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INTRODUCTION

Spouse abuse has long been recognized as a significant problem in our society. Estimates suggest that between 20% and 25% of adult women in the United States have been battered by their spouse at least once (Stark & Flitcraft, 1988). It was not until the seminal article by Makepeace (1981), however, that courtship violence was identified as a serious issue. Courtship violence, violence between non-married partners, typically has been defined as slapping, punching, shoving, kicking, biting, hitting or trying to hit with an object, throwing an object, and threatening or assaulting with a knife or gun. Since the Makepeace article, courtship violence has been the subject of a considerable amount of research.

Much of the research has tried to determine the prevalence of courtship violence. In the original Makepeace (1981) study, 21% of females reported experiencing at least one violent act from a dating partner. Since that time, prevalence estimates have ranged from a low of 19% (Bogal-Allbritten & Allbritten, 1985) to a high of 64% (Marshall & Rose, 1988). In general, 20% to 30% of women report experiencing at least one episode of violence from a dating partner (e.g., Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Follingstad, Rutledge, Polek, & McNeill-Hawkins, 1988; Gryl, Stith, & Bird, 1991; Makepeace, 1986; Matthews, 1984; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989a;
Thompson, 1991; Worth, Matthews, & Coleman, 1990). Overall, the incidence of courtship violence appears to be quite similar to spouse abuse.

Another popular area of research has included individual characteristics of the perpetrator and victim, such as self-esteem (e.g., Miller & Simpson, 1991; Stets & Pirog-Good 1990), attitude toward violence (e.g., Archer & Ray, 1989; Smith & Williams, 1992; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987; Thompson, 1991), and sex-role stereotypes (e.g., Archer & Ray, 1989; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984; Worth et al., 1990). Other research has emphasized the relationship between violence in the family of origin and courtship violence (e.g., Folliete & Alexander, 1992; Marshall & Rose, 1988; Marshall & Rose, 1990; O'Keefe, Brockapp, & Chew, 1986; Roscoe & Callahan, 1985; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987; Worth et al., 1990). Finally, characteristics of the dating relationship itself have been examined (e.g., Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Aries, Samios, & O'Leary, 1987; Gryl et al., 1991; Lo & Sporakowski, 1989; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987; Thompson, 1991).

One area which has received little attention is the specific responses that friends, family members, co-workers, and neighbors, hereafter referred to as non-professionals, make to victims of courtship violence and the relationship of these responses with a victim's emotional well-being and the
professional resources used by the victim. Studies have indicated that non-professionals are the first, and many times the only, contacts victims of spousal abuse and courtship violence make (e.g., Bergman, 1992; Gryl et al., 1992; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989a; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989b; VanVoorhis, 1993). Very few studies, however, have assessed the specific responses of non-professionals and the effects of those responses.

The current study was designed to partially fill this gap in the literature. Specifically, the current study examined the actual responses non-professionals made toward victims of courtship violence and the relationship of these responses with the victims' emotional well-being and the professional resources they utilized. The author acknowledges that men can also be victims of courtship violence; however, most of the research focuses on female victims, as did this study.

Six questions were examined. First, how do non-professionals respond to victims of courtship violence? This question was addressed by asking victims about the responses they received. Second, how do these responses match those the victim hoped for? Past research has suggested that responses that match those hoped for are evaluated as more supportive (Cutrona, Cohen, & Ingram, 1990). This question was addressed by asking victims about the responses they hoped to receive and comparing them to the responses they reported actually
receiving. Third, are increased levels of support related to a victim's emotional well-being? A measure of emotional well-being was correlated with the support women report having received to address this question. Fourth, is receiving the type of support hoped for related to levels of distress? This question was investigated by correlating difference scores between the responses the women wanted and the responses actually received with a measure of emotional well-being. Fifth, are background and personality variables related to the incidence of courtship violence? This question was examined by investigating the relationship between sex-role attitudes, emotionality, and incidence of experiencing violence as a child with the incidence of courtship violence. Sixth, is the type of support received related to the professional resources a woman utilizes? This question was explored by correlating the type of support received with the professional resources utilized.

Given the lack of empirical research in the area of social support of victims of courtship violence, the current study was exploratory in nature. To better understand the scope of courtship violence, the following review of the literature details the prevalence of courtship violence, characteristics of victims, characteristics of violent relationships, the relationship between violence in the family of origin and violence in dating relationships, social support
for victims, and the effects of violence on a women’s emotional well-being.
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Prevalence of Courtship Violence

Estimates of the prevalence of courtship violence typically have been derived from survey data, as the incidence of courtship violence is severely underreported to professionals. In the original Makepeace (1981) study, only 5.1% of individuals who experienced courtship violence notified police or legal authorities. In a survey of upper level college undergraduates, Stets and Pirog-Good (1989b) found that only 6.3% of women who had experienced a violent episode from a dating partner reported the incident to a counselor, physician, or criminal justice authority. Marshall and Rose (1988) reported that only 15% of their sample of victims had been publicly identified in some way. It is clear, therefore, that direct survey data provide the most reliable available estimates of courtship violence.

Differences among the estimates from survey data result partly from different definitions of violence. Marshall and Rose (1988), for example, included threats of violent actions, as well as actual violent acts in their questionnaire. Of the undergraduates responding to their questionnaire, approximately 64% reported that they had experienced at least one of the threats or actual acts of violence at some point in an adult relationship.

The majority of researchers have included only actual
violent acts in their surveys. The violent acts generally are assessed with a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), where violence is defined as throwing something at the partner, pushing, grabbing, slapping, kicking, biting, punching, hitting with an object, threatening with a knife or gun, and/or using a knife or gun. Using this method with two different samples, Makepeace (1981, 1986) found that 21% of women reported experiencing at least one episode of courtship violence. While a handful of studies have identified somewhat larger percentages of victims (38% by Aries et al., 1987; 38% by Billingham & Sack, 1986; 47.8% by Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984), these results appear to be due to sample idiosyncracies. The majority of research suggests that between 20% and 30% of women are the victims of courtship violence at least once in their lifetimes (e.g., Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Follingstad, Rutledge, Polek, & McNeill-Hawkins, 1988; Gryl, Stith, & Bird, 1991; Makepeace, 1986; Matthews, 1984; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989a; Thompson, 1991; Worth et al., 1990).

Even though researchers rely primarily on the survey method to estimate the prevalence of courtship violence, the generalizability of those results are limited. In all of the above mentioned studies, prevalence rates were derived from college samples. These samples are obviously limited in terms of the age, intelligence, and socioeconomic status of the
participants. No study identified the prevalence rate of courtship violence in the general population; therefore, it is impossible to know whether the estimated rates are representative of the dating population as a whole.

Correlates and Predictors of Courtship Violence

Potentially important correlates and predictors of courtship violence include individual characteristics, relationship characteristics, and early childhood experiences. Individual Characteristics

Surprisingly, relatively few studies have examined the emotional well-being of victims of courtship violence. One study investigated self-esteem and found that the occurrence of courtship violence is correlated with a lower sense of self-esteem (Deal & Wampler, 1986). Alternatively, other research has indicated no difference in self-esteem between women who have and have not experienced courtship violence (Follingstad et al., 1988).

The psychological damage of spouse abuse is well documented. Anecdotally, battered women report that low self-esteem is one of the major consequences of being battered (VanVoorhis, 1993). In addition, Wilson VanVoorhis found extremely high levels of depression among women residing in battered women's shelters. Carlson (1977) noted that the "... one trait that seemed to characterize all victims was their devastatingly low self-concept" (pp. 457-458). Mitchell &
Hodson (1983) found that the number of times battered and the level of violence was positively correlated with depression and negatively correlated with a sense of mastery and self-esteem. Similarly, other research has indicated that higher levels of violence are correlated with psychological distress (Gelles & Harrop, 1989).

Another individual characteristic which has been studied is the correlation between sex-role stereotypes and courtship violence. Currently, the data are inconclusive. Scores on the Attitude Toward Feminism Scale (Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975) failed to distinguish among women who experienced no episodes, one episode, or ongoing episodes of courtship violence (Follingstad et al., 1988). Likewise, Sigelman et al. (1984) failed to find a significant correlation between scores on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1972) and being a victim of courtship violence. Finally, Thompson (1991) measured masculinity and femininity for three groups: non-victims, victims of minor aggression, and victims of severe aggression. No differences among the groups were found.

Other research has indicated a relationship between sex-role attitudes and courtship violence. Worth et al. (1990) were able to differentiate between victims and non-victims on the basis of Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974) scores.

Additionally, Flynn (1990) suggested that a woman's sex-
role attitude is related to her response toward relationship violence. Specifically, the more modern a woman’s sex role attitudes, the less time she stayed in a violent relationship. This correlation is true only for women who experienced one episode of violence. If the woman experienced ongoing abuse, sex-role attitude had no effect on her response toward the violence.

Yet another individual characteristic researchers have examined is the emotionality of the victims and perpetrators. Stets and Pirog-Good (1987) found that being instrumentally and emotionally expressive were predictive of receiving violence. Specifically, being instrumentally expressive (e.g., being independent or self-confidant) decreases the likelihood of violence, whereas being emotionally expressive (e.g., exhibiting strong emotions or devoting oneself completely to another) increases the likelihood of violence. Gryl et al. (1991) found that when women used coercive strategies (e.g., name-calling and the use of threats or ultimatums) to try to change a partner’s behavior, the tendency toward violence rose. Finally, jealousy is an often cited precursor of courtship violence (e.g., Carlson, 1987; DeKeserdy, 1988; Matthews, 1984). Unfortunately, other than the Stets and Pirog-Good study, most studies have gained this information through anecdotal means. Few studies have used empirically sound measures of emotionality.
Overall, little conclusive evidence exists concerning the relationships between individual characteristics and courtship violence. First, while studies regarding spousal abuse have documented the negative effects of abuse on emotional well-being, few studies of courtship violence have examined the emotional well-being of victims. Second, several studies have investigated the relationship between sex-role stereotypes and courtship violence, however, the results are inconclusive. Third, while several researchers have cited possible relationships between the emotionality of the victim and courtship violence, most of the evidence is anecdotal. Research using empirically developed instruments is needed.

**Relationship Characteristics**

In general, courtship violence is significantly related to the level of seriousness of the dating relationship. Thompson (1991) asked participants to subjectively assess which of six stages best characterized the relationship: casual dating with little emotional attachment, dating often but not emotionally attached, serious dating with some emotional attachment, someone with whom you are in love, living together, and engaged. Participants who reported the higher levels of seriousness also reported experiencing more violence.

Stets & Pirog-Good (1987) measured the seriousness of the relationship along several dimensions: frequency of dating,
number of months one has been dating, the number of partners one is dating, and the degree to which one is involved in a serous relationship yet still has other partners. The frequency of dates and the number of partners were significantly related to receiving violence. Adding one date per month (with the same partner) increased the probability of violence by one percent, while adding one partner decreased the probability of violence by 41%.

Aries et al. (1987) also measured the length of the dating relationship, as well as liking for the partner, positive affect for the partner, feelings of romantic love, commitment to the relationship and, feelings of inferiority. For women, receiving violence was significantly related to the length of the dating relationship, liking for the partner, and positive affect for the partner.

In two studies, seriousness of relationship was assessed by asking participants to label their relationship as casual, dating, or steady or more serious (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Sigelman et al., 1984). Results of both indicated that 74% of the relationships which were violent were beyond the casual stage. Finally, Lo and Sporakowski (1989) found that as the relationship became more serious, women were less likely to leave regardless of the level of violence.

In general, research has demonstrated a relationship between the seriousness of a dating relationship and the
incidence of courtship violence. Violence is most likely to occur in dating relationships in which the partners have frequent contact, are monogamous, are long-term, and are defined by the participants as serious. In addition, as relationships become more serious, women are more likely to accept the violence.

