

A TEST OF THE CYCLE OF ABUSE THEORY  
THROUGH STUDY OF DATING EXPERIENCES  
OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

BY

M. JOAN MURRAY

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

Department of Educational Psychology  
University of Manitoba  
Winnipeg, Manitoba

(c) April, 1991



National Library  
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service    Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada  
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-76995-5

Canada

A TEST OF THE CYCLE OF ABUSE THEORY THROUGH  
STUDY OF DATING EXPERIENCES OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

BY

M. JOAN MURRAY

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of  
the University of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
of the degree of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

© 1991

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVER-  
SITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis. to  
the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this  
thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY  
MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the  
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-  
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

**ABSTRACT**

The cycle of abuse hypothesis proposes that those who encounter abuse in childhood have a greater chance of sustaining or perpetrating abuse in adulthood. The present study tested this hypothesis by determining the significance of the predictive power of family abuse for sexual abuse in dating. In addition, some initial Canadian statistics on abuse in the family of origin and on sexual abuse in dating were generated.

To accomplish these purposes, a small survey study was conducted using an instrument compiled for this study labelled the Dating Experience Questionnaire. The sample consisted of 60 female and 51 male undergraduate university students. Multiple linear regression analyses was used to test the predictive power of family abuse for three dependent variables: sexual victimization in dating for women and for men, and sexual coercion in dating for men.

The results of the three tests indicated that family abuse (a) was significantly predictive of sexual victimization in dating for women, (b) neared significance for victimized men, and (c) was not significantly predictive for coercive men. The cycle of abuse hypothesis was, therefore, supported.



### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation  
to:

my advisor,

Dr. Ray Henjum - for two years of advice, support,  
and dedication to this project;

my committee members,

Maureen Robinson - for injecting some sanity into  
the process,

Dr. Rick Freeze - for his considerable enthusiasm  
and faith in the worth of this project;

and to

Dr. Eric MacPhearson - for saving my thesis from  
statistical chaos.

I dedicate this thesis to:

Stuart Smith

Don Murray

and

Patricia Murray

My husband, my father, and my sister,  
three writers who survived this process before me,  
and who gave me encouragement and hope.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	iii
LIST OF TABLES .....	x
CHAPTER 1: Introduction .....	1
The Problem .....	1
Abuse in the family .....	2
Abuse in dating .....	3
Sexual abuse in dating .....	4
Justification for the Study .....	6
Theoretical Considerations .....	7
Considerations from past research .....	10
Practical Considerations .....	20
Purposes .....	24
Definition of the Terms .....	26
Abuse in the family of origin .....	27
Sexual abuse in dating .....	29
CHAPTER 2: Literature Review .....	34
Abuse in Family .....	35
Child abuse .....	35
Spouse abuse .....	39
Child sexual abuse .....	44

Physical Abuse in Adult Relationships .....	46
Male and female experiences with abuse .....	46
Reciprocity of sustaining & inflicting abuse	50
Sexual Abuse in Dating .....	51
Victimized women & coercive men .....	51
Coercive men .....	56
Discrepancies in male and female reports ....	60
Victimized men and coercive women .....	62
The Cycle of Abuse .....	68
Intergenerational transmission of child abuse	69
Intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse .....	70
Family abuse & physical abuse in dating .....	75
Childhood abuse & sexual abuse in adulthood .	79
<b>CHAPTER 3: Methods .....</b>	<b>86</b>
Subjects .....	86
Selection .....	87
Characteristics .....	88
Instrument .....	90
Section I .....	91
Section II .....	92
Section III .....	95
Pretesting .....	104
Procedure for Data Collection .....	105

Data Analyses .....	108
Descriptive statistics .....	108
Statistical tests .....	109
CHAPTER 4: Results .....	115
The Sample .....	116
Sample characteristics .....	116
Descriptions of individual subjects.....	119
Abuse in the Family of Origin .....	128
Child abuse under age 10 .....	129
Child abuse between ages 10 and 17 .....	131
Adult-to-adult abuse .....	133
Child sexual abuse .....	135
Summary of family abuse .....	137
Sexual Abuse in Dating .....	139
Sexual victimization and coercion .....	140
Discrepancies in male and female reports ...	140
Scoring sexual abuse .....	143
Sexual abuse in secondary school dating ....	146
Relationship between victimization and coercion .....	150
The Cycle of Abuse .....	151
Family abuse & sexual victimization (women).	152
Family abuse & sexual victimization (men) ..	155

Family abuse & sexual coercion (men) .....	157
Family abuse & sexual coercion (women) .....	159
<b>CHAPTER 5: Discussion .....</b>	<b>160</b>
Summary .....	160
Limitations .....	163
Observations and Conclusions .....	166
Abuse in the family of origin .....	166
Sexual abuse in dating .....	176
The cycle of abuse .....	187
Implications and Recommendations .....	190
Abuse in the family of origin .....	191
Sexual abuse in dating .....	192
Sexual abuse in intimate relationships .....	194
The cycle of abuse .....	198
References .....	202
Appendix A: Letter to Professor .....	215
Appendix B: Reply Form .....	216
Appendix C: Cover Letter .....	217
Appendix D: Dating Experiences Questionnaire .....	218
Appendix E: Reminder Letter .....	230
Appendix F: Resource Sheet .....	231

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Parent-To-Child Violence: Comparison of Rates in 1975 and 1985 .....	37
2. Rates at Which Violent Acts Occurred in the Previous Year (1975) and Ever in Marriage ..	40
3. Rates at Which Husband-to-Wife Violence Occurred in Three National Studies .....	43
4. Percentage of Women who Experienced Sexual Coercion in Three Independent Studies .....	54
5. Percentage of Men who Used Sexual Coercion in Four Independent Studies .....	56
6. Personal Traits of Sample .....	117
7. Educational Characteristics of Sample .....	118
8. Amount and Type of Child Abuse Experienced Under Age 10 .....	130
9. Amount and Type of Child Abuse Experienced Between Ages 10 and 17 .....	132
10. Amount and Type of Adult-to-Adult Abuse Observed .....	134
11. Type of child Sexual Abuse Experienced .....	136
12. General Type of Family Abuse Experienced .....	138

13.	Frequencies and Percents of Different Types of Sexual Coercion used in Dating ...	141
14.	Frequencies and Percents for Type of Coercion Used and Sexual Activity Engaged in.....	142
15.	The Scoring of Subjects into Sexual Abuse Levels .....	144
16.	Frequencies and Percents of Coercion used in Secondary School Dating .....	147
17.	Rates for Types of Coercion and Sexual Activity in Secondary School Dating .....	148
18.	A Comparison of this Study's rates of child abuse with the American Study .....	168
19.	A Comparison of this Study's rates of adult- to-adult abuse with the American Study ....	172
20.	A Comparison of the this Study's rates of sexual abuse with the Koss et al. Study ...	178



## CHAPTER 1

### Introduction

Social statistics seem to signify that something is gravely amiss in sexually intimate relationships, particularly among adolescents and young adults. For instance, in Canada, in 1986, there were 256,000 single parents with 415,250 children. The divorce rate was 1.5% compared to a 5.7% marriage rate, and 28% of all marriages ended in divorce. Over 56% of all abortions had been performed on women under age 25 indicating a large number of unwanted pregnancies in this age group. In addition, there were over 33,000 live births to never married women of this age (Statistics Canada, 1989a, 1989b).

### The Problem

Arguably, those social statistics may or may not indicate actual problems in intimate relationships. However, the prevalence of abuse in such relationships is one social statistic that is undeniably a concern

itself, as well as very likely a manifestation of fundamental problems in the nature of intimate human relationships.

### Abuse in the Family

The high prevalence of abuse among intimates is widely supported. Abuse is far more common among acquaintances than among strangers, and is most common within the family. "People are more likely to be hit, beaten up, physically injured, or even killed in their own home by another family member than anywhere else, and by anyone else, in our society" (Gelles, 1979, p. 11). Local statistics vividly illustrate this idea. For instance, in the city in which this study takes place, police received 7,685 domestic calls in 1989 which resulted in 680 domestic assault charges being laid (Turner & Bray, 1990).

Straus and Gelles (1988) reviewed over 40 studies on the prevalence of child abuse and spouse abuse; and Peters, Wyatt, and Finkelhor (1986) reviewed 19 studies on the prevalence of child sexual abuse; all studies attested to a high degree of abuse in North American families. From those reviews, the best estimates of family abuse are: (a) 10% of wives are abused by their

husbands, (b) 28% of married couples use at least mild forms of physical aggression (e.g., slaps and shoves) against one another, (c) 73% of children experience minor forms of physical punishment (e.g., slaps and spankings) from their parents, (d) 4% are severely abused (e.g., beaten up), and (e) 6% of children are sexually abused within their families.

Most tragically, the presence of abuse in a relationship can be fatal. According to Johnson and Chisholm (1989), between 1974 and 1987 there was an annual average of 212 solved murders between intimates in this country. Locally, in 1989, "more than one-third of the 43 homicides in the province were women killed by their former or current spouses or boyfriends" and in the first nine months of 1990, 14 women were killed "in violence arising from domestic disputes" (Turner & Bray, 1990, p. 1).

#### Abuse in Dating

Some of the newest research in the field of family violence is in dating, another intimate relationship with a high rate of abuse. Roscoe and Benaske (1985), along with others, have found that dating violence is remarkably similar to, and often precedes, marital

violence and, therefore, should be studied as a part of the family violence spectrum.

In the 1980's, numerous researchers (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987; Garrett-Gooding & Senter, 1987; Knutson & Mehm, 1988; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Koss & Oros, 1982; Makepeace, 1983; Miller & Marshall, 1987; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Peterson & Franzese, 1987; Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson, 1987; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984; Struckman-Johnson, 1988; Warshaw, 1988; Waterman, Dawson, & Bologna, 1989) studied the incidence and prevalence of different forms of abuse in dating relationships. All of those studies are American. It is a presumption of the present study that American results can be generalized to include Canada; however, the findings of this study may indicate otherwise.

#### Sexual Abuse in Dating

The results of all of those studies revealed that there is a high degree of courtship abuse and that the most common type of abuse in dating is sexual abuse. As many as 74% of women and 48% of men experience some

form of sexual coercion in dating (Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson, 1987); and 25% of women are victims of rape or attempted rape, 57% of which occur on dates (Warshaw, 1988). The present study is a further exploration of sexual abuse in dating.

Counsellors in schools and universities must regularly deal with the abuse occurring in students' lives and the resulting problems. Sexual abuse in dating is an abuse that many students encounter and, of the victimized students, most are negatively affected (Warshaw, 1988). Counsellors must know more about its possible causes in order to better help in its prevention and remediation.

While many studies have established that sexual abuse is a common problem in dating, few have explored possible causes of this problem. Burkhart and Stanton (1988) concluded from a review of the literature on courtship sexual abuse that research must move beyond examining prevalence and investigate "hypothesized determinants of sexual aggression among acquaintances" (p. 61). The first step in determining a cause-effect relationship is to identify a variable that is associated with sexual abuse in dating.

The current study is such a first step. The variable that is hypothesized to be associated with sexual abuse in dating is abuse in the family of origin. This hypothesized relationship will be tested by determining the significance of the predictive power of family abuse for sexual abuse in dating.

The remainder of this introduction establishes the need for this study as indicated by theory, past research, and practical considerations; and describes and defines the study's purposes and the resulting research question.

#### Justification of The Study

The justification begins with an examination of the theoretical basis of this thesis: social learning theory's idea of the cycle of abuse. Next, past research indicates which aspects of the cycle of abuse hypothesis are worth considering in a study of sexual abuse in dating. Finally, practical reasons for this study are put forward.

### Theoretical Considerations

There are a number of ideas that have been suggested to explain abuse. Those ideas will be examined with particular emphasis on the cycle of abuse hypothesis.

Correlates of abuse. Little research has been reported on the correlates of sexual abuse in dating, while the correlates of physical abuse in intimate relationships have been more extensively examined. Those correlates of physical abuse will be noted in order to give insight into variables that might be associated with sexual abuse in dating.

Researchers of abuse agree on one major point - there are a multitude of factors associated with interpersonal violence in intimate relationships. Among the associated factors that researchers have consistently found are: the cycle of abuse, low socioeconomic status, social and structural stress, social isolation and low community embeddedness, low self-esteem, personality problems, biological problems, and psychopathology (Gelles, 1985).

Psychopathological and biological theories of personality, or medical models, have been traditionally used to explain abuse (Pagelow, 1984). However, those

theories have not been supported by research: Abusers "were no more likely to be psychotic than the general public" (p. 112). In addition, the theories have been avoided in previous research on abuse in dating and so were not considered in the present study.

MacLeod (1987) felt that while all of the previous mentioned factors can precipitate abuse between intimates, only two types of explanations account for abuse: power-based theories and learning theories. According to O'Leary (1988), power-based theories examine power differentials and their relationships to abuse, namely that the most powerful tend to abuse the least powerful or that family members abuse in order to feel powerful in at least one part of their lives. Power based theories are often founded on the concept of patriarchy. Learning based theories assert that modelling or observation is the method by which most human behavior is acquired. It is upon the latter theory that the present study is based.

The cycle of abuse. The focus of this study is the cycle of abuse phenomenon as it relates to abuse in the family of origin and sexual abuse in dating. The cycle of abuse hypothesis is based on social learning theory which states that a cycle of abuse occurs when



"witnessing or suffering violence teaches people to use violence to try to solve problems or deal with stress in their lives" (MacLeod, 1987, p. 39). According to Bandura's (1973) social learning theory, the family of origin provides the child with the model for learning both aggressive behavior and the appropriate contexts for that behavior. More specifically, violence in the family of origin communicates the appropriateness of violence in love relationships.

The intergenerational transmission of child abuse (in which abused children become abusive parents) was the first aspect of the cycle of abuse theory to be explored (Kaufman & Zigler, 1987). Later the intergenerational transmission of spousal abuse was examined to determine whether those who had observed their parents physically fighting became abusive in their own marriage relationships (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). More recently, the cycle of abuse theory has expanded to the broader hypothesis that children who experience and/or observe abuse in their families of origin have a greater chance of becoming abusive or victimized in adulthood. Dating relationships are the adult relationships which are of interest to the present study.

This current cycle of abuse theory includes two types of modelling: specific and generalized. "Specific modelling occurs when individuals reproduce the particular types of family aggression to which they were exposed" (Kalmuss, 1984, p. 15). The intergenerational transmission of child abuse and spouse abuse are examples of that type of modelling. Generalized modelling occurs when an individual type of aggression in the family of origin communicates the acceptability of any type of aggression in intimate relationships.

#### Considerations From Past Research

Consistent with the cycle of abuse hypothesis, numerous researchers of abuse in the family (Browne & Finkelhor, 1988; Feshback, 1979; Finkelhor, 1986, 1988; Freeman, 1979; Gelles, 1979, 1985; Gelles & Cornell, 1985; Johnston, 1988; Kaufman & Zigler, 1987; Kalmuss, 1984; Lystad, 1979; MacLeod, 1987; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985; Shirk, 1988; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Streaan, 1988; Ulbrich & Huber, 1981; Wyatt & Powell, 1988) have suggested that early abuse is associated with abuse in adulthood. As Finkelhor (1988) stated, "Perhaps the most sinister

aspect of family violence is its self-perpetuating character. Victims of family violence seem to be at higher risk to become both future victims and future perpetrators" (p. 26). Researchers of dating abuse (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987; Koss & Dinero 1989, 1990; Lobel, 1986; Lundberg-Love & Geffner, 1989; Miller & Marshall, 1987; Murphy, 1988; Peterson & Franzese, 1987; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984) have also found that abuse in childhood is significantly related to abuse dating.

Those findings justify the study of the cycle of abuse theory in general, and have lead to the more specific hypothesis that abuse in the family of origin will be significantly predictive of sexual abuse in dating. This section further analyzes the literature in order to determine which aspects of abuse in the family and sexual abuse in dating should be examined for association.

Abuse in the family. Past research on childhood abuse has identified three aspects of abuse in the family that seem to be associated with abuse in adulthood: experiencing child abuse, observing one's parents fighting, and experiencing child sexual abuse.

For instance, in the case of child abuse many literature reviews of family violence (Feshback, 1979; Finkelhor, 1988; Freeman, 1979; Gelles & Cornell, 1985; Shirk, 1988) have concluded that being physically punished by parents may influence one's future use of and receipt of violence. As Gelles (1979) stated,

The widespread acceptability and use of physical punishment to raise children creates a situation where a conflict-prone institution (the family) serves as a training ground to teach children that it is acceptable: (1) to hit people you love, (2) for powerful people to hit less powerful people, (3) to use hitting to achieve some end or goal, and (4) to hit as an end in itself. (p. 15)

Similarly, Shirk (1988) concluded that:

The emerging empirical evidence supports the clinical hypothesis that physically abused children are "at risk" for developing heightened aggressive behavior. The preliminary results of research suggest that for many abused children, aggressiveness extends beyond the context in which it is first experienced and generalizes to other interpersonal contexts. (p. 74)

And finally, Freeman (1979) felt that, "In the case of aggression the boomerang possibilities of corporal punishment are obvious" (p. 581).

It has also been suggested that one of the long-term effects of observing one's parents fighting might be abuse in adulthood. For instance, Finkelhor (1988) concluded that "witnessing violence in one's family of origin is the most consistently demonstrated background factor among wife abusers" (p. 26).

A relationship between child sexual abuse and abuse in adulthood has also been identified. Reviews of the research on child sexual abuse (Browne & Finkelhor, 1988; Finkelhor, 1986; Streat, 1988; Wyatt & Powell, 1988) concluded that problems in adulthood associated with child sexual abuse include possible self-destructive behavior, a tendency towards revictimization, and the risk of becoming physically and sexually abusive. Browne and Finkelhor (1988) further asserted that "Sexual abuse victims' vulnerability for later sexual assault is a factor that may merit more attention" (p. 158).

That research on abuse in childhood suggests that observing parental violence, experiencing abuse from one's parents, and experiencing sexual abuse in

childhood might all be related to abuse in adult relationships. Researchers of abuse in adult relationships have found similar results. They have also suggested that all three of those types of childhood abuse are associated with being abusive or victimized in intimate relationships in adulthood.

Researchers of spouse abuse (e.g., Gelles, 1979; Johnston, 1988; Kalmuss, 1984; MacLeod, 1987; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985; Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980) found that there was a positive relationship between observing one's parents fighting and/or experiencing child abuse, and perpetrating or sustaining spouse abuse. Numerous researchers of dating abuse (e.g., Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987; Johnston, 1988; Koss, 1985; Murphy, 1988; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984) also discovered some connections between physical abuse in the family of origin and physical abuse in the adult relationship (in this case dating).

Furthermore, various researchers (Koss & Dinero, 1989; Lundberg-Love & Geffner, 1989; Miller & Marshall, 1987; McShane, 1988; Peterson & Franzese, 1987; Petrovich & Templer, 1984; Silbert & Pines, 1983) found

a significant relationship between sexual abuse in childhood and sexual abuse in adulthood.

One study (Burke, Stets & Pirog-Good, 1988) explored the relationship between physical abuse in the family of origin and sexual abuse in dating. Those researchers also found a significant relationship between those two variables. Koss and Dinero (1990) and Miller and Marshall (1987) examined all three types of abuse in the family and both studies found all to be significantly predictive of sexually coercive behavior in dating by men.

Because of those findings, all three types of abuse in the family of origin, child abuse, adult-to-adult abuse, and child sexual abuse, are examined in the present study.

In addition, Gelles' (1979) findings prompted the present researcher to study child abuse within two age ranges in childhood: under age 10 and between ages 10 and 17. That author found that preschoolers and children under 10 years of age were more likely to receive minor physical punishment from their parents than children over 9 years old. For instance, 84% of children under 10 were slapped or spanked by their parents whereas children over 9 experienced such abuse

"only" 48% of the time. Because of this notable difference in the abuse experiences of children under 10 and over 9, physical punishment experienced under the age of 10 is examined separately from the same acts experienced between the ages of 10 and 17.

Sexual abuse in dating. The most common types of sexual abuse in dating, as determined by past studies (Garrett-Gooding & Senter, 1987; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Koss & Oros, 1982; Miller & Marshall, 1987; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Peterson & Franzese, 1987; Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson, 1987), were investigated in the present study: namely, sexual activity engaged in due to (a) lies, (b) verbal persuasion, (c) the threat or use of physical force, and (d) just doing it even after the dating partner objected.

In addition, the men and women in this study were examined as both perpetrators and victims of those different types of sexual abuse. The prevalence of male victims and female coercers of sexual abuse in dating is an area that seems to be lacking in the research.

Numerous studies (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Dibble & Straus, 1980;



Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987; Makepeace, 1983; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984; Straus, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1988) have reported that, in the case of minor violent acts, men and women have close to equal experiences as victims and as perpetrators. Consequently, researchers have begun to stress the importance of examining the abuse experiences of both men and women. MacLeod (1987) contended that "productive research should explore the use of control and violence by men and women caught up in battering relationships" (p. 18). Shupe, Stacey, and Hazlewood (1987) asserted, "Until recently spouse abuse had been synonymous with woman battering. Now we know things are not always so one-sided. The worst fears of feminist Susan Schechter have been realized: The professionals and the researchers are redefining the problem as more than simply men's violence against women" (p. 62). On the subject of lesbian abuse, Hart (1986a) stated, it "contradicts our belief in the inherent nonviolence of women" (p. 10) and Cecere (1986) concluded that "we can no longer afford to view violence as exclusively a male-against-female phenomenon" (p. 29).

However, in the case of sexual abuse most researchers continue to study men as coercers and women as victims. Only very recently have studies (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson, 1987; Struckman-Johnson, 1988) begun to examine and, subsequently, find to exist, sexually coercive females and victimized males. The existence of some sexual abuse in homosexual relationships also demonstrates that sexual coercion in intimate relationships is not strictly a male against female phenomenon (Lobel, 1986; Waterman, Dawson, & Bologna, 1989).

Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) suggested that researchers of sexual abuse in dating reconsider the male oriented theories of the past which only consider males as abusers and females as victims. Struckman-Johnson (1988) concluded from her study of forced sex on dates that "Investigators conducting general prevalence surveys of coercive sexual behavior should assess male and female victimization and perpetration rates" (p. 239). Studies that are more inclusive of all abuse experiences of men and women, including sexual abuse in dating, are clearly called for by previous research.

The relationship between being sexually coercive and being sexually victimized is also explored in the present study. Numerous researchers (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Knutson & Mehm, 1988; Makepeace, 1983; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984) discovered a reciprocity in the acts of perpetrating and sustaining physical abuse in adult relationships, but no research was found which examined this relationship in sexual abuse.

Another area which has not received much attention in the literature is the prevalence of sexual abuse in secondary school dating and its relationship to other types of abuse. Both Makepeace (1981) and Bernard and Bernard (1983) proposed that one of the patterns of violence in people's lives may be a chain of abuse from childhood to adulthood, including abuse in dating relationships. Bernard and Bernard (1981) further suggested that "research on partner abuse among high school students might reveal that this sort of behavior begins early in adolescence" (p. 286).

Other investigators (Burkhart & Stanton, 1988; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Shirk, 1988) have made similar suggestions, but little has been reported in that area. The only study found on sexual assault

among adolescents concluded that "Without a doubt, the dating situation provided the setting in which most female adolescents were sexually assaulted in the late 1970's" (Ageton, 1983, p. 41). Because of that finding and the former suggestions it is worthwhile to examine the prevalence of university students' experience with sexual abuse in adolescent dating.

#### Practical Considerations

Besides these justifications based on theory and past research, there are certain practical considerations. First and foremost, this research, like all research on sexual abuse in dating, is based on the premise that sexual abuse in dating is harmful, particularly for female victims: 30% of the female victims of date rape in a national American study of sexual abuse in dating contemplated suicide, 31% sought psychotherapy, and 82% said the experience had permanently changed them (Warshaw, 1988). In fact, that author concluded that being sexually abused by an acquaintance was more traumatic than being sexually abused by a stranger.

Struckman-Johnson (1988) examined the emotional impact of forced sex on both male and female victims.

Similarly, 88% of the women in her study felt bad or very bad shortly after the attack and 78% reported a long-term emotional impact. In contrast, only 27% of the male victims felt bad after the attack and 22% reported a long-term impact.

