Running head: FACTORS PREDICTING DATING VIOLENCE PERPETRATION

Factors Predicting Dating Violence Perpetration among Male and Female College Students

Colleen R. Baker

Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

Sandra M. Stith

Kansas State University

Abstract

This study examined the importance of witnessing parental violence, experiencing childhood violence, problems with alcohol, length of relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills, and partner's use of physical and psychological aggression for male and female perpetrators of dating violence in college. For males, partner's use of physical aggression, low levels of anger management skills, and high relationship satisfaction were the strongest predictors of physical aggression. For females, partner's uses of physical and psychological aggression were the most important predictors of their use of physical aggression. The model in this study was a good predictor of male violence, accounting for 81% of the variance; however, it only accounted for 51% of the variance in female violence.

Key words: dating violence, gender, physical abuse, psychological abuse, college students

Factors Predicting Dating Violence Perpetration among Male and Female College Students

Dating violence is a significant problem in our society, yet researchers have just begun to understand the scope of the problem in the last two decades. According to Jackson (1999) and Lewis and Fremouw (2001), as many as one in three college couples will be involved in at least one incident of violence during their dating relationships. Furthermore, some studies have found prevalence rates of dating violence close to 50% (Arias, Samois, & O'Leary, 1987; Pedersen & Thomas, 1992; White & Koss, 1991).

The prevalence rates of dating violence are comparable to violence rates found in marriages. At some point during the course of the relationship, physical violence occurs in 30% to 60% of marriages (O'Leary et al., 1989; Straus & Gelles, 1986). Furthermore, dating violence has been found to be a strong predictor of marital violence (White, Merrill, & Koss, 2001) and not surprisingly, data suggests that dating violence is similar in composition to marital violence (White & Koss, 1991). In fact, many believe that dating during the young adult years provides a training ground for behavior in subsequent long-term relationships. Because violent behavior that begins in the dating context often continues into the marital relationship (O'Leary et al.), it is critical to intervene while couples are dating to stop the cycle of violence.

Creating preventative measures and appropriate treatment is vital for this population because the occurrence of violence does not always lead to a relationship end. Even though abuse can have extremely damaging consequences, approximately 50% to 80% of married domestic violence victims stay with their abusive partners (Snyder & Fruchtman, 1981). Lo and Sporakowski (1989) found that within dating couples, 76% of those who experienced violence planned to continue in their relationship. This suggests that as the relationships continue, so may the abuse, if not addressed.

According to past literature, dating violence has severe consequences that can continue into marital relationships. Relationship abuse can have drastic effects on individuals involved in violent relationships, children in violent homes, and on our entire society. Much of the past literature has focused on prevalence rates to gain insight on the problem. However, only studying prevalence rates ignores what goes on within the individual and between the violent couple. This study examines factors that increase the risk of becoming violent within a dating relationship. With enhanced knowledge of risk factors associated with perpetrating violence, future prevention programs and clinical treatments can be appropriately designed. Both men and women are perpetrators within dating relationships (Kaura & Allen, 2004; O'Keefe, 1997), therefore this study examined whether risk factors differ for males and females.

Literature on risk factors of violence perpetration in dating relationships has been inconclusive and inconsistent. This may be due to the fact that many studies do not account for the influence of several risk factors, therefore leaving out influential variables that may affect violence perpetration. Furthermore, there is a lack of information on gender differences within dating violence, specifically in relation to those who perpetrate violence. This is surprising considering that both genders perpetrate violence. This study was an attempt to fill the gaps in the literature by examining numerous risk factors for violence perpetration, differentiating these factors between males and females.

The eight risk factors examined include parental violence, childhood abuse, problems with alcohol, length of dating relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills, and partner's use of physical and psychological aggression. Two predictive models were tested, one for males and one for females, to determine if risk factors operate differently for men versus women.

