



Published in final edited form as:

J Aggress Maltreat Trauma. 2013 April 29; 22(4): 348–364. doi:10.1080/10926771.2013.775987.

Males' Reactions to Participating in Research on Dating Violence Victimization and Childhood Abuse

Ryan C. Shorey, Heather Zucosky, Jeniimarie Febres, Hope Brasfield, and Gregory L. Stuart

University of Tennessee – Knoxville

Abstract

Childhood abuse and dating violence victimization are prevalent and devastating problems. While there has been an abundance of research on these topics in recent years, researchers and Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) often struggle with determining whether asking respondents questions on previous violence will result in increased emotional distress or other negative research outcomes. Empirical data is therefore needed that examines the research reactions of individuals who participate in research on childhood abuse and dating violence. The current study examined this topic among a sample of male college students ($N = 193$). Results showed that victims of childhood sexual abuse had more negative emotional reactions and victims of physical dating violence had more negative perceived drawbacks to research participation than non-victims. However, victims and non-victims did not differ on positive research reactions. These findings suggest that there are few differences between victims and non-victims on research reactions.

Keywords

Dating violence; childhood abuse; research reactions; ethics

Research has consistently demonstrated that childhood abuse and dating violence victimization are prevalent and devastating problems among college students (Roemmele & Messman-Moore, 2011; Shorey, Cornelius, & Bell, 2008). Moreover, a history of childhood abuse is associated with increased risk for continued victimization and/or the perpetration of aggression in future relationships, such as dating relationships (White & Widom, 2003; Wolfe, Wekerle, Scott, Straatman, & Grasley, 2004). This phenomenon, known as the intergenerational transmission of violence (Kalmuss, 1984), is well established empirically (Gratz, Paulson, Jakupcak, & Tull, 2009; Wolfe et al., 2004). Because of the importance of this topic and the sensitive nature of abuse experiences, it is imperative that researchers and Institutional Review Boards (IRBs) have empirical information on whether asking questions about childhood abuse and dating violence is emotionally upsetting, detrimental, and/or beneficial to participants. Although preliminary research has begun to examine this topic (Edwards, Gidycz, & Desai, in press; Shorey, Cornelius, & Bell, 2011), continued work is needed in this area. Thus, the current study examined the reactions of male undergraduate students to participating in research on childhood abuse and dating violence victimization experiences.

Childhood Abuse and Dating Violence Victimization

While definitions of the construct of childhood abuse may vary across studies, researchers generally conceptualize it as having emotional, physical, and/or sexual components (Bernstein et al., 1994; Gratz et al., 2009). Although some definitions may also include *neglect* (Bernstein et al., 1994), we restricted our study to *abuse* experiences. The prevalence

of childhood physical and emotional abuse is shockingly high, with upwards of 30% of college students reporting emotional and physical abuse during childhood (Paivio & Cramer, 2004). Meta-analytic studies have demonstrated that the prevalence of sexual abuse as a child may be as high as approximately 8% among males (Pereda, Guilera, Forns, & Gomez-Beinto, 2009). Further, experiences of childhood abuse victimization are associated with a wealth of negative physical and mental health outcomes (for reviews, see Dube et al., 2005; Springer, Sheridan, Kuo, & Carnes, 2007).

Dating violence, which includes psychological, physical, and sexual aggression (Shorey et al., 2008), is also pervasive among college students. Research has demonstrated an annual prevalence rate of psychological aggression in dating relationships of approximately 80%, of physical aggression 20–30%, and of sexual aggression 10–20% (Bell & Naugle, 2007; Shorey et al., 2008). In addition, victims of dating violence report numerous mental health problems relative to non-victims, including PTSD symptoms (Hines, 2001), depression (Shorey, Sherman, et al., 2011), and substance use (Shorey, Stuart, & Cornelius, 2011), to name a few. Moreover, because dating violence is consistently associated with childhood abuse, research on the relation between these two types of violence is relatively common in the empirical literature.

Reactions to Participating in Violence Research

As research demonstrating a consistent relationship between childhood abuse and dating violence has grown, the ethics of asking participants to answer sensitive questions regarding their experiences with these forms of abuse have been questioned by Institutional Review Boards (IRBs). A universal concern of IRBs is the welfare and emotional safety of participants who may be asked to disclose previous abuse experiences (Newman & Kaloupek, 2004). Indeed, Becker-Blease and Freyed (2006) list a number of reasons why researchers and IRBs may be hesitant to ask research participants about previous abuse experiences, which included “asking about abuse exposes participants to unusual, upsetting stimuli” (p. 221), “it is unethical to ask participants to disclose stigmatizing information” (p. 222), “questions about abuse directly cause harm” (p. 223), and “asking participants about abuse has no direct benefits to participants” (p. 223). However, as outlined by Becker-Blease and Freyed (2006), these concerns have not been supported by the empirical literature, and asking about abuse experiences is important for societal and scientific growth.

