

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Beth C. Emery for the degree of Master of Science in Human Development and Family Studies presented on September 1, 1983.

Title: Factors Contributing to Violence in Dating Relationships

Redacted for privacy

Abstract approved: _____

 June M. Henton

Until recently the study of premarital abuse has received relatively little attention from researchers. Those studies which have been concerned with this phenomenon reveal that approximately 22% of their college samples reported involvement in abusive dating relationships, indicating that there is a need for further study in this area. The purpose of this study was to increase the limited knowledge base regarding those individuals who have experienced premarital violence. A sample of 506 college volunteers completed questionnaires which were designed to determine: (1) the frequency with which dating abuse occurred and (2) whether differences existed between the premarital abuse group and the nonabuse group with regard to certain descriptive variables. These variables included self concept, attitudes toward sex roles, and exposure to family violence. In addition, the extent to which these variables were predictive of the perceived severity of the premarital abuse was examined.

T tests were used to analyze the two groups in terms of sex role attitudes and self concept. It was found that individuals who reported involvement in premaritally abusive relationships had lower self concepts as compared to the nonabuse group. No significant differences were found between the groups concerning the maintenance of either liberal or traditional sex role attitudes.

A chi-square analysis indicated that higher frequencies of both child abuse and marital violence were found in the abuse group than in the nonabuse group. Of these individuals who had been exposed to situations of child abuse, t tests revealed no significant differences in perceived psychological effects between those respondents who been involved in premarital abuse and those who had not. However, of the respondents who reported observing marital abuse, those in the premarital abuse group indicated that they experienced more severe psychological effects of the violence than did the nonabuse group.

Finally, a stepwise regression was performed to determine the extent to which the three variables of self concept, sex role attitude, and exposure to family violence, as well as a measure of physical severity, predicted the perceived psychological impact of premarital abuse. Results indicated that physical severity and self concept were significant predictors, jointly accounting for 18% of the variance.

Factors Contributing to Violence in Dating Relationships

by

Beth C. Emery

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science

Completed September 1, 1983

Commencement June 1984

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

~~Professor of Human Development and Family Studies in charge of major~~

Redacted for privacy

~~Head of department of Human Development and Family Studies~~

Redacted for privacy

~~Dean of Graduate School~~

Date thesis is presented September 1, 1983

Typed by Express Typing Service for Beth C. Emery

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank the members of my committee, June Henton, Alan Sugawara, and Rodney Cate, for their continuous help and support, not only in the preparation of this thesis but also in the completion of my degree. Without their concern and personal interest, all this would not have been possible.

I also wish to thank Sally Lloyd and James Koval for their statistical assistance in the analysis of the data and for their outstanding support and inspiration throughout the last three years.

Finally, I wish to express my appreciation for the emotional support and strength given me by Charles Emery, and Parker and Evelyn Coffin.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	1
	Introduction	1
	Importance of the Study of Premarital Violence	4
	Conceptual Framework	7
	Attitude toward Sex Roles	8
	Self Concept	12
	Exposure to Family Violence	14
	Hypotheses	18
II.	METHOD	19
	Respondents	19
	Variables	19
	Occurrence of Premarital Violence	19
	Perceived Impact of Abuse in Dating	21
	Self Concept	21
	Attitude Toward Sex Roles	22
	Occurrence of Family Violence	23
	Physical Severity of Family Violence	23
	Perceived Impact of Family Violence	24
	Demographic Information	24
	Data Analysis	24
III.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	26
	Occurrence of Premarital Violence	26
	Types of Violent Behavior	29
	Attitude Toward Sex Roles	32
	Self Concept	36
	Exposure to Family Violence	40
	Predictors of the Impact of Premarital Abuse	48
	Limitations of the Study	51
VI.	IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	52
	Implications for Education	52
	Implications for Future Research	57
	REFERENCES	59
	APPENDICES	
	Appendix A: Occurrence of Premarital Violence	62
	Appendix B: Physical Severity of Abuse in Dating	63
	Appendix C: Perceived Impact of Abuse in Dating	64
	Appendix D: Self Concept (Texas Social Behavior Inventory)	65
	Appendix E: Attitude Toward Sex Roles (Attitude Toward Women Scale)	68
	Appendix F: Occurrence of Family Violence	70

Appendix G: Physical Severity of Family Violence	71
Appendix H: Perceived Impact of Family Violence	72
Appendix I: Demographic Information	73

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Inflicting or Experiencing Certain Types of Abusive Behavior	30
2	Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Experiencing Child Abuse	43
3	Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Experiencing Marital Abuse	46
4	Summary Table for Multiple Regression on Psychological Effects of Premarital Violence	49

Factors Contributing to Violence in Dating Relationships

I. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Premarital violence is an area of study which recently has begun to attract the attention of family researchers. It is speculated that abuse during courtship is a part of the cycle of violence which has its roots within the home. Thus, in order to explore the nature of premarital violence and the implications it has for young adults in dating relationships, it may be useful to examine the scope of family violence overall.

Studies of family violence over the past several years have served to provide new information and to challenge traditional beliefs about family behavior. For example, the general public typically perceives the family to be a nonviolent unit, with the exception that family violence is a rarity found only in scattered instances. In actual fact, Steinmetz (1978) reported that marital violence is a "widespread, all pervading phenomenon" and offered a conservative estimate that over two million individuals are beaten by their spouses each year.

According to Gelles and Straus (1979), this erroneous perception of the family as a peaceful unit was partially due to "selective inattention" to the facts on the part of the public as well as social scientists. This inattention is caused by the fact that many forms of violence which occur within the family are not regarded as abusive. Afterall, few people consider fights between siblings to be a form of

violence, nor do they consider physical punishment such as spanking to be child abuse. In fact, in a study recently completed by Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980), most Americans surveyed felt that slapping a child as a form of punishment was "necessary, normal and good." Also in the same study, one out of four wives and one out of three husbands viewed the use of physical force between spouses as at least somewhat necessary, normal and good.

It becomes apparent from these examples that "violence" is a concept which is defined in different ways by different people. There are many cultural and societal factors which serve to sanction and reinforce particular types of behavior, including violence. These cultural norms must be considered when attempting to develop a working definition of the term. For the purposes of this research, the terms "violence" and "abuse" will be used in accordance with Gelles and Straus's (1979) definition. They defined violence as "an act carried out having the intention of physically hurting another person" (p. 554). The "physical hurt" may range from the effects of a slap or push to murder. The "intent to hurt" could vary from concern for a child's safety to intense hostility which could lead to death.

The research on child abuse by Kempe, Silverman, Steele, Droegemueller, and Silver (1962) stimulated a gradual increase in the awareness of physical violence between family members. The attention given this area of research then shifted to include the recognition of spouse abuse as an extensive and serious problem. Although accurate statistics are difficult to obtain, it has been estimated that domestic quarrels accounted for approximately 13% of homicides

nationwide in 1969 (Steinmentz, 1978). Given the serious implications of the figures regarding the prevalence of violence within the family, researchers began to broaden the scope of the domestic violence literature to include studies on sibling violence (Gulley, Dengerink, Pepping, & Berstrom, 1981) and elderly abuse (Block & Sinnot, 1980).

The area of violence to be examined most recently is premarital abuse. To date, very few studies have focused on the violence that occurs between dating couples (Cate, Henton, Koval, Christopher, & Lloyd, 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1981; Makepeace, 1981). Previous evidence of the occurrence of premarital violence in cases of spouse abuse has been found in several studies (Gayford, 1976; Snyder & Fruchtmann, 1981; Star, Clark, Geotz, & O'Malia, 1979). Although these researchers reported substantial incidences of abuse occurring prior to marriage, their primary focus was on the study of spouse abuse, not premarital violence.

So far, the premarital violence research has been exploratory in nature. In describing abusive relationships, it was reported that violence occurred most often in more serious, committed stages of the dating relationship (Cate et al., 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1981) and did not tend to be detrimental to the future of that relationship (Cate et al., 1982; Makepeace, 1981). Many individuals perceived the violent behavior to happen as a result of anger or confusion (Cate et al., 1982), and in some cases they related it to jealousy or the consumption of alcohol (Makepeace, 1981). A significant number of the respondents in one study (29%) also interpreted the violence to be an indication of love (Cate et al., 1982).

In addition to the variance in these perceptions, differences were found in the severity of the violent behaviors which occurred within the dating relationship. The forms of violence which were examined in these studies ranged from less severe types of abuse such as pushing or shoving and slapping to more serious and potentially harmful acts such as beating and assault with a weapon (Cate et al., 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1981; Makepeace, 1981). As might be expected, the "less extreme" violent behaviors were found to be more frequent in dating relationships (Cate et al., 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1981; Makepeace, 1981).

Another major issue which has been addressed in the premarital violence research, and which has important implications for the study of marital violence, concerned individuals' attitudes toward both marital and premarital abuse. While violence in these relationships was not seen as appropriate by either abused or nonabused individuals, those who had been involved in abusive relationships tended to express more approval for the use of violence in marital and dating relationships than did those who had not previously experienced premarital abuse (Cate et al., 1982). This finding, more than any other, emphasizes the need to explore further the contributing factors and effects of abusive interactions on the development of premarital relationships.

Importance of the Study of Premarital Violence

The study of premarital violence is important for several reasons. First, although we know it occurs, very little else is known about premarital abuse, particularly as it compares with marital or

child abuse. Yet the research which has dealt with premarital violence has found that a significant proportion of dating relationships involve some type of violence. Both Cate et al. (1982) and Makepeace (1981) reported that approximately 22% of their subjects had experienced or inflicted abuse within a premarital relationship. This indicates there is a definite need for additional information regarding the causes of violence, the characteristics of those individuals involved in abusive relationships, and the effects of that violence on the individuals as well as on the relationship itself. A study of these factors would serve to enhance our knowledge of the development of premarital relationships and of the nature of abuse in other relationships as well.

A second reason for the study of premarital violence is that the descriptive information regarding individuals involved in courtship violence and the dimensions of abusive premarital relationships is essential for the development of effective preventive and intervention programs. Certainly, there is an awareness among professionals that premarital violence exists, but there are no programs designed to meet the specific needs of individuals in these circumstances (Makepeace, 1981). Additional information regarding the special causes and dynamics of premarital abuse must be generated before appropriate and effective counseling procedures and social policies can be developed.