Method

Study Design

This study used secondary data collected in 1998 from undergraduate college students at a large Mid Atlantic university. The convenience sample consisted of 132 males and 342 females who voluntarily agreed to participate by completing a survey for research purposes.

The survey was distributed by faculty and graduate teaching assistants in human development, business, accounting, engineering, and Reserve Officer Training Cadet (ROTC) classes consisting of undergraduate students. A total of 1,250 surveys were mailed in three batches for distribution to students over the course of the 1998-1999 school year. The cleaned data set consisted of 474 completed surveys, out of approximately 800 that were successfully distributed. This generated a 59% return rate.

Demographic information such as gender, education level, age, race, parents' education levels, family income, and parents' marital status was requested for background data. Questions were also asked regarding participant's dating status and general relationship information. Participants were asked to continue the survey only if they were currently in a relationship lasting at least one month or have previously been in a relationship lasting at least one month. The relationship questions were to be answered on their current or most recent partner.

Measures

Witnessing or experiencing violence in one's family of origin was measured with two questions that followed the demographic questions. One question addressed whether or not the participant witnessed physical parental violence. This question was scored as either "yes" to witnessed violence (specifying between father to mother violence, mother to father violence, or mutual) or "no" if no violence was witnessed. The second question addressed the participant's

experience of abuse as a child within their family of origin. It asked participants to select the most severe discipline received as a child across a continuum of mild to severe verbal and physical abuse.

The Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index (RAPI; White & Labouvie, 1989) was used in this study to assess the relationship between problems with alcohol and the perpetration of violence. The RAPI is a 23-item self-report measure used to assess drinking consequences in adolescents and young adults. It has an internal consistency of .92. The instrument instructions ask, "How many times did the following things happen to you while you were drinking alcohol or because of your alcohol use during the past six months?" Items are rated by frequency of occurrence on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*more than ten times*).

The Revised Dyadic Adjustment Scale (RDAS; Busby, Christensen, Crane, & Larson, 1995) was used to see if a relationship exists between the level of relationship satisfaction and perpetration of physical dating violence. The RDAS is a 14-item instrument based on Spanier's (1976) original 32-item Dyadic Adjustment Scale. The original 32-item instrument measures components of marital and nonmarital dyadic relationships, including consensus, satisfaction, cohesion, and affectional expressions. Spanier's instrument was found valuable in that it can be used in its entirety or by subscales without losing any validity or reliability (Busby et al.). The RDAS includes the consensus, satisfaction, and cohesion subscales. In assessing for internal consistency, it was found that the RDAS had a Cronbach Alpha of .90, a Guttman Split-Half of .94, and a Spearman-Brown Split-Half of .95.

The Anger Management Scale, developed by Stith and Hamby (2002), assesses specific behaviors and cognitions that can increase or decrease anger in intimate partner violence. It consists of four subscales: escalating strategies, negative attributions, self-awareness, and

calming strategies. It has an overall reliability of .87. Statements such as, "when my partner picks a fight with me, I fight back," are rated on a scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to a 4 (*strongly agree*).

Lastly, the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) was used in this study to examine whether there is a relationship between an individual perpetrating physical violence and their partner's use of physical and/or psychological aggression. The CTS2 assesses the frequency with which an individual perpetrates physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse against their partner and the frequency of experiencing physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse from their partner. When previously assessed based on a sample of 317 undergraduates, the internal consistency reliability of the CTS2 ranged from .79 to .95. Respondents are asked to mark how many times they did each item in the past year and how many times their partner did each in the past year. Response choices range in frequency from 1 (*no, this has never happened*) to 7 (*more than 20 times in the past year*).

Statistical Analysis

Data were analyzed by gender. First, data from the independent variables collected from males (witnessing parental violence, experiencing childhood abuse, problems with alcohol, length of dating relationship, relationship satisfaction, anger management skills, partner's use of physical aggression, and partner's use of psychological aggression) were correlated with male aggression to determine the univariate relationships between each independent variable and male violence. The same correlation analysis was done with the data collected from females on the eight independent variables. This indicated which independent variables had the strongest and weakest relationships with male and female violence when examined individually.

