THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE COLLEGE
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD FEMALE
VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC
VIOLENCE (CSAVDV)
SCALE.

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Leanne S. Wilson, B. Ed.
Denton, Texas
December, 1994
THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF THE COLLEGE
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD FEMALE
VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC
VIOLENCE (CSAVDV)
SCALE.

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Leanne S. Wilson, B. Ed.

Denton, Texas

December, 1994
Wilson, Leanne S, The development and validation of the college student attitude toward female victims of domestic violence (CSAVDV) scale. Master of Science (Health Education), December, 1994, 94pp., 8 tables, 77 titles.

The purpose of this study was to develop and validate the College Student Attitude Toward Female Victims of Domestic Violence Scale. Procedures used were a 12-day test-retest for reliability, experts assessment for face validity, and a principal component factor analysis for construct validity. Cronbach's alpha for test-retest reliability was .86.

Data was obtained from 277 students at the University of North Texas during the fall semester of 1994. Seven constructs were established after factor analysis. These include male control over female behavior, justification of partner beating, aggressive and violent female victim actions, emotional control by male abandonment, double standard favoring males, emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources, and victim provocation.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Violence between men and women who are intimately related is on the increase (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). This social phenomenon has been observed by professionals in the health field, as well as researchers in studies concerning the interaction of couples (Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980). Wodarski (1987) stated that over 2 million women are victims of severe physical violence each year. Straus, et al. (1980) reported that 30% of 2,000 American families had experienced domestic violence. A 1980 study by Coleman, Weinman, and Hsi, reported that one couple in four has experienced domestic violence in their marriage. Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics in 1988 indicated that as many as 12% of all homicides in the United States were husband-wife killings (Van Hasselt, Morrison, Bellack, and Hersen, 1988). In its Uniform Crime Report (1992), the Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics indicated that 29% of all female murder victims were killed by their husband or a boyfriend. Many experts have found incidence rates as high as 60% (Gelles, 1974; Walker, 1979). Therefore, it is becoming increasingly evident that domestic violence may actually be reaching epidemic proportions (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981).
The importance of research in the area of domestic violence is also emphasized by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1991). One of their goals for *Healthy People 2000* is "to reduce physical abuse directed at women by male partners to no more than 27 per 1,000 (Baseline: 30 per 1,000 in 1985)" (p. 233).

The incidence of violence is prevalent not only between married couples, but also among college dating relationships (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988) and persons on campus who cohabitate (Claes & Rosenthal, 1990). Makepeace (1981) reported a disturbing incidence of violence in the college dating population. Twenty-one percent of the students who participated in the study were involved in a violent relationship. Bernard and Bernard (1983) concluded that violence is as much a part of college students' relationships as it is a part of marriage.

Domestic violence has an immense impact on various facets of life. Females are physically and mentally abused, with adverse psychological, emotional, physical, and economic effects on all family members and also adverse effects on the community (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). Domestic violence can cause physical injury and divorce (O'Brien, 1971) and is frequently related to alcohol abuse (Eisenberg & Micklow, 1977); drug crimes (Gelles, 1974); child abuse (Davis, 1987; Hilberman & Munson, 1978); and homicide (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). Thus, domestic
violence contributes to the overwhelmingly high level of violence in our society.

Not only is the incidence of domestic violence increasing, there is now an increase in awareness by the general public (Gentemann, 1984). Davis (1987) noted that domestic violence can affect a diverse group of people. This diversity has been shown recently in the court cases of Lorena and John Bobbitt, the Menendez brothers, and O. J. Simpson. All of these cases have contributed to the increase in awareness of domestic violence by the general public.

Another reason for the growing awareness of domestic violence today is the influence of the women’s movement (Gentemann, 1984). This movement has challenged traditional attitudes toward gender roles and given individuals the right to choose interests and occupations based on personal ability, not gender (Larsen & Long, 1988). Not all people, particularly men, have accepted these changes readily (Bernard, Bernard, & Bernard, 1985). Traditionally, the male has been the dominant figure in society, and he is likely to use physical abuse to enforce that dominance (Straus, 1977-1978). However, the women’s movement is attempting to influence society, so that the use of violence against women can be eliminated and perpetrators of that violence will be punished (Bernard et al., 1985; Gentemann, 1984).

Although attention is focused almost exclusively on battered women, husband battering does occur (Harris & Cook,
1994; Straus et al., 1980). However, because superior strength and size give men the physical advantage (Bjorkqvist, 1994; Straus, 1977-1978), and because the numbers of battered women far outweigh the numbers of battered men (Greenblat, 1985), this study focuses exclusively on violence toward women by their intimate male partners.

With the incidence of domestic violence and its awareness growing, researchers can now focus, not only on the consequences of violence, but also on the possible causes of this social problem. Several studies have indicated that men who hold more traditional views of women are more likely to blame the woman for the abuse (Finn, 1986). Research has supported the position that liberated views can be more beneficial to men and women in intimate relationships, rather than the rigid structures of traditional gender roles (Bernard et al., 1985). Thus, attitudes toward women can have significant impact on the placement of blame and responsibility in situations of domestic violence. Attitude is not, however, a predictor of behavior.

College students' attitudes toward domestic violence are important not only for college educators, but also for health professionals (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988). Not only are these students potential victims, they are also among the perpetrators of this violence. In light of the changing
social and sexual relationships on many campuses, the potential for conflict between the genders grows. College students generally reflect new cultural trends in attitudes and behaviors of society (Finn, 1986; Hastings & Hoge, 1986). Therefore, college students’ attitudes on domestic violence can be of paramount importance.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to develop and validate the College Student Attitude Toward Female Victims of Domestic Violence (CSAVDV) Scale.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of the study was to determine the reliability and validity of the College Student Attitude Toward Female Victims of Domestic Violence (CSAVDV) Scale.

Significance of the Study

Research in domestic violence has been extensive; however, it has previously focused mainly on approval or disapproval of violence in a relationship (Saunders, 1980; Saunders, Lynch, Grayson, & Linz, 1987; Straus et al., 1980). Little research has been directed at the various dimensions of attitudes regarding partner abuse, including attitudes toward battered women--the predominant victims of domestic violence (Greenblat, 1985; Saunders et al., 1987; Straus, 1977-1978).

Attitudes toward battered women have been regarded as important; however, adequate instruments to measure those
attitudes have not been available (Saunders et al., 1987). Therefore, it is postulated that the development of a reliable and valid attitude scale on victims of domestic violence can shed light on our understanding of this serious health problem (Saunders et al., 1987).

An instrument measuring attitudes toward domestic violence can have numerous purposes. First, it should provide additional information toward understanding the origins of attitude toward the physical abuse of women. Second, the results can help in the development of educational programs and in identifying program areas for emphasis and priority (Saunders et al., 1987). The instrument can be used to evaluate the impact of violence prevention education programs. With modification and validation, using samples from the community, the instrument may be adapted to assess the attitudes of professionals who work with victims of domestic violence (Saunders & Size, 1986) and also to identify attitudes, beliefs, and biases of prospective employees who work with victims of domestic violence.

Research Questions

The proposed research instrument was designed to determine if:

1. The College Student Attitude Toward Female Victims of Domestic Violence (CSAVDV) scale is a reliable scale?

2. The CSAVDV scale is a valid scale?
Limitations

1. The subjects were drawn from a convenience sample of male and female college students. The subjects did not represent a random sample of college students, which might have limited the external validity.

2. The study was limited to students at the University of North Texas, Denton, in the fall semester of 1994.

3. The scale relied on closed items.

4. The study relied entirely on self-reported data, which may have limited the internal validity.

5. The attitude and presentation style of the distributor of the questionnaire might have affected responses of subjects.

6. The respondents might not have been honest in their responses.

7. The instrument was limited to female victims of domestic violence.

8. There were more female than male volunteers in the study.

9. Forty percent of the respondents were seniors.

10. Sixty-three percent of the respondents were single and dating.

Definition of Terms

Battered Woman--a woman who has been physically abused and/or emotionally abused by her intimate male partner (Hart, 1993).
Domestic Violence--any act of physical force carried out with the intention, or perceived intention, of causing physical pain or injury to a person with whom an intimate relationship is shared (Gelles & Straus, 1988).

Egalitarianism--belief in human equality economically, politically, and socially (Hyde, 1990).

Emotional Abuse--behavior that is sufficiently threatening to the female partner, so that she believes her capacity to work, interact in the family or society, or enjoy good physical or mental health has been or might be threatened (Hoffman, 1984).

Nontraditional--identifying with aggressive, dominant, authoritarian, and power-oriented behaviors (Finn, 1986).

Physical Abuse--for the purpose of this study, is defined using the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979). This scale is a standard measure of methods of conflict resolution, which for this study will include items L through S, as follows:

L. Threw something at the other one.
M. Pushed/grabbed/shoved the other one.
N. Slapped the other one.
O. Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist.
P. Hit (tried to hit) with something.
Q. Beat up the other one.
R. Threatened with a knife or a gun.
S. Used a knife or a gun.
Reliability--the results will be consistent in further administrations of the instrument (Rubinson & Neutens, 1987).

