quantitative in nature. In addition, it used a descriptive survey design, which utilized self-reported questionnaires. The final sample included 125 students, ages 18-20, in undergraduate psychology courses at a Southern California University. This study attempted to explore the differences between the three types of dating violence profiles: 1) victim only, 2) perpetrator only and 3) mutually violent; however, only 37 participants completed the questionnaire, which made statistical analysis impossible. Nonetheless, this study explored differences in relation to the demographic characteristics and five variables: a) gender, b) self-esteem, c) severity of violence, d) relationship satisfaction, and e) acceptance of violence. Therefore, this study proposed that differences would be identified and used correlations to reveal any associations between the variables. It was discovered that dating violence occurred among the sample with an 87.8% prevalence rate.
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INTRODUCTION

"Dating violence is a pattern of repeated actual or threatened acts that physically, sexually or verbally abuse a member of an unmarried heterosexual or homosexual couple in which one or both partners is between thirteen and twenty years old (Levy, 1991).

Key words: dating violence; dating violence profiles; gender; severe violence; self-esteem; relationship satisfaction; acceptance of violence

Spousal abuse is a common problem that has been extensively studied since the 1970's. This problem is most commonly referred to as domestic violence; however, it is not specific to married couples. Domestic violence is the term used for adult couples who are in abusive relationships. But what about couples who are not adults and are in abusive relationships? How is that defined? Is there a name? Does it exist?

Abuse in adolescent dating relationships does exist. According to Levy (1991), this phenomenon is defined as "a pattern of repeated actual or threatened acts that physically, sexually or verbally abuse a member of an
unmarried heterosexual or homosexual couple in which one or both partners is between thirteen and twenty years old" (p. 4). In the literature this phenomenon is referred to as dating violence.

Several studies have researched this issue and have reported various prevalence rates. It is based on these prevalence rates that Sugarman and Hotaling (1991) estimate that at least 28% of dating individuals, including high school and college samples, have experienced dating violence.

Problem Statement

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not dating violence among a sample of college students, ages 18-20 was prevalent in Southern California. According to the research, dating violence is prevalent in today's society with rates ranging from 7% to 64.9% (Bergman, 1992; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1994; Laner, 1983; O'Keefe, Brockopp & Chew, 1986; O'Keefe & Treister, 1998; Reuterman & Burcky, 1989; Roscòe & Callahan, 1985; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). The explanation for such a variation in prevalence is due to the operationalization of the dependent variable used in the studies. For example, Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) observed that studies which
included threats, actual violence, verbal aggression and physical violence reported higher rates than those who did not include these variables (O'Keeffe, Brockopp & Chew, 1986; Laner, 1983; Laner & Thompson, 1982).

Further, the issue of dating violence profiles was also important to consider. According to Gray and Foshee (1997) there are three such profiles: victim only, perpetrator only, and mutually violent. The victim only profile does not initiate violence, but sustains violence. The perpetrator only profile initiates the violence but does not sustain it, and the mutually violent profile sustains as well as initiates the violence. Out of the studies that addressed the issue of dating violence profiles, only three studies addressed it in relation to a high school sample (Gray & Foshee, 1997; Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd & Christopher, 1983; Roscoe & Kelsey, 1986), while four studies addressed it in relation to a college sample (Billingham, 1987; Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992; Cate, Henton, Koval, Christopher & Lloyd, 1982; Pedersen & Thomas, 1992).

The studies that focused on a college sample reported the following prevalence rates: victim only ranged from 1% to 23%, perpetrator only ranged from 22%-33%, and mutually
violent ranged from 45%-68%. The overall percentage of students reporting violence ranged from 22%-65%. Due to the wide range of prevalence rates further studies addressing this issue need to be addressed in order to fully understand the dynamics associated with each profile. Moreover, such studies will aid the helping profession in developing intervention and prevention programs that will meet the needs of teenagers across all profiles, rather than the one-sided violent relationship (Gray & Foshee, 1997).

Additionally, other variables need to be addressed when looking at dating violence profiles and prevalence rates among adolescents. Some variables that have been reported in previous studies include severity of the violence, duration of the relationship, effects of the violence on the relationship and acceptance of violence to name a few (Gray & Foshee, 1997).

Gray and Foshee (1997) found that mutually violent profiles initiated a significantly higher rate of severe violence in comparison to the perpetrator only profiles. They also found that mutually violent individuals accepted violence more than the victim only individuals. Based on these findings, it appears that the variables take on
different characteristics depending on the dating violence profile. Thus, by addressing these variables it will help determine where the focus needs to be in terms of intervention and prevention services/programs.

Another important variable that should be addressed, is the issue of self-esteem. This issue is important to study because it is what allows us, as individuals, to work, live, strive and positively interact with others in our environment (Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 1997). Therefore, a low sense of self-esteem may contribute to the continued victimization and perpetration of dating violence among teenagers because they already believe that they are worth very little thus deserving the abuse or feeling as though they need to show that they are something. The studies that have addressed this issue in relation to dating violence have included a college sample (for example, Deal & Wampler, 1986; Burke, Stets & Pirog-Good, 1988), but did not address the issue in relation to the dating violence profiles.

Furthermore, the issue of gender differences is an important variable to consider when addressing the issue of dating violence. According to a study conducted by O'Keefe (1997), 21% of the females reported initiating the
violence, while 28% of the males reported initiating the violence. Another study reported almost identical results, which were 20% and 28% respectively (O'Keefe & Treister, 1998). Although both studies state there was no statistical significance, it still warrants further investigation because these studies did not look at gender differences in the context of the three dating violence profiles.