According to Warshaw (1988), there are numerous possible consequences of sexual abuse in dating for women. She reported that many victims of date rape experience posttraumatic stress disorder, which could include "a generalized sense of fear or a specific fear of death, anger, guilt, depression, a fear of men, anxiety, humiliation, embarrassment, shame, or self-blame" (p. 68). Behaviorally, the woman may be "jumpy or edgy, suffer shakiness, trembling, rapid pulse, or hot and cold flashes. She also may have trouble sleeping, lose the desire to eat, and suffer various medical complaints" (p. 68).

Some women leave their jobs or schools or even the towns in which they live in order to get away from the perpetrator.

There were also sexual consequences of date rape reported - most victims have difficulties with sex after their attacks, suffering from a range of sex-related problems, including the inability to relax,

diminished arousal, and sexual disinterest or discomfort. For those who are virgins before the attack, "some walk away from the experience believing that their rape experience is what sex is supposed to be. Others walk away wondering whether sex is anything they are ever going to want" (Warshaw, 1988, p. 74).

Another problem was the aftereffects on boyfriends, husbands, friends, and family members. Many times the rape caused the end of a relationship. Far from being helpful, friends and family often did not believe or blamed the victim. Frequently, religious, cultural, and social values held by family members were unsympathetic to victims of date rape.

A final consequence of acquaintance rape described by Warshaw (1988) was physical, including injury and disease. In addition, unwanted pregnancy results from some of the attacks which puts the women through an emotional roller-coaster, whether they decide to abort the fetus or go full term. Some of the young single mothers end up living in poverty.

In the age of A.I.D.S., another physical consequence of date rape may be death. If people are being pressured to engage in unsafe sex, the result could be fatal.

Clearly sexual abuse in dating can have dangerous and long-lasting effects. The more that is known about this abuse, the more possible it will be to help its victims and to reduce its incidence.

For instance, determining the incidence and prevalence of sexual abuse in secondary school dating and in university dating in a major Canadian urban center, or beginning to discover where and to what extent the problem exists, is the first step towards a solution. Canadian statistics on this phenomenon are desperately needed. In addition, by knowing at what age sexual abuse in dating takes place, prevention and remediation programs can be directed toward the appropriate populations.

Studying the abuse experiences of both men and women will also give a better understanding of the problem. As MacLeod (1987) stated,

By more conscientiously listening to the women's reports of their own violence, we can illuminate the reality of violence against men and reduce the amount of competition which exists between those who are advocates for women and those who feel a false reality is being created through an emphasis only on the women. (p.18)

Shupe, Stacey, and Hazlewood (1987) asserted that studying women as coercers and men as victims, as well as vice versa, "moves us closer to the final goal for all concerned persons: a realistic and effective way of stopping violence between men and women" (p. 62).

By testing the cycle of abuse hypothesis, possible at risk populations for perpetrating and suffering sexual abuse in dating might be identified. Such information would enable educational and health care professionals to tackle the problem in more appropriate and effective ways. For instance, if abuse has cyclical elements, an attempt could be made to break the cycle.

### Purposes

Two areas of self-report information are used in this study: university students' experiences with various types of abuse in their families of origin and their experiences with different kinds of sexual abuse in dating. These data enable three purposes to be fulfilled. The first is to determine the prevalences of university students' experiences with 25 individual



types of abuse in their families of origin. The second purpose is to discover the rates of both male and female experience with sexual victimization, and use of sexual coercion, in dating relationships. The final purpose is to determine the association between these abuses by detecting those types of family abuse that, in combination, are most predictive of sexual victimization and sexual coercion in dating, and to further determine the significance of that combination of variables.

Thus, the study's general research question can be stated as follows: "What is the predictive power of family abuse for sexual abuse in dating?" This research question is examined in four substudies: the predictive power of family abuse (a) for sexual victimization in dating for women, (b) for sexual victimization in dating for men, (c) for sexual coercion in dating for women, and (d) for sexual coercion in dating for men.

### Definition of the Terms

Gelles (1985) stated, "One of the major problems confronting researchers who attempt to study violence in the family has been the quagmire of definitional dilemmas encountered" (p. 350). These dilemmas include the interchangeability of the concepts "violence" and "abuse" and the considerable variations in how each concept is nominally defined.

As Straus and Gelles (1986) suggested, because there is no standard definition of abuse, and no consensus on severity, the best that can be done is to make clear the way the term is used in one's own study. For the present study, the term "abuse" was chosen from a number of other terms (violence, aggression, exploitation, assault, conflict, battering) used in the literature on family violence. It is not limited to the social, political, and legal definitions of abuse (as in spouse abuse, child abuse, and sexual abuse). Rather, abuse is an umbrella term which encompasses the different types of both violence in the family of origin and sexual coercion in dating.

Abuse in the Family of Origin

This study examines 25 types of abuse as experienced by the subjects in their families of origin. These individual abuses can be classified under four general family abuse categories. The first is child abuse under age 10: receiving physical punishment from an adult in the family of origin when the subject was under 10 years old. The second type is child abuse between ages 10 and 17: receiving physical punishment from an adult in the family of origin when the subject was between the ages of 10 and 17. The third abuse is adult-to-adult abuse, which occurs when subjects observed adults in their families physically fighting. The final type of family abuse studied is child sexual abuse: sexual experiences with a member of the family of origin.

The physical punishment categories (child abuse before age 10, child abuse between ages 10 and 17, and adult-to-adult abuse) each consist of six items resulting in 18 individual types of physical abuse in the family. These six items are six of the violence acts measured by the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979): (a) slapping or spanking; (b) pushing, grabbing, or shoving; (c) hitting with something; (d)

throwing something; (e) kicking, biting, or punching; and (f) beating up.

An adult in the family means any adult (over the age of 18) living with the student at the time, including a parent, step-parent, foster-parent, parent's live-in lover, nanny, older sibling, or grandparent. In this way the only physical abuse in the family of origin that will not be studied is sibling abuse. Because sibling abuse is almost universal and it has not been found to be associated with future abuse (Gelles, 1979), it was not included in this study.

The other seven family abuse items are sexual experiences with a member of the subject's family of origin who was five or more years older than the subject. These seven sexual experiences of progressive severity, as suggested by Finkelhor (1979), are: (a) the offender kissed and hugged the subject in a sexual way, (b) the offender showed his/her sex organs to the subject, (c) the subject showed his/her sex organs to the offender, (d) the offender fondled the subject in a sexual way, (e) the offender touched or stroked the subject's sex organs, (f) the subject touched or

stroked the offender's sex organs, and (g) the offender attempted or had sexual intercourse with the subject.

The reason for specifying an age discrepancy of five years between the subject and the offender is to better determine that abuse took place. Most people will agree that sexual activity between an adult and a child is abuse, even if the child consented and no coercion was involved. However, certain instances of sexual activity in children and adolescents would not be considered abuse; for instance, a 17-year-old and 19-year-old who both consent to sexual activity and two 9-year-olds playing "doctor." To get around that problem, Finklehor's (1986) suggestion of using a 5 year age discrepancy was adopted.

#### Sexual Abuse in Dating

For the purposes of this study, sexual abuse refers to three different types of pressure to take part in sexual activity on a date: verbal, physical, and forceful. Using such pressure against a dating partner is termed sexual coercion and experiencing such pressure from a dating partner is called sexual victimization. Male and female experience with both sexual victimization and sexual coercion in dating will

be explored. The following terms related to sexual abuse in dating are defined in this section: sexual activity, date, verbal coercion, physical coercion, and forceful coercion.

Sexual activity. This term includes sexual intercourse and sex play. Sexual intercourse is defined in this study as vaginal, anal, or oral intercourse. Vaginal and anal intercourse refer to penetration of the vagina or anus with a penis or other object, whether or not ejaculation occurs. Oral intercourse refers to contact between mouth and sex organ. Sex play includes kissing and fondling (petting), but not intercourse.

Date. A date is defined as an interaction between two people which takes place in the context of a social event or gathering (including a private date, double date or group outing) (Miller and Marshall, 1987). This date can be a spontaneous (just met at a bar, etc.) date, first date, casual date, steady date, lover, or fiancée; but does not include a relationship in which the couple is married or living together.

Verbal coercion. Using verbal pressure includes telling lies, and using verbal persuasion and arguments in order to coerce a dating partner to take part in

sexual activity. A lie is anything that is said that is untrue (e.g., "you are the first," "I can't stop now") or that is something the person did not really mean (e.g., "I love you," "you are beautiful"). Persuasion and arguments include (a) stating or intimating that a dating partner is sexually immature (e.g., "everyone else does it," "you're acting like a baby"), (b) using threats (e.g., "If you don't, I'll tell everyone you did"), (c) using guilt (e.g., "you owe it to me"), (d) and pleading.

The previous examples are taken from case studies outlined in two books on sexual abuse in dating (Warsaw, 1988; McShane, 1988) and are only a few of many possibilities. As long as the respondent feels that whatever was spoken, was said for the express purpose of gaining sexual activity, verbal coercion has taken place. A dating partner must give in to this type of coercion (sexual activity must take place) in order to be considered a victim. An individual must simply use this type of persuasion to be considered verbally coercive.

Physical coercion. Using physical coercion refers to doing the sexual activity even though the dating partner objects. Any sexual activity that takes place

after the dating partner has said "No" is physical coercion. To be considered either a victim or a coercer in this category, sexual activity must take place.

Forceful coercion. The final, and most extreme, type of coercion is forceful, that is threatening or using physical force to engage in sexual activity. In this category, sexual activity must take place for an individual to be considered a victim; however, it need not take place for a person to be considered forcefully coercive. If a person twists a dating partner's arm, holds him or her down, or uses or threatens any other physical means to engage in sexual activity, forceful coercion has taken place.

Five periods of dating will be examined: junior high school, senior high school, university, other, and the past year (September, 1989 to August, 1990).

Sexual coercion, sexual victimization, and abuse in the family are given operational definitions in the section on data analyses in Chapter 3.

The remainder of this thesis consists of four additional chapters. Chapter 2 contains literature and research which are directly relevant to this study and



forms its theoretical basis. Chapter 3 contains a thorough presentation of the methodology used in carrying out this study. The results of the study are presented in Chapter 4; and conclusions, implications, and recommendations are put forth in the final chapter.

## CHAPTER 2

### Literature Review

After an overview of the prevalence studies of abuse in the family (including child abuse, spouse abuse, and child sexual abuse), this review of the research focuses on abusive experiences in adult love relationships. This focus begins with the research of physical abuse in adult relationships, including male and female experience with both being the abuser and the abused, and the relationship between sustaining and inflicting abuse. A close examination of sexual abuse in dating follows; specifically, victimized women, coercive men, and the discrepancies in their reports, as well as the less studied problem of sexually victimized men and coercive women. The review concludes with those studies which examined the cycle of abuse theory, beginning with the research on the relationship between abuse in the family of origin and abuse in the family of procreation, followed by the research on the association between abuse in childhood and abuse in dating.

### Abuse in The Family

In this section three types of family violence will be examined for prevalence: child abuse, spouse abuse, and child sexual abuse.

#### Child Abuse

The first national American study on family violence was carried out by Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) in 1975. They used the "Response Analysis National Probability Sample" to select families which were representative of the approximately 46 million American families in the United States at that time. Their final sample consisted of 2143 households, 1146 of which had children between the ages of 2 and 18. The second national study, carried out by the same researchers, examined a national probability sample of 4032 households in 1985 (Straus & Gelles, 1986). Of those households, 1428 had at least one child aged 3 through 17. Both national surveys used the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) as their instrument, which were found to have "moderate to high reliabilities, and evidence of concurrent and construct validity" (Straus, 1979, p. 85).

The results of those two national American studies are displayed in Table 1. They show a high degree of abuse used in child rearing, with about 62% of children experiencing some form of physical punishment in the years studied.

Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) reported the percentage of parents who had ever used violence against their children, as well as the proportion for the year 1975. They found that 71% used slaps or spanks at some time while rearing their children; 46% admitted to pushes or shoves; 20% to hitting with an object; 9% to throwing something at their child; 8% to kicking, biting, or punching; 4% to beating up their child; and 3% to threatening or using guns or knives.

Not surprisingly, the less severe, and more socially acceptable, types of abuse were the most common (slapping or spanking; and pushing, grabbing, or shoving). Conversely, the most severe types of abuse were the least reported (beating up and threatening or using guns or knives). If those American data apply to Canada, it can be deduced that perhaps as many as three quarters of the subjects will have experienced some form of violence from their parents.

Table 1

Parent-To-Child Violence: Comparison of Rates in 1975 and 1985

Type of Violence	Rate per 1000 Children	
	1975 n=1146	1985 n=1428
<b>Minor Violence Acts</b>		
1 Threw something	54***	27***
2. Pushed/grabbed/shoved	318	307
3. Slapped or spanked	582	549
<b>Severe Violence Acts</b>		
4. Kicked/bit/punched	32**	13**
5. Hit, tried to hit with something	134	97
6. Beat up	13	6
7. Threatened or used gun or knife	1	2
<b>Violence Indexes</b>		
Overall violence (1-7)	630	620
Severe Violence (4-7)	140**	107**
Very Severe Violence (4,6,7)	36***	19***

\*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001 (two-tailed t-tests).

Note. From "Societal Change and Change in Family Violence from 1975 to 1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys" by M. A. Straus and R. J. Gelles, 1986, Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, p. 469.

It is interesting to note that, while the overall violence towards children stayed virtually the same between 1975 and 1985, the more severe categories of violence diminished. Significantly fewer parents threw things at their children; and kicked, bit, and punched their children in 1985 than in 1975.

Straus and Gelles (1986) suggested that this decrease in child abuse may "reflect the fact that it has been the object of the longest and most intensive campaign" (p. 471). In addition, changes in the family, such as "an increase in the average age for having a first child, a decline in the number of children per family, and therefore, a corresponding decrease in the number of unwanted children" (p. 473), might also be related to lower rates of child abuse. Gelles (1987) indicated that the higher prevalence of mothers in the work-force in 1985 may have helped to decrease the prevalence of child abuse as well, since he found that mothers who worked outside of the home tended to abuse their children less (although not significantly less) than housewives. Because those authors concluded that severe violence towards children is decreasing, it will be interesting to note the rate of severe child abuse found in the present sample.

### Spouse Abuse

The two national studies of family violence quoted above also examined the prevalence of spouse abuse. The information gained from the 1975 survey included the rates of violent acts occurring in 1975 and the rates of those same acts ever occurring in marriage. The results of that study are displayed in Table 2.

Using physical force against a child is more socially acceptable than using physical force against a spouse, so it is not surprising that child abuse was found to be more common than spouse abuse (see Tables 1 and 2). However, the percentage of people who used violence against their spouses ever in marriage was still very high, at 28% of the sample. Like child abuse, the most mild forms of abuse between adults in the family were also the most common, while the most severe types were the least prevalent. Pushing, grabbing, or shoving was the most frequently identified form of aggression, and threatening or using a weapon, and beating up were the least common types of adult abuse in the family.

However, unlike child abuse, the rate of spouse abuse does not seem to be diminishing over time.

Table 2

Rates at Which Violent Acts Occurred in the Previous  
Year (1975) and Ever in the Marriage

Type of Violence	Percent in 1975	Percent Ever in Marriage
<b>Minor Violence Acts</b>		
1 Threw something	7	16
2. Pushed/grabbed/shoved	13	24
3. Slapped	7	18
<b>Severe Violence Acts</b>		
4. Kicked/bit/punched	6	10
5. Hit, tried to hit with something	5	10
6. Beat up	2	5
7. Threatened with gun or knife	1	5
8. Used gun or knife	1	4

Note. From Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the  
American Family by M. A. Straus, R. J. Gelles, and S.  
K. Steinmetz, 1980.



According to Straus and Gelles (1986), overall couple violence in 1975 was 16.0% and in 1985 was 15.8%. Obviously, 0.2% is not a significant difference. Similarly, the 1975 and 1985 rates for severe couple violence were 6.1% and 5.8%, respectively, again showing little difference. However, in comparing overall husband-to-wife violence in 1975 and 1985 (see Table 3), there was some decrease in abuse over time, although not significant. When examining the individual acts included in husband-to-wife violence, two acts were found to have significantly decreased from 1975 to 1985: (a) slapping and (b) kicking, biting, or punching.

Straus and Gelles (1986) suggested that this decline was real and not a manifestation of either methodological differences or a greater reluctance in the more recent study to report negative behaviors. Those authors felt that the decline was consistent with changes in the family and the economy. For instance, later marriage, greater acceptability of divorce, growth of feminist ideology, and increase in the percentage of women with paid jobs all tend to equalize the balance of power between husband and wife, and past research has shown that "male dominant marriages have

the highest, and equalitarian marriages the lowest, rate of violence" (p. 473). In addition, the greater availability of shelters for battered women, new and innovative prevention and treatment programs, and more serious treatment of abusers by the law each may have helped to decrease the amount of wife abuse.

A similar study of spouse abuse was conducted in Canada. Lupri (1989) used a nationally representative sample of 1834 people and the same instrument as the one used in the American studies (the Conflict Tactics Scales). However, she only reported on the husband-to-wife abuse found in the Canadian study. Table 3 compares the Canadian and American results.

The Canadian results tend to be higher than the American. In fact, the overall husband-to-wife violence rate in Canada was 160% more than it was in America. Because each study used the same instrument, similar methodology, and representative samples, one possible explanation for the difference is that there is more wife abuse in Canada. The present results may reflect that possibility.

Table 3

Rates at Which Husband-to-Wife Violence Occurred in  
three National Studies

Type of Violence	Study		
	I N=2143 1975	II N=3520 1985	III N=1834 1986
<b>Minor Violence Acts</b>			
1 Threw something	2.8	1.6	9
2. Pushed/grabbed/shoved	10.7	9.3	12
3. Slapped	5.1	2.9	5
<b>Severe Violence Acts</b>			
4. Kicked/bit/punched	2.4	1.5	6
5. Hit/tried to hit with something	2.2	1.7	5
6. Beat up	1.1	.8	3
7. Threatened or uses gun or knife	.4	.4	1
<b>Overall Violence</b>	<b>12.1</b>	<b>11.3</b>	<b>18</b>

Note. Study I and II are the two American Family Violence Surveys (Straus & Gelles, 1986), and Study III is the national Canadian survey (Lupri, 1989).

Child Sexual Abuse

Peters, Wyatt, and Finkelhor (1986), in a review of 19 research studies on child sexual abuse, quoted prevalence rates ranging from 6% to 62% of women and 3% to 30% of men having sexual experiences in childhood. Two of the studies quoted used a national random sample of over 2000 subjects. One of those two, a national American study by Lewis published in 1985, found that 27% of the 1374 women and 16% of the 1252 men in the study reported experiencing sexual abuse during childhood. The other national study (Badgley et al., 1984) used a representative Canadian sample of 2008 persons. They found that 34% of the women and 13% of the men admitted to experiencing unwanted sexual acts before the age of 18. Results from those two national studies revealed that childhood sexual experiences are common for North American Children, encountered by approximately 1 in 7 boys and 1 in 3 girls.

In the National Population Survey conducted by Badgley et al. (1984), 24% of all childhood sexual abuse was committed by a family member. If that statistic is used, in conjunction with the prevalences of sexual abuse stated above, to estimate sexual abuse within the family of origin, approximately 7.5% of

female students and 3.5% of male students will have had sexual experiences in their families. Badgley et al. (1984) also quoted three other national Canadian surveys: the Nation Police Force Survey, the National Hospital Survey, and the National Child Protection Survey. Those surveys found 21%, 47%, and 87%, respectively, of the assailants to be family members. Clearly, those are vastly different results. According to two of those national Canadian surveys, the previous estimates of sexual abuse in the family may be conservative.

It should be noted that the National Population Survey did not distinguish between men and women when examining the relationship between perpetrator and victim. Finkelhor (1979) did make such a distinction when he studied the childhood sexual abuse experiences of 796 university students. Family members were the perpetrators of that abuse for 43% of the women and 17% of the men. That finding, if relevant to the current sample, may reduce the predicted percentage of men who experienced sexual abuse in the family of origin to 2.5% (17% of 14.5%) and increase that percentage of women to 13% (43% of 30.5%).

### Physical Abuse in Adult Relationships

This section investigates the literature on two aspects of physical abuse in intimate adult relationships which may pertain to sexual abuse in dating: (a) male and female experiences with physical abuse and (b) the reciprocity of sustaining and inflicting physical abuse.

#### Male and Female Experiences with Abuse

Traditionally, research on abuse in intimate relationships was based on the assumption that males were the perpetrators and females were the victims. More recent studies have explored the phenomena of male victims and female perpetrators of spouse abuse and dating abuse. This section examines the results of those studies.

Spouse abuse. Marriage seems to be an obvious place to look for patterns of violence which may exist in dating. In fact, Roscoe and Benaske (1985) detected a "remarkable similarity between courtship and marital violence" (p. 419), so men's and women's experiences with spouse abuse will be explored.

As stated previously, national American family violence surveys were conducted in 1975 and 1985. An interesting finding of the 1975 survey was that there was "no difference between husbands (12.1%) and wives (11.6%) in the rate of minor violence against their spouse" (Dibble & Straus, 1980, p.74). Those results were consistent with the later sample: 11.6% of the men and 12.4% of the women in that study had used minor violence against their spouses (Straus & Gelles, 1988).

Straus and his colleagues (Dibble & Straus, 1980; Gelles, 1979; Straus, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1988; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980) warn against misinterpreting the meaning of nonsignificant differences between husband-to-wife violence and wife-to-husband violence. They stress that because of the greater average size, strength, and aggressiveness of men, male-to-female violence is more dangerous. Furthermore, female violence is often an act of defence or retaliation against male violence. MacLeod (1987) also stated that "Violence by women tends to be used most often as a means of protection or retaliation" (p. 39). Nonetheless, those authors suggested that the abuse by women against men should not be ignored. The present study follows their suggestion.

Abuse in dating. The rates at which men and women sustained and perpetrated courtship violence were not as consistent as those rates for spouse abuse. Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) studied 505 university students with the same instrument used in the national surveys above (the CTS) to measure violent behavior. They also found no significant differences between men's and women's reports of inflicting or sustaining physical abuse in dating relationships. However, their rates varied more than the studies of married couples. In their research, 14% of the men and 18% of the women recorded inflicting physical abuse, while 10% of the men and 14% of the women related sustaining physical abuse.

In a study of college students by Bernard and Bernard (1983), 15% of the 168 males and 21% of the 293 females indicated that they had abused a partner, and 19% of the men and 38% of the women reported that they had been abused by a partner. Their instrument was a self-report survey which asked about abuse without defining the term. While the significances of the differences between men and women were not determined, it is interesting to note that in both of those studies (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; and Burke, Stets, & Pirog-



Good, 1988) more women than men recorded both sustaining and inflicting abuse.

Sigelman, Berry, and Wiles (1984) also used the CTS to study the dating abuse experiences of 504 college students. While they found no significant difference in the percentages of men and women who admitted committing physically abusive acts, significantly more men than women reported being the target of at least one such act ( $p < .05$ ).

Other researchers found the opposite to be true. For instance, in a study of physical violence in courtship by Makepeace (1983), 13.7% of 97 male undergraduate students recounted using violence against a dating partner and 9.3% of the 146 female students had done the same. That author stated that every specific type of violence was more commonly committed by males than by females. Again, the instrument used was the CTS.

Those studies on dating abuse clearly suggest that both men and women have some experience with perpetrating and sustaining violence in dating relationships. The research on spouse abuse and the existence of abuse in homosexual relationships (Lobel, 1986) also support this suggestion. Because of these

findings on male and female experience with physical abuse, it is worthwhile to examine if female coercers and male victims exist in sexual abuse in dating.

#### Reciprocity of Sustaining and Inflicting Abuse

A question posed by the literature is whether or not those people who inflict physical abuse also sustain abuse. Sigelman, Berry, and Wiles (1984), in a study of physical force used in dating relationships, discovered that such physical abuse was often mutual. Their results indicated a strong correlation between experiencing and perpetrating abuse for both men ( $\chi^2=44.41$ ,  $p<.0001$ ) and women ( $\chi^2=143.57$ ,  $p<.0001$ ). Similar findings were also reported by other researchers (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Knutson & Mehm, 1988; Makepeace, 1983). Reasons put forward for this reciprocity of abuse included that the modelling of abuse by one partner reinforced the use of abuse by the other, and that one person's use of violence was in reaction to (i.e., self-defence or retaliation) violence from the other. Because a reciprocity was found between the acts of inflicting and sustaining physical abuse in dating, the present results were analyzed to determine if such an

association exists between perpetrating and suffering sexual abuse in dating. No research was found that examined this specific relationship.