Existing literature on the research reactions of various populations to reporting about previous abuse (e.g., battered women; rape survivors), largely demonstrates few negative emotional reactions and some report of benefits to research participation (e.g., insight into relationships; Campbell, Adams, Wasco, Ahrens, & Sefl, 2010; Griffin, Resick, Waldrop, & Mechanic, 2003). Because of the focus of the current study, our review will be restricted to male college students who have been victimized by childhood abuse or dating violence. In a recent study, Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell (2011) compared the research reactions of male victims of psychological, physical, and sexual dating violence to non-victims. Findings demonstrated that victims of physical and psychological aggression reported more perceived benefits to research participation than non-victims, although they also reported more mildly distressing negative emotional reactions to research participation. In all, Shorey and colleagues interpreted their findings to suggest that very few male victims experience negative emotional reactions to dating violence questions, and the benefits of such research outweigh the potential risks involved.

Edwards and colleagues (in press) investigated the research reactions of male college students to questions about childhood abuse and the perpetration of dating violence. Their findings demonstrated that greater immediate negative emotional reactions to research

participation were associated with reports of physical abuse and psychological abuse/neglect during childhood. Importantly, their findings also demonstrated that only 4.3% of participants reported immediately negative emotional reactions and that negative emotional reactions did not predict continued study participation 2-months after their initial assessment. In addition, none of the 4.3% of participants reported negative reactions over the interim period between assessments. Thus, this study, in combination with the Shorey, Cornelius et al., (2011) study, provide preliminary evidence that reports of childhood or dating violence victimization are not overly distressing for males, and that there may be benefits to research participation for the participants themselves.

Still, the literature on the research reactions of males to participating in trauma-based violence research is limited, since to our knowledge, the above two studies are the only empirical investigations on this topic. Thus, there is a need for additional research to replicate and extend the findings of these previous studies. For instance, neither of these studies simultaneously examined childhood abuse victimization and dating violence victimization, and it is possible that being asked to report on both of these abuse experiences may result in different research reaction outcomes. Additionally, it is not clear whether individuals who have been victimized by both childhood abuse and dating violence would have greater negative research reactions than non-victims or individuals victimized by only one form of abuse. This information is important because it will help guide researchers and IRBs in the proper protection of research participants and help to determine whether male victims of interpersonal trauma perceive any risks and/or benefits to their research participation.

Current Study

Due to a lack of research in this area, the current study examined the reactions to participating in research on experiences with childhood emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, as well as experiences with psychological, physical, and sexual dating violence victimization. In a sample of male undergraduate students, we examined whether victims of childhood abuse and dating violence differed in their reports of research reactions relative to their non-victimized counterparts. In addition, we examined whether victims of both childhood abuse and dating violence reported less positive and more negative research reactions relative to non-victims or victims of just one form of abuse. Because there is limited research in this area, we had no specific hypotheses about which forms of abuse would be associated with positive or negative research reactions, although we did expect that victims of either childhood abuse and/or dating violence would generally report more immediately negative emotional reactions than non-victims.

Method

Participants

Male undergraduate students from a large southeastern university participated in the current study. A total of 193 students completed all measures of interest. The mean age of participants was 18.92 ($SD = 2.03$). Academically, the majority of participants were freshmen (74.6%), followed by sophomores (17.6%), juniors (4.1%), and seniors (3.6%). Ethnically, the majority of participants identified as non-Hispanic Caucasian (90.6%), Asian American (4.2%), African American (2.6%), and Hispanic (2.6%). This ethnic composition is consistent with the broader enrollment of the university where the study was conducted. At the time of the study, 32.1% of students were in a current dating relationship. The mean length in months of participants' current dating relationship was 7.95 ($SD = 9.65$). The majority of participants had at least one dating partner in the previous 12 months (73%). The sexual orientation of participants was primarily heterosexual (94.8%).

