

**A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF ABUSIVE DATING
RELATIONSHIPS AMONGST ADOLESCENTS**

Frances Whitehead

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Social Science and Humanities,
University of Cape Town, for the Degree of Master of Arts.

Supervised by Dr Gillian Finchilescu

Cape Town, 1998.

The University of Cape Town has been given
the right to reproduce this thesis in whole
or in part. Copyright is held by the author.

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the following people :

My supervisor, Dr Gillian Finchilescu, for her encouragement, support and expert guidance throughout.

Ms Jacqui Sommerville, of Information Technology Services, University of Cape Town, for her invaluable guidance and help with the statistical aspect of the thesis.

Dr Colin Tredoux, Department of Psychology, University of Cape Town, for his guidance through the mine-field of Log-linear analysis.

Ms Sarah Dewar for editing and proof-reading the manuscript.

My family, John, Sean and Sarah, and my Dad, whose faith in me, encouragement and endless support have provided me with the inspiration to write this thesis.

Special friends who have supported me in so many ways.

The financial assistance of the Centre for Science Development, (HSRC, South Africa) towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusion arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the Centre for Science Development.

The financial assistance of the First National Trust – Dr Sylvia Gavron Psychology Scholarship.

ABSTRACT

This study explores abusive heterosexual dating behaviour amongst male and female adolescents of different social classes in the Western Cape.

A broad range of abusive strategies both experienced and perpetrated as well as a number of contextual variables that contribute meaning to abusive dating behaviour are examined. This study combines the use of qualitative and quantitative methodologies. The qualitative study reports the findings of six focus groups conducted using of 46 White, 'Coloured' and Black African, male and female, high school volunteers. Focus group participants indicate the prevalence of sexual, emotional and physical violence in dating relationships. Respondents' perception of the inevitable and commonplace nature of abuse in adolescent dating relationships, is most noteworthy. Factors contributing to a potential for abuse in dating relationships are reported. In the quantitative study, a sample of 720 high school students, males and females, of different socio-economic and language groups completed a "Dating Relationship Survey". This survey is adapted from a number of standardized measuring instruments.

Descriptive analysis reveals the prevalence of abusive dating practices for both males and females in the upper and lower socio-economic classes. Log linear analyses demonstrate the gendered nature of both the experience of and the perpetration of abusive dating acts. Young women clearly experience the highest prevalence of physically abusive dating acts, while young men experience predominantly emotionally abusive behaviour. This is supported by evidence that young men are predominantly the perpetrators of physically and sexually abusive acts. A high prevalence of young women perpetrating emotionally abusive dating acts is also indicated. The important impact of social class on abusive dating

practices is demonstrated. Although dating abuse is indicated for both classes, the lower socio-economic class manifest the highest prevalence of abusive practices involving the most severe physical and sexual violence. Some gender differences are also demonstrated in the descriptive analyses of the following contextual variables: female respondents express more distress than males as regards their experience of abusive dating acts; both sexes most frequently endorse motivations of love and jealousy as being the most likely explanations of abusive dating behaviours, however, females also cite denial of sexual relations, and their partner's bad character as possible motivating factors; young males more often attribute a sexual component to describing dating relationships. Descriptive analyses and Analyses of Variance demonstrate the support of attitudes endorsing sexism in heterosexual relationships and conformity to culturally prescribed male roles. Young women in the upper socio-economic class display evidence of resisting patriarchy and rejecting domination. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation indicates a relationship, for adolescents, between the perpetration of some abusive dating behaviours and the support of attitudes endorsing sexist behaviour, conformity to male roles and the desirability of personal power. Respondents' experience of family violence is briefly explored, and indications of a possible link with physically abusive dating practices are discussed. The limitations and implications of this study are discussed. This study has provided an important narrative and substantive quantitative account of abusive dating behaviour amongst adolescents in the Western Cape.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DECLARATION	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF APPENDICES	x

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1	Violence against women in South Africa	1
1.2	Purpose of the study	7
1.3	Outline of the study	8

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	11
2.2	Intra-individual perspective	12
2.2.1	Criticism of the intra-individual perspective	13
2.2.2	Recent contributions to the intra-individual perspective	15
2.3	Sociological perspective	16
2.3.1	Criticism of the sociological perspective	21
2.4	Feminist perspective	22
2.4.1	Criticism of feminist perspective	26
2.5	Conclusion	28

CHAPTER 3

ADOLESCENCE

3.1	Introduction	29
3.2	Theories of adolescence	30
3.3	Adolescence in South Africa	33
3.4	The changing nature of relationships in adolescence	36
3.5	Definition of abusive dating behaviour	38
3.6	A review of the research into abusive dating relationships	39

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

4.1	Introduction	46
4.2	Main-stream versus feminist methodological debates	46
4.3	Research on sensitive issues	52
4.4	Methodologies used in this study	53

CHAPTER 5

QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY – FOCUS GROUPS

5.1	Introduction	57
5.2	Sample	58
5.3	Procedure	59
5.4	Results & discussion	60
5.4.1	The experience of abusive dating relationships	60
5.4.2	Forms of abusive behaviour	61
5.4.3	Factors supporting abuse	69
5.5	Conclusion	79

CHAPTER 6

QUANTITATIVE METHODOLOGY – DATING RELATIONSHIP SURVEY

6.1	Introduction	84
6.2	Sample	84
6.3	Material	86
6.4	Procedure	94
6.5	Piloting	94
6.6	Analysis of the data	96
6.6.1	The experience and perpetration of abusive dating behaviours	96
6.6.2	Adolescents' attitudes and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	100
6.6.3	Factor analysis of the responses to the experience of, and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	100
6.6.4	Contextual variables	101

CHAPTER 7**RESULTS**

7.1	Introduction	102
7.2	The experience of abusive dating behaviour	103
7.2.1	Log-linear Analyses	108
7.3	The perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	120
7.3.1	Log-linear analyses	124
7.4	Adolescents' attitudes and their experience of, and perpetration of abusive dating behaviours	135
7.4.1	Analysis of Variance	136
7.4.2	Factor Analysis of the Heterosexual Relationship Scale, the Male Role Attitude Scale and the Intrapersonal Power Scale	141
7.4.3	The Relationship between adolescents' attitudes and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	142
7.5	Factor Analysis of responses to the experience of, and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	146
7.5.1	Factor Analysis of the experience of abusive dating behaviour	146
7.5.2	Factor Analysis of the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	153
7.5.3	Comparison between the factors of experience and perpetration	159
7.6	Contextual variables	161
7.6.1	The degree of distress felt by respondents as regards both their experience of and their perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	161
7.6.2	Attributed motivation for abusive dating behaviour	173
7.6.3	The meaning of 'dating' to respondents	184
7.6.4	The experience of family violence	186

CHAPTER 8**DISCUSSION**

8.1	Introduction	191
8.2	The magnitude of the experience of abusive dating behaviour	193
8.3	The magnitude of the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	202
8.4	The context of abusive dating behaviour	206
8.5	Adolescents' attitudes and abusive dating behaviour	211
8.6	Conclusions	216
8.7	Limitations	219
8.8	Implications	222

REFERENCES

227

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1	: Ethnic group, socio-economic class and gender composition of focus groups	58
Table 2	: Sample characteristics	85
Table 3	: Frequency table of male and female experience of heterosexual dating abuse	104
Table 4	: Log-linear Analysis of the significant effects of gender and socio-economic class on the experience of abusive heterosexual dating behaviour	110
Table 5	: Significant associations of gender x the experience of abusive dating behaviour	115
Table 6	: Significant associations of socio-economic class x the experience of abusive dating behaviour	116
Table 7	: Significant associations of gender x socio-economic class x the experience of abusive dating behaviour	119
Table 8	: Frequency table of male and female perpetration of heterosexual dating abuse	121
Table 9	: Log-linear Analysis of the significant effects of gender and socio-economic class on the perpetration of abusive heterosexual dating behaviour	126
Table 10	: Significant associations of gender x the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	131
Table 11	: Significant associations of socio-economic class x the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	132
Table 12	: Significant associations of gender x socio-economic class x perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	134

Table 13	:	Summary of the ANOVA Analyses of the three attitude scales x gender x socio-economic class	136
Table 14	:	Mean and Standard Deviation scores of Heterosexual Relationship Scale, Male Role Attitude Scale and Intrapersonal Power Scale by gender x socio-economic class.	137
Table 15	:	Summary Table of Pearson's Correlation (r) between the Heterosexual Relationship Scale, the Male Role Attitude Scale and the Intrapersonal Power Scale, and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviours	145
Table 16	:	Sorted factor loadings of the experience of abusive dating behaviour	148
Table 17	:	Sorted factor loadings of the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour.	155
Table 18	:	Differences between males and females in the degrees of distress regarding their experience of abusive dating behaviour	166
Table 19	:	Differences between males and females in the degree of distress regarding their perpetration of abusive dating behaviour	171
Table 20	:	Summary of attributed motivations for experienced abusive dating behaviour	178
Table 21	:	Summary of attributed motivations for perpetrated abusive dating behaviour	183
Table 22	:	The meaning of 'dating' for adolescent respondents	184
Table 23	:	Respondents' experience of family violence	186
Table 24	:	Respondents' experience of family violence and their experience of physical abuse in a dating relationship	188
Table 25	:	Respondents' experience of family violence and their perpetration of physical abuse in a dating relationship.	189

LIST OF APPENDICES

- APPENDIX I : Case history presented to the focus groups
- APPENDIX II : The Questionnaire : Dating Relationship Survey
- APPENDIX III : Pearson's Product Moment Correlation between the three attitude scales and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour.
- APPENDIX IV : Male experience of abusive dating behaviour and possible motivations attributed to this behaviour
- APPENDIX V : Female experience of abusive dating behaviour and possible motivations attributed to this behaviour
- APPENDIX VI : Male perpetration of abusive dating behaviour and possible motivations attributed to this behaviour
- APPENDIX VII : Female perpetration of abusive dating behaviour and possible motivations attributed to this behaviour

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Violence against Women in South Africa

Since South Africa's political transition and transformation there has been a particular focus on gender issues. The country's new Constitution expressly provides that all South African women should enjoy a full and equal role in every aspect of its economy and society. Sections 9 (3) and (4) prohibit "unfair discrimination" on the grounds of, inter alia, gender and sex (Act 108 of 1996). There is accordingly considerable potential for the empowerment of women at all levels.

A great deal of national and international attention has in the past, and is currently, focused on South Africa's notoriously high levels of political and criminal violence. In 1998 violence against women has, however, become a priority of national importance. As a signatory to the Beijing Declaration at the September, 1995, 4th World Conference on Women in Beijing, China, South Africa recorded its commitment to empower all women to enjoy all human rights and fundamental freedoms. South Africa also endorsed initiatives to prevent and eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls. The South African government has also acknowledged and recognised women's organisations and

non-governmental organisations (NGOs), which had been marginalised under the previous Nationalist Party government. Many of these organisations are now working in collaboration with government departments to tackle gender issues and in particular gender violence. The South African government recently proposed new legislation which is intended to increase the power of women in their relationships with men. In terms of the 1996 Constitution, "national legislation must be enacted to prevent or prohibit unfair discrimination." Of particular relevance to this study is the far-reaching Domestic Violence Bill, which on 21 July, 1998, was tabled in Parliament by the female Deputy Minister of Justice. This Bill should substantially redress previous inattention and inaction to a social problem that has been correctly labeled "endemic" (Vogelman & Eagle, 1991, p.209). In addition, the Minister of Justice has requested the South African Law Commission (which recommends legislation) to investigate changes to the law concerning rape. These investigations are likely to deal with the issues of broadening the definition of rape, to include marital and permanent relationships, and amending certain rules of evidence which make it difficult to convict rapists.

These recent legislative initiatives confirm the urgency of the social problem of violence against women, and highlight the consequences of the earlier history of neglect and inattention to this phenomenon. There is enormous lack of understanding regarding the nature and extent of violence against women in South Africa. This is partially because the problem was previously marginalised by the law enforcement and judicial systems which held the attitude that men's abuse of women was a private entity in which they did not see fit to intervene.

In addition "...gender violence is notoriously under-reported" (Penn-Kekana, 1977, p. 5). This is believed to be due largely to the indifference and hostility on the part of the police and judicial authorities. However, the social stigma and fear of reprisals have also deterred women from reporting violence against them. For example, the Cape Town-based Rape Crisis (Personal communication, 1998) estimates that only 1 in 35 rapes is reported to the police. Other South African women's organisations working with battered women have attempted to estimate the scope of violence against women. Keen and Vogt (1998) of NICRO's (Western Cape) Support for Abused Women Project researched on the number of interdicts issued in terms of the Prevention of Family Violence Act of 1993. This research indicates that 31,224 interdicts were served in the Western Cape from December 1993 to October 1997. Although this number is not an accurate reflection of the full extent of domestic violence, it is at least an indication of the minimum number of people so affected by abuse that they were obliged to seek court protection. As a result, NICRO estimates that one in four women in South Africa is abused by her partner. In the Cape Town area, approximately 98% of the interdicts are issued to women against abusive male partners, and only 2% to men against abusive female partners. These statistics accordingly confirm the view that power imbalances are a major cause of domestic violence. Gender bias against women in the vast majority of abusive relationships has to be acknowledged and accepted.

A number of other research projects have also indicated very high levels of gender violence. A research project linked to Soul City (a South African

television 'soap opera', which addresses specific social and public health issues) reported that almost all female members of the public interviewed, related personal accounts of domestic violence (Soul City, 1977). In a current study of women attending a community health centre in Mitchell's Plain, Western Cape, preliminary findings suggest that at least one in four women have experienced abuse by a male partner (Jacobs, T., 1998. Personal communication regarding the preliminary findings of a research project entitled "Breaking the silence : A profile of domestic violence amongst women attending a community health centre"). Other research reports that so endemic is the problem of violence against women in South Africa, that it is, in all probability, perceived as an inevitable, normal and almost acceptable aspect of gender relations (Campbell, 1992; Russell, 1991; Stanton, 1993; Vogelmann & Eagle, 1991; Wood, Maforah & Jewkes, 1996). South Africa's incidence of violence against women is believed to be second only to Rwanda, which until recently was at war (Shaik & Park, 1998).

These statistics, and the perception that they are probably dramatically underestimated, graphically illustrate the enormity of the problem. This study attempts to rectify the lack of research of the related problem of violence against young women. It intends to provide a broad picture of the violence young women and young men experience in relationships with each other. The inclusion and examination of young men's roles in both the experience of and the perpetration of violence is a distinctive feature of this study which contributes to understanding the essential role men play in gender-based power relations. Previous research in South Africa has largely ignored this feature and has almost

exclusively labeled gender violence as a “women’s problem” (Abrahams & Jewkes, 1997, p. 13).

Sexual harassment practices on University campuses have featured prominently in the published and accessible literature on violence against young women (Braine et al, 1995; Mayekiso & Bhana, 1997; Naidoo & Rajab, 1992; Russell, 1993; Sutherland, 1991). These studies all confirm that sexual abuse constitutes a serious threat to the lives and well being of many young women in tertiary-educational institutions. In two further studies of black township youths in Soweto, Mokwena (1991, p. 18) and Russell (1991) independently confirm the prevalence of sexually violent behaviour in their reporting of the abduction and rape of young women by young township gangsters dubbed the “Jackrollers”.

However, a number of more recent South African studies have made an important contribution to identifying that young women are involved in abusive relationships as early as their adolescent years. These studies have provided vital information on the nature and extent of violent practices within sexual relationships of adolescents. Qualitative studies have shown violence to be a consistent and almost inevitable feature of teenage sexual relationships. In a study of pregnant teenagers in Khayelitsha, Cape Town, 22 out of 24 young women reported experiencing both sexual coercion and violence, in the form of beating, in their relationships with male partners (Wood et al., 1996). An Umtata-based study reported similarly high rates of assault in young women’s relationships (16 out of 22 reported assault). This study also reported that young men (6 out of 8)

reported being beaten by their girlfriends (Wood & Jewkes, 1998). This is one of the few studies to have included figures on male victims of intimate abuse.

Amongst Zulu adolescent women, the threat or use of physical assault following sexual refusal was also reported as commonplace (Varga & Makubalo, 1996). In quantitative research up to 60% of adolescent women reported physical assault by their male partners (Maforah, Vundule, Jewkes & Jordaan, unpublished). Forced sexual initiation was also frequently reported in studies of rural and urban adolescents. In a Khayelitsha-based study 30% of pregnant teenagers reported forced sexual initiation (Maforah et al, unpublished). This is comparable to Richter's (1996) figure of 28% of young urban women (Coloured, Indian, and African) who had been forced to have sex. Buga, Amoko and Ncayiyana (1996) report the same incidence of forced sexual initiation in their study of adolescents in rural Eastern Cape.

The perception that coercive sex and violence, though undesirable is an inevitable and therefore almost acceptable and normal part of intimate relationships, is alarmingly apparent in the reports of these studies. This picture of pervasive male control through violent and coercive sexual practices confirms Campbell's (1992, p.623) earlier research into the crisis in masculinity amongst working class Zulu young men, who cite "forced sex" as a common practice. Campbell (1992, p. 623) maintains that such violence is a "socially sanctioned recipe for living".

This study recognises the importance of focusing on a wide range of abusive dating behaviours impacting on adolescents' lives. This will broaden the current

base of South African research investigating the abuse of young women, which to date, has largely restricted itself to investigating abuse within the arena of sexual relationships.

The studies cited above have focused largely on previously (prior to 1994) disenfranchised youth. This study acknowledges that the phenomenon of violence against women is universal and transcends race and class barriers. Nonetheless, it contends that such violence in a South African context cannot be viewed without cognisance of the historically entrenched hierarchical structures of race and class within apartheid South Africa (Vogelman & Eagle, 1991). However, permission to conduct this research in schools was granted by the Western Cape Education Department on condition that no comparisons are made between respondents of different race groups. Accordingly, this study will thus focus on gender and class only.

1.2 Purpose of the study

This study will explore abusive heterosexual dating behaviour and how it affects the lives of the young women and young men involved. It is important not only to estimate the prevalence of this problem, but also to explore the meaning of this experience for these young people. The range of abusive strategies experienced and perpetrated is examined together with contextual variables which give meaning to the experiences. Power, gender and class issues, central to the feminist debate on gender oppression, will be investigated.

1.3 Outline of the Study

Numerous theories on violence against women have been expounded. In Chapter 2 these theories will be discussed with particular reference to the theoretical perspectives presented in the reviewed South African literature. The intra-individual perspective will be explored first. This will be followed by a discussion of the sociological perspective and lastly, the feminist perspective, in which this study is located.

In Chapter 3, some theoretical explanations of the developmental period of adolescence are briefly discussed. This serves to locate the study in the appropriate developmental period and highlights some of the developmental tasks faced by adolescents as they negotiate this period. Particular reference is made to the South African context of this study and its unique impact on adolescents. An exploration of adolescent relationships is of particular interest to this study, and some discussion in this chapter focuses on the central nature of relationship issues during this period. Research on abusive dating relationships is reviewed and reference is made to the common features, as well as points of difference, of explanations relating to abusive behaviour in adult relationships.

The feminist theoretical perspective which guides this study's view on violence against women is central in shaping the research questions of the study and the methods used to answer these questions. Chapter 4 discusses the methodological

issues which have shaped the research path of this study. The choice of feminist methodology is discussed in the light of the debate between mainstream and feminist methodologies. The decision to use a multiple method research design within the feminist methodological perspective, is motivated. A further important methodological consideration of research into sensitive issues is explored in this Chapter. The recognition of abusive dating behaviour as a sensitive research topic has impacted considerably on the choice of research methods and techniques employed by this study.

A focus group study was conducted to provide qualitative insight into abusive adolescent dating relationships. This study is described in Chapter 5. The first section introduces the sample used in the construction of the focus groups. The second section explains the procedure of the focus groups. The third section analyses the results of this qualitative study detailing a number of dominant themes that have emerged. The fourth and final section draws conclusions from this study and discusses these in the light of other qualitative research studies in this area.

The quantitative methodology of this research study is described in detail in Chapter 6. The sample, the material (in the form of a survey questionnaire), the procedure, the preliminary pilot study, and the proposed methods of analysing the data are described.

A detailed analysis of the results elicited from the qualitative aspect of this study, the Dating Relationship Survey questionnaire, is provided in Chapter 7.

The final Chapter 8, brings together the two complementary strands of this research, the qualitative and the quantitative study. The findings of this research study are discussed and the resulting implications for future research set down.

An important aspect of this chapter is a discussion of the limitations of this study and their implication for the interpretation and general application of the findings.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

It is essential for a research study to be predicated on a theoretical perspective. The researcher's perspective of the aetiology of violence against women immediately shapes the issues researched, the questions asked, the methodology used and ultimately, the interpretation of the findings.

A wide spectrum of theoretical explanations of the aetiology of violence against women has guided research in this field. A primary interest in this study is a theoretical explanation for violence experienced by adolescents within the context of dating relationships. It is apparent from a review of the literature on this issue that it mainly focuses on violence experienced and perpetrated within an adult and marital context. This chapter reviews these theories of relationship violence which provide a foundation for the theoretical explanations relating to the violence experienced by adolescents in dating relationships. These will be reviewed in Chapter 3.

The literature in the field of domestic violence has been characterised by recurrent issues or themes that have been the subject of considerable and, at times, contentious debate (Hamberger, 1994). This review will focus on three major orientations : the intra-individual perspective; the sociological perspective; and the feminist perspective. Criticisms of these perspectives are also addressed.

Theoretical debate in the South African literature reviewed has been notably limited. Most published research has been conducted within the intra-individual and sociological perspectives, with very little being located within the feminist perspective.

2.2 Intra-individual Perspective

This perspective generally views violence against women as a function of some physiological quality or psychological characteristics of either the abuser or the victim. Thus, physiological or psychological aberrations of one or both partners cause men to be violent towards women.

Physiological explanations have largely focused on aberrations in certain brain structures and on the role of fluctuations in the hormone, testosterone. Overstimulation of the basic brain structure, the limbic system, has been cited by some researchers as having an important role in causing aggressive and violent behaviour (Roy, 1977). Testosterone, the hormone that differentiates males and females, has also frequently been cited as contributing to male violence. Research studies have indicated a positive correlation between high levels of testosterone and measures of hostility and aggression (Thorne-Finch, 1992).

Psychological explanations have also focused on pathology, in this case within the individual psyche. Violence against women is viewed as a function of individual psychopathology in either, or both, the abuser and the abused. Poor impulse control, an immature personality, personality disorders, low frustration tolerance, dependency, depression and developmental trauma resulting in

misogyny, are all cited as probable explanations for abusive and violent behaviour (Deschner, 1984; Snell, Rosewald & Robey, 1964). Alcohol and drug addictions are also frequently cited as a causal factor for male violence. The disinhibitory powers of these substances are believed to unleash innate violent tendencies (Burr, Hill, Nye & Reiss, 1979).

From a psychological perspective, victims, who are predominantly women, are implicated in abuse acts. Personality or psychological disorders of victims prompt their partners to behave violently towards them. The research of Snell et al. (1964) describes battered women as masochistic, paranoid, depressed and sexually frigid. These characteristics are believed to provoke abuse and violence by their partners. The perspectives that focus on individual psychopathology in either the abuser or the victim, appear to absolve the perpetrator from responsibility for the abusive behaviour.

Psychological explanations for violence by men against women have been applied in several South African studies. Moolman, van der Westhuizen and Brown (1983) focused on the psychopathological characteristics of rapists, and Labuschagne and van der Hoven (1988), similarly describe the individual pathology of abusive men in their study of battery.

2.2.1 Criticism of the intra-individual perspective

These early psychological explanations of violence against women have been criticised for focusing on the deviant nature of abusers and the pathology of victims, with little or no regard for the vital and contributing role of society. In particular, they disregard the power relations “which create an enabling

framework for wife abuse” (Blumberg, Swartz & Roper, 1996, p. 19). The feminist approaches contend that the widespread nature and extent of abuse against women suggest they are a function of normal psychological and behavioural patterns of many, rather than the aberrant behaviour of a few, men (Bograd, 1988; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Goldner, Penn, Sheinberg and Walker, 1990). Much criticism is also levelled at the manner in which these theories excuse male abusive behaviour by locating the aetiology in factors allegedly beyond their control, such as alcohol and drug addiction, or poor childhood histories (Bograd, 1988). Women are, by default, implicated in the abuse they experience, and, at worst, are said to tolerate, or even need, abuse.

Feminist psychologists do not exclude psychopathology, but do, however seek to understand pathological behaviours within a patriarchal social context. The emotions and behaviours typical of battered women are viewed as extreme strategies adopted in their attempts to survive and to make sense of their experiences of violence (Dutton & Painter, 1981, 1993; Graham, Rawlings, Ihms, Latimer, Foliano, Thompson, Suttman, Farrington & Hacker, 1995; Graham, Rawlings & Rimini, 1988; Rosewater, 1988; Russell, 1982).

The central role of alcohol and drug addictions in intra-individual explanations of abusive behaviour has also been criticised. Alcohol is recognised as a risk factor in abusive behaviour. However, it is argued that the association between alcohol and violence is not a function of the disinhibitory powers of alcohol, as proposed, but rather that intoxication provides an expedient excuse for unacceptable violent behaviours. Drinking thus becomes a means of “...deviance disavowal...” or a “...time out...” from the normal rules of behaviour (Gelles & Straus, 1979, p.521).

Physiological explanations have also been criticised for ignoring the essential interplay between the factors above and the environment. Critics of this approach acknowledge that the effects of certain brain structures are factors in aggression and that high testosterone levels are associated with increased levels of violence. However, they argue that if these physiological factors were the exclusive cause of violence by males, such violence would be indiscriminate. The reality is that violent offenders are selective in both their choice of victim (that is, their partner) and their choice of abusive strategy (often one that does not leave visible marks) (Thorne-Finch, 1992).

2.2.2 Recent contributions to the intra-individual perspective

Recent research has revived the interest in intra-individual explanations of violence in intimate relationships. In many studies these have become integrated into theories involving multiple levels of explanations. These combine intra-individual and societal factors in considering the aetiology of violence in such relationships. Physiological and neurological factors in relationship aggression have been re-examined in studies involving head-injured respondents (Warnken, Rosenbaum, Fletcher, Hoge and Adelman, 1994). A number of researchers have reconsidered the psychopathology of batterers because of substantial evidence of such pathology in studies of male batterers (Dutton, 1994 (a); Dutton, 1995; Hamberger & Hastings, 1989). Significantly, this recent research refers to the interplay between psychological factors and society. One possible explanation is that disordered men exploit prevailing cultural and social norms, values and attitudes to justify their abuse of women (Dutton, 1995). From this perspective, patriarchy does not cause violence, but is responsible for the values and attitudes that personality-disordered men rely on to justify their abuse of women. This is

proposed as a possible explanation as to why some men in a patriarchal society are not violent.

2.3 Sociological perspective

The sociological perspective, in contrast to the intra-individual approach, shifts the emphasis from the individual to social-structural factors.

Probably the most widely acknowledged theory of violence against women has been developed by Straus and colleagues (Finkelhor, Gelles, Hotaling & Straus, 1983; Gelles & Straus, 1979; Straus & Hotaling, 1980; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980). This approach suggests that violence against women arises from stressful conditions such as poverty, unemployment and discrimination. The family is viewed as a cybernetic system whose everyday interactions and responses to broad social-structural conditions generates and produces stress and conflict which may lead to violence. From this perspective family conflict is ubiquitous, since each member seeks to live out his or her life in accordance with a personal agenda which inevitably differs from other members (Straus, 1979). This stress can be exacerbated by a personal history of aggressive socialisation. If social support mechanisms are lacking, violence is legitimised as a way of coping with this stress (Lenton, 1995).

This sociological explanation of the aetiology of domestic violence emphasises the need to take all family members equally into account. It concludes that female to male violence is at least as prevalent as male to female violence. Any explanation for the cause of intimate violence that focuses exclusively, or even primarily, on gender inequality is accordingly misleading. A satisfactory causal

account must therefore be gender-blind (Stets & Straus, 1990(b)). Most research studies which have been reviewed and which support this proposition of gender neutrality have extensively used the Conflict Tactic Scales (CTS) developed by Straus (1979) as a measure of inadequate and unsatisfactory modes of dealing with conflict (Straus, 1979; Straus & Gelles, 1990; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980). A substantial number of researchers have cited findings from studies using the CTS to support the concept of gender neutrality in arguing for a broadening of focus of research into intimate violence (Arias, Samios & O'Leary, 1987; Cate, Henton, Koval, Christopher & Lloyd, 1982; De Maris, 1987; Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Makepeace, 1986; Straus et al., 1980).

One such argument in favour of gender neutrality proposes that women are more often the victims of severe partner assault and injury, not necessarily because men strike more often, but because they strike harder (Morse, 1995).

In the South African literature, the term 'spouse abuse' is widely used, indicating a support for a gender-neutral approach to the issue of violence in intimate relationships. Van der Hoven (1988) and Welch (1987), in researching battery, propose that violence results from and is perpetuated by both parties, who are therefore equally responsible. Similar explanations have been proposed in some South African studies on rape. One such example is a study by Cole (1989) in which it is argued that certain behaviours by women such as hitchhiking, drinking and prostitution make them vulnerable targets and less able to resist rape. Men are thus absolved from responsibility, which is explicitly shifted onto the victims of rape.

The media and, in many instances, the South African criminal justice system have contributed to the popularity of this notion of victim responsibility. This is illustrated by a recent High Court judgement reported in the press (Argus, 29 July, 1998) in which the accused, who was a prison warder, was sentenced to three years correctional supervision for shooting and killing his wife during a maintenance court hearing. Evidence was presented to the court that the deceased had been threatened by her husband for months prior to her death. The Court however found that "there must have been some provocation to have induced such a violent response from the accused."

An important feature of these sociological approaches is that although abuse is evident in all segments of society, it is differentially distributed among different social classes. The socio-structural conditions of low income, low educational levels, unemployment and poverty generate high levels of stress to which the family system responds (Smith, 1987; Straus, 1979; Stets & Straus, 1990(a); Straus & Smith, 1990). However, there is a counter argument supported by research that the victimisation of women cuts across demographic lines of income, class and race (Hotaling and Sugarman, 1986).

The sociological approach also focuses on those social circumstances that increase the potential for violent behaviour. Researchers in the field of intimate violence have proposed the notion of an intergenerational transfer of violence. This means that exposure to violence in one's family of origin increases one's susceptibility to perpetuating violence in one's family of procreation (Cantrell, MacIntyre, Sharkey & Thompson, 1995; Straus et al., 1980). It is believed that a child who witnesses and directly experiences family violence has a potential to perpetrate violence or become a victim in later abusive relationships. In investigating this link, Hotaling

and Sugarman (1986) reviewed 52 studies and found that men who witnessed interparental violence during childhood or adolescence could consistently be predicted to commit physical aggression against their intimate partners. They found that abused women were also more likely to have witnessed violence between their parents than women who were not abused.

Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1973) and Social Cognitive Theory (Bandura, 1986) have been used to explain this link between witnessing interparental violence and the later perpetration of violence against intimate partners. Boys who observe interparental violence remember the context and sequences of those incidents of such violence. These observations, in the form of memories, may, in turn, create expectations for the outcomes of violent behaviours against an intimate partner (Choice, Lamke & Pittman, 1995, pp.114-115). One of the most rigorous examinations of the intergenerational transfer hypothesis with regard to marital aggression, was conducted by Kalmuss (1984). This study confirmed that the intergenerational transmission of violence involves not only the perpetration of violence, but also the modelling of victimisation in later relationships. It is argued that the intergenerational transfer of violence against an intimate partner is not a random occurrence characterised by indiscriminate physical aggression among family members, but occurs rather in specific patterns of abusive behaviour between individuals in particular role relationships. Children who witness interparental violence accept violence between spouses as appropriate and model the behaviours, when they later inhabit the same roles, that were not particularly directed at them. A number of South African research studies support this notion that many men have learnt, through direct observation or experience, to use violence in dealing with stress and frustration in their intimate relationships

(Chinkanda, 1990; Labuschagne, 1981; McKendrick & Hoffman, 1990; Welch 1987;).

Lenore Walker's (1979, 1983) research has focused on the concept of learned victimisation and has extended the notion one step further by proposing that gender roles, supported by cultural norms and values, assist in translating the experiences of childhood into adult abuse. Through the mediation of gender roles, women and men respectively learn to be victims and perpetrators of violence. Women who experience rigid and traditional sex-role socialisation develop a "learned helplessness," that increases their vulnerability to violence in adult relationships (Walker, 1983, p.34). Equally, men who are socialised to accept traditional patriarchal sex-role stereotypes that rigidly assign tasks according to gender, are at high risk. If these rigid expectations are not fulfilled, men may resort to violence to firstly, alleviate the stress and frustration, and secondly, reinforce and reinstate the patriarchal status quo. The impact of sex-role socialisation on violence in intimate relationships has also been researched in attitude studies. Finn (1986), using a sample of college students, found that attitudes that supported conformity to traditional sex-roles were the most powerful predictors of attitudes supporting intimate violence. Hall, Howard and Boezio (1986) found that tolerant attitudes to rape were associated with sexist attitudes towards heterosexual relationships. Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) found that men's acceptance of traditional sex roles, interpersonal violence and adversarial attitudes about intimate relationships were related to their involvement in perpetrating sexual assault against women.

2.3.1 Criticism of the sociological perspective

Sociological explanations have made an important contribution to understanding how men and women are prepared to assume gender positions in society.

However, this perspective of abuse as a function of aberrant social conditions, is as deterministic as the perspective that describes abuse as a function of an aberrant psyche (Blumberg, Swartz & Roper (1996). Feminist theorists perceive the notion of gender neutrality to be counter-intuitive and counter-factual (Dobash, Dobash, Wilson & Daly, 1992). Sociological theories fail to address the question of why it is men who are almost always the perpetrators of violent acts against intimate partners, and why women and children are usually the recipients of abusive behaviour. Dobash and Dobash (1988) submit that almost all detailed and contextualised research reveals that women primarily commit violence against their partners in self-defence or retaliation. Men's commission of violence against women is characterised by persistence and severity. There is limited evidence of these characteristics in the violence women commit against men.

In addition, because these explanations are limited to a social level, sociological perspectives have failed to explore the structures and processes that feminists believe are critical to understanding the violence perpetrated against women. This approach has neglected to explore how patriarchy defines what is stressful and how it determines conflict resolution strategies. Neither have these explanations explored the function of violent behaviour in maintaining power and control over women both as individuals and as a group.

Feminist researchers have particularly criticised the reliance upon fixed format methods of data collection such as the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) (Gelles &

Straus, 1979; Straus & Gelles, 1986, 1990; Straus et al, 1980). Feminist psychologists Dobash, Dobash, Wilson and Daly (1992) argue that the CTS neither provides a reliable or valid account of intimate violence, nor is it useful in the development of a theory that adequately explains intimate violence. Many of the studies using the CTS refer to abusive behaviour as 'family violence' or 'spouse abuse'. The present study supports the argument that such terms ignore and mask the fundamental dimension of gender in attempting to understand and solve this contemporary social problem. A theory that explicitly deals with gender's relevance to violence is essential.

2.4 Feminist perspective

The most significant assault on the intra-individual and the sociological approaches has been mounted by feminist scholars. Although liberal, socialist, radical, Marxist and feminist theorists may disagree on the origins of patriarchy, how it is perpetuated and what should be done to eliminate it, all agree that it provides the structural and ideological foundations of male violence against women. In this perspective the issues of power and gender are explicitly addressed. The historical nature of the structural inequality surrounding violence against women is emphasised and the political purpose of violence against women is recognised. Adherents to the feminist perspective assert that proper terminology is vital. The use of terms such as "wife beating" and "battered women" as opposed to "spouse abuse" are important, since this immediately locates the problem of violence against women strongly within the concept of gender inequality (Dobash & Dobash, 1988, p.66).

The patriarchy theory of violence against women is fundamentally concerned with the question of why violence is directed at women as a group. Violence against women is not an individual or a family problem as asserted by Straus and Gelles (1990), but simply a manifestation of the historical system of domination of women by men which has existed across different cultures. Feminist analyses thus attempt to explain this phenomenon at a social or group level. Personal relationships, such as heterosexual intimate relationships, are structured by and experienced within relations of power (Larken & Popaleni, 1994).

The structural component of patriarchy ensures that society is structured along gender lines. Men, as a dominant class, have differential access to important material and symbolic resources. Women are consequently devalued as inferior and secondary (Bograd, 1988). Violence, then, is the most overt and effective means of reinforcing, controlling and maintaining the status quo and, according to Yllö and Bograd (1988), even if men refrain from committing violence, they, as a class, benefit from the restriction and limitation of women's lives caused by the fear of violence. This climate of fear and control is well illustrated in two South African studies. In Van Zyl's (1988) study of women in the Western Cape, 88% of women interviewed expressed their fear of men. Similarly, Mokwena's (1992, p.18) study gives a vivid description of the fear and control elicited by young men, the "Jackrollers", in Soweto (referred to in Chapter 1). Thus the reality of domination at a societal level is, at a personal level, the most crucial factor contributing to and maintaining violence against women. Feminist researchers have proposed that when this structural inequality is challenged and control threatened, perhaps by the improved status of women, the consequence may be a

violent backlash by men in an attempt to resume and maintain control (Smith, 1990; Yllö, 1988).

The family is recognised as the most fundamental structural unit of the patriarchy, since it reflects, reproduces and recreates the hierarchical gender system of society as a whole (Kaufman, 1987). For this reason familial patriarchy is a central concern in the study of men's violence against women. The feminist perspective challenges the cultural ideal of the family as a peaceful haven (Bograd, 1988). Violence against women is not viewed as a rare and deviant phenomenon that results from the breakdown of family functioning. It is rather considered to be a predictable and common dimension of normal family life in which there is specialisation of appropriate male and female roles (Bograd, 1988; Dobash & Dobash, 1979).

The ideological component, as the energy source of patriarchal domination, is also an important feature in feminist literature (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Smith, 1990). This requires that violence against women is understood as intrinsic to a system of male supremacy. Violence must be viewed both as an inevitable consequence of the power differentials inherent in a patriarchal society and as an important factor in its maintenance. The gender relations of men and women are inevitable demonstrations of these power differentials. (Vogelman & Eagle, 1991).

This ideology relies to a considerable degree on the notion of women's obedience, respect, loyalty, dependency, sexual access and sexual fidelity. A number of studies suggest that men assault women who violate, or who they

believe are violating, these ideals. 'Manhood' is asserted with the goal of subduing 'womanhood' by any means necessary (Dobash & Dobash, 1979).

Smith (1990) has perhaps most successfully tested the relationship between an ideology of patriarchy and women abuse. He found that men who adhered to an ideology of patriarchy (that is, they support, in the eyes of their female partners, a set of beliefs and attitudes characteristically patriarchal) were more likely to engage in intimate violence.

In bringing together the notions of structural and ideological patriarchy, most feminists believe that violence against women takes place on a scale that is only possible within a social context where women are defined as subordinate to men. In such a context violence against women is viewed as part of the normal interactions between men and women. (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski, 1987; Yllö, 1984).

The issue of the intersection of race and class with gender relations is important in general feminist analyses and particularly pertinent in a South African context. Within the feminist perspective violence against women is viewed as a universal phenomenon. However, the socio-political issues of race and class must be considered in any study located in South Africa (Stanton, 1993; Van Zyl, Veinnings & Kleeberg, 1987). An inescapable historical characteristic of this country is its striking hierarchical structures of race and class. Vogelman and Eagle (1991, p. 214) conclude that these additional power structures impact so significantly that women are subjected to "dual oppression". Campbell (1992) endorses this point by proposing that the emasculation of young African men and their consequent loss of identity and high levels of frustration, are possible

explanations for their use of violence, which is most frequently directed against young women.

To summarise, the goal of more accurately reflecting women's experiences is at the core of the feminist research consulted on violence against women (Bograd, 1988). This has shaped feminist research methods, the questions asked and the interpretations made. The essential nature of feminist methodologies will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

2.4.1 Criticism of the feminist perspective

Though the feminist perspective has received (and continues to receive) much support in the last decade, some researchers have presented several challenges to feminist theory in this field. These challenges are essentially directed at feminist assertions that patriarchal structure and male socialisation are sufficient to produce dominance and a propensity to assault. Some critics question why most men, including those who adhere to patriarchal ideology, have not violently assaulted their partners (Lenton, 1995).

Contemporary research has highlighted the problem of violence in same sex relationships (Letellier, 1994; Renzetti, 1992). Some concern is expressed as to whether gender-based models reduce battered victims to unidimensional representations focusing on heterosexual relationships only, thereby excluding victims in same sex relationships. These models may also have tended to over-generalise about the nature of violent relationships, ignoring the strong possibility that certain characteristics of the perpetrator might be significant risk markers of intimate violence. Posel (1991), researching in a South African

context, also expresses concern about such a unidimensional representation of victims of patriarchy. Posel (1991) states that these orthodox notions of patriarchy do not recognise the ways in which women have contested men's powers. This latter study alerts one to the complexity of the phenomenon by demonstrating the apparent contradictions between African women's defiance of, and their submission to, patriarchal values. A severe limitation of orthodox feminist theory is its inability to provide a framework within which such contradictions may be understood. In a similar light, critics are concerned with some feminist authors' focus on extreme cases of abuse. This restricted focus may construct an image of an irreversibly damaged, helpless victim (Loseke, 1992). Such an image may be as deterministic and disempowering of women as the image of women created by the dominant discourses of patriarchy (Blumberg, Swartz & Roper, 1996).

Many contemporary critics of the feminist perspective on violence against women propose a move away from orthodoxy towards theoretical perspectives that employ multiple levels of explanation. It is contended that these multiple levels are necessary to link developmental and biological characteristics, personalities, subcultural variations and economic, social, political and community dimensions in constructing models of relationship violence (Dutton, 1994(a); Hamberger, 1994; Letellier, 1994; Miller, 1994; Renzetti, 1994; Warnken et al, 1994). These critics maintain that relying on narrow explanatory theories that are gender-based or essentially socio-cultural, are too limiting in the study of relationship aggression.

2.5 Conclusion

After considering the various theoretical perspectives, the criticisms of these perspectives and the counter-theoretical proposals, detailed in this chapter, this study will analyse the problem of violence in adolescent dating relationships in an essentially feminist perspective. It intends, however, where necessary and appropriate, to include multiple levels of analysis and interpretation. This study of violence against young women and young men in a South African context must be researched within the broader social context and must acknowledge the historical structures of race and class as inseparable from gender relations. A feminist perspective will serve to provide the frame of reference for the types of questions asked, the methods used to ask these questions, and finally, for the interpretation findings.

CHAPTER 3

ADOLESCENCE

3.1 Introduction

The literature on adolescence reveals that there is little agreement as to the chronological boundaries that define this period. Chronological criteria do not take into account the maturational differences between young people, making this a difficult time to define chronologically. This study has chosen to rely on the definition adopted by the World Health Organisation which describes adolescence as primarily constituting that age group of people between 10 and 19 years (Friedman, 1989).

Researchers have explored adolescence from a number of theoretical perspectives and appear to agree that this is a dynamic period of change, a time of many transitions, of exploration and experimentation (Cotterell, 1996; De la Rey & Carolissen, 1997; Durkin, 1995; Emler & Reicher, 1995). Adolescents experience changes in the biological sphere, in cognitive capacity and interest, in identity formation and self-concept, and in relationships with parents and peers (Durkin, 1995). Influencing this period of change is a further distinctive feature, that of a widening social vista, which contributes to the adolescent's behaviour system being more accessible to the influence of social processes (Cotterell, 1996). In addition, adolescence is not a developmental process contained and isolated

within an individual – there is a reciprocal interaction with the social environment. This process impacts on all significant others in the adolescent's social sphere and is the vehicle through which the adolescent acquires a unique identity.