Sex Role--a subset of rules or expectations for behavior in the home, work place, and society (DeGregoria, 1987) that fall along a continuum from traditional to nontraditional (Tarr, 1978).

Traditional--identifying with passive, dependent, self-sacrificing behaviors (Finn, 1986).

Validity--the extent to which an instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Rubinson & Neutens, 1987).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Domestic violence is an increasing social problem that has a great impact on various facets of life (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). The literature review attempts to determine the possible influences on domestic violence, with discussions of four areas of concern: attitudes toward domestic violence; attitudes toward the roles of women in society; the influence of attitudes toward women's roles on attitudes toward victims of domestic violence; and, finally, the scales used in measuring attitudes toward domestic violence.

Attitudes Toward Domestic Violence

The issue of domestic violence evokes a wide variety of responses (Howard, 1984; Saunders et al., 1987). The blame can be directed entirely toward the victim (Burt & Estep, 1981; Miller, Smith, Ferree, & Taylor, 1976), entirely toward the perpetrator, or divided equally between the two (Saunders et al., 1987). Disinterest, animosity, or empathy may be directed at the victim, depending on the belief held about the cause of the violence and the attitude held toward the victim’s role within the relationship and in society (Burt & Estep, 1981; Saunders et al., 1987).

Generally speaking, society tends to hold negative
attitudes toward battered women (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978; Gelles, 1974; Straus, 1977-1978), the most common victims of domestic violence (Greenblat, 1985; Howard, 1984; Straus, 1977-78). It is difficult for the general population to understand or empathize with the battered woman (Hart, 1993). One reason for this is that battered women are more likely than victims of other types of abuse to continue an intimate relationship with their abuser, thus minimizing the seriousness of the crime (Rossi, Waite, & Berk, 1974; Shotland & Straw, 1976). It is also believed that women have the power to avoid the physical abuse through accommodating the partner's demands (Hart, 1993). Other reactions to female victims of domestic violence include "she provoked him," "she encouraged him," "she enjoyed the abusive treatment," and "she is responsible for his physically abusive actions" (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978; Howard, 1984; Rossi et al., 1974; Shotland & Straw, 1976). Societal norms support the perspective that the physical abuse was caused by the woman nagging, therefore, provoking the abuse (Claes & Rosenthal, 1990); thus, she deserves to be beaten (Walker, 1979).

A study by Stark and McEvoy (1970) showed that between 16% and 26% of respondents agreed that, under some circumstances, it is appropriate for a man to hit his female partner. Richardson and Campbell (1980) found that men who were described as drunk were not blamed as often for being
physically abusive, whereas the drunk woman was more likely to be blamed for the abuse received from her partner. Ewing and Aubrey (1987) surveyed the general public regarding their attitudes to commonly held myths regarding domestic violence and found that one third of the subjects believed that a battered woman is partially responsible for the physical abuse and that her staying in the relationship shows that she enjoys the physical abuse. These studies show that, in some situations, physical abuse of women is tolerated by society.

Research on understanding attitudes toward the use of physical abuse between intimate partners is lacking (Briere, Henschel, & Smiljanich, 1992; Greenblat, 1985). Greenblat (1985), in a study on family relations, attempted to determine under what circumstances physical abuse was considered appropriate. Results showed that approval of physical abuse toward women was low, but that the tolerance level was high. Therefore, the conditions under which physical abuse is met with both approval and understanding must be determined before steps can be taken in order to reduce the support enjoyed by those who inflict the abuse and the blame aimed at the victim.

College student samples have shown similar results. Under some circumstances, approval was given to the physical abuse, depending upon perception of the cause of the violence (Greenblat, 1985).
Several studies have attempted to determine the extent to which gender influences the placement of blame (Hillier & Foddy, 1993; Howard, 1984; Kristiansen & Giulietti, 1990; Muller, Caldwell, & Hunter, 1993). These studies suggested that males attribute more blame to victims than do females. Thus, gender influences approval or disapproval of physical abuse between partners (Greenblat, 1985).

Attitudes Toward The Role of Women in Society

Another issue that influences approval or disapproval of physical abuse and may have more influence than gender is attitude toward women and their role in society (Finn, 1986; Greenblat, 1985; Kristiansen & Giulietti, 1990). The history of women's inferior status both legally and socially goes back many years (Bayer, 1975; Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978; Bernard et al., 1985; Szechtman, 1985). There was no place in Roman society for single women (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978). A woman had no alternative except to marry and become a necessary, controllable, inseparable possession of the man (Szechtman, 1985). A wife was obliged to obey her husband, and he had the legal right to punish her for any reason (Szechtman, 1985). Double standards were a fact of life for women during this time (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978). For many centuries, women first became the property of their fathers (Hamilton, 1978), and then, when man and woman were united in marriage, the control and power over her were transferred to the husband (Szechtman, 1985).
The industrial revolution continued to segregate women from the world of men (Larsen & Long, 1988). The role of woman was defined as mother and housewife, and this role was not recognized as contributing to the wealth or growth of society (Kuhn & Wolpe, 1979; Larsen & Long, 1988). Men continued to accumulate capital and power, while women continued to be deprived of both (Szechtman, 1985). This view of the sex roles was well entrenched in society, and those women who rejected their role were considered maladjusted (Larsen & Long, 1988).

Several changes occurred through the decades which benefitted women significantly (Bayer, 1975). Various strides were gained during the 1920s and 1930s. However, according to Freedman (1973), three primary events in the early 1960s were the most significant. These included (a) the establishment of the President’s Commission on the Status of Women in 1961, (b) the publication and widespread impact of Betty Friedan’s The Feminine Mystique in 1963, and (c) the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sex in Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The 1970s became long-awaited times of transition both socially and economically for women (Bernard et al., 1985). The women’s movement challenged traditional attitudes toward sex roles (Larsen & Long, 1988). Many women were delighted to take up this challenge; men, however, became resistant to these changes (Bernard et al., 1985; Tomeh, 1978).
Spence and Helmreich (1972) surveyed over 1,400 college students and found that males took a significantly more traditional view of women's roles. This attitude has continued, with males being more in favor of traditional roles for women. Several studies consistently show this trend (Bernard & Bernard, 1981; Finn, 1986; Kristiansen & Giulietti, 1990; Larson & Long, 1988).

It is not surprising that women are willing to change traditional sex role attitudes at a faster rate than men and that they are much less resistant to these changes (Bayer, 1975). As the literature has shown, women have provided men with continued obedience, respect, loyalty, sexual access, and dependency at the expense of their own happiness, and men have been the dominant figures (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978). It is understandable that men would not be supportive of equality between the sexes.

Although recent advancement has been made in areas such as employment, the law, education, and other facets of society, and although greater moves toward equality are expected, the ultimate goal, and the greatest hurdle, is changing societal attitudes toward more egalitarian standards for both sexes (Bayer, 1975).

The Influence of Attitudes Toward Women's Roles on Attitude Toward Victims of Domestic Violence

Until the late 1800s, men in the United States were given the legal right to beat their wives (Dobash & Dobash,
If a man perceived that his masculinity and dominance were challenged, he had legal and social obligations to regain his control by physically abusing his wife (Smith, 1990).

Although laws supporting these actions no longer exist, such practices today are only mildly condemned, and women are all too frequently the likely victims of male violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978; Greenblat, 1985; Smith, 1990).

Attitudes toward women have a significant impact on the approval or disapproval of physical abuse in interpersonal relationships, and several studies support this. Yllo (1983) found that the rate of violence against wives was higher in states where respondents were more traditional in their attitude toward women. Yllo (1983) attributed this higher rate of domestic violence to males trying to keep women in their place through the use of violence. In a second study, Yllo (1984) found that the highest rate of wife beating occurred in couples where the husband was the more dominant figure. Yllo and Straus (1984) examined relationships among inequality, patriarchal norms, and wife beating. They concluded that, the more patriarchal the norms, the higher the level of wife beating.

A nonclinical college sample of 300 undergraduates was surveyed by Finn (1986), who reported that men were significantly more likely to hold traditional sex role attitudes than women. Also, those with traditional attitudes
were more likely to believe that men could use physical force to maintain their dominant position. Alternatively, as sex role attitudes became more egalitarian, attitudes supporting physical force correspondingly decreased.

Several studies have also examined the relationship between marital violence and sex role attitudes (Bernard & Bernard, 1984; Bernard et al., 1985; Coleman, 1980; Sonkin, 1985). The results also indicate that men who abuse their spouses tend to be more traditional and less egalitarian in their attitudes.

