

BRUISES WITHOUT A NAME:
INVESTIGATING COLLEGE STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF
RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE TERMINOLOGY

by

KARIN H. NORDIN

CAROL B. MILLS, COMMITTEE CHAIR
JOSHUA PEDERSON
JENNIFER HOEWE
TRICIA WITTE

A THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the degree of Master of Arts in the
Department of Communication Studies
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2017

Copyright Karin H. Nordin 2017
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Rates of collegiate relationship violence are at an all-time high (Breiding, 2015). Although colleges and universities are taking steps towards reducing these rates, recent research has uncovered a fatal flaw in their methods: terminology. Lederman and Stewart (2003) surveyed relationship violence prevention campaigns across college campuses, finding ‘domestic violence’ as the most widely used name for collegiate relationship violence, yet also the one college students were least comfortable with using. 298 students at a large, southeastern university completed a survey through the online distribution tool Qualtrics. Using a basic 1-7 Likert Scale, students were asked to rate the appropriateness of the following terms: domestic violence, dating violence, dating abuse, intimate partner violence, intimate terrorism, and common couple violence. Findings indicate that students were significantly more likely to attribute the terms domestic violence, dating violence, and dating abuse to a situation if the perpetrator of violence was male rather than female. When partners were dating, students felt most comfortable with the terms ‘dating violence’ and ‘dating abuse.’ Most importantly, terminology was found to be correlated with perceptions of severity, blame, and recommendations for bystander action. Ultimately, this study suggests that schemas surround each possible relationship violence term, and offers the idea that simply adjusting what college student deem as ‘domestic violence’ could unlock the key to bystander intervention efforts and violence reduction in the future.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the Alabama Forensic Council. To each and every student I coach and have coached, know that you have taught me so much about myself, this world we live in, and what it means to be an advocate. I love each and every one of you so fiercely, and although I am technically leaving the team, I will never stop being your coach. I promise, if you need me, I am only ever a phone call away.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the incredible support of the Communication Studies department here at the University of Alabama and Dr. Beth S. Bennett. Thank you for offering me the opportunity to pursue a degree here, and thank you for every moment that I have spent learning over the past two years. To Bobby Imbody, I cannot express how grateful I am that you saw my potential and convinced me to move all the way from Minnesota to come coach for the Alabama Forensic Council. To Dr. Joshua Pederson, thank you for your calm and positive assurance every time I was worried about getting this research completed on time. To Dr. Tricia Witte, thank you for the fantastic suggestions you had on variables to add to the research. I am so grateful that I was able to find a faculty member at the University of Alabama who was studying domestic violence. To Dr. Jennifer Hoewe, thank you for many starbursts, as well as your statistical expertise that made this whole project possible. Finally, to Dr. Carol Mills, thank you for the hours I've spent in your office, the endless encouragement, and everything you've taught me about research. Most of all though, thank you for being an example of survival. I cannot articulate how thankful I am to have such a brilliant, strong, and dedicated mentor- it has truly changed my life.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO - LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Schema Theory	5
Domestic Violence Perceptions	8
<i>Gender</i>	8
<i>Provocation</i>	11
<i>Marital Status</i>	14
<i>Bystander Intervention</i>	15
CHAPTER THREE - METHOD	19
Recruitment.....	19
Participants.....	20
Survey	20

Manipulation Checks	23
Measures	24
Control Variables	25
CHAPTER FOUR - RESULTS	26
Conflict Tactics Scale (Revised).....	26
<i>Prevalence</i>	27
<i>Chronicity</i>	27
Bivariate Correlations For CTS Results	29
Impact of Perpetrator Gender.....	30
Impact of Provocation.....	33
Impact of Marital Status	35
CHAPTER FIVE - DISCUSSION	37
Summary of Study	37
Implications	40
Limitations	42
Directions for Future Research	43
Conclusion	44
REFERENCES	45

APPENDIX A – CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE 52

APPENDIX B – FULL TEXT OF VIGNETTES 55

APPENDIX C – FULL QUESTIONNAIRE..... 58

APPENDIX D – IRB APPROVAL 63

LIST OF TABLES

1. Participant Descriptive Statistics	20
2. Participant Descriptive Statistics (Continued)	20
3. Vignette Information	23
4. Conflict Tactics Scale (Revised)	28
5. Bivariate Correlations	29
6. Impact of Gender	31
7. Impact of Provocation.....	34

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In 1980, American psychologist Dr. Lenore E Walker coined the term “battered woman syndrome” to describe the mental condition of women who were living with or had recently escaped their abusive husbands (Walker, 1980). Although it had been nearly 14 years since the first women’s shelter opened (Lemon, 1996), Walker’s work marks an important moment in history because it *named* a phenomenon so many women were experiencing across the globe. The terminology soon shifted, adding labels such as domestic violence, dating abuse, and most recently intimate terrorism. Although seemingly beneficial, the variety in terminology presents a problem for domestic violence research as a whole, because with terms like “abuse” and “violence” being operationalized differently within each piece of research, it becomes difficult to compare findings, or draw accurate conclusions about everything from prevalence of violence to the experiences of survivors (Jackson, 1999).

The wide variety of terminology is paired with a lack of attention to what each term truly means. Similar to research on sexual assault terms (specifically the word ‘rape’), relationship violence research generally falls under one of two foci: the characteristics of the event itself, and the attitude of people who have experienced the event (Harris, 2011). However, Harris (2011) posits the existence of a third focus: the effects of applying the term. We understand what relationship violence generally looks like, and we understand the attitudes of survivors. However, what does it mean to apply a widely used term, such as “domestic violence”, to a

situation or relationship? Does applying the term “domestic violence” have a different impact than applying another widely used term, such as “dating abuse” or “intimate partner terrorism?”

Domestic violence, the reactions, and terminology that college students attach to an aggressive incident, all function as pieces of relational knowledge. Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2002) argue that all relational knowledge is understood through schemas. Schemas help us to understand aspects of relationships, by influencing the attributes are part of that relationship phenomenon, as well as ideas about the proper reaction to that relationship phenomenon. Consequently, this research will use schema theory to understand the cognitive structures we each hold surrounding the various terms we use to describe relationship violence.

Understanding how schemas operate in labeling and responding to violence incidents is critical to better understanding this phenomenon, specifically for college students. The first research done on college campuses found that one-fifth of students were victims of what Makepeace (1981) titled “courtship violence.” Since then, the scope of domestic violence research has widened, to include different populations, experiences, and methodologies- and with it, the terminology has expanded as well. Despite the pervasiveness, fifty-seven percent of college students believe domestic violence is difficult to identify (Fifth & Pacific Companies, 2010), and although there are undoubtedly many factors at work, one potential source of confusion is the difference between the terminology *researchers are using* and the terminology *students want to use*.

When investigating prevention campaigns, researchers found that “domestic violence” was the most commonly used term (Lederman & Stewart, 2003). However, college students who reviewed the materials were in almost unanimous agreement that the term “domestic violence” did not apply to their age group (Lederman & Stewart, 2003). This discrepancy could be part of

the reason why college students often report symptoms of victimization, but fail to identify as a victim of relationship violence (Ashcraft, 2000). In one study, 83% of students reported symptoms of abuse, such as being slapped or punched by an intimate partner; of that 83%, less than 5% of participants self-identified as a victim of domestic violence (Miller & Bukva, 2001). Miller and Bukva (2001, p. 67) offer an explanation, noting

“If an individual’s definition of abusive behaviors differs from the generally accepted definitions of abuse, that individual may inaccurately self-identify as not being in an abusive relationship when he or she truly is.”

The discrepancy between reported behavior and victim identification is a crucial one to explore, as the step of identifying as victim could be crucial in the decision to end a relationship and stop the abuse.

This study investigates the gap between terminology used and terminology preferred by seeking to understand how a variety of domestic violence terms are linked to both “typical” and “atypical” situations of relationship violence. In essence, I ask the question, “What variables make a situation qualify as ‘domestic violence?’” Through hypothetical scenarios, I investigate whether manipulating variables, such as gender of perpetrator or incident provocation, changes students’ perceptions of the “appropriate” term for the incident. Although many of the variables that are manipulated have been studied before, previous research has continually studied the first two foci (characteristics and experience) while neglecting to link such variables to how those components of an event might affect the label students use and their likelihood to intervene.

Domestic violence, the reactions, and terminology that college students attach to an aggressive incident, all function as pieces of relational knowledge. Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2002) argue that all relational knowledge is understood through schemas. Schemas help us to understand aspects of relationships, by influencing the attributes are part of that relationship

phenomenon, as well as ideas about the proper reaction to that relationship phenomenon. Consequently, this research will use schema theory to understand the cognitive structures we each hold surrounding the various terms we use to describe relationship violence.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW
Schema Theory

A schema is a cognitive structure used to organize knowledge (Bartlett, 1932). Throughout our daily lives, we react to the vast array of information surrounding us. From television to real life experiences, any information which surrounds us and to which we are repeatedly exposed to will result in the formation of a schema (Godbold & Fudge, 2010). Schemas are used when processing of that array of information needs to occur quickly, or subconsciously (Nishida, 1999). We hold schemas for everything in our lives, from where we place our attention (Frodin, 2016) to what products we choose (Davvetas & Diamantopoulos, 2016).

Schemas to understand how information seen in the media influences thought and perceptions (Slimani 2016; Hove & Paek, 2017; Alani, Clark-Taylor, Rogeshefsky, & Cerulli, 2016; Frödin, 2016). One area of considerable schema theory research investigates how gender norms impact processing. Bem (1981) proposes Gender Schema Theory, which argues that sex roles and gender stereotypes are taught so early on within society that they become the easiest schema to access when taking in information. In one study, participants were given 12 words to memorize. Although there were a wide variety of ways those words could be categorized, when reciting them later on, all participants recited the 6 male-related words first and the 6 female-related words second (Bem, 1981). In such an experiment, the gender schema operates as the most effective way for an individual to categorize information. However, Bem (1981) notes that

schemas are also used in construction of information. It is, essentially, the flip side of the coin. Although the word “cooking” might be categorized according to the gender schema, at the same time, the gender schema will help generate the word “cooking” when prompted about women-related activities. These tendencies towards gender based thought processes create gender-based labels (Davis & Wilson, 2016), one potential reason why domestic violence is often labeled as a women's issue.