Next, the independent variables were examined as a whole to understand how they

predict male and female violence. Two multiple regression analyses were conducted. The

dependent variable in the first analysis was male report of his own physical aggression. The

dependent variable in the second analysis was female report of her own physical aggression. In

each analysis the independent variables were witnessing parental violence, experiencing

childhood abuse, problems with alcohol, length of dating relationship, relationship satisfaction,

anger management skills, partner's use of physical aggression, and partner's use of psychological

aggression.

<div align="center">Results</div>

Demographics

    Males. There were 132 undergraduate males in the present study. Of those, 118 reported

that they were presently in or had been in a relationship that lasted one month or more, and

therefore were eligible for inclusion in the study. Of these 118, 3% ($n = 4$) were freshman, 23%

($n = 27$) were sophomores, 32% ($n = 38$) were juniors, 39% ($n = 46$) were seniors, and 3% ($n =$

3) represented missing data. In terms of ethnicity, 86% ($n = 100$) were Caucasian, 5% ($n = 6$)

were African American, 2% ($n = 2$) were Asian, and the remaining 9% ($n = 10$) were Latin

American, Native American (American Indian, Samoan, or Hawaiian), other, or missing data.

There was a range of reported family income by the respondents; however, the majority (48%; n

$= 56$) reported having family incomes of $80,000 or more. Of the 118 males, 31.8% ($n = 35$)

reported being physically violent toward their partner at least once in the past year. Of the 118

males, the most frequently used forms of abuse reported include grabbing a partner ($n = 23$),

shoving a partner ($n = 17$), throwing an object at a partner ($n = 10$), and twisting a partner's arm

or hair ($n = 10$).

<<Insert Table 1 Here>>

Females. There were 342 females respondents in this study. Of those, 321 reported that

they were presently in or had been in a relationship that lasted one month or more, and therefore

were eligible for inclusion in the study. The female respondents (n = 321) consisted of 3% (n =

8) freshman, 38% (n = 123) sophomores, 38% (n = 122) juniors, and 21% (n = 68) seniors. In

terms of ethnicity, 89% (n = 286) were Caucasian, 4% (n = 14) were Asian, 4% (n = 12) were

African American, and the remaining 3% (n = 9) were Latin American, Native American

(American Indian, Samoan, or Hawaiian), other, or missing data. Similar to the males, 44% (n =

140) of the females reported their family income was $80,000 or more. Of the 321 females,

41.4% (n = 130) reported being physically violent toward their partner. Of the 321 females, the

most frequently used forms of abuse reported include shoving (n = 86), grabbing (n = 80),

throwing an object at a partner (n = 42), and slapped a partner (n = 41).

<<Insert Table 2 Here>>

Correlation Analyses

The data was analyzed by gender. Correlations were run between all variables for the

male data and then for the female data. These results can be seen in Table 3 and Table 4. First,

the correlations show the strength of relationships among the independent variables. The highest

intercorrelation among independent variables was .64 for the females and .54 for the males, both

of which were between partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological

aggression. Therefore, it does not appear that multicollinearity was a problem within the

independent variables for males or females. Secondly, the correlation data determined the

univariate relationship between each independent variable and male and female violence.

Inter-correlations among variables collected from males. As can be seen in Table 3, partner's use of physical aggression ($r = .88$), partner's use of psychological aggression ($r = .46$), and alcohol problems ($r = .43$) were all significantly positively correlated with male aggression at the 0.001 level. Anger management skills were also significantly related to male aggression ($r = -.40$, $p < .001$); however, the relationship was negative, indicating that the less anger management skills a person has, the more likely they will use physical violence against a dating partner. These relationships indicate that lower anger management skills, partner's use of physical violence, partner's use of psychological violence, and problems with alcohol are all positively associated with men using physical violence in their dating relationships. Experience of childhood violence was significantly correlated with male aggression at the 0.05 level. Witnessing parental violence ($r = .08$, $p = .22$), relationship satisfaction ($r = -.11$, $p = .13$), and length of relationships ($r = -.03$, $p = .36$) were not significantly correlated with men's use of physical violence.