### Sexual Abuse in Dating

This review of sexual abuse in dating begins with the findings on sexually victimized women and sexually coercive men, and the discrepancies in their reports. What follows is information on the less studied phenomenon of sexually coercive women and victimized men.

#### Victimized Women and Coercive Men

This section reports on the prevalence studies of male against female sexual abuse in dating. The results from a popular survey used in that research (the Sexual Experiences Survey) are examined first, and then other studies are reviewed in order to determine which questions would be most worthwhile to ask in the present study.

The Sexual Experiences Survey. Koss and Oros (1982) developed one of the first instruments to

discover the prevalence of hidden sexual abuse; meaning sexual abuse rates based on surveys of the general population rather than on surveys of police or hospital records. Their instrument was called the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) and they first used it in a study of 3862 university students.

Later, Koss headed a national American study in this field. Her sample consisted of 6159 students from 32 higher education institutions, representing all regions in the United States. She developed an instrument for that study called the National Survey of Inter-Gender Relationships, which consisted of 330 questions divided into seven sections. One of those sections was the Sexual Experiences Survey. Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) reported on the results of that section of the questionnaire.

Miller and Marshall (1987) developed their own questionnaire based on, and very similar to, the SES.

Those three studies all examined university populations and their surveys were different for men and women. The female form asked questions about being victimized by men and the male form asked about sexually coercing women. Peterson and Franzese (1987) also used the SES in their study of sexual abuse in

dating, but they only studied male subjects. Table 4 displays the results derived from the female form of the survey and Table 5 shows the results from the male form.

The rates displayed in Table 4 show some inconsistencies. The inconsistencies can be explained, to a certain degree, by the exact wording of the questions. For instance, the rate found by Study II (Koss & Oros, 1982) for threatening or using force to engage in sex play was relatively high compared to the other two studies (30% compared to 14% and 13%). Study II used the words, "... man used...to try to make you engage in kissing or petting." That wording inferred that the sexual activity had not necessarily taken place, while the wording in Studies I and III explicitly stated that sexual activity had taken place. The difference in wording at least partly explains the higher percentage in Study II.

The study by Miller and Marshall (1987) tended to report smaller percentages than the other two studies. That discrepancy can be partly explained by the fact that the subjects in that study were asked only about their dating experiences while attending university, whereas Koss and Oros (1982) requested information on

Table 4

Percentage of Women who Experienced Sexual Coercion in  
Three Independent Studies

Method of Coercion	Study		
	I	II	III
	N=3187	N=2016	N=323
	M=21.4	M=21	M=?
<b>Sex Play</b>			
Verbal	44	--	--
Authority	5	--	--
Threats or force	13	30.2	14
<b>Attempted Intercourse</b>			
Threats or force	15	18.3	3
Alcohol & Drugs	12	--	--
<b>Intercourse</b>			
Verbal	25	21.4	17
Authority	2	--	--
Alcohol & drugs	8	--	--
Threats or force	9	8.2	1

(table continues)

Method of Coercion	Study		
	I	II	III
	N=3187	N=2016	N=323
	M=21.4	M=21	M=?
<b>Intercourse</b>			
Threat to end relationship	--	5.9	2
Telling lies	--	20.4	14
<b>Sex Acts</b>			
Threats or force	6	6.4	1

Note. Study I is Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski, 1987; Study II is Koss and Oros, 1982; and Study III is Miller and Marshall, 1987.

Table 5  
Percentage of Men who Used Sexual Coercion in Four  
Independent Studies

Method of coercion	Study			
	I	II	III	IV
	N=2972	N=99	N=472	N=1846
	M=21	M=20.6	M=?	M=21
<b>Sex Play</b>				
Verbal	19	--	--	--
Authority	1	--	--	--
Threats or force	2	6.4	2	4
<b>Attempted intercourse</b>				
Threats or force	2	2.4	1	4
Alcohol & drugs	5	--	--	--
<b>Intercourse</b>				
Verbal pressure	10	15.0	12	14
Authority	1	--	--	--
Alcohol & drugs	4	--	--	--

(table continues)



---

	Study			
Method of coercion	I	II	III	IV
	N=2972	N=99	N=472	N=1846
	M=21	M=20.6	M=?	M=21

---

**Intercourse**

Threats or force	1	2.7	0	1
Threat to end relationship	--	4.4	2	7
Telling lies	--	19.5	30	34

**Sex Acts**

Threats or force	1	2.4	2	0
------------------	---	-----	---	---

---

Note. Study I is Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski, 1987; Study II is Koss and Oros, 1982; Study III is Miller and Marshall, 1987; and Study IV is Peterson and Franzese, 1987.

all dating experiences and Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) specified dating experiences from age 14 on.

Even with the large variations in results, it is clear that sexual victimization for women is common.

Male reports of coercion in the four different studies displayed in Table 5 tended to be more consistent with each other, and less prevalent than female reports of victimization.

Questions on sexual abuse in dating. According to the results displayed in Tables 4, the methods of sexual coercion that women most often experienced were verbal pressure, threat or use of physical force, and the use of lies. Methods of sexual coercion which did not seem to be as common were using one's authority, using drugs or alcohol, and threatening to end the relationship. Because of those results, the questions chosen from the above items for the present study to examine sexual abuse in dating were limited to those items which asked about lying, verbal pressure, and threatening or using force.

Besides asking about verbal and forceful coercion to take part in sexual activity, a number of other studies examined physical coercion, or doing the sexual activity even after a dating partner objects. Those

studies also only examined women as victims and men as perpetrators of sexual abuse in dating.

For example, Garrett-Gooding and Senter (1987) investigated physical coercion to take part in six sexual acts. Each act was experienced by a high percentage of women against their objections: (a) kissing (64.7%), (b) touching breast over clothes (56.3%), (c) touching genitals over clothes (52.1%), (d) touching breast/genitals under clothes (38.7%), (e) attempting to remove blouse or bra (49.1%), and (f) attempting to remove pants, skirt, or underpants (40.3%). They used a representative sample of 778 undergraduate students, 403 of whom were women.

Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) asked one question to encompass all sexual activities, from kissing to intercourse, performed against a woman's objections. That question was worded, "He just did it, even after she said no" (p. 190) and it was the type of coercion that was experienced by the most women (58.6%). Those authors studied 341 women enrolled in introductory psychology classes at a large southwestern public university in the United States.

Because such a high percentage of women experienced that type of coercion (sexual activity

engaged in despite objections), it is also included in the survey for the present study, in two items. One item asks about having sex play (kissing, fondling, and petting, but not intercourse) even after the dating partner objected, the other asks about engaging in sexual intercourse after objections from the dating partner.

#### Discrepancies in Male and Female Reports

As previously explained, Studies I, II, and III in Table 4 are repeated in Table 5. Table 4 displays those studies' findings of female experience with victimization and Table 5 shows those findings of male use of coercion. It is clear from inspecting the two tables that fewer men admitted to sexually coercive behavior than women reported being sexually victimized.

In Study I (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987), for instance, 44% of the women felt verbally coerced into sexual activity other than intercourse whereas only 19% of the men felt they had been verbally coercive. Similarly, 25% of the women related being verbally coerced into sexual intercourse, while only 10% of the men admitted to such coercion. Nine percent of the women recorded being physically forced to have sex yet

only 1% of the men described using such force. Studies II and III (Koss & Oros, 1982; Miller & Marshall, 1987), as well as other studies (Garrett-Gooding & Senter, 1987; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987; Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson, 1987), reported similar differences in the self-reports of female victims and male perpetrators.

Various authors have suggested a number of possible reasons for those inconsistencies. For instance, Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) proposed that men may not perceive the wording of the questionnaire as it is intended, and that men may not see their own actions the same as women do.

Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson (1987) concluded that men often can not tell when women do not want to engage in sexual activity. They found that 74% of the 161 men in their sample "felt a dating partner said 'no' to sexual activity when they really meant 'yes'" (p. 306). If the male subjects did not believe that no meant no, it would certainly have effected their answers to the questions that were worded, "Have you engaged in (sexual activity) with a woman when she didn't want to?".

Warshaw (1988), using data from The National Survey on Inter-Gender Relationships, found a related pattern of men misunderstanding women when it came to taking part in sexual intercourse. She reported that women's and men's versions of coercive intercourse (rape) differed on many important features. For instance, 84% of the women felt they had tried to verbally reason with the men and only 36% of the men believed such reasoning had taken place. Similarly, 70% of the victims said they had physically struggled and only 12% of the men noticed their partner struggling. Warshaw concluded that men do not perceive situations as being forceful that women find quite threatening and that males are inclined to interpret female resistance as being less serious than it is.

All of those suggested reasons for the discrepancy in male and female reports of male against female sexual abuse in dating imply that men's self-reports of sexually coercive behavior may be an underestimate of the true incidence.

#### Victimized Men and Coercive Women

Because 100% of all rapes reported to the police or social agencies are committed by men (Warshaw,

1988), it is easy to assume that all coercers are men and all victims are women. To the contrary, Sandberg, Jackson, and Petretic-Jackson (1987) found that almost as many men as women experience at least mild sexual coercion. They studied 408 students who were enrolled in undergraduate psychology courses at a small midwestern university in the United States. The men and women in their study felt about equal social pressure to engage in sexual activity: A high percentage of both men and women felt it was inappropriate to refuse, felt uncomfortable saying "no," and felt that sexual activity was expected of them because their dating partner paid for the date.

Forty-eight percent of the men in their study felt verbally coerced into having sexual intercourse (compared with 74% of the women), 25% felt their female partner had engaged in sexual activity with them against their will (compared with 48% of the women), and, surprisingly, 6% reported being physically forced by their female partner to have sexual intercourse (compared with 21% of the women). That study did not examine male and female experience with perpetrating sexual abuse.

Muehlenhard and Cook (1988) investigated men's and women's experience with sexual activity that was unwanted for virtually any reason. "More women (97.5%) than men (93.5%) had experienced unwanted sexual activity; more men (62.7%) than women (46.3%) had experienced unwanted intercourse" (p. 58). Of the 486 women, 31.3% experienced unwanted sexual activity due to nonviolent physical coercion. The percentage was significantly ( $p < .01$ ) lower for men, as 22.7% of the 507 men claimed unwanted sexual activity for that reason. Nonviolent physical coercion in that study included being held down and being physically detained (e.g., he/she blocked the door to make it difficult to leave, or wouldn't let go of your hand). Verbal coercion was experienced by 26.8% of the men and 34.0% of the women, again significantly different ( $p < .05$ ). That study also did not determine experience with perpetrating sexual coercion.

Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988), in a study of 505 students enrolled in upper-level classes at a large midwestern university, examined female experience with perpetrating sexual abuse and male experience with sustaining sexual abuse, as well as vice versa. In their study, 9% of the men and 18% of the women stated



that they had sustained sexual abuse, while 27% of the men and 7% of the women indicated that they were sexually abusive to their dating partners. Sexual abuse in that study referred to engaging in sexual activity against a dating partner's will.

Struckman-Johnson (1988) studied the incidence of date rape of 355 female and 268 male university students. She used only two questions to determine the prevalence of sexual victimization and coercion: "1) In the course of your life, how many times have you been forced to engage in sexual intercourse while on a date? 2) In the course of your life, how many times have you forced someone to engage in sexual intercourse while on a date" (p. 236)? Twenty two percent of the women compared to 16% of the men reported that they had been forced to engage in sexual intercourse on a date at least once. Ten percent of the men admitted to forcing sex on a date, compared to 2% of the women. Those differences in the reports of men and women forcing and being forced to take part in sexual intercourse were both found to be significant at  $p < .05$ .

It is interesting to note that Struckman-Johnson (1988) reported that considerably fewer women related coercive behaviors than men reported being sexually

victimized. Perhaps it is possible that women as well as men underreported their abusive actions.

Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) reported quite different results. They found that the men's and women's reports of female against male sexual abuse were consistent. In addition, they were the only study to find that men reported being coercive at a greater rate than women reported victimization.

All four of those studies showed significant differences between the sexual abuse experiences of men and women in dating, with women having more experience as the victim and men having more experience as the perpetrator. At the same time, a noteworthy percentage of men reported being victims and, to a lesser extent, women admitted to being perpetrators. Thus, while it is important to recognize that crimes of sexual violence are basically crimes against women, the fact that some women can be perpetrators and some men victims should not be ignored.

Reports of sexual violence in homosexual relationships highlight this fact. Waterman, Dawson, and Bologna (1989), using a sample of 34 gay and 36 lesbian students, found that 12.1% of the men and 30.6% of the women related being victims of forced sex in

homosexual relationships. Those authors explained the significantly higher prevalence of reported sexual victimization among lesbians than among gay men with a number of possible factors, including: (a) that the average length of the female relationships was longer than that of the male resulting in more intimate relationships and greater opportunity, both of which are related to abuse; (b) that lesbian couples are more isolated than gay couples, and isolation is a predictor of abuse; and (c) that "it is possible that women may have greater awareness of issues pertaining to sexual abuse and therefore greater likelihood of identifying various forms of coercion as force" (p. 123). Those authors did not feel that women were more likely to be victimized than men in same gender relationships.

Regardless of whether or not women are victimized more than men in homosexual relationships, the existence of some sexual abuse in those relationships demonstrates that sexual abuse does not necessarily refer to males coercing females.

The Cycle of Abuse

The cycle of abuse theory proposes that encountering violence in childhood, especially in the family of origin affects one's future use of and/or receipt of violence in adulthood, particularly in the family of procreation. The theory is based on the premise that violence is learned through modelling, by both observation and direct experience. Many researchers agree with this theory. For instance, Straus (1980) stated,

At the bottom of the tangled web of violence is the truism that violence does indeed beget violence. Each generation of children brought up on violence is another generation of potential child, wife, and, yes, husband beaters. Accept violence as an inevitable part of raising children and accept the consequences of a violent society. Reject violence as a normal part of family life and you begin to see that it is possible to raise a healthy, happy, and well-behaved generation which does not see the fist as the solution. (p. 24)

Hart (1986b), in speaking of lesbian violence, felt that female as well as male batterers had learned from their upbringings to use violence. "Since violence is a tolerated tactic of control and is condoned within broad limits, particularly within the family, battering of intimate partners is widely practiced...lesbians have also learned that violence works in achieving partner compliance" (p. 175).

In this section, research is reviewed which examines four aspects of the cycle of abuse theory: the intergenerational transmission of child abuse, the intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse, the relationship between family violence and physical abuse in dating, and the relationship between abuse in childhood and sexual abuse in adulthood.

#### Intergenerational Transmission of Child Abuse

A common question in the cycle of abuse literature is, "Do abused children become abusive parents?" This is a direct modelling, role specific question in which only one form of family abuse (parent-to-child) is examined to see if it is carried over from one generation to the next (also called intergenerational transmission of child abuse).

Kaufman and Zigler (1987), in a review of the literature dealing with this question, concluded that the "best estimate of the rate of intergenerational transmission appears to be 30% +/- 5%" (p. 190). That rate is approximately six times higher than the base rate for abuse in the general population which is 5% according to those authors.

#### Intergenerational Transmission of Spouse Abuse

Much of the literature on the cycle of abuse theory examined the effects of two types of family violence on spouse abuse: experiencing parent-to-child abuse (generalized modelling) and observing parent-to-parent abuse (specific modelling). In the case of spousal violence, generalized modelling refers to accepting spouse abuse because of experiencing violence as a child, and specific modelling means modelling in one's own marriage relationship what was observed in one's parents' relationship. Kalmuss (1984) and Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) concluded from their findings that intergenerational transmission of spousal aggression involves both of those types of modelling.

Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) carried out the first national survey of family violence in America. They found that men who had seen parents physically attack each other were almost three times more likely to have hit their own wives during the year of the study than men of nonviolent parents. A similar pattern was discovered for women. For the more extreme category of abuse, they reported that "the sons of the most violent parents have a rate of wife-beating 1000% greater than that of the sons of non-violent parents" (p. 101). The daughters' rates of husband-beating were 600% higher if they grew up in homes where there was extreme spouse abuse.

Being physically punished by one's parents also affected use of abuse in the spousal relationship, however, not nearly as much. "The people who experienced the most punishment as teenagers have a rate of wife-beating and husband-beating that is four times greater than those whose parents did not hit them" (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980, p. 110). Those authors did not examine experience with child abuse before adolescence.

Those subjects who both experienced child abuse and observed parental abuse were the most likely to be

involved in spousal abuse, having the highest rate of violence (about one in three) in their own marriages.

Kalmuss (1984), using a nationally representative sample of 2143 married couples, reported similar results. She also studied the effect of those two types of abuse, parent-to-child hitting and parent-to-parent hitting, on severe marital aggression. Using chi-square, she discovered that both types of aggression are significantly related to severe marital aggression, but "parental hitting is a stronger predictor of marital aggression than is being hit by one's parents" (p. 17). Furthermore, experiencing both types of abuse was the strongest predictor of all. By using the multiplicative form of the logit coefficient, she determined that in the absence of childhood family aggression the probability of severe marital aggression was 2%. With parent-child hitting the probability was 4%, with parental hitting it was 8%, and with both types of family violence, the probability climbed to 17%.

Kalmuss (1984) felt that an issue "not adequately examined in previous research was whether childhood family aggression is associated with an increased risk of subsequent victimization by, as well as perpetration



of, marital aggression for both sexes" (p. 12). More specifically, that author felt that "the assumption that marital aggression is initiated by men and not women has led most researchers to ignore the relationship between childhood family aggression and women's perpetration of and men's victimization by such aggression in the next generation" (p. 17). She found that, "The observation of parental aggression is related to an increased likelihood that sons will be victimized by as well as perpetrate and that daughters will perpetrate as well as be victimized by marital aggression" (p. 17).

Because of that finding, and the lack of research in this area in dating relationships, the present study addresses the question of the effect of family violence on men sustaining as well as perpetrating, and on women perpetrating as well as sustaining, sexual abuse in dating.

Stacey and Shupe (1983) studied the family violence experiences of 542 shelter residents. From the results of their research, they ruled out "childhood abuse and seeing parents' violence as important overall causes of the women's adult abuse" (p. 45). However, they concluded that "serious

batterers are very likely to have been abused and neglected children themselves, growing up in homes where the father and mother quarrelled violently" (p. 100). Thirty-four percent of the female victims in their study had witnessed parental abuse and 26% had been abused by their parents, whereas 57% of the male abusers had witnessed abuse and 38% had been abused.

MacLeod (1987) found a similar trend in the women who stayed in Canadian transition houses in 1985 (20,291 women in 110 houses). Sixty-one per cent of the partners of the women reported being abused as children while "only" 39% of the women recorded such abuse.

Johnston (1988) studied a nonrandom sample of 27 men who were known wife abusers (court ordered into therapy programs) and 78 married volunteers from community and college. "The results of a regression analysis indicated that a significant ( $p < .007$ ) positive relationship exists between observing or experiencing violence [in the family of origin] and spouse abuse" (p. 197).

All of the previous studies in some way support the hypothesis that those people who observe parent-to-parent abuse and/or experience parent-to-child abuse

are more likely to sustain and/or perpetrate spousal abuse in marriage. In general, the trend found in the marriage research seems to be that being abused by a parent predicts future spouse abuse less than observing parents fighting and experiencing both types of family abuse is the most predictive of all. In addition, the association between family abuse and spouse abuse tended to be stronger for men than for women.

#### Family Abuse and Physical Abuse in Dating

The results of similar studies on dating relationships are not so categorical in their findings. Murphy (1988), with a probability sample of 485 undergraduate students, used stepwise regression to determine which variables contributed to the overall variations in courtship violence. Three variables explained 14% of the variation in women's experience, one being "mother abused father" (p. 291). Five variables explained 17% of the variation in men's experiences, including "experiencing abuse from mother" (p. 291).

The study by Bernard and Bernard (1983) was the only research found which examined the specific issue of the family as a model for premarital love

relationships. It, too, examined the same two types of family violence, parent-to-child and parent-to-parent. Those researchers surveyed 461 students at a large, Southern, urban university. The questionnaire was a self-report instrument that asked for information on abuse in dating relationships and on abuse in the family of origin. No other information about the instrument was given.

Seventy-three percent of the abusive males admitted to experiencing or observing abuse in their families of origin compared to 32% of the nonabusive males. Fifty percent of the abusive females reported experiencing or observing abuse in their families of origin compared to 23% of the nonabusive females. No further analyses were performed to determine if the differences in percentages were significant. However, a chi-square test indicated that "there was no relationship between the type of exposure a child had to abuse in the family of origin (experience vs. observation) and whether or not they became abusive themselves" (Bernard & Bernard, 1983, p. 285). Unfortunately, the family abuse history of men and women who were victims of courtship violence was not examined.

Like the research on spouse abuse, the above statistics indicate that males may be more likely to model abuse than females. The findings of Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, and Bohmer (1987) seem to support that idea. They randomly selected a sample of 289 students from a West Coast university. The logit procedure was used to assess the relative influences of the independent variables (one of which was witnessing parental aggression) on the dependent variables (sustaining and inflicting courtship aggression).

The results indicated that "the likelihood of male students inflicting courtship aggression is positively and significantly related to having witnessed parents engage in aggressive interaction" (p. 278). That relationship was not significant for women. The same pattern held true for sustaining courtship aggression: for males there was a significant association with witnessing parental aggression and for females there was no significant association. That study did not examine the effects of parent-to-child abuse.

McShane (1988) warns women, "If your date comes from a family in which there was violence--child abuse, wife beating--he may be prone to follow the example and abuse you too" (p. 155). She clearly also felt that

abuse in the family of origin makes a man susceptible to the use of violence in adulthood.

To the contrary, Sigelman, Berry, and Wiles (1984) concluded that females were more affected than males by abuse in their families of origin. They used a discriminant analysis to determine which of eight predictors were related to both abusing a partner and being abused by a partner. Their sample consisted of 504 university students. Two of those predictors were "having been abused as a child" and "having witnessed abuse in one's parental relationship" (p. 539). Both of those predictors were found to be significant among women who were abused and women who abused in dating while neither of those predictors were significant for the male subjects.

Lobel (1986) edited a book in which 14 women wrote about being abused in their lesbian relationships. Although there have been no statistical studies on lesbian abuse, it is interesting to note that of those 14 women, 10 had mentioned that either themselves or their abuser had an abusive childhood. All of the ten victims further asserted that the child abuse had a direct impact on the adult abuse. Gentlewind (1986) asks, "What is there about me that makes other people

want to beat me" (p. 45)? Breeze (1986) speaks of alternating between the two roles of victim and rescuer in a pattern which was started in childhood, and Istar (1986) said the abuse "reminded her of being battered as a child" (p. 167).

Although those findings are not as consistent as the findings of the effects of family violence on spouse abuse, the evidence still generally supports a relationship between experiencing and/or observing abuse in the family of origin and sustaining or perpetrating dating abuse.

#### Abuse in Childhood and Sexual Abuse in Adulthood

This section will explore three types of abuse in childhood as they relate to sexual abuse in adulthood: (a) physical abuse in the family, (b) sexual abuse in childhood, and (c) both of these abuses together.

Physical abuse in the family. Only one study was found that examined the relationship between violence in the family of origin and sexual abuse in dating for both men and women. Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988), as a part of their study of 505 students in upper-level classes, found that inflicting sexual abuse for both men and women was not influenced by

experiencing or observing abuse in childhood. However, sustaining sexual abuse in dating for men was influenced by both witnessing and experiencing abuse in childhood, and for women it was influenced by experiencing abuse in childhood, but not by observing parents fighting. Those results suggest that there may be a pattern of revictimization for both men and women.

To the contrary, Koss (1985) found that victimized women were not strongly affected by family violence. She used a MANOVA to compare various personality characteristics to the different levels of sexual victimization of women. A univariate analysis revealed that the levels were not significantly different on the independent variable, family violence.

Child sexual abuse. Petrovich and Templer (1984) found that 59% of the rapists in their study had been heterosexually molested as children. Those researchers contrasted that high statistic with a much lower one found in a college student population: 2.9% of the male students had been heterosexually molested as children. Information on the college student study was not reported. That finding suggests the importance of the specific modelling of sexual abuse, in which a person



who experiences sexual abuse as a child is more likely to be involved in sexual abuse as an adult.

Peterson and Franzese (1987) examined social and political correlates that characterize men who sexually abuse women. Their sample was 99 male university students. They also concluded that experiencing sexual abuse as children for men is related to future adult sexually abusive behavior directed toward women.