On the terminology side, connections between names and schemas can be found in the area of sexual assault research (Harris, 2011; Edwards, Bradshaw & Hinsz, 2014). This research focuses on one main area- the connection between an event, the word used by the public to describe that event, and the schemas attached to that word. The word rape, in particular, is a complex term with a variety of associated meanings. Some define rape as any sexual intercourse without consent, while others hold ideas that rape must be violent or cannot happen to married women (Harris, 2011). Because of the many differing societal definitions, people who have experienced traumatic sexual events sometimes do not classify those experiences as rape, choosing instead terms such as sexual assault or unwanted sexual activity, a decision which has been connected to the schemas involved with the term (Harris, 2011). Essentially, the word “rape” itself is representative of a type of behavior, and an individual’s use of that word depends on whether or not the circumstances of the specific case match the schema of “rape” that they hold (Harris, 2011). Research on sexual assault has been increasingly aware of this link, even indicating that many students will report they “forced another person into a sexual act,” but have never “raped” someone (Edwards, Bradshaw & Hinsz, 2014, p. 88). Although there has been much social discussion on the word ‘rape’, equivalent terms within relationship violence such as ‘abuse’ have not received an equal amount of attention.

Schema is crucial to understand in a domestic violence context because of the connection between relational knowledge and processing. Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2002) argue that each relational schema consists of two main pieces. First, one piece of a relational schema is descriptive knowledge, or knowledge of the attributes and features of things (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). Second, a schema also consists of procedural knowledge, or information on typical behavior sequences relating to that relationship (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). These two pieces of knowledge combine together to create interpersonal scripts, which are designed to help the schema-holder understand how they personally relate to that particular relationship (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002). In a domestic violence context, descriptive knowledge would be the individuals and characteristics of violence within the relationship- two married people, one having bruises, etc. Procedural knowledge might include behavior sequences, such as escalating violence or victims attempting to leave. Each of us then holds an idea of an interpersonal script, or our individual ideas of how we relate and react to domestic violence. However, it is important to note that this explanation of relationship schemas is entirely theoretical – very little research has actively investigated the elements of domestic violence schemas.

The existing domestic violence research utilizing schemas is based in police officer reactions to a crime scene. Robinson (2000) argues that police officers hold schemas of domestic violence, which are generated through media, socialization, experience, and training. When receiving a call concerning interpersonal violence, that schema interacts with information from the scene, influencing the officers' interpretation and reaction to the event (Robinson, 2000). The most crucial finding, however, was that a simple officer training drastically altered the schemas the officers were using and increased their likelihood of arresting the perpetrator and taking the event seriously (Robinson, 2000). This study seems to suggest that schemas are not only integral

to domestic violence research, but that testing which prevention programs manipulate schemas could be a helpful direction for reducing the crime itself. In addition to Robinson (2000), one other study has investigated domestic violence schemas and law enforcement. Stalans and Finn (1995), proposed that police officers reacting to domestic violence call upon one of two schema. They either use a normative schema, which is concerned with assigning blame based on interpretations of moral character, or an efficiency schema, based on ideas of how the situation will be best resolved (Stalans & Finn, 1995). Use of the efficiency schema resulted in more arrests and less complaints, adding to the conclusion that domestic violence schema research could be helpful in reducing domestic violence rates (Stalans & Finn, 1995).

Relationship violence is both a gendered phenomenon (McHugh, Rakowski & Swiderski, 2013) and a relational phenomenon. In order to truly understand how college students react to relationship violence, and why they react that way, we need to investigate the full content of the schemas surrounding this phenomenon. Additionally, we need to focus on terminology as a potential point of connection where the many different stereotypes college students' may hold about relationship violence could converge.

Domestic Violence Perceptions

Gender

Many scholars argue that domestic violence is fundamentally a gendered issue (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Straus, 1999; Kimmel, 2002; Belknap & Sharma, 2014). Dobash and Dobash (1979) were the first to suggest that patriarchal forces are responsible for the widespread prevalence of domestic violence. They argued that abuse within relationships was a gendered issue, affecting far more women than men. This approach, known as the feminist approach to domestic violence, is pervasive in current literature. Consistent with the original battered woman

archetype, most research investigates the narratives of women victims, and perceptions of violent acts in which the woman is the victim of violence (McHugh, Rakowski & Swiderski, 2013).

However, some estimates of domestic violence prevalence among men and women vary dramatically, but the most recent and comprehensive research studies point to the conclusion that violence is perpetrated equally by men and women (Kimmel, 2002; Breiding, 2015)

The debate surrounding gender has been studied extensively (Dasgupta, 2002; Caldwell, Swan, Allen, Sullivan, & Snow, 2009; Conradi, Geffner, Hamberger & Lawson, 2009; Kernsmith, 2005; Leisring, 2013; Kelley, Edwards, Dardis & Gidycz, 2015), demonstrating that gender cannot go unacknowledged in any domestic violence research. The nature of the violence perpetrated by women has been shown to be quite different than that perpetrated by men.

Johnson (1995) argued there are three categories of domestic violence: intimate terrorism, violent resistance, and situational couple violence (Johnson, 1995). Intimate terrorism is violence which is pre-meditated and intends to cause harm (Johnson, 1995). Alternatively, violent resistance is any action taken to defend oneself against harm, and situational couple violence is any violent action which may have a playful or joke context related to the situation (Johnson, 1995). Although the rates of violence may be equal between female and male perpetrators in situational couple violence, he argues in follow up studies that intimate terrorism and violent resistance far more often have female victims and male perpetrators (Johnson, 1995, 2001, 2005). Additionally, these follow-up studies found differences in male and female victim control, motivation for violence, seriousness of injury, and frequency of violence (Johnson, 1995, 2001, 2005). Women perpetrating violence more often do so in response to other violence, such as self-defense (Dasgupta, 2002; Caldwell et al., 2009; Conradi et al., 2009; Kernsmith, 2005).

Consistent with other research, studies of college students explore the relationship between

reported motives and gender. Moreover, violence perpetrated by women is often less severe in nature and requires less hospitalizations per year than that perpetrated by men (Caldwell et Al., 2009). Kelley et al. (2015) and Leisring (2013) investigated self-reported motivations for violence, reporting that male perpetrators more often argued they “couldn’t help it” and saw their own violence as a desire to regain control and toughness, whereas females mainly perpetrated violence in emotional regulation or self-defense.

Furthermore, social perception of domestic violence changes based on the gender of victim and perpetrator. Domestic violence vignettes portraying a male victim are commonly rated as less serious, are less likely to motivate bystander action, and the victim is deemed more worthy of blame than his female counterpart (Sylaska & Walters, 2014; Dardis, Edwards, Kelley & Gidycz, 2015). There are many potential explanations for this discrepancy. First, higher acceptability of sex roles is correlated to acceptability of domestic violence, as well as acceptance of a female victim over a male one (Jackson, 1999). Second, the physical size and gender performance of the perpetrator and victim have been shown to influence judgements of violence severity (Hamby & Jackson, 2010). Although, Hamby and Jackson (2010) found that these gender differences disappear when research controlled for size of the perpetrator versus the victim. Gender differences also disappear when research controls for the severity of injury (Gaskins, 2013). Together, this research suggests that differing perceptions of domestic violence are caused not only by gender stereotyping, but also by physically observable sex differences.

Part of the gendered nature of domestic violence also manifests itself in stereotypes of what the perfect victim should look like. Studies show that as victims are depicted in a more helpless manner, participants are more likely to show sympathy and more likely to intervene in the situation (Kristiansen & Giuliette, 1990; Winstock, 2013). Aggression and victimhood are

seen as two sides of the same phenomenon, creating a dichotomy which matches closely with the societally created gender dichotomy (Winstock, 2013). As a result, individuals who fight back or appear to resist the violence in any way often lose their victimhood status (Hamby & Jackson, 2010). Similarly, it appears there is a certain amount and type of aggression required to create a victim. Kunkel and Guthrie (2016) interviewed women living at a domestic violence shelter, reporting many of them had difficulty identifying with their relationships being “abusive.” One participant claimed that since her husband had “only” pushed her and been verbally aggressive, she didn’t feel worthy of the title of “domestic violence victim” (Kunkel & Guthrie, 2016, p 58). Because the concepts of victim and aggressor are so intimately intertwined with gender stereotypes, it is reasonable to assume that the complex nature of the identity of domestic violence victimhood could influence reporting rates.

Although research focusing on gender in domestic violence is burgeoning few studies investigate the link between gender and terminology associated with domestic violence. Perception based research will ask college students whose fault the incident is, what they should do about it, or whether or not the situation is serious. This allows researchers to investigate each variable separately, however, it limits the ability for research to create a full picture of the stereotypes and schemas surrounding college relationship violence. However, labeling encompasses a whole schema, and will likely assist research in determining what ‘counts’ as domestic violence. Therefore, this research asks the following research question:

RQ1: What are the differences, if any, between college student perceptions of violent relationship scenarios with perpetrators of different genders?

Provocation

Provocation and blame have also been widely studied within partner violence. In 1991, Kristiansen and Guilietti began investigating how blame intersects with perceptions of domestic violence. They measured participants' attitudes toward women, revealing that a less favorable attitude toward women correlated with a higher likelihood of blaming of the victim. In addition, they investigated just-world beliefs, finding a correlation between victim blaming and the belief that people "get what they deserve." Since then, many facets of blame have been investigated.

One facet of blame which is frequently studied in relationship violence research is how victim and perpetrator demographics impact bystander blame attributions. Individuals are more likely to blame the victim if he or she is younger and in a non-serious relationship, rather than if the victim is older or in a married relationship (Delgado & Bond, 1993). They are more likely to blame the batterer if the relationship is interracial (Harrison & Esqueda, 2000) or of lower socioeconomic status (Nabors, Dietz, & Jasinski, 2006). Results on gender and blame are contradictory, with some studies finding male victims are blamed more than female victims (Forbes, Jobe, White, Bloesch, & Adams-Curtis, 2005), and some studies finding the opposite (Nabors, Dietz, & Jasinski, 2006). Part of the discrepancy when it comes to gender is that often studies of intimate partner violence conflate sex with gender performance. When Russell, Kraus, Chapleau and Oswald (2016) examined sex and gender performance as separate variables, they found that masculine males and females elicit fear in bystanders, and consequently made the perpetrator worthier of blame and the victim less worthy. Finally, it is worth noting that when perpetrators are men, their violence is more likely to be blamed on personality than it is a situational factor (Nabors, Dietz, & Jasinski, 2006).

Blame is often altered through provocation. If the perpetrator is provoked by the victim by being verbally aggressive or responsible for infidelity, bystanders will attribute more blame to the victim, especially if that victim is a male (Harris & Cook, 1994; Taylor & Sorenson, 2005). This result is multiplied if the provocation is a sexual betrayal, as bystanders often report that a sexual betrayal on the victim's part justifies the use of violence (Forbes et al., 2005). Similarly, if one of the members of the relationship is drunk, that member will be associated with the most blame for the violent incident (Harrison & Esqueda, 2000; Taylor & Sorenson, 2005), although it may be judged as more appropriate and less worthy of intervention (Witte, Hopkin, & Hollis, 2015).