3.2 Theories of adolescence

A number of theoretical perspectives have focused on adolescence. The following overview of some of the theories of adolescence provides a background against which adolescent beliefs, attitudes and behaviours may be understood.

Freud's psychoanalytic perspective had significant impact on the theories of adolescence. The essence of the psychoanalytic contribution to understanding adolescence is to focus on the upsurge of instinctual energy during the period of puberty. It is believed that this instinctual energy defeats those defences that young people have constructed against their sexuality during childhood development and therefore re-ignites the conflicts of early childhood, namely the Oedipal conflicts. Adolescent sexuality is distinctly different from childhood sexuality, since it is capable of satisfaction and needs to be directed outside the family. A shift in the target of sexual gratification is fundamental to adult functioning, and thus the universal task of adolescence, according to this perspective, is to free oneself from parents in order to become an adult member of the community (Cole & Cole, 1993; Durkin, 1995). This disengagement may be characterised by processes such as a regression to infantile-like attachments (a familiar example being the idolisation of pop stars or sporting heroes), and profoundly ambivalent behaviour, as evident in fluctuations between acceptance

and rejection of parents, and dependence and independence. Non-conformity and rebellion, almost hallmarks of this period, are aids to the process of disengagement from parents. The need for alternative affective attachments explains the heightened importance of the peer social group. This group becomes a substitute for the adolescent family. This time of intense psychic conflict is also, then, a time of loneliness, as the adolescent has cast off those earlier attachments that had ensured equilibrium. The vulnerability of adolescence is the direct product of these processes (Cole & Cole, 1993).

Erikson (1968), one of the most influential theorists on adolescence, proposed a revised psychoanalytic account of adolescence which focuses on the interaction of both universal biological and social factors. Erikson's developmental model requires that the human life cycle be viewed as a series of developmental stages, each with its own unique problems to negotiate. Each problem precipitates a crisis that may be resolved more or less successfully. The most significant crisis, in Erikson's (1968) view, occurs in the 5th stage, a stage synonymous with the period of adolescence. This stage involves a conflict between the need to attain a level of self-integration and the need to meet the diffuse demands of society and to determine one's place within society. Thus, 'identity' versus 'role confusion' is the central crisis to be resolved in adolescence (Kroger, 1989). The task of adolescence involves incorporating the newly emerging biological sexual drives and the demands of society into an integrated identity. Identity, then, is a pattern of beliefs that the adolescent constructs, describing for each adolescent how they are similar to other people and how they differ. The demands of this task - achieving an integrated individual and social identity - render the adolescent

extremely vulnerable. The achievement of a coherent identity equips the adolescent to move into the next stage that involves the intimacy of adult relationships. Erikson (1968) believed each person's experience of adolescence to be unique and neither a universal or an inevitable stage. It is in this belief of uniqueness, and in his insistence that the resolution of this developmental crisis depends largely on social factors, that Erikson departs from main-stream psychoanalytic reasoning. The decisive role that Erikson accorded to societal influences has significant implications when examining adolescence in a South African context, where the central role of the historically rigid and inequitable structures of race and class must be acknowledged.

Marcia (1980) expanded this theory of adolescence by identifying various stages experienced by adolescents in their quest for identity achievement, all of which again draw attention to the interaction of developmental factors and significant social others (such as parents, the family group and membership groups).

Sociological explanations of adolescence have also emphasised the inner turmoil and outer conflict of adolescence (Emler & Reicher, 1995). Their emphasis, however, is on the role of social factors during this time of change and vulnerability. Sociological theories share a common theme, which emphasises the profound changes in role expectations, as well as conflicting expectations from parents and peers, in adolescence. The essential focus of this perspective has been on issues surrounding the realisation of the adolescent's structural position and opportunities in society. Although these explanations view adolescent

vulnerability from social structural terms rather than psychic terms, they are in agreement that the peer group is an important bolster for the adolescent in crisis.

Despite essential differences, it appears that the theoretical perspectives reviewed share an emphasis on the dynamic, transitional and extremely vulnerable characteristic of this period. With this in mind, it is important to focus on the context of this research study, and to briefly explore some of the structural and social factors that impact on this vulnerable period for many South African adolescents.

3.3 Adolescence in South Africa

Within a South African context, the social and structural factors mediating this period of vulnerability for many adolescents need to be acknowledged.

Adolescents in South Africa face the difficult task of negotiating the overlap of different identities of gender, class and race. South African society is ethnically diverse and characterised by class divisions which largely follow differences in racial classification. The State policy of the last few hundred years has ensured little contact and understanding between groups. Until recently, social and educational resources have been unequally distributed and the Nationalist government's labour practices have resulted in the separation of many black working class men and women from their families, thus affecting the meaning of 'family' for countless adolescents (and other family members). One of the systems that particularly impact on adolescents of all race and class groups in South Africa is the education system. The move towards equity in education

since 1992 has affected many schools (private, state-aided and public), and has left many schools, teachers and pupils in a state of confusion. School plays a significant role in adolescents' social interactions and is an important environment in which teenagers through academic, social and recreational activities experiment with different identities. The recent changes in education have affected adolescents of all race and socio-economic groups, and few resources have been made available to South African adolescents to assist them in negotiating these transitions (Meyer, Loxton and Boulter, 1997).

In the broader social and political picture, the fledgling democracy of recent years has not significantly impacted on demographic, economic and urbanisation factors. Research on black youth has focused on these factors as central contributors to what Mokwena (1991, p.30) calls "the process of marginalisation of black youth ...". Marginalisation refers to the systematic disempowerment of people resulting in an inability to develop psychologically, economically or otherwise (Everatt & Sisulu, 1992). Demographic factors are obvious : the demographic profile indicates that the population has a pyramid shape, with 60% of the black population below the age of 19 (Everatt & Sisulu, 1992). This clearly indicates the enormous pressure on the educational resources of the country for the foreseeable future. The economic index that has the most direct implication for youth is the unemployment index. This figure now stands at 33%, nationally, and as high as 66% in Manenberg, Western Cape, one of the suburbs from which respondents were drawn (Cape Times, 4 May, 1998). The majority of new job seekers are school-leavers, and unemployment is particularly strongly felt by those in the age bracket 16 to 30. Urbanisation is a further factor : the highest

proportion of the new urban population is youthful – these young people are mainly either living in informal settlements or squatting. Many of the country's young people are idle, uneducated, and impoverished. They are extremely vulnerable to the epidemic of violence, since violence has found acceptance as a normal way of life and is viewed as a means of self-assertion and, often, the only known means of conflict-resolution, for many young South Africans (Mokwena, 1991).

The increase in youth violence has most noticeably been accompanied by a further increase in violence that is directed against young women. In black communities in South Africa young women are even more marginalised than young men (Simpson, 1991). However, Vogelmann & Eagle (1991) argue that interpersonal intimate relationship violence affects the lives of women of all races and income levels. Violence against young women occurs in part within the framework of a male-dominated society, where men are taught to define their power in terms of their capacity to impose their will, particularly over women, with or without the consent of those affected. This is an integral part of a society that prescribes different gender roles. Young males are taught to be assertive and macho, and young women are expected to be subordinate and submissive. Young men see their mothers and other women living under the domination of their fathers and other adult males.

In South Africa, racism has compounded this dynamic. Young black males feel powerless and impotent. This inferior status contradicts their socialisation within a patriarchal culture. Inferior status is compounded by inferior education, poverty

and unemployment (usually experienced as a personal rather than a social failure). Violence thus is used as a means of increasing self-esteem. Women, who are less powerful, become victims of this displaced aggression and vehicles for symbolic assertion of masculinity and control. For many women, however, the changing social conditions and educational opportunities since 1992 have meant “the possibility of reconstructing new and empowering identities” (Campbell, 1993, p.60). This may indeed offer opportunities to challenge the patriarchal status quo, but for many it increases the risk of violence, as men attempt to reassert their threatened masculinity (Campbell, 1992).

Since adolescents are particularly influenced by social factors as they develop a sense of identity, it can be expected that violence that is of an “endemic” nature (Vogelman & Eagle, 1991), must have significant impact on how young South Africans deal with the challenges of this developmental period.

3.4 The changing nature of relationships in adolescence

Cotterell (1996, p.1) states that “relations with others lie at the heart of the adolescent experience.” The two processes that are central to adolescent’s relations with others are the development of a sense of personal identity and the process of attachment. Attachment refers to the relational ties or the emotional bond between the adolescent and some other person, group or institution (Durkin, 1995). In adolescence the individual begins to act independently of parents, shifting the emphasis of childhood emotional attachments from a principal caregiver (or caregivers) to multiple other attachments, usually peers. These

multiple social attachments are synonymous with social support, which provide the adolescent with a much needed sense of belonging, acceptance, solidarity and social affirmation. These attachments are also seen as a basis for internalising the norms of society which are manifest in the beliefs, values and behaviours of young people (Cotterell, 1996). Of interest to this study is the social context in which violence becomes an acceptable means of exerting power and of conflict resolution. It could be reasonably expected that this norm of violence be reflected in the relationships of adolescents.

An important task of adolescence is the continuation of the construction of gender, which begins in early childhood. Through this process individuals construct a sense of themselves as gendered people. Adolescents are actively involved in testing out behaviour and language that enables them to operate comfortably within a range of complex social relations. However, despite the adolescent's sense of agency and active involvement in this task, real choice is limited by the dominant power relations and social structures. Through these power relations, young people learn to desire ways of being feminine or masculine. These desires may ultimately restrict or empower them in all facets of life and particularly in their relationships with others.

In adolescence there is not only a reorientation from family to peers, but also a reorientation from investing in platonic peer relationships to investing in intimate love relationships. Both scholarly and popular literature have tended to view this as a period of innocent, romantic exploration, despite acknowledging, on the other hand, the stressful and competitive nature of courtship and its potential for

interpersonal exploitation (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989). The obvious step of linking the vulnerable and stressful nature of this time to a potential for abusive behaviour in intimate relationships, has been largely absent.

3.5 Definition of abusive dating behaviour

The term 'dating relationship', as used in this study, covers a broad spectrum of experiences, which range from one-night stands and short-term encounters to relationships that are of longer endurance and relatively stable over time (Poitras & Lavoie, 1995). The age group researched in this study has, in all likelihood, excluded co-habitation as a possible relationship.

There does not appear to be a clear and uniform definition of abusive or violent behaviour towards a dating partner in the literature reviewed. Kelly (1988, p.114) argues that "what is not named is invisible, and in a social sense, non-existent." In contributing to 'naming' this social problem, this study believes that a broad definition including a focus on physical, emotional and sexually abusive behaviour is best, in order to cast the net as widely as possible in the interests of valid and reliable research. Sexually abusive behaviour has been specifically highlighted in the reviewed literature as a major source of conflict for dating couples (Makepeace, 1981; Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski, 1987). However, other researchers remind us that emotional abuse can be equally injurious, and should not be neglected in defining the range of behaviours considered abusive (Larken & Popaleni, 1994).

This study intends to use Levy's (1991) definition as a broad basis from which to research abusive dating behaviour. This definition regards abusive dating behaviour as any actual or threatened acts that physically, sexually or verbally

abuse a member of a heterosexual or homosexual couple in which one or both partners is between 13 and 20 years old.

3.6 A review of the research into abusive dating relationships

The earliest research into courtship violence was largely descriptive.

Makepeace's (1981) seminal study was one of the first that signaled the existence of a major hidden social problem, challenging the notion that incidents of abuse were isolated individual aberrations. Makepeace (1981) proposed a prevalence figure of 1 in 5 college students that had had direct personal experience of courtship violence. The prevalence figures yielded by this study are confirmed by other researchers in this field whilst some propose that such prevalence figures are possibly a substantial under-estimation of the magnitude of the problem (Cate, Henton, Koval, Christopher & Lloyd, 1982; De Keseredy & Kelly, 1993 ; Laner & Thompson, 1982). The same reasons of secrecy and under-reporting that characterise marital abuse would apply equally in a dating context.

Descriptive research has provided much needed exposure to the problem of abuse in dating relationships. A great deal of this research has been supported by theoretical explanations relating to models of intimate violence in adult relationships. Makepeace (1981) proposed that the premarital period is one in which couples are socialised into marital abuse, and that courtship violence should be viewed as a mediating factor between violence in the family of origin and violence in later family relationships. Consequently, a number of variables,

identified as significant by research studies of marital abuse, have been investigated as to their contribution in abusive dating relationships. Variables such as gender, socio-economic class, the experiencing or witnessing of family violence, substance abuse and stress-related factors, have received particular attention.

The concept of gender-neutrality, substantiated by a number of studies into marital abuse, has also been the subject of contentious debate in the arena of premarital relationships. Some studies have proposed that dating abuse is reciprocal in nature, and for a large number of couples is a case of abusive relationships, rather than abusive individuals (Cate et al., 1982). As in the case of abuse within marital relationships these claims are hotly debated by feminist researchers, who assert that adolescent intimate relationships are subject to the same gender-based structures of power as adult intimate relationships.

The role of socio-economic class in the experience and perpetration of abusive dating relationships has also been explored. Some studies have found that social class is an unsatisfactory predictor of intimate dating violence (De Maris, 1987), whilst other researchers have found significant differences between social classes and their experience of abuse in dating relationships. One such study by Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs (1985) provides evidence that contradicts much of the marital abuse research in this area. They propose that while teenagers from high-income families experience comparatively more abuse than those in other socio-economic classes, they inflict less abuse than those in other socio-economic classes.

The role of intergenerational factors in the etiology of abusive dating behaviour has received substantial research attention. Research located within the social learning perspective has particularly supported the notion that the experience and/or witnessing of family violence is significantly related to later perpetration of abuse in courtship relationships. Many of these studies have also proposed that experiences of family violence in childhood also correlate positively with sustaining abuse in later dating relationships (Laner & Thompson, 1982; Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard & Bohmer, 1987). In some studies these experiences of childhood are viewed as contributing to an underlying vulnerability in an individual, which together with environmental stress of varying origin, acts as a catalyst for abusive behaviour. Other studies found relatively weak generational transfer effects, that were confined to male use of violence in dating relationships, or no effects at all (De Maris, 1987, 1990; Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987).

A number of factors could account for the varied and contradictory findings of these studies. The use of different populations and varied definitions of dating abuse may account for some of the variation. More importantly, though, since intergenerational transfer of violence has been strongly supported in studies of marital abuse, perhaps this lack of support in studies of dating abuse is perhaps a demonstration of the differences between courtship and marital relationships.

The role of substance abuse has also been examined in relation to the experience and perpetration of abusive behaviour in dating relationships. Alcohol in particular has been described as increasing the risk of aggressive and even violent behaviour in intimate dating relationships. Intoxication has also been widely cited as increasing the vulnerability of potential victims of abuse in dating relationships

(Barnes, Greenwood & Sommer, 1991; Cate et al., 1982; Makepeace, 1981; Muelenhard & Lenton, 1987).

While some research studies have focused on the link between stress and courtship aggression, a substantial relationship has yet to be established through research (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989; Makepeace, 1983). However, stressful aspects of dating relationships, such as vulnerable identities, perceived tenuousness of commitment, the potential for sexual and social exploitation, peer pressure, and feelings of alienation from parents and authority factors, contribute to the fact that this period is fraught with tension and stress for many adolescents (Levy, 1991).

It is obvious from the literature reviewed, that models of spousal violence are widely used in explaining this abusive social behaviour. While descriptive research has provided the problem of abusive dating behaviour with much needed exposure, some researchers question the efficacy of applying a spousal abuse model to abuse experienced in dating relationships. Some glaring differences exist between marital and dating relationships. Many of the traditional constraints (legal, economic and moral) which explain the continuation of abusive marital relationships are not pertinent to dating relationships. Attempts to answer the question as to why these relationships persist has prompted some researchers to propose that dating relationships exhibit sufficient unique characteristics to merit a theoretical explanation focusing specifically on abusive behaviour occurring in courtship relationships (De Maris, 1987; Gamache, 1991; Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989). Some of the unique characteristics of this developmental period are: the pressure to conform to peer norms; the intense sexuality of adolescence; the

rigid nature of gender roles in this developmental stage; the double standards of morality as applied to males and females; inexperience in romantic relationships; and the rejection of, and isolation from, adult authority figures.

Responding to the need to incorporate these unique features of adolescent dating into an explanatory model, Pirog-Good & Stets (1989) proposed a causal model that shares some elements with models of spousal violence, whilst including others that are characteristic of courtship relationships. This model is composed of two inter-related components. The first component includes contextual variables selected to predict who will become aggressive, the second represents situational variables and predicts when or in what situation a person will become aggressive. Research supporting the first contextual component (of who will become aggressive in a dating relationship), has focused on a number of different variables including models of aggression in intimate relationships, perceived consequences of witnessed behaviour (Cate et al, 1982; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987), psychopathology and neuropathology, arousability and emotionality (Arias et al., 1987; Cate et al. 1982; Makepeace, 1981; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987), and personality and prior use of aggression. The second component of the model (dealing with when and in what situation a person will become aggressive), has been supported by research into five major predictors of courtship aggression, namely: the expectations of a positive outcome of aggression; stress (Makepeace, 1983); the use of alcohol (Cate et al., 1982; Makepeace, 1981); the partner's use of aggression (Cate et al., 1982); and relationship conflict (Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). It is apparent that the situational and contextual characteristics cited above as leading to the use of aggression are closely related. This model's allegiance to social learning theory is clear. Consequences act to change the likelihood of aggression primarily by altering the expected outcome of such aggression (Bandura, 1973). That is, if the

consequences of an aggressive interaction are perceived as positive, then the expectation of similar positive outcomes from future aggression is increased and aggression becomes more likely.

Pirog-Good and Stets'(1989) causal model has made an important contribution in psychology towards a theoretical explanation specific to courtship aggression, and has also provided an important theoretical framework, based on the social learning perspective, for designing and interpreting studies in this area.

A search for feminist literature on abusive intimate relationships, reveals that there is a distinct absence of feminist research on the particular problem of violence against women in a dating context. Larken and Popaleni (1994, p. 24) state that

... the issue of violence in the lives of adolescent girls has received little attention in the vast feminist project of politicising male violence against women.

Their study focuses on how two forms of violence - sexual harassment and heterosexual courtship violence - affect the lives of adolescent girls and, in particular, the impact of this behaviour on young women's psychological development. For adolescents, acts of diminishment, intimidation and force are active displays of male control.

There is speculation that this dearth of research by feminist scholars into the relationships of young people does not indicate a lack of acknowledgement of the problem or an indifference to it, but rather reveals that heterosexual dating relationships, like other personal relationships, "are associations shaped by,

dictated according to and experienced within, relations of power” (Larken & Popaleni, 1994, p.215). In this sense, adolescent intimate relationships are viewed subject to the same gendered structures of power as adult relationships. For adolescents the express purpose of male control is to maintain the status quo of male domination and male privilege.

This study, informed by the feminist perspective, intends to contribute to an understanding of how heterosexual courtship violence affects the lives of both young women and young men.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will deal with two methodological issues relevant to this study: main-stream versus feminist methodological debates; and research into sensitive issues. The application of these methodological issues in this study is then discussed.

4.2 Main-stream versus feminist methodological debates

The purpose of this section is to explore briefly the methodological debates between main-stream and feminist researchers, and to identify the main areas of contention as they relate to research into violence against women.

In the study of violence against women, methodological issues are not just a consequence of different perspectives on violence against women, but instead are central to much of the debate regarding violence against women. Methodological issues must therefore be examined and given an important place in any study into this social problem (Yllö, 1988).

Within the feminist perspective there are a number of theories accounting for women's oppression, each with its own distinctive explanation of sexism and its own suggestions to overcome it. Despite these differences, a number of fundamental assumptions unite and distinguish feminist explanations from other perspectives. Feminist research is based on the theoretical premise that women are oppressed. Its express intention is the understanding of this oppression, and its manifestations, in order to end it (Kelly, 1988).

The feminist critique of main-stream positivist methodology in social science has focused on three central issues: the lack of visibility of women researchers and women's research issues; epistemology; and ethics.

The issue of the invisibility of women arises from assertions that science is not immune to the institutionalised patriarchal practises that encourage and enforce gender bias in societies. This gender bias is evident in the lack of recognition awarded to, and the under-representation of, women scientists and researchers. More important, however is the invisibility of women's concerns in research, which are at best researched as deviations from male norms (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1995). This bias is particularly evident in South Africa. Until recently, despite the magnitude of violence against women, very little empirical research on this issue of violence against women, had been undertaken (Russell, Hansson & Van Zyl, 1991).

The central feminist vs main-stream debate, though, has been the epistemological critique, which questions the very foundations of positivist science - the claim that scientific knowledge is in essence objective, rational and value-free. Feminists assert

that all knowledge (not only biased knowledge) has social and historical origins (Reinharz, 1992). An important implication of the concept of objectivity and empiricism is the separation between the subject and object of research, the knower and the known, the researcher and the researched. This is regarded as the only means to achieve 'unbiased' knowledge. This is in stark contrast to feminist researchers' assertions that any observations are inherently value-laden, together with their belief in the impossibility of human objectivity. The feminist critique argues that the role of the researcher is central to the research process. Research is not just **about** or **on** women, but **for** women. This emphasises the subjectivity of this critique. As feminist researchers we are part of the group that we're attempting to gather data from, understand and change (Kelly, 1988).

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to attempt to review in full feminist critique on positivism and scientific method. Feminist scholarship has, for the most part, spearheaded research in the arena of intimate abuse of women, and it is within this locus that feminist methodology is considered.

A crucial concern in research into violence against women is the further objectification, distancing, and dehumanising of women who have been the objects of violence (Yllö, 1988). It is believed that positivist research methods recreate in the research process the hierarchical structures of society, with the inherent aspects of power, control and manipulation. This is an ethical dilemma for researchers who seek the emancipation of women. Feminist researchers are particularly sensitive to the nature of the researcher/researched relationship, advocating a more collaborative style of relationship. At the very heart of feminist analysis of violence against women is the

conviction that this behaviour is simply one manifestation of the system of patriarchal power that has dominated women both historically and across cultures. This unequal power distribution is a fundamental aspect of feminist philosophy and feminist research must guard against the recreation of further power imbalances in the researcher/researched relationship.

This vociferous critique against main-stream positivist research has focused efforts to identify distinctively 'feminist methods' for research, with a natural affinity developing between feminist research and qualitative methodologies. In the field of research into violence against women, Dobash & Dobash (1988) argue that general positivist methodology is inadequate and too narrow in scope to capture the dynamics and the complexity of the violent and abusive experiences of women. They insist that only qualitative methods are useful to the feminist researcher in the quest for understanding the experiences of women from their own frames of reference. This approach, they assert, recognises the critical and necessary inter-relationship between the researcher and the researched. It fosters a greater sensitivity to the rights of participants as unique individuals, rather than as objects of research. The researcher reflects women's experiences in their own terms and seen through their own eyes. Henwood and Pidgeon (1995) remark that qualitative methods also encourage the essential and critical relationship between the subjectivities of researcher and researched in the social construction of knowledge. A pertinent South African example of qualitative research is Van Zyl's (1988) study of women's experience of male violence in the Western Cape, which focused on women's own definitions of the violence they experienced.

However, despite the apparent usefulness of qualitative methods in addressing feminist concerns of invisibility, epistemology and ethics, the reliance on pure qualitative methods is not without problems. Two important concerns are described in the literature reviewed (Henwood & Pidgeon, 1995).

Firstly, the question is posed as to whether qualitative methods can be used effectively to challenge substantive gender-based claims in order to effect political change. It can be argued though that feminist researchers may be more effective in political change by working within the “rhetoric of representative surveys and ‘precise’ quantification”, (Henwood & Pigeon, 1995, p.11). Some researchers have also questioned whether there is in fact a true dualism between quantitative and qualitative research procedures. It is argued that both these methodologies are in fact different forms of the same analytic procedure of re-representing complex raw data (Peplau & Conrad, 1989; Reinharz, 1992).

Secondly, although qualitative methods may contribute to more ethical research, in the sense of increasing the collaborative style of research and resolving the dilemma of hierarchical relationships between researcher and researched, other ethical dilemmas may be created. Qualitative methods of investigation may become invasive as they grant the researcher special access to otherwise private areas of participant’s lives. These methods could also present dangers to the researched when the relationship between the researcher and researched is terminated on completion of the research project. These dilemmas highlight the concern that qualitative methods of research are not necessarily inherently free of power relationships.

Given dilemmas such as these, as well as concerns that relying on purely qualitative methods of research is simply a replacement of one orthodoxy with another, some feminist researchers have proposed a move towards what is termed “methodological pluralism” (Henwood & Pigeon, 1995, p.13). This proposition encourages researchers studying women’s concerns and in particular, violence against women to consider which aspects of scientific method are of value and will not conflict with their feminist beliefs and assumptions. In doing so, the substantive issues of feminist research, a power analysis of gender relationships and recognition of women’s oppression, are not necessarily neglected, while relying primarily on the methods of traditional science (Saunders, 1988).

It is important to recognise how quantitative methods have been used to successfully challenge substantive gender-biased claims in social science. Feminist researchers in the arena of violence against women, such as Russell (1982, 1984), have been most effective in challenging existing sexist assumptions, and thereby effecting political change, while working within the constraints of surveys and providing statistical evidence. Bowker, Arbitell and McFerron (1988) suggest that employing quantitative methods in feminist research gives researchers legitimacy and enables them to have an impact on decision makers, challenge the status quo and ultimately improve the situation for women. Thus quantitative methodology, sensitively employed in feminist research, can lend legitimacy to research, impacting considerably on decision- and public policy-makers. It is clear that numbers, in the form of frequency counts, are central to developing a societal response to violence against women. Establishing the frequency of a problem certainly influences the seriousness with which it is taken.

In the light of this debate, it is not surprising that recent feminist research is not characterised by a universal, uniquely feminist method. Peplau & Conrad (1989) propose that no research method is uniquely feminist or can guarantee upholding feminist beliefs – any research method is vulnerable to misuse in sexist ways. Feminist researchers should thus remain cognisant of the limitations of all research methods. Recently, many feminist researchers have attempted to reconcile feminist beliefs and traditional views of science by emphasising the value of adapting conventional scientific practices to serve feminist goals. Providing motivation for this are the variety of questions and goals, set by research, for and about women, which demand an equally wide variety of approaches and methods. However, all research methods are united in honouring the feminists' call to maintain a self-critical eye regarding choice of a given method and the implications for women of this choice (Bograd, 1988). It is acknowledged that data collection, its interpretation, and its use, are inherently political activities, which confront and challenge the status quo and lobby for changes in women's lives.

4.3 Research on sensitive issues

An important consideration of this study has been the methodological issues that arise when researching sensitive topics.

An important concern of feminist research and of this study in particular has been finding a balance between dealing with the extremely sensitive nature of some research problems, and remaining true to the feminist goal of overcoming the

traditional invisibility of women and opening up the private world of women's experience.

Focus group research is recognised as a particularly useful means of exploring sensitive issues such as intimate dating behaviours. In these groups participants may be more willing to reveal more of their ideas and experiences since the focus is on the group rather than on the individual (Lee, 1993; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990).

Within these groups the synergetic effect (the process whereby individual responses triggered off responses in other participants) is a very effective method of dealing with issues of a sensitive nature. A number of principals recommended by Zeller (1993) particularly enhance the capacity of focus groups to elicit sensitive information from participants, while minimising socially desirable responses. The 'principal of reactivity' recommends that a stimulus be used (in this study a case history was effective) as a catalyst to prompt the responses of participants. The 'principal of legitimation' is applied by providing encouragement and a non-judgemental attitude to a variety of comments, thoughts, experiences and opinions. It is also important to legitimate non-participation and to encourage respondents to share their responses with the group if and when they feel comfortable.

4.4 Methodologies used in this study

This research study intends to follow the current move to methodological pluralism. This methodological decision is supported from within the field of research into violence against women by a number of researchers. Yllö (1988) in particular called for a rapprochement between feminist and main-stream social science approaches to

research methodology in the study of violence against women. Similarly, Reinharz (1992 p. 242) states that feminist research practices must be recognised “...as a plurality”, rather than an orthodoxy, with a multiplicity of methods allowing feminists to study a broad range of subjects and reach a broad set of goals.

The research questions of this study are as follows:

- Do adolescent boys and girls in South Africa experience violence in dating relationships ?
- What forms does this violent behaviour take ?
- What is the frequency of abuse in dating relationships amongst adolescents in South Africa ?

In order to answer these questions, this study has employed both qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

The exploratory and descriptive nature of this study is acknowledged by the use of qualitative methodology in the form of focus groups. These were employed in the early stages of the study in order to hear the voices of young women (and young men). The data from these focus groups provides important descriptive information in response to the first two research questions of, “Do adolescents in South Africa experience dating violence”, and, “What form does this take”. This data also provided an invaluable guide in the design and checking of the relevance of statements and questions contained in the questionnaire.

There are a number of reasons as to why research into abusive dating relationships is

considered 'sensitive'. This research probes a pressing social issue, that of violence against women, which is firmly located in a dominant patriarchal socio-political context. In addition, the probing of these possibly hidden, stressful and painful experiences may have potential consequences for the participants of the study, as this research challenges a taken-for-granted view of the adolescent world – that it is one of innocent, romantic exploration.

An important feature of sensitive research particularly pertinent to this study is the risk of potential consequences or implications for participants. The preservation of confidentiality was an important feature of the gathering of both the qualitative and the quantitative data. Research participants, both survey and focus group, were guaranteed anonymity and confidentiality.

The need for incidence studies requires that a quantitative method of data collection is employed, and to this end a survey questionnaire was designed to gather data for empirical analysis. In using this method of data collection, this study acknowledges the importance, when using quantification in feminist research, of employing statistics in the role of describing the violence and elucidating the processes involved in it. At the same time it is important to safeguard against the use of statistics in a reductionist manner to specify the characteristics of individuals (Dobash and Dobash, 1988). The construction of the survey questionnaire (Appendix II) also required careful attention to a number of techniques utilised to maximise the opportunities of this research. The first impression created by the survey questionnaire was considered vital in determining how willingly and openly the respondent would reveal information. This study was cautious about defining the boundaries of the study too narrowly, so perhaps

preventing respondents from defining it in their own terms. With this in mind, no explicit indication was given that the survey was about abuse in dating relationships. The survey was labelled a survey of "Dating Relationships Survey", encouraging respondents to consider the wide ambit of dating behaviour. In the introductory instructions, respondents were asked to respond to, "some behaviours that you may have experienced in these [dating] relationships". This was intended to convey to respondents that the behaviours referred to are common and not especially unusual, so as to reduce the threatening nature of the questions.

The selection of participants for research is an important area in which feminist research should guard against sexist bias. This study supports Peplau & Conrad (1989) in their assertion that, in order to understand the social, historical and political factors shaping women's lives, feminist research must include a study of women's inter-relationships with men, as well as how the patriarchal beliefs, attitudes and institutions of culture impinge on women's lives. This study therefore believes that it is appropriate for feminist research to study young men as well as young women.

Finally, this study has been acutely aware of the ethical responsibility to its research participants, and has striven to honour the principals of privacy, confidentiality and a non-condemnatory attitude, in order to form a basis of trust between the researcher and the researched.

CHAPTER 5

QUALITATIVE METHODOLOGY : FOCUS GROUPS

5.1 Introduction

The necessity for a qualitative method of study was motivated in Chapter 4. Focus groups were selected as the most effective method of data collection given the exploratory and descriptive nature of the first two research questions.

These are, ‘Do adolescent boys and girls in South Africa experience abuse in dating relationships?’ and ‘what forms does this abuse take?’

An allegiance to the feminist perspective also guided the choice of focus groups as a method of qualitative data collection. Focus groups are recognised within feminist research studies as being an extremely effective way of hearing the voices of respondents, in this case the voices of adolescent girls and boys (Oakley, 1981). In addition, these groups satisfy the feminist call for a more collaborative style of relationship between the researcher and the respondent. Focus groups are also recognised as very effective methods of data collection when researching topics of a sensitive nature, as in the case of this study (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). In focus groups the locus of attention is primarily on the group rather than on the individual. This encourages participants to reveal more of their perceptions and experiences. In addition, the synergetic effect (described more fully in Chapter 4) is likely to increase the amount and depth of the information revealed by participants within these groups.

The construction of the focus groups was informed by methodological literature in this field (Krueger, 1994; Morgan, 1988; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990).

5.2 Sample

Participants, consisting of 46 adolescent volunteers, 22 female and 24 male, (ages 16 - 20 years), were divided into 6 focus groups (3 male and 3 female). Three schools agreed to participate in this research. One of the schools was traditionally White from a middle to upper socio-economic area, the second, traditionally "Coloured"¹ in a lower socio-economic area, and the third, Black African, in a lower socio-economic area. The groups in this latter school were conducted in Xhosa².

TABLE 1

Ethnic group, socio-economic area, and gender composition of focus groups

Focus Group	No.	Ethnic Group	Socio-economic Area	Gender
Focus Group 1	4	White	Middle class area	Female
Focus Group 2	8	White	Middle class area	Male
Focus Group 3	10	Black African	Lower class area	Female
Focus Group 4	8	Black African	Lower class area	Male
Focus Group 5	8	'Coloured'	Lower class area	Female
Focus Group 6	8	'Coloured'	Lower class area	Male

¹ The term "Coloured" refers to a population category established under the apartheid regime. People so classified consequently had different life experiences to other racial and ethnic groups categorised by this regime. The use of this terminology does not indicate that this study accepts either the notion that 'racial groups' exist or the validity of racial categories.

² Xhosa is a home language spoken extensively by Black people in the Western Cape, South Africa.

Focus group 1 is appreciably smaller than the other focus groups. Although 8 volunteers agreed to participate in this group, only 4 attended the group. It was difficult to reschedule to another date, and it was decided to proceed with the group.

5.3 Procedure

The duration of each focus group interview was 40 - 50 minutes. The groups were all held on school premises in a setting that ensured privacy. All participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity and gave their permission for the interviews to be audio-taped.

The focus groups were all initially asked to listen to a transcript of a case study from Levy (1991) (see Appendix 1). The language of this transcript was modified to suit a South African context and the different socio-economic class, cultural and language groups represented in the focus groups. It was intended that this case study should provide a stimulus for participants to explore their own experiences and those of peers, as well as their attitudes to abusive relationships. The facilitator then guided the discussion by posing a number of open style questions. These questions initially probed participants' reactions to the case study, and thereafter questions relating more to own and peer experience of abusive dating relationships were used to focus the discussion, while taking due care not to inhibit its natural flow.

The Xhosa focus groups were conducted by Black African Xhosa-speaking facilitators, experienced in relationship counselling and specifically trained by the researcher to facilitate the discussion in the focus groups. The text data was transcribed verbatim and translated into English by the Xhosa-speaking facilitators. All other focus groups were facilitated by the researcher, and the text data, recorded

on audio-tape, was transcribed verbatim.

A thematic content analysis similar to Mostyn's (1985, p. 133) "Concept Book Approach", was used to sort and categorise the data around emergent key concepts and themes. The data was then interpreted according to these themes.

Following Mostyn's (1985) suggestion, quotations are used not only as proof that the data produced these themes, but also to preserve the language of the respondents.

Where sections are omitted within a single response, it is indicated by three dots (...). In order to clarify the context of the quotations selected, the particular focus group of the speaker has been identified after each quotation.

5.4 Results and Discussion

5.4.1 The experience of abusive dating relationships

It was apparent that most male and female participants in all the focus groups were familiar with the concept of abusive behaviour in dating relationships. Significantly, no participants rejected the case history as being "unlikely" or "exaggerated".

Participants indicated their awareness that abusive behaviour was experienced and perpetrated by adolescents in dating relationships.

Many related the experience of a friend, family member or peer in an abusive relationship, such as this participant:

... one of my friends is heavily abused by her boyfriend, but she still is hooked on him, she's convinced that this guy loves her, that is why he beats her up. (Female, "Coloured").

A recurrent feature of the focus group discussion was the acceptance of the normality of abusive behaviour within dating relationships.

Yes, it is common that girls are controlled and beaten up, but they don't really mind ... (Female, Black).

This supports Vogelmann & Eagle's (1991, p.209) statement that, "so prevalent and widely tolerated is such violence that it has come to be perceived almost as normative and to a large extent accepted rather than challenged".

5.4.2 Forms of abusive behaviour

In the analysis of apparent themes in the focus group data, different forms of abusive actions became apparent. It is also clear in the focus group discussions that an abusive action is rarely of one form only. For example, sexual abuse and coercion in most instances are experienced as incorporating significant components of psychological abuse. This supports the findings of researchers such as Koss, Gidycz and Wisniewski (1987), as well as Kelly's (1988) notion of a continuum of abusive behaviour, along which women locate actions that they experience as abusive without necessarily having to name them as a particular form of abuse.

Participants' descriptions of the forms that abusive behaviour take have been grouped under the following headings: psychological abuse; physical abuse; and sexual abuse.

Psychological Abuse : Walker (1984) defines psychologically abusive behaviour as being that which undermines a woman's self-esteem or sense of control or safety. This definition has guided the analysis of the focus group data. Almost all female participants acknowledged their own or close peers' experiences of "feeling put down", humiliated, criticised and rated within the context of heterosexual dating relationships.

... boys like to put you down a lot ... (Female, Black).

Several participants, both male and female, described the acts of intimidation and surveillance that they had experienced or witnessed. These are powerful statements, which serve to warn young women of the possible consequences (often violent) should they challenge their ascribed position in relation to young men.

... she talks and makes with all the other guys, he just walks by and just stares at her...she knows that her boyfriend is watching her and then she gets it afterwards ... (Male, "Coloured").

Some male participants were strikingly open in their support of the practise of humiliating their female dating partners:

I think its good to humiliate a girl first, because if she starts, she embarrasses you and humiliates you in public, for nobody's business. (Male, Black).

One participant explained how he used this type of abusive behaviour to convey a message to his partner:

... it's difficult to tell a chick straight away that you no longer love her, its better to put her down a lot and act instead ... she should know as a girl that actions speak more louder than words, she'll have to understand the conveyed message no matter how ... (Male, Black).

Criticism was described by female participants as the most frequent means used by young men to diminish their dating partners. This criticism usually involved insults about appearance, sexuality and ability to attract other boyfriends.

... and if he's told you that you're ugly and fat, you would worry about whether or not you can actually find another guy ... (Female, White).

Female participants felt they were constantly needing to change their appearance in order to satisfy the demands of their male partners to look a certain way. Rating was another act of diminishment described by some female participants. This is the practise of assigning ranking scores to females on the basis of their attractiveness/unattractiveness, or some other physical attribute. These young women expressed their feelings of being objectified and degraded by this behaviour. One female

participant described a common rating practise of a group of adolescent males at a school social:

... one of the things they do (I heard this through another person too), they have these things called 'dog fights', where they bet on who can kiss the ugliest girl ... (Female, White)

Very few participants labelled these familiar behaviours as abusive. For the most part, they were viewed as "common" or "normal" behaviours that one had to learn to put up with.

Physical Abuse : In the focus groups physical violence was acknowledged as an act of force that had either been personally experienced, or was known to have been perpetrated by dating partners within the social circle of participants. As compared to psychological abuse, physical violence was more readily identified and labelled by most participants as an abusive and violent action.

... this other friend of mine is being physically abused by her boyfriend. He beats her up and says it is only because he loves her too much.

(Female, Black).

When the participants were canvassed for their perceptions of why such behaviour takes place in dating relationships, many participants articulated motives for abusive behaviour that clearly reduce male culpability, and in many cases left an impression

of female culpability. This participant clearly supports this notion:

I did the same [beat] my girl, although I am a cool guy, but I had to do it, she made me do it. (Male, "Coloured").

This desire to reduce male culpability was not restricted to male participants, some female participants clearly supported the notion of female culpability in many abusive dating situations. This supports Makepeace's (1981) study, which found little, or no, gender differentiation in the use of such motives to explain away responsibility for violent behaviour in dating relationships.

Some male participants clearly articulated the re-establishment of their male power and control as being primary motives in employing physical violence against their dating partners, and as evidenced in the quote below, one participant felt that the necessity to "save face" within his peer group was paramount.

... pressure of friends, jealousy, also some friend might tell you that she is seeing another guy behind your back, or something, and then you feel a fool, you won't have your friends talking like that ... it starts getting serious for you ... and it's easier to push the girl around because she's weaker than you ...
(Male, Black).

Sexual abuse and coercion : The strong emphasis on sexual relationships in the focus group discussions appears to confirm Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs' (1985)

assertion that sexuality is probably the major focus of concern for dating couples:

... if there's no sex in the relationship it won't last ... (Female, "Coloured").

A striking theme evident in the data from all of the focus groups was the indication that sexual abuse and coercion was a common experience of adolescents. Some studies have proposed sexual violence to be so pervasive that it may be viewed as 'normal' interactions between men and women (Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski, 1987; Muehlenhard & Linton, 1987).

Some male participants, when contemplating the possibility of a sexual encounter in dating, identified the attraction of the "helplessness" of some young girls - this emphasises the implicit notion of power, coercion and force in sexual encounters,

... some girls are like helpless, the young ones that come into Std 6 or so. The Std 6's are easy targets, they're soft, they give in quick ... (Male, "Coloured"),

and the predatory nature of the interaction,

It's good to get a virgin, they dress all nice and it's the older guys that go in to get these girls. They're soft and they can't say no ... (Male, "Coloured").

Discussion in the focus groups also reflected the tendency for males to interpret female behaviour in a more sexualised manner than women, supporting the findings of Muehlenhard and Linton (1987). This type of sexualised interpretation of behaviour is often fundamental in reducing male culpability. In the experience of

some of the participants, it acts to shift the focus of responsibility for sexual violence from the male assailant.

... if a guy has a car then he will always find a girlfriend. The girls want a guy with a car, and then sometimes they complain that the guy took advantage of them. But if you go for the car, then you must go to bed afterwards. (Male, Black).

Many of the female participants expressed their feelings of extreme vulnerability and indignation regarding the double standards of morality. Women who have more than one sexual partner are regarded as promiscuous, whereas men who have multiple partners are regarded as macho. The fear of a “bad reputation” was expressed by many female participants, whilst amongst some male participants a strong theme of bravado and acceptance appears to accompany these early sexual encounters.

... most boys will go out with girls just to have a sexual relationship with them, and to be popular, and then the next day, they brag about them, about how many girls they can get ... (Male, Black).

Many males in the focus groups reported that they viewed having a number of different sexual partners as one time as being highly desirable, and in most cases the norm in their peer group:

.... its important to have as many girls ... you need to get experience now. When you are married one day you should be able to manoeuvre your wife and mistress business ... (Male, Black).

A small minority of males argued against this practise, and then, it appears, only for fear of contracting a sexually transmitted disease.

Not all guys feel that way, 'cause [sic] there is this killer disease around the corner, that is AIDS. At least two girls are enough ... (Black, Male).

Female participants in all the focus groups reported their experience of having to accept their boyfriends' practice of multiple partners as a normal feature in dating relationships, despite feeling "used" and "taken for granted", and angry:

Boys like to make us weekend specials ... and they don't bother to see you or phone you during the week, but you are obliged to be available for him during weekends ... maybe during the week he sees the other girls, and then on weekends you're something special. (Female, "Coloured").

Many participants indicated that alcohol consumption was an important risk factor in the initiation and the experience of unwanted sexual activity in dating relationships. This risk is considerable for this age group, since alcohol consumption is reportedly an important aspect of adolescent socialising. Participants' responses support the recent study by Norris, Nurvis and Dimeff (1996), which reports on the role of alcohol as a risk factor for sexual victimisation.

... and some guys if they can't make it, they get the girl drunk and then they have sex. (Female, "Coloured").