Those two studies (Peterson & Franzese, 1987; Petrovich & Templer, 1984) found that men who experienced sexual abuse in childhood were more likely to sexually abuse women in adulthood. The implication that finding has for the present study is that, because this study examines the predictive power of family abuse for sexual abuse in dating, it is important to explore the sexual abuse, as well as the physical abuse, that takes place in the men's families.

Browne and Finkelhor (1988) stated that a "serious effect on which the empirical literature agrees is the apparent vulnerability of women who have been sexually abused as children to being revictimized later in life" (p. 158). Lundberg-Love and Geffner (1989) expressed similar sentiments in relation to sexual abuse in dating. They noted that a risk factor for women "which

other researchers reveal is important in predicting date rape is the experience of childhood or adolescent sexual abuse, particularly incest" (p. 175). However, not much evidence was found in the present literature review to indicate this pattern in women.

There was one study (Koss & Dinero, 1989), though, which did report a positive relationship between sexual abuse in childhood and sexual abuse in dating for women. That study examined the data from the National Survey of Inter-Gender Relationships. They discovered that "Of the women in the attempted rape and rape categories, 66% reported childhood sexual experiences....By comparison, 20% of nonvictimized women reported childhood sexual experiences" (p. 248).

Silbert and Pines (1983) examined the determinants of prostitution. Their sample consisted of 200 current and former female prostitutes. Similarly, they found that "Sixty percent of the subjects were sexually exploited as juveniles by an average of two males each" (p. 286).

McShane (1988) interviewed a number of women who had been victims of dating abuse. She does not give any information about her sample and states "the results can be labeled as 'soft research' laden with

personal accounts and observations" (p.15). One of her observations was that "All types of abuse in one's own family can lead to an acceptance and expectation of abuse in a relationship" (p. 93). In demonstrating the cyclical form of sexual abuse, she quoted one woman as stating "I was raped by my father when I was growing up so when I dated men I was used as a sex object" (p. 93).

There are similar statements found in Lobel's (1986) book on lesbian abuse. Cormier (1986) felt that being sexually abused by her brother in childhood began a "cycle of accepting sexual coercion and manipulation within relationships" (p. 12). Kim (1986) also believed that being a survivor of incest and a battered lesbian were closely linked.

Both the previous cited statistics and the personal accounts imply that women's adult experiences with sexual victimization may be influenced by childhood sexual abuse, giving reason to examine female, as well as male, experience with sexual abuse in the family.

According to the previous data, sexually abused men are more likely to become sexually coercive, while sexually abused women are more likely to be

revictimized. However, the previous studies did not examine men as victims and women as coercers of sexual abuse. The current study will explore the relationships between sexual abuse in childhood, and sexually coercive women and victimized men, as well as vice versa. As previously indicated, sexual abuse in childhood will be confined to that experienced within the family of origin.

Both physical and sexual abuse in childhood. Two studies explored the association between sexual abuse as well as physical abuse in childhood and sexual abuse in dating for men. Miller and Marshall (1987) studied 795 graduate students. A chi-square test of independence determined that there was a significant relationship between men "being molested or abused as children and coercing others into sexual acts at university" (p. 40).

Koss and Dinero (1990) found similar results. They examined the data from the National Survey of Inter-Gender Relationships. The nationally representative sample consisted of 6159 students, 2972 of whom were men. They used a blockwise discriminant function analysis to determine the least redundant set of variables' predictive of the level of self-reported

sexual aggression. The three sets of variables included Early Experiences, Psychological Characteristics, and Current Behavior.

Early Experiences consisted of two variables: Early Sexual Experiences and Family Violence. When those two variables were used to classify the men into levels of sexual aggression, 47.21% of the men could be grouped correctly. Other variables in the categories of Psychological Characteristics and Current Behavior failed to "add significantly to the prediction of sexual aggression that can be made on the basis of early experiences alone" (Koss & Dinero, 1990, p. 145).

Both of those studies found that sexual and physical abuse in childhood were related to sexually coercive behavior in dating by men. In addition, the Koss and Dinero (1990) study concluded that the most important factors in classifying sexually coercive men might be early abuse experiences. Those findings give credence to examining both physical and sexual abuse in the family in greater detail, as possible factors associated with sexual abuse in dating for men. No similar studies were found for women.

## CHAPTER 3

### Methods

In this chapter, the study's subjects, instrument, procedures for data collection, and data analyses are explained in detail. This explanation includes selection and characteristics of the subjects, descriptions of the three sections of the study's questionnaire, administration of the questionnaire, and analyses of the data consisting of descriptive statistics and statistical tests.

#### Subjects

While the university population may be less appropriate for many studies, this population seems suitable for a study of sexual victimization in dating. The average age of the victim of date rape is in the early twenties which is also the age of the majority of undergraduate university students. Also, it is in the age group of 17-24 that women most often report prior knowledge of the offender (Notman & Nadelson, 1980).

In addition, virtually all of the studies quoted in this paper which examined abuse in dating used a university population. Because no Canadian study of this type was found in the research, it is suitable to use a population similar to that used in studies conducted in the United States. How the subjects were selected for this study and the characteristics of those subjects are described in this section.

#### Selection

Subjects for this study were chosen from the population of undergraduate students attending summer courses in the Faculty of Arts at a university in western Canada. All 200, 300, and 400 level courses in the Faculty that were offered in the 1990 summer session during the day were selected, resulting in 13 professors being asked to participate. Classes at the 100 level were not included in order to secure more subjects who had completed at least one year of university.

The professors of the 13 courses that were selected were given a letter (see Appendix A), a reply form (see Appendix B), and a copy of the Dating Experiences Questionnaire (see Appendices C and D).

The letter explains the study and asks for permission to use 20 minutes of the professor's class time for administration of the questionnaire. The professors were asked to complete the reply form and return it to the researcher in the self-addressed envelope provided for them.

This first request resulted in seven replies, represented a 54% return rate. Five of the responses were positive. Any professor who did not return the reply form by the specified date was sent a reminder letter (see Appendix E). Four more professors responded to the reminder letter, resulting in an 85% response rate, and a 54% participation rate (7 of the 13 professors agreed to take part). The seven classes were from the Departments of Economics (2), History (1), Psychology (2), and Sociology (2). Of the four professors who did respond but did not agree to participate, two gave reasons why: one felt he could not spare the class time, the other was uncomfortable with the subject matter of the study.

#### Characteristics

All members of each sample class who were present, 135 students in all, were administered the



questionnaire. From those completed questionnaires, only those that were answered by students who had studied at university for at least one year and who were under 35 years of age were included in the study. University students who were beyond their freshman year would have at least some university experience on which to comment, whether that experience was abusive dating, nonabusive dating, or no dating. An age range of approximately 15 years was used (19-34) so that all subjects would fall within one generation.

Of the 135 questionnaires returned, 24 were not usable: 14 subjects were over the age of 35, one was a freshman, one subject answered the questionnaire inconsistently, and eight subjects did not finish their surveys. Incomplete surveys were probably due to lateness, as the researcher observed that a number of students arrived late to class and did not have time to finish the questionnaire. Since it is likely that the reason for incomplete questions was lateness rather than some other factor, it is reasonable to assume that those students who did not finish the survey were not systematically different from those students who did finish.

The final sample consisted of 60 women and 51 men ranging in age from 19 to 34. Based on their reports, the majority of the subjects had completed at least two years of university (88%), had attended university during the past year (91%), were middle class (81%), and were heterosexual (90%).

### Instrument

All studies quoted in this paper which investigated abuse in dating relationships used self-report questionnaires to collect their data. Obviously, it would be impractical as well as unethical to observe or manipulate the dating behavior of couples. It would seem that self-report methods are the most practical in deriving information on this topic.

The instrument compiled for the present study is called the Dating Experiences Questionnaire (see Appendices C and D). It consists of closed-ended questions in three sections. The kind of information that each section derives, along with how the items were chosen, is described in detail. When relevant,

the wording of the items and the scoring of the items are also explained. Finally, pretesting of the questionnaire is described.

### Section I

Description. The first section of this questionnaire asks about background information. Gender needed to be specified because male and female responses were analyzed separately. The subjects' age and years of study were asked to determine which subjects would make up the sample, since only those subjects who were under 35 years of age, and who had completed at least one year of university, were used. Last year's university attendance gave some idea of current lifestyle. Sexual orientation and socio-economic status were requested in order to describe the sample using factors of significance to sexual abuse in dating. Finally, the subjects were asked where they attended secondary school in order to determine if the sexual abuse in secondary school dating took place locally or elsewhere.

Item selection. The questions in this section were modeled after items from Section A of the National Survey of Inter-Gender Relationships.

Section II

Description. The second section of this instrument derives information on experiences with abuse in the family of origin. Question 1 determines how often (never, less than once a month, once or twice a month, once or twice a week, almost every day) the subjects experienced 18 types of physical abuse in their families. These abuses were categorized into three subsections: (a) subsection 1A requires information on how frequently the subject was physically punished in six ways (ranging from being slapped to being beaten up) by any adult in the family when the subject was under 10 years old; (b) subsection 1B asks for the same information about physical punishment when the subject was between 10 and 17 years old; and (c) subsection 1C requests how often subjects had observed adults in their families physically fighting in the same six ways. The final question in Section II, question 2, solicits whether or not the subject had experienced any of seven forms of sexual abuse (ranging from sexual kissing and hugging to sexual intercourse) by a family member who was five or more years older than the subject.

Item selection. Questions 1A, 1B, and 1C in this section are based on the Violence Scales of the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS). That instrument was used in numerous studies including the two national American studies of family violence (Straus & Gelles, 1986) and a national Canadian study of wife abuse (Lupri, 1989), as well as a number of studies of physical abuse in dating (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Makepeace, 1983; Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, & Bohmer, 1987; Sigelman, Berry, & Wiles, 1984). For the CTS Violence Scales, "The reliability of coefficients are high" (Straus, 1979, p. 32), concurrent validity is also high, and there is evidence of content and construct validity.

Of the eight items on the Straus Form N of the CTS Violence scales (Straus, 1979), only the first six are used in the Dating Experiences Questionnaire to determine child abuse experienced (#1A and #1B) and parental abuse observed (#1C). The last two items on that form asked about threatening to use or using guns or knives. Those extreme types of violence are uncommon and were not needed to meet the objectives of the present study, so were omitted. The number of

response options was reduced from eight to five, which was sufficient for the purposes of this study.

To discover experience with sexual abuse in the family of origin, one of the questions developed by Finkelhor (1979) was used. He studied the childhood sexual abuse experiences of university students. Item 75 on his questionnaire (p. 175) was used for question 2 in Section II of the Dating Experiences Questionnaire.

Item wording. The wording of the directions to question 1 was based on question 15 in Section B of the National Survey of Inter-Gender Relationships. However, the term parent in those directions was changed to any adult (over the age of 18) in your family of origin in the present survey. This change was made in order to be more inclusive of all abuse experienced in the family. Any adult living with the child (e.g., step-parent, foster-parent, parent's lover, grandparent, nanny, older sibling) is likely to be a guardian figure, so his or her abusive behavior should be included in a study of abuse in the family of origin.

Section III

Description. The final section of this instrument determines subjects experiences with sexual victimization and sexual coercion in dating. Questions 1 to 8 in the section inquire about experiences with different types of sexual victimization. Sexual victimization refers to taking part in sexual activity against your will through the use of coercion. Questions 10 to 17 deal with the different kinds of sexual coercion in dating. Sexual coercion refers to making a dating partner engage in sexual activity against his or her will by using coercion.

The methods of sexual coercion examined included: (a) lies, (b) arguments and verbal persuasion, (c) engagement in sexual activity even after the dating partner has objected, and (d) the threat or use of physical force. Each of these methods of coercion were considered for two types of sexual activity: sex play and sexual intercourse. All dating was investigated, as well as dating during more specific life periods including junior high, senior high, university, and other (any other time of life). The subjects were also asked whether or not the coercion had taken place in the previous year (September, 1989 to August, 1990).

Item selection. A few items (Questions 5, 6, 13, and 14) in Section III of the Dating Experiences Questionnaire came from the survey developed by Muehlenhard and Linton (1987). However, the majority of the questions in section III (questions 1-4, 7-12 and 15-16) were taken directly from the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) developed by Koss and Oros (1982). The researcher received written permission from Mary Koss to use items from her survey in the present study. The reliability and validity of the SES will be discussed in this section.

Koss and Gidycz (1985) calculated the internal consistency (cronback alpha) of the items in the Sexual Experiences Survey to be .74 for women and .89 for men. Those authors suggested that, although these levels are acceptable, they do indicate some diversity among the items. That diversity could be explained by the possibility that sexual victimization does not consist of a sequential progression of acts in which one necessarily results from another.

Test-retest reliability was calculated to be 93%, which suggests stable responses over time.

The validity of the Sexual Experiences Survey was found by comparing written self-reports (answers on the



Sexual Experiences Survey) to oral self-reports (responses given in a standardized interview regarding their written answers to the survey). The Pearson correlation between a woman's level of victimization based on written self-reports and her level of victimization based on oral self-reports was .73 ( $p < .001$ ). "In 23.5% of respondents, changed responses resulted in a change in the classification of their level of victimization" (Koss & Gidycz, 1985, p. 423). Of those changes, 68% were from a higher category of victimization to a lower category.

The Pearson correlation between a man's level of sexual coercion based on written self-reports and his level of sexual coercion based on oral self-reports was .61 ( $p < .001$ ). Thirty-seven percent of the respondents changed the classification of their level of sexual coercion between interview and survey. Of those changes, 92% were moves to a lower category of sexual coercion. Respondents had a tendency to deny in the interview what they had admitted in the survey. That tendency led the researchers to surmise that male participants "are willing to reveal behavior anonymously that they do not wish to discuss openly" (Koss & Gidycz, 1985, p. 423).

The results of that test of validity demonstrate the merit of administering an anonymous questionnaire rather than collecting data through interviews. In addition, the validity and reliability studies of the questionnaire indicate that its items should be deemed acceptable for use in the present study of sexual abuse in dating.

Item wording. Koss and Oros (1982) developed two forms of their survey, one for women and one for men. The female form asked questions about being sexually victimized by men and the male form enquired about sexually coercive behavior towards women. The Sexual Experiences Survey seems to make two inaccurate assumptions.

The first is that men are always the coercers and women always the victims of sexual abuse in dating. Some recent studies (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988; Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretić-Jackson, 1987; Struckman-Johnson, 1988) have reported findings which contradict this assumption. Struckman-Johnson (1988) implored investigators who are conducting general prevalence surveys of coercive sexual behavior to use instruments which "permit all participants to respond both as victim and perpetrator"

(p. 239). The present survey permits such a response by using the same survey for both men and women.

The other seemingly inaccurate assumption made by Koss and Oros (1982) is that all dating relationships are heterosexual. The focus of the present study is on all dating relationships rather than on only heterosexual dating relationships. The data analysis does not distinguish between homosexual dating and heterosexual dating.

Because of these two unsubstantiated assumptions, the questions on the Sexual Experiences Survey could be leading questions which may result in biased answers. Consequently, the wording of the items in Section III of the Dating Experiences Questionnaire have been slightly changed from that of the Koss and Oros survey to reflect more neutral language. More specifically, the term "dating partner" is used instead of "man" or "woman." Dating partner could mean the heterosexual dating partner of a male or female, or the homosexual dating partner of a male or female. Questions that are worded more neutrally, and are asked to both men and women, should result in less biased answers and a more complete and accurate picture of sexual abuse in dating relationships.

In addition, the phrase in the Sexual Experiences Survey, "when she didn't want to" has been omitted from the questions on sexual coercion (Section III, 9-16) in the present survey. That omission results from the findings of numerous researchers that people, particularly men, do not always know when a dating partner "does not want to." For instance, Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson (1987) found that 74% of the men and 52% of the women in their survey felt a dating partner said "no" to sexual activity when they really meant "yes."

Scoring of sexual abuse. The purpose of this subsection is to explain how the items in Section III of the Dating Experiences Questionnaire are scored in order to measure the levels of sexual victimization and coercion that the subjects had experienced in dating. The answers to the first eight questions can classify a subject into one of four distinct and independent levels of victimization, as determined by this researcher. Subjects can be classified into corresponding levels of coercion according to their answers to questions 10 to 17. The four different levels of sexual victimization/coercion are not victimized/coercive (level 0), verbally victimized/

coercive (level 1), physically victimized/coercive (level 2), and forcefully victimized/coercive (level 3).

This classification is by type of coercion rather than by level of sexual activity. The three types of coercion used for the classification include, (a) verbal, which refers to the use of words (lies, persuasion, arguments) to persuade a dating partner to take part in sexual activity; (b) physical, which indicates doing the sexual activity even after the dating partner has objected; and (c) forceful, which is threatening or using physical force to take part in sexual activity. Again, experiencing these types of coercion from a dating partner is sexual victimization, and using these types of persuasion is sexual coercion.

Sexual abuse is difficult to classify in terms of severity, which implies that one type of coercion is less severe than another and precedes another. Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) categorized sexual abuse using a combination of type of coercion used (verbal considered less severe than physical force) and type of sexual activity engaged in (sex play considered less severe than sexual intercourse).

The present study chose to categorize sexual abuse according only to the type of sexual coercion used, without considering the type of sexual activity engaged in. Muehlenhard, Friedman, and Thomas (1985) proposed that unwanted sexual activity without penetration was at least as serious as unwanted intercourse and, indeed, "the effects of the ambiguity (of sex play) are likely to be especially dramatic" (p. 308).

It is obvious why not victimized/coercive is deemed the lowest level of sexual coercion in this study. Forcefully victimized/coercive is considered the highest level of sexual abuse in agreement with the categorization of sexual coercion by other studies. The use or threat of physical force to engage in sexual activity seems intrinsically more severe than other types of sexual coercion, whether or not it is. Verbal pressure implies that the coercer is at least attempting to gain permission, whereas when the coercer just does it against the partner's will, permission is not sought. For this reason physically victimized/coercive is classified as more serious than verbally victimized/coercive.

It should be noted that this classification may be misleading since, arguably, verbal, physical, and

forceful pressure to take part in sexual activity could each conceivably be equally coercive depending on the context of the pressures. However, it is hoped that the present classification of coercive experiences generally represents an ordinal scale.

The four different levels of victimization are scored as follows: (a) Answering "NO" to questions 1-8 on the questionnaire indicates that the subject was not sexually victimized (level 0), (b) answering "YES" to any question from 1-4 and "NO" to questions 5-8 on the questionnaire signifies that the subject was verbally victimized (level 1), (c) answering "YES" to questions 5 and/or 6 and "NO" to questions 7 and 8 on the questionnaire specifies that the subject was physically victimized (level 2), and (d) answering "YES" to questions 7 and/or 8 shows that the subject was forcefully victimized (level 3).

The researcher classified the responses by referring to question 9 in section III which asks the highest number from 1 to 8 to which the respondent answered "YES." Answering "0" to this question means not victimized, "1"- "4" indicates verbally victimized, "5" or "6" is forcefully victimized, and "7" or "8" is physically victimized.

Similarly, the four levels of sexual coercion are scored as follows: Answering "NO" to questions 10-17 on the questionnaire indicates that the subject was not sexually coercive (level 0), answering "YES" to any question from 10-13 and "NO" to questions 14-17 on the questionnaire specifies that the subject was verbally coercive (level 1), answering "YES" to question 14 and/or 15 and "NO" to question 16 and 17 on the questionnaire means that the subject was physically coercive (level 2), and answering "YES" to 16 and/or 17 signifies that the subject was forcefully coercive (level 3).

The researcher classified the responses according to the answer to question 18 which asks the highest number from 10 to 17 to which the respondent answered "YES." Answering "0" indicates not victimized, "10"- "13" means verbally victimized, "14" and/or "15" denotes forcefully victimized, and "16" and/or "17" signifies physically victimized.

### Pretesting

The questionnaire was pretested on eight graduate university students. The only problem these students found was in the wording of the directions to Section



II, question 1: "Select the year that this type of punishment occurred most often when you were...". Even after much discussion, the students could not come up with completely clear wording for the question. The researcher decided to explain verbally to the classes the meaning of this sentence.

#### Procedure for Data Collection

The researcher contacted the professor of each of the seven sample classes to confirm time and place of survey administration and number of students in the class. The professors also decided when during their classes it would be most convenient for the study to take place. In five of the courses, administration took place at the beginning of the class; in the other two courses, the questionnaire was given at the end of the class.

The researcher administered the questionnaire to each of the sample classes by first introducing herself, distributing the questionnaires, and asking students not to open them until directions were given. The researcher read the cover page of the questionnaire

(see Appendix C) out loud to the class. This first page contains information that insured participants of anonymity and confidentiality. It also explains the voluntary nature of the study, including the right to skip questions or to stop at any time. The risks and benefits to the student are also outlined. In addition to reading the cover letter, the directions to Section II, question 1 were clarified for the students. This introduction was carried out in a business-like manner in order to generate serious responses to the questionnaire.

Before students began, they were separated from each other as much as possible. For two of the larger classes, half of the students were taken to another classroom which was monitored by an assistant. In the other classes, which were small, it was possible to separate all students by at least one empty seat. Some space between the students while they completed the survey allowed them more privacy, which should result in more truthful answers.

The use of an assistant in the administration of the survey also enabled the researcher to be available to help any student who may have become upset while answering the questions. The researcher has training

and experience in counselling. However, no student became visibly upset while completing the survey. Similarly, in the national American study of sexual abuse in dating, "very few problems with participants were encountered" (Warshaw, 1988, p. 197).

All students in each class were given a questionnaire and they had 20 minutes in which to complete it. Those who did not wish to participate were asked to stay in their seats and do other work so that they would not be embarrassed by having to stand up and walk out of the classroom. However, all students participated. This high participation rate is consistent with the national American study in which "virtually all the students (98.5%) in the selected classes were willing to complete the survey" (Warshaw, 1988, p. 197). Any questions subjects had while completing the questionnaire were answered privately by the researcher. Very few questions were asked. All questionnaires were collected at the same time, after 20 minutes had elapsed, also in order to avoid embarrassing those who chose not to participate or those who took longer than average to finish.

After the survey was collected, the researcher responded to any questions or comments. At the end,

students were given a self-explanatory resource sheet (See Appendix F) listing community and university agencies that would be of help for victims of sexual abuse. That sheet also contained an address where subjects could write to receive the findings of this study.

The previous procedures follow closely with those procedures used in the National Survey of Inter-Gender Relationships, as outlined by Koss (1988).

### Data Analyses

This section outlines the descriptive and statistical methods used in Chapter 4 of this study to analyze the data derived from this study's survey instrument, the Dating Experiences Questionnaire.

#### Descriptive Statistics

Frequencies and percentages of positive responses to questions in Sections II and III of the Dating Experiences Questionnaire were calculated independently for men and women. The calculations determined the prevalences both of abuse in the family of origin and

of sexual abuse in dating for the men and women in this sample. More specifically, the rates of 25 specific types of family abuse (i.e., being slapped or spanked before age 10) as well as four general categories of family abuse (i.e., being physically punished before age 10) were detected. The data derived on sexual abuse in dating included the male and female rates for each type of sexual victimization and coercion, in addition to the levels of coercion used (verbal, physical, or forceful) and the types of sexual activity engaged in (sex play or intercourse). Prevalences of sexual abuse in secondary school dating were similarly presented.

#### Statistical Tests

Two statistical procedures were used in the study: the chi square test of independence and multiple linear regression analysis.

Chi Square. In order to determine the association between inflicting and sustaining sexual abuse in dating, the chi square statistic was calculated. Chi square ( $\chi^2$ ) tests two dichotomous variables for independence; in this case the variables were sexual victimization in dating (measured as yes or no) and

sexual coercion in dating (measured as yes or no). because there were so few sexually coercive women in this study, this association was only statistically tested for men.

Linear regression analysis. Multiple linear regression analysis was used to test the cycle of abuse theory statistically. It was felt that if a combination of family abuse items predicted sexual abuse in dating at a significant level ( $p \leq .05$ ), then the cycle of abuse theory would be supported.

The valid use of linear regression analyses to test hypotheses requires that all exploratory analyses be performed on one set of data, that a hypothesis then be formulated, and that the hypothesis be tested on an independent set of data.

That procedure was used in this study. Forty subjects were selected at random from the pool of 110 subjects for preliminary analysis and the remaining 70 subjects were used to test the resulting hypothesis. The two data sets, exploratory and final, were further divided by gender so that the analyses could be performed independently for male and female subjects. The exploratory data set for females comprised 22 subjects and for males comprised 18 subjects. One of

the two final data sets was composed of 37 female subjects, and the other of 33 male subjects.