Procedure

Students from psychology courses were recruited for the current study. As part of their course requirements, students at the university where the current study was conducted can participate in research for partial course credit. Interested students read a brief description of the current study through an online survey website used specifically by the university where the current study was conducted. Students were required to be 18 years or older in order to participate. All measures were completed through an online survey website that uses encryption to ensure confidentiality of responses. Students were first provided with an informed consent that they also completed online. Upon consent, students were provided with standardized instructions for all measures completed. Once all surveys were finished, students were provided with a list of referrals for local mental health services and domestic violence referrals and received partial course credit in their psychology course for their participation. All procedures were approved by the university's IRB.

Measures

Demographics—Participants were asked to indicate their age, gender, race, academic level, relationship status, and sexual orientation.

Dating Violence—The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) was used to examine dating violence victimization in the previous 12 months. The CTS2 is a 78-item self-report measure that examines psychological, physical, and sexual aggression that occurs in intimate relationships. While the CTS2 also examines the perpetration of aggression, the current study focused solely on victimization experiences. Participants were asked to indicate how frequently they had experienced each item on the CTS2 using a 7-point scale (*0 = Never; 6 = More than 20 times*) in their current or most recent dating relationship. Items were recoded by taking the mid-point for each response (e.g., a “4” for the response “3 to 5 times”), with scores ranging from 0 to 25 for each item. Higher scores indicate more frequent victimization. All items were summed after recoding to create a total score for each subscale (Straus, Hamby, & Warren, 2003). The CTS2 is the most widely used measure for assessing violence between intimate partners and has demonstrated good reliability and validity across a wide range of populations (Vega & O’Leary, 2007). For the current study, internal consistency estimates were .77 for psychological victimization, .86 for physical victimization, and .79 for sexual victimization.

Childhood Abuse—The Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ; Bernstein & Fink, 1997) was used to examine abuse sustained during childhood. This 28-item self-report measure assesses the frequency of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse during childhood. All items are rated on a five-point scale (*0 = Never True; 4 = Very Often True*) to indicate how often each type of abuse occurred. Higher scores on each subscale indicate more frequent abuse experiences. Example items include “people in my family said hurtful or insulting things to me” (emotional abuse), “people hit me so hard that it left me with bruises or marks” (physical abuse), and “someone tried to make me do sexual things or watch sexual things” (sexual abuse). The CTQ is a widely used measure of childhood abuse experiences and has demonstrated good reliability and validity across a range of samples (Scher, Stein, Asmundson, McCreary, & Forde, 2001). In the current study, internal consistency for each subscale was .83 (emotional abuse), .60 (physical abuse), and .92 (sexual abuse).

Research Reactions—The Reactions to Research Participation Questionnaire (RRPQ; Newman, Willard, Sinclair, & Kaloupek, 2001) was used to assess participants' reactions to participating in the current study. The RRPQ is a 21-item self-report measure that examines

five different domains of research participation reactions. These domains include: Participation Factor (PF; cost-benefit ratio of the research), Personal Benefits (PB; perceived personal insight from the research), Emotional Reactions (ER; negative emotional responses to the research), Perceived Drawbacks (PD; the questions were too personal), and Global Evaluation (GE; faith in confidentiality and the researchers). All items were rated on a five-point scale ($1 = \textit{Strongly Disagree}$; $5 = \textit{Strongly Agree}$), with higher scores indicating more positive research evaluations. For instance, higher scores on the ER scale indicate *less* negative emotional responses to the research. The RRPQ has demonstrated good reliability across samples (DePrince & Chu, 2008). In the current study, internal consistency estimates were .84 for PF, .95 for PB, .85 for ER, .80 for PD, and .95 for GE. This was the last measure completed by participants.

Results

All analyses were conducted in SPSS version 18.0. First, all violence subscales, for both the CTS2 and CTQ, were positively skewed and were thus log transformed prior to conducting statistical analyses. We also compared individuals in a current dating relationship to individuals not in a current dating relationship on research reactions, and no differences between groups were found. Thus, the entire sample was retained for analyses. Table 1 displays correlations, means, and standard deviations for all study variables. The mean scores for all of the variables of interest are similar to those found in previous research on research reactions, dating violence, and childhood abuse with male college students (e.g., Shorey, Cornelius, et al., 2011). Childhood physical abuse was negatively and significantly associated with personal benefits, perceived drawbacks, and global evaluation research reactions; childhood sexual abuse was negatively and significantly associated with emotional reactions and perceived drawbacks research reactions. It should be noted that all of these correlations were low (i.e., $<.19$). Childhood emotional abuse was not significantly related to research reactions. Psychological dating violence victimization was negatively and significantly associated with personal benefits research reactions; physical dating violence victimization was negatively and significantly associated with personal benefits, perceived drawbacks, and global evaluation research reactions. Sexual dating violence victimization was negatively and significantly associated with perceived drawbacks and global evaluation research reactions. As with childhood abuse, the correlations between dating violence subscales and research reactions were relatively small.

