10-19-2015

How Can I Help? How Emerging Adults Respond to Victims of Dating Aggression

Jillian Catherine Siobhan Glasgow
University of Windsor

How Can I Help? How Emerging Adults Respond to Victims of Dating Aggression

By

Jillian Glasgow

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Department of Psychology
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts
at the University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2015

How Can I Help? How Emerging Adults Respond to Victims of Dating Aggression

by

Jillian Glasgow

APPROVED BY:

_____

A. Fitzgerald
Department of Sociology, Anthropology, and Criminology

_____

R. Menna
Department of Psychology

_____

P. Fritz
Department of Psychology

September 8, 2015

DECLARATION OF ORIGINALITY

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.

ABSTRACT

The current study investigated how young adults (i.e., helpers) who are approached by a dating aggression (DA) victim respond to the victim. It was hypothesized that most helpers would give helpful responses, that women would give more helpful responses than men, that female victims would receive more helpful responses than male victims, and that helpers' attributions and attitudes would predict type of responses given. Students (N = 162) completed online measures of demographics, hostile attribution bias, attitudes about gender roles, attitudes about DA, and questions assessing help-giving experiences. Helpers gave more helpful than unhelpful responses, men gave more unhelpful responses than women, and there was no difference between responses given to male and female victims. Condemning attitudes about DA and traditional gender role attitudes predicted more unhelpful responses and increased hostile attribution was associated with encouraging the victim to seek help. These findings have implications for helping victims of DA.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my supervisor Dr. Patti Fritz for her encouragement and support over these past two years. Not only has she helped me develop and complete my master's thesis and involved me in her other lab projects, but she has also been a caring and supportive presence throughout my Master's degree. I have a learned a lot from her about research and life during and after grad school, and look forward to working on my dissertation with her. She is always ready with a listening ear or thoughtful solution whenever I run into a problem and I couldn't ask for a better supervisor. I would also like to thank my committee, Dr. Amy Fitzgerald and Dr. Rosanne Menna, for their helpful and insightful comments, and Dr. Dennis Jackson for addressing any and all stats questions I might have.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their emotional support throughout the past two years. Mom and Dad, thanks for always being there when I was feeling overwhelmed and for your encouragement and support throughout my entire academic career to date. Thanks Kenzie and Lachlan for your encouraging messages and for listening when I need an ear. Last but not least, I would like to thank my wonderful cohort for being so cooperative and being always ready to help each other. Specifically, thanks to Subie and the "child people", Abi, Aranda, Natalie, and Jason. We have reviewed each other's publications, scholarship proposals, thesis projects, used each other as sounding boards, and constantly supported and pushed each other to reach this point; I couldn't have done it without you. Thanks to all of you for your constant and continued support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

When individuals experience dating aggression, they have a number of alternatives, such as leaving the relationship, staying in the relationship, confronting their romantic partner, or seeking support from other sources for the problem. Seeking help for the problem can be a stepping-stone for further action and an adaptive coping mechanism for the individual (Boldero & Fallon, 1995). Sources of support can be informal (e.g., friends, family) or formal (e.g., counselor, police, health professional). The responses the victims receive from the persons they approach could either encourage or discourage future help seeking and, in some cases, could have positive or negative psychological consequences (Hines & Douglas, 2011).

Studies have shown that dating aggression is more prevalent in adolescence and emerging adulthood than in middle and older adulthood (e.g., O'Leary, 1999). Furthermore, if adolescents or emerging adults seek support for dating aggression, they most often utilize informal sources of support, particularly friends (Boldero & Fallon, 1995). As research has suggested that negative responses to help seeking attempts can be associated with decreased psychological functioning (Hines & Douglas, 2011; Mitchell & Hodson, 1983), it is important to understand from whom individuals are receiving help and what kinds of responses they are receiving. The current study investigated how emerging adults retrospectively reported responding when approached by a victim of dating aggression (e.g., helpful vs. unhelpful responses) and if their causal attributions and attitudes about dating aggression predicted their responses. In the current study, I will refer to individuals who are approached by victims of dating aggression as *helpers*, as

this term is used in the literature on help seeking. However, the term "helpers" does not necessarily indicate that the response provided was a helpful one, simply that an individual was approached for help.

Help Seeking

Models of help seeking propose that before help seeking occurs, an individual must first recognize and define the problem, make the decision to seek help, and finally, actively seek help (Goldsmith et al. 1988; Srebnik, Cauce & Baydar, 1996). Thus, the help seeker is an active participant in the process. In the first step, perceived problem severity and naming the problem are both suggested to be involved in defining the problem (Broadhurst, 2003). Furthermore, Srebnik and colleagues (1996) have suggested that demographic characteristics, such as ethnicity or religion, contribute to individuals' decisions of whether or not to seek help in the second step. Finally, the researchers proposed that such barriers as low SES or knowledge of available help, and such facilitators as strong social networks contribute to an individual actively seeking help. Though initial models of help seeking have proposed that this process is linear, Gross and McMullen (1983) have suggested that there is nonlinear movement between these stages.

It has also been suggested that a match between help seeker and helper is very important in determining the usefulness of the help. For instance, Colarossi and Eccles (2003) conducted a study where middle to late adolescents completed measures of support seeking, depression, and self-esteem. In addition to finding that increased perceived support was related to decreased depression and increased self-esteem, the authors also found that these effects were larger within same-sex dyads (e.g., girls seeking support from a female friend, boys seeking support from their fathers).

Therefore, it is possible that a match between the needs and characteristics of the help seeker, such as similar gender, and the ability of the helper increases perceived support and support-seeking behaviour in general.

However, individuals do not necessarily seek support for a problem even though it is distressing to them. When Boldero and Fallon (1995) examined adolescent support-seeking behaviour in a sample of 1,000 adolescents aged 11-18 years, they found that only half of their sample reported seeking help for personal problems that caused them significant distress. Specifically, the adolescents were more likely to seek help for interpersonal problems than academic or health problems. Furthermore, the adolescents most often went to friends, rather than teachers, family, or professionals for their interpersonal problems. These findings suggest that when faced with an interpersonal problem, adolescents and emerging adults are more likely to turn to their friends for help than to any other member of their support network. One such interpersonal problem could potentially be experiences with dating aggression.

Dating Aggression

For the purposes of this study, the term *dating aggression* is used instead of *dating violence*, as the term violence implies significant physical or psychological consequences and the consequences in this study will be unknown. Furthermore, a *dating* relationship was defined as a romantic relationship between two individuals who share an emotional and/or sexual attachment beyond that of friendship, but which is not yet a more seriously committed relationship (e.g., engagement, marriage). This definition has been used in previous research to describe this type of relatively nonpermanent relationship (e.g., Murray & Kardatzke, 2007; Straus, 2004). Finally, dating aggression can take a

number of forms. It can be physical (such as pushing, shoving, hitting, throwing objects, slapping, kicking, biting, beating, and threatening with a gun or knife; Charkow & Nelson, 2000), sexual (such as sexual coercion, forces sexual acts, physical violence during sexual activity, and threats when sexual activity is refused; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996), or psychological (such as threats, insults, undermining a partner's self-esteem, yelling, and swearing; Charkow & Nelson, 2000).

The current study investigated dating aggression in the emerging adult population, as emerging adults have been shown to not only engage in more risk-taking behaviours in general (Arnett, 2000), but also to be at greater risk for dating aggression (e.g., O'Leary, Woodin, & Fritz, 2006). Emerging adulthood was first defined by Arnett (2000) as a stage of development between adolescence and adulthood, typically occurring between 18 and 25 years of age, which is distinguished by increasing independence and self-exploration in various domains, such as love, work, and worldviews. As such, emerging adulthood is an important target for investigations of dating aggression, as this transition period is important for individuals' identity development in all areas of life, including in romantic relationships. In the current study, I included participants aged 17 as well, as they would also be in university and therefore in the emerging adulthood stage.

Disturbingly, a study by Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, and Ryan (1992) found that only 36% of 305 college students did not have some form of aggression in their relationships. With respect to different types of abuse, Amar and Gennaro (2005) report that 48% of their sample of women aged 18-25 experienced at least one occurrence of physical aggression and a cross-cultural study by Straus (2004) looking at 31 different universities across the globe found that physical abuse was experienced by 17% to 45%

of the sample (median 29%). Sexual aggression tends to be more gendered, with women experiencing more sexual aggression than men (e.g., Straus, 2004; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). Specifically, Nicholson and colleagues (1998) found that 35.5% of the college women in their sample reported unwanted sexual experiences compared to only 11.3% of men. Finally, psychological aggression is by far the most common with estimates ranging from 80% to 90% (Dekeseredy & Kelly, 1995). Similarly, Neufeld, McNamara, and Ertl (1999) found that 90% of their sample of undergraduate women had experienced at least one act of psychological aggression and over 75% had experienced more than three acts in the past six months.

A number of risk factors for perpetration of dating aggression have been identified, such as insecure attachment, anger, acceptance of male violence, gender inequality, traditional sex role attitudes, high jealousy, and limited social support coping (Carr & Vandeusen, 2002; Murray & Kardatzke, 2007; O'Leary et al, 2006). Similarly, Makepeace (1981) found that the most common reason for physical aggression was jealousy. Makepeace also found that in over 50% of emerging adult dating relationships where abuse occurred, the victims were still in the relationship, suggesting that relationships are not necessarily broken off in the presence of dating aggression.

Being a victim of dating aggression is associated not only with increased risk of injury in cases of physical aggression (Straus, 2004), but it also is associated with a number of psychological consequences, such as poorer psychological functioning, increased substance dependence, and other psychiatric disorders (e.g., depression, anxiety; Brown et al., 2009). For instance, Amar and Gennaro (2005) studied 702 women aged 18-25 and found that victims had higher somatization, interpersonal sensitivity,

depression, anxiety, and hostility than nonvictims. The researchers also found that victims of more severe aggression scored even higher on all of these dimensions than victims of more mild aggression and had increased risk of meeting criteria for a psychiatric disorder. Similarly, Clements, Ogle, and Sabourin, (2005) found that college students who experienced high levels of abuse showed increased dysphoria and hopelessness and decreased self-esteem and optimism. This finding was consistent for both genders, demonstrating that both men and women have increased risk of negative psychological symptoms if they have experienced dating aggression.

However, there are a number of gender differences that have been identified in the literature with regards to dating aggression. For instance, Harned (2001) found that women reported more psychological and physical damage than did men who were similarly victimized. Additionally, though Straus (2004) found similar rates of perpetration by both men and women, men were found to inflict more injury than women and to perpetrate more severe assaults. Interestingly, a study looking at emerging adult couples between the ages of 18 and 30 found that for women, the number of people from whom they sought support had a buffering effect, such that when they sought help from more people, they reported lower levels of psychological distress than those who sought help from a fewer number of helpers (Fortin, Guay, Lavoie, Boisvert, & Beaudry, 2012). Furthermore, qualitative data collected from 251 undergraduate women showed that labeling a violent experience as abuse was a gradual process, which was often triggered by support seeking (Harned, 2005). Thus, the response an individual received when seeking help for dating aggression could be essential for the individual to attempt to address the aggression or to leave the abusive relationship.

Dating Aggression and Help Seeking

Liang, Goodman, Tummala-Narra, and Weintraub (2005) have elaborated on the three stages of help seeking, (i.e., problem definition, decision to seek help, and actively seek help; e.g., Srebnik et al., 1996) and applied it to the dating aggression literature on help seeking. The researchers have suggested that the first step, problem appraisal and definition, is comprised of a pre-contemplation stage, where individuals deny the severity of the event; contemplation, where individuals begin to recognize the abuse as a problem; and preparation, where they stop thinking of the abuse as their fault and move to the next step by deciding to seek help from others. For individuals to decide to seek help, they must recognize the problem as undesirable and unlikely to change without the help of others. Liang et al. (2005) have suggested that the individual will sometimes try to cope with the abuse themselves before seeking help. Finally, to actively seek help, the individual must identify a source of support. As the researchers stated, "social support will function as a stress buffer only if the type of support that is provided matches the victim's particular coping needs and situation" (p. 79, Liang et al., 2005). In addition, the helper the victim chooses will also determine how the victim defines the problem and whether the victim will seek help again. Thus, the response given by the helper could be important in encouraging further help seeking.

As suggested by Liang et al. (2005), help seeking can be an important factor for victims to decide to change the situation, either by confronting the partner about the violence or by leaving the abusive relationship. Therefore, a great deal of research has been conducted investigating factors that promote or inhibit help seeking in victims of dating aggression. For instance, research suggests that college and middle school students

are more likely than high school students to talk to someone about dating aggression (Black, Tolman, Ballahan, Saunders, & Weisz, 2008). Furthermore, in a sample of adolescents, Black and Weisz (2003) found that the more acts of violence experienced, the more likely adolescents were to turn to their friends.

Similar to research on help seeking in general, research on female victims' help seeking suggests that women are more likely to seek informal support than formal support (e.g., Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989) and that of informal sources of support, they are more likely to seek help from a friend (Jackson, 2002; Ocampo, Shelley, & Jaycox, 2007). However, the helpfulness of informal resources is often called into question. In one study in particular, Fanslow and Robinson (2010) collected a large sample of adult female victims (aged 18-64) of aggression by an intimate partner and asked about the helpfulness of the victims' help-seeking experiences. Though the majority of women who sought help reported that they received a helpful response, 40% of the victims reported that the source they told had not tried to help. Similarly, qualitative data collected from 11 emerging adult female victims (ages 16-28) examining victims' experiences with help seeking showed that some women reported that their family and peers seemed aware of the violence and yet did not comment or offer help (Rosen & Stith, 1993). This reaction gave the victims the impression that the violence was acceptable or deserved and therefore contributed to the culture of victim blaming.

Although Jackson (2002) found that most adolescent victims reported positive outcomes of help seeking and lack of change or worsening of the situation if they did not disclose, other researchers have suggested that a minority of responses may tend towards victim blaming (Douglas & Hines, 2011; Koval, 1989). Furthermore, Douglas and Hines

(2011) showed that each negative help-seeking experience was associated with an increase in posttraumatic stress disorder symptomology in a sample of adult men. This finding demonstrates the importance of understanding what factors might contribute to an individual responding negatively to a victim, in order to prevent helpers from engaging in these potentially damaging types of responses. Research has investigated why adolescents and emerging adults report not seeking help and a number of studies have found different results. For instance, Love and Richards (2013) found that adolescents did not disclose for fear of what others would think and fear of retaliation from the partner. Martin, Houston, Mari, and Decker (2012) found that some adolescents were concerned that friends would be in a similar situation and unavailable for support. Lastly, Mahlstedt and Keeny (1993) found that emerging adults felt it was a private matter or reported feeling embarrassed.

