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METHODOLOGY

In the previous chapters the theoretical concepts underlying the research findings have been unfolded and the status of the presently available studies in the area have been delineated. In the present chapter, the specific research hypotheses have been detailed in line with the broad objectives of Chapter 1. The variables of the study have been described and justified. Their operational definitions have been specified and the tools for assessing them have been described. The selection of the sample and selection of the measures used have also been elaborated here. The procedure of data collection and the statistical tools employed have been narrated.

Research Hypotheses

Research Hypotheses 1 to 5: Concerned with Reasoning

**Hypothesis 1:** There will be significant effect of sex on the use of Reasoning as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

**Hypothesis 2:** There will be significant association between the self and the partner’s usage of Reasoning as a conflict tactics in dating relationship.

**Hypothesis 3:** There will be significant association of general aggressiveness with Reasoning as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

**Hypothesis 4:** There will be significant association of gender role identity with Reasoning as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

**Hypothesis 5:** There will be significant association of love attitude with Reasoning as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.
Research Hypotheses 6 to 10: Concerned with Psychological Aggression

Hypothesis 6: There will be significant effect of sex on the use of Psychological Aggression as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

Hypothesis 7: There will be significant association between the self and the partner’s usage of Psychological Aggression as a conflict tactics in dating relationship.

Hypothesis 8: There will be significant association of general aggressiveness with Psychological Aggression as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

Hypothesis 9: There will be significant association of gender role identity with Psychological Aggression as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

Hypothesis 10: There will be significant association of love attitude with Psychological Aggression as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

Research Hypotheses 11 to 15: Concerned with Violence

Hypothesis 11: There will be significant effect of sex on the use of Violence as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

Hypothesis 12: There will be significant association between the self and the partner’s usage of Violence as a conflict tactics in dating relationship.

Hypothesis 13: There will be significant association of general aggressiveness with Violence as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

Hypothesis 14: There will be significant association of gender role identity with Violence as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.

Hypothesis 15: There will be significant association of love attitude with Violence as a conflict tactics in dating relationship as reported in case of self and partner.
During analysis of data, these were turned to statistical hypotheses and sub-hypotheses from each main hypothesis were framed as and when required for separate testing. This was done particularly for the sub-scores of Aggressiveness (Total Aggression, Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility), Gender Role Identity (Masculinity and Femininity) and Love Attitude (Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania and Agape) for the Total sample, as well as for Women and Men separately.

Besides it was decided that if the association between the dependent and independent variables were found to be significant, then subsequent prediction of the dependent variables from the independent ones would be attempted.

**Research Design**

The research design has been schematically presented in the Figure 3.1. Its details have been presented in the following sections.
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**Figure 3.1:** Schematic Representation of Research Design

**Independent Variables**

- **Aggression** (A deliberate attempt to harm another being)
  - Physical Aggression
  - Verbal Aggression

**Dependent Variable**

- **Conflict Tactis** (Tactics used by dating couples to resolve conflict in their relationship)
  - Measured by Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979)

- **Gender Role Identity** (The degree of perceived masculinity and femininity in oneself)
  - Masculinity
  - Femininity

- **Impact on**

  **Reasoning**
  - Psychological Aggression
  - Violence

- **Love Attitude** (Styles of loving)
  - Eros
  - Storge
  - Mania
  - Ludus
  - Pragma
  - Agape

**Measured by**:

- Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992)
- Cultural adaptation Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974)
- Love Attitude Scale (Hendrick et al., 1998)

**Sampling Units**: College Students (18 to 25 years) from Kolkata (India) involved in a dating relationship for the past one year.