The dependent variable, sexual abuse in dating, was subdivided into sexual victimization and sexual coercion. Both of these variables were scored, as described previously, from 0 (not victimized/coercive) to 3 (forcefully victimized/coercive). The examination of two dependent variables for both genders resulted in the analyses of four substudies: (a) family abuse and sexual victimization in dating for women, (b) family abuse and sexual victimization in dating for men, (c) family abuse and sexual coercion in dating for men, and (d) family abuse and sexual coercion in dating for women.

The pool of items designed to assess abuse in the family of origin consisted of 25 items. Each of these items was scored according to the frequency with which it was experienced, ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (almost every day). For the exploratory analyses, these items were clustered into four categories representing four general forms of family abuse: (a) Six items concerning child abuse before age 10, each depicting a progressively more severe type of physical punishment; (b) six similar levels of items concerned with child

abuse after age 9; (c) six levels of adult-to-adult abuse, spanning the same six types of physical violence; and (d) seven levels of items concerned with child sexual abuse within the family, each intended to represent progressive stages of sexual abuse. Items were clustered for the preliminary analyses because doing so was most likely to detect redundancies in items.

Both the exploratory and final linear regression analyses were executed on the MYSTAT statistical program.

Since the procedures for data analysis are essentially the same for each substudy, only the analyses of family abuse and sexual victimization in dating for women will be described in detail.

First, preliminary analyses were performed on the exploratory female sample using a variation on the Botward technique of linear regression analysis. This technique enabled a thorough exploration of the data to determine which set of family abuse items, in combination, were most likely to best predict sexual victimization in dating for women. For each of the four clusters of items, multiple regression equations



determined the item or combination of items that maximized the predictive power of the cluster.

The resulting best predictors from all four pools of items were analyzed in the same way to determine one hypothesis of this study: those items most likely to best predict sexual victimization in dating for women. That collection of items became the basis for stating the null hypothesis for this phase of the study.

Finally, this null hypothesis was tested on the final female sample. Only one multiple linear regression analysis, the hypothesis developed from the exploratory sample, was run on the final sample. The significance of the  $r^2$  in the final sample can be considered a valid test of the hypothesis.

Essentially, this same procedure was used for the data analysis of two of the other substudies: (a) family abuse and sexual victimization in dating for men and (b) family abuse and sexual coercion in dating for men. However, one exception must be noted. For both of these substudies, the family abuse category of sexual abuse was not included in the analyses because there were too few observations of this type of abuse in the male subjects.

The final substudy, family abuse and sexual coercion in dating for women, was not analyzed statistically because of the small number of coercive women in this study. Instead, the family abuse history of sexually coercive women was reported descriptively.

## CHAPTER 4

### Results

The present study set out to accomplish three goals. The first was to determine the prevalence of university students' experience with different forms of abuse in their families of origin. The second goal was to find the prevalences of both male and female experience with sexual victimization, and use of sexual coercion, in dating relationships. The final purpose of this study was to discover the association between these two types of abuse; or, more specifically, to detect those types of family abuse that, in combination, are most predictive of sexual abuse in dating and to further determine the significance of that combination of variables.

In order to achieve these goals, a survey, the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire, was administered which asked questions in three areas: (a) background information, (b) experience with abuse in the family of origin, and (c) experience with sexual abuse in dating. This chapter contains a presentation of the results obtained from that survey.

### The Sample

Section I of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire derived background information on the subjects. This information is summarized in two tables. Table 6 presents the subjects' personal characteristics: gender, age, socio-economic status, and sexual orientation. Table 7 displays information about their schooling: the number of years of university they completed, their university attendance during the last school year, and where they attended secondary school.

#### Sample Characteristics

The sample consisted of 60 female and 51 male undergraduate summer students in the Faculty of Arts at a university in western Canada. The range in ages, and the mean age, of men and women were not notably different. The vast majority of subjects were middle class and heterosexual. The subjects also had very similar schooling; most had completed at least two years of university and had attended university during the 1989/1990 school year, and about 3/5ths of the subjects had completed at least some of their secondary schooling locally.

Table 6

Personal Traits of Sample

Characteristic	Gender	
	Male N=51	Female N=60
<b>Age</b>		
Range	19-32	19-34
Average	24.9 yrs	23.8 yrs
<b>Socio-Economic Level:</b>		
Low	7 (14%)	5 (8%)
Middle	39 (76%)	51 (85%)
High	4 (8%)	4 (7%)
Did not respond	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
<b>Sexual Orientation:</b>		
Heterosexual	45 (88%)	55 (92%)
Homosexual	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Bisexual	3 (6%)	2 (3%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)	2 (3%)

Table 7

Educational Characteristic of Sample

Characteristic	Gender	
	Male	Female
<b>Years of University Completed:</b>		
0 years	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
1 year	4 (8%)	8 (13%)
2 years	18 (35%)	26 (43%)
3 or more years	28 (55%)	25 (42%)
Did not respond	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
<b>Last Year's Student Status:</b>		
Full-time	37 (73%)	54 (90%)
Part-time	6 (12%)	4 (7%)
Not a student	6 (12%)	2 (3%)
Did not respond	2 (4%)	0 (0%)
<b>Local Secondary Schooling:</b>		
All	22 (43%)	23 (38%)
Some	8 (16%)	12 (20%)
None	20 (39%)	25 (42%)
Did not respond	1 (2%)	0 (0%)

### Descriptions of Individual Subjects

Ten subjects were selected to illustrate the level of abuse that some people experience in their lives. Information was extracted from the questionnaires that they completed.

Subject A. This subject was chosen because she reported experiencing the most overall physical and sexual abuse throughout her life. She was a 28 year old heterosexual woman who had completed two years of university but had not attended university during the previous school year. She lived in a low income family.

Before the age of 10 she was slapped or spanked; pushed, grabbed, or shoved; and hit with something once or twice a week. After age ten these same types of punishment diminished to once or twice a month. An adult in her family slapped, kicked, bit, punched, and beat up another adult a few times a year (less often than once a month). She was kissed and hugged in a sexual way, fondled in a sexual way, and had her sex organs stroked by a member in her family who was at least five years older than her.

In junior high school Subject A was verbally coerced to take part in sex play. In senior high and

in university she was verbally and physically coerced to take part in both sex play and sexual intercourse. In addition, at another time in her life she was forcefully coerced to take part in both sex play and sexual intercourse - she was raped. During every period of her life this woman reported being abused in some way. She admitted to no sexually coercive behavior in dating, herself.

Subject B. This subject also experienced abuse throughout her life. This heterosexual, middle-class woman was only 19 years old. She had completed one year of university and was a full-time university student during the previous year.

Before the age of 10 she was slapped or spanked once or twice a week; and was pushed, grabbed, or shoved; hit with something; had something thrown at her; and kicked, bit, or punched a few times a year. After age 9 she was pushed, grabbed, or shoved almost every day. She experienced slaps or spans, and kicks, bites, or punches once or twice a month and she had things thrown at her and was hit with something a few times a year. Adults in her home also fought - slapping once or twice a month and pushing, hitting with something, and throwing things at the other a few



times a year. A member in her family made her show him or her, her sex organs. In junior high she was verbally coerced to take part in sex play and in senior high she was verbally and physically coerced to take part in sex play. She also admitted to using verbal coercion in order to engage in sex play in senior high school.

Subject C. This subject experienced the most abuse as a child; indeed she reported the most severe abuse possible on this survey. She was a 30 year old heterosexual female who had completed one year of university and was a full-time student during the previous year. She was currently living in a low socio-economic income bracket.

When she was less than ten years old, this woman experienced every type of physical child abuse asked about on the survey almost every day, from being slapped to being beaten up. The same was true when she was between the ages of 10 and 17. She was slapped, pushed, hit with something, had something thrown at her, kicked, and beaten up by an adult in her family almost every day of her childhood. She also experienced every type of sexual abuse by a member of her family from being kissed and hugged in a sexual way

to sexual intercourse. No adult in her family was physically abusive to another adult.

This woman experienced no sexual coercion during her education (junior high, senior high, and university). However, during another time of her life she experienced all types of coercion (verbal, physical, and forceful) to take part in both sex play and sexual intercourse. This subject was severely and constantly beaten as a child, raped by a family member as a child, and raped by a dating partner as an adult. She reported no coercive behaviors herself.

Subject D. This subject also experienced extreme abuse in her family. She was a 21 year old, heterosexual, middle class, full-time student who had completed 2 years of university.

According to this subject, when she was under ten years old she was severely abused (An adult threw something at her; kicked, bit, or punched her; and beat her up) almost every day. She was slapped, pushed around, and hit with something less frequently, a few times a year. When she was an older child, the severe types of child abuse mentioned above continued to be employed almost every day. As an older child she was also slapped and hit with something almost every day.

An adult in her family was equally abusive to another adult in her family: this subject reported observing every type of adult violence, from slapping to beating up, almost every day.

During university this woman felt she has been verbally coerced to take part in sex play and in intercourse. She was not sexually coercive herself.

Subject E. This subject is used to illustrate the relationship between sexual abuse in the family and sexual abuse in dating for one subject. She was 20 years old, heterosexual, middle class, and a full-time student who had completed one year of university.

Subject E was not physically abused in her family of origin; however, she reported all types of sexual abuse by a family member, from being kissed and hugged in a sexual way to sexual intercourse. During senior high school she was verbally coerced to take part in sexual intercourse. While attending university and during another time of her life she was both verbally and physically coerced to take part in sexual intercourse. This woman also reported sexually coercive behaviors. She admitted to verbally pressuring her dating partner to engage in sex play.

Subject F. The male subject who experienced the most overall abuse in his life was 25 years old, heterosexual, and middle class. He was a full-time university student who had completed two years of university.

According to his questionnaire, under age 10 he was slapped or spanked almost every day. In addition, he was pushed; hit with something; and kicked, bit, or punched once or twice a week, and something was thrown at him and he was beaten up once or twice a month. The pattern was similar, if a little less frequent, when he was between the ages of 10 and 17. The adults in this subject's family did not physically fight and he was not sexually abused in his family.

In junior high school this subject was verbally coerced to take part in sex play. He was verbally coerced to take part in both sex play and intercourse during his senior high school years. In addition, this man used verbal persuasion in high school to coerce a dating partner to engage in sex play and in university he used verbal persuasion to coerce a dating partner into sexual intercourse. For Subject F, there was a reciprocity in experiencing sexual victimization and using sexual coercion in dating.

Subject G. This subject was the most sexually coercive of all the men in this study. He was 24, middle class, and heterosexual. This full-time student had completed at least three years of university.

In junior high and in senior high he used verbal (lies) and physical (did the sexual activity even after partner objected) coercion to take part in both sex play and sexual intercourse. In other words, throughout secondary school, including junior high school, he raped his dating partners (had sex with them against their will). Also, while attending university and at another time of his life he used verbal pressure to gain sexual activity (both sex play and intercourse) with his dating partners. This man had not been sexually victimized by a date.

He did experience some abuse in his family of origin. Before the age of 10 he was slapped or spanked and hit with something once or twice a month. After age 10 he did not experience any physical punishment and he was never sexually abused by a family member. Adults in his family, however, did fight. One adult slapped and beat up another adult once or twice a week. Pushing, grabbing, or shoving; and kicking, biting, or

punching took place between adults once or twice a month.

Subject H. This subject was a 22 year old, heterosexual, middle class male who was a full-time student and had completed at least three years of university.

Subject H was almost as sexually coercive in dating as Subject G. In junior high school, senior high school, and in university he reported verbally pressuring his dating partners to engage in both sex play and intercourse and physically coercing his dating partner to take part in sex play. He, like the subject before him, started coercing dates to engage in intercourse as early as junior high school and continued to do so much of his life. He reported no abuse in his family of origin.

Subject I. This subject recorded the most abuse in his family of origin of the male subjects. Subject I was 28 years old, heterosexual, and middle class. He was a full-time student who had completed at least three years of university.

This subject reported experiencing frequent and severe abuse as a child. Before the age of 10 he was slapped or spanked and beaten up almost every day.

After age 10, he was slapped, pushed, and beaten up, again almost every day. Such abuse also took place between adults in his family. He observed every type of violence between adults almost every day, from slapping to beating up. He experienced no sexual abuse in the family.

This subject did not experience any sexual victimization in dating, nor did he use any sexual coercion in dating.

The behavior patterns of Subjects H and I reflect the results of this study that there is no association between abuse in the family and sexual coercion in dating for men. Subject H was very sexually coercive in dating but had not experienced any abuse in his family of origin. Subject I experienced severe abuse in his family but was not coercive in dating.

Subject J. This subject was a 32 year old, heterosexual, middle class man who had completed at least three years of university and was a full-time student.

Subject J reported experiencing much abuse in his family. Before age 10 he was slapped and pushed around once or twice a week. He was also hit with something; kicked, bit or punched; and beaten up a few times a

year. Between the ages of 10 and 17 he experienced the same physical punishments with the same frequency. He was also sexually abused by a family member - made to show his sex organs and shown a family member's sex organs.

He was not sexually victimized in dating, but he was sexually coercive during all periods of his life - junior high, senior high, university and other. His coercive behavior consisted of using verbal pressure to engage in both sex play and sexual intercourse.

#### Abuse in the Family of Origin

Section II of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire derived information on 25 types of abuse clustered into four general family abuse categories: child abuse before age 10, child abuse between ages 10 and 17, adult-to-adult abuse, and child sexual abuse. Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 represent these four categories, respectively. Each table displays the prevalences, in frequencies and percents, of subjects who had experienced the types of family abuse classified under that category. Table 12 summarizes this information.



Child Abuse Under Age 10

The first of these tables (see Table 8), which describes six types of child abuse before age 10, indicates that, not surprisingly, being slapped or spanked before age 10 by an adult in the family was the type of abuse most commonly experienced by both men and women in this study. However, more men than women reported experiencing this type of abuse (70% compared to 59%) and, in addition, men claimed they had experienced it more frequently than women: Almost twice as many men (45%) as women (25%) reported being slapped or spanked more often than once a month. While more male subjects than female subjects reported experiencing the lesser forms of abuse under age 10 (slapped or spanked; pushed, grabbed, or shoved; and hit with something), the more severe types of abuse (having something thrown something at you; kicked, bit, or punched; and beaten up) were more evenly distributed between the sexes.

Table 8

Amount and Type of Child Abuse Experienced Under Age 10

Type of Abuse	Amount of Abuse		
	Never	< once a Month	> once a Month
<b>Women (N=59)</b>			
Slapped/Spanked	24 (41%)	20 (34%)	15 (25%)
Pushed/Grabbed	43 (73%)	9 (15%)	7 (12%)
Hit With Something	44 (75%)	11 (19%)	4 (7%)
Threw Something At	50 (85%)	6 (10%)	3 (5%)
Kicked/Bit/Punched	53 (90%)	4 (7%)	2 (3%)
Beat Up	51 (86%)	4 (7%)	4 (7%)
<b>Men (N=51)</b>			
Slapped/Spanked	15 (30%)	13 (25%)	23 (45%)
Pushed/Grabbed	31 (61%)	10 (20%)	10 (20%)
Hit With an Object	26 (51%)	16 (31%)	9 (18%)
Threw Something At	44 (86%)	3 (6%)	4 (8%)
Kicked/Bit/Punched	45 (88%)	4 (8%)	2 (4%)
Beat Up	40 (78%)	7 (14%)	4 (8%)

Child Abuse Between Ages 10 and 17

Table 9 exhibits subjects' experiences with 6 types of physical punishment between the ages of 10 and 17. Less distinct differences between the genders appear at this age than when the subjects were under age 10. For instance, while more men than women still experienced the lesser forms of abuse at this older age, the differences were much smaller: only 15% more men than women were slapped or spanked (compared to 100% more at the younger age). In addition, men tended not to experience this abuse more frequently than women. Also, the more severe types of abuse were experienced by approximately the same percentage of women as men and at a greater frequency by women: For instance, 7% of the women were beaten up more often than once a month by an adult in the family compared to "only" 2% of the men.

Table 9

Amount and Type of Child Abuse Experienced Between the  
Ages of 10 and 17

Type of Abuse	Amount of Abuse		
	Never	< once a Month	> once a Month
<b>Women (N=59)</b>			
Slapped/Spanked	37 (63%)	17 (29%)	5 (8%)
Pushed/Grabbed	44 (75%)	13 (22%)	2 (3%)
Hit With Something	47 (80%)	8 (14%)	4 (7%)
Threw Something At	52 (88%)	5 (8%)	2 (3%)
Kicked/Bit/Punched	53 (90%)	3 (5%)	3 (5%)
Beat Up	51 (86%)	4 (7%)	4 (7%)
<b>Men (N=51)</b>			
Slapped/Spanked	26 (51%)	18 (35%)	7 (14%)
Pushed/Grabbed	35 (69%)	11 (22%)	5 (10%)
Hit With Something	39 (76%)	10 (20%)	2 (4%)
Threw Something At	48 (94%)	2 (4%)	1 (2%)
Kicked/Bit/Punched	45 (88%)	5 (10%)	1 (2%)
Beat Up	45 (88%)	5 (10%)	1 (2%)

### Adult-to-Adult Abuse

Table 10 shows the types and amounts of adult-to-adult abuse the subject observed in the family when he or she was under 18 years old. Women reported most observing adults in the family pushing, grabbing, and shoving; whereas slapping was the form of physical abuse between adults most commonly recorded by men. Strangely, the second most commonly observed form of abuse for men was not pushing, grabbing, or shoving as might be expected, but was the more severe type of violence of kicking, biting, or punching. Beating up was the type of adult abuse least reported, just as it was for child abuse. However, unlike child abuse, being hit with something was very uncommon for adults in the family.

The biggest differences between the genders in reports of adult-to-adult abuse were in the items slapping; biting, kicking, or punching; and beating up. More than twice as many men as women observed these three forms of abuse.

Table 10

Amount and Type of Adult-to-Adult Abuse Observed

Type of Abuse	Amount of Abuse		
	Never	< once a Month	> once a Month
Women (N=59)			
Slapped	51 (86%)	4 (7%)	4 (7%)
Pushed/Grabbed	48 (81%)	9 (15%)	2 (3%)
Hit With Something	53 (90%)	4 (7%)	2 (3%)
Threw Something At	52 (88%)	5 (8%)	2 (3%)
Kicked/Bit/Punched	54 (92%)	2 (3%)	3 (5%)
Beat Up	57 (97%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)
Men (N=51)			
Slapped	36 (71%)	9 (18%)	6 (12%)
Pushed/Grabbed	43 (84%)	4 (8%)	4 (8%)
Hit With Something	44 (86%)	3 (6%)	4 (8%)
Threw Something At	46 (90%)	3 (6%)	2 (4%)
Kicked/Bit/Punched	41 (80%)	6 (12%)	4 (8%)
Beat Up	46 (90%)	3 (6%)	2 (4%)

Child Sexual Abuse

While more men had been physically abused in their families of origin than women, many more women had been abused sexually by a family member (see Table 11). In this study, 13 (22%) of the women had been sexually abused compared to 3 (6%) of the men. In addition, the men only reported voyeurism activities (showing and being showed sex organs) while the women reported all types of sexual experiences with family members. The most commonly reported sexual activity for women was being fondled in a sexual way (15%). The least reported activities were those that were most severe: being made to touch or stroke another's sex organs and attempted or perpetrated intercourse (incest). These two activities were still experienced by an alarmingly high percentage of women: 8% of the female sample.

Of the 16 subjects who had suffered sexual abuse in the family, 7 had also observed adults in their families fighting, and all but one had also experienced physical punishment as a child. For five of the female subjects, the physical punishment occurred almost every day.

Table 11

Type of Child Sexual Abuse Experienced

Type of Sexual Abuse	Gender	
	Female	Male
Kissed/Hugged in Sexual Way	6 (10%)	0 (0%)
Shown Other's Sex Organs	6 (10%)	2 (4%)
Made to Show Own Sex Organs	7 (12%)	2 (4%)
Fondled in a Sexual Way	9 (15%)	0 (0%)
Own Sex Organs were Touched/Stroked	7 (12%)	0 (0%)
Made to Touch/Stroke other's Sex Organs	5 (8%)	0 (0%)
Intercourse was Attempted/Achieved	5 (8%)	0 (0%)



Summary of Family Abuse

Table 12 summarizes the data on abuse in the family within four general categories: abused by an adult before age 10, abused between ages 10 and 17, observed adults fighting, and sexually abused as a child. Finally, the prevalence of any abuse in the family is displayed.

As this table shows, more men (82%) than women (73%) experienced abuse in their families of origin. A greater percentage of men than women reported experiencing each general type of physical abuse in the family (abuse before age 10, abuse between ages 10 and 17, and adults fighting) while, as stated earlier, many more women than men reported sexual abuse in the family.

Both more male and female subjects reported experiencing abuse under age 10 than over age 9. However, 50% more men were abused before age 10 while only 25% more women were abused at the younger age, showing that the abuse experiences of men changed more than the abuse experiences of women.

Not shown in the table is the finding that virtually all (98%) of the subjects who experienced abuse after age 9 were also abused before age 10.

Table 12

Type of Abuse Experienced in the Family of Origin

Type of Family Abuse	Gender	
	Female	Male
Child Abuse Before Age 10	40 (68%)	42 (82%)
Child Abuse Between Ages 10 & 17	27 (46%)	34 (67%)
Adult-to-Adult Abuse	16 (27%)	19 (37%)
Child Sexual Abuse	13 (22%)	3 (6%)
Any Abuse in the Family	43 (73%)	42 (82%)

Of those male subjects who were abused before age 10, 82% were also physically punished after age 9. Similarly, 68% of the women abused at a younger age were also abused as an adolescent.

Many more subjects in this study had been physically punished by an adult in the family than had observed adults physically fighting. Of the women who had been abused in their families, 36% had also observed adults in their families fighting. For men this rate was 45%. Again it was observed that virtually all (98%) of those subjects (both male and female) who observed adults in their families fighting were also abused themselves by an adult in their families when they were under ten years old.

#### Sexual Abuse in Dating

Table 13 presents, in frequencies and percents, the prevalences of both male and female sexual victimization and coercion in dating. The Victimized column represents the number of subjects who were victimized by the different types of sexual coercion in dating. The Coercive column shows the number of

subjects who used the different types of coercion to gain sexual activity from their dating partners.

#### Sexual Victimization and Coercion

The victimization column in Table 13 indicates that more women than men experienced every type of coercion, except for verbal persuasion to take part in intercourse, according to the subjects' own self-reports. Both the male and the female subjects reported forceful victimization (being physically forced to take part in either sex play or sexual intercourse) least of all. However, the greatest disparity between the sexes was also found in the two forceful victimization categories.

The rates displayed in the Coercive column in Table 13 indicate that many more men than women reported being sexually coercive in dating in every way except for using physical force to engage in sex play.

#### Discrepancies in Male and Female Reports

Table 14 shows that while many men reported being sexually victimized only a few women reported being sexually coercive; yet comparable numbers of women reported victimization and men reported coercion.

Table 13

Frequencies and Percents of Different Types of Sexual  
Coercion used in Dating

Type of Coercion Used	Victimized		Coercive	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
<b>Sex Play</b>				
Lies	17 (28%)	6 (12%)	3 (5%)	19 (37%)
Persuasion	17 (28%)	12 (24%)	2 (3%)	8 (16%)
Physical	16 (27%)	6 (12%)	2 (3%)	8 (16%)
Forceful	6 (10%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
<b>Intercourse</b>				
Lies	12 (20%)	6 (12%)	1 (2%)	13 (25%)
Persuasion	10 (17%)	10 (20%)	0 (0%)	7 (14%)
Physical	13 (22%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)	5 (10%)
Forceful	4 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 14

Frequencies and Percents for Type of Coercion Used and  
Type of Sexual Activity engaged in

	Victimized		Coercive	
	Male n=51	Female n=60	Male n=51	Female n=60
<b>Coercion:</b>				
Lies	9 (18%)	21 (35%)	21 (41%)	3 (5%)
Persuasion	16 (31%)	21 (35%)	10 (20%)	2 (3%)
Verbal*	19 (37%)	27 (45%)	24 (47%)	4 (7%)
Physical	9 (18%)	19 (32%)	9 (18%)	2 (3%)
Forceful	1 (2%)	7 (12%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)
<b>Sexual Activity:</b>				
Sex Play	18 (35%)	24 (40%)	23 (45%)	5 (8%)
Intercourse	14 (27%)	21 (35%)	15 (29%)	1 (2%)

\* Verbal includes the use of lies and/or persuasion to coerce a dating partner into sexual activity

However, the types of coercion that men reported using and women reported experiencing differed. More men admitted to using lies to gain sexual activity than women reported hearing lies; whereas, women reported the methods of verbal persuasion, physical coercion, and force more often than men admitted to using these types of coercion. For instance, no man in the present study admitted to using physical force to take part in sexual activity, while 12% of the women reported being victimized by this most severe method of coercion.