Given that some of these reasons are associated with concern about how the helper will respond, it is surprising that little research has investigated the specific responses adolescents and young adults are receiving from individuals chosen as helpers. One study conducted by Mahlstedt and Keeny (1993) specifically investigated the types of responses young adult female victims were receiving from helpers. Using pilot study qualitative data from four women who reported on helpful and unhelpful responses to help seeking, the researchers identified three categories of support seeking: supportive (i.e., listening, nurturing, helping to make decisions, encouraging to seek professional help), unhelpful (i.e., anger with the assailant, saying "I told you so," shock, trivialization, desire to seek revenge, seeing victim as a failure), and directive (i.e., gave helpful advice, gave unhelpful advice, helped make decisions, made decisions for

victim). These options were then listed in checklist format and a larger sample of female victims (N = 130) endorsed which responses they received if they sought help.

The most frequently reported responses were listened, gave helpful advice, and anger with the assailant (Mahlstedt & Keeny, 1993). It was found that professionals were less likely to give unhelpful responses than were friends and family members. Interestingly, though brothers tended to use what the researchers labeled an "unhelpful" strategy of wanting to seek revenge against the assailant, female victims reported that this behaviour was actually helpful. The researchers suggested that this type of response indirectly interrupted victim blame and was therefore perceived as supportive by the victims. Finally, qualitative data suggested that the most desired responses were understanding, advice giving, listening, and interrupting victim blame. In addition, the qualitative data suggested that victims might perceive anger towards the assailant and excessive advice giving as indirectly blaming. Mahlstedt and Kenny's study (1993) demonstrates the importance of understanding what kinds of responses young adult victims are receiving from their helpers, as the response can be important in interrupting victim blame and helping the victim to cope with the aggression.

Social Information Processing Theory

Dodge and Crick's (1990) model of social information processing is a social-cognitive model that might help explain how some helpers decide what is an acceptable behavioural response. The model proposes that the information-processing theory applied to other areas of cognition can also apply to how individuals react in social situations. It is comprised of a number of steps, including encoding, interpretation, response selection, and response enactment. At the first step, relevant social information, identified by the

individual through selectively attending to certain cues, is encoded in long-term memory. Next, the information is mentally represented and interpreted using schemas (a mental representation of an object, event, or person that is representative of that category) and scripts (a type of schema that consists of a list of actions that the individual believes are carried out in stereotypical situations). After interpreting the information encoded in long-term memory, a number of possible social responses are identified by associated mental networks, so that responses that are frequently used are the easiest to access and are most likely to be included as possible behavioural responses. Next, the individual decides which behavioural response will be enacted based on its acceptability and on possible instrumental or interpersonal outcomes. Finally, the individual then enacts the chosen behavioural response using their protocols and scripts to transform the response into action.

Research has shown that deficits at any stage in this process, for example, misinterpreting others' actions or failing to properly enact on the chosen response, are associated with aggressive behaviour in children (Dodge & Crick, 1990; Fite, Cates, Hotzworth-Munroe, Dodge, & Nay, 2008). Hostile attribution bias has been identified as a particular bias occurring at the second step of the social information processing model, wherein ambiguous social situations are attributed as hostile. For instance, imagine Fred was building a house of cards and John walked by and bumped the table. If Fred decided that John had done this on purpose to annoy Fred, Fred has attributed hostile actions to John and may therefore act aggressively towards him. In this way, it is suggested that incorrectly interpreting an ambiguous situation can affect later steps in the social information processing model and ultimately result in aggression (Fite et al., 2008).

However, researchers have not yet explored how having hostile attributions about others may influence individuals help-giving behaviours or how individuals provide help to victims of aggression. The current study therefore applied this model of social cognition to help-giving for dating aggression to see if those with higher hostile attribution bias might report providing different types of responses.

Attitudes about Dating Aggression and Gender

In addition to the hostile attribution bias, it is likely that other attitudes, such as more traditional gender role attitudes or permissive attitudes towards dating aggression, might play a role in the interpretation step of the social information-processing model. Therefore, attitudes might be associated with how helpers interpret the situation when approached by a victim, and therefore may help predict their response.

Traditional gender role attitudes and permissive attitudes about dating aggression have both been found to be related to perpetration of dating aggression (e.g., Nabors & Jasinski, 2009; Stith et al, 2004) and are often correlated with each other (e.g., Price & Byers, 1999). Specifically, in a meta-analysis by Stith et al. (2004) using studies with only married and cohabitating couples, permissive attitudes about dating aggression emerged as a strong predictor of perpetration of aggression, whereas traditional sex-role attitudes had a moderate effect. Similarly, Archer and Graham-Kevan (2003) found that instrumental beliefs about aggression (i.e., acceptance of aggression for instrumental purposes such as teaching someone a lesson) were associated with the perpetration of physical aggression in a college student sample.

A number of predictors have been found to be associated with permissive attitudes, such as child maltreatment (e.g., Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001). For instance,

Foo and Margolin (1995) found that child sexual and physical abuse were significant predictors of men's aggression in romantic relationships. More specifically, studies have suggested that abuse by the opposite sex parent is associated with more permissive attitudes (Dardis, Edwards, Kelley, & Gidycz, 2013). Additionally, Byers and Eno (1991) found that men who were more sexually experienced held more traditional views of women's gender role and more rape supportive beliefs. Similarly, Bookwala et al. (1992) found that women were more likely to perpetrate dating aggression if they held more traditional gender role beliefs. Furthermore, Nabors, Dietz, and Jasinski (2006) found that college students were less likely than adults to identify female perpetrated behaviours as dating aggression. This finding suggests that, in general, college students tend to hold more permissive attitudes toward female-perpetrated aggression and therefore may be less sympathetic to male victims.

However, some research has suggested that in general, men are more likely to hold permissive attitudes than women (Nabors & Jasinski, 2006; Price & Byers, 1999), whereas other research suggests that there are fewer gender differences (Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003). In one study in particular, Nabors and Jasinski (2009) showed that physical abuse perpetration was associated with higher levels of acceptance of male violence, but this effect was driven primarily by the men in the sample. Similarly, it has been shown that men tend to endorse more myth-based beliefs about abuse than women (Nabors et al., 2006), and that men were more likely to blame the victim than were women (Bryant & Spencer, 2003). Men's responses to victims of dating aggression may therefore tend to be more unhelpful than women's responses.

Informal Helpers of Dating Aggression

Though relatively few studies have investigated interventions from informal helpers, there are a few that may provide some direction for the current research. For instance, a qualitative study of 18 adults who had helped victims of marital or dating violence by Latta and Goodman (2011) found three stages of help-giving behaviour, similar to those identified in the help-seeking model. Specifically, the three phases were: becoming aware of the violence (i.e., moving from unawareness to suspicions about the abuse, and then confirming their suspicions), developing a narrative (e.g., gathering information about the survivor, her relationships, and relevant conditions for intervention), and taking action (deciding on a course of action to intervene in the violence). A larger scale study using random-digit-dialing also focused on adults who intervened in marital or dating aggression (Beeble, Post, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2008). Half of the individuals who reported knowing someone who had been a victim of relationship violence (N = 6,010) reported intervening in some way and the vast majority of individuals provided help by listening or talking to the victim. Beeble and colleagues (2008) found that women engaged in all forms of support (i.e., emotional, formal, and instrumental) more than men, and in general, were more likely to help than men, though this difference was relatively small.

Additionally, a few studies have also investigated helping behaviours and predictors of helping in college populations (Banyard, Moynihan, Walsh, Cohn, & Ward, 2010; Chabot, Tracy, Manning, & Poisson, 2009; West & Wandrei, 2002). For instance, Charbot and colleagues (2009) provided several vignettes of dating aggression to 71 undergraduate college students, 26 of whom were male, and found that variables related to the aggressive situation and personal attributions were more influential than individual

characteristics. Specifically, the sex of the aggressor, the severity of the incident, and the students' attributions as to the cause of the aggression predicted reporting more helpful interventions (such as phoning the police), whereas the students' own self-esteem and experience with dating aggression was not related to the helpfulness of their interventions. Interestingly, the authors found that men and more aggressive individuals were equally as likely to intervene as women and less aggressive individuals, but that their reported interventions were less helpful and more dangerous (e.g., fighting the aggressor). Similarly, in a larger study of 1,241 undergraduate students, where 28.9% of the sample reported that a friend had disclosed unwanted sexual experiences, Banyard et al (2010) found that women were more likely to report experiencing positive responses from their friends than were men, though the effect sizes were small.

Finally, a study by West and Wandrei (2002) is one of the few studies that has investigated informal helpers' attitudes and the helpfulness of their reported behaviours. The researchers presented 157 undergraduate students who were primarily female (82%) a video showing a man striking a female victim, with the victim either being passive and quiet or yelling at the aggressor (though never attacking the aggressor). The researchers also developed a scale of helpful and unhelpful behaviours based on Mahlstedt and Keeny's (1993) study to measure the helpfulness of intervention. As in previous research (e.g., Price & Byers, 1999), women were found to have more condemning attitudes toward domestic violence and to attribute less blame to the victim than were men. Women were also found to provide more helpful interventions than men. Additionally, lower levels of victim blame and condemning attitudes towards violence were found to predict more helpful interventions and increased victim blame was significantly related to

unhelpful interventions, though the variance explained was small. These findings suggest that attitudes towards dating aggression and attributions about the situation, such as victim blame, may play a role in predicting individuals' responses to victims of dating aggression.

Current Study

To date, there is little research examining the specific responses that help-seeking victims of dating aggression receive from their helpers. Even less is known about the specific characteristics of the helpers and how their characteristics influence their responses. The current study, therefore, investigated (a) how young adults reported responding when approached by a victim of dating aggression, (b) how helpers' attitudes about dating aggression (including traditional gender roles) and their tendency to attribute hostile intent to other's behaviours influenced their reported responses, and (c) how the gender of the helper and the gender of the victim might have related to the types of responses given. This study builds upon research by West and Wandrei (2002) as it investigated how helpers' attitudes and gender related to the reported helpfulness of their responses. However, it extends past research by investigating what individuals retrospectively reported doing in a real situation when they were approached by a dating aggression victim (rather than relying on a videotaped scenario). Additionally, it investigated if hostile attribution bias also plays a role in predicting helping behaviour, and if the gender of the victim is related to the reported helpfulness of the response. These research questions were tested using the behaviours proposed by Mahlstedt and Keeny (1993; i.e., supportive, unhelpful, and directive) as well as more specific

behaviours described by the researcher, with each of the possible responses presented in a checklist.

Hypothesis 1: Responses to help seeking. My first hypothesis had three components and aimed to assess the helpfulness of the behavioural response and whether gender of the participant or victim was associated with the helpfulness of the response. As was found in other research (e.g., Jackson, 2002), responses reported to be helpful were expected to be more frequent than responses reported to be unhelpful or directive. In addition, women were expected to report giving more helpful responses than men, as it has been shown that men tend to hold more permissive attitudes towards dating aggression (Price & Byers, 1999). Finally, all participants were expected to report providing more helpful responses if the victim was female than if the victim was male, as previous research has found that students tend to have more permissive attitudes toward female perpetrated aggression (e.g., Nabors et al., 2006; Price & Byers, 1999)

Hypothesis 2: Attributions and attitudes. I also investigated if young adults' attitudes about dating aggression and hostile attributions were associated with the kind of responses they give. As little research has investigated how young adults respond to help seeking from victims of dating aggression, I posed this as an exploratory research question. See Table 1 for a summary of hypotheses and their respective analyses.

Table 1

Hypotheses and Statistical Analyses

Hypothesis	Independent Variable(s)	Dependent Variable(s)	Prediction	Analysis
1A	-	Helpful/unhelpful	More helpful than unhelpful responses	Mean Comparison
1B	Sex of participant	Type of responses	Women provide more helpful responses than men	Logistic Regression
1C	Sex of victim	Type of responses	More helpful responses will be given to female than to male victims.	Logistic Regression
2	Type of responses	• Hostile attribution bias • Gender role attitudes • Attitudes about dating aggression	Exploratory	Hierarchical regression

CHAPTER II

Method

Participants

Individuals were eligible to participate in the study if they reported having been approached by a victim of dating aggression for help (see Appendix). The original sample included 167 participants at the University of Windsor, and five participants were excluded from the analyses as they exceeded the age limit for the study. Thus, the final sample consisted of 162 participants (106 women, 56 men) between the ages of 17 and 25 who reported having been approached by a victim of dating aggression. On average, participants were 20.12 years old. In the current study, the participants were mostly heterosexual (93.8%), with 2 identifying as homosexual, 5 identifying as bisexual, and 1 identifying as pansexual. The majority of participants were White (65.4%), followed by Asian (including Korean, Chinese, Filipino, South, Southeast, and West Asian; 13%), Arab (7.4%), Black (6.2%), Latin American (1.2%), and Other (4.9%). Most students were Canadian (82.7%) full-time students (95.7%). Participants were primarily Atheist (30.2%) or Roman Catholic (29%), followed by Agnostic (9.9%), Muslim (9.9%), Protestant (6.8%), and Other (9.3%).

The majority of participants were approached about psychological aggression (85.8%), followed by physical (56.2%) and sexual aggression (42%). About half of the participants (46.3%) reported having experienced dating aggression themselves (psychological: 43.2%, sexual: 11.7%, physical: 13.6%), and 22.2% reported having perpetrated dating aggression (psychological: 21%, sexual: 0%, physical: 4.9%). Most participants had never received any form of training in helping victims of dating aggression (80.2%), but some had participated in the Bystander Initiative (14.8%) and

some had some other training (4.9%). The Bystander Initiative is a program on campus aimed at educating students about sexual assault, intervening in sexual assault, and how to help victims of assault.

Participants were recruited primarily through the university's Participant Pool (93.8%), wherein students taking eligible psychology and business courses can receive bonus points towards their courses by participating in research (see Appendix A for a description of the study on the Participant Pool website). A smaller portion was recruited via poster (1.2%), social media (0.6%), and word of mouth (1.2%; see Appendix B for recruitment poster). Participants recruited through the participant pool received a bonus point for completion of the study and all other participants were entered into a draw for one of four $30 gift certificates for the local mall. The study received clearance from the institutional Research Ethics Board.

Procedure and Materials

Participants indicated interest in participating in the study either by signing up for a time slot through the participant pool website or by emailing the researcher if recruited outside the pool. Only participants who indicated in a prescreening questionnaire that a victim of dating aggression had approached them were able to sign up and participate in the study. Once they had indicated interest in participating, the researcher sent them an email with a study ID and a link to one of several surveys, all with the same content but with measures in a different order (see Appendix C). The participants were directed to an online survey where a consent form addressed the subject of the study, potential harms, and the rights of the participant (Appendix D). An online format was chosen for this study in order to increase participation, as men are more difficult to recruit (Galea &

Tracy, 2007) and participants may be more likely to participate in an online survey (Dolnicar, Laesser,& Matus, 2009). Furthermore, online formats have been shown to be as valid and reliable as pencil-and-paper methods (e.g., Bonini Campos, Zucoloto, Sampaio Bonafé, Jordani, & Maroco, 2011). Participants gave consent by clicking *yes* and then continued to the online survey. Participants were informed that they would not receive compensation if they completed less than 80% of the survey or if they completed the survey in less than 10 minutes, as these data would not be considered valid or admissible. To ensure that only participants who had been approached by a victim of dating aggression were recruited into the study, the first question of the survey once again asked participants if they had been approached by a victim of dating aggression in the past. If participants responded negatively to this question, they were directed out of the survey, told they were not eligible for the study, and were not compensated. The study was composed of several questionnaires assessing demographics, experience helping victims of intimate partner aggression, hostile attribution bias, attitudes toward dating aggression, gender role attitudes, and social desirability. The demographics and experiences helping a victim questionnaires were consistently presented to participants as the first two measures to ensure collection of accurate and complete demographic information and to avoid biasing how participants reported helping responses. The remaining measures were presented in random order to prevent ordering effects.