**Early Childhood Experiences**

Researchers have investigated the relationship between observing and/or receiving violence in the family of origin and involvement in courtship violence. Several studies indicate that between 50% and 60% of women involved in courtship violence had either witnessed violence between their parents or had been abused by a parent (O'Keefe et al., 1986; Roscoe & Callahan, 1985; Worth et al., 1990). In contrast, only 23% of women not involved in a violent dating relationship had witnessed or experienced violence in their family of origin (Riggs & O'Leary, 1989). Unfortunately, in the studies of courtship violence, data were included for both perpetrators and victims of courtship violence. Therefore, it is impossible to determine the effect of viewing violence or being abused in the family of origin on becoming a victim of courtship violence.

Results of studies analyzing the effect of violence in the family of origin only on women victims of courtship violence have been mixed. Stets and Pirog-Good (1987) asked
participants to think of the worst year of their childhood and indicate the frequency their parents used violent tactics toward each other or the respondent. Results failed to support a relationship between witnessing or experiencing abuse as a child and being a victim of courtship violence.

Alternatively, other research has found a significant relationship between violence in the family of origin and being a victim of courtship violence. Sigelman et al., (1984) found that witnessing parental abuse or experiencing child abuse predicted victim status in a violent dating relationship. The authors, however, did not indicate the method used in determining violence in the family of origin.

Marshall and Rose (1988) asked participants to indicate the frequency of violence between their parents and the frequency which they were abused as children on the Conflicts Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979). Experiencing violence in a dating relationship was significantly correlated with abuse as a child, as well as with witnessing abuse between parents. In another study, participants rated the frequency of violence in their family of origin using the Conflict Tactics Scale (Marshall & Rose, 1990). Again, respondents rated both the violent acts between parents and child abuse. When entered into a regression equation, having been abused as a child significantly added to the power of predicting being abused in a dating relationship.
Several studies have examined the relationship between experiencing or witnessing violence in the family of origin and the incidence of violence in a courtship relationship. Unfortunately, however, much of this research has combined perpetrators and victims of courtship violence in the same analyses. As a result, determining what relationship exists between violence in the family of origin and experiencing violence in a courtship relationship is impossible from these data. A few studies have separated data for victims and perpetrators. These data have been mixed; most have indicated a relationship between courtship violence and violence in the family of origin, but some have failed to support that relationship. Overall, the relationship between violence in the family of origin and being a victim of courtship violence requires further study.

Social Support of Courtship Violence

As previously noted, research indicates that no more than 15% of victims of courtship violence ever report that violence to a professional (Makepeace, 1981; Marshall & Rose, 1988; Stets & Pirog-Good 1989b). While few empirical studies have investigated social support, it appears that victims do talk to non-professionals about the violence. Women victims of courtship violence tend to use social support as a coping mechanism (Gryl et al., 1991). Generally, women talk to friends and parents about the violence. Stets and Pirog-Good
(1989a) found that of women who perceived that they had experienced at least one episode of violence, 96% told a friend and 39% told a parent about the violence.

These results parallel non-professional contacts made by victims of spousal abuse. In a study of spousal battering, Wilson VanVoorhis (1993) asked women about the people outside the violent relationship that they contacted. One question asked the women to think of the one person to whom they were closest and with whom they discussed the abuse. The most common contact of this type was female friend, with 38% of participants endorsing the item. Mother, sister, and other female relative all ranked as second most common, with rates of 13%. Another question asked the women who, outside the battering relationship, they first talked to about the abuse. Again, 38% of respondents indicated they contacted a female friend, making a female friend the most popular first contact. Mother ranked second at 15%, followed closely by sister at 13%. (VanVoorhis, 1993)

The lack of research concerning social support of victims of dating violence is surprising given the potential ramifications of such support. In a study of spousal abuse, Mitchell and Hodson (1983) suggested that the social support a battered woman receives is related to the woman’s mental health. Social Support was measured along five dimensions: empathic responses of friends, avoidance responses of friends,
contact with friends and family (unaccompanied by partner), contact with friends and family (accompanied by partner), and number of supporters. In addition coping responses were divided into three categories. **Active behavioral coping** reflects an individual's "overt behavioral attempts to deal directly with the problem and its effects" (p. 639). **Active cognitive coping** reflects "attempts to manage one's appraisal of the stressfulness of the event" (p. 639). Finally, **Avoidance coping** reflects an individual's attempts to avoid the situation. Psychological health was measured along the dimensions of self-esteem, mastery, and depression.

Mitchell and Hodson's (1983) results indicated that responses from friends were correlated with the battered woman's psychological health and the coping style she used. Empathic responses from friends were correlated positively with a woman's self-esteem, while avoidance responses were correlated positively with depression, a lower sense of mastery, and lower self-esteem. Empathic responses tended to be positively correlated with both active styles of coping; however, the results were not significant. Avoidance responses from friends were correlated negatively with the active coping styles.

In addition, the coping responses the battered woman used were correlated with her psychological health. Both active coping styles were correlated negatively with depression and
positively with a higher sense of mastery and higher self-esteem, while the avoidance coping style showed the opposite pattern.

In other words, social support affected women's psychological well-being both directly and indirectly. Women who received higher levels of social support felt better about themselves and used more active coping strategies that further increased self-esteem. (Mitchell & Hodson, 1983)

Another study of spousal abuse emphasized non-professionals’ definitions of battering (Ferraro & Johnson, 1977). If non-professionals defined the situation as unimportant or private, the battered woman did the same. If, on the other hand, non-professionals defined the situation as serious and deserving immediate attention, the woman was more likely to seek further outside resources. One final study asked women residing in women’s shelters about the actual responses they received from non-professionals (VanVoorhis, 1993). Support received from non-professionals was negatively correlated with depression.

While these results indicate that social support is important to and used by victims, several gaps exist in the literature about social support. First, there is no indication about what type of social support would be most helpful. Cutrona, Cohen, and Ingram (1990) suggest that several contextual determinants influence the degree to which
helping behaviors are perceived as supportive. One of these determinants is the extent that the kind of support received matches the kind of support hoped for.

Wilson VanVoorhis (1993) asked women residing in women's shelters about the type of support they would have liked to have received, as well as, the type of support they actually received from non-professionals. Receiving the type of support hoped for had no effect on the women's psychological well-being. Overall, there was no difference in support received and support hoped for therefore, it is difficult to assess the potential effects of receiving support which is quite different from what was hoped for. Further research is required to answer this question.

A second gap in the literature pertains to the actual responses non-professionals are making toward victims of courtship violence. Recently, two studies investigated the specific responses that college students would most likely give a women who had experienced a violent episode from a partner (Epperson, Wilson, Estes, & Lovell, 1992; Paisley, 1987). Students read one of 27 scenarios depicting a violent situation between a man and woman that varied along three dimensions: seriousness of the relationship, severity of abuse, and frequency of abuse. Participants then filled out a participant response questionnaire, on which they rated how likely they would be to give a range of responses. A
principal axis factor analysis indicated three groups of responses: supportiveness and willingness to become involved, suggestions for decisive action, and recommendations to work on the relationship.

Overall, participants were likely to label all incidents as battering and be supportive of the woman (Epperson et al., 1992; Paisley, 1987). One disturbing pattern that emerged in both studies was that participants were slightly less likely to be supportive of the victim at the highest levels of severity and frequency. Given that the highest frequency was 6 episodes of violence in the Paisley study, and 4 episodes in the Epperson et al. study, one must wonder what happens to non-professional responses towards women who are abused more often. Another finding of some concern was that participants were most likely to suggest decisive action in casual relationships with the lowest frequency and severity of abuse. Typically, dating relationships in which there is violence are beyond the casual dating stage (e.g., Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Sigelman et al., 1984).

One other recent study examined the types of responses battered women reported receiving (VanVoorhis, 1993). Women residing in women’s shelters responded to a modified version of the participant response questionnaire used in the Epperson et al. (1992) and Paisley (1987) studies indicating the types of responses actually received from non-professionals.
Overall, women reported receiving responses which were emotionally and instrumentally supportive. They did not receive responses directing them to work on the relationship.

The generalizability of these studies to victims of courtship violence is limited. First, the Epperson et al. (1992) and Paisley (1987) studies asked about potential responses to written scenarios. Questions remain whether participants would actually respond in the ways they reported they would respond. Second, the Wilson VanVoorhis (1993) study surveyed women residing in women’s shelters. Many of these women were married at the time of the abuse. In addition, women who have sought shelter from abuse may be quite different than other women who experience violence at the hands of a partner.

Current Study

The current study was designed to partially fill the above mentioned gaps in the literature. Six specific research questions were addressed: (1) How do non-professionals respond to victims of courtship violence? (2) How do these responses compare to those a victim hoped to receive? (3) Is type of support received related to a victim’s emotional well-being? (4) Is receiving the type of support hoped for related to a victim’s emotional well-being? (5) Are background and personality variables related to the incidence of courtship violence? (6) Is the type of support received from non-
professionals related to the professional resources a victim utilizes?

The first question addressed the types of responses non-professionals made toward victims of courtship violence. The modified version of the participant response questionnaire used in the Wilson VanVoorhis (1993) study was used. Based on previous data (VanVoorhis), it was hypothesized that victims of dating violence would report receiving responses which showed a supportiveness and willingness to become involved and responses indicating some decisive action and would not report being told to work on the relationship. The second question asked how the responses received from non-professionals compared with those the victim hoped for. Again, it was hypothesized that women would report hoping for supportiveness and willingness to become involved responses, and responses indicating decisive action, but not responses telling the women to work on the relationship.

The third question assessed whether the type of support received was related to psychological well-being. Previous results indicated receiving emotionally and instrumentally supportive responses were negatively correlated with level of distress, while being told to work on the relationship was positively correlated with distress (VanVoorhis, 1993). It was hypothesized that those results would replicate in the current study.
The fourth question examined the relationship between receiving the type of support hoped for and level of distress. Cutrona et al. (1990) suggested that receiving the type of support hoped for was perceived as more helpful than receiving support different than that which was hoped for. In a study of spousal abuse, however, the match between support received and support hoped for was not related to level of distress. These results could have been tempered by a limited variability between type of support received and hoped for in that particular sample of women. Therefore, it was hypothesized that receiving the type of support hoped for would be related to level of distress.

The fifth question investigated the relationship between background and personality variables and the incidence of courtship violence. As previously discussed, research to this point, has failed to clarify the relationship of such variables as sex-role attitudes, emotionality, and experiencing violence as a child, with the incidence of courtship violence (e.g., Archer & Ray, 1989; Folliete & Alexander, 1992; Marshall & Rose, 1988; Roscoe & Callahan, 1985; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984; Smith & Williams, 1992; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987; Thompson, 1991; Worth et al., 1990). Consequently, no hypothesis was advanced regarding these relationships.

The sixth question explored the relationship of social
support with the professional resources a victim utilized. Mitchell and Hodson (1983) found that social support was related to coping styles used by battered women. Specifically, those women who received empathic responses from friends and family members were more likely to use active methods of coping, such as contacting professionals, rather than passive or avoidant methods of coping. Therefore, it was hypothesized that increased levels of support would lead to more professional resources contacted.
METHOD

Participants

Participants were recruited through a mass survey of undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course. Of the 963 women who participated in mass testing, 254 (26.4%) reported experiencing at least one episode of physical violence from a dating partner. One hundred and thirteen (44.5%) of the 254 eligible women agreed to, and participated in the current study. The remainder either could not be reached by phone, declined to participate, or agreed to participate, but failed to attend. While any woman assaulted by a romantic partner was able to participate, only data from women assaulted in the context of a heterosexual dating relationship was analyzed. The sample was limited to American-born women since other cultures may have different values about gender roles and appropriate responses to courtship violence that the instruments were not designed to measure. Participants who were enrolled in an eligible course were given extra credit toward a course grade for their participation. Other participants were entered in a lottery for one of three chances of winning $50.00.

Courtship violence can include verbal abuse; however, for the purposes of this study, participants must have experienced physical abuse from a partner. Physical abuse was defined as throwing something at the partner, pushing, grabbing,
slapping, kicking, biting, punching, hitting with an object, threatening with a knife or gun, and/or using a knife or gun.