The present study was designed to address the above limitations. The study’s main purpose was to increase the understanding of dating violence profiles in receiving and inflicting dating violence against one’s partner. More specifically, the purpose was to examine what factors encompassed each profile with relation to gender, self-esteem, severity of violence, relationship satisfaction, and acceptance of violence.
LITERATURE REVIEW

The broad subject of dating violence as it relates to college students is a common phenomenon in today's society. In the 1980s, when dating violence among college students was first studied, the estimates of this violence ranged from 21 percent to 38 percent (Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985; Makepeace, 1981; Matthews, 1984; Sigelman, Berry & Wiles, 1984). During this time, other studies began exploring dating violence among teenagers and discovered that the prevalence rates ranged from 9 percent to 41.3 percent (Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd & Christopher, 1983; O'Keeffe, Brockopp & Chew, 1986; Roscoe & Callahan, 1985).

Although the percentages from both samples are similar, the 9 percent prevalence rate reported by Roscoe and Callahan (1985) raises some questions. For example, why is there such a gap between the prevalence rates among the teenage sample and the college sample? One explanation provided was that dating violence rates can vary dramatically from one region to another (Laner & Thompson, 1982).

The Roscoe and Callahan study (1985) was the only study that did not draw a sample from the Western United States. Instead, their sample was drawn from the Midwest,
which has the second lowest prevalence rates according to a study conducted by Sugarman and Hotaling (1989). Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) found when studies were grouped into four regions within the United States the prevalence rates were as follows: Eastern region - 22.8%; Midwestern region - 25.7%; Western region - 27.5%; and Southern region - 43.8%. However, one must keep in mind that the prevalence rate discrepancy can also be attributed to methodological differences as well as the operationalization of the dependent variable - violence/abuse.

Currently, several studies have investigated dating violence prevalence rates within a teenage sample (Bergman, 1992; Gray & Foshee, 1997; O'Keefe, 1997; O'Keefe & Treister, 1998) and found similar results to those reported in the 1980s. Although prevalence rates are an important factor, it is not the only one. To better treat the problem at hand, specifics about dating violence also need to be explored. One such factor is that of dating violence profiles, which was the focus of this study.

As of 1997, there were only a handful of studies that reported prevalence rates based on dating violence profiles. Four studies were based on a college sample and reported prevalence rates ranging from 22 percent to 65
percent (Billingham, 1987; Bookwala, Frieze, Smith & Ryan, 1992; Cate, Henton, Koval, Christopher & Lloyd, 1982; Pedersen & Thomas, 1992). An explanation for the differences in prevalence rates is how the individual authors chose to operationalize the dating violence variable.

For example, the study that reported a 65% prevalence rate also included verbal threats, a factor that the other studies did not include (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith & Ryan, 1992). However, according to Levy’s (1991) definition of dating violence verbal abuse is an aspect of this phenomenon and therefore should be included in the operationalization of the dating violence variable. Nonetheless, the other authors did not include verbal threats, which could account for the discrepancy of prevalence rates among a college sample. As a result, researchers need to be consistent with the way in which they operationalize the dating violence variable.

Two other studies included high school students and reported prevalence rates of 12 and 19 percent (Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd & Christopher, 1983; Roscoe & Kelsey, 1986). Although the reason for the following is unclear, it is important to mention that the prevalence rates in
these studies are significantly smaller than the college sample. However, it could be attributed to different sampling and data collection methods as well as the fact that many high school students may not have had any experience in dating.

The most recent study of high school students did not report overall prevalence rates of violence, but reported them according to the three dating violence profiles (Gray & Foshee, 1997). Nonetheless, future research examining the differences between these two sample populations warrants further investigation.

As previously stated, there have been a handful of studies that looked at dating violence within the context of dating violence profiles. However, six of these studies failed to distinguish initiation of violence out of self-defense from perpetration of violence that was not in self-defense. Therefore, it needs to be very clear why the students used violence. Did they use it to defend themselves from their partners' abuse (e.g., self-defense) or did they use it to abuse their partners first?

The above is a very important factor that needs to be addressed, which is why this study was based on the article in which the author focused specifically on the differences
between the three dating violence profiles (Gray & Foshee, 1997). Gray and Foshee's (1997) study distinguishes between violence perpetrated out of self-defense and violence not perpetrated out of self-defense. This is important because one who responds with violence out of self-defense is not mutually violent but rather a victim, which is an important distinction for intervention services.

In addition, Gray and Foshee's (1997) study explored various factors associated with dating violence to identify if any differences were present in relation to the profiles. These factors included severity of violence and acceptance of violence, both of which were explored in this study. Gray and Foshee (1997) found that the mutually violent profile initiated a significantly higher rate ($p = .002$) of severe violence in comparison to the perpetrator only profile. In reference to the level of acceptance, it was found that mutually violent profiles accepted dating violence more than the victim only profiles.

Although the above study was a step in the right direction, there were two factors that the author of the current study believed to be important that were not explored or addressed in Gray and Foshee's study (1997).
One such factor was the issue of gender. Studies that have addressed this issue have found differences in the amount of violence males and females initiated, with males having a more frequent occurrence than their female counterparts (O'Keefe, 1997).

However, the above study did not address gender differences within the context of the dating violence profiles; therefore, it is not known why males initiated the violence. This was a factor the author believed to be important and was therefore addressed in the current study.

The second issue was the level of self-esteem among individuals in these violent relationships. O'Keefe and Treister (1998) found that lower self-esteem was a significant predictor in receiving violence. In contrast to their findings, a study conducted by Burke, Stets and Pirog-Good (1988) found no relationship between experiencing dating violence and low self-esteem, despite the fact that both studies used the same self-esteem scale developed by Rosenberg (1979). In addition, these studies did not look at self-esteem within the context of the dating violence profiles. Therefore, using the same self-esteem scale, the researcher explored the participant's level of self-esteem.
Another issue relevant to this study was the level of satisfaction within the relationship. O'Keefe (1997) and O'Keefe and Treister (1998) examined this issue and found that females reported less relationship satisfaction and were most often the victims of dating violence; however, they did not explore this issue within the context of dating violence profiles. As a result, the present study chose to explore relationship satisfaction within the context of the three profiles in hopes of providing the helping profession with a better understanding of the possible issues that interact with one another to either increase or decrease the likelihood of dating violence occurring.

