THE RELATIONSHIP OF SUBTLE AND OVERT PSYCHOLOGICAL

ABUSE TO WOMEN'S SELF-CONCEPT

AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SYMPTOMS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

University of North Texas in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Christine L. McKibbin, B.S., M.S.

Denton, Texas

August, 1997

McKibbin, Christine L., <u>The relationship of subtle and overt psychological abuse to women's self-concept and psychological symptomotology</u>. Doctor of Philosophy (Clinical Psychology), August, 1997, 146 pp., 13 tables, references, 189 titles.

Research has documented an association between sustained overt psychological abuse and women's self-concept and psychological distress. However, the focus on overt domination and control limits our understanding of its impact and is a weakness addressed in this study. Women in distressed relationships who had sustained severe psychological abuse from a partner and either no, moderate, or serious violence met inclusion criteria ($n$ = 93). Women completed questionnaires measuring self-concept (i.e., self-esteem, interpersonal competence, problem-solving confidence, and depression proneness) and psychological symptoms from the SCL90-R (Derogatis, 1983). Raters distinguished subtle and overt psychological abuse from a devised item pool. Correlation and hierarchical multiple regression techniques were used. As expected, subtle psychological abuse was an effective predictor of women's problem-solving confidence, depression, anxiety, and somatization regardless of the overt psychological abuse or violence. Analyses within groups revealed that subtle

psychological abuse accounted for a significant proportion of variance in problem-solving confidence for women in the psychological abuse only group. Subtle psychological abuse was also an effective predictor of depression, anxiety, and somatization in the moderate violence group. Correlation matrices compared between groups showed that the psychological abuse only group patterns differed from both the moderate and severe violence groups.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SUBTLE AND OVERT PSYCHOLOGICAL

ABUSE TO WOMEN'S SELF-CONCEPT

AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SYMPTOMS

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

University of North Texas in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Christine L. McKibbin, B.S., M.S.

Denton, Texas

August, 1997

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The impact of men's harmful behaviors on women has been the subject of research since the early 1970's; largely rising from the women's movement. The impact of violent and, more recently, verbally aggressive behavior has been increasingly recognized. Consequently, women have developed a vocabulary to describe the process of dominance and control that was previously believed to be a central, but unfortunate part of their lives.

Although men may engage in behaviors that serve to dominate women, social influence research and women's self-reports suggest that men may also use tactics other than dominance and control to undermine women. The purpose of this study was to empirically demonstrate that men may abuse women in subtle ways and that these tactics are equally if not more harmful than violence. To support the need for and benefit of research in this area, research on violence and psychological abuse was reviewed to describe our current conceptualization of abusive behavior. Social influence theory substantiates the gap in our current knowledge of psychological abuse tactics and their impact on women.

Violence

Violence in intimate relationships is a serious social problem about which a body of literature has accumulated. The research interest has grown because it has been recognized as an all too common occurrence, often with serious consequences. Men's violent acts toward women occur in all social and ethnic groups, across all ages and socioeconomic groups (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). Research indicates that partner violence toward a woman is chronic in 10% (Stark & Filcraft, 1988) to 16% (Browne, 1987) of American marriages and 9% (Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994) to 73% of premarital relationships (Marshall & Rose, 1990). Approximately 30% (O'Leary et al., 1989; Straus, & Gelles, 1986) to 50% (Stark & Filtcraft, 1988) of women experienced at least one episode of violence at some time during their marriage.

Although these rates are high, violence in some groups has been consistently higher. For example, violence was found among 14% (Hilberman & Munson, 1977-78) to 71% (Cascardi, Langhinrichsen, & Vivian, 1992) of couples seeking counseling, among 53% of divorced or separated women (Andrews & Browne, 1988), and 84% of women volunteering for a study of "bad" or "stressful" relationships (Marshall, 1994; 1996). The acts reported in these studies ranged from pushing or shoving to using a knife or gun. The effects of

violent acts range from momentary upset through serious and
pervasive psychological and emotional problems (Cascardi et
al., 1992; Follingstad, Brennan, Hause, Polek, & Rutledge,
1991; Russel, Lipov, Phillips, & White, 1989) to death
(Campbell, 1992). When men kill their partner or former
partner, it is usually after many incidents of battering
(Campbell, 1992; Stout, 1991; Wilson & Daly, 1992).

Several instruments have been developed to measure the
frequency and/or severity of violence between partners.
These include the Family Violence Scale (FVS; Bardis, 1973),
the Domestic Violence Assessment Form (DVAF; Kuhl, 1982),
the Index of Spouse Abuse (Hudson & McIntosh, 1981), the
Center for Social Research Severity Index (CSRSI; Stacey &
Schupe, 1983), and the Measure of Wife Abuse (Rodenburg &
Fantuzzo, 1993). The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus,
1979) is the most widely used measure and the Severity of
Violence Scales (Marshall, 1992a, 1992b) are the most
detailed.

The CTS (Straus, 1979) has subscales for reasoning,
verbal or symbolic aggression, and violence. Although the
CTS has been used across many samples, victims, and sites,
and is generally sound (Barling, O'Leary, Jouriles, Vivian &
MacEwen, 1987; Straus, 1990), there are limitations (Dobash
& Dobash 1988; Lambert & Fantuzzo, 1988; Marshall, 1994;
Rhodes, 1985). The verbal aggression subscale contains

verbal and nonverbal acts (i.e., "cried," "stomped out of the room," "sulked or refused to talk") as well as threats of violence (i.e., "threatened to hit or throw something at him/her"). The eight item violence subscale also includes a threat (i.e., "threatened with a gun or knife"). Another limitation, that is observed in the previous examples, is that some items include several acts with differing potential for harm which could obscure valuable information (Dobash & Dobash, 1988; Marshall, 1994). The possibility that different levels of violence may have different implications and different relationships with other variables was not taken into account. Consequently, a recent modification differentiates minor (e.g., grabbing) and serious (e.g., beat up) acts (Neidig & O'Leary, 1991) on this unidimensional subscale. Finally, the order of acts is related to frequency, not necessarily reflecting severity (Breines & Gordon, 1983; Marshall, 1994), motivation (Browne, 1987; Cascardi, Vivian, & Meyer, 1991), or impact (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Cantos, et al., 1994; Cascardi, et al., 1992; Makepeace, 1986; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989) which likely differ for males and females.

To address these problems, many researchers have modified the CTS (e.g., Billingham, 1987; Bird, Stith, & Schladale, 1991; Cascardi, Langhinrichsen, & Vivian, 1991;

Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, & Sebastian, 1991; Lebov-Keeler & Pipes, 1990; Makepeace, 1981; Mason & Blankenship, 1987; Murphy & O'Leary, 1993; Neidig, 1986). In addition, Marshall developed a more specific measure; the multidimensional Severity of Violence Against Women Scale (SVAWS; Marshall, 1992a) and Severity of Violence Against Men Scale (SWAMS; Marshall, 1992b).

Marshall's (1992a, 1992b) scales correct several short-comings of the CTS. Threats of violence, acts of violence, and sexual aggression are differentiated and both threats and acts of violence have subscales which vary by the severity of the acts. The 46 items on both scales are the same, but the order and severity differ for men's acts toward women (SVAWS) and womanize acts toward men (SVAMS). Also, items are less inclusive than the CTS. For example, an individual who responded affirmatively to the CTS violence item "threw, smashed, hit, or kicked something" may have "hit or kicked a wall, door or furniture," but never "thrown an object at (the partner)" nor "broken an object" which are threats of violence on the SVAMS and SVAWS. Because of these distinctions, Marshall (1994) was able to show that men and women inflict and sustain different acts although their profiles may appear the same on the CTS.

Mental Health Consequences. The mental health consequences for victims of partner violence range from

minor to serious (Cascardi et al., 1992; Christopoulus et al., 1987; Follingstad, Brennan et al., 1991; Hilberman, 1980; Kilpatrick, Best, Saunders, & Veronen, 1988; Star, Clark, Goetz, & O'Malia, 1979). For example, of 3,000 married or cohabitating women, from a 6,002 subject sample who reported sustaining violence in the Second National Family Violence Survey (Gelles & Straus, 1988), 95% experienced at least one form of moderate distress (e.g., sadness or depression, nervousness, stress) and 70% reported at least one form of severe distress (e.g., felt completely hopeless about everything, considered suicide) within the previous year (Gelles & Harrop, 1989).

In this body of literature, effects have been found in both clinical and non-clinical samples. Clinical samples consist of women seeking help specifically for the violence from shelters, emergency rooms, the police or a therapist. Depression and anxiety may be experienced by more than 75% (Follingstad, Brennan et al., 1991; Gleason, 1993) of women in these samples. Other symptoms include poor problem-solving skills (Launius & Lindquist, 1988), helplessness (Frieze, Hymer, & Greenberg, 1984; Shepherd, 1990), low self-esteem and self-confidence (Hartik, 1989; Shepard & Pence, 1988), intense fear (Goodman et al., 1993), confusion (Ferarro & Johnson 1983), shock and numbing (Goodman et al., 1993), social isolation, somatic complaints (Jaffe, Wolfe,

Wilson, & Zak, 1986), obsessive compulsive behavior (Gleason, 1993), and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD; Browne, 1992; Gleason, 1993). Effects identified in non-clinical samples include low self-esteem (Mills, 1984), depression (Andrews & Brown, 1988; Gelles & Harrop, 1989), anger (Follingstad, Wright et al., 1991) somatic symptoms (Gelles & Harrop, 1989), and PTSD (Vitanza, Vogel, & Marshall, 1995).

Researchers believe that emotional and mental health in studies result from the violence women sustain from their partner. However, psychological abuse may coexist with violence and also play a primary role in victims' mental health (Dickstein, 1988; Marshall, 1994; Tolman, 1992). Leeder (1988), who relied on clinical opinion and case examples, equated psychological abuse to violence by noting that the only difference is the weapon choice, words or a fist.

Women in shelters (Dobash & Dobash, 1981; Follingstad & Rutledge et al., 1990; Okun, 1986; Walker, 1979) and emergency rooms (Follingstad & Rutledge et al., 1990) have said the psychological and emotional abuse they sustain is worse than the violence. Yet, few studies address psychological abuse. With very little empirical data upon which to base opinions, most of the discussion has relied on anecdotal reports and has been directed toward victims or

counselors with a focus on self-help (White, 1985) or treatment (Adams, 1989; Ball & Wyman, 1977-78; Dickstein, 1988; Leeder, 1988; Sonkin, Martin, & Walker, 1985).

Research presented thus far shows that sustained violence is clearly associated with a variety of psychological symptoms and disorders. Reported symptoms may range from mild (e.g., nervousness) to severe (e.g., PTSD). Although associations between violence and mental health have been found, anecdotal evidence suggests that these relationships may not be direct. Instead, another factor such as psychological abuse may better account for reported symptoms. Because studies have primarily addressed violence, there is little empirical evidence regarding the contribution of psychological abuse to mental health.

Psychological Abuse

As mentioned, most available literature that suggests a relationship between psychological abuse and psychological symptoms is anecdotal. However, some empirical data do exist to associate psychological abuse with women's mental health. Unfortunately, the data are affected by researchers' conceptualization of the abuse from a violence perspective. Thus, there is not yet a clear picture of what constitutes psychological abuse or what actually accounts for mental health symptoms reported by battered women. The existing literature indicates a relationship between

psychological abuse and distress was reviewed and an alternative conceptualization was proposed for further study.

A self-help book (White, 1985) to empower black women who have been battered is an example of anecdotal evidence suggesting a relationship between psychological abuse and distress. White's perspective was based on her clinical experience. The overt and controlling tactics she identified included shame tactics, causing embarrassment, ridicule, withholding affection, disclosure of affairs, manipulation with lies, and undermining a victim's sense of power and confidence. White argued that effects of psychological abuse may last longer than effects of violence. Other books and chapters have been written from the same perspective to educate people who treat abused women (Adams, 1989; Ball & Wyman, 1977-78); Barnett & LaViolette, 1993; Campbell, 1991; Ganley, 1989; Leeder, 1988).

Using anecdotal evidence, authors have noted that the negative impact of psychological abuse may not be recognized. O'Neil and Egan (1993) described cumulative effects such as self-devaluation (e.g., fear of failure, guilt, low expectancies for success, and lack of confidence), self-restriction (e.g., fear of success, noncompetitiveness, and passivity), and self-violation

(e.g., eating disorders, addictions, isolation, and suicide). They argued that victims do not bring acts of psychological abuse to the attention of others because they are often unable to label their experience. Instead of discussing the abuse, they internalize the pain and suffer privately.

Dickstein (1988) noted that, because victims may believe psychological abuse is unimportant, most do not discuss it with their therapists. He argued that women's headaches, backaches, insomnia, depression, and anxiety are more easily verbalized and have less shame or guilt attached. Consequently, women describe these symptoms instead. Because psychologically abusive acts are difficult to identify or seem like common, day to day occurrences not worthy of mention, their importance often goes unrecognized by women, their helping professionals, and researchers.

Recently, research on psychological abuse has been published which documents anecdotal evidence in clinical literature. For example, of 130 women in conflictual or violent relationships, 78% had experienced both emotional abuse and violence (Bennett, Cohen-Silver, & Ellard, 1988). Of these women, 77% felt that the emotional abuse was equally or more difficult to deal with than violence. Others have made the same point (Follingstad, Laughlin et al., 1991; Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, & Polek,

1990; Herbert, Cohen-Silver, & Ellard, 1991; Loring & Meyer, 1992; Thompson, 1987).

Hamilton and Coates' (1993) research also supports the idea that psychological abuse can cause harm. They conducted a study of 270 women who had sustained psychological abuse, violence, or sexual aggression in a past or present relationship and who had sought help from social service professionals. Of these 270 women, 238 (88%) sought help for psychological distress due to sustained emotional abuse.

Conceptualization. Because the interest in psychological abuse was derived from battered women, the logical approach has been to consider it another form of dominance or control. Consequently, the focus has been on psychological abuse as it accompanies or results from violence; assuming that both violence and psychological abuse derive from a desire to dominate and control a partner. Terms used include environmental abuse (Gondolf, 1985), emotional abuse (NiCarthy, 1986), psychological abuse and battering (Edleson, 1984; Okun, 1986), psychological torture (Russell, 1982), confined abuse (Star, 1982), assaultive behavior (Okun, 1986), maltreatment (Hudson & McIntosh, 1981; Tolman, 1989, 1992) and social abuse (Walker, 1979).

According to Gelles (1976), women stay in violent relationships because they are dominated by a violent and abusive partner. Several authors (e.g., Edleson, Eisikovits, & Guttmann, 1985; Ferraro & Johnson, 1991; Gamache, 1982; Graham, 1994; Hilberman & Munson, 1977-78; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980, and Walker, 1986) argue that the purpose of psychological abuse is to engender threat and reinforce the effects of violence, reminding victims that violence could occur again. This threat is viewed as a powerful form of manipulation that a man uses to obtain what he wants from a woman. Authors believe that a woman remains in an abusive relationship because she is afraid of retaliatory violence and because she has been "beaten down" psychologically and emotionally. Although women may remain in relationships for these reasons, there is much more to psychological abuse than these overt and fear eliciting tactics.

Hilberman and Munson (1977-1978) were first to identify behaviors that may constitute psychological abuse from interviews with 60 battered women referred for psychiatric evaluation. Specific behaviors included, causing embarrassment, extreme jealously, refusing to allow women to work, monitoring their daily activities, and isolating them from others by preventing communication. Typically, from a violence perspective, these acts are overtly dominating and

controlling. Hilberman and Munson argued that psychological abuse was usually a precursor to violence and that physical and psychological symptoms were caused by the constant threat of violence.

Also from a violence perspective, Walker (1979, 1984) described psychologically abusive behaviors that correspond to Amnesty International's definition of torture. These include isolation, induced physical exhaustion, obsessiveness and possessiveness, vague and specific threats of death, degradation, forced alcohol or drug use, altered states of consciousness produced through hypnotic states, and occasional indulgences. Walker (1986) argued that most abusive behaviors occur in conflict or anger and are expressed, for example, through cold silence, yelling, sarcasm, and abrupt movements. From interviews with battered women, she concluded that the threat of physical violence was always present and each woman believed that her partner could kill either her or himself. Thus, Walker believes that psychological abuse, like violence, is a form of dominance and control.

Dickstein (1988) identified 19 common examples of psychological abuse including: ignoring; ridicule and insults of women's, beliefs, religion, race, heritage, or class; withholding approval; criticism; name calling; humiliation; controlling money and decision making; threats

to leave; threats to hurt; torturing or killing pets; verbal harassment and accusations of infidelity; property destruction; and threats with weapons. Thus, Dickstein also identified forms of abuse that represent overt domination and control.

Sonkin et al., (1985) also listed several types of psychological abuse. Acts included control (e.g., being picked up and dropped off, told whom they can bring home) pathological jealousy, mental degradation (name calling), and isolation (e.g., putting strict limits on women's behavior). They made the point that psychological abuse not only includes explicit (verbal) threats of violence, but also implicit threats of violence coupled with nonverbal extreme controlling behavior. By way of an ongoing threat, psychological abuse is equated with physical and sexual violence as ways to control, dominate, and intimidate a partner.

This dominance or control perspective has predominated in empirical research. Because most investigators have assumed that psychological abuse is most likely to occur in the context of a violent relationship and because behaviors believed to maintain dominance are easy to operationalize, overt acts have received the most attention. Thus, researchers have typically assessed obvious abuse like verbal aggression (Bergman, 1992; Billingham, 1987;

Billingham & Sack, 1987; Dutton & Painter, 1993; Kasian & Painter, 1993; Laner, 1985; Lebov-Keelor & Pipes, 1990; Lim, 1990; Margolin, Burman, & John, 1989; Margolin, John, & Gleberman, 1988; Murphy & O'Leary, 1989; Rancer & Niemasz, 1988; Sabourin, 1991) which include insulting (Margolin, et al., 1988; Stets, 1991), yelling, demeaning or degrading statements (e.g., criticizing skills or abilities) and name calling (Stets, 1991). A few other dominating, overt forms of control have been assessed as well. These include attempts to control another's emotions and acts (e.g., "I get my partner to act in a way that I want her to act"; Stets, 1991; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989), intimidation (e.g, going out of his way to find out what she is doing) and threats to change the relationship (Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, & Polek, 1990), isolation (e.g., attempts to monitor, choose her friends, or limit family contact), restriction (Cantos et al., 1992; Follingstad et al., 1990), and withdrawal (Frieze & McHugh, 1992; Margolin et al., 1989; Margolin, et al., 1988).

Measurement of psychological abuse. Most studies have used or adapted the CTS verbal aggression subscale (Billingham, 1987; Billingham & Sack, 1987; Brown & Wampold, 1983; Dutton & Hemphill, 1992; Dutton & Painter, 1993; Edleson, Eiskovits, Guttman & Sela-Amit, 1991; Frieze & McHugh, 1992; Mason & Blankenship, 1987; Margolin &

Gleberman, 1988; Murphy & O'Leary, 1989; Russel, Lipov, Phillips & White, 1989; Stets, 1990, 1991; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989). Some instruments developed with battered women in shelters or clinical settings measure psychological abuse from a dominance and control perspective (Hudson & McIntosh, 1981; Rodenburg & Fantuzzo, 1993; Shepard & Campbell, 1992; Tolman, 1989). Other researchers have created specific items (Follingstad, Brennan et al., 1991; Follingstad, Rutledge, McNeil-Harkins, & Polek, 1991; Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, & Polek, 1990; Sabourin, 1991; Stets, 1991) or data coded from observations (Margolin, et al., 1989; Margolin, et al., 1988).