Finally, the study of premarital violence will provide researchers with a broader perspective of the cycle of violence as a whole. The areas of child abuse and marital violence have been studied extensively and many researchers have concluded that there may

be a relationship between the two (e.g., Gelles, 1976; Kempe et al., 1962; Parke & Collmer, 1975). The exposure to violence or abuse during childhood has been associated with the use of violent behavior within a marital relationship. Children learn that the abusive forms of behavior they have observed are normative and appropriate interactions for adult relationships as well (Gelles, 1976; Parke & Collmer, 1975). This exposure to violence in combination with other factors such as low self concept and traditional attitudes toward sex roles also have been cited as predictive of involvement in abusive marital relationships (Barnett, Pittman, Ragan, & Salus, 1980). It is possible that these same characteristics may be important issues in the premarital relationship, yet none of these factors have been applied to the study of premarital violence. In doing so it is possible to obtain a more accurate description of those individuals who are or may become involved in abusive premarital relationships. This, in turn, will increase our understanding of the patterns and characteristics of violent behavior over the life cycle.

The present study is an attempt to further contribute to our understanding of violence between premarital couples. The major purpose is to compare individuals who have experienced premarital abuse with those who have not on three specific variables:

(1) attitude toward sex roles, (2) self concept, and (3) exposure to family violence. A second purpose is to predict to what extent these factors may influence how the individual perceives the impact of the violence.

Conceptual Framework

As mentioned earlier, violence in relationships is perceived differently by different people, with individuals defining its meaning based on their unique sets of circumstances and perceptions. Symbolic interactionists would suggest that the best way to understand human behavior is to deal with these mentalistic meanings (symbols) and values that occur in the mind (Burr, Leigh, Day, & Constantine, 1979). The valuing process--how salient or important something is to an individual--is shaped by the feedback received from others within a symbolic context.

This conceptualization of individuals and their behavior stresses the importance and influence of the socialization process. Symbolic interaction assumes that individuals are neither good nor bad at birth but, instead, possess incredible potential by nature. This potential is influenced by what individuals encounter and how they react to it, rather than by a biological or psychological predisposition to act in certain ways (Burr et al., 1979).

The type and source of feedback or reaction behavior is of interest, also. Primary groups such as the family are seen as having the greatest impact on the individual. Thus, if persons are continually involved in and exposed to abusive or violent situations within the home, they may interpret that type of behavior as appropriate and normal. In addition, if the sanctions they receive for abusive behavior are positive, the value held for that violence as an acceptable and important method of interaction could be reinforced. Therefore, an individual who has been "socialized" to regard violence

between intimate family members as proper could generalize that meaning to other intimate relationships. As a result, abuse would be viewed as a legitimate interaction pattern between dating partners who are at a committed or serious stage of their relationship.

Based on a symbolic interaction perspective, it would seem critical to assess the individual's perception of the abuse occurring within these significant relationships if the full impact of the violence is to be determined. Beyond the basic physical effects, influences on the individual may differ markedly depending on how one defines the situation. Feelings about self and others, relationship factors, and cultural norms may each contribute to a person's perceptions of the violent event and how it is internalized.

Attitude Toward Sex Roles. Individuals' attitudes toward sex roles refer to their beliefs and values concerning the appropriate behavior for a particular sex. For example, traditional attitudes would place females in an expressive role--an emotionally oriented role--and would cast males in an instrumental role--one which is task-oriented (Parsons & Bales, 1955).

The issue of sex role attitudes is in actuality related to the individual's socialization. The expectations people have for their partners' behavior, whether in a marital or dating context, depend largely upon the manner in which they have been socialized and the role models which they have observed within their families. This is basically a symbolic interaction perspective in that it parallels the assumption that people's definitions and expectations of self and others are shaped primarily by interaction with intimates (family

members). Attitudes and values regarding sex roles as well as many other issues are transmitted from one generation to the next on the familial, the cultural, and the societal levels. Many researchers assert that the American society maintains a high tolerance level for violence (Gelles, 1975; Gelles & Straus, 1979; Star, 1980). Criminal violence and abuse between family members occur more frequently in the U.S. than in any other industrialized nation (Star, 1980). If this is the case, then violent behavior should be regarded as normative from a symbolic interaction point of view.

The media and forms of social interaction also have a significant impact on the development and maintenance of individuals' views toward a certain role. Stereotypes of aggressive roles are continually reaffirmed for adults and children through ordinary social interaction (e.g., the value placed on the "tough" male) and through the mass media (the James Bond or Bogart types) (Straus, 1973). With this acceptance and valuing of aggressive behavior at the societal level, combined with the estimated high incidence rate of family violence, the likelihood that an individual will be exposed to some form of positive evaluation or interpretation of violent behavior is practically assured.

Some marital violence research has related sex role attitudes to violent and aggressive behavior. These studies have shown that family violence is most likely to occur when the husband and wife have very traditional views of marital behavior (Barnett et al., 1980; Star, 1980; Star et al., 1979). Abusive husbands often believe that the man should be head of the household, should be the breadwinner, and should

make all of the major decisions (Star, 1980). Although the wives of abusive husbands claim that marriage should be an equal partnership and they profess to maintain more liberal views toward sex roles, these wives tend in reality to conform to their husbands' role expectations (Star, 1980; Star et al., 1979). In these studies, women who were battered agreed that the husband should be the head of the house and that it was a wife's duty to obey her husband. They also expressed the feeling that a woman's greatest joy involved being a wife and mother (Star et al., 1979). The balance of power and division of labor within these families reflected a stereotypic attitude toward sex roles as well.

Sex role attitudes such as this must obviously influence the perceptions these wives have of the violence that they experience. It may be that the severity of the violence is diminished by the belief that the husband's abusive behavior is a normal method of maintaining power with the family.

Also consistent with sex role attitudes, flexibility of one's attitude has been found to be important in determining whether or not violence will occur. Rigid and inflexible traditionalism is described as characteristic of violent spouses by Barnett et al. (1980) and by Rosenbaum and O'Leary (1981). Violence also has been observed in families which are unable to allow for any deviation from the expected marital role behavior (Star, 1980; Straus, 1973). It seems, then, that those individuals who have developed very specific and rigid definitions of a particular role may have difficulty in accepting alternate forms of behavior for that role.

Other researchers have attributed marital violence to a discrepancy in attitudes between traditional, conservative husbands and nontraditional, liberal wives (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Whitehurst, 1974). Spouse abuse could arise from the need of the traditional male to "control" his wife and to resolve the difference in sex role perspectives (Whitehurst, 1974). An experimental study by Nirenberg and Gaelebein (1979) lends support to this discrepancy issue. Individuals were compared on the basis of their sex role values and level of aggressiveness, or tendency toward violence, as exhibited in a laboratory situation. Results showed that males with traditional attitudes toward sex roles were far more aggressive than were males with liberal views. However, the opposite was found to be true of females. Women with more liberal sex role attitudes tended to use aggressive behavior more than did those women who were traditional in their attitudes. There are no clearcut reasons for the gender differences in behavior and sex role values, but the finding that traditional males and liberally oriented females are more aggressive is consistent with our information about spousal violence. Observations by family researchers suggest that violence sometimes stems from incongruities in husband and wife sex role attitudes.

In terms of the perceived impact of abusive behavior, it may be that the traditionally oriented male perceives violence as a legitimate strategy of influence. Consequently, in situations where the wife maintains attitudes different from his own or where marital roles deviate from his expectations, the traditional male may resort to violence as an attempt to influence, rather than harm, his wife.

In addition, traditional females may not view aggression as an appropriate aspect of their feminine role; whereas, a female with more liberal sex role attitudes might perceive violence to be a somewhat more acceptable type of behavior.

So far, the issues of inflexibility, traditionalism, and discrepancies between attitudes toward sex roles have been studied only within the confines of the marital relationship. It would seem appropriate, therefore, to determine whether sex role attitudes affect the interactions which occur between dating couples just as they influence marital behavior.

Self Concept. Self concept has been defined as a learned constellation of perceptions, cognitions, and values (Wylie, 1961), all of which are based on how individuals feel, see, and experience the events around them and how they think of themselves (Mead, 1976). An important part of learning comes from observing the reactions one receives from others. Symbolic interaction theory emphasizes the learning aspect of this definition. It states that humans gradually differentiate themselves from their environment, determining personal likes and dislikes and traits through a continual process of interactions with others. The discovery of similarities and differences between the self and others causes the constant redefining of one's own image in relation to other individuals. Thus, the definition or awareness of the self is an ongoing and dynamic process which is due to interaction with others (Burr et al., 1979).

It is difficult to discuss self-concept from an interactionist's perspective without referring to the work of self theories such as

Rogers (1961), Maslow (1956), and Moustakas (1956). While they are different in many ways, self theory and symbolic interaction do utilize similar approaches with regard to the development of the individual. In fact, some researchers consider self theory close enough in outlook to regard it as a subtheory of symbolic interactionism. Both speak to the relationship between self concept and behavior in similar terms. According to interactionism, it is impossible to understand behavior without first understanding what meaning and value it holds for the individual. That meaning is determined by the perceptions and evaluations individuals have of their environment, their interactions with that environment, and themselves--or self concept. For self theorists, behavior is the result of the interaction between individuals, as they interpret the self (self concept) and the environment (Mead, 1976). A logical assumption, then, would be that if an individual's level of self concept were known, it would be possible to better understand and, perhaps, to predict that person's behavior.

Low self concept levels have been associated with violent behavioral interactions in both child and marital abuse literature. The little research that exists has examined the relationship between self concept and violent behavior, finding that individuals who are in abusive relationships also have relatively low self concepts (Barnett et al., 1980; Gelles, 1976; Martin & Beezely, 1976; Star et al., 1979). Generally, this finding is reported in terms of characteristics or traits typically found in individuals involved in abusive relationships. Profiles of women abused in marital relationships

describe them as having low self-esteem, feelings of worthlessness, and lacking self-confidence (Barnett et al., 1980; Star et al., 1979). Low self concept also has been considered to be a trait common to victims of child abuse (Martin & Beezely, 1976). Finally, negative self concept has been discussed as one reason why abused wives stay with their husbands (Gelles, 1976).