After completing the questionnaires, participants were directed to a debriefing form, which listed community and online resources for dating aggression, counseling services, and information on how to wipe one's browser history (Appendix G). The study took approximately 30-60 minutes to complete. Following completion of the study,

participants were awarded compensation (bonus points for participants registered for the participant pool and enrolled in one or more eligible courses or entry into a draw for one of four $30 gift certificates for male participants recruited outside of the participant pool). A pilot study of the first 20 participants was conducted to ensure participants were correctly screened and the online survey and measures were functioning as expected. As the survey functioned as expected, data collection continued as planned.

Demographics. Participants were asked demographic questions such as age, gender, ethnicity, country of origin, years in Canada, education, occupation, relationship status, and previous experience with dating aggression (Appendix E).

Experiences with victims of dating aggression. To assess participants' prior experience with being asked by victims of dating aggression for help with this problem, participants were first asked if they had ever been approached for help by a victim of dating aggression, how many times they have been approached, and by how many different people (see Appendix F). They were then asked to describe in an open-ended question the details of their most recent experience of being approached by a victim, such as the gender of the victim, the nature of the aggression, what their initial reaction was, and what they did to try to help or comfort the victim. Additionally, using the same categories of helping defined by Mahlstedt and Keeny (1993; supportive, unhelpful, and directive), participants were given a checklist listing possible responses they might have given, (e.g., "I listened to the person," "I nurtured the person," "I told the person I had told them this would happen"). In addition to the 13 items used by Mahlstedt and Keeny (1993), 17 new items were included to expand on the three categories to include a number of other, more specific behaviours that individuals might use (e.g., "I gave the

person a hug," "I told the person I had always thought the relationship was a bad idea," "I encouraged the person to contact the police"). Included in these more specific behavoiurs were items that were seen by the researcher as unhelpful (e.g., "I told you so"), but phrased in a more socially acceptable manner (e.g., "I told the person I expected something like this to happen") to lessen the effect of socially desirable responding. Participants were asked to check off which of the responses they used and were then presented with the same checklist and asked to check off the response they used the most frequently. Additionally, participants rated how much they performed a particular behavior on a Likert scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*a lot*), where higher scores represented a greater number of helping behaviour used. Next, the participants were asked to rate on a Likert scale how helpful they felt they were and how satisfied the victim seemed with their response (from 1 = *not at all helpful/satisfied* to 7 = *extremely helpful/satisfied*).

Hostile attribution bias. Hostile attribution bias was assessed using the Social-Information-Processing – Attribution and Emotional Response Questionnaire (SIP-AEQ; Coccaro, Noblett, & McCLoskey, 2009). The questionnaire is comprised of eight vignettes that involve another individual, whose motives for behaving a certain way are ambiguous. Each participant was to imagine that the events described in the vignettes were happening to them. A sample vignette is, "You tell a friend something personal and ask your friend not to discuss it with anyone else. However, a couple of weeks later, you find out that a lot of people know about it." Participants are asked after each vignette to rate on a Likert scale from 0 (*not at all likely*) to 3 (*very likely*) four possible motives for the other person to have behaved that way. Each motive assesses different attributions: direct hostile attribution (e.g., "My friend wanted to expose my secret"), indirect hostile

attribution (e.g., “My friend wanted me to feel stupid for asking to keep my secret”), instrumental attribution (e.g., “My friend wanted to impress other people with their secret knowledge about me”), and benign attribution (e.g., “My friend forgot that this was an important secret for me”). As direct and indirect hostile attribution scores are similar, they combine to form a single Hostile Attribution subscale, and the other questions form the Instrumental Attribution (IA) and Benign Attribution (BA) subscales, respectively. Though all options were asked of participants, only the Hostile Attribution subscale was used as past research has shown it has the highest internal consistency (α = .87) and the other two subscales had relatively low consistency (IA: α = .53, BA: α = .65; Coccoro et al., 2009). Higher scores reflect high levels of hostile attribution bias. The scale has been shown to be correlated with measures of hostile automatic thoughts, aggression, childhood maltreatment, and negativity, and to distinguish between controls and individuals who are impulsive aggressive (Coccoro et al., 2009). In the current study, internal consistency was good (α = .86). Summed scores were used in the analysis.

Gender role attitudes. The full Gender Attitude Inventory (GAI) contains 109 items assessing 16 different subscales, such as attitudes about female superiority, traditional stereotypes, homosexuality, chivalry, and several others (Ashmore, Del Boca, & Bilder, 1995). However, only specific scales which comprise a larger factor of “stereotypes” were used in the current study to reduce the number of items, as the subscales that comprise “stereotypes” assess attitudes at the individual level (e.g., women have these traits). The subscales falling under this factor are Traditional Stereotypes (e.g., “Men are more competitive than women), Female Superiority (e.g., “On average, women are better than men”), and Women’s Rights (e.g., “Passage of legislation to further

women's rights is necessary"). Women's Rights loaded on the stereotypes factor for men only and thus was only calculated as part of the men's mean scores on these measures. The items are assessed on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 7 (*strongly disagree*). The measure has been shown to have good internal consistency for both genders (for men: α = .74-.94, for women: α = .57-.93), to be correlated with attitudes towards women, political conservatism, and opinions about social issues, and to have good test-retest reliability (Ashore et al., 1995). Higher scores represent more traditional stereotypes, both positive and negative. The measure had excellent internal consistency for the shared items (items 1-16: α = .95) and for male and female scales combined (α = .91) in the present study. As there are different items on the male and female versions of this measure, means were calculated and used in the analyses.

Attitudes toward dating aggression. The Attitudes toward Dating Violence questionnaire is a 76-item measure assessing attitudes towards dating aggression (Price, Byers, & Dating Violence Research Team, 1999). It assesses Attitudes Towards Male Dating Violence (ATMDV) and Attitudes Towards Female Dating Violence (ATFDV), with specific scales for physical (15 items for Male Dating Violence, 13 items for Female Dating Violence), sexual (12 items for ATMDV, 12 items for ATFDV), and psychological aggression (12 items for ATMDV, 12 items for ATFDV). A sample item includes; "After a couple is going steady, the guy should not force his girlfriend to have sex." The items are rated on a Likert scale from 1 (*strongly agree*) to 5 (*strongly disagree*), with higher scores denoting less acceptance of dating aggression use. All scales have good internal consistency, ranging from .75 to .87, and the measure has been shown to be related to traditional gender role attitudes, history of abuse, and dating

aggression perpetration (Price & Byers, 1999). In the current study, internal consistency was excellent for all items (α = .98), for male-perpetrator items (α = .97) and for female-perpetrator items (α = .97). To maintain similar ranges and variances with the other attitude measure, means were calculated for each participant and used in the analysis.

Control variables. Potential variables controlled for in this study were social desirability and the frequency with which an individual is approached for help by a particular victim. As attitudes about intimate partner aggression might be subject to self-favorable responding, the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale Short-Form C (MCSDS Form C; Reynolds, 1982) was used to assess social desirability. The MCSDS Form C is a brief form of the original 33-item measure (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), containing only 13 true (1) or false (0) items (5 reverse coded items), and is design to assess participants' tendencies to provide socially desirable responses. Items reflect either highly culturally desirable behaviours that are typically performed infrequently (e.g., "No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener") or culturally undesirable behaviours that are typically common (e.g., "I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way"). Higher scores indicate higher likelihood of responding in a socially desirable manner. The scale is correlated with other measures of social desirability (Reynolds, 1982) and has good internal consistency (α = .89; Fischer & Fick, 1983). Summed scores were used in the analysis and internal consistency in the current study was adequate, α = .69. An additional control variable was the number of times an individual was approached by the victim, as it is likely that individuals who are repeatedly sought by the same victims will provide different responses the more they are sought.

CHAPTER III

Results

Data Cleaning

I checked the data for completeness and unusual response patterns, and to verify that responses were in the appropriate range. All data were considered accurate. As a reminder, participants were first asked whether they had used each helping behaviour (Yes/No), and then were required to indicate to what degree they used each behaviour on a Likert scale, regardless of whether they replied *No* to the dichotomous question. However, a number of participants responded to the Yes/No options for the helping behaviours (missing 0.6-2.5%), but did not respond on the Likert scale data for the same items, and therefore, there was significant missing data for the Likert scale items (1.2-12.3%). Little's (1988) missing completely at random (MCAR) test was violated for these scale items, but not for the binary *Yes/No* options, and therefore data were multiply imputed for the scale items. Before using multiple imputation, data were inputted for the scale items for participants who answered *Yes* (to the dichotomous item), but left them blank if they answered *No*. Specifically, if they answered all or almost all of the Likert scales when they answered *Yes* to the dichotomous question, but left the Likert scale blank when they answered *No*, 1 (i.e., the lowest value of the scale range) was inputted as the Likert value (to coincide with *No*). After this modification, Little's MCAR remained significant and there was still 1.9-6.9% missing data for these items. Little's MCAR was also violated for the dependent variables, and therefore multiple imputation, an expectation-maximization procedure, was used to impute missing data points for 10 datasets, and the analyses were run with and without multiple imputation. However, as results changed when multiple imputation was used, the multiply imputed findings were

reported. I also ran analyses separately with both the binary scale data and resulting factors and with the Likert scale data and resulting factors; results for both analyses were reported.

There was one outlier detected with Mahalanobis' distance and one influential observation detected with a visual examination of a histogram of Cook's distance. Both outliers appeared to be outliers due to extreme scores on the variable reflecting the number of times participants were approached by the victim (i.e., 50 and 20, respectively). Analyses were run with and without outliers and as results differed with outliers removed, the results were reported for both sets of data. In addition, most variables were relatively normally distributed (as determined by visual inspection of histograms and skewness and kurtosis statistics). However, the number of times participants were approached was right-skewed (i.e., most participants were only approached once), and the Attitudes About Dating Aggression (AADV) measure was left-skewed (i.e., most participants reported holding nonaccepting attitudes of dating aggression). Though several transformations were attempted (i.e., square-root, natural log, log 10), none were able to resolve the skewness and therefore statistical analyses which are considered robust to violations of normality were used.

When both the Attitudes Towards Male Dating Violence (ATMDV) and Attitudes Towards Female Dating Violence (ATFDV) were included in the analyses, tolerance was low for these variables (i.e., Tolerance = .12 for both ATMDV and ATFDV). As a tolerance value less than two indicates multicollinearity, the total scale (AADV) was used to assess attitudes towards dating aggression and tolerance improved. As Box's M is sensitive to violations of normality, the variances for the dependent variables were

visually compared for similarity (i.e., one was not twice the size of another) and therefore homogeneity of variance was assumed.

Factor Analysis

To group helping behaviours from the measure designed by the researcher based on Mahlstedt and Keeny's (1993) items, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted on both the binary data items (i.e., Yes/No responses to helping items) and the Likert scale data. Though by some standards this sample might be considered too small for factor analysis, it has been suggested that appropriate sample size should be determined based on absolute value of factors loadings (Stevens, 2009), such that factors with "four or more loadings above .60… are reliable, regardless of sample size, [factors] with 10 or more low (.40) loadings are reliable as long as sample size is greater than about 150, and [factors] with only a few low loadings should not be interpreted unless sample size is at least 150" (p. 333.) These guidelines were used to determine if the resulting factors had adequate interpretability. The two sets of items resulted in different factor structures; thus both are reported. For both sets of data, factors structure improved when factors included items designed by the researcher in addition to Mahlstedt and Keeny's (1993) items, and therefore all items were used.

Binary data. Open access software R version 3.1.3 was used to factor binary items as this software was able to calculate the tetrachoric correlation matrix necessary for factoring binary data. Extraction method was expectation maximization (EM). R only has two rotation methods for Factor Analysis: Varimax, which produces an orthoganl rotation (i.e., rotation without allowing the factors to correlate), and Promax, which produces an oblique rotation (i.e., rotation allows factors to correlate). All factor

structures were run with both rotation methods to determine the most appropriate fit Scree plots showed three eigenvalues over 1. As a result, the analyses were run for three factors, which is consistent with Mahlstedt and Keeny's (1993) three factors. However, given that three factors produced generally poor pattern matrices (e.g., items loaded on multiple factors or had low loadings), two and four factors were attempted in an effort to determine the best fit. Items were removed if they did not load highly on any factor (i.e., if pattern matrix loadings were less than .30) or if they loaded on more than one factor (i.e., if pattern matrix loadings on two factors were within .10 of each other). In addition, two items (i.e., "I listened to the person" and "I told the person they should not have made his or her partner angry") were removed as the variance of these items was 0 (all participants endorsed "I listened to the person" and no participants endorsed "I told the person he or she should not have made his or her partner angry"). The software was unable to produce a tetrachoric correlation matrix with these items included. The best factor structure produced was a four-factor structure with Promax (oblique) rotation, with items 2, 5, 8, 9, 11, 22, 23, 24, and 27 removed. Factors and pattern matrix loadings are presented in Table 2, with loadings less than .10 not shown. As the loadings were generally considered high for some factors and sample size was above 150, sample size was deemed adequate for all factors according to Steven's (2009) guidelines.

Table 2

Factors Found Using Binary Data

	Factor 1 Unsurprised	Factor 2 Help-seeking	Factor 3 Helpful	Factor 4 Unhelpful
I said that I told the person this would happen.	**0.94**			
*I was shocked.	**-0.67**			
I told the person he or she should break up with his or her partner.	**0.76**			0.43
I told the person I had expected something like this to happen.	**0.92**			
I told the person I had thought the relationship was a bad idea.	**0.88**			
I told the person they should not have been in that relationship.	**0.76**			
I encouraged the person to seek professional help.		**1.04**		
I encouraged the person to talk to a counselor.		**0.99**		
I encouraged the person to talk to a professional.		**1.03**		
I encouraged the person to contact the police.		**0.52**	0.42	
I encouraged the person to get help from somewhere/someone.		**0.82**		
I helped the person make decisions.			**0.43**	
I made decisions for the person.			**0.52**	
I hugged the person.			**0.49**	
I told the person it was not his or her fault.			**0.95**	
I helped the person decide what to do.			**0.67**	
*I did not know what to say so I did not say anything.			**-0.40**	
I saw the person as a failure.				**1.01**

*I gave unhelpful advice.	**-0.72**

Note. *Reverse scored items. Factor loadings less than .4 were not reported.