The Index of Spouse Abuse (ISA; Hudson & McIntosh, 1981) has been used in several studies (Laner, 1985; McFarlane, Parker, Soekin, & Bullock, 1992; Parker, McFarlane, Soeken, Torres, & Campbell, 1993). The scale consists of 30 items with an 11-item physical subscale (e.g., "punches me with his fists," "threatens me with a weapon") and 19 item non-physical subscale (e.g., "belittles me," "demands sex whether I want it or not," "demands I stay home to take care of the children"). These two scales are not completely distinct. For example, the physical subscale includes nonphysical behaviors (e.g., "screams and yells") and the non-physical subscale includes physical and sexual acts, (e.g., "demands sex whether I want it or not").

The Abusive Behavior Inventory (ABI; Shepard & Campbell, 1992) has only been used in its original scale development study. The 30 items which reflect psychological abuse (e.g., "called you names," "used your children to threaten you," "threatened to hit or throw something at you") and physical violence (e.g., "spanked you," "threw you around," "kicked you") form two dimensions.

The 52 item Measure of Wife Abuse (MWA; Rodenburg & Fantuzzo, 1993) is the most recent scale. The four factors include 11 items for physical violence (e.g., "kicked," "pushed," "scratched"), 14 items for verbal aggression (e.g., "told you he would kill you," "told you you were ugly," "told you you were a horrible wife"), 15 items for psychological abuse (e.g., "took your wallet," "kidnaped the children," "followed you"), and 12 items for sexual aggression (e.g., "raped you," "prostituted you").

The 58 item Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (Tolman, 1989) has been used in a few published studies (Dutton & Hemphill, 1992; Dutton & Painter, 1993; Kasian & Painter, 1993). The dominance/isolation dimension includes items related to rigid observance of traditional sex roles, demands for subservience and isolation from resources. This dimension is measured by 26 items (e.g., "monitored time," "ordered around," "threatened to have an affair"). In contrast, the emotional/verbal abuse dimension

includes withholding emotional resources, verbal attacks, and behavior that degrades women. This dimension is measured by 23 items (e.g., "called names," "yelled and screamed," "insulted in front of others"). The remaining items did not load on either factor.

These four measures have several limitations. For example items assume marriage or cohabitation on the ABI (e.g., "refused to do housework"), ISA (e.g., "partner becomes very upset if dinner, housework or laundry is not done when he thinks it should be"), MWA (e.g., "partner told you you were a horrible wife") and PMWI (e.g., "did not do fair share of housework"). Questions pertaining to children on the ABI (e.g., "told you were a bad parent"), ISA (e.g., "demands that I stay home to take care of the children"), MWA (e.g., "partner told you he would kill the children"), and PMWI (e.g., "threatened to take the children away from me") are not applicable to childless women. Violent acts like "threw, hit, kicked, or smashed something" (ABI) and "attempted suicide" (MWA) are included on psychological abuse subscales as was sexual aggression on the ISA (e.g., "demands sex whether I want it or not"). Some items on the ABI are over-inclusive (e.g., threw, hit, kicked, or smashed something") and do not allow researchers to determine which acts or how many acts are actually sustained by a woman.

A focus on effectiveness or completion of controlling acts rather than a partner's attempts is another problem on the MWA (e.g., "imprisoned you in your house," "harassed you over the telephone"), ISA (e.g., "orders me around," "treats me like a dunce"), ABI (e.g., "made you do something humiliating or degrading," "put you on an allowance"), and PMWI (e.g., "kept me from seeing family," "did not allow me to work"). However, attempts to control or the manner in which a partner makes his attempts may also constitute abuse (Marshall, 1994). Only one item measuring such an attempt is present on the ABI (e.g., "tried to keep you from doing something you wanted to do"), MWA (e.g., "attempted suicide"), and PMWI (e.g., "tried to make me feel crazy").

The focus on dominance as a compliance gaining tactic is yet another problem with the MWA (e.g., "told you were a horrible wife,"), ISA (e.g., "belittles me intellectually"), ABI (e.g., "said things to scare you"), and PMWI (e.g., "monitored your time"). However, dominance may not be the only tool a partner uses to control another. Marshall (1994) argued that men may abuse from a dependent position as well (e.g., tell his partner she is the only one who can understand him) or only use dominance to require that he be taken care of (e.g., a man claiming he needs sex). When researchers neglect attempts to control as well as the use of dependence tactics some valuable information may be

missed. Despite these problems, the PMWI appears to be the best instrument currently available.

Other researchers have devised specific items for study (Follingstad, Brennan et al., 1991; Follingstad, et al., 1990; Follingstad et al., 1988; Stets, 1990, 1991; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989) which reflect an overtly dominating and controlling style of abuse. For example, Follingstad et al.'s (1988) items reflect controlling tactics (e.g., "checked up on her," "accused her of infidelity") which were also used in other studies (Follingstad, Brennan et al., 1991; Follingstad et al., 1990). Stets (1990) assessed overt acts of psychological aggression such as "insulted," "made him/her feel guilty," "degraded," and "criticized" were included. Control was measured by items such as "I keep my partner in line," "I get my partner to act in a way that I want him/her to act." These measures have many of the problems associated with published scales (Marshall, 1994). They are narrowly focused and, like established measures, miss other valuable information.

Research results. To date, research has shown that overtly dominating and controlling forms of psychological abuse are significantly related to a variety of variables including violence, relationship duration, victims' mental, and physical health. Although these relationships have been identified, a narrow conceptualization has limited our

knowledge about psychological abuse and its association with other variables.

Studies have shown a relationship between violence and psychological abuse using a variety of measures. This relationship has been most frequently assessed using the CTS. Pan, Niedig, & O'Leary (1994) found a mild violence factor to be moderately correlated ($r$ = .50) with verbal aggression within a sample of military personnel. In Lloyd's (1990) study, all distressed and violent couples and a majority of non-distressed and violent couples reported using verbal attacks on their partner. Similarly, CTS verbal aggression scores have been shown to be higher in violent than nonviolent dating couples (Billingham, 1987) and couples in counseling (Russel, Lipov, Phillips, & White, 1989).

Part of the association of violence and psychological abuse may be an artifact of the measures used. It is illogical to assume that only violent men use psychological abuse. Psychological abuse is also likely, for example, when couples are nearing divorce. A good measure would assess psychological abuse regardless of whether violence was present. The origin of items on the PMWI in the experiences of battered women was evident in a study by Dutton & Painter (1993). They recruited self-identified emotionally abused women ($n$ = 25) and women in shelters ($n$ =

50). Although scores for the two groups should have been close they were significantly different. Battered women scored much higher on dominance/isolation ($\underline{M}$ = 79.1) and emotional abuse ($\underline{M}$ = 95.5) than emotionally abused women ($\underline{M}$ = 43.1 and $\underline{M}$ = 64.4 respectively). The highest possible scale scores were 130 for dominance/isolation and 115 for emotional abuse.

Other studies using the CTS have shown that the occurrence of psychological abuse may predict later violence. In Follingstad et al.'s, (1990) sample, women who experienced significantly more frequent verbal threats of violence and restriction were more likely to predict when violence would occur than those who experienced these acts less frequently. In addition, premarital verbal aggression has also predicted violence at 18 months after marriage (O'Leary, Malone, & Tyree, 1994) and 30 months after marriage (Murphy & O'Leary, 1989). Data from Straus and Gelles' (1986) Second National Family Violence Survey (Stets, 1990) revealed small significant correlations between verbal aggression and violence for both black ($\underline{r}$ = .27) and white ($\underline{r}$ = .18) males. Interestingly, verbal aggression occurred without violence in more than 50% of the sample.

Studies using other measures of verbal aggression such as the PMWI, Infante and Wigley's (1986) Verbal

Aggressiveness Scale, the ISA, observation, and items devised for particular studies have shown similar relationships. Smith and O'Leary's (1987) observation of expressed emotion during conflict revealed that expressed high negative affect (e.g., anger, hostility, cruelty) predicted whether couples were or were not violent. Infante and Wigley's (1986) measure of verbal aggression was moderately correlated with violence scores ($r$ = .32). Similarly, Laner's study (1989) of 296 female college students, revealed that the level of perceived unpleasant competitive acts (e.g., using sarcasm, acting boastfully) were positively associated with level of perceived combativeness: high competitiveness with combativeness (56%); medium competitiveness and combativeness (38%); low competitiveness and combativeness (64%). Parker, McFarlane, Soeken, Torres, and Campbell (1993) used the ISA non-physical violence subscale and the verbal aggression on the CTS. Many women (17%) and teens (8.5%) who sustained violence were also psychologically abused. Similarly, more injured than non-injured wives who sustained violence in Cantos et al.'s, (1994) study reported their husbands used psychologically controlling behaviors.

A similar relationship between psychological abuse and violence is found when verbal aggression is defined as control. For example, Follingstad, et al.'s (1990) study

revealed that the strongest predictor of dating violence was the occurrence of controlling behaviors (e.g., monitoring behavior, choosing friends for her, jealousy). Although, women who sustained no or only one incident of violence did not differ in allowing; with ongoing violence women were more likely to allow male control and were controlled more often (Follingstad et al., 1988). Controlling acts have also been associated with men inflicting and women sustaining mild and severe sexual aggression (Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1989).

Research shows that psychological abuse (e.g., verbal aggression) is common and occurs on a frequent basis. High rates of psychologically harmful acts have been reported among married (Cantos et al., 1993; Stets, 1990) and dating or engaged couples (Arias, Samios, & O'Leary, 1987; O'Leary, 1989). One national study found that at least one incident of psychological abuse occurred in 80% of 1,909 married women (Follingstad et al., 1990). Although this rate is staggering, the prevalence among sub-populations (e.g., couples in counseling or violent relationships) may be even higher. For example, among married and dating women with a history of sustained violence, 99% also experienced psychological abuse (Stets, 1990).

Some forms of psychological abuse are more common or occur more frequently than others. For example, according

to women in Stets' (1991) study, degrading and name calling occurred less often than upsetting or hurting women's feelings. Follingstad et al.'s, (1990) study found high rates of ridicule or verbal harassment (90%), restricted activities (79%), threats of violence (74%), severe jealousy or possessiveness (73%), property damage (59%) and threats to end a marriage (48%), many of which occurred once a week. Ridicule or verbal harassment was reported to be the worst type of emotional abuse. In Tolman's (1989) scale development study, the 207 shelter women reported having a partner withhold affection (91%), being yelled and screamed at (90%), having time monitored (85%), and being insulted (81%). Similarly, more than 85% of Marshall's (1993) sample of community women in "bad or stressful" relationships reported induced guilt, emotional isolation, rejection, having responsibility shifted onto them, and the emotional withdrawal of their partner.

Although limited in number, some studies have documented associations between psychological abuse and other variables. Using a variety of measures, psychological abuse has been related to relationship duration (Mason & Blankenship, 1987), relationship status (Follingstad et al., 1990; Kasian & Painter, 1992; Mason & Blankenship, 1987; Vitanza, Walker, & Marshall, 1990) and satisfaction (Marshall, 1993; Kasian & Painter, 1992; Stets, 1991), self-

esteem (Aguilar & Nightingale, 1994; Dutton & Painter, 1993; Lebov-Keeler & Pipes, 1990; Stets, 1991), mental health (Dutton & Painter, 1993; Follingstad, Brennan et al., 1991; Marshall, 1993), physical health (Follingstad, Brennan, et al., 1991; Marshall, 1993; Marshall, Vitanza, & Paulman, 1991), sustained or witnessed violence in the family of origin (Lebov-Keeler & Pipes, 1990; Murphy & O'Leary, 1993; Stets, 1991; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989), and coping (Marshall, 1993). These studies have shown that psychological abuse impacts many aspects of women's lives. Further, they support the possibility that many effects commonly observed in battered women may actually be due to psychological abuse rather than violence.

A few studies have addressed relationship variables. Using the CTS, Mason and Blankenship (1987) found a positive relationship between verbal aggression and relationship duration. More broadly, Marshall's (1993) study revealed that relationship satisfaction correlated with the perceived impact of 31 types of abuse, ranging from $r = -.24$, for degrade, to $r = -.52$ for intruding into women's activities. Vivian (1986) also found that negative affect expressed during communication discriminated between maritally satisfied and dissatisfied couples.

An association between psychological abuse, operationalized as control, and relationship variables has

also been reported. For example, Stets (1991) found that women's relationship satisfaction was negatively correlated with male partners' use of emotional control tactics. Similarly, Kasian and Painter (1992) found a negative correlation between satisfaction and emotional/verbal and dominance/isolation types of psychological abuse on the PMWI. Male attempts to control and degrade women, withdraw from them, and engage in fewer positive behaviors have also been associated with women having terminated their relationship (Vitanza et al., 1990). Taken together, these findings indicate that verbal aggression and control may lead to dissatisfaction, but may not be sufficient to cause women to terminate their relationships.

Psychological abuse has also been associated with mental health. For example, using the CTS verbal aggression subscale, Lebov-Keeler and Pipes (1990) found that women who were psychologically abused had lower self-esteem scores than those who were not abused although the difference was small ($M$ = 30.6 vs. $M$ = 33.7). Aguilar and Nightingale (1994) found that emotional/controlling abuse was the only factor of several they included which significantly related to lower self-esteem. Similarly, Dutton and Painter (1993) found that shelter women's receipt of PMWI emotional abuse significantly predicted self-esteem, attachment to a partner, and trauma symptoms. Conversely, Stets' (1991)

showed that women's low self-esteem predicted receipt of verbal aggression from their partners.

Other studies have associated mental health symptoms with the frequency and types of psychological abuse (e.g., verbal attacks, isolation-restriction, jealousy-possessiveness, verbal threat of harm, verbal threat to leave, and destruction of property among others). Follingstad, Brennan et al., (1991) found that the number of symptoms a woman experienced (e.g., depression and anxiety) increased linearly as they sustained more types of psychological abuse. Follingstad et al., (1990) found that women who sustained high levels of emotional abuse and who generally believed what their partner said tended to experience more negative effects than those who sustained less abuse or had less believable partners.

Similarly, Marshall's (1993b) study of psychologically abused women revealed that the impact of 21 types of abuse correlated with somatization, obsessive-compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, anxiety, depression, hostility, paranoia, psychoticism, and global distress scores on the SCL-90R (Derogatis, 1983). All of the sample had sustained a severe level of psychological abuse, and scored higher than 93% of the normative sample for overall emotional distress regardless of whether they had also sustained violence. Yet violence may moderate the relationship

between mental health variables and psychological abuse. For example, thoughts of suicide related to the impact of 28 types of psychological abuse in the sample. Twenty-seven positive correlations were found within the moderate violence group, five in the severe violence group, and six inverse relationships were found in the group that had not sustained violence. Further, women in the severe violence group were more likely to have attempted suicide (43.8%) than were women in the psychological abuse only (22.6%) or the moderate violence (13.3%) group. From these findings Marshall argued that psychological abuse itself is harmful to women's health, but the particular type of harm depends on level of violence.

Psychological abuse may also affect physical health. Using items devised for their study, Marshall, Vitanza, and Paulson (1991) found that men's control of women's emotions and superiority tactics were associated with serious and chronic illness, increased visits to a physician, taking psychotropic medication, and hospitalization for emotional problems. During the preceding year, 39% of the sample had seen a physician more often than in the past. Many women had taken psychotropic medication (71%) or been hospitalized (13%) for emotional problems (Marshall 1993b). Further, a chronic illness was more likely among psychologically abused

women (38.7%) than among those who had experienced moderate (16.7%) or severe (10.3%) violence (Marshall, 1993b).

Psychological abuse in perpetrators' and victims' families of origin has also been associated with inflicted and sustained psychological abuse. In Murphy and O'Leary's (1993) study, witnessing verbal aggression in the family of origin was associated with similar behaviors directed toward the current partner. Witnessing violence when young was also positively associated with men's acts of interpersonal control and verbal aggression in dating relationships (Stets, 1991).

All available studies reviewed except Marshall (1993a; 1993b; 1994) were developed from traditional views of psychological abuse. Only verbal aggression or other overt acts of dominance or control were measured. Taken together, these studies strongly suggest that psychological abuse alone can be harmful to women. However, knowledge about the relationship between psychological abuse and other variables is still limited because of narrow conceptualizations. By only assessing overt ways of dominating and controlling a partner, researchers may be missing a broader spectrum of potentially harmful behaviors.

Overtly dominating acts may be much less frequent than subtle acts. For example, deTurck found an increased likelihood of punishment (1985) and aggression (1987) when

subjects were faced with resistance. Lim (1990) found that verbal aggression increased with unfriendly responses and was rapidly escalated by strong resistance. Such studies suggest that verbal aggression and other forms of psychological abuse may only occur when more socially desirable persuasive techniques fail. Thus, a man may begin with gentle, calm, and subtle messages before resorting to overt or dominating techniques which may escalate as necessary to gain partner compliance.

Loring and Myers (1992) presented anecdotal evidence which suggests that even subtle behaviors may be abusive. Their interviews with women having relationship problems focused on the day to day interactions which women described as having a powerful impact on their lives. Behaviors which were considered psychologically abusive included their partner sighing, laughing at them, shaking their head at their ideas, or ignoring them.

Marshall (1994) took a broader approach than have others. Her definition includes acts which have the potential to harm or undermine a woman's sense of self for which the intent to harm, control, or dominate need not be present. Because psychological abuse lies in the effect of a particular act, a subtle act can have as much influence on a woman as an overt act. Marshall's perspective is supported by the social influence literature and evidenced

in common experiences. An example may illustrate her approach. Just as people may have difficulty explaining why or how one person can make them feel good about themselves, they may also wonder precisely how another person can make them feel bad about themselves. Many people have been in relationships in which they "discovered" they had changed at some point. However, if asked how the change had occurred, they may be unsure, refer to the partner in negative terms, but focus on their own weakness in letting it happen.

Social influence perspective. Application of social influence theories (Festinger, 1954; Higgins, Klein, & Strauman, 1985; Tesser, Millar, & Moore., 1988; Steele, 1988) makes it clear that interpersonal and intrapersonal processes can strongly impact women's self-concept. Several social psychological theories and studies on self-concept have shown the importance of interactions with others in determining how one views the self. These interactions with others may be positive or negative and may serve to enhance as well as hurt self-concept. Because feedback may vary from context to context, an individual's self-concept is also likely to vary across contexts (Doherty, Scheier, & Buss, 1975; Festinger, 1954; Higgins, 1987, 1989; Markus & Nurius, 1986; McGuire & McGuire, 1982; Swann, 1983; Tesser et al., 1988). For example, a woman who is repeatedly, verbally or non-verbally, discounted by a partner when

stating her opinion may eventually believe many of her opinions have little merit.  However, she may be praised for comments in class and, thus, doubt herself less in an educational setting.

Various theories converge to show that a partner's comments may harm a woman's sense of self even if her partner has the best intentions and loves her deeply. Neither she nor her partner may be aware of the effect of his comments.  For example, Self-discrepancy theory (Higgins et al., 1985) holds that people are motivated to reach a condition where their actual self-perception matches their ideal and ought self-representations.  Higgins (1987) argues that people hold four kinds of inner standards.  Standards can either be their own (e.g., "I want to be a straight-A student") or other's (e.g., "My father wants me to be a straight-A student").  Furthermore, these standards can represent either their own ideals or personal goals (e.g., "I want to be a concert pianist") or duties and obligations which represent a moral conscious (e.g., "I must not lie"). Thus, individuals can experience different kinds of discrepancies between their view of themselves and their standards. Individuals may not match their own ideals or even other's ideals.  Individuals may not match their own or other's moral "oughts."  Discomfort will be induced by a chronic or transitory discrepancy between any two of the

three (actual, ought, ideal) self-representations. These
discrepancies can be triggered through feedback from others
causing depression, anxiety (Higgins et al., 1987), or
changes in self-esteem (Pelham & Swann, 1989). A partner
may provide evaluative feedback which highlights a woman's
self-discrepancies. For example, a partner may comment in a
teasing, angry, disappointed, or wishful tone "I remember
when you used to be a size six," making a discrepancy
between her actual and ideal body image salient.