Instruments Used in Measuring Attitudes Toward Domestic Violence

The problem with most of the previous research is that it has been done primarily on clinical samples (Gentemann, 1984). Also, researchers have not had adequate instruments to measure specific attitudes and beliefs of physical abuse by men toward women (Marshall, 1992; Saunders et al., 1987; U.S. Department of Health, 1991). Existing measures focus mainly on the approval or disapproval of the violence (Saunders, 1986; Straus et al., 1980).

An Attitude Toward Force in Marriage Scale was developed by Finn (1986); however, reliability and validity were not established. Greenblat (1985) also researched approval of wife abuse under various situations and reported no reliability and validity data on the scale. Therefore, general attitudes on wife abuse and beliefs about victims
are largely unexplored (Saunders et al., 1987).

Saunders et al. (1987) developed an instrument called The Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating (IBWB). This scale measures attitudes and beliefs about physical abuse between married couples. However, with the large number of couples living together in the 1990s, a valid and reliable instrument assessing attitudes toward partners that are intimately related, but not necessarily married, has been much needed and long awaited. Although scales measuring attitude toward women exist, they have been designed based on concepts that were current in the 1970s (Kalin & Tilby, 1978; Parelius, 1975; Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Since then, new ideas and trends on the changing role of women have surfaced and need to be addressed in a scale. Although the relationship between attitude toward physical abuse and attitude toward women has been acknowledged by researchers, no validated scale measuring this relationship is available.

In summary, the review of literature has shown that there is a significant need for continued research in the area of attitude toward women and the relationship shown toward female victims of domestic violence. Women's inferior status both legally and socially has been apparent for many years (Bayer, 1975; Bernard et al., 1985; Dobash & Dobash, 1977-1978; Szechtman, 1985). The fact that women are progressing in terms of equality is having an impact on the attitude of the general public toward female victims of
domestic violence. The women's movement has changed the once subservient role of women in society. This change is causing conflict over gender roles, which research has shown to be a determinant of violence between couples who are intimately involved. It must be mentioned that attitude will not predict behavior consistently. However, attitude toward women and their role in society, can influence attitude toward female victims of domestic violence (Gentemann, 1984; Greenblat, 1985; Smith, 1990; Straus et al., 1980).
Chapter III

Research Methodology

Development of the Instrument

In the process of developing the CSAVDV scale, the researcher completed the following steps, as listed in Algina and Crocker (1986):

1. Identified the primary purpose(s) for which the test scores would be used.
2. Identified behaviors that represented the construct or defined the domain.
3. Prepared a set of test specifications, delineating the proportion of items that should focus on each type of behavior identified in Step 2.
4. Constructed an initial pool of items.
5. Reviewed items (and revised as necessary).
6. Held preliminary item tryouts (and revised as necessary).
7. Field tested the items on a convenience sample representative of the population for whom the test is intended.
8. Designed and conducted reliability and validity studies for the final form of the test.
9. Determined statistical properties of item scores and, where appropriate, eliminated items that did not
meet preestablished criteria.

10. Developed guidelines for administration, scoring, and interpretation of the test scores.

The steps listed above are explained in greater detail as follows:

Step 1: To identify the primary purposes for which the instrument would be used, the researcher completed a thorough literature review.

Step 2: To identify behaviors that represented the construct or defined the domain, the researcher completed the following:

A thorough and extensive literature review was done to gain insight into important concepts and behaviors that were significant and necessary. The purpose of this review was to ensure that relevant concepts and content areas were included in the design of the instrument.

A content analysis was conducted. Open ended questions were posed to subjects from the population to be tested about the content of interest. The subjects were selected from a convenience sample during class time in which the researcher was instructing. This questioning was done verbally, and a combination of focus groups and face-to-face interviews were used. The researcher held two focus group sessions. The first session was with five females, and the second was with two females and three males. During the focus group sessions, the researcher posed six questions to
the subjects; this questioning was followed by general
discussion about the issues (see Appendix C). When all the
questions had been discussed, the subjects gave the
researcher their responses in writing. These responses were
anonymous and allowed them the opportunity to emphasize
issues they had not felt comfortable discussing. The face to
face interviews involved the same questioning technique. The
researcher spoke with 5 individuals and the same format was
followed as in the focus group.

The judgement of experts was solicited. The researcher
obtained input from five individuals with extensive
experience in the fields of test development, domestic
violence, and college student health. Initially, these
experts were to provide insight into the various concepts to
be included. However, the first two experts suggested that
the pool of items should be developed, with the appropriate
concept area written adjacent to each item. This enabled the
expert to review the concepts to be included and the items
to be included. The purposes of the experts were varied.
Some reviewed content; others, test development; and others,
appropriateness of items.

Experts included were Deborah Casimo, Director of the
Battering Intervention Program at Friends of the Family of
Denton, Texas. This nonprofit organization is a shelter for
victims of domestic violence, which also provides counseling
for battered women and perpetrators and intervention
programs for couples. Linda Marshall of the Department of Psychology at the University of North Texas is an expert in the field of domestic violence. She has been involved in several studies on the topic of domestic violence and has published many articles on the subject (Marshall, 1992; Marshall & Rose, 1990). Angela Taylor and Brian Bowden of the Counseling and Testing Center at the University of North Texas, counsel college students on interpersonal problems that include the incidence of domestic violence and abuse. To provide a legal-law enforcement perspective, Nancy Estes, a chief police officer from the University of North Texas campus police, was included on the expert panel.

Step 3: In preparing a set of test specifications, the researcher combined all the information gained previously from steps 1 and 2 and produced several concept areas that were used to develop items. The five concept areas were (a) victim actions (from passive to aggressive); (b) male role in society (home, work place, and in public); (c) female role in society (home, work place, and in public); and (d) blame/responsibility/provocation; and (e) control.

Step 4: With these five concepts in mind, an initial pool of items was compiled. A Likert scale was developed to measure attitude. The Likert scale is useful because, not only does it provide information on the attitudes toward a topic, it also provides the intensity of that attitude (Larsen & Long, 1988).
At this point, the scale consisted of 44 items and was divided into two sections. The first section determines college student attitude toward female victims of domestic violence. The second section determines college student attitude toward the role of women in society. The panel of experts was then approached individually (see Appendix D) and asked to review the concept areas and the items. Their suggestions were incorporated into the scale.

Step 5: Review items - Step 5 is a two-stage process. First, the scale was reviewed informally by five college students selected from the sample to be tested. One physical education class was randomly selected from a pool of all classes offered. The instructor for the class was approached for permission. Five students were then randomly selected from the roll by using the nth name. Participation was completely voluntary (see Appendix E). In all cases the randomly selected student was present and willing to participate. The students' role was to review each item for clarity, appropriateness of words, and general understanding. Wording was changed to Items 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 31, 35, and 39. Second, once the revision of items was completed, a more formal review by the panel of experts was done on an item-by-item basis to establish face validity. The experts chosen had familiarity with the population for whom the test is intended, so content could analyzed for familiarity and appropriate grammar. Panel members were
asked to rate every test item as either acceptable or unacceptable.

The pool of 44 items was decreased to 41 (26 items in section 1 and 15 items in section 2). Changes in wording were made to 8 items (1, 3, 4, 15, 18, 19, 20, and 21) in section 1. No changes in wording were made to items in section 2 (see Appendix F). Section 3, demographics, was also reviewed, and no changes were made.

Step 6: Item tryouts were held and the scale was given to convenient subjects from the population to be tested. Each subject completed the questionnaire individually, and the researcher was available for clarification and feedback. The researcher worked one-on-one with the three females and four males selected for this process. Six of the seven subjects asked for clarification of Items 17 and 26. Therefore, after careful review, the researcher made the appropriate changes to these unclear items.

Step 7: A convenience sample of five college students volunteered to participate in the field test. This step was more formal than Step 6. It was an opportunity for the researcher to give the introductory comments, define various terms, time the length of the questionnaire, de-brief, and allocate sufficient time for the total process. This step was necessary so that instructors could be informed of the allocated time needed by the researcher if their class was selected. This was the last step before validation of the
scale; therefore this step was important.

Step 8: A 12-day interval test-retest was completed to measure the reliability of the scale. On the day of test one, 32 subjects were invited from two randomly selected physical education classes to voluntarily participate (see Appendix E). In class one, 15 of the 18 class members were willing to participate (83%). In class two, 17 of the 20 class members were willing to participate (85%). On the day of the re-test, two subjects from each class were absent. Therefore, 28 questionnaires were used for reliability analysis. The reliability coefficients of the CSAVDV scale were calculated using Cronbach's alpha and Guttman split-half. A t-test for paired samples was also completed, and each item from test 1 was correlated with each item from test 2.

In order to determine the construct validity of the CSAVDV scale, a factor analysis was conducted.

Step 9: The statistical analysis was done using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The results for the reliability and validity analysis are discussed in detail in chapter 4.

Step 10: Guidelines for administration of the scale for future research were developed, and are discussed in detail in chapter 5.