These reports which relate low levels of self concept to violent behavior are consistent with the theoretical base being used within this research. The meaning or impact that violent interactions have for both the abuser and the victim is greatly influenced by self concept. According to Rogers (1969), defensiveness and hostility are the results of low self-esteem and feelings of worthlessness. As for the victim, it is difficult--if not impossible--to determine whether one's self concept is lowered by repeated abuse or whether it is reinforced by that abuse. Low self concept also might act as an inhibitor to terminating a violent relationship. Given the uncertainty and insecurity of dating situations, it might predict that individuals may act violently or be accepting of violent behavior in accordance with their level of self concept and their perception of the social and personal acceptability of that type of behavior.

Exposure to Family Violence. The cycle of violence is a topic frequently discussed in the family violence literature. One of the most common and consistent conclusions of domestic violence research is that individuals who have experienced violence as children, or who have been witness to some other form of family violence (usually marital violence), are more likely to become involved in abusive

parent-child and marital relationships as adults (Barnett et al., 1980; Gayford, 1975; Gelles, 1976; Kempe et al., 1962; Parke, 1980; Parke & Collmer, 1975; Vexler, 1980). Straus et al. (1980) not only found evidence to support this conclusion but also state that the greater the frequency of violence during childhood, the more abusive the individual will be later in life.

The explanation offered for this relationship most often is that the exposure to violence as either a victim or an observer teaches the individual how to be violent and that it is an appropriate form of behavior (Gelles, 1976). This experience with violence provides a role model for the individual, causing many to grow up expecting violence and abuse to be a part of their adult lives (Snyder & Fruchtman, 1981). To understand this cyclical process, it is necessary to determine how it begins. An important part of the explanation of family violence is the fact that violence is first experienced within the family unit and is experienced in relationships with those who profess love for one another (Gelles & Straus, 1979). Take, for example, physical punishment which is a common form of discipline in many families. Two things happen when physical punishment is used. First, depending on the intent of the punishment, some type of behavior is learned--what to do, what not to do, etc. And secondly, more subtle, yet equally important, lessons are learned regarding the meaning of the act of physical punishment. These are the issues which are important to the interactionist's perspective in understanding the cycle of violence.

The first consequence of physical punishment is the association of love with violence. The child begins to learn that those who love him or her most are also those who hit and have the right to hit (Gelles & Straus, 1979). The second unintended consequence is the lesson that when something or someone is important, this justifies the use of physical force (Gelles & Straus, 1979). Thus, according to interaction theory, violence acquires meaning and value for the individual. Since these perceptions of abuse seem to be positive, the individual may come to regard the impact or severity of the violent act to be minimal. These "lessons" or meanings for the violence resulting from physical punishment become an integral part of the personality of the individual. This socialization process, including societal forces, provide the sanctions and reinforcement necessary for the generalization of that meaning to other social relationships, especially to those which are closest to the intimacy of the parent-child relationship--that of husband and wife. Therefore, Gelles and Straus (1979) suggested that early experiences with physical punishment may provide legitimacy for all types of violence, particularly intrafamily violence. In addition, there may not even be the need for some children to generalize the acceptability of the violence to other relationships. They may already be observing abusive interactions between their mothers and fathers, leading to a more direct socialization for their subsequent behaviors.

If it can be stated that children will generalize the meaning of violence from their childhood to other intimate relationships, such as the husband-wife dyad, it also should be logical to assume that they

would generalize that same meaning to other intimate or close relationships. The premarital relationship is such an example. In keeping with the family violence literature, those individuals who have been exposed to family violence should be more likely to exhibit or be more tolerant of violent behavior in all adult relationships. Support for this assumption has come from sources whose primary purpose was the investigation of marital abuse (Gayford, 1976; Snyder & Fruchtman, 1981; Star et al., 1979). The reported rates of premarital abuse experienced by the battered spouses in these studies ranged from 25% (Gayford, 1976) to 49% (Star et al., 1979). It seems that many of the individuals who have had an extensive history of violence within their family of origin also have experienced frequent instances of abuse prior to marriage (Snyder & Fruchtman, 1981). To them, violence is an acceptable and expected form of behavior.

While there seems to be consistent support for the existence of the cycle of violence and the association between the exposure to violence as a child and the use of violence as an adult, there is one limitation regarding this assumption. Evidence of the cycle of violence has been derived from studies which have dealt only with abusive or abused individuals (Gelles, 1980). No comparison groups have been used and no effort has been made to determine what ratio of individuals who were abused as children or were witness to family violence are not involved in violent familial relationships. Although this study is unique in that it will use a nonabused comparison group, it is still predicted that those who were exposed to some form of family violence are more apt to experience premarital violence as

well. This information will not only aid the study of premarital violence in the descriptive sense but also will broaden our perspective of the cycle of violence as a whole.

Hypotheses

Based on the preceding rationale, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. Individuals who have experienced physical abuse (as an abuser or a victim) in a dating relationship are more traditional in their perception of sex roles than are those who have not experienced abuse.
2. Individuals who have experienced physical abuse in a dating relationship have lower self concept levels than do those who have not experienced abuse.
3. Individuals who have experienced abuse in a dating relationship have:
 - a. been exposed to more severe levels of family violence
 - b. perceived the violence to have a more serious impact on them.

Further, an additional analysis was included to determine to what extent attitudes toward sex roles, level of self concept, and exposure to family violence were predictive of the perceived impact of premarital abuse.

II. METHOD

Respondents

The individuals participating in this study were a group of college students from a large northwestern university. The decision to use college students for the sample was based on accessibility and their representativeness of young adults who have had a considerable amount of dating experience. The sample consisted of 506 volunteers from introductory family studies, chemistry, and biology courses and ROTC who ranged in age from 17 to 50, with a mean of 20 years. Of the respondents, 53.4% were female and 46.6% were male. Class standing was predominately freshman and sophomore, and socioeconomic status of the sample could be described as middle class. Ethnic background of the respondents was primarily Caucasian.

Variables

Occurrence of Premarital Violence. The occurrence of premarital violence was determined through the use of a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) (Straus, 1979; see Appendix A). Although the scale used in this study represented a revision of Straus' instrument, the format was the same. Since the attempt was toward refinement by identifying more specific behaviors, reliability and validity estimates should not be greatly affected. The reliability and validity of the Violence Scale of the CTS have been established by Straus (1979). The internal consistency reliability coefficients for the Violence Scale are relatively high. Since several scores are available within this scale, depending upon the role relationship being studied (i.e., conjugal, parent-child,

child-parent, or sibling) the internal consistency reliability coefficients have been shown to range from a low of .62 for the Parent-to-Child relationship to .88 for the Couple Scores or Conjugal relationship (Straus, 1979).

Concurrent and construct validity were established for this scale. Evidence of concurrent validity was determined by correlating college students' perceptions of family violence with the perceptions of their parents. The Violence Scale correlation between student and father was .64 while the correlation between student and mother was .33 (Straus, 1979). Also, the results of previous studies utilizing the CTS were consistently related to findings concerning the "catharsis" theory of aggression control, the transmission of violence from one generation to the next (or the cycle of violence), and the violence in conjugal power structure.

For the purposes of this study, items representing only physically violent behaviors were selected from the Violence Scale of the CTS. These items then were delineated into more specific behaviors in order to obtain a higher degree of accuracy regarding the types and severity of violence occurring in premarital relationships. Respondents were to indicate whether or not they had experienced any of the following behaviors (as the initiator or the recipient of abuse) in a premarital relationship:

1. pushing or shoving
2. pushing or shoving the other against an object
3. slapping the other on the arm or body
4. slapping the other on the face
5. kicking, biting, or hitting with fists
6. trying to hit the other with an object
7. hitting the other with an object
8. beatings

9. threatening with a knife or gun
10. using a knife or gun

Distinguishing between subjects' involvement in abusive or nonabusive relationships was accomplished by recording whether or not the respondents had checked any item on the CTS. Those who checked any part of the scale were recorded as having experienced premarital violence, while those who left the scale blank were recorded as not having experienced premarital violence. The inclusion of the partners' behaviors was an effort to increase the descriptive quality of the study. After completion of the CTS, the respondents then were asked to indicate how severe they perceived the reported abuse to be physically for both themselves and their partners. Respondents were requested to indicate the most serious physical results of the abuse, using a list of choices ranging from a low severity score of 1 (no physical effects) to a high score of 6 (hospitalization) (see Appendix B).

Perceived Impact of Abuse in Dating. The perceived impact of the abuse was determined by the respondents' perceptions of their ability to cope with everyday events and responsibilities as a result of the occurrences of abuse in their relationship. Individuals were asked to indicate on a seven-point scale the extent to which they were affected emotionally by the violence (see Appendix C). Responses varied from a low severity score of 1 (no effects) to a high severity score of 7 (overwhelming effects).

Self Concept. A short, sixteen-item form of the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI: Spence & Helmreich, 1978) was used to measure the respondents' self concept (see Appendix D). The

statements are designed to assess the individual's self-confidence and competence in social situations. The respondents were asked to rate themselves on a five-point scale varying from "not at all characteristic of me" to "very much characteristic of me." Scores on each item could range from 0 to 4, with high scores indicating high self concept. The sum of the scores yields the individual's overall self concept and can range from 0 to 64. Higher scores indicate higher levels of self concept. Construct validity for the TSBI has been evidenced in experimental studies on interpersonal attraction in which the reactions of individuals with high and low self-esteem differed when interacting with competent men (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Internal consistency for the short form of the TSBI was found to be .91. The correlation between the short sixteen-item and the long thirty-two item forms for a sample of college students given the TSBI was .96 (Spence & Helmreich, 1978).