Instruments

Eight questionnaires were used in the current study:
Participant Response Questionnaire, Social Provisions Scale (Cutrona & Russell, 1987), Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), Social Issues Inventory (Enns, 1987), Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977), and State-Trait Personality Inventory (Spielberger, 1979).

Coefficient alphas were computed for each scale based on data from participants completing all items of the scale. The number of participants completing all items of the specific scales ranged from 98 to 111. In addition, women answered several questions concerning demographic information.

Participant Response Questionnaire

The Participant Response Questionnaire (see Appendix H) consists of three subtests, based on the Participant Response Questionnaire used with a sample of battered women (VanVoorhis, 1993).

The first subtest is the General Actual Response subtest. Items on the General Actual Response subtest asked women about the actual responses received from non-professionals overall. Respondents reported their degree of agreement with each of the 16 potential non-professional responses listed on the
General Actual Response subtest, using a 5-point likert-type scale anchored by totally disagree (1) and totally agree (5). The final question on the General Actual Response subtest was an open-ended inquiry about other responses the women encountered from non-professionals. The coefficient alpha was .66.

The second subtest is the Specific Actual Response subtest. The first item on the Specific Actual Response subtest was a multiple choice item asking the woman to identify the person to whom she felt closest and with whom she discussed the violence. The response options included mother, father, sister, brother, other female relative, other male relative, female friend, male friend, female coworker, and male coworker. This item focused the woman's responses on the Specific Actual Response subtest on one particular relationship. The remaining 16 items were the same as those items on the General Actual Response subtest but they were responded to in reference to the specific person identified in the first item. The coefficient alpha was .68.

The third subtest is the Preferred Response subtest. Unfortunately, two items which were added to the two Actual Response subtests to increase the reliability on one factor, were inadvertently not added to the Preferred Response subtest. Therefore, the Preferred Response subtest contained 14 potential responses of non-professionals. The items of
this subtest asked women to indicate the types of responses they would have liked to have received. Responses to these items used the same 5-point scale as the General and Specific Actual Response subtests. Similarly, the final item of the Preferred Response subtest asked respondents to list other responses from non-professionals they wished they had received. The coefficient alpha was .76.

As previously stated, Epperson et al. (1992) used a modified version of the Participant Response Questionnaire. A factor analysis of these data, using an orthogonal rotation, yielded a three-factor solution. The three factors were labeled based on the content of the items which comprised each factor. The supportiveness and willingness to become involved factor included such items as: 1) I was given the opportunity to talk about my feelings, 2) The person indicated that she or he wanted to talk to me again, and 3) The person seemed to want to help me figure out what I could do that would be best for me. The suggestions for decisive action factor included such items as: 1) I was told to call the police to report the incident, 2) The person told me to stay at their house or at another person’s house for safety, and 3) The person offered to call the police for me. Finally, the recommendations to work on the relationship factor consisted of the following: 1) The person focused on the positive aspects of my relationship with my partner and 2) I was told to see a
professional to work on the relationship with my partner. Coefficient alphas for the resulting factor scores, using unit scoring for items loading .45 or higher on a factor, were .80, .89, and .64 respectively.

VanVoorhis (1993) used a short form of the Participant Response Questionnaire with a sample of battered women residing in women's shelters throughout Iowa. Coefficient alphas were computed for the three factors found in the Epperson et al. (1992) study for both the Actual Response and the Preferred Response subtests. The coefficient alpha for the total Actual Response subtest was .83. Coefficient alphas for the three subscales were calculated to be: supportiveness and willingness to become involved (Actual Supportiveness) = .80, with 5 items; suggestions for decisive action (Actual Decisive Action) = .84, with 7 items; recommendations to work on the relationship (Actual Work on Relationship) = .50, with 2 items. The coefficient alpha for the total Preferred Response subtest was .82. Coefficient alphas for the three subscales were calculated to be: supportiveness and willingness to become involved (Preferred Supportiveness) = .60, with 5 items; suggestions for decisive action (Preferred Decisive Action) = .88, with 7 items; recommendations to work on the relationship (Preferred Work on Relationship) = .41, with 2 items.

Coefficient alphas for the three subscales of the General
Actual Response subtest based on data from the current study were: supportiveness and willingness to become involved (General Actual Supportiveness) = .69, with 5 items; suggestions for decisive action (General Actual Decisive Action) = .84, with 7 items; recommendations to work on the relationship (General Actual Work on Relationship) = .55, with 4 items.

Coefficient alphas for the three subscales of the Specific Actual Response subtest based on data from the current study were: supportiveness and willingness to become involved (Specific Actual Supportiveness) = .65, with 5 items; suggestions for decisive action (Specific Actual Decisive Action) = .84, with 7 items; recommendations to work on the relationship (Specific Actual Work on Relationship) = .44, with 4 items.

Coefficient alphas for the three subscales of the Preferred Response subtest based on data from the current study were: supportiveness and willingness to become involved (Preferred Supportiveness) = .79, with 5 items; suggestions for decisive action (Preferred Decisive Action) = .87, with 7 items; recommendations to work on the relationship (Preferred Work on Relationship) = .32, with 2 items.

Social Provisions Scale (SPS)

The Social Provisions Scale (Cutrona & Russell, 1987) (see Appendix F) is a 24-item measure of general social
support in a person's life. Participants responded to each item using the following 4 point scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, and 4 = Strongly Agree. Reliability for the Social Provisions Scale ranges from .87 to .91 across a range of samples (Cutrona, 1990). The coefficient alpha based on data from the current study was .91.

Scores on the Social Provisions Scale have been found to be predictive of loneliness among new college students. In addition, scores on the Social Provisions Scale correlate more highly with other measures of social support (such as Satisfaction with Support and Attitudes Toward Support), than measures of conceptually distinct constructs (for example, Social Desirability and Depression). (Cutrona, 1982)

**Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale**

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) (see Appendix B) is a 10-item measure of self-esteem. Participants responded to each item on a 4 point likert-type scale anchored at strongly agree (1) and strongly disagree (4). The scale was originally standardized with a sample of 5000 advanced high school students from 10 random New York schools. A test-retest correlation was found to be .85 and a reproducability coefficient of .92 was determined (Rosenberg). Since then, a wide variety of samples have yielded similar results (Robinson & Shaver, 1973 in Pollingstad et al., 1988). Coefficient
alpha based on data from the current study was .73.

Validity for the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was established by comparing scores on the Self-Esteem Scale with scores on a measure of depression, a measure of psychosomatic symptoms, and a measure of peer group reputation. As expected, those persons with higher levels of depression reported lower self-esteem. Also as expected, those persons with lower self-esteem scores experienced a greater number of psychosomatic symptoms. Finally, people with higher self-esteem scores were more likely to be identified by their peers as active class participants and possible leaders. (Rosenberg, 1965)

**Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)**

The Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) is an 18-item scale designed to measure conflict in relationships. For the purpose of the current study, only the last eight items, measuring physical violence, were used (see Appendix G). Participants responded to the eight items two times: once to report the frequency of violence in their family of origin, (coefficient alpha = .72) and once to report the frequency violence in their dating relationships (coefficient alpha = .75). Scoring methods used with the CTS have been quite varied. In some research, items are dichotomously scored as either "yes" the violence occurred or "no" the violence did not occur (e.g., Gryl et al., 1991; Stets & Pirog-Good,
1989a). In other research, items are scored on a likert-type scale estimating the frequency of the violent acts (e.g., Archer & Ray, 1989; Billingham & Gilbert, 1990; Marshall & Rose, 1990). The current study used a likert-type scale estimating the frequency of each violent act. Each item was responded to on the following scale: 1 = never, 2 = 1 time, 3 = 2 to 5 times, 4 = 6 to 10 times, 5 = more than 10 times.

The CTS has been widely used to assess dating violence (e.g., Archer & Ray, 1989; Aries et al., 1987; Billingham & Gilbert, 1990; Billingham & Sacks, 1986; Gryl et al., 1991; Makepeace, 1983; Sigelman et al., 1984; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989a). Straus (1979) originally found a coefficient alpha of .88 for the violence portion of the CTS in couples. Gryl et al. calculated a coefficient alpha of .90 for a sample of first-year college students in dating relationships.

Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D)

The Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (Radloff, 1977) (see Appendix C) is a 20-item instrument designed to measure depressive symptoms in the general population. Participants were instructed to focus on their feelings during the last week. Each item was responded to on the following 4 point scale: 1 = rarely or none of the time, 2 = some of the time, 3 = much of the time, and 4 = most of the time. Coefficient alpha based on the current data was .92.
The reliability and validity of the CES-D originally was assessed though administration to 2,514 people living in either Kansas City, Missouri, or Washington County, Maryland. The coefficient alpha was .85 for the complete scale. In addition, negative life events over the previous year were correlated with higher levels of depression as indicated by the CES-D.

VanVoorhis (1993) administered the CES-D to a sample of battered women residing in women’s shelters. The coefficient alpha based on data from those participants was .92.

**State-Trait Personality Inventory**

The State-Trait Personality Inventory (see Appendix D) is a 60-item measure of state and trait anxiety, anger, and curiosity (Spielberger, 1979). Thirty items, consisting of potential current feelings, assess state anxiety, anger, and curiosity. Respondents were instructed to think about how they feel right now and responded to each item using the following 4 point scale: 1 = not at all, 2 = somewhat, 3 = moderately, and 4 = very much.

An additional 30 items, consisting of statements of global feelings and beliefs, measure trait anxiety, anger, and curiosity. Respondents were instructed to think about how they feel in general and responded to each item using the following 4 point scale: 1 = almost never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, and 4 = almost always. The scales of interest for the
current study are trait anxiety and anger; however, data were collected on the other scales for psychometric purposes. Coefficient alphas based on data from the current study for the trait anxiety and trait anger scales were .83 and .85, respectively.

Based on a sample of female college students, alpha coefficients for the Trait Anxiety Scale was found to be .85. Using the same sample, alpha coefficients for the Trait Anger Scale was found to be .82 (Spielberger, 1979).

Correlations between the Trait Anxiety and Trait Anger subscales of the State-Trait Personality Inventory and their respective parent inventories, the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory and the State-Trait Anger Inventory, have been quite high (Spielberger, 1979). The correlation of the Trait Anxiety subscale of the State-Trait Personality Inventory and the Trait Anxiety subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory was .95. Similarly, the Trait Anger subscale from the State-Trait Personality Inventory correlated with the Trait Anger subscale of the State-Trait Anger Inventory at .97.

The psychometrics of both the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory and the State-Trait Anger Inventory have been researched extensively. The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory Trait-Anxiety Scale achieves correlations ranging from .73 to .85 with the Manifest Anxiety Scale and the Anxiety Scale
Questionnaire (Spielberger & Sydman, 1994). College students' scores on The State-Trait Anxiety Inventory State-Anxiety Scale are significantly higher under exam conditions than under normal class conditions (Spielberger & Sydman, 1994). In addition, the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory successfully discriminates between normal individuals and psychiatric patients for whom anxiety is a major symptom (Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, & Crane, 1983).

The State-Trait Anger Inventory correlates most highly with the Buss-Durkee Hostility Inventory, with a range of .66 to .71 for college students (Spielberger, Jacobs, Russell, & Crane 1983). Crane (1981) found higher State-Trait Anger Inventory scores among a group of hypertensive patients than controls, and the hypertensive patients became angrier than controls when confronted with a mildly frustrating task.

**Social Issues Inventory**

The Social Issues Inventory (Enns, 1987) measures attitudes toward feminism (see Appendix E). The scale consists of 32 items: 10 items measuring attitudes towards feminism and 22 masking items. Participants responded to each item on a 5-point likert-type scale anchored at strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (5). Coefficient alpha based on data from the current study was .84. Test-retest data gathered over a two week interval with 50 female college students resulted in a correlation coefficient of .81.
Convergent validity was established through correlating scores from the Social Issues Inventory with scores from several other measures of feminism. The Social Issues Inventory achieved a correlation of .68 with subjective identification with feminism. The correlation between the Social Issues Inventory and the Attitudes Toward Women Scale was somewhat lower at .36. Enns (1987) suggests this result is expected since the Attitudes Toward Women Scale measures attitudes regarding the appropriateness of specific social roles and behaviors, rather than agreement with feminism.