<<Insert Table 3 Here>>

Inter-correlations among variables collected from females. As can be seen in Table 4, partner's use of physical aggression ($r = .68$), partner's use of psychological aggression ($r = .56$), and alcohol problems ($r = .28$) were all significantly correlated with female violence at the 0.001 level. Furthermore, anger management skills ($r = -.39$) and relationship satisfaction ($r = -.35$) were also significant at the 0.001 level, but negatively correlated, indicating that low anger management skills and low relationship satisfaction are related to use of physical aggression against a dating partner. These relationships indicate that partner's use of physical violence, partner's use of psychological violence, lower anger management skills, low relationship satisfaction, and alcohol problems are all positively associated with females using physical

violence in their dating relationship. Witnessing parental violence was significantly correlated with female violence at the 0.05 level; however, the relationship was weak ($r = .11$). Experience of childhood abuse ($r = .08$, $p = .10$) and length of relationship ($r = .08$, $p = .08$) were not significantly correlated with female aggression.

<<Insert Table 4 Here>>

Regression Analyses

The correlation analyses reported above indicated that partner's use of physical and psychological aggression both were highly related to men's and women's use of physical aggression. Therefore, it was anticipated that these two partner variables would account for most of the variance within the model in predicting male and female aggression. In order to test this hypothesis, a regression analyses was conducted for each gender. Partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression were entered first into the regression, followed by the other six variables (witnessed parental abuse, experienced childhood abuse, anger management skills, relationship satisfaction, problems with alcohol, and length of relationship). This showed how much variance the partner variables accounted for compared to the rest of the variables.

Regression analysis for male data. When the two partner variables were entered first into the regression, they accounted for 77% of the variance for male aggression within the model. Partner's use of physical aggression was significant at the 0.001 level ($\beta = .89$); however, partner's use of psychological aggression was not significant. When the rest of the six independent variables were entered, the total model predicted 81% of male aggression. Partner's use of physical violence remained significant ($\beta = .85$, $p < .001$), and now anger management skills ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .001$) and relationship satisfaction ($\beta = .16$, $p < .01$) were significant.

<<Insert Table 5 Here>>

Regression analysis for female data. The regression for the female data included just the partner's use of physical aggression ($\beta = .54$, $p < .001$) and partner's use of psychological aggression ($\beta = .22$, $p < .001$), which were both significant and accounted for 49% of the variance. When the rest of the six variables were added to the model, the total model predicted 51% of the variance. Partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression both remained significant; however, the significance level for partner's use of psychological aggression changed ($\beta = .15$, $p < .05$). No other variables were significant in the model.

<<Insert Table 6 Here>>

Discussion

Of the 118 undergraduate males in this study who were in or had previously been in a dating relationship lasting one month or more, 31.8% ($n = 35$) reported being physically violent toward their partner in the past year. Furthermore, 41.4% ($n = 130$) of the females who were in or had been in a relationship ($n = 321$) reported being physically violent toward their partner in the past year. These findings correspond with previous research that has found prevalence rates of college dating violence to range between 20% and 50% (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001). Furthermore, we found a higher percentage of violence perpetration among females, which is consistent with most previous research (e.g., Bookwala, Frieze, & Grote, 1992; Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Riggs, O'Leary, & Breslin, 1990; White & Koss, 1991).