Selection of Subjects

The subjects used to generate the pool of test items
and to validate the scale were randomly selected from a convenience sample of students at the University of North Texas, Denton, during the fall semester of 1994. Students participating in required physical education classes were asked to complete the questionnaire. Because physical education is required of all students at the university, these classes are made up of a wide spectrum of the college population, thus eliminating the bias of selecting only students from one school or college or from a particular discipline.

Subjects for the test-retest and the pilot study were selected by the same process. The researcher randomly selected classes from a list of all physical education classes available on the Monday, Wednesday, and Friday schedule (MWF) and the Tuesday and Thursday schedule (TTh). This random selection was done by picking the appropriate number of classes to meet the required number of subjects. The test/re-test required 30 subjects; therefore, two classes were used. The pilot study required 210 subjects in order to adhere to the minimum of five subjects per item (Nunnally, 1978). However, 300 questionnaires were administered, allowing a ratio of 7:1; thus, 12 classes were selected from the pool. Instructors from the chosen classes were approached and in all cases instructors were willing to allow the class to participate. Of the questionnaires administered, 277 were returned, producing a usable return
rate of 92%. The researcher observed that females more than males volunteered willingly for the study.

At the time of data collection, the instructor of the class introduced the researcher, who expressed appreciation, explained the purpose, stressed anonymity, and handed out the participant sheet (see Appendix E). Those students who were unwilling to participate after reading the letter joined the instructor to continue class, while volunteers stayed with the researcher. Before the questionnaire was administered, the participants were informed of counselling services available in the area. Then definitions were explained, careful reading encouraged, honesty emphasized, appreciation given; and, of course, anonymity was assured.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF DATA ANALYSIS

The results of the data analysis consist of three sections. The first section presents descriptive data on the demographics of the subjects. The second section reports on results of the reliability of the CSAVDV scale, and the third section highlights results of the validity of the CSAVDV scale.

Demographic Data of the Pilot Study

The questionnaire was administered to a randomly selected convenience sample of 300 students at the University of North Texas, Denton, during physical education classes. With 277 questionnaires returned, the usable return rate was 92%.

Descriptive statistics and frequency analysis for demographics of the sample are shown in Table 1. The sample population for the pilot study consisted of 183 female subjects (66.1%) and 94 male subjects (33.9%). Ages ranged from 18 to 49. A majority of the subjects were between 19 and 22 years, with a mean age of 21 years and a standard deviation of 4.17. Of the subjects, 62% were single and dating; 18% were single and not dating; 9.7% were living with their partner and not married (cohabitating); 8% were married; and the remainder were either divorced or separated.
Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Respondents for Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 277</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>66.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 277</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over 50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>freshman</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 277</td>
<td>sophomore</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>junior</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>married</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 277</td>
<td>divorced</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>widowed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cohabitating</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>single/dating</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>single/ not dating</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 277</td>
<td>African</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>American</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>active</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 277</td>
<td>inactive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attendance</td>
<td>often</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the respondents, 5% were Asian; 8% were African American; 7% were Hispanic; and 79% were Caucasian.

Of the respondents, 57% believed they were active in their religion; 43% believed they were inactive. Church was frequented *always* by 17.7% of respondents, *often* by 14.1%, *sometimes* by 27.4%, *rarely* by 27.8%, and *never* by 13%.

The respondents' awareness of domestic violence has been influenced as follows: Of the respondents, 35.7% have a friend who was abused; 13% of respondents have been abused; 4% have a neighbor who was abused; and 23.8% have a family member who was abused. Education and awareness have occurred in the following ways: 68.2% in magazines; 33.6% through education in the home; 84.5% through television; 53.8% through education in the school; and, finally, 69% of the respondents felt their awareness of domestic violence occurred through movies.

**Face Validity of the Scale**

As discussed in chapter 3, five experts were invited to assess the face/logical validity of the scale. The experts were from the University of North Texas campus police, the Student Counseling and Testing Center, Friends of the Family
of Denton, and the psychology department. An item was rated as acceptable if it was considered as measuring what it was supposed to measure. Otherwise, it was rated as unacceptable. An item had to be rated acceptable by four of the five experts to be included on the questionnaire. The original pool of 44 was decreased to 41. Changes in wording were made to eight items (1, 3, 4, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21) in section 1. No changes in wording were made to items in section 2. After the establishment of face validity, the scale consisted of 41 items in total; 26 items in section 1 and 15 items in section 2 (see Appendix F).

Reliability of the Scale

A 12-day interval test-retest was completed to measure the reliability of the CSAVDV scale. On the day of test one, 32 subjects were invited from two physical education classes to participate (see Appendix E). On the day of the re-test, four of the subjects were absent. Therefore, 28 (87.5%) of the subjects questionnaires were used for the reliability analysis.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale section</th>
<th>Alpha value</th>
<th>Guttman split-half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1:</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2:</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 1 (26 items) had an alpha value of .77 and a Guttman split-half value of .77. Section 2 (15 items) had an alpha value of .56 and a Guttman split-half value of .55 (see Table 2).

A t-test for paired samples correlated each item on test 1 with each item of test 2 (test/re-test). Items were considered for deletion if the following occurred (see Table 3):

1. The correlation of the test and re-test was low.
2. The two-tailed correlational significance was greater than 0.05.
3. The two tailed nonsignificance was less than 0.05, indicating a significant difference between the mean scores of the test and re-test.

Table 3

Correlation, Two-Tailed Significance and Two-Tailed Non-Significance Between Test and Re-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation between test and re-test</th>
<th>Two-tailed significance</th>
<th>Two-tailed non-significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.477</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation between test and re-test</th>
<th>Two-tailed significance</th>
<th>Two-tailed non-significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13*</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16*</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22*</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24*</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>.890</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.826</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.735</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33*</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.806</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38*</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.496</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items were deleted to make version 2 of the CSAVDV scale.

This criteria indicated that an item was not reliable because it was answered differently from test 1 to test 2. Items that had a low correlation and a two-tailed correlational significance of greater than 0.05 were Items 4, 16, 22, 33, and 38. Items that had a two-tailed non-significance of less than 0.05 were Items 8, 13 and 24. After deletion of the selected items (4, 8, 13, 16, 22, 24,
33, and 38), the reliability coefficients increased.

Cronbach's alpha for section 1 (item total = 20) was .83; Guttman split-half was .91. In section 2 (item total = 13), Cronbach's alpha was .87, and Guttman split-half, .90 (see Table 4).

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCALE SECTION</th>
<th>ALPHA VALUE</th>
<th>GUTTMAN SPLIT-HALF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 items</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 items</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the reliability of the CSAVDV scale was established, version 2, containing a total of 33 items, (20 in section 1 and 13 in section 2) was used for the pilot study to establish construct validity (see Appendix G). For convenience, the items remained labelled with the same number to avoid confusion.

**Construct Validity of the CSAVDV Scale**

To establish construct validity of the scale, a principal component factor analysis was performed. First, a correlation matrix and a one-tailed significance of correlation matrix was completed. This matrix showed the correlation between each of the items.

A principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was applied to the final statistics. This initially
established 10 factors with eigenvalues greater than one. However, Factor 10 contained only one item (Item 5), and the eigenvalue was exactly one. The researcher eliminated this item because it was in a factor alone, the eigenvalue was one, and the correlation between the test/retest was .396. Factor analysis was computed again, this time eliminating Item 5, and nine factors with eigenvalues greater than one were established (the researcher refers to this as factor analysis 1). This accounted for 62.5% of the total variance (see Table 5).

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor number</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Male control over female behavior</td>
<td>7.662</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male justification of partner beating</td>
<td>2.468</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Aggressive and violent female victim actions</td>
<td>2.079</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emotional control by male abandonment</td>
<td>2.051</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Double standard favoring males</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources</td>
<td>1.354</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Victim provocation</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Female and male equality</td>
<td>1.133</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Passive victim action</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contained in Factor 1 (male control over female behavior) are items that reflect the freedom and control that men have in society (for example, "Men have a right to say what their partner can do," and "Females, more than males, should be criticized for having many sex partners"). This factor accounted for 23.2% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 2 (male justification of partner beating) are items that reflect justification for partner beating (for example, "A woman who is unwilling to have sex with her partner deserves to be physically abused" and "A man has a right to physically abuse his partner if she is drunk"). This factor accounted for 7.5% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 3 (aggressive and violent female victim actions) are items that reflect aggressive victim actions (for example, "If a woman has been physically abused, she has a right to shout and yell at her abuser" and "If a woman has been physically abused, she has a right to break the bones of her abuser"). This factor accounted for 6.3% of the total variance.

Factor 4 (emotional control by male abandonment) contains items that reflect abandonment (for example, "Men have the right to threaten abandonment, if they feel she hasn’t behaved suitably" and "Men have the right to abandon their partner if they feel she hasn’t behaved suitably"). This factor accounted for 6.2% of the total variance.
Factor 5 (double standard favoring males) contains items that reflect male-oriented behaviors (for example, "Swearing in public is more acceptable for males than females" and "Spitting in public is more acceptable for males than females"). This factor accounted for 4.5% of the total variance.