In summary, the review of the literature revealed gaps in various studies, which warranted further investigation. Examples of these include the five variables this study explored, they were: a) gender, b) self-esteem, c) severity of violence, d) relationship satisfaction, and e) acceptance of violence. This study differed from previous research in that it explored relationships among variables that have yet to be explored in relation to dating violence profiles.
However, this study built upon previous research because it was attempting to find similar results in terms of gender differences, self-esteem and severity of violence. It was the hope of this author that the data she received would support already existing data, which would further support the need for prevention and intervention programs that focus on decreasing the occurrence of dating violence among teens.

**Problem Focus**

This study used a Post-positivist approach and was exploratory in nature. Self-report questionnaires regarding dating violence profiles, self-esteem, severity of the violence, relationship satisfaction, and acceptance of violence were used.

The primary purpose of the current study was to identify the differences between the three profiles. In addition, the researcher also wanted to determine what factors or group of factors influenced the receiving and/or inflicting of dating violence so early intervention and prevention programs can be developed. Therefore, the research question was as follows: are there any differences between dating violence profiles among college students, ages 18-20, in relation to their gender, level of self-
esteem, severity of the violence, relationship satisfaction, and acceptance of violence? This question led to the following hypotheses, which attempted to support the findings of previous studies:

**Hypothesis 1.** Mutually violent relationships will initiate higher rates of severe violence than perpetrator-only relationships.

**Hypothesis 2.** The mutually violent relationship will have a higher acceptance rate of dating violence in comparison to the victim only relationship.

**Hypothesis 3.** Males and females will be equally represented in mutually violent relationships, but females will be overrepresented in victim only relationships.

**Hypothesis 4.** The victim-only relationship will have a lower self-esteem than the other two profiles and, on average, males will report a higher self-esteem than their female counterparts.
METHODS

Participants

One hundred twenty-five participants responded out of 210 students, which produced a 60% response rate. The final sample included 125 participants: 31 males (24.8%) and 94 females (75.2%) (see Table 1). The students ranged in age from 18 to 20; the mean age was 19.02 years (see Table 2). As Table 3 indicates, the racial/ethnic composition that was most represented in the sample was Caucasian (40%). In addition, most students were currently in a dating relationship and not living with their partners (see Table 4 & 5).

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

Normative Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year in College</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Relationship (months)</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15.37</td>
<td>13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent Together Weekly</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>27.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

Ethnic Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native-American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4
Categorical Relationship Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Together</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>88.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Dating Partner</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past Dating Partner</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 5
Relationship Status Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dating</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedures

Self-report questionnaires measuring level of self-esteem, severity of violence, relationship satisfaction, and acceptance of violence were distributed to 210 college students, ages 18-20, in undergraduate psychology courses at a Southern California University. Student participation was voluntary and required all participants to sign consent forms. To ensure complete anonymity, the participants were instructed not to put their names or any identifying
information on the questionnaires. All questionnaires contained a three-digit code, which allowed the researcher to identify what questionnaires belonged together without revealing the identity of the participant. Therefore, their responses remained anonymous and confidential.

Questionnaires were completed by the participants at home and returned during the following class session. Included in the packet that was sent home with the students was a set of instructions to ensure they completed the questionnaires correctly (see Appendix A). After receiving the completed questionnaires the researcher debriefed the students on the purpose of the research and provided a debriefing statement, which contained resources such as local counseling agencies and local hotline telephone numbers. Those participants who returned their questionnaires received extra credit.

Measures

*Sociodemographic information.* The participants were asked to answer a series of questions related to their age, gender, grade, and ethnicity. In addition, they were asked questions regarding their most recent dating relationship (see Appendix B).
**Dating Violence Profile.** Consistent with the methods and questions used in Gray and Foshee's (1997) study, the students were asked to answer two questions regarding their most recent or current dating partner who was referred to as Partner X (see Appendix C). The profiles were determined based on the following criteria: 1) victim only - at least one positive response to an item in question one and all negative responses to items in question two; 2) perpetrator only - at least one positive response to an item in question two and all negative responses to items in question one; and 3) mutually violent - at least one positive response to an item in questions one and two (Gray & Foshee, 1997). The purpose for utilizing this questionnaire was to help the researcher identify violence used out of self-defense.

**Self-esteem.** Self-esteem was measured by using the 10-item Rosenberg self-esteem scale (Rosenberg, 1979, as cited in Burke, Stets & Pirog-Good, 1988) (see Appendix D). This scale reported a reliability coefficient of .85. Consent to use this scale was granted by the author's widow (see Appendix E).

**Severity of Violence.** This researcher chose to adhere to the definition provided by Levy (1991) and include
verbal/emotional abuse. Therefore, severe violence was defined as any act that had a probability of causing physical and/or emotional injury. This variable was measured by the Physical Assault (alpha = .86), Sexual Coercion (alpha = .87), Injury (alpha = .95), and Psychological Aggression (alpha = .86) subscales of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) (Straus & Hamby, 1996).

These subscales were also used to determine the prevalence rate for the sample population (see Appendix F). In addition, the Negotiation subscale (alpha = .79) was used to measure how many students reported negotiating their differences rather than reverting to violence to settle a disagreement or argument. Written permission to use the CTS2 was granted by the author (see Appendix G).