Tesser et al.'s (1988) self-evaluation theory shows how
the performance of others can affect self-evaluations,
especially in close relationships. Self-concept may be
threatened and subject to change when a close other
outperforms one's self. Research has repeatedly
demonstrated that when outperformed by a close other on a
task high in self-relevance, one's self-definition changes
(Salovey & Rodin, 1991; Tesser, 1986; Tesser et al., 1988;
Tesser & Collins, 1988; Tesser & Moore, 1990) and self-
esteem is diminished, generating negative affect such as
frustration, anger (Tesser & Collins, 1988), jealousy, or
envy (Salovey & Rodin, 1991; Tesser & Collins).

The intent to harm need not be present for harm to
occur. For example, after several months in a yoga class, a
woman may demonstrate to her partner her new ability to
touch her ankles. Her sense of accomplishment may dissolve

if he says, "Oh you are trying to do this" as he places his palms on the floor. Thus, she would be reminded that she is not as successful as her partner. The partner of a woman who prides herself on academic success may joke or state, "I think the kids got their brains from me, after all, I was class Valedictorian." This woman's self-concept could be threatened even if she was ranked 5th in her class.

Self-Affirmation theory (Steele, 1988) also shows how interpersonal feedback may impact self-concept. People often cope with threats to self-worth by affirming unrelated aspects of themselves. Research demonstrates that feedback may harm self-concepts (Brown & Smart, 1991; Shrauger & Shoenenman, 1979). This is particularly true for women with high self-esteem. They may emphasize their positive features as a compensatory strategy whereas women with low self-esteem tend to generalize their failure (Steele, 1988; Wicklund & Gollwitzer, 1982). From this perspective, if a woman with high self-esteem did not obtain a desired job she may seek support from her partner regarding her attractiveness. Her partner's response could enhance or harm her self-concept. A neutral, apparently innocuous comment (e.g., "I think you look o.k.") or a critical comment may make the woman feel worse, diminishing her self-concept. In contrast, a woman with low self-esteem may not

have even sought the support. Thus, a woman with low self-esteem would not allow an opportunity for affirmation.

Self-knowledge may also be gained through social comparison processes (Festinger, 1954). Research shows that comparisons with similar, superior, and inferior others affect self-concepts (Salovey & Rodin, 1984, 1985; Wills, 1981; Wood, Taylor, & Lichtman, 1983, 1985). These comparisons may be intentionally sought or forced by the environment. A woman's self-concept may change after intentionally comparing herself to others in a variety of contexts. However, unsolicited social comparisons may also undermine her self-concept. For example, a partner could draw attention to another woman's intelligence and occupational success which may cause a woman to evaluate herself as less successful and less positive. Within this context, her self-concept may be restructured.

Marshall (1994) contended that subtle behaviors in interpersonal interactions like those mentioned here may impact a woman's self-concept by increasing uncertainty about herself, her partner, or her relationship. Uncertainty is typically associated with discomfort or anxiety which may cause people to seek information to decrease that discomfort. When research on uncertainty in self-concept (Baumgardner, 1990; Epstein, 1986; Pelham, 1991), relationships (Berger, 1988; Cupach & Metts, 1987;

Noller & Gallois, 1988), behavior (Weinstein, 1989), coping (Janoff-Bulman, 1988; Lopes, 1987) and cognitive processes (Chaiken, Liberman & Eagly, 1989; Masters & Keil, 1987) is coupled with attitude change research showing that thinking about something results in a confirmatory bias (Markus & Wurf, 1987; Ross, 1980), the possibilities for psychological abuse become clear. The recognition of these many possibilities makes it evident that much psychological abuse may occur through various means and through everyday interactions rather than only during conflicts.

Rationale and Hypotheses

Researchers have documented an association between sustained violence and women's self-concept and with psychological distress. Effects ranging from low self-esteem, low self-confidence, decreased satisfaction with the self in physical, social, and family domains to serious psychological symptoms such as depression, anxiety, and PTSD have been found in clinical and non-clinical samples. Although no cause and effect relationship has been established, the focus on violence research has led us to view violence as the primary contributory factor.

Although violence researchers initially addressed battering, they eventually expanded their scope to include verbal aggression and other forms of psychological abuse (i.e., domination and control tactics). Instruments such as

the CTS, ABI, WAI, and PMWI measure overt forms of psychological abuse from this perspective. Available research has shown that psychologically abused women have mental health problems similar to women who have sustained violence. Associations have been found between psychological abuse and low self-esteem, and psychological symptoms such as depression, anxiety, and somatization.

The narrow focus on aggressive, dominating and controlling forms of psychological abuse is a primary weakness of current literature. Theories of interpersonal influence suggest that a much broader approach may be more appropriate. Research based on social comparison, self-affirmation, self-discrepancy, and self-evaluation theories demonstrates how the intent to harm, control, or dominate need not be present to undermine self-concept. Research findings based on social influence theory, anecdotal evidence (Loring & Myers, 1992), and empirical evidence (Marshall, 1994) suggests that subtle behaviors inherent in day to day communication may be equally if not more harmful than overt domination and, thus, have a powerful impact on women's lives. From this perspective, it appears necessary to consider a broader spectrum of acts when operationalizing psychological abuse. If subtle harmful behaviors, present in day to day interactions, continue to be ignored valuable information may be neglected.

The present study extended previous research by including subtle behaviors inherent in day to day communication which are insidious and have the potential to undermine a woman's self-concept and increase psychological symptoms. Specifically, this study was conducted to explore the relationship between subtle abuse, self-concept variables (i.e., self-esteem, interpersonal competence, problem-solving confidence, and depression proneness) and psychological symptoms experienced by women. This study also revealed relationships between subtle and overt abuse and between psychological abuse and violence.

Several hypotheses were derived from this new perspective. First, greater subtle psychological abuse was expected to be related to self-concept (low self-esteem, low interpersonal competence, high depression proneness, low problem solving confidence) and psychological symptomatology (high depression, high anxiety, high somatization) scores. Second, greater subtle psychological abuse was expected to enhance prediction of low self-concept and psychological symptomatology above and beyond greater overt psychological abuse and sustained violence. An additional research question addressed differences among these groups (sustained no, moderate, and severe violence).

CHAPTER II

METHOD

## Sample

Data for the proposed study were collected by Linda L. Marshall, Professor of Psychology at the University of North Texas. The sample was comprised of 93 English speaking women, 18 to 59 years of age ($M$ = 36.03, $SD$ = 10.57) who were paid fifty dollars for their participation. They were married ($n$ = 42), cohabiting ($n$ = 14), dating ($n$ = 10), recently divorced ($n$ = 4) or separated ($n$ = 23) from their partner. The relationships ranged in duration from one to 44 years ($M$ = 11.55 years, $SD$ = 8.43). None of these women had been out of this most recent relationship longer than one year.

## Screening Procedure

Volunteers ($n$ = 620) were recruited through advertisements and announcements seeking women in "bad" or "stressful" relationships. Telephone screening interviews eliminated 468 (75.4%) women who did not meet criteria for the study. To participate, women had to have had a recent long term, intimate relationship with a male, have no recent therapy, and be seriously psychologically abused. Serious

psychological abuse was defined as a score over 200 on 51 psychological abuse items devised for this study (Marshall, 1996). This score reflected a mean of approximately four on a seven point frequency scales (never to very often).

A second order screen was conducted using the acts of physical violence on the Severity of Violence Against Women Scale (SVAWS; Marshall, 1992a). This scale was used to categorize subjects into one of three groups: psychological abuse only (PA), moderate violence (MV) and severe violence (SV). To qualify, women had to score 15 or lower on the acts of violence subscale of the SVAWS with no acts of serious violence (PA and MV groups) or over 25 including acts of serious, life threatening violence (SV group). In order to create distinct groups, women who scored between 15 and 25 on the SVAWS were excluded from the study ($n$ = 10). The 21 SVAWS violence items were rated from never (0) to very often (4). On this basis, 41 women qualified for the psychological abuse only (PA) group with a sum of 5 or lower on the violence items. Fifty women qualified for the moderate violence group (MV) with scores between 5 and 15 and 51 women qualified for the severe violence group (SV) with scores over 25 on the violence items. Thus, a total of 142 women qualified for the study.

Questionnaires were sent to qualified volunteers. Complete data were obtained from 93 women. Attrition occurred because women had moved or had phones disconnected

(n = 12), their husband interfered in some way (n = 4), they were out of the relationship longer than one year, had therapy (n = 3), no longer had time (n = 4) or no longer wanted to participate (n = 6). An additional 20 women were dropped from the study when they could not be contacted by telephone or an interview could not be completed due to scheduling problems or missed appointments. Thus, 30 women remained in the PA group, 31 women in the MV group, and 32 women in the SV group.

The final sample was diverse, but women tended to be middle class. Approximately 11% were minority women (i.e., African American, Asian and Hispanic). Almost a third (31.2%) had attended or completed high school, 46.2% had post high school training or some college, 15.1% had a bachelor's degree and 8.6% had attended graduate school. Some women (37.6%) had never worked outside the home. However, many had worked periodically (18.3%) or most (44.1%) of the time.

Instruments

The entire questionnaire took participants three to five hours to complete. Instruments in this study included the SVAWS (Marshall, 1992a), the Symptom Checklist 90-revised (SCL-90-R; Derogatis, 1983), Interpersonal Competence Scale (Spitzberg, personal communication), the Depression Proneness Rating Scale (Zemore, 1983), Problem-

Solving Confidence (Heppner & Petersen, 1982), the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1979), and a demographic questionnaire. Additional psychological abuse items were developed specifically for the study.

The Severity of Violence Against Women Scale (SVAWS). The SVAWS (Marshall, 1992a) used in screening has 46 items rated on a scale from never (0) to very often (4) (Appendix A). A unique advantage of this measure is that females rather than researchers rated how violent, serious, abusive, threatening and aggressive it would be if a man inflicted each act on a woman. Nine empirically derived factors (Symbolic Violence, Threats of Mild Violence, Threats of Moderate Violence, Threats of Serious Violence, Mild Violence, Minor Violence, Moderate Violence, Serious Violence, and Sexual Aggression) represent over-riding dimensions Threats of Violence, Acts of Violence and Sexual Aggression by male partners. Mean inter-item correlations for the nine dimensions ranged from a low of .73 for Threats of Serious Violence to a high of .96 for Sexual Aggression and these mean inter-item correlations were higher within the dimensions than between the dimensions when the SVAWS was developed. A total violence score was calculated for this study and used to identify the three levels of violence (i.e., psychological abuse only, moderate violence, and severe violence).

Symptom Checklist 90-Revised (SCL-90-R). The SCL-90-R (Derogatis, 1983) is a 90 item measure assessing psychological distress in the past 7 days across 9 symptom dimensions (Somatization, Obsessive-Compulsive, Interpersonal Sensitivity, Depression, Anxiety, Hostility, Phobic Anxiety, Paranoid Ideation, and Psychoticism). Derogatis reported internal consistencies ranging from (alpha = .77) for Psychoticism to (alpha = .90) for Depression. Test-retest reliability was within an appropriate range ($r$ = .80 to .90) for symptom constructs. Strong convergent and construct validity have also been reported, especially for non-clinical samples. Items were rated on a five point scale of symptomatology from "not at all" (0) to "extremely" (4) for the previous month. For this study, mean symptom scores were calculated on Depression, Anxiety, and Somatization subscales. Estimates of reliability in this sample were similar to previous estimates, (alpha = .88) for anxiety (alpha = .90) for Somatization and (alpha = .92) for depression, which also indicates that these subscales are internally consistent. Higher scores reflected greater symptom intensity.

Psychological abuse. Items were devised for this study to assess a broad range of acts reflecting both overt and subtle forms of psychological abuse. These items were

derived from the literature on maltreatment of children, clinical case studies on violence, shelter workers' perceptions and the compliance literature. These items represent the 42 categories of psychological abuse in Table 1 which was reproduced from Marshall (1994). Threats of violence, although psychologically abusive, were measured on the SVAWS (Marshall, 1992a) because they are so closely associated with acts of violence. Other than verbal aggression, the categories of acts listed in the Table 1 can be enacted in both subtle and overt ways. For example, "you were so sweet last night, I don't know what happened can be said in a tone of voice that is loving, teasing, sarcastic, angry, or hostile. Some items were rated on a 7-point rating scale anchored by "never" (1) and "very often" (7) where as others were achored by "not at all" (1) and "a great deal" (7). Both subtle and overt scales developed for this study were comprised of items devised as part of a larger study (Marshall, 1993). Scale development and scale score calculations are presented in the description of second pilot study, scale development.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE). The 10 item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1979) was used to assess women's global self-attitude (Appendix B). Items were originally rated on a four point scale from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." However, the rating scale

was modified to include six points which ranged from "not at all like me" to "very much like me." The RSE has been shown to have adequate internal consistancy (alpha = .72) and stability over time ($r$ = .92) (Rosenburg, 1979). This scale is one of the most widely used instruments for self-esteem. This measure has also demonstrated construct and convergent validity. Scores have been significantly correlated with measures of depressive affect, anxiety, and peer group reputation across a variety of samples. Scores on the RSE were also significantly correlated with similar measures such as the Coopersmith Self-Esteem Inventory (Coopersmith, 1967; 1984). The estimate of reliability in this sample (alpha = .89) is similar to previous estimates and indicates that this scale is internally consistent. Mean scores were calculated after reversing the five negatively worded items. High means represented high self-esteem.

Interpersonal Competence Scale. The Interpersonal Competence Scale (Spitzberg, personal communication) is a 16 item measure to assess perceived conversational skill (Appendix C). Items were originally rated on a five point scale from "almost never true" to "almost always true" which was modified to seven points. Subjects were asked to rate whether, on average across conversations, the statement was true when they were talking with their partner. Five items were reverse scored. Chronbach's alpha calculated on this

sample was high (alpha = .91). High scores represented high interpersonal-competence.

Depression Proneness Rating Scales (DPRS). The Depression Proneness Rating Scales (DPRS; Zemore, Fischer, Garratt, & Miller, 1989) has 12 items to assess depressive symptoms subjects have experienced (Appendix D). The original nine point rating scale was modified to seven points on which subjects rated how frequently, compared to others, they had experienced each symptom ("much less often" to "much more often"). The mid-point was described as "about the same." Reliability estimates have indicated that this scale is internally consistent (alpha = .95) and stable over a nine week time period ($r$ = .82). Scores have also been significantly correlated with the Beck Depression Inventory and Depression Adjective Checklist among samples of university undergraduates. The estimate of reliability in this sample (alpha = .90) is similar to previous estimates and indicates that this scale is internally consistent. Mean scores were calculated with high scores reflecting high depression proneness.

Problem-Solving Confidence. The 11-item Problem-Solving Confidence subscale of the Problem-Solving Inventory (Heppner & Petersen, 1982) has been used to assess confidence in engaging in a wide range of problem-solving activities (Appendix E). Items were originally rated on a

9-point scale from "very much less" to "very much more" than others. However, the rating scale was modified to cover seven points from "less than other women" to "more than other women." Estimates of reliability have indicated this subscale is internally consistent (alpha = .85) as well as stable over a 2 week time interval ($r$ = .85). Concurrent and construct validity has also been established among samples of university students. Scores on Problem-Solving Confidence have been correlated with level of Problem-Solving Skills Estimate (Heppner, 1979) and the Means-Ends Problem Solving Procedure (Platt & Spivack, 1975). The estimate of reliability in this sample (alpha = .85) is similar to the previous estimmate and indicates that this subscale is internally consistent. Mean scores were calculated for use in this study after reversing negatively worded items. Thus, high scores represented high confidence in participants.

Subtle Psychological Abuse Scale Development

Pilot 1. The list of psychological abuse items used in a larger study was presented to three independent raters (two Ph.D. Clinical Psychologists (one female, one male), and one Ph.D. Sociologist (female). These raters, not overly familiar with this abuse literature were selected as a convenience sample. Operational definitions of subtle (ratings of 1 or 2) and overt acts (ratings of 4 or 5) were

used to rate each item on a five point scale from "very subtle" (1) to "very overt" (5) (Appendix F). By nature, subtle acts are difficult to identify. Therefore, it was not expected that all raters would rate each item identically. As a result, items rated identically by two or more raters were used to create subtle and overt scales.

Initial results did not reflect distinct categories of subtle and overt acts. Rather, a few trends emerged. Many items theoretically identified as "subtle" were included with those identified as "overt" (e.g., "teases you," "points out ways your job or other activities have hurt you," "compares you to other women so that you seem worse," "says your friends or family are using you or really don't care about you," "changes so what is ok now is bad later"), items theoretically identified as "subtle" were dropped from consideration because of poor inter-rater reliability (e.g., "wrestles with you," "says his actions which hurt you were to help you be a better person," "says he cannot live without you"), and items which reflected positive acts were frequently identified as "subtle" (e.g., "tells you things will get better," "lets you know he appreciates you," "acts courteous and socially proper").

These raters' familiarity with the nature of the project and use of the term "abuse" used in definitions may have created a confound between the degree of pleasure or

displeasure caused by a particular act and the subtle or overt nature of the act. A lack of definition specificity may have been another problem. The definition of "subtle" and "overt" referred to the act itself rather than the message or meta-message content. Therefore, raters may not have known to identify acts which contain underlying messages. In addition, the term abuse was used on the questionnaire. Based on definitions provided, raters may have considered "subtle" those acts which were not obviously abusive. This confound may have caused the inclusion of many positive acts in the subtle category. Due to the nature of problems described, neither subtle nor overt psychological abuse scales were created from these initial data.

Pilot 2. For the second scale development study, two separate rating forms (i.e., hurtful-pleasurable rating and a subtle-overt rating) were created and counterbalanced by alternating the order of presentation. Female graduate students in psychology were asked to rate items on a seven point scales from "extremely hurtful" (1) to "extremely pleasurable" (7) (Appendix G). They also rated items on a scale from (1) "extremely subtle" to (7) "extremely overt". This method was chosen to clearly distinguish items which convey both subtle and hurtful messages from items which may send both overt and hurtful messages or positive messages.

Definition specificity and clarity was enhanced by emphasizing message content rather than the act and providing general examples. Ten rating forms of the thirty-seven distributed were returned.

A mean was calculated for each item to indicate the degree to which it was subtle or overt as well as the degree of pleasure or pain possibly elicited by the message. Items were separated into four categories (i.e., subtle and hurtful, subtle and pleasurable, overt and hurtful, overt and pleasurable). Mean ratings below 4 indicated item subtlety or hurtfulness and mean item ratings greater than 4 indicated item overtness or pleasure. Items rated as both subtle and hurtful or both overt and hurtful were retained for subtle (49 items) and overt (59 items) psychological abuse scales, respectively. Items rated as both subtle and pleasurable, overt and pleasurable, or neutral were dropped from analyses ($\underline{n}$ = 142). Neutral items (i.e., mean rating of 4) were excluded).

Chronbach's alpha was conducted on the subtle (alpha = .87) and overt (alpha = .91) scales. Internal consistencies of this magnitude suggested that scales included more items than necessary (Devellis, 1991). In addition, correlational analyses revealed a strong, positive relationship between subtle and overt psychological abuse ($\underline{r}$ = .84). Therefore, modifications were made to reduce the number of scale items

and to better distinguish between subtle and overt acts. Only items with the 15 highest (most overt) and 15 lowest (most subtle) mean ratings were included. These items are presented in Tables 2 and 3. Chronbach's alpha was then calculated on the modified subtle (alpha = .69) and overt (alpha = .82) scales but the iter-scale correlation remained high ($r$ = .73). Items were then dropped based on mean ratings until an acceptable correlation between the two scales was achieved. This yielded a total of 12 items for each scale. One additional item, "he points out ways in which the children have hurt you," was dropped from the subtle scale because women who did not have children would not be able to respond to this item. It was replaced by the subtle psychological abuse item with the next lowest item-total correlation (i.e., "promises to change"). Chronbach's alpha was calculated on both subtle (alpha = .70) and overt (alpha = .82) scales. This resulted in a lower relationship and greater distinction between subtle and overt psychological abuse ($r$ = .63).