We next categorized individuals into victims and non-victims of each type of childhood abuse and dating violence victimization. Consistent with previous research (e.g., Hines & Saudino, 2003; Rhatigan & Street, 2005; Shorey, Brasfield, Febres, & Stuart, 2011; Shorey, Cornelius, & Bell, 2011), for each type of victimization, individuals who endorsed at least one act of aggression victimization were considered victims. Using this method of categorization, 49.2% of the sample was categorized as victims of childhood emotional abuse, 51.9% as victims of childhood physical abuse, and 4.7% as victims of childhood sexual abuse. For dating violence, 53.2% were classified as victims of psychological victimization, 18.1% as victims of physical victimization, and 16.7% as victims of sexual victimization.

Having classified individuals into victims and non-victims of each type of aggression, we examined differences between these groups on all five research reaction subscales. As displayed in Table 2, there were no significant differences between victims and non-victims of childhood emotional or physical abuse on research reactions. However, for childhood sexual abuse, victims reported significantly more negative emotional reactions and perceived drawbacks research reactions than non-victims. We calculated effect sizes for the

group differences and found that the difference between victims and non-victims were large for both emotional reactions ($d = 1.37$) and perceived drawbacks ($d = .92$) (Cohen, 1988).

Table 3 displays differences between victims and non-victims of dating violence victimization on research reactions. No significant differences emerged between victims and non-victims of psychological aggression or sexual aggression on any of the five research reaction subscales. For victims of physical aggression, the only significant difference that emerged was on the perceived drawbacks research reaction subscale, with victims reporting more negative perceived drawbacks than non-victims. The effect size for this difference fell in the medium range ($d = .53$). When examining the specific items on the perceived drawbacks subscale, victims rated participation as more “boring” and that they would be less likely to participate again knowing what the study involves.

Lastly, we examined whether individuals who were victims of both childhood abuse and dating violence reported different research reactions than non-victims or victims of just one type of abuse (childhood or dating violence). This resulted in 40.1% of the sample having been victimized by any form of both childhood abuse and dating violence victimization. Again, t tests were conducted to examine differences between groups. As displayed in Table 4, there were no significant differences between victims of both childhood abuse and dating violence and non-victims/victims of one form of abuse on research reactions.

Discussion

There has been an abundance of research in recent years on childhood abuse and dating violence among male college students, which has led to an increased understanding of the correlates and consequences of these devastating behaviors. Still, IRBs are left with the difficult task of determining whether these studies are emotionally upsetting to participants, and whether participants perceive any benefits to answering questions on violence victimization. In the absence of empirical data on this topic, IRBs have to make decisions regarding human protection on the basis of their personal opinions. Thus, the current study examined the research reactions of male college students to answering questions on childhood emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, as well as psychological, physical, and sexual dating violence victimization. Findings were largely consistent with previous research demonstrating minimal negative reactions among participants.

First, our results indicated that only certain forms of victimization were associated with negative research reactions. For instance, our correlation analyses showed that as the frequency of childhood sexual abuse increased, negative emotional reactions and perceived drawbacks to research participation increased. In addition, childhood physical abuse and physical and psychological dating violence were associated with less perceived personal benefits to research participation; physical dating violence was also associated with more perceived drawbacks. This finding is slightly surprising, as previous research has found physical dating violence victimization to be associated with increased personal benefits (Shorey, Cornelius, et al., 2011). However, this study also asked about childhood abuse experiences and had a larger sample of males than the Shorey et al. study, thus differences between studies may have impacted these differential results. Regardless, it should be noted that the correlations between certain forms of victimization and negative research reactions were relatively small, which is consistent with previous research.