**Resources Scale**

The Resources Scale (see Appendix I) is a list of 10 professional resources women may have contacted about courtship violence. On each item, participants responded "yes" if they had contacted that particular professional or "no" if they had not made that contact. The following professionals were included: attorney, counselor/psychologist, religious advisor, psychiatrist, community mental health center, police, physician, women’s shelter, student counseling center, and hospital.

**General Information Questions**

Participants also responded to general information questions in the following areas (see Appendix J): age, citizenship, race, education, the length of the most recent violent relationship, the seriousness of the most recent
violent relationship, the length of the violence in the most recent relationship, the gender of the perpetrator, the first person contacted about the violence, all the people ever contacted about the violence, the number of violent episodes experienced prior to making contact with someone outside the violent relationship, the total number of partners who had been violent towards the woman, the total number of times the woman had experienced violence from a dating partner during her lifetime, the length of time since the last violent episode, and the length of time since the women had been involved in a violent relationship.

The entire survey consisted of 231 items. Participants responded to 220 items on electronically scanned answer sheets. The remaining 11 questions were written on the questionnaires and hand coded. The instruments were ordered according to level of specificity. The specific questionnaires followed the more general measures to prevent thoughts concerning a specific event from contaminating the general responses. The order was as follows: Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale, State-Trait Personality Inventory, Attitude Towards Feminism Scale, Social Provisions Scale, Conflict Tactics Scale, Participant Response Questionnaire (General, Specific, and Preferred), Resources Scale, and General Information Questions.
Procedure

As part of the mass testing survey, students were asked if they had ever experienced any of the following acts from a dating partner: having something thrown at them, pushing, grabbing, slapping, kicking, biting, punching, hitting with an object, and/or threatening with a knife or gun.

Female students who responded positively to any of the violence items were contacted by phone. The student was asked if she would be willing to fill out additional questionnaires about past dating relationships in return for extra credit or a monetary reward. Students who were willing were scheduled individually for testing.

An undergraduate research assistant administered the questionnaires, explaining that the survey concerned past dating relationships the women may have had. In addition, a letter to participants (see Appendix A) was attached to each questionnaire briefly explaining the nature of the study. Participants were notified that their completion of the questionnaires indicated their informed consent. Participants were asked to record their answers on the provided answer sheets. No identifying data was collected.

When each participant completed the questionnaire, she was given a debriefing announcement (see Appendix K) explaining the study in more detail. The debriefing announcement also listed several agencies the woman could
contact for more information about dating violence or to talk with someone about any violence she may be experiencing. The current study was approved by the Department of Psychology Human Participants in Research Committee and the Iowa State University Human Subjects Committee.
RESULTS

Demographics

Participants

Eighty-eight percent of the women in the study were white, four percent were African-American, three percent were Hispanic, one percent was Asian, and three percent of the women did not endorse a specific ethnicity. All women were United States citizens. Participants ranged in age from 17 to 24 years, with a mean of 18.84 years (sd=1.06). All but one of the participants indicated the violence they had experienced was from a male partner.

Relationship

The women were asked to describe the seriousness of their relationship with their most recent violent partner. Participants chose one of five options: 1) casually dating, 33%; 2) seriously dating, 60%; 3) engaged, 5%; 4) living together, 3%; 5) married, 1%. The woman who indicated she was married to her perpetrator and the woman who indicated her perpetrator was female were dropped from further analyses, leaving 111 participants.

The length of the relationship ranged from one month to seven years ten months, with 73% of the relationships being less than or equal to two years in length. The mean relationship length was 19.90 months (sd=24.47, median=13.00, mode=3.00). The length of the violence in the relationship
ranged from 1 to 80 months, with a mean of 5.56 months (sd=7.67). Although 23% of the women indicated that they continued to have a dating relationship with the perpetrator, only 1 woman indicated she continued to experience violence in this relationship.

The Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating was used to assess the types and frequencies of violent episodes women experienced (see Table 15 for summary statistics). The mean score was 11.98 (sd=3.31). The most common types of violence women experienced included having something thrown at them or being pushed, grabbed, shoved, or slapped (see Table 1). Women also responded to an item asking how many total violent episodes they experienced in their dating relationships. Fifty-one percent of women indicated experiencing 1 or 2 episodes of violence, 41% experienced 3 to 10 episodes, and 9% experienced more than 10 episodes. Finally, women reported a range from 1 to 9 total violent partners, with 78% of women indicating 1 violent partner, 14% indicating 2 violent partners, and the remaining 8% being fairly evenly distributed along the rest of the continuum.

Non-professional Contacts

Participants answered three questions about the non-professionals outside the violent relationship that they contacted. The first question asked the women to think of the one person to whom they were closest and with whom they
Table 1. Percentages and frequencies of women who reported experiencing each type of violence delineated by the Conflict Tactics Scale at least once

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>threw something at me.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pushed grabbed or shoved me.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slapped me.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kicked me, bit me, or hit me with a fist.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hit me or tried to hit me with something.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beat me up.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threatened me with a knife or gun.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically injured me with a knife or gun.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

discussed the violence. The most common contact of this type was female friend, with a rate of 65%. Mother ranked as second most common, with a rate of 14%. Sister and male friend ranked third, with rates of 8%. Percentages and frequencies for this question are listed in Table 2.

The second question asked the women who, outside the dating relationship, they first talked to about the violence. Again, female friend ranked most common, with a rate of 64%. Mother and male friend ranked second and third with rates of 15% and 8% respectively. Percentages and frequencies for this question are listed in Table 3.

The final question regarding non-professional contacts outside the dating relationship asked the women to identify
Table 2. Percentages and frequencies of the one person to whom the women felt closest and with whom they discussed the violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Female Relative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Male Relative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Friend</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Friend</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Coworker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Coworker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Percentages and frequencies of the one person with whom women first discussed the violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sister</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brother</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Female Relative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Male Relative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Friend</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Friend</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Coworker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Coworker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

all the people they talked to about the violence. These results are summarized in Table 4. Again, the people most frequently contacted were female friend, male friend and mother. Overall, women talked about the violence with two to three non-professionals outside the dating relationship (mean=2.80, sd=1.75).

Women were also asked how many violent episodes occurred before they talked about the violence with a non-professional outside the relationship. Sixty percent of the women talked about the violence after the first episode; another 24% talked about the violence after the second or third episode. The remaining women were fairly evenly distributed along the
rest of the continuum (see Table 5). Interestingly, the number of violent episodes before first disclosure correlated significantly with total number of violent episodes experienced ($r=.73, \ p=.000$). The mean number of violent episodes experienced by women who disclosed the violence after the first episode was 2.34 ($sd=2.75$), while the mean number of violent episodes experienced by women who waited until the second episode or later to disclose the violence was 10.61 ($sd=10.60$). A student $t$-test comparing the two groups indicted that those women who waited until the second episode or later to disclose the violence experienced significantly more episodes of violence ($t=26.54, \ p.000$).
Table 5. Number of violent episodes before first contact outside the dating relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Episodes</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Frequency is reported in number of women.

*b Percent is reported in percent of women.
Professional Contacts

Women were also asked about professionals they may have contacted about the violence. Women responded "yes" or "no" to whether they had contacted any of the following professionals about the violence: attorney, counselor/psychologist, religious advisor, psychiatrist, community mental health center, police, physician, women's shelter, student counseling service, or residence hall advisor. Twenty percent of women contacted a professional. A counselor/psychologist was the most common person contacted, with a rate of 15%, followed by police, at 8%, and Student Counseling Service, at 7% (see Table 6).

Research Questions

How do non-professionals respond to victims of courtship violence?

Support received specific to the courtship violence was assessed with the Specific and General Actual Response subtests. The Specific Actual Response subtest asked women to indicate how the person to whom they were closest, and with whom they had discussed the violence, had responded. The General Actual Response subtest asked women to indicate how people in general responded to the violence (see Table 7 for items of each subscale of the Specific and General Actual Response Subtests).

The Specific and General Actual Response subtest totals
Table 6. Frequencies and percentages of women utilizing a professional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor/Psychologist</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Counseling Service</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Advisor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatrist</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Assistant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Shelter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mental Health Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Professional Utilized</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Frequency is reported in number of women.

*b Percent is reported in percent of women.
Table 7. Items of Each Subscale of the Specific and General Actual Response Subtests of the Participant Response Questionnaire

Supportiveness and Willingness to Become Involved (Actual Supportiveness)
I was given the opportunity to talk about my feelings. The person indicated that she or he wanted to talk to me again.
The person did not want to get involved.®
The person seemed to want to help me figure out what I could do that would be best for me.
The person seemed to think that I was the cause of the violence.®

Suggestions for Decisive Action (Actual Decisive Action)
I was told to call the police to report the incident.
I was told to go to a women's shelter to be safe.
I was told to see a physician for medical attention.
The person told me to stay at their house or at another person's house for safety.
I was told to see a lawyer to get a restraining order to keep my partner away from me.
I was encouraged to get out of the relationship with my partner.
The person offered to call the police for me.

Recommendations to Work on the Relationship (Actual Work on Relationship)
The person focused on the positive aspects of my relationship with my partner.
I was told to see a professional to work on the relationship with my partner.
I was told to see a religious advisor to work on the relationship with my partner.
The person encouraged me to talk to my partner to see what I could do differently to make the relationship better.

® Reverse Scored Items
and all parallel subscale scores were correlated to determine the relationship between the two subtests. Correlation coefficients ranged from .79 to .87 (see Table 8). Given the correlations of the subtests and their parallel subscales were higher than their respective reliabilities, the two scales were summed together to create one Actual Response subtest. Coefficient alphas were calculated across all participants who completed all questions of the subtest and were: Actual Response Total = .82, with 32 items; supportiveness and willingness to become involved (Actual Supportiveness) = .80, with 10 items; suggestions for decisive action (Actual Decisive Action) = .92, with 14 items; recommendations to work on the relationship (Actual Work on Relationship) = .77, with 8 items (see Table 9).

Mean scores were computed for the full scale as well as the subscales. Out of a possible range of 1 to 5, with 5 indicating greater endorsement, the total Actual Response subtest average score was 2.55 (sd=.60). The mean subscale scores were as follows: Actual Supportiveness = 3.89 (sd=.75), Actual Decisive Action = 1.83 (sd=.89), and Actual Work on Relationship = 2.03 (sd=.74) (see Table 10 for summary statistics).
Table 8. Reliabilities$^a$ and Correlations$^b$ for the Specific and General Response Subtests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S-Tot</th>
<th>S-Sup</th>
<th>S-DA</th>
<th>S-Wrk</th>
<th>G-Tot</th>
<th>G-Sup</th>
<th>G-DA</th>
<th>G-Wrk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-Tot</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-Sup</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-Wrk</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Tot</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-Sup</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-DA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Reliabilities are reported along the diagonal.
$^b$ Correlations are reported above the diagonal.

S-Tot = Specific Actual Response Subtest
S-Sup = Specific Actual Supportiveness
S-DA = Specific Decisive Action
S-Wrk = Specific Work on Relationship

G-Tot = General Actual Response Subtest
S-Sup = General Actual Supportiveness
S-DA = General Decisive Action
S-Wrk = General Work on Relationship
Table 9. Reliabilities\textsuperscript{a} and Correlations\textsuperscript{b} for the Actual Response Subtest and subscales (Specific and General Actual Response Subtests combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Actual Total</th>
<th>Supportiveness</th>
<th>Decisive Action</th>
<th>Work on Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Total</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive Action</td>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Reliabilities are reported along the diagonal.
\textsuperscript{b} Correlations are reported above the diagonal.

