The Role of Dating Violence and Relationship Characteristics in Post-Relationship Pursuit

Amanda Singer, M.A.

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Psychology (Clinical Program).

Chapel Hill
2006

Approved by:

Bernadette Gray-Little, Ph.D.

Martha Cox, Ph.D.

Sherry Hamby, Ph.D.

Joe Lowman, Ph.D.

Mitch Prinstein, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

AMANDA SINGER: The Role of Dating Violence and Relationship Characteristics in Post-
Relationship Pursuit
(Under the direction of Bernadette Gray-Little)

The purpose of this study is to examine the associations between relationship characteristics, dating violence, and post-relationship pursuit to better understand the role relationship characteristics and dating violence play in predicting the level of violence following relationship termination. The participants were 335 undergraduate students. Participants completed measures of dating violence, post-relationship pursuit, personality and relationship factors, and relationship investment. Dating violence was expected to predict post-relationship pursuit. Relationship characteristics including length, intimacy, jealousy, investment in the relationship, relationship commitment, and low anger management for offenders were hypothesized to predict post-relationship pursuit even after the variance associated with dating violence was controlled for. Findings indicate that relationship characteristics, particularly investment, predict nonsevere and severe post-relationship pursuit, especially for women. Assault, injury, and sexual coercion during a relationship predict severe post-relationship pursuit, especially for men. Sexual coercion during a relationship and dominance predict Ambiguous post-relationship pursuit following the relationship's termination. These findings suggest that although dating violence plays a significant role in predicting ambigious and severe post-relationship pursuit, relationship characteristics are important considerations for violence after a relationship ends, regardless of whether there was violence prior to the relationship termination.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The connection between love and violence is an unfortunate but well established reality. This connection spans across types of relationships, patterns of hurting one's partner, and time. Of the many of ways in which love and violence intertwine, dating violence and post-relationship pursuit are particularly important for young adult populations, as they have been found to have higher frequencies than in other populations and often co-occur. One of the questions often associated with these two particular types of relationship violence is what might underlie or connect them. The nature of the violent relationship, in terms of relationship characteristics specific to a given relationship, might be one possible source of this connection. Relationship characteristics may relate to both types of violence, but only because of the strong association between dating violence and post-relationship pursuit. In this study, relationship characteristics, dating violence, and post-relationship pursuit are analyzed to determine whether relationship characteristics predict post-relationship pursuit after dating violence is controlled for. In other words, is there a unique connection between post-relationship pursuit and relationship characteristics?

Dating Violence

Definitions and conceptualizations of intimate partner violence have changed considerably over the last two decades. As researchers have gained a greater understanding of the way in which love and violence are often combined, the field has progressed from believing such violence to exist only in a heterosexual family context with men as aggressors to seeing the range in which individuals can aggress against one another in dating,

cohabitating, and same-sex partnerships, as well as traditional family situations. In addition, we understand that both men and women can play the role of perpetrator, and that "violence" can include not only physical assault, but also a multitude of other acts intended to hurt or harm a romantic partner.   With this better understanding of the nature of dating and domestic violence also comes an interest in understanding the causes and predictors of such a violent relationship. The next section addresses what we understand about dating violence in unmarried, dating partners.

Prevalence

Since dating violence began as a separate research field in the 1980s, multiple studies have found higher rates of partner violence among dating (non-married) couples than among married couples. In the United States and Canada, 20 to 40% of college students reported physically assaulting a partner in the previous 12 months (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). This estimate of rate of perpetration has been found through multiple studies over the past 15 years (Archer, 2000; Hines & Saudino, 2003;O'Leary, Barling, Arias, Rosenbaum, Malone, & Tyree, 1989; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996; Zweig, Barber, & Ecceles, 1997). In fact, Straus (2001) in the International Study of Dating Violence found that even the lowest rates of perpetration of physical assaults across the 31 universities in 16 countries was 17% of students within the previous 12 months, with the highest at 45% and median at 29% of students.   These prevalence rates of perpetration include relatively minor assaults; when looking at only severe physical assaults, prevalence rates drop to 9.4% at the median university, with 6.7% of students inflicting an injury on a dating partner within the previous 12 months. Other forms of measuring dating violence have found similar rates of assault. Observations of high school couples found that 51% displayed some violent

2

behavior during the observation, and 30% of adult couples displayed reciprocal acts of violence during an interaction (Capaldi & Crosby, 1997).

Some of this violence seems to be reciprocal, with both partners contributing to perpetrating the violent interaction. This finding has led to a debate within the field regarding the definitions and traditional understanding of who it is that perpetrates violence in relationships. Traditionally, it was believed that men aggressed against women, but many studies have found that prevalence rates between men and women are roughly similar (e.g. Hines & Saudino, 2003; Johnson, 1995; Katz, Kuffel, & Coblentz, 2002). Some theorists have even suggested that women may in fact be more frequent perpetrators of assaultive interactions between couples (Archer, 2000; Stets & Straus, 1990; Straus, 1997; Straus, 2001). However, though women may play a strong role in perpetrating dating violence, theorists point to traditional clinical experience, self-reports of relationship satisfaction, rates of reports to law enforcement of dating violence, and medical reports of injuries sustained during these episodes indicating women are more severely traumatized and sustain greater injury as a result of dating violence (Amar & Gennaro, 2005; Foshee, 1996; Harris, 1991; Katz, Kuffel, & Coblentz, 2002; Makepeace, 1986; Saunders, 2002; Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994). These findings seem to indicate that even if rates of dating violence are similar and reciprocal for men and women, the experience men and women have in violent dating relationships is dramatically different.

Some theorists challenge these findings of balance between prevalence ratings of dating violence between men and women. Saunders (2002) found that many of the studies that find equality between men and women in respect to the frequency of dating violence have questions framed in ways that exclude, or rate as less important, items on sexual abuse

and stalking; many of these studies only examine couples who are still together rather than couples that have separated. Such distinctions in methodology may change the amount of apparent reciprocal violence rather than give an accurate presentation of male vs. female perpetration. Therefore, understanding what factors contribute to each gender's perpetration of dating violence and their understanding of the purpose violence serves is important. Part of this question is whether the same factors that lead to dating violence perpetration by men also predict dating violence perpetration for women, or is there something unique in the experience of the relationship for each gender that differentiates male and female violence? In this study, I hope to contribute to this portion of the understanding of violent relationships by looking not only at predictors for men and women of violence during a relationship, but also of violence following its termination.

Causal Models/ Predictors

To better understand the nature of dating violence, much of the literature has discussed and tested various causal models to explain why violence exists within a romantic context, or to at least understand what kinds of factors seem to predict its occurrence. These models can be considered in several broad categories depending on the focus of the predicting factors: the perpetrator, the victim, the relationship itself, and society's influence. While these categories certainly overlap and interact with one another, it may be helpful to analyze them individually to gain a more complete view of dating violence as an outcome.

Perpetrator theories: By and large, most studies analyzing dating violence focus on the perpetrator of the violence in an effort to connect personality, clinical, and other predicting factors to later examples of violence. One traditionally popular theory for perpetration of violence in romantic relationships is the family-of-origin theory stating that

perpetrators re-enact as adolescents or adults violence they observed or experienced as children. The connection between violence in the family-of-origin and later violent relationships has been shown through multiple studies (Egeland, 1993; Cantrell, MacIntyre, Sharkey, & Thompson, 1995; Carr & VanDeusen, 2002; Kinsfogel & Grych, 2004; Lichter & McCloskey, 2004; Widom, 1989), and there are several suggested mechanisms for this association. Genetic predisposition (Egeland, 1993), and social learning processes (Crick & Dodge, 1994; Dostal, & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1997; Lochman & Dodge, 1994; Rich, Gidycz, & Warkentin, 2005) are among the most popular. Using a relationship-violence sorting task to study social learning mechanisms, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Hankla, & Stormberg (2004) found evidence of differing semantic associations among individuals from violent vs. nonviolent homes. Further distinctions were found among those who were currently in violent relationships vs. those not currently in violent relationships, indicating that both past and current experience of violent relationships affects the way in which people (perpetrators in particular) understand their roles in relationships.

Family-of-origin violence may also contribute to the understanding of later gender roles and may predict perpetration in this regard. Similar to theorists proposing social learning theories to explain dating violence, Lichter and McCloskey (2004) and Kinsfogel and Grych, (2004) both found that adolescents who had been exposed to marital violence as children were more likely to justify and approve of violence in dating relationships. Sibling violence in families-of-origin has also been found as a predictor for later dating violence, enlarging the scope of the transmission of violence beyond the parent-child dyad to other family members, as well (Carr & VanDeusen, 2002; Noland, V., Liller, K., & McDermott, R., 2004; Simonelli, Mullis, Elliot, & Pierce, 2002). All of these cognitive and socialization

theories share the basic idea that family violence, whether experienced between the parents, between parents and children, or between siblings, normalizes violence in relationships and may actually associate positive feelings of love and affection with the occurrence of violent behavior.

Some theorists view dating violence as continuation of other antisocial behavior. Prior criminal or violent behavior is predictive of later relationship violence (Buzawa, Hotaling, Klein, & Byrne, 1999; DeLucia, Owens, Will, & McCoin, 1999; Moffitt, Krueger, Caspi, & Fagan, 2000). A variety of explanations have been offered for this connection. For example, the perpetrator's attribution of violence as a reasonable means of conflict resolution in multiple situations, an inability to conform to prosocial behavior norms, and other antisocial personality characteristics in perpetrators. Straus & Ramirez (2004) assessed this relationship with college students in dating relationships, finding that criminal history (whether reported to law officials or not) significantly predicted physical assaults in dating relationships, with a greater number of prior crimes predicting more severe assaults on dating partners.

Another set of factors commonly recognized as predictors of dating violence are clinical syndromes. Perpetrator substance abuse is frequently found to differentiate between violent and nonviolent relationships, especially for male perpetrators (Hamberger, Guse, 2002; Lundeberg, Stith, Penn, & Ward, 2004; Miller, 2003; Smith, White, & Holland, 2003). Even when substance use does not meet DSM-IV abuse or dependence criteria, significantly more dating violence episodes occur when the perpetrator is inebriated than occur when the perpetrator is sober (Abbey, Clinton-Sherrod, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003; Leonard & Senchack, 1993; Lundeberg, Stith, Penn, & Ward, 2004). Other clinical syndromes in

6

perpetrators, such as depression, have modest positive correlations with dating violence, indicating a consistent but comparatively low association between syndromes and dating violence (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992; Arias & O'Leary, 1988).

Personality traits appear to be more predictive of dating violence than clinical syndromes. Trait anger and hostility have been shown to significantly predict dating violence (Barnett, Fagan, & Booker, 1991; Beasley & Stoltenberg, 1992; Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Foo & Margolin, 1995), as well as differentiate between perpetrators engaging in minor assaults vs. more severe assaults (Parrott & Zeichner, 2003). Trait problems with anger management also are predictive of dating violence (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith & Ryan, 1992; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Riggs, O'Leary, Breslin, 1990; Straus & Medeiros, 2002; White, Merrill, & Koss, 1999), particularly of physical assaults and injuries (Straus & Medeiros, 2002; White, Merrill, & Koss, 1999). Lundeberg, Stith, Penn, & Ward (2204) were able to classify groups of nonviolent, psychologically violent, and physically violent men in dating relationships based on their level of anger management, with low anger management associated with physically violent male daters. The way in which people express anger, which is related to both trait anger and anger management, also affect the frequency and severity of dating violence. Wolf and Foshee (2003) found that anger expression style actually mediated the relationship between experiencing family violence and later dating violence perpetration, especially for men.

Although these theories offer different mechanisms for the way in which characteristics of the perpetrator affect the dating situation, they all share the common assumption that the dating violence phenomenon can be predicted by factors existing within the perpetrator and that these are factors that are present for the perpetrator regardless of the

7

nature of the current relationship or current partner. Although some of these perpetrator factors seem to operate in the same manner affecting men and women (Straus & Medeiros, 2002), many interact with socialization theories (to be discussed later) that suggest family-of-origin experiences or personality factors will affect men and women differently because of the difference in the way in which men and women are socialized and understand relationships.

Victim theories: Many theorists focus on factors associated with the perpetrator in order to avoid the pitfall of victim blaming. Other theorists suggest that being able to identify and predict who will likely be victimized and seek law enforcement or psychological help will enable prevention and support services to provide better care. Therefore, attempts have been made to identify commonalities among victims of dating violence that distinguish victims from non-victims. Though most studies do not find the victims' family-of-origin experiences with violence to be as predictive for victims as those of perpetrators, some have found modest correlations between experiencing or witnessing violence as a child and later victimization, particularly for female victims (Lichter & McCloskey, 2004; Stith, Rosen, Middleton, Busch, Lundenberg, & Carlton, 2000).

Victim attributes, such as age, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status are more commonly assessed than family-of-origin. By and large, the only consistent demographic findings among victims is that physical and sexual aggression by dating partners is most commonly experienced by individuals in their mid-teens to early 20s, making high school and college populations good sample pools (Malick, Sorenson, & Aneshensel, 1997; Marx, Van Wie, & Gross, 1996; Stets & Henderson, 1991). Women are more likely than men to report being victims of dating violence and to seek assistance from legal, medical, or mental

health services (Amar & Alexy, 2005; Amar & Gennaro, 2005; Saunders, 2002). Most other demographic victim attribute studies have mixed results or find no significant patterns among victims (Clark, Beckett, Wells, & Dungee-Anderson, 1994; Harned, 2002; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989).

The experience of earlier victimization seems to predict later victimization to a high degree. Although family-of-origin models have only moderate associations with later victimization, experiencing violence outside the family home is much more predictive subsequent dating violence. Gagne, Lavoie, and Herbert (2005) found high associations between current dating violence victimization and victimization that occurred in the previous 12 months, particularly for adolescent girls. Although many of these prior experiences of victimization occurred through dating relationships, many also occurred outside a formal romantic relationship, in the context of harassment by male peers at school, and victimization through physical assault by male or female peers. Foshee, Benefield, Steven, & Ennett (2004) also found that being hit by an adult, regardless of whether the adult was a family member, predicted dating violence victimization over the next 12 months for both male and female adolescents. Both of these studies and others have found that the more recent the experience of violence, the more likely the occurrence of re-victimization in a dating relationship (Smith, White, & Holland, 2003).

Although researchers are careful to avoid victim blaming, the frequency of re-victimization may suggest underlying characteristics placing some people at greater risk than others. One suggestion of an underlying risk factor is the experience of other risky behaviors. Gover (2004) found that both male and female adolescents who were repeat

victims of dating violence also scored highly on other measures of risky behavior, such as drug use, sexual promiscuity, alcohol abuse, drunk driving, etc.

The most successful victim-theory in predicting who will experience dating violence is bidirectional violence, in which people engage in violent behavior as perpetrators as well as victims. Although self-defined as victims because of greater injury or because they are less frequently the perpetrator, these individuals may hit back in self-defense or receive greater violence in reciprocation for minor violence (slapping, pushing, etc). Both male and female victims who engage in bi-directional violence are more likely to experience severe physical aggression (Gray & Foshee, 1997; Stets & Straus, 1990). Bookwala and colleagues (1992) found that among college students, the strongest predictor of perpetration of physical violence was the receipt of violence from a dating partner. Similar to the perpetrator theories of prediction, many victim theories reflect the underlying assumption that victim attributes are present in the victim regardless of the nature of the perpetrator or the relationship context. However, the notion that victims elicit violence by their own violent behavior implies a contextual view of violence.

Relationship theories: Unlike either the perpetrator or victim theories, models focusing on the relationship itself assume that neither the perpetrator nor victim operates in a vacuum. These theories, while incorporating aspects of the perpetrator, victim, or both, relationship theories place emphasis on characteristics that are only present in a romantic relationship. Some of these factors address basic elements of the relationship. For example, studies consistently indicate that the longer the duration of the relationship, the greater the likelihood of dating violence (Eckhardt, Jamison, & Watts, 2003; Hendy, Weiner, Bakerofskie, Eggen, Gustitus, & McLeod, 2003; Shook, Gerrity, Jurich, Segrist, 2000). The

degree of sexual intimacy also is a consistent predictive factor, with greater intimacy predicting greater frequency of both minor and severe physical assaults and injuries (Ehrensaft & Vivian, 1999; Hendy, Weiner, Bakerofskie, Eggen, Gustitus, & McLeod, 2003; Shook, Gerrity, Jurich, Segrist, 2000). Although less consistent, some studies have found that the greater the level of the relationship status (dating to cohabitating to married), the greater the frequency and severity of violent events (Hanley & O'neil, 1997). All of these relationship characteristics can also be related to positive outcomes, such as relationship satisfaction, but it seems that increasing the connection between the partners also increases the violence in dating relationships.

Other relationship predictors incorporate more personal aspects of the romantic partners. Perpetrators' feelings of jealousy and need for social control significantly predict higher frequencies of violent episodes in dating relationships (Eckhardt, Jamison, & Watts, 2003; Ehrensaft & Vivian, 1999; Hendy, Weiner, Bakerofskie, Eggen, Gustitus, & McLeod, 2003; Shook, Gerrity, Jurich, Segrist, 2000).   Perpetrators' feelings of commitment to the partner combined with relationship dissatisfaction predict higher frequencies of violent dating episodes (Hanley & O'neil, 1997), as well as a chronicity rather than occasional violent outbursts (Marcus, 2004). The degree to which the perpetrator feels betrayed by his or her partner predicts the severity in relationships with sporadic violence. Forbes, Jobe, White, Bloesch, and Adams (2005) found that participants were likely to see violence as a more acceptable response to sexual betrayal than nonsexual betrayal, particularly if there was at least one violent episode in the relationship prior to the betrayal act. This finding was particularly true for male participants.   Although these characteristics are assessed within the

11

perpetrator and not the victim, they do not exist outside of a relationship context, and are therefore considered to be relationship characteristics.

Specific relationship problems can also predict dating violence. Mahlstedt and Welsh (2005) found that couples in violent relationships were more likely to report communication as a primary problem in their relationship compared to nonviolent couples. The authors also found that when presenting a dating violence situation to observers, even observers not in a relationship were likely to attribute the violence to communication problems. Investigations have found that couples who are not able to engage in negotiation tactics to solve problems within the relationship have a higher frequency of physical assaults (Bird, Stith, & Schladale, 1991; Canary, Spitzberg, & Semic, 1998; Cordova, Jacobsen, Gottman, Rushe, & Cox, 1993; Mahlstedt & Welsh, 2005; Marcus & Swett, 2002; Straus & Medeiros, 2002). Another specific relationship issue that predicts frequency and severity increases in dating violence is dissatisfaction with the relationship power balance (Ronfeldt, Kimerling, Arias, 1998). Kaura & Allen (2004) also found that both men and women who scored high on measures of power dissatisfaction were more likely to use violence to attempt to restore satisfactory power balance from the perpetrator's point of view.

Societal theories: Issues of power are also used in predictive models focusing on dating violence as a social problem. Some theorists focus attention on the way in which members of society outside the violent dating relationship respond to violent scenarios and the effect that these responses and attributions have on the members of a violent dating relationship. Regarding power in relationships, Katz, Kuffel, and Coblentz (2002) proposed that socialization of men and women into differential power roles in relationships necessitates a different experience of dating violence for men and women, regardless of who

is perpetrating the violence in the relationship. Socialization also impacts the expectations men and women have toward conflict in relationships. Prospero (2006) found that male adolescents were more likely to expect aggressive responses to conflict in romantic relationships, both their own responses and those of their partner. It may be that such an expectation for men might encourage more aggressive responding to ambiguous situations.