Coefficient of Attenuation was then computed. This calculation was used to account for measurement error in the correlation and reflects the unobserved correlation between the latent factors. Although the attenuated correlation was $r$ = .63, correlation corrected for attenuation suggested that latent factors were correlated at $r$ = .82. Thus,

subtle and overt psychological abuse scales may have measured the same latent construct. Although the unattenuated correlation may indicate one latent construct, theory suggests that a distinction be made between subtle and overt tactics. Thus, they were treated as separate correlated scales. Mean scores were calculated for both scale with high scores representing high frequency.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This study included three independent and seven
dependent variables.  Predictor variables were subtle
psychological abuse, overt psychological abuse, and
sustained violence.  Criterion variables were self-esteem,
interpersonal competence, problem-solving confidence,
depression proneness, depression, anxiety, and somatization.
This study employed correlational analyses, hierarchical
multiple regression, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).  SPSS
was employed for all analyses.  An alpha level of .05 was
selected to determine significance of all analyses.

Distributional characteristics (i.e., skewness,
kurtosis, and outliers) of variables were also examined for
participant age, length of relationship, as well as the
variables of interest.  Analyses revealed a slight skew for
two variables (somatization, skewness = .82, SE skewness =
.25; frequency of sustained violence, skewness = .98, SE
skewness = .25).  Thus, only a few women reported frequent
somatization or frequent severe violence.  All other
variables were normally distributed.  No participant had
extreme scores (i.e., outliers) on any measure included in
this study.  Means and standard deviations of all criterion

variables collapsed across PA, SV, and MV groups are presented in Table 4. Means and standard deviations of these same criterion variables within violence groups are presented in Table 5.

Attrition analyses were conducted on age, partner's age and length of relationship). ANOVA was employed to test differences between the 93 subjects who completed questionnaires and 49 subjects who were dropped from the study. Results indicate no significant differences between these two groups. Further attrition analyses were conducted on these same variables within each of the three violence groups. There were no differences between completers and non-completers within groups.

ANOVAs were used to test for differences on all predictor and dependent variables by variables that may confound the results. Possible confounding variables were relationship status (i.e., current vs past relationship), length of relationship, and violence. Women who were out of their relationship reported more frequent overt psychological abuse ($M$ = 3.96, $SD$ = 1.17) vs. ($M$ = 3.01, $SD$ = 1.14) $F(1,91)$ = 6.70, $p \leq$ .05, lower self-esteem ($M$ = 4.43, $SD$ = .83) vs. ($M$ = 3.76, $SD$ = 1.06) $F(1,91)$ = 4.07, $p \leq$ .05, and lower anxiety scores ($M$ = .69, $SD$ = .74) vs. ($M$ = 1.25, $SD$ = .87) $F(1,92)$ = 4.17, $p \leq$ .05 than women who were in a relationship. Although group differences were

identified, only 11 of the 91 women were no longer in a relationship.  Because the group was small, these results may be unreliable.  Therefore, this variable was not controlled in hypothesis testing.

ANOVA were also conducted by length of relationship.  A median split was used to create two groups: "long term" (longer than nine years) and "short term" (less than or equal to nine years).  No significant differences were found on the variables used in this study.  ANOVAs conducted by violence group on the other variables of interest.  Women's scores on the measure of overt psychological abuse differed significantly across levels of violence.  Women in the SV group sustained significantly $F(2,91)$ = 13.96, $p \leq$ .01. more overt psychological abuse ($M$ = 3.87, $SD$ = .22) than women who sustained moderate violence ($M$ = 2.95, $SD$ = .18) or no violence ($M$ = 2.50, $SD$ = .15) tested using Tukey-$A$, $p \leq$ .05.

Hypothesis Testing and Group Patterns

Analyses were conducted to determine relationships among the independent variables.  As noted earlier subtle and overt psychological abuse were related ($r$ = .63, $p \leq$.05).  The strength of correlation between the two variables increased as violence increased within each group.  The weakest relationship occurred within the PA group ($r$ = .48, $p \leq$.01), followed by the MV group ($r$ = .70, $p \leq$.01), and the SV group ($r$ = .73, $p \leq$.01).  However, there was no

relationship between violence and either overt ($r$ = .30, ns) or subtle psychological abuse ($r$ = .14, ns).

Hypothesis 1. Correlations were computed to test the relationship of subtle psychological abuse to self-concept and psychological symptoms. These results are presented in Table 6. Subtle psychological abuse was expected to have a negative relationship with the self-concept variables self-esteem, interpersonal competence and problem solving confidence. The only significant correlation was in the opposite direction from that predicted. Post-hoc two by three ANOVAs were used to better understand this relationship. A median split was used to create groups that were high or low in subtle psychological abuse. No main effects or interaction were found. Post-hoc inspection of the correlations between subtle psychological abuse and problem solving confidence within each violence group revealed a correlation within the PA group ($r$ = .50, $p \leq$ .01), but no significant correlations in the MV ($r$ = .09, ns) and SV ($r$ = .15, ns) groups. Only among women who did not sustain violence, was the correlation significant.

Positive relationships were expected and found for subtle psychological abuse and depression proneness, depression, anxiety, and somatization. Post-hoc analyses within the violence groups revealed relationships between subtle psychological abuse and depression ($r$ = .47, $p \leq$.01),

anxiety ($\underline{r}$ = .49, $\underline{p}$ $\leq$.01), and somatization ($\underline{r}$ = .48, $\underline{p}$ $\leq$.01) within the moderate violence group as well as with depression ($\underline{r}$ = .37, $\underline{p}$ $\leq$.05) within the severe violence group.

Hypothesis 2. Hierarchical multiple regression analyses tested the ability of subtle psychological abuse to predict self-concept (i.e., self-esteem, interpersonal competence, depression proneness, problem-solving competence) and psychological symptomatology (i.e., depression, anxiety, somatization) beyond the variance accounted for by overt psychological abuse and sustained violence. These hierarchical analyses were theoretically based. Because the literature has supported the relationship of violence to the criterion variables and because it was most easily observable and quantified, the frequency of sustained violence was entered first in each equation. Overt psychological abuse was entered second because its relationship with the criterion construct was also empirically established. Subtle psychological abuse was entered last to determine whether it would predict the criterion after accounting for dominance tactics. To further explore the relationships, regression equations were then calculated within each violence group.

Results, presented in Table 7, indicated that only violence made a significant contribution to women's self-

esteem for the entire sample. Neither the inclusion of overt nor subtle psychological abuse enhanced prediction. To determine whether the pattern of results differed, separate regression equations were calculated for each violence group entering overt, then subtle psychological abuse. Again, neither the inclusion of overt psychological abuse nor subtle psychological abuse predicted women's self-esteem scores in the any of the three groups. Post hoc correlations between subtle psychological abuse and self-esteem within violence groups and for the entire sample were not significant. Thus, subtle psychological abuse was not statistically related to women's self-esteem.

Hierarchical regression equations were then calculated to determine whether the prediction of competence could be enhanced by including subtle psychological abuse. Results are presented in Table 8. Contrary to expectation, only violence predicted women's interpersonal competence. Neither overt nor subtle psychological abuse served to significantly enhance prediction. To further explore these relationships, regression equations were calculated within violence groups. As expected, in the PA group, subtle psychological abuse significantly enhanced prediction of interpersonal competence scores above that provided by overt psychological abuse. In both the MV and SV groups, neither

overt nor subtle psychological abuse predicted interpersonal competence scores.

Next it was expected that subtle psychological abuse would enhance the prediction of depression proneness after both violence and overt psychological abuse scores were accounted for. Results are presented in Table 9. Contrary to expectation, overt psychological abuse was the only effective predictor of depression proneness scores. Subtle psychological abuse did not predict depression proneness after violence and overt psychological abuse were accounted for. Regression equations were again calculated within the groups. Results indicate that neither overt nor subtle were effective predictors of depression proneness within any one group.

Next, it was expected that subtle psychological abuse would predict problem-solving confidence scores after the effects of violence and overt psychological abuse were controlled. Results are presented in Table 10. As expected, only subtle psychological abuse predicted problem-solving confidence. To further explore this relationship, regression equations were calculated for each violence group. In the PA group, subtle psychological abuse was an effective predictor of problem-solving confidence scores after variance accounted for by overt psychological abuse was removed. However, in both the MV and SV groups,

neither overt nor subtle psychological abuse predicted problem-solving confidence scores.

It was also expected that subtle psychological abuse would predict depression after variance accounted for by violence and overt psychological abuse had been removed. Results are presented in Table 11. Both violence and subtle psychological abuse significantly predicted depression, overt psychological abuse did not. As expected, subtle psychological abuse enhanced the prediction of depression. To further explore these relationships, regression equations were calculated within the three violence groups. In the PA and SV groups, neither overt nor subtle psychological abuse significantly predicted depression. However, subtle psychological abuse significantly enhanced prediction of depression beyond that provided by overt psychological abuse in the MV group.

Next, it was anticipated that subtle psychological abuse would be a more effective predictor of anxiety than violence and overt psychological abuse. Results are presented in Table 12. Both violence and subtle psychological abuse significant predicted anxiety scores, but overt psychological abuse did not. Regression equations were again calculated within the three violence groups. In the PA and SV groups, neither overt nor subtle psychological abuse significantly predicted anxiety. However, subtle

psychological abuse significantly enhanced prediction of anxiety beyond that provided by overt psychological abuse in the MV group.

Finally, it was expected that subtle psychological abuse would be a more effective predictor of somatic symptoms than violence and overt psychological abuse. Results are presented in Table 13. Both violence and subtle psychological abuse significantly predicted somatic symptoms, but overt psychological abuse did not. To further explore these relationships, regression equations were calculated within the three violence groups. In the PA and SV groups, neither overt nor subtle psychological abuse significantly predicted somatic symptom scores. However, subtle psychological abuse significantly enhanced prediction after overt psychological abuse was controlled in the MV group.

An additional research question was also explored in this study. Inter-relationships among the psychological constructs were tested for similarity between three pairs of groups (PA and MV; PA and SV; MV and SV). In order to make these comparisons, the intercorrelations matrix was allowed to vary between each of the two groups analyzed. Subsequently, these matrices were constrained to be invariant between the two groups. The test of similarity of the construct intercorrelations between PA and MV groups

revealed significantly different intercorrelation matrices chi squared ($\underline{n}$ = 62, 45 df) = 86.43, $\underline{p}$ ≤ .001. Comparisons between PA and SV groups also revealed significantly different correlation matrices ($\underline{n}$ = 61, 45 df) = 83.77, $\underline{p}$ ≤ .001. A test for similarity between MV and SV yielded no significant difference.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Research has documented the relationship of sustained violence to women's self-concept and psychological distress. Effects have ranged from low self-esteem to serious psychological symptoms (e.g., PTSD). Similar associations have been found in the emerging literature on psychological abuse. However, the focus on dominating and controlling forms of psychological abuse limits understanding of its true nature and impact on women's well being.

Research based on social influence theory, and both anecdotal (Loring & Myers, 1992), and theoretical (Marshall, 1994) evidence suggests that subtle behaviors inherent in everyday communication may be equally, if not more harmful than overt domination. Therefore, the present study extended previous research by including subtle behaviors inherent in day to day communication which have potential to undermine a woman's self-concept and increase her psychological symptoms. This study was conducted to explore the relationship of subtle psychological abuse to overt psychological abuse and violence as well as its relationship to self-concept (i.e., self-esteem, interpersonal

competence, problem-solving confidence, depression proneness) and psychological symptoms experienced by women (i.e., depression, anxiety, somatization).

## Scale Development

Because there currently was no established instrument to measure subtle psychological abuse, a preliminary measure was constructed and a comparable overt psychological abuse scale was also created.  The subtle psychological abuse scale addressed three weaknesses found among the four existing scales (Hudson & McIntosh, 1981; Rodenburg & Fantuzzo, 1993; Shepherd & Campbell, 1992; Tolman, 1989). First, items were selected which were applicable to women who were single, not cohabitating, and who had no children. Second, some items implied abuse from a dependent position as opposed to strictly dominating or controlling position. Third, the scale also addressed other subtle ways of undermining women (e.g., use of humor or expressed concern).  Taken together, creation of this preliminary scale broadened the previously narrow conceptualization of psychological abuse and enabled the collection of potentially valuable information previously missed.

In spite of scale improvements, some limitations continued to exist.  The primary problem was item ambiguity. Items were vague and applied to a variety of behaviors, self-concept domains, and means of communication (i.e., how often does he seem down or depressed, how often does he make

you feel guilty). Richer information would be available if items were included which specified the mode of communication (e.g., use of humor, dependence, or concern). For example, the item "how often does he become down or depressed" may provide better information about use of dependence as a control tactic if it read "how often does he become down or depressed when you do something without him." The item "how often does he make you feel guilty" may provide better information about use of eye contact if it read "how often does he look at you in a way that makes you feel guilty." Specifying mode of communication may allow researchers to identify which subtle tactics are most effective and harmful. The primary problem with this approach, however, would be an inordinately long scale necessitated by having each item repeated for several modes of communication (e.g., teasing, angry, sad.) Because data were archival in nature and part of a larger study, it was not possible to change items to reflect more specific means of undermining a partner. These limitations should be addressed in future studies.

In spite of scale limitations, creation of both subtle and overt measures provided some initial information about inter-relationships of subtle and overt psychological abuse and violence. The finding that the relationship between subtle and overt psychological abuse increased with severity of violence was interesting and has several possible

explanations. Violence may mediate the relationship between the forms of psychological abuse. Thus, the presence of violence may actually change the relationship between subtle and overt psychological abuse. An alternative explanation may be that as men become more violent, they are also more likely to engage in both forms of psychological abuse. Because the frequency of behaviors are identified by the abuse recipient, the increasing relationship between subtle and overt abuse may reflect hyper vigilance that often accompanies increasing severity of violence. As violence increases, a woman may attend to and recall more types of abuse because she spends more time monitoring his behavior in an effort to protect herself. Finally, this finding may simply be an artifact of this particular sample. Replication of this study will provide more information about the nature of this relationship.

Self-Esteem

Although the relationship of violence to self-esteem appears well understood from empirical and theoretical perspectives pertaining to women in battered women's shelters, little is directly known about the impact of less traumatic acts on women's global self-worth. The models of the self derived from social influence theories discussed earlier in this paper, all describe processes by which everyday, non-traumatic, social interaction may undermine women's self-worth. Although these theories suggest that

subtle acts may impact self-esteem, findings from this study did not support the hypothesis. When subtle acts occurred in absence of violence or after accounting for violence, global self-esteem was not affected. Based on cognitive process descriptions for coping with trauma and other violent events (Janoff-Bulman, 1988), it seems possible that subtle acts which occur through daily communication are not a substantial threat to victims' assumptive worlds and, thus, may not create shifts in a core, global construct like self-esteem.

An alternative explanation may be more likely. Inspection of the Rosenberg Self-esteem measure revealed that items tap a global self-evaluation. However, Self-Evaluation Maintenance theory (Tesser et al., 1988) suggests that the impact of interpersonal influence takes place in domain specific areas such as self evaluation of intelligence, body image, attractiveness, family relationships, and occupational performance. Because social influence may impact an individual in specific domains and leave others unaffected, there may be no consistent effect on self-esteem across participants. A man may engage in subtle and hurtful acts which pertain to some domains, but not others. In addition, his partner may receive positive feedback from others which buffer the impact of subtle psychological abuse in certain domains. On the other hand, if subtle and hurtful acts were targeted to a variety of

domains, it makes sense that the self-evaluation may become more global and manifest in reduced self-esteem. A better test of the effect of subtle psychological abuse on self-concept would use more domain specific measures of self-esteem.

Depression-Proneness

Social comparison theory (Festinger, 1954), supporting research (Salovey & Rodin, 1984, 1985; Wills, 1981; Wood et al., 1983, 1985) and finding that subtle psychological abuse is correlated with depression proneness demonstrate the potential that subtle psychological abuse has to undermine self-concept. The Depression Proneness Rating Scale (DPRS; Zemore, 1983) used in this study, required that women make a comparison to other women regarding their feelings of guilt and worth, discouragement, and self-disappointment. Self-affirmation theory (Steele, 1988) suggests that women who have low self-esteem are less likely to seek information about themselves. However, when women are forced to compare themselves to others, research indicates that women with low self-esteem are more likely to compare themselves to those who are better off than themselves, thus rating themselves less well.

These comparisons with similar others affects self-concept (Salovey & Rodin, 1984, 1985; Wills, 1981; Wood et al., 1983, 1985). These studies show that social comparisons which may occur on an everyday basis are related

to changes in self-evaluation. Because depression proneness may be viewed as a measure of women's self-concept, the finding, that subtle psychological abuse was correlated with depression proneness, supports both the existing research and anecdotal evidenced that everyday communication is related to women's self-evaluation.

Problem-Solving Confidence and Interpersonal Competence

The present study also addressed domain specific constructs (problem-solving confidence, interpersonal competence). The Self-Evaluation Maintenance Model (Tesser et al.,1988) assumes that people behave so as to maintain a positive self-evaluation (Tesser, 1986) which functions as a motive for social comparison (Wood et al., 1985). Threats precipitate downward comparisons to people who are inferior or less fortunate to enhance the self (Salovey & Rodin, 1984, 1985; Wills, 1981; Wood et al., 1983,1985). In this study, women who sustained frequent subtle psychological abuse rated themselves as able to solve their problems and maintain positive interpersonal relationships. According to theory, these women may rely on downward comparisons to maintain their self-concept in the face of threats from subtle psychological abuse.

Findings from this study also suggest that women may be more likely to make downward comparisons when a threat is not physical. Results showed that when violence occurred, the relationship of subtle psychological abuse to problem-

solving confidence and interpersonal competence became non-existent. Thus, women who sustained violence may have been forced, by the obvious physical threat to make upward comparisons to other women.

Another explanation for research findings may be taken from general behavioral principles. Women who sustain severe psychological abuse may maintain problem-solving confidence or interpersonal competence because they function as independent agents in their environment. However, when violence occurs in a relationship, women's perceptions of their ability to impact their environment may change. With increasing violence, women may be punished for acting as independent agents and, subsequently, assertive and social behavior may extinguish. Therefore, it is plausible that when subtle psychological abuse is coupled with violence, the relationship becomes non-significant.

Psychological Symptoms

The strong, positive, relationship of subtle psychological abuse to depression, anxiety and somatization is informative of the impact of subtle acts on women's psychological well-being. Social influence theory may again be used to understand these findings, as well as the processes by which subtle acts may be hurtful. Because uncertainty caused by subtle psychological abuse may be associated with increased anxiety or discomfort, it seems intuitive that the clear and positive relationship could

reflect this uncertainty. Women who sustain many subtle and hurtful acts may become less certain about themselves as a worthwhile or capable individual, about their relationship, or their partner. According to this line of reasoning, these women are likely to experience and report symptoms like anxiety, depression, somatization.

Inspection of the subtle psychological abuse items corroborates the relationship of uncertainty to women's psychological well-being. Some items addressed behaviors likely to create women's uncertainty such as "Changes his mind about what he likes" and "Changes his mind so that what is ok now is bad later." If women sustain acts such as these on a frequent basis, it is likely that they will experience increased uncertainty.