N: Women = 207; Men = 207.
Selection of Variables

A variable is a symbol to which numerals or values are assigned (Kerlinger, 1995). It is defined as an event or condition, which can have different values – ideally, in experiments, an event or condition, which can be measured (Morgan et al., 1993). Variables are essentially categorized as dependent, independent and control variables (Snodgrass et al., 1985). In the perspective of the present inquiry also, these three kinds of variables have been defined and reported in the following section.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is the attribute or performance being measured to determine the effect of manipulating an independent variable. The dependent variable may be characterized as behavioral, psychological or social, depending on the nature of work. Generally, a researcher tries to select the most sensitive, reliable and unobtrusive dependent variable possible.

In Chapter 1, the broad nature of the dependent variables has been illustrated. The dependent variables of this study are the three different aspects of conflict tactics (Reasoning, Psychological Aggression and Violence) used by the dating couples during conflicting situations.

“Conflict Tactics” is the means or the tactics used by dating couples (in other cases, by married or cohabiting couples) to resolve conflicts in their relationship. Conflict tactics is measured as how the partners in dating relationships engage in psychological and physical attacks on each other and also their use of reasoning or negotiation to deal with conflicts.

There are infinite varieties of coping techniques, which partners in a dating relationship can employ in a conflict situation. These tactics can be categorized under 4 subheads. Namely, negotiation or reasoning tactics, where the conflict is resolved by calm discussion, etc. Secondly the partners may use psychological or verbal aggression, where a partner insults, or use threats, etc., while trying to resolve a conflict. Thirdly, the partners may use violence, where mild physical force, like
pushing, slapping, etc., or severe physical force, like beating, choking, etc., are used as a coping method. Fourthly sexual coercion, behavior that compels the partner to engage in unwanted sexual activity, can be used in resolving conflicts in a dating relationship.

In the present study the first three types of conflict tactics were chosen as dependent variables. The sexual coercion tactics was deliberately omitted for this study since sexual contact is minimal between dating couples in India.

Hence the dependent variable “conflict” had 3 essential components and were investigated separately. The three aspects of conflict serving as dependent variable in the present study were:

1. **Reasoning Tactics** defined as ‘the use of rational discussion, argument, reasoning – an intellectual approach to the dispute’.

2. **Psychological Aggression** defined by the use of verbal and non-verbal acts, which symbolically hurt or use threat to hurt partner.

3. **Violence** defined by the use of physical force against another person as a means of resolving conflicts. This includes both minor and severe violence.

**Rationale:** It has already been elucidated in the introductory section, that conflict is an inevitable part in the development and maintenance of relationships (Adams, 1965; Coser, 1956; Scanzoni, 1972). As a relationship becomes more intimate, potentiality for conflict also increases. The causes of conflict can be various and so can be the coping patterns. Partners in dating relationships may choose to use constructive tactics (like intellectual reasoning), or destructive tactics (like psychological aggression or different degrees of physical violence). In the present research all options of conflict tactics were included.

For the purpose of studying violence in the present study, the report of incidences of minor and severe violence was clubbed together, to yield a single index of violent interaction. This was done since the pilot survey revealed that report of severe violence was virtually non-existent in the sample. Therefore, it was decided to treat the use of any kind of violence as a single index. Some earlier studies have also resorted to this technique (Byrne & Arias, 1997).
Independent Variables

The independent variables of this study are:

1. **Sex** – ‘Sex’ refers to the biological distinction between males and females, and ‘gender’ is the social and cultural counterpart of sex. This means women and men are defined as different types of beings each with their own opportunities, roles and responsibilities.

   **Rationale:** Society, through developmental and social learning strategies, prepares women and men differently to express affects including aggression (Macaulay, 1985; Mitscherlich, 1987) and to react and cope differently in a conflicting situation (Archer, 2000; George, 1999; Harders, Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson & Caraway, 1998). Such studies are however rare in the Indian scenario. Therefore sex was deemed to be a significant independent variable.