Expectation appears to be important in understanding gender differences in the maintenance of violent relationships, as well. Marcus (2004) found that women in chronic violent relationships, regardless of whether they were perpetrators or victims, expected their relationships to become less violent following a violent incident compared to other women not in chronic violent relationships.   Men in chronic violent relationships, however, expected the level of violence to increase following a violent incident, again regardless of whether the men were perpetrators or victims of dating violence. Socialization also impacts the explanations for why violence is experienced in relationships. Mahlstedt and Welsh (2005) found that participants were more likely to associate dating violence with issues of power and gender socialization when given a presentation about dating violence as a social problem, whereas they attributed the violence to more immediate relationship and communication problems when the dating violence was presented without the discussion of the social problem.

Social and gender roles in relationships may also play a key role in understanding dating violence. Lichter & McCloskey (2004) found that while family-of-origin violence significantly predicted later perpetration of dating violence, possessing traditional attitudes of male-female relationships and justifying dating violence were associated with higher levels of dating violence regardless of whether family-of-origin violence existed. The effect of this

family violence was also analyzed by Kinsfogel & Grych (2004), who found that adolescent boys who had been exposed to parental discord or violence were more likely to view aggression as justifiable in a romantic relationship, but this connection between witnessing parental conflict in the approval of violent relationships was not found in adolescent girls, highlighting the different impact that violence may have for male and female witnesses. Social roles seem to impact the attitudes of acceptable levels of violence, as well as the response to a violent incident. Gordon, Burton, and Porter (2004) found that women's forgiveness was correlated with traditional femininity scores, and both were predictive of the intention to remain with violent partners.

Attribution and acceptability of violence to individuals outside the relationship dyad are also assessed as societal theories of dating violence. Dating violence appears more acceptable to those outside the relationship when there is a proposed justification (self-defense, vengeance, etc.; Cauffman, Feldman, Jensen, & Arnett, 2000), when the violence is minor and perpetrated by women (Straus, 2003), and when the relationship is of longer duration (Harrison, & Abrishami, 2004). Harrison and Abrishami (2004) also found that observers were more likely to be lenient toward perpetrators who were described as part of their in-group (matching demographic conditions) than when described as a part of an out-group, mirroring findings by other authors indicating that men find violence perpetrated by men more acceptable than violence perpetrated by women, and women find violence perpetrated by women more acceptable than violence perpetrated by men (Corbin, Bernat, Calhoun, McNair, & Seals, 2001; Beyers, Leonard, Mays, & Rosen, 2000; McDonald, & Kline, 2004). Finally some theorists point to media examples (particularly song lyrics) of the acceptability of violence in the culture of the United States, particularly that of violence

14

against women and romantic partners, and the differential effect it may have on potential perpetrators predisposed to violence through some of the individual factors such as low anger management or experiencing family-of-origin violence (Johnson & Adams, 1995; Maxwell, 2001).

In an effort to take a broader perspective and encompass all of these societal ideas White and Kowalski (1998) developed an integrated contextual developmental model of dating violence that assumes that patriarchal societies accord men higher value than women. Therefore, men are expected to dominate in politics, economics, and the social world, which includes family life and interpersonal relationships. The power dynamics that are inherent in this patriarchal context become active at the interpersonal level, and so all relationships will be affected by the internalization of gendered values, expectations and behaviors. Several studies have been conducted to analyze pieces of this model in terms of patriarchal expectations and beliefs, which support this basic premis (Avni, 1991; Kurz, 1996; Katz, Kuffel, & Coblentz, 2002; O'Sullivan & Byers, 1992). In a patriarchal society, a social climate is established that supports and perpetuates violence against women, particularly violence in heterosexual romantic relationships.

While no theory is comprehensive in and of itself, each proposes new insight into predictors of violence within a dating relationship. The question I seek to answer here is whether or not these same individual and relationship factors will be associated with violence *once a relationship has ended* if the association between the predictors and violence during the relationship is controlled for. Commonly, this violence or unwanted pursuit after a relationship ends is called "stalking."

Post-relationship pursuit

Although violent relationships have been empirically studied for decades, scientific study of stalking or post-relationship pursuit is still in its relative infancy. Much of the current literature is at the stage of distinguishing among definitions and attempting to form a consensus as to what behaviors constitute a stalking relationship. The term "stalking" is a legal one that refers to a situation where an individual engages in repetitive, unwanted behaviors that cause fear or distress on the part of the target. Although no firm consensus has been reached on the specific wording of a definition for stalking, legal definitions generally include the following basic criteria: 1) behaviors must be repetitive, 2) the behavior must be unwanted and the victim must communicate their dissatisfaction to the offender, and 3) the victim must experience significant fear of bodily harm for the self or for someone the victim cares about (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 2002; Wright & Burgess, 1996). Although most states include these three criteria in legal definitions, most researchers assessing perpetrators focus on repetitive behaviors occurring after the end of a romantic relationship, as assessing whether the victim has communicated their displeasure or whether the victim experiences significant fear is unreliable or impossible from a perpetrator's perspective (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000; White, Kowalski, Lyndon, & Valentine, 2000).

Prevalence

Based on the legal guidelines, stalking *perpetration* point prevalence among the general population is between 2 and 5%, and the prevalence among collegiate populations is between 6 and 20% of students (Cupach & Sptizberg, 2000; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). The lifetime prevalence of stalking *victimization* ranges from 2 to 8% of the national population

(Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998). The point prevalence of victimization is even higher on college campuses, ranging between 10 and 40% depending upon the definition of stalking used in the examination (Bjerregaard, 2000; Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000). In a meta-analysis of studies with college student participants, an overall rate of violence was found to be 38.7% when a behavioral definition of stalking was used without the victim communication or fear criteria (Rosenfeld, 2004).

Victim and perpetrator demographic characteristics are relatively consistent across studies (Bjerregaard, 2000; Tjaden, & Thoennes,1998; Wright & Burgess, 1996). Victims are more likely to be female and perpetrators are more likely to be male. Nearly all victims are stalked by someone they know, and former partners make up the largest percentage of perpetrators by far, especially for female victims. Stalkers tend to be slightly older than their victims and in a higher SES level compared to perpetrators of other violent crimes like simple assault or murder, (typically comparable to that of their victim). There have been no consistent ethnic or racial differences found among prevalence rates or behavioral patterns.

Exploratory analyses of stalking prevalence and perpetrator and victim demographics make up the majority of the examinations to date. Although this approach is appropriate given that stalking is a recent interest in psychological domains, the findings have not been entirely cumulative due to unreliable definitions of what constitutes stalking. The frequency or severity of behaviors, the victim's method of communication of dissatisfaction with these behaviors, and how much fear is necessary-- all affect the prevalence or demographic information such studies find. Analysis of the psychological phenomenon of stalking will continue to be difficult until researchers agree upon a definition.

Explanatory models

Causal explanatory models for a stalking situation encompass a variety of possible important variables, which can be broken down into a similar set of categories observed in the causal models for dating violence. The most common models for violence after a relationship are perpetrator, victim, and relationship theories.

Perpetrator theories: One of the first proposed perpetrator theories was psychosis, especially paranoid schizophrenia or delusional disorder, on the part of the perpetrator. This approach reflected the myth that the majority of stalking victims were celebrities and perpetrators believed they had formed a romantic relationship with the celebrity, indicating delusional beliefs or loss of contact with reality. In early interviews of men incarcerated for stalking and in background examinations of men who had been reported for stalking perpetration, however, very few (less than 2%) of the perpetrators showed signs of psychosis or had any history of psychotic illness, and rates of other mental illness, like depression and anxiety, were no higher than in the general population (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994).

Another commonly held model of perpetration of stalking is the family-of-origin model. Experiences of abuse in the family of origin have been found to be predictive in other varieties of intimate violence, like dating and domestic violence and sexual assault, as was discussed above. However, although Langhinrichsen-Rohling and Rohling (2000) found an association between victimization and low-levels of obsessive relational intrusion (or low severity stalking) toward later partners, most studies have found that stalking perpetrators do not fit the family-of-origin pattern of violence. Most stalkers do not come from physically or

sexually abusive homes, nor were most stalkers stalked themselves before engaging in this behavior (Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Rohling, 2000).

Victim theories: Very few explanatory models for stalking focus attention on the victims, aside from prevalence studies assessing the demographic variables mentioned above. Although relatively new in the intimate violence literature, routine activity theory explanations may go somewhat further in explaining some stalking situations by connecting the victim and perpetrator. Routine activity theory suggests that a combination of several elements in time and space fosters the opportunity for a crime to take place. For stalking, these elements include motivated perpetrators, easy access to victims, and a lack of protective resources for their victims; all of these elements are particularly salient on a college campus where stalking victimization rates are at their highest (Mustaine, 1999). However, like other causal explanations, this model does not address one of the most important aspects of a stalking relationship- the relationship itself.

Relationship theories: Although explanations of stalking based on the psychosis, family-of-origin, and routine activity theory have added to the literature by either ruling out past stalking myths or helping researchers to conceptualize the phenomenon in different ways, the most predictive models have been those that assessed violence in the relationship preceding termination (Brewster, 2000; McFarlane, Campbell, Wilt, Sachs, Eulrich, & Xu, 1999; Wright & Burgess, 1996). Findings from these studies indicate that physical violence *during* a romantic relationship is the largest single predictor of violence continuing *after* the relationship is over in the form of post-relationship pursuit. One of the primary distinctions between these studies and other studies assessing "stalking" is that researchers assessing post-relationship pursuit focus attention on behaviors that happen after a formal relationship,

ruling out issues like erotomanic delusions. Here, the "stalking" literature becomes the "post-relationship pursuit" literature.

Relationship characteristics have been found to be predictive of post-relationship pursuit perpetration, such as jealousy responses to break-ups, the level of sexual intimacy or passion immediately before the break-up, the need for control in the relationship (Dye & Davis, 2003), and the perpetrator's psychological and social control during the relationship (Brewster 2003). Previous analysis of this data set found that the perpetrator's sense of investment significantly predicted the frequency of both severe and non-severe pursuit behaviors, especially for women (Singer & Gray-Little, 2004). In this study, these types of relationship characteristics hypothesized to predict both dating violence and post-relationship pursuit are analyzed to understand how relationship characteristics also predict post-relationship pursuit once dating violence is controlled for.

Although causal theories for dating violence and post-relationship pursuit have many factors in common, few studies have assessed these factors at the same time using the same participants. In particular, no previous studies have examined relationship characteristics that may exist in both dating violence and unwanted pursuit for the same participants. In this study, I wished to examine whether factors found in other studies to be predictive of dating violence (high jealousy and dominance and low anger management in offenders) also correlated with increased post-relationship pursuit. Similarly, I planned to explore whether the relationship characteristics (high investment in the relationship, and high intimacy within the relationship) found to be predictive of post-relationship pursuit also correlated with factors of dating violence, such as assault, injury, and sexual coercion. There is a clear link in the post-relationship pursuit literature between the presence of physical violence within a

20

relationship and its occurrence after the relationship terminates (Bjerregaard, 2000; Brewster, 2000; Brewster, 2003; Coleman, 1997; Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000; Logan, Leukefeld, & Walker, 2000; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000). The link seems to suggest that similar factors underlie both types of violence, but it may be that these relationship characteristics simply correspond to dating violence, which then continues as post-relationship pursuit.

Hypotheses

1) Based on the results of previous dating violence studies and the previous analysis conducted with this data set, I expected that the following relationship characteristics will correlate positively with dating violence and post-relationship pursuit: Length of the relationship, level of Sexual Intimacy, the Number of Break-ups before the final relationship termination, Investment in the relationship, Dominance, Jealousy, Relationship Commitment, and Relationship Distress. Anger Management was expected to negatively correlate with dating violence and post-relationship pursuit.

2) Given the consistent association found in previous studies between violence experienced during the relationship and violence occurring after its termination, I expected to find a positive association between dating violence and post-relationship pursuit in that dating violence will predict post relationship pursuit. In particular, dating violence was expected to predict more severe types of post-relationship pursuit, as these types of post-relationship pursuit are less normative and more threatening.

3) I hypothesized the relationship characteristics would post-relationship pursuit outcomes, and these characteristics would continue to be predictive for post-relationship pursuit when dating violence is controlled for. In effect, I expected relationship

characteristics to be predictive of post-relationship pursuit over and above its association with dating violence during the relationship.

4) Gender differences were observed in the associations between relationship variables and post-relationship pursuit during previous analyses with this data set. Based on these earlier findings, I expected relationship variables specific would be associated with dating violence and post-relationship pursuit outcomes for women (i.e., Investment in the relationship, Relationship Commitment, and Relationship Distress). I also expect that relationship variables that tend to be more consistent from relationship to relationship will be associated with dating violence and post-relationship pursuit for men (i.e. low Anger Management, Dominance, and Jealousy).

METHODS

Participants

Four hundred and thirty seven participants were recruited through the Introductory Psychology Participant Pool at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill in the Fall of 2003 and Spring of 2004 and received 1 hour of research credit toward a 6 hour class requirement for their participation. In order to be included in the analyses, participants had to have had a previous romantic relationship lasting at least 2 months that was terminated at the time of assessment. Participants were asked to answer all the questions regarding a single relationship in which they experienced a "difficult break-up." Three hundred and thirty five participants met the relationship requirement and completed all measures referencing the same relationship. The other 102 participants either did not meet the two month relationship that is now terminated requirement, did not answer substantial portions of the questionnaires, or did not answer all the questionnaires about the same relationship. Of this 335, 223 participants endorsed perpetrating at least one episode of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit. This sample of perpetrators was used for all analyses. The perpetrator sample was made up of 153 women, accounting for 68.6% of the sample, and 70 men, 31.4%, and the sample had a mean age of 19.1 years.

Seventy nine point eight percent of the sample (178 participants) self-identified as Caucasian, 11.2% as African American (25 participants), 4.9% as Asian American (11 participants), 1.8% as Hispanic (4 participants), 0.9% as Native American (2 participants), and 1.3% as "other" (3 participants). Although not representative of the general

demographic distribution nationally or state-wide, this distribution is similar to the general distribution among students taking the introduction to psychology course from which the participant pool was drawn. Most undergraduate students are not financially independent, so parents' annual income was used to help address socio-economic status. Fifty-three percent of students reported that their parents' combined annual income totaled $80,000 or more, 13.3% reported parental annual income of $70,000-79,000, 8.6% reported parental annual income of $60,000-69,000, and 7.9% reported between $50,000 and 59%.

Relationship characteristics. All included participants reported having been in a relationship that lasted at least 2 months, with 38.4% reporting a current relationship, as well. The mean length of the assessed relationship was 7.8 months and ended an average of 13.4 months prior to testing. The mean number of break-ups before the final termination of the relationship was 1.09, with 54.4% of participants reporting at least 1 break-up and reconciliation during the course of the relationship. Eighty nine percent of the participants reported the relationship was an exclusive dating relationship, with 48.2% reporting engaging in intercourse during the course of the relationship. The majority of romantic relationships reported were with an opposite sex partner, with 1.86% of participants indicating that the relationship was with a same-sex partner. Forty-six percent of respondents reported being the partner who terminated the relationship, with 24.6% reporting that their partner made the decision, and 25.3% reporting that the decision to end the relationship had been mutual. Instrumentation:

Post-relationship pursuit: Post-relationship pursuit was measured with the Stalking Behavior Checklist (SBC), which was originally compiled by Coleman (1997) and then later adapted to include a Likert-type scale measuring frequency of specific post-relationship

pursuit behaviors. It contains 27 behavioral items, 13 of which rank as non-severe and therefore have to have a greater frequency of occurrence to be classified as post-relationship pursuit, and 14 of which rank as severe and therefore need to only have happened at least twice for post-relationship pursuit to have taken place. Non-severe items include pursuit behaviors such as "Called him/her at home," "Talked to his/her parents or friends to get information about him/her," and "Drove by his/her house." Severe items include pursuit behaviors such as "Made threats to his/her new partner," "Attempted to break into his/her home or car," "Threatened to physically harm myself," and "Physically harmed him/her." Coleman (1997) found an average of 3.32 non-severe behaviors and an average of 1.1 severe post-relationship pursuit behaviors among men who had been reported to the police for post-relationship pursuit behavior. The SBC has been commonly recognized as containing a representative collection of post-relationship pursuit behaviors derived from police and victim reports. It was again adapted by Logan, Leukefeld, and Walker (2000) to measure both post-relationship pursuit perpetration and victimization with the same behavior items by adding the question "My former partner did this to me" following each behavior. This adaptation allows measurement of patterns of post-relationship pursuit victimization as well as perpetration. Frequency was assessed for both non-severe and severe items by counting the number of endorsed behaviors in each range. For the purposes of this study, the SBC was re-named "The Post-relationship Behavior Index" when given to participants.

The SBC was factor-analyzed prior to the rest of the data analysis for the current study. Three theoretically relevant factors emerged. "Nonsevere Post-relationship Pursuit" was similar to the original nonsevere classification. "Ambiguous Post-relationship Pursuit" was an entirely new subscale containing 3 items that were unclear as to their intent: "I

25

followed my former partner," "I watched my former partner," and "I went to a location where I knew my partner would be." Finally, "Severe Post-relationship Pursuit" was similar to the original severe classification and included items that appeared to be threatening, such as "Called and hung up" that was originally classified as a nonsevere behavior in the SBC.

The "Nonsevere" subscale appears to be made up of items that in themselves do not contain threats or a clear violent component. In fact, without placing a frequency constraint of the behavior occurring at least once a week following the break-up, 92% of participants report at least one instance of one behavior. These behaviors are actually normative in this sample, which is unsurprising as they could reflect a break-up or separation process that many couples experience, as they call, email or write, or meet in person to finalize the end of the relationship and process what that ending means. For this reason, a frequency criteria for these behaviors occurring at least once a week was established to differentiate between the normative break-up process and a connection that persists post-relationship. The frequency criteria lowers the prevalence of occurrence from 92% of participants reporting at least one behavior to 65.7%, which is still a substantial proportion of participants who initiate contact after the relationship termination. Therefore, while this subscale was intended to measure behaviors that might be non-threatening in content but uncomfortable because of their high frequency, it may still be capturing a continued relationship that is not a violent one. The results and findings should be viewed with this possibility in mind.

The second of the three post-relationship pursuit scales is Ambiguous Post-relationship Pursuit. This scale consisted of three items that while not clearly threatening, were also not part of the normative break-up process. Two of these types of behaviors (following, watching their former partner) were originally classified by the authors in the

"nonsevere" category, and so the same frequency constraint of the behavior occurring at least once a week was applied. The third type of behavior (and stealing or reading their former partner's mail) was originially classified in the "severe" category, but because it is not explicitly violent, the frequency constraint of occurring at least once a week was again applied. Because there were so few behaviors, the range and the amount of information collected regarding Ambiguous post-relationship pursuit was quite limited. Other post-relationship pursuit scales have also classified these behaviors as "nonsevere" or "indirect," but there may be something unique about individuals who perpetrate this kind of post-relationship pursuit that is not overtly threatening but also does not fall into the range of typical break-up behaviors. Additional research to further define this construct might prove fruitful in understanding perpetrators who may not necessarily use explicit violence to pursue or stalk their targets.

The third of the post-relationship pursuit scales is Severe Post-relationship Pursuit, which appears in many ways to be the clearest and most easily defined. These behaviors included some type of threatening content, and so unlike the previous two scales, these behaviors need to have happened only twice rather than weekly. One criticism that has been found with this scale, however, is that threats as well as actual violence are both included, and there may in fact be a substantial difference between the two. Although factor analysis did not indicate two different factors appearing in this scale, analyzing the distinction between individuals who threaten vs. follow through with those threats might be very meaningful in assessing risk for potential victims.