There was this dance at school, and this girl go so drunk and then there must have been many guys who made it with her, and there was this whole scandal about it - she was so drunk she doesn't know how many [sexual] partners she's had... (Male, "Coloured").

It appears from the focus group data that most participants agree that alcohol consumption considerably heightens the risk of sexual aggression. There appeared to be a common agreement that women who are drinking are likely to be seen as more sexually available and therefore more culpable should unwanted sexual behaviour occur. Alcohol, then, was considered by many participants as a strong factor in reducing male culpability for coercive and abusive sexual behaviour. There appeared to be tacit agreement that women who consume alcohol "look for trouble".

5.4.3 Factors supporting abuse

The analysis of data further revealed a number of themes which appear to describe factors that may encourage and support these different forms of abusive behaviour in intimate dating relationships. These factors are: peer pressure, the idealising of intimate relationships, attitudes to relationship violence, the adolescent's relationship with parents, the issue of trust among peers and adversarial attitudes in dating relationships.

Peer Pressure : Pressure to behave in a way approved of by peers appeared to be an important factor in many of the heterosexual relationships described by the participants. Many female participants expressed the pressure to conform to peer norms that emphasise the importance of having a dating partner. Often their self-

esteem appeared precariously dependent on this ability to attract a partner and to maintain a relationship.

I've stuck with guys that are horrible to me, just because its kiff [cool] to say I have a boyfriend ... (Female, White).

Adolescence is a time when gender role expectations refine the acquisition of masculinity for boys and the complimentary femininity for girls. Peer groups often require rigid conformity to female and male gender role expectations. Participants described how a young female's acceptability in certain groups often depends on being attached to a male, and in particular to his status,

... your friend, she will say, look, you'll never get a perfect guy, he's sporty, good looking, all the girls love him, he goes to clubs, he's got a car - that's all girls of our age want. (Female, White)

Some reported that if such an attachment to a male was viewed as highly desirable by a peer group, then perhaps the disclosing of unsatisfactory features of the relationship would be very difficult, as this would reflect "failure" to sustain an intimate relationship. Gamache (1991) cites this as one of the major tasks of femininity. One participant said she would avoid feeling "humiliated":

... sometimes you don't want to be humiliated by the other girls, and you keep on pretending that everything is OK. (Female, Black).

This pressure to conform to peer group norms supports Gamache's (1991) view that adolescent peer pressure contributes significantly to a young person's vulnerability

and thus to possible entrapment in an abusive relationship.

The potent influence of peer groups is also apparent in some of the male participant's responses. Some describe the fear of being humiliated in front of their peers by their dating partners, resulting in the possible need to exercise control over the relationship lest the control be wrested away. This reflects the fragility of masculinity during this period and the need to banish any threat by assertions of power. Describing another practice that bolsters this fragility, male participants reported that bragging about real or fictitious conquests to their male peer group is a common occurrence, and can score them significant ranking points, in their quest to be recognised as "one of the boys":

... most boys will go out with girls just to have a sexual relationship with them and to be popular and then the next day, they brag about them, about how many girls they can get. (Male, "Coloured").

Idealising of romantic relationships; possessiveness means love : A significant aspect of enmeshment and distorted reality is the belief that possessiveness and jealousy means love (Cate et al, 1982). Many participants, both male and female, articulated the notion that this type of behaviour symbolises love in an intimate relationship.

Some male participants expressed their belief that this behaviour is a symbol of love:

Sometimes you do it [hit her] because you love her too much ... (Male, Black).

... with some girls its different, if you beat a girl, she'll love you like mad ...
(Male, Black).

Pirog-Good and Stets (1989) propose that frequently some normative confusion is linked to dating violence and, in their view, this accounts for the belief that violence is a sign of love and belonging. This normative confusion, they state, is linked to the degree of isolation of the relationship, thus a relationship that is isolated is not subject to the constant reality testing that other, more socially connected relationships experience. Some participants endorsed the practise of jealously isolating their girlfriends from others who may influence the relationship:

... it's all right to spend too much time with your girl, because if you let her spend too much time with friends, they usually influence each other, discussing boys, seeing rights and wrongs, and she might end up rejecting your love. (Black, Male).

Highly idealised conceptions of romantic heterosexual relationships were evident in the responses of many participants. Some participants expressed the link between this idealising of a relationship and the possible denial of the reality of the abusive nature of a relationship.

... even if this sort of thing [abuse] does happen, you like block it out, you don't take it seriously. I think, especially if the guy is so popular ... (Female, White).

Some participants described the cognitive distortions necessary to support this idealised view of a relationship:

I mean, when you are in that kind of relationship, you use every ounce of energy convincing yourself that it is actually all right, that it was my fault, that I did aggravate him and he does love me because, look, he apologises.
(Female, White).

Kelly (1988) reports an adaptive coping strategy of minimising whereby young women minimise the effects and reality of abuse in a relationship in order to maintain an idealised fantasy of the relationship. One participant clearly described this minimising of the force and harm of the abuse:

... but he's not like hitting you hard, he's just pushing you around ...
(Female, "Coloured").

Attitudes to relationship violence : In all the focus groups, an important theme that emerged in the discussion was the inevitability of violence, particularly physical and sexual violence, in dating relationships. Some participants of both sexes expressed their condemnation of this inevitable abuse

... its wrong for boys to hit girls ... (Male, "Coloured").

... it's not right that he hits you ... (Female, Black).

However, a few participants, notably all male, expressed a less condemnatory attitude, and in some cases positively endorsed abusive behaviour. These participants

perceived aggression and abusive behaviour towards their dating partners as an acceptable means of dealing with the inevitable conflict and frustrations experienced in relationships:

... sometimes, it [hitting] is good, to just put her on the right track ...
(Male, "Coloured").

These less condemnatory and even supportive attitudes towards relationship violence are alarming. Although no relationship was revealed in this set of data, a concern would be a possible link between the acceptance of the use of aggression as a response to conflict and the likelihood that males would act aggressively against their dating partners. This link has been researched in the literature (Cate et al., 1982; Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989). In accordance with social learning theory, if individuals anticipate positive outcomes to their use of aggression towards others, as articulated by one participant,

... with some girls its different, if you beat a girl, she'll love you like mad ...
(Male, Black),

they may be more likely to actually behave aggressively towards others - in this case, their dating partners.

Relationship with parents : A perception shared by many participants was that of minimal and distant communication with parents and significant adults about their dating relationships.

Many participants felt isolated in general from their parents, particularly as regards seeking advice and assistance about romantic relationships. It was a common theme that participants relied more on their peers for support and advice, rejecting the advice of those who have experience in the nature of intimate relationships in favour of their peers' relative lack of experience.

Some participants felt strongly that parents did not value their feelings:

... they [parents] think only of school, they say its puppy love, and all that. They don't listen to you. If you say it to your friend, he won't say it's puppy love because he has experienced the same thing. (Male, "Coloured").

Gamache (1991) expressed concern about this rejection of, and isolation from parental and other adult authority figures. The subsequent reliance on inexperienced peers for support increases the vulnerability of the adolescent in intimate relationships. However, it was encouraging to hear from some participants that they felt they could approach their parents, or a least some close family member, to discuss their dating relationships:

I can talk to my parents, because they tell me I can discuss problems with them. It won't go out of the house, it is a family thing. (Male, Black).

Trust and adversarial attitudes in dating relationships : The issue of trust was a common theme in focus group discussions. The tenuous nature of trust within adolescent peer groups was expressed by many participants. It appears that this is not particularly gender specific, though it was most strongly articulated by the female participants. Many adolescents experience an alienation from parental and family

figures (as evidenced in the preceding section) and, in addition, it would appear that they feel unable to trust and confide in their own peer group. This contributes to a position of extreme isolation, confusion and (possibly) great vulnerability to entrapment in abusive relationships.

Some female participants clearly articulated their hesitation about confiding in their female peers regarding aspects of intimate relationships that they are concerned about. Some discrepant opinions as regards trust within their peer group, were expressed by male participants. One group felt strongly that,

... the boys in our class are open to each other, but the girls would rather skinner [gossip] behind their backs . I don't think they can trust each other.
(Male, "Coloured").

whilst another male group discussed their concern about "feeling a fool" in front of their male peers. One of these participants clearly expressed his anxiety about confiding in male friends:

Sometimes you talk to a guy and they just laugh about it. Or they try to help you, but the next thing they make fun about it and then you lose your friendship, and you get angry and you get into a fight ... (Male, Black).

A very apparent theme expressed in all the focus group discussions was the lack of trust, and, in most, instances, powerful distrust, between the genders:

... boys should not be trusted ... (Female, Black),

... but its difficult to trust these girls ... (Male, "Coloured").

This distrust was expressed by many male participants in fairly harsh adversarial statements:

... most of these girls take guys for a ride, they want something, but they don't want to give you something. That's why nowadays most boys will go out with girls just to have a sexual relationship with them and to be popular and then the next day they like brag about them, about how many girls they can get. (Male, "Coloured").

Adversarial attitudes about intimate heterosexual relationships have been widely researched in the literature. Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) propose a link between the perpetration of sexual assault against women and adversarial attitudes as regards intimate relationships.

Power and Control : It has been argued that abusive behaviour in intimate heterosexual relationships is a consequence of the power disparity between men and women (Russell, 1984). An overarching theme in this focus group research was that of power and control.

... guys like to take full control of your life ... (Female, Black)

It is clearly evident from the data analysis that participants (male and female) support the notion that power and control rests in the hands of males. If it is temporarily challenged within a relationship by a female partner, then it is considered understandable by some (both male and female) for the male partner to resort to

coercive and abusive behaviour in order to restore power to its rightful patriarchal ownership. One male participant talked about the “scariness” of losing control, power and possession:

... some guys are scared to lose their girlfriends, that’s why they start smacking them around and things ... (Male, “Coloured”).

Gamache (1991) states that, in addition to the notion of female socialisation reinforcing subordination to males, the often common practice of girls dating older boys also reinforces these power inequities.

There are so many guys who are older, and the girls look up to guys like that, and they are the ones that take advantage of the power they’ve got. There are so many guys who like emotionally abuse you like that ... (Female, White).

Muehlenhard and Linton (1987) state that in dating relationships, the age differences between the couple, who initiates the date, who pays the expenses and who has the car, are all related to who holds the power in the relationship. Some participants in the focus groups clearly articulated their experiences of this notion.

This theme of male power and male dominance as articulated by the focus groups is reflected in feminist literature as a key factor underlying the abuse of women.

Dobash and Dobash (1979) reflect that numerous theoretical and empirical studies support the notion that males tend to beat females who are perceived as violating the ideals of obedience, respect, loyalty, dependency, sexual access and sexual fidelity.

5.5 Conclusion

These focus groups have provided a valuable start in understanding adolescents' perception and experience of abusive dating relationships.

A narrative has emerged as to "what violence means to the participants themselves" (Bograd, 1988, p.23). In answering the first research question, it is apparent that abuse is experienced by many South African adolescents in dating relationships. In addition, the gendered nature of intimate violence is strongly indicated by the focus group data. Almost all references to abusive dating behaviour either identify or imply that females are the recipient and males the perpetrators of such behaviour. It may even be that the impression of prevalence gathered in these focus groups is an under-representation of the pervasiveness of the problem. Some participants may have chosen not to reveal their own experiences for a number of reasons. The secrecy so characteristic of intimate relationships, and the stigma attached to being assaulted in an intimate relationship, are two possible reasons for under-reporting. A third stems from the nature of the relationship of the perpetrator to the respondent. Most often sexual coercion is perpetrated by someone who is known to the victim, thus it may be possible that the victim would find it difficult to identify acts of sexual coercion (because of the emotional nature of the relationship with the perpetrator) and, consequently, would not report these acts as occurrences of sexual coercion (Poitras & Lavoie, 1995).

Most male and female participants described the inevitability of abuse in dating relationships, particularly in those relationships that involve sexual intimacy. Some male participants articulated their support of the use of aggression (particularly physical and sexual) as a means of resolving conflict, or getting a relationship "on the right track". Many participants felt that coercive and possessive behaviour

signified “love” in a relationship, and for this reason found such coercion, and even violence, an acceptable and normal aspect of an intimate relationship. This finding supports the qualitative studies of Wood and Jewkes (1998) and Wood et al. (1996), which report that for many male and female participants the construction of the meaning of love is equivalent to sex.

A number of participants, both male and female, rejected violence as a means of resolving relationship conflict. Some male participants intimated that they could well understand and empathise with the ease of perpetration of abusive acts against a dating partner. Most evident, though, was a strong tendency for both male and female participants to articulate motives for abusive behaviour, such as jealousy, clearly reduced male culpability, and in some cases indicated female culpability. Jealousy, as the emotional expression of wanting to have sole access to someone, was also seen by many participants as being indicative of love.

Participants highlighted some specific features of their adolescent lives which possibly contribute to their vulnerability to enmeshment in an abusive relationship. Most significant amongst these was the well-researched factor of peer pressure. Both male and female participants experienced the absolute necessity of having a dating partner. For female participants much of their self-esteem appeared to be based on their ability to retain a boyfriend no matter what his behaviour. The status of this partner in terms of physical appearance, money and a car, is most important. Jaffe, Suderman, Reitzel and Killip (1992) propose that this emphasis on status of a partner leaves adolescent girls at high risk of accepting abusive behaviour from a dating partner. For male participants, peer groups reinforced the conquest nature of heterosexual dating relationships, as well as the desirability of having a number of different dating partners.

A striking theme of the discussions was the generally idealised and overly romanticised description of dating relationships. Many participants perceived enmeshment, jealousy, possessiveness and some forms of abuse as signifiers of love in their intimate dating relationships. Yllö and Straus (1981) propose, from their research, that for some individuals, physical violence towards one's partner serves as a symbol of closeness and ownership and is thus considered by many, male and female alike, to be acceptable. Romanticised notions in relationships sometimes lead to poor judgement, say Rosenthal, Lewis and Cohen, (1996).

Particularly evident in this research study are the strong feelings of distrust and isolation experienced by many adolescents. Clearly, many participants do not perceive or experience significant others as trustworthy. Feelings of distrust towards parents, teachers and other authority figures, and the ensuing isolation from the assistance and advice that these significant adults might render, were apparent. Perhaps most striking, though, were the feelings of distrust expressed by the adolescents towards each other. Females were very distrustful of their same sex peers, and in some instances males also expressed their lack of trust in their own peer group. Most potent of all, however, was the extreme distrust between genders. This was expressed in strongly adversarial statements. Overall, the world really does seem to be a very unsafe place for these adolescents.

A number of research studies have reported that adversarial attitudes towards the opposite gender, as well as the acceptance of aggression towards women, increase the likelihood that males would act aggressively towards dating partners (Burt, 1980; Hall, Howard & Boezio, 1986; Pirog-Good and Stets, 1989; Pleck, Sonenstein & Ku, 1993). Although no clear link is apparent from the data, these earlier research

studies provide justification for speculating about its existence.

Several different means of coercion and force were identified in the discussion. Many participants did not name their experiences and these behaviours as abusive. It is speculated that the commonness and inevitability of these experiences amongst adolescents earns them an acceptability, particularly in the arenas of sexual and psychological coercion. However, some participants were able to describe or label as abusive those behaviours that they felt unacceptable, despite the peer pressure to accept these as "normal" in heterosexual relationships. It is significant though that, in the instances when abusive behaviour was named as such, this was usually coupled with a statement that reduced the culpability of the male perpetrator. In a few instances the responsibility was clearly shifted to the female recipient of the abuse. The role of alcohol in the experience of sexual coercion and assault is an example of this. Some participants expressed the view that forced sex is sometimes justifiable when the girl is drunk or on drugs.

For these participants the arena of sexual relationships appeared focal in their lives, and the most fraught with conflict and the very common experience of abusive and coercive behaviours. In some accounts of abusive experiences, participants are clearly familiar with psychological and physical forms of control. The separation into different forms of abuse is seldom an initiative of the respondents; most often it has been imposed to facilitate analysis and discussion. This confirms Larken and Popaleni's (1994) assertion that all these different forms share a common feature of intimidating, diminishing and coercing those that experience the abuse.

An important theme of heterosexual dating relationships, as described by these participants, is the power and controlling nature of male adolescents within

relationships. Most female participants reported feelings of being controlled in intimate relationships and many males favoured the notion that power and control is rightly assigned to the male partner in a heterosexual dating relationship.

The findings of these focus groups need to be interpreted with a degree of caution given the small sample size. However, this study has provided valuable descriptive evidence of the existence of abusive dating behaviour in adolescent relationships and the forms that this abuse takes. The gendered nature of abusive dating relationships is also clearly described by these groups. Some factors that may support abuse in these relationships are also highlighted. An additional important outcome of this qualitative study is its invaluable assistance in confirming the validity of the questions presented in the survey questionnaire of quantitative study, as well as aiding, supplementing and adding depth to the interpretation of the quantitative results.

These findings raise the question as to the extent to which the experience and perpetration of abuse has altered the lives of young women and men before they become adults, and highlights the need for further in-depth research into the problem of abusive intimate relationships at this important developmental stage. Issues raised by these focus groups emphasise the very unique and specific problems encountered by these young people, and potential interventions need to be specifically tailored to address these issues.

CHAPTER 6

QUANTITATIVE METHODOLOGY : DATING RELATIONSHIPS SURVEY

6.1 Introduction

In this study a survey questionnaire was constructed to give a broad description of abusive adolescent dating relationships. Fineran's (1996) survey instrument, developed to investigate sexual harassment in a high school setting, was used as a framework for developing a survey questionnaire which would investigate a broad range of abusive adolescent dating behaviours, both experienced and perpetrated by high school students.

6.2 Sample

The data for this study was gathered from 8 high schools in the Western Cape. The total sample consisted of 720 pupils.

The demographics of the sample are as represented in Table 2.

In attempting to get a sample representative of the Cape Town population of high school students, schools representative of class and language groups were selected from a list provided by the Education Department of the Western Cape. These schools were contacted for permission to conduct the study. Within this selection, 8 high schools agreed to participate. The sample comprises pupils at these high schools who volunteered to participate in the study.

TABLE 2**SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS**

	N	%
Total Number in Sample	720	
Sex		
Female	373	51.81%
Male	347	48.19%
Age		
15 years old or younger	401	55.69%
Older than 15	319	44.31%
Socio-economic Class *		
'Best off'	250	34.72%
'Middle'	34	4.72%
'Worst off'	394	54.72%
Home Language *		
English	207	28.75%
Afrikaans	238	33.06%
Xhosa	245	34.03%
Other	27	3.75%
Note : * indicates categories in which classification data is missing. In socio-economic class, data is missing in 42 questionnaires (5.84%) and in language, data is missing in 3 questionnaires (0.41%).		

6.3 Material

The survey questionnaire, the Dating Relationships Survey (Appendix II) is comprised of four sections :

Section A : Designed to gather demographic information such as age, gender of respondent, student year of study, home language and socio-economic class. The respondent's residential area is used as a proxy for socio-economic class. This variable has been cited as an important indicator of social class (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Lockhart, 1987; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980). The data on residential area of the respondent was coded prior to data analysis using the Report by Urban Studies, Surveys Land Information Branch, Levels of Living in the Cape Metropolitan Area (1996). In this report a composite index, combining six social indicators (namely, income, education, unemployment, welfare and overcrowding) is used to classify residential suburbs into three categories: "best off"; "middle"; "worst off". For the purposes of analysis, the "middle" category was combined with the "best off" category, thus giving two socio-economic class categories – "best off" and "worst off". This was done for a number of reasons : firstly, the "middle" category was too small in number (N=34) to be meaningful in analysis; and secondly, the majority of the suburbs identified in this "middle group" were closer in range on the composite index to "best off" than to "worst off".

Questions 10 to 14 in this section are intended to explore the respondents' particular experience and the understanding of a dating relationship. The definition of dating relationships used by this study covers a wide spectrum of experiences, ranging from one night stands and short-term encounters to

relationships that are long-lasting and stable over time (Poitras & Lavoie, 1995).

Section B : The intention of this research is to investigate adolescents' experience of abusive dating behaviours. This section explores the experience of the respondent as a **recipient** of abusive dating behaviour.

Questions 1 to 22 are intended to measure psychologically abusive behaviours experienced by adolescents in dating relationships.

Issues of psychological maltreatment in a dating population are of particular interest, as the literature states that psychological abuse may be a precursor to physical violence (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). Kasian and Painter (1992) used the modified Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI) to assess the occurrence of psychological abuse in a sample of college students. For the present study, five reliable factors from this scale were extracted to reflect the following concepts: isolation and control; diminishment of self esteem; jealousy; verbal abuse and withdrawal. Kasian & Painter's (1992) factor analysis reveals that the reliability coefficients of these factors are greater than 0.7). Questions 1 to 22 are derived from Kasian and Painter's (1992) PMWI and moderately adapted to suit a South African scenario.

Questions 22 to 30 measure physically abusive behaviour experienced by respondents.

This form of abuse is possibly the most widely researched of all abusive behaviours in intimate relationships. The Conflict Tactics Scale has been widely used in research on abuse in dating relationships (Arias et al., 1987; Cate et al.,

1982; De Maris, 1987; Makepeace, 1981). The 'violence' or physical abuse aspect of the CTS measures the tendency of a respondent to use physical force against another person as a means of resolving conflict (Straus, 1979).

A modified version of this aspect of the scale is used in the Dating Relationships Survey.

Questions 31 to 38 are intended to measure sexually abusive behaviours experienced by adolescents in dating relationships.

The majority of instruments reviewed in the literature have a limited applicability for this research study, as they were developed for use on an adult population in a college or university setting (Koss & Oros, 1982). In addition, these instruments measure, for the most part, a limited range of sexually abusive behaviours. Current literature advocates expanding the definition of sexual harassment and coercion and addressing the spectrum of coercive strategies by including milder violations, such as verbal sexual taunting and the flaunting of pornography (Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995). Fineran (1996) developed a survey instrument specifically for investigating sexual harassment in a high school setting. In response to the call for a broader spectrum focus, the questions in this survey cover the major areas of sexual harassment. These range from behaviours that are least intrusive and non-physical (such as the calling of sexually offensive names) to most intrusive and physical (such as sexual intercourse without consent). Questions 31 to 38 of the Dating Relationships Survey have been adapted from Fineran's (1996) survey.

Following Fineran's (1996) initiative, this study recognises the importance of moving beyond the mere identification of specific abusive behaviours to the

examination of the frequency of occurrence of these behaviours and the meaning they hold for the respondents. The resultant data will provide a broader context for the content of abusive dating behaviour. A set of sub-questions have been included in this study which explore the context of each abusive behaviour.

These sub-questions explore:

- The peer relationship of the respondent and the perpetrator;
- The gender of the perpetrator - this is important when examining gender issues of abusive adolescent dating relationships;
- The frequency of occurrence of the specific abusive behaviour;
- The emotional impact of the specific abusive behaviour, that is, how threatening and upsetting the behaviour is to the respondent;
- The perceived motivation for the specific abusive behaviour; and
- The respondent's perception of the frequency of occurrence of this specific abusive behaviour within their own peer group.

Questions 39 to 42 are intended to explore the extent to which respondents have been exposed to violence in their own families.

The intergenerational transfer of violence has been consistently reported in the literature as predictive of violence in intimate relationships. Cantrell, MacIntyre, Sharkey and Thompson ,(1995), Straus et al., (1980), Hotaling and Sugarman, (1986), Kalmuss, (1984), as well as other researchers in this field all propose the existence of a cycle of violence. They suggest that exposure to violence in their family of origin increases the likelihood for older adolescents and young adults to perpetrate violence in intimate relationships.

Question 43 is open-ended and included in the questionnaire in order to provide

an unstructured opportunity for respondents to describe a dating experience that is pertinent to the study.

Section C : This section of the Dating Relationships Survey intends to explore adolescents' attitudes which would indicate their support of a patriarchal belief system. Feminist literature contends that such a belief system, by investing power and privilege in the hands of males, legitimises the use of violence against women (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Some studies have provided support for the link between patriarchal beliefs and the perpetration of intimate relationship violence (Burt, 1980; Flynn, 1990; Finn, 1986; Spence & Helmreich, 1978). Two scales have been adapted for use in measuring such attitudes.

Firstly, the standardised Heterosexual Relationships Scale (HSRS) (Hall, Howard & Boezio, 1986) was adapted for use in this section, in order to examine adolescents' beliefs regarding male domination of women. This scale is designed to measure the degree of sexism in attitudes towards women in heterosexual relationships. Within this scale, sexism is indicated by:

- The belief that men should dominate women;
- A perception of members of the opposite sex as sex objects; and
- The belief that sex involves conquest.

Hall, Howard & Boezio (1986) administered this scale to adolescents ranging from 14 to 17 years, and reported a coefficient alpha of 0.64.

Secondly, a scale measuring adolescent attitudes to the male gender role is included as a further measure of support for a patriarchal belief system. This is an adapted version of the Male Role Attitude Scale (MRAS) developed by Pleck, Sonenstein and Ku (1994), and is intended to measure "beliefs about the

importance of men adhering to culturally defined standards for male behaviour” (Pleck et al., 1994, p.480). This scale is specifically adapted to an adolescent sample. Pleck et al. (1994) obtained a coefficient alpha of 0.56, which they considered minimally adequate.

Thirdly, in addition to the measuring of attitudes supporting patriarchy, a third scale, intended to measure adolescents’ support of the desirability of personal power, is included in this section. The link between the desirability of personal power and the perpetration of abusive dating practices is also explored. This measure consists of six questions adapted from a scale called The Index of Personal Reactions (IPR) developed by Bennett (1988), and includes items intended to measure adolescents’ ability to handle power and self-confidence.

Section C is designed as a 7 point Likert Scale with respondents indicating they strongly disagree (1), mostly disagree (2), disagree (3), uncertain (4), slightly agree (5), mostly agree (6) or strongly agree (7), with each statement. A 7-point Likert scale was employed to increase the reliability of the scale (Kline, 1986; Moser & Kalton, 1971; Nunally, 1978). Reverse scoring was introduced on a number of questions to minimise the effect of a response set towards agreement or disagreement.

Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation found that these scales have a moderately strong and significant association (HSRS and MRAS, $P = .38$, $p = 0.00$; MRAS and IPPS, $P = .39$, $p = 0.00$; HSRS and IPPS, $P = .37$, $p = 0.00$). It is proposed that these three sub-scales may measure related but different aspects of power, possibly social power (that is power invested by society in adolescents) and also a power that is more typically intrapersonal.

Section D : An important limitation of many studies researching abusive intimate behaviour has been the restricted focus of the study. Abusive intimate behaviour has, for the most part, been examined either from the victim's or from the perpetrator's frame of reference, rarely including both. This study attempts to broaden this focus by providing a more complete description of the nature of both the experience and the perpetration of peer sexual harassment.

This section will explore the perpetration of the same range of abusive behaviours identified in Section B. The statements in this section are phrased to identify the respondent as being the agent of the behaviour, for example:

Question 27: I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist.

Each statement of behaviour is again followed by the same set of sub-questions requiring the respondent to :

- Identify his/her peer relationship to the victim;
- Identify the gender of the victim;
- Specify the frequency of occurrence of the behaviour;
- Describe the emotional impact of the behaviour on the respondent;
- Describe the respondent's perceived motivations for perpetrating the behaviour; and
- Identify whether the respondent is aware of his/her peer group's experience of such behaviour.

The Dating Relationship Survey was translated from English into Afrikaans and Xhosa by experienced bilingual mother-tongue translators. This study, mindful

of the pitfalls of translation methodology, was guided by the literature (Drennan & Levett, 1991). An important aspect of this study is the investigation of abusive dating behaviour as it is experienced and perpetrated by different language groups and different cultures. In attempting to achieve cross-cultural equivalence of the questionnaire, this research study employed the technique of back-translation recommended by Brislin (1970). The back-translators were also bilingual persons. In the Xhosa translation particularly, this study noted the comments of Mtuzi (1990) that, despite the translator's linguistic competence, some aspects of Xhosa linguistic reality are difficult and often impossible to translate into equivalent linguistic forms. The cautions of Drennan & Levett (1991) are noted as regards viewing back-translation as a foolproof guard against linguistic mis-match. In order to supplement the back-translation process, an additional technique of piloting was used. The questionnaire was piloted on a small group of school-going adolescents roughly representative of the main sample in cultural orientation and language. This pilot study is briefly discussed in Section 6.5 in this Chapter.

An evaluation of the process of translation is an important aspect of the limitations of this study. It is not solely, however, a question of the accuracy and adequacy of the translation, but also to what translation has, and has not, given access. This is important to keep in mind in the interpretation of the data.

6.4 Procedure

Permission to undertake this research project was granted by the Ethical Board of the University of Cape Town and the Western Cape Department of Education.

The questionnaire was presented to the school pupils during school hours by the researcher, in some schools with a Xhosa- or Afrikaans-speaking assistant. All respondents consented to participation in the study and anonymity and confidentiality were assured. No class teachers were present during the administration of the questionnaire.

Each group of students was given detailed instructions as to the completion of the questionnaire, and any initial queries were answered. The questionnaire took between 40 and 50 minutes to complete. The researcher (and assistant where applicable) were on hand to answer any further queries during this time.

6.5 Piloting

Sections A, B and D were piloted on a sample of 16 high school pupils (five, Grade 11 and eleven, Grade 8 pupils) randomly selected from the class population at a central Cape Town high school. The pupils were representative of the cultural, ethnic and language groupings within the schools selected for the main study. The questionnaire was administered to the students in a manner identical to that of the main study. These students were then grouped into two focus groups, one comprising Grade 11 participants and the other Grade 8 participants. The researcher facilitated discussion as to the content, structure, clarity and language of the questionnaire. The data from these focus groups was

analysed in order to effect any changes and additions to the final format of the original (English) and translated questionnaires.

Section C of the questionnaire was piloted on 254, First year Psychology students at the University of Cape Town. The reliability analyses of the three different scales revealed the following :

Scale 1 : Heterosexual Relationships Scale : Cronbach's Alpha = .65

Scale 2 : Male Role Attitude Scale : Cronbach's Alpha = .68

Scale 3 : Intrapersonal Power Scale : Cronbach's Alpha = .44

The Cronbach's Alpha on Scale 1 and Scale 2 is considered marginally reliable. However Cronbach's Alpha of .44 on Scale 3 is considered to be on the low side. The piloted scales were in a 4-point Likert-type format, with options of 'strongly disagree', 'disagree', 'agree', and 'strongly agree'. Following Nunally's (1978) recommendation, it was decided to increase the Likert scale to a 7-point scale in order to increase reliability. All items in the scales were retained, although two items in Scale 3 were rephrased. It was anticipated that this would assist in ensuring the reliability of this scale.

6.6 Analysis of the Data

All analyses in this study have been performed using the Statistica Computer program.

6.6.1 The experience of, and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviours

Two types of analysis were performed in this section of the study:

Firstly, a descriptive analysis was performed on the data in order to obtain an overview of the frequency of experience and the frequency of perpetration of each of the acts of abusive dating behaviour. A more in-depth examination of these frequencies and their relationship with other variables follows.

Since a primary focus of this study is to explore whether the experience of, and the perpetration of, the various acts of abusive dating behaviour are associated with the variables of gender and socio-economic class a second type of analysis, Log-linear analysis, was performed on the data.

In a number of studies the relationship between age and the frequency of experience (or perpetration) of abusive dating behaviour revealed little or no significance for the different age groups of adolescents (Fineran, 1996; Muelenhard & Linton, 1987). In addition, the analytical consideration that the inclusion of age, as an added variable, would in all likelihood result in cell

frequencies too low for meaningful analysis militated against looking at possible associations between age and the experience of, and perpetration of, abusive dating behaviours.

Log linear analysis has been used to explore the statistical association between the following three attributes:

1. The experience of, and perpetration of, various acts of abusive dating behaviour;
2. Gender; and
3. Socio-economic class

Log linear analysis is particularly appropriate for this study since it allows for the testing of statistical association in such a three-dimensional (3-variable) frequency table (that is, between the variables of the experience or perpetration of various acts of abusive behaviour, gender and socio-economic class) (Howell, 1992; Hayes, 1994). Log linear analysis treats dependent and independent variables alike, ignoring the distinction between the two. In the interpretation of log-linear analysis one variable can, however, be interpreted as a response variable (dependent variable), and the others as design variables (independent variables). In this analysis the response variable is the experience of, or the perpetration of, the various acts of abusive dating behaviour, and the design variables are gender and socio-economic class.

Using log-linear analysis, this three-dimensional frequency table reflects various main effects and interaction effects that add together in a linear fashion to bring about the observed table of frequencies. The principal of log linear analysis is that given the marginal totals for the three factors (experience or perpetration of

an abusive act, gender, and socio-economic class), the expected cell frequencies can be computed if there is no association between these three variables - that is, if all three variables are independent. Significant deviations of the observed frequencies from the expected frequencies indicate a lack of independence and therefore an association between the variables. Log-linear analysis therefore follows a model-fitting approach, in which different models that reflect different associations between the variables are tested for their 'goodness of fit'.

Using the log-linear model, this study has proceeded to identify the 'best fit model' through the following steps :

1. The table of all k-factor interactions is examined for an indication of whether the 'best fit model' should contain all 2-way interactions, or whether there is an improvement in fit when adding all 3-way interactions.
2. If the improvement in fit when adding 3-way interactions is significant (that is, a poor fit is indicated) this is evidence of a saturated model. Such a model indicates interaction (or association) between all variables. An example of this is Item 5 (Table 4), "This person tried to make me feel I was not thinking right". In this case the interaction of the design variables (gender and economic class) are tested for significance, using a Chi-square statistic, at each level of the response variable. That is, firstly at the level of the positive, ('Yes') experience of Item 5, and secondly at the level of non-experience, ('No'), of Item 5. A significant Chi-square thus indicates the association between these variables at that level. In order to interpret the magnitude of this association, the expected

frequency table is examined and the frequencies interpreted in a proportional relationship to one another.

3. If the k-factor table indicates that the 'best fit model' should contain some 2-way interactions, then the table of marginal and partial associations is examined in order to determine which 2-way associations would best fit the data. These 2-way associations, when dropped from the model, worsen the fit of the model, that is, a significant Chi-square is indicated. However, if the Chi-square is not significant when the interactions are dropped from the model, then the model is a good fit, the expected cell frequencies can be computed from the marginal cell frequencies and no association is indicated between the variables of that particular 2-way association. The statistical significance of all the 2-way associations is tested by comparing the Chi-square of the model that includes the effect (that is, the particular 2-way association) with the Chi-square of the model that excludes the effect. If the differential Chi-square is significantly larger than that of the model that included the effect, that is the model which excludes the effect is a poorer fit, then it can be concluded that there is a significant association between those two variables.

The interactions between design variables (gender and economic class), although of no interest to the study, are included in the model, so as to preclude their contribution to the overall lack of model fit. In order to interpret the magnitude of the significant associations between variables, the expected frequency table is examined and the frequencies are interpreted in a proportional relationship to one another.

6.6.2. Adolescents' attitudes and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour

This section comprises three analyses. Firstly, an Analysis of Variance explores the possible associations between gender and socio-economic class and adolescents' sexist attitudes, their attitudes supporting conformity to culturally prescribed male roles, and their attitudes about intrapersonal power.

Secondly, a Factor Analysis explores whether there is a shared construct underlying the responses to the three scales. Thirdly, the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation explores the relationships between the perpetration of various acts of abusive dating behaviour and adolescents' sexist attitudes, their attitudes which indicate supporting conformity to culturally prescribed male roles, and their attitudes to intrapersonal power.

6.6.3 Factor Analysis of the responses to the experience of and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour

A Factor Analysis was conducted on the responses to both the questions about abusive dating experience and those about perpetrated abusive dating behaviour. This was done in order to explore how adolescents understood and made sense of abusive dating behaviours by their grouping some abusive acts together and differentiating between others.

6.6.4 Contextual variables

The degree of distress felt by respondents as regards their experience of, and their perpetration of abusive dating behaviour.

The t-test statistic is used to determine whether there is a difference in the mean degree of distress experienced by males and females in both their experience of and their perpetration of the various abusive dating behaviours.

Attributed motivation for abusive dating behaviour

A descriptive analysis has been used to determine the frequency with which particular motivations are attributed to the various acts of abusive behaviour. These motivations are descriptively compared for both males and females.

The meaning of 'dating' to respondents

A descriptive analysis of the data has been used to determine how adolescent males and females define a dating relationship.

The experience of family violence

A descriptive analysis was applied to the responses on questions B39 to B42, which related to the experience and witnessing of family violence.

CHAPTER 7

RESULTS

7.1 Introduction

This chapter is organised into four main parts. The first part examines the respondents' experience of abusive dating behaviour. The second looks at the respondents' perpetration of the same forms of abusive dating behaviour identified in the previous section. The third part examines respondents' support of a patriarchal belief system (operationalised as supporting sexist attitudes in heterosexual relationships and as supporting conformity to culturally prescribed male roles) and their support of the desirability of personal power. In addition, this section explores the relationship between respondents' patriarchal beliefs and desires for personal power and their perpetration of abusive dating behaviours. The final section examines four contextual variables relating to the experience of and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour. These variables are discussed in the following order: the degree of distress felt by both respondents who have experienced abusive dating behaviour, and by those who have perpetrated abusive dating behaviour; the reasons attributed to acts of abusive behaviour both by respondents who have experienced this behaviour and by those that have perpetrated this behaviour; the meaning of 'dating' for the full sample of male and female respondents; the witnessing of and the experience of family violence for respondents who have experienced dating abuse and those who have perpetrated dating abuse.

7.2 The experience of abusive dating behaviour

In order to understand the frequency of experience for males and females of various acts of abusive behaviour, the responses of the total sample (N= 720 respondents, 347 males and 373 females) to questions B1(a) to B38(a) were subjected to descriptive analysis. Table 3 provides a summary of this analysis. The frequency counts denoted as 'Full N' in Table 3 represent the frequencies of male and females who responded (indicating either 'experienced' or 'not experienced') to each item of abusive behaviour. It is apparent that not all respondents answered all of the 38 questions and thus the Full N varies from question to question. The frequency counts, 'X-sex Dat. N.' in Table 3, represent those male and female respondents who identified that they had experienced that particular abusive act in a 'dating' relationship with someone of the opposite sex. These frequency counts are also expressed as a percentage of the Full N for males and females. Excluded from these frequency counts are those respondents who: (a) either did not experience the abusive act; or (b) whose experience of the act was not explicitly within a dating situation; or (c) who did not identify the sex of the perpetrator of the abusive act; or (d) who identified the perpetrator as being of the same sex.

For those respondents who identified a same sex perpetrator of an abusive act, it is not clear from the data whether this act was perpetrated within a homosexual dating relationship or whether the dating aspect was erroneously identified. In this case the act was possibly experienced within a peer relationship, for example an act of bullying.

TABLE 3

FREQUENCY TABLE OF MALE AND FEMALE EXPERIENCE OF HETEROSEXUAL DATING ABUSE

Total Sample N =720

Total Male Sample N = 347

Total Female Sample N = 373

Note : Full N : Total N of Males and Females that responded to that question. X-Sex Dat. N. : N of Males and Females who experienced that behaviour in a heterosexual dating relationship.

Q.		Male			Female		
			N	%Male		N	%Female
1.	This person tried to keep me from seeing or talking to my family	Full N	282		Full N	319	
		X-sex Dat. N	9	3.19	X-sex. Dat. N	16	5.02
2.	This person interfered with my relationship with friends	Full N	228		Full N	258	
		X-sex. Dat. N	38	16.67	X-sex. Dat. N	42	16.28
3.	This person blamed me for causing his/her aggressive behaviour	Full N	251		Full N	270	
		X-sex. Dat. N	22	8.76	X-sex Dat.N	19	7.04
4.	This person blamed me for his/her problems	Full N	265		Full N	261	
		X-sex. Dat. N	24	9.06	X-sex. Dat. N	16	6.13
5.	This person tried to make me feel I was not thinking right	Full N	219		Full N	249	
		X-sex. Dat. N	28	12.79	X-sex. Dat. N	30	12.05
6.	This person tried to stop me from going to school	Full N	263		Full N	302	
		X-sex. Dat. N	14	5.32	X-sex. Dat.N	17	5.63
7.	This person tried to stop me from doing things that I enjoy	Full N	244		Full N	263	
		X-sex. Dat. N	32	13.11	X-sex. Dat. N	38	14.45
8.	This person treated me like I was stupid	Full N	223		Full N	255	
		X-sex. Dat. N	21	9.42	X-sex. Dat. N	23	9.02
9.	This person ordered me around	Full N	237		Full N	265	
		X-sex Dat. N	17	7.17	X-sex. Dat. N	33	12.45
10.	This person insulted me in front of others	Full N	195		Full N	229	
		X-sex. Dat.N	25	12.82	X-sex. Dat. N	24	10.48
11.	This person put me down about the way I look	Full N	235		Full N	255	
		X-sex Dat. N	18	7.66	X-sex. Dat. N	18	7.06
12.	This person told me I couldn't manage on my own	Full N	262		Full N	293	
		X-sex. Dat. N	19	7.25	X-sex. Dat. N	20	6.83
13.	This person was jealous and suspicious of my friends	Full N	233		Full N	250	
		X-sex. Dat. N	39	16.74	X-sex. Dat. N	62	24.80

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

Q.		Male			Female		
			N	%Male		N	%Female
14.	This person wanted to know where I was all the time	Full N	235		Full N	271	
		X-sex Dat. N	48	20.43	X-sex. Dat. N	69	25.46
15.	This person accused me of seeing other people of the opposite sex	Full N	263		Full N	297	
		X-sex Dat. N	39	14.83	X-sex Dat.N	70	23.57
16.	This person did not want me to socialise with friends of the same sex	Full N	280		Full N	307	
		X-sex Dat. N	22	7.86	X-sex Dat.N	35	11.40
17.	This person swore at me	Full N	179		Full N	224	
		X-sex Dat. N	21	11.73	X-sex Dat.N	31	13.84
18.	This person called me names	Full N	203		Full N	232	
		X-sex Dat. N	17	8.37	X-sex Dat N	21	9.05
19.	This person shouted and screamed at me	Full N	219		Full N	246	
		X-sex Dat. N	23	10.50	X-sex Dat.N	22	8.94
20.	This person gave me the silent treatment, refused to talk to me	Full N	238		Full N	237	
		X-sex Dat. N	36	15.13	X-sex Dat.N	31	13.08
21.	This person was not affectionate towards me	Full N	262		Full N	281	
		X-sex Dat N	44	16.79	X-sex Dat.N	51	18.15
22.	This person changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	Full N	235		Full N	252	
		X-sex Dat. N	28	11.91	X-sex Dat.N	45	17.86
23.	This person threatened to hit or throw something at me	Full N	229		Full N	278	
		X-sex Dat. N	11	4.80	X-sex Dat.N	36	12.95
24.	This person threw something at me	Full N	244		Full N	289	
		X-sex Dat. N	9	3.69	X-sex Dat.N	19	6.57
25.	This person grabbed, pushed or shoved me	Full N	233		Full N	266	
		X-sex Dat. N	12	5.15	X-sex Dat.N	38	14.29
26.	This person slapped me	Full N	251		Full N	275	
		X-sex Dat. N	24	9.56	X-sex Dat.N	51	18.55
27.	This person kicked, bit or hit me with a fist	Full N	239		Full N	286	
		X-sex Dat. N	9	3.77	X-sex Dat.N	20	6.99
28.	This person beat me up	Full N	288		Full N	311	
		X-sex Dat. N	5	1.74	X-sex Dat.N	25	8.04

TABLE 3 CONTINUED

Q.		Male			Female		
			N	%Male		N	%Female
29.	This person threatened me with a knife or gun	Full N	254		Full N	313	
		X-sex. Dat. N	3	1.18	X-sex. Dat. N	12	3.83
30.	This person used a knife or gun on me	Full N	287		Full N	318	
		X-sex. Dat. No.	2	.70	X-sex. Dat. N	6	1.89
31.	This person called me sexually offensive names	Full N	262		Full N	277	
		X-sex. Dat. N	13	4.96	X-sex. Dat. N	19	6.86
32.	This person spread false sexual rumours about me	Full N	245		Full N	265	
		X-sex. Dat. N	21	8.57	X-sex. Dat. N	27	10.19
33.	This person told me sexually offensive jokes	Full N	220		Full N	271	
		X-sex. Dat. N	16	7.27	X-sex. Dat. N	17	6.27
34.	This person showed me sexually offensive pictures or books	Full N	208		Full N	277	
		X-sex. Dat. N	15	7.21	X-sex. Dat. N	18	6.50
35.	This person touched or brushed up against me in a sexual way	Full N	260		Full N	271	
		X-sex. Dat. N	46	17.69	X-sex. Dat. N	48	17.71
36.	This person fondled me in a sexual way without my consent	Full N	277		Full N	288	
		X-sex. Dat. N	20	7.22	X-sex. Dat. N	24	8.33
37.	This person attempted to have sex with me without my consent	Full N	285		Full N	306	
		X-sex. Dat. N	21	7.37	X-sex. Dat. N	32	10.46
38.	This person had sex with me without my consent	Full N	290		Full N	317	
		X-sex. Dat. N	16	5.52	X-sex. Dat. N	13	4.10

This study has chosen to restrict its focus to abusive acts in heterosexual dating relationships. The importance of researching abuse in same sex relationships is acknowledged. However, the practical limitations of time and the scope of this study, as well as the lack of clarity about the nature of the same sex data, as explained above, have precluded attention to this area of research.