2. **Aggressiveness** – “Aggression” is a term used to describe a deliberate attempt to harm another being. General aggressiveness includes (i) **Physical Aggression**, (ii) **Verbal Aggression**, (iii) **Anger**, and (iv) **Hostility**. Physical and verbal aggression, which involve hurting or harming others, represent the instrumental or motor component of behavior. Anger, which involves physiological arousal and preparation for aggression, represents the emotional or affective component of behavior. Hostility, which consists of feelings of ill will and injustice, represents the cognitive component of behavior. So aggression includes all the three domains of behavior – instrumental, affective and cognitive.

   **Rationale:** While aggression is the propensity to harm another individual, violence is the actual harm done to another individual. Thus, aggression may be conceived of as the psychological forerunner of violence. Empirical research (Murphy & O’Leary, 1989; Straus 1974) has supported a strong association between psychological aggression and the probability of physical assault (violence). However, under the societal stricture, aggression does not necessarily result in physical violence, but
vicariously through psychological pressurization, verbal argument or other verbal and non-verbal emotional expressions. So in studying the coping tactics, aggression plays an important role (Mathews, 1984).

3. **Gender Role Identity** – “Gender role identity” is the degree of perceived masculinity and femininity in oneself. *Masculinity* is the role prescribed by the society for males and *Femininity* is the role prescribed for females. The Masculinity (M) and Femininity (F) are not the two ends of a single pole, as supposed earlier (Constantinople, 1973), but are two different dimensions of the personality (Bern, 1974). It is supposed that in every person there is a certain amount of masculinity as well as femininity. So a measure of gender role identity will give both the Masculinity (M) and Femininity (F) scores of the subject.

**Rationale:** As pointed out in the previous chapter, violence was found to be dependent on gender role identity of the perpetrator. Some studies (Thompson, 1991; Markman et al., 1993) have also found masculinity and femininity playing an important role in coping tactics in intimate relationships. The findings however are ambiguous, and studies in the context of Indian society are none. Therefore it seems that a clear-cut conclusion is still lacking. So research in this field in the Indian context was considered necessary.

4. **Love Attitude** – Each and every person possesses different attitudes of love, which can be categorized into 6 types on the basis of its dimensions (Lee, 1976). These are *Eros* (intense, passionate love), *Ludus* (game-playing, uncommitted love), *Storge* (friendship-based love), *Pragma* (practical ‘shopping list’ love), *Mania* (obsessive, dependent love) and *Agape* (altruistic, gift love).

**Rationale:** Unlike in married couples where both love and social bondage hold the relationship, dating relationship is solely based on ‘love’. It is the core of premarital dating relationships. So the quality of the relationship depends on the love attitude of the concerned individuals. But a contrasting finding is that violence or conflict
(which is an opposite action/emotion to love) is also found in dating relationships. Hence love attitude was considered as an important independent variable in studying conflict in dating relationships. Earlier studies (Bookwala et al., 1994; Richardson et al., 1989) have also indicated the importance of love attitude in dating conflict resolution.

**Control Variables**

**Selection of the control variables**

In Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 it was indicated that conflict in dating relationship could be influenced by a number of variables other than those selected here as independent variables. To avoid contamination in the effect of independent variables as far as practicable, it was imperative to identify at least the most important relevant variables and control them to maximize the effect of independent variable on dependent variable. Some such variables, which may influence the coping strategy used by the dating couples, have been discussed here.

**Demographic Variables**

*Age* – Individuals between the age 18 to 25 were chosen as subjects for this study.

**Rationale:** According to the developmental psychologist, the age for the commencement of adulthood is 18 years. It is usually at this age when a girl or a boy achieves physical and psychological maturity and is capable of forming an independent and stable relationship. Even according to the Indian law, an individual is considered as an adult at the age of 18yrs. Although dating may start at an earlier age, but at 18 years, an individual becomes legally responsible for her/his decision. Hence the lower age limit of the present sample has been decided to be 18 years.
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Twenty five was the upper age limit of the present sample. Mostly by 25 years people complete their graduation and post-graduation, and after that she/he finds a job, gets married and settles down in life. Consequently premarital dating ends with marriage. Apart from this, in some previous studies (Fiebert & Gonzales, 1997), age was found to be an important variable in infliction of dating violence. Hence, a larger age range was not considered, since that might have an effect on the result.