The four factors were: (a) Unsurprised – where high scores indicated greater frequency of less helpful responses indicating lack of surprise (e.g., "I told the person I had expected something like this to happen."); (b) Help-seeking – where high scores indicated greater frequency of encouraging help from professional or other sources (e.g., "I encouraged the person to contact the police"); (c) Helpful – where high scores indicated greater frequency of helpful responses (e.g., "I helped the person make decisions"); and (d) Unhelpful – where high scores indicated greater frequency of unhelpful responses (e.g., "I saw the person as a failure"). The four factors had adequate to good internal reliability (i.e., Unsurprised: α =.78; Help-seeking: α =.87; Helpful: α =.59) with the exception of the final factor, Unhelpful (α = .16). Only two items loaded on the last factor "unhelpful" and both were low base rate behaviours (e.g., only 9 participants endorsed "I saw the person as a failure"), which may explain the low internal reliability of the factor. The two items which loaded on this factor also had a low and nonsignificant correlation, $r(160) = .095$, $p = .23$. However, the fourth factor was included in the analysis as these two factors consistently held together and strengthened the factor structure, and were thought to contain important information about particular participants. Specifically, the item "I saw the person as a failure" is a response that is highly negative and is strongly suggestive of victim blaming, and therefore individuals endorsing this item might be qualitatively different than those who do not. Therefore, the fourth factor was retained. To test the validity of the factors, the factors were correlated with participants' reports of how helpful they felt they were and how satisfied the victim seemed with their response. The Helpful factor was related to increased feelings of helpfulness and victim satisfaction (as reported by the helper). Factors were somewhat

correlated, as reported in Table 3, though lower than would be expected with a Promax (Oblique) rotation. In short, though there was minimal missing data from the binary items, there were a number of problems with the resulting factor structure from the binary data items. Thus both the results using the binary scale data and the Likert scale data were reported.

Table 3

Correlations among Binary Factors

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Factor 1: Unsurprised	--	.05	**.16***	-.03
Factor 2: Encouraged help-seeking		--	**.18***	.08
Factor 3: Helpful			--	-.03
Factor 4: Unhelpful				--

Note. $*p < .05$.

Likert scale data. SPSS version 19.0 was used to determine factors for the Likert Scale items using expectation maximization to extract factors. Oblimin rotation was used, as it allows a range of rotation methods from orthogonal to oblique or in between (i.e., allowing the factors to correlate somewhat; Stevens, 2009) by indicating a value of *tau* (i.e. *tau* = -4 is orthogonal, and *tau* = 1 is oblique). All factor structures were run with *tau* = 0 and -2, both of which fall between orthogonal and oblique, as the factors were expected to correlate somewhat, but not highly. As Scree plots of eigenvalues showed that the first three factors contributed the most explained variance the analyses were run for three factors, which is consistent with Mahlstedt and Keeny's (1993) three factors. To prevent over- or under-factoring, two and four factors were also attempted in an effort to determine the best fit. Items were removed if they did not load highly on any factor (i.e., if pattern matrix loadings were less than. 30) or if they loaded on more than one factor (i.e., if pattern matrix loadings on two factors were within .10 of each other). The best factor structure produced was a three-factor structure with Oblimin (*tau* = 0) rotation, with items 1, 5, 7, 14, 15, 22, and 23 removed. Pattern and structure matrices for factor loadings are presented in Tables 4 and 5 respectively, with loadings less than .2 not shown. As the loadings were generally considered high for some factors and sample size was above 150, sample size was deemed adequate for all factors according to Steven's (2009) guidelines.

Table 4

Pattern Matrix for Factors Extracted from Likert Scale Data

	Factor 1 Unhelpful	Factor 2 Help-Seeking	Factor 3 Helpful
I said that I told the person this would happen.	**.626**		
I trivialized the event.	**.493**		
I wanted to seek revenge against the person's partner.	**.573**		
I saw the person as a failure.	**.819**		
I gave unhelpful advice.	**.761**		
I made decisions for the person.	**.507**		
I told the person it did not sound like the event was a big deal.	**.931**		
I told the person I had expected something like this to happen.	**.804**		
I told the person I had thought the relationship was a bad idea.	**.542**		
I did not know what to say so I did not say anything.	**.845**		
I did not know what to do so I did not do anything.	**.826**		
I told the person they should not have been in that relationship.	**.533**		
I told the person they should not have made his or her partner angry.	**.897**		
I encouraged the person to seek professional help.		**-.856**	
I encouraged the person to talk to a counselor.		**-.931**	

I encouraged the person to talk to a professional.	**-.980**	
I encouraged the person to contact the police.	**-.558**	
I encouraged the person to get help from somewhere/someone.	**-.726**	
I nurtured the person.		**.439**
I helped the person make decisions.		**.716**
I gave helpful advice.		**.733**
I helped the person decide what to do.		**.692**
I told the person he or she should break up with his or her partner.		**.516**

Note. Factor loadings less than .4 were not reported.

Table 5

Structure Matrix for Factors Extracted from Likert Scale Data

	Factor 1 Unhelpful	Factor 2 Help-Seeking	Factor 3 Helpful
I said that I told the person this would happen.	**.666**		
I trivialized the event.	**.530**		
I wanted to seek revenge against the person's partner.	**.594**		
I saw the person as a failure.	**.814**		
I gave unhelpful advice.	**.722**		
I made decisions for the person.	**.600**		
I told the person it did not sound like the event was a big deal.	**.925**		
I told the person I had expected something like this to happen.	**.803**		
I told the person I had thought the relationship was a bad idea.	**.545**		
I did not know what to say so I did not say anything.	**.826**		
I did not know what to do so I did not do anything.	**.807**		
I told the person they should not have been in that relationship.	**.555**		
I told the person they should not have made his or her partner angry.	**.895**		
I encouraged the person to seek professional help.		**-.870**	.366
I encouraged the person to talk to a counselor.		**-.906**	.264
I encouraged the person to talk to a professional.		**-.959**	.300

I encouraged the person to contact the police.	.460	**-.634**	.263
I encouraged the person to get help from somewhere/someone.		**-.725**	.298
I nurtured the person.			**.443**
I helped the person make decisions.			**.735**
I gave helpful advice.			**.742**
I helped the person decide what to do.			**.719**
I told the person he or she should break up with his or her partner.			**.553**

Note. Factor loadings less than .4 were not reported.

The three factors were: (a) Unhelpful – where high scores indicated that participants reported engaging in less helpful responses more frequently (e.g., "I told the person I had expected something like this to happen," "I trivialized the event"); (b) Help-seeking – where high scores indicated that participants reported encouraging more help from professional or other sources (e.g., "I encouraged the person to contact the police"); and (c) Helpful – where high scores indicated that participants reported engaging in more helpful responses (e.g., "I helped the person make decisions"). The three factors had good to excellent internal reliability (i.e., Unhelpful: α =.92; Help-seeking: α =.92; Helpful: α =.76). To test the validity of the factors, the factors were correlated with participants' reports of how helpful they felt they were and how satisfied the victim seemed with their response. The Helpful factor was related to higher ratings of feeling helpful, $r(156) = .43$, $p < .001$, and higher ratings of victims seeming satisfied, $r(157) = .26$, $p = .001$. Furthermore, help-seeking was related to high ratings of victim satisfaction, $r(154) = .16$, $p = .044$. Factors were moderately and statistically significantly correlated, as reported in Table 6.

Table 6

Correlations between Likert Scale Factors

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Factor 1: Unsurprised	1.00	**.38*** **	**.26*** **
Factor 2: Encouraged help-seeking		1.00	**.39*** **
Factor 3: Helpful			1.00

Note. ***$p < .001$.

Descriptive Statistics

Means, standard deviations, and ranges for independent and dependent variables are reported in Table 7. A matrix of bivariate Pearson's correlations is presented in Table 8. The number of times an individual was approached by the victim was significantly correlated to Binary Factor 1 (Unsurprised), Binary Factor 2 (Help-seeking), Binary factor 3 (Helpful), Scale Factor 2 (Help-seeking), and thus, was used as a control variable for all quantitative analyses. In addition, social desirability and bystander training were significantly related to the helpful binary factor and were therefore used as covariates in analyses involving this factor. See Table 1 for a summary of hypotheses and their respective analyses.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics

	M	*SD*	Min	Max
Age	20.12	1.75	17	25
Times approached by victim	2.69	5.85	0.00	50
Social desirability	7.50	2.79	2.00	13.00
Gender attitudes	3.20	1.23	1.00	7.00
Attitudes about dating aggression	4.32	0.86	1.22	4.97
Hostile attribution bias	19.84	9.61	0.00	49
Binary factors				
Factor 1: Unsurprised	1.94	1.72	0.00	6.00
Factor 2: Help-seeking	2.43	1.97	0.00	5.00
Factor 3: Helpful	4.26	1.32	0.00	6.00
Factor 4: Unhelpful	0.92	0.43	0.00	2.00
Likert factors				
Factor 1: Unhelpful	2.15	1.42	0.31	6.54
Factor 2: Help-seeking	3.34	2.02	0.20	7.00
Factor 3: Helpful	4.78	1.40	0.40	7.00

Table 8

Bivariate Correlations

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Times approached	--	.03		**.30****	**.18***	**.17***	-.13	.10	**.17***	.16	.003	-.06	.14
2. Social desirability		--		.01	-.11	**-.17***	-.001	-.05	-.11	-.12	-.04	.09	-.09
3. Bystander training			--	-.07	.15	**-.18***	-.01	-.00	.14	-.10	.14	.12	-.08
4. Unsurprised binary				--	.05	**.16***	-.03	**.25****	.02	**.21****	-.11	.12	.09
5. Help seeking binary					--	**.18***	.08	**.18***	**.78****	**.22****	-.04	**.20***	.04
6. Helpful binary						--	-.03	.07	**.22****	**.56****	.07	.04	-.08
7. Unhelpful binary							--	.04	.10	**.19***	.04	-.10	.12
8. Unhelpful scale								--	**.38****	**.26****	**-.29****	.05	**.24****
9. Help seeking scale									--	**.39****	-.06	**.18***	.10
10. Helpful scale										--	.07	-.08	.02
11. AADV											--	**-.31****	**-.39****
12. Hostile attribution												--	**.20***
13. Gender attitudes													--

Note. **p* <.05. ***p* <.01. "Times Approached" = number of times an individual was approached by the victim; 2-5 = Helping Factors using Binary (Yes/No) data; 6-8 = Helping Factors using Likert Scale Data; AADV = Attitudes About Dating Violence.

Hypothesis 1: Responses to Help Seeking

Hypothesis 1a. Visual examination of means shows that participants reported providing more helpful responses than unhelpful responses, as expected for both the binary and Likert data scales (see Table 7). Therefore, on average, participants tended to report using more helpful than unhelpful responses. In addition, with respect to which response participants reported using "the most," the majority of responses were "I listened to the person" (50%), "I nurtured the person" (13.6%), "I told the person it was not his or her fault" (8.0%), and "I told the person he or she should break up with his or her partner" (5.6%), all of which could be considered helpful responses and loaded on the Helpful factors. Most other responses were endorsed by a few participants only (see Table 9).

Table 9

Percentage of Participants who Endorsed Each Helping Behaviour

	Yes (%)	No (%)	Most (%)
I listened to the person.	99.4	0	50
I nurtured the person.	90.7	8	13.6
I helped the person make decisions.	77.8	21	2.5
I encouraged the person to seek professional help.	49.4	49.4	2.5
I was angry with the person's partner.	92.0	5.6	2.5
I said that I told the person this would happen.	14.8	84.6	.6
I was shocked.	74.7	24.7	3.7
I trivialized the event.	17.3	81.5	0
I wanted to seek revenge against the person's partner.	34.4	64.8	.6
I saw the person as a failure.	5.6	93.8	0
I gave helpful advice.	95.1	3.7	1.9
I gave unhelpful advice.	13.0	85.8	0
I made decisions for the person.	19.1	79.6	0
I hugged the person.	77.2	22.2	3.1
I told the person it was not his or her fault.	89.5	9.9	8.0
I helped the person decide what to do.	74.7	24.7	.6
I told the person he or she should break up with his or her partner.	75.3	24.1	5.6
I encouraged the person to talk to a counselor.	45.7	53.7	.6
I encouraged the person to talk to a professional.	44.4	54.3	.6
I encouraged the person to contact the police.	34.0	65.4	1.9
I encouraged the person to get help from somewhere/someone.	68.5	30.9	0
I encouraged the person to talk to his or her partner.	53.7	45.1	0
I told the person that I was angry with his or her partner.	68.5	30.9	.6
I told the person it did not sound like the event was a big deal.	1.2	96.9	0

I told the person I had expected something like this to happen.	13.0	85.8	0
I told the person I had thought the relationship was a bad idea.	34.6	64.2	.6
I did not know what to say so I did not say anything.	10.5	88.9	0
I did not know what to do so I did not do anything.	13.6	85.2	0
I told the person they should not have been in that relationship.	66.7	30.9	.6
I told the person they should not have made his or her partner angry.	0	99.4	0

Hypothesis 1b. In order to test whether men and women responded differently to victims, a logistic regression was conducted, as homogeneity of variance and normality were violated and a MANOVA was therefore not appropriate. Logistic regression is more robust to violations of normality and homogeneity of variance and conducts a comparable analysis to MANOVA (Stevens, 2009). Logistic Regression uses multiple continuous variables to predict whether an event will occur using binary data. For our analyses, women were coded 0 and men 1, such that the event predicted by our continuous independent variables (i.e., the helping scales) was whether the participant would be male.

For analyses run using the binary helping factors, there were no significant differences between genders on any of the binary factors. However, for the multiply imputed data using the Likert scale factors, men provided less helpful responses than women (β = -.48, p = .023) and more unhelpful responses than women (β = .32, p = .003; pooled results are reported, see Table 10). Thus, consistent with predictions, women provided more helpful responses than men.

It is also interesting to note that it was more difficult to recruit men for this study and that though I attained the goal of 100 women by the end of the fall semester, only 34 men were recruited in the fall and it took an additional semester of data collection to obtain the final sample of 56 men reported in this study. Furthermore, of 169 individuals who responded affirmatively to the screening question in the summer semester (i.e., have you been approached by a victim of dating aggression), only 17 (10%) were male. It is therefore possible that men are approached less frequently about dating aggression issues than are women.