**Relationship Satisfaction.** The Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) developed by Hendrick (1988) measured relationship satisfaction (See Appendix H). The RAS contained seven items and had a reliability of alpha = .86. Permission to use the scale was granted by its author (see Appendix I).

About Dating Index, which measured how justifiable it was for a boy or girl to hit or slap their partner. The author of this study adapted a Justification of Violence Scale from O'Keefe and Treister's scale that measured the participant's acceptance of dating violence (see Appendix J). This scale was used to identify if there was any time when it was okay for a girl to hit a boy, yet not okay for a boy to hit a girl in the same situation and under the same circumstances.

The strength of these instruments is that they have been used in multiple studies that have addressed the issue of dating violence among high school and college students. Another strength is that all of the instruments are short and therefore quickly completed.

Protection of Human Subjects

All participants remained anonymous and appropriate informed consent was obtained. Additionally, the author adhered to the rules set forth by the Human Subjects Review committee. No participant was unnecessarily exploited for the purpose of this study. All participants were fully informed of the study's purpose (see Appendix K) and received information regarding available resources upon completion of the study (e.g., local counseling agencies...
and domestic violence hotline telephone numbers) (see Appendix L).
RESULTS

Data analysis was not conducted on the dating violence profiles because only 37 participants completed the questionnaire that determined the participant’s dating violence profile (e.g., victim, perpetrator, or mutually violent) (see Figure 1 & Table 6). However, correlations were utilized to analyze the other variables and to identify any associations as well as significant relationships between the variables.

FIGURE 1
Profile Bar Graph
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**Dating Violence Profiles**
TABLE 6
Profiles By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

Gender was compared to the level of self-esteem (see Table 7), the individual subscales of the CTS2 (see Table 8), relationship satisfaction (see Table 9), acceptance of violence (see Table 10 & 11), inflicting violence (see Table 12), receiving violence (see Table 13), severe violence (see Table 14) and all demographic characteristics and no significant relationships or associations between variables were discovered.

Independent t-tests were used to test whether any of the means of the above variables were significantly different for males versus females. One variable showed a significant difference, which was the physical violence. Males reported a mean score of physical violence of 2.2069, which is significantly different from the females who reported a mean score of 7.9130 (significance=.045) (see
Table 8). No other significant differences were found for all other means on the gender variable.

**TABLE 7**

**Self-esteem Variable By Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.47</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Aggression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15.14</td>
<td>16.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>19.52</td>
<td>25.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>23.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62.41</td>
<td>36.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>67.81</td>
<td>38.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>66.52</td>
<td>37.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Injury</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>12.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>10.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7.91</td>
<td>25.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>22.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sexual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>15.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>13.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9

**Relationship Satisfaction Variable By Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 10

**Girl-to-Boy Violence By Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 11

**Boy-to-Girl Violence By Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.28</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12

**Inflicting Violence By Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 13

**Receiving Violence By Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 14

**Severe Violence By Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prevalence and Severity of Violence

The Physical Assault, Sexual Coercion, Injury, and Psychological subscales of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) were used to obtain the prevalence rate. The dating violence prevalence rate for this sample was 87.8%.

The above subscales were also used to determine the severity of violence. Forty-one out of 119 respondents reported severe violence in their dating relationships, which is 32.8% of the sample. The severity of violence variable was analyzed against all variables revealing significant relationships between inflicting violence \((r=.906, p=.000)\) and receiving violence \((r=.804, p=.000)\) (see Table 15).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inflicting Violence</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>.906**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Violence</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>.804**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Self-esteem

Data analysis revealed that there was an association between self-esteem and relationship satisfaction \((r=-.185, p=.041)\) (see Table 16).
TABLE 16

Self-esteem Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Satisfaction</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-0.185*</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

Relationship Satisfaction

Significant associations were found between relationship satisfaction and the following demographic characteristics: current dating partner ($r = -0.456$, $p = 0.000$), past dating partner ($r = -0.492$, $p = 0.000$), number of months dating ($r = 0.316$, $p = 0.000$), and hours spent together weekly ($r = 0.255$, $p = 0.006$) (see Table 17). In addition, when analysis was conducted with the level of self-esteem, CTS2 subscales, acceptance of violence, inflicting violence, receiving violence, and severe violence, significant relationships were revealed. They were the level of self-esteem ($r = -0.185$, $p = 0.041$) and the Negotiation subscale of the CTS2 ($r = 0.278$, $p = 0.002$) (see Table 17).
TABLE 17

Relationship Satisfaction Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Dating Partner</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-.456**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Dating Partner</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-.492**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Months Dating</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.316**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent Together Weekly</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>.255**</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Self-Esteem</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-.185*</td>
<td>0.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation Subscale</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>.278**</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Acceptance of Violence

The acceptance of violence variable was analyzed by looking at the girl-to-boy violence and the boy-to-girl violence separately. The girl-to-boy violence was found to have significant relationships with the following variables: number of months dating ($r = -.272$, $p = .007$), physical assault subscale ($r = .397$, $p = .000$), sexual coercion subscale ($r = .452$, $p = .000$), injury subscale ($r = .484$, $p = .000$), psychological aggression subscale ($r = .201$, $p = .049$), inflicting violence ($r = .457$, $p = .000$), receiving violence ($r = .388$, $p = .000$), and justification of boy-to-girl violence ($r = .428$, $p = .000$) (see Table 18). The boy-to-girl
violence had significant relationships with the following variables: year in college ($r=-.224$, $p=.021$), living together ($r=-.218$, $p=.026$), the sexual coercion subscale ($r=.220$, $p=.024$), and the justification of girl-to-boy violence ($r=.428$, $p=.000$) (see Table 19).