Examination of findings across levels of violence revealed an interesting, but puzzling pattern regarding the relationship of subtle psychological abuse to psychological symptoms. Specifically, the psychological abuse only group and severe violence group were similar and different from the moderate violence group. A relationship was found between subtle psychological abuse and depression, anxiety, and somatization within the moderate violence group, but not in the other two groups.

Explanations about why this finding has emerged in this sample are speculative at best. Marshall noted that the relationship of violence to psychological symptoms may be

indirect and she identified uncertainty as a potential mediator. However, she also noted that that violence may moderate the impact of psychological abuse. According to Marshall (1993), men may enhance the impact of abuse by exhibiting both positive and negative, helpful and harmful behaviors and attitudes simultaneously. By inflicting psychological abuse in a "loving" or dependent way (e.g., what would I do if you really did go crazy) he may, thus, increase her uncertainty. These acts were similar to subtle psychologically abusive behavior as operationalized in the present study.

Uncertainty may play a critical role in the manifestation of psychological symptoms. It is possible that women in the MV group sustain violence which is novel to the relationship. This novelty may create some uncertainty about the relationship or her security in the relationship. Because subtle psychological abuse items reflect uncertainty and because the uncertainty is related to anxiety and discomfort, it makes sense that it would be related to symptoms like depression, anxiety, and somatization.

Attribution theory augments this explanation and may help explain a lack of similar findings in both the SV and PA groups. Women in the SV group likely sustain violence on a regular basis and across a variety of situations. Violence for these women may become predictable and they may

become aware that the violence occurs regardless of their own behavior. There is likely less uncertainty when behaviors are more predictable. In addition, the occurrence of behavior across a variety of domains may make her less likely to attribute causation to herself. Because uncertainty about the occurrence of and attribution for violence is reduced, it makes sense that subtle psychological abuse would not predict depression, anxiety, and somatization for a woman in the SV group. On the other hand, because moderate violence occurs less frequently, there is increased likelihood that a woman in the MV group could attribute causation to herself, thus, increasing her uncertainty about herself or her relationship.

Although subtle psychological abuse items reflect uncertainty and this uncertainty is related to anxiety and discomfort, subtle psychological abuse did not predict depression, anxiety, and somatization among women in the psychological abuse only group. It is possible that these subtle interactions may not create obvious or intense uncertainty as seen when violence enters the relationship. It appears that when subtle psychological abuse is paired with infrequent and possibly novel violent episodes, the impact may be most harmful.

Clearly, these explanations for this pattern of findings are speculative and alternative explanations do exist. For example, it is also possible that these findings

do not represent the complex process presented, but are simply an artifact of this sample. Replication studies will be necessary to support or disconfirm findings from this study and to better understand the role of violence in mediating the impact of subtle psychological abuse.

<u>Summary</u>

In sum, findings from this study show that subtle and harmful acts can be identified and measured. Further, they support existing social influence theory, research, and anecdotal evidence that subtle psychological tactics can be harmful. As Marshall (1994) noted, subtle acts received from a woman's partner may foster feelings of uncertainty and this uncertainty may manifest in psychological symptoms.

<u>Limitations of the Current Study</u>

Although this study provides empirical evidence for existence of subtle psychological abuse and its negative impact of women's psychological well-being, several limitations have been noted. For example, results will not generalize to all people. These data were archival and limited to the impact of men's behavior on women because women's abuse of men may occur differently with different effects (Marshall, 1993). Of those women included in the study, a clear majority were Caucasian and middle class. Therefore, it is believed that results will generalize best to women with similar demographic status.

Although, the sample size was adequate when conducting analyses on the entire sample, analyses within the violence groups compromised statistical power and is, therefore, another limitation. Because of this limited power, we likely do not have complete information regarding the indirect effects of violence and subtle psychological abuse on women's psychological well-being. This problem should be addressed in further studies.

Another limitation was present with scale development. To date, the preliminary subtle psychological abuse scale designed for this study is the first of it's kind and, therefore, has an inherent validity limitation. Concurrent validity could not be established because no other psychological abuse scale even includes subtle acts. Although the scale demonstrated adequate internal consistency, the limited number of items prohibited a split-half reliability assessment. In addition, data were collected at one point in time as part of a larger study (Marshall, 1993). Therefore, no knowledge exists regarding the stability of women's reports over time.

Limitations of the subtle psychological abuse items were noted elsewhere. Because items were devised as part of a larger study, ambiguous items could not be modified to reflect various self-concept domains. Therefore, it was impossible to ascertain whether subtle psychological abuse really does impact a global construct like self-esteem.

Moreover, it is not clear which subtle psychologically abusive tactics relate to low self-esteem. Because this study could not make optimal use of social influence models when creating items, we may only speculate about which processes best serve to undermine women's self-concept and elicit psychological symptoms.

Implications for Future Research

The present study serves as a first step toward understanding the nature and impact of psychological abuse. However, future research should address sample characteristics (e.g., ethnic representation, sample size) and measurement as well as address the prevalence and impact of subtle psychological abuse within or across both genders, and various ethnic and socioeconomic status groups. Because findings appeared to differ based on level of violence, future studies should also obtain larger samples to increase the likelihood of finding effects if they are truly present.

Future research may also address scale development issues. Subsequent subtle psychological abuse scales may better reflect the process by which women may be undermined if items are included which reflect the various social influence theory models. In addition, future scales should also include items which are specific to common self-concept domains as well as those which are ambiguous and global. Such modifications may yield more information about which social influence processes are most likely to undermine

women's self-concept, which specific domains are most easily impacted or most resilient, and which domains are most closely related to women's global self-concept.

Therapeutic Implications

Findings from this study also have important practical implications. When working with distressed women and couples, many psychotherapists do not routinely probe for abuse. When abuse inquiries are made, psychotherapists would most be most likely to probe only for occurrence of overt psychological abuse and violence. Little if any attention may be paid to obscured or underlying messages because they may not be recognized as abusive or harmful. Findings from this study suggest that more attention should be paid to these less obvious acts. Because this study has also shown that these subtle tactics may occur with or without more obvious psychological abuse or violence, it is important that counselors probe for less obvious acts even when there is no obvious evidence of abuse.

Dickstein (1988) noted that victims tend to think that psychological abuse is unimportant and, thus, do not present victimization to mental health professionals. Instead, these women are more aware of and more likely to report their physical symptoms and depression because they are easy to identify. Although, Dickstein (1988) was referring to overt tactics, helping professionals (e.g., psychologists, counselors, social workers, and physicians) should be aware

that psychological symptoms (depression, anxiety, and somatic symptoms) are also strongly and positively related to sustained subtle psychological abuse. Thus, women who present these symptoms, may be victims of subtle undermining tactics. It is important to understand that, by the nature of subtle abuse, women may not be able to verbalize what contributes to their feelings or physical symptoms. In fact, they may misinterpret the locus of etiology regarding their symptoms. Therefore, psychologists and other helping professionals should not only identify and label the abuse, but validate and normalize associated psychological symptoms.

Psychologists and other counseling professionals may also want to incorporate findings from the present study into their clinical interventions. Client education, as an intervention, may address the nature and impact of subtle psychological abuse so women and men may identify these tactics in their own communication repertoire as well as those received from their partner. Without the ability to identify, verbalize, and confront subtle and hurtful acts, women's self-concept may be repeatedly undermined. Psychologists and counselors may also want to use social influence as an intervention. Because we can see how social influence may bolster as well as undermine self-concept, counselors may also rely on social influence theory to both buffer the impact of subtle psychological abuse and

positively impact women's self-evaluations. Thus,
therapists may help women to seek new, self-affirming
information from close others which contradicts negative
messages from her partner. When positive new and
disconfirming information is integrated into a previously
negative self-structure, a woman's view of self may become
increasingly positive.

APPENDIX A

SEVERITY OF VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN SCALE

Severity of Violence Against Women Scale

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| never | once | a few times | many times | very often |

HOW OFTEN HAS YOUR PARTNER:
_____ hit or kicked a wall, door or furniture
_____ thrown, smashed or broken an object
_____ driven dangerously with you in the car
_____ shaken a finger at you
_____ made threatening gestures or faces at you
_____ shaken a fist at you
_____ acted like a bully toward you
_____ destroyed something belonging to you
_____ threatened to harm or damage things you care about
_____ threatened to destroy property
_____ threatened someone you care about
_____ threatened to hurt you
_____ threatened to kill himself
_____ threatened to kill you
_____ threatened you with a weapon
_____ threatened you with a club-like object
_____ acted like he wanted to kill you
_____ threatened you with a club-like object
_____ acted like he wanted to kill you
_____ threatened you with a knife or gun
_____ held you down, pinning you in place
_____ pushed or shoved you
_____ shook or roughly handled you
_____ grabbed you suddenly or forcefully
_____ scratched you
_____ pulled your hair
_____ twisted your arm
_____ spanked you
_____ bit you
_____ slapped you with the palm of his hand
_____ slapped you with the back of his hand
_____ slapped you around your face and head
_____ hit you with an object
_____ punched you
_____ kicked you
_____ stomped on you
_____ choked you
_____ burned you with something
_____ used a club-like object on you
_____ beat you up
_____ used a knife or gun on you
_____ demanded sex whether you wanted it or not

_____ made you have oral sex against your will
_____ made you have sexual intercourse against your will
_____ physically forced you to have sex
_____ made you have anal sex against your will
_____ used an object on you in a sexual way.

APPENDIX B

ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM

Answer these questions thinking about the way you see
yourself.

not at all like me   1   2   3   4   5   6   very much like me

_____ On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
_____ At times I think I am no good at all.
_____ I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
_____ I am able to do things as well as most people.
_____ I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
_____ I certainly feel useless at times.
_____ I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal
       plane with others.
_____ I wish I could have more respect for myself.
_____ All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
_____ I take a positive attitude toward myself.

APPENDIX C

SPITZBERG INTERPERSONAL COMPETENCE SCALE

Spitzberg Interpersonal Competence Scale

How much do you disagree or agree with each statement about the way you are when you are with people.

strongly disagree   1   2   3   4   5   6   strongly agree

_____ I believe I am very knowledgeable about how to interact with people.

_____ I generally feel comfortable with my ability to handle conversations with others.

_____ I often feel as if I do not know how to behave or what to say in conversations.

_____ I am not very knowledgeable about how to interact with people in a variety of social situations.

_____ I am almost never at a loss to find something to talk about in a conversation.

_____ If I see that a conversation is not going well, I can usually find a way of making it work.

_____ In get-acquainted conversations I often cannot find things to talk about to keep the conversation going.

_____ Even when I am not sure what to do or say in a conversation, I can usually figure it out when I want.

_____ Generally, I know what to say and do in conversations.

_____ I can usually find the right things to say or do to get someone to like me.

_____ I usually have a good sense of how to phrase things I want to say.

_____ I am careful to find out all I can about people and situations when I am going to encounter them for the first time.

_____ I pay close attention to people I am conversing with to help me adapt my statements and improve the conversation.

_____ I have a good sense of when people want or need to end a conversation.

_____ I am generally not very attentive to what is going on in conversations.

_____ I am not very good at predicting what people are going to say next in conversations.

APPENDIX D

DEPRESSION PRONENESS RATING SCALE

## DEPRESSION PRONENESS RATING SCALE

Compare yourself to other women using this scale:

much less often   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   much more often

COMPARED TO OTHER WOMEN, HOW OFTEN:

_____ do you get depressed
_____ do your depression last
_____ do you feel discouraged about the future
_____ do you feel distant or isolated from people
_____ do you see yourself as a failure
_____ do you feel guilty or unworthy
_____ do you have difficulty concentrating or making
      decisions
_____ do you feel tired and lacking energy
_____ do you feel disappointed in yourself
_____ do you feel sad or blue
_____ do you think seriously about suicide
_____ do you suffer loss of appetite
_____ have you considered suicide

APPENDIX E

PROBLEM SOLVING INVENTORY

PROBLEM SOLVING INVENTORY

Describe yourself in comparison to other women.  Decide how true each statement is for you, then write a number to describe whether you do it more or less than other women.

```
I do this less                              I do this more
than other women  1   2   3   4   5   6   7 than other women
```

\_\_\_\_\_ I am usually able to think up creative and effective alternatives to solve a problem.

\_\_\_\_\_ I have the ability to solve most problems even though initially no solution is immediately apparent

\_\_\_\_\_ Many problems I face are too complex for me to solve

\_\_\_\_\_ I make decisions and am happy with them later

\_\_\_\_\_ When I make plans to solve a problem, I am almost certain that I can make them work.

\_\_\_\_\_ Given enough time and effort, I believe I can solve most problems that confront me.

\_\_\_\_\_ When faced with a novel situation I am confident that I can handle problems that may arise.

\_\_\_\_\_ I trust my abilities to solve new and difficult problems.

\_\_\_\_\_ After making a decision, the outcome I expected usually matches the actual outcome.

\_\_\_\_\_ When confronted with a problem, I am unsure of whether I can handle the situation.

\_\_\_\_\_ When I become aware of a problem, one of the first things I do is try to find out exactly what the problem is.

APPENDIX F

PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE ITEM RATING FORM

# PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE ITEM RATING FORM

Directions: Please rate each item listed on the following pages using the 5-point likert scale (1=very subtle to 5= very overt). Place the number corresponding to your rating in the space provided at the left of each item.
Please use the following definitions to guide your item ratings. If you are unsure about whether an act is subtle or overt, or if you think the act could be done in both overt or subtle ways, please choose the midpoint and place a 3 in the space provided to the left of the respective item.

Definitions:

Overt Psychological Abuse: Those behaviors which, to the victim and/or observer, are obviously hurtful and are likely to cause the recipient to feel emotional pain or anger. The recipient would be aware of the hurtful nature of the act.

Subtle Psychological Abuse: Those behaviors which appear so slight as to be difficult to detect or clearly delineate. These acts are neither obviously hurtful, nor necessarily are they clearly believed (by a recipient or observer) to cause anger or pain in the recipient. Although not readily identified, these hurtful messages may be conveyed in subtle ways (e.g., a look or glance, change in voice quality, use of humor, love, disappointment) and may appear as ordinary communication, a joke, protectiveness, or dependence of a man on his partner. These behaviors often contain underlying messages not obvious to an observer or recipient. Harmful message content may be obscured by a joking or loving tone while relatively non-harmful content may be obscured by a quick look, glance, or change in voice quality.

---

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Subtle | Somewhat Subtle | Unsure | Somewhat Overt | Very Overt |

_____ Tells you you have no right to your feelings (A12)
_____ Tells you how much he loves you
_____ Tells you about things you did when he wasn't with you
_____ Tells you how much you need him
_____ Refuses to discuss the children's problems (A13)

_____ Call you pet names
_____ Goes through your personal things (like your purse or drawers)
_____ Tease you
_____ Says he couldn't help hurting you
_____ Asks people about you
_____ Wrestles with you
_____ Takes your car keys or disables your car
_____ Points out ways your friends or your family have hurt you
_____ Shows he cares about you when you do what he wants
_____ Threatens to make other people dislike you
_____ Has time for what he wants, but not for what you want
_____ Goes places with you when you would rather he didn't
_____ Shows he cares about you when you feel bad about yourself
_____ Avoids or refuses to be affectionate
_____ Reacts negatively to your emotional needs
_____ Tells people negative or hurtful things you have said about them
_____ Tries to make it up to you after he hurts or upsets you
_____ Expects you to quit whatever you are doing in order to do what he wants.
_____ Asks your friends or your family about you
_____ Talks about the bad things about himself
_____ Tells someone what a good person you are (A15)
_____ Buys you things then criticizes you for using them
_____ Starts a discussion or fight when you are going to bed
_____ Compliments you about the kind of person you are
_____ Belittles you or puts you down to neighbors, acquaintances or coworkers
_____ Goes through or reads your mail
_____ Threatens to find you if you leave
_____ Discusses problems calmly and rationally
_____ Makes you feel good about yourself
_____ Takes something small and blows it all out of proportion, "making a mountain out of a mole hill"
_____ Acts positive toward you
_____ Rubs it in or reminds you that he was right and you were wrong
_____ Makes other plans when you want to do something
_____ Promises not to hurt you again
_____ Points out ways your job or other activities have hurt you
_____ Complains about or attacks you background
_____ Says that his actions (which hurt you) were to help you be a better person
_____ Acts affectionate
_____ Does things that make you aware of how much bigger and

physically stronger he is
_____ Interrupts you and doesn't let you finish what you were saying
_____ Has money for what he wants, but not what you want
_____ Shows you that he feels weak, helpless or vulnerable
_____ Locks you in or out of the house
_____ Tells your friends or family that you are crazy or have emotional problems
_____ Listens to your phone calls
_____ Thinks you were right about something
_____ Refuses to discuss his own problems
_____ Expects you to wait on him or cater to his whims
_____ Makes you feel guilty
_____ Compares you to other women so that you seem worse
_____ Lets you know that he thinks you are a good person
_____ Calls you hurtful names
_____ Acts sarcastic
_____ Shows you that you were wrong
_____ Tells you the problems in your relationship are your fault (A19)
_____ Tells you he is the best thing that ever happened to you
_____ Tells you everything you do is his business
_____ Tells you you over-react
_____ Tells you he does not love you
_____ Tells you you cannot make it without him
_____ Shows he cares about you when you feel good about yourself (A20)
_____ Talks about how he puts up with a lot from you
_____ Finds fault with what you felt you have done well
_____ Accuses you of flirting or coming on to another man
_____ Admits when he is wrong
_____ Refuses to discuss problems in your relationship
_____ Accuses you of putting yourself or what you want before him
_____ Makes fun of or ridicules things that interests you
_____ Acts like he dislikes you
_____ Takes care of the children so you can do something you want to do
_____ Follows you
_____ Changes, so that what is ok now is bad later
_____ Checks to make sure you have done what you said you did
_____ Shows you that he needs you or relies on you
_____ Does not give you mail or messages
_____ Accuses you of putting yourself before the children
_____ Does what you want
_____ Says that he can't stand to be away from you
_____ Acts rude or mean to your friends or your family
_____ Expects you to be able to guess or anticipate what he wants

_____ Wants to end your relationship
_____ Seems down or depressed
_____ Lies to you about something when you know it is a lie
_____ Lets you do what you want
_____ Tells you secrets to someone
_____ Shows he cares about you when you are not feeling well
_____ Points out your faults or criticize you in public
_____ Puts you down to someone you don't know well
_____ Makes fun of you for not being able to do something
that takes physical
strength.
_____ Talks about how good your relationship is
_____ Ignores you in public
_____ Acts impulsive
_____ Asks you to lie for him
_____ Promises to change (A22)
_____ Laughs at you, makes fun of you or ridicules you in
public
_____ Interrupts your sleep or keeps you up too late
_____ Apologizes to you
_____ Tries to get you to drink or take drugs
_____ Compliments you about something you did
_____ Makes you choose between something he wants and your
friends and family
_____ Criticizes, ridicules or makes fun of the way you look
_____ Puts down your religion or moral beliefs
_____ Lets you know that he appreciates you
_____ Acts negative toward you
_____ Criticizes that way you are as a mother
_____ Dismisses what you say by saying something negative
about it
_____ Teases you about the way you look
_____ Shows patience or caring when you are upset
_____ Makes fun of or ridicule you in private
_____ Gives in to you
_____ Puts you down in public
_____ Expects you to get his permission or check with him
before making any plans
_____ Brings up religion to you
_____ Goes places with you
_____ Teases you about being physically weak
_____ Justifies hurting you, saying that he had to
_____ Acts loving toward you
_____ Puts you down or insults you in private
_____ Shows patience or caring when you don't feel well
_____ Expects what he wants to be placed above what you want
_____ Calls or stops by when you are at work
_____ Makes you choose between something he wants and
something you want
_____ Compliments you about the kind of person you are
_____ Acts courteous, socially proper