Our findings also demonstrated that victims of childhood sexual abuse reported more negative emotional reactions and perceived drawbacks than non-victims of childhood sexual abuse. In fact, the effect size difference between victims and non-victims on emotional reactions was large ($d = 1.37$), suggesting a robust difference between these groups. Given

the traumatic nature of childhood sexual abuse, it is not surprising that this difference emerged. That is, one would expect that being asked to recall childhood sexual abuse experiences, regardless of the setting (e.g., research, therapy), would produce uncomfortable and difficult emotions that individuals would likely rate as negative and/or unwanted, which may also be one of the reasons that they also viewed more drawbacks to study participation. It would be interesting for future research to examine whether there are differences between individuals with childhood sexual abuse histories on research reactions. That is, would reactions be more intense, and potentially more negative, for victims with posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptomatology, depression, a lack of emotion regulation skills, if the perpetrator was a parent, or for those who have never received psychotherapy to process and cope with their abuse experiences. Knowing the individual difference variables that make research reactions worse for victims could have important implications for protecting this vulnerable population. Moreover, it is possible that becoming emotionally upset during research participation could compromise the reporting on additional study measures, and future research should determine whether this is indeed occurring.

The only difference in research reactions that emerged between victims and non-victims of all forms of dating violence was for physical aggression, with victims of this type of aggression reporting more perceived drawbacks to research participation than non-victims. The effect size for this difference fell in the medium range ($d = .53$). Interestingly, this is a result that is not consistent with previous research (i.e., Shorey, Cornelius, et al., 2011). The perceived drawbacks subscale assesses whether participants viewed the questions as too personal, whether the study was boring, and whether participants felt that the procedures took too long (Newman et al., 2001). It is possible that victims of physical aggression reported more perceived drawbacks than non-victims because they found the questions on violence to be too personal or because they had lower levels of distress tolerance (i.e., lower ability to experience and withstand negative states; Simons & Gaher, 2005), which would likely contribute to feelings of the study taking too long, being boring, and too personal. Indeed, preliminary research with female victims of dating violence (Shorey, Febres, et al., 2012) has demonstrated that one's ability to tolerate distress is associated with research reactions, irrespective of victimization status. Thus, additional research is needed to examine whether distress tolerance is also associated with research reactions among male victims and increases negative research reactions.

It should also be noted that we found relatively few differences between victims and non-victims on research reactions, consistent with previous research (e.g., Shorey, Cornelius, et al., 2011). For instance, victims of childhood emotional abuse, childhood physical abuse, psychological victimization from a dating partner, and sexual aggression from a dating partner did not report more negative or positive research reactions than non-victims. Moreover, individuals who had been victimized by both childhood abuse and dating violence did not report more negative emotional reactions than non-victims and victims of only one form of aggression. Thus, these findings are consistent with previous research (Edwards et al., in press; Shorey, Cornelius, et al., 2011) and suggest that most victims of interpersonal violence (i.e., childhood abuse and dating violence) do not become emotionally upset due to answering questions about previous victimization experiences. Rather, only a small subset of victims (e.g., childhood sexual abuse victims) may become emotionally upset or perceive drawbacks to study participation (e.g., victims of physical dating violence and childhood sexual abuse).

Implications for IRBs and Researchers

In combination with previous research on this topic (Edwards et al., in press; Shorey, Cornelius, et al., 2011), the current study has important implications for both IRBs that approve violence research and for the researchers who conduct such studies. First, this study

could be disseminated to IRBs to provide them with empirical information regarding the research reactions to participating in violence research. As mentioned earlier, IRBs have historically had to make decisions regarding human protection without the appropriate empirical studies to support their decisions (Carter-Visscher et al., 2007). This study, and others, demonstrate that only a small minority of college students who participate in violence research will experience strong, negative emotional reactions to their research participation, and this may be limited to the most severe and infrequent forms of abuse (i.e., childhood sexual abuse). Thus, IRBs should be aware that the potential for negative emotional responses is present, albeit unlikely, and researchers should have the proper protections and referral resources in place to protect participants from continued distress.

As for researchers, the current study has several important implications for the proper protection, informed consent and debriefing of participants. First, research participants should be informed that it is possible, although unlikely, that they will experience strong, negative emotional reactions in response to answering study questions. Participants could be informed that previous research has demonstrated that answering the questions in the current study tend not to be overly distressing. In addition, research participants should be informed that they may gain personal insight into themselves and their relationships through study participation, as this is a finding previous research has demonstrated when answering questions on dating violence (Shorey, Cornelius, et al., 2011). Researchers should have a list of local referral sources for participants should they experience distress and wish to seek support. For instance, in addition to the contact information for the primary investigator(s), phone numbers and addresses for the university counseling center, local community mental health centers, and services for domestic violence should be provided to individuals who participate in violence research. While we have never had a participant contact us due to being emotionally distressed in relation to their research participation, it is an empirical question that remains unanswered on whether subjects use the referral sources provided to them. Lastly, researchers should be cognizant of the possibility of strong, negative emotional reactions due to answering questions about interpersonal trauma affecting responses to additional self-report measures. Researchers could consider allowing participants to take a short break after answering trauma questions and allow time for processing of one's emotional reactions.