The picture presented by the descriptive analysis of the abusive dating experiences of male and female respondents in heterosexual relationships is more or less congruent with previous studies, and clearly indicates that females and males experience a continuum of abusive behaviours in heterosexual dating relationships. These range from non-physical emotionally and verbally abusive behaviours to physically and sexually abusive acts. Of particular note is the comparatively high prevalence for female respondents of the experience of physically and sexually abusive acts of a severe nature. This overview analysis also highlights male respondents' experience of abusive heterosexual dating behaviour, and in particular their experience of acts in the emotionally abusive range. In addition, a most prominent feature of the male responses is the comparatively high frequency count recorded of male respondent's experience of rape, approximately 6% compared to females 4%. Recent research has begun to highlight the previously neglected phenomena of male experience of abusive dating behaviour, and in particular, male experience of sexual coercion (Fineran, 1996; Poitras & Lavoie, 1995; Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995). This study's evidence of a comparatively high male experience of rape is an anomaly that requires further attention.

This descriptive analysis has provided a broad overview of respondent's experience of abusive dating behaviours in heterosexual relationships. The experience of each type of abusive dating behaviour and its association with the sex of the respondent and the socio-economic class of the respondent is explored in more depth by the log-linear analyses in Section 7.1.2.

7.2.1 Log-Linear Analyses

Log-linear analysis has been used in this study to explore the associations between the experience of the various acts of abusive heterosexual dating behaviour and gender and socio-economic class.

The motivation for selecting this method of data analysis as well as a brief overview of the application of log-linear analysis in this study, is presented in Section 6.6.1 of Chapter 6.

An important issue in a study such as this, which involves sets of multiple analyses (two sets of 38 analyses) using the same data, is the probability of Type 1 errors. One solution to control for Type 1 errors is the Bonferroni method (Howell, 1992). Using this method when undertaking 38 analyses each with a probability of .05, the probability of a type one error (α') is reset at .001 ($\alpha' = \alpha / 38$) so that the whole experiment has a type one error of .05. Those significances which fulfil this criteria are noted in italics in Table 4 and Table 9. However, in view of the exploratory nature of this study, I am reluctant to discard or disregard

the information contained in the remaining significances. Thus, although mindful of the problem of increasing Type 1 errors, this study intends to proceed with the interpretation of all the significances.

Results of the Log-Linear Analyses

The results of the Log-linear analyses for all the items of abusive dating behaviour are presented in Table 4. The following discussion focuses firstly on those items that indicate no significant associations with gender and socio-economic class, secondly, on those items that indicate a significant two-way association with gender, thirdly, on those items that indicate a significant two-way association with socio-economic class and fourthly, on those items that indicate a significant three-way association with both gender and socio-economic class. It is important to note that some acts of abusive behaviour may show evidence of a significant two-way association for both gender and socio-economic class.

Abusive dating behaviours which have no significant association with gender and socio-economic class

For 44.74 % (N=17) of the abusive dating acts described in this study there is no apparent association between the experience of those acts and either gender or socio-economic class. These behaviours are mainly of an emotionally manipulative nature such as: being kept from seeing or talking to family (B1); being blamed for causing a partner's aggressive behaviour (B3); being blamed for causing a partner's problems (B4); being stopped from doing the things one enjoys (B7); being treated like one is stupid (B8); being ordered around (B9); being insulted in front of others (B10); being put down about the way one looks

TABLE 4

LOG LINEAR ANALYSIS OF THE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF GENDER AND ECONOMIC CLASS ON THE EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE HETEROSEXUAL DATING BEHAVIOUR

$p < 0.05$ ** is significant, $p > 0.05$ is not significant. (Note : the Maximum Likelihood Chi-square statistic is computed in this Log-Linear analysis, the italic $LR\chi^2$ (df) are those that are significant at the $p = .001$ level and therefore fulfill the criteria of controlling the Type 1 error rate.

No.	ITEM (RESPONSE VARIABLE, RV)	BEST FIT MODEL Gender (1) Economic Class (2) RV (3)	SIGNIFICANT PARTIAL EFFECTS χ^2		
			Gender x Class x RV	Gender x RV	Class x RV
1.	This person tried to keep me from seeing or talking to my family	$LR\chi^2$ (4) = 2.44, $p = .65$ Best Model : 1,2,3			
2.	This person interfered with my relationship with friends	$LR\chi^2$ (2) = .42, $p = .81$ Best Model : 12,23			<i>$LR\chi^2(2) = 234.84, p = .000^{**}$</i>
3.	This person blamed for causing his/her aggressive behaviour	$LR\chi^2$ (4) = 3.25, $p = .52$ Best Model : 1,2,3			
4.	This person blamed me for his/her problems	$LR\chi^2$ (4) = 3.11 ($p = .54$) Best Model : 1,2,3			
5.	This person tried to make me feel I was not thinking right	Saturated Model 123	$LR\chi^2(1) = 4.26, p = .03 *$		
6.	This person tried to stop me from going to school	$LR\chi^2$ (2) = .38, $p = .83$ Best Model : 12,23			<i>$LR\chi^2(2) = 531.71, p = .000^{**}$</i>
7.	This person tried to stop me from doing things that I enjoy	$LR\chi^2$ (5) = 5.47, $p = .36$ Best Model : 2,3			
8.	This person treated me like I was stupid	$LR\chi^2$ (4) = .70, $p = .95$ Best Model : 1,2,3			
9.	This person ordered me around	$LR\chi^2$ (5) = 8.64, $p = .12$ Best Model : 3,2			
10.	This person insulted me in front of others	$LR\chi^2$ (4) = 5.78, $p = .22$ Best Model : 1,2,3			

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

No.	ITEM (RESPONSE VARIABLE, RV)	BEST FIT MODEL Gender (1) Economic Class (2) RV (3)	SIGNIFICANT PARTIAL EFFECTS χ^2		
			Gender x Class x RV	Gender x RV	Class x RV
11.	This person put me down about the way I look	LR χ^2 (4) = 2.31, p=.64 Best Model : 1,2,3			
12.	This person told me I couldn't manage on my own	LR χ^2 (2) = 1.65, p=.44 Best Model : 12,23			LR χ^2 (2) = 474.89, p=.000 **
13.	This person was jealous and suspicious of my friends	LR χ^2 (5) = 5.88, p=.32 Best Model : 3,2			
14.	This person wanted to know where I was all the time	LR χ^2 (5) = 6.54, p=.26 Best Model : 1,3			
15.	This person accused me of seeing other people of the opposite sex	LR χ^2 (2) = 2.84, p=.24 Best Model : 12,13		LR χ^2 (2) = 208.87, p=.000 **	
16.	This person did not want me to socialize with friends of the same sex	LR χ^2 (2) = 3.30, p=.19 Best Model : 12,23			LR χ^2 (2) = 429.56, p=.000 **
17.	This person swore at me	LR χ^2 (2) = .47, p=.79 Best Model : 12,23			LR χ^2 (2) = 246.03, p=.000 **
18.	This person called me names	LR χ^2 (5) = 5.94, p=.31 Best Model : 3,2			
19.	This person shouted and screamed at me	LR χ^2 (5) = 3.33, p=.64 Best Model : 3,2			
20.	This person gave me the silent treatment, refused to talk to me	LR χ^2 (5) = 7.02, p=.22 Best Model : 3,2			
21.	This person was not affectionate towards me	LR χ^2 (6) = 2.60, p=.86 Best Model : 3			
22.	This person changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	LR χ^2 (5) = 8.20, p=.14 Best Model : 3,2			
23.	This person threatened to hit or throw something at me	LR χ^2 (2) = 3.74, p=.15 Best model : 23,13			LR χ^2 (2) = 16.37, p=.0002** LR χ^2 (2) = 16.98, p=.0002**

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

No.	ITEM (RESPONSE VARIABLE, RV)	BEST FIT MODEL Gender (1) Economic Class (2) RV (3)	SIGNIFICANT PARTIAL EFFECTS χ^2		
			Gender x Class x RV	Gender x RV	Class x RV
24.	This person threw something at me	Saturated Model 123	LR $\chi^2(1)$ = 4.07, p=.043**		
25.	This person grabbed, pushed or shoved me	LR $\chi^2(2) = .73$, p=.69 Best Model : 12,13		LR $\chi^2(2) = 363.77$, p=.000**	
26.	This person slapped me	Saturated Model 123	LR $\chi^2(1)$ = 14.37, p=.0001 **		
27.	This person kicked, bit or hit me with a fist	Saturated Model 123	LR $\chi^2(1)$ = 7.70, p=.006 **		
28.	This person beat me up	LR $\chi^2(2) = 1.5$, p=.47 Best Model : 23,13		LR $\chi^2(2) = 13.84$, p=.0009**	LR $\chi^2(2) = 26.44$, p=.000 **
29.	This person threatened me with a knife or gun	LR $\chi^2(2) = 1.13$, p=.57 Best Model : 23,13		LR $\chi^2(2) = 13.04$, p=.01 **	LR $\chi^2(2) = 13.06$, p=.01 **
30.	This person used a knife or gun on me	LR $\chi^2(2) = 1.51$, p=.47 Best Model : 12, 23			LR $\chi^2(2) = 721.43$, p=.000 **
31.	This person called me sexually offensive names	Saturated Model 123	LR $\chi^2(1) = 3.95$, p=.05**		
32.	This person spread false sexual rumors about me	Saturated Model 123	LR $\chi^2(1) = 5.23$, p=.02 **		
33.	This person told me sexually offensive jokes	LR $\chi^2(2) = .68$, p=.71 Best Model : 12,23			LR $\chi^2(2) = 418.05$, p=.000 **
34.	This person showed me sexually offensive pictures or books	LR $\chi^2(4) = 3.09$, p=.54 Best Model : 1,2,3			
35.	This person touched or brushed up against me in a sexual way	LR $\chi^2(2) = .38$, p=.83 Best Model : 12,23			LR $\chi^2(2) = 242.46$, p=.000**

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

No.	ITEM (RESPONSE VARIABLE, RV)	BEST FIT MODEL Gender (1) Economic Class (2) RV (3)	SIGNIFICANT PARTIAL EFFECTS χ^2		
			Gender x Class x RV	Gender x RV	Class x RV
36.	This person fondled me in a sexual way without my consent	LR χ^2 (5) = 5.58, p=.34 Best Model : 3,2			
37.	This person attempted to have sex with me without my agreement	LR χ^2 (2) = 1.13, p=.57 Best Model : 12,23			LR χ^2 (2) = 443.81, p=.000 **
38.	This person had sex with me without my agreement	LR χ^2 (2) = .87, p=.65 Best Model : 12,23			LR χ^2 (2) = 581.03, p=.000 **

(B11); a partner being jealous and suspicious of one's friends (B13); having a partner wanting to know where one is all the time (B14); a partner giving one the silent treatment (B20); experiencing a partner's withdrawal of affection (B21); and a partner changing moods very quickly (B22). Some of the behaviours are also of a verbally abusive nature such as being called names (B18) and being shouted and screamed at (B19). Other behaviours of a sexually harassing nature, such as being shown pornography (B34) and being fondled in a sexual way without consent (B36), also show no association with gender or socio-economic class.

Abusive dating behaviours which have a significant association with gender

A significant two-way association between gender x the experience of abusive dating behaviour is evident for 13.15% (N=5) of the acts of abusive behaviour described in this study. These significant associations, together with the proportional interpretations for males and females, are presented in Table 5. Without exception, these associations highlight the gendered nature of the experience of some acts of abusive dating behaviours, particularly those of physical battery. Females respondents clearly indicate a higher prevalence of experience of some emotionally abusive acts, involving jealousy and possessiveness. Of particular note is that almost twice as many females as males experience acts of possessive jealousy. Female respondents also indicate a higher prevalence the experience of threatened and actual physical abuse, including the threatened use of a weapon by a partner. Female respondents in this study indicate that their experience of threatened physical abuse (including threatened use of a weapon) and actual physical abuse in the form of being grabbed, pushed or

shoved, is three times more frequent than male respondents' experience. In addition, female respondents' experience of being beaten up by a partner is almost four times more frequent than that of male respondents. It is important to note that the experience of attempted rape and rape does not show evidence of a significant association with gender, and thus the high frequency of male experience of rape hinted at in the descriptive analysis is not supported by further analysis.

TABLE 5

SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATIONS OF GENDER X THE EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR		
Behaviour	Female Ratio	Male Ratio
	Exp : Not Exp.	Exp. : Not Exp.
B15. This person accused me of seeing people of the opp.sex	1 : 3	1 : 5
B23. This person threatened to hit or throw something at me	1 : 6	1 : 18
B25. This person grabbed, pushed or shoved me	1 : 6	1 : 21
B28. This person beat me up	1 : 11	1 : 43
B29. This person threatened me with a knife or gun	1 : 24	1 : 77
Note : The male and female ratios refer to abusive act experienced : abusive act not experienced		

Abusive dating behaviours which have a significant association with socio-economic class

A significant two-way association between socio-economic class x the experience of abusive dating behaviour is evident for 34.21% (N=13) of the acts of abusive behaviour described in this study. These significant associations, together with the

proportional interpretations for the 'best off' and the 'worst off' socio-economic class, are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATIONS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASS X THE EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR		
Behaviour	'Best off' Ratio Exp : Not Exp.	'Worst off' Ratio Exp : Not Exp.
B2. This person interfered with my relationship with friends	1 : 3	1 : 7
B6. This person tried to stop me from going to school	1 : 60	1 : 11
B12. This person told me I couldn't manage on my own	1 : 34	1 : 8
B16. This person did not want me to socialise with friends of the same sex	1 : 27	1 : 6
B17. This person swore at me	1 : 4	1 : 10
B23. This person threatened to hit or throw something at me	1 : 15	1 : 7
B28. This person beat me up	1 : 86	1 : 10
B29. This person threatened me with a knife or gun	1 : 119	1 : 22
B30. This person used a knife or gun on me	1 : 265	1 : 33
B33. This person told me sexually offensive jokes	1 : 27	1 : 10
B35. This person touched or brushed up against me in a sexual way	1 : 3	1 : 8
B37. This person attempted to have sex with me without my consent	1 : 19	1 : 7
B38. This person had sex with me without my consent	1 : 52	1 : 12
Note : The 'best off' and 'worst off' ratios refer to abusive act experienced : abusive act not experienced		

From this analysis it is apparent that adolescents in the 'worst off' socio-economic class have a higher ratio of experience of abusive dating behaviour in heterosexual relationships for 10 of the 13 items that indicate a significant class x experience

association. For the remaining 3 items, respondents in the 'best off' socio-economic class report a higher ratio of abusive experience. In the 'best off' socio-economic class 1 in 3 respondents report experiencing emotionally abusive behaviours, such as a partner interfering with their relationship with friends, and sexually harassing behaviours, such as a partner touching or brushing up against them in a sexual way (this is more than twice as prevalent as in the 'worst off' economic class). Respondents in this class also report a 1 in 4 prevalence of being sworn at by a partner (twice as prevalent as in the 'worst off' economic class).

In the 'worst off' socio-economic class, respondents record a comparatively high prevalence of experiencing the jealously possessive behaviour of a partner not wanting them to socialise with friends of the same sex (1 in 6). Verbal abuse in the form of being sworn at is also experienced by more than twice as many respondents in the 'worst off' class. A high prevalence of experiencing the threat of physical abuse (1 in 7) and actual physical abuse in the form of being beaten up (1 in 10), is also reported by respondents in this class. This is eight times higher than the reported prevalence in the 'best off' socio-economic class. Although the prevalence of the experience of being threatened with a weapon (1 in 22) and actual weapon assault (1 in 33) is relatively low, it is important to note how much more rarer such experiences are in the 'best off' socio-economic class (1 in 119 for threat of use, and 1 in 265 for actual use of a weapon). Particularly noteworthy is the comparatively high prevalence of experience of attempted rape (1 in 7) and rape (1 in 12) recorded by respondents in the 'worst off' socio-economic class. The latter is four times higher than the prevalence reported by those in the 'best off' socio-economic class.

Abusive dating behaviours which have a significant association with the interaction socio-economic class and gender

A three-way interaction, the experience of an abusive dating behaviour x gender x socio-economic class, is indicated for 6 experiences of abusive dating behaviour, that is for 15.79% of the acts of abuse described in the questionnaire. These significant associations, together with the proportional interpretations for males and females in the 'best off' and the 'worst off' socio-economic classes, are presented in Table 7.

Of the significant three way interactions, one involves the emotionally abusive experience of being made to feel one is not thinking right; three relate to experiences of physical abuse, such as being slapped, being kicked, bitten or hit with a fist or having something thrown at one; and the remaining two involve the sexually abusive experiences of being called sexually offensive names, or having false sexual rumours spread about one.

It is apparent that females in the 'worst off' socio-economic class experience a higher prevalence than males of being slapped (five times higher); kicked, bitten or hit with a fist (eight times higher), and having something thrown at them (four times higher). Females in the 'best off' socio-economic class display a higher prevalence of the experience of emotionally abusive behaviours such as being made to feel they are not thinking right (twice as high); and mildly sexually abusive behaviour such as being called sexually offensive names (four times more prevalent than males), and having false sexual rumours spread about them (twice

as prevalent as males). Only in the 'best off' socio-economic class do males apparently experience a higher prevalence of physical abuse in the form of being slapped. This experience is fifteen times higher for males as compared to females.

TABLE 7

Behaviour	'Best off'		'Worst off'	
	Female exp.	Male exp.	Female exp.	Male exp.
B5. This person tried to make me feel I was not thinking right ($\chi^2(1) = 3.53$; $p = .06$)	2	1	1	1
B24. This person threw something at me ($\chi^2(1) = 3.34$; $p = .06$)	1	1	4	1
B26. This person slapped me ($\chi^2(1) = 2.68$; $p = .0004$)	1	15	5	1
B27. This person kicked, bit or hit me ($\chi^2(1) = 7.03$; $p = .008$)	1	1	8	1
B31. This person called me sexually offensive names ($\chi^2(1) = 3.13$; $p = .07$)	4	1	1	1
B32. This person spread false sexual rumours about me. ($\chi^2(1) = 3.69$; $p = .05$)	2	1	1	1

Note : Table 7 reflects the significant chi-square values for the interaction Gender x Economic class x Response Variable at the 'Yes' level of the RV, that is, the positive experience of that item of abusive dating behaviour.
The ratios reflected are those of Female experience of abusive act : Male experience of abusive act for each socio-economic class.

7.3 The perpetration of abusive dating behaviour

To determine the frequency of perpetration of abusive dating behaviour, the responses to Questions D1(a) to D38 (a) of the total sample of 720 respondents (347 males and 373 females) were subjected to descriptive analysis. Table 8 provides a summary of this descriptive analysis. The frequency counts, denoted as 'Full N' in Table 8, represent the frequencies of male and female respondents who responded to each item of abusive behaviour, indicating they had either perpetrated or not perpetrated that particular act. As in the case of the experience of abusive dating behaviour, the Full N varies from item to item, since not all respondents answered each question. The frequency counts denoted as 'X-sex Perp. N', represent those male and female respondents who identified that they have perpetrated that particular abusive act in a dating relationship against a partner of the opposite sex. These frequency counts are also expressed as a percentage of the Full N for the male and female sample responding to that item. The same exclusions set out for the experience of abusive behaviour (Section 7.2) apply to the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour and, again, the focus of this study is on abusive behaviour that is perpetrated within a heterosexual dating relationship.

This descriptive overview indicates that males perpetrate a broad spectrum of abusive dating behaviours in heterosexual relationships. These range from emotionally abusive behaviours of control, 'putting down', and possessive jealousy, to threatened and actual physical violence of a severe nature, including the threatened and actual use of weapons against a partner. Males also indicate a

TABLE 8**FREQUENCY TABLE OF MALE AND FEMALE PERPETRATION OF HETEROSEXUAL DATING ABUSE**

Total Sample N = 720 Total Male Sample = 347 Total Female Sample = 373

Note : Full N : Total N of Males and Females that responded to that question; X-Sex Dat. N. : N of Males and Females who perpetrated that behaviour in a heterosexual dating relationship

Q.		Male			Female		
		Full N	N	%Male	Full N	N	%Fem.
1.	I tried to keep him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family	Full N	287		Full N	314	
		X-sex Perp. N	15	5.23	X-sex Perp.N	10	3.18
2.	I interfered with his/her relationship with friends	Full N	272		Full N	292	
		X-sex Perp. N	15	5.51	X-sex Perp.N	20	6.85
3.	I blamed him/her for causing my aggressive behaviour	Full N	260		Full N	295	
		X-sex Perp. N	14	5.38	X-sex Perp.N	21	7.12
4.	I blamed him/her for my problems	Full N	269		Full N	285	
		X-sex Perp. N	16	5.95	X-sex Perp.N	32	11.93
5.	I tried to make him/her feel he/she was not thinking right	Full N	257		Full N	285	
		X-sex Perp. N	27	10.51	X-sex Perp. N	32	11.23
6.	I tried to stop him/her from going to school	Full N	275		Full N	309	
		X-sex Perp. N	4	1.45	X-sex Perp.N	8	2.59
7.	I tried to stop him/her from doing things that he/she enjoys	Full N	267		Full N	296	
		X-sex Perp. N	24	8.99	X-sex Perp.N	26	8.78
8.	I treated him/her like he/she was stupid	Full N	254		Full N	289	
		X-sex Perp. N	8	3.15	X-sex Perp.N	6	2.08
9.	I ordered him/her around	Full N	250		Full N	294	
		X-sex Perp. N	8	3.20	X-sex Perp.N	13	4.42
10.	I insulted him/her in front of others	Full N	246		Full N	267	
		X-sex Perp. N	10	4.07	X-sex Perp.N	15	5.62
11.	I put him/her down about the way he/she looks	Full N	245		Full N	288	
		X-sex Perp. N	5	2.04	X-sex Perp.N	11	3.82
12.	I told him/her they couldn't manage on their own	Full N	264		Full N	294	
		X-sex Perp. N	22	8.33	X-sex Perp.N	22	7.48

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

Q.		Male			Female		
			N	%Male		N	%Fem.
13.	I was jealous and suspicious of his/her friends	Full N	262		Full N	277	
		X-sex Perp. N	41	15.65	X-sex Perp.N	36	13.00
14.	I wanted to know where he/she was all the time	Full N	248		Full N	292	
		X-sex Perp. N	38	15.32	X-sex Perp.N	54	18.49
15.	I accused him/her of seeing other people of the opposite sex	Full N	262		Full N	293	
		X-sex Perp. N	33	12.60	X-sex Perp.N	52	17.75
16.	I did not want him/her to socialise with friends of the same sex	Full N	272		Full N	305	
		X-sex Perp. N	8	2.94	X-sex Perp.N	14	4.59
17.	I swore at him/her	Full N	208		Full N	265	
		X-sex Perp. N	11	5.29	X-sex Perp.N	30	11.32
18.	I called him/her names	Full N	234		Full N	265	
		X-sex Perp. N	13	5.56	X-sex Perp.N	10	3.77
19.	I shouted and screamed at him/her	Full N	233		Full N	262	
		X-sex Perp. N	15	6.44	X-sex Perp.N	21	8.02
20.	I gave him/her the silent treatment, refused to talk to him/her	Full N	241		Full N	252	
		X-sex Perp. N	47	19.50	X-sex Perp.N	48	19.05
21.	I was not affectionate towards him/her	Full N	252		Full N	298	
		X-sex Perp. N	24	9.52	X-sex Perp.N	30	10.07
22.	I changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	Full N	244		Full N	273	
		X-sex Perp. N	25	10.25	X-sex Perp.N	27	9.89
23.	I threatened to hit or throw something at him/her	Full N	242		Full N	295	
		X-sex Perp. N	9	3.72	X-sex Perp.N	7	2.37
24.	I threw something at him/her	Full N	237		Full N	292	
		X-sex Perp. N	5	2.11	X-sex Perp.N	5	1.71
25.	I grabbed, pushed or shoved him/her	Full N	237		Full N	280	
		X-sex Perp. N	11	4.64	X-sex Perp.N	11	3.93
26.	I slapped him/her	Full N	244		Full N	282	
		X-sex Perp. N	17	6.97	X-sex Perp.N	20	7.09
27.	I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist	Full N	237		Full N	291	
		X-sex Perp. N	10	4.22	X-sex Perp.N	8	2.75

TABLE 8 CONTINUED

Q.		Male			Female		
			N	%Male		N	%Fem.
28.	I beat him/her up	Full N	244		Full N	297	
		X-sex Perp. N	10	4.10	X-sex Perp.N	3	1.01
29.	I threatened him/her with a knife or gun	Full N	261		Full N	292	
		X-sex Perp. N	7	2.68	X-sex Perp.N	4	1.37
30.	I used a knife or gun on him/her	Full N	258		Full N	299	
		X-sex Perp. N	4	1.55	X-sex Perp.N	4	1.34
31.	I called him/her sexually offensive names	Full N	259		Full N	288	
		X-sex Perp. N	9	3.47	X-sex Perp.N	6	2.08
32.	I spread false sexual rumours about him/her	Full N	258		Full N	286	
		X-sex Perp. N	8	3.10	X-sex Perp.N	4	1.40
33.	I told him/her sexually offensive jokes	Full N	233		Full N	282	
		X-sex Perp. N	12	5.15	X-sex Perp.N	7	2.48
34.	I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures or books	Full N	238		Full N	290	
		X-sex Perp. N	16	6.72	X-sex Perp.N	5	1.72
35.	I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way	Full N	236		Full N	281	
		X-sex Perp. N	34	14.41	X-sex Perp.N	15	5.34
36.	I fondled him/her in a sexual way without his/her consent	Full N	261		Full N	286	
		X-sex Perp. N	10	3.83	X-sex Perp.N	5	1.75
37.	I attempted to have sex with him/her without his/her agreement	Full N	263		Full N	292	4
		X-sex Perp. N	16	6.08	X-sex Perp.N	4	1.37
38.	I had sex with him/her without his/her agreement	Full N	263		Full N	301	
		X-sex Perp. N	9	3.42	X-sex Perp.N	2	.66

higher frequency of perpetrating sexually abusive acts ranging from sexually harassing acts to more sexually intrusive and violent acts, particularly attempted rape and rape. Female respondents, by comparison, appear to perpetrate comparatively more emotionally and verbally abusive acts.

Overall, it is apparent that although respondents of both sexes acknowledge their perpetration of acts of abuse in dating relationships, the most severe physically and sexually abusive acts are recorded as being perpetrated by male respondents against their female partners.

As in the case of the in-depth analysis of the experience of abusive dating behaviour, this descriptive analysis provides a broad overview of respondents' perpetration of abusive dating behaviours in heterosexual relationships. The perpetration of each type of abusive dating behaviour and its association with the sex of the respondent and the socio-economic class of the respondent is explored in more depth by the log-linear analyses in Section 7.3.1.

7.3.1 Log-linear analyses

Log-linear analysis has been used in this study to explore the associations between the perpetration of the various acts of abusive heterosexual dating behaviour and gender and socio-economic class. For the same reasons motivated in Chapter 6 (Section 6.6.1) age has not been included as a variable.

Results of the Log-Linear Analyses

The results of the Log-linear analyses for all the items of perpetrated abusive dating behaviour are presented in Table 9. The following discussion focuses firstly on those items that indicate no significant associations with gender and socio-economic class; secondly, on those items that indicate a significant two-way association with gender; thirdly, on those items that indicate a significant two-way association with socio-economic class; and fourthly, on those items that indicate a significant three-way association with both gender and socio-economic class. It is important to note that some acts of perpetrated abusive behaviour may show evidence of a significant two-way association for both gender and socio-economic class.

Abusive dating behaviours (perpetrated) which have no significant association with gender and socio-economic class

For 68.42% (N=26) of the perpetrated abusive dating acts described in this study there is no apparent association with either gender or socio-economic class. Many of these acts are in the emotionally abusive range, such as: interfering with a partner's relationships with friends (D2); blaming a partner for one's own aggressive behaviour (D3); stopping a partner from going to school (D6); trying to stop a partner from doing things that he/she enjoys (D7); treating a partner like he/she is stupid (D8); ordering a partner around (D9); insulting a partner in front of others (D10); putting a partner down about his/her appearance (D11); being jealous and suspicious of a partner's friends (D13); accusing a partner of seeing someone of the opposite sex (D15); not wanting a partner to socialise with friends

TABLE 9

LOG-LINEAR ANALYSIS OF THE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF GENDER AND ECONOMIC CLASS ON THE PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE HETEROSEXUAL DATING BEHAVIOUR

$p < 0.05$ ** is significant, $p > 0.05$ is not significant. (Note : The Maximum Likelihood Chi-Square statistic ($LR\chi^2(df)$) is computed in these analyses, the italic $LR\chi^2(df)$ are those that are significant at the $p = .001$ level and therefore fulfill the criteria of controlling the Type 1 error rate.

No.	ITEM (RESPONSE VARIABLE, RV)	BEST FIT MODEL Gender (1) Economic Class (2) RV (3)	SIGNIFICANT PARTIAL EFFECTS χ^2		
			Gender x Class x RV	Gender x RV	Class x RV
1.	I tried to keep him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family	$LR\chi^2(2) = 1.78, p = .41$ Best Model : 12,23			<i>$LR\chi^2(2) = 603.61, p = .000^{**}$</i>
2.	I interfered with his/her relationship with friends	$LR\chi^2(5) = 5.19, p = .39$ Best Model : 3,2			
3.	I blamed him/her for causing my aggressive behaviour	$LR\chi^2(5) = 5.75, p = .33$ Best Model : 1,3			
4.	I blamed him/her for my problems	$LR\chi^2(2) = .53, p = .77$ Best Model : 13,23	$LR\chi^2(2) = 6.37, p = .04^{**}$		$LR\chi^2(2) = 9.65, p = .008^{**}$
5.	I tried to make him/her feel he/she was not thinking right	$LR\chi^2(2) = 1.73, p = .42$ Best Model : 12,23			<i>$LR\chi^2(2) = 366.49, p = .000^{**}$</i>
6.	I tried to stop him/her from going to school	$LR\chi^2(5) = 4.36, p = .50$ Best Model : 1,3			
7.	I tried to stop him/her from doing the things that he/she enjoys	$LR\chi^2(5) = 8.10, p = .15$ Best Model : 1,3			
8.	I treated him/her like he/she was stupid	$LR\chi^2(5) = 6.44, p = .27$ Best Model : 1,3			
9.	I ordered him/her around	$LR\chi^2(4) = 1.62, p = .80$ Best Model : 1,2,3			

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

No.	ITEM (RESPONSE VARIABLE, RV)	BEST FIT MODEL Gender (1) Economic Class (2) RV (3)	SIGNIFICANT PARTIAL EFFECTS χ^2		
			Gender x Class x RV	Gender x RV	Class x RV
10.	I insulted him/her in front of others	LR χ^2 (5) = 5.69, p=.34 Best Model : 3,2			
11.	I put him/her down about his/her appearance	LR χ^2 (4) = 1.41, p=.84 Best Model : 1,2,3			
12.	I told him/her they couldn't manage on their own	LR χ^2 (2) = 2.90 p=.23 Best Model : 12,23			LR χ^2 (2) = 452.35, p=.000**
13.	I was jealous and suspicious of his/her friends	LR χ^2 (5) = 4.33, p=.50 Best Model : 3,2			
14.	I wanted to know where he/she was all the time	LR χ^2 (2) = 1.67, p=.43 Best Model : 12,23			LR χ^2 (2) = 252.80, p=.000**
15.	I accused him/her of seeing other people of the opposite sex	LR χ^2 (4) = 5.66, p=.23 Best Model : 1,2,3			
16.	I did not want him/her to socialise with friends of the same sex	LR χ^2 (5) = 6.68, p=.24 Best Model 1,3			
17.	I swore at him/her	LR χ^2 (4) = 5.92, p=.22 Best Model : 1,2,3			
18.	I called him/her names	LR χ^2 (5) = 6.03, p=.30 Best Model : 3,2			
19.	I shouted and screamed at him/her	LR χ^2 (4) = 3.94, p=.41 Best Model : 1,2,3			
20.	I gave him/her the silent treatment	LR χ^2 (5) = 5.85, p=.32 Best Model : 2,3			
21.	I was not affectionate towards him/her	LR χ^2 (5) = 2.71, p=.74 Best Model : 1,3			

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

No.	ITEM (RESPONSE VARIABLE, RV)	BEST FIT MODEL Gender (1) Economic Class (2) RV (3)	SIGNIFICANT PARTIAL EFFECTS χ^2		
			Gender x Class x RV	Gender x RV	Class x RV
22.	I changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	LR χ^2 (5) = 4.67, p=.45 Best Model : 2,3			
23.	I threatened to hit or throw something at him/her	LR χ^2 (5) = 6.54, p=.26 Best Model : 1,3			
24.	I threw something at him/her	LR χ^2 (4) = 6.34, p=.17 Best Model : 1,2,3			
25.	I grabbed, pushed or shoved him/her	Saturated Model 123	LR χ^2 (1) = 5.24, p=.02**		
26.	I slapped him/her	Saturated Model 123	LR χ^2 (1) = 10.36, p=.001**		
27.	I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist	LR χ^2 (4) = 2.02, p=.73 Best Model : 1,2,3			
28.	I beat him/her up	LR χ^2 (2) = 4.49 p=.11 Best Model : 13,12		LR χ^2 (2)= 603.60, p=.000 **	
29.	I threatened him/her with a knife or gun	LR χ^2 (4) = 6.54, p=.16 Best Model : 1,2,3			
30.	I used a knife or gun on him/her	LR χ^2 (5) = 8.19, p=.15 Best Model : 1,3			
31.	I called him/her sexually offensive names	LR χ^2 (6) = 4.56, p=.60 Best Model : 3			
32.	I spread false sexual rumours about him/her	LR χ^2 (6) = 8.35, p=.21 Best Model : 3			
33.	I told him/her sexually offensive jokes	LR χ^2 (4) = 6.14, p=.19 Best Model : 1,2,3			

TABLE 9 CONTINUED

No.	ITEM (RESPONSE VARIABLE, RV)	BEST FIT MODEL Gender (1) Economic Class (2) RV (3)	SIGNIFICANT PARTIAL EFFECTS χ^2		
			Gender x Class x RV	Gender x RV	Class x RV
34.	I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures or books	LR χ^2 (2) = 2.63, p=.27 Best Model : 23,13	LR χ^2 (2)= 17.61, p=.001**	LR χ^2 (2) = 8.31, p=.012**	
35.	I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way	LR χ^2 (2) = 3.56, p=.17 Best Model : 23,13	LR χ^2 (2)= 19.94, p=.0001**	LR χ^2 (2) = 8.72, p<.012**	
36.	I fondled him/her in a sexual way without his/her consent	LR χ^2 (5) = 8.26, p=.14 Best Model : 1,3			
37.	I attempted to have sex with him/her without his/her agreement	LR χ^2 (2) = 1.18, p=.55 Best Model : 23,13	LR χ^2 (2)= 13.92, p=.0009**	LR χ^2 (2) = 14.92, p=.0005**	
38.	I had sex with him/her without his/her agreement	LR χ^2 (2) = 4.27, p=.12 Best Model : 12,13	LR χ^2 (2)= 646.15, p=.000**		

of the same sex (D16); giving a partner the silent treatment (D20); not being affectionate towards a partner (D21); and subjecting a partner to one's sudden mood changes (D22). Other verbally and physically abusive acts also indicate no significant associations with gender or socio-economic class, such as: swearing at a partner (D17); calling a partner names (D18); shouting and screaming at a partner (D19); threatening to hit or throw something at a partner (D23); actually throwing something at a partner (D24); kicking, biting or hitting a partner (D27); threatening a partner with a knife or gun (D29); and actually using a weapons on a partner (D30). A few of the less severe acts of sexual abuse also indicate no associations with gender or socio-economic class, such as: calling a partner sexually offensive names (D31); spreading false sexual rumours about a partner (D32); and telling a partner sexually offensive jokes (D33). The sexually harassing act of fondling a partner in a sexual way without their consent (D36) also indicates no associations with gender or socio-economic class.

Overall, a broad range of abusive acts - emotional, verbal, physical and sexual –do not indicate significant association with either gender or socio-economic class.

Abusive dating behaviours (perpetrated) which have an association with gender

A significant two-way association between gender and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviours is apparent for 15.79% (N=6) of the behaviours described in this study. These significant associations, together with the proportional interpretations for males and female perpetrators, are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATIONS OF GENDER X THE PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR		
Behaviour	Female Ratio Perp : Not Perp.	Male Ratio Perp. : Not Perp
D4. I blamed him/her for my problems	1 : 7	1 : 14
D28. I beat him/her up	1 : 95	1 : 24
D34. I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures/books	1 : 55	1 : 13
D35. I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexually offensive way	1 : 19	1 : 6
D37. I attempted to have sex with him/her without consent	1 : 70	1 : 14
D38. I had sex with him/her without his/her consent.	1 : 145	1 : 29
Note : The female and male ratios refer to abusive act perpetrated : abusive act not perpetrated.		

The ratios presented in Table 10 indicate that female respondents acknowledge a higher ratio than males of the perpetration of some mildly emotionally abusive acts, such as blaming a partner for one's own problems. Approximately twice as many females as males acknowledge perpetrating this behaviour on a heterosexual dating partner. However, severe physical abuse, such as beating a partner up, is perpetrated almost four times more often by male respondents than by females (4% of males report perpetrating physical assault). In considering sexually abusive acts, it is apparent that males acknowledge perpetrating significantly more of these behaviours than female respondents. Sexually abusive acts which are significantly associated with male perpetration vary from mildly sexually harassing acts of showing a partner sexually offensive pictures and books, to more severe sexual violence of touching or brushing up against a partner in a sexual way, attempted rape and rape. Three times more males than females acknowledge

touching or brushing up against a partner in a sexual way, and five times more males than females acknowledge attempting to rape (7% of males) or actually raping a partner (3% of males).

Abusive dating behaviours (perpetrated) which have an association with socio-economic class

A significant two-way association between socio-economic class and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour is evident for 21.05% (N=8) of the abusive acts described in this study. These significant associations together with the proportional interpretations for the ‘best off’ and ‘worst off’ socio-economic classes are presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11

SIGNIFICANT ASSOCIATIONS OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASS X THE PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR		
Behaviour	‘Best off’ Ratio Perp. : Not perp.	‘Worst off’ Ratio Perp. : Not perp.
D1. I tried to keep him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family	1 : 65	1 : 15
D4. I blamed him/her for my problems	1 : 17	1 : 7
D5. I tried to make him/her feel they were not thinking right	1 : 21	1 : 5
D12. I told him/her they couldn’t manage on their own	1 : 30	1 : 7
D14. I wanted to know where he/she was all the time	1 : 8	1 : 3
D34. I showed him/her sexually offensive books or pictures	1 : 58	1 : 16
D35. I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way	1 : 7	1 : 13
D37. I attempted to have sex with him/her without consent	1 : 124	1 : 14
Note : The ‘best off’ and ‘worst off’ ratios refer to abusive act perpetrated : abusive act not perpetrated.		

In only one of these acts - the sexually harassing act of touching or brushing up against a partner in a sexual way - is a higher prevalence of perpetration recorded for the 'best off' socio-economic class. Almost twice as many respondents in the 'best off' socio-economic class (1 in 7) record perpetrating this act than the 'worst off' socio-economic class (1 in 13). For all the other acts that indicate a significant association with socio-economic class, the 'worst off' socio-economic class records a higher rate of perpetration. These acts include some emotionally abusive acts (such as blaming a partner for one's own problems) which are more than twice as frequently perpetrated by respondents in the 'worst off' socio-economic class. Acts of possessive jealousy are also perpetrated more often by this socio-economic class, such as wanting to know where a partner is all the time (perpetrated almost three times as often by this class). Some other behaviours such as, attempting to prevent a partner having contact with his/her family, trying to make a partner feel he/she is not thinking right, and telling a partner he/she can't manage on their own, are approximately four times more frequently perpetrated by respondents in the 'worst off' socio-economic class than those in the 'best off' socio-economic class. The perpetration of some sexually harassing acts (showing a partner pornography, four times more prevalent, and touching or brushing up against a partner in a sexual way, twice as prevalent) are also more prevalent in the 'worst off' socio-economic class. Particularly noteworthy is the higher prevalence (eight times more prevalent) of attempted rape in the 'worst off' economic class.

Overall, it is apparent that responses from those in the 'worst off' socio-economic class show evidence of the highest prevalence of perpetration of abusive dating

behaviours of varying severity. The comparatively high prevalence of attempted rape is of particular concern.

Abusive dating behaviours (perpetrated) which have a significant association with the interaction socio-economic class and gender

Three-way interaction, the perpetration of an abusive dating behaviour x gender x socio-economic class, was indicated for two items describing the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour, that is for 5.26% (N=2) of the acts of abuse described in this study. These significant associations, together with the proportional interpretations for males and females in the ‘best off’ and the ‘worst off’ socio-economic classes, are presented in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Behaviour	‘Best off’		‘Worst off’	
	Female perp.	Male perp.	Female perp.	Male perp.
D25. I grabbed, pushed or shoved this person ($\chi^2(1) = 4.70; p=.03$)	2	: 1	1	: 2
D26. I slapped this person. ($\chi^2(1) = 9.70; p=.001$)	10	: 1	1	: 2

Note : Table 12 reflects the significant chi-square values for the interaction : Gender x Economic class x Response Variable at the ‘Yes’ level of the RV, that is, the positive perpetration of that item of abusive dating behaviour.
The ratios reflected are those of Female perpetration of abusive act : Male perpetration of abusive act, for each socio-economic class.

It is apparent that for both these acts of physical abuse, in the ‘best off’ socio-economic class, females indicate the highest prevalence of perpetration as compared to males, and in the ‘worst off’ socio-economic class, males indicate the

highest prevalence of perpetration. In the 'best off' socio-economic class twice as many females as males admit to grabbing, pushing or shoving their partners, and ten times as many females as males admit to slapping their partners. In the 'worst off' socio-economic class twice as many males as females admit to grabbing, pushing or shoving their partners and the same proportion admit to slapping their partners. Males are thus the predominant perpetrators of these physically abusive behaviours in the 'worst off' socio-economic class and females the predominant perpetrators of these same behaviours in the 'best off' socio-economic class.