Table 10. Summary Statistics for Actual Response Subtest and subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Total</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Supportiveness</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Decisive Action</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Work on Relationship</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do these responses compare to those a victim hoped to receive?

**Preferred Responses.** The Preferred Response subtest was used to measure the types of responses women hoped for (see Table 11 for items of each subscale and Table 12 for correlations and reliabilities for the Preferred Response subtest and subscales).

Average scores were computed for the total Preferred Response subtest as well as the three subscale scores. Parallel to the Actual Response subtest, out of a possible range of 1 to 5, with 5 denoting greater endorsement, the average score for the total Preferred Response subtest was 2.57 (sd=.63). The mean subscale scores were as follows: Preferred Supportiveness = 3.87 (sd=1.02), Preferred Decisive Action = 1.79, (sd=.92), and Preferred Work on Relationship = 2.06 (sd=.93) (see Table 13 for summary statistics).

**Difference Scores.** Differences between actual and preferred responses were computed by subtracting the Preferred Response score from the Actual Response score for the total subtests as well and the three subscale scores.\(^1\) A positive difference would indicate that women received more support than they had hoped for, while a negative difference would

\(^1\) The two items included in the Actual Work on Relationship subscale, which were not included in the Preferred Work on Relationship subscale, were dropped before computation of the Work on the Relationship difference score.
Table 11. Items of Each subscale of the Preferred Response Subtest

Supportiveness and Willingness to Become Involved  
(Preferred Supportiveness)
I wanted to be given the opportunity to talk about my feelings.
I wanted the person to indicate that she or he wanted to talk to me again.
I did not want the person to get involved. 
I wanted the person to help me figure out what I could do that would be best for me.
I wanted the person to see that the violence wasn't my fault.

Suggestions for Decisive Action (Preferred Decisive Action)
I wanted to be told to call the police to report the incident.
I wanted to be told to go to a women's shelter to be safe.
I wanted to be told to see a physician for medical attention.
I wanted the person to tell me to stay at their house or at another person's house for safety.
I wanted to be told to see a lawyer to get a restraining order to keep my partner away from me.
I wanted to be encouraged to get out of the relationship with my partner.
I wanted the person to offer to call the police for me.

Recommendations to Work on the Relationship (Preferred Work on Relationship)
I wanted the person to focus on the positive aspects of my relationship with my partner.
I wanted to be told to see a professional to work on the relationship with my partner.

* Reverse Scored Items
### Table 12. Reliabilities\(^a\) and Correlations\(^b\) for the Preferred Response Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preferred Total</th>
<th>Supportiveness</th>
<th>Decisive Action</th>
<th>Work on Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Total</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisive Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work on Relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Reliabilities are reported along the diagonal.

\(^b\) Correlations are reported above the diagonal.

### Table 13. Summary Statistics for Preferred Response Subtest and subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Total</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Supportiveness</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Decisive Action</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Work on Relationship</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>1 to 5</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
suggest they received less support than they had hoped for.
The mean difference scores were: Actual-Preferred Response Total = .02 (sd=.52), Actual-Preferred Supportiveness = .03 (sd=.88), Actual-Preferred Decisive Action = .04 (sd=.69), and Actual-Preferred Work on Relationship = .00 (sd=.92) (see Table 14 for summary statistics). Student t-tests were computed on all means; none were significantly different from zero. Overall, women reported that they received about as much support as they would have liked to have received.

Additionally, the types of responses received felt supportive to the women. A correlation between the three Actual Response subscale scores and the Social Provisions scale indicated a significant positive relationship between the Actual Supportiveness subscale and the Social Provisions Scale (r=.30, p=.001).

Is type of support received related to a victim's emotional well-being?

Two types of support were measured: general support and support specific to the courtship violence. General support was measured with the Social Provisions Scale, and as previously stated, support specific to the courtship violence was measured with the Actual Response subtest. The mean score for the Social Provisions Scale, out of a possible range of 24 to 96, with higher numbers indicating greater support, was 81.70 (sd=11.19). See Table 15 for a summary of the Social
Table 14. Summary Statistics for the Difference Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Preferred difference</td>
<td>-4 to 4</td>
<td>-1 to 4</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Preferred Supportiveness difference</td>
<td>-4 to 4</td>
<td>-3 to 4</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Preferred Decisive Action difference</td>
<td>-4 to 4</td>
<td>-4 to 4</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual/Preferred Work on Relationship difference</td>
<td>-4 to 4</td>
<td>-4 to 3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provisions Scale.

Four scales were used to measure emotional well-being: Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale, Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, Trait Anxiety Scale, and Trait Anger Scale. Scores on the CES-D were converted from a scale ranging from 1 to 4 to a scale ranging from 0 to 3 to correspond to the Radloff (1977) study. The mean score was 16.8 (sd=10.29) out of a possible range from 10 to 60, near the clinical cutoff of 16. Fully, 46% of women scored above the clinical cutoff (see Table 15 for summary statistics).

The mean score on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale was 19.76 (sd=4.33), out of a possible range of 10 to 40, with higher numbers indicating higher self-esteem (see Table 15 for summary statistics). Follingstad et al. (1988) administered
Table 15. Summary Statistics for Social Provisions Scale, Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale, Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale, Trait Anxiety Scale, Trait Anger Scale, Social Issues Inventory, Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating, and Conflict Tactics Scale-Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Actual Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Provisions Scale</td>
<td>24 to 96</td>
<td>56 to 107</td>
<td>81.70</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>0 to 60</td>
<td>0 to 46</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Scale</td>
<td>10 to 40</td>
<td>12 to 33</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anxiety Scale</td>
<td>10 to 40</td>
<td>11 to 38</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anger Scale</td>
<td>10 to 40</td>
<td>11 to 38</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Issues Inventory</td>
<td>10 to 50</td>
<td>18 to 50</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating</td>
<td>8 to 40</td>
<td>9 to 28</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Tactics Scale-Family</td>
<td>8 to 40</td>
<td>8 to 28</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale to women who had and had not experienced courtship violence. The average self-esteem score of women who reported no violence was 32.96, and the average score of women who experience courtship violence was 33.52. Although no differences were found between the two groups, their average scores on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale were substantially higher than those obtained with the current sample.

The mean score on the Trait Anxiety scale was 19.82 (sd=5.30), out of a possible range of 10 to 40, with higher numbers indicating higher levels of anxiety (see Table 15 for summary statistics). Spielberger et al. (1979) surveyed 185 female college students and found a mean Trait Anxiety scale score of 19.38.

Finally, the mean score on the Trait Anger scale was 20.84 (sd=5.51), out of a possible range of 10 to 40, with higher numbers indicating a greater tendency to actively express anger (see Table 15 for summary statistics). Spielberger et al. (1979) administered the Trait Anger scale to a group of 185 female college students and found a mean score of 19.14.

Correlation coefficients were calculated among all the emotional well-being scales. Correlations ranged from .02 to .69 with all but one being statistically significant (see Table 16). An overall Distress variable was computed by
Table 16. Correlations among the Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale, Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale, Trait Anxiety Scale, and Trait Anger Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CES-D</th>
<th>Self-Esteem Scale</th>
<th>Trait Anxiety Scale</th>
<th>Trait Anger Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES-D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem Scale</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anxiety Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait Anger Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

standardizing total scores from each scale and summing together. All of the analyses were run separately for each of the emotional well-being scales, as well as for the overall Distress variable. None of the patterns obtained from the analyses with each of the individual emotional well-being scales were different from those with the Distress variable. Therefore, only those analyses using the Distress variable are discussed.

A regression analysis was performed to determine whether support specific to the courtship violence predicted emotional well-being as measured by the Distress variable. Actual Supportiveness, Actual Decisive Action, and Actual Work on the Relationship were entered as independent variables, and the Distress variable was the dependent variable. This analysis was not statistically significant \[F(3,103)=1.29, p=.28\]. In
addition, the Actual Response subscale scores were correlated with the Distress variable. None of these correlations reached significance.

A second regression analysis was performed to examine the relationship between general social support and distress. The predictors were Social Provisions Scale, Actual Supportiveness, Actual Decisive Action, and Actual Work on the Relationship, while the criterion was the Distress variable. The predictor variables again failed to account for a significant amount of variance in the distress reported \[F(4,102)=1.91, \ p=.11\]. The Social Provisions Scale was reliably, negatively correlated with the Distress variable \(r=-.23, \ p=.014\).

In a sample of women residing in women’s shelters, Wilson VanVoorhis (1993) found that several chronicity variables, including length of violence, number of abusive partners, and amount of violence experienced correlated significantly with depression. Therefore, these chronicity variables, along with length of time since the violence, were entered in a regression analysis to predict distress. The model tested failed to reach significance \[F(4,96)=.45, \ p=.77\]. Additionally, none of the predictor variables correlated significantly with the Distress variable.

One final model tested the interaction effects of severity of violence and time since the violence on distress.
An overall severity variable was created by standardizing scores from the Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating and the Total Number of Violent Episodes variables and summing together. In addition, an interaction variable was created by multiplying the overall severity variable with the time since the violence. Therefore, the predictor variables were overall severity, time since the violence, and the product of overall violence and time since the violence. The criterion variable was the CES-D. The model failed to reach significance \[ F(3,102) = .33, \ p = .80 \].

Is type of support hoped for related to a victim’s emotional well-being?

The relationship between distress and receiving the type of support hoped for was investigated using the Actual-Preferred Response difference scores. The total Actual-Preferred Response score was correlated with the Distress variable. In addition, the three subscale difference scores, Actual-Preferred Supportiveness, Actual-Preferred Decisive Action, and Actual-Preferred Work on the Relationship, were correlated with the Distress variable. None of the correlations reached significance.

Finally, a regression equation entering Actual-Preferred Supportiveness, Actual-Preferred Decisive Action, and Actual-Preferred Work on the Relationship as independent variables and the Distress variable as the dependent variable failed to
reach significance \( F(3,100)=.73, \ p=.54 \).

Are background and personality variables related to the incidence of courtship violence?

The current study examined the relationship between courtship violence and sex-role attitudes, emotionality, and the incidence of experiencing violence as a child.

The incidence of courtship violence was assessed with the Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating. Emotionality was measured with the Trait Anger Scale. Sex-role attitudes were assessed by the Social Issues Inventory. The Social Issues Inventory consists of 10 items responded to on a scale from 1 to 5, with higher numbers indicating greater endorsement. The mean score of the Social Issues Inventory was 33.64 (sd=5.78), out of a range from 10 to 50 (see Table 15 for summary statistics). During standardization of the scale, Enns (1987) found means ranging from 39.53 to 41.17 in groups of college students.

The incidence of childhood violence was estimated with the Conflict Tactics Scale-Family. Parallel to the Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating, the Family scale measures types and frequencies of violent acts experienced as a child. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents experienced at least one episode of violence from a parent (see Table 15 for summary statistics).

A regression analysis was performed entering Trait Anger, Social Issues Inventory, and Conflict Tactics Scale-Family as
independent variables. The Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating was the dependent variable. The model failed to reach significance [F(3,107)=1.07, p=.37]. In addition, none of the predictor variables correlated significantly with the Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating.

Is the type of support received from non-professionals related to the professional resources a victim utilizes?

Several analyses investigated the relationship between support from non-professionals and professional contacts. The number of professional contacts made was assessed by the Resources Scale. Respondents indicated "yes" or "no" to whether or not they had contacted a particular professional.

First, the number of professional contacts made was correlated with the Actual Support subtest and its subscales (Actual Supportiveness, Actual Decisive Action, and Actual Work on the Relationship). Actual Decisive Action correlated significantly with the number of professionals utilized (r=.24, p=.014). Neither of the other two subscale scores correlated significantly with the number of professionals utilized. Second, a regression analysis was performed in which the Actual Support subscale scores were entered as predictor variables and the Resources Scale was entered as the criterion. This analysis was marginally significant [R^2=.07, F(3,102)=2.67, p=.052] (see Table 17).