Limitations

The current study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting study findings. First, this study employed a sample of primarily non-Hispanic Caucasian college males, which limits the generalizability of findings to more diverse, non-college student samples. Additional research is needed that examines the research reactions among a more diverse sample. Second, the cross-sectional design of the current study precludes the determination of whether negative emotional reactions persisted after the study ended, although there is preliminary research that indicates negative emotional reactions do not continue after research participation (Edwards et al., in press). Still, additional research is needed that examines whether negative reactions persist. Our measure of dating violence victimization, the CTS2, only examines a small subset of psychologically aggressive behaviors, and additional research is needed to determine whether more in-depth measures of psychological aggression produce different research reaction outcomes. Moreover, future research should investigate whether interview-based methods for examining childhood abuse and dating violence result in similar research reactions as completing self-report measures of these constructs.

In summary, the current study examined the research reactions to participating in research on childhood abuse and dating violence victimization among a sample of male college students. Our findings demonstrated few differences between victims of childhood abuse,

and victims of dating violence, compared to non-victims on research reactions, supporting the findings of previous research. Victims of childhood sexual abuse reported more negative emotional reactions than non-victims, and victims of physical dating violence perceived more drawbacks to the research than non-victims. Although proper protections for guarding against continued distress should be put in place by researchers, our findings suggest that participating in violence research is not overly distressing to the vast majority of participants. Continued research is needed that examines whether negative emotional reactions persist after research participation, as well as identifying the individual difference variables among victims may make research participation more distressing.

References

- Bell KM, Naugle AE. Effects of social desirability on students' self-reporting of partner abuse perpetration and victimization. *Violence and Victims*. 2007; 22:243–256. [PubMed: 17479559]
- Carter-Visscher RM, Naugle AE, Bell KM, Suvak MK. Ethics of asking trauma-related questions and exposing participants to arousal-inducing stimuli. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*. 2007; 8:27–55. [PubMed: 18032343]
- Cornelius TL, Shorey RC, Beebe SM. Self-reported communication variables and dating violence: Using Gottman's marital communication conceptualization. *Journal of Family Violence*. 2010; 25:439–448.
- DePrince AP, Chu A. Perceived benefits of trauma research: Examining methodological and individual difference factors in responses to research participation. *Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics*. 2008; 1556:35–47. [PubMed: 19385781]
- Edwards KM, Gidycz CA, Desai AD. Men's reactions to participating in interpersonal violence research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. (in press).
- Gratz KL, Paulson A, Jakupcak M, Tull MT. Exploring the relationship between childhood maltreatment and intimate partner abuse: Gender differences in the mediating role of emotion dysregulation. *Violence and Victims*. 2009; 24:68–82. [PubMed: 19297886]
- Griffin MG, Resick PA, Waldrop AE, Mechanic MB. Participation in trauma research: Is there evidence of harm? *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 2003; 16:221–227. [PubMed: 12816333]
- Kalmuss D. The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1984; 46:11–19.
- Kaura SA, Lohman BJ. Dating violence victimization, relationship satisfaction, mental health problems, and acceptability of violence: A comparison of men and women. *Journal of Family Violence*. 2007; 22:367–381.
- Leyro TM, Zvolensky MJ, Bernstein A. Distress tolerance and psychopathological symptoms and disorders: A review of the empirical literature among adults. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2010; 136:576–600. [PubMed: 20565169]
- Logan TL, Walker R, Shannon L, Cole J. Combining ethical considerations with recruitment and follow-up strategies for partner violence victimization research. *Violence Against Women*. 2008; 14:1226–1251. [PubMed: 18809849]
- Newman E, Willard T, Sinclair R, Kaloupek D. Empirically supported ethical research practice: The costs and benefits of research from the participants' views. *Accountability in Research*. 2001; 8:309–329. [PubMed: 12481796]
- Pereda N, Guilera G, Forns M, Gomez-Benito J. The prevalence of child sexual abuse in community and student samples: A meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2009; 29:328–338. [PubMed: 19371992]
- Rhatigan DL, Street AE. The impact of intimate partner violence on decisions to leave dating relationships: a test of the investment model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2005; 20:1580–1597. [PubMed: 16246918]
- Roemmele MS, Messman-Moore TL. Child abuse, early maladaptive schemas, and risky sexual behavior in college women. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*. 2011; 20:264–283. [PubMed: 21660814]