7.4. Adolescents' attitudes and their experience of, and perpetration of abusive dating behaviour.

This section comprises three analyses: the first, the Analysis of Variance, explores possible associations between gender and socio-economic class and adolescents' sexist attitudes, their attitudes about conformity to culturally prescribed male roles and their attitudes about intrapersonal power; the second, the Factor Analysis, explores whether an underlying construct of power explains the responses to the three scales; and the third, the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation, explores the relationship between the above mentioned attitudes and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour.

Three adapted scales, the Heterosexual Relationship Scale (hereafter referred to as HSRS), the Male Role Attitude Scale (hereafter referred to as MRAS) and the Intrapersonal Power Scale (hereafter referred to as IPPS), were used to measure adolescents' attitudes to heterosexual relationships, attitudes to conformity to the male gender role and whether or not adolescents endorse the notion of personal power. Analyses were conducted over the full sample of respondents (N=720). However, not all the respondents in the full sample completed this section (Section C) of the questionnaire and, in addition, some respondents did not complete every question in this section. Thus the sample number differs for each scale. Reliability analyses were conducted on the three scales: the reliability analysis of the HSRS (N= 659) reveals a Cron. alpha = .67; the reliability analysis of the MRAS (N=652) reveals a Cron. alpha = .62; and the reliability analysis of the IPPS (N= 645) reveals a Cron. Alpha = .61.

7.4.1 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Responses to the three power scales were statistically analysed as 2 (Gender) x 2 (Economic Class) ANOVAS. The results of the ANOVA analyses are presented in Table 13. The mean scores for each scale considered as a function of gender x economic class are presented in Table 14.

TABLE 13

**SUMMARY OF THE ANOVA ANALYSES OF THE THREE ATTITUDE
SCALES
GENDER X SOCIO-ECONOMIC CLASS**

DEPENDENT VARIABLES			
	HSRS	MRAS	IPPS
<u>F Statistics for Effects</u>			
Gender (1)	24.10 ***	1.07	1.18
Econ. Class (2)	8.26 ***	10.04 ***	.64
1 x 2	.51	6.68 ***	7.01 ***

*** p<.01

** p<.05

* p<.10

TABLE 14

**MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION SCORES OF
HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIP SCALE, MALE ROLE
ATTITUDE SCALE & INTRAPERSONAL POWER SCALE BY
GENDER x ECONOMIC CLASS**

Scale	'Best off'		'Worst off'	
	Male \bar{x} (Std.Dev)	Female \bar{x} (Std.Dev)	Male \bar{x} (Std.Dev)	Female \bar{x} (Std.Dev)
HSRS N=659	32.47 (11.06)	28.33 (7.53)	34.07 (7.96)	30.97 (9.80)
MRAS N=652	35.89 (7.83)	33.48 (6.61)	36.28 (9.36)	37.26 (9.06)
IPPS N=645	25.97 (6.03)	24.03 (5.54)	24.17 (7.50)	24.99 (6.68)

Scale Midpoints

HSRS : 36

MRAS : 32

IPPS : 24

Results of the ANOVA Analyses

Heterosexual Relationship Scale

No significant interaction effects, gender x socio-economic class, are indicated in this analysis ($F(1,655) = .51, p=.48$). However the main effects for Socio-Economic Class ($F(1,655) = 8.26, p=.004$) and Gender ($F(1,655) = 24.10, p<.000001$) are highly significant. Male respondents ($M=33.27$) display significantly more sexist attitudes to heterosexual dating relationships than female respondents ($M=29.65$); and respondents in the 'worst off' economic class ($M=32.52$) record more sexist attitudes to heterosexual dating relationship than those in the 'best off' economic class ($M=30.40$). It should, however, be noted that, since the scores for both male and female respondents and 'worst off' and 'best off' respondents lie below the scale midpoint of 36 and show variations of between 7 and 11 points, it is not possible to interpret the scores of females or those in the 'best off' class as indicating that the whole sample display egalitarian attitudes, since many of the scores fall in the more traditional attitude range.

Male Role Attitude Scale

A significant interaction effect is indicated between gender and socio-economic class ($F(1,648) = 6.68, p=.009$). Tukey's HSD analysis of statistically significant pairs of means reveals that females in the 'best off' socio-economic class ($M=33.48$) stand out as indicating the least conformity to the endorsement of culturally prescribed male roles. This is significantly different to males in the 'best off' socio-economic class ($M=35.89$) ($p=.02$), and males ($M=36.28$) ($p=.003$) and females ($M=37.31$) ($p=.0002$) in the 'worst off' socio-economic class.

No statistically significant difference is revealed between males in the 'worst off' (M = 36.28) and 'best off' socio-economic classes (M=35.89) ($p=.96$), or between females (M=37.31) and males (M=36.28) ($p=.66$) in the 'worst off' socio-economic class.

It should be noted that all these mean scores lie above the midpoint of 32 on the MRAS, indicating that all groups tend towards supporting a conformity towards traditional, culturally prescribed male roles. Interestingly, females in the 'best off' socio-economic class (M=33.48) declare the least support for adhering to culturally prescribed traditional male roles, while females in the 'worst off' socio-economic class (M=37.26) display the most support for adhering to culturally prescribed male roles.

The Intrapersonal Power Scale

A significant interaction effect is revealed for gender x socio-economic class ($F(1,64) = 7.01, p=.008$). Tukey's HSD test reveals that males in the 'best off' economic class (M=25.97) manifest the highest scores on this scale, indicating that they most endorse the desirability of intrapersonal power. Their scores have a tendency to be greater than that of females in the same socio-economic class (M=24.03) ($p=.06$) and a tendency to be greater than males in the 'worst off' socio-economic class (M=24.17) ($p=.10$). This indicates that females in the 'best off' and males in the 'worst off' socio-economic classes display less of a tendency to endorse the desirability of personal power. There is no difference in the scores on this scale between males (M=24.17) and females (M=24.99) ($p=.68$) in the

'worst off' socio-economic class, and females in the 'best off' socio-economic class ($M=24.03$) ($p=.59$).

Overall, the mean scores of the groups tend to lie close to the midpoint of 24 of this scale, however males in the 'best off' socio-economic class ($M=25.97$) show the most tendency to support the desirability of intrapersonal power.

Summary

In measuring attitudes which support sexist beliefs and behaviour in heterosexual relationships, respondents' scores lie below the midpoint of the scale and show evidence of a variation of between 7 and 11 points, thus tending to indicate a general support for more traditional sexist attitudes in heterosexual relationships. Predictably, male respondents and those in the 'worst off' economic classes display the most support for more traditional sexist attitudes.

In examining attitudes which support the conformity to culturally prescribed male roles, both sexes and socio-economic classes show an almost equal tendency to support conformity to traditional male roles. An interesting picture emerges across the socio-economic classes: in the 'best off' economic class, females express less support than males for conformity to traditional male roles, however, in the 'worst off' economic class, females express as much support as males for conformity to traditional male roles.

An overview of the Heterosexual Relationship and the Male Role Attitude scales reveals a very similar picture for females in the 'best off' socio-economic class:

that of showing evidence of the least support for sexist dating attitudes and the least support for conformity to traditional male roles.

When examining adolescents' attitudes regarding the desirability of intrapersonal power, male respondents in the 'best off' socio-economic class showed the highest mean desire for personal power.

7.4.2 Factor Analysis of the Heterosexual Relationship scale, the Male Role Attitude Scale and the Intrapersonal Power Scale

In order to explore whether there is a shared construct underlying the responses on the three scales listed above, the totals of the scales were subjected to a factor analysis using the Principal Component Extraction Method. Pair-wise deletion of missing data was used. One factor with an Eigenvalue of 1.92 emerged. This factor explained 64.75% of the variance. The sum scores of all three scales load onto this factor, and all three loadings are greater than .79.

From this analysis I suggest that these three scales measure different aspects of the construct of power - the Heterosexual Relationship Scale and the Male Role Attitude Scale measuring power which comes from society and the Intrapersonal Power Scale measuring more personal power, located within the adolescent.

7.4.3 The relationship between adolescents' attitudes and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour

Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used to examine the relationship between the three different scales (the Heterosexual Relationship Scale, the Male Role Attitude Scale and the Intrapersonal Power Scale) and the perpetration of acts of abusive dating behaviour for the full sample of respondents (N=720). The correlation coefficients between the three scales and the perpetration of acts of abusive dating behaviour are tabulated in Appendix III. A summary of the statistically significant correlations is presented in Table 15. It should be noted from Appendix III and Table 15 that the correlations on the male/female, 'best off'/'worst off' groups were performed separately.

The Heterosexual Relationship Scale, which examines adolescent's beliefs regarding male domination of women, reveals a significant association for 7 of the abusive behaviours. For male respondents in the 'worst off' socio-economic class there is a positive association between sexist attitudes and the emotionally abusive behaviour of blaming a partner for one's problems ($r=.29, p<.05$). The reverse is true for females in the 'best off' socio-economic class who show evidence of a negative association as regards sexist attitudes and the perpetration of some emotionally and verbally abusive behaviours. Females in this socio-economic class who do not support the belief of male domination over women are more likely to perpetrate abusive behaviours which are characterised by blaming a partner for one's problems ($r = -.30, p<.05$), or shouting and screaming at a partner ($r = -.39, p<.05$). This negative relationship is intuitively easy to

understand, since young women who do not support sexist beliefs and the belief in male privilege, are more likely to be verbally abusive to their partners and to view their male partners as blameworthy. For male respondents in the 'best off' socio-economic class, there is a positive association between sexist attitudes and the perpetration of a number of abusive behaviours ranging from emotionally abusive acts such as trying to stop a partner going to school, ($r = .40, p < .05$), not wanting a partner to socialise with friends of the same sex ($r = .33, p < .05$), to physically threatening acts, such as threatening a partner with a knife or gun ($r = .48, p < .05$), and sexually abusive acts, such as touching or brushing up against a partner in a sexual way ($r = .42, p < .05$), and raping a partner ($r = .34, p < .05$).

The Male Role Attitude Scale, which examines adolescents' support of conformity to culturally prescribed males roles, reveals significant associations for four acts of abusive behaviour. For females in the 'best off' socio-economic class there is evidence of a negative association between supporting conformity to male roles and the emotionally abusive act of blaming a partner ($r = -.33, p < .05$), as well as the physically abusive act of kicking, biting or hitting a partner ($r = -.33, p < .05$). This is consistent with the findings of the Heterosexual Relationship Scale. In this case, females who do not support conformity to prescribed male roles are more likely to perpetrate these acts of emotional and physical abuse. For males in the 'best off' socio-economic class there is a positive association between supporting conformity to culturally prescribed male roles and the perpetration of emotionally abusive and controlling behaviour such as trying to stop a partner going to school ($r = .35, p < .05$). Again, this is consistent with the findings of the Heterosexual Relationship Scale. Males in the 'worst off' socio-

economic class also show a positive association between supporting conformity to culturally defined male roles and the perpetration of emotionally abusive acts such as changing moods very quickly ($r = .29, p < .05$). Although this focuses on a different aspect of emotionally abusive behaviour, it does support the association revealed for males in the 'worst off' socio-economic class on the Heterosexual Relationship Scale. Males in this class who support conformity to culturally defined male roles are likely to perpetrate these forms of emotionally abusive behaviour on a partner.

The Intrapersonal Power Scale which examines adolescents' support, for the desirability of intrapersonal power, reveals positive associations for eight abusive behaviours. Males in the 'worst off' socio-economic class dominate these associations. For this group, there are significant associations between supporting the desire for intrapersonal power and perpetrating abusive behaviours ranging from emotionally abusive acts such as: ordering a partner around ($r = .31, p < .05$); not wanting a partner to socialise with friends of the same sex ($r = .31, p < .05$); and changing moods very quickly ($r = .32, p < .05$); to physically abusive acts such as: beating up a partner ($r = .31, p < .05$); to acts of sexual harassment such as: spreading false sexual rumours about a partner ($r = .31, p < .05$); and telling sexually offensive jokes to a partner ($r = .32, p < .05$). Males in the 'best off' socio-economic class show a positive association between supporting the desire for intrapersonal power and the perpetration of controlling and abusive acts such as trying to stop a partner going to school ($r = .40, p < .05$). Similarly, females in the 'best off' socio-economic class who support the desire for intrapersonal power are also more likely to order a male partner around ($r = .30, p < .05$).

TABLE 15

SUMMARY TABLE OF PEARSON'S CORRELATION (r) BETWEEN THE HETEROSEXUAL RELATIONSHIP SCALE, THE MALE ROLE ATTITUDE SCALE AND THE INTRAPERSONAL POWER SCALE AND THE PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOURS

SCALE	BEHAVIOUR PERPETRATED	PEARSON'S 'r' * p <.05	GENDER x ECONOMIC CLASS
HSRS	4. I blamed him/her for my problems	.29 (df=81)	Male 'Worst off'
	" " "	-.30 (df=92)	Female 'Best off'
	6. I tried to stop him/her from going to school	.40 (df=69)	Male 'Best off'
	16. I did not want him/her to socialise with friends of the same sex	.33 (df=69)	Male 'Best off'
	19. I shouted and screamed at him/her	-.39 (df=92)	Female 'Best off'
	29. I threatened him/her with a knife or gun	.48 (df=69)	Male 'Best off'
	35. I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way	.42 (df=69)	Male 'Best off'
	38. I had sex with him/her without his/her agreement	.34 (df=69)	Male 'Best off'
MRAS	4. I blamed him/her for my problems	-.33 (df=92)	Female 'Best off'
	6. I tried to stop him/her from going to school	.35 (df=69)	Male 'Best off'
	22. I changed moods, very quickly from very calm to very angry	.29 (df=81)	Male 'Worst off'
	27. I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist	-.33 (df=92)	Female 'Best off'
IPPS	6. I tried to stop him/her from going to school	.40 (df=69)	Male 'Best off'
	9. I ordered him/her around	.31 (df=81)	Male 'Worst off'
	" " "	.30 (df=92)	Female 'Best off'
	16. I did not want him/her to socialise with friends of the same sex	.31 (df=81)	Male 'Worst off'
	22. I changed moods, very quickly from very calm to very angry	.32 (df=81)	Male 'Worst off'
	28. I beat him/her up	.31 (df=81)	Male 'Worst off'
	32. I spread false sexual rumours about him/her	.31 (df=81)	Male 'Worst off'
	33. I told him/her sexually offensive jokes	.32 (df=81)	Male 'Worst off'

In the analysis of association for each of the three scales, the number of cases in each cell are small as a result of the class x gender division. For this reason it is difficult to draw conclusions from the lack of association between the scales and the various abusive behaviours.

7.5 Factor analysis of responses to the experience of and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour.

A central task of feminist research is to understand abusive behaviour from the viewpoint of those being researched, rather than imposing the researcher's understanding on the study. This study felt it important to explore how the adolescent respondents understood and grouped together certain items of abusive dating behaviour, both experienced and perpetrated, and how these groupings differ. Consequently a factor analysis was conducted on the responses to the items describing both the experience of abusive behaviour (B1(a) to B38(a)) and the items describing the perpetration of abusive behaviour (D1(a) to D38(a)).

7.5.1. Factor analysis of the experience of abusive dating behaviour

In order to explore how adolescents understand the experience of abusive dating behaviour, the responses from the full sample of 720 respondents to all the items (B1(a) to B38(a)) dealing with the experience of abusive dating behaviour was subjected to a factor analysis by the Principal Component Extraction Method. This was followed by a Varimax rotation. Pair-wise deletion of missing data was used so as to include the maximum number of respondents possible. Six factors

with Eigenvalues of 3.70, 3.09, 2.52, 2.46, 2.35, and 2.22, emerged. These six factors together explained 43.07% of the variance. These six factors and the loadings of each item (represented by the question number, for example, B1(a) are presented in Table 16.

Interpretation of the Factors

Factor 1

Seven items load onto this factor. Those that load most strongly are four items that describe the experience of being demeaned or 'put down': this person insulted me in front of others (B10a); this person put me down about the way I look (B11a); this person called me names (B18a); this person swore at me (B17a). A further item - this person treated me like I was stupid (B8a) - loads less strongly but nevertheless significantly, and also reflects experiences of being 'put down' and insulted. An item reflecting the experience of being ignored also loads strongly onto this factor: this person gave me the silent treatment, refused to speak to me (B20a). One item reflecting the experience of sexual harassment - this person spread false sexual rumours about me (B32a) - also loads significantly onto this factor.

It would appear that the essence of this factor is the experience of being humiliated and insulted. It is also not surprising that the item reflecting the experience of being ignored and the item reflecting the experience of sexual harassment load significantly onto this factor. Both these behaviours may be interpreted as intended to humiliate and demean a partner.

TABLE 16
SORTED FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR

Loadings <0.35 or >-0.35 have been replaced with “-”

QUESTION	EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
B1A	This person tried to keep me from seeing or talking to my family	-	-	-	-	-	-
B2A	This person interfered with my relationship with friends	-	-	.369	-	-	-
B3A	This person blamed me for causing his/her aggressive behaviour	-	-	.523	-	-	-
B4A	This person blamed me for his/her problems	-	-	.552	-	-	-
B5A	This person tried to make me feel I was not thinking right	-	-	-	-	-	-
B6A	This person tried to stop me from going to school	-	-	-	-	.400	-
B7A	This person tried to stop me from doing things that I enjoy	-	-	-	-	-	.545
B8A	This person treated me like I was stupid	.398	-	.443	-	-	-
B9A	This person ordered me around	-	-	.643	-	-	-
B10A	This person insulted me in front of others	.716	-	-	-	-	-
B11A	This person put me down about the way I look	.673	-	-	-	-	-
B12A	This person told me I couldn't manage on my own	-	-	-	-	-	-
B13A	This person was jealous and suspicious of my friends	-	-	-	-	-	.582
B14A	This person wanted to know where I was all the time	-	-	-	-	-	.628
B15A	This person accused me of seeing other people of the opposite sex	-	-	-	-	-	.651
B16A	This person did not want me to socialise with friends of the same sex	-	-	-	-	-	.432
B17A	This person swore at me	.619	-	-	-	-	-
B18A	This person called me names	.639	-	-	-	-	-
B19A	This person shouted and screamed at me	-	.511	-	-	-	-
B20A	This person gave me the silent treatment, refused to talk to me	.670	-	-	-	-	-
B21A	This person was not affectionate towards me	-	-	-	-	-	-
B22A	This person changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	-	-	.503	-	-	-
B23A	This person threatened to hit or throw something at me	-	.598	-	-	-	-
B24A	This person threw something at me	-	.524	-	-	-	-
B25A	This person grabbed, pushed or shoved me	-	.618	-	-	-	-
B26A	This person slapped me	-	.587	-	-	-	-
B27A	This person kicked, bit or hit me with a fist	-	.663	-	-	-	-
B28A	This person beat me up	-	.512	-	-	.363	-
B29A	This person threatened me with a knife or gun	-	-	-	-	.697	-

TABLE 16 CONTINUED

QUESTION	EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5	FACTOR 6
B30A	This person used a knife or gun on me	-	-	-	-	.750	-
B31A	This person called me sexually offensive names	-	-	-	-	-	-
B32A	This person spread false sexual rumours about me	.455	-	-	-	-	-
B33A	This person told me sexually offensive jokes	-	-	-	-	-	-
B34A	This person showed me sexually offensive pictures or books	-	-	-	-	-	-
B35A	This person touched or brushed up against me in a sexual way	-	-	-	.510	-	-
B36A	This person fondled me in a sexual way without my consent	-	-	-	.747	-	-
B37A	This person attempted to have sex with me without my agreement	-	-	-	.746	-	-
B38A	This person had sex with me without my agreement	-	-	-	.650	.450	-
Eigenvalues		3.70	3.09	2.52	2.46	2.35	2.22
% Variance Explained		9.76%	8.14%	6.63%	6.49%	6.20%	5.85%
Total % Variance Explained		43.07%					

This factor is thus interpreted as referring to respondents' experience of being humiliated.

Factor 2

Seven items load strongly on this factor. The six items that load most strongly refer to respondents' experience of direct, interpersonal physical assault: this person kicked, bit or hit me with a fist (B27a); this person grabbed, pushed or shoved me (B25a); this person threatened to hit or throw something at me (B23a); this person slapped me (B26a); this person threw something at me (B24a); and this person beat me up (B28a).

A further item which refers to direct interpersonal verbal abuse loads significantly on this factor: this person shouted and screamed at me (B19a).

The essence of this factor is thus interpreted as the experience of direct interpersonal abuse, mainly physical, but including elements of verbal abuse.

Factor 3

Six items load significantly onto this factor. The four items that load most strongly appear to refer to the controlling, blaming (culpability reducing) and mercurial nature of the perpetrator : this person ordered me around (B9a); this person blamed me for his/her problems (B4a); this person blamed me for causing his/her aggressive behaviour (B3a); and this person changed moods very quickly

from very calm to very angry (B22a). Two further items which load a little less strongly but still significantly also refer to the controlling nature of the perpetrator: this person treated me like I was stupid (B8a); and this person interfered with my relationship with friends (B2a).

The central theme of this factor thus appears to focus on respondents' experience of being controlled and manipulated.

Factor 4

Four items load strongly onto this factor. These items all refer to non-consensual sexual experiences : this person fondled me in a sexual way without my consent (B36a); this person attempted to have sexual intercourse with me without my agreement (B37a); this person had sexual intercourse with me without my agreement (B38a); and this person touched or brushed up against me in a sexual way (B35a).

This factor is thus interpreted to embody the experience of sexual harassment and rape.

Factor 5

Five items load significantly onto this factor. Three of these items refer to respondents' experiences of severe physical assault in the form of battery: this person used a knife or gun on me (B30a); this person threatened me with a knife or gun (B29a); and this person beat me up (B28a). A further item refers to respondents' experience of rape: this person had sex with me without my

agreement (B38a). A further item which loads significantly - this person tried to stop me from going to school (B6a) - appears to not fit this factor. However, it is speculated that isolating the victim from public scrutiny would be a likely consequence of the perpetration of rape and battery.

This factor is thus interpreted as referring to the experience of severe battery and rape, and differs from factor 2 in that the physical and psychological consequences of experiencing those behaviours grouped under factor 5 are necessarily much more severe. With the exception of the experience of being beaten up (B28a), which is shared between the two items, the items of factor 2 may be of less physical and psychological trauma to the victim.

Factor 6

Five items load strongly onto this factor. Three items that load most strongly are clearly items that describe the experience of possessive and jealous behaviour: this person accused me of seeing other people of the opposite sex (B15a); this person wanted to know where I was all the time (B14a); and this person was jealous and suspicious of my friends (B13a). Two further items that load strongly describe the controlling behaviour synonymous with possessiveness: this person tried to stop me from doing things that I enjoy (B7a); and this person did not want me to socialise with friends of the same sex (B16a).

This item is thus interpreted as referring to the experience of jealous and possessive behaviour.

Summary of factors of experience of abusive dating behaviour

Six factors emerge which describe respondents' experience of abusive dating acts.

They are :

- Factor 1: The experience of humiliating and demeaning behaviour;
- Factor 2: The experience of interpersonal verbal and physical assault;
- Factor 3: The experience of blaming and manipulative behaviour;
- Factor 4: The experience of sexual harassment and rape;
- Factor 5: The experience of battery and rape;
- Factor 6: The experience of jealous and possessive behaviour;

It is important to note that Item 28 of Factor 2 (This person beat me up) and Item 38 of Factor 4 (This person had sex with me without my consent) are both duplicated in Factor 5. This duplication was retained since both items contribute substantially to the meaning of the factor.

7.5.2 Factor analysis of the perpetration of abusive behaviour

In order to understand how adolescents understand and group together the behaviours which constitute the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour, the responses of the full sample of respondents (N=720) was subjected to a factor analysis by the Principal Component Extraction Method. This was followed by a Varimax rotation. Pair-wise deletion of missing data was used so as to include the maximum number of respondents possible. Five factors with Eigenvalues of 4.55, 4.21, 2.70, 2.35 and 2.16 emerged. These five factors together explained 42.03%

of the variance. These five factors and the loadings of each item (represented by the question number, for example, D1a) are presented in Table 17.

Interpretation of the Factors

Factor 1

Nine items load onto this factor. Those that load most strongly are five items that describe acts of humiliating or demeaning a partner in an intimate relationship: I insulted him/her in front of others (D10a); I swore at him/her (D17a); I shouted and screamed at him/her (D19a); I called him/her names (D18a); and I treated him/her like h/she was stupid (D8a). One other item indicating the act of controlling a partner loads a little less strongly but nevertheless significantly: I ordered him/her around (D9a). Three other items describing acts of physical assault also load significantly onto this factor: I grabbed, pushed or shoved him/her (D25a); I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist (D27a); and I threw something at him/her (D24a).

It would appear that this factor is, in essence, describing the acts which are used as a means of dominating a partner: humiliating behaviours; controlling behaviours; and physical assault. This factor is interpreted thus as referring to the perpetration of acts of domination in an intimate relationship.

Factor 2

Seven items load significantly onto this factor. All these items describe the perpetration of acts of sexual abuse. The item that loads most strongly describes the act of rape: I had sex with him/her without his/her agreement (D38a).

TABLE 17

SORTED FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR

Loadings <0.45 or >-0.45 have been replaced with “-”

QUESTION	PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
D1A	I tried to keep him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family	-	-	.671	-	-
D2A	I interfered with his/her relationship with friends	-	-	.490	-	-
D3A	I blamed him/her for causing my aggressive behaviour	-	-	.554	-	-
D4A	I blamed him/her for my problems	-	-	-	-	.642
D5A	I tried to make him/her feel he/she was not thinking right	-	-	-	-	.574
D6A	I tried to stop him/her from going to school	-	-	.605	-	-
D7A	I tried to stop him/her from doing things that he/she enjoys	-	-	.476	-	-
D8A	I treated him/her like he/she was stupid	.602	-	-	-	-
D9A	I ordered him/her around	.496	-	-	-	-
D10A	I insulted him/her in front of others	.734	-	-	-	-
D11A	I put him/her down about the way he/she looks	-	-	-	-	-
D12A	I told him/her they couldn't manage on their own	-	-	-	-	-
D13A	I was jealous and suspicious of his/her friends	-	-	-	-	-
D14A	I wanted to know where he/she was all the time	-	-	-	-	-
D15A	I accused him/her of seeing other people of the opposite sex	-	-	-	-	.593
D16A	I did not want him/her to socialise with friends of the same sex	-	-	-	-	-
D17A	I swore at him/her	.680	-	-	-	-
D18A	I called him/her names	.617	-	-	-	-
D19A	I shouted and screamed at him/her	.631	-	-	-	-
D20A	I gave him/her the silent treatment, refused to talk to him/her	-	-	-	-	-
D21A	I was not affectionate towards him/her	-	-	-	-	.525
D22A	I changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	-	-	-	-	-
D23A	I threatened to hit or throw something at him/her	-	-	-	.497	-
D24A	I threw something at him/her	.464	-	-	-	-
D25A	I grabbed, pushed or shoved him/her	.501	-	-	-	-
D26A	I slapped him/her	-	-	-	.568	-
D27A	I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist	.499	-	-	-	-
D28A	I beat him/her up	-	-	-	.457	-
D29A	I threatened him/her with a knife or gun	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE 17 CONTINUED

QUESTION	PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4	FACTOR 5
D30A	I used a knife or gun on him/her	-	-	-	-	-
D31A	I called him/her sexually offensive names	-	.493	-	-	-
D32A	I spread false sexual rumors about him/her	-	-	-	-	-
D33A	I told him/her sexually offensive jokes	-	.480	-	-	-
D34A	I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures or books	-	.508	-	-	-
D35A	I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way	-	.563	-	-	-
D36A	I fondled him/her in sexual way without his/her consent	-	.780	-	-	-
D37A	I attempted to have sex with him/her without his/her agreement	-	.685	-	-	-
D38A	I had sex with him/her without his/her agreement	-	.784	-	-	-
	Eigenvalues	4.55	4.21	2.70	2.35	2.16
	% Variance Explained	11.97%	11.08%	7.11%	6.19%	5.68%
	Total % Variance Explained	42.03%				

The item referring to the act of attempted rape - I attempted to have sex with him/her without his/her agreement (D37a) - also loads strongly onto this factor.

The other five strongly-loaded items describe acts of sexual harassment: I fondled him/her in a sexual way without his/her consent (D36a); I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way (D35a); I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures or books (D34a); I called him/her sexually offensive names (D31a); and I told him/her sexually offensive jokes (D33a).

This item is thus interpreted to embody the perpetration of rape and sexual harassment.

Factor 3

Five items load strongly onto this factor. Three of the items pertain to the perpetrator's exercise of power and control over the intimate partner: I tried to keep him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family (D1a); I tried to stop him/her from going to school (D6a); I interfered with his/her relationship with friends (D2a); and I tried to stop him/her from doing the things that he/she enjoys (D7a).

It appears that the power and control described by this factor is a means of isolating the partner. A further item also loads strongly onto this factor: I blamed him/her for causing my aggressive behaviour (D3a). This item describes a powerful act of controlling a partner - that of shifting of responsibility for violent behaviour away from the perpetrator and onto the partner.

This factor is thus interpreted as describing the perpetrator's demonstrative power and control of a partner.

Factor 4

Three items load strongly onto this factor. These items refer to the perpetrator's threatened and actual acts of physical assault: I slapped him/her (D26a); I beat him/her up (D28a); and I threatened to hit or throw something at him/her (D23a).

The essence of this factor is clearly the perpetration of direct physical assault.

Factor 5

Four items load strongly onto this factor. The first item which loads most strongly - I blamed him/her for my problems (D4a) - again describes the act of abrogation of responsibility and agency on the part of the perpetrator. The other three strongly loaded items are: I accused him/her of seeing other people of the opposite sex (D15a); I tried to make him/her feel he/she was not thinking right (D5a); and I was not affectionate towards him/her (D21a). These items all reflect the perpetration of psychological control over a partner. It appears that the control indicated by this factor is motivated by feelings of possessiveness and jealousy. This control would be strongly supported by the perpetrator's denial and shifting of responsibility onto the intimate partner.

The essence of this item thus may be described as the perpetration of psychological control over an intimate partner.

Summary of the factors of perpetration of abusive dating behaviours

Five factors emerge which describe respondents' perpetration of abusive dating acts. They are :

- The perpetration of dominating behaviour;
- The perpetration of rape and sexual harassment;
- The perpetration of demonstrative power;
- The perpetration of direct physical assault; and
- The perpetration of psychological control.

7.5.3 Comparison between the factors of experience and perpetration

In comparing the factors that have emerged from the analysis of responses to the experience of and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour, there is a substantial congruency between the manner in which respondents have grouped the items of experienced abuse and the items of perpetrated abuse. Six factors emerge in the analysis of responses of experienced abuse and five factors emerge in the analysis of responses of perpetrated abuse.

The perpetration factor (Factor 1) describing the perpetration of acts amounting the humiliating or demeaning a partner has a very similar grouping of items to the experience factor (Factor 1) which describes the experience of being insulted or put down by a partner. The perpetration of humiliating and demeaning behaviour does extend to include some items of physical abuse. Respondents therefore

consider these physically abusive acts as being a component of humiliating or demeaning a partner.

The factors of experience (Factor 2) and perpetration (Factor 4) of physically abusive acts are very similar in their component items, with the experience of abuse differing only in describing a wider range of abusive acts. As mentioned, some of these items are included as part of humiliating a partner when considered from the perpetration angle.

The factors which describe the experience of sexually abusive acts, Factor 4 for experience, and Factor 2 for perpetration, also show evidence of substantial similarity. The only evident difference is that the perpetration factor includes a wider range of sexually abusive acts, from sexually harassing behaviours to severely sexually violent behaviours.

In describing the experience of controlling abusive behaviours, respondents have grouped these items into two categories, firstly, the experience of blaming and culpability-reducing behaviours (Factor 3) and, secondly, the experience of possessive jealousy (Factor 6). In the perpetration factor, similar acts of control have been grouped in two categories, the first describing the perpetration of attempts to isolate a partner (Factor 3) and the second describing the perpetration of control through acts motivated by possessive jealousy (Factor 5).

A factor which emerged clearly in the experience of abusive behaviour (Factor 5), describes the experience of severe physical assault (battery) and rape. The analysis of perpetrated acts has not established such a clear category. The component items in the case of perpetration have been incorporated into two different factors: the factor which describes physical assault and the factor which describes sexual assault.

7.6 Contextual Variables

Since abusive dating behaviour is not fully described by its frequency of experience and perpetration, a number of other variables were included in this study to provide a broader context for the understanding of these acts of abusive behaviour.

7.6.1 The degree of distress felt by respondents as regards both their experience of and their perpetration of abusive dating behaviour

Respondents who indicated their experience of abusive dating acts were asked to specify how distressed they felt about each act of abusive behaviour that they had experienced. Similarly, those respondents who admitted perpetrating acts of abusive dating behaviour were also asked to indicate how distressed they felt about the perpetration of each act. Responses were recoded as follows:

'like it' = 0; 'don't know' = 1; 'upsets me a little' = 2; 'upsets me a lot' = 3.

Table 18 compares the degree of upset felt by male and female respondents in response to their experience of abusive behaviour. Table 19 describes the degree of upset felt by male and female respondents in connection with their perpetration of various acts of abusive dating behaviour.

The factor analysis provides a framework from the respondent's point of view to understand both the experience of and the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour. This perspective, provided by the factor analysis, is enriched by examining the feelings associated with each act of abusive behaviour experienced and perpetrated. In the factors that describe respondents' experience of abusive dating behaviour, two items, item 28 of Factor 2 (This person beat me up), and item 38, of Factor 4 (This person had sex with me without my agreement), are repeated in Factor 5. This duplication is retained in this part of the analysis since it is felt that both items make a meaningful and important contribution to these factors.

The mean of the degree of distress for male and female respondents who indicated their experience of abusive heterosexual dating behaviours is compared across each of the items which are grouped under Factors 1 to 6 for the experience of abusive behaviour, and Factors 1 to 5 for the perpetration of abusive behaviour (An initial comparison over two factors, for both experience and perpetration of abuse, by gender and socio-economic class reveals that the inclusion of the socio-economic class variable does not substantially alter the means of males and females. It was decided, therefore, to restrict this analysis to gender only). T-values are calculated from these means in order to establish significant

differences. A meta-analysis using the standard normal deviate, z value, was used to combine the results of these t -tests for each individual item, in order to draw inferences of difference between males and females for each factor overall (Howell, 1992, p.192). This meta-analysis is possible if the t -tests of each item are independent and they test the same general hypothesis. One further condition of this meta-analysis is that each item's degrees of freedom are less than 10 ($df > 10$).

This method of meta-analysis, using the standard normal deviate, z value, is not possible on those factors with items that do not comply these requirements.

- (a) Factor 5, the experience of battery and rape, for which Item 30, $df=6$.
- (b) Factor 1, the perpetration of dominating behaviour, for which Item 24, $df=5$.
- (c) Factor 3, the perpetration of demonstrative behaviour, for which Item 6, $df=9$.
- (d) An independent t -test cannot be performed when the Standard Deviation = 0. This is the case for the following items which also refer to the perpetration of abusive behaviour: Items 8 and 27 of Factor 1; Items 34 and 38 of Factor 2; and Item 28 of Factor 4. This method of meta-analysis is thus not possible for these factors.

Thus, a meta-analysis using the standard normal deviate, z value, is performed on five of the factors (Factors 1,2,3,4 and 6) relating to the experience of abuse and on only one factor (Factor 3) relating to the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour. These z values are included in Tables 18 and 19.

The degree of distress associated with the experience of abusive dating behaviour

Over each of the seven items that make up Factor 1: The experience of humiliating and demeaning behaviour, the female means are generally higher, than the male means, indicating that they feel more distressed, but these differences do not reach significance. However, the meta-analysis of this factor reveals that when considering this factor overall, females respondents do experience a significantly higher degree of distress than male respondents ($z = -3.10$; $p = .002$).

In considering Factor 2: The experience of interpersonal verbal and physical assault, female respondents register a higher degree of distress for all but one item, though only three items reach statistical significance. Females are significantly more distressed than males with regard to experiences of being kicked, bitten or hit with a fist ($t(27) = 2.48$); being slapped ($t(71) = -2.19$); and being shouted and screamed at by a partner ($t(42) = -2.47$). The overall analysis of this factor also reveals that females respondents feel significantly more distressed than their male counterparts about interpersonal verbal and physical assault ($z = -3.60$; $p = .0002$).

In considering Factor 3: The experience of blaming and manipulative behaviour, female respondents again register a higher degree of distress for all but one of the items, though statistical significance is reached on only one item. Female respondents describe being more distressed than males about their experience of a

partner interfering with their relationships with friends ($t(77) = -2.06$). The meta-analysis confirms that, as regards the overall experience of blaming and manipulative behaviour, male and female respondents generally do not differ in the degree of distress felt with regard to these experiences ($z = -1.32, p = .09$).

The experience of sexual harassment and rape (Factor 4) is significantly more distressing for female than male respondents for three of the four items. These are attempted rape ($t(51) = -4.20$), rape ($t(27) = -2.54$), and being touched or brushed up against in a sexual way ($t(92) = -6.14$). The meta-analysis of this factor confirms that, overall, females feel more distressed than males regarding their experience of sexual harassment and rape ($z = -6.55; p = .00006$).

The analysis of the items comprising Factor 5: The experience of battery and rape, reveals that females indicate feeling more distressed than males for all three of the items that comprise this factor. However, a significant difference is recorded for only one item, namely the experience of rape ($t(27) = -2.54$). A meta-analysis is not possible for this factor since the t-test on Item 30 indicates a $df=6$.

The analyses of items under Factor 6, the experience of jealous and possessive behaviour, indicates that females feel more distressed than their male counterparts for all of the items that comprise this factor, though only three of the items reach statistical significance. In particular, they feel significantly more distressed about their partner wanting to know where they are all the time ($t(113) = -2.55$), their partner being jealous and suspicious of friends

TABLE 18
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALES AND FEMALES IN THE DEGREE OF DISTRESS
REGARDING THEIR EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR

EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR	MALE			FEMALE			t-value	df
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Factor 1 : The experience of humiliating and demeaning behaviour								
10. This person insulted me in front of others	25	2.32	1.03	24	2.63	.71	-1.22	47
11. This person put me down about the way I look	18	2.00	1.08	18	2.61	.70	-2.01	34
20. This person gave me the silent treatment, refused to talk to me	36	2.22	.96	30	2.40	.62	-.88	64
18. This person called me names	16	2.43	.81	21	2.89	1.10	-1.41	35
17. This person swore at me	21	2.33	.97	31	2.48	.72	-.64	50
32. This person spread false sexual rumours about me	21	2.43	1.03	26	2.62	.75	-.73	45
8. This person treated me like I was stupid	19	2.26	1.05	23	2.65	.65	-1.47	40
							z = -3.06, p= .002 *** Females experience higher distress	
Factor 2 : The experience of interpersonal verbal and physical assault								
27. This person kicked, bit or hit me with a fist	9	1.44	1.24	20	2.40	.82	-2.48 *	27
25. This person grabbed, pushed or shoved me	12	2.08	1.24	36	2.53	.77	-1.49	46
23. This person threatened to hit or throw something at me	11	2.27	.90	35	2.66	.64	-1.59	44
26. This person slapped me	24	1.96	1.20	49	2.45	.71	-2.19 *	71
24. This person threw something at me	8	2.63	.52	19	2.42	.61	.85	25
28. This person beat me up	5	2.60	.89	25	2.64	.57	-.13	28
19. This person shouted and screamed at me	23	2.00	1.00	21	2.62	.59	-2.47 *	42
							z = -3.60, p= .0002 *** Females experience higher distress	

*** p<.001 ** p<.01 * p<.05

TABLE 18 CONTINUED

EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR	MALE			FEMALE			t-value	df
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Factor 3 : The experience of blaming and manipulative behaviour								
9. This person ordered me around	8	2.63	.74	22	2.59	.73	.13	28
4. This person blamed me for his/her problems	24	1.79	.88	16	2.31	.79	-1.91	38
3. This person blamed me for causing his/her aggressive behaviour	22	2.05	.99	19	2.47	.84	-1.45	39
22. This person changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	27	2.04	1.13	44	2.39	.78	-1.54	69
8. This person treated me like I was stupid	19	2.26	1.05	23	2.65	.65	-1.47	40
2. This person interfered with my relationship with friends	38	2.05	1.01	41	2.48	.84	-2.06 *	77
$z = -1.32, p = .09$								
Factor 4 : The experience of sexual harassment and rape								
36. This person fondled me in a sexual way without my consent	20	1.85	1.38	24	2.08	1.06	-.63	42
37. This person attempted to have sex with me without my agreement	21	1.38	1.40	32	2.56	.62	-4.20 ***	51
38. This person had sex with me without my agreement	16	1.69	1.30	13	2.69	.63	-2.54 *	27
35. This person touched or brushed up against me in sexual way	46	.61	1.08	48	1.10	1.13	-6.14 ***	92
$z = -6.62, p = .00006$ *** Females experience higher distress								
*** $p < .001$ ** $p < .01$ * $p < .05$								

TABLE 18 CONTINUED

EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR	MALE			FEMALE			t-value	df
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Factor 5 : The experience of battery and rape								
30. This person used a knife or gun on me	2	1.50	2.12	6	2.50	.84	-1.06	6
38. This person had sex with me without my agreement	16	1.69	1.30	13	2.69	.63	-2.54 *	27
6. This person tried to stop me from going to school	6	1.71	1.38	17	2.18	1.19	-1.02	21
28. This person beat me up	5	2.60	.89	25	2.64	.57	-.13	28
(No meta-analysis performed)								
Factor 6 : The experience of jealous and possessive								
behaviour								
15. This person accused me of seeing other people of the opposite sex	39	2.21	.95	69	2.42	.74	-1.28	106
14. This person wanted to know where I was all the time	46	1.43	1.13	69	1.97	1.10	-2.55 *	113
13. This person was jealous and suspicious of my friends	38	1.92	1.10	61	2.48	.67	-3.15 *	97
7. This person tried to stop me from doing things that I enjoy	32	1.75	1.08	38	2.03	1.13	-1.05	68
16. This person did not want me to socialise with friends of the same sex	22	1.73	1.20	34	2.47	.90	-2.63 *	54

z = -4.72, p = .00006 * Females experience higher distress**

*** p < .001 ** p < .01 * p < .05

($t(97) = -3.15$), and their partner not allowing them to socialise with friends of the same sex ($t(54) = -2.63$). The meta-analysis of this factor endorses the finding that female respondents generally feel more upset than males with regard to their experience of jealous and possessive behaviour ($z = -4.72, p = .00006$).

The overall picture formed when considering these abusive experiences within the framework constructed by respondents, is one of female respondents experiencing more distress than their male counterparts with regard to their abusive experiences. The only items on which male respondents' means are slightly higher than females (though far from reaching significance) are the experiences of having something thrown at one (Male $M = 2.63$ and Female $M = 2.42$), and of a partner ordering one around (Male $M = 2.63$ and Female $M = 2.59$).

The degree of distress associated with the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour

The feelings of respondents relating to their perpetration of various abusive acts of dating behaviour was also analysed. The acts of abusive behaviour have again been grouped according to the five factors elicited in the Factor Analysis of perpetrated acts. Table 19 describes the significant differences in the degree of distress felt by male and female respondents about their perpetration of various acts of abusive behaviour and includes details of the meta-analysis, using the standard normal deviate, z value, of items comprising Factor 5. This is the only factor (as explained earlier) which meets the conditions of this method of meta-analysis.