TABLE 18

Girl-to-Boy Violence Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Months Dating</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-.272**</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.452**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.484**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>.201*</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflicting Violence</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.457**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving Violence</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>.388**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boy-to-girl Violence</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).
TABLE 19

Boy-to-Girl Violence Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year in College</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-.224*</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Together</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>-.218*</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>.220*</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl-to-boy Violence</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Subscales of the CTS2

Each of the five subscales were analyzed against all of the demographic characteristics and only three variables were found to have significant relationships. The Psychological Aggression subscale was found to have a significant relationship with the age variable ($r=-.202, p=.027$) as well as the year in college variable ($r=-.201, p=.029$) (see Table 20). The only other scale to have a significant relationship with any of the demographic characteristics was the Negotiation Subscale, which was found to be associated with the number of hours partners spend together in a one week period ($r=.235, p=.011$) (see Table 20).
### TABLE 20

**CTS2 Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( r )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological Aggression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-0.202*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-0.201*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours Spent Together Weekly</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.235*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).
DISCUSSION

The most important thing to mention prior to beginning the discussion is that the researcher's hypotheses were not supported. The reason for this was that the dating violence profile questionnaire was not completed. A total of 37 out of 125 participants completed the questionnaire, which created a problem because the dating violence profiles were the basis of this study. Despite the fact that the sample size was small it did reveal that females were overrepresented in the victim only profile in comparison to their male counterparts, which was consistent with the researcher's hypothesis. In addition, females were represented three times as much as their male counterparts in the mutually violent profile, which was not consistent with the researcher's hypothesis.

As a result, the author chose to analyze the other variables to determine what factors influenced the inflicting and/or receiving of violence; and to support the results of previous findings.

The existence of dating violence in this sample had a prevalence rate of 87.8%, which was higher than most studies but it included verbal/emotional abuse. However, a study conducted by Bookwala et al (1992) reported a
prevalence rate of 65%, which also included verbal abuse. Therefore, it appears that dating violence is more prevalent when verbal/emotional abuse is included in the definition of violence.

Severe violence was also prevalent in this study. Over one-third of the respondents reported experiencing severe violence. Although this study was unable to support previous research that found mutually violent individuals initiated higher rates of severe violence than perpetrators: it was able to identify significant relationships. This variable had positive significant correlations with inflicting and receiving violence. This means that the more violence a person receives or inflicts on their partner, the more severe the violence becomes.

Gender was not found to be a significant factor in the occurrence of dating violence. This could be due to the fact that there was not equal representation of males and females in the sample. Nonetheless, the author of this study was unable to support previous findings that found gender differences in the initiation of violence and level of relationship satisfaction.

Consistent with the findings of Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988), one’s level of self-esteem had no
relationship with the occurrence of dating violence. However, the level of self-esteem and relationship satisfaction was found to have a negative relationship, which means that as one increases the other does not. So one can assume that if an individual has a high level of self-esteem they are more likely to report when they are not satisfied with their relationship and therefore leave if it does not get better. On the other hand, if an individual has low self-esteem they may report that they are satisfied with their relationship, regardless of whether or not it is true. The reason for this may be that they have such a low sense of self that they do not feel they deserve better.

In addition to the significant relationship with self-esteem, the level of relationship satisfaction was found to have positive correlations with the number of months dating and the amount of time one spends with their partner in a one-week period. Therefore, it appears that the longer one dates their partner and the more time they spend together the higher their level of relationship satisfaction. In addition, the results show that the more satisfied one is with their relationship, then the more likely they are to
negotiate their differences rather than resorting to violence to resolve their issues.

The results further showed that it was more justifiable for a girl to use violence on a boy when an injury, physical, sexual, or emotional abuse had occurred. Moreover, the length of the relationship appeared to have some influence on the justification of girl-to-boy violence. The results showed that the shorter the relationship had been in existence the more justified girl-to-boy violence was.

Also, the more justified a person believes girl-to-boy violence is the more justified boy-to-girl violence becomes. As a result, it appears that if a girl hits a boy then the boy is justified in hitting her back and vice-versa. This is contrary to popular belief that under no circumstances are boys to hit girls, regardless of whether or not they hit him first. However, it appears as though that is not the case with this sample.

In addition, it was found that justification of girl-to-boy violence increased the more an individual received or inflicted violence. Therefore, the more a person resorts to violence the more justified they believe it to be. The same with receiving violence. If a person
constantly receives violence as a way to resolve problems then they are more likely to believe in the justification of using violence to solve all problems.

In contrast to girl-to-boy violence, the justification of boy-to-girl violence appears to include different factors with the exception of one. Both girl-to-boy violence and boy-to-girl violence are more justified when violence of a sexual nature occurs. However, the less time they have been in college and the less time they have lived together the more justified it is for boy-to-girl violence.

The Psychological Aggression and Negotiation subscales of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale were correlated to a few of the demographic characteristics utilized in this study. In reference to psychological aggression, the results show that the younger the individual and the less time they have been in college the more psychological abuse occurs. The data analysis revealed that the more time spent with one’s partner during a one-week period the more likely they are to negotiate their differences rather than resort to violence.

Limitations

This study utilized convenience sampling, which is a type of nonprobability sampling. This sampling method
limits the generalizability of the findings to the larger population because it is difficult to claim that the sample is representative of the larger population. The reason for this is because the probability of an individual being selected cannot be estimated. Another limitation is the fact that the participants were asked to recall past experiences, which could have resulted in memory distortion.

Yet another limitation is the fact that the participants did not complete the dating violence profile questionnaire; therefore, the researcher was unable to analyze the data in relation to this variable. As a result, the researcher was unable to support the findings of Gray and Foshee (1997) and therefore unable to discover what factors or group of factors encompass the dating violence profiles. Nonetheless, the researcher was able to identify some factors that contributed to the occurrence of dating violence.