Factor 6 (emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources) contains items that reflect access to finances (for example, "Females should have equal access to the finances regardless of who is the main breadwinner"). This factor accounted for 4.1% of the total variance.

Factor 7 (victim provocation) contains items that reflect victim provocation (for example, "Battered women often provoke physically abusive actions from men" and "A woman who nags constantly deserves the physical abuse from her partner"). This factor accounted for 4.0% of the total variance.

Factor 8 (female and male equality) contains an item that reflects female equality ("Females should pay for half the bill when on a date"). This factor accounted for 3.4% of the total variance.

Factor 9 (passive victim action) contains items that reflect passive actions from the victim (for example, "A woman who remains passive during the physical abuse is saying she does not mind being abused" and "Avoiding
conflict should be a battered woman’s priority”). This factor accounted for 3.2% of the total variance. The factor loading for each item from the nine factors is shown in Table 6.

It was evident after factor analysis 1 that Item 23, "Men have the right to say what their partner can do," correlated with items in Factor 1. These were all in section 2, thus it seemed appropriate to move Item 23 to section 2.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item and factor number</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1 (male control over female behavior)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 28</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 29*</td>
<td>.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 30</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 31</td>
<td>.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 32*</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 35</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 36</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 41</td>
<td>.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2 (male justification of partner beating)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>.533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 15</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 18</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 19</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 20</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 21</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3 (aggressive and violent female victim actions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 9</td>
<td>.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 10</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 11</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item and factor number</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 (emotional control by male abandonment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 26</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5 (double standard favoring males)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 34*</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 40</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6 (emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 39</td>
<td>.863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7 (victim provocation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 6*</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 17</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 8 (female and male equality)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37*</td>
<td>.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 9 (passive victim action)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2*</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 3*</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Items deleted after factor analysis one, two, and three.

To further assess the construct validity of the CSAVDDV scale, the original sample size of 277 was split into two groups: one group with 100 subjects and the other with 177 subjects. Factor analysis was done to both of these groups (factor analysis 2 and 3) with the following results. Ten factors were established in factor analysis 2 (N = 100).
When a comparison to factor analysis 1 was made, seven factors were identical; Factor 1 (male control over female behavior), Factor 2 (male justification of partner beating), Factor 3 (aggressive and violent female victim actions), Factor 4 (emotional control by male abandonment), Factor 5 (double standard favoring males), Factor 6 (emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources), and Factor 7 (victim provocation) except for Item 32 "Females should have the same amount of authority as males in bringing up the children" and Item 6 "a woman who nags constantly deserves the physical abuse from her male partner." These items along with Item 2, "A woman who remains passive during the abuse is saying she does not mind being abused," Item 3, "Avoiding conflict should be a battered woman’s priority" and Item 37, "Females should pay for half the bill when on a date" were distributed to Factors 8, 9, and 10.

Factor analysis 3 (N = 177) established nine factors. These were also identical for Factors 1 through 7. The only difference was that Item 29 "males should share in household tasks eg. doing the laundry, cooking and cleaning" and Item 34 "there are jobs in which males should be hired over females", along with Item 2 "a woman who remains passive during the physical abuse is saying she does not mind being abused" were in Factor 8. Factor 9 contained Item 3 "avoiding conflict should be a battered woman’s priority,"
Item 6 "a woman who nags constantly deserves the physical abuse from her male partner" and Item 37 "females should pay for half the bill when on a date".

After completing factor analysis 1, 2, and 3 several items were eliminated because they were unstable. These were; Item 2 "a woman who remains passive during the physical abuse is saying she does not mind being abused"; Item 3 "avoiding conflict should be a battered woman’s priority"; Item 6 "a woman who nags constantly deserves the physical abuse from her partner"; Item 29 "males should share in household tasks eg doing the laundry, cooking and cleaning"; Item 32 "females should have the same amount of authority as males in bringing up the children"; Item 34 "there are jobs in which males should be hired over females" and Item 37 "females should pay for half the bill when on a date". Factor analysis 1, shows low factor loadings on these items: .464, .683, .494, .449, .530, .340 and .726, respectively. Item 37 (factor loading .726) was deleted because it was the only item in the factor, as well as being unstable across factor analysis 1, 2, and 3. The final version of the CSAVDV scale consists of 25 items, fifteen in section 1 and ten in section 2 (see Appendix H).

To compare differences in gender, a factor analysis was completed on males and females (factor analysis 4 and 5). A principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was applied to the final statistics.
Factor analysis 4 (males = 94) extracted eleven factors with eigenvalues greater than one. This accounted for 73.2% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 1 (male justification of partner beating) are Items 12, 15, 18, 19, 20, and 21. This factor accounted for 21.5% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 2 (male and female roles and expectations) are Items 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 35. This factor accounted for 8.3% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 3 (emotional control by males) are Items 14, 25, 26, and 39. This accounted for 7.8% of the variance.

Contained in Factor 4 (male control over female behavior) are Items 17, 23, 36 and 41. This factor accounted for 6.3% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 5 (violent female victim actions) are Items 9, 10 and 11. This factor accounted for 5.9% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 6 (double standard favoring males) are Items 27 and 40. This factor accounted for 5.2% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 7 (aggressive female victim actions) is Item 7. This factor accounted for 4.0% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 8 (inequality in the workplace) is Item 34. This factor accounted for 3.8% of the total variance.
variance.

Contained in Factor 9 (victim provocation) are Items 1, 2, and 6. This factor accounted for 3.6% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 10 (male and female equality) is Item 37. This factor accounted for 3.4% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 11 (passive victim action) is Item 3. This factor accounted for 3.2% of the total variance. The factor loadings for each item are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Factor Loading For Eleven Factors Extracted From Factor Analysis on Males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item and factor number</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1 (male justification of partner beating)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 15</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 18</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 19</td>
<td>.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 20</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 21</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2 (male and female roles and expectations)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 29</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 30</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 31</td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 32</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 35</td>
<td>.763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{table continues}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item and factor number</th>
<th>Factor number</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3 (emotional control by males)</td>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4 (male control over female behavior)</td>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 5 (violent female victim actions)</td>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 6 (double standard favoring males)</td>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 7 (aggressive female victim actions)</td>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>.376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 8 (inequality in the workplace)</td>
<td>Item 34</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 9 (victim provocation)</td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>.355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 10 (male and female equality)</td>
<td>Item 37</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 11 (passive victim action)</td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor analysis 5 (females = 183) extracted twelve factors with eigenvalues greater than one. This accounted for 69.1% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 1 (male justification of partner beating) are Items 15, 18, 19, 20, and 21. This factor accounted for 17% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 2 (aggressive and violent female victim actions) are Items 7, 9, 10, and 11. This factor accounted for 8.4% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 3 (double standard favoring males) are Items 27 and 40. This factor accounted for 6.7% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 4 (male control over female behavior) are Items 23, 30, 32, and 41. This factor accounted for 5.7% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 5 (emotional control by abandonment) are Items 25 and 26. This factor accounted for 5% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 6 (male and female roles and expectations) are Items 28, 31, and 35. This factor accounted for 4.9% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 7 (male and female equality) are Items 29, 34, 36, and 37. This factor accounted for 4.2% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 8 (emotional control by restricting female access to finances) are Items 14 and 39. This factor
accounted for 4% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 9 (passive victim action) are Items 2 and 3. This factor accounted for 3.5% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 10 (victim provocation) are Items 1 and 6. This factor accounted for 3.3% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 11 (nonthreatening behavior) is Item 17. This factor accounted for 3.2% of the total variance.

Contained in Factor 12 (victim blame) is Item 12. This factor accounted for 3.1% of the total variance. The factor loadings for each item are shown in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

{table continues}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item and factor number</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3 (double standard favoring males)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 40</td>
<td>.860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 4 (male control over female behavior)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 30</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 32</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 41</td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 5 (emotional control by abandonment)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 26</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 6 (male and female roles and expectations)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 31</td>
<td>.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 35</td>
<td>.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 7 (male and female equality)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 34</td>
<td>.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 36</td>
<td>.546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 37</td>
<td>.673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 8 (emotional control by restricting female access to finances)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>.858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 39</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 9 (passive victim action)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 3</td>
<td>.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 10 (victim provocation)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 6</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Factor 11 (nonthreatening behavior)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 12 (victim blame)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Tables 7 and 8, several factors extracted from factor analysis 4 and 5 are identical. However, the items contained in these factors differ from males to females.

Contained in the factor 'male control over female behavior' are Items 23, 30, 32, and, 41 for females and Items 17, 23, 36, and, 41 for males.

Contained in the factor 'male justification of partner beating' are Items 15, 18, 19, 20, and, 21 for both males and females. Item 12, in females, has its own factor.