In considering the items that comprise Factor 1: The perpetration of dominating behaviour, no significant differences in feelings of distress are indicated between males and females. Male respondents indicate feeling a little more distressed than females respondents about swearing at a partner and calling a partner names. Both sexes indicate that they feel uncertain about treating a partner like he/she is stupid, whereas females indicate that they tend to like throwing something at a partner.

No meta-analysis was performed on this factor.

In considering the items that comprise Factor 2: The perpetration of rape and sexual harassment, males and females do not differ significantly in their feelings of distress as regards the perpetration of any of the individual acts that comprise this factor. Interestingly, both sexes indicate that they like touching or brushing up against a partner in a sexual way and also like showing a partner sexually offensive books or pictures. Although only five females responded to this item, they all indicated that they liked showing their partner pornography. No meta-analysis was performed on this factor.

Analysis of the items that comprise Factor 3: The perpetration of demonstrative power, indicates that although males register somewhat more distress than females for three of the five items of this factor, females are significantly more distressed than males as regards their own acts of trying to stop a partner from going to school ($t(9) = -4.43$). A meta-analysis was not performed on this factor.

For Factor 4, the perpetration of direct physical assault, although females do indicate feeling a little more distressed than males regarding their perpetration of

TABLE 19
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MALES AND FEMALES IN THE DEGREE OF DISTRESS
REGARDING THEIR PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR

PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR	MALE			FEMALE			t-VALUE	df
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Factor 1 : The perpetration of dominating behaviour								
10. I insulted him/her in front of others	10	1.60	1.43	15	1.87	.83	-.60	23
17. I swore at him/her	10	2.20	1.14	26	1.58	.95	1.66	34
19. I shouted and screamed at him/her	15	2.0	1.13	21	2.10	1.18	-.26	34
18. I called him/her names	12	2.0	1.35	10	1.6	.97	.78	20
8. I treated him/her like he/she was stupid	8	1.0	0	6	1	0	-	-
25. I grabbed, pushed or shoved him/her	10	1.7	1.42	11	2.18	.98	-.91	19
27. I kicked, bit or hit him/her	9	1.44	1.51	8	1.38	1.19	.09	15
9. I ordered him/her around	8	1.63	1.30	12	1.08	1.08	1.02	18
24. I threw something at him/her	4	1.50	1.73	3	.67	1.15	.71	5
(No meta-analysis performed)								
Factor 2 : The perpetration of rape and sexual harassment								
38. I had sex with him/her without his /her consent	8	.75	.89	2	2.0	0	-	-
36. I fondled him/her in a sexual way without his/her consent	9	.55	1.01	5	1.8	1.10	-2.15	12
37. I attempted to have sex with him/her without his /her consent	15	1.33	1.18	4	2.25	.96	-1.43	17
35. I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way	32	.22	.55	15	.27	.46	-.31	45
34. I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures or books	16	.75	1.06	5	0	0	-	-
31. I called him/her sexually offensive names	8	1.25	1.39	6	1.5	1.05	-.37	12
33. I told him/her sexually offensive jokes	11	1.18	1.17	6	1.17	.75	1.88	15
(No meta-analysis performed)								

*** p<.001 ** p<.01 * p<.05

TABLE 19 CONTINUED

PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR	MALE			FEMALE			t-VALUE	df
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
Factor 3 : The perpetration of demonstrative power								
1. I tried to stop him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family	15	1.87	1.19	10	1.30	1.25	1.15	23
6. I tried to stop him/her from going to school	4	.25	.50	7	2.89	1.11	-4.43 **	9
3. I blamed him/her for causing my aggressive behaviour	13	2.38	1.19	21	2.05	.97	.88	32
2. I interfered with his/her relationship with friends	14	1.71	1.14	20	1.65	1.14	.15	32
7. I tried to stop him/her from doing the things that he/she enjoys	24	1.42	1.18	24	1.5	1.22	-.23	46
(No meta-analysis performed)								
Factor 4 : The perpetration of direct physical assault								
26. I slapped him/her	15	1.53	1.25	20	1.70	1.13	-.42	33
23. I threatened to hit or throw something at him/her	8	1.25	1.49	7	2.0	.58	-1.25	13
28. I beat him/her up	9	1.33	1.32	3	2.0	0	-	-
(No meta-analysis performed)								
Factor 5 : The perpetration of psychological control								
4. I blamed him/her for my problems	15	1.93	1.28	34	2.03	.90	-.31	47
15. I accused him/her of seeing other people of the opposite sex	30	2.20	1.03	52	1.85	.99	1.52	80
5. I tried to make him/her feel he/she was not thinking right	25	1.56	1.23	31	1.71	1.22	-.46	54
21. I was not affectionate towards him/her	20	2.0	1.21	29	1.34	1.20	1.89	47
z = 1.51, p=.13								

*** p<.001 ** p<.01 * p<.05

all the acts comprising this factor, none of these differences reach significance. Again, no meta-analysis was performed on this factor.

Finally, regarding the items comprising Factor 5, the perpetration of psychological control, male respondents indicate feeling a little more distressed than females with regard to accusing their partner of seeing another male, and withholding affection from their partner; while female respondents feel a little more distressed than males about blaming their partner for their problems and trying to make their partner feel he is not thinking right. However, none of these differences reach significance. In addition the meta-analysis reveals no overall significant differences between male and female respondents' feelings of distress regarding the perpetration of psychological control.

In summary, although some differences are indicated between males and females as regards their own perpetration of various abusive acts, only one of these (that of trying to stop a partner from going to school) reaches significance, indicating more distress felt by females about their own behaviour towards a partner.

7.6.2 Attributed motivation for abusive dating behaviour

A further important descriptive dimension of abusive dating behaviour is the explanation attributed to abusive dating behaviour. This study considered it important to examine these attributions both from the point of view of respondents who had experienced abusive dating behaviour as well as from the perspective of those who had perpetrated abusive dating behaviour. The factors generated by the

Factor Analysis were again used as a framework within which the abusive acts, experienced and perpetrated, are grouped. A descriptive analysis by gender was conducted on the selected categories of motivation.

The variable of socio-economic class has been omitted from this descriptive analysis, since its inclusion in an initial analysis over two factors did not yield substantially different results and the resulting cell sizes were too small to allow for meaningful interpretation.

Explanations attributed to abusive dating behaviour by respondents who experienced abusive dating behaviour.

Participants who had experienced heterosexual dating abuse were asked to attribute a possible motive for the perpetrator's abusive actions. Participants were asked to select one of the following motives for each abusive act experienced: this person loves me; this person is a bad person; this person feel jealous of me; this person was drunk or on drugs; I refused to have sex with this person; I was drunk or on drugs; this person was defending himself (for Items 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 & 30); or other.

The items describing the experience of abusive acts were again grouped into the six factors generated by the factor analysis. Appendix IV and Appendix V describe the number of responses by male and female respondents per category of attribution for each abusive act. Table 20 is a summary for each of the six factors of the average percentage of responses per attribution for males and females.

In considering the experience of humiliating and demeaning behaviour, 27.76% of female responses and 28.72% of male responses indicate that they believe their partner acted this way because he or she was possessively jealous of them. Male respondents also ascribed this abusive behaviour relatively frequently as being indicative of their partner's love for them (17.14%). Interestingly, far more males (13.53%) than females (6.22%) attributed their partner's intoxication as a possible motive. The reverse picture is true for females who, more frequently than males, attribute their own intoxication as motivating their partner's abusive behaviour (7.24% for females compared to 2.44% for males).

Male and female respondents ascribe similar motives to behaviour which is collectively described as interpersonal verbal and physical assault. 'This person loves me' is the most frequently endorsed motive for both males (24.00%) and females (21.23%). It is, in addition, important to note that of both sexes a comparatively high frequency attribute this behaviour to their partner being a bad person (18.53% of males and 19.26% of females). Again, relatively more males (18.68%) compared to females (10.26%) also cite their partner's state of being drunk or on drugs as a possible motivation for assault.

As regards the experience of blaming and manipulative behaviour, male respondents select with almost equal frequency three possible motives for this behaviour. These are that their partner loves them (20.75%), that their partner is a bad person (20.28%) and that their partner is possessively jealous of them (23.34%). Female respondents most frequently endorse the motive of possessive jealousy (27.66%) as the most likely explanation for their experience of these

behaviours. However, relatively more females (16.41%) also cite their partner's substance intoxication as well as their own intoxication (14.35%) as possible explanations for their experiences. Only 00.60% of males cite their own intoxication as a possible explanation for their abusive experiences.

The analysis of motivations attributed to acts comprising sexual harassment and rape indicates that female respondents most frequently attribute their refusal of sex as a primary motive for their partners' acts (24.10%), and, as a secondary motive, they endorse their partner being a bad person (17.85%). An almost equal number of females endorse their partner's (7.65%) or their own (6.35%) intoxication as possibly motivating their partner's abusive actions. For males, in stark contrast, the most frequently endorsed motive for these behaviours is that their partner loves them (31.22%). This choice of motive perhaps confirms the suspicion that this study's male respondents have interpreted the statements 'attempted to have sex with me without my consent (Question 37) and 'had sex with me without my consent' (Question 38) in a different way to female respondents. Clearly, their (male) experience as victims of non-consensual sexual experiences is interpreted as a more loving, less harsh and less forceful experience. In addition, males also appear to favour endorsing their partner's intoxication (15.54%) as a possible motive for their experiences, and in contrast to females, only 2.11% of males endorse their own intoxication as a possible explanation for their experiences.

Interestingly, in the examination of the experience of rape and battery, female respondents most frequently endorsed the motive that their partner loves them

(30.23%), and second most frequently: that their partner is a bad person (21.05%).

A relatively high number of females also cite their refusal to have sex with a partner as a motivation for their partner's abusive behaviour (18.33%).

An examination of the separate acts that comprise this factor reveals that for the behaviours that describe battery, the motive most frequently ascribed is their partner's love for them. Male respondents on the other hand, most frequently endorsed the motive of their partner being drunk or on drugs (27.41%). In comparison, females again endorsed their own intoxication (10.03% as compared to 6.56% of males) as a possible motive for their partner's abusive behaviour.

For both males and females who experience jealous and possessive behaviour, the most popular choice of motive is their partner's love for them (40.78% of males and 39.04% of females). A comparatively higher frequency of males (6.18%) again cite their partner's intoxication as a possible motive for their experiences. Their own intoxication, although cited by relatively few respondents of both sexes, is endorsed by more females (2.73%) as an explanation.

In summary, it is apparent that for the various categories of abusive behaviour, the most frequently ascribed motivations are that their partner loves them, is possessively jealous of them, their refusal to have sex with their partner and their partner is a bad person. It is evident that for male respondents the most popularly ascribed motivation attributed to abusive behaviours that they experience is that their partner loves them. From this perspective such behaviours are most probably viewed as evidence of a loving relationship. For females, acts of physical assault are similarly most frequently ascribed to their partner's love for them, whereas

TABLE 20 :
SUMMARY OF ATTRIBUTED MOTIVATIONS FOR EXPERIENCED ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR

BEHAVIOUR	GENDER	MOTIVATIONS							
		Loves me	Bad person	Jealous of me	He/she drunk or on drugs	I refused sex	I drunk or or on drugs	He/she defending him/herself	Other
The experience of humiliating and demeaning behaviour	Av. Male %	17.14	13.60	28.72	13.53	9.19	2.44		11.17
	Av. Female %	12.22	14.66	27.76	6.22	11.90	7.24		18.62
The experience of interpers. verbal & physical assault	Av. Male %	24.00	18.53	7.02	18.68	11.87	6.28	2.38	11.10
	Av. Female %	21.23	19.26	12.87	10.26	14.24	3.74	9.17	5.40
The experience of blaming & manipulative behaviour	Av. Male %	20.75	20.28	23.34	8.37	8.76	0.60		13.00
	Av. Female %	15.01	11.61	27.66	16.41	13.53	14.35		26.91
The experience of sexual harassment & rape	Av. Male %	31.22	7.53	11.90	15.54	10.93	2.11		8.64
	Av. Female %	15.56	17.85	0.78	7.65	24.10	6.35		13.38
The experience of battery and rape	Av. Male %	21.65	10.13	10.04	27.41	22.41	6.56		1.79
	Av. Female %	30.23	21.05	5.94	7.09	8.33	10.03		4.86
The experience of jealous and possessive behaviour	Av. Male %	40.78	16.39	23.57	6.18	5.95	1.65		4.55
	Av. Female %	39.04	9.95	21.97	2.93	5.72	2.73		8.59

their experiences of sexual assault are seen as primarily motivated by their refusal to have sex with their partner. Relatively more female respondents also endorse the motive of their partner being a bad person as an explanation for their experiences of physical and sexual assault. These results indicate that for many adolescents, their notions of love are intertwined with experiences of physical abuse and forced sex. When referring to own or a partner's intoxication as a possible motive for a perpetrator's abusive behaviour, an interesting pattern emerges which may be indicative of females internalising the blame for the abusive behaviours that they experience. It appears that females, more frequently than males, attribute their own intoxication as a possible motive for most of their experiences of abusive behaviour. In contrast, males generally endorse the culpability of their female abusive partner by relatively frequently indicating their partner's intoxication as a possible motive.

Explanations attributed to abusive dating behaviour by respondents who admit to perpetrating such abusive acts

Participants who acknowledged perpetrating heterosexual dating abuse were asked to attribute a possible motive for their own abusive actions. They were asked to select one of the following motives for each abusive act perpetrated: I love this person; I am a bad person; I am jealous of this person; I was drunk or on drugs; this person refused to have sex with me; this person was drunk or on drugs; I was defending myself (for Items 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 & 30); or other.

The items describing the perpetration of abusive acts were again grouped by the five factors generated by the factor analysis. Appendix VI and Appendix VII

describe the number of responses by male and female respondents per category of attribution for each abusive act. Table 21 is a summary, for each of the five factors, of the average percentage of responses per attribution for males and females.

In describing the perpetration of dominating behaviour, 40.05% of male responses attributed the perpetration of this behaviour to their love of their partner and 33.82% of female responses supported this attribution. A relatively high frequency of males (17.81%) cites their own bad character as a possible reason for their actions, indicating some feelings of culpability. However, a relatively high frequency of males (14.29%) also cites their own intoxication as a possible reason, which may be viewed as an endorsement of some mitigation as regards their blameworthiness. In comparison, some female perpetrators (11.14%) may also indicate a shifting of responsibility for their own abusive actions, by citing their partner's intoxication as a possible motivation for their behaviour.

An comparably high percentage of male (52.36%) and female (45.03%) responses attribute their love for their partner as an explanation for their perpetration of rape and sexual harassment. A number of male respondents, again, cite their state of alcohol or drug intoxication (14.92%) as being the reason for perpetrating these acts (while no females endorse this reason); or say it was because their partner 'refused to have sex with them' (12.54%). Some female respondents (23.94%) attribute their actions to 'I am a bad person'. Interestingly, a relatively high frequency of females (14.42%) endorse their partner's intoxication as a possible reason for their abusive behaviour.

In describing the reasons for perpetrating demonstrative power both male (42.47%) and female (49.92%) respondents cite their love for their partner as the prime motivating factor for this behaviour. A relatively high frequency of males also cites being drunk or on drugs as an explanation for their behaviour (18.12%), whereas a relatively high frequency of females (12.03%) cites their partner's intoxication as a motivating factor in their perpetration of these abusive acts. A relatively high frequency of females also cite being a bad person as a reason for their perpetration of these acts (14.20%)

As regards direct physical assault on partners, responses of males (31.11%) primarily endorse this behaviour as being due to their love for their partner. Secondly, males (24.07%) cite their own intoxication as a possible reason. It should be noted that no females cite this reason for their abusive acts in this category. However, female respondents do relatively frequently cite that they assaulted their partner because their partner was drunk or on drugs (27.06%), and also many cite being a bad person as an motivating factor (23.89%). Again, it is apparent that no males cite their partner's intoxication as a possible motive for their own abusive acts as described by this factor. It is important to note that a relatively high frequency of females (17.86%) also ascribe their physically abusive behaviour as being motivated by self-defense.

In considering the perpetration of psychological control, both males (57.36%) and females (45.55%) most frequently cite their love for a partner as being the reason for this abusive behaviour. Again, a pattern is evident with male respondents

relatively frequently citing their own intoxication (5.92%) in comparison to female respondents relatively frequently citing their partner's intoxication (7.58%) as a possible explanation for their abusive actions.

In summary, there appears to be some agreement in the analysis of responses of male and female perpetrators of abusive dating behaviour as to the motivation for this behaviour. Clearly, for both sexes, most responses indicate a love for their partner as the primary motive behind a wide range of abusive behaviours. However, female respondents' attribution of blame to themselves (I am a bad person) as regards their perpetration of sexually and physically abusive acts is noteworthy. In addition, the notion of self-defense, cited in the responses of some females as the motive behind the physical assault of a partner, is also important. An interesting pattern is also becomes evident when considering the role that respondents have attributed to alcohol and drug intoxication in abusive behaviour. Male perpetrators, it appears, have used their own substance intoxication as a mitigating reason for perpetrating a wide range of abusive behaviours. In contrast, female respondents rarely cite their own intoxication, choosing rather to cite their partners' intoxication as an explanation for their abusive actions and possibly thereby shifting culpability for their abusive actions onto their partner.

TABLE 21**SUMMARY OF ATTRIBUTED MOTIVATIONS FOR PERPETRATED ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR**

BEHAVIOUR	GENDER	MOTIVATIONS							
		I love him/her	I am bad person	I was jealous of him/her	I was drunk/ on drugs	He/she refused sex	He/ she drunk/ on drugs	I was defending myself	Other
The perpetration of dominating behaviour	Av. Male %	40.05	17.81	8.18	14.29	5.00	5.26	6.36	10.17
	Av. Female %	33.82	10.15	7.62	3.49	2.50	11.14	6.06	23.48
The perpetration of rape and sexual harassment	Av. Male %	52.36	3.79	3.59	14.92	12.54	3.10		5.78
	Av. Female %	45.03	23.94	5.24	0.00	0.00	14.42		7.28
The perpetration of demonstrative power	Av. Male %	42.47	10.59	6.93	18.12	14.92	0.00		6.95
	Av. Female %	49.92	14.20	8.21	3.00	0.00	12.03		10.03
The perpetration of direct physical assault	Av. Male %	31.11	17.41	10.37	24.07	10.37	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Av. Female %	15.00	23.89	4.76	0.00	0.00	27.06	17.86	5.00
The perpetration of psychological control	Av. Male %	57.36	15.07	5.62	5.92	10.71	1.04		4.29
	Av. Female %	45.55	11.58	8.85	1.70	1.62	7.58		20.20

7.6.3 The meaning of 'dating' to respondents

The concept 'dating' is used throughout the study, and in order to establish the context of this study, it is important to explore what 'dating' means to adolescents. Since this study has chosen to focus on those adolescents who have experienced abuse in heterosexual dating relationships and those who have perpetrated abusive acts in similar relationships, it is important to understand this concept from their frame of reference.

A descriptive analysis of the responses of male (N=347) and female (N=373) participants reveals some similar trends in the meaning of dating for both sexes. Table 22 describes the meaning of 'dating' for male and female adolescents. For both males (40.36%) and females (49.86%), the majority of responses indicate that 'dating' means going to parties, movies and discos together.

TABLE 22

THE MEANING OF 'DATING' FOR ADOLESCENT RESPONDENTS				
What dating means.	Males (N=347)		Females (N=373)	
	N	%	N	%
1. Seeing each other at school	33	9.51	56	15.01
2. Seeing each other after school	53	15.27	92	24.66
3. Going to parties/movies/discos together	140	40.36	186	49.86
4. Getting involved in 'petting'	27	7.78	19	5.09
5. Having a sexual relationship	46	13.26	11	2.95
6. All of the above	80	23.05	59	15.82

For male respondents, the next most popular choice of meaning (endorsed by 23.05% of males) includes the entire range of dating behaviour cited in the study (that is: seeing each other both at and after school, going to parties, movies and discos, 'petting' and sexual relationships). It is important to note that comparatively fewer females (15.82%) endorse this description of 'dating'. For female respondents (24.66%) the next most popular description of 'dating' is 'seeing each other after school'.

In summary, it is important to note as a context for this study that female respondents describe their experience of dating relationships as involving going to parties, movies and discos or just seeing each other after school. Most male respondents, although supporting this first descriptive choice of dating, describe dating secondly, as involving a wider range of behaviours, including a sexual relationship. It is also evident that comparatively few males and females endorsed the description 'petting' as being an appropriate description of 'dating'. Possibly, many respondents did not understand the meaning of 'petting'. This assumption is made on the basis of a number of queries during the administration of the questionnaire regarding the meaning of 'petting'.

7.6.4 The experience of family violence

The experience of family violence, both directly as a victim and indirectly as a witness has been linked in the literature to both the experience of and the perpetration of abusive behaviour. For this reason, this study believed it important, albeit briefly and superficially, to explore respondents' experience of family violence.

A descriptive analysis of the relevant data is presented in Table 23.

TABLE 23

RESPONDENTS' EXPERIENCE OF FAMILY VIOLENCE				
The Experience of Family Violence	Males (N=347)		Females (N=373)	
	N	%	N	%
B39. The experience of family members or people in the home hitting each other when they are arguing	89	26.97	115	32.67
B40. The experience of being hit or having something thrown at you by a family member during an argument	112	34.46	110	31.43
B41. The experience of seeing family members throwing things at each other when they are arguing	78	23.93	104	29.63
B42. The experience of seeing family members using weapons against each other when they are arguing	32	9.79	48	13.56

For female respondents, over 30% have both witnessed family members using physical violence against each other, and themselves been victims of family violence. For males who have experienced abusive dating behaviour, slightly fewer (over 25%) have witnessed family violence whilst over 30% have themselves been victims of family violence. For both male and female respondents a lower percentage have witnessed weapons being used in family arguments (9.79% for males and 13.56% for females).

Using two items of abusive behaviour described in both the experience of abuse section (Section B) and the perpetration of abuse section (Section D), descriptive analysis was used to explore the frequency of male and female respondents who had experienced or perpetrated these acts of physical abuse in heterosexual dating relationships, and who had also experienced the various categories of family violence as described by Questions 39 to 42 in the questionnaire. Table 24 and Table 25 display details of these frequency counts.

The two items selected of physically abusive behaviour are:

in Section B: B27. This person kicked, bit or hit me with a fist.

B28. This person beat me up,

and,

in Section D: D27. I kicked, bit or hit this person with a fist

D28. I beat this person up.

TABLE 24

The Experience of Family Violence	This person kicked, bit, Or hit me with a fist		This person beat me up	
	Male N N=9 (%)	Female N N=20 (%)	Male N N=5 (%)	Female N N=25 (%)
B39. The experience of family members or people in the home hitting each other when they are arguing	2 (22.22%)	7 (35%)	2 (40%)	10 (40%)
B40. The experience of being hit or having something thrown at you by a family member during an argument	5 (55.55%)	7 (35%)	5 (100%)	11 (44%)
B41. The experience of seeing family members throwing things at each other when they are arguing	3 (33.33%)	7 (35%)	1 (20%)	8 (32%)
B42. The experience of seeing family members using weapons against each other when they are arguing	2 (22.22%)	2 (10%)	2 (40%)	7 (28%)

From the above table it is apparent that over one third of females who are victims of physically abusive dating practices (in the form of being kicked, bitten or hit by a partner, or being beaten up by a partner), have also witnessed family violence and themselves been victims of family violence. In particular, of the female respondents who have been beaten up by a partner, 44% (N=11) have been direct victims of family violence. For males, it is apparent that 100% (N=5) of the male respondents who have been beaten up by a partner have also been direct victims of family violence, and similarly, 55% (N=5) who have been kicked, bitten or hit by a partner, have also been victims of family abuse.

It is also evident that 40% (N=2) of male respondents who have been beaten up by a partner have also witnessed family violence including the use of weapons in family arguments.

TABLE 25

The Experience of Family Violence	I kicked, bit, or hit this person with a fist		I beat up this person	
	Male N N=10 (%)	Female N N=8 (%)	Male N N=10 (%)	Female N N=3 (%)
B39. The experience of family members or people in the home hitting each other when they are arguing	4 (40%)	1 (62.50%)	3 (30%)	1 (33.33%)
B40. The experience of being hit or having something thrown at you by a family member during an argument	5 (50%)	1 (62.50%)	6 (60%)	2 (66.66%)
B41. The experience of seeing family members throwing things at each other when they are arguing	3 (30%)	1 (62.50%)	4 (40%)	1 (33.33%)
B42. The experience of seeing family members using weapons against each other when they are arguing	6 (60%)	1 (62.50%)	6 (60%)	1 (33.33%)

In considering those respondents who acknowledge perpetrating these acts of physical abuse, 50% (N=5) of male respondents who have kicked, bitten, or hit a partner, record that they have been themselves victims of family violence, and 60% (N=6) record witnessing the use of weapons in family arguments. Males who acknowledge that they have beaten up a partner also record a relatively high frequency of being victims of family violence (60%, N=6), and the same number

also record witnessing weapons being used during family arguments. Of the female perpetrators who record beating up a partner, 66% state they have also been victims of family violence

From the above tables, it appears that a high frequency of male, and a relatively high frequency of female respondents, who have experienced severe physically abusive dating strategies of being beaten up by a partner, have themselves also been victims of family violence; and more than half the sample of both male and female respondents who have beaten up a partner, or kicked, bitten or hit a partner, also record that they have been victims of family violence.

As stated earlier, these findings are interpreted with caution because of the small numbers involved, but nonetheless, they serve to link family violence to both the experience and the perpetration of physical abuse in dating relationships.

CHAPTER 8

DISCUSSION

8.1 Introduction

Prior South African research on abuse of young women, focusing mainly on abuse within sexual relationships, has highlighted young women's common experience of male coercive and abusive behaviour (National Progressive Primary Health Care Network, NPPHCN, 1995; Maforah, et al., unpublished; Varga & Makubalo, 1996; Wood et al., 1996). The picture present by these studies is that coercive and violent sexual relationships, though undesirable, are considered by young people as an almost inevitable and often common, feature of intimate relationships.

Few studies have presented a broad picture examining different strategies of abuse both sustained and perpetrated within adolescent dating relationships. This study considered it important to explore beyond sexually abusive behaviour, which has been the focus of the majority of adolescent studies in this field. Since sexual abuse in intimate adolescent relationships has been shown to be so prevalent, it is conceivable that emotionally, verbally and physically abusive behaviours may also impact on young people's lives. Following the lead of Fineran (1996) and Wood and Jewkes (1998), this study has also considered how abusive dating behaviour impacts on young

women and young men, thus affecting their physical, emotional, sexual and material well being. **The main purpose of this study is to provide a preliminary assessment of the magnitude of the phenomenon of abusive dating behaviour** (both sustained and perpetrated) as it affects both sexes and different economic classes within the context of adolescent heterosexual dating.

A number of contextual variables have also been examined since this study supports the argument that incidence is meaningless without considering context (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). The broad context is examined by asking respondents to report on what dating means to them. The family context is explored by probing both the direct experience of and the witnessing of violence in respondents' families of origin. The feelings evoked by the experience and the perpetration of these acts and the attributed motivations for the behaviour are examined since the way in which behaviour is perceived defines the act.

This study has sought to understand abusive dating behaviour from a feminist perspective, which firmly locates gender and power issues as central concerns. Following Fineran's (1996) lead, this study has sought to examine adolescents' attitudes as regards sexism, culturally prescribed male roles and the desirability of personal power, and how such attitudes relate to the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour in an adolescent population.

This study has responded to the call by some feminist researchers (Peplau & Conrad, 1989; Reinharz, 1992; Yllö, 1988), in using a plurality of methods to explore abusive dating behaviour amongst adolescents. As a result, this discussion will integrate focus group and survey questionnaire findings.

Finally, the limitations inherent in this study are set down, and the implications of this research are discussed.

8.2 The magnitude of the experience of abusive dating behaviour

This study has established, both in the focus group discussion and in the empirical study, that abusive dating behaviour is widely experienced by adolescents in high school. The focus group discussions highlight the ubiquitous experience by young women of abusive and coercive strategies in their dating relationships with young men. This supports the findings of other South African studies mentioned in earlier chapters (NPPHCN, 1995; Varge & Makabalo, 1996; Wood & Jewkes, 1996; Wood et al., 1996).

The empirical information gathered by this study both supports and expands on these studies. The prevalence of young women's experience of abusive dating behaviours is indeed confirmed. In addition, however, this study highlights young male respondents' experience of abusive heterosexual dating behaviour. This evidence of male victimisation runs contrary to the stereotype that defines females as victims and males as perpetrators. A number of other studies focusing on sexual victimisation within dating

relationships have reported similarly high rates of male victimisation (Fineran, 1996; Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995). It is feasible to anticipate, given the notion of a continuum of violence applied to female experience of abusive intimate violence (Kelly, 1996), that male victimisation could extend to the experience of other abusive strategies in dating relationships. This is supported in this study through male respondents' reporting of their experiences of a wide range of abusive strategies in dating relationships.

Some male and female respondents reported that they had experienced some of the abusive acts within same-sex relationships. However, it remained unclear as to whether these were experiences within homosexual or lesbian relationships. It is also possible that the dating nature of the relationship may have been erroneously identified, and the abuse may in fact have been incidents of peer abuse, such as bullying. Abusive homosexual and lesbian behaviour and peer abuse (such as bullying) are important areas for research, but the limitations of this study have necessitated restricting the to heterosexual dating relationships. This refinement of focus revealed that young women reported higher rates of victimisation in heterosexual relationships for most abusive strategies. This firmly supports the notion of the gendered experience of abuse in intimate relationships. The abusive acts experienced most prevalently by young women are those of jealous and possessive behaviour, physical assault (including battery) and threatened physical assault. The data, in particular, highlight young women's

vulnerability to physical assault in comparison to male vulnerability to the same strategies of assault. One in six young women experience the threat of physical assault or having something thrown at them by a male partner. This is three times more prevalent than the similar experience of young men. One in six young women experience being grabbed, pushed or shoved by a male partner compared to one in twenty-one young men. One in eleven young women, or 9%, experience being beaten up by a male partner, compared to one in forty-three young men, or 2%). This last statistic is evidence that young women's experience of battery in heterosexual dating relationships is four times more prevalent than that of young men. Makepeace reported, without differentiating between the sexes, a prevalence of 1 in 5 college students who experienced violence in a courtship relationship and Gamache (1991), who also did not distinguish between male and female prevalence, reported that one in ten high school students had experienced physical violence in dating relationships. This study's evidence that 9% of young women (1 in 11) experience battery in a dating relationship is confirmation within a South African context of a similarly high, if not higher prevalence.

The empirical study reveals that young men report being victims of almost all forms of abusive strategies in heterosexual relationships. The study does not, however, support significant evidence that young men are more likely than young women to be victims of any of the abusive strategies.

However, it does appear that a substantial number of young men experience

some of the more subtle emotionally abusive strategies. These experiences reported by young males are intuitively easy to understand since they support the gender role expectations and gender stereotypes of female assertiveness and control being expressed through non-physical strategies.

This study also reveals that male victimisation extends into the arena of sexual victimisation. The empirical evidence again reveals little difference in the prevalence of such experiences for males and females. Previous research on sexual coercion in dating relationships has highlighted that young men do experience sexually coercive and harassing behaviour in heterosexual dating relationships, however, these experiences are most commonly confined to milder sexual violations. Young women are more likely to experience more extreme sexual violations (Fineran, 1996; Poitras & Lavioe, 1995; Waldner-Haugrud and Magruder, 1995). Fineran (1996) considers a number of alternative explanations for female-perpetrated sexual harassment. On the one hand, it may be viewed as a rejection of feminine ideals and a mirroring of the male model of dominance, and on the other hand, it may be seen as retaliation against, or a resistance, to male sexual assault. However, regardless of its etiology, Fineran (1996) remarks on the variance of this pattern of behaviour to that noted in studies of sexual harassment on university campuses where male-initiated sexual harassment is dominant. This observation is supported by research on South African university campuses, where female-initiated sexual harassment is seldom

reported (Mayekiso & Bhana, 1997; Naidoo & Rajab, 1992; Sutherland, 1991).

Of particular interest is the evidence that approximately the same number of young men (5%) as young women (4%) report having experienced rape in a heterosexual dating context. This reported prevalence raises a number of questions. If a comparatively equal proportion of young males are indeed victims of unwanted sexual intercourse, as indicated by this study, what coercive tactics are used by young females to pressure boys into sexual intercourse? Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder (1995) report that verbal baiting, reflecting gender role concerns for men and women, may be the most commonly used tactic. Accusations of being a virgin, homosexual or impotent reflect traditional role scripts to which many adolescent males may be vulnerable. A further question centres on whether male respondents have interpreted this item in a different way to female respondents. Male responses may reflect traditional masculine role beliefs that men engage in sexual intercourse whenever the opportunity arises (Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995). Shefer and Ruiters (1998, p. 41) hold that central to male sex-drive discourse is the notion that males are "ever ready" for sexual intercourse and that sex is "a biological urge outside of their control". Aligned to the notion of a gendered interpretation is the suggestion that 'sexual intercourse without permission' may be defined as 'rape' by young females, and as 'seduction' by young males. If power is not perceived to be involved, the experience is much more acceptable, less threatening, and less

distressing (Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995). In addition, since many male respondents may feel it socially more desirable and more male-role congruent to admit to experiencing sexual intercourse, the notion of permission or consent can become almost irrelevant.

The narrative of abusive dating behaviour constructed by the focus groups supports the extent and range of young women's experience of abusive strategies. However, a great deal of the discussion centered on the commonplace nature of abuse experienced by young women, particularly in the arena of sexual relationships, and their feeling that men control and dictate sexual relationships. This confirms the findings of other qualitative studies which have demonstrated the pervasive nature of abuse in sexual relationships (Wood & Jewkes, 1998; Wood et al., 1996). The focus groups' discussions revealed little evidence of male participants' experience of abusive dating strategies. Some males within the groups referred only briefly to a feeling of being manipulated by their female partners. It is speculated that the social and cultural emphasis on a male-dominant power structure and machismo may preclude the public admittance of their victimisation by young men, other than by referring to the stereotypical notions of females as being devious and manipulative. Another potential explanation centres on the possible perception of an absence of a power differential in female to male abusive behaviour. Young males thus perceive the acts differently - either as not abusive at all, or almost certainly,

as less abusive than females would perceive them, and therefore less distressing (Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995).

It is thus apparent that both the descriptive empirical data and the qualitative data support the feminist thesis that the experience of many forms of abusive behaviour in intimate relationships, such as dating relationships, is a gendered issue.

South Africa, historically, is a highly stratified society divided along class and racial lines. This stratification impinges on all aspects of South African's lives, our beliefs, attitudes and behaviours. Consciously or unconsciously, young people's choices between the many ways of being masculine or feminine are influenced by factors such as socio-economic class and ethnicity (Shefer, 1997). Although this study has not examined the effect of racial stratification on respondents' experiences, it has demonstrated that for some respondents' their gender and their location in a particular socio-economic class is an important determinant of their experience of some forms of emotionally, physically and mildly sexually abusive dating behaviour. Young women in a higher socio-economic class experience comparatively more incidents of some forms of emotional abuse and some mildly sexually abusive acts. In comparison, young women in a lower socio-economic class experience a higher prevalence of some physically abusive acts such as being kicked, bitten, slapped and having something thrown at them. Young men's position in a socio-economic class

is also pertinent to their experience of abusive dating acts, since those in an upper socio-economic class appear to experience a prevalence fifteen times higher than that of their female counterparts of being slapped by a partner.

Having considered, firstly, the gendered experience of abusive dating behaviour, and, secondly, the inevitable intersection of gender and socio-economic class in the experience of this behaviour, this study demonstrates, importantly, that a respondent's socio-economic class is, for some strategies of abusive behaviour, a far more important factor or determinant of this experience than the respondent's gender. Respondents in a lower socio-economic class clearly experience the greatest proportion of abusive strategies. These are wide ranging, from controlling and jealous emotionally abusive behaviours, to verbal abuse and threatened or actual physical abuse. One in ten respondents in this lower class report their experience of physical abuse. This is eight times higher than similar experiences in an upper socio-economic class. Most significant is the comparatively high prevalence of attempted rape and rape reported by respondents in a lower socio-economic class. One in seven (approximately 14%) report their experience of attempted rape and one in twelve (approximately 8%) their experience of rape. Both of these reported prevalence figures are four times higher than those reported by respondents in an upper socio-economic class. Respondents in a higher socio-economic class demonstrate that their experience of abuse is qualitatively different, being characterised more by emotionally abusive, verbally abusive and

mildly sexually harassing strategies of control. These findings have some parallels with research into marital abuse (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1990; Smith, 1987; Straus, 1980; Straus & Smith, 1990; Yllö & Strauss, 1981).

While confirming the classless nature of intimate violence, these studies propose that abusers and abusive behaviours in intimate relationships appear to be more numerous in the lower socio-economic classes.

Previous South African studies have not reported on socio-economic class differences in dating abuse. However, much of the research conducted in disadvantaged, urban and rural lower socio-economic class communities in this country, has demonstrated that coercive and violent behaviour is almost an inevitable part of intimate relationships within these communities (Campbell, 1992; Mokwena, 1991; Shifman, Madlala-Routledge & Smith, 1998; Wood et al., 1996). This study has provided an important comparison between higher and lower socio-economic class experiences of abusive dating behaviour. The stronger emphasis of the respondents' socio-economic class as opposed to gender on their experience of abusive dating strategies is noteworthy. A possible explanation lies in the inextricable link between gender, class and race structures in South Africa (Vogelman & Eagle, 1991). The culture of violence that pervades South African society is particularly oppressive in the lower socio-economic classes. For the most part, this strata of South African society comprises those men and women who have been politically and economically marginalised for decades.

Violence experienced by young men and women in their dating

relationships thus becomes an inevitable extension of this culture of violence which is endemic in the lower socio-economic classes.

8.3 The magnitude of perpetration of abusive dating behaviour

This study provides stark evidence, both in discussion and empirical evidence, of a startlingly high incidence of perpetration of various acts of abusive dating behaviour. The discussions with adolescents focused primarily on male perpetration of these abusive acts. Although the empirical evidence in this study suggesting a relatively high incidence of female perpetration is not supported by the focus groups, it is to some degree confirmed by other studies on sexual coercion (Fineran, 1996; Muelenhard & Linton, 1987; Poitras & Lavoie, 1996).

A closer look at the strategies of abuse perpetrated by adolescents reveals that although males and females are both implicated in the perpetration of abusive dating behaviour, their choice of strategies differ. A comparatively higher percentage of young men report using strategies of control at the more severe end of the continuum. The perpetration of physical assault is reported by approximately 4% of male respondents compared to 1.5% of female respondents. In the arena of sexual assault, 7% of male respondents report attempted rape of a partner and 3% report raping a partner. This compares with 1.5% of females who report attempted rape of a partner and 0.68% who report raping a partner. It is interesting to note that 5% of females report mild sexual harassment of a partner by sexually touching or

brushing up against them.. Although still substantially lower than the reported male prevalence of 17% for the same behaviour, it is an indication that female respondents are implicated in sexually harassing behaviours, albeit of a milder nature than their male counterparts.

In comparison, a greater percentage of young women report using more subtle forms of psychological control on their dating partners. Twice as many female respondents (14% as compared to 7% of males) indicate perpetrating the emotionally manipulative behaviour of blaming a partner for their own problems. This pattern is, to a certain extent, congruent with the gendered patterns of abusive strategies reportedly experienced by male and female respondents. It appears that young men and women take advantage of gender differences and stereotypes in their choice of strategies of control. Particularly noteworthy is the obviously gendered pattern evident in the perpetration of attempted rape and rape. However, with regard to the reported experience of attempted rape and rape, no significant gender differences were evident. This lack of evidence of a strongly gendered pattern in the experience of violent sexual assault lends support to the argument that many young women possibly either do not admit to their experience of attempted rape or rape and, or may fail to perceive some actions as attempted rape or rape (Poitras & Lavoie, 1996).

Overall the evidence points to the fact that the perpetration of many abusive strategies is strongly influenced by the gender of the perpetrator. These

abusive strategies reinforce for young women their devalued, powerless and inferior status, whilst bolstering male machismo and the male-dominant power structure. The proportionally higher prevalence of female perpetration of emotionally abusive acts - such as blaming a partner for their own problems (twice as many females as males) - is a possible illustration of young female respondents' use of their perceived powerlessness to deny responsibility and agency for their problems. It may also be interpreted as a manifestation of young women's use of an alternative form of power which is assertive, but does not directly challenge men's authority (Posel, 1991).

The intersection of gender and class and its effect on the perpetration of some forms of milder physical abuse is evident in this study. Young women in a higher socio-economic class appear to be the most frequent perpetrators of mild physical abuse, whilst in a lower socio-economic class, young men demonstrate a proportionately greater perpetration of these same acts. This finding is, in part, congruent with the experience of abuse by females in a lower socio-economic class, who indicate a proportionately great prevalence of the experience of physically abusive acts than their male counterparts. It is interesting to note the tendency of females in a higher socio-economic class to use physically abusive strategies against their partners, again indicating a congruency with the high prevalence of the experience of mild forms of physical abuse recorded by young men of the same class. This may, once again, be construed as reflecting the way in which young women of this class actively mirror a model of male dominance which includes the

practise of oppressive acts; or it may be interpreted as a retaliation against male dominance.

A respondent's location in a particular socio-economic class also impacts significantly on the perpetration of certain strategies of abuse in dating relationships. Respondents in both a lower and upper socio-economic groups are clearly implicated in the perpetration of abusive strategies on dating partners. A difference is, however, evident in the particular forms of abuse and strategies used on their partners. Respondents in the lower socio-economic class are implicated in the perpetration of abusive dating strategies ranging across the spectrum from milder and more subtle strategies of possessive ownership and psychological control to more severe sexually abusive strategies. Particularly startling is the evidence that one in fourteen (7%) respondents in the lower socio-economic class indicate that they have attempted to rape a partner. This is eight times higher than the prevalence recorded for the upper socio-economic class. This evidence supports the experiences of abuse revealed by respondents in a lower socio-economic class, and lends further credence to the notion of the influence on intimate relationships of the culture of violence dominating these communities. Respondents in a higher socio-economic classes report perpetrating a comparatively higher prevalence of sexually harassing acts. This empirical data lends itself to reconfirmation of the understanding that the perpetration of abuse knows no class boundaries and that abusive dating partners occur in all socio-economic classes, although their strategies of

violence and control appear to differ. However, it is clearly evident that abusive dating acts are perpetrated most prevalently by dating partners in a lower socio-economic class.

8.4 The context of abusive dating behaviour

To add greater meaning and depth to the incidence data, this study has examined a number of contextual issues. A description of the meaning of dating to adolescents contributes a broad context to the study and locates behaviours within this context. Experiences within the family impinge greatly on the adolescent's sense of identity, belief and attitude formation, and consequent behaviours can be better understood within this context. The emotions evoked by the experience of abusive acts and the emotions consequent upon the perpetration of abusive behaviour, contribute largely to the meaning of the behaviour. In addition, the way in which the abusive behaviour is perceived, both by the recipient and by the perpetrator, defines the act, and thus examination of perceived causes or attributed motivations for the behaviour is important.

Dating is a concept used throughout this study and it is important to clarify the respondents' understanding of this concept. Some gender difference is apparent in this description. Most female respondents describe dating as involving going to parties, movies, discos or just socialising after school. Most male respondents supported this description, although many felt dating

also involved a sexual relationship. This interpretation is supported in discussion with adolescents, who emphasize the centrality of sexuality in their heterosexual relationships, and it is apparent that having a girlfriend or boyfriend is an overwhelming preoccupation for most adolescents. Notions of masculinity are evidently largely constructed through sexual relationships with girls and, similarly, notions of femininity are constructed in terms of sexual desirability to males. The discussions with adolescents clearly indicate that, for both males and females, their sexual prowess or desirability afford them positioning within peer groups and therefore evaluations of self-worth and power are inextricably linked to adolescent sexuality.