**Suggestions for Further Research**

Despite the fact that the results of this study could not be generalized to the larger population, it does support previous research and shows that dating violence does exist. However, why adolescents engage in dating
violence is still unknown. Therefore, questionnaires designed to determine their dating violence profiles are needed. The questionnaire that was used in this study is a step in the right direction; however, the majority of the students did not complete it. Therefore, prior to distributing the questionnaires, the researcher should further clarify the directions.

In addition, future research should try and obtain equal representation of males and females to identify if there are any differences between the genders. Furthermore, a sample that could also be generalized to the larger population would also be beneficial to the dating violence literature.

**Implications for Social Work**

Currently there are very few programs available to students experiencing dating violence. This study allowed social workers to increase their knowledge base as to the dynamics that may be present within these violent relationships. Programs designed for victims and/or perpetrators are a must if the cycle of violence is to be broken. These programs need to include conflict resolution skills, effective communication patterns and an education component, which teaches students that under no
circumstances is violence justified as well as educate them on the various types of abuse (e.g., physical, sexual, and psychological/emotional).

Who better to design these programs than social workers, because they have been trained to start where the client is as well as be an instrument of positive change. Furthermore, according to the profession's Code of Ethics, social workers have an ethical responsibility to the broader society in terms of promoting the general welfare of society at the global level as well as the individual level. This includes a teenager's well being.

In conclusion, this study supported previous research and showed that dating violence does exist. It further showed that teens engage in severe violence one-third of the time. Therefore, it appears that dating violence is a problem in today's society and is common among our teen population. Thus, intervention and prevention services need to be developed for this population. In addition, further research needs to be conducted to further determine what factors play a role in the existence of dating violence.
APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS

TO ENSURE THAT ALL PARTICIPANTS COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONNAIRES IN THE SAME MANNER, HERE ARE SOME BRIEF INSTRUCTIONS.

IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY IN A RELATIONSHIP, PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONNAIRES WITH THAT PERSON IN MIND.

IF YOU ARE NOT CURRENTLY IN A RELATIONSHIP, PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONNAIRES WITH YOUR MOST RECENT PARTNER IN MIND.
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions.

1. Age: (Please circle one)
   1. 18  2. 19  3. 20

2. Year in college: __________

3. Gender: (Please circle one)
   1. Male  2. Female

4. Ethnicity: (Please circle one)
   1. Caucasian  4. Hispanic
   3. Asian  6. Other (please specify) __________

5. Do you currently have a boyfriend or girlfriend? (Please circle one) (If yes, skip #6 and go directly to #7. If no, skip this question and go directly to #6).
   1. Yes  2. No

6. If you are currently not in a relationship, have you had a boyfriend or girlfriend in the past? (Please circle one). If so, please answer the remaining questions with that boyfriend/girlfriend in mind.
   1. Yes  2. No

7. How long did you or have you been dating your partner? _______ months

8. How often did/do you and this person spend time together alone in a one-week period? _______ hours

9. What was/is your relationship status with your partner?
   1. Dating  4. Divorced
   2. Engaged  5. Separated
   3. Married

10. Did/are you and your partner living together?
    1. Yes  2. No
APPENDIX C

DATING VIOLENCE PROFILE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions while thinking about your most recent or current dating partner.

1. How many times did Partner X use any of the following violent acts? (Only report when partner X did it to you first)
   - Pulled hair _____
   - Scratched _____
   - Slapped _____
   - Physically twisted an arm _____
   - Slammed or held against a wall _____
   - Kicked _____
   - Bent an arm _____
   - Bit _____
   - Tried to choke _____
   - Pushed, grabbed, or shoved _____
   - Dumped out of the car _____
   - Threw something and hit with object _____
   - Burned _____
   - Hit with fists _____
   - Hit with something hard beside fist _____
   - Spit on _____
   - Beat up _____
   - Assaulted with a knife or gun _____

2. How many times did you use any of the following violent acts on Partner X? (Only report when you did it to partner X first)
   - Pulled hair _____
   - Scratched _____
   - Slapped _____
   - Physically twisted an arm _____
   - Slammed or held against a wall _____
   - Kicked _____
   - Bent an arm _____
   - Bit _____
   - Tried to choke _____
   - Pushed, grabbed, or shoved _____
   - Dumped out of the car _____
   - Threw something and hit with object _____
   - Burned _____
   - Hit with fists _____
   - Hit with something hard beside fist _____
   - Spit on _____
   - Beat up _____
   - Assaulted with a knife or gun _____

Gray & Foshee (1997)
APPENDIX D

THE ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

BELOW IS A LIST OF STATEMENTS DEALING WITH YOUR GENERAL FEELINGS ABOUT YOURSELF. IF YOU STRONGLY AGREE, CIRCLE SA. IF YOU AGREE WITH THE STATEMENT, CIRCLE A. IF YOU DISAGREE, CIRCLE D. IF YOU STRONGLY DISAGREE, CIRCLE SD.

1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
   1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

2. At times I think I am no good at all.
   1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
   1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
   1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
   1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

6. I certainly feel useless at times.
   1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
   1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
   1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
   1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
    1. SA  2. A  3. D  4. SD

NOTE: Reprinted with permission by the author.
Thank you for your interest in the Self-Esteem Scale of Dr. Morris Rosenberg. Regrettably, Dr. Rosenberg passed away several years ago. However, Dr. Florence Rosenberg, Manny's widow, has given permission to use the Self-Esteem Scale for educational and professional research. Please be sure to give the credit due to Dr. Morris Rosenberg when you use it. We would also appreciate receiving copies of any published works resulting from this research.

Below you will find a copy of the scale, along with brief instructions on norming and scoring it. A fuller description of the scale may be found in the Appendix of Society and the Adolescent Self-Image. You may wish to contact Dr. Rosenberg's co-authors for more information relating to his work.