Attitude Toward Sex Roles. A shortened version of the Attitude Toward Women Scales (AWS: Spence & Helmreich, 1978) was used to assess the subjects' attitudes toward sex roles (see Appendix E). The fifteen-item scale contains statements which describe the rights and privileges that women should have. The respondent was asked to indicate his or her agreement with each statement on a four-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (agree strongly) to 4 (disagree strongly). Possible scores can vary from 15 to 60. A low score indicates a very traditional outlook on sex roles, while a high score reflects a liberal or egalitarian attitude toward sex roles. Spence and Helmreich (1978) report that this shortened version of the AWS has a

significantly high correlation of .91 with the original fifty-five item AWS. Evidence of the correlation was obtained in a study of college students. Construct validity for the AWS has been provided by data concerning score differences between various groups. Spence and Helmreich (1978) state that these differences are in expected directions. For example, they have found that women score higher (are more egalitarian) than men and that college students score higher than their same sex parents.

Occurrence of Family Violence. Evidence of subjects having been victims of child abuse or having been witness to marital violence was determined through the use of the modified version of the CTS Violence Scale (Straus, 1979) developed for use in this research (see Appendix F). Respondents were asked to fill out the scale as before, first indicating whether or not their parents directed any of the behaviors toward them when they were children. Next, they responded to whether or not any of the behaviors had occurred between their parents. As this measure of family violence is the same CTS scale that was used to determine the occurrence of premarital violence, the scoring procedure is essentially the same. Therefore, a check of any behavior on the scale was recorded as an indication of child abuse or marital violence. A blank scale was recorded as evidence of a non-violent family environment.

Physical Severity of Family Violence. Subjects' perception of the physical severity of the violence occurring within the family was assessed for both the individual as a child and for that individual's parents. Participants were to indicate the most severe physical

effects resulting from the violent behaviors using the same scale which was used to determine physical severity in dating (Appendix G). Answers ranged from a low severity score of 1 (no physical effects) to 6 (hospitalization). Two scores were obtained, then, one for the individual and one for the parents, both with scores ranging from 1 to 6.

Perceived Impact of Family Violence. The perceived impact of abuse was assessed by two seven-point scales based on the individual's perceptions of the reported violence (see Appendix H). With regard to the perceptions of the violence directed at the individual during childhood, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt abused by their parents. Their answers ranged from a low score of 1 (not abused at all) to 7 (extremely abused). The perceived impact of the violence occurring between parents was determined by responses indicating the level of emotional disturbance caused by the violence. The scale varied from a low score of 1 (not at all upset) to a high score of 7 (extremely upset).

Demographic Information. Background information was collected on all participants regarding gender, age, class standing, ethnic background, parental occupation and education, number of siblings as well as the participant's birth order in an effort to broaden the descriptive quality of the study (see Appendix I).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using a series of t tests by which abused and nonabused groups were compared to (1) attitude toward sex roles, (2) self concept levels, and (3) exposure to family violence. In

addition, a stepwise regression analysis was used to predict the amount of variance accounted for in perceived impact of violence by the three independent variables specified above.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Occurrence of Premarital Violence

The incidence of premarital abuse among the respondents was found to be 14.2%. Of the 506 subjects, 72 reported experiencing and/or inflicting some type of abuse within a premarital relationship. This incidence rate is somewhat low in comparison to previous findings by Cate et al. (1982) and Makepeace (1981), both of whom reported approximately 22% of their respective samples to have experienced premarital violence.

There are several possible reasons for this discrepancy, the first of which is related to the timing of the data collection. Volunteers were recruited from classes at the end of spring term. In the majority of those classes, attendance was well below average. This leads to the consideration that perhaps there are differences between individuals who attend classes at the end of the term and those who do not. Possibly they are more studious, less likely to have a great deal of dating experience, etc. The remaining students who were sampled, then, could represent a distinct sub-population with characteristics or experiences unlike those of the population as a whole.

The timing of the data collection also affected the composition of the sample in that this was a time when most seniors had taken their finals and were no longer attending the classes which were polled for this research project. The loss of this segment of the population may well have contributed to the relatively low incidence of premarital abuse, simply because seniors have more dating

experience than many underclassmen. The fact that they may date more frequently than underclassmen implies a greater likelihood of involvement in an abusive premarital relationship.

Additional support for the reasoning that the loss of seniors from the population may have affected the rate of premarital violence comes from analysis of the class standing of the respondents. Seniors made up the smallest proportion of the sample (12.1%), followed by juniors (22.5%), sophomores (29.8%), and finally, the largest proportion of the sample, freshmen (34.4%). In examining the incidence of abuse occurring within each class, however, it was found that 19.7% of the seniors reported involvement in violent relationships, to be exceeded only by juniors, 20.2% of whom reported experiencing some type of violence in dating. Of the sophomores, 13.9% had been exposed to dating violence, while only 8.6% of the freshmen reported such an occurrence. It would seem, then, that despite the fact that juniors and seniors represent a small segment of the total sample (34.6%), the upperclassmen do comprise a rather significant proportion of the abused sample (freshmen and sophomores make up 50% of the abused respondents; juniors and seniors make up 48.6%; and graduate students account for 1.4% of the abused sample). This leads one to speculate that had more seniors been present in those classes polled, the rate of premarital violence might have been somewhat higher.

A second factor which could have influenced the incidence rate relates to the demographic characteristics of the sample, specifically age and socioeconomic status. These factors were evident in a recent

study of dating violence among high school students (Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd, & Christopher, in press). For example, 12.1% of their respondents reported having experienced some type of abuse. Since this rate coincides more closely with the findings of the present study, further examination of these two samples seems appropriate. The high school sample consisted primarily of juniors and seniors from various geographical areas throughout the State of Oregon. Their ages would compare roughly to those of freshmen and sophomores at the college level whose experience with premarital violence was similar to that of the high school sample (being 8.6% and 13.9%, respectively).

The discrepancy between the lower incidence rate of college freshmen and the higher high school incidence rate may be explained by one of the major differences between the two samples (viz., socioeconomic status). While the college sample from this study was determined to be primarily middle class, the socioeconomic standing of the respondents in the high school was more varied. The majority tended to come from blue-collar backgrounds, where there is less opportunity or emphasis placed upon obtaining a university degree. In this sense, one might expect a lower incidence of premarital abuse among college freshmen since they represent only a select group of the high school population.

It is most likely that the combination of the two factors, the timing of the data collection as well as the compositional characteristics of the sample, is responsible for the low rate of premarital violence found among the respondents of this study. The loss of the senior population and possible differences between students who attend

and who do not attend classes at the end of the term, plus the relative age and socioeconomic status of the population from which the sample was drawn, must all be considered important aspects of the explanation of the incidence of premarital violence.

Types of Violent Behavior

The types of violence reported most frequently within this study tended to be less severe acts, such as pushing or shoving, slapping on the face or body, and kicking, biting, or hitting with fists (see Table 1). Pushing and shoving was the most frequently cited category of behavior to occur. Of the subjects who reported directing violence toward their partners, 64.7% pushed or shoved them, while 63.1% of the partners reciprocated with the same behavior. Forty-seven percent slapped their partners on the body, and 40% of the partners also slapped them on the body. Of those individuals who reported abuse, 32.3% were slapped on the face and 27.5% slapped their partners. Partners kicked, bit, or hit with their fists 26.2% of the respondents, while 23.5% reported using these same tactics on their partners.

The more physically severe type of violence, such as hitting or trying to hit with an object, beatings, and threatening to use or actually using a gun or knife, did occur but with much less frequency than did the less extreme types of behavior. Fewer respondents reported the following violent acts:

1. Trying to hit with an object--5.9% initiated by the subject; 9.2% initiated by the partner.

Table 1

Numbers and Percentages of Respondents Inflicting
or Experiencing Certain Types of Abusive Behavior

Type of Behavior	Initiated by Self		Initiated by Partner	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Pushed or Shoved	33 ^a	63.7	41	63.1
Pushed or Shoved Against an Object	7	13.7	15	23.1
Slapped on Body	24	47.1	26	40.0
Slapped on Face	14	27.5	21	32.3
Kicked, Bit, or Hit with Fists	12	23.5	17	26.2
Tried to Hit the Other with an Object	3	5.9	6	9.2
Hit the Other with an Object	2	3.9	5	7.7
Beat the Other Up	2	3.9	3	4.6
Threatened with a Knife or Gun	0	0.0	2	3.1
Used a Knife or Gun	0	0.0	1	1.5
Other	1	1.5	1	1.5

^aTotal n = 72

2. Hitting with an object--3.9% initiated by the subject; 7.7% by the partner.

3. Beatings--3.9% initiated by the subject; 4.6% by the partner.

4. Threatened use of a gun or knife--none initiated by the subject; 4.6% by the partner.

5. Use of gun or knife--none by the subject: 1.5% by the partner.

These figures were found to be consistent with the reports of previous research on premarital violence, which stated that the less extreme types of abusive behaviors were reported more frequently in dating relationships than were severe acts of violence (Cate et al., 1982; Makepeace, 1981). This lower frequency of severe acts may reflect the fact that individuals who are in abusive dating relationships find it easier to terminate that relationship before more serious types of violence occur. Even though 78% of the respondents indicated that the abuse occurred after the relationship had become serious, there seem to be few logical reasons for individuals to remain in violent dating relationships. Unlike married couples, dating couples do not have the same type of responsibilities and commitments to their relationship or each other (i.e., children, financial dependencies, etc.) (Gelles, 1975). Dating couples are more independent both financially and emotionally and do not rely upon the relationship for the same types of security which are reported by married couples (Gelles, 1975). In this light, it seems that an abusive premarital relationship may likely be terminated before the violence reaches a severe level.

Attitude Toward Sex Roles

It was hypothesized that individuals who had experienced physical abuse in a dating relationship would be more traditional in their perceptions of sex roles than would those who had not experienced abuse. A t test was computed to determine if a difference did exist between the two groups. No significant difference was found, $t(504) = -.02, p > .05$. The mean scores on the Attitude Toward Women Scale (AWS) of both groups varied only slightly, with an abused group mean of 46.35 and a nonabused group mean of 46.32. (The scores could range from a low of 15, indicating traditional attitudes, to a high of 60, which represents very liberal sex role attitudes.) The similar scores of both groups indicate that most of the respondents in this study expressed a somewhat liberal or egalitarian attitude toward sex roles. This coincides with Spence and Helmreich's (1978) finding that college students do tend to score relatively high on this scale.