Contained in the factor 'aggressive and violent female victim actions' are items 7, 9, 10, and, 11 for females. This factor was divided into two for the males; 'aggressive female victim actions' (included Item 7) and 'violent female victim actions' (included Items 9, 10, and 11).

Contained in the factor 'emotional control by male abandonment' and 'emotional control by restricting female access to resources' are Items 25 and 26 and Items 14 and 39 respectively. These items are identical to the items in the factor 'emotional control over female behavior'.
Contained in the factor 'double standard favoring males' are Items 27 and, 40. These are identical for both males and females.

Contained in the factor 'victim provocation' are Items 1 and 6 for females, and 1, 2, and, 6 for males.

Contained in the factor 'female and male equality' are Items 34, 36, and, 37 for females, and Item 37 for males.

Contained in the factor 'passive action' are Items 2 and 3 for females, and Item 3 for males.

The factor 'male and female roles and expectations' occurred in both male and female factor analyses, however the items were different. The female factor included Items 28, 31, and, 35. The male factor included Items 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and, 35.

Factors that were extracted in the female factor analysis that did not occur in the male factor analysis were: victim blame and nonthreatening behavior. Factors that were extracted in the male factor analysis that did not occur in the female analysis were: inequality in the workplace.

The most difference between males and females occurred in these factors: male control over female behavior; male and female roles and expectations and, male and female equality.

Changes in the scale were not made after factor analysis 4 and 5 because of the sampling bias (of
respondents, 33.9% were males and 66.1% were females).

After determining the reliability, face validity, and construct validity of the scale, it was determined that a multiple regression analysis should be performed to determine the impact of gender on each of the seven factors. Throughout the regression analysis, gender remained the independent variable, whereas each of the seven factors were dependent variables. To determine whether gender did account for the variance, the following criteria were established:

1. The significant t value had to be <0.05.
2. The significant F value had to be <0.05.

In Factor 1 (male control over female behavior), the significant t value is 0.000 (indicating that the regression line is significantly different from zero). The R square value is .231, indicating that 23.1% of Factor 1 can be accounted for by gender. The significant F value is also 0.000 (indicating that the percentage explained by gender is significant).

In Factor 2 (male justification of partner beating), the significant t value is 0.000. The R square value is .139, indicating that 13.9% of Factor 2 can be accounted for by gender. The significant F value is 0.000 (indicating that the percentage explained by gender is significant).

In Factor 3 (aggressive and violent female victim actions), the significant t value is 0.100 (indicating that the regression line is not significantly different from
zero). The R square value is .009, indicating that .09% of Factor 3 can be accounted for by gender. The significant F value is 1.000 (indicating that the percentage explained by gender is not significant).

In Factor 4 (emotional control by male abandonment), the significant t value is 0.000. The R square value is .070, indicating that 7% of Factor 4 can be accounted for by gender. The significant F value is 0.000 (indicating the percentage explained by gender is significant).

In Factor 5 (double standard favoring males), the significant t value is 0.698 (indicating that the regression line is not significantly different from zero). The R square value is .01, indicating that 1% of Factor 5 can be accounted for by gender. The significant F value is 0.0698 (indicating that the percentage explained by gender is not significant).

In Factor 6 (emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources), the significant t value is 0.000 (indicating that the regression line is significantly different from zero). The R square value is .08, indicating that 8% of Factor 6 can be accounted for by gender. The significant F value is 0.000 (indicating the percentage explained by gender is significant).

In Factor 7 (victim provocation), the significant t value is 0.000 (indicating that the regression line is significantly different from zero). The R square value is
.127, indicating that 12.7% of Factor 7 can be accounted for by gender. The significant F value is 0.000 (indicating that the percentage explained by gender is significant).

After completing the regression analysis, it was determined that Factors 3 (aggressive female victim actions) and 5 (double standard favoring males) were not influenced by gender, however, the remaining factors 1 (male control over female behavior), 2 (male justification of partner beating), 4 (emotional control by male abandonment), 6 (emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources), and 7 (victim provocation) were influenced by gender. This will be discussed in the next chapter.

After completing the factor analysis, the final version (25 items) of the CSAVDV scale (see Appendix H) was deemed to have a good measure of construct validity.

Reliability of the final version of the scale was established for each of the seven factors. Cronbach’s alpha for Factor 1 (male control over female behavior) is .83, for Factor 2 (male justification of partner beating) is .86, for Factor 3 (aggressive and violent female victim actions) is .72, for Factor 4 (emotional control by male abandonment) is .83, for Factor 5 (double standard favoring males) is .80, for Factor 6 (emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources) is .83 and, for Factor 7 (victim provocation) is .35.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings of the Study

The CSAVDV scale was administered to a convenience sample of 277 students at the University of North Texas, Denton. The sample size was more than adequate because it allowed an approximate ratio of the number of subjects to the number of items on the questionnaire of 7:1. Data were analyzed by using descriptive statistics for the demographics of subjects, expert assessment for face validity, a 12-day interval test/re-test for reliability, and a principal component factor analysis for construct validity.

Face Validity

A panel of five experts assessed the face validity of the CSAVDV scale. This process was very important because the panel members’ professional experience and expertise allowed them to evaluate the appropriateness and meaningfulness of each item. Thus, their suggestions were important in improving the face validity of the scale.

Reliability of the Scale

After the expert assessment, the original pool of 44 items was decreased to 41. This revised scale was administered to a sample of 28 subjects, using a test-retest
design. If the test is repeated within a short time period between the two administrations, memory may produce high reliability coefficients. However, a long time period between the tests can permit learning and growth, which will also produce an inconsistent reliability coefficient (Nunnally, 1978). The time period between the test-retest of 12 days was considered acceptable.

Cronbach’s alpha and Guttman split-half coefficients demonstrated moderately high test-retest reliability. A t-test for paired samples indicated those items to be eliminated (see Table 3). After elimination of 8 items, 6 items from section 1 and 2 items from section 2, the reliability coefficients increased. Cronbach’s alpha for section 1 was .83, Guttman split-half was .91, Cronbach’s alpha for section 2 was .87, Guttman split-half was .90.

After establishing construct validity, Cronbach’s alpha and Guttman split-half reliability coefficients on the final version of the CSAVDV scale (25 items) are .86 and .91, respectively, for section 1, and .89 and .91, respectively, for section 2. Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient for each of the factors on the final version of the scale are: .83 for Factor 1; .86 for Factor 2; .72 for Factor 3; .83 for Factor 4; .80 for Factor 5; .81 for Factor 6 and, .35 for Factor 7.

Nunnally (1978) suggests .70 is an acceptable reliability. Therefore, the results of the reliability tests
show acceptable internal consistency and coefficient of stability for the 25 items of the revised scale.

**Construct Validity**

Factor analysis was used to determine the construct validity of the CSAVDV scale. The principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was used because it is the most appropriate method for this study (Nunnally, 1978). Seven factors (male control over female behavior, male justification of partner beating, aggressive and violent female victim actions, emotional control by male abandonment, double standard favoring males, emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources and victim provocation) with an eigenvalue greater than 1 (see Table 5) and a factor loading greater than .45 (see Table 6) were established. The factor loadings are evidence for construct validity of the CSAVDV scale.

It was evident after data collection that the sample included more female respondents than male respondents. Therefore, factor analysis was done to determine differences between factor extraction in males and females. This indicated that six factors were almost identical. These are: male justification of partner beating; aggressive and violent female victim actions; double standard favoring males; emotional control by abandonment; emotional control by restricting female access to resources and, victim provocation.
A multiple regression analysis was performed to determine whether gender accounted for the variance in any of the seven factors. This indicated that Factor 3 (aggressive female victim action) and Factor 5 (double standard favoring males) were not influenced by gender. However, factor 1 (male control over female behavior), factor 2 (male justification of partner beating), factor 4 (male abandonment), factor 6 (female access to financial resources) and factor 7 (victim provocation), were influenced by gender.

Conclusions

The results from efforts to establish face validity, reliability coefficients, and factor analyses allowed the researcher to make the following conclusions regarding the findings of this study:

1. Following expert assessment of the CSAVDV scale, the 41 items were declared to have high face/logic validity.

2. In determining the coefficient of stability and internal consistency for reliability, a test-retest, with a 12-day time period between administrations produced acceptable results. Nunnally (1978) suggests .70 is an acceptable reliability. Eight items were deleted after the test-retest because a t-test for paired samples indicated low correlation and low significance. Cronbach’s alpha, after deletion of the eight items, was .83 for section 1 and .87 for section 2. Guttman split-half was .91 for section 1
and .90 for section 2. Thus, version 2 of the CSAVDV scale (33 items) has been shown to be reliable across time.

3. Seven factors were obtained through principal component factor analysis, which accounted for 59% of the total variance. The 7 factors extracted were male control over female behavior, male justification of partner beating, aggressive and violent female victim actions, emotional control by male abandonment, double standard favoring males, emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources and, victim provocation.