Locality - The sample group was selected from the urban society of Kolkata.

Rationale: Rural, urban and sub-urban areas differ in social and cultural rules and regulations. This creates a difference in attitudes towards the relationship and towards their partner. Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs (1985) and Makepeace (1987) reported that individuals reared in large urban areas are more likely to get involved in dating violence than those from small rural areas. Whereas, others (Sigelman et al., 1984; Spencer & Bryant, 2000) were of the opinion that individuals from rural areas were more likely to be victims of dating violence than their suburban and urban counterparts.

Secondly, since dating is a recent phenomenon it is most common in the urban areas. This type of pre-marital love relationship is actually influenced by modernization and exposure to Western culture. The rural society of our country is still unexposed to modern culture and hence dating is rare and condemned.

Thirdly, fear of exposure and subsequent penalization due to such a relationship is greater in rural and suburban societies. So free and frank confession might not come from such a conservative population.

This is not to say that the nature of rural population is less meaningful. Indeed, it may be assumed that such an exploration would yield important insight in the play of cultural factors in dating. Inclusion of this sample may be attempted in subsequent research.
Religion - The subjects in the study were Hindu by religion.

Rationale: Each religious group has a distinctive type of culture, manner, custom, attitude towards self and other members of their family and society at large. In order to maintain a homogeneity in subjects, a single group was chosen. Secondly, this religion forms the major bulk of Indian population and has an advantage of being abundantly and easily available in Kolkata.

Language - Bengali speaking subjects only were included in the study.

Rationale: Like religion, difference in spoken language reflect differences in socio-cultural orientation. Since in Kolkata, Bengali speaking subjects constitute the major bulk of the population it was decided that only this group would be incorporated.

Physical and mental health of the subject

Subjects with chronic physical and mental disorder were excluded by using suitable screening test (GHQ-28 by Goldberg & Hiller, 1979), as it was evident from Chapter 2 that these variables might have a tremendous negative impact on the relationship aspect. The cutoff score was taken as 5, below which all subjects were considered as normal.

Family variables

Size and type of family - In the present study, only nuclear and semi-nuclear extended families were included (number of family members not more than six).

Rationale: The complexity of relationships differs between a nuclear and a joint family. Hence certain personality factors like attitude towards a relationship, tolerance towards others, etc., differ in these two types of families. Secondly, joint families are rare in the urban areas of proper Kolkata.
Internal structure of the family - For the present study, individuals from intact families with no history of parental separation, divorce or remarriage were included. 

Rationale: History of any type of conflict in the family like parental separation or death of a parent has strong impact on the personality of the individual and their attitude toward others. A number of studies (Makepeace, 1987; O'Keefe et al., 1986) have also indicated that those who got involved in dating violence were more likely to have grown up in homes marked by divorce or separation. Therefore subjects from broken homes were excluded.

Number of siblings – Subjects with not more than two siblings were chosen for the study.

Rationale: Research findings (Dunn, 1983; Papalia & Olds, 1997) suggest that growing up amongst many brothers and sisters create a different social attitude. Relationships between siblings set the stage for other relationships. Since, majority of educated middle class urban people in India have an average of one or two children, the control was exercised by limiting the number of siblings to two.

Economic and educational status

Educational qualification - Undergraduate and postgraduate students were included in the study. Anyone who had not qualified the higher secondary examination was excluded.

Rationale: It has been found that violence in intimate relationship depends to some extend to the educational level of the partner (Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988).

Secondly, in our society the opportunity for free mixing comes with the entrance in the college. Before that most individuals study in same-sex schools. So dating is more prevalent among students of under-graduate and post-graduate levels.
Income of the family - In the present study only those belonging to the middle income status have been chosen as subjects.