The fact that there is virtually no difference in scores between the groups may be attributed to characteristics of the population from which the sample was drawn. The sample tended to be homogeneous in nature in that it was composed solely of college students. As such, one would expect to find a certain similarity in value systems regarding many issues, including attitudes toward the abilities and rights afforded each of the sexes. Socioeconomic status of the sample also denotes a certain conformity in terms of values. Since the subjects in this study were found to be primarily middle class, it is logical to assume that they would adhere to the values and beliefs of that class, which include liberal attitudes toward sex roles. In

contrast, blue-collar values are expressed in a more rigid and traditional sex role orientation (Rubin, 1976), but obviously were not represented to any great extent within the current sample.

Another important explanation for the lack of an association between sex role attitude and premarital violence lies in the inherent differences between dating and marital relationships. Since the hypothesis that traditional sex role attitudes may be associated with premarital violence was based on results of research concerned with marital relationships, the absence of any significant findings prompts one to analyze the differences between these two relationships being compared.

There are two basic issues which highlight the diversity of premarital and marital relationships with regard to sex role attitudes. First, the commitment level between the two types of relationships differs greatly. As stated previously, with reference to the severity of abuse, individuals in marital relationships exhibit higher levels of commitment due to certain marital relationships--children, financial commitments and dependencies, as well as emotional and social dependence (Gelles, 1975). These factors may increase individuals' tolerance level for abuse, whatever the cause. Dating couples, however, may be more likely to terminate abusive relationships because their commitment level and dependence upon each other and the relationship are not as high as within a marriage. Therefore, if a dating couple experiences serious conflict or inflexibility in terms of sex role attitudes, they may break up rather than resort to violence. Afterall, dating has been commonly termed a mate

selection process in which individuals seek to find a compatible partner based on various criteria including beliefs and value systems (i.e., attitudes toward sex roles) (Kerchkoff & Davis, 1962; Murstein, 1970). When serious discrepancies occur, regardless of the issue, individuals may seek out others whose beliefs are more closely aligned with their own. Hence, sex role attitudes may serve as an indicator of incompatibility during the early stages of a relationship rather than as a predictor of violence.

Another aspect of the commitment factor involves the value that the couple places on their attitudes toward sex roles, or, in other words, how important sex role attitudes and beliefs are to the relationship at that point in time. Many times these attitudes or standards might not affect the premarital relationship either negatively or positively, because a couple has not reached that stage in the relationship where the partners begin to project these perceptions and expectations onto each other. To do so would be to place both individuals within the context of a marital role, and they are not yet serious enough to think in those terms. Marital violence research has shown, however, that sex role attitudes can have a strong negative effect upon the relationship. Couples involved in abusive marriages tend to have very traditional and rigid attitudes toward sex roles (Barnett et al., 1979; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Star, 1980; Star et al., 1979). In other words, spouses' expectations for their partners' behavior, as well as for their own, are strictly and narrowly defined. Deviance from these marital roles or expectations often results in violence (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). Dating

couples, on the other hand, may not place much emphasis on particular sex role attitudes or on the differences between perceptions. If this is the case, then these types of expectations and attitudes toward sex roles may not be as relevant for the premarital relationship as they are for the married couple. Consequently, these sex role expectations may not have a serious impact upon dating relationships, because the issues raised by a particular attitude or difference in attitudes may not necessarily be applicable to the couple at that point in time. For example, values concerning child-rearing, such as who should assume the primary caretaker role, can be debated within a dating context without serious or violent results. However, in viewing this issue from a marital perspective, it becomes a more salient and problematic issue for discussion and could conceivably be the cause of violence between husband and wife if serious differences in opinion occur.

It is obvious that an issue such as child-rearing can be much more complicated than it appears in that there are many intervening factors, such as career goals or financial obligations, which could affect this situation in a variety of ways. The important concern is that this example of child-rearing, a sex role issue, clearly illustrates the fact that dating couples differ from marital couples on an experiential level as well as on a commitment level. While sex role related issues such as finances, career goals, child-rearing, and the division of household labor may be discussed by dating couples, the structure of the relationship does not provide the opportunity for the actual practice or display of sex role attitudes.

In this case it seems that discussing values as opposed to implementing and living them may result in two distinctly different types of behavior. Therefore, the attitude or differences in attitudes regarding the rights and behaviors of women may not have the same violent results in a courting relationship as in the marital relationship.

In summary, the present study attempted to assess the differences in sex role attitudes between individuals who had experienced premarital violence and those who had not. Since no differences were found, it becomes necessary to consider those factors which may have influenced the results in this direction. The homogeneity of the sample plus the very nature and structure of the premarital relationship itself are likely explanations for the fact that this researcher did not find a relationship between traditional sex role attitudes and premarital violence.

Self Concept

It was hypothesized that individuals who had been involved in abusive premarital relationships would have lower levels of self concept than those individuals who had not experienced premarital violence. Respondents' scores on the Texas Social Behavior Inventory (TSBI: Spence & Helmreich, 1978) were analyzed through the use of a t test. There was a significant difference between the two groups, $t(87) = 2.08$, $p < .05$, indicating that those respondents who had experienced some type of premarital violence had lower self concepts than those who had not experienced premarital violence. (The mean for

the nonabuse group was 42.12, while the mean for the abuse group was 39.63.)

This finding is supported by the results of previous research in the areas of marital violence and child abuse, which have frequently associated violent behavior with low levels of self concept (Barnett et al., 1980; Gelles, 1976; Martin & Beezely, 1976; Star et al., 1979). In general, these studies have approached this association between low self concept and violent behavior as descriptive in nature, primarily referring to self concept in terms of a personality trait or characteristic of abused or abusive individuals.

Such treatment of an important issue regarding the violence which occurs within intimate relationships seems to be consistently superficial due in part to the fact that it is impossible to imply causality from this type of research. For example, it cannot be determined from the data that an individual's level of self concept is necessarily the result or cause of particular types of behaviors which occur in a relationship. In other words, it cannot be proven that an individual with a relatively low self concept would become involved in an abusive relationship more easily than one with a comparatively high self concept. Similarly, it is dangerous to assume that individuals would be more or less likely to terminate an abusive relationship based on their level of self concept.

The involvement in, or termination of, abusive relationships would seem to deal more with the circumstances of the victim rather than the abuser in most cases. As such, the data provide very little evidence to support speculation as to the impact of self concept on

victims and their perceptions of their partners, themselves, and the premarital relationship itself. However, even though it may be difficult to state that premarital violence causes or is caused by a low self concept on the part of one or both of the individuals involved in an abusive relationship, it is somewhat easier to apply certain rationale to the abuser.

One such explanation involves the theoretical framework which states that individuals may resort to hostility as a result of low self-esteem and feelings of worthlessness (Rogers, 1969). Therefore, it would seem likely that those individuals who direct violence at their dating partners may be doing so in an attempt to elevate their own feelings of self worth and to attain some type of superiority over another individual. Post hoc analysis of the data found a significant difference in levels of self concept between aggressors (the initiators as well as reciprocators of violence in the relationship) and victims (those who were abused only), $t(69) = -2.39$, $p < .05$. Aggressors had significantly lower self concepts than did the victims of the abuse. (In this case, the mean score of the aggressors was 37.98 and the mean of the victims was 43.81.) This finding, coupled with the symbolic interactionist's rationale that violence may be the result of feelings of worthlessness, allows speculation in the direction of the abusers' need to improve their self image. Such improvement or enhancement of self could be achieved through the aggressor's dominance over the partner, usually a person who is important to, and perhaps even dependent to some extent on, the aggressor. This need for dominance or control, then, would seem to be

a key factor in explaining violence on the part of the abuser. Individuals with low self concepts may feel that their violent behavior and physical intimidation of their dating partner will result in their control of that person and the relationship in the emotional and perhaps even cognitive as well as the behavioral areas of the relationship.

The fact that victims had comparatively higher levels of self concept is somewhat contrary to the expected results. There are two possible explanations for this, the first of which is concerned with the difference between premarital relationships and other intimate relationships in which low self concepts have been found to be characteristic of individuals involved in violent interactions. As stated previously with regard to sex role attitudes, individuals' levels of commitment to the dating relationship may not be as high or as great as in other close relationships (i.e., the marital or parent-child) may not look to that premarital relationship for the emotional support and sense of identity which one would expect to find in a marriage. Therefore, abuse would not be internalized to the same degree that it might be in a marital relationship. Victims of abuse in premarital relationships may not see themselves as the cause of the violent behaviors of their partners to the same degree that their counterparts do in marital interactions (Star, 1980). As a result, the violence which was experienced in dating may have had less of an impact on the victims' sense of identity and self worth than previously anticipated.

The second issue regarding the victim's level of self concept deals with the fact that respondents were questioned about their dating relationships, which in many cases resulted in retrospective information since many partners had broken up prior to the study. The self concept score, however, reflected the current status of the individual. Since self concept has been described as situational, or, in other words, fluctuating depending upon one's particular situation or circumstances, a victim's self concept might actually have been higher at the time of the study than it was at the time when abuse was occurring. This is merely speculation, however, and is difficult to substantiate based on the information which is currently available from this study.

Exposure to Family Violence

This study sought to determine the extent to which exposure to family violence (child abuse and/or marital violence) impacted upon individuals' behavior in premarital relationships. A chi-square analysis was conducted to determine whether individuals who had been exposed to some type of family violence would be more likely to engage in premaritally abusive behavior than would those individuals who had not been involved in violent family situations. The findings supported the assumption that, in general, those respondents who were involved in premaritally abusive relationships also had been exposed to situations of child abuse and/or marital violence within their families more frequently than had those who were not in abusive premarital relationships, $\chi^2(1) = 4.64$, $p < .05$.

Based on these findings, it would seem that the use of violence within the context of the family environment may predispose individuals to use or to be tolerant of violence in their future intimate relationships (i.e., premarital, marital, or parent-child). Much of the family violence research speaks to the issue of the transmission of violence from generation to generation (Barnett et al., 1980; Gelles, 1976; Parke, 1980). In other words, parents or other relatives act as role models for children, providing them with patterns of behavior to imitate. Exposure to violence as a child, either as a victim or as an observer, not only teaches the child how to behave in violent ways but also that violence is an appropriate form of behavior (Gelles, 1976). This in turn fosters the expectation that violence or abuse will be a part of adult relationships. This expectation, plus the violent interaction patterns learned in the family, become especially important when the dating relationship is examined, since it is in the dating context that individuals first establish an intimate relationship with someone outside the family. Thus, if violence has become a part of an individual's behavioral repertoire, particularly in close familial relationships, it is logical to assume that abuse might be manifested in a dating relationship as well.