Interestingly, the Preferred Response total subtest score
Table 17. Regression Equation Using Actual Support Subscale Scores to Predict Number of Professionals Utilized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variables</th>
<th>Standardized Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Supportiveness</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Decisive Action</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-2.430</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual Work on Relationship</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = 0.07 \]
\[ \text{adj-}R^2 = 0.05 \]

\[ F (3,102) = 2.67, \ p = 0.052 \]

correlated with the number of professionals utilized \( (r=0.28, \ p=0.004) \). In addition, the Preferred Decisive Action score correlated with the number of professionals utilized at \( r=0.30 \) \( (p=0.002) \). It appears that the more a women wants to be told to seek out a professional, the more she does so.
DISCUSSION

Given the relative lack of empirical research regarding the specific responses non-professionals make toward victims of courtship violence, and the impact these responses may have on the victim’s emotional well-being and professional resources she utilizes, the current study was exploratory in nature. As previous research has indicated, victims of courtship violence talk with non-professionals about the violence sooner and more often than professionals (e.g., Bergman, 1992; Gryl et al., 1992; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989a; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989b). While 100% of the respondents in the current study talked with a friend and/or family member about the violence, only 21% ever contacted a professional.

Women were asked four questions regarding who they spoke with about the violence, three questions about the non-professional contacts and one about the professional contacts made. The first question asked participants to name the one person, to whom they were closest and with whom they discussed the violence. The second question asked women to name the first person with whom they discussed the violence. The third question asked respondents to name all the people they ever talked with about the violence. Among all three questions, female friend was the most frequently endorsed person. Other popular non-professional contacts included mother, sister, and male friend. The fourth question asked women to indicate
which of 10 professionals they had ever contacted about the violence. Counselor/psychologist was the most frequent professional contact, followed by the police and the Student Counseling Service.

Some research has suggested that the timing of an outside contact is important. Epperson et al., (1990) found that respondents were less likely to support a woman if she had experienced 4 episodes of abuse than if she experienced 1 or 2 episodes. A study of women residing in women’s shelters found that most women either talk about the violence after the first episode, or they wait until the abuse has become chronic (VanVoorhis, 1993). Encouragingly, fully 84% of the women in the current study talked about the violence after the first, second, or third episode.

Clearly, women are speaking with non-professionals about the violence. It remains unclear, however, what kinds of responses the non-professionals are making toward victims of courtship violence. The first research question addressed this issue. Results from the Actual Response subtest indicate that friends and family members are often supportive and willing to become involved. Women reported that they were given the opportunity to talk about their feelings, that they were encouraged to talk about the issue again, and that they were helped to determine what was best for them. Alternatively, women denied being told to work on the
relationship or being given suggestions for decisive action.

These results differ somewhat from responses by women who were residing in women's shelters. Women in shelters indicated that they did receive suggestions for decisive action (VanVoorhis, 1993). One of the main differences between the two groups of women is that the women in the current study experienced less severe and fewer episodes of violence than the women in the shelters. While 75% of women in shelters experienced nine or more episodes of abuse, 75% of the women in the current study experienced 5 or fewer episodes. In addition, the severity of violence was quite different between the two populations. In response to a question about physical injuries, women in shelters commonly reported stabbings, hair pulling, bruises over entire body and face, and broken bones. In response to the same question, many women in the current study denied any injuries. The most common injuries which were reported included bruises and an inability to trust males. Possibly, friends and family members wait to provide specific advice until a situation approaches crisis proportions.

Some research suggests that supportive responses feel most helpful when they match what the recipient hoped for (Cutrona et al, 1990). Therefore the second research question focused on the types of responses preferred by victims of courtship violence and the match between their preferences and
what they received. In addition to reporting the actual responses given by friends and family members, women were given the opportunity to specify the types of responses they would have liked to have received. In general, women wanted responses which indicated supportiveness and willingness to become involved. Women wanted friends and family members to understand that the violence was not the women's fault, and they wanted to be given the opportunity to talk about the violence.

Women denied wanting to be given recommendations to work on the relationship, either by focusing on the positive aspects of the relationship or by recommending that the victim talk to a professional about how to improve the relationship. Women also denied wanting to be given suggestions for decisive action. For example, they did not want to be told to call the police, to go to a friend's house or a shelter, or to seek medical attention. Again, these results are quite different than those obtained from women residing in women's shelters. Women in shelters did want to be given suggestions for decisive action (VanVoorhis, 1993).

One possible explanation for the difference focuses on the women's definitions of the violence. Ferraro and Johnson (1983) found that women were more likely to define a violent incident as important and deserving attention if an outside person defined the incident as serious. Women in shelters
have been exposed to shelter advocates who define the incidents as abuse. Previous to that exposure, they were given advice from friends and family members which implied their situations were serious. Women in shelters clearly defined the incidents they experienced as violence. Many of the women in the current study did not define the incident(s) as violence. It is unclear how the respondents' definitions of the episodes may have been affected by their own perceptions, non-professional responses, or a combination of the two. Further research is needed in this area.

A comparison of the actual responses received and the responses women reported preferring indicated that women received the type of support they had hoped for. In addition, women perceived these responses as supportive. Specifically, the response which was preferred, supportiveness and willingness to become involved, was positively correlated to general social support.

In general, it appears that women are receiving the type of support hoped for and are perceiving the support positively. The effects of that support on a women's emotional well-being remains unclear. The third research question addressed this issue. General social support, as measured by the Social Provisions scale, was negatively correlated with the Distress variable, indicating that higher levels of general support are related to lower levels of
depression, anxiety, and anger, as well as higher levels of self-esteem. Support received specific to the courtship violence was not related to distress.

These results differ from those obtained from women residing in women's shelters. For those women, support specific to the violence was able to predict a significant amount of variation in depression scores in a regression equation. The amount of variance accounted for did not increase when general social support was added to the model (VanVoorhis, 1993). Some research has shown, that in cases of severe trauma, general social support does not mediate levels of distress (e.g. Popiel & Susskind, 1985). Therefore, one possible explanation for the differing results could be that, due to the lower frequency and severity of the violence, the courtship violence victims are not experiencing a "severe trauma".

The fourth research question asked whether receiving the type of support hoped for was related to levels of distress. Difference scores were computed by subtracting the Preferred Response total and subscale scores from the Actual Response total and subscale scores. None of the mean difference scores were significantly different from zero. Therefore, similar to the Wilson VanVoorhis (1993) sample of battered women, participants in the current study reported receiving the type of support hoped for. When entered in a regression equation,
the difference scores failed to predict level of distress. Additionally, none of the difference scores were correlated with the Distress variable. Data from the current sample suggest that receiving the type of support hoped for is unrelated to emotional well-being. This result is similar to that obtained by Wilson VanVoorhis with a sample of battered women.

The fifth research question explored the relationship between personality and background variables, and the incidence of courtship violence. One frequently investigated personality variable is sex-role attitudes; results have been mixed. Several studies have been unable to differentiate between women who have and who have not experienced courtship violence on the basis of sex-role attitudes (Follingstad et al., 1988; Sigelman et al., 1984; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1972). Other research has demonstrated a relationship between sex-role attitudes and the incidence of courtship violence (e.g. Flynn, 1990; Worth et al., 1990). Data from the current study fail to support a relationship. Sex-role attitudes, as measured by the Social Issues Inventory, were not significantly related to amount of violence experienced, as assessed by the Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating.

Another commonly studied personality variable is emotionality. Gryl et al. (1991) found that women who used coercive strategies to influence their partner were more
likely to experience violence. Coercive strategies included name-calling, threatening, and using ultimatums. The current study used the Trait Anger Scale as a measure of emotionality. The data failed to support a relationship between anger expression and the incidence of courtship violence.

A frequently investigated background variable is a history of experiencing abuse as a child, again, results have been mixed. Marshall and Rose (1988) found a significant relationship between experiencing abuse as a child and experiencing courtship violence. In a second study, Marshall and Rose (1990) had participants rate violent acts they had witnessed or received as children on the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979). These data were able to account for a significant amount of variance in predicting courtship violence. Alternatively, data gathered by Stets and Pirog-Good (1987) were unable to support a relationship between experiencing and/or witnessing abuse as a child and experiencing courtship violence. The current study assessed violence experienced as a child with a family version of the Conflict Tactics Scale. These data were not significantly related to courtship violence as assessed by a dating version of the Conflict Tactics Scale.

Finally, the scores from the Social Issues Inventory, the Conflict Tactics Scale-Family, and the Trait Anger Scale failed to account for a significant amount of variance in
courtship violence as measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale-Dating.

The sixth research question asked if the type of support received from non-professionals was related to the professional resources utilized. Somewhat relatedly, data from one study indicated that women's definitions of a violent episode are influenced by friends' and family members' definitions. If the friend or family member labels an incident as battering, the woman is more likely to label it as battering herself (Ferraro & Johnson, 1983). Intuitively, it would seem to follow that if a non-professional told a woman she should seek legal aide, she would be more likely to do so than if the person told her to try to improve her relationship, however, no empirical study to date has examined this issue.

A regression equation using data from the current study indicated a marginal relationship between support, as measured by the Actual Response subtest, and the number of professional contacts made. In addition, actual suggestions for decisive action were significantly related to the number of professionals utilized. Therefore, as more suggestions for decisive action were made, women utilized more professionals. The data also indicated, however, a significant relationship between a woman's preferences for decisive action and the number of professionals utilized. Also, Preferred Decisive
Action scores were significantly correlated with Actual Decisive Action scores. Finally, Preferred Decisive Action scores were significantly correlated with the total number of non-professionals contacts. It is possible that women who prefer decisive action responses will contact more non-professionals in search of those responses, or that the women’s attitudes in describing the violence will predispose non-professionals to give those responses. It is also possible that women who prefer decisive action responses will contact professionals even if they are not prompted to do so. Further research is needed to disentangle these possibilities.

Limitations

The current study is limited in a number of ways. First, the generalizability of the current sample is limited. The population was self-selected, as all participants originally became eligible for the study by participating in a screening survey as part of an introductory psychology class. Additionally, all respondents were college students, therefore, their educational and socioeconomic status is not representative of the dating population as a whole. Furthermore, all members of the sample ranged in age from 17 to 24. Hence, the generalizability to all dating females is questionable. Finally, of the group of women who were eligible to participate, only 44.5% did so. The remaining either could not be reached by phone, declined to participate,
or agreed to participate, but failed to attend the scheduled appointment. It is impossible to determine if the characteristics of the women who participated differed from those of women who did not participate.

An additional limitation surfaced due to the fact that the women surveyed, on average, did not report levels of distress significantly different than the average female college student. Currently, it is impossible to determine if these women experienced distress related to the courtship violence or how social support might be related to that distress.

Further limitations emerged due to the fact that the data were based on surveys. Since all measures were self-report instruments and retrospective in nature, they were subject to memory failures or biases. Additionally, the surveys were not counterbalanced by order due to the possibility of answers on a general questionnaire contaminating answers on a specific questionnaire. The fixed order of administration may have led to an order effect.

Finally, the difference scores create limitations. First, the reliability of difference scores is lower than the parent scales. Second, the variability among the difference scores was extremely low. It is unclear how receiving responses quite different than those preferred may affect distress.
The study, however, was still needed and important. First, very little empirical research has investigated the specific responses made toward women who have experienced courtship violence. Second, few studies have explored the relationship between courtship violence and psychological distress. Third, no empirical studies, to date, have examined the relationship of social support with the emotional well-being of victims of courtship violence. Finally, no empirical studies, to date, have investigated the relationship of social support with help-seeking behavior of victims of courtship violence. Information regarding these issues could be useful in developing public education programs on campuses.

Conclusions and Implications for Further Research

Women in the current study indicated they received the type of support hoped for from friends and family members: supportiveness and a willingness to become involved. As anticipated, women did not want and were not given recommendations to work on the relationship. Contrary to expectations, women did not want and were not given suggestions for decisive action. Suggestions for decisive action include advice to call the police, stay with a friend, contact a women’s shelter, etc.