Table 10

Logistic Regression Results Predicting Helper Gender from Type of Help Provided for Each Dataset Used (i.e., Multiple Imputation, With and Without Outliers)

	β	S.E.	Wald	Exp(β)	95% C.I. for Exp(β)
Original Data					
Binary Factor 1: Unsurprised	0.12	0.11	1.19	1.13	(0.91, 1.40)
Binary Factor 2: Help-seeking	0.00	0.10	0.01	1.01	(0.83, 1.22)
Binary Factor 3: Helpful	-0.08	0.15	0.31	0.92	(0.68, 1.24)
Binary Factor 4: Unhelpful	-0.75	0.43	3.06	0.47	(0.20, 1.10)
Original data, outliers removed					
Binary Factor 1: Unsurprised	-0.02	0.17	0.01	0.98	(0.71, 1.36)
Binary Factor 2: Help-seeking	-0.13	0.14	0.86	0.88	(0.67, 1.15)
Binary Factor 3: Helpful	0.13	0.23	0.31	1.14	(0.72, 1.79)
Binary Factor 4: Unhelpful	-0.59	0.59	1.00	0.56	(0.18, 1.76)
Multiple Imputation					
Likert Factor 1: Unhelpful	**0.32***	0.14		1.38	(1.04, 1.81)
Likert Factor 2: Help-seeking	0.09	0.11		1.09	(0.89, 1.35)
Likert Factor 3: Helpful	**-0.48****	0.16		0.62	(0.45, 0.85)
Multiple Imputation, outliers removed					
Likert Factor 1: Unhelpful	**0.31***	0.14		1.37	(1.04, 1.81)
Likert Factor 2: Help-seeking	0.09	0.11		1.09	(0.89, 1.35)
Likert Factor 3: Helpful	**-0.48****	0.16		0.62	(0.45, 0.85)

Note. $*p < .05$. $**p < .01$. Pooled data reported for multiple imputation. Binary factors controlled for bystander training, times approached, and social desirability.

Hypothesis 1c. In order to assess whether participants responded differently to male (*n* = 18) and female victims (*n* = 136), another logistic regression was conducted, this time predicting victims' gender. Again, female victims were coded 0 and male victims 1. There were no significant findings for either the binary factors or Likert factors (see Table 11); thus the hypothesis that participants would provide more unhelpful responses to male victims was not supported.

Table 11

Logistic Regression Results Predicting Gender from Type of Help Provided for Each Dataset Used (i.e., Multiple Imputation, With and Without Outliers)

	β	S.E.	Wald	Exp(β)	95% C.I. for Exp(β)
Original Data					
Binary Factor 1: Unsurprised	-0.02	0.17	0.01	0.98	(0.71, 1.36)
Binary Factor 2: Help-seeking	-0.13	0.14	0.87	0.88	(0.67, 1.15)
Binary Factor 3: Helpful	0.13	0.23	0.31	1.14	(0.72, 1.78)
Binary Factor 4: Unhelpful	-0.59	0.59	0.99	0.56	(0.18, 1.77)
Original data, outliers removed					
Binary Factor 1: Unsurprised	-0.03	0.17	0.88	0.98	(0.70, 1.35)
Binary Factor 2: Help-seeking	-0.12	0.13	0.36	0.86	(0.68, 1.15)
Binary Factor 3: Helpful	0.18	0.23	0.43	1.20	(0.77, 1.87)
Binary Factor 4: Unhelpful	-0.59	0.58	0.31	0.56	(0.18, 1.72)
Multiple Imputation					
Likert Factor 1: Unhelpful	0.34	0.19		1.40	(0.97, 2.02)
Likert Factor 2: Help-seeking	-0.13	0.16		0.88	(0.64, 1.21)
Likert Factor 3: Helpful	-0.19	0.23		0.83	(0.53, 1.29)
Multiple Imputation, outliers removed					
Likert Factor 1: Unhelpful	0.34	0.19		1.40	(0.97, 2.02)
Likert Factor 2: Help-seeking	-0.13	0.16		0.88	(0.64, 1.21)
Likert Factor 3: Helpful	-0.19	0.23		0.83	(0.53, 1.29)

Note. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. Pooled data reported for multiple imputation. Binary factors controlled for bystander training, times approached, and social desirability

Hypothesis 2: Attributions and Attitudes

To test the hypothesis that participants' attitudes and attributions would be associated with the types of responses they provided, I conducted seven hierarchical regressions, one for each type of response on the binary factors (i.e., unsurprised, help-seeking, helpful, unhelpful) and the Likert factors (i.e., unhelpful, help-seeking, helpful), which were the dependent variables. In all analyses, I controlled for the number of times an individual was approached (i.e., this variable was entered in step one). Social desirability and bystander training were also controlled for in the regression for the Helpful binary factor as these variables were correlated with this factor. Results are reported in Table 12.

For the binary factors, increased hostile attribution bias was related to higher levels of encouraged help-seeking and higher gender role attitude scores were associated with greater use of unhelpful responses. These findings indicated that individuals were more likely to encourage victims to seek other sources of support if they tended to attribute hostile attributions to others and that individuals who gave more unhelpful responses held more traditional gender role attitudes. For the Likert factors, increased unhelpful responses were associated with less accepting attitudes of dating aggression and more traditional gender role attitudes. However, the latter was no longer significant when outliers were removed. In addition, increased help-seeking responses were associated with increased hostile attribution bias.

Table 12

Hierarchical Regression Results Predicting Type of Help Provided from Attributions and Attitudes (Unstandardized Betas and 95% Confidence Intervals) for Each Dataset Used (i.e., Original Data and Multiple Imputation, With and Without Outliers)

	Dating violence attitudes (β)	Dating violence attitudes CI	Gender role attitudes (β)	Gender role attitudes CI	Hostile attribution (β)	Hostile attribution CI
Original Data						
Binary Factor 1: Unsurprised	-0.15	(-0.49, 0.20)	-0.02	(-0.25, 0.22)	0.39	(-0.09, 0.86)
Binary Factor 2: Help-seeking	-0.01	(-0.42, 0.39)	-0.02	(-0.29, 0.25)	**0.64***	**(0.09, 1.19)**
Binary Factor 3: Helpful	0.09	(-0.17, 0.35)	-0.15	(-0.32, 0.03)	0.33	(-0.04, 0.69)
Binary Factor 4: Unhelpful	0.04	(-0.05, 0.13)	**0.07***	**(0.01, 0.13)**	-0.10	(-0.22, 0.03)
Original data, outliers removed						
Binary Factor 1: Unsurprised	-0.12	(-0.47, 0.22)	-0.02	(-0.25, 0.22)	0.37	(-0.10, 0.84)
Binary Factor 2: Help-seeking	-0.01	(-0.42, 0.40)	-0.01	(-0.29, 0.26)	**0.64***	**(0.09, 1.19)**
Binary Factor 3: Helpful	0.09	(-0.18, 0.35)	-0.14	(-0.32, 0.04)	0.33	(-0.03, 0.70)
Binary Factor 4: Unhelpful	0.03	(-0.06, .012)	**0.06***	**(0.00, 0.12)**	-0.10	(-0.22, 0.03)
Multiple Imputation						
Likert Factor 1: Unhelpful	**-0.44****	**(-0.70, -0.18)**	**0.18***	**(0.00, .036)**	-0.07	(-0.42, 0.29)
Likert Factor 2: Help-seeking	-0.11	(-0.50, 0.29)	0.09	(-0.17, 0.36)	**0.57***	**(0.02, 1.09)**
Likert Factor 3: Helpful	0.00	(-0.25, 0.26)	0.05	(-0.13, 0.22)	-0.09	(-0.44, 0.26)
Multiple Imputation, outliers removed						
Likert Factor 1: Unhelpful	**-0.44****	**(-0.70, -0.17)**	0.17	(-0.01, 0.35)	-0.07	(-0.43, 0.29)
Likert Factor 2: Help-seeking	-0.12	(-0.52, 0.28)	0.10	(-0.17, 0.36)	**0.57***	**(0.03, 1.10)**
Likert Factor 3: Helpful	0.00	(-0.25, 0.26)	0.04	(-0.13, 0.21)	-0.09	(-0.44, 0.26)

Note. *$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. Pooled data reported for multiple imputation. All analyses controlled for number of times approached and analyses using helpful binary factors controlled for social desirability and bystander training.

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

This study explored the responses provided by helpers to victims of dating aggression and how helpers' attitudes predicted what types of responses they would give. Some hypotheses were supported, which has implications for bystander training programs and the psychological well-being of victims who seek help. The Likert scale data were deemed more reliable despite a missing data problem, given the various concerns about the binary data scales. Namely, these concerns were: factor analysis on binary data has some known statistical problems and was therefore, less recommended (Starkweather, 2014); some factors had moderate or low internal reliability; the fourth factor contained only two items which were minimally correlated; and the correlations between factors were low, despite using oblique rotation. Furthermore, though the Likert scale data had significant associations where the binary did not, the reverse was not true, suggesting the Likert scale data may have been more sensitive to statistical effects. Therefore, in the following discussion, though findings from the binary scales will be discussed, the focus will be primarily on the results emerging from analyses using the Likert scale data.

Types of Responses and Gender

As was predicted and consistent with past research (e.g., Jackson, 2002), participants reported providing more helpful than unhelpful responses. Moreover, the majority of responses participants reported using "the most" were considered helpful (e.g., listening to the person, nurturing the person). Thus, it is likely that, in general, individuals are more likely to provide helpful support and comfort to victims of dating aggression. This is a promising finding as research suggests that unhelpful responses can

discourage future help-seeking and be related to poorer psychological wellbeing (e.g., Hines & Douglas, 2011). Therefore, it is encouraging that most responses provided by participants in this study were deemed mostly helpful.

However, men tended to provide more unhelpful responses and fewer helpful responses than women, as hypothesized, suggesting there are gender differences in responding to victims of dating aggression. This difference may be due in part to men's and women's differential attitudes on dating aggression, as found by Price and Byers (1999), where men tended to hold more permissive attitudes than women. It may also be that men are less capable of providing adequate emotional support (e.g., comforting, talking about emotions related to the problem); it has been suggested that men may be more likely to provide instrumental support (e.g., offering money, housing, a ride to the hospital or women's shelter, more concrete supports) when sought for help (Barbee et al., 1993; Charbot et al., 2009), a form of support which may be less helpful in these kinds of situations.

Finally, and contrary to hypotheses, there was no difference in the types of responses given to victims based on their gender. I expected that male victims might receive more unhelpful responses as individuals tend to hold more permissive attitudes toward female-perpetrated aggression (Nabors et al., 2006), but this was unsupported. This finding suggests that individuals respond in a similar manner regardless of the victim's gender, and therefore men and women tend to receive the same level of helpfulness as women in these scenarios. It may be that there was not enough power to detect significant effects, as only 18 victims were male. It should be noted that the direction of the relations were in the expected directions (i.e., more unhelpful and less

helpful responses given to male than female victims). On the other hand, it may be that individuals are similarly empathic to victims of dating aggression when approached in person, regardless of gender. It is also possible that, though previous research has shown more permissive attitudes towards female-perpetrated aggression, attitudes have become more equivalent in the years since this research was conducted.

Types of Responses and Attitudes and Attributions

As expected, attitudes and attributions predicted responses given by participants. Specifically, I found that across imputed datasets, increased hostile attribution predicted more encouragement of seeking help from other sources. It may be that individuals who score higher on hostile attribution are less empathetic to victims and therefore tend to encourage them to seek help from other sources. It is also possible that these individuals have less social competence and feel incapable of providing adequate support, thus referring the victim to other sources. Finally, it is possible that these individuals interpret the situation as more severe than do individuals without this bias, and are therefore more likely to refer victims to more formal sources of support such as police or mental health counseling. Further research in this area is necessary to determine why individuals with higher hostile attribution bias might be prone to encouraging further help-seeking and if this is common practice for these individuals or specific to dating aggression situations.

Furthermore, there is some evidence that more traditional gender role attitudes predict more unhelpful responses (seen in three of the datasets reported in Table 12). This finding is consistent with other research suggesting that attributions such as victim blaming were related to more unhelpful types of responses (West & Wandrei, 2002). However, in contrast to the victim blaming research and hypotheses, results from the

present study indicated that individuals with more condemning attitudes towards dating aggression tended to provide more unhelpful responses (seen in the two imputed datasets reported in Table 12). It is possible that individuals who hold more condemning attitudes towards dating aggression may resort more readily to responses reflecting victim blame (e.g., "I told the person they should not have been in that relationship") as they are unable to understand why someone would tolerate an aggressive partner. They may therefore be less sympathetic to individuals who find themselves in a dating aggression situation. Future research should further investigate how attitudes about dating aggression are related to responses given to identify a more specific mechanism for this relationship. I did not find an association between helpful responses and attitudes or attributions, suggesting that other variables not used in this study may be better at predicting helpful responses or that factors contributing to helpful responses are more complex and varied than those that predict unhelpful responses. West and Wandrei (2002) found that victim blaming (both general and specific) was related to helpful responses, and therefore it is also possible that specific attributions about the situation may be better at predicting helpful responses rather than general attitudes.

Limitations

Some limitations were present in the current study. First, there was a small number of male victims of dating aggression present in the sample, which may have made it more difficult to detect gender differences in help provided for victims. Though previous research has typically found similar rates of dating aggression between men and women with the exception of sexual aggression (e.g., Straus, 2008), it may be that women experience more severe aggression (Cercone, Beach, & Arias, 2005), and

therefore are more likely to seek help than men. Conversely, men may be less likely in general to seek help for dating aggression as individuals tend to have more permissive attitudes towards female-perpetrated aggression (Price & Byers, 1999) and there may be more stigma surrounding men seeking help for aggression by female perpetrators (Douglas & Hines, 2011). Further research is necessary to investigate if gender differences exist with a larger sample of male victims.

Second, there are issues of self-report bias in the current study. Though social desirability was not found to be related to many of the helping scales, it is still likely that there was socially desirable reporting. For instance, most participants would have been unlikely to admit to "giving unhelpful advice." Though there were a few participants who endorsed this and similar items, it is possible that this is an underestimate of unhelpful responses provided. Furthermore, I collected data from only the helpers in this sample and not the victims. Therefore, the items I as the researcher interpreted as more helpful or unhelpful may not have been so to the victims. Similarly, a helper may be unequipped to assess whether the advice they gave was "helpful" or not, as a victim likely would not have informed the helper if this were the case. There is also some evidence from help-seeking research that what is perceived as "helpful" is a function of the interaction between the victim and the helper (Lakey & Orehek, 2011). Thus the research presented here is only a piece of the bigger picture and further research should attempt to collect data from both the victims and their helpers.

Third, the measure used to assess types of helping responses was designed specifically for this study based on some previous research in the area (i.e., Mahlstedt & Keeny, 1993). Though the measure was associated with self-reported ratings of

helpfulness and the factors generally had good internal reliability, the measure is otherwise lacking in validity. More well-studied and well-validated measures of types of responses should be developed in the future in order to most accurately reflect the most common responses provided by emerging adults in dating aggression situations. Furthermore, this measure may not be useful for other populations as there are likely different patterns of responses that may be deemed helpful, among different age groups, ethnicities, and socio-economic backgrounds.

Finally, the findings are limited in their generalizability as participants were mostly White, heterosexual, Canadian, full-time university students between the ages of 17 and 25. It is likely that university students experiences of dating aggression, and therefore their help-seeking and help-giving experiences, differ from the experiences of those with lower social-economic status or less education. Research has shown that intimate partner aggression is more prevalent among those with low SES backgrounds (e.g., Coker, Derrick, Lumpkin, Aldrich, & Oldendick, 2000; Leone, Johnson, & Cohan, 2007) and therefore these individuals may be more likely to seek help because of the increased severity, or less likely, as it is a common experience among their peers. Furthermore, it is possible that help-giving is different when the victims are married to their partner as, for instance, leaving the partner becomes more challenging. Finally, it is likely that support-giving systems differ across cultures, including the attitudes towards gender and dating aggression, the types of responses typically provided, and the types of responses perceived as most helpful. For example, Mahlstedt and Keeny (1993) found that African American victims reported some responses as being helpful that were considered unhelpful by Caucasian victims. Therefore, future research should investigate

if gender, attitudes, and attributions predict helpfulness of responses in more ethnically diverse samples, among married and older victims, and in samples with more diverse SES backgrounds.