In addition to the difference between premarital abuse and nonabuse groups with regard to the incidence of family violence, other factors, such as the types of abuse which occurred and the physical severity and psychological effects or impact of the family violence, were analyzed. First, the types of family violence experienced by the

respondents were categorized as either child abuse or marital violence. In general, those individuals who reported involvement in abusive premarital relationships also reported more instances of child abuse, both in terms of frequency and severity, than did those individuals who had not been in premaritally abusive relationships (see Table 2).

As might be expected, 82.5% of the premaritally abusive sample reported they had been slapped on the body. This type of behavior might be interpreted as spanking and as such generally may not be considered as an abusive interaction between parent and child. However, 65% of the premarital abuse sample reported being slapped on the face (as compared with 59% of the nonabuse sample), and 52.5% indicated that they had been pushed or shoved (as compared to 45.2% of the nonabuse sample, which reported this type of behavior to have occurred.) Premaritally abused respondents also indicated more severe types of violent behavior, such as being kicked, bitten, or hit with fists (22.5%) as opposed to 13.3% of the nonabuse group, which reported the same behaviors. With regard to the psychological effects of child abuse, even though the premaritally abused sample tended to report more physically severe types of child abuse, they did not indicate that these behaviors had a serious impact on them. The effects of the abuse were assessed through the use of a seven-point Likert scale where respondents indicated the extent to which they felt abused as a child. A t test was used to determine whether or not differences existed between the two groups. No significant differences were found, $t(233) = -.52, p > .05$. In addition, the

Table 2
Numbers and Percentages of Respondents
Experiencing Child Abuse

Type of Behavior	Did Not Experience Premarital Abuse		Did Experience Premarital Abuse	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Pushed or Shoved	85 ^a	45.2	21 ^b	52.5
Pushed or Shoved Against an Object	41	21.8	9	22.5
Slapped on Body	153	81.4	33	82.5
Slapped on Face	111	59.0	26	65.0
Kicked, Bit, or Hit with Fists	25	13.3	9	22.5
Tried to Hit the Other with an Object	41	21.8	8	20.0
Hit the Other with an Object	73	38.8	13	32.5
Beat the Other Up	22	11.7	2	5.0
Threatened with a Knife or Gun	1	.5	1	2.5
Used a Knife or Gun	0	0.0	1	2.5

^aTotal n = 188 (43.3% of total nonabusive sample)

^bTotal n = 40 (55.6% of total abusive sample)

psychological effects of child abuse for both groups were extremely low, with 85% of the respondents stating that the violent acts had little or no effect on them. The mean for the premaritally non-violent group was 1.97, while the mean for the premarital abuse group was 2.1. A possible explanation for this could include the fact that as children these individuals interpreted such violence as a normal part of their discipline. Physical punishment could take many forms, from spanking to pushing to hitting with objects, and, therefore, these acts were not to be taken seriously. Individuals who experienced such parent-child interactions would not be likely to consider this type of physical violence to be abusive.

These overall findings regarding abusive parent-child relationships would seem to provide evidence in support of the statement found throughout the family violence literature that childhood exposure to physical punishment (even though it may be couched in terms of being a protective measure or that "it's for your own good," etc.) may legitimize the use of violent behavior (Straus & Gelles, 1979). This study seems to indicate that this acceptance of violence can lead to its use not only within the family but also within other intimate adult relationships, such as dating relationships.

The types of marital violence which respondents reported to have observed were generally less severe and occurred less frequently in both the nonabuse and abuse dating groups as compared with their reports of child abuse. Once again, however, those individuals who had experienced premarital violence were more likely to report violence occurring between their parents than were those who had not

been involved in violent dating relationships. For example, while 30.6% of the premarital abuse group indicated exposure to marital violence, only 16.1% of the nonabuse group reported such behaviors (see Table 3). Those individuals involved in abuse, however, reported higher incidences of violence in only three categories:

1. pushing and/or shoving--72.7% as compared to 67.1% of the nonabusive group;
2. slapping on the face--63.6% as compared to 45.7% of the nonabusive group;
3. beatings--18.2% as compared to 5.7% of the nonabusive group.

Interestingly, even though fewer numbers of individuals experiencing premarital abuse reported marital violence as compared to the nonabuse group, it was found that the marital violence which did occur had a greater impact on that group. There was a significant difference between the two groups, $t(189) = -2.10$, $p < .05$, with the premarital abuse group perceiving greater psychological effects or impact as a result of observing marital violence. (The mean of the premarital nonabuse group was 4.86 and that of the premarital abuse group was 5.75.)

These particular findings are of importance because they tend to support the fact that a cycle of violence may indeed exist. Violence and abuse may be passed on from generation to generation, especially if the violence observed within the family impacts significantly upon the individual. It may be that abusive behavior will be repeated in future relationships if individuals as children perceive it as being normal or serving a particular purpose.

Table 3
Numbers and Percentages of Respondents
Experiencing Marital Violence

Type of Behavior	Did Not Experience Premarital Abuse		Did Experience Premarital Abuse	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Pushed or Shoved	47 ^a	67.1	16 ^b	72.2
Pushed or Shoved Against an Object	36	51.4	4	18.2
Slapped on Body	39	55.7	9	40.9
Slapped on Face	32	45.7	14	63.6
Kicked, Bit, or Hit with Fists	22	31.4	5	22.7
Tried to Hit the Other with an Object	25	35.7	4	18.2
Hit the Other with an Object	17	24.3	4	18.2
Beat the Other Up	4	5.7	4	18.2
Threatened with a Knife or Gun	3	4.3	0	0.0
Used a Knife or Gun	0	0.0	0	0.0

^aTotal n = 70 (16.1% of total nonabusive sample)

^bTotal n = 22 (30.6% of total abusive sample)

More importantly, it seems that the salient issue with regard to exposure to family violence may not necessarily be whether or not an individual is abused or observes severe and/or frequent types of violence occurring between other family members, but how much of an impact that violence has upon the individual. From the theoretical perspective of the symbolic interactionist, these findings indicate that it is the meaning of the family violence, whether it occurs between parent and child or between spouses, that is important. For example, with regard to the violence that occurs between parents and children, even though the severity of the abuse ranged from pushing and shoving to the actual use of a gun or knife, individuals did not perceive these acts to have much influence or impact upon them. In other words, they did not perceive the violence which occurred to be abusive. Perhaps the meaning that these acts of violence took on was one of a "normative" disciplinary nature.

On the other hand, marital violence, while less frequent and severe, was reported to have a much greater psychological impact upon the individuals, especially for those who had become involved in premaritally abusive relationships. Part of the explanation for this may be due to the fact that parents are the primary role models or socializing agents for their children. If they use violence in their marital relationship, their children may come to perceive those types of behaviors as a necessary or normal aspect of intimate relationships. The fact that this study found that premaritally abusive or abused individuals perceived their parents' violent actions as having as important psychological impact upon them supports this

assumption. It has been stated previously that exposure to family violence may lead individuals to be tolerant of or to use violence later in intimate relationships (such as in dating). In addition to the examination of exposure to family violence, it is equally important to include these other factors, the physical severity and psychological effects of the family violence, in the analysis of domestic or premarital violence. The meaning or purpose which violence holds for many individuals may make the difference between an abusive or nonabusive relationship, whether it be premarital, marital, or parental.

Predictors of the Impact of Premarital Abuse

In order to determine the extent to which the three variables of attitude toward sex roles, self concept, and exposure to family violence, as well as a measure of physical severity, were predictive of the perceived impact of premarital violence, a stepwise regression was performed. Five independent variables--(1) physical effects of the abuse, (2) self concept, (3) sex role attitude, (4) family violence, and (5) gender--were regressed on psychological effects of premarital violence. The overall regression was significant, $F(5,62) = 2.78$, $p < .05$, $R = .43$. Physical effects entered the model first, followed by self concept. Together these two variables accounted for 18% of the variance in the psychological effects of premarital violence. Exposure to family violence and gender (both entered as dummy variables), as well as sex role attitude, did not make a significant contribution to the model that contained self concept and physical effects (see Table 4).

Table 4

Summary Table for Multiple Regression on
Psychological Effects of Premarital Violence

Variable	Multiple R	R ²	Simple R	Overall F	F to Enter
Physical Effects	.35	.12	.35	9.23**	9.23**
Self Concept	.43	.18	-.23	7.21***	4.68*
Family Violence	.43	.18	-.04	4.77**	.08
Gender	.43	.18	-.09	3.52**	.02
Sex Role Attitude	.43	.18	-.07	2.78*	.03

*p < .05

**p < .01

***p < .001

This pattern of findings lends support to the assumption that the more severe the physical effects of the premarital abuse and the lower the self concept of the individuals involved, the greater the impact of that violence. If violent behaviors result in some type of injury, which could range from cuts or bruises to hospitalization, it only seems logical that the initial violence causing that injury will have some type of lasting psychological influence on the individuals involved. Self concept becomes a predictive factor when individuals see themselves as part of the reason for the abusive acts. In many cases individuals attribute the cause of the violence to some previous behavior or perhaps even a personality characteristic (Gelles, 1976). Such reasoning could and does prompt people who are involved in abusive relationships, as the aggressor or the victim, to evaluate themselves and their self worth in negative terms.

It is interesting to note that while many of the variables analyzed were what could be considered socialization variables, such as exposure to family violence and sex role attitude, the variables found to be the most predictive were physical severity and self concept, which are essentially interactional variables. It could be that the ability to predict the severity of the psychological effects of the premarital violence lies not in socialization factors but in the composition of the relationship itself. The severity of the aftermath of the violence, combined with the individuals' self perceptions, are strictly situational and have little to do with role models or socializing agents. Therefore, the individuals and their relationship, plus the environment and manner in which they interact,

become the indicators that will determine the impact that these individuals perceive the premarital abuse to have.