Past research indicates that if non-professionals define the violence in the relationship as serious, women do the same and are more likely to seek further outside services (Ferraro
If women do not see the violence as serious, they are not as likely to seek outside services. Anecdotally, many women indicated they did not perceive what they had experienced as violence. Therefore, it is reasonable that the women did not want to, nor be told to, seek outside services. Potentially, as violent episodes become more frequent and serious, women will be more likely to define the episodes as violence and want suggestions for decisive action. The nature of this relationship, however, remains unclear, requiring further research.

It may be useful, in future research, to ask the women if they perceived the episodes as violence or abuse, and who, if anyone, defined the incident similarly. It will also be important to obtain a sample of women who have experienced a wide variety of frequencies and severities of violence, possibly through a wide-range random mailing or telephone survey. With such a sample, the changes in support preferences could be analyzed across the severity and frequency continuums.

While women received the types of support specific to the violent relationship which they preferred, this support was not related to the women’s emotional well-being, contrary to previous results (VanVoorhis, 1993). Again, it is possible that the low frequency and severity of the violence experienced relative to that experienced in previous samples
accounts for these results. Likely, as the violent episodes become more severe and frequent, social support specific to the situation will have more of an effect on emotional well-being. Further research is need to determine the exact nature of this relationship.

Again, future research should include a more varied population. Specifically, the variance of the frequency and severity of violent episodes experienced should be increased. The effects of specific and general social support on emotional well-being could then be examined across a continuum ranging from a few, mild to many, severe episodes of violence.

Another possible reason that social support seemed relatively unrelated to psychological distress in the current sample could be that these women were not distressed, on average, when they completed the survey. It is not possible to determine if they did not experience any distress related to the violence or if that distress was not emerging. In future research, it may be useful to try to survey the women shortly after the violent episode. When initially screened, for example, women could be asked about the recency of the violence, and then included only if the violence occurred in the previous 30 days. Alternatively, women's shelters or student counseling centers could be asked to survey women. Of course, the latter method would be limited in generalizability.
Surveying women soon after the violence is experienced could provide information about what types of violent episodes are related to distress. It would also help to combat memory failures and biases. This research would be limited, however, in that finding high numbers of women who recently experienced violence would be quite time-consuming.

Previous research has been mixed regarding the relationship between several personality and background variables and the incidence of courtship violence (e.g., Archer & Ray, 1989; Folliete & Alexander, 1992; Marshall & Rose, 1988; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Miller & Simpson, 1991; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990; Worth et al., 1990). Data from the current study failed to support relationships between sex-role attitudes, anger expression, and child physical abuse with the amount of violence experienced in the context of a dating relationship.

Finally, it was hypothesized that the type of support received would be related to the professional resources utilized. The data indicated marginal support for this hypothesis. The types of responses which would most likely result in a professional contact, recommendations for decisive action, were not preferred or received by the women in the current study. Potentially, the desire for decisive action responses will increase, as the severity and frequency of violent episodes experienced increase. At that time, non-
professionals may also begin to make more decisive action responses. Subsequently, a relationship between responses received and professionals contacted may strengthen. Further research is needed to examine this possibility. Again, including a more varied population in the future will help answer these questions.

Furthermore, future research needs to expand the types of relationships investigated. For example, very little to no research has examined aspects of violence toward men or gay or lesbian violent relationships. It will be important to ascertain the prevalence of violence toward men and violence in gay and lesbian relationships. In addition, future research should examine the types and numbers of non-professional and professional contacts made by people experiencing violence in these relationships. Finally, the responses given to these victims by non-professionals and professionals should be examined and compared with those given to women victims of courtship violence in traditional relationships.

Finally, future research also should include the non-professionals who have actually provided support to women in violent relationships. Friends and family members could provide a rich source of information about what they remember actually telling a women who has experienced violence in a relationship, as well as when that advice or support was
It may be useful, for example, to ask victims names of non-professionals they talked to about the abuse. These non-professionals could then be contacted and asked to respond to the Participant Response Questionnaire regarding the actual responses they made to the victim. The victim could then be asked about the types of responses she would have preferred receiving. The non-professionals' responses could be compared to the victim's responses, which may lead to an increase in variability in difference scores. In addition, the victims' answers about the responses they wanted to receive would not contaminate the reports of what types of support were actually received.

It will also be important, however, to examine any differences between what types of support the victim remembers receiving and the types of support the non-professionals surveyed remember providing. Therefore, additional future research should survey victims about the support they received and non-professionals about the support they provided.

Courtship violence is clearly an issue which must be addressed on college campuses. First, educational seminars should be developed regarding the prevalence of courtship violence, appropriate definitions of courtship violence, and helpful responses to people who are in relationships in which there is courtship violence. Many women in the current study
reported they did not believe what they experienced was violence. While some of these women may have been shoved once as an angry boyfriend left the scene, other women were slapped or hit. People need to be educated about what violence is so it can be recognized immediately. People must also be informed of the professional resources available and be encouraged to use or suggest use of those resources.

Additional educational programs should concentrate on conflict management, stress management, and substance abuse. Both women and men should be educated on appropriate methods to de-escalate arguments without sacrificing personal values. One of these methods includes knowing when a situation is becoming dangerous and being able to leave that situation. As stress increases, people become more irritable, and college is obviously stressful to many. Teaching study skills, time management skills, and relaxation strategies could help people be less stressed and consequently less prone to irritable outbursts in relationships. It will be equally important, however to educate students about the relationship between stress and violence. Finally, students should be educated about the relationship between substance abuse and courtship violence. As substance abuse relaxes inhibitions, people can be more inclined participate in violence than they would be if no substances were involved. Awareness of and research regarding courtship violence are growing. Research and
awareness must continue to grow, however, to answer the many remaining questions and decrease the number of people who experience violence in the context of a dating relationship.
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APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT INSTRUCTIONS
Dear Research Participant:

You have been asked to participate in this study because, during mass testing, you indicated that you had experienced at least one episode of violence in a romantic relationship. A violent episode includes: having something thrown at you, being pushed, grabbed, slapped, kicked, bit, punched, hit with an object, threatened with a knife or gun, and/or injured with a knife or gun.

The following questionnaires will ask you for more information about that relationship as well as other relationships you have. All your responses will be anonymous. It is not expected that you will feel any discomfort or experience any risks. If, however, you become concerned about anything during the experiment, please talk to the experimenter. S/he will be able to help you or will be able to tell you someone else who can. If you have any questions at any time during the survey, please ask the experimenter. You may decide not to participate at any time without penalty; you will still receive your extra credit. If you decide not to participate, simply return the questionnaire to the experimenter.

Unless otherwise specified, all answers will be recorded on the provided answer sheet. There are several separate questionnaires; make sure the number of the question corresponds with the number on the answer sheet. Completing this study will require about 45 minutes, and you will earn 1 extra credit point.

If you have questions about the study, you may call me at (515) 233-6077 or write to me at Iowa State University, Department of Psychology, Ames, Iowa 50011-3180. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact any member of the department of Psychology Ethics Committee (Dr. Veronica Dark or Dr. Norman Scott) at 294-1742.

Completing the survey indicates that you have voluntarily chosen to participate. If you do not want to participate, simply return your packet to the experimenter.

Sincerely,

Carmen Wilson VanVoorhis, M.S.
Before you begin, please fill out the following information on the bottom of your answer sheet:

1. AGE: Indicate your AGE in the columns labeled "YEAR" under the section titled "BIRTH DATE."

2. ETHNICITY: Please indicate your ethnicity in column E according to the following:
   - 0 - Caucasian
   - 1 - African American
   - 2 - Hispanic
   - 3 - Asian
   - 4 - Other

3. CITIZENSHIP: In column G, enter a 1 if you are a U.S. citizen; otherwise, enter a 2 in this column.

4. YEAR IN SCHOOL: In column I, please indicate current year in school according to the following:
   - 0 - non-degree seeking
   - 1 - freshman
   - 2 - sophomore
   - 3 - junior
   - 4 - senior
   - 5 - graduate student
   - 6 - other
APPENDIX B

ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE
Confidence Scale

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements using the scale below. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
10. At times I think I am no good at all.
APPENDIX C

CENTER FOR EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES DEPRESSION SCALE
Please think about how you have been feeling during the last week. Read each statement carefully. Using the scale below, indicate how much of the time you have felt what each statement describes. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet.

A = Rarely or none of the time
B = Some of the time
C = Much of the time
D = Most of the time

11. I was bothered by things that don’t usually bother me.
12. I did not feel like eating. My appetite was poor.
13. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family and friends.
14. I felt that I was just as good as other people.
15. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.
16. I felt depressed.
17. I felt that everything I did was an effort.
18. I felt hopeful about the future.
19. I felt as though my life had been a failure.
20. I felt fearful.
21. My sleep was restless.
22. I was happy.
23. It seemed that I talked less than usual.
24. I felt lonely.
25. People were unfriendly.
26. I enjoyed life.
27. I had crying spells.
28. I felt sad.
29. I felt that people disliked me.
30. I could not get going.
APPENDIX D

STATE TRAIT PERSONALITY INVENTORY
A number of statements that people use to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement carefully. Using the scale below, record how you feel right now. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe your present feelings best. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet.

A = Not at all
B = Somewhat
C = Moderately so
D = Very much so

31. I feel calm
32. I feel like exploring my environment.
33. I am furious.
34. I am tense.
35. I feel curious.
36. I feel like banging on the table.
37. I feel at ease.
38. I feel interested.
39. I feel angry.
40. I am presently worrying over possible misfortunes.
41. I feel inquisitive.
42. I feel like yelling at somebody.
43. I feel nervous.
44. I am in a questioning mood.
45. I feel like breaking things.
46. I am jittery.
47. I feel stimulated.
48. I am mad.
49. I am relaxed.
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50. I feel mentally active.
51. I feel irritated.
52. I am worried.
53. I feel bored.
54. I feel like hitting someone.
55. I feel steady.
56. I feel eager.
57. I am burned up.
58. I feel frightened.
59. I feel disinterested.
60. I feel like swearing.

A number of statements that people use to describe themselves are given below. Read each statement carefully. Using the scale below, record how you generally feel. There are no right or wrong answers. Do not spend too much time on any one statement but give the answer which seems to describe how you generally feel. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet.

A = Almost never
B = Sometimes
C = Often
D = Almost always

61. I am a steady person.
62. I feel like exploring my environment.
63. I am quick tempered.
64. I feel satisfied with myself.
65. I feel curious.
66. I have a fiery temper.
67. I feel nervous and restless.
68. I feel interested.
69. I am a hotheaded person.
70. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.
71. I feel inquisitive.
72. I get angry when I’m slowed down by others mistakes.
73. I feel like a failure.
74. I feel eager.
75. I feel annoyed when I am not given recognition for doing good work.
76. I get in a state of tension or turmoil as I think over my recent concerns and interests.
77. I am in a questioning mood.
78. I fly off the handle.
79. I feel secure.
80. I feel stimulated.
81. When I get mad, I say nasty things.
82. I lack self-confidence.
83. I feel disinterested.
84. It makes me furious when I am criticized in front of others.
85. I feel inadequate.
86. I feel mentally active.
87. When I get frustrated, I feel like hitting someone.
88. I worry too much over something that really does not matter.
89. I feel bored.
90. I feel infuriated when I do a good job and get a poor evaluation.
Please indicate your degree of agreement with each of the following statements using the scale below. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91. The civil rights movement was one of the most positive occurrences of this century.

92. Welfare programs should not be provided to people who refuse to take responsibility for themselves.

93. The leaders of the women's movement may be extreme, but they have the right idea.

94. Although some war protesters may be overly radical, they successfully point out the absurdity of achieving peace through war.