Interestingly, both men and women had the same four variables in the same order of relationship strength that were significantly correlated in the univariate analyses with male and female physical aggression. In order of significance, these included partner's use of physical

aggression, partner's use of psychological aggression, and problems with alcohol and anger management skills. The genders differed in that for males, experience of childhood violence was also significant and for females, relationship satisfaction and witnessing of parental violence were also significant. Length of relationship was not significantly correlated with one's use of physical violence for males or females, therefore possibly suggesting that abuse can occur at any stage of a college dating relationship. Interestingly, length of relationship was significantly correlated ($r = .22, p < .001$) with the female partner's report that she was receiving psychological aggression from her male partner. Therefore, the longer the relationship, the more likely a man may become psychologically aggressive toward his partner. These findings are similar to research results by Alexander, Moore, and Alexander (1991), who found that length of dating relationship was significantly related to the amount of verbal abuse within the relationship but was not significantly related to physical abuse.

The correlations give a good view of how each independent variable relates to male or female aggression when looked at individually. However, the multivariate analyses indicated that when the independent variables are collectively examined to predict male and female violence, the relationship strength of each individual independent variable changed based on the inclusion of other variables.

For both males and females, the partner variables predicted the most variance in the model, 77% and 49% respectively. The total model accounted for 81% of the variance for males and 51% for females. For both genders, partner's use of physical aggression was a highly significant predictor of their own use of physical violence. Interestingly though, partner's use of psychological aggression was not a significant predictor for males, but was significant for females. It appears that men's use of psychological aggression has a much stronger impact on a

woman's likelihood of using physical aggression than does women's use of psychological aggression on male violence. These findings may be explained by society's view of what is acceptable behavior for each gender. Traditionally, if a man says something offensive or belittling to a woman and a woman uses physical violence as a response, for example by slapping him, society is much more accepting than if it were the man using physical violence against a woman for something she said.

The results indicated that for males, in order of significance, partner's use of physical aggression, low anger management skills, and high relationship satisfaction were the strongest variables associated with male's use of physical aggression against a dating partner. The findings of partner's use of physical aggression and low anger management skills predicting male violence are consistent with past research (Lundberg, Stith, Penn, & Ward, 2004; Marshall & Rose, 1990; White & Koss, 1991). However, the result indicating a high relationship satisfaction increases a male's use of physical aggression does not correspond to past research findings. In any event, although relationship satisfaction was significant, the beta weight shows that the relationship is small.

For females, partner's use of physical aggression, followed by partner's use of psychological aggression, were the strongest variables associated with female's use of physical aggression against a dating partner. Since the model only predicted 51% of female violence, this indicates that other unknown factors are influential in female's use of physical violence. Since the model in this study predicted 81% of male violence, the unknown variables associated with female violence may be variables specific to only females. Therefore, more research needs to be conducted in order uncover variables impacting female violence to close this gap. Since anger

management was not a predictor for female violence, this suggests that for females violence may relate to other factors such as self-esteem issues or possibly jealousy.

Although, experiencing childhood violence was correlated with male violence and witnessing parental violence was correlated with female violence, it was surprising that these variables did not have a larger influence on one's likelihood of using physical violence against a dating partner. Although past research has found different results for each gender, most findings support that these variables do indeed play a part in the continuing cycle of violence. However, this study showed that with the inclusion of a variety of variables, witnessing and experiencing violence do not significantly predict male or female physical aggression. Therefore, growing up in a violent home does not necessarily mean that an individual will be violent in later relationships.

Furthermore, it was surprising that experiencing problems when using alcohol was not a significant predictor of physical aggression for either gender when placed in a regression model with numerous other factors. Most research results suggest that problems with alcohol play a crucial role in dating violence perpetration. This study found that it significantly correlates to dating violence; however, it is not a strong predictor when placed in a model with other influential variables. This is another example of how the inclusion of a variety of variables gives a clearer view of the phenomenon occurring.