Dating violence: Dating violence was measured with the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996), which was produced in

1996 as a revision of Straus's (1979) Conflict Tactics Scale. The questionnaire contains 39 items assessing the ways in which partners deal with conflict within a relationship, measuring outcomes with subscales of Physical Assault, Injury, Psychological Aggression, Sexual Coercion, and Negotiation. These items are answered on a 0 to 7 ordinal scale, with ratings of 0-6 indicating the frequency of occurrence in the past year (or last year of the relationship), and 7 indicating previous occurrence but not in the past year (or last year of the relationship). Participants are asked to respond to the items rating frequency of their perpetration (i.e. I hit my partner, I forced my partner to have sex when they didn't want to, I accused my partner of being a lousy lover) as well frequency of their victimization (i.e. My partner did this to me). Internal reliability alphas for all subscales indicate good reliability (Physical Assault = .86, Injury = .95, Psychological Aggression = .79, Sexual Coercion = .87, and Negotiation = .86), and it is generally recognized as a valid and reliable measure in the field (Archer, 1999). Frequency of behaviors for the Minor and Severe Assault, Minor and Severe Injury, and Minor and Severe Sexual Coercion subscales were used as dependent variables measuring dating violence.

Relationship Characteristics: Relationship characteristics of jealousy, dominance, anger management, relationship commitment, relationship distress, and investment in the relationship were of primary interest. Five of these characteristics were measured with The Personal and Relationships Profile (PRP). Jealousy was defined by the scale as extreme concern about the possible sexual and social exclusiveness of a person's partner or former partner. There are 8 items on this scale, such as "I would hate it if my partner paid a lot of attention to someone besides me" or "I would be upset if my partner hugged someone a little too long." Dominance involves a relationship that is hierarchical and in which the person

with greater advantage uses the advantage to gain status, privilege, or control over his or her partner. This subscale consists of 9 items such as "Sometimes I have to remind my partner of who's boss" or "I have a right to be involved with everything my partner does." Anger Management is conceptualized as a person's ability to recognize the signs of anger and use self-talk or behavioral self-soothing to actively deal with that anger. There are 9 items on this scale, such as "I can calm myself down when I am upset with my partner," and "When I feel myself getting angry at my partner, I try to tell myself to calm down." Relationship Commitment is the degree to which a person wishes and plans to work for the ongoing existence of the relationship. This subscale consists of six items, such as "My relationship with my partner is the most important relationship I have" and "Caring for my partner means more to me than caring for my self." Finally Relationship Distress is a subscale that assesses areas of dissatisfaction with the relationship, characterized by high conflict and few positive interactions. There are 8 items on this subscale, such as "I wish my partner and I got along better than we do" and "My partner treats me well (reversed)."

These scales are part of the PRP, which was developed in 1999 by Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman as a collection of 22 subscales assessing both personal or intrapsychic measures (screens for clinical syndromes and personality disorders, history of abuse, social desirability, etc.) and relationship characteristics (jealousy, dominance, conflict, etc.) that are often correlates of dating and domestic violence. The questionnaire's 206 items are answered on a 1-4 ordinal scale asking participants to rate their level of agreement (1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=agree, 4= strongly agree) to items such as those described above. Internal reliability among college students is adequate, with a mean alpha of .74. Summed scores from the jealousy, anger management, dominance, relationship

commitment, and relationship distress scales were used as independent variables, with higher values indicating greater quantity or intensity of the construct.

Investment in the relationship was assessed with the Investment Model Scale, Revised (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998). This measure consists of subscales assessing investment in relationships, the availability of alternatives to the present relationship, the degree of perceived commitment to the relationship, and the degree of relationship satisfaction. Only the investment subscale was included in this study. Each subscale consists of 7 items on which respondents rate how strongly they agree or disagree on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with higher scores indicating greater quantity. Investment items include questions such as "I put a lot of time and energy into my relationship," and "I shared many interests and activities with my partner that I lost when we broke up." Rubult et al. (1998) report Cronbach alphas of .77 for investment. Using a sample of married persons, Rusbult, Johnson, and Morrow (1986) found that men obtained a mean investment score of 4.39, and women, a mean of 4.51. Mean scores for the Investment subscale was used as an independent variable.

Demographic Information: The questionnaire battery also included a demographics questionnaire to assess participant characteristics (gender, age, ethnicity, year in school, sexual orientation, parental income), as well as relationship demographics for the terminated relationship, including the number of past relationships, gender of partner in past relationship, length of past relationship, formal status during relationship (dating, living together, engaged, married, etc.), sexual intimacy in past relationship (kissing to intercourse), the number of times the couple broke up before finally terminating the relationship, who terminated the relationship, age at the time of relationship termination, and how much time

has passed since the termination of the relationship. While all of these variables were used to assess and define the sample, Length, Intimacy level, and the Number of Break-ups before termination were used as independent variables in the regression analyses.

Procedures

Participants signed up for a one hour block of time. Upon arrival at the testing site (a classroom), the administrator informed participants about the procedures of the study and gave them consent forms to sign and instructions to complete the questionnaire contained in a packet (see Appendix A). Consent procedures included information regarding the nature of the study as an examination of current- and post-relationship behavior and the administrator assured the participants that their time would be credited regardless of completion of the questionnaires (See Appendix B). When they completed all questionnaires, participants returned all test materials to the packet envelopes, sealed the envelopes, and dropped them into a box at the front of the room. The administrator debriefed and gave each participant a referral to psychological services in the event that distress had taken place as a result of completing the questionnaires (See Appendix C). No names were included on the questionnaires to ensure anonymity as well as confidentiality.

Data Analysis

To empirically examine the underlying structure of the Stalking Behavior Checklist, a 27 item scale, I conducted an unrestricted exploratory factor analysis (EFA) of the 27 items using a principal component analysis. The final solution was rotated using an oblique rotation to determine appropriate factors as outcome variables for the Stalking Behavior Checklist.

Next, correlations were then run to assess the association among the relationship variables, dating violence, and post-relationship pursuit. The correlations were run on the total perpetrator sample of 223 participants who had engaged in at least one dating violence or post-relationship pursuit behavior and then for men and women separately.

The third stage of the analyses consisted of hierarchical regression models that were run to determine if independent variables of relationship Length, level of Intimacy, the Number of Break-ups before the final termination, Investment in the relationship, Anger Management, Jealousy, Dominance, Relationship Commitment, and Relationship Distress account for significant variance in post-relationship variables once dating violence is controlled. Dating violence was assessed by these variables: Minor and Severe Assault, Injury, and Sexual Coercion interactions, (from the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale). Post-relationship Pursuit was assessed by the numbers of behaviors in the Nonsevere, Severe, and Ambiguous Post-relationship Pursuit subscales of the Stalking Behavior Checklist. These models were run for the total perpetrator sample, and for men and women separately.

To further assess the association between the relationship predictors, dating violence, and post-relationship pursuit, mediation analyses were conducted to determine whether the occurrence of violence within the relationship mediated the association between the relationship variables and post-relationship pursuit. Mediation analyses were run for the total perpetrator sample, and for men and women separately.

RESULTS

Descriptive Analyses

   Relationship Characteristics. Two measures contributed the six relationship

variables used in the analyses. The Investment scale measures perceived investment on a 1-7

scale. The items are then averaged to create the subscale, with higher scores indicating

greater investment. Participants had a mean investment rating of 4.70, with a standard

deviation of 1.18. This mean was comparable to the mean ratings found by Rusbult, Martz,

& Agnew (1998). Five of the 22 subscales of the Personal Relationship Profile (PRP) were

used in the present analyses. All of the subscales consisted of items on a 1-4 scale, which are

then summed to create subscale scores, with higher scores suggesting stronger or greater

experience of the construct.   Anger Management had a mean of 26.34 and a standard

deviation of 3.14. Dominance had a mean of 16.51 and a standard deviation of 3.16.

Jealousy had a mean of 20.47 and a standard deviation of 4.51. Relationship Commitment

had a mean of 15.71 and a standard deviation of 3.07. Finally, Relationship Distress had a

mean of 13.86 and a standard deviation of 4.03. These results suggest that although this

sample was made up of a special population of college students, it has similar rates of the

relationship characteristics compared to previous investigations using the same measures.

See Table 1 for means and standard deviations for the relationship variables for the Total

sample, and for men and women separately.

Table 1
Relationship characteristics used in analyses for all samples

Characteristics	Men		Women		Total	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Relationship Length (months)	7.10	1.41	8.43	1.70	7.83	1.62
Number of break-ups	0.84	1.17	1.21	1.53	1.09	1.43
Intimacy	3.15	1.00	2.97	1.09	3.02	1.07
Investment	4.49	1.04	4.76	1.21	4.70	1.18
Anger Management	26.88	3.26	26.08	3.06	26.34	3.14
Dominance	16.95	3.37	16.31	3.05	16.51	3.16
Relationship Commitment	16.03	2.95	15.56	3.13	15.71	3.07
Relationship Distress	13.85	3.82	13.87	4.15	13.86	4.03

Note: N=223 participants endorsing perpetration of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit.
Note: Higher scores indicate greater Intimacy, Investment, Anger Management, etc.

Violence. Dating violence was measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale. Assault perpetration was assessed in terms of Total Assault, Minor Assault, and Severe Assault. Thirty one percent of participants endorsed any Assault behavior, with 29.13% of participants endorsing Minor Assault, and 12.58% of participants endorsing Severe Assault. Participants reported perpetrating a mean of 0.76 Total Assault incidents, with a mean of 0.57 Minor Assault incidents, and a mean of 0.18 Severe Assault incidents. Injury perpetration was assessed in terms of Total Injury, Minor Injury, and Severe Injury. For Total Injury, 6.87% of participants endorsed any violent interaction where they injured their partner, with 6.59% endorsing Minor Injury, and 0.9% endorsing Severe Injury. Participants reported perpetrating a mean of 0.11 total incidents resulting in Injury, with a mean of 0.08 incidents resulting in Minor Injury, and a mean of 0.02 incidents resulting in Severe Injury. Sexual Coercion was assessed in terms of Total Sexual Coercion, Minor Sexual Coercion, and Severe Sexual Coercion. For Total Sexual Coercion, 25.07% of participants endorsed at least one interaction where they used force or coercion to have sex with their partner, with 25.06% of participants endorsing Minor Sexual Coercion, and 2.1% of participants endorsing

34

Severe Sexual Coercion. Participants reported perpetrating a mean of 0.42 Total Sexually

Coercive behaviors, with a mean of 0.39 Minor Sexually Coercive behaviors, and a mean of

0.03 Severe Sexually Coercive behaviors. The prevalence ratings for dating violence and

post-relationship pursuit suggest that these are common occurrences in this college sample.

The results and breakdowns of prevalence, means, and standard deviations for men, women,

and the total sample can be found in Table 2.

Table 2
Dating violence and post-relationship pursuit rates for men, women, and entire sample

Variable	Men			Women			Total		
	Prevalence	*M*	*SD*	Prevalence	*M*	*SD*	Prevalence	*M*	*SD*
	Dating Violence								
Minor Assault	20.91%	0.48	1.16	33.33%	0.63	1.11	29.13%	0.57	1.13
Severe Assault	9.09%	0.16	0.60	14.35%	0.19	0.54	12.58%	0.18	0.56
Total Assault	22.73%	0.65	1.64	35.13%	0.81	1.51	31.00%	0.76	1.55
Minor Injury	6.36%	0.10	0.41	6.73%	0.08	0.30	6.87%	0.11	0.46
Severe Injury	0	--	--	1.35%	0.04	0.34	0.90%	0.02	0.28
Total Injury	6.36%	0.10	0.41	7.14%	0.11	0.49	6.87%	0.11	0.46
Minor Sexual Coercion	28.18%	0.51	0.90	23.66%	0.33	0.67	25.07%	0.39	0.76
Severe Sexual Coercion	1.82%	0.05	0.39	2.24%	0.02	0.15	2.10%	0.03	0.26
Total Sexual Coercion	28.18%	0.55	1.09	23.66%	0.35	0.76	25.07%	0.42	0.88
	Post-Relationship Pursuit								
Non-severe	70.91%	1.56	1.44	63.39%	1.23	1.35	65.67%	1.33	1.35
Ambiguous	12.73%	0.13	0.33	7.59%	0.08	0.29	9.25%	0.10	0.30
Severe	18.18%	0.32	1.56	14.73%	0.14	0.03	15.18%	0.20	0.96
Total	53.64%	1.65	2.59	49.11%	1.12	1.71	50.55%	1.29	2.05

Note: N=335 participants reporting on a relationship lasting at least 2 months, now terminated.

To define appropriate factors defining post-relationship pursuit, an exploratory factor

analysis using oblique rotation was conducted with the Stalking Behavior Checklist. Initial

eigenvalues indicated no more than five factors were needed. Upon examination of these factors, two factors had only one item associated, and these items had low associations. These items and factors were removed, leaving three factors. Together, these three factors accounted for 63.1% of the variance in the Stalking Behavior Checklist, with factor 1 making up 47.7%, factor 2 making up 15.3%, and factor 3 making up 6.1% of the variance. Factor 1 consisted of 15 behaviors that had a clear threatening element, such as explicit threats, damaging the target's property, or violent behavior toward the former partner or their new partner. This factor will be referred to as "Severe Post-Relationship Pursuit." The second factor defined through the exploratory factor analysis was made up of 8 items that were found to be non-threatening and are likely to be normative break-up behaviors for college students, such as phone calls to former partners and sending letters or gifts. These items will be referred to as "Nonsevere Post-Relationship Pursuit." The third factor was made up of three behaviors for which intent was unclear and while not explicitly threatening, might be interpreted as such by a target of the pursuit, such as following, watching the target, or stealing or reading their mail. These items will be referred to as "Ambiguous Post-Relationship Pursuit." While these factors appear similar to those originally defined by the authors, some of the specific items originally termed to be "nonsevere" by the authors loaded on the "severe" factor (making hang-up calls) or the "ambiguous" factor (following and watching the former partner). Item factor loadings following oblique rotation can be found in Table 3.

For Nonsevere Post-Relationship Pursuit, 65.67% of participants reported perpetrating at least one Nonsevere behavior that met frequency standards (i.e. occurring at least once a week), with a mean of 1.33 Nonsevere behaviors. For Ambiguous Post-

Relationship Pursuit, 9.25% of participants reported perpetrating at least one Ambiguous

behavior that met frequency standards (i.e. occurring at least once a week), with a mean of

0.10 behaviors. For Severe Post-Relationship Pursuit, 15.18% of participants reported

perpetrating at least one Severe behavior that met frequency standards (i.e. occurring at least

twice), with a mean of 0.20 behaviors. These results and breakdowns of prevalence, means,

and standard deviations for men, women, and the total sample also can be found in Table 2.

Table 3
Item factor loadings, means, and standard deviations for the Stalking Behavior Checklist

Item	Factors			*M*	*SD*
	1	2	3		
1. Called him/her at home	.02	**.76**	-.20	2.87	1.44
2. Called him/her at work.	-.08	.15	.09	0.29	0.85
3. Came to his/her home.	.04	**.77**	-.18	2.17	1.29
4. Came to his/her work or school.	-.03	.10	.12	0.83	1.45
5. Talked to his/her parents and/or friends to get information or to talk about him/her.	.08	**.51**	.23	2.14	1.18
6. Followed him/her.	.23	.15	**.44**	0.95	0.46
7. Made hang-up calls.	**.44**	.19	.10	0.98	0.60
8. Sent him/her letters.	.16	**.64**	-.18	1.55	0.93
9. Sent him/her gifts.	.23	**.68**	-.17	0.54	0.65
10. Drove by their house.	.12	**.54**	.28	0.89	0.98
11. Watched him/her.	.16	.23	**.58**	0.51	1.13
12. Left messages on his/her machine.	.08	**.72**	-.21	0.79	1.19
13. Sent him/her photos.	.21	**.55**	-.23	0.25	0.67
14. Made threats to his/her new partner.	**.68**	.17	.21	0.07	0.89
15. Attempted to break into his/her car.	**.96**	-.16	-.12	0.01	0.56
16. Attempted to break into his/her house.	**.94**	-.18	-.09	0.01	0.56
17. Broke into his/her home.	**.85**	-.04	.16	0.01	0.56
18. Broke into his/her car.	**.95**	-.15	.10	0.04	0.06
19. Violated a restraining order.	**.89**	-.03	-.08	0.01	0.16
20. Threatened to cause self-harm.	**.92**	-.02	.18	0.62	1.02
21. Threatened to harm him/her.	**.96**	-.16	-.12	0.22	0.94
22. Stole/read his/her mail.	.21	-.15	**.54**	0.09	0.82
23. Attempted to harm him/her.	**.93**	-.15	-.13	0.02	0.28
24. Damaged property of his/her new partner.	**.88**	-.03	.13	0.06	0.72
25. Physically harmed yourself.	**.60**	.004	-.07	0.15	0.93
26. Harmed his/her new partner.	**.83**	-.12	-.10	0.01	0.13
27. Physically harmed him/her.	**.97**	-.16	-.12	0.01	0.11

Note: The values in boldface type reflect the item's primary factor loading.
Note: Items 2 and 4 did not load on these three factors and were removed from analyses.

Dating violence and post-relationship pursuit overlap. There appears to be

considerable overlap between those perpetrators who are violent during the relationship and

those who are violent after the relationship ends. Table 4 represents percentages of the *total*

sample who endorsed committing dating violence, post-relationship pursuit, both, or neither.

It appears that approximately one third of the 335 participants who answered all

questionnaires referencing the same relationship did not engage in either type of violence,

which means that about two thirds of all participants perpetrated some form of violence

against their former partner. Of this total sample, 23.9% of the sample reported perpetrating

post-relationship pursuit, but not dating violence, 16.2% reported perpetrating dating

violence but not post-relationship pursuit, and 26.5% reported perpetrating both. This

overlap reflects the substantial co-occurrence of dating violence and post-relationship

pursuit, but also highlights that there are some relationships that are violent during the

relationship but not afterwards and others that become violent after termination without the

occurrence of prior dating violence.

Table 4
Relationship violence groups: prevalence for men, women, and the total sample

		Dating Violence		
		Yes	No	Total
		Men		
Post-Relationship Pursuit	Yes	24.5%	29.1%	53.6%
	No	11.9%	35.5%	46.4%
	Total	36.4%	63.6%	100.00%
		Women		
	Yes	27.5%	21.4%	48.9%
	No	18.3%	32.8%	51.1%
	Total	45.8%	54.2%	100.0%
		Total sample		
	Yes	26.5%	23.9%	50.6%
	No	16.2%	33.4%	34.6%
	Total	42.7%	57.3%	100.0%

Note: N=335 participants reporting on a relationship lasting at least 2 months, now
terminated.

Correlational Analyses

      Correlations among relationship predictors. The rest of the analyses were conducted using the "perpetrator sample" of participants who endorsed committing at least one dating violence or post-relationship pursuit item. Relationship Length, Intimacy level, the Number of Break-ups before final termination, Investment in the relationship, Anger Management, Dominance, Jealousy, Relationship Commitment, and Relationship Distress were considered relationship predictors. It was hypothesized there would be significant positive correlations among these predictors, except Anger Management, which would correlate negatively. In general, the number of significant correlations and the effect sizes of these correlations were lower than anticipated. Patterns to the correlations indicate associations among the demographic relationship characteristics and investment with small to moderate effect sizes. There was also a pattern of correlation among relationship characteristics from the PRP with small to moderate effect sizes. Correlation patterns among these predictors were similar for both men and women. See Table 5 for correlations among relationship predictors for perpetrators.

Table 5
Correlations among relationship characteristics for the total sample of 223 perpetrators.