Frequency of violence was associated with less victim blaming, because the violence was seen as a relationship problem (Harrison & Abrishami, 2004). Incidents labeled as the first time violence had occurred in the relationship were more likely to be blamed on the victim, because of a situational/personal rather than relational attribution (Harrison & Abrishami, 2004). If the victim returns to the abuser, he or she will be blamed more than if she does not (Yamawaki, Ochoa-Shipp, Pulsipher, Harlos, & Swindler, 2012). Overall, situational factors will be noticed more and blamed for the violence if the perpetrator is male (Stewart, Moore, Crone, DeFreitas, & Rhatigan, 2012).

The discrepancy between first time arguments and frequent arguments points to a potential difference in terminology attribution, although prior research has not studied that directly. If the violence is happening for the first time and is a "situational" event, there is really no label for it other than an argument (Harrison & Abrishami, 2004). However, if the violence is frequent, students may attribute the label "domestic violence" to the event, therefore altering

perceptions of blame (Harrison & Abrishami, 2004). Throughout the previous research, many terms for relationship violence were interchanged, but none were studied side by side.

Finally, bystander demographics and experience play a role in the association of blame with violence in relationships. Consistently, research finds that men who read a vignette concerning domestic violence are considerably more likely than women to blame the victim (Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Stewart et al., 2012; Yamawaki et al., 2012), especially if they hold traditional views of relationship, are accepting of violence, or believe popular myths of domestic violence (Stewart et al., 2012; Yamawaki et al., 2012; Eigenberg & Policastro, 2016). Across all situations, people who have experienced domestic violence blame the victim less than those who have not (Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Eigenberg & Policastro, 2016). Some of these correlations could be a result of in-group versus out-group associations, as in-group members tend to blame in-group perpetrators of violence less than out-group perpetrators of violence (Harrison & Abrishami, 2004).

It is important to research blame as an important part of intimate partner violence because bystander attributions of who is to blame for the violent incident impact their recommendations for courses of action and their own decision to step in and assist victims (Taylor & Sorenson, 2005). However, the role terminology plays in the placement of blame has been overlooked.

Consequently, this study proposes the following research question:

RQ2: What are the differences, if any, between college student perceptions of violent relationship scenarios where the perpetrator was provoked and where the perpetrator was not provoked?

Marital Status

Bethke (1993) gave college students vignettes which depicted domestic violence and varied in relationship seriousness, revealing students were more tolerant of the violence when the

relationship was more seriousness. Since then, only one study has followed up on relationship seriousness as a potential perception influence. Miller and Bukva (2001) investigated perceptions of violence as a function of a couple's relationship status. Participants judged violence as being "more serious" when it was present in a relationship congruent to their own (i.e., dating) rather than when it was present in a marital relationship. In the majority of relationship violence research, college students are often used as participants when investigating perceptions of violence, but vignettes used rarely depict college age or dating couples and instead focus on older, married ones (Miller & Bukva, 2001). Compared to other areas of domestic violence perception, there is a large gap in the research in this area. A few studies done in the 1980s examined differences in violence perpetration among dating versus married couples (Rouse, Breen, & Howell, 1988; Stets & Straus, 1989) however none of them investigated perceptions of those relationship. Consistent with gender, this gap also includes a lack of research investigating terminology, particularly the terminology applied to younger couples as opposed to older couples. As a result, this study proposes the following research question:

RQ1: What are the differences, if any, between college student perceptions of violent relationship scenarios within a couples of differing relationships statuses?

Bystander Intervention

Perhaps one of the most important facets to examine in intimate partner violence is bystander intervention. Multiple health initiatives have focused on ending intimate partner violence, with those that are most successful focusing not only on the couple involved but also the surrounding community and support system (Wolfe & Jaffe, 1999; Bannister, Cohall, A., Cohall, R. & Northridge, 1999). Peterson, Sharps, Banyard, Powers, Kaukinen, Gross, and Campbell (2016) compared a traditional dating violence awareness program with a bystander

based program, finding that the bystander program was more successful in changing attitudes, awareness, and likelihood of intervention, as well as decreasing domestic violence on campus. This research was replicated and endorsed in 2015 by the American Public Health Association, which named engaging community members in bystander intervention techniques as the best way to decrease rates of violence in relationships (Wee, Todd, Oshiro, Greene & Frye, 2016). Community engagement is a relatively new idea in domestic violence reduction when compared to other social issues. For example, college students report they intervene less in situations where domestic violence is occurring than in situations that could lead to sexual assault (Palmer, Nicksa, & McMahon, 2016; Nicksa, 2013) or robberies (Nicksa, 2013). However, bystander intervention is a complicated phenomenon, with many variables in play during every situation.

Gender is one of those variables. On the relationship side, if the perpetrator of the violence is male and victim is female, bystanders are more likely to take action (Chabot, Tracy, Manning & Poisson, 2009; Palmer, 2013). On the bystander side, women are more likely than men to report physical violence to authorities, but less likely to step in while the violence is occurring (Nicksa, 2013; Palmer, Nicksa, & McMahon, 2016). Males are more likely to intervene in situations of physical violence and are more likely to interact with the perpetrator verbally or physically (Chabot, Gray, Makande & Hoyt, 2016; Palmer, Nicksa, & McMahon, 2016).

Personal experiences also alter bystander behavior. If a bystander has previous experience with domestic violence or child abuse, he or she is more likely to intervene (Chabot et al., 2009). Even if that bystander has not personally experienced violence, more knowledge on domestic violence such as previous exposure to intervention programs is correlated with likelihood of intervention (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Nabi, Southwell & Hornick, 2002;

Alfredsson, Ask, & von Borgstede, 2014). Additionally, the bystander's personal feelings are relevant (Alfredsson, Ask, & von Borgstede, 2014). Both an overall perception of domestic violence as a "serious" issue and feelings toward domestic violence ranked as "strong" make a bystander more likely to intervene (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011; Alfredsson, Ask, & von Borgstede, 2014). Each of the above studies measured explicitly physical violence. However, research shows that psychological violence is less likely to cause intervention (Woods, Shorey, Strauss, Cornelius & Rowland, 2016).

Relational characteristics have been briefly examined as well. Palmer, Nicksa, and McMahon (2016) tested relational distance as a manipulator of bystander behavior, finding participants were more likely to directly intervene if they knew the victim or perpetrator and delegate to authorities if they didn't know victim or perpetrator. Similarly, Griffith, Negy, and Chadee (2006) found increased rates of intervention if the victim was a friend, neighbor, or co-worker.

Situational changes can make a difference in the likelihood of intervention. When bystanders judge the violence to be more severe, they are more likely to intervene (Chabot et al., 2009). Additionally, if the perpetrator is drunk, bystanders report intent to intervene (Chabot et al., 2016). At parties, such as those on a college campus, students are more likely to intervene if the violence is obvious and serious, rather than subtle (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011). If participants identify the situation of violence as an "emergency," they will almost always step in, most frequently contacting police or talking to the victim (Chabot et al., 2016). Finally, numerous studies have identified victim blaming as being negatively correlated to bystander behavior (West & Wandrei, 2002).

The intervention itself varies across context. Overall, college students are more likely to talk to the victim of violence, rather than call the police or contact campus authorities (Branch, Richards, & Dretsch, 2013). In a group situation, students will likely delay intervention until they enter a one-on-one setting with the victim, instead of intervening the moment the violence occurs (Banyard & Moynihan, 2011), a distinction other research labels as private versus public intervention (Palmer, Nicksa, & McMahon, 2016). Interacting with the perpetrator was found, across studies, to be the least common form of bystander intervention (Chabot et al., 2016).

It is important to note that none of these factors can truly be separated. Gender and seriousness of violence have both been demonstrated to change bystander behavior, but perpetrator gender has been related to the seriousness of violence, so these variables do not operate independently (Chabot et al., 2009). It is also important to discuss that the previously cited studies all measured participants' intention to act, rather than actual action. Nabi et al., (2002) investigate the phenomenon of bystander intervention using the theory of reasoned action, finding that beliefs related to domestic violence were positively correlated with both intentions to act and actual actions.

Schemas influence not only information processing, but also alter the course of action taken based on that information (Axelrod, 1973). Although it has not been investigated, the theoretical framework suggests that labels associated with domestic violence could affect bystander intervention, prompting the final research question:

RQ4: Is there a correlation between specific labels of relationship violence and the action bystanders will recommend?

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Recruitment

Participants were recruited in two ways. First, students were solicited through the communication research participation pool at a large Southern university. This source of data was ideal for this research because it allowed the researcher to access a large population of college students, the theoretical and practical focus of these research questions, in a relatively short period of time. Additionally, the participant pool allows students to receive credit for their contribution to research projects while maintaining their anonymity, motivating thorough and honest participation in the study. Second, students were recruited through emails sent to various instructors who were teaching undergraduate communication courses. Because each instructor was also part of the college, and all courses count in the university's general education requirements and draw from all over the university, there are no discernable differences between participants recruited through either method. Through this secondary recruitment method, no incentive was given, therefore students had no reason to complete the survey twice. Finally, the most recent nationwide poll indicates 43% of college students identify as victims of dating violence (Breiding, 2015). Being surrounded by relationships and most likely violence in the collegiate setting makes this sample ideal.

During recruitment, potential participants were given a pre-written script which described the research as being concerned with college student perceptions of relationship dynamics. The protocol was pre-approved by the Institutional Review Board, and was necessary in order to

avoid priming students to use a specific term in the questionnaire after reading it in recruitment materials.

Participants

299 participants completed the online survey. 182 of those participants were recruited from the participant pool, and the remaining 117 were recruited through instructor request. Students were marked as eligible for participation if they were enrolled in full-time classes at the university. Considering this study aims to investigate the perceptions of college students overall, no age distinctions were made.

Full descriptive statistics are below in Table 1 and Table 2. A total of 299 students completed the questionnaire. Their ages ranged from 18 to 26, with an average of 19.90 ($SD = 1.44$). Approximately 26% of the sample was male ($n=72$), and 74% was female ($n=208$). Participants were allowed to select multiple ethnic and racial backgrounds. 2.3% identified as Asian, 8% identified as Black or African American, 4% identified as Hispanic or Latino, 1% identified as Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, and 86.3% identified as White. Additionally, participants were asked about their sexual orientation. 90% identified as heterosexual, 3.7% identified as homosexual, 5% identified as bisexual, and 1 participant chose not to answer.

Twelve participants failed manipulation checks and/or failed to complete all survey questions, and were consequently removed from the data. This left a final sample of 287 total participants. The distribution of responses ended up as follows: Condition 1 (44), Condition 2 (36), Condition 3 (38), Condition 4 (38), Condition 5 (37), Condition 6 (39), Condition 7 (33), and Condition 8 (36).