_____ Punishes you for not doing something
_____ Expects you to be at his beck and call
_____ Encourages you to go places without him
_____ Tries to get you to do something illegal (A24)
_____ Lets you know that he appreciates what you do for him
_____ Insults you in public
_____ Shows you that he thinks you are emotionally stronger than he is
_____ Tries to make you jealous
_____ Asks you about your activities
_____ Teases you about your behavior
_____ Lets you know that he appreciates your strengths
_____ Calls or stops by when you are with your friends or family
_____ Makes you choose between something he wants and the children
_____ Encourages you to talk about your opinions or ideas
_____ Points out your faults or criticizes you in private
_____ Talks about the good things in his life
_____ Makes fun of or ridicules things you're good at
_____ Accuses you of putting him last
_____ Lets you know that he loves you in spite of your weaknesses, problems or
other things like that
_____ Thinks you have insulted him
_____ Accuses you of not being loyal
_____ Encourages you to share your positive feelings
_____ Ignores you in private
_____ Criticizes, ridicules or makes fun of your behavior
_____ Tries to make you apologize to him
_____ Thinks your friends or your family are a good influence on you
_____ Tries to get you to say bad things about yourself
_____ Lets you know that your happiness is more important than his own
_____ Tells his friends or his family that you are crazy or have emotional
problems
_____ Accuses you of putting the children first, before him
_____ Tries to keep from upsetting you
_____ Checks up on you
_____ Changes his mind about things that he likes
_____ Takes things you dislike into account
_____ Criticizes you about things you do
_____ Punishes you for something you do
_____ Tells you who you saw or what you did when he wasn't with you
_____ Tells you how you could have done something better
_____ Tells you how you should change
_____ Tells you how you are different form the way you used to be

_____ Tells you you don't know what you are doing

_____ Tells you how bad he feels about having hurt or upset you

_____ Tells you what to do

_____ Tells you how to do things

_____ Points out ways the children have hurt you in some way

_____ Criticizes the things you do well

_____ Points out your problems to you

_____ Tells you that your friends flirt or come on to him

_____ Criticizes you about the way you are

_____ Tells you that you are not good enough for him

_____ Takes things you like into account

_____ Use your weaknesses or things you are sensitive about against you

_____ Lets you know that his happiness is more important than you own

_____ Teases you about your personality or background

_____ Points out your emotional flaws or problems

_____ Compares you to other women

_____ Reminds you of your past mistakes

_____ Discounts or puts down your accomplishments, things you do well

_____ Draws away from you, withdraws from you

_____ Puts you down to your friends or your family

_____ Makes fun of or ridicules your personality or background

_____ Changes his mind about things that he dislikes

_____ Talks about the good times in your relationship

_____ Keeps on you about one issue over and over

_____ Uses private things about you in a way which hurts you

_____ Encourages you to share your negative feelings

_____ Accuses you of putting your friends or family before him

_____ Talks about the bad things in your relationship

_____ Points out ways that things you do hurt you or are bad for you

_____ Points out how desirable or sexy he is to other women

_____ Shows consideration even when it is uncomfortable for him or conflicts with his own needs or desires

_____ Tries to get you to be with people you don't approve of or don't like

_____ Talks about how good you are

_____ Treats you like you are helpless or like you are a child

_____ Criticizes your decisions

_____ Asks you to explain why you do things that make him angry

_____ Tries to protect you

_____ Uses information about your past against you

_____ Tells you that he needs you

_____ Accuses you of lying

_____ Tells you that your friends or your family are selfish
_____ Thinks your activities are a bad influence
_____ Tells you that you need him more than he needs you
_____ Tells you that he is protecting you
_____ Tells you that people laugh behind your back
_____ Tells you what you can't do
_____ Tells you that he tries to make you happy
_____ Acts rude or mean to your coworkers, neighbors or
acquaintances
_____ Tells you that he will not hurt you
_____ Tells you how bad you are
_____ Puts you down to his friends or his family
_____ Accuses you of being selfish
_____ Tells you that you are crazy or have emotional
problems
_____ Teases you about things you do well
_____ Uses your problems against you

Tells you...
_____ People say negative things about you
_____ What happens between you and him is no one else's
business
_____ You are the best thing that has ever happened to him
_____ You cause him to do things that hurt you
_____ He couldn't stand it if you were with another man
_____ The problems the children have are your fault
_____ You are too good for him
_____ You have no right to be angry or mad
_____ People watch you for him
_____ Things will get better
_____ You do not love him
_____ Your friends or your family are using you or don't
really care about you
_____ You are crazy or have emotional problems
_____ No other man would put up with you
_____ What he does is no one's business
_____ He is better than you
_____ You started an argument, when you know you didn't
_____ He wants what is best for you
_____ You can't do anything right
_____ He needs you more than you need him
_____ He is the only person that you can depend on or trust
_____ You deserve it when he upset or hurt you
_____ Other women are better than you
_____ You are the only one who understands him or can help
him
_____ Your friends or family are trouble makers
_____ You are not a good mother
_____ Your activities cause problems with him
_____ He cannot live without you

APPENDIX G

ITEM RATING FORM

ITEM RATING FORM

Dear fellow graduate student:

Below is a list of acts that may occur in intimate relationships. Some acts occur in all relationships whereas others may depend on the nature of the relationship involved. In general some of these acts would likely seem very subtle and perhaps ambiguous whereas other acts seem very overt and obvious. The acts listed may cause pleasure, anger, hurt, etc. in the recipient. Alternatively, they may cause no reaction. Imagine a man doing each act to his partner.

Please rate each item using the 7-point scale (1=extremely subtle to 7=extremely overt). Place the number corresponding to your rating in the space to the left of each item. If you believe the act may send a message corresponding to your rating in the space to the left of each item. If you believe the act may send a message which is neutral or may be either subtle or overt, depending on how it is done, the midpoint (4) should be used.

Definitions:

Overt Acts: Items where the message may be easy to detect or readily understood by the recipient and/or an observer. One example would be where the meaning would be clear to anyone who saw the act described in the item. These acts send a clear message.

Subtle Acts: Items where the message may be appear difficult to detect or clearly delineate, ambiguous, and may not have a clear meaning to a recipient for observer. One example would be where several different meanings may be conveyed by the act. Although not readily identified, these messages may be conveyed in subtle ways (e.g., a look or glance, change in voice quality, use of humor, love, disappointment) and may appear as ordinary communication, a joke, protectiveness, or dependence of a man on his partner.

---

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Very Subtle | Somewhat Subtle | Unsure | Somewhat Overt | Very Overt |

_____ Tells you you have no right to your feelings (A12)
_____ Tells you how much he loves you
_____ Tells you about things you did when he wasn't with you
_____ Tells you how much you need him

_____ Refuses to discuss the children's problems (A13)
_____ Call you pet names
_____ Goes through your personal things (like your purse or drawers)
_____ Tease you
_____ Says he couldn't help hurting you
_____ Asks people about you
_____ Wrestles with you
_____ Takes your car keys or disables your car
_____ Points out ways your friends or your family have hurt you
_____ Shows he cares about you when you do what he wants
_____ Threatens to make other people dislike you
_____ Has time for what he wants, but not for what you want
_____ Goes places with you when you would rather he didn't
_____ Shows he cares about you when you feel bad about yourself
_____ Avoids or refuses to be affectionate
_____ Reacts negatively to your emotional needs
_____ Tells people negative or hurtful things you have said about them
_____ Tries to make it up to you after he hurts or upsets you
_____ Expects you to quit whatever you are doing in order to do what he wants.
_____ Asks your friends or your family about you
_____ Talks about the bad things about himself
_____ Tells someone what a good person you are (A15)
_____ Buys you things then criticizes you for using them
_____ Starts a discussion or fight when you are going to bed
_____ Compliments you about the kind of person you are
_____ Belittles you or puts you down to neighbors, acquaintances or coworkers
_____ Goes through or reads your mail
_____ Threatens to find you if you leave
_____ Discusses problems calmly and rationally
_____ Makes you feel good about yourself
_____ Takes something small and blows it all out of proportion, "making a
mountain out of a mole hill"
_____ Acts positive toward you
_____ Rubs it in or reminds you that he was right and you were wrong
_____ Makes other plans when you want to do something
_____ Promises not to hurt you again
_____ Points out ways your job or other activities have hurt you
_____ Complains about or attacks you background
_____ Says that his actions (which hurt you) were to help you be a better person
_____ Acts affectionate

_____ Does things that make you aware of how much bigger and physically stronger he is

_____ Interrupts you and doesn't let you finish what you were saying

_____ Has money for what he wants, but not what you want

_____ Shows you that he feels weak, helpless or vulnerable

_____ Locks you in or out of the house

_____ Tells your friends or family that you are crazy or have emotional problems

_____ Listens to your phone calls

_____ Thinks you were right about something

_____ Refuses to discuss his own problems

_____ Expects you to wait on him or cater to his whims

_____ Makes you feel guilty

_____ Compares you to other women so that you seem worse

_____ Lets you know that he thinks you are a good person

_____ Calls you hurtful names

_____ Acts sarcastic

_____ Shows you that you were wrong

_____ Tells you the problems in your relationship are your fault (A19)

_____ Tells you he is the best thing that ever happened to you

_____ Tells you everything you do is his business

_____ Tells you you over-react

_____ Tells you he does not love you

_____ Tells you you cannot make it without him

_____ Shows he cares about you when you feel good about yourself (A20)

_____ Talks about how he puts up with a lot from you

_____ Finds fault with what you felt you have done well

_____ Accuses you of flirting or coming on to another man

_____ Admits when he is wrong

_____ Refuses to discuss problems in your relationship

_____ Accuses you of putting yourself or what you want before him

_____ Makes fun of or ridicules things that interests you

_____ Acts like he dislikes you

_____ Takes care of the children so you can do something you want to do

_____ Follows you

_____ Changes, so that what is ok now is bad later

_____ Checks to make sure you have done what you said you did

_____ Shows you that he needs you or relies on you

_____ Does not give you mail or messages

_____ Accuses you of putting yourself before the children

_____ Does what you want

_____ Says that he can't stand to be away from you

_____ Acts rude or mean to your friends or your family

_____ Expects you to guess or anticipate what he wants

_____ Wants to end your relationship
_____ Seems down or depressed
_____ Lies to you about something when you know it is a lie
_____ Lets you do what you want
_____ Tells you secrets to someone
_____ Shows he cares about you when you are not feeling well
_____ Points out your faults or criticize you in public
_____ Puts you down to someone you don't know well
_____ Makes fun of you for not being able to do something
         that takes physical
         strength.
_____ Talks about how good your relationship is
_____ Ignores you in public
_____ Acts impulsive
_____ Asks you to lie for him
_____ Promises to change (A22)
_____ Laughs at you, makes fun of you or ridicules you in
         public
_____ Interrupts your sleep or keeps you up too late
_____ Apologizes to you
_____ Tries to get you to drink or take drugs
_____ Compliments you about something you did
_____ Makes you choose between something he wants and your
         friends and family
_____ Criticizes, ridicules or makes fun of the way you look
_____ Puts down your religion or moral beliefs
_____ Lets you know that he appreciates you
_____ Acts negative toward you
_____ Criticizes that way you are as a mother
_____ Dismisses what you say by saying something negative
         about it
_____ Teases you about the way you look
_____ Shows patience or caring when you are upset
_____ Makes fun of or ridicule you in private
_____ Gives in to you
_____ Puts you down in public
_____ Expects you to get his permission or check with him
         before making any plans
_____ Brings up religion to you
_____ Goes places with you
_____ Teases you about being physically weak
_____ Justifies hurting you, saying that he had to
_____ Acts loving toward you
_____ Puts you down or insults you in private
_____ Shows patience or caring when you don't feel well
_____ Expects what he wants to be placed above what you want
_____ Calls or stops by when you are at work
_____ Makes you choose between something he wants and
         something you want
_____ Compliments you about the kind of person you are
_____ Acts courteous, socially proper

_____ Punishes you for not doing something
_____ Expects you to be at his beck and call
_____ Encourages you to go places without him
_____ Tries to get you to do something illegal (A24)
_____ Lets you know that he appreciates what you do for him
_____ Insults you in public
_____ Shows you that he thinks you are emotionally stronger than he is
_____ Tries to make you jealous
_____ Asks you about your activities
_____ Teases you about your behavior
_____ Lets you know that he appreciates your strengths
_____ Calls or stops by when you are with your friends or family
_____ Makes you choose between something he wants and the children
_____ Encourages you to talk about your opinions or ideas
_____ Points out your faults or criticizes you in private
_____ Talks about the good things in his life
_____ Makes fun of or ridicules things you're good at
_____ Accuses you of putting him last
_____ Lets you know that he loves you in spite of your weaknesses, problems or
other things like that
_____ Thinks you have insulted him
_____ Accuses you of not being loyal
_____ Encourages you to share your positive feelings
_____ Ignores you in private
_____ Criticizes, ridicules or makes fun of your behavior
_____ Tries to make you apologize to him
_____ Thinks your friends or your family are a good influence on you
_____ Tries to get you to say bad things about yourself
_____ Lets you know that your happiness is more important than his own
_____ Tells his friends or his family that you are crazy or have emotional problems
_____ Accuses you of putting the children first, before him
_____ Tries to keep from upsetting you
_____ Checks up on you
_____ Changes his mind about things that he likes
_____ Takes things you dislike into account
_____ Criticizes you about things you do
_____ Punishes you for something you do
_____ Tells you who you saw or what you did when he wasn't with you
_____ Tells you how you could have done something better
_____ Tells you how you should change
_____ Tells you how you are different form the way you used to be
_____ Tells you you don't know what you are doing

_____ Tells you how bad he feels about having hurt or upset you

_____ Tells you what to do

_____ Tells you how to do things

_____ Points out ways the children have hurt you in some way

_____ Criticizes the things you do well

_____ Points out your problems to you

_____ Tells you that your friends flirt or come on to him

_____ Criticizes you about the way you are

_____ Tells you that you are not good enough for him

_____ Takes things you like into account

_____ Use your weaknesses or things you are sensitive about against you

_____ Lets you know that his happiness is more important than you own

_____ Teases you about your personality or background

_____ Points out your emotional flaws or problems

_____ Compares you to other women

_____ Reminds you of your past mistakes

_____ Discounts or puts down your accomplishments, things you do well

_____ Draws away from you, withdraws from you

_____ Puts you down to your friends or your family

_____ Makes fun of or ridicules your personality or background

_____ Changes his mind about things that he dislikes

_____ Talks about the good times in your relationship

_____ Keeps on you about one issue over and over

_____ Uses private things about you in a way which hurts you

_____ Encourages you to share your negative feelings

_____ Accuses you of putting your friends or family before him

_____ Talks about the bad things in your relationship

_____ Points out ways that things you do hurt you or are bad for you

_____ Points out how desirable or sexy he is to other women

_____ Shows consideration even when it is uncomfortable for him or conflicts with his own needs or desires


_____ Tries to get you to be with people you don't approve of or don't like

_____ Talks about how good you are

_____ Treats you like you are helpless or like you are a child

_____ Criticizes your decisions

_____ Asks you to explain why you do things that make him angry

_____ Tries to protect you

_____ Uses information about your past against you

_____ Tells you that he needs you

_____ Accuses you of lying

\_\_\_\_\_ Tells you that your friends or your family are selfish
\_\_\_\_\_ Thinks your activities are a bad influence
\_\_\_\_\_ Tells you that you need him more than he needs you
\_\_\_\_\_ Tells you that he is protecting you
\_\_\_\_\_ Tells you that people laugh behind your back
\_\_\_\_\_ Tells you what you can't do
\_\_\_\_\_ Tells you that he tries to make you happy
\_\_\_\_\_ Acts rude or mean to your coworkers, neighbors or acquaintances
\_\_\_\_\_ Tells you that he will not hurt you
\_\_\_\_\_ Tells you how bad you are
\_\_\_\_\_ Puts you down to his friends or his family
\_\_\_\_\_ Accuses you of being selfish
\_\_\_\_\_ Tells you that you are crazy or have emotional problems
\_\_\_\_\_ Teases you about things you do well
\_\_\_\_\_ Uses your problems against you

Tells you...
\_\_\_\_\_ People say negative things about you
\_\_\_\_\_ What happens between you and him is no one else's business
\_\_\_\_\_ You are the best thing that has ever happened to him
\_\_\_\_\_ You cause him to do things that hurt you
\_\_\_\_\_ He couldn't stand it if you were with another man
\_\_\_\_\_ The problems the children have are your fault
\_\_\_\_\_ You are too good for him
\_\_\_\_\_ You have no right to be angry or mad
\_\_\_\_\_ People watch you for him
\_\_\_\_\_ Things will get better
\_\_\_\_\_ You do not love him
\_\_\_\_\_ Your friends or your family are using you or don't really care about you
\_\_\_\_\_ You are crazy or have emotional problems
\_\_\_\_\_ No other man would put up with you
\_\_\_\_\_ What he does is no one's business
\_\_\_\_\_ He is better than you
\_\_\_\_\_ You started an argument, when you know you didn't
\_\_\_\_\_ He wants what is best for you
\_\_\_\_\_ You can't do anything right
\_\_\_\_\_ He needs you more than you need him
\_\_\_\_\_ He is the only person that you can depend on or trust
\_\_\_\_\_ You deserve it when he upset or hurt you
\_\_\_\_\_ Other women are better than you
\_\_\_\_\_ You are the only one who understands him or can help him
\_\_\_\_\_ Your friends or family are trouble makers
\_\_\_\_\_ You are not a good mother
\_\_\_\_\_ Your activities cause problems with him
\_\_\_\_\_ He cannot live without you.