There is no charge associated with the use of this scale in your professional research.
**APPENDIX F**

**REVISED CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE**

*Relationship Behaviors*

Even when couples really like each other, they sometimes have disagreements. This is a list of things that couples sometimes do when they disagree. Please answer the following questions while thinking about your most recent or current dating partner.

### How often did this happen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Once in the past year</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Twice in the past year</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-5 times in the past year</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6-10 times in the past year</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11-20 times in the past year</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>More than 20 times in the past year</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not in the past year, but it did happen before</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>This has never happened</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
2. My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
3. I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
4. My partner explained his or her side of a disagreement to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
5. I insulted or swore at my partner. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
6. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
7. I threw something at my partner that could hurt. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
8. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
9. I twisted my partner's arm or hair. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
10. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
11. I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with my partner. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
12. My partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
13. I showed respect for my partner's feeling about an issue. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
14. My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
15. I made my partner have sex without a condom. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
16. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 = Once in the past year</th>
<th>2 = Twice in the past year</th>
<th>3 = 3-5 times in the past year</th>
<th>4 = 6-10 times in the past year</th>
<th>5 = 11-20 times in the past year</th>
<th>6 = More than 20 times in the past year</th>
<th>7 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before</th>
<th>0 = This has never happened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. I pushed or shoved my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>make my partner have oral or anal sex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I used a knife or gun on my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner in a fight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I called my partner fat or ugly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My partner called me fat or ugly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I destroyed something belonging to my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My partner went to a doctor because of a fight with me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I choked my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I shouted or yelled at my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I slammed my partner against a wall.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 = Once in the past year
2 = Twice in the past year
3 = 3-5 times in the past year
4 = 6-10 times in the past year
5 = 11-20 times in the past year
6 = More than 20 times in the past year
7 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before
0 = This has never happened

39. I said I was sure we could work out a problem. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
40. My partner was sure we could work it out. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
41. I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner,
    but I didn't. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
42. My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with
    me, but didn't. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
43. I beat up my partner. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
44. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
45. I grabbed my partner. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
46. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
47. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon)
    to make my partner have sex. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
48. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
49. I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a
    disagreement. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
50. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
51. I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but
    did not use physical force). 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
52. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
53. I slapped my partner. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
54. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
55. I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
56. My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
57. I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
58. My partner did this to me. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
59. I suggested a compromise to a disagreement.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
60. My partner did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
61. I burned or scalded my partner on purpose.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
62. My partner did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
63. I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force).  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
64. My partner did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
65. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
66. My partner accused me of this.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
67. I did something to spite my partner.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
68. My partner did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
69. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
70. My partner did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
71. I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight with my partner.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
72. My partner still felt physical pain the next day because of a fight we had.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
73. I kicked my partner.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
74. My partner did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
75. I used threats to make my partner have sex.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
76. My partner did this to me.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
77. I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
78. My partner agreed to try a solution I suggested.  1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0

NOTE: Reprinted with permission by the authors.
APPENDIX G

APPROVAL LETTER TO USE THE CTS2

APPLICATION TO USE THE CTS

THIS APPLICATION COVERS (circle): CTSPC  CTS2  Both

PROJECT TITLE/PURPOSE OF ADMINISTERING THE TESTS: The title is still a work in progress. However, the purpose for administering the CTS2 is to identify the prevalence of violence in intimate relationships.

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PERSONS TO BE TESTED:

WOMEN: ____  MEN: ____  COUPLES: ____  (both tested)  CHILDREN: 200-250 (15-18 yrs.)

MONTH AND YEAR TESTING WILL BEGIN: 01/01 AND END: 05/31

DO YOU PLAN TO CARRY OUT AND PROVIDE US WITH PSYCHOMETRIC ANALYSES? (See attached page)

☐ Yes, please attach a paragraph describing your plan

☐ No, please indicate the form in which you plan to provide data to us for purposes of our conducting psychometric analyses

☐ Test answer sheets or test booklets (these will be returned to the Cooperating User by the Authors)

☐ File of data on disk in one of the following formats (circle one): ASCII, Word Perfect, Word, SPSS, SAS, STATA

Name of Cooperating User: Beidette Hernandez
Address: 4593 Central Ave.
Riverside, CA 92506

PHONE: 909-734-0431  FAX: 909-336-7562
E-Mail: jmarabirree@earthlink.net

I agree to the terms of agreement on page 2 and to provide data as indicated above.

Cooperating User Signature: Beidette Hernandez  DATE: 11/1/99

STUDENTS: Please have your faculty advisor for this research sign this form:

Faculty Advisor Signature:  DATE: 11/8/99

Advisor Name, Title, and Institution: McHeytting, Professor of Psychology, Cal State San Bernadino

For the Test Authors:  DATE: 12/14/99

* The Test Authors of the CTSPC are Murray A. Straus, Sherry L. Hamby, David Finkelhor, David W. Moore and Desmond Runyan
APPENDIX H
RELATIONSHIP ASSESSMENT SCALE

Please circle the letter for each item that best answers that item for you.