Limitations of the Study

Although the findings of this study represent important aspects of premarital violence, there are a few limitations dealing primarily with the sample selection which should be discussed. First, the sample was comprised totally of college students, which reduces the generalizability of the findings to some extent. A more ideal sample would have included individuals with more diverse backgrounds and experiences. Noncollege subjects, respondents from both rural and urban areas, and a greater representation of various ethnic groups would have produced a better and more generalizable sample.

A second issue concerned with the sample involves the timing of the data collection. The fact that the study was conducted at the end of spring term proved detrimental to the ease of obtaining subjects. This ultimately may have affected the rate of premarital violence, which was relatively low as compared with previous studies on premarital abuse. Overall, however, these limitations are relatively minor and would not seem to minimize the significance of the findings.

IV. IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Implications for Education

The type of information derived from a study on premarital violence such as this can and should be used in a variety of educational settings and programs. For instance, parenting classes are one such avenue through which information could be disseminated. The participants in these courses would undoubtedly benefit greatly from the information. The possible implications which this type of research has for parenting classes is indeed farreaching. Participants in these groups, whether parents or prospective parents, need to know that instances of premartial violence do exist in large enough numbers, so that they see it as a realistic issue which they may face with their own children one day.

There are many issues addressed in this study which should be of general concern to parents regardless of whether they may have teenagers who have experienced abuse in current or past dating relationships. For example, this research has provided strong evidence to support the theory that the acceptance and use of violence may be passed on from parent to child. If parents and prospective parents are aware of this, perhaps they will become willing and better able to monitor their own behaviors toward each other and toward their children. Parenting classes can provide participants with developmental information regarding children's social, physical, intellectual, and emotional growth, thereby giving them the basis upon which to develop realistic expectations for their children. Oftentimes abuse of children occurs because parents have inadequate

knowledge of child development and therefore maintain unrealistic standards for their children's developmental progress. In addition to helping parents to understand child development, parenting programs also can offer examples of parenting and discipline styles which are alternatives to physical punishment. Such basic information may do much to help parents interact with their children in more constructive and nonviolent ways.

Violence within the family is not the only issue regarding the problem of premarital abuse which should concern parents. We know from previous research that teenagers usually do not tell their parents about the violence they experience (Henton et al., in press). Why do they go to friends instead of parents? Perhaps they fear intervention on the part of these adults. Concerned parents may have a tendency to try to terminate an abusive relationship or to take some type of direct action against the partner, particularly if the partner is the abuser. Such behavior on the part of parents could represent the loss of the teenagers' ability to make their own decisions (good or bad) and, more importantly, the loss of the independence and autonomy which they have struggled so hard to achieve. Parental intervention also could result in some kind of retaliation by the dating partner or by peers, which could seem more embarrassing or devastating to the teenager than was the initial abuse itself.

Parenting programs can help parents to change the fact that they are usually the last to know about their children's experiences with violence. They can learn more about the problems adolescents face and sensitize themselves to the issues which precipitate those problems.

In this way, parents can become accessible resources to their children as well as being part of a support network. They can help their teenagers realize that there are alternatives not only to abusive relationships, but to other kinds of problematic behavior as well.

Another issue which parents and other adults may become aware of as they study parenting is the degree of the impact that peers and society have upon the teenager. The importance of these socializing agents cannot be underestimated when examining relationships and what motivates these youth toward certain kinds of behavior. The acceptance of abuse within a dating relationship can occur for a variety of reasons, stemming from cultural and peer influences. Reinforcement of violence among intimates, as well as violence in general, comes not just from the family but also from friends and the society in which one lives. In some cases, physical violence is a way of life for certain cultural and subcultural groups. For instance, American society has always condoned violence through glamorization of certain historical events (e.g., the violence of the "wild west") and figures (e.g., John Wayne and Humphrey Bogart types) in the movies and other media. Almost without realizing it, children and adolescents internalize the message that the use of physical violence is acceptable, or even a necessary part of interacting with others. When physical violence is molded in such a positive manner, the symbolic interactionist would say that it begins to take on meaning and importance for the individual and that the reenactment of the event

which has been observed (i.e., violence) becomes more likely to be imitated.

In addition, society (especially peers) emphasizes the importance of being involved in some type of dating relationship. Popularity is associated with dating for many teenagers and the possibility of not having a boyfriend or girlfriend is far worse than the consequences of an involvement in an abusive dating relationship. Perhaps this is one reason why individuals, no matter what the age, remain in premaritally violent relationships, sometimes for relatively long periods.

Not only can parents help children to realize that there are viable alternatives to abusive relationships and behaviors, but educational programs can be developed for use in the public school systems as well. Since the present study found that the strongest predictor of psychologically damaging premaritally violent relationships was, in essence, an interactional one (physical effects of the abuse), then it is necessary that a program aimed at informing adolescents of the facts about premarital violence emphasize relationship issues, in addition to dealing with the individual needs and concerns of a teenager. The opportunity to implement this type of curriculum already exists in the form of sex education or family planning courses which are taught in most schools today. The incorporation of units on interpersonal skills such as decision making, communication skills, self awareness, self concept, and the identification of goals into these courses would not be difficult. Providing junior and senior students with a forum in which to analyze and discuss their concerns about friendships and dating relationships,

in addition to supplying knowledge about birth control and pregnancy, could only improve adolescents' overall understanding of themselves and their peers. When considering the prevalence of abusive premarital relationships, the development and implementation of such programs seems essential in order to provide teenagers with the interpersonal skills necessary to avoid, or at least terminate, abusive dating relationships.

Much of what has been previously discussed (i.e., understanding the developmental level of children and adolescents, the influences of socializing agents and the relationship, and interactional issues which shape the dating environment) is also applicable to the helping professions. Given the incidence of premarital violence discovered in the current research, social workers, high school counselors, and family therapists are likely to encounter clients who have been involved in a premaritally abusive relationship. Since little research has been conducted in this area until recently, these professionals have had minimal information from which to make decisions regarding proper counseling techniques or treatment. The findings of the study, though descriptive in nature, have added significantly to that existing knowledge base. With the application of a conceptual framework, such as symbolic interactionism, which allows for the interpretation and perceptions of the abuse by the individual involved, the counselor or therapist will be better able to help both abuser and victims of premarital violence to cope with the issues of self concept and the psychological repercussions of an abusive relationship. Because of the young age of the partners,

involvement in such a dating relationship presents a unique set of problems for both the client and the professional. The realization that this is an emergent problem should prompt both the helping professionals and researchers to work toward developing a better understanding of premarital violence in order to help individuals who may become involved in dating violence, as well as prevent an increase in the occurrence of dating abuse.

Implications for Future Research

The implications for further research based on the findings of this study are pervasive. Not only do certain issues and questions deal with the area of premarital abuse but they lead to further investigation into other areas of domestic violence, such as marital violence and elder abuse. Because the predictive factors of the perceived severity of the abuse revolve around situational variables, future research should move in the direction of a closer examination of certain relationship components with respect to an abuse sample (including premarital, marital, and elder abuse). For example, what are these individuals' expectations for a dating, marital, or parent-child relationship? Do they possess adequate interpersonal skills? Is there a pattern in abused or abusive individuals' behavioral reactions to the abuse? In terms of individual factors, it would be interesting and useful to know how influential society and peer groups were in the socialization of both the aggressor and the victim and if there were differences between the two. Finally, it would be most helpful and informative to study premaritally abusive couples, perhaps using an interview format, in order to obtain more

complete and detailed information regarding the relationship interaction issues mentioned previously. It may be useful to reexamine the abused couples' attitudes toward sex roles. The literature has suggested that not only the maintenance of traditional attitudes toward the roles and behaviors may lead to the use of violence (Star, 1980) but also the discrepancies in couples' attitudes toward sex roles may result in abusive behavior (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). If this is the case, then differences or discrepancies in sex role attitudes may be found in abusive couples where few were discovered in a study of individual dating partners. Therefore, research using premaritally abusive couples would add immensurably to the knowledge that we as researchers and educators possess at this time.

In summary, this study has produced significant findings in the area of premarital violence, an area which has received little attention by researchers until recently. The results of low self concept, exposure to family violence, and the predictors of the psychological effects of premarital violence have been discussed. These findings are exciting in that they add considerably in a descriptive nature to our understanding of the violence which occurs in intimate relationships. In addition to broadening our knowledge base, this study has important implications for intervention and educational programs as well as for future research in all areas of domestic violence.

REFERENCES

- Barnett, E. R., Pittman, C. B., Ragan, C. K., & Salus, M. K. Family violence: Intervention strategies (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Publication No. OHDS 80-30258). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.
- Burr, W. R., Leigh, G. K., Day, R. D., & Constantine, J. Symbolic interaction and the family. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family (Vol. II). New York: The Free Press, 1979.
- Cate, R., Henton, J., Koval, J., Christopher, F. S., & Lloyd, S. Premarital abuse: A social psychological perspective. Journal of Family Issues, 1982, 3, 79-90.
- Gayford, J. J. Wife battering: A preliminary survey of 100 cases. British Medical Journal, 1975, 1, 79-90.
- Gelles, R. J. Abuse wives: Why do they stay? Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 659-668.
- Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. Determinants of violence in the family: Toward a theoretical integration. In W. R. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family (Vol. I). New York: The Free Press, 1979.
- Gulley, K. J., Dengerink, H. A., Pepping, M., & Bergstrom, D. Research note: Sibling contribution to violent behavior. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1981, 43, 333-337.
- Henton, J., Cate, R., Koval, J., Lloyd, S., & Christopher, S. Romance and violence in dating relationships, in press.
- Kempe, C. H., Silverman, F. N., Steele, B. F., Droegemueller, W., & Silver, H. K. The battered-child syndrome. Journal of the American Medical Association, 1962, 181, 17-24.
- Kerchkoff, A. C., & Davis, K. E. Value consensus and need complementarity in mate-selection. American Sociological Review, 1962, 27, 295-303.
- Laner, M., & Thompson, J. Abuse and aggression in courting couples. Paper presented at the Western Social Science Association Meetings, San Diego, California, April 1981.
- Makepeace, J. M. Courtship violence among college students. Family Relations, 1981, 30, 97-102.