There were less distinct differences in the types of sexual activity in which men and women reported engaging. In fact, all subjects were coerced to engage in sex play at just a slightly higher rate than they were coerced to engage in sexual intercourse; while, as previously stated, rates varied widely in the levels of coercion used.

#### Scoring Sexual Abuse

The categorization of subjects into one of four levels of sexual abuse in dating (see Table 15) shows some main differences between men and women. For instance, a greater percentage of victimized men than women were classified into verbal victimization, while

Table 15

The Scoring of Subjects into Sexual Abuse Levels

Type and (Level)	Victimized		Coercive	
	Male n=51	Female n=60	Male n=51	Female n=60
None (0)	30 (59%)	31 (52%)	25 (49%)	55 (92%)
Verbal (1)	12 (24%)	9 (15%)	17 (33%)	3 (5%)
Physical (2)	8 (16%)	13 (22%)	9 (18%)	0 (0%)
Forceful (3)	1 (2%)	7 (12%)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)
Any Coercion	21 (41%)	29 (48%)	26 (51%)	5 (8%)



more women than men were categorized into the more severe levels of victimization: physical and forceful. It is also interesting to note that two of the five coercive women admitted to using physical force, whereas none of the 29 coercive men reported using such force.

Not displayed in the table is that all but 2 (90%) of those subjects who were scored at level 2 of victimization had also been verbally victimized in dating (level 1). For those who were scored at level 3, 88% experienced at least one lower level of victimization in dating (level 1 or 2) and 75% experienced both lower levels of victimization (levels 1 and 2). Similarly, most of those who had been sexually coercive at a higher level had also been sexually coercive at a lower level. More specifically, the two subjects who had been forcefully coercive had also been verbally and physically coercive, and 7 (78%) of the 9 subjects who had been physically coercive had also been verbally coercive.

Sexual Abuse in Secondary School Dating

A disturbing amount of sexual coercion in dating takes place among adolescents (see Tables 16 & 17). Of the 29 women in this study who were sexually abused in dating, 21 (72%) were abused while attending secondary school. In other words, 35% of the female sample reported sexual victimization in secondary school dating. Only 20% more women were coerced to engage in sex play (17) than were coerced to take part in intercourse (14) during adolescence. Approximately one quarter of the women in this study were coerced to engage in sexual intercourse before the age of 18 while on a date.

Of those women who were sexually victimized in secondary school, 43% had attended school locally, 24% had received some of their secondary schooling locally, and 33% had attended school elsewhere. A slightly higher percentage of the women who were victimized in high school attended school locally than the entire sample of women, suggesting that at least as many local girls experienced sexual coercion in dating as girls from elsewhere.

Table 16

Frequencies and Percents of the Different Types of  
Sexual Coercion used in Secondary School Dating

Type of Coercion Used	Victimized		Coercive	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
<b>Sex Play</b>				
Lies	3 (6%)	12 (20%)	13 (25%)	1 (2%)
Persuasion	5 (10%)	8 (13%)	5 (10%)	0 (0%)
Physical	3 (6%)	9 (15%)	5 (10%)	0 (0%)
Forceful	1 (2%)	4 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Intercourse</b>				
Lies	2 (4%)	8 (13%)	7 (14%)	0 (0%)
Persuasion	4 (8%)	5 (8%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)
Physical	1 (2%)	6 (10%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Forceful	0 (0%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 17

Rates for Types of Coercion and Types of Sexual  
Activity in Secondary School Dating

	Victimized		Coercive	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
<b>Type of Coercion:</b>				
Lies	4 (8%)	15 (25%)	11 (22%)	1 (2%)
Persuasion	6 (12%)	11 (18%)	7 (14%)	0 (0%)
Verbal*	7 (14%)	19 (32%)	14 (27%)	1 (2%)
Physical	3 (6%)	12 (20%)	5 (10%)	0 (0%)
Forceful	1 (2%)	5 (8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<b>Sexual Activity:</b>				
Sex Play	7 (14%)	17 (28%)	15 (29%)	1 (2%)
Intercourse	4 (8%)	14 (23%)	7 (14%)	0 (0%)

\* Verbal includes the use of lies and/or persuasion to coerce a dating partner into sexual activity

In this survey, more than twice as many women as men reported being sexually victimized in early dating, compared to closer to the same percentage of women (48%) and men (41%) being victimized in any dating. Only one third of those men who were victimized in dating were victimized during adolescence, and only about half of those subjects were coerced to engage in sexual intercourse. Of the male sample, 14% were coerced to take part in any sexual activity, 14% were coerced to engaged in sex play, and 8% were coerced into sexual intercourse while attending secondary school.

Of the men who had been victimized in early dating, 57% went to school locally, 14% had received some of their secondary schooling locally, and 29% had attended school elsewhere. Again, a greater percentage of the victimized boys in secondary school dating attended local schools (71%) than the entire sample of males (59%), indicating that, for this sample, local boys were at least as likely as others to be victimized on a date during adolescence.

The majority of the men (60%) who were coercive in dating were coercive in adolescent dating. However, while a comparable number of women were coerced to take

part in both sex play and intercourse at this young age, only half as many men reported coercing a dating partner to engage in sexual intercourse as reported coercing a partner into sex play. In addition, men tended not to report the more severe types of coercion in adolescence (physical and forceful) that the women clearly felt they had experienced.

Of the 15 men who reported coercive behavior in adolescent dating, 53% went to school locally, 7% received some of their schooling locally, and 40% attended school elsewhere. Because these proportions are not notably different than the proportions of the entire sample, it can be inferred that the sexually coercive behaviors of local boys in secondary school are not different from those behaviors of boys who live elsewhere.

#### Relationship Between Victimization and Coercion

The null hypothesis, the variables sexual victimization in dating and sexual coercion in dating are independent for men, was tested using the chi square test of independence. Of the 21 men who reported being coercive in dating, 16 also reported being victimized in dating. Of the 30 men who reported

no coercion in dating, 20 reported no victimization in dating.

The results of this 2 X 2 comparison indicated that the null hypothesis must be rejected. For this sample there is a significant association between being sexually victimized and being sexually coercive in dating for men ( $\chi^2=9.079$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p<.01$ ,  $\phi=0.42$ ). In addition, all 5 of the women who reported coercive behaviors also reported being sexually victimized. These findings suggest an association between the acts of sustaining and inflicting sexual abuse in dating.

### The Cycle of Abuse

This section focuses on the statistical analysis of the relationship between abuse in the family of origin and sexual abuse in dating. This association is explored for men and women separately and for two dependent variables, resulting in four substudies: (a) family abuse and sexual victimization in dating for women, (b) family abuse and sexual victimization in dating for men, (c) family abuse and sexual coercion in

dating for men, and (d) family abuse and sexual coercion in dating for women.

The relationships were measured using multiple linear regression analysis. A variation on the Botward technique of exploratory analysis was used to search for a probable best set of family abuse predictors of sexual abuse in dating, and standard linear regression analysis was used to determine the significance of that set of predictors. If a combination of items representing abuse in the family of origin has significant predictive power for future sexual abuse in dating, then the cycle of abuse hypothesis is supported.

#### Family Abuse and Sexual Victimization for Women

To find a likely best set of predictors of sexual victimization in dating for women, preliminary analyses were conducted using the exploratory female sample. The items were partitioned into four clusters: child abuse before age 10, child abuse between ages 10 and 17, adult-to-adult abuse, and child sexual abuse. The results of that analysis suggest that:

1. For the set of items assessing child abuse under age 10, being pushed, grabbed, or shoved was able



to account for most of the power of the pool to predict future sexual victimization in dating ( $r^2=.293$ ). The other five items in this pool did not add significantly to its predictive power.

2. Two items taken separately best represented the predictive strength of the six items assessing child abuse between ages 10 and 17: (a) being pushed, grabbed, or shoved; and (b) being beaten up ( $r^2=.35$ ).

3. Three items were required to optimize the predictive power of the pool assessing adult-to-adult abuse; observing an adult (a) slap another adult, (b) hit another adult with something, and (c) throw something at another adult ( $r^2=.47$ ).

4. For the pool of items assessing child sexual abuse in the family, being kissed or hugged in a sexual way was the only item with significant predictive power ( $r^2=.193$ ).

This analysis therefore identified a set of seven items that was most likely to predict sexual victimization in dating for women. When a multiple regression equation was tested on the exploratory data using these seven items, one item was discarded. The final set of six items that seemed to have the greatest potential for predicting sexual victimization in dating

for women was: (a) being pushed, grabbed, or shoved before age 10; (b) being beat up between ages 10 and 17; observing an adult in the family (c) slap another adult, (d) hit another adult with something, and (e) throw something at another adult; and (f) being kissed and hugged in a sexual way ( $r^2=.726$ ;  $F=6.618$ ;  $df=6,15$ ;  $p=.001$ ). This  $r^2$  is, of course, completely invalid as a test of any hypothesis as it involves massive optimization on chance. However, it does suggest a likely best set of items to be used in a test of an hypothesis on an independent sample.

The null hypothesis for the women in the present study, then, was that this combination of six family abuse variables was independent of the variable sexual victimization in dating. This hypothesis was tested on the final sample of women using linear regression analysis. The combination of six items was highly significantly associated with sexual victimization in dating for the women in the final sample ( $r^2=.424$ ,  $F=3.686$ ;  $df=6,30$ ;  $p=0.007$ ); the null hypothesis was rejected. This  $r^2$  means that approximately 42% of the variance that distinguishes nonvictimized women from victimized women can be accounted for by the combination of these six types of abuse in the family.

Family Abuse and Sexual Victimization for Men

The exploratory male sample was used for the preliminary analysis of family abuse predictors for sexual victimization in dating for men. The exploratory analyses employed three clusters of family abuse items: child abuse before age 10, child abuse between ages 10 and 17, and adult-to-adult abuse. The results of these analyses follow:

1. For the set of items which probed child abuse before age 10, three items were able to account for the predictive ability of all the items in the category. Those three items were (a) being pushed, grabbed, or shoved; (b) having something thrown at you; and (c) being kicked, bit, or punched ( $r^2=.361$ ).

2. Three items were also required to account for the predictive power of the pool of items sampling child abuse between ages 10 and 17: (a) being slapped or spanked; (b) being pushed, grabbed, or shoved; and (c) having something thrown at you ( $r^2=.353$ ).

3. Three items from the pool of adult-to-adult abuse were again needed to account for the predictive power of the pool. Those items were observing an adult (a) slap another adult; (b) kick, bite, or punch another adult; and (c) beat-up another adult ( $r^2=.330$ ).

A further linear regression analysis of the exploratory data using those nine items resulted in two of the items (having something thrown at you between the ages of 10 and 17, and observing an adult kick, bite, or punch another adult) being discarded. An equation using the remaining seven items resulted in an  $r^2$  of .777 ( $F=4.977$ ;  $df=7,10$ ;  $p=.012$ ). Again, this  $r^2$  is not a valid test of any hypothesis but it did suggest which items would be most worthwhile to test on the final sample.

The null hypothesis for men, then, was that the combination of these seven types of abuse in the family of origin (being pushed, grabbed, or shoved, having something thrown at you, and being kicked, bit, or punched before age 10; being slapped or spanked, and being pushed, grabbed, or shoved between ages 10 and 17; and observing an adult slap another and beat up another adult) is independent of sexual victimization in dating. A multiple regression analysis was performed on the final sample of men using these eight items. The resulting  $r^2$  was .357, but with  $F=1.985$ ;  $df=7,25$ ;  $p=0.098$ , some caution should be exercised in rejecting the null hypothesis.

Family Abuse and Sexual Coercion in Dating for Men

The final preliminary analyses for men were performed on the exploratory male sample with the dependent variable of sexual coercion in dating. Linear regression equations were determined for the same three sets of family abuse items as for sexual victimization: child abuse before age 10, child abuse between ages 10 and 17, and adult-to-adult abuse. The same procedure as used earlier suggested that:

1. Three of the first set of items be maintained: (a) being pushed, grabbed, or shoved; (b) being hit with something; and (c) having something thrown at you before the age of 10 ( $r^2=.317$ ).
2. Three items were also required to maximize the predictive power of the second set of items: (a) being slapped or spanked; (b) being pushed, grabbed, or shoved; and (c) being beat up between the ages of 10 and 17.
3. A combination of two items (observing an adult in the family slap another, and push, grab, or shove, another) were able to represent most of the predictive strength of the third set of items.

When these 8 items were used in a linear regression analysis of the exploratory sample, it was

found that four items were able to account for the predictive power of the pool. Three of these items were types of child abuse that took place between the ages of 10 and 17, namely being slapped or spanked; being pushed, grabbed, or shoved; and being beaten up. The fourth item was observing an adult in the family slap another adult in the family. For the exploratory sample, these four items gave an  $r^2$  of .679 ( $F=6.860$ ;  $df=4,13$ ;  $p=.003$ ). Again, this  $r^2$  is not a valid test of any hypothesis but simply suggests the combination of items that is most likely to be associated with sexual coercion in dating for men.

The final null hypothesis tested in this study was that this combination of four family abuse items is independent of sexual coercion in dating for men. When a multiple linear regression analysis was performed on the final male sample using these four items with the dependent variable sexual coercion in dating, the resulting  $r^2$  was .123 ( $F=.979$ ;  $df=4,28$ ;  $p=.435$ ). This result indicates that this null hypothesis cannot be rejected. There is no evidence that the relationship apparently found in the exploratory analyses was not due to chance.

### Family Abuse and Sexual Coercion in Dating for Women

Because there were so few sexually coercive women in this study, multiple linear regression analyses could not be performed with that dependent variable. The following section will examine descriptively the family abuse experiences of the five sexually coercive women. No statistical hypotheses can be tested using such descriptive data.

One of the coercive women did not report her family abuse history. Of the four coercive women who did complete Section II of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire on family experiences, all recorded some form of family abuse: three reported physical abuse before age 10, three reported physical abuse after age 10, one recounted observing her parents fighting, and three recorded experiencing child sexual abuse in the family. In addition, as mentioned previously, all five of the sexually coercive females experienced sexual victimization in dating.

## CHAPTER 5

### Discussion

This chapter begins with a summary of the research method used in the study, followed by some limitations of this method. It continues with observations and conclusions that have been drawn from a synthesis of past research and the results presented in Chapter 4. Finally, some recommendations for the use of this data are put forth.

#### Summary

The high prevalence of both abuse in the family of origin and sexual abuse in dating was substantiated by past research. In addition, the literature indicated a possible positive association between these two variables. This possible association was the basis of the study's research question, "What is the predictive power of family abuse for sexual abuse in dating?"

In addition to answering the research question, the study generated some initial Canadian statistics on



the prevalence of 25 individual types of abuse in the family of origin. It also produced initial Canadian rates of sexual abuse in dating, including the prevalence of sexually victimized men and women and sexually coercive men and women, and the rates of sexual abuse in all dating as well as more specifically in adolescent dating. The relationship between being sexually victimized and being sexually coercive was also determined.

To accomplish these purposes, an exploratory study was conducted. A self-report instrument, labelled the Dating Experiences Questionnaire, was compiled for the study. It consisted of closed-ended questions in three sections: one asking about background information, the second requiring information on experiences with abuse in the family of origin, and the third section requesting data on experiences with sexual victimization and use of sexual coercion in dating.

The researcher administered the questionnaire to seven co-operating classes in the Faculty of Arts at a university in western Canada. All students in these classes participated in the study, but for various reasons 24 of the questionnaires were not usable.

The final sample for this study consisted of 51 males and 60 females attending summer courses in the Faculty. The vast majority of the subjects were full-time university students who had completed at least two years of study, were heterosexual, and were middle-class. They ranged in age from 19 to 34.

Frequencies with which questions were answered positively were determined in order to find the percentage of men and women who had experienced the various types of family abuse and sexual abuse in dating. These descriptive statistics included the amount and severity of family abuse experienced by the subjects, the level and type of sexual victimization sustained and sexual coercion used in dating, and the life period(s) in which the dating abuse took place. In addition, in order to determine the association between inflicting and sustaining sexual abuse in dating, a chi square test of independence was performed on the variables sexual coercion in dating and sexual victimization in dating for men.

Multiple linear regression analysis was used to answer the research question, "What is the predictive power of family abuse for sexual abuse in dating?" A variation on the Botward technique of exploratory

analyses was employed to determine which aspects of family abuse were most likely to contribute to the prediction of sexual victimization in dating for men, of sexual victimization in dating for women, and of sexual coercion in dating for men. The resulting combinations of family abuse items were tested for significance on the final samples using linear regression equations. The relationship between family abuse and sexual coercion in dating for women was examined descriptively due to the small number of coercive women in the study.

#### Limitations

The subjects, instrument, and method that were used may tend to limit the generalizability of findings from this study in certain ways. Firstly, the sample used in this study was a volunteer sample, dependent on both which professors agreed to allow their classes to participate and which students agreed to take part. However, the reply form (see Appendix B) produced some characteristics of those professors who did not wish to participate and all students present when the study was

conducted completed the survey. It is thought that, because all students participated, a good sample of the full range of university student experiences of interest to this study may have been represented. However, summer students attending university may be different from regular university students and the sample was relatively small, so caution in generalizing the findings beyond the summer school population is suggested.

It was an assumption of this study that sexual abuse can be measured, implying that one type of sexual coercion is more severe than another. This assumption is questionable. Also, levels of sexual abuse for the current study were determined using criteria derived from, but not previously used in, past research.

However, the current results indicate some validity to the method used for scoring sexual abuse in this study. For instance, the present study found that subjects were coerced to engage in sex play at just a slightly higher rate than they were coerced to engage in sexual intercourse, while rates varied widely in the levels of coercion used. This finding implies that the level of coercion used is more notable than the type of sexual activity engaged in which at least partly

justifies this study's categorization of sexual abuse by level of coercion rather than by type of sexual activity. Another finding of this study was that most students who had been scored at a higher level of sexual victimization or coercion had also experienced lower levels. This finding implies that there does seem to be at least some sequential progression to sexual abuse in dating based on the type of coercion used, giving further validity to a method of scoring sexual abuse which is based on the method of coercion.

The present instrument consisted of a new collection of questions. While all of the questions had previously been used in published surveys, the questionnaire as a whole had not been used. Thus, reliability data for the present instrument were not previously available. However, significant results in this study for women support the validity of the present questionnaire. It seemed necessary to examine different frequencies and severities of abuse in the family, and different levels of abuse in dating, in order to determine a good set of family abuse predictors.

The results of this study may be subject to response bias, as is all self-report data. But some

information is known. Koss and Gidycz (1985) found that, across methods (interview and survey), women's answers tended to be more consistent than men's. Also, respondents may have felt uncomfortable answering certain questions in a classroom setting. Hopefully, the act of physically separating the students by seating arrangement minimized this potential problem.

Finally, a thorough study of the association between abuse in the family of origin and sexual abuse in dating should examine all forms of these types of abuse. While the current study strived to include the most common and important types of abuse, it did not examine all possibilities.

### Observations and Conclusions

This section will compare and contrast the present findings with other studies and make observations and conclusions from the synthesis of data.

#### Abuse in the Family of Origin

The results of the present study suggest that the prevalence of abuse in the Canadian family is at least

as high as it is in the American family. Seventy-three percent of the women and 82% of the men in this study reported experiencing some form of abuse in their families of origin. These rates, representing 77% of the sample, are slightly higher than the 73% reported in the national American study of family violence (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980).

Child abuse. When comparing this study's child abuse statistics to those of the first national American study, some interesting observations can be made (see Table 18). Generally speaking, the rates of the less severe types of adult-to-child violence (slaps or spanks; pushes, grabs, or shoves) are higher in the American study, whereas the more severe types of child abuse are more prevalent in the current sample. In particular, the rates of two violent acts are considerably higher in the present study. Thirty-six percent of the subjects in this study admitted to being hit with an object by an adult in the family, whereas in the American study only 20% reported such hitting. An even greater disparity is found in the most extreme category of abuse: 18% of the present sample reported being beaten up compared to 4% of the American sample.

Table 18

Comparing This Study's Rates of Child Abuse to the  
American Study\*

Type of Abuse	Study	
	American*	Present
Slapped/Spanked	71%	64%
Pushed/Grabbed/Shoved	46%	33%
Hit With Something	20%	36%
Threw Something At	9%	15%
Kicked/Bit/Punched	8%	11%
Beat up	4%	18%

\* Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980)



One possible reason for these differences is that the present study included any adult living with the child while the American study only examined the abuse by parents of the child. Also, the American study asked the parents about their own behavior whereas the present study questioned the subjects about the behavior of the adults in their families.

However, it must be questioned why these two particular types of abuse were reported by comparatively more subjects in the present study, while less severe types of abuse were reported at a greater rate in the American study. Perhaps the parents in the American study were more truthful about their use of the less severe forms of punishment than their use of the more severe violent acts; but it is unlikely that such an explanation can account for a 450% difference. This much higher prevalence of being beaten up in the present study is particularly distressing, especially since severe child abuse is supposedly on the decrease (Straus & Gelles, 1986).

Like Gelles (1979), the present study distinguished between child abuse before age 10 and after age 9. Both studies found more abuse in the younger age group; however, the present research

discovered less of a difference between the two age groups than did Gelles. For instance, Gelles found that 75% more children were slapped or spanked before age 10 than after age 9, whereas in the present study, slapping or spanking changed only by about a third.

In addition, the present results indicate that the change in abuse experiences of boys was twice as high as the change in the abuse experiences of girls. Besides the category of being slapped or spanked, girls' abuse experiences showed little differences between the times when they were younger and older. Boys, however, showed a decrease in the amount of abuse they received after age 9 in every category but one (being kicked, bit, or punched). Most notably, in two categories (being hit with something and being beaten up) there were twice as many younger boys receiving the punishment as older boys. This finding that considerably fewer older boys were abused while the abuse of girls remained more constant may reflect the greater average aggressiveness and strength of adolescent boys.

Unlike other studies, the present data differentiates the family abuse experiences of men and women. One general conclusion that can be made from

this differentiation is that men tended to receive minor physical blows more than women when they were young (under 10). However, as the age of the children and the severity of abuse increased, the abuse experiences of men and women became more similar, and even began to reverse the initial pattern. In other words, while little boys were more likely to be spanked than little girls, boys and girls were equally apt to be beat up, with more adolescent girls than adolescent boys experiencing this extreme type of abuse frequently. It seems that severe child abusers did not discriminate between their sons and daughters as did those parents who used the more socially acceptable forms of corporal punishment.

Adult-to-adult abuse. When comparing the present rates of adult violence in the home with the first national American study (see Table 19), the two sets of results are more consistent than those of child abuse discussed above. The present study yielded a somewhat higher prevalence of slapping, and kicking, biting, or punching; and the American study of family violence found slightly higher rates of pushing, grabbing, or shoving, and throwing something at another adult, but the differences were relatively small. The overall

Table 19

Comparing This Study's Rates of Adult-to-Adult Abuse  
with the American Study\*

Type of Abuse	Study	
	American*	Present
Slapped/Spanked	18%	21%
Pushed/Grabbed/Shoved	24%	17%
Hit With Something	10%	12%
Threw Something At	16%	11%
Kicked/Bit/Punched	9%	14%
Beat up	5%	6%

\* Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1980.

violence rate for spouses in the American study was 28% compared to 32% in the present study. Again, the higher prevalence in the current study might be partly explained by the fact that all adults living in the home were included rather than just parents. In addition, Lupri (1989) found that the rate of husband-to-wife violence in Canada was considerably higher than it was in America. Perhaps the higher rate of spouse abuse in the present study reflects that finding.

Men's and women's observations of adults in their families fighting were also examined independently. While 37% of the men observed fighting between adults in their families, only 27% of the women were subjected to this type of violence. No other study was found which examined the family abuse experiences of men and women separately, so there have been no speculations of the reasons for differences in these experiences of men and women. Perhaps adults were less likely to fight in front of their daughters than in front of their sons. Or maybe daughters underreported the adult violence in their homes. Sigelman, Berry, and Wiles (1984), in studying dating violence, concluded that socially desirable responding among women "leads to

underreporting of experience with abusive behavior" (p. 545).