Table 1

Participant Descriptive Statistics

	(n = 299)	
Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
How old are you?	19.90	1.44
How many relationships have you been in?	2.62	.82
How serious was your last relationship? (1-7)	4.67	1.90

Table 2

Participant Descriptive Statistics (Continued)

	(n = 299)	
What is your sex?	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Male	72	25.7
Female	208	74.3
Did Not Answer	7	
What is your ethnicity?	<i>n</i>	<i>%</i>
Alaskan Native / American Indian	1	.7
Asian	7	2.4
Black or African American	24	8.4
Hispanic or Latino	12	4.2

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	1	.7
White	247	86.1

Survey

The online survey began with a page that introduced the researcher, the intent of the research, and information on the participants’ rights concerning privacy and confidentiality. This page described the study as begin concerned with “relationship dynamics”, and did not indicate or use any of the terms studied within the research. In order to ensure participant safety, during the introductory paragraphs the participants were told they had the ability to stop the study at any time, and skip any question they were uncomfortable answering. At the end of the page, participants were asked to confirm that they had read and understood the consent form, and agreed to participate in the survey. If they selected no, the window would immediately close and they would be unable to complete the research.

After completing demographic experience, participants were assigned to one of eight conditions. Each condition had a unique combination of perpetrator gender, marital status, and provocation variables, listed below in Table 3. Condition assignment was entirely random with the exception that the online survey attempted to keep males and females equally distributed among those conditions. The full text of the vignettes can be found in Appendix B.

Vignettes have been commonly used in communication studies (Barter & Renold, 1999) and domestic violence research (Miller & Bukva, 2001). The vignettes used in this study were originally used in the Hamby and Jackson (2010) research on gendered perceptions of domestic violence, but have been adapted for the specific variables tested in this research.

After completing reading the vignette, participants were asked to respond to the incident they read in 3-5 sentences. Although these responses were not used in the current research, they did confirm that the students had clearly read and understood the situation they were presented with. Additionally, participants were asked to label the incident they had just read.

Table 3

Vignette Information

Condition	Gender of Perpetrator	Marital Status of Couple	Provocation of Violence
1	Male	Married	Spilled Drink
2	Male	Married	Partner Flirts
3	Male	Dating	Spilled Drink
4	Male	Dating	Partner Flirts
5	Female	Married	Spilled Drink
6	Female	Married	Partner Flirts
7	Female	Dating	Spilled Drink
8	Female	Dating	Partner Flirts

Manipulation Checks

After completing the prompts that required a written response, participants were asked to answer a series of manipulation checks. To check the gender manipulation, students were asked to identify the gender of the perpetrator of the violence. To check the marital status, students were asked to confirm the marital status of the couple in the vignette. Finally, to check provocation, students were asked to verify what happened before the violence escalated at the beginning of the vignette. Participants who failed the manipulation check on gender or

provocation were removed from the dataset. 56 participants failed the manipulation check on marital status and were left in the dataset, which will be discussed later.

Measures

Following manipulation checks, participants were asked to rate the extent to which they thought the situation was serious, violent, and dangerous on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = *not at all* and 7 = *very*). Low scores represented the incident being not serious, violent, or dangerous, whereas high scores representing the incident being more serious, violent, or dangerous. Pearson product-moment correlations were run to determine the relationship between the seriousness, violence, and danger. There was large, positive, statistically significant correlation between seriousness and violence ($r = .507, n = 287, p < .001$), seriousness and danger ($r = .616, n = 287, p < .001$), and violence and danger ($r = .705, n = 287, p < .001$). These tests indicated that seriousness, violence, and danger were highly correlated and as a result they were summed to create a Perception of Severity (POS) scale. For the POS scale, $M = 4.89, SD = 1.49$ and $\alpha = .81$.

Additionally, participants were asked to what extent they believed each person in the scenario caused, was responsible for, and was to blame for the incident they read. These questions combined are known as the TVA, or Total Victim Attribution scale, which has been used in previous domestic violence perception studies (Pavlou & Knowles, 2001). In this study, the questions on the Total Victim Attribution scale were used to measure the attribution of blame to both the male and female. For blame of the female, $M=3.41, SD = 2.51$, and $\alpha = .89$. For blame of the male, $M=3.98, SD = 2.70$, and $\alpha = .88$.

Next, participants were asked to determine how appropriate the following terms were for the situation they read: Domestic Violence, Intimate Partner Violence, Dating Violence,

Relationship Abuse, Dating Abuse, Common Couple Violence, Just An Argument. They rated this on a Likert scale of 1-7, with 7 being most appropriate.

Finally, participants were asked to what extent they would recommend a bystander take the following actions: Personally Intervene, Talk To The Victim Later, Talk To The Perpetrator Later, Call The Police, Do Nothing. They rated this on a Likert scale of 1-7, with 7 representing “highly recommend” and 1 representing “do not recommend.”

Control Variables

To control for experience with relationship violence, the Conflict Tactics Scale – Revised (CTS2) was administered at the end of the study. The CTS2 is the most widely used scale in domestic violence research, and consists of subscales that evaluate type of violence used (psychological aggression, physical assault, and sexual coercion), as well as the impact of violence (Vaga & O’Leary, 2007). The scale has demonstrated excellent test-retest reliability in previous studies, with usual internal consistency of .79-.96 (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996).

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

First, the Conflict Tactics Scale was scored to determine participants previous experience with domestic violence. Next, bivariate correlations were conducted to determine if previous domestic violence experience was related to perception of severity, victim attribution, terminology use, or bystander intervention recommendations. Following bivariate correlations, MANCOVAs were conducted to determine the impact of each individual variable (GENDER, MARITAL STATUS, PROVOCATION) on terminology and bystander intervention. After MANCOVAs, conditional process analysis was used to analyze each condition individually and explore any interactions between the three independent variables. Finally, bivariate correlations were conducted to determine the relationships between terminology choices and bystander intervention recommendations.

Conflict Tactics Scale (Revised)

The CTS2 can be scored in two ways, prevalence and chronicity. Prevalence was scored by assigning each participant a 0-1 dichotomy based on their answers, with a score of 1 assigned if they report an act has occurred and 0 if an act has not occurred. Chronicity was scored by using the midpoint of each option to total how many times an act has occurred. Both of the scoring methods used followed the recommendations of Straus et al. (1996). For this research, the CTS psychological aggression and physical violence subscales were used, as well as major scales for sexual coercion and injury. Overall, results were consistent with previous research

using the CTS, with the exception of verbal violence being more prevalent (Breiding, 2015). The scale was found to have internal consistency of $\alpha = .88$. Full results can be found in Table 4.

Prevalence

A total of 57% of the students ($N = 287$) reported being the victim of emotional abuse, physical violence, or sexual violence in the past year. 54% ($n = 154$) reported emotional abuse specifically, 24% ($n = 68$) reported physical violence specifically, and 26% ($n = 74$) reported sexual violence specifically. A total of 57% ($n = 163$) of students also reported perpetrating emotional abuse, physical violence or sexual violence in the past year. 55% ($n = 157$) reported perpetrating emotional abuse, 32% ($n = 92$) reported perpetrating physical violence, and 22% ($n = 63$) reported perpetrating sexual violence. Perpetrating and being the victim of emotional abuse, physical violence, or sexual violence were highly correlated ($r = .95$, $N = 287$, $p < .001$).

Chronicity

Students reported experiencing emotional abuse most frequently, averaging 6.68 acts within the past year ($SD = 12.45$). Physical violence resulted in an average of 2.19 acts ($SD = 7.88$), while sexual violence averaged 2.89 acts ($SD = 9.7$). Students reported perpetrating emotional abuse most frequently as well, with an average of 6.91 acts in the past year ($SD = 12.84$). Following emotional abuse, sexual violence perpetration averaged at 2.31 acts within the past year ($SD = 8.26$) and physical abuse perpetration averaged at 2.02 acts within the past year ($SD = 7.51$).

Table 4

Conflict Tactics Scale (Revised)

(n=299)

	Chronicity		Prevalence
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	% Who Reported At Least 1 Act
Psychological Aggression			
Victim (Minor Subscale)	6.67	12.45	Victim: 53.7
Perpetrator (Minor Subscale)	6.92	12.84	
Victim (Severe Subscale)	1.64	6.47	Perpetrator: 54.7
Perpetrator (Severe Subscale)	1.44	5.39	
Physical Violence			
Victim (Minor Subscale)	2.19	7.88	Victim: 24.7
Perpetrator (Minor Subscale)	2.02	7.51	
Victim (Severe Subscale)	1.79	9.07	Perpetrator: 32.4
Perpetrator (Severe Subscale)	1.23	6.82	
Sexual Coercion			
Victim	2.89	9.70	25.8
Perpetrator	2.31	8.27	22.0
Injury			
Victim (Minor Subscale)	.62	2.62	

Perpetrator (Minor Subscale)	.64	3.61	Victim: 15.0
Victim (Severe Subscale)	.71	3.96	Perpetrator: 14.3
Perpetrator (Severe Subscale)	.76	4.38	

Bivariate Correlations for CTS Results

Tests were conducted to determine if chronicity of domestic violence experience was correlated to perception of severity, blame attribution, terminology use, or bystander intervention recommendations. No correlation was found between domestic violence experience and perception of severity, blame attribution, or recommendation of bystander intervention. For terminology, previous domestic violence experience was slightly positively correlated with usage of the term “common couple violence” ($r = .121, N = 287, p < .05$). Because of this correlation, previous domestic violence experience was used as the control variable in all MANCOVAs which tested terminology. These correlations are recorded in Table 5.

Table 5

Bivariate Correlations

To what extent would you label this... (n=299)

	Domestic violence?	Intimate Partner Violence?	Dating Violence?	Dating Abuse?	Relationship Aggression?	Common Couple Violence?	A Normal Argument	Intimate Terrorism
Domestic Violence Experience	-.001	-.028	.036	.032	-.010	.121*	.080	.019

Note: * indicates significance at the $p < .05$ level.

Impact of Perpetrator Gender

A one-way multivariate analysis of variance with the CTS as a control variable (MANCOVA) was conducted to determine the impact of gender on the appropriateness of the 7 relationship violence terms. Using Wilk's statistic, there was a significant effect of perpetrator gender on terminology choice, $\lambda = .90$, $F(8, 278) = 4.09$, $p < .05$. Subsequent univariate analyses indicated that gender had a significant impact on the following terms: Domestic Violence, ($F(1, 285) = 30.09$, $p < .05$); Dating Violence ($F(1, 285) = 6.02$, $p < .05$); Dating Abuse ($F(1, 285) = 7.58$, $p < .05$); and Intimate Terrorism ($F(1, 285) = 5.83$, $p < .05$). Each term was rated as more appropriate when the perpetrator in the vignette was male than when the perpetrator was female.