This research was guided by two theoretical frameworks, feminist theory and ecological theory. Feminist theory predicted that risk factors would operate differently for men and women due to hierarchy and power in intimate relationships. This prediction is supported by the results found in this study. Men and women did have different risk factors that predicted their use of violence, except for the common risk factor of partner's use of physical aggression. What is most

notable is that for females, partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression were the only significant predictors of female violence even when included with all other potential variables. This suggests that women's use of physical violence is dependent on men's behaviors. If a man uses physical violence or psychological aggression, results of this study suggest that a woman may retaliate with physical aggression, in which case the man would likely reciprocate, increasing the risk of injury due to greater physical stronger. Furthermore, low anger management skills were found to predict male physical aggression toward their dating partner, which leaves females again at the mercy of male behavior. Feminist theory emphasizes the importance of examining gender differences in dating violence perpetration. Ecological theory guided the research by providing a framework to view the eight variables used in the study. Through this theory, a variety of risk factors were examined allowing for a multifaceted view of what influences someone to become violent within a dating relationship.

Although Systems Theory was not originally used to develop this research, the results support that dating violence occurs within a system, since the factors that predict both male and female aggression are interactional (i.e., partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression). Viewing the interactions between males and females in dating violence through Systems Theory may provide insight into the cycles that are occurring.

Limitations

This study is limited in its ability to generalize the results. First, 86% of the men in the sample and 89% of the women were Caucasian, making the results difficult to generalize to other racial groups. Secondly, the sample consisted of only currently enrolled undergraduate college students. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized to non-college populations. Lastly, the

shortcoming of survey methodology and quantitative research is that we do not know the meaning and process behind the statistical data.

Clinical Implications

Gender differences should be largely considered in prevention programs and clinical treatment since this study shows that men and women differed in risk factors predicting violence perpetration. For males, partner's use of physical violence, low anger management skills, and high relationship satisfaction were associated with male's use of physical violence. This suggests that a psychoeducational component on anger management skills could be valuable for men. For females, partner's use of physical aggression and partner's use of psychological aggression were strongly associated with female's use of physical violence. Addressing partner's use of physical aggression in prevention programs and clinical treatment would be useful for both genders. This could be done by teaching positive ways to respond to partner abuse, such as not using physical aggression in retaliation and also encouraging victims to seek help. The results from this study help clarify gender differences in dating violence perpetration, which can give light to cycles occurring between a couple, allowing for proper intervention to break the cycle. For example, if a man is psychologically abusive to his partner, this may provoke a woman to become physically violent, which in turn may create risk that the man will also use physical aggression, and thus the cycle continues.

Future Research

This is the first study that addresses a variety of risk factors for the perpetration of dating violence across genders, attempting to fill a gap in the literature. The results from this study suggest that there are still important variables missing from the female model of risk factors; more research should be done to uncover these missing pieces. Furthermore, this study did not

explore possible subgroups of individuals. We know from the research on marital violence that violence is not a unitary phenomena. It is possible that for one group of individuals, anger management skills may be more important, and for another group, childhood experiences may be most important. This study considered all the females as one group and all the males as another group, but did not look for subgroups within the larger groups. Future studies looking at subgroups may increase our knowledge of factors related to dating violence perpetration. Lastly, a qualitative component could add to the understanding of dating violence perpetration, especially to gain insight on why males who have a higher relationship satisfaction are likely to be more violent toward their partner.

References

Alexander, P. C., Moore, S., & Alexander, E. R., III. (1991). What is transmitted in the

intergenerational transmission of violence? *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53*(3),

657-667.

Arias, I. Samois, M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression

during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2*(1)*,* 82-90.

Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. & Grote, N. (1994). Love, aggression, and satisfaction in dating

relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11*, 625-632.

Burke, P., Stets, J., & Pirog-Good, M. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem and physical and

sexual abuse in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *51*, 272-285.

Busby, D., Christensen, C., Crane, D., & Larson, J. (1995). A revision of the dyadic adjustment

scale for sue with distressed and nondistressed couples: Construct hierarchy and

multidimensional scales. *Journal of Marital & Family Therapy, 21*(3)*,* 289-308.