This study believed it important to examine, albeit briefly, adolescents' experience of violence in other important relationships, in this case, within the family of origin. Current literature has consistently reported an important link between violence in the family of origin, either experienced or witnessed, and violence in intimate relationships (Cantrell, MacIntyre, Sharkey & Thompson, 1995; Choice, Lamke & Pittman, 1995; Kalmuss, 1984; Walker, 1979, 1983). McKendrick & Hoffman (1990, p. 164) refer to the role of the family in teaching violent behaviour. The family is perceived as "the cradle of violence" since the experiences of violence in family life are often made manifest in later relationships. This study demonstrates considerable support for this notion of intergenerational violence. One third of female respondents indicate that they have either

witnessed or directly experienced violent behaviour in their families of origin. Of the male sample, slightly fewer (just under one third) have also witnessed or experienced family abuse. An exploratory link made between the experience of family violence and the experience of particular acts of physical abuse, as well as the perpetration of the same physically abusive acts, tentatively suggests that a high frequency of males and a relatively high frequency of females who indicated that they had experienced being beaten up by a partner, also report their own direct experience of family violence. A similar pattern is suggested for perpetrators of physical abuse: more than half the sample of males and females who acknowledge kicking, biting or hitting a partner, or beating up a partner, also report having themselves been victims of family violence. In addition, over one third of both victims and perpetrators of physically abusive dating acts have also witnessed family violence.

A further contextual issue is a description of the feelings evoked in adolescents by abusive dating behaviour. The empirical data examined the degree of distress evoked in the recipient and in the perpetrator of these acts. It is markedly apparent that although young male respondents record some feelings of distress about experiencing abusive behaviours, young females feel significantly more distressed about their experiences of a wide range of abusive acts. Gender differences are also apparent in the feelings evoked by the experience of abusive behaviour. The feelings attached to the act give the act meaning, and in this sense the act has a perceptively different

meaning for males and females in that it is viewed as more distressing by females and less distressing by males. For young females, each act of abuse experienced reinforces their lower status in the patriarchal hierarchy and contributes to the narrative of what it means to be female. For males, the negative emotional reaction is diminished because the act is not interpreted as an aspect of an over-arching system of control and diminishment, as it is in the case of females.

Perpetrators' emotions (both male and female) regarding their abusive acts are predictably a lot less negative. Some gender differences are nonetheless apparent. Young women certainly express more distress with regard to a number of their abusive acts, particularly those that run counter to feminine stereotypes. Behaviours that involve sexual abuse and coercion challenge society's feminine stereotype and this contradiction may be distressing to young women. Young men do report some distress about their dominating and controlling abusive behaviours. This is somewhat surprising, since these actions are traditionally viewed as supporting a male-dominant power structure emphasising machismo and devaluing feminine qualities. It appears that young men do feel distressed by some of their assertions of power, despite the conformity of these behaviours to the cultural norms that support a hierarchy of power in heterosexual relationships.

A further dimension which gives meaning to the act of abusive behaviour, both sustained and perpetrated, is the perceived motivation attributed to the

abusive acts. From the discussions, it is apparent that many adolescents exhibit a tendency to idealise their own and peer intimate relationships. Possessiveness and jealousy are interpreted as signs of love by many young men and women. The empirical study clearly supports this with both sexes reporting that their partner's violent behaviour, ranging across the continuum of abusive strategies, is motivated by love. Possessive jealousy is also viewed by many adolescents as an important motivating factor for many abusive acts. For many young women, explanations involving sexual denial and their partner's bad character are attributed to their experience of violent sexual acts, including rape. In contrast, young women's experience of violent physical acts including battery is understood by some as an indicative of their partners' love for them. Male and female perpetrators of abusive dating acts also most often attribute many of their abusive behaviours to their love for their partner. Young males particularly appear to view love in terms of notions of ownership of a girlfriend and their expectations of her sexual availability. This is emphasised by male respondents in the discussion groups who feel that sexual denial is an indication of sexual infidelity and that an acceptable consequence is punishment of girlfriend by beating. As something of a contrast, some young women who perpetrate abusive acts recognise their own culpability and cite their bad character as a reason for their abusive behaviour. Other female perpetrators cite self-defense as an explanation for physically assaulting their partners. Substance intoxication, which has been substantially cited in current literature as a vulnerability risk factor in

abusive intimate relationships, is endorsed by a number of male and female respondents as a possible explanation for abuse in dating relationships. The manner of this endorsement does however, link with gender issues around responsibility and blameworthiness for abusive actions. It would appear that female respondents are endorsing their culpability by citing their own substance intoxication as a motive for their victimisation, while male respondents clearly endorse their female partner's blameworthiness by citing her intoxication as a possible motive for her behaviour. Similarly, male perpetrators of abuse appear to use their own intoxication as a mitigating motive for their perpetration of abusive acts against their female partners. Female perpetrators also appear to abrogate responsibility for their abusive actions by citing their partner's intoxication as a possible motive.

Thus a picture emerges, true for both young women and men, of inter-twined notions of love and possession, physical abuse and forced sex, with some indication that young women feel somewhat responsible for their victimisation in abusive relationships.

8.5 Adolescents' attitudes and abusive dating behaviour

The issue of power is central to the feminist perspective on violence against women. Feminist scholars contend that patriarchy, which structurally places power and privilege in the hands of men and ideologically legitimizes this

arrangement, is the source of violence against women in contemporary society.

In discussion, adolescents emphasize the centrality of power and control in negotiating heterosexual dating relationships. Most males and a number of females support the notion that power and control rightfully rests in the hands of males. Respondents in these groups concur that masculinity appears to be inextricably linked to notions of ownership, the ability to control girlfriends, and to have a number of sexual partners. Male control is frequently enforced by threats of, or actual, physical and sexual assault. Young women feel powerless to challenge this situation.

The empirical study demonstrates in the main that many male and female respondents support more traditionally sexist attitudes to heterosexual relationships and also support conformity to culturally prescribed male roles. However, females in a higher socio-economic class show the least support of these sexist attitudes. This is in contrast to their counterparts in a lowest socio-economic class who report a support of a sexist belief system as strong as males in this same class. For females in a lower socio-economic class, the force of male dominance is most keenly felt in the pervasive culture of violence that is their everyday lived-in experience. For these females, support of the culturally prescribed norms of male hierarchy is most probably a means of survival. Posel (1991) proposes that patriarchal relationships can absorb the exercise of some degree of power by women,

providing male authority remains intact. It is speculated that within a lower socio-economic class women are able to develop and extend their powers on condition that they simultaneously adhere to patriarchal notions of 'proper' relations between men and women.

Regarding the desirability of personal power, most respondents record moderate support for the notion. Only male respondents in a higher socio-economic class indicate a more than moderate desire for personal power. This is possibly a reflection of the power inherent in being both male and positioned in the upper socio-economic class.

A number of noteworthy associations are demonstrated between the perpetration of abusive dating behaviours and adolescents' sexist attitudes, their attitudes that indicate supporting conformity to culturally prescribed male roles and their attitudes that support the desirability of personal power. It appears that the strongest associations between these attitudes and the perpetration of abusive behaviours are evident for adolescents in the upper socio-economic class. However, males and females appear to contradict each other in the direction of this association. Males in an upper socio-economic class who support both sexist heterosexual attitudes and conformity to culturally prescribed male roles have a strong tendency to perpetrate a range of abusive dating behaviours, from emotionally controlling and jealous behaviours, to physically threatening behaviour, to sexually intrusive and violent acts of rape. This finding is supported in the

literature by research which proposes that attitudes which support conformity to traditional sex roles and adversarial attitudes to heterosexual relationships are powerful predictors of attitudes supporting intimate violence (Finn, 1986; Muelenhard & Linton, 1987).

In contrast, females in this socio-economic class demonstrate that their lack of support of both sexist attitudes and conformity to culturally prescribed male roles is strongly associated with a tendency to perpetrate some emotionally and verbally abusive behaviours on their male partners. This association is intuitively easy to understand, since young women who do not support male sexist belief systems are more likely to be assertive in relationships with young men and, as in the case of males, abusive acts may serve to reinforce this assertiveness.

There is in contrast, a predominance of males in the lower socio-economic class who support the desire for personal power and who also show evidence of perpetrating abusive dating behaviours ranging from emotionally controlling and jealous acts, to severe physical abuse and sexually intrusive behaviour. Interestingly, although males in the upper socio-economic class record a strong desire for personal power (as mentioned earlier), this group shows evidence of being likely only to attempt preventing a partner from going to school. Females in this same class who also desire personal power are also likely to order their male partners around. The scale used in this measurement, the Index of Personal

Power, is an adapted version of Bennett's (1988) Index of Personal Relations, and essentially measures both an adolescent's ability to handle power and their expression of self-confidence. A number of research studies in South Africa have focused on the crisis of masculinity amongst males in the lower socio-economic classes (Campbell, 1992; Wood & Jewkes, 1998) and the inevitable use of violence, particularly violence against women, as a strategy to regain and assert status and power. These studies could provide a basis for understanding this study's demonstration of a strongly evident link between support for the desire for personal power and the perpetration of abusive dating strategies by males in the lower socio-economic class. Young males who, because of their class position, face a crisis of masculinity, resort to reconstructing their masculinity and power through the often violent control of young women.

The relatively small number of associations revealed by these scales is disappointing. A number of factors may account for this. First, the relatively small numbers in the analysis may militate against the evidence of stronger associations. Second, it would appear that these scales may have been inappropriate for this study. This is discussed under the limitations of the study.

8.6 Conclusions

This study has provided a clear indication that abusive dating behaviour is a widespread phenomenon affecting young men and women of different socio-economic classes in the Western Cape. However, the evidence of relatively high frequencies of male victims of certain abusive strategies and of females perpetrating abuse in heterosexual dating relationships, has also proved that it is a complex issue, which confronts a number of stereotypes and prior perceptions. Previous research emphasising the gendered nature of violence has positioned young women as victims and men as perpetrators (Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski, 1987; De Keseredy & Kelly, 1993; Wood et al., 1996; Varga & Makubalo, 1996). Few studies have reported female-initiated male victimisation, and those that do have focused on the arena of sexual coercion (Poitras & Lavoie, 1996; Waldner-Haugrud & Magruder, 1995). This study clearly demonstrates that both young males and females may be victims of abusive dating behaviour, but that their experiences appear to be qualitatively different, with abusive and coercive strategies generally conforming to gender differences and stereotypes. This study highlights in particular the gendered nature of abuse in intimate relationships with young women experiencing most of the severe physical abuse. Abusive young men primarily use physical and sexual force because young women are less able to resist given their size and strength relative to most men. Abusive young women, in contrast, utilise strategies that do not rely on strength, but focus more on emotional control and manipulation.

Gender differences are also evident in the feelings evoked by both the experience of and the perpetration of abusive behaviour. Young women indicate that they feel more distressed about their abusive dating experiences than do young men. In examining the motives which adolescents attribute to acts of abusive behaviour, young men's and young women's responses indicate the complex inter-twining of constructions of love, jealousy, physical abuse and forced sex. This finding lends support to the adolescent studies of Wood, Maforah & Jewkes (1996) and Wood & Jewkes (1998) and confirms to some extent the complex and grim picture they paint of adolescent sexual relationships.

The important role of socio-economic class in the experience of and perpetration of abusive dating behaviour is also clearly demonstrated. This emphasises the importance, in a South African context, of considering gender relations in conjunction with structures of class and ethnicity. It is apparent that the expression and the experience of intimate violence is particularly influenced by this context. Although this study has demonstrated that dating abuse knows no class boundaries, differences exist between young people in lower and higher socio-economic classes in the forms of abuse experienced, in the strategies of abuse selected for perpetration, and in the severity of the experience. Young people in the lower socio-economic classes evidently experience and perpetrate abusive strategies ranging along the whole continuum of violent acts, with particular emphasis on the more extreme strategies. Young males and females in the

upper socio-economic classes also experience and perpetrate abuse across the continuum of abusive strategies, although, the emphasis is clearly on the more subtle emotionally abusive acts, as well as some mildly physically and sexually intrusive behaviours. The culture of violence endemic to the lower socio-economic class in this country is proposed as a possible explanation for the exaggerated emphasis of socio-economic class in this study. In the lower socio-economic classes, adolescents experience violence as a common-place means of control, a method of gaining ascendancy and means of punishment. Parental violence and violence between men and women outside of the familyhome is, for many, a daily occurrence. Severe physical punishment meted out by parents and teachers, as well as peer violence in the form of bullying and intimidation by gangsters, is also frequently experienced by many adolescents within these socio-economic classes (Wood & Jewkes, 1998). It is no wonder that, for many, intimate relationships become characterised by coercive and violent behaviour.

This study has also provided brief and descriptive support for the link between personal experience of and witnessing of family violence and the later perpetration of abusive behaviour on an dating partner.

Qualitative and quantitative evidence is provided of the centrality of patriarchal issues of power and control in adolescent heterosexual dating relationships. Sexist attitudes and attitudes which support male privilege are supported by many adolescents, male and female, and upper and lower

socio-economic class alike. It appears that adolescents are strongly influenced by society's cultural norms that support a hierarchy of power in heterosexual relationships (Levy, 1991). Young males learn to exercise control over women and young women learn what it means to be a female and controlled in such a society. Evidence is provided of a link between sexist attitudes and the support of conformity to culturally prescribed male roles and the perpetration of some forms of abusive behaviours. This association exists most strongly for male respondents in a higher socio-economic class, whereas male respondents in a lower socio-economic class demonstrate the link between their desire for personal power and the perpetration of abusive acts on their dating partners. This study has also demonstrated some evidence of young women's resistance to patriarchy and rejection of domination. Young women are implicated in the perpetration of some forms of abusive behaviour. In addition young women in a upper socio-economic classes show evidence of resisting support of those attitudes that endorse sexist beliefs and conformity to culturally prescribed male roles.

8.7 Limitations

In interpreting of the results of the qualitative study, a number of limitations and threats to validity must be considered. Firstly, the effect of social interaction within the groups on opinion formation and the articulation of experiences may have resulted in some adolescents responding in a socially

desirable manner. This is particularly relevant in this study since the information pursued is of a sensitive nature. Equally, a low level of trust between peers (particularly apparent in one of the female groups) may have prejudiced self-disclosure. Secondly, the data may be biased by the influence of a dominant group member. This dominance was occasionally apparent in some of the male and female groups. Thirdly, the facilitator may have unconsciously influenced the discussion in the group by either the cueing of desirable responses or the selection and phrasing of probing questions.

In the empirical study, the process of translation holds inherent problems. Possibly the most important is that, despite the accuracy and adequacy of the translation, there is a need for cognisance of what a translation has allowed access to and what it has not. This is important to bear in mind in interpreting the data.

The lengthy nature of the questionnaire was problematic. The questionnaire was administered during school hours and some respondents had insufficient time for completion. Some respondents also appeared to lose interest. This resulted, in some instances, in too little data for analysis and the interpretation of a more generalised picture was prejudiced. This is particularly apparent in the analysis of the attitude scales.

The lack of representation of a 'middle-level' socio-economic class in this study may have influenced its findings. Although a middle-class category was initially represented in the data, this class was amalgamated with the 'best off' socio-economic class. The motivation for this decision is discussed in Chapter 6. The differences between the remaining 'best off' and 'worst off' socio-economic classes may have been so significant as to dominate the analyses, masking the effect of other important variables such as gender.

The measures of adolescents' attitudes selected for this study appear to have been inappropriate for a number of reasons. One reason may be because these scales are dated and reflect values no longer pertinent to present-day adolescents. In addition, these scales did not include any monitor of a socially desirable response format. Male chauvinism and sexist attitudes have received a great deal of media and popular press attention since the development of these scales, and adolescents may have responded to the scales in a socially desirable manner. Conformity in scoring is evident on all the scales.

Although the Heterosexual Relationship Scale and the Male Role Attitude Scale were designed for and used on adolescent populations, both recorded a low alpha in this study (.51 and .62 respectively). The Heterosexual Relationships Scale was marginally improved by eliminating 4 of the 13 items (.67 after eliminating items). Pleck et al. (1994) proposed that the

low reliabilities of the Male Role Attitude Scale may result from the small number of items and from the diversity of the sample. This may be the case in this study. The Index of Personal Power Scale was part of a larger scale (Index of Personal Reactions) designed for use on an adult population and adapted for use on an adolescent sample in Fineran's (1996) study. There is no established reliability for its use as a sub-scale.

An important consideration when researching sensitive issues is the feature of lack of disclosure. The literature on violence against women has consistently referred to the issue of under-estimation of the problem due to lack of disclosure (Cate et al, 1982; De Keseredy & Kelly, 1993; Laner & Thompson, 1982). This must be recognised as a possible feature of this study. In addition, there is also a possibility that some respondents may have either individually (in answering the questionnaire) or collectively (in the focus groups) exaggerated their claims of having experienced or perpetrated abusive dating behaviours. It should be noted that this study's claims of prevalence are, however, largely supported by international and South African research studies.

8.8 Implications

This study has clearly indicated that abusive heterosexual dating patterns are present and strikingly prevalent as early as adolescence. This is a time when young people are particularly susceptible to social influences shaping their

beliefs, attitudes and behaviours. In line with Kelly's (1988) assertion that the naming of an object is crucial to its existence in reality, this study has made a contribution to naming and identifying the social problem of abusive dating behaviour amongst adolescents and identifying some of the strategies of abuse, both experienced and perpetrated. This study has also demonstrated the inextricable intersection of gender and class in South African society in shaping the dating experiences of many young people. In addition, it has highlighted the sheer dimension of violence and harassment in the school environment in South Africa. This inevitably restricts the right of many girls and boys to participate fully in quality education, which is predicated on students being able to participate in safety, confidently and without fear of violence.

This study supports Vogeliman & Eagle's (1991, p.219) assertion of the dual role of educational institutions. The purpose of these institutions is to encourage the acquisition of knowledge and, in addition, to challenge, confront and question "undesirable social practices". In the school environment, values and ideas already established by the home environment may be reinforced or redefined and new values may be learnt. Traditional gendered forms of behaviour leading to gender oppression are learnt during early childhood years. These negative behaviour patterns can be addressed, confronted and changed by educationalists. Confronting these issues with the captive audience of primary school children is essential given the high

drop out rate after the first few years of schooling particularly in the lower socio-economic classes.

Teachers play a pivotal role in transmitting all forms of knowledge, including those that reinforce gender and class inequalities. For this reason teachers must question their own beliefs and implicit values. This should be an important aspect of teacher-training as well as in-service programs. If educationalists are to be effective agents of reform, the support of families and the broader community is also necessary. School-based programs need to interact with parents and communities if these intervention strategies are to have a chance of succeeding. Intervention programs at school need to address the gendered and social dimensions of violence and, in particular relationship violence. Individualistic psychological interventions simply promote the belief that individual-based pathology is the root cause of violent behaviour. Such approaches fail to consider how our society has constructed masculinity as naturally 'aggressive'. Although it is idealistic to envisage that the education system could eradicate the various forms of violence, and intimate relationship violence in particular, it is feasible to believe that through educational institutions this topic can be given a priority placing on the education agenda. In this way, school pupils' and educators' understanding and awareness of intimate relationship violence can be significantly altered.

For this altered understanding to be achieved, curriculum structures need to focus on :

- Imparting an understanding of how masculinity and femininity as we understand the concepts, are socially constructed;
- Encouraging school pupils to examine, question and challenge underlying meanings and social constructions that characterise the normative understanding of masculinity and femininity;
- Ensuring that school pupils understand the mechanisms of sex, the associated emotional aspects and what constitutes sexuality; and
- Examining and confronting the interwoven and contradictory narratives of intimacy, affection, power, control, humiliation and abuse. These narratives dominate sexual expression in our society.

These initiatives are likely to have maximal effects that will, in all likelihood, continue into adulthood. It is important that adolescent girls and boys learn to establish mutually respectful and non-abusive intimate relationships, and such interventions may well assist adolescents to build a stronger base from which to negotiate the difficulties, stresses and responsibilities inherent in adolescent and later adult life.

Domestic violence has recently become a priority item on the government's mental health agenda (Argus, 22 July, 1998). This initiative must be extended to include non-marital relationships from as early as adolescence. Legal and support services must be equally available to this sector of the abused population, although specifically tailored to deal with the unique characteristics of dating relationships.

For most young people, adolescence is a crucial developmental time that creates a readiness for adulthood. The experience of abuse, coercion and violence alters the lives of young people and influences patterns of adult intimate relationships. The findings of this study have contributed to putting this social problem on the agenda of domestic violence in South Africa. This study has also contributed to an understanding of some of the gender and class dynamics that appear to be inherent in this problem.

REFERENCES

- Abrahams, N. & Jewkes, R. (1997). Men on violence against women. Urbanisation and Health Newsletter, Medical Research Council, 34.
- Cape Argus. (1998, 22 July). How husbands get away with murder. Women's Week special supplement.
- Arias, I., Samios, M. & O'Leary, K.D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2, 1, 82-90.
- Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression : A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ. : Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action : A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ. : Prentice Hall.
- Barnes, G.E., Greenwood, L. & Sommer, R. (1991). Courtship violence in a Canadian sample of male college students. Family Relations, 40, 37-44.
- Beijing Declaration. Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, China, 4 – 15 September, 1995.
- Bennett, J.B. (1988). Power and influence as distinct personality traits : Development and validation of a psychometric measure. Journal of Research in Personality, 22, 361-394.
- Bograd, M. (1988). Feminist perspectives on wife abuse : An introduction. In K. Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), Feminist Perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Bowker, L.H., Arbitell, M. & McFerron, J.R. (1988). On the relationships between wife beating and child abuse. In K. Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), Feminist Perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Blumberg, J.M., Swartz, L., & Roper, K. (1996). Possibilities for intervention in wife abuse : Discourses among care givers in a community health project. In L.E. Glanz & A.D. Spiegel (Eds.), Violence and family life in a contemporary South Africa : Research and policy issues. Pretoria : HSRC.
- Braine, J.D., Bless, C. & Fox, P.M.C., (1995). How do students perceive sexual harassment? An investigation on the University of Natal, Pietermaritzburg campus. South African Journal of Psychology, 25, 140 -149.

Brislin, R.W. (1970). Back translation for cross-cultural research. Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 1, 3, 185 - 216.

Buga, G., Amoko, D. & Ncayiyana, D. (1996). Sexual behaviour, contraceptive practice and reproductive health among school adolescents in rural Transkei. South African Medical Journal, 86, 5, 523 - 527.

Burr, W.R., Hill, R., Nye, F.I. & Reiss I.L. (1979). Contemporary theories about the family. Vol. 1. New York : Free Press.

Burt, M.R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 2, 217-230.

Cantrell, P.J., MacIntyre, D.I., Sharkey, K.J., & Thompson, V. (1995). Violence in the marital dyad as a predictor of violence in the peer relationships of older adolescents/young adults. Violence and Victims, 10, 1, 35-40.

Campbell, C. (1992). Learning to kill? Masculinity, the family and violence in Natal. Journal of Southern African studies, 18, 3, 614-628.

✓ Campbell, C. (1993). Identity and difference. Agenda, 12, 45-65.

Cape Times, (1998, 4 May). Unemployment indices.

Cate, R.M., Henton, J.M., Koval, J., Christopher, F.S. & Lloyd, S. (1982). Premarital abuse : A social psychological perspective. Journal of Family Issues, 3, 1, 79-90.

Chinkanda, E.N. (1990). The victimisation of women : Some cultural aspects. Conference paper, Human Sciences Research Council Conference, "The nature and trends of victimisation". November 1990.

Choice, P., Lamke, L.K. & Pittman, J.F. (1995). Conflict resolution strategies and marital distress as mediating factors in the link between witnessing interparental violence and wife battering. Violence and Victims, 10, 2, 107-119.

✓ Cole, J. (1989). The role of lifestyle and opportunity in the female's vulnerability to rape. Social Work, 25, 4, 251-255.

✓ Cole, M. & Cole, S. R. (1993). The development of children. (2nd ed.). W.H. Freeman : New York.

Constitutional Assembly. (1996). Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act 108 of 1996. Cape Town.

Cotterell, J. (1996). Social Networks and social influences in adolescence. Routledge : London.

De Keseredy, W. S. & Kelly, K. (1993). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in Canadian university and college dating relationships. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 18, 157-159.

De la Rey, C. & Carolissen, R. (1997). Teenage pregnancy : A contextual analysis. In C. de la Rey, N. Duncan, T. Shefer & A. van Niekerk (Eds.), Contemporary issues in human development. A South African focus. Halfway House : International Thomson Publishing.

De Maris, A. (1987). The efficacy of a spouse abuse model in accounting for courtship violence. Journal of Family Issues, 8, 3, 291-305.

De Maris, A. (1990). The dynamics of generational transfer in courtship violence : A bi-racial exploration. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 219-231.

Deschner, J.P. (1984). The hitting habit. Anger control for battering couples. New York : Free Press.

Dobash, R.E. & Dobash, R.P. (1979). Violence against wives : A case against the patriarchy. New York : Free Press.

Dobash, R.E. & Dobash, R.P. (1988). Research as social action : the struggle for battered women. In K. Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park : Sage.

Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R.P., Wilson, M. & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. Social Problems, 39, 1, 71-91.

Drennan, G. & Levett, A. (1991). Translation in psychological research : Theoretical and conceptual aspects (Part 1). Culture, Medicine & Psychiatry, 15, 361 - 381.

Dutton, D.G. (1994). Patriarchy and Wife Assault : The ecological fallacy. Violence and Victims, 9, 2, 167-182.

Dutton, D.G. (1995). A scale for measuring propensity for abusiveness. Journal of Family Violence, 10, 2.

- Dutton, D.G. & Painter, S.L. (1981). Traumatic Bonding : The development of emotional attachments in battered women and other relationships of intermittent abuse. Victimology : An International Journal, 6, 1-4, 139-155.
- Dutton, D.G. & Painter, S.L. (1993). Emotional attachments in abusive relationships : A test of Traumatic Bonding Theory. Violence and Victims, 8, 2, 105-120.
- ↳ Durkin, K. (1995). Developmental Social Psychology. From infancy to old age. Oxford : Blackwells.
- ↳ Emler, N. & Reicher, S. (1995). Adolescence and delinquency. The collective management of reputation. Oxford : Blackwells.
- ↳ Erikson, E.H. (1968). Identity : Youth and crisis. New York : Norton.
- ↳ Everatt, D. & Sisulu, E. (Eds.) (1992). Black youth in crisis. Facing the future. Braamfontein : Ravan Press.
- Fineran, S. (1996). Peer sexual harassment amongst teenagers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Chicago.
- Finkelhor, D., Gelles, R.J., Hotaling, G.T., & Straus, M.A. (Eds.) (1983). The dark side of families. Current family violence research. Beverly Hills : Sage.
- Finn, J. (1986). The relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes supporting marital violence. Sex Roles, 14, 5/6, 235-244.
- Flynn, C.P. (1990). Sex roles and women's response to courtship violence. Journal of Family Violence, 5, 1, 83-94.
- ↳ Friedman, H.L. (1989). The health of adolescents : Beliefs and behaviour. Social Science Medicine, 29, 309-315.
- Gamache, D. (1991). Domination and control : The social context of dating violence. In B. Levy (Ed.), Dating violence : Young women in danger. Seattle : Seal.
- Gelles, R.J. & Straus, M.A. (1979). Determinants of violence in the family : Towards a theoretical integration. In W.R. Burr, R. Hill, F. Ivan, & I.L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories of the family (pp. 549-581). New York : Free Press.
- Goldner, V., Penn, P., Sheinberg, M. & Walker, G. (1990). Love and Violence : Gender paradoxes in volatile attachments. Family Process, 29, 4, 343-364.

- Graham, D.L.R., Rawlings, E.I., Ihms, K., Latimer, D., Foliano, J., Thompson, A., Suttman, K., Farrington, M. & Hacker, R. (1995). A scale for identifying "Stockholm Syndrome" reactions in young dating women. Factor structure, reliability and validity. Violence and Victims, 10, 1, 3-22.
- Graham, D.L.R., Rawlings, E. & Rimini, N. (1988). Survivors of terror : Battered women hostages and the Stockholm Syndrome. In K. Yllö & M. Bograd, (Eds.), Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Gwartney-Gibbs, P.A., Stockard, P. & Bohmer, S. (1987). Learning courtship aggression : The influence of parents, peers and personal experiences. Family Relations, 36, 276 - 282.
- Hall, E.R., Howard, J.A. & Boezio, S.L. (1986). Tolerance of Rape : A sexist or antisocial attitude? Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10, 101-118.
- Hamberger, K. (1994). Domestic partner abuse : Expanding paradigms for understanding and intervention. Violence and Victims, 9, 2, 91-94.
- Hamberger, L.K. & Hastings, J.E. (1989). Counselling male spouse abusers : Characteristics of treatment completers and dropouts. Violence and Victims, 4, 275-286.
- Hayes, W.L. (1994). Statistics (5th ed.). Florida : Harcourt Brace.
- Henwood, K. & Pidgeon, N. (1995). Remaking the link : Qualitative research and Feminist Standpoint Theory. Feminism & Psychology, 5, 1, 7-30.
- Hollway, W. (1989). Subjectivity and method in psychology. London : Sage.
- Hotaling, G.T. & Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence : The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1, 2, 101-124.
- Howell, D.C. (1992). Statistical methods for psychology (3rd ed.). Boston : PWS-Kent.
- Jaffe, P.G., Sudermann, M., Reitzel, D. & Killip, S.M. (1992). An evaluation of a secondary school primary intervention program on violence in intimate relationships. Violence & Victims, 7, 2, 129-146.
- Kalmuss, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 277-286.
- Kalmuss, D. & Straus, M.A. (1990). Wife's marital dependency and wife abuse. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical violence in American Families. New Brunswick, NJ. : Transaction.

- Kasian, M. & Painter, S.L. (1992). Frequency and severity of psychological abuse in a dating population. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7, 3, 350-364.
- Kaufman, M. (1987). The construction of masculinity and the triad of men's violence. In M. Kaufman (Ed.), Beyond Patriarchy : Essays by men on pleasure, power and change. Toronto : Oxford University Press.
- Kelly, L. (1988). How women define their experiences of violence. In K. Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Kline, P. (1986). A handbook of test construction. London : Methuen.
- Koss, M.P., Gidycz, C.A. & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape : Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimisation 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 victimisation. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50, 3, 455 - 457.
- ✓ Kroger, J. (1989). Identity in adolescence : The balance between self and other. London : Routledge.
- Krueger, R.A. (1994). Focus groups. A practical guide for applied research (2nd ed.). California : Sage.
- Labuschagne, J.M. (1981). Non-consensual sexual offenses. Journal of Contemporary Roman-Dutch Law, 44, 18.
- Labuschagne, I. & van der Hoven A. (1988). Slagoffer – belewenis. In C. H. Cilliers (Ed.), Victimologie. Pretoria : Haum.
- Lane, K.E. & Gwartney-Gibbs, P.A. (1985). Violence in the context of dating and sex. Journal of Family Issues, 6, 1, 45-59.
- Laner, M.R. & Thompson, J. (1982). Abuse and aggression in courting couples. Deviant Behaviour, 3, 229-244.
- Larken, J. & Popaleni, K. (1994). Heterosexual courtship violence and sexual harassment : The public and private control of young women. Feminism and Psychology, 4, 2, 213-227.
- Lee, R.M. (1993). Doing research on sensitive topics. London : Sage.
- Lenton, R.L. (1995). Power versus feminist theories of wife abuse. Canadian Journal of Criminology, July, 305-330.

- Letellier, P. (1994). Gay and bisexual male domestic violence victimisation : Challenges to feminist theory and responses to violence. Violence and Victims, 9, 2, 95-106.
- Levy, B. (Ed.) (1991). Dating violence : Young women in danger. Seattle : Seal.
- Lockhart, L.L. (1987). A re-examination of the effects of race and social class on the incidence of marital violence : A search for reliable differences. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49, 603-610.
- Loseke, D.R. (1992). The battered woman and shelters : The social construction of wife abuse. New York : State University Press.
- Maforah, F., Vundule, C., Jewkes, R., & Jordaan E., (unpublished). A case control study of teenage pregnancy in Khayelitsha, Cape Town. Tygerberg : Medical Research Council.
- Makepeace, J.M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. Family Relations, 30, 97-102.
- Makepeace, J.M. (1983). Life events stress and courtship violence. Family Relations, 32, 101-109.
- Makepeace, J.M. (1986). Gender Differences in Courtship. Violence victimization. Family Relations, 35, 383-388.
- Marcia, J. (1980). Identity in adolescence. In J. Adelson (Ed.), Handbook of adolescent psychology. New York : Wiley.
- Mayekiso, T.V. & Bhana, K. (1997). Sexual harassment : perceptions and experiences of students at the University of Transkei. South African Journal of Psychology, 27, 4, 230 - 235.
- McKendrick B. & Hoffman W. (Eds.) (1990). People and violence in South Africa. Cape Town : Oxford University Press.
- Meyer, J., Loxton, H. & Boulter, S. (1997). A systems approach to the enhancement of the self-concept. In C. de la Rey, N. Duncan, T. Shefer and A. van Niekerk (Eds.), Contemporary issues in human development. A South African focus. Halfway House : International Thomson Publishing.
- Miller, S.L. (1994). Expanding the boundaries : Toward a more inclusive and integrated study of intimate violence. Violence and Victims, 9, 2, 183-194.
- Mokwena, S. (1991). The era of the Jackrollers : Contextualising the rise of youth gangs in Soweto. Johannesburg : The Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

- Mokwena S. (1992). Living on the wrong side of the law. Marginalisation, youth and violence. In D. Everatt & E. Sisulu (Eds.). Black Youth in Crisis. Facing the future. Braamfontein : Ravan Press.
- Morgan, D.L. (Ed.) (1988). Successful focus groups. Advancing the state of the art. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Moser, C.A. & Kalton, G. (1971). Survey Methods in social investigation. London : Heinemann.
- ✓ Mostyn, B. (1985). The content analysis of qualitative research data : A dynamic approach. In M. Brenner, J. Brown & D. Canter (Eds.), The research interview. Uses and approaches. London : The Academic Press.
- Moolman, C., van der Westhuizen, J., & Brown, A. (1983). The R-factor is rape. Pretoria : Procon.
- Morse, B.J. (1995). Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scale : Assessing gender differences in partner violence. Violence and Victims, 10, 4, 251-272.
- Mtuzi, P.T. (1990). Problems of equivalence and adequacy in a trilingual context. South African Journal of Linguistics, 8, 1, 30 – 32.
- 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.
- Naidoo, L.R. & Rajab D., (1992). A survey of sexual harassment and related issues among students at the University of Natal. University of Natal Student Counselling Centre, Durban.
- National Progressive Primary Health Care Network (NPPHCN). (1995). Youth speak out for a healthy future : A study on youth sexuality. Braamfontein : NPPHCN/UNICEF.
- Norris, J., Nurvis, P.S. & Dimeff, L.A. (1996). Through her eyes : Factors affecting women's perception of and resistance to acquaintance sexual aggression threat. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20, 123-145.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978). Psychometric Theory (2nd ed.). New York : McGraw-Hill.
- ✓ Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women : A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), Doing feminist research. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Penn-Kekana, L. (1997). Gender violence in South Africa : Causes effects and responses. Urbanisation and Health Newsletter, South African Medical Research Council, 34.
- Peplau , L.A. & Conrad, E. (1989). Feminist methods in Psychology. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13, 379-400.
- Pirog-Good, M.A. & Stets, J.E. (Eds.) (1989). Violence in dating relationships. Emerging social issues. New York : Praeger.
- Poitras, M. & Lavoie, F. (1995). A study of the prevalence of sexual coercion in adolescent heterosexual dating relationships in a Quebec sample. Violence & Victims, 10, 4, 299-313.
- Pleck, J.H., Sonenstein, F.L. & Ku, L.C. (1994). Attitudes towards male roles among adolescent males : A discriminant validity analysis. Sex Roles, 30, 481 - 501.
- Posel, D. (1991). Women's powers, men's authority : Rethinking patriarchy. Unpublished paper for Conference on Women and Gender in Southern Africa.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). Feminist methods in social research. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Renzetti, C.M. (1992). Violent betrayal : partner abuse in lesbian relationships. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Renzetti, C.M. (1994). On dancing with a bear : Reflections on some of the current debates among domestic violence theorists. Violence and Victims, 9, 2, 195-200.
- Richter, L. (1996). A survey of reproductive health issues among urban Black youth in South Africa. Final report for Society for Family Health.
- Rosenbaum, A. & O'Leary, K.D. (1981). Marital violence : Characteristics of abusive couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 63-71.
- Rosenthal, S.L., Lewis, L.M. & Cohen, S.S. (1996). Issues related to the sexual decision-making of inner-city adolescent girls. Adolescence, 31, 123, 731-739.
- Rosewater, L.B. (1988). Battered or schizophrenic? Psychological tests can't tell. In K. Yllö & M. Bograd, (Eds.), Feminist Perspectives on wife abuse (pp.200-216). Newbury Park : Sage.
- Roy, M. (Ed.) (1977). Battered women : A psychosociological study of domestic violence. New York : Van Nostrand Reinhold.

- Russell, D.E.H. (1982). Rape in Marriage. New York : Macmillan.
- Russell, D.E.H. (1984). Sexual Exploitation. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Russell, D.E.H. (1991). Rape & child sexual abuse in Soweto : An interview with community leader, Mary Mabaso. South African Sociological Review, 3, 2, 62 – 83.
- Russell, D.E.H. (1993). The story of Lulu Diba. Acquaintance rape at a rural university. Agenda, 16.
- Russell, D., Hansson, D. & van Zyl, M. (1992). A selected bibliography of male violence against women and girls in South Africa. Institute of Criminology, University of Cape Town.
- Saunders, D. (1988). Wife abuse, husband abuse, or mutual combat ? A feminist perspective on the empirical findings. In K Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Shaik, F. & Park, Y.J. (1998). The fight against violence against women in South Africa. Lola Press, 8, 4 – 6.
- Shefer, T. (1997). The making of the gendered self. In C. de la Rey, N. Duncan, T. Shefer & A. van Niekerk (Eds.), Contemporary issues in human development. A South African focus. Halfway House : International Thomson Publishing.
- Shefer, T. & Ruiters, K. (1998). The masculine construct in heterosex. Agenda, 37, 39 – 45.
- Sheinberg, M. & Penn, P. (1991). Gender dilemmas, gender questions and the gender mantra. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 17, 1, 33-44.
- Shifman, P., Madlala-Routledge, N. & Smith, V. (1998). Women in Parliament caucus for action to end violence. Agenda, 36, 23 – 26.
- Simpson, G. (1991). Explaining sexual violence : Some background factors in the current socio-political context. Johannesburg : Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.
- Smith, M.D. (1987). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in Toronto. Violence and Victims, 2, 3, 173-187.
- Smith, M.D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating : A test of a feminist hypothesis. Violence and Victims, 5, 4, 257-273.

- Snell, J.E., Rosewald, R.J. & Robey, A. (1964). The wife beater's wife. Archives of General Psychiatry, 4, 107-112.
- Soul City, (1997). Violence against women. A report compiled by Social Services (Pty) Ltd., Johannesburg.
- Spence, J. T. & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). Masculinity and femininity. Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents. Austin & London : University of Texas Press.
- Stanton, S. (1993). A qualitative and quantitative analysis of empirical data on violence against women in Greater Cape Town from 1989 – 1991. Institute of Criminology, University of Cape Town, Research Report Series .
- Stets, J.E. & Pirog-Good, M.A. (1987). Violence in Dating Relationships. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50, 3, 237-246.
- Stets, J.E. & Straus, M.A. (1990a). The marriage license is a hitting license : A comparison of assaults in dating and cohabiting couples and married couples. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical Violence in American Families. New Brunswick, NJ. : Transaction.
- Stets, J.E. & Straus, M.A. (1990b). Gender difference in reporting marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical Violence in American Families. New Brunswick, NJ. : Transaction.
- Stewart, D.W. & Shamdasani, P.N. (1990). Focus groups . Theory and practice. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Straus, M.A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence : The Conflict Tactics Scale. 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. 223-36). Minneapolis : University of Minnesota Press.
- Straus, M.A. & Gelles, R.A. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed in two national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 465-480.
- Straus, M.A. & Gelles, R.A. (Eds.) (1990). Physical violence in American Families. New Brunswick, NJ. : Transaction.
- Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J. & Steinmetz, S.K. (Eds.) (1980). Behind closed doors : Violence in the American Family. New York : Anchor Press.

- Straus, M.A. & Hotaling, G.T. (Eds.) (1980). The social causes of husband-wife violence. Minnesota : University of Minnesota Press.
- Straus, M.A. & Smith, C. (1990). Violence in Hispanic Families in the United States : Incidence rates and structural interpretations. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical Violence in American Families. New Brunswick, NJ. : Transaction.
- Sugarman, D.B. & Hotaling, G.T. (1989). Dating violence : Prevalence, context and riskmarkers. In M.A. Pirog-Good & J.E. Stets (Eds.), Violence in dating relationships : Emerging social issues. New York : Praeger.
- Sutherland, C. (1991). Sexual harassment : A darker side of campus life. Agenda : A journal about women and gender, 11, 7 - 10.
- Thorne-Finch, R. (1992). Ending the Silence. The origins and treatment of male violence against women. Toronto : Toronto University Press.
- Urban Studies Surveys & Land Information Branch (1996). Levels of living in the Cape Metropolitan Area. The social health and well-being of the communities of the Cape Metropolitan Area. City Planner's Department, Cape Town.
- Van Zyl, M. (1988). A victimology study of women in the Western Cape. Research Report. Pretoria : HSRC.
- Van Zyl, M., Vienings, I. & Kleeberg, C. (1987). Violence as a means of control. (Part 2). The experiences of battered women in the Cape Town Rape Crisis shelter. Conference paper, ASSA National Conference.
- Van der Hoven, A.E. (1988). Social Factors conducive to family violence. Acta Criminologica, 1, 1, 34 - 50.
- Varga, C. & Makubalo, E. (1996). Sexual (non-)negotiation among black African teenagers in Durban, South Africa. Agenda, 28; 31 - 38.
- ✓ Vogelman, L. (1995). The sexual face of violence : Rapists on rape. Johannesburg : Ravan Press.
- ✓ Vogelman, L. & Eagle, G. (1991). Overcoming endemic violence against women in South Africa. Social Justice, 18, 1-2, 209-229.
- Waldner-Haugrud, L. & Magruder, B. (1995). Male and female victimisation in dating relationships : Gender differences in coercion techniques and outcomes. Violence & Victims, 10, 3, 203 - 215.
- Walker, L.E. (1979). The battered woman syndrome. New York : Harper and Row.