Child sexual abuse. A disturbing number of women in this study reported sexual experiences with a family member five or more years older than the subject. The high reporting of this type of abuse seems to contradict the idea that women in this study underreported their abuse experiences.

Based on the research by Badgley et al. (1984), the best Canadian estimates for sexual abuse in the family are 7.5% of females and 3.5% of males. In the present study, the results are approximately three times higher than expected for women, at 22% of the female sample, and twice as high for men, where 6% of the male sample admitted to sexual abuse by a family member. However, it is not uncommon for similar studies on childhood sexual abuse to show widely varying results, as is apparent by the numerous studies reviewed by Peters, Wyatt, and Finkelhor (1986). In addition to different prevalences of childhood sexual abuse, studies have come up with differences in the amount of that abuse that takes place within the family, ranging from 21% to 87% of all childhood sexual

abuse being committed by a family member (Badgley et al., 1984).

The results of the Badgley et al. (1984) report were used to predict the prevalence of family sexual abuse in the present study because their research used a random and representative national Canadian sample, whereas the other studies used more specific populations from hospitals, police stations, and child protection agencies.

Again, a possible reason for this sample's higher prevalence of sexual abuse in the family may be the fact that any person living with the child is considered to be a family member in the present study, whereas other studies were more limited in their definitions of a family member. Otherwise, because the two studies used a similar definition of sexual abuse, it is difficult to surmise why the present sample would be so different from a nationally representative sample in their family sexual experiences.

The relationship among family abuses. It is interesting to note that, in the present study, the existence of child abuse between ages 10 and 17, of adult-to-adult abuse, and of child sexual abuse each have one thing in common, and that is the existence of

child abuse before age 10. Virtually all subjects who had experienced any one of the three former mentioned abuses also experienced child abuse before age 10. In addition, for the present sample, 85% of the subjects who had experienced early child abuse also experienced at least one other general type of family abuse: 75% were abused after age 10, and 50% either observed their parents fighting or were sexually abused. These findings were not reported by other research.

If these findings were a trend in the general population, than abuse in the family would not usually be isolated to one form. Early child abuse would be predictive of other abuse in the family, and other abuse in the family would almost always indicate that early child abuse is taking, or has taken, place.

#### Sexual Abuse in Dating

In this section, the reports of sexual victimization and sexual coercion in dating from both men and women are examined.

Victimized women and coercive men. Like previous research, the present study found a high prevalence of sexual victimization in dating for women, with 48% of the women reporting victimization and 51% of the men



admitting to sexually coercive behavior. Because the present study used questions based on the Koss and Oros (1982) survey, it is most appropriate to compare the present results with those studies using that survey, in particular, the national American study by Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski (1987) (see Table 20).

Studies on sexual abuse in dating do not tend to be consistent, and the present study is no exception. While some of the present rates are similar to the findings of other studies, other rates differ greatly. For instance, the rates of male coercers in the two studies are similar, while the rates of female victims in the present study tend to be somewhat lower than in the Koss et al. study. Few studies ask exactly the same questions, which could account for some differences. In addition, self-report data cannot be measured objectively, making comparisons between studies difficult.

The Koss survey did not examine the use of physical coercion in dating (i.e., sexual activity engaged in even after the partner has objected). Other studies which did investigate this form of coercion found that females reported being physically coerced to

Table 20

A Comparison of the Present Study's Results (Women as Victims, Men as Coercers) with the Koss et al. Study

Method of coercion	Present Study (1990)		Koss et al. Study (1987)	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
<b>Sex Play</b>				
Lies	37%	28%	--	--
Persuasion	16%	28%	19%	44%
Physical Force	0%	10%	6%	13%
<b>Intercourse</b>				
Lies	25%	20%	20%*	20%*
Persuasion	14%	17%	15%	25%
Physical Force	0%	7%	3%	9%

\* Because the use of lies was not examined in the Koss et al. study, the data on lies come from an earlier study by Koss (Koss & Oros, 1982).

take part in sex play at rates of 48% (Sandberg, Jackson, & Petretic-Jackson, 1987), 59% (Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987), and 65% (Garrett-Gooding & Senter, 1987), which are approximately twice as high as the present study's 27%. For being physically coerced to take part in intercourse, female rates of 31.3% (Muehlenhard & Cook, 1988) and 18% (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988) were reported. The 22% physical coercion rate for the present study is more consistent with that research.

Discrepancies between male reports of coercion and female reports of victimization. Contrary to the results of other studies (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Garrett-Gooding, & Senter, 1987; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Koss & Oros, 1982; Miller & Marshall, 1987; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987) which found that fewer men reported being sexually coercive than women related being sexually victimized, the present study found agreement between the two. In this study, 49% of the women recorded being sexually victimized, and 51% of the men recounted coercive behaviors. However, the men did not admit to the more severe types of coercion that the women reported enduring.

Perhaps this disagreement in the types of coercion used can be explained, at least in part, by previous findings. In the present study, 32% of the women reported physical coercion while only 18% of the men admitted to using that type of coercion. Sandberg, Jackson, and Petretic-Jackson (1987) found that men tended not to believe women when they said no. If this finding is true for the men in the present study, it could influence their answers to questions about physical coercion (engaging in sexual activity even after your partner has objected). Similarly, 12% of the women recounted forceful victimization experiences while no man related using force. This finding might be explained by Warshaw's (1988) conclusion that men do not perceive situations as being forceful that women find quite threatening.

Victimized men and coercive women. The relatively high rate of male victimization found in the present research (41%) seems to support the results of other studies which all found notable, although varying, numbers of men reporting experiences with sexually coercive dating partners.

For instance, Muehlenhard and Cook (1988) found that 27% of the men in their study reported being

verbally coerced to take part in sex play and 13% were so coerced to engage in intercourse. Those results are somewhat lower than the present study's findings of 28% and 20%, respectively. In contrast, those authors reported that 23% of the men in their study were forcefully coerced (using nonviolent methods) to participate in sex play and 6% were physically forced (using nonviolent methods) to engage in intercourse, prevalences which are much higher than the present study's 2% and 0%. Sandberg, Jackson, and Petretic-Jackson (1987) also found higher rates: 48% of the men in their study felt verbally coerced into sexual intercourse and 6% asserted that they had been physically forced to engage in intercourse.

Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good (1988) found that 9% of the men in their study were physically coerced to take part in sexual activity. This finding is in agreement with the present results of 8% of the men reporting being physically coerced to engage in intercourse and 12% reporting being physically coerced to take part in sex play.

The prevalence of female sexual coercion found in the present study is consistent with the results of past research. Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988)

found that 7% of the women in their study (compared to 8% in the current study) admitted to sexually abusive behavior (taking part in sexual activity against their dating partner's will). Struckman-Johnson (1988) found that 2% of her female subjects admitted to forcing their dating partners to engage in sexual intercourse. In the present study, 2% of the females recounted using lies to persuade their dating partners to engage in sexual intercourse, and 3% related using physical force to engage in sex play.

Discrepancies in male reports of victimization and female reports of coercion. In the current study, 41% of the men reported being sexually victimized in dating, yet only 8% of the women reported sexually coercive behaviors. The two previous studies which examined the issues of sexually coercive females and victimized males also found that men reported sustaining sexual abuse more than women reported being sexually abusive. One of those studies (Struckman-Johnson, 1988) found that eight times more men reported sustaining sexual abuse than women reported perpetrating the abuse.

It is difficult to explain this inconsistency. Perhaps men overreported their experiences as victims

and/or women underreported their use of coercion. Or maybe men were coerced by other men; however, since 88% of the male sample claimed to be heterosexual, it is unlikely that so many experienced coercion to take part in homosexual activity on a date.

Those studies which speculated about reasons for the discrepancies between male reports of sexual aggression and female reports of sexual victimization came up with the following: men did not perceive the wording of the questions as it was intended, men did not see their own actions the same as women did, and men could not tell when a woman was really objecting to sexual activity. Perhaps these same reasons can be applied to why women do not admit to sexually coercive behavior at the rate that men report sexual victimization.

It is interesting to note that in the case of physical abuse, this discrepancy in female reports of perpetration and male reports of victimization does not exist. In fact, for physical abuse in dating the opposite seems to be true: women tended to report using more abuse than men reported sustaining (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988). In addition, in this study women admitted to forceful

sexual coercion while men did not. Women's seemingly truthful reporting of some abusive behaviors is incompatible with the notion that they are underreporting other abusive behaviors.

Sexual abuse in secondary school dating. The present data indicate that much of sexual coercion in dating takes place, or begins, in secondary school. Indeed, more sexual abuse in dating took place during secondary school than during any other period of life, including university, according to the self-reports of the women in this study. Warshaw (1988), reporting results from the national American study of sexual abuse in dating, stated that 38% of the women who had been raped were aged 14 to 17. In the current study, half of the women raped (physically forced to take part in intercourse) were under age 18 at the time and 71% of those coerced to take part in sex play were adolescents.

On the other hand, more men indicated that they had been victimized during university dating than during secondary school dating. In this sample, 35% of the women had been coerced to take part in any sexual activity (compared to 14% of the men) and 23% had been coerced to engage in sexual intercourse (compared to 8%



of the men) in adolescence. In effect, this finding indicates that one out of every four girls is being raped by their dates in adolescence (rape in this case meaning taking part in sexual intercourse against one's will).

Due to the high prevalence of sexual abuse that seems to be perpetrated against girls in secondary school dating, it is possible that most of the sexual activity that takes place between adolescents is forced on girls against their wills.

The relationship between sexual victimization and sexual coercion in dating. An interesting finding of the present study is an apparent positive relationship between the acts of inflicting and sustaining sexual abuse in dating. While numerous researchers have identified a reciprocity in sustaining and inflicting physical abuse in dating and marriage, no research was found which reported such a phenomenon in sexual abuse in dating.

A reciprocity in physical abuse has been explained by self-defence, protection, and retaliation (Dibble & Straus, 1980; Gelles, 1979; MacLeod, 1987; Straus, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1988; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). A relationship between using and

receiving sexual coercion is not so easily accounted for, as it is unlikely that someone would respond to being sexually coerced by immediately becoming sexually coercive for the purpose of self-defence or protection.

Another reason for the reciprocity of physical abuse put forward was that one person's modelling of abuse reinforces that behavior in another. Social learning theory certainly supports that explanation of aggressive behavior. According to Bandura (1973), abusive behavior by one person can teach, instigate, or sustain abuse by another. It seems likely that people might learn some of their dating behavior from the modelling of a dating partner. The research on animal aggression supports the modelling theory; for instance, Trudeau, Bergmann-Riss, and Hamburg (1981), in a review of chimpanzee research on aggression, stated that "23% of all attacks occurred within five minutes of a previous attack" (p. 36). Perhaps adults model the behavior they observe from their dating partners, including sexual abuse.

Power based theories may also show that people who are dominated in one relationship may be dominant in another.

### The Cycle of Abuse

It was concluded from this study that there is a positive association between abuse in the family of origin and sexual abuse in dating; the cycle of abuse hypothesis was supported. This association was most apparent for women and manifested itself through a combination of six family abuse items being significantly predictive ( $=.007$ ) of sexual victimization in dating. The six items included: (a) being pushed, grabbed, or shoved before age 10; (b) being beaten beat up between ages 10 and 17; observing an adult in the family (c) slap another adult; (d) hit another adult with something; and (e) throw something at another adult; and (f) being kissed or hugged in a sexual way. This combination of items accounted for 42% of the variance which distinguished the sexually victimized women.

Since variance partitioning is not a valid method of analyses, no relative effects of individual variables can be suggested. The only conclusion that can be made is that family abuse, when confined to the combination of these six specific family abuse items, is significantly predictive of sexual victimization in dating for women.

This relationship neared significance for men while no significant association was found in the present study between family abuse and sexual coercion in dating for men.

The research on spouse abuse tended to find that experiencing child abuse, observing parental violence, and experiencing both types of physical family violence were each progressively more predictive of future involvement with spouse abuse. The present results might be interpreted as being at least somewhat consistent with those findings for women for two reasons: (a) Family abuse items from the categories of both adult-to-adult abuse and child abuse were included in the combination of items found to be significantly predictive of sexual victimization in dating for women; and (b) in the present study virtually all those who observed adults fighting were also abused themselves. It seems that women who experience more than one form of family abuse are more vulnerable to future sexual victimization in dating.

Studies on spouse abuse also found that family abuse seemed to affect men more than women. Research on the relationship between physical abuse in the family and physical abuse in dating were not so

consistent. While two studies (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, and Bohmer, 1987) similarly found that men from abusive families were more likely to use or experience physical violence in dating than women from abusive families, Sigelman, Berry, and Wiles (1984) discovered the opposite to be true. The present research agrees more with the last study and so is inconsistent with the majority of research on spouse and dating abuse; for the present sample, it seems that women who experienced family abuse were more likely to encounter sexual abuse in dating than men from abusive families.

One study which examined the relationship between physical abuse in the family and sexual abuse in dating (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988) found that family abuse was associated with victimization in dating for both men and women but was not related to coercion in dating for either men or women. To the contrary, two studies (Koss & Dinero, 1990; Miller & Marshall, 1987) reported that both physical and sexual abuse in childhood were significantly associated with sexually coercive behavior in dating for men. The present study shows some consistency with the former research and contradicts the later, since in this study family abuse

was significantly predictive of sexual victimization for females and neared significance for males, while no significant association was found between family abuse and sexual coercion in dating.

Four substudies were analyzed in the present research in order to determine if the association between abuse in the family and sexual abuse in dating differed for men and women, and differed for sexual victimization and sexual coercion. Because the previously cited research reported inconsistent findings, no definitive conclusions can be made about these aspects of the cycle of abuse.

#### Implications and Recommendations

This final section puts forth some implications of the data and recommendations for future research in the general areas of abuse in the family of origin, sexual abuse in dating, and the association between the two. It also examines the implications of sexual abuse in dating within the broader context of sexual abuse in sexually intimate relationships.

Underlying these implications and recommendations is the assumption that abuse, including family abuse and sexual abuse in dating, is unacceptable. It is harmful and needs to be stopped. This assumption underlies all abuse research reviewed in this paper. It may be generally held that coercion is part of the mating game, but such a belief does not make it harmless. Research (McShane, 1988; Warshaw, 1988) shows that any coercion to take part in sexual activity is not only unwanted by the victim, but it can also have devastating consequences.

#### Abuse in the Family of Origin

There clearly continues to be much abuse in the family of origin, including physical child abuse, child sexual abuse, and adult-to-adult abuse. Strides must continue to be made to develop strategies for education on the prevalences and consequences of these abuses, for remediation for their victims, and for primary prevention to stop family violence before it begins.

According to the findings of the present study, areas which should not be overlooked in future research on family abuse include the possibilities: (a) that the existence of child abuse after age 9, adult-to-

adult abuse, and child sexual abuse each indicate that early child abuse has taken, or is taking, place; (b) that the existence of early child abuse suggests that there may be other abuse in the family; (c) that men and women seem to have different experiences with all types of family abuse except for extreme child abuse; (d) that the prevalence of severe child abuse and of the sexual abuse of children in the family might be higher than previously suggested; and (e) that, while the boys' rates of child abuse seem to decrease with age, the prevalences of child abuse for girls remain more constant.

#### Sexual Abuse in Dating

Clearly, sexual abuse in dating is a common problem, with possibly as many as one out of every two people being involved in it at some time in their lives. Even more disturbing is that most of this abuse seems to take place during adolescence, especially for females.

More street lights around campuses and campus police escorts to cars is helping only a small portion of the problem of sexual abuse, which goes way beyond stranger attacks in dark corners on university



campuses. Studies must now examine methods of both prevention and remediation for the very common problem of sexual abuse in dating, a problem far more widespread and urgent than stranger rape. Remediation services need to be made available to victims of sexual abuse in dating of all ages, and any strategies for the prevention of sexual abuse in dating must start at the intermediate level of school (Grades 5 to 7), where the vast majority of young people can be reached before any dating begins.

In addition, it seems that both males and females can be victims and coercers. Future studies of sexual abuse in dating should not ignore this possibility. More needs to be known about the sexual victimization of men and the use of sexual coercion by women in order to gain a more complete and accurate understanding of sexual abuse in dating.

The apparent relationship in the acts of using and sustaining sexual abuse in dating also needs further study. Can such a reciprocity be found in larger samples, and, if so, what may be some possible reasons for this phenomenon?

In addition, the discrepancies between the self-reports of men and women of their experiences with

sexual abuse in dating suggest that sexual coercion is neither universally understood nor recognized. It would seem that people need to be educated about (a) what sexual coercion is, (b) the unacceptability of all forms of sexual coercion, and (c) the identification of nonconsent (i.e., that no means no). The vast discrepancy between male reports of victimization and female reports of coercion is particularly perplexing in light of the fact that female reports of other types of abuse tend to be consistent with male reports. What is it about sexual abuse that creates such discrepancies in reporting?

#### Sexual Abuse in Sexually Intimate Relationships

Studies agree that the more intimate the relationship, the greater the likelihood of physical violence. Pagelow (1984), in her review of the research, concluded that "as intimacy grows in some relationships, so does the potential for violence" (p. 257). According to Sigelman, Berry, and Wiles (1984), "living with a member of the opposite sex, married or unmarried, was the strongest and most consistent predictor of involvement in abuse, especially of being a target of abuse" (p. 545). It seems that sexual

intimacy is a major factor in physical abuse. Perhaps sexual intimacy is also a factor in sexual abuse. This idea has had little attention in the research possibly because of the general opinion that somehow a relationship of consensual intercourse cannot become a sexually abusive relationship.

For instance, the phenomenon of marital rape is just beginning to come out of the closet for the very reason that marriage did give the spouses the right to unrestricted sexual activity with each other. This "right" is now being questioned by Canada and by some States in America which recently began to identify marital rape as a crime.

Until 1981 in Canada, Bill C-52 stated that "rape within marriage was limited to situations where the spouses lived apart" (Kinnon, 1985, p. 15). In 1981, Bill C-53 finally abolished the husband's exemption from prosecution for forcible sexual intercourse with his wife. In America, as of 1987, "28 states allowed a husband to be prosecuted for rape even while he lives with his partner; 21 states allowed prosecution of the partners if they were living apart; and 1 state, Alabama, retained the marital exclusion for married

partners, irrespective of where they lived" (Gelles, 1987, p. 149).

Even with Canada and some States legally being able to charge a husband with the rape of a cohabitating wife, it is clearly still not universally accepted. For instance, the reaction from Christian fundamentalist groups in Canada to Bill C-53 was that "A husband's right of sexual access to his wife is necessary for the survival of the family unit" (Kinnon, 1985, p. 17). In a recent wife rape case in Canada where the husband was found guilty, his sentence was simply one year probation. The judge commented,

"I am of the view, and I believe it is common ground, that the degree of trauma associated with a sexual attack is affected by the relationship, if any, between the parties. And I think it cannot be said that the trauma suffered by the victim is as great where there has been a past history of lawful sexual relations with the accused as it would be if she were attacked by a stranger." (Ellis-Grunfeld, 1985, pp. 5-6)

This disturbing conclusion that prior consensual sexual intimacy with the assailant makes the sexual abuse less damaging seems to be widespread. It is this

same principal that has kept date rape in the closet until recently. In rebuttal, that author stated, "Those who counsel survivors agree that trauma is often greater when the assailant is known to the survivor. Basic trust has been violated and the relationship damaged. Data also indicates that a high percentage of survivors know their assailant and often have a trust or love relationship prior to the assault" (p. 6).

Sexual abuse in marriage, like sexual abuse in dating, has just begun to be studied in the last decade. This trend must continue so that all sexual abuse is examined irrespective of the relationship between the assailant and victim. In addition, the results of this study seem to suggest that sexual abuse should also be examined irrespective of the type of sexual activity engaged in. Sexual abuse studied in isolation, rather than with factors which may be irrelevant, should result in more accurate data on this topic.

The association between sexual abuse in dating and sexual abuse in marriage has not been examined in previous research. Because, like physical abuse, the evidence seems to suggest that sexual coercion by a partner before marriage would be likely to persist, and

perhaps to intensify, after marriage, this relationship also needs study.

### The Cycle of Abuse

No definitive conclusions were drawn on the cycle of abuse hypothesis since research, including the present study, yielded variant results. While most studies tend to support the cycle of abuse hypothesis in general, they find different aspects of abuse to be cyclical. It would seem that the questions on the cycle of abuse that this thesis set out to answer need further research on bigger samples; specifically, the questions of if and how the relationship between family abuse and sexual abuse in dating (a) differs for men and women and (b) differs for those who sustain and those who inflict sexual abuse in dating.

In the present study it proved necessary to examine different frequencies and severities of abuse in the family, and different levels of abuse in dating, in order to determine a good set of family abuse predictors. Future studies should therefore also explore the frequencies with which a wide variety of family abuses take place and should classify sexual abuse in dating into different levels.

Moreover, it is probable that even more types of both abuse in the family and sexual abuse in dating should be studied in order to examine the cycle of abuse theory more thoroughly. For instance, Pagelow (1984) and others suggested including which gender does the abusing as well as the gender of the child experiencing the family abuse. The reader is also directed to Muehlenhard and Cook (1988) for quite a complete list of types of sexual abuse in dating.

The present findings, in isolation, on the relationship between abuse in the family or origin and sexual abuse in dating suggest certain implications for women and men.

Implications for women. According to the results of this study, a combination of particular types of family abuse is predictive of sexual victimization in dating for women. This finding suggests that perhaps the cycle of abuse theory should not be dismissed, as many researchers proclaim, but rather should be taken seriously for women. If further research focusing on more refined models and bigger samples find similar results, then the findings would have important implications for helping professionals and social policies. Awareness of such predictive power of family

abuse should help counsellors in the prevention and remediation of victims of sexual abuse in dating, and social agencies may be expected to pay more attention to the daughters in abusive families.

Pagelow (1984) stated that many professionals and nonprofessionals have advanced the positions that "if it is true that living in a violent home as a girl puts one into a cycle whereby she is victimized as an adult, then there must be something about that person that brings about the violence, or she may be attracted to violent people, or violence itself is attractive" (p. 245). That author stressed the dangers of such thinking, asserting that evidence of revictimization must not be used to blame the victim. Gelles (1989) felt that growing up in a violent home teaches the acceptability of abuse in love relationships, but not the desire for such abuse. If it is true that blaming the victim is harmful and inaccurate, then instead of needing to be deprogrammed for less exciting relationships as Pizzely suggests (Pagelow, 1984), it would be more helpful to educate women that they do not have to accept abuse in their lives.

Implications for men. This study found no association between abuse in the family and sexual



coercion in dating for men. Because other studies (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Koss & Dinero, 1990; Miller & Marshall, 1987; and Peterson & Franzese, 1987) did find an association between those two variables, the idea of a possible relationship between family abuse and sexual coercion in dating should not be dismissed. However, if it is true that there is no association between family abuse and sexual coercion in dating for men, then what does cause or contribute to such behavior? Because the theory that is most often mentioned in the literature, besides social learning theory, is power based theory, it may be fertile ground for future study in the field of male experience with sexual abuse. Perhaps different theories are needed for males and females to explain sexual abuse in dating.

### References

- Ageton, S. S. (1983). Sexual assault among adolescents. Lexington, Mass: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Badgley, R. F., Allard, H. A., McCormick, N., Proudfoot, P. M., Fortin, D., Ogilvie, D., Rae-Grant, Q., Gelinis, P., & Pepin L. (1984). Sexual offences against children: Report of the committee on sexual offences against children and youths (Volume 1). Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bernard, M. L., & Bernard, J. L. (1983). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. Family Relations, 32, 283-286.
- Browne, A., & Finkelhor, D. (1988). Initial and long-term effects: A review of the research. In D. Finkelhor (Ed.), A sourcebook on child sexual abuse (pp. 143-179). Beverly Hills, CAL: Sage.
- Burke, P. J., Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. Social Psychology Quarterly, 51(3), 272-285.

- Burkhart, B. R., & Stanton, A. L. (1988). Sexual aggression in acquaintance relationships. In G. W. Russell (Ed.), Violence in intimate relationships (pp. 43-65). New York: PMA.
- Cecere, D. J. (1986). The second closet: Battered lesbians. In K. Lobel (Ed.), Naming the violence: Speaking out about lesbian battering (pp. 21-31). Seattle: The Seal Press.
- Cormier, J. (1986). Coming full circle. In K. Lobel (Ed.), Naming the violence: Speaking out about lesbian battering (pp. 124-130). Seattle: The Seal Press.
- Dibble, U., & Straus, M. A. (1980). Some social structure determinants of inconsistency between attitudes and behavior: The case of family violence. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42(1), 71-80.
- Ellis-Grunfeld, R. (1985). Sexual assault: Manitoba concerns (GovDocs Can6 Man1 W6.7 Se99). Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- Feshback, N. D. (1979). The effects of violence in childhood. In D. G. Gil (Ed.), Child abuse and violence (pp. 575-585). New York: AMS press.