1. How well does your partner meet your needs?
   A: __ B: __ C: __ D: __ E: __
   Poorly Average Extremely well

2. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?
   A: __ B: __ C: __ D: __ E: __
   Unsatisfied Average Extremely satisfied

3. How good is your relationship compared to most?
   A: __ B: __ C: __ D: __ E: __
   Poorly Average Excellent

4. How often do you wish you hadn't gotten in this relationship?
   A: __ B: __ C: __ D: __ E: __
   Never Average Very often

5. To what extent has your relationship met your original expectations?
   A: __ B: __ C: __ D: __ E: __
   Hardly at all Average Completely

6. How much do you love your partner?
   A: __ B: __ C: __ D: __ E: __
   Not much Average Very much

7. How many problems are there in your relationship?
   A: __ B: __ C: __ D: __ E: __
   Very few Average Very many

Note: Reprinted with author's permission.
APPENDIX I

APPROVAL LETTER TO USE THE RAS

From: Susan Hendrick <susan.hendrick@TTU.EDU>
To: James Crabtree <jmcrabtree@earthlink.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 20, 1999 8:15 AM
Subject: re: relationship satisfaction scale

Dear Ms. Hernandez:
You have my permission to use the scale in your study. I would be happy to fax it to you, if you have a fax number. Otherwise, I will mail you a copy along with a recent reprint regarding psychometrics of the scale. I am not prepared to send you the information you want via e-mail (sorry, just don't have time).
Susan Hendrick

At 10:36 PM 10/19/99 -0700, you wrote:
> Hello Mrs. Hendrick, I found the article you wrote regarding this scale in the Journal of Marriage and the Family (1998) and would appreciate your approval to use it in my study. Thank you
> for your time. Sincerely, Bridgette L. Hernandez
APPENDIX J

THE JUSTIFICATION OF VIOLENCE SCALE

Some people think it is all right to hit or slap others under certain conditions. After each of the following statements indicate whether or not you think it is OK for couples to slap or hit one another under the following situations. Circle a number from 1 to 4 that shows your opinion. For example, 1=never all right, 2=sometimes all right, 3=usually alright, and 4=always all right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think it is OK for a GIRLFRIEND to hit/slap her partner if:</th>
<th>Never All Right</th>
<th>Sometimes All Right</th>
<th>Usually All Right</th>
<th>Always All Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) They threaten to break up with her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) They are drunk/drugged and acting crazy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) In an argument, they hit her first.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) She finds out they are cheating on her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) They call her nasty names.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) They flirt with another person in front of her and her friends at a party.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) They make her look foolish in front of family or friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) They refuse to let her go out for an evening with her friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Is there any other time it is OK.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you think it is OK for a BOYFRIEND to hit/slap his partner if:</th>
<th>Never All Right</th>
<th>Sometimes All Right</th>
<th>Usually All Right</th>
<th>Always All Right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) They threaten to break up with him.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) They are drunk/drugged and acting crazy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) In an argument, they hit him first.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) He finds out they are cheating on him.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) They call him nasty names.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) They flirt with another person in front of him and his friends at a party.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) They make him look foolish in front of family or friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) They refuse to let him go out for an evening with his friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Is there any other time it is OK.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

STUDENT INFORMED CONSENT

The study in which you may voluntarily participate is a study of dating violence among students, ages 18-20. Bridgette Hernandez, Graduate Student of Social Work at California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), is conducting this study under the supervision of Dr. McCaslin, Chair of the Research Sequence. This study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of CSUSB. The university requires that you give your consent before you can participate in this or any other research study.

In this study you will fill in a six-part survey. The first part asks socio-demographic questions such as age, gender, ethnicity, etc. The second part contains the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale, which measures how you handle disagreements with your boyfriend or girlfriend. The third part contains questions related to dating violence profiles. The fourth part contains the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. The fifth part contains a Relationship Assessment Scale, which measures relationship satisfaction. The sixth part contains the Justification of Violence Scale, which assesses a student's acceptance of dating violence. The instruments you will be given will not have your name on them to insure complete anonymity of your responses. Please note that you are not required to take or complete the study and that you have the right to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty. Completion of the instruments has taken our test respondents no more than 35-45 minutes, but it may take you more or less time.

Questions related to dating violence may cause you emotional discomfort. Therefore, upon completion of the study, you will be given a debriefing statement with the names and numbers of local agencies you may contact to help discuss and resolve your emotional discomfort. Also, the author of the study will be available for you to discuss any concerns you may have.

Please be assured that findings will be reported in group form only. No identifying information will be used that may identify you. At the conclusion of the study, you may, upon request, receive a copy of the findings by contacting Bridgette Hernandez at 909-745-2414. If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Dr. McCaslin at 909-880-5507. If you have any questions about research participants' rights, please contact the Institutional Review Board at 909-880-5027.

By checking the box provided below and dating this form, you acknowledge that you have been informed and understand the nature of the study and freely consent to participate. You further acknowledge that you are at least 18 years of age.

☐ I agree to participate in this study. __________________________ Date: __________________________

☐ I do not agree to participate in this study.
APPENDIX L

STUDENT DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Bridgette Hernandez, Graduate Student of Social Work at California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB), conducted this research study under the supervision of Dr. McCaslin, Chair of the Research Sequence, to find out whether you experience violence in your relationship with your boyfriend or girlfriend. The instruments used in the study were the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale, a Dating Violence Profile Questionnaire, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, the Relationship Assessment Scale and the Justification of Violence Scale. The Institutional Review Board at CSUSB approved the study.

If any questions asked on the questionnaires or any aspect of the study caused you any emotional stress and you would like to talk to somebody about it, you can contact the following agencies. In addition, I will also be available to talk with you about any concerns you may have.

Thank you for your participation.

AGENCY LISTINGS

• Alternatives to Domestic Violence
  Office number: 909-320-1370
  24-hour Crisis Line: 909-683-0829
  Countywide: 800-339-7233

• Rape Crisis Center
  24-hour Crisis Line: 909-686-RAPE

• Family Service Association of Riverside
  Office number: 909-686-3706

• Youth Service Center
  Office number: 909-683-5193

• National Domestic Violence Hotline
  1-800-799-7233

A brief summary of the findings and conclusions of the study will be available after June 1, 2000 and can be obtained by calling Bridgette Hernandez at 909-745-2414. If you have any other questions please contact Dr. McCaslin, Chair of the Research Sequence, at 909-880-5507. Thank you for your participation in the study.
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