Characteristic	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Relationship Length	.31**	.35**	.46**	-.15*	-.04	-.02	.07	-.05
2. Number of Break-ups	1	.21**	.25**	-.22**	.05	.001	-.07	.25**
3. Intimacy	-	1	.41**	-.15*	.10	.14*	-.07	.07
4. Investment	-	--	1	-.11	-.002	.12	.12	-.05
5. Anger Management	-	--	--	1	-.29**	-.16*	.21**	-.35**
6. Dominance	-	--	--	--	1	.33**	-.17*	.44**
7. Jealousy	-	--	--	--	--	1	-.03	.10
8. Relationship Commitment	-	--	--	--	--	--	1	-.58**
9. Relationship Distress	-	--	--	--	--	--	--	1

* p<.05
** p<.01
Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit.

   Correlations among Dating Violence and Post-relationship Pursuit variables. Minor and Severe Assault, Minor and Severe Injury, and Minor and Severe Sexual Coercion were variables assessing dating violence. Nonsevere, Severe, and Ambigous Post-relationship Pursuit were variables assessing violence following a dating relationship. It was hypothesized that there would be positive correlations among all the dating violence measures and among all the post-relationship pursuit behaviors, and between the dating violence measures and the Ambiguous Severe and Post-Relationship Pursuit measures. With one exception of the association between Minor Injury and Severe Sexual Coercion, each of the dating violence variables were correlated with the other dating violence variables, and all at a significance level of at least p<.01. The post-relationship pursuit variables were also significantly associated with one another to a small to moderate level. As expected, all of the dating violence variables correlated significantly with severe post-relationship pursuit, with one exception of Severe Injury. Neither Nonsevere Post-Relationship Pursuit nor Ambiguous Post-Relationship Pursuit were significantly associated with any of the dating

violence variables. These results were similar when correlations were run separately for men and women. See Table 6 for information regarding correlations among dating violence and post-relationship pursuit for perpetrators.

Table 6
Correlations among relationship violence variables for the total sample of 223 perpetrators.

Variable	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Minor Assault	.63**	.61**	.30**	.30**	.28**	.02	.01	.34**
2. Severe Assault	1	.53**	.45**	.28**	.34**	.10	.01	.43**
3. Minor Injury	--	1	.18**	.35**	.11	.09	.03	.35**
4. Severe Injury	--	--	1	.70**	.28**	.02	-.01	.01
5. Minor Sexual Coercion	--	--	--	1	.36**	.07	-.07	.29**
6. Severe Sexual Coercion	--	--	--	--	1	.04	.11	.45**
7. Nonsevere Post-Relationship Pursuit	--	--	--	--	--	1	.16*	.18**
8. Ambiguous Post-Relationship Pursuit	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	.29**
9. Severe Post-Relationship Pursuit	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1

*p<.05
**p<.01
Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit

Correlations among relationship variables and dating violence and post-relationship pursuit. Correlations were run to assess the association between the relationship variables and the dating violence and post-relationship pursuit outcomes. Hypotheses stated that Length, Intimacy, the Number of Break-ups before termination, Investment, Dominance, Jealousy, Relationship Commitment, and Relationship Distress would correlate positively with dating violence and post-relationship pursuit variables, and that Anger Management would correlate negatively with dating violence and post-relationship pursuit variables. The resulting correlations were of less magnitude, (i.e., lower in effect size) and were less frequently significant than expected. Some dating violence and post-relationship pursuit outcomes had more significant correlations associated with them than others. Minor Assault

and Minor Sexual Coercion had more relationship characteristics significantly associated with them than the other dating violence outcomes. The post-relationship pursuit outcomes had less consistent correlations, though Nonsevere and Severe Post-Relatioinship Pursuit were both significantly associated with Investment. See Table 7 for correlations between relationship characteristics and dating violence and post-relationship pursuit.

Table 7
Correlations among relationship characteristics and relationship violence variables

Variable	Minor Assault	Severe Assault	Minor Injury	Severe Injury	Minor Sexual Coercion	Severe Sexual Coercion	N-S PRB	Ambig PRB	Severe PRB
Length	.18**	.18**	.09	.09	.21**	.03	.10	-.15*	.13
Number of break-ups	.15*	.06	.12	.01	.23**	.10	-.01	.02	.06
Intimacy	.15*	.16*	.10	-.08	.22**	.08	.13	-.05	.15*
Investment	-.07	-.08	.03	-.17.*	-.05	-.12	.22**	-.04	.26**
Anger Management	-.25**	-.15*	-.10	-.10	-.20**	-.06	.03	-.05	-.14*
Dominance	.14*	.03	.12	-.09	.16*	.15*	-.01	.20**	.06
Jealousy	.03	-.05	.08	-.10	.12	-.05	-.07	.07	-.03
Relationship Commitment	-.16*	-.05	-.09	.06	-.05	.03	.09	-.06	-.01
Relationship Distress	.16**	.14*	.12	.06	.10	.05	-.08	.09	.04

*p<.05
**p<.01
Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit.

Regression Analyses

Hierarchical regression analyses. Although some of the effect sizes were small, correlational analyses generally indicated associations among relationship characteristics, the dating violence variables, and the post-relationship pursuit outcomes. To assess whether relationship characteristics can still be predictive of post-relationship pursuit variables once the variance in post-relationship pursuit associated with dating violence is controlled for, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. Minor dating violence variables were

entered into block 1, severe dating violence variables were entered into block 2, and the relationship characteristics were entered into block 3. Due to the low correlation among the outcome measures and the relationship characteristics of Jealousy, Relationship Commitment and Relationship Distress, only relationship Length, Intimacy, the Number of Break-ups before final termination, Investment, Anger Management, and Dominance were included in block 3. Individual Analysis of Variance Models (ANOVAs) associated with each block were also assessed. Regressions were run separately for the total sample, for men, and for women.

Although the dating violence blocks were not significant for Nonsevere Post-Relationship Pursuit for the total subset (Block 1: F (3,223) = 1.18, NS, Block 2: F change (3,223)= .79, $NS)$, relationship characteristics were significant once variance associated with dating violence was controlled for (Block 3: F change(6, 223)= 2.79, p=.02). Investment significantly predicted Nonsevere Post-Relationship Pursuit (B = .29, t(223) = 2.69, p = .01). When the genders were analyzed separately, all models predicting Nonsevere Post-Relationship pursuit were not significant for men. However, the coefficients for Minor Assault (B=.42, t(70)=2.04, p=.04) and Investment (B=.31, t(70)= 2.17, p=.03) were significant for men. For women, the models were again not significant. The coefficients for Minor Injury (B=.20, t(153), 2.01, p= .04) and for Investment (B=.22, t(153)= 2.05, p=.04) did reach significance. See Table 8 for the hierarchical regression models and Table 9 for the coefficients of the individual variables predicting Nonsevere Post-Relationship Pursuit for men, women, and the total sample.

Table 8

Hierarchical regression for post-relationship pursuit outcomes with minor dating violence in block 1, severe dating violence in block 2, and relationship characteristics in block 3

Predictors	Men			Women			Total		
	r^2	df	*F change*	r^2	df	*F change*	r^2	df	*F change*
Nonsevere Post-relationship Pursuit									
Block 1: Minor DV	.04	3	0.82	.04	3	2.0	.02	3	1.18
Block 2: Severe DV	.07	2	1.02	.06	3	0.77	.03	3	0.79
Block 3: Relationship Characteristics	.15	6	0.98	.13	6	1.90	.10	6	2.79*
Ambiguous Post-relationship Pursuit									
Block 1: Minor DV	.02	3	0.486	.06	3	2.69*	.01	3	0.71
Block 2: Severe DV	.09	2	2.45	.06	3	0.63	.04	3	2.40
Block 3: Relationship Characteristics	.23	6	1.76	.12	6	1.55	.11	6	2.71*
Severe Post-relationship Pursuit									
Block 1: Minor DV	.22	3	6.01**	.05	3	2.31	.10	3	8.28**
Block 2: Severe DV	.55	2	23.62**	.06	3	0.50	.26	3	15.01**
Block 2: Relationship Characteristics	.62	6	1.68	.14	6	2.33*	.31	6	2.67*

*p<.05

**p<.01

Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit.

Table 9

Standardized coefficients for minor and severe dating violence and relationship characteristics predicting nonsevere post-relationship pursuit

Variable	Men		Women		Total	
	Beta	*t*	Beta	*t*	Beta	*t*
Minor Dating Violence						
Minor Assault	0.42	2.04*	0.03	0.30	0.08	0.10
Minor Injury	0.21	1.04	0.20	2.01*	0.16	1.82
Minor Sexual Coercion	0.003	0.02	-0.12	-1.31	-0.06	-0.78
Severe Dating Violence						
Severe Assault	0.12	0.69	0.02	0.19	0.05	0.54
Severe Injury	--	--	-0.13	-1.34	-0.10	-1.41
Severe Sexual Coercion	0.16	1.11	-0.01	-0.06	0.04	0.59
Relationship Characteristics						
Length	-0.12	-0.80	0.05	0.46	0.02	0.18
Intimacy	-0.15	-1.14	0.06	0.63	0.03	0.36
Number of break-ups	-0.05	-0.33	-0.03	-0.31	-0.07	-0.87
Investment	0.31	2.17*	0.22	2.05*	0.23	2.70**
Anger management	-0.10	-0.66	0.06	0.67	0.04	0.56
Dominance	-0.06	-0.44	0.01	0.06	0.02	0.33

*p<.05
**p<.01
Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit.

When analyzing the total sample, the minor and severe dating violence models for Ambiguous Post-relationship Pursuit were not significant (Block1: $F(3,223)$= .71, *NS*, Block 2: *F change*$(3,223)$= 2.4, *NS*). However, the model testing whether relationship characteristics predicted post-relationship pursuit once dating violence was accounted for was significant *(F change*$(6,223)$= 2.71, *p*= .02) The coefficients for Minor Sexual Coercion (B=.168, $t(223)$=2.30 *p*=.02) and for Severe Sexual Coercion (B=.20, $t(223)$=2.67, *p*=.01) were both significant, as was the coefficient for Dominance (B=.22, $t(223)$=3.12, *p*=.002). When analyzing men alone, all three models were not significant. However, Severe Sexual Coercion (B=.32, t(70)= 2.24, p=.03) was individually predictive of Ambiguous Post-Relationship Pursuit. With women only, the minor dating violence block significantly

predicted Ambigious Post-Relationship Pursuit, (Block1: $F(3,153)$= 2.69, p=.04), but the

other two blocks were not significant (Block 2: *F change* $(3,153)$= .63, *NS,* Block 3: *F*

change $(6,153)$=1.55, *NS*). Specifically, Minor Sexual Coercion (*B*= .26, *t*(153)=2.78,

p=.006) significantly predicted Ambiguous Post-Relationship Pursuit. See Table 8 for model

information for Ambigious Post-Relationship Pursuit and Table 10 for information about

individual coefficients.

Table 10
*Standardized coefficients for minor and severe dating violence and relationship
characteristics predicting ambiguous post-relationship pursuit*

Variable	Men		Women		Total	
	Beta	*t*	Beta	*t*	Beta	*t*
Minor Dating Violence						
Minor Assault	0.01	0.07	0.09	0.81	0.01	0.10
Minor Injury	-0.16	-0.92	0.13	1.36	0.05	0.58
Minor Sexual Coercion	0.05	0.37	0.26	2.78**	0.18	2.29*
Severe Dating Violence						
Severe Assault	0.10	0.57	-0.13	-1.22	-0.09	-1.02
Severe Injury	--	--	-0.05	-0.49	-0.04	-0.56
Severe Sexual Coercion	0.32	2.24*	0.09	0.81	0.20	2.67*
Relationship Characteristics						
Length	-0.25	-1.74	-0.07	-0.67	-0.14	-1.66
Intimacy	0.12	0.97	0.20	1.93	-0.04	-0.57
Number of break-ups	0.13	0.99	0.08	0.89	0.09	1.26
Investment	0.06	0.43	0.08	0.76	0.03	0.40
Anger management	-0.04	-0.25	0.01	0.15	-0.01	-0.11
Dominance	0.22	1.68	0.16	1.34	0.22	
						3.12**

*p<.05
**p<.01
Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence
or post-relationship pursuit.

In the hierarchical regression for Severe Post-Relationship Pursuit with the total

sample, all three models were significant both as hierarchical blocks (Block 1: $F(3,223)$=

8.28, p<.000, Block 2: *F change* (3, 223)= 15.01, p<.000, Block 3: *F change* (6,223)= 2.67,

p=.02), and as individual ANOVA models (Model 1: $F(3,223)$= 8.28, p<.000, Model 2:

$F(6,223)= 12.45$, $p<.000$, Model 3: $F(12, 223)= 7.85$, $p<.000$). Specifically, the coeffiecients

for Minor Assault ($B=.24$, $t(223)=2.96$, $p=.003$), Minor Sexual Coercion ($B=.18$, $t(223)=2.63$,

$p=.01$), Severe Injury ($B=.13$, $t(223)=2.09$, $p=.04$), Severe Sexual Coercion ($B=.44$, $t(223)=$

6.68, $p<.000$), and Investment ($B=.21$, $t(223)=2.81$, $p=.006$) were significant predictors of

Severe Post-Relationship Pursuit.. For men, a similar pattern of associations emerged. All

models were significant when entered individually (Model/Block1: $F(3,70)=6.01$, $p=.001$,

Model 2: $F(5, 70)=15.53$, $p<.000$, Model 3: $F(11,70)=8.43$, $p<.000$), and when entered in a

hierarchical fashion, the first two blocks, the dating violence blocks, were significant

(Block1: $F(3,70)=6.01$, $p=.001$, Block 2: F $change$ $(2, 70)= 23.62$, $p<.000$), but not the

relationship characteristics block (Block 3: F $change$ $(6,70)= 1.68$, NS).   Minor Sexual

Coercion ($B=.25$, $t(70)= 2.1$, $p=.04$), Severe Sexual Coercion ($B=.65$, $t(70)= 6.53$, p$<.000$),

and Investment ($B=.21$, $t(70)=2.14$, $p=.04$) were individually predictive of Severe Post-

Relationship Pursuit for men.   When women were analyzed alone, however, only the

relationships characteristics models were significant when entered hierarchically (Block 3: F

$change(6,153)= 2.33$, $p=.03$ or individually as an ANOVA ($F(12,153)= 1.90$, $p=.04$). Minor

Assault ($B=.22$, $t(153)= 2.37$, $p=.02$) and Investment ($B=.27$, $t(153)= 2.72$, $p=.007$) were both

significant coefficients predicting severe post-relationship pursuit for women. See Table 8

for overall hierarchical model information predicting Severe Post-Relationship Pursuit and

Table 11 for information regarding individual coefficients.

Taken together, the hierarchical analyses indicate that relationship characteristics,

particularly investment and dominance, do predict Nonsevere, Ambiguous, and Severe Post-

Relationship Pursuit once dating violence is controlled, as was hypothesized. Also as

expected, both minor and severe dating violence predict Severe Post-Relationship Pursuit,

but they do not seem to be associated with either Nonsevere or Ambiguous Post-Relationship

Pursuit.

Table 11
Standardized coefficients for minor and severe dating violence and relationship characteristics predicting severe post-relationship pursuit

Variable	Men		Women		Total	
	Beta	*t*	Beta	*t*	Beta	*t*
Minor Dating Violence						
Minor Assault	0.30	1.78	0.22	2.37*	0.24	2.96**
Minor Injury	0.01	0.05	-0.06	-0.65	-0.02	-0.20
Minor Sexual Coercion	0.25	2.08*	0.06	0.71	0.18	2.63**
Severe Dating Violence						
Severe Assault	0.11	0.91	0.06	0.56	0.07	0.88
Severe Injury	--	--	0.08	0.79	0.17	2.64*
Severe Sexual Coercion	0.66	6.53**	0.05	0.48	0.41	6.24**
Relationship Characteristics						
Length	-0.10	-0.95	0.03	0.28	0.01	0.14
Intimacy	0.04	0.40	-0.11	-1.06	-0.02	-0.28
Number of break-ups	0.12	1.22	0.09	0.95	0.04	0.54
Investment	0.21	2.14*	0.29	2.73**	0.21	2.81**
Anger management	-0.03	-0.26	-0.02	-0.23	-0.002	-0.03
Dominance	0.06	0.60	0.07	0.80	0.10	1.61

*p<.05
**p<.01
Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit.

Mediational multivariate analyses. Direct and indirect paths were analyzed to

determine whether dating violence variables mediates the association between the

relationship predictors and the post-relationship pursuit outcomes. There were not sufficient

paths to establish mediation for any of the predicting variables. Aggregating the dating

violence variables into Total Assault, Total Injury, and Total Sexual Coercion did not yield

any additional testable models. Analyzing these paths through univariate ANOVAs rather

than multivariate analyses did not change these results.

Post-hoc Analyses

Z tests were conducted following the planned analyses to help determine the significance of the differences between men and women for the blocks of relationship characteristics and dating violence in the hierarchal regression model predicting post-relationship pursuit. Both dating violence blocks (minor and severe dating violence) produced significant z scores for men, but not for women (men: $z= 5.82$, women: $z= 0.98$). The relationship characteristic block produced significant z score for women, but not for men (men: $z= 1.04$, women: $z= 9.23$). These findings indicate that there may be different predictors leading to post-relationship pursuit for men than for women. The presence of violence of any kind in the relationship prior to termination makes men more likely to offend as post-relationship pursuers, whereas relationship characteristics, such as intimacy, investment, low anger management, and dominance, make women more likely to offend as post-relationship pursuers.

Given the findings of the initial regression models and z-tests, additional hierachal regression models were run to better understand the nature of the effect of interaction of gender and the predicting variables on post-relationship pursuit outcomes. Interaction terms were added to the original blocks for each of the predictors. Therefore, block one consisted of Minor Dating Violence variables (Minor Assault, Minor Injury, and Minor Sexual Coercion) as well as the interactions for each with gender (Minor Assault x gender, Minor Injury x gender, and Minor Sexual Coercion x gender. Block two consisted of Severe Dating Violence Variables (Severe Assault, Severe Injury, and Severe Sexual Coercion) and the corresponding interactions with gender for each variable. Block three consisted of the relationship characteristics (Length, Intimacy, the Number of Break-ups before final

termination, Investment, Anger Management, and Dominance) and the corresponding

interactions for each with gender. Nonsevere Post-relationship Pursuit, Ambiguous Post-

relationship Pursuit, and Severe Post-relationship Pursuit were the dependent variables

predicted by the above described blocks. The regression model was run using the total

"offender only" sample, including both the men and women who participated and met criteria

as offenders.

The results replicate the initial hierarchal regressions, as well as lend support to the

supposition that the gender differences observed when the models were run separately by

gender exist when placed under more rigorous examination. As Table 12 demonstrates, there

is an interaction effect between gender and minor sexual coercion found in block 2 (B=.07,

t(223)= 2.39, p=.02), supporting the earlier finding that it is for men that offending through

sexual violence during a relationship predicts Nonsevere Post-relationship Pursuit following

the relationship's termination. A similar effect is found for Ambiguous Post-relationship

Pursuit, as is shown in Table 13. An interaction between gender and Severe Sexual Coercion

is observed (B=.25, t(223)= 2.27, p=.02), as well as between gender and Dominance (B=.08,

t(223)= 2.12, p=.03). Probing these interactions demonstrate again that men who have used

sexual violence during the relationship are more likely to offend after the relationship is

terminated, whereas women who feel a high level of dominance are more likely to offend

after termination. Finally, gender effects are also found for Severe Post-relationship Pursuit

(see Table 14), with gender interacting significantly with both Minor and Severe Sexual

Coercion (Minor Sexual Coercion and gender: B=.22, t(223)= 2.39, p=.02); Severe Sexual

Coercion and gender: (B=1.46, t(223)= 3.88, p<.000), indicating that sexual offending during

a relationship predicts Severe Post-relationship Pursuit for men, not women. Although

Minor Assault also predicted Severe Post-relationship Pursuit (B=.13, t(223)= 3.11, p=.002), there was no significant gender interaction, indicating that general violence during a relationship is predictive of Severe Post-Relationship Pursuit for both offenders of both genders. Interestingly, there was also a gender interaction with investment predicting Severe Post-relationship Pursuit (B=.15, t(223)= 2.08, p=.03), again emphasizing the more important role of relationship characteristics in predicting Post-relationship Pursuit for women offenders. Although not conducted as a part of the originally planned analyses, these results support the idea that violence during the relationship is much more predictive of violence after the relationship for men than it is for women. In fact, relationship characteristics, particularly those of dominance and investment appear to be more predictive of violence after the relationship ends for women than for men.