- Martin, H. P., & Beezeley, P. Personality of abused children. In H. P. Martin (Ed.), The abuse child: A multidisciplinary approach to developmental issues and treatment. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1976.
- Maslow, A. H. Self-actualizing people: A study of psychological health. In C. E. Moustakas (Ed.), The self. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.
- Mead, D. E. Six approaches to child rearing. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 1976.
- Moustakas, C. E. True experience and the self. In C. E. Moustakas (Ed.), The self. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956.
- Murstein, B. I. Stimulus-value-role. A theory of marital choice. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 465-481.
- Nirenberg, T. D., & Gaebelin, J. W. Third party instigated aggression: Traditional versus liberal sex role attitudes. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1979, 5, 348-351.
- Parke, R. D. Socialization into child abuse: A social interactional perspective. In J. V. Cook & R. T. Bowles (Eds.), Child abuse--commission and omission. Ontario: Butterworth & Co., Limited, 1980, 295-317.
- Parke, R. D., & Collmer, C. W. Child abuse: An interdisciplinary analysis. In E. M. Heatherington (Ed.), Review of child development research (Vol. 5). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. Family, socialization and interaction process. New York: The Free Press, 1955.
- Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.
- Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K. D. Marital violence: Characteristics of abusive couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1981, 49, 63-71.
- Rubin, L. Worlds of pain. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1976.
- Snyder, D. K., & Fruchtman, L. A. Differential patterns of wife abuse: A data-based typology. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1981, 49, 878-885.

- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1978.
- Star, B. Patterns in family violence. Social Casework, 1980, 61, 339-346.
- Star, B., Clark, C. G., Goetz, K. M., and O'Malia, L. Psychological aspects of wife battering. Social Casework, 1979, 60, 479-487.
- Steinmetz, S. K. Violence between family members. Marriage and Family Review, 1978, 1, 1-16.
- Straus, M. A. A general systems theory approach to a theory of violence between family members. Social Science Information, 1973, 12, 105-125.
- Straus, M. A. The conflict tactics (CT) scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41, 75-90.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1980.
- Vexler, S. Social learning theory and child abuse interventions. In J. V. Cook & R. T. Bowles (Eds.), Child abuse--comission and omission. Ontario: Butterworth and Co., Limited, 1980.
- Whitehurst, R. N. Violence in husband-wife interaction. In S. K. Steinmetz & M. A. Straus (Eds.), Violence in the family. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1974.
- Wylie, R. C. The self concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

APPENDICES

Appendix A:

Occurrence of Premarital Violence (Conflict Tactics Scale)

In the most recent relationship where any of the following behaviors occurred, please indicate which of these behaviors you engaged in and which behaviors your partner engaged in by placing an "X" in the appropriate space(s).

	YOU	YOUR PARTNER	
Pushed or shoved the other			
Pushed or shoved the other against an object			
Slapped the other on the body			
Slapped the other on the face			
Kicked, bit, or hit with fists			
Tried to hit the other with an object			
Hit the other with an object			
Beat the other up			
Threatened with a knife or gun			
Used a knife or gun			
Other (specify)			

Appendix B:
Physical Severity of Abuse in Dating

Indicate the most serious physical effect you have experienced as a result of the previous behaviors by placing a check beside the appropriate response. (Check only one answer.)

<input type="checkbox"/> NO EFFECTS	<input type="checkbox"/> CUTS OR BURNS
<input type="checkbox"/> BRUISES ON THE BODY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGENCY ROOM TREATMENT
<input type="checkbox"/> BRUISES ON THE FACE	<input type="checkbox"/> HOSPITALIZATION

Indicate the most serious physical effect your partner has experienced as a result of the previous behaviors by placing a check beside the appropriate response. (Check only one answer.)

<input type="checkbox"/> NO EFFECTS	<input type="checkbox"/> CUTS OR BURNS
<input type="checkbox"/> BRUISES ON THE BODY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGENCY ROOM TREATMENT
<input type="checkbox"/> BRUISES ON THE FACE	<input type="checkbox"/> HOSPITALIZATION

Appendix C:
Perceived Impact of Abuse in Dating

On the following scale please indicate by circling the appropriate dots (:) the extent to which the preceding behaviors affected your ability to perform or deal with your everyday relationships and responsibilities.

NO : : : : : : OVERWHELMING
EFFECTS EFFECTS

Appendix D:

Self Concept (Texas Social Behavior Inventory)

The following items ask you to describe your reactions and feelings when you are around other people. Each item has a scale, marked with the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, with (1) indicating "not at all characteristic of me" and (5) "very characteristic of me," and the other numbers, points in between.

For each item, choose the number which best describes how characteristic the item is of you.

1. I am not likely to speak to people until they speak to me.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

2. I would described myself as self-confident.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

3. I feel confident of my appearance.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

4. I am a good mixer.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

5. When in a group of people, I have trouble thinking of the right things to say.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

6. When in a group, I usually do what the others want rather than make suggestions.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

7. When I am in disagreement with other people, my opinion usually prevails.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

8. I would describe myself as one who attempts to master situations.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

9. Other people look up to me.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

10. I enjoy social gatherings just to be with people.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

11. I make a point of looking other people in the eye.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

12. I cannot seem to get others to notice me.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

13. I would rather not have very much responsibility for other people.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

14. I feel comfortable being approached by someone in a position of authority.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

15. I would describe myself as indecisive.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

16. I have no doubts about my social competence.

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all			Very much	
characteristic			characteristic	
of me			of me	

Appendix E:

Attitude Toward Sex Roles (Attitude Toward Women Scale)

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward roles in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feeling about each statement by indicating whether you (A) agree strongly, (B) agree mildly, (C) disagree mildly, or (D) disagree strongly.

	AGREE STRONGLY	AGREE MILDLY	DISAGREE MILDLY	DISAGREE STRONGLY
1. Swearing and obscenity are more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.	A	B	C	D
2. Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.	A	B	C	D
3. It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause in the marriage ceremony.	A	B	C	D
4. A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.	A	B	C	D
5. Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.	A	B	C	D
6. Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.	A	B	C	D
7. A woman should not expect to go exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.	A	B	C	D
8. It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.	A	B	C	D

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9. The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men. | A | B | C | D |
| 10. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades. | A | B | C | D |
| 11. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together. | A | B | C | D |
| 12. Sons in the family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters. | A | B | C | D |
| 13. In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up the children. | A | B | C | D |
| 14. Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set up by men. | A | B | C | D |
| 15. There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted. | A | B | C | D |

Appendix F:

Occurrence of Family Violence (Conflict Tactics Scale)

Many times the members of a family have disagreements about how certain decisions should be made and who should make them. Children may have spats or fights among themselves; parents and children may have different ways of settling differences between themselves; and husbands and wives may disagree with each other or get annoyed at one another. They also may have spats or fights when they are in a bad mood or are tired. Have the following behaviors ever happened to you in your family or perhaps occurred between your parents? (a) pushing or shoving, (b) slapping, (c) kicking, biting, or hitting with fists, (d) hitting with an object, (e) beatings, (threatening with a knife or gun, (g) using a knife or gun.

NO ____ If "no," continue to question # ____.

YES ____ If "yes," continue to question # ____.

On the following scale please indicate whether or not any of these behaviors were directed toward you as a child and whether or not your parents directed any of these behaviors toward each other. Place an "X" in the appropriate space(s).

BEHAVIOR	PARENTS DIRECTED TOWARD <u>ME</u>	PARENTS DIRECTED TOWARD <u>EACH OTHER</u>
Pushed or shoved the other		
Pushed or shoved the other against an object		
Slapped the other on the body		
Slapped the other on the face		
Kicked, bit, or hit with fists		
Tried to hit the other with an object		
Hit the other with an object		
Beat the other up		
Threatened with a knife or gun		
Used a knife or gun		

Appendix G:
Physical Severity of Family Violence

Indicate the most serious physical effect you experienced as a child as a result of the previous behaviors by placing a check beside the appropriate response. (Check only one answer.)

<input type="checkbox"/> NO EFFECTS	<input type="checkbox"/> CUTS OR BURNS
<input type="checkbox"/> BRUISES ON THE BODY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGENCY ROOM TREATMENT
<input type="checkbox"/> BRUISES ON THE FACE	<input type="checkbox"/> HOSPITALIZATION

When your parents participated in the above behaviors, what was the most serious physical effect on either parent? Place a check beside the appropriate response. (Check only one answer.)

<input type="checkbox"/> NO EFFECTS	<input type="checkbox"/> CUTS OR BURNS
<input type="checkbox"/> BRUISES ON THE BODY	<input type="checkbox"/> EMERGENCY ROOM TREATMENT
<input type="checkbox"/> BRUISES ON THE FACE	<input type="checkbox"/> HOSPITALIZATION

Appendix H:

Perceived Impact of Family Violence

On the scale below specify the degree to which you felt abused by your parents by circling the appropriate dots (:).

NOT ABUSED : : : : : : : EXTREMELY
AT ALL ABUSED

When your parents participated in the above behavior to what extent did you feel upset? Indicate by circling the appropriate dots (:).

NOT UPSET : : : : : : : EXTREMELY
AT ALL UPSET

Appendix I:
Demographic Information

Gender: Male _____ Female _____

Age _____

Class standing: Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____

Graduate _____ Other (specify) _____

Major _____

Ethnic background: Caucasian _____ Black _____ Native American _____

Hispanic _____ Oriental _____ Other (specify) _____

Father's occupation _____

Mother's occupation _____

Mother's employment status: Full-time _____ Part-time _____ Not at all _____

Father's education: highest level achieved

_____ none
_____ grades 1-6
_____ grades 7-8
_____ grades 9-11

_____ grade 12
_____ college, non-graduate or
_____ post high school job training
_____ college graduation
_____ graduate work in college

Mother's education: highest level achieved

_____ none
_____ grades 1-6
_____ grades 7-8
_____ grades 9-11

_____ grade 12
_____ college, non-graduate or
_____ post high school job training
_____ college graduation
_____ graduate work in college

Number of siblings (brothers and sisters) _____

Your birth order (first child, second child, etc.) _____