Future Research

As this study was one of the first to investigate real-life responses given by helpers to victims of dating aggression, the findings also lend themselves to future explorations in this area. For instance, an important question for future research would be: can changing attitudes make bystander interventions more effective and more effectively train individuals to be helpers? As the nature of this study was correlational and cannot infer the directionality of these relationships, research should investigate if permissive or traditional attitudes predispose individuals to give unhelpful responses, and then whether individuals' attitudes can be changed, leading to more helpful responses. Furthermore, would an intervention training program be more effective if attitudes are targeted? Or, are attitudes relatively rigid at this stage and interventions would therefore be more effective at targeting concrete behaviours only? As victims tend to seek help from friends and informal sources of support first, answering questions such as these can help train individuals in helping victims of dating aggression and ultimately make the help-seeking experience comfortable and supportive for the victim.

Another important step in future research is to study dyads of victims and their helpers. It is likely that helpers may perceive their responses as more or less helpful than victims perceive them, which has important implications for understanding what types of responses are more helpful, and lead to the best physical and psychological outcomes for the victims. Furthermore, it is likely that interaction variables play an important role in

determining the helpfulness of responses and it would be important to know what types of variables predict satisfactory help-seeking experiences so that these variables can be implemented in training lay people and clinicians in best helping victims. As research has shown that responses to help-seeking can predict well-being and future help-seeking (e.g., Hines & Douglas, 2011), it is important to maximize the effect of victims' help-seeking attempts.

Finally, it is also important to investigate the gender differences found in this study, where men provided less helpful and more unhelpful responses than women. This finding again has implications for victim help-seeking as responses from men could potentially be more damaging than those from women. It would therefore be important to investigate the reasons for this difference in order to assess if men need more, or different, training than women in order to be effective helpers, or, if they are approached less frequently than women and are therefore less familiar with how to best handle the situation. As there are gender differences in responding, men may benefit from bystander training differently than women and therefore it would be interesting to investigate outcomes for men and women after undergoing training. In short, future research should focus on how to best develop and modify bystander training to provide the most helpful responses to victims.

Conclusions

This study was among the first to investigate emerging adults' responses to real life experiences with victims of dating aggression. The findings suggest that though more helpful than unhelpful responses were provided in general, men, individuals with more traditional gender role attitudes, and individuals with more permissive attitudes towards

dating aggression are more likely to give unhelpful responses. These associations can help to inform the development and modification of training interventions for lay people, clinicians, police, and others who work with victims. By developing better and more effective training programs, we can better help and support victims of dating aggression, in turn reducing adverse effects of negative help-seeking experiences.

References

Amar, A. F., & Gennaro, S. (2005). Dating violence in college women: Physical injury, healthcare usage, and mental health symptoms. *Nursing Research, 54*(4), 235-242. doi: 10.1097/00006199-200507000-00005

Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist, 55,* 469-480. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469

Archer, J., & Graham-Kevan, N. (2003). Do beliefs about aggression predict physical aggression to partners? *Aggressive Behavior, 29,* 41–54. doi:10.1002/ab.10029

Ashley, O. S., & Foshee, V. A. (2005). Adolescent help-seeking for dating violence: Prevalence sociodemographic correlates, and sources of help. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 36,* 25-31. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2003.12.014

Ashmore, R. D., Del Boca, F. K., & Bilder, S. M. (1995). Construction and validation of the Gender Attitude Inventory, a structured inventory to assess multiple dimensions of gender attitudes. *Sex Roles, 32,* 753-785. doi:10.1007/BF01560188

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Walsh, W. A., Cohn, E. S., & Ward, S. (2010). Friends of survivors: The community impact of unwanted sexual experiences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25,* 242-256. doi:10.1177/0886260509334407

Barbee, A. P., Cunningham, M. R., Winstead, B. A., Derlega, V. J., Gulley, M. R., Takeelov, P. A., & Druen, P. B. (1993). Effects of gender role expectation on the social support process. *Journal of Social Issues, 49*(3), 175-190.

Beeble, M. L., Post, L. A., Bybee, D., & Sullivan, C. M. (2008). Factors related to willingness to help survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of*

Interpersonal Violence, 23, 1713-1729. doi:10.1177/0886260508314333

Black, B. M., Tolman, R. M., Callahan, M., Saunders, D. G., & Weisz, A. N. (2008). When will adolescents' tell someone about dating violence victimization? *Violence Against Women, 14,* 741-758. doi:10.1177/1077801208320248

Black, B. M., & Weisz, A. N. (2003). Dating violence: Help-seeking behaviors of African American middle schoolers. *Violence Against Women, 9,* 187-206. doi:10.1177/1077801202239005

Boldero, J., & Fallon, B. (1995). Adolescent help-seeking: What do they get help for and from whom? *Journal of Adolescence, 18,* 193-209. doi:10.1006/jado.1995.1013

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

Bonini Campos, J. A. D., Zucoloto, M. L., Aampaio Bonafé, F. S., Jordani, P. C., & Maroco, J. (2011). Reliability and validity of self-reported burnout in college students: A cross randomized comparison of paper-and-pencil vs. online administration. *Computers in Human Behaviour, 27,* 1875-1883. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.04.011

Broadhurst, K. (2003). Engaging parents and carers with family support services: What can be learned from research on help-seeking? *Child and Family Social Work, 8,* 341-350. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2206.2003.00289.x

Brown, A., Cosgrave, E., Killacky, E., Purcell, R., Buckby, J., & Yung, A. R. (2009). The longitudinal association of adolescent dating violence with psychiatric disorders and functioning. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24,* 1964-1979. doi:10.1177/0886260508327700

Bryant, S. A., & Spencer, G. A. (2003). University students' attitudes about attributing blame in domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 18,* 369–376. doi:10.1023/A:1026205817132

Byers, E. S., & Eno, R. J. (1991). Predicting men's sexual coercion and abuse from attitudes, dating history, and sexual response. *Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 4,* 55-70.

Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. M. (2002). The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence in college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17,* 630-646. doi:10.1177/0886260502017006003

Cercone, J. J., Beach, S. R. H., & Arias, I. (2005). Gender symmetry in dating intimate partner violence: Does similar behaviour imply similar constructs? *Violence and Victims, 20,* 207-218. Retrived from http://ezproxy.uwindsor.ca/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/208531184?accountid=14789

Chabot, H. F., Tracy, T. L., Manning, C. A., & Poisson, C. A. (2009). Sex, attribution, and severity influence intervention decisions of informal helpers of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24,* 1696-1713. doi:10.1177/0886260509331514

Charkow, W. B., & Nelson, E. S. (2000). Relationship dependency, dating violence and scripts of female college students. *Journal of College Counseling, 3,* 17-28. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2000.tb00160.x

Clements, C., Ogle, R., & Sabourin, C. (2005). Perceived control and emotional status in abusive college student relationships: An exploration of gender differences.

Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 20, 1058-1077. doi:10.1177/0886260505277939.

Coccaro, E. F., Noblett, K. L., & McCloskey, M. S. (2009). Attributional and emotional responses to socially ambiguous cue: Validation of a new assessment of social/emotional information processing in healthy adults and impulsive aggressive patients. *Journal of Psychiatric Research, 43,* 915-925. doi:10.1016/j.jpsychires.2009.01.012

Coker, A. L., Derrick, C., Lumpkin, J., Aldick, T. E., & Oldendick, R. (2000). Help-seeking for intimate partner violence and forced sex in South Carolina. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 19,* 316-320. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(00)00239-7

Colarossi, L. G., & Eccles, J. S. (2003). Differential effects of support providers on adolescents' mental health. *Social Work Research, 27,* 19-30. doi:10.1093/swr/27.1.19

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*(4), 349-354. doi:10.1037/h0047358

Dardis, C. M., Edwards, K. M., Kelley, E. L., & Gidycz, C. A. (2013). Dating violence perpetration: The predictive roles of maternally versus paternally perpetrated childhood abuse and subsequent dating violence attitudes and behaviours. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma, 22,* 6-25. doi:10.1080/10926771.2013.743948

Dekeseredy, W. S., & Kelly, K. (1995). Sexual abuse in Canadian university and college dating relationships: The contribution of male peer support. *Journal of Family Violence, 10,* 41- 53. doi:10.1007/BF02110536

Dodge, K. A., & Crick, N. R. (1990). Social information-processing bases of aggressive behavior in children. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 16,* 8-22. doi:10.1177/0146167290161002

Dolnicar, A., Laesser, C., & Matus, K. (2009). Online versus paper: Format effects in tourism surveys. *Journal of Travel Research, 47,* 295-316. doi: 10.1177/0047287508326506

Douglas, E. M., & Hines, D. A. (2011). The helpseeking experiences of men who sustain intimate partner violence: An overlooked population and implications for practice. *Journal of Family Violence, 26,* 473-485. doi:10.1007/s10896-011-9382-4

Fanslow, J. L., & Robinson, E. M. (2010). Help-seeking behaviors and reasons for help seeking reported by a representative sample of women victims for intimate partner violence in New Zealand. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25,* 929-951. doi:10.1177/0886260509336963

Fischer, D. G., & Fick, C. (1993). Measuring social desirability: Short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*(2), 417-424. doi:10.1177/0013164493053002011

Fite, J. E., Cates, J. E., Hotzworth-Munroe, A., Dodge, K. A., & Nay, S. Y. (2008). Social information processing mediates the intergenerational transmission of aggressiveness in romantic relationships. *Journal of Family Violence, 22,* 367-376. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.367

Foo, L., & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence, 10,* 351-377. doi:10.1007/BF02110711

Fortin, I., Guay, S., Lavoie, V., Boisvert, J-M., & Beaudry, M. (2012). Intimate partner violence and psychological distress among young couples: Analysis of the moderating effect of social support. *Journal of Family Violence, 27,* 63-73. doi:10.1007/s10896-011-9402-4

Galea, S., & Tracy, M. (2007). Participating rates in epidemiologic studies. *Annals of Epidemiology, 17,* 643-654. doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2007.03.013

Goldsmith, H., Jackson, D., & Hough, R. (1988). Process model of seeking mental health services: Proposed framework for organizing the research literature on helpseeking. In H. Goldsmith, E. Lin, R. Bell, & D. Jackson (Eds.), *Needs assessment: Its future* (pp. 49-64). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Gross, A. E., & McMullen, P. A. (1983) Models of the helpseeking process. In B. M. DePaulo, A. Nadler, & J. D. Fisher, *New directions in help-seeking, Vol. 2* (pp. 47–70). London, UK: Academic Press Inc.

Harned, M. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims, 16*(3), 269-285. Retrieved from http://www.ingentaconnect.com.ezproxy.uwindsor.ca/content/springer/vav/2001/00000016/00000003/art00003?token=005b1c0d052b861ed6e26e58654624316342357467217a3f2524455e4e26636a6b7c253033297656e66a178cfe8

Harned, M. S. (2005). Understanding women's labeling of unwanted sexual experiences with dating partners. *Violence Against Women, 11,* 374-413. doi:10.1177/1077801204272240

Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2011). Symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder in men who sustain intimate partner violence: A study of helpseeking and community samples. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 12,* 112-127. doi:10.1037/a0022983

Jackson, S. (2002). Abuse in dating relationships: Young people's accounts of disclosure, non-disclosure, help-seeking and prevention education. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 31,* 79-86. Retrieved from http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.uwindsor.ca/ps/i.do?action=interpret&ty=as&v=2.1&lm=&u=wind05901&it=search&s=RELEVANCE&p=AONE&qt=SP%7E79%7E%7EIU%7E2%7E%7ESN%7E0112-109X%7E%7EVO%7E31&sw=w&authCount=1

Josephson, W. L., & Proulx, J. B. (2008). Violence in young adolescents' relationship: A path model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23,* 189-208. doi:10.1177/0886260507309340

Koval, J. E. (1989). Violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Pediatric Health Care, 3,* 298-304.

Lakey, B., & Orehek, E. (2011). Relational regulation theory: A new approach to explain the link between perceived social support and mental health. *Psychological Review, 118,* 482-495. doi:10.1037/a0023477

Latta, R. E., & Goodman, L. A. (2011). Intervening in partner violence against women: A

grounded theory exploration of informal network members' experiences. *The Counseling Psychologist, 39,* 973-1023. doi:10.1177/0011000011398504

Leone, J. M., Johnson, M. P., & Cohan, C. L. (2007). Victim help seeking: Differences between intimate terrorism and situational couple violence. *Family Relations, 56,* 427-439. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3729.2007.00471.x

Liang, B., Goodman, L., Tummala-Narra, P., & Weintraub, S. (2005). A theoretical framework for understanding help-seeking processes among survivors of intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 36,* 71-84. doi:10.1007/s10464-005-6233-6

Little, R. J. A. (1988). A test of missing completely at random for multivariate data with missing values. *Journal of American Statistical Association, 83,* 1198-1202. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2290157

Love, S. R., & Richards, T. N. (2013). An exploratory investigation of adolescent intimate partner violence among African American youth: A gendered analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28,* 3342-3366. doi:10.1177/0886260513496898

Mahlstedt, D., & Kenny, L. (1993). Female survivors of dating violence and their social networks. *Feminism and Psychology, 3,* 319-333. doi:10.1177/0959353593033003

Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. *Family Relations, 30,* 97-102. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/584242

Martin, C. E., Houston, A. M., Mmari, K. N., & Decker, M. R. (2012). Urban teens and young adults describe drama, disrespect, dating violence and help-seeking

preferences. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 16,* 957-966. doi:10.1007/s10995-011-0819-4

Mitchell, R. E., & Hodson, C. A. (1983). Coping with domestic violence: Social support and psychological health among battered women. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 11,* 629-653. doi:10.1007/BF00896600

Murray, C. E., & Kardatzke, K. N. (2007). Dating violence among college students: Key issue for college counselors. *Journal of College Counseling, 10,* 79-89. doi:10.1002/j.2161-1882.2007.tb00008.x

Nabors, E. L., Dietz, T. L., & Jasinski, J. L. (2006). Domestic violence beliefs and perceptions among college students. *Violence and Victims, 21,* 779-795. doi:10.1891/vv-v21i6a007

Nabors, E. L., & Jasinski, J. L. (2009). Intimate partner violence perpetration among college students: The role of gender role and gendered violence attitudes. *Feminist Criminology, 4,* 57-82. doi:10.1177/1557085108325235

Neufeld, J., McNamara, J. R., & Ertl, M. (1999). Incidence and prevalence of dating partner abuse and its relationship to dating practices. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14,* 125-137. doi:10.1177/088626099014002002

Nicholson, M. E., Maney, D. W., Blair, K., Wamboldt, P. M., Mahoney, B. S., & Yuan, J. (1998). Trends in alcohol-related campus violence: Implications for prevention. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, *43*(3), 34-52. Retreived from http://www.jadejournal.com/.