Table 12

Standardized coefficients for minor and severe dating violence and relationship characteristics and gender interactions predicting nonsevere post-relationship pursuit

Variable	Beta	*t*
Minor Dating Violence		
Minor Assault	0.02	0.27
Minor Injury	-0.87	-1.03
Minor Sexual Coercion	0.64	1.84
Minor Assault * Gender	0.07	2.43*
Minor Injury * Gender	0.74	1.76
Minor Sexual Coercion * Gender	-0.31	-1.46
Severe Dating Violence		
Severe Assault	0.26	0.33
Severe Injury	--	--
Severe Sexual Coercion	0.33	0.28
Severe Assault * Gender	0.001	0.002
Severe Injury * Gender	-3.26	-1.68
Minor Sexual Coercion * Gender	-0.42	-0.44
Relationship Characteristics		
Gender	1.99	1.52
Length	0.16	0.07
Intimacy	-0.26	-0.90
Number of break-ups	-0.93	-0.36
Investment	0.60	2.10*
Anger management	0.01	0.13
Dominance	0.05	0.51
Length * Gender	-0.01	-0.08
Intimacy * Gender	0.15	0.92
Number of break-ups * Gender	0.02	0.11
Investment * Gender	-0.18	-1.11
Anger management * Gender	-0.01	-0.09

*$p<.05$
**$p<.01$

Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit.

Table 13

Standardized coefficients for minor and severe dating violence and relationship characteristics and gender interactions predicting ambiguous post-relationship pursuit

Variable	Beta	t
Minor Dating Violence		
Minor Assault	0.01	0.51
Minor Injury	-0.41	-2.22*
Minor Sexual Coercion	0.19	2.40*
Minor Assault * Gender	0.09	1.32
Minor Injury * Gender	0.25	2.28*
Minor Sexual Coercion * Gender	0.13	.2.75**
Severe Dating Violence		
Severe Assault	0.05	0.28
Severe Injury	--	--
Severe Sexual Coercion	0.22	0.87
Severe Assault * Gender	-0.05	-0.52
Severe Injury * Gender	-0.03	-0.68
Minor Sexual Coercion * Gender	-0.52	-0.24
Relationship Characteristics		
Gender	.53	1.83
Length	-.08	-1.59
Intimacy	0.12	1.85
Number of break-ups	0.05	0.87
Investment	0.40	0.62
Anger management	0.01	0.28
Dominance	0.11	1.99*
Length * Gender	0.04	1.22
Intimacy * Gender	0.01	0.22
Number of break-ups * Gender	-0.02	-0.69
Investment * Gender	0.08	2.13*
Anger management * Gender	-0.003	-0.24

*p<.05

**p<.01

Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit.

Table 14

Standardized coefficients for minor and severe dating violence and relationship characteristics and gender interactions predicting severe post-relationship pursuit

Variable	Beta	*t*
Minor Dating Violence		
Minor Assault	0.13	3.11**
Minor Injury	0.51	1.39
Minor Sexual Coercion	0.52	3.44*
Minor Assault * Gender	0.02	1.34
Minor Injury * Gender	-0.34	-1.56
Minor Sexual Coercion * Gender	0.22	.2.34*
Severe Dating Violence		
Severe Assault	0.14	0.44
Severe Injury	--	--
Severe Sexual Coercion	2.61	5.74**
Severe Assault * Gender	0.003	0.02
Severe Injury * Gender	-0.07	-0.89
Minor Sexual Coercion * Gender	1.46	3.88**
Relationship Characteristics		
Gender	1.19	2.35*
Length	-.09	-1.01
Intimacy	0.08	0.73
Number of break-ups	0.17	1.67
Investment	0.10	2.19*
Anger management	0.01	0.25
Dominance	0.38	0.92
Length * Gender	0.05	0.92
Intimacy * Gender	-0.05	0.08
Number of break-ups * Gender	-0.08	-1.36
Investment * Gender	0.15	2.08*
Anger management * Gender	-0.01	-0.35

*$p<.05$

**$p<.01$

Note: N=223 participants who endorsed perpetrating at least one incident of dating violence or post-relationship pursuit.

DISCUSSION

Primary Findings

Overall, it appears that relationship characteristics do predict all types of post-relationship pursuit over and above the appearance of violence during the dating relationship for the total sample. Relationship characteristics seem to be particularly important predictors for women in predicting their perpetration of severe post-relationship pursuit. Furthermore, the results indicate that investment in the relationship is an important individual relationship predictor for nonsevere and severe post-relationship pursuit, as was found both through correlational analyses and hierarchical regression coefficients. It appears dominance is an important individual predictor for ambiguous post-relationship pursuit, as was found through correlations and hierarchical regression coefficients.

Investment predicts nonsevere and severe post-relationship pursuit. The connection between investment and nonsevere post-relationship pursuit makes sense in several ways. Many of the participants endorsing nonsevere post-relationship pursuit might have been indicating a positive post-relationship connection as well as a negative one, given the low severity of the items and that many of the behaviors are part of a normative, healthy separation process. Investment in a relationship indicates a high level of connection and a person feeling as though something important has been sacrificed for the sake of their partner or the relationship (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998). Such sacrifice of both time and emotion and the commonality of friendships and activities assessed in this investment scale may lead to wanting to keep that level of connectivity after the relationship. For those who

are keeping this connection through nonsevere behaviors, either as a part of a normative break-up process or through a high frequency of these unwanted nonsevere pursuit behaviors, investment indicates an unwillingness to let the relationship end, and a continuation of the relationship through nonviolent activities that emphasize the perceived connection.

The troubling aspect of investment appears to be its connection to the most severe types of post-relationship pursuit. Here, the sense of connection and sacrifice reflected in the construct of investment leads perpetrators, particularly perpetrators who are women, to explicitly threaten or harm their partner to maintain the relationship. As was found in a previous study conducted with this data set, high levels of investment may translate into a sense of entitlement over relationship decisions, such as termination, and over a former partner(Singer & Gray-Little, 2004). Just as investors in a business receive votes or board memberships reflecting how much they have sacrificed financially for the sake of the company, perpetrators of severe post-relationship pursuit want similar control or "voting rights" over the relationship and their former partner that reflect the degree to which they feel they have sacrificed for the sake of the relationship or their partner. Investment and post-relationship pursuit have not been assessed in this manner in other investigations, but Brewster (2003) and Dye and Davis (2003) both found that higher levels of perpetrator's need for control significantly predicted higher levels of post-relationship pursuit. It could be that investment is one reason why these perpetrators feel this need or sense of control over their former partners.

The low level of correlation between investment and types of dating violence and the fact that investment is still individually predictive in the relationships block once the occurrence of dating violence has been controlled for suggests there may be a unique

connection between feeling highly invested in a relationship and the perpetration of violence after it ends. Although not assessed in the present investigation, it could be this sense of investment that predicts the occurrence of violence after a relationship when there has not been previous dating violence. Further analysis and investigation in this area could be tremendously fruitful.

Dominance predicts ambiguous post-relationship pursuit. The association between relationship predictors and ambiguous post-relationship pursuit seems to deviate somewhat from this pattern of investment. Rather than investment predicting pursuit behaviors that are unclear as to their intent, higher levels of the perpetrator's need for and sense of dominance predict ambiguous post-relationship pursuit. Dominance correlated with ambiguous post-relationship pursuit when all of the other relationship characteristics except for length were not significant, and it remained predictive as a coefficient in the hierarchical regression analyses for the total sample. As dominance appears to not only indicate a sense of control over the former partner person but also a power dynamic and feeling of superiority (Strauss, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1999), perpetrators scoring highly on dominance may engage in behaviors the target may or may not be aware to stay connected. Following or watching a former partner may occur outside of the target's awareness, which may make the high dominance perpetrator feel more comfortable in that it feeds his or her sense of superiority and ownership of the former partner in that he or she is able to observe and be involved in the former partner's activities on the perpetrator's terms. On the other hand, if the perpetrator makes him or herself known to a former partner by being more obvious in the following or watching behaviors, the level of threat, while still ambiguous, goes up. The inability of the former partner to do anything to change this seemingly unobtrusive behavior

could also appeal to the perpetrator's need for dominance. Although this is the first time dominance has been assessed with ambiguous post-relationship pursuit, dominance has been found to predict dating violence in other studies, and a similar process may be at work (Smith, White, & Holland, 2003; Straus & Medeiros, 2002; White, Merrill, & Koss, 1999).

Dating violence predicts post-relationship pursuit. The results also indicate a connection between both minor and severe dating violence and severe post-relationship pursuit, especially for men. The connection between dating violence and subsequent post-relationship pursuit is well documented, and these findings support this general finding (i.e. Bjerregaard, 2000; Brewster, 2000; Brewster, 2003; Coleman, 1997; Cupach, & Spitzberg, 2000; Smith, White, & Holland, 2003; White, Kowalski, Lyndon, & Valentine, 2000). However, most analyses have conceptualized dating violence as a dichotomous variable and analyzed the connection between the occurrence of any dating violence and post-relationship pursuit. The results here suggest that not only is the occurrence of any violent behavior predictive of severe post-relationship pursuit, but severe dating violence is predictive of severe post-relationship pursuit once the variance associated with minor violence is controlled for. Therefore, it is not simply the presence of violence within a dating relationship that predicts violence after a relationship, but the level of violence during the dating relationship is particularly important to consider, as it predicts more severe post-relationship pursuit after the relationship terminates. Minor Assault, Severe Injury, and Minor and Severe Sexual Coercion seem to be especially important types of dating violence predicting severe post-relationship pursuit. The connection between sexual coercion and severe post-relationship pursuit seems to be particularly important for men. It may be that men who are violent sexually during the relationship may have similar underlying

relationship characteristics as men who are violent after the termination. For example, the same high level of investment that predicts post-relationship pursuit due to the expectation of a "return" for their sacrifices may also translate to an expectation of return during the relationship through sexual activity.

Sexual coercion also seems to be an important dating violence predictor for ambiguous post-relationship pursuit. For women, this connection seems to be the clearest between minor sexual coercion and ambiguous post-relationship pursuit, and for men, the clearest association is between severe sexual coercion and post-relationship pursuit. This particular connection between sexual coercion and the ambiguity inherent in following or watching behaviors is interesting. Although not assessed in a manner that can directly address the unique connection between sexual coercion and ambiguous post-relationship pursuit, there may be a conceptual link that further research could investigate. Sexual coercion is the one form of dating violence that in and of itself may be ambiguous. Studies indicate very different experiences of the same event between perpetrators and victims of sexual coercion, particularly in the context of a dating relationship such as these (Abbey, Clinton-Sherrod, McAuslan, Zawacki, & Buck, 2003; Corbin, Bernat, Calhoun, McNair, & Seals, 2001; Marx, Van Wie, & Gross,1996; McDonald & Kline, 2004; Zweig, Barber, & Ecceles, 1997). The ambiguity and unclear nature of these interactions may mirror the ambiguity and unclear nature of the intent behind following or watching a former partner. Although dating violence in any form, including sexual coercion, may predict severe post-relationship pursuit behavior, those individuals, both men and women, who choose to pursue former partners using ambiguous behaviors may have a tendency to be sexually violent during the relationship.

Sexual coercion, whether in a minor or severe form, also could be reflecting a similar underlying relationship characteristic. High levels of dominance, leading perpetrators to feel a sense of ownership and control over their partner, could translate into sexual coercion during the relationship, as ownership over sex is a key strategy toward a sense of possession over a partner. Although our correlations between dating violence and dominance are small, they could reflect a similar underlying mechanism for these types of dating violence and for ambiguous post-relationship pursuit. Because the construct of ambiguous post-relationship pursuit is a new one created expressly for the present study, further investigation needs to be done to examine how this type of post-relationship pursuit is similar to and differs from the other, more well-established forms.

Exploratory findings

Prevalence. In this investigation, half of the participants endorsed some perpetration of post-relationship pursuit behavior. Even taking into account the fact that the non-severe behaviors may also reflect something that is normative in the break-up process, this indicates that 16% of participants perpetrated severe post-relationship pursuit, and 9% perpetrated ambiguous post-relationship pursuit. Although this is a higher rate than the National Violence Against Women Survey or some of the other estimates of "stalking" from a legal definition (McFarlane, Campbell, Wilt, Sachs, Eulrich, & Oxu, 1995; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998; Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 2002; Wright & Burgess, 1996;), these rates of perpetration fit the prevalence rates of other studies assessing post-relationship pursuit from a behavioral perspective, and particularly those studies that have used college students as participants, as was done here (Brewster, 2003; Rosenfeld, 2004; Saunders, 2002; Shook, Gerrity, Jurich, & Segrist, 2000; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000). In addition, the prevalence for

dating violence in this study coincides with many other studies assessing dating violence in college students (i.e. Saunders, 2002; Straus, 2001). Many of the relationships reported by participants took place in late high school or early college, indicating a high risk among these students for dating violence and post-relationship pursuit in general.

The prevalence of dating violence and post-relationship pursuit also seem to be relatively balanced between men and women. While there were somewhat higher prevalence ratings for post-relationship pursuit for men than for women, and somewhat higher prevalence ratings for dating violence for women than for men, these differences were neither large nor statistically significant. Furthermore, although other studies find higher rates of injury when men aggress against women than when women aggress against men (i.e., Straus, 2001), none of the men who participated endorsed any severe injury perpetration, while a few of the women did. Given that there were twice as many women in the sample than men, this finding could simply be an artifact of not having enough men to assess a behavior that occurs at a relatively low frequency for this population. Many studies have found similarly balanced rates of perpetration between men and women when assessed through self-reporting by perpetrators (Clark, Beckett, Wells, & Dungee-Anderson, 1994; Foshee,1996; Kaura & Allen, 2004; Miller, 2003; Ronfeldt, Kimerling, Arias, 1998; Straus, 1997; Smith, White, & Holland, 2003). However, some theorists question this finding as due to measurement technique, and there is substantial evidence in the dating violence and post-relationship pursuit literature that indicates that while the rates of offense might be similar, the effects of these offenses are not (Amar & Alexy, 2005; Amar & Gennaro, 2005; Archer, 2000; Bjerregaard, 2000; Brewster, 2003; Beyers, Leonard, Mays, & Rosen, 2000; Eckhardt, Jamison, & Watts, 2003; Ehrensaft & Vivian, 1999; Foshee, 1996; Hines & Saudino, 2003;

Makepeace, 1986; Miller, 2003; Saunders, 2002). Because the present study focused on perpetrators and on their behaviors rather than the results of the behaviors, it was impossible to assess whether the level of distress or negative consequences was greater for one gender or the other.

Correlations among relationship characteristics, dating violence, and post-relationship pursuit. The results indicate that many of the relationship characteristics co-vary. In particular, the demographic relationship characteristics of length, intimacy level, and the number of break-ups before termination, were all positively correlated with one another. These associations indicate that there are relationships that experience a high level of connection where all three of these demographic characteristics are at a high level. Feeling a high sense of investment in the relationship was positively and significantly related to this high sense of connectedness as assessed through the demographic relationship characteristics. This finding indicates that as relationships become more intense and more connected, participants feel like they put more into the relationship, sacrifice more for their partner, and generally expect more return for their investment. This result replicates other studies findings of the association between investment and demographic relationship characteristics (Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew, 1998; Rusbult, Johnson, & Morrow, 1986).

There was also a significant association among the relationship characteristics assessed by the Personal Relationship Profile. Anger management, Dominance, Jealousy, Relationship Commitment, and Relationship Distress significantly correlated with one another in expected directions. These results also replicate commonly found correlations among relationship characteristics (Mahlstedt, & Welsh, 2005; Strauss, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1999; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). Interestingly, although

62

investment in the relationship was expected to correlate significantly with these scales, particularly with relationship commitment, it appears to capture a separate experience. Investment and relationship commitment do share a positive correlation, but it is small and not one that reaches significance. A possible explanation for this is that the relationships assessed in this study were predominantly high school and early college relationships, and neither men nor women may expect these young relationships to result in long-term relationships or marriage. Because of the limited relationship history many of these participants would have experienced prior to this relationship, these relationships may have felt very connected and very important, leading the participants to feel very invested in the relationship. An adolescent tendency toward high emotionality could make these first relationships feel very important and meaningful, which in this sample might be captured with high investment. As such, this particular sample may be selecting participants who would score highly on measures of investment but not necessarily on measures of commitment because of the adolescent nature of the relationships and low expectation for these relationships to continue in the future.

Correlations indicate a significant association among the dating violence variables of assault, injury, and sexual coercion. With the exception of the association between severe injury and severe sexual coercion, all of these outcomes are significantly associated to a moderate or high degree. This finding lends support to earlier studies finding violent relationships often contain more than one type of violence (Clark, Beckett, Wells, & Dungee-Anderson, 1994; Katz, Kuffel, & Coblentz, 2002; Lundeberg, Stith, Penn, & Ward, 2004; Marcus & Swett, 2002; O'Leary, Barling, Arias, Rosenbaum, Malone, & Tyree, 1989; Shook, Gerrity, Jurich, Segrist, 2000; Smith, White, & Holland, 2003; Straus, 2001; Vivan &

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994). The lower association for some of the injury outcomes could be reflective of the relative infrequency of the occurrence of injury resulting from violent interactions for the sample.

There were also positive correlations among the post-relationship pursuit outcomes. Correlations were small but significant between nonsevere and ambiguous or severe behaviors, and moderate between the ambiguous and severe behaviors. While these differences in the sample are not substantial, it could indicate somewhat of a different experience for the perpetration of nonsevere vs. either of the other two post-relationship pursuit types. This difference becomes increasingly supported through the examination of the correlations among dating violence and post-relationship pursuit types, as dating violence is positively correlated with severe pursuit perpetration to a moderate degree but not with either nonsevere or ambiguous post-relationship pursuit. This may indicate participants who perpetrate violence during the relationship are similar to or the same as those who use overtly threatening behaviors to pursue their former partners.

Finally, the post-hoc z-tests indicate that there may be an interesting difference in what leads men and women toward post-relationship pursuit. Although such findings need to be replicated in an independent sample using this comparison as part of the initial hypotheses, the suggestion here is that we may be able to differentially predict who will engage in post-relationship pursuit behavior, and that our risk criteria needs to be different for men than for women. This ability to differentially predict has implications for not only risk assessment of individual cases, but also prevention programs and the way we measure and understand the impact of dating violence and post-relationship for each gender.

Limitations

Clearly, the results must be interpreted within the limits of the participants and our methodology. The participants were predominantly white, heterosexual, middle class, freshman and sophomore college students. Although dating violence and post-relationship pursuit behaviors have a moderate to high prevalence among college students, it is important to bear in mind the college participants are a special sample and results found with them may not generalize to other groups (Amar & Gennaro, 2005; Bjerregaard, 2000; Clark, Beckett, Wells, & Dungee-Anderson, 1994; Hines & Saudino, 2003; Logan, Leukefeld, & Walker, 2000; Shook, Gerrity, Jurich, Segrist, 2000; Straus, 2001). The information about the relationships, the level of violence, and the level of post-relationship pursuit was all collected retrospectively, which may affect the accuracy of the reports. Capaldi & Crosby (1997) found that teenage dating partners underreported dating violence in retrospective reports compared to reports taken throughout the time period assessed. Alternatively, asking the participants to report on dating violence after there was post-relationship pursuit might encourage them to remember the relationship more violently that they otherwise would have. Asking participants to report on post-relationship pursuit after having experienced a violent dating relationship might also encourage them to remember the time period following the break-up as more violent than they otherwise would have.