APPENDIX H

TABLES

Table 1

Types of Psychologically Abusive Acts

| | |
|---|---|
| Control-Activities | Intrude-Activities |
| Control-Emotions | Intrude-Privacy |
| Control-Information | Isolate-Emotionally |
| Control-Thinking | Isolate-Physically |
| Corrupt | Jealousy |
| Degrade | Loyalty |
| Denigrate | Monopolize Perception |
| Dominate-Emotionally | Omnipotence |
| Dominate-Physically | Possessiveness |
| Double Binds | Punish |
| Embarrass | Reject |
| Encourage Dependence | Rules |
| Exploit | Sabotage |
| Fear & Anxiety-Mental | Secrecy |
| Fear & Anxiety-Physical | Delf-Denunciation |
| Fights or Conflicts | Shift-Responsibility |
| Humiliate | Surveillance |
| Induce Debility-Emotional | Threats-Emotional |
| Induce Debility-Physical | Threats-Physical |
| Induce Guilt | Verbal Aggression |
| Induce Powerlessness | Withdraw |

Table 2

Psychometric Properties of Subtle Psychological Abuse Scale: Item-Total Correlations and Alpha if Item Deleted

| Item | Item-Total Correlations | Alpha if Item Deleted |
|---|---|---|
| How often does he change his mind about things he likes | .3662 | .6706 |
| How often does he draw away from you, withdraw from you | .2783 | .6834 |
| How often does he tell you he is the only person that you can depend on or trust | .1775 | .7014 |
| How often does he change what is ok now to bad later | .4858 | .6511 |
| How often does he use your weaknesses or things you are sensitive about against you. | .4101 | .6660 |
| How often does he change his mind about things that he dislikes | .4994 | .6508 |
| How often does he thinks your activities are a bad influence | .3754 | .6691 |
| How often does he make you feel guilty | .4639 | .6636 |
| How often does he seem down or depressed | .1375 | .7036 |
| How often does he interrupt your sleep or keep you up too late | .4026 | .6642 |
| How often does he expect you to be able to guess or anticipate what he wants | .5471 | .6482 |
| How often does he promises to change | .0055 | .7309 |

Table 3

Psychometric Properties of Overt Psychological Abuse scale: Item-Total Correlations and Alpha if Item Deleted

| Item | Item-Total Correlations | Alpha if Item Deleted |
|---|---|---|
| How often does he follow you | .5039 | .8009 |
| How often does he tell you you have no right to your feelings | .3526 | .8128 |
| How often does he point out your faults or criticizes you in public | .6047 | .7922 |
| How often does he criticize, ridicule, or make fun of the way you look | .5605 | .7956 |
| How often does he tell you that you are crazy or have emotional problems | .4283 | .8074 |
| How often does he tell his friends and family that you are crazy or have emotional problems | .4811 | .8028 |
| How often does he take your car keys or disable your car | .4959 | .8020 |
| How often does he put you down in public | .6299 | .7883 |
| How often does he threatens to find you if you leave | .3842 | .8131 |
| How often does he insults you in public | .6115 | .7906 |
| How often does he lock you in or out of the house | .1864 | .8222 |
| How often does he tell you he does not love you | .3543 | .8126 |

Table 4

Means and standard deviations for abuse, self-concept, and psychological symptom variables

| Variable | n | M | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| Abuse | | | |
| Sustained Violence | 93 | 16.27 | 16.46 |
| Overt Psychological Abuse | 93 | 3.12 | 1.18 |
| Subtle Psychological Abuse | 93 | 4.42 | .92 |
| Self-Concept | | | |
| Self-Esteem | 92 | 3.84 | 1.05 |
| Interpersonal Competence | 91 | 4.39 | .86 |
| Problem-Solving Confidence | 92 | 4.34 | .84 |
| Depression Proneness | 93 | 4.14 | 1.24 |
| Psychological Symptoms | | | |
| Depression | 93 | 1.77 | .96 |
| Anxiety | 93 | 1.19 | .87 |
| Somatization | 93 | 1.08 | .84 |

Table 5

Means and standard deviations for psychological abuse, self-concept, and
psychological symptom variables within violence groups

| Variables | No Violence | | | Moderate Violence | | | Severe Violence | | | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | n | M | SD | n | M | SD | n | M | SD | |
| Psychological abuse | | | | | | | | | | |
| Overt | 30 | $2.50_a$ | .15 | 31 | $2.95_a$ | .18 | 32 | $3.87_b$ | .22 | 14.13** |
| Subtle | 30 | 4.37 | .87 | 31 | 4.27 | .91 | 32 | 4.63 | .97 | 1.28 |
| Self-Concept | | | | | | | | | | |
| Self-Esteem | 30 | 4.13 | 1.06 | 30 | 3.84 | .94 | 32 | 3.56 | 1.10 | 2.31 |
| Interpersonal Competence | 29 | $4.75_a$ | .77 | 31 | 4.32 | .87 | 31 | $4.13_b$ | .85 | 4.29* |
| Problem-Solving Confidence | 30 | 4.61 | .78 | 31 | 4.14 | .77 | 31 | 4.30 | .91 | 2.52 |
| Depression Proneness | 30 | 3.73 | 1.24 | 31 | 4.33 | 1.19 | 32 | 4.36 | 1.22 | 2.63 |
| Psychological Symptoms | | | | | | | | | | |
| Depression | 30 | $1.39_a$ | .78 | 31 | 1.91 | 1.01 | 32 | $1.98_b$ | .98 | 3.20* |
| Anxiety | 30 | $.88_a$ | .70 | 31 | 1.24 | .96 | 32 | $1.41_b$ | .86 | 3.11* |
| Somatization | 30 | $.71_a$ | .69 | 31 | 1.15 | .79 | 32 | $1.37_b$ | .90 | 5.51** |

Note. Means with different subscripts differ significantly, $p \leq .05$ using Tukey a.
Note. * = $p \leq .05$; ** = $p \leq .01$

113

Table 6

Correlation Matrix of Predictor and Criterion Variables

| | Self-Esteem | Interp. Compet | Dep. Prone | Prob. Solve | Dep | Anx | Somat | Subtle | Overt | Viol |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S-E | (.89) | | | | | | | | | |
| I-C | .46** | (.91) | | | | | | | | |
| D-P | -.71** | -.36** | (.90) | | | | | | | |
| P-S | .36** | .51** | -.28 | (.85) | | | | | | |
| Dep. | -.55** | -.11 | .65 | -.16 | (.92) | | | | | |
| Anx. | -.42** | -.17 | .56** | -.21* | .83** | (.88) | | | | |
| Somat | -.35** | -.07 | .49** | -.14 | .71** | .77** | (.90) | | | |
| Subtle | -.17 | .11 | .28** | .23* | .30** | .31** | .30** | (.69) | | |
| Overt | -.24* | -.08 | .29** | .00 | .23* | .24* | .25* | .63** | (.81) | |
| Viol | -.23* | -.21 | .16 | -.06 | .22* | .22* | .28** | .18 | .51** | (.96) |

Note. S-E = Self-Esteem, I-C = Interpersonal Competence, D-P = Depression Proneness, P-C = Problem-Solving Confidence, Dep = SCL-90-R Depression Scale, Anx = SCL-90-R Anxiety Scale, Somat = SCL-90-R Somatization Scale, Subtle = Subtle Psychological Abuse, Overt = Overt Psychological Abuse, Viol = Violence (SVAWS).

Note. Alpha internal consistency reliability presented on diagonal. Inter-correlations presented off diagonal.

Note. * = p ≤ .05; ** = p ≤ .01

Table 7

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Self-Esteem

| Variable Entered | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | R | p | $R^2$Cha | F Cha | $\Delta p$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entire Sample | | | | | | | |
| Violence | -.01 | .01 | .23 | .03 | .05 | 4.76 | .03 |
| Overt Acts | -.10 | .14 | .26 | .04 | .01 | 1.73 | .19 |
| Subtle Acts | -.07 | .16 | .27 | .09 | .00 | .21 | .63 |
| Psychological Abuse Only Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .10 | .23 | .08 | .66 | .01 | .20 | .66 |
| Subtle Acts | -.02 | .27 | .09 | .91 | .00 | .05 | .94 |
| Moderate Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | -.16 | .18 | .11 | .56 | .13 | .35 | .55 |
| Subtle Acts | -.02 | .29 | .12 | .84 | .00 | .00 | .95 |
| Severe Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | -.28 | .15 | .31 | .08 | .09 | 3.30 | .08 |
| Subtle Acts | -.20 | .29 | .34 | .17 | .05 | .47 | .50 |

Note. Values for $\beta$ and SE $\beta$ represent all variables entered in the regression equation. Statistics presented are at the step in which the variable was entered.

Table 8

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Interpersonal Competence

| Variable Entered | $\beta$ | $SE\ \beta$ | $R$ | $p$ | $R^2$Cha | $F$ Cha | $\Delta p$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entire Sample | | | | | | | |
| Violence | -.01 | .01 | .21 | .05 | .05 | 4.76 | .03 |
| Overt Acts | .04 | .09 | .22 | .13 | .00 | .21 | .65 |
| Subtle Acts | .23 | .13 | .28 | .07 | .03 | 3.13 | .08 |
| Psychological Abuse Only Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | -.03 | .18 | .03 | .87 | .00 | .03 | .86 |
| Subtle Acts | .41 | .18 | .41 | .09 | .17 | 5.35 | .03 |
| Moderate Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .26 | .16 | .29 | .11 | .09 | 2.60 | .11 |
| Subtle Acts | -.10 | .25 | .30 | .28 | .01 | .15 | .70 |
| Severe Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | -.01 | .13 | .01 | .94 | .00 | .01 | .94 |
| Subtle Acts | .13 | .24 | .10 | .92 | .01 | .30 | .59 |

Note. Values for $\beta$ and $SE\ \beta$ represent all variables entered in the regression equation. Statistics presented are at the step in which the variable was entered.

Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Depression Proneness

| Variable Entered | β | SE β | R | p | R²Cha | F Cha | Δp |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entire Sample | | | | | | | |
| Violence | .01 | .01 | .16 | .12 | .03 | 2.46 | .04 |
| Overt Acts | .13 | .10 | .30 | .04 | .02 | 2.02 | .16 |
| Subtle Acts | .34 | .13 | .32 | .05 | .08 | 7.56 | .01 |
| Psychological Abuse Only Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .00 | .28 | .00 | .99 | .00 | .00 | .99 |
| Subtle Acts | -.09 | .31 | .05 | .96 | .00 | .08 | .79 |
| Moderate Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .43 | .22 | .35 | .06 | .12 | 3.83 | .06 |
| Subtle Acts | .59 | .32 | .47 | .03 | .10 | 3.40 | .07 |
| Severe Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .32 | .17 | .32 | .07 | .11 | 3.50 | .07 |
| Subtle Acts | .39 | .31 | .39 | .09 | .15 | 1.60 | .22 |

Note. Values for β and SE β represent all variables entered in the regression equation. Statistics presented are at the step in which the variable was entered.

Table 10

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Problem-Solving Confidence

| Variable Entered | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | R | p | $R^2$Cha | F Cha | $\Delta p$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entire Sample | | | | | | | |
| Violence | .00 | .01 | .06 | .58 | .00 | .30 | .59 |
| Overt Acts | .03 | .09 | .07 | .81 | .00 | .14 | .71 |
| Subtle Acts | .34 | .13 | .29 | .05 | .08 | 7.56 | .01 |
| Psychological Abuse Only Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .19 | .17 | .20 | .29 | .04 | 1.17 | .29 |
| Subtle Acts | .47 | .17 | .49 | .02 | .21 | 7.52 | .01 |
| Moderate Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .06 | .15 | .07 | .70 | .00 | .15 | .70 |
| Subtle Acts | .11 | .24 | .11 | .83 | .01 | .23 | .63 |
| Severe Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .01 | .13 | .02 | .94 | .00 | .01 | .93 |
| Subtle Acts | .28 | .25 | .20 | .56 | .04 | 1.20 | .28 |

Note. Values for $\beta$ and SE $\beta$ represent all variables entered in the regression equation. Statistics presented are at the step in which the variable was entered.

Table 11

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Depression

| Variable Entered | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | R | p | $R^2$Cha | F Cha | $\Delta$p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entire Sample | | | | | | | |
| Violence | .01 | .01 | .22 | .04 | .05 | 4.57 | .04 |
| Overt Acts | .13 | .10 | .26 | .04 | .02 | 2.02 | .16 |
| Subtle Acts | .36 | .14 | .36 | .01 | .06 | 5.89 | .02 |
| Psychological Abuse Only Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | -.22 | .17 | .24 | .21 | .06 | 1.64 | .21 |
| Subtle Acts | .08 | .19 | .25 | .43 | .01 | .17 | .69 |
| Moderate Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .30 | .19 | .29 | .12 | .08 | 2.55 | .12 |
| Subtle Acts | .68 | .26 | .51 | .02 | .18 | 6.60 | .02 |
| Severe Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .19 | .44 | .24 | .19 | .06 | 1.78 | .19 |
| Subtle Acts | .43 | .25 | .37 | .11 | .08 | 2.84 | .10 |

Note. Values for $\beta$ and SE $\beta$ represent all variables entered in the regression equation. Statistics presented are at the step in which the variable was entered.

Table 12

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Anxiety

| Variable Entered | $\beta$ | SE $\beta$ | R | p | $R^2$Cha | F Cha | $\Delta$p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entire Sample | | | | | | | |
| Violence | .01 | .01 | .23 | .03 | .05 | 4.87 | .03 |
| Overt Acts | .13 | .09 | .27 | .04 | .02 | 2.13 | .15 |
| Subtle Acts | .32 | .12 | .37 | .01 | .07 | 6.75 | .01 |
| Psychological Abuse Only Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .08 | .16 | .10 | .62 | .01 | .26 | .62 |
| Subtle Acts | .12 | .18 | .16 | .70 | .02 | .48 | .50 |
| Moderate Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .28 | .18 | .29 | .13 | .08 | 2.50 | .13 |
| Subtle Acts | .73 | .24 | .56 | .01 | .23 | 9.00 | .01 |
| Severe Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .05 | .13 | .07 | .70 | .01 | .15 | .70 |
| Subtle Acts | .30 | .23 | .24 | .42 | .05 | 1.64 | .21 |

Note. Values for $\beta$ and SE $\beta$ represent all variables entered in the regression equation. Statistics presented are at the step in which the variable was entered.

Table 13

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses for Somatization

| Variable Entered | β | SE β | R | p | R²Cha | F Cha | Δp |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entire Sample | | | | | | | |
| Violence | .01 | .01 | .29 | .01 | .08 | 7.96 | .01 |
| Overt Acts | .11 | .08 | .32 | .01 | .02 | 1.84 | .18 |
| Subtle Acts | .32 | .12 | .41 | .01 | .07 | 7.49 | .01 |
| Psychological Abuse Only Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .09 | .15 | .11 | .58 | .01 | .32 | .58 |
| Subtle Acts | .18 | .17 | .16 | .72 | .01 | .35 | .56 |
| Moderate Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | .30 | .14 | .37 | .04 | .14 | 4.56 | .04 |
| Subtle Acts | .58 | .18 | .61 | .01 | .23 | 10.10 | .01 |
| Severe Violence Group | | | | | | | |
| Overt Acts | -.01 | .13 | .01 | .95 | .00 | .00 | .95 |
| Subtle Acts | .47 | .24 | .35 | .15 | .12 | 3.93 | .06 |

Note. Values for β and SE β represent all variables entered in the regression equation. Statistics presented are at the step in which the variable was entered.

REFERENCES

Adams, D. (1989). Treatment models of men who batter: A profeminist analysis. In K. Yllo, & M. Bograd (Eds.), Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Aguilar, R., & Nightingale, N. (1994). The impact of specific battering experiences on the self-esteem of abused women. Journal of Family Violence, 9, 35-45.

Andrews, B., & Brown, G. (1988). Marital violence in the community. British Journal of Psychiatry, 153, 305-312.

Arias, I., & Johnson, P. (1989). Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, 298-307.

Arias, I., Samios, M., & O'Leary, D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2, 82-90.

Ball, P., & Wyman, E. (1977-78). Battered wives and powerlessness: What can counselors do. Victimology, 2, 545-552.

Bardis, P. (1973). Violence: Theory and quantifications. Journal of Political and Millitary Sociology, 1, 121-146.

Barling, J., O'Leary, K., Jouriles, E., Vivian, D., & MacEwen, K. (1987). Factor similarity of the conflict tactics scale across samples, spouses and sites. Journal of Family Violence, 2, 37-56.

Barnette, O., & LaViolette, A. (1993). It could happen to anyone: Why battered women stay. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Baumgardner, A. (1990). To know oneself is to like oneself. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 1062-1072.

Berger, C. (1988). Uncertainty and information exchange in developing relationships. In S. Duck (Ed.), Issues in children's and families' lives Vol. II: Family Violence. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Bergman, L. (1992). Dating violence among high school students. Social Work, 37, 21-27.

Billingham, R. (1987). Courtship violence: The patterns of conflict resolution strategies across seven levels of emotional commitment. Family Relations, 36, 283-289.

Billingham, R., & Sack, A. (1987). Conflict tactics and the level of emotional commitment among unmarrieds. Human Relations, 40, 59-74.

Bird, G., Stith, S., & Schladale, J. (1991). Psychological resources, coping strategies, and negotiation styles as discriminators of violence in dating relationships. Family Relations, 40, 45-50.

Breines, W., & Gordon, L. (1983). The new scholarship on family violence. Signs, 8, 490-571.

Brinkerhoff, M., & Lupri, E. (1988). Interspousal violence. Canadian Journal of Sociology, 13, 407-434.

Brown, J., & Smart, S. (1991). The self and social conduct: Linking self-representations to social behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 368-375.

Brown, J., & Wampold, B. (1983, August). Predictors of abused wives' own level of violence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association. Anneheim, CA.

Browne, A. (1987). When battered women kill. New York: McMillan.

Browne, A. (1993). Family violence and homelessness the relevance of trauma histories in the lives of homeless women: Economic and social issues. American Journal of Orthopsychicatry, 63, 370-384.

Buss, D., & Scheier, M. (1976). Self-consciousness, self-awareness, and self-attribution. Journal of Research in Personality, 10, 463-468.

Cantos, A., Neidig, P., & O'Leary, K. (1994). Injuries of women and men in a treatment program for domestic violence. Journal of Family Violence, 9, 113-124.

Campbell, J. (1992). If I can't have you no one can: Power and control in homicide of female partners. In J. Heidfan, & D. Russell (Eds.), <u>Femicide: The politics of human killing</u> (pp. 97-109). E. H. C.

Cascardi, M., Langhinrichsen, J., & Vivian, D. (1992). Marital aggression: Impact, injury and health correlates for husbands and wives. <u>Archives of Internal Medicine, 152,</u> 1178-1184.

Cascardi, M., Vivian, D., & Meyer, S. (1991, November). <u>Context and attributions for marital violence in discordant couples.</u> Poster presented at the 25th Annual Convention of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, New York, NY.

Chaiken, S., Liberman, A., & Eagly, A. (1989). Heuristic and systematic information processing within and beyond the persuasion context. In J. Uleman, & J. Burgh (Eds.), <u>Unintended thought</u> (pp. 212-251). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Christopoulos, C., Cohn, D., Shaw, D., Joyce,S., Sullivan-Hanson, J., Kraft, S., & Emery, R. (1987). Children of abused women: Adjustment at time of shelter residence. <u>Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49,</u> 611-619.

Claerhout, S., Elder, J., & Janes, C. (1982). Problem-solving skills of rural battered women. <u>American Journal of Community Psychology, 10,</u> 605-612.

Coates, D., Renzaglia, G., & Embree, M. (1983). When helping backfires: Help and helplessness. In J. Fisher, A. Nadler, & B. DePaulo (Eds.), New directions in helping (pp. 251-279). New York: Academic Press.

Coates, D., & Winston, T. (1983). Counteracting the deviance of depression: Peer support groups for victims. Journal of Social Issues, 39, 169-194.

Coates, D., & Winston, T. (1987). The dilemma of distress disclosure. In V. Derlega, & J. Berg (Eds.), Self-disclosure theory, research and therapy (pp. 229-242). New York: Plenum Press.

Cupach, W., & Metts, S. (1987). Perceived cues associated with relationship change and stability. International Conference of Personal Relationships, Iowa City.

DeGregoria, B. (1987). Sex role attitude and perception of psychological abuse. Sex Roles, 16, 227-235.

Derogatis, L. (1983). SCL-90 Administration, scoring and procedures manual. Towson, MD: Clinical Psychometric Research.

DeTurck, M. (1987). When communication fails: Physical aggression as a compliance gaining strategy. Communication Monographs, 54, 106-112.

Dickstein, L. (1988). Spouse abuse and other domestic violence. Psychiatric Clinics of North America, 11, 611-628.

Dobash, R., & Dobash, R. (1989). Research as social action: The struggle for battered women. In K. Yllo, & M. Bograd (Eds.), Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Dutton, D., & Painter, S. (1981). Traumatic bonding: The development of emotional attachments in battered women and other relationships of intermittent abuse. Victimology, 6, 13-23.

Dutton, D., & Painter, S. (1993). Emotional attachments in abusive relationships: A test of traumatic bonding theory. Violence and Victims, 8, 105-120.

Edleson, J. (1984). Working with men who batter. Social Work, 29, 237-242.

Edleson, J., Eiskovits, R., & Guttman, E. (1985). Men who batter: A critical review of the evidence. Journal of Family Issues, 6, 229-247.

Epstein, S. (1986). Anxiety, arousal and the self-concept. Stress and Anxiety, 10, 265-305.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison process. Human Relations, 7, 117-140.

Feindler, E. (1987). Clinical issues and recommendations in adolescent anger-control training. Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy, 4, 267-274.

Ferraro, K., & Johnson, J. (1983). How women experience battering: The process of victimization. Social Problems, 30, 325-339.

Follingstad, D., Brennan, A., Hause, E., Polek, D., & Rutledge, L. (1991). Factors moderating physical and psychological symptoms of battered women. <u>Journal of Family Violence, 6,</u> 81-95.