Ocampo, B. W., Shelley, G. A., & Jaycox, L. H. (2007). Latino teens talk about help seeking and help giving in relation to dating violence. *Violence Against Women, 13,* 172-189. doi:10.1177/10778012062982

O'Leary, K. D. (1999). Developmental and affective issues in assessing and treating partner aggression. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 6,* 400-414. doi:10.1093/clipsy/6.4.400

O'Leary, D. K., Woodin, E. M., & Fritz, P. A. T. (2006) Can we prevent the hitting? Recommendations for preventing intimate partner violence between young adults. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma, 13,* 121-178. doi:10.1300/J146v13n03_06

Price, E. L., Byers, E. S., & Dating Violence Research Team (1999). The Attitudes Towards Dating Violence Scales: Development and initial validation. *Journal of Family Violence, 14,* 351- 375. doi:10.1023/A:1022830114772

Reitzel-Jaffe, D., & Wolfe, D. A. (2001). Predictors of relationship abuse among young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16,* 99-115. doi:10.1177/088626001016002001

Reynolds, W. M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38*(1), 119-125. doi:10.1002/1097-4679(198201)38:1<119::AID-JCLP2270380118>3.0.CO;2-I

Rosen, K. H., & Stith, S. M. (1993). Intervention strategies for treating women in violent dating relationships. *Family Relations, 42,* 427-433. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/585344

Srebnik, D., Cauce, A. M., & Baydar, N. (1996). Help-seeking pathways for children and adolescents. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 4,* 210-220. doi:10.1177/106342669600400402

Starkweather, J. (2014) Factor analysis with binary items: A quick review with examples. *Benchmarks RSS Matters.* Retrieved from http://www.unt.edu/rss/class/Jon/Benchmarks/BinaryFA_L_JDS_Sep2014.pdf

Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1989). Patterns of physical and sexual abuse for men and women in dating relationships: A descriptive analysis. *Journal of Family Violence, 4,* 63-76. doi:10.1007/BF00985657

Stevens, J. (2009). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences* (5th Ed). New York, NY: Routledge.

Stith, S. M., Smith, D. B., Penn, C. E., Ward, D. B., & Tritt, D. (2004). Intimate partner physical abuse perpetration and victimization risk factors: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 10,* 65-98. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2003.09.001

Straus, M. A. (2004). Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide. *Violence Against Women, 10,* 790-811. doi:10.1177/1077801204265552

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,* 283-316. doi:10.1177/019251396017003001

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Pearson Inc.

West, A., & Wandrei, M. L. (2002). Intimate partner violence: A model for predicting interventions by informal helpers. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17,* 972-986. doi:10.1177/0886260502017009004

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Participant Pool Study Description for Male Participants

Title: Emerging Adults Responses to Reports of Dating Aggression

The purpose of this study is to understand more about how young adults respond when approached by a friend about dating aggression. More specifically, we want to find out about what thoughts and feelings might be related to different types of responses. If you agree to participate, you will participate in a small group discussion on social interactions and fill out a brief questionnaire.

Eligibility Requirements: To participate in this study, you must be a male university student who is between the ages of 17 and 25 years who has been approached by a friend about a dating aggression problem (such as being insulted, pushed, and/or hit by a romantic partner).

Duration: 60 minutes

Points: 1

Testing Dates: This study is conducted online and must be completed within a week after signing up for the study.

Research Contact Information:

Jill Glasgow, Master's student, Child Clinical Psychology, glasgowj@uwindsor.ca

Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz, supervisor, pfritz@uwindsor.ca

Participant Pool Study Description for Female Participants

Title: Emerging Adults Responses to Reports of Dating Aggression

The purpose of this study is to understand more about how young adults respond when approached by a friend about dating aggression. More specifically, we want to find out about what thoughts and feelings might be related to different types of responses. If you agree to participate, you will participate in a small group discussion on social interactions and fill out a brief questionnaire.

Eligibility Requirements: To participate in this study, you must be a female university student who is between the ages of 17 and 25 years who has been approached by a friend about a dating aggression problem (such as being insulted, pushed, and/or hit by a romantic partner).

Duration: 60 minutes

Points: 1

Testing Dates: This study is conducted online and must be completed within a week after signing up for the study.

Research Contact Information:

Jill Glasgow, Master's student, Child Clinical Psychology, glasgowj@uwindsor.ca

Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz, supervisor, pfritz@uwindsor.ca

Appendix B

Additional Male Participant Recruitment Flyer

Volunteers Wanted for a Research Study

Are you male and between the ages of 17 and 25? Have you ever been approached by a friend about a dating aggression problem, such as insulting, pushing, hitting?

If yes: You are eligible to participate in a research study being conducted at the University of Windsor about responses to reports of dating aggression

- **We are looking for**: men to participate in an online study conducted through the University of Windsor
- **You would be asked to**: Fill out measures asking about background information, your experience with a friend experiencing dating aggression, and your beliefs about men, women, and their interactions.
- **The study will take**: between 30-60 minutes to complete online

In appreciation of your time you will be entered into a draw for a 1 of 4 $30 Devonshire Gift Cards

Contact Jill Glasgow at E-mail: **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**

This study has been reviewed by and received ethics clearance from the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board

Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**
Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**
Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**
Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**
Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**
Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**
Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**
Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**
Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**
Research Study **glasgowj@uwindsor.ca**

Appendix C

Email Message for Participants from Pool

Dear Research Participant,

We *sincerely* thank you for participating in our study on responses to dating aggression, and for contributing to scientific advancements being made at the University of Windsor.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete the online survey by [ENTER DATE], or as close to this data as possible. The survey can be accessed by clicking on the following URL link or by copying and pasting the URL into your Internet browser: [INSERT HYPERLINK].

After reading the online consent form and agreeing to participate in the study, you will be prompted to enter the study "ID given to you by the researcher."

YOUR STUDY NUMBER IS:

Please enter this number—and only this number—into the space next to, "Please type in the ID given to you by the researcher." Then, click *next*, and proceed to answer the remainder of the survey questions.

We ask that you answer all questions as honestly and as accurately as possible, without the assistance of others, in a safe and secure location. Please **DO NOT** type your name, student ID number, or any other identifying information in the survey. If you are unsure about an item, please make your best guess.

When you are finished, you can email Jill Glasgow, glasgowj@uwindsor.ca, the Primary Investigator, to let her know that you have completed the online survey. Participants will receive 1 bonus point for 60 minutes of participant towards the psychology participant pool, if registered in the pool and enrolled in on or more eligible courses. Once we verify that you have completed the online survey, we will award your bonus point.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us. We would be more than happy to assist you. You can contact the Primary Investigator, Jill Glasgow at glasgowj@uwindsor.ca, or her faculty supervisor, Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz at pfritz@uwindsor.ca, (519) 253-3000 ext. 3707.

Thank you again for your time and participation in scientific research. Your contribution to our understanding of emerging adults' responses to dating aggression is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jill Glasgow
MA Candidate, Child Clinical Psychology
University of Windsor

Email Message for Participants from outside of Pool

Dear Research Participant,

We *sincerely* thank you for participating in our study on responses to dating aggression, and for contributing to scientific advancements being made at the University of Windsor.

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete the online survey by [ENTER DATE], or as close to this data as possible. The survey can be accessed by clicking on the following URL link or by copying and pasting the URL into your Internet browser: [INSERT HYPERLINK].

After reading the online consent form and agreeing to participate in the study, you will be prompted to enter the study "ID given to you by the researcher."

YOUR STUDY NUMBER IS:

Please enter this number—and only this number—into the space next to, "Please type in the ID given to you by the researcher." Then, click *next*, and proceed to answer the remainder of the survey questions.

We ask that you answer all questions as honestly and as accurately as possible, without the assistance of others, in a safe and secure location. Please **DO NOT** type your name, student ID number, or any other identifying information in the survey. If you are unsure about an item, please make your best guess.

When you are finished, you can email Jill Glasgow, glasgowj@uwindsor.ca, the Primary Investigator, to let her know that you have completed the online survey. Participants will be entered into a draw for a chance to win one of four 30$ gift cards to the Devonshire Mall. Once we verify that you have completed the online survey, your name will be entered into the draw. Winners will be drawn at the end of data collection on Apr. 15, 2014.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us. We would be more than happy to assist you. You can contact the Primary Investigator, Jill Glasgow at glasgowj@uwindsor.ca, or the her faculty supervisor, Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz at pfritz@uwindsor.ca, (519) 253-3000 ext. 3707.

Thank you again for your time and participation in scientific research. Your contribution to our understanding of emerging adults' responses to dating aggression is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Jill Glasgow
MA Candidate, Child Clinical Psychology
University of Windsor

Appendix D

Appendix M1: CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Participant Pool Sample

Title of Study: Emerging Adults' Responses to Reports of Dating Aggression

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Jill Glasgow under the supervision of Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz from the Department of Psychology, University of Windsor. If you have any questions or concerns about this research please feel free to contact Jill Glasgow at glasgowj@uwindsor.ca or Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz, through email (pfritz@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone (519-253-3000, ext. 3707). The results from this study will form the basis of a Master's thesis research project, which is supported by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada and an Ontario Graduate Scholarship.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to understand more about how young adults respond when approached by a friend about dating aggression. More specifically, we want to find out about the thoughts and feelings that might be related to different types of responses.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you complete an online questionnaire on FluidSurveys asking about some background information, your experiences with dating aggression, your experiences being approached by someone reporting dating aggression, and beliefs about men, women, and their interactions.

Participation should take no more than 60 minutes and you will be compensated with 1 bonus point from the participant pool that you can apply to an eligible psychology course in which you are enrolled. You will not be contacted for follow-up sessions or subsequent related studies as this study only requires one session.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

This study does not have any major risks except that you may have some negative feelings (e.g., anxiety, sadness, embarrassment, anger) in response to some of the things that you will be asked to think about and share. In addition, the subject matter may cause some

distress or you may feel uncomfortable talking about a friend who is experiencing dating aggression. However, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer, and you can stop participating in this study at any time without penalty. We will also not be asking for identifying information about your friend to preserve their anonymity. Should you experience any form of distress after being in this study, please either contact someone from the list of community resource that will be given to you or contact Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz (pfritz@uwindsor.ca or 519-253-3000 ext. 3707). Additional resources and sources of help in the community will be provided to all people taking part in this study. Please contact any of these sources if you would like to talk more about any of your experiences.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

Information obtained from this study will add to our understanding of young adults' experiences with friends who report dating aggression. Such information can be used to help raise awareness and to develop prevention and treatment programs aimed at helping individuals cope with situations and provide the most helpful responses possible. In addition, some people report that they learn something about themselves in the process of taking part in research. Your participation will help us learn more about the types of responses young adults have when sought for help for dating aggression problems and why they respond the way they do. We want to learn more about how young adults feel about these experiences so that we can better understand their point of view and help young adults who may be in this situation in the future.

COMPENSATION

Participants who complete the study will receive a 1 bonus points for 60 minutes of participation towards the psychology participant pool, if registered in the pool and enrolled in one or more eligible courses. Though no penalty will be given, compensation will be withheld if the participants complete the study in less than 10 minutes or do not complete the study through to the end.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. All of the information that you reveal on the online questionnaire will be kept private and will only be accessed by researchers directly involved with the study. The information collected will be stored in an electronic database on a secure server which is password-protected. When downloaded, the data will be kept on an encrypted USB and on a secure computer in a locked office. Your name and email will be required for compensation but it will be deleted once the bonus marks have been assigned and semester grades have been submitted. The information from this study may be published at a later date but only group information, and not personally-identifying information, will be discussed. In accordance with the guidelines of the American Psychological Association, your data will be kept for five years

following the last publication of the data. If the data are not used for subsequent research or will not be published, the data will be destroyed.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without penalty by clicking the "Discard responses and exit" button below and your responses will be immediately deleted. However, if you choose to withdraw before completing the study to the end, you will not receive compensation as we will not have enough information to identify you and award points. You may choose not to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if you do not engage with the study in a meaningful manner. More specifically, if you complete the study in less than 10 minutes, your data will not be considered viable and you will not receive compensation. If you wish to withdraw your data after completing the study, you can email the researchers within a week after your completion, your data will be deleted, and you will still be eligible for compensation.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

A summary of research findings will be available to you upon completion of the project on the Research Ethics Board website, http://www1.uwindsor.ca/reb/study-results.

Date when results are available: September 2015.

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

The data from this study may be used in future research.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Research Ethics Coordinator,
University of Windsor
Windsor, ON
N9B 3P4
Telephone: 519-253-3000 ext. 3948
Email: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH SUBJECT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I understand the information provided for the study Emerging Adults' Responses to Dating Aggression as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. By clicking "I agree" I know that I am consenting to participating in this study.

You may print this page for your records.

- ☐ I agree
- ☐ I do not agree

Appendix M2: CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH
Non-Participant Pool Sample

Title of Study: Emerging Adults' Responses to Reports of Dating Aggression

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Jill Glasgow under the supervision of Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz from the Department of Psychology, University of Windsor. If you have any questions or concerns about this research please feel free to contact Jill Glasgow at glasgowj@uwindsor.ca or Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz, through email (pfritz@uwindsor.ca) or by telephone (519-253-3000, ext. 3707). The results from this study will form the basis of a Master's thesis research project, which is supported by the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada and an Ontario Graduate Scholarship.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to understand more about how young adults respond when approached by a friend about dating aggression. More specifically, we want to find out about the thoughts and feelings that might be related to different types of responses.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you complete an online questionnaire on FluidSurveys asking about some background information, your experiences with dating aggression, your experiences being approached by someone reporting dating aggression, and beliefs about men, women, and their interactions.

Participation should take no more than 60 minutes and you will be compensated with one entry into a draw for four 30$ gift certificates to Devonshire Mall (drawn on April 15, 2015). You will not be contacted for follow-up sessions or subsequent related studies as this study only requires one session.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

This study does not have any major risks except that you may have some negative feelings (e.g., anxiety, sadness, embarrassment, anger) in response to some of the things that you will be asked to think about and share. In addition, the subject matter may cause some distress or you may feel uncomfortable talking about a friend who is experiencing dating aggression. However, you do not have to answer any questions that you do not want to answer, and you can stop participating in this study at any time without penalty. We will also not be asking for identifying information about your friend to preserve their anonymity. Should you experience any form of distress after being in this study, please either contact someone from the list of community resource that will be given to you or contact Dr. Patti Timmons Fritz (pfritz@uwindsor.ca or 519-253-3000 ext. 3707). Additional resources and sources of help in the community will be provided to all people

taking part in this study. Please contact any of these sources if you would like to talk more about any of your experiences.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO PARTICIPANTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

Information obtained from this study will add to our understanding of young adults' experiences with friends who report dating aggression. Such information can be used to help raise awareness and to develop prevention and treatment programs aimed at helping individuals cope with situations and provide the most helpful responses possible. In addition, some people report that they learn something about themselves in the process of taking part in research. Your participation will help us learn more about the types of responses young adults have when sought for help for dating aggression problems and why they respond the way they do. We want to learn more about how young adults feel about these experiences so that we can better understand their point of view and help young adults who may be in this situation in the future.