There were approximately twice as many women in the study as men. Although this gender difference reflects a typical introductory psychology course from which the sample was drawn, when analyzing romantic relationships that are primarily heterosexual, it would be more meaningful to have genders equally represented. Finally, because this sample was so overwhelmingly heterosexual, the present findings may not be applicable to same-sex

dating partners. Many of the relationship characteristics chosen for these analysis and the way in which dating violence and post-relationship pursuit have been conceptualized largely comes out of a literature which recognizes the impact of societal views about gender and gender roles on heterosexual romantic relationships. If, for example, power dynamics are a key component to understanding the role of dominance, and power dynamics are intrinsically liked to the effects of a patriarchal society, such theories no longer apply the same way when the relationship dyad consists of two people of the same gender.

Theoretical Implications

First, the distinction between different types of post-relationship pursuit is one that many researchers have considered. There have been multiple frameworks used to understand the ways in which people pursue one another after the termination of a romantic relationship: indirect vs. direct approach behaviors, the different intents behind pursuit (i.e. behaviors designed to "win" the partner back vs. "scare" the partner back), and the most common, types of severity (Bjerregaard, 2000; Brewster, 2003; Coleman, 1997; Cupach, & Spitzberg, 2000; Dye & Davis, 2003; Logan, Leukefeld, & Walker, 2000; Rosenfeld, 2004; Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 2002). This is the first study I'm aware of that has classified severity into three categories rather than the typical two. By adding the ambiguous post-relationship pursuit scale to the nonsevere and severe distinctions, there may be further distinctions found among predictors or outcomes of post-relationship pursuit. Not only was the ambiguous scale found empirically through exploratory factor analysis, but it makes sense conceptually that there are types of behaviors that are neither normative except for frequency (as in the nonsevere behaviors) nor directly or explicitly threatening. These would be the types of behaviors that might only be able to be measured through assessing perpetrators, as targets may not be fully

66

aware of them, and interestingly, these are the types of behaviors often described when participants are asked an open-ended question of what is "stalking" (Cauffman, Feldman, Jensen, & Arnett, 2000; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000; Tjaden, Thoennes, & Allison, 2002). Additional research may be able to further define this type of post-relationship pursuit.

Another important theoretical consideration is the finding that relationship characteristics are predictive of post-relationship pursuit in all of its forms, even after the variance associated with dating violence is controlled for. What is suggested by this finding is that there are relationship attributes that are uniquely related to post-relationship pursuit, even if dating violence is a common precursor to violence following the termination of the relationship. Investment and dominance appear to be good starting points for further analysis of this association. If in fact relationship characteristics such as investment and dominance differentially predict types of post-relationship pursuit in relationships where there has not been dating violence prior to break-up, this could help us to better understand the connection between love and violence.

The non-significant findings for expected correlates of post-relationship pursuit, especially jealousy, may indicate that this construct is not well enough defined at this point. Other studies have found an association between jealousy and post-relationship pursuit, which was why it was included in the present analyses (Dye & Davis, 2003; Forbes, Jobe, White, Bloesch, & Adams-Curtis, 2005; Hanley, & O'neill, 1997; Harrison & Abrishami, 2004), but it may be that jealousy is associated with other conceptualizations of post-relationship pursuit, rather than the nonsevere, ambiguous, severe types used here. Further analysis might be useful to understand how the different typologies may affect the predictive ability of theoretically relevant constructs.

These results, particularly the post-hoc tests, indicate a significant difference in the process of post-relationship pursuit for men and women. If there is indeed a different sent of predictors leading someone to perpetrate stalking or post-relationship pursuit, this could highlight a different process in the development of violent relationships for men and women. If violence after a relationship ends is seen as a continuation of violence during a relationship for men, it may be that for men, relationships are understood as more stable entities, and that the strategies that were effective (or simply utilized) for them during relationships are the ones they use after the relationship ends. Thus, the developmental progression in a relationship is fairly consistent for men. For women, on the other hand, violence after a relationship ends is more dependent on the relationship characteristics occurring in that specific relationship. Relationship length, level of intimacy, and investment are all factors specific to a relationship, and not necessarily characteristics that follow individuals from relationship to relationship. Other relationship characteristics, such as low anger management, jealousy, and dominance, however, are consistent from relationship to relationship. This makes the developmental picture leading to post-relationship violence much more complex for women than for men, and may make it more difficult to predict.

Clinical Implications

The present results support findings from other investigations that college students are appropriate samples from which to draw information about dating violence (i.e. Straus, 2001). The frequency of occurrence of dating violence and post-relationship pursuit make this sample ideal in many ways to be able to examine these constructs more in depth. These results also support the idea that college students are particularly at risk for dating violence and post-relationship pursuit. The connection between dating violence and severe post-

68

relationship pursuit, while not surprising, is very troubling. Not only are students who ever experience even minor dating violence at risk for severe post-relationship pursuit, but increased severity of violence in the relationship predicts increased severity of violence after the relationship. Knowing that these particular students are at risk, interventions can be designed to target both perpetrators and victims of dating violence, potentially before the end of the dating relationship. If those at risk for perpetration or victimization could be identified early, it may be easier to circumvent the violence pattern that appears to continue after break-up. Given the particular association between dating violence perpetration and severe-post-relationship perpetration for men, it may be especially important to educate young women about these patterns so that they are able to more easily identify what violent dating relationship is and whether or not they need additional services to stay safe after a break-up.

The high sense of investment that is apparently not associated with relationship commitment could put young daters in a unique position that boosts the probability that they will experience post-relationship pursuit as a target or offender. Knowing that such relationships are at high risk not only due to the age and maturity level of the daters, but also due to the combination of relationship factors, may help professionals working with young adults and college students to manage their level of investment and more appropriately treat perpetrators or victims who are experiencing difficulty with the post-relationship pursuit.

Taken together, these results and implications highlight the need for additional attention to and research into what predicts post-relationship pursuit, obsessive relational intrusion, unwanted pursuit, stalking, or however the phenomenon is labeled, as clearly it is a relatively common experience among college students. Relationship characteristics, especially investment and dominance, appear to be uniquely related to post-relationship

pursuit, answering the initial question of whether or not relationship characteristics are only related to post-relationship pursuit due to its association to dating violence. It also appears that the level of severity of dating violence is also important in predicting post-relationship pursuit, but only in pursuit that has a clear threatening element. This investigation gives evidence toward answering some questions, but it brings to light many more about the nature of ambiguous post-relationship pursuit and the way in which relationship characteristics may differentially predict specific types of post-relationship violence. As the field becomes more adept at understanding the occurrence and nature of post-relationship pursuit, hopefully we will also become more successful at mitigating its effects and breaking the relationship between violence and love.

Post-Relationship Behaviors- Relationships and How We End Them

Participant # _____

PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Personal Relationships Profile

The following statements are about you or the relationship between you and your partner. "Your partner" is the person you *were* dating, living with, engaged to, or married to. Please read each statement and decide how much you agree with it.

For questions that refer to your partner, please do the following:

> Answer questions about a former romantic partner from a relationship that lasted at least two months and that is now over. If you have had more than one romantic relationship lasting at least two months, please choose one in which you experienced a difficult break up to answer the questions. Answer all of the questions about the same former romantic partner and relationship.

Section I: Background Information

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS STARTING WITH ITEM #1.

1. What is your sex?   Circle 1 or 2
    1 = Male
    2 = Female

2. What is your year at the university?
    1 = Freshman
    2 = Sophomore
    3 = Junior
    4 = Senior

3. How old are you?
    1 = 17
    2 = 18
    3 = 19
    4 = 20
    5 = 21
    6 = 22-24
    7 = 25-29
    8 = 30-39
    9 = 40-49
    0 = 50 or Older

4. What is your racial or ethnic identity?
    1 = Asian
    2 = African American (Black)
    3 = Caucasian (White)
    4 = Native American (American Indian, Samoan, or Hawaiian)
    5 = Hispanic (Latino)
    6 = Other

5. What is your father's highest level of education?
    1 = less than high school
    2 = high school graduate
    3 = some college
    4 = two-year college graduate (for example, community college)
    5 = four-year college graduate
    6 = some graduate school
    7 = graduate degree

6. What is your mother's highest level of education?
   1 = less than high school
   2 = high school graduate
   3 = some college
   4 = two-year college graduate (for example, community college)
   5 = four-year college graduate
   6 = some graduate school
   7 = graduate degree

7. What is your family's yearly income? (Make your best estimate)
   1 = Under $9,999
   2 = $10,000 to $19,999
   3 = $20,000 to $29,999
   4 = $30,000 to $39,999
   5 = $40,000 to $49,999
   6 = $50,000 to $59,999
   7 = $60,000 to $69,999
   8 = $70,000 to $79,999
   9 = $80,000 or more

8. What is your parents' current marital status?
   1 = married to each other
   2 = separated
   3 = divorced
   4 = never married to each other and not living together
   5 = never married to each other and living together
   6 = one or both parents have died

9. Who are you living with?
   1 = With my partner (or was living with him/her before the relationship ended)
   2 = In a room or apartment of my own. No one shares my room.
   3 = With a roommate who is not my partner
   4 = With my parents

Section II: You and Your Relationships

The following statements are about you or the relationship between you and someone else (such as your former partner or members of your family). Please read each statement and decide how much you agree with it. If a question doesn't apply to you or to the relationship described, please mark "1 Strongly Disagree" as your answer. For questions asking about your partner, use a romantic partner from a relationship lasting at least two months that is now over. Answer questions as you would have during the relationship, and use the same partner to answer all of those questions.

1 = Strongly Disagree	*2 = Disagree*	*3 = Agree*		*4 = Strongly Agree*	
16. My relationship with my partner is the most important relationship I have	1	2	3	4
17. My parents made sure I went to school	1	2	3	4
18. I would give up almost anything for my partner	1	2	3	4
19. My partner doesn't have enough sense to make important decisions	1	2	3	4
20. I often feel empty	1	2	3	4
21. I often break things that belong to others on purpose	1	2	3	4
22. People usually like my partner	1	2	3	4

73

23. I'd do almost anything to keep people from leaving me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

24. I can calm myself down when I am upset with my partner   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

25. Before I let myself get really mad at my partner, I think about what will happen if I lose my temper
   1   **2**   **3**   **4**

26. My parents did not keep me clean   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

27. A woman who has been raped probably asked for it   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

28. I have family members who would help me out if I had a problem   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

29. Men are more dishonest than women   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

30. My partner often nags me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

31. I rarely have anything to do with religious activities   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

32. My partner is basically a good person   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

33. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

34. Sometimes I can't remember what happened the night before because of drinking
   1   **2**   **3**   **4**

35. I can't bring myself to say nice things to my partner even when I'm thinking them
   1   **2**   **3**   **4**

36. Since age 15, I have stolen or tried to steal something worth more than $50.00
   1   **2**   **3**   **4**

37. When I was a kid, I saw my mother or father kick, punch, or beat up their partner
   1   **2**   **3**   **4**

38. I often feel resentful of women   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

39. I can feel my blood rising when I start to get mad at my partner   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

40. I lie to make myself look better   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

41. I enjoy my day-to-day life   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

42. I try not to think about terrible things that happened to me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

43. I usually wake up feeling pretty good   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

44. Since age 15, I have stolen money (from anyone, including family)   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

45. When I was a kid, people (adults or kids) who were not part of my family pushed, shoved, or slapped me, or threw things at me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

1 = *Strongly Disagree*	2 = *Disagree*	3 = *Agree*	4 = *Strongly Agree*			

46. I make excuses when I've said something to my partner I shouldn't have **1** **2** **3** **4**

47. Men treat women badly **1** **2** **3** **4**

48. My life is generally going well **1** **2** **3** **4**

49. A boy who is hit by another boy should hit back **1** **2** **3** **4**

50. My partner does things just to annoy me **1** **2** **3** **4**

51. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone **1** **2** **3** **4**

52. When I was a kid, people (adults or kids) who were not part of my family told me to hit back if someone hit me or insulted me **1** **2** **3** **4**

53. My relationships have big ups and downs **1** **2** **3** **4**

54. Before I was 18, an adult in my family had sex with me (vaginal, anal, or oral) **1** **2** **3** **4**

55. Men irritate me a lot **1** **2** **3** **4**

56. Sometimes I have doubts that my relationship with my partner will last **1** **2** **3** **4**

57. My partner and I disagree about what types of affection are okay in public **1** **2** **3** **4**

58. Men respect women **1** **2** **3** **4**

59. My parents did not comfort me when I was upset **1** **2** **3** **4**

60. Women treat men badly **1** **2** **3** **4**

61. I worry that I have a drug problem **1** **2** **3** **4**

62. I don't think about how what I do will affect other people **1** **2** **3** **4**

63. I give up easily on difficult projects **1** **2** **3** **4**

64. Marriage is forever **1** **2** **3** **4**

65. I don't like my work or classes **1** **2** **3** **4**

66. Once sex gets past a certain point, a man can't stop himself until he is satisfied **1** **2** **3** **4**

67. No matter who I am talking to I am always a good listener **1** **2** **3** **4**

68. I don't tell my partner when I disagree about important things **1** **2** **3** **4**

69. I have a right to know everything my partner does **1** **2** **3** **4**

70. I can usually tell when I am about to lose my temper at my partner **1** **2** **3** **4**

71. When I was a teenager, I was hit a lot by my mother or father **1** **2** **3** **4**

72. Before I was 18, another kid in my family made me look at or touch their private parts (sex organs), or looked at or touched mine   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

73. Before age 15, I stole or tried to steal something worth more than $50.00   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

74. It's all right to break the law as long as you don't get hurt   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

75. My father or mother told me to hit back if someone hit me or insulted me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

76. I avoid doing anything that reminds me of terrible things that happened to me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

77. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

78. When I was a kid, I often saw kids who were not in my family get into fights and hit each other   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

79. I am generally in a good mood   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

80. I can think of a situation when I would approve of a wife slapping a husband's face   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

81. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

82. I spend time with friends who have been in trouble with the law   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

83. I have goals in life that I try to reach   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

84. I would feel betrayed if my partner was too busy to spend time with me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

85. I often do things that are against the law   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

86. I think good things will happen to me in the future   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

87. If a wife refuses to have sex, there are times when it may be okay to make her do it   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

88. When I am drinking I usually have five or more drinks at a time   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

89. I would hate it if my partner confided in someone besides me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

90. I sometimes drink five or more drinks at a time, but only on weekends   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

91. I have friends who have committed crimes   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

92. When a boy is growing up, it's important for him to have a few fist fights   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

93. There is nothing I can do to control my feelings when my partner hassles me   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

94. When I was a kid, I saw a member of my family who was not my mother or father, push, shove, slap, or throw something at someone   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

95. Before I was 18, an adult in my family made me look at or touch their private parts (sex organs), or looked at or touched mine   **1   2   3   4**

96. I have thought seriously about ending my relationship with my partner   **1   2   3   4**

97. I am constantly looking for signs of danger   **1   2   3   4**

98. I go back and forth between thinking my partner is perfect or terrible   **1   2   3   4**

99. I can think of a situation when I would approve of a husband slapping a wife's face   **1   2   3   4**

100. To get ahead, I have done some things which are not right   **1   2   3   4**

101. I am easily frustrated by women   **1   2   3   4**

102. My partner likes to make me mad   **1   2   3   4**

103. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged **1   2   3   4**

104. I often do things that other people think are dangerous   **1   2   3   4**

105. Caring for my partner means more to me than caring for myself   **1   2   3   4**

106. When I was less than 12 years old, I was spanked or hit a lot by my mother or father   **1   2   3   4**

107. I recognize when I am beginning to get angry at my partner   **1   2   3   4**

108. My partner needs to remember that I am in charge   **1   2   3   4**

109. My partner and I disagree about each other's irritating habits   **1   2   3   4**

110. When my partner says something mean, I usually say something mean back   **1   2   3   4**

111. It is usually my partner's fault when I get mad   **1   2   3   4**

112. People often interrupt me when I'm trying to get things done   **1   2   3   4**

113. I am easily startled   **1   2   3   4**

114. My partner and I disagree about whether it is okay to tell each other we disagree   **1   2   3   4**

115. Before I was 18, an adult who was not part of my family had sex with me (vaginal, anal, or oral)   **1   2   3   4**

116. I sometimes drink enough to feel really high or drunk   **1   2   3   4**

117. Since age 15, I hit or threatened to hit someone who is not a member of my family   **1   2   3   4**

118. I generally have the final say when my partner and I disagree   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

119. My partner treats me well   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

120. Women irritate me a lot   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

121. I don't have enough money for my daily needs   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

122. My partner and I disagree about his or her friends and family   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

123. My parents did not help me to do my best   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

124. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

125. I can set up a time out break during an argument with my partner   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

126. I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

127. Men are rude   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

128. My relationship with my partner is worth the effort I put into it   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

129. I attend a church, synagogue, or mosque once a month or more   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

130. A man should not walk away from a physical fight with another man   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

131. I have had thoughts of cutting or burning myself   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

132. In the past, I used coke, crack, or harder drugs (like uppers, heroin, or opiates) more than once or twice
                                                                                    1   **2**   **3**   **4**

133. My sex life with my partner is good   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

134. I get hassled because of who I am   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

135. My parents did not care if I got into trouble in school   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

136. I often get hurt by things that I do   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

137. I have overdosed on drugs or had a severe health problem because of taking drugs to get high
                                                            1   **2**   **3**   **4**

138. Before I was 18, another kid who was not part of my family made me look at or touch their private parts
(sex organs), or looked at or touched mine   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

139. When I feel myself getting angry at my partner, I try to tell myself to calm down
                                                                                    1   **2**   **3**   **4**

140. It's sometimes necessary for parents to slap a teen who talks back or is getting into trouble
                                                                                    1   **2**   **3**   **4**

141. I have a right to be involved with anything my partner does   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

142. I am so sad, sometimes I wonder why I bother to go on living   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

143. Before I was 18, an adult who was not part of my family made me look at or touch their private parts (sex organs), or looked at or touched mine   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

144. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others
          1   **2**   **3**   **4**

145. Since age 15, I have physically attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them
          1   **2**   **3**   **4**

146. Terrible things happened to me that made me feel helpless and horrified   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

147. I would hate it if my partner paid a lot of attention to someone besides me **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

148. When I don't understand what my partner means I ask for more explanation
          1   **2**   **3**   **4**

149. I wish my partner and I got along better than we do   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

150. When my partner and I have problems, I blame him or her   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

151. My housing is not satisfactory (e.g., too much noise, heating problems, run-down, problems with neighbors)   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

152. I would be upset if my partner hugged someone a little too long   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

153. My partner and I disagree about when to have sex   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

154. I share my thoughts with a family member   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

155. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

156. I feel sad quite often   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

157. I'd feel jealous if my partner were helpful to someone of the opposite sex **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

158. Women are rude   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

159. When my partner is nice to me I wonder what my partner wants   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

160. I only treat people badly if they deserve it   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

161. Before I was 18, another kid in my family did things to me that I now think was sexual abuse
          1   **2**   **3**   **4**

162. When my partner wants to talk about our problems, I try to avoid talking about them
          1   **2**   **3**   **4**

163. I have trouble following the rules at work or in school   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

164. I often lie to get what I want   **1**   **2**   **3**   **4**

165. Finding time for meals is hard for me   1   2   3   4

166. There have been times when I have felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right   1   2   3   4

167. I insist on knowing where my partner is at all times   1   2   3   4

168. My partner and I disagree about my friends and family   1   2   3   4

169. When I'm mad at my partner, I say what I think without thinking about the consequences
                                                                                             1   2   3   4

170. My parents gave me enough clothes to keep me warm   1   2   3   4

171. My partner and I disagree about how much money to spend when we go places
                                                                                             1   2   3   4

172. Before age 15, I hit or threatened to hit my parents   1   2   3   4

173. I say mean things to my partner, but then tell him or her "I'm only kidding"
                                                                                             1   2   3   4

174. Before I was 18, another kid who was not part of my family did things to me that I now think was sexual abuse   1   2   3   4

175. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I have thought too little of my ability
                                                                                             1   2   3   4

176. It is sometimes necessary to discipline a child with a good, hard spanking 1   2   3   4

177. My mood is always changing   1   2   3   4

178. My parents helped me with homework if I needed help   1   2   3   4

179. My friends pressure me to do things I don't want to do   1   2   3   4

180. I change suddenly from being one kind of person to another   1   2   3   4

181. Sometimes I have to remind my partner of who's boss   1   2   3   4
182. There are more bad things than good things in my relationship with my partner
                                                                                             1   2   3   4

183. My partner and I disagree about how much time we should spend together 1   2   3   4

184. My parents helped me when I had problems   1   2   3   4
185. I have considered leaving my partner   1   2   3   4

186. Terrible things have happened to me that I remember over and over   1   2   3   4

187. Before age 15, I physically attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them
                                                                                             1   2   3   4

80

1 = Strongly Disagree		*2 = Disagree*		*3 = Agree*		*4 = Strongly Agree*	

188. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings **1   2   3   4**

189. I've been terrified by things that have happened to me **1   2   3   4**

190. I've told others I will kill myself **1   2   3   4**

191. I would be upset if someone hugged my partner a little too long **1   2   3   4**

192. I would hate it if someone else paid a lot of attention to my partner **1   2   3   4**

193. Before age 15, I stole money (from anyone, including family) **1   2   3   4**

194. My partner and I have a very good relationship **1   2   3   4**

195. I have a good social life with my partner **1   2   3   4**

196. I feel sorry when I hurt someone **1   2   3   4**

197. I have thought about killing myself **1   2   3   4**

198. People at work or school don't get along with me **1   2   3   4**

199. I have been treated for a drug problem **1   2   3   4**

200. My partner and I disagree about telling other people about things that happen between us
    1   2   3   4

201. I would be mad if my partner flirted with someone else **1   2   3   4**

202. I have bad dreams about terrible things that happened to me **1   2   3   4**

Conflict Tactics Scale

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times with they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might have happened when you had differences. Please circle how many times you did each of these things in the past year, and how many times your former partner did them in the past year. If you or your former partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, circle "7."