Follingstad, D., Laughlin, J., Polek, D., & Rutledge, L. (1991). Identification of patterns of wife abuse. <u>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6,</u> 187-204.

Follingstad, D., Rutledge, L., Berg, B., Hause, E., & Polek, D. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. <u>Journal of Family Violence, 5,</u> 107-120.

Follingstad, D., Rutledge, L., Polek, D., & McNeill-Hawkins, K. (1988). Factors associated with patterns of dating violence toward college women. <u>Journal of Family Violence, 3,</u> 169-182.

Follingstad, D., Wright, S., Lloyd, S., & Sebastian, J. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. <u>Family Relations, 40,</u> 51-57.

Frieze, I. (1983). Investigating the causes and consequences of marital rape. <u>Signs, 8,</u> 532-553.

Frieze, I., Hymer, S., & Greenberg, M. (1984). Describing the victims of crime and violence. In S. Kahn (Ed.), <u>Victims of crime and violence. Final report of the APA task force on the victims of crime and violence.</u> Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Frieze, I., & McHugh, M. (1981, August). Violence and other bases of power in marriage. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Frieze, I., & McHugh, M. (1992). Power and influence strategies in violent and nonviolent marriages. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16, 449-465.

Gamache, D. (1991). Domination and control: The social context of dating violence. In B. Levy (Ed.), Dating violence: Young women in danger (pp. 69-83). Seattle: The Seal Press.

Ganley, A. (1987). Perpetrators of domestic violence: An overview of counseling the court-mandated client. In Domestic violence on trial. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Gelles, R. (1976). Abused wives: Why do they stay. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 659-668.

Gelles, R., & Harrop, J. (1989). Violence, battering and psychological distress among women. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, 400-420.

Gelles, R., & Straus, M. (1990). The medical and psychological costs of family violence. In R. Gelles (Ed.), Physical violence in american families (pp. 425-429). New York: Transaction.

Gleason, W. (1993). Mental disorders in battered women: An empirical study. Violence and Victims, 8, 53-68.

Gondolf, E. Treating the batterer. In M. Hansen, & M. Harway (Eds.), Battering and family therapy: A feminist perspective (pp. 105-118). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Goodman, L., Koss, M., & Felipe-Russo, N. (1993). Violence against women: Physical and mental health effects. Part I: Research findings. Applied and Preventive Psychology, 2, 79-89.

Graham, D. (1992). Loving to survive: Sexual terror, men's violence, and women's lives. New York: University Press.

Gryl, F., Stith, S., & Bird, G. (1991). Close dating relationships among college students: Differences by use of violence and by gender. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 8, 243-264.

Hamberger, L., Saunders, D., & Hovey, M. (1992). Prevalence of domestic violence in communty practice and rate of physician inquiry. Family Medicine, 24, 283-287.

Hamilton, B., & Coates, J. (1993). Perceived helpfulness and use of professional services by abused women. Journal of Family Violence, 8, 313-324.

Hartik, L. (1982). Identification of personality characteristics and self-concept factors of battered wives. Palo Alto, CA: R & E Research Associates.

Heppner, P. (1979). The effects of client perceived need and counselor role on clients' behaviors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 5950A-5951A. (University Microfilms No. 79-07,542).

Heppner, P., & Petersen, C. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem-solving inventory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29, 66-75.

Herbert, T., Silver, R., & Ellard, J. (1991). Coping with an abusive relationship: How and why do women stay. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53, 311-325.

Heppner, P., & Petersen, C. (1982). The development and implications of a personal problem solving inventory. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 29, 66-75.

Higgins, E. (1989). Self-discrepancy theory: What patterns of self-beliefs cause people to suffer. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology (Vol. 22, pp. 93-136). San Diego: Academic Press.

Higgins, E., Klein, R., & Strauman, T. (1985b). Self-concept discrepancy theory: A psychological model for distinguishing among different aspects of depression and anxiety. Social Cognition, 3, 51-76.

Higgins, E., Klein, R., & Strauman, T. (1987). Self-discrepancies: Distinguishing among self-states, self-state conflicts, and emotional vulnerabilities. In K. Yardley, & T. Honess (Eds.), Self and identity: Psychosocial perspectives (pp. 173-186). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Hilberman, E. (1980). Overview: The wife-beaters wife reconsidered, American Journal of Psychiatry, 137, 1336-1346.

Hilberman, E., & Munson, K. (1977-78). Sixty battered women. Victimology: An International Journal, 2, 460-470.

Hoffman, P. (1984). Psychological abuse of women by spouses and live-in lovers. Women & Therapy, 3, 37-53.

Hotaling, G., & Sugarman, D. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence. Violence and Victims, 1, 101-124.

Hotaling, G., & Sugarman, D. (1990). Prevention of wife assault. In K. Ammerman, & M. Hersen (Eds.), Treatment of Family Violence (pp. 385-405). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Hudson, W., & McIntosh, S. (1981). The assessment of spouse abuse: Two quatifiable dimensions. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 873-888.

Infante, D., & Wigley, C. (1986). Verbal aggressiveness: An interpersonal model and measure. Communication Monographs, 53, 61-69.

Jaffe, P., Wolfe, D., Wilson, S., & Zak, L. (1986). Emotional and physical health problems of battered women. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 31, 625-629.

Janoff-Bulman, R. (1988). Victims of violence. In S. Fisher, & J. Reason (Eds.), Handbook of Life Stress, Cognition and Health (pp. 101-113). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Kasian, M., & Painter, S. (1992). Frequency and severity of psychological abuse in a dating population. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7, 350-364.

Kilpatrick, D., Best, C., Saunders, B., & Veronen, L. (1988). Rape in marriage and in dating relationships: How bad is it for mental health. Annals of the New York Acadamy of Sciences, 528, 335-344.

Kuhl, A. (1982). Community responses to battered women. Victimology, 7, 49-59.

Lambert, L., & Fantuzzo, J. (1988). Assessing spousal abuse: Beyond the conflict tactics scales. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Fullerton, CA.

Laner, M. (1989). Competition and combativeness in courtship: Reports from women. Journal of Family Violence, 4, 181-195.

Launius, M., & Lindquist, C. (1988). Learned helplessness, external locus of control, and passivity in battered women. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3, 307-318.

Lebov-Keeler, K., & Pipes, R. (1990). Psychological abuse among college women in exclusive heterosexual dating relationships. Boston: American Psychological Association.

Leeder, E. (1988). Enmeshed pain: Counseling the lesbian battering couple. Women and Therapy, 7, 81-99.

Lim, T. (1990). The influences of receivers' resistance on persuaders verbal aggressiveness. Communication Quarterly, 38, 170-188.

Lloyd, S. (1990). Conflict types and strategies in violent marriages. Journal of family and violence, 5, 270-284.

Lopes, L. (1987). Between hope and fear. Advances in experimental social psychology, 20, 255-293.

Loring, M., & Myers, D. (1992). Differentiating emotionally abused women. Unpublished manuscript.

Makepeace, J. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. Family Relations, 30, 97-102.

Makepeace, J. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. Family Relations, 35, 383-388.

Malone, J., Tyree, A., & O'Leary, K. (1989). Generalist countainment: Different effects of past aggression for wives and husbands. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, 687-697.

Margolin, G., Burman, B., & John, R. (1989). Home observations of married couples reenacting naturalistic conflicts. Behavioral Assessment, 11, 101-118.

Margolin, G, John, R., & Gleberman, L. (1988). Affective responses to conflictual discussions in violent and nonviolent couples. Journal of Consulting and clinical psychology, 56, 24-33.

Markus, H., & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible selves. American Psychologist, 41(9), 954-969.

Markus, H., & Wurf, E. (1987). The dynamic self-concept: A social psychological perspective. Annual Review of Psychology, 38, 299-337.

Marshall, L. (1992a). Development of the severity of violence against women scales. Journal of Family Violence, 7, 103-121.

Marshall, L. (1992b). The severity of violence against men scales. Journal of Family Violence, 7, 189-203.

Marshall, L. (1993a, April). Coping and health in psychologically and physically abused women. Presented at the Women's Psychological and Physical Health: A scholarly and social agenda, Lawrence, KS.

Marshall, L. (1993b, June). Psychological abuse, violence and emotional distress. Paper presented at the International Network on Personal Relationships, Milwaukee, WI.

Marshall, L. (1994). Physical and psychological abuse. In W. Cupach, & B. Spitzberg (Eds.), The dark side of interpersonal communication (pp. 281-311). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Marshall, L., & Rose, P. (1987). Gender, stress and violence in the adult relationships of a sample of college students. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 4, 299-316.

Marshall, L., & Rose, P. (1990). Premarital violence: The impact of family of origin violence, stress, and reciprocity. Violence and Victims, 5, 51-64.

Mason, A., & Blankenship, V. (1987). Power and affilitation motivation, stress, and abuse in intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 203-210.

Masters, J., & Keil, L. (1987). Generic comparison processes in human judgment and behavior. In J. Masters, & W. Smith (Eds.), Social comparison, social justice and relative deprivation (pp. 11-54). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

McFarlane, J. (1989). Battering during pregnancy: Tip of an iceberg revealed. Women & Health, 15, 69-84.

McFarlane, J., Parker, B., & Soeken, L. (1995). Abuse during pregnancy: Frequency, severity, perpetrator and risk factors of homicide. Public Health Nursing, 12, 284-289.

McGuire, W., & McGuire, C. (1986). Differences in conceptualizing self versus conceptualizing other people as manifested in contrasting verb types used in natural speech. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1135-1143.

Mills, T. (1984). Victimization and self-esteem: On equating husband abuse and wife abuse. Victimology: An International Journal, 8, 254-261.

Murphy, C., & Cascardi, M. (1993). Psychological aggression and abuse in marriage. In R. L. Hampton, & T. Eullota (Eds.), Family violence prevention and treatment (pp. 86-113). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Murphy, C., Meyer, S., & O'Leary, D. (1993). Family of origin violence and MCMI-II psychopathology among partner assaultive men. Violence & Victims, 8, 165-176.

Murphy, C., & O'Leary, D. (1989). Psychological aggression predicts physical aggression in early marriage. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57, 579-582.

Neidig, C. (1986). The development and evaluation of a spouse abuse treatment program in a millitary setting. Special issue: The vevelopment and evaluation of human service programs in the millitary. Evaluation and Program Planning, 9, 275-280.

Neidig, C., & O'Leary, K. (1991). Fear and injuries of women and men in a treatment program for domestic violence. Stony Brook, NY: Behavioral Science Associates.

Noller, P. (1987). Nonverbal communication in marriage. In D. Perlman, & S. Duck (Eds.), Intimate Relationships: Development, Dynamics, and deterioration (pp. 149-175). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Noller, P., & Fitzpatrick, M. (1990). Marital communication in the eighties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 832-843.

Noller, P., & Gallois, C. (1988). Understanding and misunderstanding in marriage. In p. Noller & M. A. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), <u>Perspectives on marital interaction</u> (pp. 53-77). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Nurius, P., Furrey, J., Berliner, L. (1992). Coping capacity among women with abusive partners. <u>Violence and Victims, 7,</u> 229-243.

Okun, L. (1986). <u>Woman abuse: Facts replacing myths.</u> Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

O'Leary, K., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of spousal aggression. <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57,</u> 263-268.

O'Leary, K., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1994). Physical aggression in early marriage: Pre-relationship and relationship effects. <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48,</u> 465-479.

O'Neil, J., & Egan, J. (1993). Abuses of power against women: Sexism, gender role conflict, and psychological violence. In E. Cook (Ed.), <u>Women, relationships, and power implications for counseling</u> (pp. 49-78). Alexandria: American Counseling Association.

Pagelow, M. (1981). Factors affecting women's decisions to leave violent relationships. <u>Journal of Family Issues, 2,</u> 391-414.

Pan, H., Neidig, P., O'Leary (1994). Male-female and aggressor-victim differences in the factor structure of the modified conflict tactics scale. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9, 366-382.

Parker, B., McFarlane, J., Soeken, K., Torres, S., & Campbell, D. (1993). Physical and emotional abuse in pregnancy: A comparison of adult and teenage women. Nursing Research, 42, 173-178.

Pelham, B., (1991). On confidence and consequences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 518-530.

Pelham, B., & Swann, W. (1989). From self-conceptions to self worth. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57, 672-680.

Pelham, B., & Swann, W. (1994). The juncture of intra personal and interpersonal knowledge: Self-certainty and interpersonal congruence. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 349-357.

Pirog-Good, M., & Stets, J. (Eds.), (1989). Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues. New York: Praeger.

Platt, J., & Spivack, G. (1975). Unidimensionality of the means end problem solving procedure. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 31, 15-16.

Rancer, A., & Niemasz, J. (1988, April). The influence of argumentativeness and verbal aggressiveness in intrafamily violence. Paper presented to the Eastern Communication Association Convention, Baltimore, MD.

Rhodes, J. (1985). Developing biased social judgements. The false-consensus effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 1352-1359.

Riggs, D., Kilpatrick, D., & Resnick, H. (1992). Long-term psychological distress associated with marital rape and aggravated asssault: A comparison to other crime victims. Journal of Family Violence, 7, 283-296.

Rodenburg, F., & Fantuzzo, J. (1993). The measure of wife abuse: Steps toward the development of a comprehensive assessment technique. Journal of Family Violence, 8, 203-228.

Rosenburg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books.

Ross, B. (1980). Nonverbal behavior and theory of emotion: The facial feedback hypothesis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 811-824.

Russel, M., Lipov, E., Phillips, N., & White, B. (1989). Psychological profiles of violent and nonviolent maritally distressed couples. Psychotherapy, 26, 81-87.

Sabourin, T. (1991). Perceptions of verbal aggression in interspousal violence. In D. Knudsen, & J. Miller (Eds.), Abused and Battered: Social and Legal Responses to Family Violence. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Sonkin, D., Martin, D., & Walker, L. (1985). The male batterer: A treatment approach. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Salovey, P., & Rodin, J. (1991). Provoking jealousy and envy: Domain relevance and self-esteem threat. Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10, 395-413.

Shepard, M., & Campbell, J. (1992). The abusive behavior inventory: A measure of psychological and physical abuse. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7, 291-305.

Shepard, M., & Pence, E. (1988). The effect of battering on the employment status of women. Affilia, 3, 55-61.

Shepherd, J. (1990). Victims of personal violence: The relevance of Symonds' model fo psychological response and loss-theory. British Journal of Social Work, 20, 389-332.

Shrauger, J., & Shoeneman, T. (1979). Symbolic interactionist view of self-concept: Through the looking glass darkly. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 549-573.

Smith, D., & O'Leary, K. (1987, July). Affective components of problem-solving communication and their relationships with interspousal aggression. Paper presented at the Third National Family Violence Research Conference. Durham, NH.

Sonkin, D., Martin, D., & Walker, L. (1985). The male batterer: A treatment approach, New York: Springer-Verlag.

Spitzberg, B., & Marshall, L. (1991, July). Courtship violence and relational outcomes. Paper presented at the Fifth International Conference on Personal Relationships, Oxford, England.

Stacey, W., & Schupe, H. (1983). The family secret: Domestic violence in america. Boston, MA: Beacon.

Star, B., Clark, G., Goetz, K., & O'hara, C. (1979). Psychosocial aspects of wife battering. Social Casework, 41, 479-487.

Stark, E., & Filcraft, A. (1988). Violence among inmates: An epidemiological review. In V. Van Hasselt, R. Morrison, A. Bellack, & M. Hersen (Eds.), Handbook of Family Violence (pp. 293-318). New York: Plenum Press.

Steele, C. (1988). The psychology of self-affirmation. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 21, 261-302.

Stets, J. (1990). Verbal and physical aggression in marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 501-514.

Stets, J. (1991). Psychological aggression in dating relationships: The role of interpersonal control. Journal of Family Violence, 6, 97-114.

Stets, J., & Pirog-Good, M. (1990). Interpersonal control and courtship aggression. Journal and Social and Personal Relationships, 7, 371-394.

Stout, K. (1991). Intimate femicide: A national demographic overview. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6, 476-485.

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

Straus, M. (1990). Measuring intrafamily conflict: The Conflict Tactics (CTS) Scales. In M. Straus, & R. Gelles (Eds.), Physical violence in american families: Risk factors and adaptions to violence in 8,145 families (pp. 29-45). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Straus, M., & Gelles, R. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 465-479.

Straus, M., Gelles, R., & Steinmetz, S. (1980). Behind closed doors: Violence in the american family. Garden City NY: Anchor Books.

Swann, W. (1983). Self-verification: Bringing social reality into harmony iwth the self. In J. Suls, & A. Greenwald (Eds.), Psychological perspectives on the self vol II. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Taylor, S., & Brown, J. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. Psychological Bulletin, 103, 193-210.

Taylor, S., & Lobel, M. (1989). Social comparison activity under threat: Downward evaluation and upward contacts. Psychological Review, 96, 569-575.

Tesser, H. (1986). Some effects of self-evaluation maintenance on cognition and action. In R. Sorrentino, & E. Higgins (Eds.), The handbook of motivation and cognition: Foundations of social behavior. New York, NY: Guilford.

Tesser, A., & Collins, J. (1990). Emotion in social reflection and comparison situations: Intuitive, systematic, and exploratory approaches. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 695-709.

Tesser, A., Millar, M., & Moore, J. (1988). Some affective consequences of social comparison and reflection processes: The pain and pleasure of being close. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 49-61.

Tesser, A., & Moore, J. (1990). Independent threats and self-evaluation mainenance processes. Journal of Social Psychology, 130, 677-689.

Thompson, W. (1987). Courtship violence: Toward a conceptual understanding. Youth and Society, 18, 162-176.

Tolman, R. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. Violence and Victims, 4, 159-177.

Tolman, R. (1992). Psychological abuse of women. In R. Ammerman, & T., Nersen (Eds.), Assessment of family violence (pp. 291-310). New York: Wiley and Sons.

Vitanza, S., Walker, F., & Marshall, L. (1991, August). The effect of psychological abuse on women's relationships and health. Poster presented at the annual American Psychological Association Conference, Sanfancisco, CA.

Vitanza, S., Vogel, L., & Marshall, L. (1995). Distress symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder in abused women. Violence and Victims, 10, 23-34.

Vivian, D., & O'Leary, D. (1987, July). Communication patterns in physically aggressive engaged couples. Paper presented at the Third National Family Violence Research Conference, Durham, NH.

Walker, L. (1979). The battered woman. New York: Harper & Row.

Walker, L. (1984). Violence against women: Implications for mental health policy. In L. Walker (Ed.), Women and Mental Health Policies (pp. 197-206). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Walker, L. (1986). Psychological causes of family violence. In M. Lystad (Ed.), Violence in the home: Interdisciplinary perspectives (pp. 71-97). New York: Bruhner-Mazel.

Wauchope, B. (1988). Help-seeking decisions of battered women: A test of learned helplessness and two stress theories. Paper presented at the Easter Sociological Society.

Weinstein, N. (1989). Effects of personal experience on self-protective behavior. Psychology Bulletin, 105, 31-50.

Wicklund, R., & Gollwitzer, P. (1982). Self-symbolizing and the neglect of others perspectives. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 702-715.

Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). Till death do us part. In J. Radford, & D. Russell (Eds.), Femicide. The politics of woman killing (pp. 83-98).

Wood, J., Taylor, S., & Lichtman, R. (1983). It could be worse: Selective evaluation as a response to victimization. Journal of Social Issues, 39, 19-40.

Wood, J., Taylor, S., & Lichtman, R. (1985). Social comparison and adjustment to breast cancer. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 1169-1183.

Zemore, R., Fisher, D., Garratt, L., & Miller, C. (1989). The depression proneness rating scale: Reliability, validity and factor structure. Current Psychological Research and Reviews, 9, 255-263.