Jackson, S. M. (1999). Issues in the dating violence research: A review of the literature.

Aggression and Violent Behavior, 4(2), 233-247.

Kaura, S. & Allen, C. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence

perpetration by men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(5), 576-588.

Lewis, S. F., & Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature.

Clinical Psychology Review, 21(1), 105-127.

Lo, A. W., & Sporakowski, M. J. (1989). The continuation of violent dating relationships among

college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 30*, 432-439.

Lundberg, K., Stith, S., Penn, C., & Ward, D. (2004). A comparison of nonviolent, psychologically violent and physically violent male college daters. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(10), 1191-1200.

Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1990). Premarital violence: The impact of family of origin violence, stress and reciprocity. *Violence and Victims, 5*(1)*,* 51-64.

O'Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*(4), 546-568.

O'Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbau, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*(2), 263-268.

Pedersen, P., & Thomas, C. (1992). Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a Canadian-university sample. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 24*(4), 490-501.

Riggs, D., O'Leary, K. & Breslin, F. (1990). Multiple correlates of physical aggression in dating couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5*, 61-73.

Snyder, D., & Fruchtman, L. (1981). Differential patterns of wife abuse: A data-based typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49*(6), 878-885.

Spanier, G. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38*(1), 15-28.

Stith, S., & Hamby, S. (2002). The anger management scale: Development and preliminary psychometric properties. *Violence and Victims, 17*(4), 383-402.

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41*, 75-88.

Straus, M., Hamby, S., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics

Scale (CTS2). *Journal of Family Issues, 17*(3), 283-317.

White, J., & Koss, M. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher

education students. *Violence and Victims, 6*(4), 247-256.

White, H. R., & Labouvie, E. W. (1989). Towards the assessment of adolescent problem

drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, *50*, 30–37.

White, J., Merrill, L. & Koss, M. (2001). Predictors of premilitary courtship violence in a Navy

recruit sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(9)*,* 910-927.

Author Note

Address correspondence to Sandra M. Stith, Ph.D., Professor of Marriage and Family Therapy, FSHS, 101 Campus Creek Complex, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506 sstith@ksu.edu.

Colleen R. Baker, MS, is a recent graduate of Virginia Tech's marriage and family therapy master's program.

Sandra M. Stith, PhD, was a professor of marriage and family therapy at Virginia Tech when this project was completed. She is currently a professor of marriage and family therapy at Kansas State University.

Table 1

Male Perpetrators: Types of Physical Violence Used Against a Partner

	Frequency	Valid Percent	
Threw an object	10	8.7	(N = 115)
Twisted arm or hair	10	8.7	(N = 115)
Shoved	17	14.8	(N = 115)
Used a knife or gun	5	4.3	(N = 115)
Punched	4	3.5	(N = 115)
Choked	5	4.3	(N = 115)
Slammed against wall	4	3.5	(N = 115)
Beat up	4	3.5	(N = 115)
Grabbed	23	20.5	(N = 112)
Slapped	3	2.7	(N = 112)
Burned	3	2.6	(N = 114)
Kicked	2	1.8	(N = 112)

Table 2

Female Perpetrators: Types of Physical Violence Used on a Partner

	Frequency	Valid Percent	
Threw an object	42	13.2	(N = 319)
Twisted arm or hair	27	8.5	(N = 319)
Shoved	86	27.0	(N = 319)
Used a knife or gun	5	1.6	(N = 319)
Punched	32	10.0	(N = 319)
Choked	7	2.2	(N = 319)
Slammed against wall	14	4.4	(N = 319)
Beat up	5	1.6	(N = 319)
Grabbed	80	25.2	(N = 318)
Slapped	41	12.9	(N = 317)
Burned	6	1.9	(N = 318)
Kicked	22	7.0	(N = 315)