A second one-way MANCOVA was conducted to determine the impact of gender on how strongly participants recommended bystander action. Using Wilks' statistic, gender was shown to have a significant effect on what extent participants recommended bystanders take action, $\lambda = .75$, $F(5, 280) = 18.271$, $p < .05$. Specifically, participants' recommendations were significantly different regarding whether a bystander should personally intervene ($F(1, 284) = 56.89$, $p < .05$), talk to the victim later ($F(1, 284) = 5.91$, $p < .05$), call the police ($F(1, 284) = 52.12$, $p < .05$), and do nothing ($F(1, 284) = 10.86$, $p < .05$). Consistent with terminology results, participants recommended bystanders 'personally intervene', 'talk to the victim later', and 'call the police' more in the male perpetrator condition than the female perpetrator condition. Although the response was not statistically significant, it is interesting to note that the recommendations for 'talk to the perpetrator later' were opposite of the rest of the options, with participants recommending a bystander talk to the female perpetrator ($M = 3.71$, $SD = 2.24$) more than a male perpetrator ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 2.23$). 'Do nothing' was recommended more in the female perpetrator condition than male perpetrator condition.

Table 6

*Impact of Gender**(N = 287)*

	Multivariate			Univariate Follow Up	
	Wilks' λ	<i>F</i>	(<i>df</i>)	<i>F</i>	(<i>df</i>)
GENDER AND TERMS	.90	4.09*	8, 278		
Domestic Violence				30.09**	1, 285
Intimate Partner Violence				3.32	1, 285
Dating Violence				6.02*	1, 285
Dating Abuse				7.58*	1, 285
Relationship Aggression				3.24	1, 285
Common Couple Violence				.795	1, 285
A Normal Argument				2.94	1, 285
Intimate Terrorism				5.83*	1, 285
GENDER AND BYSTANDER	.75	18.27**	5, 280		
Personally Intervene				28.70**	1, 284
Talk To Victim Later				3.01*	1, 284
Talk To Perp Later				.215	1, 284
				28.04**	1, 284
				6.39*	1, 284

Call The Police

Do Nothing

Note: * indicates significance at the $p < .05$ level, ** indicates significance at the $p < .01$ level

Previous studies have been unable to discern whether perceptions related to domestic violence are derived from gender stereotypes or observable sex differences. Consistent with these findings, a one-way ANOVA showed that gender had a significant impact on the perception of severity (POS) scale ($F(1, 285) = 60.52, p < .001$), with the male perpetrator vignette being rated as more serious ($M = 5.50, SD = 1.33$) than the female perpetrator condition ($M = 4.26, SD = 1.38$). Bivariate correlation tests showed moderate positive correlation between perception of severity and the terms ‘domestic violence’ ($r = .62, n = 287, p < .05$), ‘intimate partner violence’ ($r = .32, n = 287, p < .05$), ‘dating violence’ ($r = .49, n = 287, p < .05$), ‘dating abuse’ ($r = .49, n = 287, p < .05$), ‘relationship aggression’ ($r = .42, n = 287, p < .05$), and ‘intimate terrorism’ ($r = .36, n = 287, p < .05$) in addition to negative correlation between perception of severity and labeling the incident ‘a normal argument’ ($r = -.23, n = 287, p < .05$).

Additionally, bivariate correlation tests were conducted to determine the relationship between the perception of severity scale and intervention recommendations. The severity scale was only used in correlation with the gender variable because of the Hamby and Jackson (2010) research which argues gender differences may actually severity differences. Therefore, it was important to ensure that the two gender conditions were being perceived as having a severity differences to match up with previous research (Hamby & Jackson, 2010). A strong positive correlation was discovered between perception of severity and ‘personally intervene’ ($r = .50, n = 287, p < .05$), and moderate positive correlations were found for ‘talk to the victim later’ ($r = .34, n = 287, p < .05$) and ‘call the police’ ($r = .12, n = 287, p < .05$). A negative correlation was

found for 'do nothing' ($r = -.28, n = 287, p < .05$). Taken together, the data suggests it is difficult to discern whether it is the seriousness of an incident, the gender of the perpetrator, or a combination of both which truly impacts terminology and bystander intervention recommendations.

Impact of Provocation

First, a MANCOVA was conducted to determine whether or not the provocation conditions (spilled drink versus victim flirting) altered the placement of blame. After controlling for gender of the perpetrator, Wilks' tests showed provocation significantly impacted the placement of blame ($\lambda = .97, F(2,283) = 4.601, p < .05$). Specifically, the follow up ANOVA showed that provocation was only significant in the conditions where the victim was male ($F(1,284) = 4.74, p < .05$). He was blamed more when he flirted ($M = 4.26, SD = 2.57$) than when there was a drink spilled ($M = 3.70, SD = 2.81$).

Second, a MANCOVA was conducted to investigate the impact of provocation on the use of relationship violence terminology. Still controlling for gender of the perpetrator, Wilks' tests showed provocation significantly impacted the terminology participants believed to be appropriate for the situation ($\lambda = .94, F(8,277) = 2.31, p < .05$). Consequent investigations into each individual term reveal significance for only one term, 'a normal argument' ($F(1,285) = 9.37, p < .05$). Participants were more likely to label the vignette as being 'a normal argument' if the victim had flirted than when the victim had not flirted.

Third, a MANCOVA was conducted to determine whether or not provocation an impact on the recommended bystander action. Results indicated that provocation had no impact on

recommended bystander action. Additionally, provocation was found to have no significant impact on the perception of severity.

Table 7

Impact of Provocation (n = 299)

	Multivariate			Univariate Follow Up	
	<i>Wilks' λ</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>(df)</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>(df)</i>
PROV AND BLAME	.97	4.60*	2, 283		
Female Victim Attribution				1.42	1, 287
Male Victim Attribution				4.74*	1, 287
PROV AND TERMS	.94	2.27*	8, 278		
Domestic Violence				.87	1, 285
Intimate Partner Violence				.77	1, 285
Dating Violence				.00	1, 285
Dating Abuse				.81	1, 285
Relationship Aggression				3.96*	1, 285
Common Couple Violence				2.32	
A Normal Argument				9.37*	
Intimate Terrorism				.41	

Note: * indicates significance at the $p < .05$ level, ** indicates significance at the $p < .01$ level

Impact of Marital Status

Fifty-three participants failed the manipulation check that asked what the marital status was of the couple in the vignette. All of those who failed were in the married conditions, whereas none of the participants in the dating condition failed. Potential reasons for this will be discussed in the conclusion section. These failed manipulations were left in for gender and provocation tests, but were eliminated specifically for analyses of the marital status condition. After the failed manipulation check participants were removed, 43% ($n = 100$) of the sample were in the married conditions and 57% ($n = 134$) of the sample were in the dating conditions.

A one-way MANCOVA was conducted to investigate whether or not marital status influenced preferred relationship violence terminology. Wilks' test determined significance for this relationship ($\lambda = .79$, $F(8,225) = 2.31$, $p < .05$), specifically for the terms dating violence ($F(1,232) = 21.81$, $p < .05$) and dating abuse ($F(1,223) = 18.10$, $p < .05$). These terms were marked as preferable when the vignette described a dating couple.

A one-way MANCOVA was conducted to investigate whether or not marital status influenced recommendations for bystander intervention. No significant relationship was found.

Correlation Between Terminology and Bystander Recommendations

To determine whether or not recommended bystander intervention was correlated with certain relationship violence terminology, bivariate correlation tests were conducted between the terminology options and each individual bystander recommendation option. Labeling an event as 'domestic violence' was positively correlated with 'personally intervene' ($r = .49$, $n = 234$, $p < .05$), 'talk to the victim later' ($r = .35$, $n = 234$, $p < .05$), and most strongly with 'call the police' ($r = .60$, $n = 287$, $p < .05$). Labeling an event as 'domestic violence' was also negatively

correlated with 'do nothing' ($r = -.24, n = 234, p < .05$). The labels 'intimate partner violence', 'dating violence' and 'dating abuse' and 'intimate terrorism' had similar correlations. Using the term 'relationship aggression' was the only label which was positively correlated with 'talking to the perpetrator later' ($r = .19, n = 234, p < .05$). Although it did not reached significance, the term 'common couple violence' was negatively correlated with every potential bystander action. However, the term 'common couple violence' was significantly positively correlated with 'do nothing' ($r = .15, n = 234, p < .05$). Finally, labeling the scenario as a 'normal argument' was significantly negatively correlated with 'personally intervene' ($r = -.15, n = 234, p < .05$), call the police ($r = .12, n = 234, p < .05$), and significantly positively correlated with 'do nothing' ($r = .46, n = 234, p < .05$).

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Summary of Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate what demographic and situational factors are part of college students' schemas surrounding specific relationship violence terminology. Using an online survey, this research asked college students to read a vignette which described a situation of relationship violence. Vignettes differed by gender of perpetrator, type of provocation, and marital status of the couple in question. The results of the study indicated that college students do hold unique schemas for the following terms: domestic violence, dating abuse, dating violence, relationship aggression, and intimate terrorism. The schemas attached to these terms contain specific attitudes about the severity of an incident, blame, and what appropriate bystander actions would be for such an incident.

Additionally, on a theoretical note, the ideas presented in the Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2002) on relational schemas were supported. Participants' showed that their schemas surrounding relationship violence had multiple components that were related, including descriptive knowledge (who is involved in violent relationships) as procedural knowledge (what should be done in response to witnessing violence in relationships).

The results from the first research question, "What are the differences, if any, between college student perceptions of violent relationship scenarios with perpetrators of different genders?" indicated that gender significantly influenced the perceived severity of

an incident, the terminology college students' preferred to attach to that incident, and the preferred bystander reactions to that incident. Specifically, participants thought the situation they read was more severe, could be labeled 'domestic violence', 'dating violence', 'dating abuse', and 'intimate terrorism', and highly recommended actions such as 'personally intervene' and 'call the police' when the perpetrator of the violence was male rather than female. These results are consistent with previous research which used relationship violence vignettes. However, an important new finding was the relationship between terminology choice, severity, and recommended bystander action. Together, these results suggest that the college student schemas surrounding domestic violence are only activated when the perpetrator is a man, and that those schemas include recommendations to react in a way which would stop the abuse.

Results from the second research question, "What are the differences, if any, between college student perceptions of violent relationship scenarios where the perpetrator was provoked and where the perpetrator was not provoked?" indicated that provocation influenced who the participants' blamed for the violence. When the victim of the violence was male, he was blamed more when he talked with a female friend at the movie theater than when a drink was spilled on his girlfriend. In the condition with a female victim, there were no significant differences in blame depending on whether a drink was spilled or whether the victim talked with someone else at the movie theater.

When a female perpetrated violence on her male boyfriend after he talked with another girl at the movies, participants were more likely to label the situation as a "normal argument." However, the same was not true for the condition with the opposite gender. Essentially, these results suggest that it is normal for a female to perpetrate violence if she sees her partner talk to someone else, but that same behavior is not normal for a male perpetrator.