4. Reliability coefficients for each of the seven factors on the final version of the CSAVDV scale are .83, .86, .72, .83, .80, .81, and .35, respectively. Nunnally (1978) suggests that .70 is an acceptable reliability coefficient, thus, six factors are deemed to have acceptable reliability.

5. Factor analysis on male and female respondents suggests that six factors; male justification of partner beating; aggressive and violent victim actions; emotional control by male abandonment; double standard favoring males; emotional control by restricting female access to resources and, victim provocation were similar in item content. Three factors; male control over female behavior; male and female roles and expectations and, male and female equality, differed in their item content.

6. A regression analysis determined that gender was
significant in Factor 1 (male control over female behavior), Factor 2 (male justification of partner beating), Factor 4 (male abandonment), Factor 6 (female access to financial resources) and Factor 7 (victim provocation). Gender was not significant in the items included in Factor 3 (aggressive female victim actions) and Factor 5 (double standard favoring males).

Discussion

This study reports on several steps in the development and validation of a scale measuring college students’ attitude toward female victims of domestic violence.

A sample of 277 students at the University of North Texas, Denton, completed the CSAV DV scale. Face validity, reliability, and construct validity were determined. Face validity of the scale was deemed acceptable by the panel of experts. The results of the reliability tests show good internal consistency, and coefficient of stability. Factor analysis produced seven factors that remained stable throughout two further factor analyses. The factors are:-

1. Male control over female behavior
2. Male justification of partner beating
3. Aggressive and violent female victim actions
4. Emotional control by male abandonment
5. Double standard favoring males
6. Emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources
7. Victim provocation

The male and female factor analyses found that similarities occurred in the following factors: male justification of partner beating; aggressive and violent female victim actions; emotional control by male abandonment; double standard favoring males; emotional control by restricting female access to financial resources and, victim provocation. Differences occurred in the following factors: male control over female behavior; male and female roles and expectations and, male and female equality. The last two factors were extracted in factor analysis 4 and 5, but not in factor analysis 1, 2 or 3.

A multiple regression analysis found that Factor 3 and Factor 5 were not influenced by gender. Factors 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7 were influenced by gender. This indicates that male and female responses differed significantly in those factors where a large variance was accounted for by gender.

After validating this scale, it was evident that the uses of this scale are numerous. College students' attitudes toward domestic violence are important not only for college educators, but also for health professionals (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988). College students generally reflect new cultural trends in attitudes and behaviors of society (Finn, 1986; Hastings & Hoge, 1986). Therefore, the CSAVDV scale should provide additional information toward understanding the origins of attitude toward the physical abuse of women.
The CSAVDV scale can help in the development of educational programs and, in identifying program areas for emphasis and priority. The results indicate that gender plays a significant role in responses to the scale. This needs to be considered when developing educational programs.

It has previously been reported that attitude toward women and their role in society can influence attitude toward female victims of domestic violence (Gentemann, 1984). More favorable attitudes toward women, and less defined sex roles, that have been encouraged through educational programs, may contribute to a lower level of domestic violence.

Guidelines for Administration of the Scale

The following guidelines for administration of the scale are offered for future research:

1. Define domestic violence and physical abuse using the definitions provided in chapter 1.

2. Encourage male participation so that female and male response rate is similar.

3. Provide counseling services and shelters that are available in the area where the study is taking place.

4. Provide a comfortable, safe, and quiet environment for completion of the questionnaire.

5. Emphasize anonymity.

6. Scoring of the CSAVDV scale can be done by calculating the item total of both sections combined (25
items), by calculating the items in section 1 (15 items) separately to the items in section 2 (10 items), or by calculating the item total in each of the seven factors.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are offered for future research:

1. A comparison of the CSAVDV scale with an established scale that also measures attitude toward domestic violence to assess the criterion validity.

2. A study exploring the relationship between college students' attitudes toward women and their attitudes toward female victims of domestic violence, using the CSAVDV scale to determine the relationship between these two constructs.

3. A study exploring the difference between male and female college students' attitudes toward female victims of domestic violence, using the CSAVDV scale.

4. A similar scale that measures attitude toward male victims of domestic violence should be developed.

5. A similar scale that applies to domestic violence between homosexual as well as heterosexual couples needs to be developed.

6. The CSAVDV scale should be administered to a non-college population to determine the validity and application within the community.

7. A study to establish norms to determine scoring and scaling of the CSAVDV scale.
APPENDIX A

STEPS INVOLVED IN SCALE DEVELOPMENT
Steps Involved in Scale Development

1. Identify primary purposes for test score use

2. Identify behaviors that represent the construct:
   a) literature review
   b) content analysis
   c) expert judgement

3. Prepare a set of test specifications

4. Construct initial pool of items

5. Review items and revise

6. Hold item tryouts

7. Field test the items

8. Conduct reliability and validity studies

9. Determine statistical properties of item scores

10. Develop guidelines
APPENDIX B

APPROVAL LETTER FOR HUMAN SUBJECTS
August 30, 1994

Leanne Wilson
4115 Winding Way Ct
Dallas, TX 75287

Dear Mrs. Wilson:

Your proposal entitled "The Relationship Between College Students’ Attitudes Toward Females and Their Attitudes Toward Female Victims of Domestic Violence," has been approved by the IRB and is exempt from further review under 45 CFR 46.101.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (817) 565-3946.

Good luck on your project.

Sincerely,

Sandra Terrell, Chair
Institutional Review Board
APPENDIX C

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS
**Questions Used in Focus Group Session.**

1. In society, who has more freedom, men or women?
2. Why, give me some examples?
3. What about other areas of society?
4. What do you think domestic violence means?
5. In situations of men beating their female partner, what excuses are often made for the beating?
6. What should a battered woman do?
APPENDIX D

LETTER OF REQUEST TO PANEL OF EXPERTS
Dear __________________,

As a graduate student at the University of North Texas in Denton, I am conducting research on college students' attitude toward female victims of domestic violence.

Because of your expertise in this area, you have been selected to be on a panel to review the survey which will be used for my research. Your willingness to review this survey is greatly appreciated.

My research will involve developing and validating a questionnaire which will examine the relationship between college students' attitude toward females, and their attitude toward female victims of domestic violence.

The questionnaire is made up of three sections. Section one contains statements on attitude toward female victims of domestic violence. Respondents are asked to circle one of five options – strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree.

Section two contains statements on attitude toward the role of women in society. These statements pertain to career, home and social situations. As in section one, respondents are asked to circle one of five options. Section three is made up of demographics.

It would help me greatly if you could take the time (15 - 20 minutes) to read sections one and two. Please make suggestions for improvement by adding concepts that may have been omitted, changing wording that may be inappropriate and any general comment you feel is important in the development of this questionnaire.

Thank you very much for your time. A self addressed, stamped envelope has been provided. Please return to me within one week.

Sincerely,

Leanne Wilson
University of North Texas

Chwee Lye Chng, Ph.D.
Professor and Thesis Advisor
APPENDIX E

INTRODUCTORY COVER LETTER TO SUBJECTS
Dear Participant,

As a graduate student at the University of North Texas in Denton, I am conducting research on college students' attitudes toward female victims of domestic violence.

You have been selected as a subject for my research. Your participation in this project is completely voluntary, and you are free to discontinue your participation at any time.

The research report will be available for your review on file at the University of North Texas as a master's thesis.

The attached questionnaire consists of approximately 40 statements which require you to respond by either circling the appropriate response or filling in the appropriate answer. Remember, your responses are strictly confidential. The results will be reported in statistical form only, and no response will be associated with any individual, therefore, you will remain anonymous. Although you may benefit from exploring your feelings and thoughts regarding the issue of domestic violence, there will be no tangible rewards given to participants, and in no way will your willingness or refusal to participate affect your grade or personal treatment in this class.

This survey, which takes approximately 15 minutes to complete, should be done in class today. Your cooperation and honesty will help me to make this survey accurate and useful. Thank you very much for your assistance in this very important study. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 214 - 250 1704 (home).

Sincerely,

Leanne Wilson
University of North Texas

Chwee Lye Chng, Ph.D.
Professor and Thesis Advisor
APPENDIX F

VERSION ONE OF THE CSAVDV SCALE (41 ITEMS)
CSAVDV SCALE

SECTION ONE

Listed below are several statements regarding domestic violence. Please circle the appropriate response regarding your attitude toward these statements by using the following scale. There are no right or wrong answers. This is an instrument to determine your attitude.