- Walker, L.E. (1983). The battered woman syndrome study. In D. Finkelhor, R. Gelles, G.T. Hotaling, & M.A. Straus (Eds.), The dark side of families : Current family violence research. Beverley Hills : Sage.
- Walker, L.E. (1984). The battered woman syndrome. New York : Springer.
- Warnken, W.J., Rosenbaum, A., Fletcher, K.E., Hoge, S.K. & Adelman, S.A. (1994). Head injured males : A population at risk for relationship aggression. Violence and Victims, 9, 2, 153-166.
- Welch, G.J. (1987). Cognitive behavioural intervention for spouse abuse. Social Work, 23, 3 153 - 159.
- Wood, K. & Jewkes R., (1998). 'Love is a dangerous thing' : micro-dynamics of violence in sexual relationships of young people in Umtata. Pretoria : CERSA, Women's Health, Medical Research Council.
- Wood, K., Maforah, F. & Jewkes, R.. (1996). Sex, violence and constructions of love amongst Xhosa adolescents : Putting violence on the sexuality agenda. Tygerberg : CERSA, Women's Health, Medical Research Council.
- Yllö, K. (1984). The status of women, marital equality, and violence against wives. A contextual analysis. Journal of Family Issues, 5, 307-320.
- Yllö, K. (1988). Political and methodological debates in wife abuse research. In K. Yllö & M. Bograd (Eds.), Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Yllö, K. & Bograd, M. (1988). Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park : Sage.
- Yllö, K. & Straus, M.A. (1981). Interpersonal violence among married and cohabiting couples. Family Relations, 30, 339-347.
- Zeller, R.A. (1993). Focus group research on sensitive topics. In D.L. Morgan (Ed.), Successful focus groups. Advancing the state of the art. Newburg Park : Sage.

APPENDIX I

CASE HISTORY PRESENTED TO THE FOCUS GROUPS

This is the story of Sarah :

I was twelve when our family moved to a new area. This meant that I had to go to a new school. Looking back, I know I fell in with the wrong crowd, but at the time, it seemed cool to smoke and later to take drugs and drink. I felt that to fit in with these friends I would have to do all of the things that they were doing. Then I met this guy, Andy. He was so cute; all my friends loved him and all of us would have given anything to be with him. He was so cool looking. He was what seemed to be perfect at the time. I was quite pretty too, quite thin and sporty. I competed in gymnastics – until I stopped because he wanted to spend more time with me.

At first things were great. The first three months or so I thought things could not be better. My family really liked him, and my friends told me all the time how lucky I was to get him. He really spoiled me with so much attention, wanting to be with me all the time and saying how much he missed me when we were apart. He was often quite jealous when I had been out with girlfriends or even just with my family, but it felt really nice to know that he cared for me so much. Slowly though his jealousy became quite heavy and he would get really angry if I even talked to someone else when we went out. He started pushing me around a bit when he was cross or he'd grab my arm really hard. I didn't think too much about it and often felt that I shouldn't have talked so much to that person and that he must have felt really left out. He often used to pick fights with me and try to keep me away from my friends. But I really loved him, and I thought he really cared for me and was only trying to look after me.

I began to put on weight and this made him angry, and he used to put me down a lot. He used to be really rude about the way I dressed and often compared me to other cute girls, but I figured that they were much cuter than me and I was just so lucky that he loved me. I also began staying at home quite a lot, not going to school, and my school work started falling behind.

My parents really liked him and we had been together for quite a few months, so everyone thought things were great. At the end of that year, my parents renovated an outside room of our house and they allowed me to move in. It was quite separate from the house and I used to sneak him in. It was almost as if we were living together, but no one knew. Often when he got angry with me, he would threaten to wake up my parents if I screamed or didn't stop crying. He started hitting me more and more and before we

APPENDIX I CONTINUED.

went out, he often threatened to kill me if I even so much as talked to someone else.

I never told anyone about this. He never hit me so that there was a bruise, so no one could see what was going on. All this was going on while other people thought that we were just a perfect couple. But, once Andy slapped me so hard that I had a bruised face and my eye was swollen shut. I told everyone that I had fallen, but my parents started to ask questions. They said that Andy was not allowed to come to the house any more. I still saw him secretly, and even though I tried to break up with him quite a few times, it was difficult. He would cry and promise never to hit me again.

I started to feel that I was never going to break out of this. I knew that I had to stop seeing him, but he would follow me and really made my life miserable. He would threaten me with all sorts of things.

Finally, I met this other guy named Steve. He is really huge and has a reputation for being a tough man. Andy is terrified of him and has stopped pestering me. I know one of the reasons for seeing Steve is that he offers me protection. But I'm still nervous all the time.

Levy (1991)

APPENDIX II : THE QUESTIONNAIRE

DATING RELATIONSHIP SURVEY

DATING RELATIONSHIPS SURVEY

INTRODUCTION

I am interested in finding out how young people feel about dating relationships. This questionnaire is going to ask you about some behaviours that you may have experienced in these relationships.

Your responses to the questions will be completely anonymous and confidential. Please **DO NOT** put your name anywhere on the questionnaire.

If you come to a statement that you don't really understand, or about which you find it difficult to form an opinion, please mark that statement in the **LEFT HAND MARGIN with an 'X'**.

PLEASE DO NOT LEAVE ANY STATEMENT UNMARKED.

SECTION A

Instructions : Answer each one of the following questions. Be careful not to leave any questions out. Please answer as accurately as possible. Mark your answer with a ✓.

1. How old are you?
2. Are you a) **MALE** b) **FEMALE**
3. What class/standard are you in ?
 a) Std 6
 b) Std 7
 c) Std 8
 d) Std 9
 e) Std 10/ Matric
4. What language do you mainly speak at home ?
 a) Xhosa
 b) English
 c) Afrikaans
 d) Other
5. What suburb do you live in ?
6. Do you have a mother? **YES** **NO**
 If **YES**, then : What is your mother's education level ?
 a) Less than high school
 b) Std. 8
 c) Matric
 d) College or technical school
 e) University Graduate
 f) Not sure
7. Do you have a father? **YES** **NO**
 If **YES**, then : What is your father's education level?
 a) Less than high school
 b) Std 8
 c) Matric
 d) College or technical school
 e) University Graduate
 f) Not sure

Please turn over

8. Is your mother presently employed ? YES NO
If YES, then what job does your mother do ?
9. Is your father presently employed ? YES NO
If YES, then what job does your father do ?
10. Have you ever had a girlfriend /boyfriend ? YES NO
11. Do you have a boyfriend /girlfriend at this particular time? YES NO
12. Do you prefer to have quite a few girl/boyfriends rather than one serious relationship ? YES NO
13. Are many of your friends in serious relationships with a girl/boyfriend at this particular time ? YES NO
14. What does having a boy/girlfriend mean to you ?
..... a) seeing each other at school
..... b) seeing each other after school
..... c) going to parties/movies/ discos together
..... d) getting involved in "petting"
..... e) having a sexual relationship
..... f) all of the above

SECTION B

Instructions : Read each of the following statements carefully about some behaviours that may occur in relationships between girls and boys, then answer a) YES or NO, whether you have **experienced** the behaviour that the statement describes.

If you answer YES, then answer Questions (b) to (g).

If you answer NO, then only answer Question (g) and move onto the next statement.

Each question starts with " This person", and it refers to the girl or boy who **did** the behaviour to you.

1. This person tried to keep me from seeing or talking to my family.

a) YES NO

b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How often has this happened to you ?

1. Once 2. 2 - 3 times..... 3. more than 3 times

Please turn over

- e) How do you feel about this ?
- | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| I don't know | I like it | It upsets me a little | It upsets me a lot |

- f) It happens because :
- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. This person loves me | 2. This person is a bad person |
| 3. This person feels jealous of me | 4. This person was drunk or on drugs |
| 5. I refused to have sex with this person | 6. I was drunk or on drugs. |
| 7. Other (explain)..... | |

- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

2. This person interfered with my relationship with friends.

- a) **YES** **NO**

- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
- | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. |
| someone in my school | a friend | a person I am going out with | a person I was going out with | Other |

- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

- d) How often has this happened to you ?
- | | | |
|------------|------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Once | 2 - 3 times..... | more than 3 times |

- e) How do you feel about this ?
- | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| I don't know | I like it | It upsets me a little | It upsets me a lot |

- f) It happens because :
- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. This person loves me | 2. This person is a bad person |
| 3. This person feels jealous of me | 4. This person was drunk or on drugs |
| 5. I refused to have sex with this person | 6. I was drunk or on drugs. |
| 7. Other (explain) | |

- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

3. This person blamed me for causing his/her aggressive behaviour.

- a) **YES** **NO**

- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
- | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. |
| someone in my school | a friend | a person I am going out with | a person I was going out with | Other |

- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

- d) How often has this happened to you ?
- | | | |
|------------|------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Once | 2 - 3 times..... | more than 3 times |

- e) How do you feel about this ?
- | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| I don't know | I like it | It upsets me a little | It upsets me a lot |

- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

4. This person blamed me for his/her problems.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

5. This person tried to make me feel I was not thinking right.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....

g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

6. This person tried to stop me from going to school.

a) **YES** **NO**

b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

d) How often has this happened to you ?

1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about this ?

0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happens because :

..... 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. Other (explain)

g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

7. This person tried to stop me from doing things that I enjoyed.

a) **YES** **NO**

b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

d) How often has this happened to you ?

1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about this ?

0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happens because :

..... 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. Other (explain)

g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

8. This person treated me like I was stupid.

a) YES NO

b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How often has this happened to you ?

1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about this ?

0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happens because :

..... 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain)

g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?

YES NO

9. This person ordered me around.

a) YES NO

b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How often has this happened to you ?

1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about this ?

0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happens because :

..... 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain)

g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?

YES NO

10. This person insulted me in front of others.

a) YES NO

- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
1. Once 2. 2 - 3 times..... 3. more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
- 0 I don't know 1 I like it 2 It upsets me a little 3 It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
- YES** **NO**

11. This person put me down about the way I look.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
1. Once 2. 2 - 3 times..... 3. more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
- 0 I don't know 1 I like it 2 It upsets me a little 3 It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
- YES** **NO**

12. This person told me I couldn't manage on my own.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

13. This person was jealous and suspicious of my friends.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain)
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

14. This person wanted to know where I was all the time.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain)
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

15. This person accused me of seeing other people of the opposite sex.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

16. This person did not want me to socialise with friends of the same sex.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happens because :

..... 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
..... 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
..... 7. Other (explain).....	

g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

17. This person swore at me.

a) **YES** **NO**

b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
someone in my school	a friend	a person I am going out with	a person I was going out with	Other

c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

d) How often has this happened to you ?

1	2	3
Once	2 - 3 times	more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about this ?

0	1	2	3
I don't know	I like it	It upsets me a little	It upsets me a lot

f) It happens because :

..... 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
..... 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
..... 7. Other (explain).....	

g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

18. This person called me names.

a) **YES** **NO**

b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
someone in my school	a friend	a person I am going out with	a person I was going out with	Other

c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

d) How often has this happened to you ?

1	2	3
Once	2 - 3 times	more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about this ?

0	1	2	3
I don't know	I like it	It upsets me a little	It upsets me a lot

- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....

- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

19. This person shouted and screamed at me.

- a) YES NO

- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other

- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

- d) How often has this happened to you ?

1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

- e) How do you feel about this ?

0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....

- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

20. This person gave me the silent treatment, refused to talk to me.

- a) YES NO

- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other

- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

- d) How often has this happened to you ?

1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

- e) How do you feel about this ?

0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....

- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

21. This person was not affectionate towards me.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. Other (explain)
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

22. This person changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

23. This person threatened to hit or throw something at me.

a) YES NO

b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How often has this happened to you ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happens because :

..... 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
..... 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
..... 7. This person was defending him/herself
..... 8. Other (explain).....

g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?

YES NO

24. This person threw something at me.

a) YES NO

b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How often has this happened to you ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happens because :

..... 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
..... 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
..... 7. This person was defending him/herself
..... 8. Other (explain).....

g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?

YES NO

25. This person grabbed, pushed or shoved me.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. This person was defending him/herself
8. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

26. This person slapped me.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. This person was defending him/herself
8. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

27. This person kicked, bit or hit me with a fist.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. This person was defending him/herself
 8. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

28. This person beat me up.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. This person was defending him/herself
 8. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

29. This person threatened me with a knife or gun.

- a) YES NO

- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1. Once 2. 2 - 3 times..... 3. more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 I don't know 1 I like it 2 It upsets me a little 3 It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. This person was defending him/herself
8. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

30. This person used a knife or gun on me.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1. Once 2. 2 - 3 times..... 3. more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 I don't know 1 I like it 2 It upsets me a little 3 It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. This person was defending him/herself
8. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

31. This person called me sexually offensive names.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

32. This person spread false sexual rumours about me.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

33. This person told me sexually offensive jokes.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

34. This person showed me sexually offensive pictures or books.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
 1 This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. Other (explain),
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
YES **NO**

35. This person touched or brushed up against me in a sexual way.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

36. This person fondled me in a sexual way without my agreement.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. Other (explain).....
- g) Have you seen this behaviour happening to other friends ?
 YES NO

37. This person attempted to have sexual intercourse with me without my agreement.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did this to you? (pick one only)
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How often has this happened to you ?
- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about this ?
- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happens because :
- 1. This person loves me 2. This person is a bad person
 3. This person feels jealous of me 4. This person was drunk or on drugs
 5. I refused to have sex with this person 6. I was drunk or on drugs.
7. Other (explain).....

SECTION C

Instructions : Tick the answer you think most suits what you feel about these statements. There are no right or wrong answers. Answer as quickly and honestly as you can.

1. **When I am going out with someone, I like to do what I want rather than what he/she wants**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. **It is more important for me to go out with someone I get along with, than someone who is good looking.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. **Most girls like kind and considerate guys better than tough ones.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. **It is fine for a girl to ask a guy out, even if he has never asked her out.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. **A person with good looks is nicer to go out with than a person who is clever.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. **When a girl goes out with a guy, he should mainly decide where they will go, and what they will do.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. **When I go out with some-one, I usually try to see how far I can get the other person to go sexually.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. **A guy has to show a girl that he's in charge or she will boss him.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. **I like to go out with some-one who others really think is good looking.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. **I think a guy and a girl should pay their own way when they go out.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. **Most girls like to go out with a guy who is the boss.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. **It's fine for a guy to punch someone who flirts with his girlfriend.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. **In my culture is is acceptable for a boy to hit his girlfriend.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. **It is essential for a guy to get respect from others.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. **A man always deserves the respect of his wife and children.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. **I admire a guy who is totally sure of himself.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. **A guy will lose respect if he talks about his problems.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. **A young man should be physically tough, even if he is not big.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. **It bothers me when a guy acts like a girl.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. **I don't think a husband should do housework.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. **Men are always ready for sex.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. **I think being a forceful person is important.**

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. It is important for a person to know how to get what he/she wants.

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. It is not important for a person to have a strong influence on other people.

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

25. It is a good thing for a person to get his/her own way in most things.

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

26. It is important to know how to impress people.

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

27. Being a powerful person is important.

Strongly disagree *Mostly disagree* *Disagree* *Uncertain* *Slightly Agree* *Mostly Agree* *Strongly Agree*
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

SECTION D

Instructions : In SECTION B you answered questions about behaviour that was done to you by someone else. In this SECTION D you are asked to answer questions about behaviour that you have done to another person.

After reading each statement answer (a) YES or NO, whether you have ever done this behaviour to another person. If your answer is YES, then answer questions (b) to (f). If your answer is NO, answer Question (g) and then move on to the next question.

1. I tried to keep him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

Please turn over

- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

2. I interferred with his/her relationship with friends.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

3. I blamed him/her for causing my aggressive behaviour.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

Please turn over

4. I blamed him/her for my problems.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

5. I tried to make him/her feel that he/she was not thinking right.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

6. I tried to stop him/her from going to school.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

7. I tried to stop him/her from doing things he/she enjoyed.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

8. I treated him/her like he/she was stupid.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

9. I ordered him/her around.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

10. I insulted him/her in front of others.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

11. I put him/her down about his/her appearance.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

12. I told him/her they couldn't manage on their own.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain).....

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

13. I was jealous and suspicious of his/her friends.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

14. I wanted to know where he/she was all the time.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

15. I accused him/her of seeing other people of the opposite sex.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

16. I did not want him/her to socialise with friend of the same sex.

a) **YES** **NO**

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

17. I swore at him/her.

a) **YES** **NO**

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

Please turn over

- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

20. I gave him/her the silent treatment.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How many times have you done this ?
- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

21. I was not affectionate towards him/her.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How many times have you done this ?
- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

22. I changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

23. I threatened to hit or throw something at him/her.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. I was defending myself
..... 8. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

24. I threw something at him/her.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. I was defending myself
..... 8. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

25. I grabbed, pushed or shoved him/her.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. I was defending myself
..... 8. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

26. I slapped him/her.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. I was defending myself
..... 8. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

27. I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist.

a) YES NO

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. I was defending myself
..... 8. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

28. I beat him/her up.

a) YES NO

Please turn over

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2 3
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. I was defending myself
..... 8. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

29. I threatened him/her with a knife or gun.

a) **YES** **NO**

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**

d) How many times have you done this ?

1 2 3
Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

e) How do you feel about doing this ?

0 1 2
I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

f) It happened because :

..... 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
..... 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
..... 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
..... 7. I was defending myself
..... 8. Other (explain)

g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

30. I used a knife or gun on him/her.

a) **YES** **NO**

b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)

1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other

- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. I was defending myself
8. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

31. I called him/her sexually offensive names.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times. ... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

32. I spread false sexual rumours about him/her.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times

- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

33. I told him/her sexually offensive jokes.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

34. I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures or books.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot

- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

35. I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexually offensive manner.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How many times have you done this ?
- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

36. I fondled him/her in a sexual way without his/her agreement.

- a) YES NO
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
 someone in my school a friend a person I am going out with a person I was going out with Other
- c) Is this person above MALE or FEMALE
- d) How many times have you done this ?
- 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
- 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
- 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. YES NO

37. I attempted to have sexual intercourse with him/her without his/her agreement.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

38. I had sexual intercourse with him/her without his/her agreement.

- a) **YES** **NO**
- b) Who did you do this to ? (pick one only)
 1. someone in my school 2. a friend 3. a person I am going out with 4. a person I was going out with 5. Other
- c) Is this person above **MALE** or **FEMALE**
- d) How many times have you done this ?
 1 2 3
 Once 2 - 3 times..... more than 3 times
- e) How do you feel about doing this ?
 0 1 2 3
 I don't know I like it It upsets me a little It upsets me a lot
- f) It happened because :
 1. I love this person 2. I am a bad person
 3. I was jealous of this person 4. I was drunk or on drugs
 5. This person refused to have sex with me 6. This person was drunk or on drugs
 7. Other (explain)
- g) I have seen a friend behaving this way. **YES** **NO**

APPENDIX III

PEARSON'S PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATION BETWEEN THE THREE ATTITUDE SCALES AND PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR

BEHAVIOUR PERPETRATED		ATTITUDE SCALES											
		HSRS				MRAS				IPPS			
		MB	MW	FB	FW	MB	MW	FB	FW	MB	MW	FB	FW
1.	I tried to keep him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family	.19	-.07	-.07	.02	.13	-.22	-.05	.13	.15	-.21	-.16	-.05
2.	I interfered with his/her relationship with friends	.04	.19	-.08	-.12	.23	.04	.23	.06	.18	.03	.05	-.09
3.	I blamed him/her for causing my aggressive behaviour	.14	.20	-.03	.09	.22	.12	.05	.10	.11	.10	.18	.11
4.	I blamed him/her for my problems	-.03	.29*	-.30*	.04	-.07	.18	-.33*	.13	.06	.14	-.20	.18
5.	I tried to make him/her feel he/she was not thinking right	-.08	-.08	-.01	-.09	-.15	-.01	-.16	.15	-.09	.09	-.008	.04
6.	I tried to stop him/her from going to school	.40*	.04	-.06	-.01	.35*	.04	-.07	-.02	.40*	.09	-.14	-.04
7.	I tried to stop him/her from doing the things that he/she enjoys	.14	.19	.12	-.15	-.22	.11	-.08	.03	-.16	.12	-.07	.02
8.	I treated him/her like he/she was stupid	-.06	.07	.05	.01	.13	.13	.05	-.05	.23	.21	.19	.09
9.	I ordered him/her around	.06	.07	.02	.10	-.08	.07	-.06	-.05	.13	.31*	.30*	.03
10.	I insulted him/her in front of others	-.20	.05	.16	-.01	.12	.08	-.02	-.18	.22	.05	.22	-.02
11.	I put him/her down about his/her appearance	.14	.07	-.16	.02	.03	-.09	-.14	.02	.17	.04	.008	-.03
12.	I told him/her they couldn't manage on their own	.20	-.19	.07	-.009	.08	-.06	.06	-.01	.17	-.02	.14	-.08
13.	I was jealous and suspicious of his/her friends	-.004	.07	.12	-.07	-.07	.23	-.09	-.11	.18	.03	-.05	-.16
14.	I wanted to know where he/she was all the time	-.08	.21	.17	.14	.07	.24	.01	.11	.09	.21	.11	-.15
15.	I accused him/her of seeing other people of the opposite sex	.22	-.005	-.02	-.21	-.20	.16	-.08	.18	.08	.13	.04	-.05
16.	I did not want him/her to socialise with friends of the same sex	.33*	.08	-.06	-.11	.11	-.02	-.07	.06	.23	.31*	-.14	.04
17.	I swore at him/her	-.12	.18	.09	-.02	.07	.03	-.12	-.07	.22	.08	.13	.06

APPENDIX III CONTINUED BEHAVIOUR PERPETRATED		ATTITUDE SCALES											
		HSRS				MRAS				IPPS			
		MB	MW	FB	FW	MB	MW	FB	FW	MB	MW	FB	FW
18.	I called him/her names	.11	-.03	.05	-.03	.09	-.03	-.22	-.18	.22	.13	.04	-.08
19.	I shouted and screamed at him/her	-.18	.02	-.39*	-.004	.17	-.13	-.21	-.10	.21	.18	.03	-.04
20.	I gave him/her the silent treatment	-.04	.03	.05	.02	.07	.05	-.13	-.13	.10	.12	.10	-.05
21.	I was not affectionate towards him/her	.11	.03	-.007	-.07	.08	.17	-.12	-.05	.09	.22	.15	-.12
22.	I changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	-.12	.13	-.11	-.004	.13	.29*	-.20	-.14	.20	.32*	.12	-.08
23.	I threatened to hit or throw something at him/her	.21	.05	-.22	-.18	-.06	.05	-.04	-.21	.15	.001	-.01	-.18
24.	I threw something at him/her	.01	-.11	.20	-.09	-.01	-.13	-.15	.0004	.22	.13	.09	-.05
25.	I grabbed, pushed or shoved him/her	.06	.10	-.5	-.14	.14	.05	.17	-.15	.23	.23	.22	-.08
26.	I slapped him/her	.22	.02	.10	-.12	-.009	.15	-.03	-.22	.15	.21	-.06	.005
27.	I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist	.06	.12	.04	-.18	.06	.07	-.33*	-.02	.11	.22	.09	-.19
28.	I beat him/her up	.05	.12	-	-.01	.01	.17	-	-.05	.20	.31*	-	-.05
29.	I threatened him/her with a knife or gun	.48*	.02	-	-.04	.17	.002	-	.17	.23	.11	-	-.07
30.	I used a knife or gun on him/her	.09	.19	-	-.09	.18	.02	-	-.008	.13	.21	-	-.23
31.	I called him/her sexually offensive names	.21	.08	.10	-.04	.04	-.04	-.09	-.13	.08	.12	.20	.05
32.	I spread false sexual rumours about him/her	-.09	.18	.04	-.02	.06	.14	.22	.04	-.05	.31*	.09	-.02
33.	I told him/her sexually offensive jokes	.22	.09	.23	-.04	.04	.17	.0008	.008	.19	.32*	.22	-.06

APPENDIX III CONTINUED		ATTITUDES											
		HSRS				MRAS				IPPS			
		MB	MW	FB	FW	MB	MW	FB	FW	MB	MW	FB	FW
		BEHAVIOUR PERPETRATED											
34.	I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures or books	.08	.01	-	-.03	-.05	.08	-	.01	.06	.22	-	.05
35.	I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way	.42*	.13	.07	-.02	.14	-.05	.01	-.03	.22	.10	.05	-.07
36.	I fondled him/her in a sexual way without his/her consent	.0003	.09	.18	-.08	-.08	.10	.14	-.005	-.22	.007	.03	-.04
37.	I attempted to have sex with him/her without his/her agreement	.23	.18	.06	-.12	.06	.20	.03	-.02	.03	.24	.13	-.15
38.	I had sex with him/her without his/her agreement	.34*	-.001	-	-.05	.15	.06	-	-.09	.13	.16	-	-.09

Note :

HSRS : Heterosexual Relationship Scale

MRAS : Male Role Attitude Scale

IPPS : Interpersonal Power Scale

* $p < .05$

MB = Male 'Best off' (N=71) (df=69)

MW = Male 'Worst off' (N=83) (df=81)

FB = Female 'Best off' (N = 94) (df=92)

FW = Female 'Worst off' (N=114) (df=112)

APPENDIX IV

MALE EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR AND POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONS ATTRIBUTED TO THIS BEHAVIOUR

EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR FOR MALES	%								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G*	H	(N)
FACTOR 1 : The experience of humiliating and demeaning behaviour									
10. This person insulted me in front of others	12.00	8.00	36.00	12.00	4.00	4.00		20	25
11. This person put me down about the way I look	16.66	11.11	33.33	16.66	11.11	5.55		0	18
20. This person gave me the silent treatment, refused to talk to me	33.33	8.33	25.00	5.55	11.11	2.77		8.33	36
18. This person called me names	29.41	5.88	35.29	17.64	0	0		11.76	17
17. This person swore at me	9.52	19.05	23.81	23.81	4.76	4.76		14.29	21
32. This person spread false sexual rumors about me	4.76	19.04	28.57	14.29	23.81	0		4.76	20
8. This person treated me like I was stupid	14.29	23.81	19.05	4.76	9.52	0		19.05	21
Average %	17.14	13.60	28.72	13.53	9.19	2.44		11.17	
FACTOR 2 : The experience of interpersonal verbal & physical assault									
27. This person kicked, bit or hit me with a fist	22.22	11.11	11.11	11.11	11.11	11.11	0	22.22	9
25. This person grabbed, pushed or shoved me	8.33	16.66	8.33	25	8.33	0	16.66	16.66	12
23. This person threatened to hit or throw something at me	36.36	27.27	0	18.18	9.09	0	0	9.09	11
26. This person slapped me	41.66	8.33	16.66	16.66	4.16	4.16	0	8	24
24. This person threw something at me	33.33	33.33	0	11.11	22.22	0	0	0	9
28. This person beat me up	0	20.00	0	40.00	20.00	20.00	0	0	5
19. This person shouted and screamed at me	26.07	13.04	13.04	8.7	8.2	8.7	0	21.73	23
Average %	24.00	18.53	7.02	18.68	11.87	6.28	2.38	11.10	
FACTOR 3 : The experience blaming & manipulative behaviour.									
9. This person ordered me around	0	22.22	22.22	11.11	11.11	0		33.33	8
4. This person blamed me for his/her problems	33.33	16.66	20.83	8.33	16.66	0		4.16	24
3. This person blamed me for causing his/her aggressive behaviour	27.27	22.72	18.18	13.63	4.54	0		4.54	22
22. This person changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	28.57	17.85	7.14	7.14	10.74	3.57		14.28	28
8. This person treated me like I was stupid	14.28	23.81	19.04	4.76	9.52	0		19.05	21
2. This person interfered with my relationship with friends	21.05	18.42	52.63	5.26	0	0		2.63	38
Average %	20.75	20.28	23.34	8.37	8.76	0.60		13.00	

A = This person loves me

B = This person is a bad person

C = This person feels jealous of me.

D = This person was drunk or on drugs

E = I refused to have sex with this person.

F = I was drunk or on drugs

G = This person was defending him/herself (*Only for items 23, 24,25,26,27,28,29, 30)

H = Other

(Appendix IV continued)

EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR AND POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONS ATTRIBUTED TO THIS BEHAVIOUR

EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR FOR MALES	%								(N)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G*	H	
FACTOR 4 : The experience of sexual harassment and rape									
36. This person fondled me in a sexual way without my consent.	30.00	10.00	15.00	15.00	10.00	0		15	20
37. This person attempted to have sex with me without my agreement.	38.09	9.52	9.52	23.8	19.05	0		0	21
38. This person had sex with me without my agreement.	43.75	6.25	18.75	12.5	12.5	6.25		0	16
35. This person touched or brushed up against me in a sexual way.	13.04	4.34	4.34	10.86	2.17	2.17		19.56	46
Average %	31.22	7.53	11.90	15.54	10.93	2.11		8.64	
FACTOR 5 : The experience of battery and rape									
30. This person used knife or gun on me.	0	0	0	50.00	50.00	0		0	2
38. This person had sex with me without my agreement	43.75	6.25	18.75	12.5	12.5	6.25		0	16
6. This person tried to stop me from going to school	42.85	14.28	21.42	7.14	7.14	0		7.14	14
28. This person beat me up	0	20.00	0	40.00	20.00	20.00		0	5
Average %	21.65	10.13	10.04	27.41	22.41	6.56		1.79	
FACTOR 6 : The experience of jealous and possessive behaviour									
15. This person accused me of seeing other people of the opposite sex.	41.02	15.38	20.51	7.69	7.69	0		7.69	39
14. This person wanted to know where I was all the time.	50.00	20.83	14.58	4.16	4.16	0		6.25	48
13. This person was jealous and suspicious of my friends.	35.89	10.25	30.76	5.12	10.25	5.12		2.56	39
7. This person tried to stop me from doing things that I enjoy.	40.62	21.87	15.62	9.37	3.12	3.12		6.25	32
16. This person did not want me to socialise with friends of the same sex.	36.36	13.63	36.36	4.54	4.54	0		0	22
Average %	40.78	16.39	23.57	6.18	5.95	1.65		4.55	

A = This person loves me
E = I refused to have sex with this person.

B = This person is a bad person
F = I was drunk or on drugs

C = This person feels jealous of me.
G = This person was defending him/herself (*Only for items 23, 24,25,26,27,28,29 30)

D = This person was drunk or on drugs
H = Other

APPENDIX V

FEMALE EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR AND POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONS ATTRIBUTED TO THIS BEHAVIOUR

EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR FOR FEMALES	%								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G*	H	(N)
FACTOR 1 : The experience of humiliating and demeaning behaviour									
10. This person insulted me in front of others	16.66	12.5	37.5	12.5	0	8.33		8.33	24
11. This person put me down about the way I look	11.11	33.33	27.77	5.55	5.55	5.55		11.11	18
20. This person gave me the silent treatment, refused to talk to me	16.13	3.23	22.58	0	12.9	6.45		38.71	31
18. This person called me names	19.05	19.05	23.81	0	14.28	14.76		19.04	21
17. This person swore at me	6.45	9.68	22.58	12.9	12.9	3.22		29.03	31
32. This person spread false sexual rumors about me	7.41	7.41	29.63	3.7	33.33	3.7		11.11	27
8. This person treated me like I was stupid	8.7	17.39	30.43	8.9	4.35	8.7		13.04	23
Average %	12.22	14.66	27.76	6.22	11.90	7.24		18.62	
FACTOR 2 : The experience of interpersonal verbal & physical assault									
27. This person kicked, bit or hit me with a fist	15.00	15.00	25.00	5.00	15.00	5.00	15.00	5	20
25. This person grabbed, pushed or shoved me	21.05	15.78	5.26	10.53	15.79	2.63	21.05	5.26	38
23. This person threatened to hit or throw something at me	13.88	27.77	13.88	11.11	8.33	2.77	11.11	2.77	36
26. This person slapped me	27.45	13.73	9.8	11.76	15.68	1.96	11.76	5.88	51
24. This person threw something at me	21.05	15.79	10.53	15.79	15.79	5.26	5.26	5.26	19
28. This person beat me up	32.00	24.00	12.00	4.00	20.00	4.00	0	0	25
19. This person shouted and screamed at me	18.18	22.73	13.64	13.64	9.09	4.55	0	13.64	22
Average %	21.23	19.26	12.87	10.26	14.24	3.74	9.17	5.40	
FACTOR 3 : The experience blaming & manipulative behaviour.									
9. This person ordered me around	9.09	15.15	42.42	48.48	51.51	54.54		63.64	33
4. This person blamed me for his/her problems	12.5	18.75	18.75	6.25	6.25	12.5		25	16
3. This person blamed me for causing his/her aggressive behaviour	21.05	5.26	21.05	21.05	5.26	5.26		15.79	19
22. This person changed moods very quickly from very calm to very angry	24.44	13.33	20.00	4.44	6.66	2.72		17.78	45
8. This person treated me like I was stupid	8.7	12.39	30.43	8.7	4.35	8.7		13.04	23
2. This person interfered with my relationship with friends	14.29	4.76	33.33	9.52	7.14	2.38		26.19	42
Average %	15.01	11.61	27.66	16.41	13.53	14.35		26.91	

A = This person loves me

B = This person is a bad person

C = This person feels jealous of me.

D = This person was drunk or on drugs

E = I refused to have sex with this person.

F = I was drunk or on drugs

G = This person was defending him/herself (*Only for items 23, 24,25,26,27,28,29 30)

H = Other

(Appendix V continued)

FEMALE EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR AND POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONS ATTRIBUTED TO THIS BEHAVIOUR

EXPERIENCE OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR FOR FEMALES	%								(N)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G*	H	
FACTOR 4 : The experience of sexual harassment and rape									
36. This person fondled me in a sexual way without my consent.	29.17	12.5	0	8.33	25.00	12.5		12.5	24
37. This person attempted to have sex with me without my agreement.	15.63	21.88	3.13	12.5	34.38	3.13		6.25	32
38. This person had sex with me without my agreement.	15.38	30.77	0	7.69	30.77	7.69		7.69	13
35. This person touched or brushed up against me in a sexual way.	2.08	6.25	0	2.08	6.25	2.08		27.08	48
Average %	15.56	17.85	0.78	7.65	24.1	6.35		13.38	
FACTOR 5 : The experience of battery and rape									
30. This person used knife or gun on me.	50	0	0	16.66	16.66	16.66	0	0	6
38. This person had sex with me without my agreement	15.38	30.77	0	7.69	30.77	7.69		7.69	13
6. This person tried to stop me from going to school	23.53	29.41	11.76	0	5.88	11.76		11.76	17
28. This person beat me up	32.00	24.00	12.00	4.00	20.00	4.00		0	25
Average %	30.23	21.05	5.94	7.09	18.33	10.03	0.00	4.86	
FACTOR 6 : The experience of jealous and possessive behaviour									
15. This person accused me of seeing other people of the opposite sex.	47.14	5.71	24.29	7.14	4.28	0		8.57	70
14. This person wanted to know where I was all the time.	47.32	8.7	17.39	1.44	7.24	2.89		8.69	69
13. This person was jealous and suspicious of my friends.	32.25	4.83	16.13	3.23	3.23	0		9.68	62
7. This person tried to stop me from doing things that I enjoy.	34.21	10.53	26.32	0	5.26	7.89		13.15	38
16. This person did not want me to socialise with friends of the same sex.	34.29	20.00	25.71	2.86	8.57	2.86		2.86	35
Average %	39.04	9.95	21.97	2.93	5.72	2.73		8.59	

A = This person loves me
E = I refused to have sex with this person.

B = This person is a bad person
F = I was drunk or on drugs

C = This person feels jealous of me.
G = This person was defending him/herself (*Only for items 23, 24,25,26,27,28,29, 30)

D = This person was drunk or on drugs
H = Other

APPENDIX VI

MALE PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR AND POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONS ATTRIBUTED THIS BEHAVIOUR

PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR BY MALES	%								(N)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G *	H	
FACTOR 1 : The perpetration of dominating behaviour									
10. I insulted him/her in front of others	30.00	0	10.00	20.00	20.00	0		20	10
17. I swore at him/her	54.55	72.72	0	0	0	9.09		18.18	11
19. I shouted and screamed at him/her	60	13.33	6.67	6.67	0	6.67		6.67	15
18. I called him/her names	46.15	7.69	15.38	15.38	0	0		15.38	13
8. I treated him/her like he/she was stupid	37.5	25.00	12.5	25.00	0	0		0	8
25. I grabbed, pushed, or shoved him/her	27.27	9.09	9.09	9.09	0	9.09	9.09	18.81	11
27. I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist	60.00	0	0	20.00	0	10.00	10	0	10
9. I ordered him/her around	25.00	12.5	0	12.5	25.00	12.5		12.5	8
24. I threw something at him/her	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	0	0	0	0	5
Average %	40.05	17.81	8.18	14.29	5.00	5.26	6.36	10.17	
FACTOR 2 : The perpetration of rape and sexual harassment									
38. I had sex with him/her without his/her consent	66.66	11.11	0	11.11	11.11	0		0	9
36. I fondled him/her in a sexual way without his/her consent	50.00	0	0	10.00	30.00	0		0	10
37. I attempted to have sex with him/her without his/her consent	31.25	12.5	0	12.5	31.25	6.25		6.25	16
35. I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way	85.29	2.94	2.94	0	2.94	2.94		2.94	34
34. I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures or books	50.00	0	0	12.5	12.5	12.5		6.25	16
31. I called him/her sexually offensive names	33.33	0	22.22	33.33	0	0		0	9
33. I told him/her sexually offensive jokes	50.00	0	0	25.00	0	0		25	12
Average %	52.36	3.79	3.59	14.92	12.54	3.10		5.78	

A = I love this person

B = I am a bad person

C = I was jealous of this person

D = I was drunk or on drugs

E = This person refused to
have sex with me

F = This person was drunk or
on drugs

G = I was defending myself

H = Other

* (Note : only Q. 23,24,25,26
27, 28,29,30)

(Appendix VI continued)

MALE PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR AND POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONS ATTRIBUTED TO THIS BEHAVIOUR

PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR BY MALES	%								(N)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G *	H	
FACTOR 3 : The perpetration of demonstrative power									
1. I tried to keep him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family	53.33	13.33	0	20	6.66	0		6.66	15
6. I tried to stop him/her from going to school.	25.00	0	0	25.00	50.00	0		0	4
3. I blamed him/her for causing my aggressive behaviour	35.71	7.14	7.14	21.42	7.14	0		21.42	14
2. I interfered with his/her relationship with friends	40.00	20.00	6.66	20.00	6.66	0		6.66	15
7. I tried to stop him/her from doing the things that he/she enjoys.	58.33	12.5	20.83	4.16	4.16	0		0	24
Average %	42.47	10.59	6.93	18.12	14.92	0.00		6.95	
FACTOR 4 : The perpetration of direct physical assault									
26. I slapped him/her	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	0	0	0	0	5
23. I threatened to hit or throw something at him/her.	33.33	22.22	11.11	22.22	11.11	0	0	0	9
28. I beat him/her up.	40.00	10.00	0	30.00	20.00	0	0	0	10
Average %	31.11	17.41	10.37	24.07	10.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	
FACTOR 5 : The perpetration of psychological control									
4. I blamed him/her for my problems	56.25	12.5	0	6.25	18.75	0		6.25	16
15. I accused him/her of seeing other people of the opposite sex.	72.73	12.12	3.03	9.09	0	0		3.03	33
5. I tried to make him/her feel he/she was not thinking right.	62.96	14.81	11.11	0	7.4	0		3.7	27
21. I was not affectionate towards him/her.	37.5	20.83	8.33	8.33	16.67	4.17		4.17	24
Average %	57.36	15.07	5.62	5.92	10.71	1.04		4.29	

A = I love this person

B = I am a bad person

C = I was jealous of this person

D = I was drunk or on drugs

E = This person refused to have sex with me

F = This person was drunk or on drugs

G = I was defending myself

H = Other

* (Note : only Q. 23,24,25,26
27, 28,29,30)

APPENDIX VII

FEMALE PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR AND POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONS ATTRIBUTED TO THIS BEHAVIOUR

PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR BY FEMALES	%								(N)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G *	H	
FACTOR 1 : The perpetration of dominating behaviour									
10. I insulted him/her in front of others	20.00	6.66	20	6.66	0	13.33		26.66	15
17. I swore at him/her	30.00	6.66	13.33	0	0	3.33		43.33	30
19. I shouted and screamed at him/her	38.09	0	9.53	4.76	0	0		38.09	21
18. I called him/her names	40.00	0	0	0	10	10.00		30.00	10
8. I treated him/her like he/she was stupid	16.66	33.33	16.66	0	0	16.66		16.66	6
25. I grabbed, pushed, or shoved him/her	18.88	9.09	9.09	0	0	9.09	18.18	36.36	11
27. I kicked, bit or hit him/her with a fist	50.00	12.5	0	0	12.5	12.5	0	12.5	8
9. I ordered him/her around	30.77	23.08	0	0	0	15.38		7.69	13
24. I threw something at him/her	60.00	0	0	20.00	0	20.00	0	0	5
Average %	33.82	10.15	7.62	3.49	2.50	11.14	6.06	23.48	
FACTOR 2 : The perpetration of rape and sexual harassment									
38. I had sex with him/her without his/her consent	0	50.00	0	0	0	50.00		0	2
36. I fondled him/her in a sexual way without his/her consent	40.00	20.00	20.00	0	0	20.00		0	5
37. I attempted to have sex with him/her without his/her consent	50.00	50.00	0	0	0	0		0	4
35. I touched or brushed up against him/her in a sexual way	100.0	0	0	0	0	0		0	15
34. I showed him/her sexually offensive pictures or books	80.00	0	0	0	0	0		20.00	5
31. I called him/her sexually offensive names	16.66	33.33	16.66	0	0	16.66		16.66	6
33. I told him/her sexually offensive jokes	28.57	14.28	0	0	0	14.28		14.28	7
Average %	45.03	23.94	5.24	0.00	0.00	14.42		7.28	

A = I love this person

B = I am a bad person

C = I was jealous of this person

D = I was drunk or on drugs

E = This person refused to
have sex with me

F = This person was drunk or
on drugs

G = I was defending myself

H = Other

* (Note : only Q. 23,24,25,26
27, 28,29,30)

(Appendix VII continued)

FEMALE PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE DATING BEHAVIOUR AND POSSIBLE MOTIVATIONS ATTRIBUTED TO THIS BEHAVIOUR

PERPETRATION OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR BY FEMALES	%								(N)
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G *	H	
FACTOR 3 : The perpetration of demonstrative power									
1. I tried to keep him/her from seeing or talking to his/her family	50.00	20.00	0	10.00	0	10.00		0	10
6. I tried to stop him/her from going to school.	50.00	12.5	0	0	0	25.00		12.5	8
3. I blamed him/her for causing my aggressive behaviour	33.1	25.81	9.52	0	0	4.76		23.81	21
2. I interfered with his/her relationship with friends	55.00	5.00	20.00	5.00	0	5.00		10.00	20
7. I tried to stop him/her from doing the things that he/she enjoys.	61.53	7.69	11.53	0	0	15.38		3.84	26
Average %	49.92	14.20	8.21	3.00	0.00	12.03		10.03	
FACTOR 4 : The perpetration of direct physical assault									
26. I slapped him/her	45.00	5.00	0	0	0	5.00	25.00	15.00	20
23. I threatened to hit or throw something at him/her.	0	0	14.28	0	0	42.85	28.57	0	7
28. I beat him/her up.	0	66.66	0	0	0	33.33	0	0	3
Average %	15.00	23.89	4.76	0.00	0.00	27.06	17.86	5.00	
FACTOR 5 : The perpetration of psychological control									
4. I blamed him/her for my problems	47.06	14.7	5.88	2.94	0	8.82		20.58	34
15. I accused him/her of seeing other people of the opposite sex.	55.77	5.77	13.46	3.84	0	1.92		17.31	52
5. I tried to make him/her feel he/she was not thinking right.	59.37	12.5	9.38	0	3.13	6.25		6.25	33
21. I was not affectionate towards him/her.	20.00	13.33	6.66	0	3.33	13.33		36.67	30
Average %	45.55	11.58	8.85	1.70	1.62	7.58		20.20	

A = I love this person

B = I am a bad person

C = I was jealous of this person

D = I was drunk or on drugs

E = This person refused to have sex with me

F = This person was drunk or on drugs

G = I was defending myself

H = Other

* (Note : only Q. 23,24,25,26, 27, 28,29,30)