- Finkelhor, D. (1979). Sexually victimized children.  
New York: The Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). Child sexual abuse: New theory  
and research. New York: The Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1986). A sourcebook on child sexual  
abuse. Beverly Hills, CAL: Sage.
- Finkelhor, D. (1988). Stopping family violence:  
Research priorities for the coming decade. Beverly  
Hills, CAL: Sage.
- Freeman, M. D. A. (1979). Violence in the home.  
Westmead, England: Saxon House.
- Garrett-Gooding, J., & Senter, R. Jr. (1987).  
Attitudes and acts of sexual aggression on a  
university campus. Sociological Inquiry, 57, 348-  
371.
- Gelles, R. J. (1979). Family violence. Beverly Hills,  
CAL: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J. (1985). Family violence. Annual Review  
of Sociology, 11, 347-367.
- Gelles, R. J. (1987). Family violence (2nd ed.).  
Beverly Hills, CAL: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J., & Cornell, C. P. (1985). Intimate  
violence in families. Newbury Park, CAL: Sage.

- Gentlewind, C. (1986). Will it never end? In K. Lobel (Ed.), Naming the violence: Speaking out about lesbian battering (pp. 9-18). Seattle: The Seal Press.
- Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A., Stockard, J., & Bohmer, S. (1987). Learning courtship aggression: The influence of parents, peers, and personal experiences. Family Relations, 36, 276-282.
- Hart, B. (1986a). Preface. In K. Lobel (Ed.), Naming the violence: Speaking out about lesbian battering (pp. 9-18). Seattle: The Seal Press.
- Hart, B. (1986b). Lesbian battering: An examination. In K. Lobel (Ed.), Naming the violence: Speaking out about lesbian battering (pp. 173-189). Seattle: The Seal Press.
- Johnson, H. (1988). Wife abuse. Canadian Social Trends, Spring, 17-20.
- Johnson, H., & Chisholm, P. (1989). Family Homicide. Canadian Social Trends, Autumn, 17-18.

- Johnston, M. E. (1988). Correlates of early violence experience among men who are abusive toward female mates. In G. T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T. Kirkpatrick, and M. A. Straus (Eds.), Family abuse and its consequences: New directions in research (pp. 192-202). Beverly Hills, CAL: Sage.
- Kalmuss, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46(1), 11-19.
- Kaufman, J., & Zigler, E. (1986). Do abused children become abusive parents? American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57(2), 186-192.
- Kim (1986). It couldn't happen to me. In K. Lobel (Ed.), Naming the violence: Speaking out about lesbian battering (pp. 131-136). Seattle: The Seal Press.
- Kinnon, D. (1985). Report on sexual assault in Canada (GovDocs Can1 L216.6 Se99). Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- Knutson, J. F., & Mehm, J. G. (1988). Transgenerational patterns of coercion in families and intimate relationships. In G. W. Russell (Ed.), Violence in intimate relationships (pp. 66-90). New York: PMA.

- Koss, M. P. (1985). The hidden rape victim: Personality, attitudinal, and situational characteristics. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 9, 193-212.
- Koss, M. P. (1988). Afterword. In R. Warshaw, I never called it rape. Toronto: Harper & Row.
- Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1989) Discriminant analysis of risk factors for sexual victimization among a national sample of college women. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57(2), 242-250.
- Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1990). Predictors of sexual aggression among a national sample of male college students. Annals News York Academy of Sciences, 133-147.
- Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual experiences survey: Reliability and validity. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53(3), 422-423.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55(2), 162-170.

- Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). Sexual experiences survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50(3), 455-457.
- Lobel, K. (1986). Naming the violence: Speaking out about lesbian battering. Seattle: The Seal Press.
- Lundberg-Love, P., & Geffner, R. (1989). Date rape: Prevalence, risk factors, and a proposed model. In M. A. Pirog-Good and J. E. Stets (Eds.), Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues (pp 169-184). New York: Praeger.
- Lupri, E. (1989). Male violence in the home. Canadian Social Trends, Autumn, 19-21.
- Lystad, M. H. (1979). Violence at home: A review of the literature. In D. G. Gil (Ed.), Child abuse and violence (pp 387-412). New York: AMS Press.
- MacLeod, L. (1987). Battered but not beaten... Preventing wife battering in Canada. Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. Family Relations, 30, 97-101.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1983). Life events stress and courtship violence. Family Relations, 32, 101-109.



- McShane, C. (1988). Warning! Dating may be hazardous to your health! Racine, WI: Mother Courage Press.
- Miller, B., & Marshall, J. C. (1987). Coercive sex on the university campus. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28(1), 38-47.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Cook, S. W. (1988). Men's self-reports of unwanted sexual activity. The Journal of Sex Research, 24, 58-72.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 34(2), 186-196.
- Murphy, J. E. (1988). Date abuse and forced intercourse among college students. In G. T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T. Kirkpatrick, and M. A. Straus (Eds.), Family abuse and its consequences: New directions in research (pp. 285-296). Beverly Hills, CAL: Sage.
- Notman, M. T., & Nadelson, C. C. (1980). Psychodynamic and life-stage considerations in the response to rape. In S. L. McCombie (Ed.), The rape crisis intervention handbook (pp. 131-144). New York: Plenum Press.

- O'Leary, K. D. (1988). Physical aggression between spouses: A social learning theory perspective. In V. B. Van Hasself, R. L. Morrison, A. S. Bellack, and M. Hersen (Eds.), Handbook of family violence (pp. 31-52). New York: Plenum Press.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1984). Family violence. New York: Praeger.
- Peters, S. D., Wyatt, G. E., & Finkelhor, D. (1986). Prevalence. In D. Finkelhor (Ed.) A sourcebook on child sexual abuse (pp. 15-59). Beverly Hills, CAL: Sage.
- Peterson, S. A., & Franzese, B. (1987). Correlates of college men's sexual abuse of women. Journal of College Students Personnel, 28(3), 223-228.
- Petrovich, M., & Templer, D. I. (1984). Heterosexual molestation of children who later became rapists. Psychological Reports, 54, 810.
- Roscoe, B., & Benaske, N. (1985). Courtship violence experienced by abused wives: Similarities in patterns of abuse. Family Relations, 34(3), 419-424.

- Sandberg, G., Jackson, T. L., & Petretic-Jackson, P. (1987). College students' attitudes regarding sexual coercion and aggression: Developing educational and preventive strategies. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28(4), 302-311.
- Shirk, S. R. (1988). The interpersonal legacy of physical abuse of children. In M. B. Straus (Ed.), Abuse and victimization across the life span (pp. 57-81). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Shupe, A., Stacey, W. A., & Hazlewood, L. R. (1987). Violent men, violent couples: The dynamics of domestic violence. Toronto: D. C. Heath and Company.
- Sigelman, C. K., Berry, C. J., & Wiles, K. A. (1984). Violence in college students' dating relationships. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 14, 530-548.
- Silbert, M. H., & Pines, A. M. (1983). Early sexual exploitation as an influence in prostitution. Social Work, 28(4), 285-289.
- Stacey, W., & Shupe, A. (1983). The family secret: Domestic violence in America. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Statistics Canada (1989a). Target groups project: The family in Canada (GovDocs Can1 Cs 8.5 89-509). Ottawa: Government of Canada.

- Statistics Canada (1989b). Target groups project: Youth in Canada (GovDocs Can1 Cs 8.5 89-511).  
Ottawa: Government of Canada.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-88.
- Straus, M. A. (1980). Wife-beating: How common and why? In M. A. Straus & G. T. Hotaling (Eds.), The social causes of husband-wife violence (pp. 23-39). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 465-479.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1988). How violent are American families? Estimates from the National Family Violence Resurvey and other studies. In G. T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T. Kirkpatrick, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), Family abuse and its consequences: New directions in research (pp. 14-37). Beverly Hills, CAL: Sage.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press.

- Strean, H. S. (1988). Effects of childhood sexual abuse on the psychosocial functioning of adults. Social Work, 33(5), 465-467.
- Struckman-Johnson, C. (1988). Forced sex on dates: It happens to men, too. The Journal of Sex Research, 24, 234-241.
- Trudeau, M. B., Bergmann-Riss, E., & Hamburg, D. A. (1981). Towards an evolutionary perspective on aggressive behavior: The chimpanzee evidence. In A. R. Liss (Ed.) Biobehavioral aspects of aggression, (pp 27-40). New York: Liss, Inc.
- Turner, R., & Bray, A. (1990, November 3). Battered women married to fear. Winnipeg Free Press, pp. 1, 4.
- Ulbrich, P., & Huber, J. (1981). Observing parental violence: Distribution and effects. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 623-631.
- Warshaw, R. (1988). I never called it rape: The Ms. report on recognizing, fighting and surviving date and acquaintance rape. Toronto: Harper & Row.

Waterman, C. K., Dawson, L. J., & Bologna, M. J.

(1989). Sexual coercion in gay male and lesbian relationships: Predictors and implications for support services. The Journal of Sex Research, 26(1), 118-124.

Wyatt, G. E., & Powell, G. J. (1988). Lasting effects of child abuse. Newbury Park, CAL: Sage.

Appendix A

Letter to Professor

Department of Educational Psychology  
Faculty of Education  
University of Manitoba

(Current date)

(Professor's name)  
(Department)  
Faculty of Arts  
University of Manitoba

Dear (Professor's name):

I am an M.Ed. student in the Department of Educational Psychology and I would greatly appreciate your help in my research thesis.

I am examining university students' experience with sexual coercion in dating relationships and abuse in the family of origin to determine if there is an association between the two. An important part of the study is to discover the incidence and prevalence of sexual coercion in dating. Knowing to what extent the problem exists is the first step towards a solution. Also by identifying populations which are possibly at risk for perpetrating and suffering date rape and other forms of sexual coercion in dating, educational and health care professionals will be better able to help the victims of this problem and reduce its incidence.

I am asking all the professors who teach summer courses in the Faculty of Arts at the 200, 300, and 400 levels if they will participate in my study. Your (course name and number) class is one of these courses.

I would very much appreciate being able to use 20 minutes out of one of your classes in which I can administer the Dating Experiences questionnaire. Please examine the enclosed questionnaire so that you can decide if you will support, and cooperate in, my study. I realize that this is a controversial subject and that the summer is a busy time of year, and I will completely understand if you decide against participating. Either way, it would be very helpful if you could fill out the enclosed form and return it to me by (date).

If you would like more information on this study, please feel free to phone me at my home number, . My thesis advisor, Dr. Ray Henjum, would also be happy to answer any questions. His phone number is . Thank-you for your cooperation.

Sincerely

Joan Murray

**Appendix B**

**Reply Form**

**I. Please check one:**

1. [ ] I will allow Joan Murray to use 20 minutes of my class time to administer the Dating Experiences Questionnaire.
2. [ ] I will NOT allow Joan Murray to use 20 minutes of my class time to administer the Dating Experiences Questionnaire.
3. [ ] Before I make up my mind, I would like more information on this study.

**II. Please fill in the section that corresponds to the number you checked above:**

1. I, \_\_\_\_\_, give permission to Joan Murray to use 20 minutes of one of my classes so that she may administer the Dating Experiences Questionnaire.

A tentative time and place for administration is:

Date and Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Place: \_\_\_\_\_  
(I will contact you before this time for confirmation)

2. Please state the reason(s) you would prefer not to allow time in your class for this study:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. If you would like to speak with me about this study, please state time, and place or phone number:

\_\_\_\_\_

**III. Please complete:**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Course: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_



## Appendix C

Cover Letter

Dear Student:

I am an M.Ed. student in the Department of Educational Psychology and I would like to ask you to participate in my research thesis of the dating experiences of students on this campus. By answering the items included in the following questionnaire, you will be providing valuable information in an area that we know very little about. The questionnaire should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete.

Since the questions that follow are sexually explicit and highly personal, there is a possibility that you might be upset or offended at the content of some of the items. Participation is completely voluntary; you may choose not to fill out any of this questionnaire. Also, you may stop answering questions at any point or skip any question you do not wish to complete. Your full cooperation, however, would be both very helpful and appreciated.

If you agree to respond, be assured that all data gathered is confidential and anonymous. There are no identifying marks to be made on this questionnaire (i.e., do not write your name or your student number) so there is no way you can be connected with your answers. In addition, all questionnaires will be guarded by me with the utmost care and no one but me will have access to them.

If you decide not to participate you may do so very discreetly. All questionnaires have this letter as a cover sheet. If you decide not to fill out any or all parts, just turn in your questionnaire at the end of the 20 minutes along with everyone else, and no one will be aware that your questionnaire is incomplete.

Thank you for your cooperation

J. Murray

Appendix D

Dating Experiences Questionnaire

Circle the number that corresponds to your answer. Please answer each item honestly. Work independently and do not look at another student's questionnaire. Read all directions carefully.

SECTION I: Background Information

- |   |                  |   |
|---|------------------|---|
| 1. Your gender  | Male             | 1 |
|   | female           | 2 |
| 2. How old are you today? (fill in the blank)   | _____ years      |   |
| 3. How many years of full-time university study have you completed?                                 |                  | 0 |
|   |                  | 1 |
|   |                  | 2 |
|   | (three or more)  | 3 |
| 4. During the last school year (September/1989 to April/1990), what was your university attendance? | full-time        | 1 |
|   | part-time        | 2 |
|   | did not attend   | 3 |
| 5. What is your sexual orientation?   | Heterosexual     | 1 |
|   | Homosexual       | 2 |
|   | Bisexual         | 3 |
| 6. Did you attend Grades 7-12 in Winnipeg?  | Yes, all grades  | 1 |
|   | Yes, some grades | 2 |
|   | No, no grades    | 3 |
| 7. What do you consider your family's socio-economic status to be?                                  | High             | 1 |
|   | Middle           | 2 |
|   | Low              | 3 |

**SECTION II:** These questions pertain to your life in your family of origin (the people you lived with before the age of 18).

1. Physical blows sometimes occur between family members. Circle approximately how often the following incidences occurred during a year of your childhood.

- 0 = Never
- 1 = Less often than once a month
- 2 = Once or twice a month
- 3 = Once or twice a week
- 4 = Almost every day

A. An adult (over the age of 18) in your family of origin (e.g., parent, step-parent, foster-parent, parent's live-in lover, grandparent, nanny, older sibling) did this to you. Select the year when you were UNDER 10 years old that this type of punishment happened most often.

- |                                    |   |   |   |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Slapped or spanked you?         | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. Hit you with something?         | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. Threw something at you?         | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. Kicked, bit, or punched you?    | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f. Beat you up?                    | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

B. An adult (over the age of 18) in your family of origin did this to you. Select the year when you were between 10 and 17 years old that this type of punishment happened most often.

- |                                    |   |   |   |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. Slapped or spanked you?         | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you? | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. Hit you with something?         | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| d. Threw something at you?         | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| e. Kicked, bit, or punched you?    | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| f. Beat you up?                    | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

C. An adult (over the age of 18) in your family or origin did this to another adult in your family of origin? Answer for the year that this type of fighting happened most often when you were under 18 years old.

a. Slapped the other?	0	1	2	3	4
b. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other?	0	1	2	3	4
c. Hit the other with something?	0	1	2	3	4
d. Threw something at the other?	0	1	2	3	4
e. Kicked, bit, or punched the other?	0	1	2	3	4
f. Beat the other up?	0	1	2	3	4

2. Many people have sexual experiences as children and adolescents (before the age of 18). Has anyone in your family of origin (any person you lived with when you were under the age of 18), who was at least five years older than you, ever:

	NO	YES
a. Kissed and hugged you in a sexual way?	0	1
b. Showed you his/her sex organs?	0	1
c. Made you show him/her your sex organs	0	1
d. Fondled you in a sexual way	0	1
e. Touched or stroked your sex organs	0	1
f. Made you touch or stroke his/her sex organs	0	1
g. Attempted or had sexual intercourse with you	0	1

**SECTION III:** In the following section are questions about your sexual experiences with dating partners from age 13 on. "Dating partner" on this questionnaire refers to a spontaneous (just met at a bar, party, etc) date, first date, casual date, steady date, lover, or fiance, but it does not include a partner you were living with at the time. If you are currently married or living with someone, please refer only to your dating experiences, and not to the experiences you have had while living with your partner. "SEXUAL INTERCOURSE" refers to vaginal, anal, or oral intercourse: penetration of the vagina or anus by a penis or other object, or contact between mouth and sex organ. "SEX PLAY" refers to petting, kissing, or fondling, but NOT intercourse.

1. Have you ever found out that a dating partner had persuaded you to engage in SEX PLAY by saying things he or she didn't really mean ("I can't stop now", "I love you", etc.)?

No	0	(Go to question 2)
Yes	1	

1a. If yes, when did this happen to you? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

1b. If yes, has this happened to you in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

2. Have you ever found out that a dating partner had obtained SEXUAL INTERCOURSE with you by saying things he or she didn't really mean ("I can't stop now", "I love you", etc.)?

No	0	(Go to question 3)
Yes	1	

2a. If yes, when did this happen to you? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

2b. If yes, has this happened to you in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

3. Have you ever given in to SEX PLAY when you didn't want to because you felt overwhelmed by your dating partner's continual persuasion and arguments (that is, anything you feel your partner said for the express purpose of gaining sexual activity - "everyone else does it", "please", "you owe it to me", etc.)?

No 0 (Go to question 4)  
Yes 1

3a. If yes, when did this happen to you? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9) 1  
Senior High (Grades 10-12) 2  
University 3  
Other 4

3b. If yes, has this happened to you in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No 0  
Yes 1

4. Have you ever given in to SEXUAL INTERCOURSE when you didn't want to because you felt overwhelmed by your dating partner's continual persuasions and arguments (that is, anything you feel your partner said for the express purpose of gaining sexual activity - "everyone else does it", "please", "you owe it to me", etc.)?

No 0 (Go to question 5)  
Yes 1

4a. If yes, when did this happen to you? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9) 1  
Senior High (Grades 10-12) 2  
University 3  
Other 4

4b. If yes, has this happened to you in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No 0  
Yes 1

5. Have you ever had SEX PLAY when you didn't want to because your dating partner just did it even after you verbally objected (e.g., said "no")?

No	0	(Go to question 6)
Yes	1	

5a. If yes, when did this happen to you? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

5b. If yes, has this happened to you in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

6. Have you ever had SEXUAL INTERCOURSE when you didn't want to because your dating partner just did it even after you verbally objected (e.g., said "no")?

No	0	(Go to question 7)
Yes	1	

6a. If yes, when did this happen to you? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

6b. If yes, has this happened to you in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

7. Have you ever had a dating partner engage in **SEX PLAY** with you when you didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?

No	0	(Go to question 8)
Yes	1	

7a. If yes, when did this happen to you? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

7b. If yes, has this happened to you in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

8. Have you ever had a dating partner engage in **SEXUAL INTERCOURSE** with you when you didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.)?

No	0	(Go to question 9)
Yes	1	

8a. If yes, when did this happen to you? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

8b. If yes, has this happened to you in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1



9. Did you answer "Yes" to any of the questions 1-8 in this section?

No	0	(Go to question 10)
Yes	1	

9a. If yes, look back to the questions 1-8 in this section. What is the HIGHEST question number to which you answered "Yes"? (circle one)

1	2
3	4
5	6
7	8

10. Have you ever said things you really didn't mean ("I can't stop now", "I love you", etc.) to try to persuade your dating partner to engage in SEX PLAY?

No	0	(Go to question 11)
Yes	1	

10a. If yes, when did you do this? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

10b. If yes, did you do this in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

11. Have you ever said things you didn't really mean ("I can't stop now", "I love you", etc.) to try to obtain SEXUAL INTERCOURSE with a dating partner?

No	0	(Go to question 12)
Yes	1	

11a. If yes, when did you do this? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

11b. If yes, did you do this in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

12. Have you ever tried to persuade a dating partner to engage in SEX PLAY by using persuasion and arguments (that is, saying something for the express purpose of gaining sexual activity - "everyone else does it", "please", "you owe it to me", etc.)?

No	0	(Go to question 13)
Yes	1	

12a. If yes, when did you do this? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

12b. If yes, did you do this in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

13. Have you ever tried to obtain SEXUAL INTERCOURSE with a dating partner by using persuasion and arguments (that is, saying something for the express purpose of gaining sexual activity - "everyone else does it", "please", "you owe it to me", etc.)?

No	0	(Go to question 14)
Yes	1	

13a. If yes, when did you do this? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

13b. If yes, did you do this in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

14. Have you ever engaged in SEX PLAY even after your dating partner verbally objected (e.g., said "no") by just doing it anyway?

No	0	(Go to question 15)
Yes	1	

14a. If yes, when did you do this? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

14b. If yes, did you do this in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

15. Have you ever engaged in SEXUAL INTERCOURSE even after your dating partner verbally objected (e.g., said "no") by just doing it anyway?

No	0	(Go to question 16)
Yes	1	

15a. If yes, when did you do this? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

15b. If yes, did you do this in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

16. Were you ever in a situation where you threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting his/her arm, holding him/her down, etc.) to try to make your dating partner engage in SEX PLAY, whether or not SEX PLAY actually occurred?

No	0	(Go to question 17)
Yes	1	

16a. If yes, when did you do this? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

16b. If yes, did you do this in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

17. Have you ever tried to engage in **SEXUAL INTERCOURSE** with your dating partner by threatening or using some degree of force (twisting his/her arm, holding him/her down, etc.), whether or not intercourse actually occurred?

No	0	(Go to question 18)
Yes	1	

17a. If yes, when did you do this? Please circle all appropriate answers.

Junior High (Grades 7-9)	1
Senior High (Grades 10-12)	2
University	3
Other	4

17b. If yes, did you do this in the last year (from September, 1989 until now)?

No	0
Yes	1

18. Did you answer "Yes" to any of the questions 10-17 in this section?

No	0
Yes	1

18a. If yes, look back to the questions 10-17 in this section. What is the **HIGHEST** question number to which you circled "Yes"? (circle one)

10	11
12	13
14	15
16	17

Appendix E

Reminder Letter

Department of Ed. Psych.  
Faculty of Education  
University of Manitoba

(Date)

(Professor's name)  
(Department)  
Faculty of Arts  
University of Manitoba  
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2M1

Dear Professor (name):

Approximately two weeks ago you should have received information on my research thesis entitled A Test of the Cycle of Abuse Through Study of Dating Experiences of University Students. The information was given to you in order for you to decide if you would allow me to use 20 minutes of your class time to conduct this study.

If you have already sent your reply or if you did not receive my request, please disregard this note. If you happen to still have my request, and if you can find time in the next week, I would greatly appreciate you completing the reply form and mailing it through inter-departmental correspondence in the envelope that was provided for you. I realize that the deadline I gave for responding may not have been sufficient and I apologize for initially stating such an early deadline.

I sincerely thank-you for your time.

Respectfully

Joan Murray

Appendix F

Resource Sheet

Now that you have completed the questionnaire, you may feel like talking about your experiences or simply obtaining information on the topic of sexual coercion in dating. The counselling centre on campus is an excellent free resource for students which has professional, experienced counsellors who will be happy to talk with you:

The University of Manitoba Counselling Service  
474 University Centre  
University of Manitoba

474-8592

Or you may prefer a more anonymous phone-in service such as the Sexual Assault Counselling line, 786-8631. This service is a part of Klinik Community Health Centre and is run by trained counsellors who will talk with anyone who has ever had any sexually abusive experience, including sexual coercion in dating.

OTHER COMMUNITY RESOURCES

FOR WOMEN:

- Manitoba Committee on Wife Abuse: 942-3052  
(24 hour counselling over the phone)
- Osborne House: 775-8197  
(24 hour emergency shelter for women)

FOR WOMEN & MEN:

- Domestic Abuse Counselling: 788-4402  
(Offers group counselling for victims of wife/dating abuse and abusers)
- Klinik Crisis Line: 786-8686  
(24 hour Crisis Telephone Service)

If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please send me (at the address below) your address and I will be happy to send a copy to you.

Ms. J. Murray  
c/o Professor Ray Henjum  
Faculty of Education  
University of Manitoba  
Winnipeg, Manitoba  
R3T 2N2