COMPENSATION

Participants who complete the study will receive one entry into a draw for four 30$ gift certificates to Devonshire Mall. The draw will take place once all data have been collected (expected date: April 15, 2015). Though no penalty will be given, compensation will be withheld if the participants complete the study in less than 10 minutes or do not complete the study through to the end.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission. All of the information that you reveal on the online questionnaire will be kept private and will only be accessed by researchers directly involved with the study. The information collected will be stored in an electronic database on a secure server which is password-protected. When downloaded, the data will be kept on an encrypted USB and on a secure computer in a locked office. Your name and email will be required for compensation but it will be deleted once the bonus marks have been assigned and semester grades have been submitted. The information from this study may be published at a later date but only group information, and not personally-identifying information, will be discussed. In accordance with the guidelines of the American Psychological Association, your data will be kept for five years following the last publication of the data. If the data are not used for subsequent research or will not be published, the data will be destroyed.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without penalty by clicking the "Discard responses and exit" button below and your responses will be immediately deleted. However, if you choose to withdraw before completing the study to the end, you will not receive compensation as we

will not have enough information to identify you. You may choose not to answer any questions you do not want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if you do not engage with the study in a meaningful manner. More specifically, if you complete the study in less than 10 minutes, your data will not be considered viable and you will not receive compensation. If you wish to withdraw your data after completing the study, you can email the researchers within a week after your completion, your data will be deleted, and you will still be eligible for compensation.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

A summary of research findings will be available to you upon completion of the project on the Research Ethics Board website, http://www1.uwindsor.ca/reb/study-results.

Date when results are available: September 2015.

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

The data from this study may be used in future research.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research participant, contact:

Research Ethics Coordinator,
University of Windsor
Windsor, ON
N9B 3P4
Telephone: 519-253-3000 ext. 3948
Email: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH SUBJECT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I understand the information provided for the study Emerging Adults' Responses to Dating Aggression as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. By clicking "I agree" I know that I am consenting to participating in this study.

You may print this page for your records.

- ☐ I agree
- ☐ I do not agree

Appendix E

Demographic Characteristics

Please provide the study ID assigned to you by the researcher.

_____

When is your birthday? Please give the month and year (example, April 1990).

_____.

How old are you?

_____

With which gender do you most identify?

- ☐ Female
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Other: (Please specify): _____

What sexual orientation do you most identify with (e.g., Heterosexual, homosexual, etc.)?

_____

What year are you in?

- ☐ First year
- ☐ Second year
- ☐ Third year
- ☐ Fourth year
- ☐ Fifth year
- ☐ Other: _____

Which race or ethnicity do you identify with the most?

- ☐ White
- ☐ Chinese
- ☐ South Asian (e.g., East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, etc.)
- ☐ Black
- ☐ Filipino
- ☐ Latin American
- ☐ Southeast Asian (e.g., Cambodian, Indonesian, Laotian, Vietnamese, etc.)
- ☐ Arab

- ☐ West Asian (e.g., Afghan, Iranian, etc.)
- ☐ Japanese
- ☐ Korean
- ☐ Aboriginal
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

What is your religious preference?

- ☐ Roman Catholic
- ☐ Anglican
- ☐ Jewish
- ☐ Protestant (e.g., Methodist, Presbyterian, Lutheran, etc.)
- ☐ Muslim
- ☐ Buddhist
- ☐ Hindu
- ☐ Sikh
- ☐ Agnostic
- ☐ None
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Where did you learn about this online study?

- ☐ Social media site
- ☐ Word of mouth
- ☐ Poster
- ☐ Participant Pool Advertisement
- ☐ Face-to-face
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

Are you a:

1. Part-time student?
2. Full-time student?

In which country were you born?

- ☐ Canada
- ☐ US
- ☐ Other: _____

If not born in Canada, how long have you lived in Canada? Please answer in years and months (e.g., 2 years 3 months)

I have lived in Canada for ____ years and ____ months

Are you currently in a dating relationship?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Are your parents?

- ☐ Married
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Separated
- ☐ Widowed
- ☐ Only father is remarried
- ☐ Only mother is remarried
- ☐ Both parents are remarried
- ☐ Never Married

Where do you live right now?

- ☐ Parental Home
- ☐ In residence (alone)
- ☐ In residence (shared)
- ☐ Off-campus (alone)
- ☐ Off-campus (with significant other)
- ☐ Off-campus (with roommates)
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____

Have you ever participated in the Bystander Initiative on Campus or received training in helping victims of dating aggression? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Yes, I participated in the Bystander initiative.
- ☐ Yes, I received training in helping victims of dating aggression.
- ☐ No, I have never received any form of training.

Have you ever experienced any form of dating aggression? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes, psychological aggression (for example: threats, insults, undermining self-esteem, controlling behaviours, swearing)
- ☐ Yes, sexual aggression (for example: forced sexual acts, sexual coercion, physical violence during sex, threats when sex is refused)
- ☐ Yes, physical aggression (for example: pushing, shoving, hitting, throwing objects, slapping, kicking, biting, beating, threatening with a weapon, punching)

If yes, how many occurrences of each type of dating aggression did you experience?

Psychological

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1-2
- ☐ 3-5
- ☐ 6-10
- ☐ 11+

Sexual

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1-2
- ☐ 3-5
- ☐ 6-10
- ☐ 11+

Physical

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1-2
- ☐ 3-5
- ☐ 6-10

How many of your (past and current) romantic partners have used psychological aggression against you?

_____ partners

How many of your (past and current) romantic partners have used sexual aggression against you?

_____ partners

How many of your (past and current) romantic partners have used physical aggression against you?

_____ partners

Have you ever used any of the following in a romantic relationship? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ Psychological aggression (for example: threats, insults, undermining self-esteem, controlling behaviours, swearing)
- ☐ Sexual aggression (for example: forced sexual acts, sexual coercion, physical violence during sex, threats when sex is refused)

- ☐ Physical aggression (for example: pushing, shoving, hitting, throwing objects, slapping, kicking, biting, beating, threatening with a weapon, punching)
- ☐ No, I've never done any of these.

If yes, how many times did you do each of the behaviours listed above?

Psychological

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1-2
- ☐ 3-5
- ☐ 6-10
- ☐ 11+

I have engaged in psychological aggression toward my romantic partner(s) in _____ different (past or current) intimate relationships.

Sexual

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1-2
- ☐ 3-5
- ☐ 6-10
- ☐ 11+

I have engaged in sexual aggression toward my romantic partner(s) in _____ different (past or current) intimate relationships.

Physical

- ☐ 0
- ☐ 1-2
- ☐ 3-5
- ☐ 6-10

I have engaged in physical aggression toward my romantic partner(s) in _____ different (past or current) intimate relationships.

Appendix F

Approached by a Victim of Dating Aggression

Have you ever been approached by someone who told you they were experiencing some form of dating aggression? (Select all that apply)

- ☐ No
- ☐ Yes, psychological aggression (for example: threats, insults, undermining self-esteem, controlling behaviours, yelling, swearing)
- ☐ Yes, sexual aggression (for example: forced sexual acts, sexual coercion, physical violence during sex, threats when sex is refused)
- ☐ Yes, physical aggression (for example: pushing, shoving, hitting, throwing objects, slapping, kicking, biting, beating, threatening with a weapon, punching)

How many times have you been approached about one or more of these issues? _____

How many people have approached you about one or more of these issues? _____

The following questions pertain to the MOST RECENT time you were approached by someone who told you they were experiencing dating aggression. Please be as detailed as possible in your responses.
When did the event occurred (both month and year, if possible)
Month _____ Year _____

Were with other people when told (and if so, how many people)

- ☐ Yes _____
- ☐ No

Did you personally witness the aggressive incident you described above?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

What did the person say happened?

What was you initial response?

What did you do next?

How did you feel?

How do you think the other person felt?

What happened to the person and their relationship (e.g., broke up, stayed together, talked about it)?

What was the person's gender?

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

Were you approached by this person about a dating aggression issue more than once?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If YES, how many times did this person approach you about a dating aggression problem?

_____

Did you at the time consider the person to be your friend?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Please rate on this scale how close you felt to the person at the time that you were approached by him or her.

Not at all close						Very close
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

How close do you feel to this person now?

Not at all close						Very close
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please first indicate whether you believe you reacted to the person with the behaviour described in the statement. Indicate that you believe you did this by indicate **Y for Yes** or that you do not believe you did the behaviour described in the statement by indicating **N for No.**

Next, for each item, **even the items for which you selected No**, please rate on a scale how much you felt that you did each reaction from "not at all" to "very much".

Yes	No		Not at all						Very Much
Y	**N**	I listened to the person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I nurtured the person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I helped the person make decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I encouraged the person to seek professional help.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I was angry with the person's partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I said that I told the person this would happen.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I was shocked.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I trivialized the event.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I wanted to seek revenge against the person's partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I saw the person as a failure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I gave helpful advice.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I gave unhelpful advice.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I made decisions for the person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I hugged the person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I told the person it was not his or her fault.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I helped the person decide what to do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I told the person he or she should break up with his or her partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I encouraged the person to talk to a counselor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Y	**N**	I encouraged the person to talk to a professional.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I encouraged the person to contact the police.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I helped the person get help from somewhere/someone.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I encouraged the person to talk to his or her partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I told the person that I was angry with his or her partner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I told the person it did not sound like the event was a big deal.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I told the person that I had expected something like this to happen.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I told the person I had thought the relationship was a bad idea.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I did not know what to say so I did not say anything.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I did not know what to do so I did not do anything.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I told the person they should not have been in that relationship.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	I told the person they should not have made his or her partner angry.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Y	**N**	Other: _____	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please select from the following list which reaction you used THE MOST. (Select only one)

- ☐ I listened to the person.
- ☐ I nurtured the person.
- ☐ I helped the person make decisions.
- ☐ I encouraged the person to seek professional help.
- ☐ I was angry with the person's partner.
- ☐ I said that I told the person this would happen.
- ☐ I was shocked.
- ☐ I trivialized the event.
- ☐ I wanted to seek revenge against the person's partner.
- ☐ I saw the person as a failure.
- ☐ I gave helpful advice.
- ☐ I gave unhelpful advice.
- ☐ I made decisions for the person.
- ☐ I hugged the person.
- ☐ I told the person it was not his or her fault.
- ☐ I helped the person decide what to do.
- ☐ I told the person he or she should break up with his or her partner.
- ☐ I encouraged the person to talk to a counselor.
- ☐ I encouraged the person to talk to a professional.
- ☐ I encouraged the person to contact the police.
- ☐ I helped the person get help from somewhere/someone.
- ☐ I encouraged the person to talk to his or her partner.
- ☐ I told the person that I was angry with his or her partner.
- ☐ I told the person it did not sound like the event was a big deal.

- ☐ I told the person that I had expected something like this to happen.
- ☐ I did not know what to say so I did not say anything.
- ☐ I did not know what to do so I did not do anything.
- ☐ I told the person they should not have been in that relationship.
- ☐ I told the person they should not have made his or her partner angry.
- ☐ Other: _____

Please rate on the following scale how helpful you felt you were to this person.

Not at all helpful		Somewhat helpful				Very helpful
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please rate on the following scale how satisfied the person seemed with your response.

Not at all satisfied		Somewhat satisfied				Very satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix G

Appendix G: Letter of Explanation

Thank you for your participation and for keeping the information in this letter confidential! We are interested in understanding how young adults report responding to friends who have experienced dating aggression and what beliefs might be related to their responses. More specifically, we want to understand how young adults' attributions in social situations, attitudes about gender roles, and attitudes about dating violence might be related to the way young adults respond to victims. We hope that this research study will give us a better understanding of your experiences responding to a potential victim of dating aggression, as little research has looked at individual experiences of this kind. Your data will be kept confidential, accessible only by the researchers, and once all participants have been compensated, any identifying information will be deleted. Please contact me (glasgowj@uwindsor.ca) or my supervisor (pfritz@uwindsor.ca) if you have any questions or concerns about this study. If you wish to withdraw your data, please email the researchers within one week of completing this study. Once the study is finished, you will be able to view the results from the study on the Research Ethics Board website at http://www1.uwindsor.ca/reb/study-results. Sometimes when people have questions or problems they may not know who to talk to or where to get help. Here is a list of services in your area. If you, a friend, or a family member have questions, would like someone to talk to, or need help with a problem, one of these resources may be able to help. **To Receive Compensation:** Please follow the link at the bottom of the page.

Mental Health and Family Resources in Windsor-Essex County

<table>
<tr>
<td>Student Counselling Centre

The Student Counseling Centre at the University of Windsor provides free, confidential counseling to registered students as well as consultation and referral services for University of Windsor faculty and staff. Services are provided by Psychologists, a Clinical Therapist, a Registered Nurse, and Master's-level graduate students.

CAW Centre
Phone: 519-253 3000 ext 4616.</td>
<td>Psychological Services and Research Centre

The Psychological services provide support to students in immediate distress and as well as longer services in form of psychotherapy to enhance growth and functioning.

University of Windsor

Phone: 519-973-7012 or 519-253-3000 ext 7012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress Centre of Windsor-Essex County

Crisis Phone: (519)-256-5000

For Persons in Distress</td>
<td rowspan="2">Community Living Essex County

372 Talbot Street North
Essex, ON N8M 2W4

www.communitylivingessex.org

mainmail@communitylivingessex.org

519-776-6483, 1-800-265-5820

Supports families of children, youth, and adults with intellectual disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiatus House

Phone: 519-982-8916, 1-800-265-5142
Website: http://www.hiatushouse.com
Confidential interventions for victims of domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Mental Health Association

1400 Windsor Ave</td>
<td>Essex Community Services-Community Information Essex

Victoria Place, 35 Victoria Ave Unit 7, Essex,</td>
</tr>
</table>

www.cmha-wecb.on.ca, infor@cmha-wecb.onc.a (519) 255-7440 Mental health services for people 16 years and up	ON www.essexcs.on.ca, ecs@essexcs.on.ca 519-776-4231 Community information center providing referrals and community information about services in Essex
Lesbian Gay Bi Youth Line Tel: 1-800-268-YOUTH Help for youth who are 26 and under who live anywhere in Ontario.	**For other general information about community services and resources in communities across Ontario, dial '211' or go to www.211ontario.ca.**

To receive compensation, please answer the following: Did you sign up for this study through the Psychology Participant Pool?

- ☐ **Yes (directs to Compensation for Pool, Appendix G1)**
- ☐ **No (directs to Compensation for Draw, Appendix G2)**

VITA AUCTORIS

NAME:	Jillian Catherine Siobhan Glasgow
PLACE OF BIRTH:	Ottawa, Ontario
YEAR OF BIRTH:	1991
EDUCATION:	Kennebecasis Valley High School, Quispamsis, NB, 2009
	Acadia University, B.ScH., Wolfville, NS, 2013
	University of Windsor, M.A., Windsor, ON, 2015