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
N - neutral
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

1. Battered women often provoke physically abusive actions from men.  
SA A N D SD

2. A woman who remains passive during the physical abuse is saying she does not mind being abused.  
SA A N D SD

3. Avoiding conflict should be a battered woman's priority.  
SA A N D SD

4. A battered woman, who is financially dependent on the abuser, has no option but to stay in the abusive relationship.  
SA A N D SD

5. A battered woman should leave the abusive relationship immediately, no matter what the cost.  
SA A N D SD

6. A woman who nags constantly deserves the physical abuse from her partner.  
SA A N D SD

7. If a woman has been physically abused, she has a right to shout and yell at the abuser.  
SA A N D SD
8. If a woman has been physically abused, she has a right to punch the abuser.

9. If a woman has been physically abused, she has a right to break the bones of the abuser.

10. If a woman has been physically abused, she has the right to cut off the genitals of the abuser.

11. If a woman has been physically abused, she has the right to kill the abuser.

12. A woman who is unwilling to have sex with her partner, deserves to be physically abused.

13. A woman who does not devote her time to looking after her partner, deserves to be physically abused.

14. Regardless of work status, a woman should have equal access to all the finances.

15. A woman should accept that physical abuse is a normal response to interpersonal conflicts in the home.

16. Sometimes a man must hit his partner so she understands he is the decision maker.

17. A woman involved in an intimate relationship, should be able to have same sex and opposite sex friends without feeling threatened by her partner.
18. A man has a right to physically abuse his partner if she is flirting with other people.

19. A man has a right to physically abuse his partner if she is drunk.

20. In some situations it may be okay for a man to punch his partner.

21. In some situations it may be okay for a man to kick his partner.

22. A man does not have the right to tell his partner who she can and cannot speak to.

23. Men have the right to say what their partner can do.

24. Women should only go to work if their partner says it is O.K.

25. Men have the right to threaten abandonment, if they feel she hasn't behaved suitably.

26. Men have the right to abandon their partner if they feel she hasn't behaved suitably.
SECTION TWO

27. Swearing in public is more acceptable for males than females.

28. Females who are drunk in public should be condemned more than males who are drunk in public.

29. Males should share in household tasks eg. doing the laundry, cooking and cleaning.

30. Females depend on males for their happiness.

31. Females driving a semi (huge truck) are socially inappropriate.

32. Females should have the same amount of authority as males in bringing up children.

33. Females should pursue careers, rather than stay home to care for their partner and children.

34. There are jobs in which males should be hired over females.

35. Females, more than males, should be criticized for having many sex partners.

36. Females should learn to keep their opinions to themselves.

37. Females should pay for half the bill when on a date.

38. Females should be regarded as less capable in the work place.

39. Females should have equal access to the finances, regardless of who is the main breadwinner.

40. Spitting in public is more acceptable for males than females.

41. In relationships, females should expect to be controlled by males.
APPENDIX G

VERSION TWO OF THE CSAVDV SCALE (33 ITEMS)
CSAADV SCALE

SECTION ONE

Listed below are several statements regarding domestic violence. Please circle the appropriate response regarding your attitude toward these statements by using the following scale. There are no right or wrong answers. This is an instrument to determine your attitude.

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
N - neutral
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

1. Battered women often provoke physically abusive actions from men.  
   SA  A  N  D  SD

2. A woman who remains passive during the physical abuse is saying she does not mind being abused.  
   SA  A  N  D  SD

3. Avoiding conflict should be a battered woman's priority.  
   SA  A  N  D  SD

5. A battered woman should leave the abusive relationship immediately, no matter what the cost.  
   SA  A  N  D  SD

6. A woman who nags constantly deserves the physical abuse from her partner.  
   SA  A  N  D  SD

7. If a woman has been physically abused, she has a right to shout and yell at the abuser.  
   SA  A  N  D  SD

9. If a woman has been physically abused, she has a right to break the bones of the abuser.  
   SA  A  N  D  SD
10. If a woman has been physically abused, she has the right to cut off the genitals of the abuser.

11. If a woman has been physically abused, she has the right to kill the abuser.

12. A woman who is unwilling to have sex with her partner, deserves to be physically abused.

14. Regardless of work status, a woman should have equal access to all the finances.

15. A woman should accept that physical abuse is a normal response to interpersonal conflicts in the home.

17. A woman involved in an intimate relationship, should be able to have same sex and opposite sex friends without feeling threatened by her partner.

18. A man has a right to physically abuse his partner if she is flirting with other people.

19. A man has a right to physically abuse his partner if she is drunk.

20. In some situations it may be okay for a man to punch his partner.

21. In some situations it may be okay for a man to kick his partner.
23. Men have the right to say what their partner can do.

25. Men have the right to threaten abandonment, if they feel she hasn’t behaved suitably.

26. Men have the right to abandon their partner if they feel she hasn’t behaved suitably.
SECTION TWO

27. Swearing in public is more acceptable for males than females.

28. Females who are drunk in public should be condemned more than males who are drunk in public.

29. Males should share in household tasks eg. doing the laundry, cooking and cleaning.

30. Females depend on males for their happiness.

31. Females driving a semi (huge truck) are socially inappropriate.

32. Females should have the same amount of authority as males in bringing up children.

34. There are jobs in which males should be hired over females.

35. Females, more than males, should be criticized for having many sex partners.

36. Females should learn to keep their opinions to themselves.

37. Females should pay for half the bill when on a date.

39. Females should have equal access to the finances, regardless of who is the main breadwinner.

40. Spitting in public is more acceptable for males than females.

41. In relationships, females should expect to be controlled by males.
APPENDIX H

FINAL VERSION OF THE CSAVDV SCALE (25 ITEMS)
CSAVDV SCALE

SECTION ONE

Listed below are several statements regarding domestic violence. Please circle the appropriate response regarding your attitude toward these statements by using the following scale. There are no right or wrong answers. This is an instrument to determine your attitude.

SA - strongly agree
A - agree
N - neutral
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

1. Battered women often provoke physically abusive actions from men. SA A N D SD
2. If a woman has been physically abused, she has a right to shout and yell at the abuser. SA A N D SD
3. If a woman has been physically abused, she has a right to break the bones of the abuser. SA A N D SD
4. If a woman has been physically abused, she has the right to cut off the genitals of the abuser. SA A N D SD
5. If a woman has been physically abused, she has the right to kill the abuser. SA A N D SD
6. A woman who is unwilling to have sex with her partner, deserves to be physically abused. SA A N D SD
7. Regardless of work status, a woman should have equal access to all the finances. SA A N D SD
8. A woman should accept that physical abuse is a normal response to interpersonal conflicts in the home. SA A N D SD
9. A woman involved in an intimate relationship, should be able to have same sex and opposite sex friends without feeling threatened by her partner.

10. A man has a right to physically abuse his partner if she is flirting with other people.

11. A man has a right to physically abuse his partner if she is drunk.

12. In some situations it may be okay for a man to punch his partner.

13. In some situations it may be okay for a man to kick his partner.

14. Men have the right to threaten abandonment, if they feel she hasn’t behaved suitably.

15. Men have the right to abandon their partner if they feel she hasn’t behaved suitably.
SECTION TWO

1. Men have the right to say what their partner can do.

2. Swearing in public is more acceptable for males than females.

3. Females who are drunk in public should be condemned more than males who are drunk in public.

4. Females depend on males for their happiness.

5. Females driving a semi (huge truck) are socially inappropriate.

6. Females, more than males, should be criticized for having many sex partners.

7. Females should learn to keep their opinions to themselves.

8. Females should have equal access to the finances, regardless of who is the main breadwinner.

9. Spitting in public is more acceptable for males than females.

10. In relationships, females should expect to be controlled by males.
SECTION THREE

Please check the appropriate response for the following that best describes you:

1. Male (1) _____ Female (2) _____

2. Freshman (1) _____ Sophomore (2) _____ Junior (3) _____
   Senior (4) _____ Graduate student (5) _____

3. Age: (write in space provided)
   __________ years

4. Marital Status:
   Married (1) _____ Divorced (2) _____ Widowed (3) _____
   Separated (4) _____
   Living with partner but not married (5) _____
   Single and dating (6) _____ Single and not dating (7) _____

5a. Religion:
   Regardless of religion please check whether religion plays an active or inactive part in your life.
   Active (1) _____ Inactive (2) _____

5b. Please check frequency of Church attendance:
   Always (1) _____ Often (2) _____ Sometimes (3) _____
   Rarely (4) _____ Never (5) _____

5c. Please check the extent to which you believe your religion affects your attitude.
   Always (1) _____ Often (2) _____ Sometimes (3) _____
   Rarely (4) _____ Never (5) _____
6. Which of the following have increased your awareness of domestic violence:— (Please check all that apply)

(1) Friend was abused____
(2) I was abused____
(3) Neighbor was abused____
(4) Family member was abused____
(5) Magazines/newspaper____
(6) Education (home)____
(7) Television____
(8) Education (school)____
(9) Movies____
(10) Other (please explain)____________________

7. What is your ethnicity?

(1) Asian____ (2) African American____
(3) Hispanic____ (4) Caucasian____
(5) other (please state)____________________

8. Please make any additional comments in the space provided.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.
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