95. Affirmative action programs for minorities hurt the career options of the majority.

96. There are better ways for women to fight for the equality than through the women's movement.

97. A strong national defense is the only way to assure that individual freedom will be preserved.

98. More people would favor the women's movement if they know more about it.

99. Every person should be guaranteed access to adequate food, housing, and other basic necessities.

100. The civil rights movement has helped Americans eliminate their stereotypes and prejudices.

101. Right wing political groups pose a major threat to our freedom.

102. The women's movement has positively influenced relationships between men and women.

103. Welfare programs are contributing to the downfall of the American family.
104. Instead of criticizing our nation, we should be proud of its contributions to freedom and world peace.

105. Our nation has an obligation to provide adequately for the poor, disabled, elderly, and homeless.

106. The women's movement is too radical and extreme in its views.

107. Civil rights leaders should spend more time solving problems, rather than talking about prejudice.

108. Feminists are too visionary for a practical world.

109. Political liberals are naive to think that welfare programs will help people become self-sufficient.

110. Opponents of our government's policies have destructive influences on our society.

111. Feminist principles should be adopted everywhere.

112. I am excited that the civil rights movement has helped minorities gain more power in our society.

113. A powerful defense in the only way to ensure our nation's survival and strength.

114. Feminists are a menace to this nation and the world.

115. We must make a strong commitment to eradicating poverty in our country before intervening in the affairs of other nations.

116. Most people who get involved in peace marches are too idealistic for the real world.

117. I am overjoyed that women's liberation is finally happening in the country.

118. The application of civil rights principles in all aspects of work and social life is our only hope for full equality between people.

119. I consider myself to be politically conservative.

120. I am supportive of the aims of the civil rights movement.

121. I consider myself a feminist and supportive of the women's movement.
122. I favor political activism as an appropriate response to injustice.
APPENDIX F

SOCIAL PROVISIONS SCALE
Social Support Scale

Using the scale below, indicate your agreement with each of the following statements. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

123. There are people I can depend on to help me if I really need it.

124. I feel that I do not have any close personal relationships with other people.

125. There is no one I can turn to for guidance in times of stress.

126. There are people who depend on me for help.

127. There are people who enjoy the same social activities I do.

128. Other people do not view me as competent.

129. I feel personally responsible for the well-being of another person.

130. I feel part of a group of people who share my attitudes and beliefs.

131. I do not think other people respect my skills and abilities.

132. If something went wrong, no one would come to my assistance.

133. I have close relationships that provide me with a sense of emotional security and well-being.

134. There is someone I could talk to about important decisions in my life.

135. I have relationships where my competence and skill are recognized.

136. There is no one who shares my interests and concerns.

137. There is no one who really relies on me for their well-
138. There is a trustworthy person I could turn to for advice if I were having problems.

139. I feel a strong emotional bond with at least one other person.

140. There is no one I can depend on for aid if I really need it.

141. There is no one I feel comfortable talking about problems with.

142. There are people who admire my talents and abilities.

143. I lack a feeling of intimacy with another person.

144. There is no one who likes to do the things I do.

145. There are people I can count on in an emergency.

146. No one needs me to care for them anymore.
Think of the most recent dating relationship in which your partner was violent toward you. Using the scale below, please indicate the frequency of the violent acts listed below which occurred in this relationship. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>2 to 5 times</td>
<td>6 to 10 times</td>
<td>&gt; 10 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

147. My partner threw something at me.
148. My partner pushed, grabbed, or shoved me.
149. My partner slapped me.
150. My partner kicked me, bit me, or hit me with a fist.
151. My partner hit me or tried to hit me with something.
152. My partner beat me up.
153. My partner threatened me with a knife or gun.
154. My partner physically injured me with a knife or gun.

Now, think about the conflict in your family as you were growing up. Using the scale below, please indicate the frequency you experienced any of the violent acts listed below from a parent. Record your answers on your answer sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1 time</td>
<td>2 to 5 times</td>
<td>6 to 10 times</td>
<td>&gt; 10 times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

155. My parent threw something at me.
156. My parent pushed, grabbed, or shoved me.
157. My parent slapped me.
158. My parent kicked me, bit me, or hit me with a fist.
159. My parent hit me or tried to hit me with something.
160. My parent beat me up.
161. My parent threatened me with a knife or gun.
162. My parent physically injured me with a knife or gun.
APPENDIX H

PARTICIPANT RESPONSE QUESTIONNAIRE
Think back to the times you can remember discussing the violence which occurred in your dating relationship with people outside that relationship. In general, how did people respond when you discussed the violence. Use the scale below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet. Take your time and think carefully about each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

163. I was given the opportunity to talk about my feelings.
164. I was told to call the police to report the incident.
165. I was told to go to a women's shelter to be safe.
166. The person indicated that she or he wanted to talk to me again.
167. The person focused on the positive aspects of my relationship with my partner.
168. I was told to see a physician for medical attention.
169. I was told to see a counselor to work on the relationship with my partner.
170. The person did not want to get involved.
171. The person told me to stay at their house/room or at another person's house/room for safety.
172. I was told to see a lawyer to get a restraining order to keep my partner away from me.
173. I was encouraged to get out of the relationship with my partner.
174. The person encouraged me to talk to my partner to see what I could do differently to make the relationship better.
175. The person offered to call the police for me.
176. The person seemed to want to help me figure out what I could do that would be best for me.
177. The person seemed to think that I was the cause of the violence.

178. I was told to see a religious adviser to work on the relationship with my partner.

On the green paper, please indicate any other responses people made.

**Specific Actual Responses**

Now, think back to the times you can remember discussing the violence which occurred in your dating relationship with someone outside that relationship. Think of the one person to whom you were closest and with whom you discussed the abuse.

179. Please mark the choice which best describes that person's relationship to you. (Remember, mark your choice on the provided answer sheet).
   a. mother  f. other male relative
   b. father  g. female friend
   c. sister  h. male friend
   d. brother i. female coworker
   e. other female relative  j. male coworker

Now, please think of how that person generally responded when the two of you discussed the violence. Use the scale below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet. Take your time and think carefully about each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

180. I was given the opportunity to talk about my feelings.

181. I was told to call the police to report the incident.

182. I was told to go to a women's shelter to be safe.

183. The person indicated that she or he wanted to talk to me again.

184. The person focused on the positive aspects of my relationship with my partner.

185. I was told to see a physician for medical attention.

186. I was told to see a professional to work on the
relationship with my partner.

187. The person did not want to get involved.

188. The person told me to stay at their house/room or at another person's house/room for safety.

189. I was told to see a lawyer to get a restraining order to keep my partner away from me.

190. I was encouraged to get out of the relationship with my partner.

191. The person encouraged me to talk to my partner to see what I could do differently to make the relationship better.

192. The person offered to call the police for me.

193. The person seemed to want to help me figure out what I could do that would be best for me.

194. The person seemed to think that I was the cause of the violence.

195. I was told to see a religious adviser to work on the relationship with my partner.

On the green paper, please indicate any other responses the person made.

Preferred Responses

Now, think about the responses you wished people would have made. What responses would have felt most helpful to you at the time? Use the scale below to indicate how much you agree or disagree with each statement. Record your answers directly on your answer sheet. Take your time and think carefully about each statement.

A  B  C  D  E
Strongly   Strongly
Disagree   Agree

196. I wanted to be given the opportunity to talk about my feelings.

197. I wanted to be told to call the police to report the
incident.

198. I wanted to be told to go to a women’s shelter to be safe.

199. I wanted the person to indicate that she or he wanted to talk to me again.

200. I wanted the person to focus on the positive aspects of my relationship with my partner.

201. I wanted to be told to see a physician for medical attention.

202. I wanted to be told see a professional to work on the relationship with my partner.

203. I did not want the person to get involved.

204. I wanted the person to tell me to stay at their house/room or at another person’s house/room for safety.

205. I wanted to be told to see a lawyer to get a restraining order to keep my partner away from me.

206. I wanted to be encouraged to get out of the relationship with my partner.

207. I wanted the person to offer to call the police for me.

208. I wanted the person to help me figure out what I could do that would be best for me.

209. I wanted the person to see that the violence wasn’t my fault.

On the green paper, please indicate any other responses you would have liked to have received.
APPENDIX I

RESOURCES SCALE
Resources Scale

Have you ever contacted any of the following professional resources listed below about the violence in your relationship? If you have contacted the resource, record an A on your answer sheet. If you have not contacted the resource, record a B on your answer sheet.

A = yes
B = no

210. Attorney
211. Counselor/Psychologist
212. Religious advisor
213. Psychiatrist
214. Community Mental Health Center
215. Police
216. Physician
217. Women’s Shelter
218. Student Counseling Service
219. Hospital
APPENDIX J

GENERAL INFORMATION QUESTIONS
General Information Questions

Please answer the following questions on your answer sheet.

220. Think back to the first time you talked to someone other than your partner about the violence. Please mark the answer which best describes that person's relationship to you.
   a. mother
   b. father
   c. sister
   d. brother
   e. other female relative
   f. other male relative
   g. female friend
   h. male friend
   i. female coworker
   j. male coworker

221. Please fill in the ovals which correspond to all the people you ever talked to about the abuse.
   a. mother
   b. father
   c. sister
   d. brother
   e. other female relative
   f. other male relative
   g. female friend
   h. male friend
   i. female coworker
   j. male coworker

222. How many of your partners have been violent toward you?
   a. 1
   b. 2
   c. 3
   d. 4
   e. 5
   f. 6
   g. 7
   h. 8
   i. 9
   j. 10 or more
Please answer the following questions on this sheet.

223. Think of the most recent romantic relationship in which you experienced at least one episode of violence. How long were you/have you been involved with that person?

_______ / _______
years     months

224. How long was the relationship violent?

_______ / _______
years     months

225. How long has it been since this person has been violent toward you?

_______ / _______ / _______
years     months     days

226. How long has it been since you were involved with this person? (Please put 0 in the blanks if you are currently involved with the person)

_______ / _______ / _______
years     months     days

227. How would you describe your relationship with this person (please circle one)?
   a. casually dating
   b. seriously dating
   c. engaged
   d. living together
   e. married

228. What gender is this person?
   a. male
   b. female

229. About how many times had your partner been violent towards you when you first talked about the violence with another person?

____________________________________

230. What is the total number of times all of your partners have been violent toward you?

____________________________________
231. What physical or psychological injuries have you suffered from the violence (please list below)?
APPENDIX K

DEBRIEFING ANNOUNCEMENT
Debriefing Announcement

Thank-you for completing the questionnaires. You have just participated in a study about social support of victims of dating violence.

Approximately 20% to 30% of women experience violence from a dating partner at least once in their lives.

Research shows that a woman's ability to cope with a violent relationship is affected by how professionals, such as police or doctors, react to her. For example, if a police officer does not seem helpful, a woman is less likely to call the police if she is victimized again.

Very few women, however, report dating violence to professionals. Women who experience dating violence usually tell friends and family members about the violence. Research suggests that how friends and family members react to the woman affects how the woman deals with the abuse. For example, one friend may be very concerned and push the woman to call the police. Another friend may not want to talk about the abuse. Research further suggests that battered women are more likely to do such things as call the police when other people support those things. Social support also reduces the stress for women who experience dating violence. Less stress is related to better mental health.

Unfortunately, almost no research has investigated the types of responses friends and family members make toward victims of dating violence or how these responses affect a victim's level of distress or the professionals she chooses to contact. You have helped us begin to fill that gap in the literature. If you have further questions about dating violence or the current study, please contact Carmen Wilson VanVoorhis, M.S. at 233-6077 or Douglas Epperson, Ph.D. at 294-2047 (W206 Lagomarcino, Psychology Department).

If you have further questions about dating violence, or would like to talk with someone about any of your relationships, any of the following agencies would have someone available to help you.

**Crisis Telephone Listening Services**

- **Open Line** 233-5000
- **Community Telephone Service** 1 (800) 244-7431
- **Assault Care Center Extending Shelter and Support (ACCESS)** 233-2303

**Counseling Services**

- **Assault Care Center Extending Shelter and Support (ACCESS)** 232-2303
- **Student Counseling Service** 294-5056
- **Catholic Charities** 232-7421
- **Central Iowa Mental Health** 232-5811