- Shook NJ, Gerrity DA, Jurich J, Segrist AE. Courtship violence among college students: a comparison of verbally and physically abusive couples. *Journal of Family Violence*. 2000; 15:1–22.
- Shorey RC, Cornelius TL, Bell KM. A critical review of theoretical frameworks for dating violence: Comparing the dating and marital fields. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 2008; 13:185–194.
- Shorey RC, Cornelius TL, Bell KM. Reactions to participating in dating violence research: Are our questions distressing participants? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2011; 26:2890–2907. [PubMed: 21156687]
- Shorey RC, Rhatigan DL, Fite PJ, Stuart GL. Dating violence victimization and alcohol problems: An examination of the stress-buffering hypothesis for perceived support. *Partner Abuse*. 2011; 2:31–45.
- Shorey RC, Sherman AE, Kivisto AJ, Elkins SR, Rhatigan DL, Moore TM. Gender differences in depression and anxiety among victims of intimate partner violence: The moderating effect of shame-proneness. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2011; 26:1834–1850. [PubMed: 20587460]
- Simons J, Gaher R. The Distress Tolerance Scale: Development and validation of a self-report measure. *Motivation and Emotion*. 2005; 29:83–102.
- Straight ES, Harper FWK, Arias I. The impact of partner psychological abuse on health behaviors and health status in college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2003; 18:1035–1054. [PubMed: 19771708]
- Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, Sugarman DB. The revised conflict tactics scale (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*. 1996; 17:283–316.
- Straus, MA.; Hamby, SL.; Warren, WL. *The Conflict Tactics Scales Handbook*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services; 2003.
- White HR, Widom CS. Intimate partner violence among abused and neglected children in young adulthood: The mediating effects of early aggression, antisocial personality, hostility, and alcohol problems. *Aggressive Behaviors*. 2003; 29:332–345.
- Wolfe DA, Wekerle C, Scott K, Straatman A-L, Grasley C. Predicting abuse in adolescent dating relationships over 1 year: The role of child maltreatment and trauma. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*. 2004; 113:406–415. [PubMed: 15311986]

Table 1

Correlations, means, and standard deviations among study variables

	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.
1. Childhood Emotional Abuse	---	.61***	.41***	.34***	.43***	.40***	-.04	-.02	-.07	-.05	-.13
2. Childhood Physical Abuse		---	.47***	.33***	.50***	.49***	-.11	-.15*	-.02	-.16*	-.18*
3. Childhood Sexual Abuse			---	.37***	.58***	.52***	.00	.02	-.19**	-.17*	-.11
4. Psychological Victimization				---	.64***	.58***	-.07	-.14*	-.08	-.12	-.12
5. Physical Victimization					---	.87***	-.10	-.17*	.02	-.24**	-.22**
6. Sexual Victimization						---	-.06	-.10	-.00	-.18*	-.14*
7. RRPQ (PF)							---	.76***	.09	.60***	.75***
8. RRPQ (PB)								---	-.06	.55***	.70***
9. RRPQ (ER)									---	.23**	.18*
10. RRPQ (PD)										---	.56***
11. RRPQ (GE)											---
<i>M</i>	1.91	1.72	.24	8.90	2.63	2.39	15.57	15.01	13.53	19.95	20.30
<i>SD</i>	3.14	2.43	1.43	18.80	12.97	11.24	4.32	4.66	4.51	5.04	5.69

Note: RRPQ = Research Reactions Participation Questionnaire; PF = Participation Factor; PB = Personal Benefits; ER = Emotional Reactions; PD = Perceived Drawbacks; GE = Global Evaluation.