Please use the same relationship you referred to above, in which dated for at least two months and may have experienced a difficult break-up. If the relationship ended more than 1 year ago, use the last year of the relationship for "the past year."

How often did this happen?
1 = Once in the past year	*5 = 11-20 times in the past year*
2 = Twice in the past year	*6 = More than 20 times in the past year*
3 = 3-5 times in the past year	*7 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before*
4 = 6-10 times in the past year	*0 = This has never happened*

1. I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
2. My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

3. I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
4. My partner explained his or her side of a disagreement to me. **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

5. I insulted or swore at my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
6. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

7. I threw something at my partner that could hurt.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
8. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

9. I twisted my partner's arm or hair.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
10. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

11. I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with my partner. **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
12. My partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with me. **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

13. I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
14. My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

15. I made my partner have sex without a condom.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
16. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

17. I pushed or shoved my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
18. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

19. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
     my partner have oral or anal sex.
20. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

21. I used a knife or gun on my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
22. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

How often did this happen?

    1 = Once in the past year   *5 = 11-20 times in the past year*
    2 = Twice in the past year   *6 = More than 20 times in the past year*
    3 = 3-5 times in the past year   *7 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before*
    4 = 6-10 times in the past year   *0 = This has never happened*

23. I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner in a fight.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
24. My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

25. I called my partner fat or ugly.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
26. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

27. I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
28. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

29. I destroyed something belonging to my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
30. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

31. I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
32. My partner went to a doctor because of a fight with me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

33. I choked my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
34. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

35. I shouted or yelled at my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
36. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

37. I slammed my partner against a wall.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
38. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

39. I said I was sure we could work out a problem.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
40. My partner was sure we could work it out.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

41. I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner, but I didn't.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
42. My partner needed to se a doctor because of a fight with me, but didn't   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

43. I beat up my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
44. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

45. I grabbed my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
46. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

47. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
    partner have sex.
48. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

49. I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
50. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

51. I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
    use physical force).
52. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

53. I slapped my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
54. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

    1 = Once in the past year   *5 = 11-20 times in the past year*
    2 = Twice in the past year   *6 = More than 20 times in the past year*
    3 = 3-5 times in the past year   *7 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before*
    4 = 6-10 times in the past year   *0 = This has never happened*

55. I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
56. My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

57. I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
58. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

59. I suggested a compromise to a disagreement.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
60. My partner suggested a compromise to a disagreement.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

61. I burned or scalded my partner on purpose.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
62. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

63. I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force).   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
64. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

65. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
66. My partner accused me of this.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

67. I did something to spite my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
68. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

69. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
70. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

71. I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight with my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
72. My partner felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight we had.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

73. I kicked my partner.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
74. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

75. I used threats to make my partner have sex.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
76. My partner did this to me.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

77. I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**
78. My partner agreed to try a solution I suggested.   **1 2 3 4 5 6   7 0**

Experiences in Close Relationships

The following statements concern how you feel in romantic relationships. WE ARE INTERESTED IN HOW YOU GENERALLY EXPERIENCE RELATIONSHIPS, NOT JUST WHAT IS HAPPENING IN A CURRENT OR PAST RELATIONSHIP. Respond to each statement by indicating how much you agree or disagree with it. Choose the number using the following rating scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly	…….	…….	Neutral/ Mixed	…….	…….	Agree Strongly

1. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

2. I tell my partner just about everything.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

3. I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner. 1   2   3   4   5   6   7

4. I often worry that my partner will not want to stay with me.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

5. I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

6. I find that my partners don't want to get as close as I would like.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

7. I'm afraid that once a romantic partner gets to know me, he or she won't like who I really am.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

8. I do not often worry about being abandoned.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

9. I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them.
   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

10. My partner only seems to notice me when I'm angry.
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

11. My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away.
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

12. It makes me mad that I don't get the affection and support I need from my partner.
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

13. I am nervous when partners get too close to me. 1   2   3   4   5   6   7

14. I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him or her.
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

15. Sometimes romantic partners change their feelings about me for no apparent reason.
    1   2   3   4   5   6   7

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly	…….	…….	Neutral/ Mixed	…….	…….	Agree Strongly

16. I usually discuss my problems and my concerns with my partner.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

17. I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

18. When I show my feelings for romantic partners, I'm afraid they will not feel the same about me.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

19. I'm afraid that I will lose my partner's love.   **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

20. I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

21. I rarely worry about my partner leaving me.   **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

22. I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

23. I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

24. My romantic partner makes me doubt myself.   **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

25. I find it easy to depend on romantic partners.   **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

26. When my partner is out of sight, I worry that he or she might become interested in someone else.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

27. My partner really understands me and my needs. **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

28. It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

29. I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

30. I worry a lot about my relationships.   **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

31. I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners.

                                       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

32. I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners. **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

33. It's not difficult for me to get close to my partner.**1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

34. I worry that I won't measure up to other people. **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

35. I talk things over with my partner.   **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

36. It's easy for me to be affectionate with my partner.**1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

Relationship Characteristics Questionnaire

Answer the following questions about the same relationship that is now terminated that lasted at least 2 months. If you have more than one relationship, now over, that lasted at least 2 months, choose the one in which you experienced a difficult break-up. Please use the same relationship for each question.

37. Age of former partner at time of onset of relationship: _____

38. Gender of former partner:
   1 = Male
   2 = Female

39. Your age at time of onset of relationship:_____

40. How long did the relationship last?
   1 = Less than 2 months
   2 = 3 to 6 months
   3 = 6 to 9 months
   4 = 9 months to 1 year
   5 = 1 to 2 years
   6 = 2 to 3 years
   7 = More than 3 years

41. How long ago did this relationship end?
   1 = It has not ended
   2 = Less than one month ago
   3 = About 1 month ago
   4 = About 2 months ago
   5 = Three to five months ago
   6 = Six months to eleven months ago
   7 = About a year ago
   8 = More than a year but less than 2 years ago
   9 = About 2 years ago
  10 = More than 2 years ago

42. What was the status level of the relationship at the time of break-up?
   1 = Casually dating
   2 = Exclusively dating
   3 = Engaged
   4 = Living together
   5 = Married

43. What was the intimacy level of the relationship?
   1 = Kissing
   2 = Touching
   3 = Oral Sex
   4 = Genital intercourse

44. Number of break-ups before final termination
   0 = None
   1 = 1
   2 = 2
   3 = 3
   4 = 4
   5 = 5 or more

45. Who decided to terminate the relationship?
   1 = I did
   2 = My partner did
   3 = It was a mutual decision

46. Is the partner in this section the same partner you referred to in earlier sections of the survey?
   1 = Yes- same partner as in sections I and II of the Personal Relationships Profile AND as in
         the Conflict Tactics Scale
   2 = No- I used my current partner to refer to in the earlier sections of the survey. I'm
         reporting a different relationship that is now terminated in this current Relationship
         Characteristics Questionnaire
   3 = Not sure

Post-Relationship Scale

Please answer the following questions about the SAME RELATIONSHIP you described in the

Demographics Questionnaire directly above. Respond to the questions as you would have *during the*

***relationship*, prior to its termination.**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly	…….	…….	Neutral/ Mixed	…….	…….	Agree Strongly

56. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each statement regarding the fulfillment
of each need in alternative relationships (e.g. by another dating partner, friends, family).

    (a) My needs for intimacy (sharing personal thoughts, secrets, etc.) could have been fulfilled in
alternative relationships.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

    (b) My needs for companionship (doing things together, enjoying each other's company, etc.) could
have been fulfilled in alternative relationships.
                   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

    (c) My sexual needs (holding hands, kissing, etc.) could have been fulfilled in alternative
relationships.
                   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

    (d) My needs for security (feeling trusting, comfortable in a stable relationship, etc.) could have been
fulfilled in alternative relationships.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

    (e) My needs for emotional involvement (feeling emotionally attached, feeling good when another
feels good, etc.) could have been fulfilled in alternative relationships.
                   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

57. The people other than my partner with whom I might become involved were very appealing to me.
                   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

58. My alternatives to our relationship were close to ideal (dating another, spending time with friends or on my
own, etc.)   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

59. If I had not been dating my partner, I would have been fine—I would have found another appealing person
to date.   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

60. My alternatives were attractive to me (dating another, spending time with friends or on my own, etc.)
                   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

61. My needs for intimacy, companionship, etc. could have easily been fulfilled in an alternative relationship.
                   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

62. Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the following statements regarding your former
relationship.
    (a) I invested a great deal of time in our relationship.
                   1   2   3   4   5   6   7

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Disagree Strongly	…….	…….	Neutral/ Mixed	…….	…….	Agree Strongly

(b) I told my partner many private things about myself (I disclose secrets to him/her).

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

(c) My partner and I had an intellectual life together that would be difficult to replace

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

(d) My sense of personal identity (who I am) was linked to my partner and our relationship

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

(e) My partner and I shared many memories

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

63. I put a great deal into our relationship that I lost when the relationship ended.

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

64. Many aspects of my life became linked to my partner (recreational activities, etc.), and I felt like I would lose all of this if we were to break up.

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

65. I felt very involved in our relationship—like I put a great deal into it.

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

66. I felt that my relationship with friends and family members would be complicated if my partner and I broke up (e.g.

partner is friends with people I care about). **1   2   3   4   5   6   7**

67. Compared to other people I know, I invested a great deal in my relationship with my former partner.

        1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Post-Relationship Behavior Index

Please answer each of the following questions about the same former relationship, thinking about the period of time following the termination of the relationship. Please estimate how often each behavior occurred. Please respond to each question with the following response scale:

0-Never   *1*- Once or Twice   *2*-More than twice   *3*- Once a week   *4*-Once a day   *5*-More than once a day

After the break up with your former partner did **you**:

68.	Called him/her at home	0 1 2 3 4 5
69.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
70.	Called him/her at work	0 1 2 3 4 5
71.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
72.	Came to his/her home	0 1 2 3 4 5
73.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
74.	Came to his/her work or school	0 1 2 3 4 5
75.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
76.	Talked to his/her parents and/or friends to get information or to talk about him/her	0 1 2 3 4 5
77.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
78.	Followed him/her	0 1 2 3 4 5
79.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
80.	Made hang-up calls	0 1 2 3 4 5
81.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
82.	Sent him/her letters	0 1 2 3 4 5
83.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
84.	Sent him/her gifts	0 1 2 3 4 5
85.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
86.	Drove by their house	0 1 2 3 4 5
87.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
88.	Watched him/her	0 1 2 3 4 5
89.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
90.	Left messages on his/her machine	0 1 2 3 4 5
91.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5
92.	Sent him/her photos	0 1 2 3 4 5
93.	My former partner did this to me	0 1 2 3 4 5

		0	1	2	3	4	5
94.	Made threats to his/her new partner	0	1	2	3	4	5
95.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
96.	Attempted to break into his/her car	0	1	2	3	4	5
97.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
98.	Attempted to break into his/her home	0	1	2	3	4	5
99.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
100.	Broke into his/her home	0	1	2	3	4	5
101.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
102.	Broke into his/her car	0	1	2	3	4	5
103.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
104.	Violated a restraining order	0	1	2	3	4	5
105.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
106.	Threatened to cause self harm	0	1	2	3	4	5
107.	My former partner did this	0	1	2	3	4	5
108.	Threatened to harm him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5
109.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
110.	Stole/read his/her mail	0	1	2	3	4	5
111.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
112.	Attempted to harm him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5
113.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
114.	Damaged property of his/her new partner	0	1	2	3	4	5
115.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
116.	Physically harmed yourself	0	1	2	3	4	5
117.	My former partner did this	0	1	2	3	4	5
118.	Harmed his/her new partner	0	1	2	3	4	5
119.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5
120.	Physically harmed him/her	0	1	2	3	4	5
121.	My former partner did this to me	0	1	2	3	4	5

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE PLACE THIS PACKET BACK IN THE ENVELOPE; THEN BRING THE ENVELOPE TO THE FRONT OF THE ROOM AND PLACE IT IN THE BOX. BE SURE TO PICK UP A DEBRIEFING SHEET ON YOUR WAY OUT. PLEASE LET THE EXPERIMENTER KNOW IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS REGARDING THE MATERIAL OR YOUR PARTICIPATION. THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION.

APPENDIX B: CONSENT MATERIALS

Consent Procedures Script

Thank you for your participation in this study. The purpose of the study is to see whether the way in which people see themselves in relationships, a psychological concept called Romantic Attachment Theory, and other relationship characteristics are associated with different behaviors as a relationship ends. In a minute, I'm going to hand out packets of questionnaires. Included are 6 questionnaires for the study. All of them are going to ask you to report information about you and a former romantic partner. Please answer all the questions on these three about the same relationship, one that existed for more than 2 months. If you have more than one relationship that lasted for at least 2 months, choose one in which you experienced a difficult break-up. Some of the questions in these assessments may seem very personal. For that reason, no names will be put on any of the questionnaires, and not even I will be able to match you with your test packet. When the results are reported, I will not use any individual scores, only group averages of the 600 people who are expected to participate. This means that there will not be any identifying information of any kind in reports that would enable someone reading them to know how you scored or even that you participated in the study. Because this group of questionnaires is actually a combination of two studies, I will be sharing some of the results. However, no names will be shared, and all of the results that they report will also be reported as group averages. Furthermore, although you help us most by answering every question, you can skip questions you do not want to answer, and you can stop your participation at any point without penalty. You will still receive credit for the amount of time you spend in the testing session. The whole testing session should not take more than an hour, and you will receive full credit if you complete all the forms (1hour of credit). Please remember that your participation here is entirely voluntary. Anyone who either does not wish to participate or who has not been in a former romantic relationship that lasted 2 months is free to leave at any time. A current relationship is not necessary for participation, only a former one. Are there any questions before we get started?

I'm now distributing the Informed Consent forms. Each of you will receive two copies. Please read it thoroughly. When you're ready to continue, sign it and return one of the copies to me. The other copy is for your records. If at any time you have questions or concerns regarding your participation or the study, my contact information, as well as my faculty advisor's contact information, is on this sheet. The information to contact the Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board, the people who ensure that research is conducted ethically, is also included on this sheet in case you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant. Please take a moment now to read this form and sign at the bottom. Then I will collect one of the copies.

I'm now going to distribute the questionnaire packets. Please do not write your name or Personal Identification Number anywhere on the testing booklets. The numbers on the materials are just to make sure the questionnaires all stay together. Please answer them in the order in which they are placed in the testing packet. As you answer these, please remember that there are no right or wrong answers, and that your honesty is very much appreciated. If

you have any questions during the session, please do not hesitate to come and ask me. After you're finished with all of the questionnaires, please place all the materials back into the envelope and seal it. When you're ready, you may begin.

Consent Form

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT
CHAPEL HILL

Department of Psychology
College of Arts & Sciences

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
CB# 3270, Davie Hall
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3270

Post-Relationship Behaviors- Relationships and How We End Them

Principal Investigator: Amanda Singer
                             266 Davie Hall
                             Campus Box # 3270
                             alsinger@email.unc.edu
                             919-260-2945

Faculty Advisor: Bernadette Gray-Little
                             Executive Associate Provost
                             Professor of Clinical Psychology
                             264 Davie Hall
                             bernadet@email.unc.edu
                             919-962-3990

Aims and Procedure:

The purpose of this research study is to examine people's behavior during a relationship and after a relationship is over and how that behavior might relate to their attachment style or other relationship characteristics. An attachment style is the way an individual sees him or herself and his or her partner in the relationship. This study hypothesizes that these attachment styles affect the way in which people behave during a relationship and as a relationship ends.

At the beginning of the study, you will be given a test packet with 6 questionnaires. The questionnaires will ask about information about you, about how you see yourself in romantic relationships in general, and about your current and past romantic relationships. You will be asked to complete each questionnaire and when finished, return the questionnaires to the packet envelope. Envelopes will then be collected. No names will appear on any of the testing material; therefore, your participation is completely anonymous as well as confidential. This session should not last more than 1 hour.

Six hundred students in total are expected to participate in the study before it is completed. Findings will only be presented as group data. Therefore, no individuals will be portrayed. Results will also be shared with another research team we are collaborating with, but no names will be sent, and all of their findings will only be presented as group data, as well.

<u>Risks and Benefits:</u>

During the testing, some of the questions may seem very personal. However, you can never be identified by the answers that you give. Also, while it helps us most to answer every question, you can skip questions you do not wish to answer. It is unlikely, but possible, that you may find it uncomfortable to focus on your current or past relationships. You may end your participation at any time and for any reason, without penalty. You will be given credit for the amount of time you spent during the testing session.

By participating in this study, you will be given first hand experience with psychological research. You will also be aiding the psychological community in general by contributing to research. Finally, you will receive 1 hour worth of participation credit.

If you have any questions or concerns, you may contact the principal investigator and her faculty advisor, listed above. You may also contact the UNC-CH Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board at the following email address and telephone number if you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant:

Academic Affairs Institutional Review Board
919-962-7761
aa-irb@unc.edu

No negative effects of participation are expected, but if you find yourself feeling distressed after your participation, please discuss your feelings with either Amanda Singer or Bernadette Gray-Little. You will also be given information for Counseling and Psychological Service (CAPS), the student counseling service at UNC-CH.