Table 3

Correlations between Variables: Males

	Wit. Abuse	Exp. Abuse	Alcohol Prob.	Rel. Length	Rel. Satsf.	Anger Skills	P. Use of Phys.	P. Use of Psy.
Wit. Abuse	--							
Exp. Abuse	.31***	--						
Alcohol Prob.	-.01	.15	--					
Rel. Length	-.00	-.12	-.15	--				
Rel. Satisf.	-.05	-.17*	-.29***	-.04	--			
Anger Skills	.07	-.05	-.30***	-.14	.49***	--		
P. Use of Phys.	.15	.20*	.43***	-.05	-.18*	-.32***	--	
P. Use of Psy.	.05	.26**	.27**	.13	-.18*	-.38***	.54***	--
Self Use of Phys.	.08	.21*	.43***	-.03	-.11	-.40***	.88***	.46***

$N = 109$; *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Wit. Abuse = Witness of Parental Violence
Exp. Abuse: Experience of Childhood Abuse
Alcohol Prob.: Problems with Alcohol
Rel. Length: Length of Dating Relationship
Rel. Satisf.: Relationship Satisfaction
Anger Skills: Anger Management Skills
P. Use of Phys.: Partner's Use of Physical Aggression
P. Use of Psyc.: Partner's use of Psychological Aggression
Self Use of Phys.: Use of Physical Aggression on Partner

Table 4

Correlations among Variables: Females

	Wit. Abuse	Exp. Abuse	Alcohol Prob.	Rel. Length	Rel. Satsf.	Anger Skills	P. Use of Phys.	P. Use of Psy.
Wit. Abuse	--							
Exp. Abuse	.35***	--						
Alcohol Prob.	-.08	.05	--					
Rel. Length	.07	.00	-.23***	--				
Rel. Satsf.	.04	-.01	-.26***	-.01	--			
Anger Skills	-.02	-.12*	-.33***	-.12*	.58***	--		
P. Use of Phys.	.11*	.10*	.28***	.08	-.31***	-.33***	--	
P. Use of Psy.	.02	.05	.31***	.22***	-.40***	-.47***	.64***	--
Self Use of Phys.	.11*	.08	.28***	.08	-.35***	-.39***	.68***	.56***

$N = 291$; *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

Wit. Abuse = Witness of Parental Violence
Exp. Abuse: Experience of Childhood Abuse
Alcohol Prob.: Problems with Alcohol
Rel. Length: Length of Dating Relationship
Rel. Satsf.: Relationship Satisfaction
Anger Skills: Anger Management Skills
P. Use of Phys.: Partner's Use of Physical Aggression
P. Use of Psyc.: Partner's use of Psychological Aggression
Self Use of Phys.: Use of Physical Aggression on Partner

Table 5

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Males as Criterion

Step and predictor variable	R^2	ΔR^2	β	*p*
Step 1	.77	.77		
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.89	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			-.03	.63
Step 2	.81	.05		
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.85	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			-.10	.08
Witnessed Parental Violence			-.06	.24
Experienced Childhood Violence			.09	.06
Anger Management Skills			-.22	.00
Relationship Satisfaction			.16	.00
Problems with Alcohol			.06	.26
Length of Dating Relationship			.01	.76

Note. $F = 53.52$, $(N = 109, p < .001)$

Table 6

Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis Summary with Violence by Females as Criterion

Step and predictor variable	R^2	ΔR^2	β	*p*
Step 1	.49	.49		
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.54	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			.22	.00
Step 2	.51	.02		
Partner's use of Physical Aggression			.51	.00
Partner's use of Psychological Aggression			.15	.02
Witnessed Parental Violence			.05	.23
Experienced Childhood Violence			-.02	.74
Anger Management Skills			-.10	.08
Relationship Satisfaction			-.07	.17
Problems with Alcohol			.05	.34
Length of Dating Relationship			.01	.97

Note. $F = 36.67$, ($N = 290$, $p < .001$)