* $p < .05$,

** $p < .01$,

*** $p < .001$

Table 2

Differences between Victims and Non-Victims of Childhood Abuse on Research Reactions

	Victims <i>M (SD)</i>	Non-Victims <i>M (SD)</i>	<i>t, p</i>	<i>d</i>
Childhood Emotional Abuse				
RRPQ (PF)	15.68 (4.18)	15.41 (4.48)	.43, .66	.03
RRPQ (PB)	15.12 (4.44)	14.89 (4.93)	.33, .73	.04
RRPQ (ER)	13.56 (4.08)	13.42 (4.94)	.21, .82	.03
RRPQ (PD)	20.62 (4.72)	19.26 (5.30)	1.85, .06	.27
RRPQ (GE)	20.15 (5.47)	20.40 (5.96)	.29, .77	.04
Childhood Physical Abuse				
RRPQ (PF)	15.36 (4.75)	15.82 (3.85)	.71, .47	.10
RRPQ (PB)	14.64 (4.76)	15.34 (4.60)	1.02, .31	.14
RRPQ (ER)	13.86 (4.31)	13.13 (4.74)	1.10, .27	.16
RRPQ (PD)	19.81 (5.19)	20.02 (4.97)	.27, .78	.04
RRPQ (GE)	20.14 (5.89)	20.65 (5.36)	.62, .53	.09
Childhood Sexual Abuse				
RRPQ (PF)	16.44 (3.50)	15.53 (4.36)	.61, .54	.23
RRPQ (PB)	16.77 (3.27)	14.92 (4.71)	1.16, .24	.45
RRPQ (ER)	8.88 (4.10)	14.76 (4.42)	3.23, .001	1.37
RRPQ (PD)	16.11 (3.55)	20.14 (5.03)	2.36, .01	.92
RRPQ (GE)	18.44 (4.47)	20.39 (5.73)	1.01, .31	.37

Note: RRPQ = Research Reactions Participation Questionnaire; PF = Participation Factor; PB = Personal Benefits; ER = Emotional Reactions; PD = Perceived Drawbacks; GE = Global Evaluation.

Table 3

Differences between Victims and Non-Victims of Dating Violence on Research Reactions

	Victims <i>M (SD)</i>	Non-Victims <i>M (SD)</i>	<i>t, p</i>	<i>d</i>
Psychological Victimization				
RRPQ (PF)	15.18 (4.31)	16.03 (4.23)	1.35, .17	.19
RRPQ (PB)	14.52 (4.58)	15.67 (4.53)	1.72, .08	.25
RRPQ (ER)	13.51 (4.21)	13.59 (4.86)	.12, .90	.01
RRPQ (PD)	19.84 (4.89)	20.31 (5.17)	.62, .53	.09
RRPQ (GE)	19.80 (5.80)	21.10 (5.28)	1.58, .11	.23
Physical Victimization				
RRPQ (PF)	14.82 (4.28)	15.77 (4.26)	1.17, .24	.22
RRPQ (PB)	13.91 (5.23)	15.31 (4.41)	1.58, .11	.28
RRPQ (ER)	12.76 (4.97)	13.68 (4.42)	1.07, .28	.23
RRPQ (PD)	17.85 (5.00)	20.50 (4.89)	2.84, .005	.53
RRPQ (GE)	18.76 (6.47)	20.72 (5.40)	1.84, .06	.32
Sexual Victimization				
RRPQ (PF)	15.74 (4.13)	15.52 (4.39)	.25, .80	.05
RRPQ (PB)	14.90 (4.81)	15.06 (4.60)	.17, .86	.03
RRPQ (ER)	13.06 (4.78)	13.57 (4.46)	.56, .57	.11
RRPQ (PD)	19.35 (5.35)	20.15 (4.94)	.81, .42	.15
RRPQ (GE)	20.58 (5.59)	20.25 (5.81)	.28, .77	.05

Note: RRPQ = Research Reactions Participation Questionnaire; PF = Participation Factor; PB = Personal Benefits; ER = Emotional Reactions; PD = Perceived Drawbacks; GE = Global Evaluation.

Table 4

Differences between Victims of both Childhood Abuse and Dating Violence and Non-Victims/Victims of One Form of Abuse on Research Reactions

	Victims <i>M (SD)</i>	Non-Victims <i>M (SD)</i>	<i>t, p</i>	<i>d</i>
Combined Childhood and Dating Victimization				
RRPQ (PF)	15.14 (4.21)	15.97 (4.19)	1.28, .20	.19
RRPQ (PB)	14.46 (4.48)	15.51 (4.59)	1.51, .13	.23
RRPQ (ER)	14.07 (3.72)	13.16 (4.93)	1.34, .19	.20
RRPQ (PD)	19.78 (4.67)	20.36 (5.11)	.75, .45	.11
RRPQ (GE)	19.91 (5.61)	20.93 (5.47)	1.2, .23	.18

Note: RRPQ = Research Reactions Participation Questionnaire; PF = Participation Factor; PB = Personal Benefits; ER = Emotional Reactions; PD = Perceived Drawbacks; GE = Global Evaluation.