It is important to note, however, that due to the large number of women in the sample, these results could have been influenced by empathy. Research shows that women are more empathetic, specifically towards other women than they are towards other men (Harrison & Abrishami, 2004; Touissant & Webb, 2005). Because the female participants may have empathized more with the female perpetrator, they could have blamed the male victim more and influenced the results of the study.

A positive finding of the study is that provocation had no impact on perceived severity or recommended bystander action. This contrasts previous studies such as Taylor and Sorenson (2005) which found that when the victim was blamed more, participants were less likely to recommend bystander action. Additionally, provocation had no impact on the terms ‘domestic violence’, ‘dating violence’, or ‘dating abuse’, suggesting that college student schemas of what counts as relationship violence do not take into account what may have happened to provoke the violence.

The third research question, “What are the differences, if any, between college student perceptions of violent relationship scenarios within a couples of differing relationships statuses?” also showed significant results. Consistent with previous research, this study found that vignette containing a dating couple will be labeled as engaging in ‘dating violence’ or ‘dating abuse’ more than a vignette containing a married couple. However, contradictory to the results of Lederman and Stewart (2003), this research found no significant differences in the appropriateness of the term ‘domestic violence’ based on the married status of the couple. It is possible college student schemas of the term ‘domestic violence’ have expanded since the article was published in 2003. However, it is also possible that the manipulation of dating versus married conditions was unsuccessful, which will be discussed below in limitations of the study.

Finally, the fourth research question, “Is there a correlation between specific labels of relationship violence and the action bystanders will recommend?”, can be answered with yes. There was a positive correlation between participants’ willingness to label an incident as relationship violence (domestic violence, dating violence, dating abuse intimate terrorism) and recommending bystander action (personally intervene, talk to the victim, call the police). These bystander recommendations as well as terminology were both individually correlated with perceived severity. Taken together, these results suggest that if an incident is severe enough, it qualifies under the collegiate ‘relationship violence’ schema. Additionally, these relationship violence schemas were shown to have specific procedures attached to them, such as calling the police and personally intervening in the situation.

Implications

This study has several implications for domestic violence prevention in the collegiate setting. First, the sheer number of students who reported perpetrating or being the victim of relationship violence adds to the urgency of educating college students on relationship violence. Specifically, reporting perpetrating and being a victim of relationship violence were highly correlated, meaning that bi-directional violence among college students is stunningly common. With more than half the sample reporting psychological aggression either as a victim or perpetrator, the results of this study emphasize a need for specific programs addressing verbal and emotional abuse within college students.

Second, this study suggests a need for more education on female perpetrators of domestic violence. Similar to sexual assault, the college student schema of domestic violence requires a female victim, ultimately erasing the many experiences of male victims. Part of this stereotype

seems to be intertwined with the severity of the incident. In college students especially, domestic violence is not always bruises hidden under long sleeves. College students need to be taught that incidents that seem less severe, like a slap or a derogatory remark, can still ‘count’ as domestic violence. Additionally, future research needs to attempt to address the confounding variable of severity when investigating gendered perceptions of domestic violence. If a female abuser commits an act of violence which is rated equally as severe as a male abuser’s act, will gender differences disappear?

Third, a significant and new finding from this research is that the label associated with a situation of relationship violence does invoke a schema, and that those schemas hold a collection of knowledge related to severity, blame, and even what the response should be. Two conclusions can be made because of this discovery. First, rather than studying these variables individually, the results of this research imply that we can study them all together as relationship violence schemas. It is likely that there are more potential factors which align with these schemas, such as race or attractiveness, that beg investigation in the future. There are hundreds of studies out there which investigate domestic violence perceptions, but they are only tiny pieces of the entire puzzle. More work is needed to push these pieces together, to finally see the picture of relationship violence schemas that may be revealed.

Additionally, these labels could have an impact on victim identification. When college students, from an outside perspective, do not identify female perpetrated relationship violence as “domestic violence” or “dating violence”, it is possible that lack of identification extends to the victim level as well. A male victim of such violence may be hesitant to seek help or identify as a victim in the first place, because they know the cultural schema surrounding relationship violence does not include his narrative.

Secondly, this data gives us vital insight into changing college student reactions to relationship violence. In this research, students were most likely to take action when the variables followed the schema that they held- a male abuser, a dating couple, with no provocation. We have the ability to alter that schema, and add other combinations of gender, race, sexuality, marital status, provocation, and blame. Bystander intervention is crucial in reducing domestic violence in college students. If we want to improve bystander intervention, the results of this study suggest one approach is key - changing what college students' believe 'counts' as domestic violence.

Limitations

One serious limitation of this study is the ratio of male participants to female participants. Only 26% (n=72) of the survey identified as male, whereas 74% (n=208) identified as female. Previous research has shown that participant gender is a factor in perceptions of domestic violence vignettes like the ones used in this research (Sylaska & Walters, 2014; Hamby & Jackson, 2010). Ideally, a future study would recruit an equal number of males and females, and analyze each gender separately in order to compare results.

Another limitation of this study was the number of participants (53) who were eliminated after failing to correctly identify the couple as married in the manipulation check. There are several potential explanations for this failure. First, since the participants are college students, it is possible that they automatically assumed the situation they were reading was happening to individuals within their age group. This would explain why every single one of the manipulation failures was in the condition where participants were married, and none were in the dating condition. Another possible explanation would be that the situation in the vignettes (going to the

movies, returning home afterward) activated college students' schemas of a "dating" relationship rather than a "married" relationship, even though it did list the couple as married. This is possible, especially considering the vignettes were adapted from a Hamby and Jackson (2010) study which did have the couple in the vignettes dating rather than married.

Finally, it is worth noting that the participants were all from a College of Communication. Many classes in that college, such as interpersonal communication, teach students about relationship violence and lead discussions on what causes relationship violence and counts as relationship violence. It is possible that because of this education, the participants used were more aware or educated than the general population about the falsity of many relationship violence stereotypes, and the way those stereotypes are influenced by the media and variables such as the ones investigated.

Directions for Future Research

First, future research needs to investigate how severity, perpetrator, and victim gender are correlated within perception research. As suggested in previous research (Lederman & Stewart, 2002), the differences in ratings of male and female perpetrated vignettes may actually come from a difference in the perceived severity of the violence, rather than gender stereotypes alone. Future research should make an effort to compare different levels of violence and different genders of perpetrators. Additionally, this research should use vignettes modeled off actual levels of violence in reality. Even the research which shows males and females equally perpetrate domestic violence admits that females have a higher rate of hospitalization and injury (Breiding, 2015), indicating that the severity schemas that observers hold may be reflective of situation in everyday life that have a hand in developing those schemas.

Additionally, future research should make an effort to ground domestic violence research in a theoretical framework. Although relational schemas offer a broad understanding of how relationship violence perceptions may be structured, future research should focus on theories which may offer insight on how to change victim identification or bystander intervention. Participant expectations of what events occur within “domestic violence” labeled relationships would be a particularly interesting direction. Similarly, the connection needs to be investigated between actions participants would recommend for bystanders and actions they would actually take when witnessing a situation of relationship violence.

Conclusion

This research began a discussion of what terminology college students used to label incidences of violence in relationships. Perception research is vital to reducing domestic violence on college campuses, because until we understand how college students label incidents of relationship violence, we cannot hope to change their action in response to those incidents. Additionally, terminology varies dramatically across research with college student subjects, potentially acting as a confounding variable in those studies. This research can potentially provide an explanation for the variance in the results of previous studies and could assist in the formation of a standard term for collegiate domestic violence research.

Teaching college students that domestic violence is wrong requires us to teach them it exists. Nothing exists until we name it; so perhaps, terminology is the root cause of the silence that traps victims of collegiate domestic violence. If we can understand what violence within collegiate relationships is called, if we can name this demon, perhaps we can finally begin to eradicate it.

REFERENCES

- Alani, A., Clark-Taylor, A., Rogeshefsky, A., & Cerulli, C. (2016). Exploring Collegiate Perceptions of Feminism Through Bem's Gender Schema Theory. *New York Journal of Student Affairs*, 16(1), 17-35.
- Alfredsson, H., Ask, K., & von Borgstede, C. (2014). Motivational and cognitive predictors of the propensity to intervene against intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(10), 1877-1893.
- Ashcraft, C. (2000). Naming knowledge: A language for reconstructing domestic violence and systemic gender inequity. *Women and Language*, 23(1), 3.
- Axelrod, R. (1973). Schema theory: An information processing model of perception and cognition. *American Political Science Review*, 67(04), 1248-1266.
- Bannister, H., Cohall, A., Cohall, R., & Northridge, M. (1999). Love shouldn't hurt: Strategies for health care providers to address adolescent dating violence. *Journal of the American Medical Women's Association*, 54(3), 144-148.
- Banyard, V. L., & Moynihan, M. M. (2011). Variation in bystander behavior related to sexual and intimate partner violence prevention: Correlates in a sample of college students. *Psychology of Violence*, 1(4), 287
- Barter, C., & Renold, E. (1999). The use of vignettes in qualitative research. *Social Research Update*, 25(9), 1-6.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). Remembering: An experimental and social study. *Cambridge: Cambridge University*.
- Belknap, J., & Sharma, N. (2014). The significant frequency and impact of stealth (nonviolent) gender-based abuse among college women. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 15(3), 181-190.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological review*, 88(4), 354.
- Bethke, T. (1993). An experimental study of factors influencing the acceptability of dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8, 36-51.

- Branch, K. A., Richards, T. N., & Dretsch, E. C. (2013). An exploratory analysis of college students' response and reporting behavior regarding intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration among their friends. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260513504494.
- Bryant, S. A., & Spencer, G. A. (2003). University students' attitudes about attributing blame in domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18(6), 369-376.
- Breiding, M. J. (2015). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization-national intimate partner and sexual violence survey, United States, 2011. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(4), E11.
- Caldwell, J. E., Swan, S. C., Allen, C. T., Sullivan, T. P., & Snow, D. L. (2009). Why I hit him: Women's reasons for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 18, 672-697. doi:10.1080/10926770903231783
- Chabot, H. F., Tracy, T. L., Manning, C. A., & Poisson, C. A. (2009). Sex, attribution, and severity influence intervention decisions of informal helpers in domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(10), 1696-1713.
- Chabot, H. F., Gray, M. L., Makande, T. B., & Hoyt, R. L. (2016). Beyond Sex Likelihood and Predictors of Effective and Ineffective Intervention in Intimate Partner Violence in By standers Perceiving an Emergency. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260515621064.
- Conradi, L., Geffner, R., Hamberger, L. K., & Lawson, G. (2009). An exploratory study of wo men as dominant aggressors of physical violence in their intimate relationships. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma*, 18, 718-738. doi:10.1080/10926770903231718
- Dardis, C. M., Edwards, K. M., Kelley, E. L., & Gidycz, C. A. (2015). Perceptions of Dating Violence and Associated Correlates A Study of College Young Adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260515597439.
- Dasgupta, S. D. (2002). A framework for understanding women's use of nonlethal violence in intimate heterosexual relationships. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 1364-1389. doi: 10.1177/107780102237408
- Davvetas, V., & Diamantopoulos, A. (2016). How Product Category Shapes Preferences Toward Global and Local Brands: A Schema Theory Perspective. *Journal of International Marketing*, 24(4), 61-81.
- Davis, T., & Wilson, J. M. (2016). Gender Schema Theory. *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Gender and Sexuality Studies*.
- Delgado, A. R., & Bond, R. A. (1993). Attenuating the attribution of responsibility: The lay perception of jealousy as a motive for wife battery. *Journal of Applied Social*

Psychology, 23(16), 1337–1356.

- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1979). Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy (pp. 179-206). New York: Free Press.
- Edwards, S. R., Bradshaw, K. A., & Hinsz, V. B. (2014). Denying rape but endorsing forceful intercourse: Exploring differences among responders. *Violence and Gender*, 1(4), 188-193.
- Eigenberg, H., & Policastro, C. (2016). Blaming Victims in Cases of Interpersonal Violence: Attitudes Associated With Assigning Blame to Female Victims. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 26(1), 37-54.
- Fifth & Pacific Companies, Inc. (Formerly: Liz Claiborne, Inc.), Conducted by Knowledge Net works, (December 2010). "College Dating Violence and Abuse Poll," Available at: <https://www.breakthecycle.org/surveys>.
- Forbes, G. B., Jobe, R. L., White, K. B., Bloesch, E., & Adams-Curtis, L. E. (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*, 52(3-4), 165-173.
- Frödin, O. (2016). Attention schema theory, an interdisciplinary turn? Cognition, culture and institutions. *Anthropological Theory*, 1463499616678484.
- Gaskins, J. L. (2013). The Impact of Gender, Sexual Orientation, and Victim Injury Severity on Perceptions of Intimate Partner Violence.
- Griffith, S. A. M., Negy, C., & Chadee, D. (2006). Trinidadian and US Citizens' Attitudes Toward Domestic Violence and their Willingness to Intervene- Does Culture Make a Difference? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37(6), 761-778.
- Godbold Kean, L., & Fudge Albada, K. (2003). The relationship between college students' schema regarding alcohol use, their television viewing patterns, and their previous experience with alcohol. *Health communication*, 15(3), 277-298.
- Hamby, S., & Jackson, A. (2010). Size does matter: The effects of gender on perceptions of dating violence. *Sex Roles*, 63, 324-331. doi:10.1007/s11199-010-9816-0
- Harris, R. J., & Cook, C. A. (1994). Attributions about spouse abuse—It matters who the batterers and victims are. *Sex Roles*, 30(7–8), 553–565.
- Harrison, L. A., & 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(9–10), 543–550.

- Harrison, L. A., & Esqueda, C. W. (2000). Effects of race and victim drinking on domestic violence attributions. *Sex Roles*, 42(11–12), 1043–1057.
- Harris, K. L. (2011). The next problem with no name: The politics and pragmatics of the word rape. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 34(1), 42-63.
- Hove, T. & Paek, H.J., (2017). How the Media Effects Schema and the Persuasion Ethics Schema Affect Audience Responses to Antismoking Campaign Messages. *Health Communication*, 1-11.
- Howard, J. A. (1984). The “normal” victim: The effects of gender stereotypes on reactions to victims. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 47(3), 270–281.
- Jackson, S. M. (1999). Issues in the dating violence research: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 4(2), 233-247.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 283–294.
- Johnson, M. P. (2001). Conflict and control: Symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. In A. Booth, A. C. Crouter, & M. Clements (Eds.), *Couples in conflict* (pp. 95–104). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Johnson, M. P. (2005). Domestic violence: It’s not about gender—Or is it? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 1126-1130. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2005.00204.x
- Jackson, S. M. (1999). Issues in the dating violence research: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 4(2), 233-247.
- Kelley, E. L., Edwards, K. M., Dardis, C. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2015). Motives for physical dating violence among college students: A gendered analysis. *Psychology of Violence*, 5(1), 56.
- Kernsmith, P. (2005). Exerting power or striking back: A gendered comparison of motivations for domestic violence perpetration. *Violence and Victims*, 20, 173-185. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.2005.20.2.173
- Kimmel, M. S. (2002). “Gender symmetry” in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 1332-1363. doi:10.1177/107780102237407
- Koerner, A. F., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of family communication. *Communication theory*, 12(1), 70-91.
- Kristiansen, C. M., & Giulietti, R. (1990). Perceptions of wife abuse. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 14(2), 177-189.

- Kunkel, A., & Guthrie, J. A. (2016). Survivor: Women's Stories of Navigation and Tensions in a Domestic Violence Shelter. *Western Journal of Communication*, 80(1), 100-120.
- Lederman, L. C., & Stewart, L. P. (2003). Using Focus Groups to Formulate Effective Language for Health Communication Messages: A Media Campaign to Raise Awareness of Domestic Violence on a College Campus. *Qualitative research reports in communication*, 4.
- Lemon, N. K. (1996). Domestic violence law: A comprehensive overview of cases and sources.
- Leisring, P. A. (2013). Physical and emotional abuse in romantic relationships: Motivation for perpetration among college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28, 1437-1454. doi:10.1177/0886260512468236
- Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. *Family Relations*, 97-102.
- McHugh, M., Rakowski, S., & Swiderski, C. (2013). Men's Experience of Psychological Abuse: Conceptualization and Measurement Issues. *Sex Roles*, 69(3/4), 168-181. doi:10.1007/s11199-013-0274-3
- Miller, J., & Bukva, K. (2001). Intimate violence perceptions: Young adults' judgments of abuse escalating from verbal arguments. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 133-15
- Nabi, R. L., Southwell, B., & Hornik, R. (2002). Predicting intentions versus predicting behaviors: Domestic violence prevention from a theory of reasoned action perspective. *Health Communication*, 14(4), 429-449.
- Nabors, E. L., Dietz, T. L., & Jasinski, J. L. (2006). Domestic violence beliefs and perceptions among college students. *Violence and Victims*, 21(6), 779-795.
- Nicksa, S. C. (2013). Bystander's willingness to report theft, physical assault, and sexual assault: The impact of gender, anonymity, and relationship with the offender. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260513505146.
- Nishida, H. (1999). A cognitive approach to intercultural communication based on schema theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23(5), 753-777.
- Palmer, J. E. (2013). "A few times I have knocked on doors at parties...": Peers as bystanders in preventing and responding to dating violence and sexual violence on a college campus (Doctoral dissertation, American University).
- Palmer, J. E., Nicksa, S. C., & McMahon, S. (2016). Does Who You Know Affect How You Act? The Impact of Relationships on Bystander Intervention in Interpersonal Violence Situations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260516628292.
- Pavlou, M., & Knowles, A. (2001). Domestic violence: Attributions, recommended punishments

- and reporting behaviour related to provocation by the victim. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 8(1), 76-85.
- Peterson, K., Sharps, P., Banyard, V., Powers, R. A., Kaukinen, C., Gross, D., & Campbell, J. (2016). An evaluation of two dating violence prevention programs on a college campus. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260516636069.
- Russell, B., Kraus, S. W., Chapleau, K. M., & Oswald, D. (2016). Perceptions of Blame in Intimate Partner Violence The Role of the Perpetrator's Ability to Arouse Fear of Injury in the Victim. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260516646999.
- Robinson, A. L. (2000). The effect of a domestic violence policy change on police officers' schemata. *Criminal justice and behavior*, 27(5), 600-624.
- Rouse, L. P., Breen, R., & Howell, M. (1988). Abuse in intimate relationships: A comparison of married and dating college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 3(4), 414-429.
- Slimani, N. (2016). Making Sense of Aljazeera's Televised News: A Schema Theory Perspective. *Studies in Media and Communication*, 4(1), 21-29.
- Stalans, L. J., & Finn, M. A. (1995). How novice and experienced officers interpret wife assaults: Normative and efficiency frames. *Law and Society Review*, 287-321.
- Stets, J. E., & Straus, M. A. (1989). The marriage license as a hitting license: A comparison of assaults in dating, cohabiting, and married couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 4(2), 161-180.
- Stewart, C., Moore, T., Crone, T., DeFreitas, S. C., & Rhatigan, D. (2012). Who gets blamed for intimate partner violence? The relative contributions of perpetrator sex category, victim confrontation, and observer attitudes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(18), 3739-3754.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2) development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of family issues*, 17(3), 283-316.
- Straus, M. (1999). The controversy over domestic violence by women. *Violence in Intimate Relationships*, 17-44.
- Sylaska, K. M., & Walters, A. S. (2014). Testing the extent of the gender trap: college students' perceptions of and reactions to intimate partner violence. *Sex Roles*, 70(3-4), 134-145.
- Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2005). Community-based norms about intimate partner violence: Putting attributions of fault and responsibility into context. *Sex Roles*, 53(7-8), 573-589.

- Toussaint, L., & Webb, J. R. (2005). Gender differences in the relationship between empathy and forgiveness. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(6), 673-685.
- Vega, E. M., & O'Leary, K. D. (2007). Test–retest reliability of the revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2). *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(8), 703-708.
- Walker, L. E. (1980). *The Battered Woman*. Perennial Library.
- Wee, S., Todd, M. J., Oshiro, M., Greene, E., & Frye, V. (2016). Modifiers of neighbors' bystander intervention in intimate partner violence: a concept mapping study. *Violence and Gender*, 3(1), 55-63.
- West, A., & Wandrei, M. L. (2002). Intimate partner violence: A model for predicting interventions by informal helpers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 972-986.
- Winstok, Z. (2013). What Can We Learn From the Controversy Over the Role of Gender in Partner Violence?. *Partner Abuse*, 4(3), 399-412.
- Witte, T. H., Kopkin, M. R., & Hollis, S. D. (2015). Is It Dating Violence or Just “Drunken Behavior”? Judgments of Intimate Partner Violence When the Perpetrator Is Under the Influence of Alcohol. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 50(11), 1421-1426.
- Wolfe, D. A., & Jaffe, P. G. (1999). Emerging strategies in the prevention of domestic violence. *Future of Children*, 9, 133-144.
- Woods, W. C., Shorey, R. C., Strauss, C. V., Cornelius, T. L., & Rowland, T. (2016). The Relationship Between Dating Violence and Bystander Behavior: An Initial Investigation. *Partner Abuse*, 7(1), 55-69.
- Yamawaki, N., Ochoa-Shipp, M., Pulsipher, C., Harlos, A., & Swindler, S. (2012). Perceptions of domestic violence the effects of domestic violence myths, victim's relationship with her abuser, and the decision to return to her abuser. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(16), 3195-3212.