I agree to participate in the study described above. The investigator has explained the study to me and answered any questions I have. I understand that I may withdraw at any time without penalty. I have also been given a copy of this form for my records.

_____   **I am 18 years old or older.**

_____   **I am under 18, but have a parental consent form on file in the Participant Pool Office (Davie 311).**

_____   _____

Date   Participant's Signature

APPENDIX C: DEBRIEFING MATERIALS

Debriefing Script

Thank you again for your participation in this research study. As I indicated before, the study will examine patterns of romantic attachment and other relationship characteristics to explore how they might relate to post-relationship behaviors. You may have realized during testing that several of the questions in the Current Relationship Scale and the Post-Relationship Behavior Index asked about threatening or violent behaviors you may have enacted toward a partner or that a partner may have done toward you. One of the questions this examination will analyze is whether those who have engaged in these kinds of behaviors have similar romantic attachment patterns to one another. Specifically, research of romantic attachment in other areas of relationships indicates there may be a different attachment pattern for people who use several minor threatening behaviors vs. a few severe ones. I'm also going to see if this pattern is different for men than it is for women, or if there are any patterns among people who have experienced these behaviors from a former partner.

Two of the measures you completed, the Personal-Relationship Profile and the Current Relationship Scale, are also part of a larger, international study that is evaluating dating violence. This study is looking at how dating violence differs or is the same across different regions of the United States, as well as different parts of the world.

Your participation earns you 1 hour of credit. This credit will be posted immediately after this session.

Although it was not the intention, I realize that the personal nature of some of the questions may have caused you some discomfort or anxiety. Therefore, I'm now going to give everyone the referral information for the Counseling and Psychological Service (or CAPS) here on campus, along with more detailed information about the study. If you experienced any distress from participating in this study, please talk to someone over at CAPS. If you have any questions about the research, the information presented here, or about your participation, please feel free to ask them now or to contact me or my advisor later.

Thank you.

Debriefing form

Post-Relationship Behaviors-
Relationships and How We End Them:
Information About This Research Study and Your Participation

Thank you again for your participation in this research study. As was stated before, the purpose was to explore if there is a connection between the way people see themselves and their partners in romantic relationships and the way they behave once the relationship is over. Sometimes this behavior is threatening, and this study aims to see whether Romantic Attachment styles can help to explain why this is so. To better explore this connection, several measures were used. The Experiences in Close Relationships Inventory assesses the way that people see themselves or feel about their romantic relationships in general. Patterns are usually seen in the way people answer these questions, which are commonly called "attachment styles," and they are usually the same across different relationships. I'm looking at the way these different styles relate to the kinds of behaviors people engage in during conflict in the relationship and once a specific relationship is over. Another way to look at these patterns are through how invested you feel about the relationship and whether other relationships can meet your needs. The Post-Relationship Scale was designed to assess this. The Demographic Questionnaire assessed specific information about a past relationship so that I can see what connection those general patterns have when specific information is already taken into account. The Post-Relationship Behavior Index measures the frequency and severity of some behaviors that people may engage in. The Personal Relationships Profile looks at the way your personality might affect the way you relate to someone else. Finally, the Current Relationship Scale looks at the way you resolved conflicts in your past relationship. These last two questionnaires are also being used in a study headed by the Family Research Laboratory at the University of New Hampshire to examine dating relationships and violence and how it may be the same or different across the United States and in different parts of the world.

Some of the questions you were asked were very personal. It certainly was not our intention to cause anyone anxiety or distress by asking these questions. However, if you feel anxious or distressed now or later because of the questionnaires, or if you wish to speak to someone about a current or past relationship, please contact the Counseling and Psychological Services office (CAPS) on the 3rd floor of the Taylor Student Health Services Building.

Phone number: 919-966-3658 (weekdays from 8 am to 5 pm)
919-966-2281 (after hours or weekends)

Thank you again for your participation. Again, feel free to contact me or my research advisor at any time if you have questions regarding the study.

Amanda Singer,   Bernadette Gray-Little, Ph. D.,
Principal Investigator   Executive Associate Provost
266 Davie Hall   Professor of Clinical Psychology
CB # 3270   264 Davie Hall
919-593-3240   919-962-3990
alsinger@email.unc.edu   bernadet@email.unc.edu

REFERENCES

Abbey, A., Clinton-Sherrod, A., McAuslan, P., Zawacki, T., & Buck, P. (2003). The relationship between the quantity of alcohol consumed and the severity of sexual assaults committed by college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 813-833.

Amar, A. & Alexy, E. (2005). 'Dissed' by dating violence. *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care, 41*, 162-171.

Amar, A. & Gennaro, S. (2005). Dating violence in college women: Associated physical injury, healthcare usage, and mental health symptoms. *Nursing Research, 54*, 235-242.

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 651-680.

Arias, I. & O'Leary, K. (1988). Cognitive-behavioral treatment of physical aggression in marriage. In N. Epstein, S. Schlesinger, and W. Dryden (Eds.). *Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy With Families*, New York: Brunner/Mazel. 118-150.

Avni, N. (1991). Battered wives: Characteristics of their courtship days. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6*, 232-239.

Barnett, O., Fagan, R., & Booker, J. (1991). Hostility and stress as mediators of aggression in violent men. *Journal of Family Violence, 6*, 217-241.

Beasley, R. & Stoltenberg, C. (1992). Personality characteristics of male spouse abusers. *Professional Psychological Research and Practice, 23*, 310-317.

Beyers, J., Leonard, J., Mays, V. & Rosen, L. (2000). Gender differences in the perception of courtship abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15,* 451-467.

Bird, G., Stith, S., & Schladale, J. (1991). Psychological resources, coping strategies, and negotiation styles as discriminators of violence in dating relationships. *Family Relationships: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 40*, 45-50.

Bjerregaard, B. (2000). An empirical study of stalking victimization. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 389-406.

Bookwala, J., Frieze, I., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims, 7*, 297-311.

Brewster, M. (2000). Stalking by former intimates: Verbal threats and other predictors of physical violence. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 41-54.

Brewster, M. (2003). Power and control dynamics in pre-stalking and stalking situations. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*, 207-218.

Buzawa, E., Hotaling, G., Klein, A., & Byrne, J. (1999). *Response to domestic violence in a proactive court setting*. Lowell, MA: University of Massachusetts.

Canary, D., Spitzberg, B., & Semic, B. (1998). The experience and expression of anger in interpersonal settings. In P.A. Anderson & L.K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Research, theory, application, and contexts.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press. 189-213.

Cantrell, P., MacIntyre, D., Sharkey, K., & 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*, 35-41.

Capaldi, D. & Crosby, L. (1997). Observed and reported psychological and physical aggression in young, at risk couples. *Social Development, 6*, 184-206.

Carr, J. & VanDeusen, K. (2002). The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence in college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 630-646.

Cascardi, M. & Vivian, D. (1995). Context for specific episodes of marital violence: Gender and severity of violence difference. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 10*, 265-293.

Cauffman, E., Feldman, S., Jensen, L., & Arnett, J. (2000). The (un)acceptability of violence against peers and dates. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 15*, 652-673.

Clark, M., Beckett, J., Wells, M., & Dungee-Anderson, D. (1994). Courtship violence among African American college students. *Journal of Black Psychology, 20*, 264-281.

Coleman, F. (1997). Stalking behavior and the cycle of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12,* 420-432.

Corbin, W., Bernat, J., Calhoun, K., McNair, L., & Seals, K. (2001). The role of alcohol expectancies and alcohol consumption among sexually victimized and nonvictimized college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 297-311.

Cordova, J., Jacobsen, N., Gottman, J., Rushe, R., & Cox, G. (1993). Negative reciprocity and communication in couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*, 559-564.

Crick, N. & Dodge, K. (1994). A review and reformation of social-information processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin, 115*, 74-101.

Cupach, W., & Spitzberg, B. (2000). Obsessive relational intrusion: Incidence, perceived severity, and coping. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 357-372.

DeLucia, B., Owens, C., Will, J., & McCoin, S. (1999). *Hubbard House, Inc. Domestic offender obtaining reeducation program outcome assessment.* Jacksonville, FL: Northeast Florida Center for Community Initiatives, University of North Florida.

Dostal, C. & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1997). Relationship-specific cognitions and family-of-origin divorce and abuse. *Journal of Divorce and Remarriage, 27*, 101-120.

Dye, M., & Davies, K. (2003). Stalking and psychological abuse: Common factors and relationship-specific characteristics. *Violence and Victims, 18*, 163-180.

Eckhardt, C., Jamison, R., & Watts, K. (2003). Anger experience and expression among male dating violence perpetrators during anger arousal. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 1102-1115.

Egeland, B. (1993). A history of abuse is a major risk factor for abusing the next generation. In R. Gelles and D. Loseke (Eds.) *Current Controversies on Family Violence.* Newbury Park, Sage. 197-208.

Ehrensaft, M. & Vivian, D. (1999). Spouses' reasons for not reporting existing marital aggression as a marital problem. *Journal of Family Psychology, 10*, 443-454.

Foo, L. & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence, 10*, 351-377.

Forbes, G., Jobe, R., White, K., Bloesch, E., and Adams-Curtis, L. (2005). Perceptions of dating violence following a sexual or nonsexual betrayal of trust: effects of gender, sexism, acceptance of rape myths, and vengeance motivation. *Sex Roles, 53*, 165-173.

Foshee, V. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse: Prevalence, types, and injuries. *Health Education Resource, 11*, 275-286.

Foshee, V., Benefield, T., Steven, E., & Ennett, S. (2004). Longitudinal predictors of serious physical and sexual dating violence victimization during adolescence. *Preventative Medicine: An International Journal Devoted to Practice and Theory, 39*, 1007-1016.

Gray, H. & Foshee, V. (1997). Adolescent dating violence: Differences between one-sided and mutually violent profiles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 126-141.

Gagne, M., Lavoie, F., & Herbert, M. (2005). Victimization during childhood and revictimization in dating relationships in adolescent girls. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 29*, 1155-1172.

Gordon, K., Burton, S., & Porter, L. (2004). Predicting the intentions of women in domestic violence shelters to return to partners: Does forgiveness play a role? *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*, 331-338.

Gover, A. (2004). Risky lifestyles and dating violence: A theoretical test of violent victimization. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 32*, 171-180.

Hamberger, L. & Guse, C. (2002). Men's and women's use of intimate partner violence in clinical samples. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 1301-1332.

Hanley, M., & O'neill, P. (1997). Violence and committment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12* , 685-704.

Harned, M. (2002). A multivariate analysis of risk markers for dating violence victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 1179-1197.

Harris, M. (1991). Effects of gender of aggressor, sex of target, and relationship on evaluations of physical aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6*, 174-186.

Harrison, L. & Abrishami, G. (2004). Dating violence attributions: Do they differ for in-group and out-group members who have a history of dating violence? *Sex Roles, 51*, 543-550.

Hendy, H.,Weiner, K., Bakerofskie, J., Eggen, D., Gustitus, C., & McLeod, K. (2003). Comparison of six models for violent romantic relationships in college men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 645-666.

Hines, D. & Saudino, K. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence and Victims, 18*, 197-217.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 476-494.

Johnson, M. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 283-294.

Johnson, J. & Adams, M. (1995). Differential gender effects of exposure to rap music on African American adolescents' acceptance of teen dating violence. *Sex Roles, 33*, 597-606.

Katz, J., Kuffel, S., & Coblentz, A. (2002). Are there differences in sustaining dating violence? An examination of frequency, severity, and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Family Violence, 17*, 247-271.

Kaura, S. & Allen, C. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence perpetration by men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 576-588.

Kinsfogel, K. & Grych, H. (2004). Interparental conflict and adolescent dating relationships: Integrating cognitive, emotional, and peer influences. *Journal of Family Psychology,18*, 505-516.

Kurz, D. (1996). Separation, divorce, and woman abuse. *Violence Against Women, 2*, 63-81.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Hankla, M., & Stormberg, C. (2004). The relationship behavior networks of young adults: A test of the intergenerational transmission of violence hypothesis. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*, 139-151.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Rohling, M. (2000). Negative family-of-origin experiences: Are they associated with perpetrating unwanted pursuit behaviors? *Violence and Victims, 15*, 459-472.

Leonard, K. & Senchack, M. (1993). Alcohol and premarital aggression among newlywed couples. *Journal for the Study of Alcohol, 11*, 96-108.

Lichter, E. & McCloskey, L. (2004). The effects of childhood exposure to marital violence on adolescent gender-role beliefs and dating violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 28*, 344-358.

Logan, T., Leukefeld, C., & Walker, W. (2000). Stalking as a variant of intimate violence: Implications from a young adult sample. *Violence and Victims, 15,* 91-111.

Lochman, J. & Dodge, K. (1994). Social-cognitive processes of severely violent, moderately aggressive, and nonaggressive boys. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 62,* 366-375.

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

Mahlstedt, D. & Welsh, L. (2005). Perceived causes of physical assault in heterosexual dating relationships. *Violence Against Women, 11*, 447-473.

Makepeace, J. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. *Family Relationships: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 35*, 383-388.

Malick, S., Sorenson, S., & Aneshensel, C. (1997). Community and dating violence among adolescents: Perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 21*, 291-302.

Marcus, R. (2004). Dating partners' responses to simulated dating conflict: Violence chronicity, expectations, and emotional quality of relationship. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 130,* 163-188.

Marcus, R. & Swett, B. (2002). Violence and intimacy in close relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 570-586.

Marx, B., Van Wie, V., & Gross, A. (1996). Date rape risk factors: A review and methodological critique of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1*, 27-45.

Maxwell, J. (2001). The perception of relationship violence in the lyrics of a song. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*, 640-662.

McDonald, T. & Kline, L. (2004). Perceptions of appropriate punishment for committing date rape: Male college students recommend lenient punishments. *College Student Journal, 38*, 44-57.

McFarlane, J., Campbell, J., Wilt, S., Sachs, C., Eulrich, Y., & Oxu, X. (1995). Stalking and intimate partner femicide. *Homicide Studies, 3*, 300-316.

Miller, J. (2003). Gender and adolescent relationship violence: A contextual examination. *Criminology, 41,* 1207-1249.

Moffitt, T., Krueger, R., Caspi, A., & Fagan, J. (2000). Partner abuse and general crime: How are they the same? How are they different? *Criminology, 38*, 199-232.

Mustaine, E. (1999). A routine activity theory explanation for women's stalking victimizations. *Violence and Victims, 5,* 43-63.

Noland, V., Liller, K., & McDermott, J. (2004). Is adolescent sibling violence a precursor to college dating violence? *American Journal of Health Behavior, 28*, S13-S23.

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

O'Sullivan, L. & Byers, E. (1992). College students' incorporation of initiator and restrictor roles in sexual dating interactions. *Journal of Sex Roles, 29*, 435-446.

Parrott, D. & Zeichner, A. (2003). Effects of trait anger and negative attitudes towards women on physical assault in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*, 301-308.

Prospero, M. (2006). The role of perceptions in dating violence among young adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*, 470-484.

Rich, C., Gidycz, C., & Warkentin, J. (2005). Child and adolescent abuse and subsequent victimization: A prospective study. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 29*, 1375-1394.

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

Ronfeldt, H., Kimerling, R., Arias, I. (1998). Satisfaction with relationship power and the perpetration of dating violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 60*, 70-78.

Rosenfeld, B. (2004). Violence risk factors in stalking and obsessional harassment: A review and preliminary meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 31*, 9-36.

Rusbult, C., Johnson, D., & Morrow, G. (1986). Predicting satisfaction and commitment in adult romantic involvements: An assessment of the generalizability of the investment model. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 49,* 81-89.

Rusbult, C., Martz, J., & Agnew, C. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment size. *Personal Relationships, 5,* 357-391.

Saunders, D. (2002). Are physical assaults by wives and girlfriends a major social problem? A review of the literature. *Violence Against Women, 8,* 1424-1448.

Shook, N., Gerrity, D., Jurich, J., Segrist, A. (2000). Courtship violence among college students: A comparison of verbally and physically abusive couples. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*, 1-22.

Simonelli, C., Mullis, T., Elliot, A., & Pierce, T. (2002). Abuse by siblings and subsequent experiences of violence within the dating relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 103-122.

Sinclair, H., & Frieze, I. (2000). Initial courtship behavior and stalking: How should we draw the line? *Violence and Victims, 15*, 23-40.

Singer, A. & Gray-Little, B. (2004). "Can't stop loving you:" Are post-relationship behaviors better understood through associated attachment profiles or relationship characteristics? Unpublished paper.

Smith, P., White, J., & Holland, L. (2003). A longitudinal perspective on dating violence among adolescent and college-age women. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*, 1104-1110.

Stets, J. & Henderson, D. (1991). Contextual factors surrounding conflict resolution while dating: Results from a national study. *Family Relationships: Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies, 40*, 29-36.

Stets, J. & Straus, M. (1990). Gender differences in reporting of marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In M. Straus & R. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. 151-166.

Stith, S., Rosen, K., Middleton, K., Busch, A., Lundenberg, K., & Carlton, R. (2000). The Intergenerational Transmission of Spouse Abuse: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Marriage & Family, 62*, 640-655.

Strauss, M. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) scales. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 41*, 75-88.

Straus, M. (1997). Physical assaults by women partners: A major social problem. In M. Walsh (Ed.). *Women, Men, and Gender: Ongoing Debates*. New Haven: Yale University Press. 210-221.

Straus, M. (2001). Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide. *Violence Against Women, 10*, 790-811.

Straus, M. (2003). *Analyzing and interpreting data from the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale and the international dating violence study*. Paper presented at the International Conference on Family Violence Research, July, Portsmouth, NH. Available: http://pub-pages.unch.edu/~mas2/.

Straus, M., Hamby, S., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*, 283-316.

Strauss, M., Hamby, S., Boney-McCoy, S., and Sugarman, D. (1999). *The personal and relationships profile (PRP)*. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire. Available: http://pub-pages.unch.edu/~mas2/.

Straus, M. & Medeiros, R. (2002). *Gender differences in risk factors for physical violence between dating partners by university students*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology annual meeting, November 14th, Chicago, IL. Durham, NH: University of New Hampshire, Family Research Laboratory. Available: http://pub-pages.unch.edu/~mas2/.

Straus, M. & Ramirez, I. (2004). Criminal history and assault of dating partners: The role of type of prior crime, age of onset, and gender. *Violence and Victims, 19*, 413-434.

Sugarman, D. & Hotaling, G. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In A.A. Priog-Good & J.E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues*. New York: Preager. 3-31.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey* (NCJ Report no 169592). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N., & Allison, C. (2002). Comparing stalking victimization from legal and victim perspectives. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 7-21.

Vivan, D., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1994). Are bi-directionally violent couples mutually victimized? A gender-sensitive comparison. *Violence and Victims, 9,* 107-124.

White, J. & Kowalski, R. (1998). Male violence towards women: An integrative perspective. In: *Human aggression: Theories, research, and implications for social policy*. Geen, Russell G.; Donnerstein, Edward; San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press, Inc., 203-228.

White, J., Kowalski, R., Lyndon, A., & Valentine, S. (2000). An integrative contextual developmental model of male stalking. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 373-388.

White, J., Merrill, L., & Koss, M. (1999). Predictors of premilitary courtship violence in a Navy recruit sample. San Diego: United States Navy, Naval Health Research Center.

Widom, C. (1989). The cycle of violence. *Science, 244*, 160-166.

Wolf, K. & Foshee, V. (2003). Family violence, anger expression styles and adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*, 309-316.

Wright, J., & Burgess, A. (1996). A typology of interpersonal stalking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11*, 487-503.

Zweig, J., Barber, B., & Ecceles, J. (1997). Sexual coercion and well-being in young adulthood: Comparisons by gender and college status. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 291-308.