APPENDIX A

CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE

Taken from Straus et al. (1996)

The CTS2 follows in the form to be administered.

RELATIONSHIP BEHAVIORS

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when 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 happen when you have differences. Please circle how many times you did each of these things in the past year, and how many times your partner did them in the past year. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, circle "7."

How often did this happen?

1 = Once in the past year

2 = Twice in the past year

3 = 3-5 times in the past year

4 = 6-10 times in the past year

5 = 11-20 times in the past year

6 = More than 20 times in the past year

7 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

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 my partner have oral or anal sex.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
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
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 called me fat or ugly.	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 see 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

(continued)

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 partner have sex.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
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 use physical force).	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0
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
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 did this to me.	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 still felt physical pain 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

NOTE: Copyright © 1995 Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman. Reprinted with permission. Do not administer this instrument without written permission of the authors.

APPENDIX B

FULL TEXT OF VIGNETTES

CONDITION #1:

Tyler and Alicia, who have been married for 3 years, just returned from a movie. While at the movies, Alicia spoke to her friend Mike, which made Tyler jealous. When they returned to their home, Tyler let Alicia know how he was feeling. The more Tyler talked, the more he yelled and cursed, and then he grabbed Alicia's arm tightly. Then, Tyler slapped her in the face. Finally, he stopped and said that she had better be careful the next time she sees Mike, or any man for that matter.

CONDITION #2:

Tyler and Alicia, who have been married for 3 years, just returned from a movie. While at the movies, someone spilled a drink on Tyler, which made Tyler upset. When they returned to their home, Tyler let Alicia know how he was feeling. The more Tyler talked, the more he yelled and cursed, and then he grabbed Alicia's arm tightly. Then, Tyler slapped her in the face. Finally, he stopped and said that people need to be more careful when holding drinks.

CONDITION #3:

Tyler and Alicia, two college students who have been casually dating for about a month, just returned from a movie. While at the movies, Alicia spoke to her friend Mike, which made Tyler jealous. When they returned to Tyler's dorm, Tyler let Alicia know how he was feeling. The more Tyler talked, the more he yelled and cursed, and then he grabbed Alicia's arm tightly. Then, Tyler slapped her in the face. Finally, he stopped and said that she had better be careful the next time she sees Mike, or any boy for that matter.

CONDITION #4:

Tyler and Alicia, two college students who have been casually dating for about a month, just returned from a movie. While at the movies, someone spilled a drink on Tyler, which made Tyler upset. When they returned to Tyler's dorm, Tyler let Alicia know how he was feeling. The more Tyler talked, the more he yelled and cursed, and then he grabbed Alicia's arm tightly. Then, Tyler slapped her in the face. Finally, he stopped and said that people need to be more careful when holding drinks.

CONDITION #5:

Tyler and Alicia, who have been married for 3 years, just returned from a movie. While at the movies, Tyler spoke to his friend Jenna, which made Alicia jealous. When they returned to their home, Alicia let Tyler know how she was feeling. The more Alicia talked, the more she yelled and cursed, and then she grabbed Tyler's arm tightly. Then, Alicia slapped him in the face. Finally, she stopped and said that he had better be careful the next time he sees Jenna, or any woman for that matter.

CONDITION #6:

Tyler and Alicia, who have been married for 3 years, just returned from a movie. While at the movies, someone spilled a drink on Alicia, which made Alicia upset. When they returned to their home, Alicia let Tyler know how she was feeling. The more Alicia talked, the more she yelled and cursed, and then she grabbed Tyler's arm tightly. Then, Alicia slapped him in the face. Finally, she stopped and said that people need to be more careful when holding drinks.

CONDITION #7:

Tyler and Alicia, two college students who have been casually dating for about a month, just returned from a movie. While at the movies, Tyler spoke to his friend Jenna, which made Alicia jealous. When they returned to Alicia's dorm, Alicia let Tyler know how she was feeling. The more Alicia talked, the more she yelled and cursed, and then she grabbed Tyler's arm tightly. Then, Alicia slapped him in the face. Finally, she stopped and said that he had better be careful the next time he sees Jenna, or any girl for that matter.

CONDITION #8:

Tyler and Alicia, two college students who have been casually dating for about a month, just returned from a movie. While at the movies, someone spilled a drink on Alicia, which made Alicia upset. When they returned to Alicia's dorm, Alicia let Tyler know how she was feeling. The more Alicia talked, the more she yelled and cursed, and then she grabbed Tyler's arm tightly. Then, Alicia slapped him in the face. Finally, she stopped and said that people need to be more careful when holding drinks

APPENDIX C

FULL QUESTIONNAIRE

Q1 Karin Nordin, Principal Investigator from the University of Alabama, is conducting a study called Relationship Dynamics: An Investigation. She wishes to find out how college students perceive specific events which may occur within a relationship.

Taking part in this study involves completing a web survey that will take about 10 minutes. This survey contains questions about relationship experience, relationship dynamics, and your perceptions of specific relationship events.

We will protect your anonymity by not gathering any identifying information and using ID numbers to analyze data. Only the investigators (the investigator, research team members) will have access to the data. The data are password protect and encrypted. Only summarized data will be presented at meetings or in publications.

There will be no direct benefits to you. The findings will be useful to college administrator and communication studies researchers for understanding social perceptions of romantic relationships.

The chief risk is that some of the questions may make you uncomfortable. You may skip any questions you do not want to answer.

If you have questions about this study, please contact Karin Nordin at khnordin@crimson.ua.edu or Dr. Carol Mills at cbmills@ua.edu. If you have questions, concerns, or complaints about your rights as a research participant, contact Ms. Tanta Myles, the Research Compliance Officer, at (205) 348-8461 or toll-free at 1-877-820-3066. If you have complaints or concerns about this study, file them through the UA IRB outreach website at http://osp.ua.edu/site/PRCO_Welcome.html. Also, if you participate, you are encouraged to complete the short Survey for Research Participants online at this website. This helps UA improve its protection of human research participants.

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS COMPLETELY VOLUNTARY. You are free not to participate or stop participating any time before you submit your answers.

If you understand the statements above, are at least 18 years old, and freely consent to be in this study, click on the Yes, I agree button to begin.

Q66 I have read the information above, and I agree to participate in this survey.

- Yes, I agree (1)
- No, I disagree (2)

If No, I disagree Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Survey

Q2 How old are you?

Q5 What is your racial or ethnic identification? (Select all that apply)

- Alaskan Native or American Indian (1)
- Asian (2)
- Black or African American (3)
- Hispanic or Latino (4)
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander (5)
- White (6)
- Other (7)
- I Prefer Not To Respond (8)

Q7 What is your sex?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Q9 What year in school are you?

- Freshman (1)
- Sophomore (2)
- Junior (3)
- Senior (4)
- Other (5) _____

Q68 Are you currently a member of a Greek Organization?

- Yes (1)
- No (2)

Q10 Which of the following best describes your sexual orientation?

- Heterosexual (straight) (1)
- Homosexual (gay/lesbian) (2)
- Bisexual (3)
- Other (4)
- Prefer not to say (5)

Q11 Are you now married, widowed, divorced, separated or never married?

- Married (1)
- Widowed (2)
- Divorced (3)
- Separated (4)
- Never Married (5)

Q88 How many relationships have you been in?

- I have never been in a relationship. (1)
- Only one relationship. (2)
- 2-4 relationships. (3)
- 4-8 relationships. (4)
- More than 8 relationships. (5)

Q89 On a scale of 1 to 7 (7 being most serious) how serious was your last relationship?

- 1 (1)
- 2 (2)
- 3 (3)
- 4 (4)
- 5 (5)
- 6 (6)
- 7 (7)

Q16 PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING STORY CAREFULLY: {Vignette}

Q18 What gender was the perpetrator of the violence?

- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Q19 What relationship status was the couple in question?

- Dating (1)
- Married (2)

Q20 What happened before the couple got home?

- They went to a baseball game (1)
- Someone spilled a drink on ____ (2)
- They ate pizza together (3)
- ____ talked with their friend _____ (4)

Q67 Please rate the following....

- _____ How serious was this incident? (1)
- _____ How violent was this incident? (2)
- _____ How dangerous was this incident? (3)

Q81 Please rate the following....

- _____ Rate the extent to which Alicia is to blame for the incident you read. (1)
- _____ Rate the extent to which Alicia is responsible for the incident you read. (2)
- _____ Rate the extent to which Alicia caused the incident you read. (3)

Q82 Please rate the following....

- _____ Rate the extent to which Tyler is to blame for the incident you read. (1)
- _____ Rate the extent to which Tyler is responsible for the incident you read. (2)
- _____ Rate the extent to which Tyler caused the incident you read. (3)

Q49 How would you label the incident between the couple you just read about?

Q52 To what extent would you label this domestic violence?

_____ Please rate the extent (1)

Q54 To what extent would you label this intimate partner violence?

_____ Please rate the extent (1)

Q55 To what extent would you label this dating violence?

_____ Please rate the extent (1)

Q56 To what extent would you label this dating abuse?

_____ Please rate the extent (1)

Q57 To what extent would you label this relationship aggression?

_____ Please rate the extent (1)

Q59 To what extent would you label this common couple violence?

_____ Please rate the extent (1)

Q58 To what extent would you label this a normal argument?

_____ Please rate the extent (1)

Q87 To what extent would you label this intimate terrorism?

_____ Please rate the extent (1)

Q60 If a bystander witnessed the incident between Tyler and Alicia, would you recommend the following actions?

_____ Personally intervene (1)

_____ Talk to the victim later (2)

_____ Talk to the perpetrator later (3)

_____ Call the police (4)

_____ Do nothing (5)

Q72 Would you take any actions not listed above? If so, what actions? If not, why not?

Q83 Do you have any final comments or information the researcher should know about incidents like the one you read about?

Appendix D

IRB APPROVAL

THE UNIVERSITY OF
ALABAMA

Office of the Vice President for
Research & Economic Development
Office for Research Compliance

January 23, 2017

Karin Nordin
Department of Communication Studies
College of Communication & Information Sciences
Box 870172

Re: IRB # 17-OR-034, "Relationship Perceptions: An Examination"

Dear Ms. Nordin:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your proposed research.

Your application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. You have also been granted the requested waiver of written documentation of informed consent and alteration of informed consent. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on January 22, 2018. If your research will continue beyond this date, please complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, please complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, please complete the Request for Study Closure form.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.

Sincerely,



Carpanato T. Myles, MSM, CHM, CIP
Director & Research Compliance Officer
Office for Research Compliance