Rationale: Several studies have examined family income as a risk marker of dating violence. Makepeace (1987) found higher rates of involvement in dating violence among the lowest and the highest income groups. Whereas, Mathews (1984) found no relationship between dating violence and family income.

According to West Bengal Government’s Declaration for the Housing Instructive Cooperation (Feb. 2000), the family income of middle class people per month is Rs.7501/- to Rs.15000/- only.

Relationship Variables

Length of the relationship - The subjects in our study were involved in the present dating relationship for at least 1 year.

Rationale: Earlier studies revealed that to develop a stable relationship some time is required. Arias, et al. (1987) indicated that the length of time that an individual dated a partner was positively associated with male and female perpetration and female victimization in the current dating situation. However, Stets and Pirog-Good (1987b) reported that the number of months a partner dated was not different for people who had sustained than those who had not. So it was decided that data should be collected from only those subjects who have been dating for more than a year.

Frequency of meeting the partner - The accepted range of frequency of meeting the partner was between 24 to 48 times a year, that is on an average 2 to 4 times a month. Subjects with less than twice meeting a month were excluded from the study.

Rationale: The Conflict Tactics Scale, which is the measure of the dependent variable, measures the frequency of the usage of the different coping tactics in the
past one year. So the frequency of usage of the conflict tactics is directly dependent on the frequency of meeting the partner.

**Frequency of exclusively meeting the partner** - The accepted range of frequency of exclusively meeting the partner was between 24 to 48 times a year, that is on an average 2 to 4 times a month. Subjects with less than twice meeting a month were excluded from the study.

**Rationale:** Exclusively meeting the partner provides an opportunity to express their emotions (both love and anger) to each other, which is impossible in front of the others. So the frequency of showing violence during a conflict depends directly on the frequency of exclusive meetings.

**Involvement in the relationship** - Only those individuals who were involved in a serious relationship were included in the study. Individuals presently dating more than one partner were excluded.

**Rationale:** Mason and Blankenship (1987) have found that conflict in an intimate relationship depends on the commitment and involvement between the partners. Conflict resolution strategies also differ with the level of emotional commitment (Billingham, 1987).
**Sample of the Study**

The study was conducted with Bengali college students of Kolkata, West Bengal, India. The sampling criteria were as follow:

**General Inclusion Criteria**

1. Age of the subject: 18-25 years
2. Sex: Both women and men
3. Locality: Residing in Kolkata at least for the last 5 years
4. Religion: Hindu
5. Language: Mother tongue Bengali
6. Educational status: Undergraduate or Postgraduate students in any field (Science, Humanities and Commerce).
7. Educational institute: Govt. or private colleges with a predominant Bengali culture, that is at least 75% of the students are Bengali
8. Family structure: Nuclear or extended family
9. Siblings: Not more than two
10. Parental income: Middle income level
11. Parental work status: Both business and service, both single and dual career
12. Relationship status: Unmarried and involved in a dating relationship for at least the past 1-year.

**General Exclusion Criteria**

1. History of any acute physical illness or chronic illness having residual effect
2. Any present mental illness or history of mental illness having residual effect
3. History of any major break in family for example divorced or dead parents.
4. Presently having more than a single dating partner.

Selection of Sampling Techniques

Various techniques have been devised for obtaining a sample, which will be representative of its population. The adequacy of a sample (i.e. its lack of bias) depends upon the method used in collecting the sample (Garrett, 1966). Commonly used sampling methods are as follows.

1. Random Sampling: Random sampling is the selection of cases from the population in such a manner that every individual in the population has an equal chance of being chosen. In addition, the selection of any one individual is in no relevant way tied to the selection of any other. Selections are independent of one another. A random sample is fairly representative of the population (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973).

2. Biased Sampling: In this type of sampling there is a systematic error. Certain types of cases have advantage over others in being selected. The likelihood of individual being chosen thus differs from one to another.

3. Stratified Random Sampling: This method is also known as quota or controlled sampling. It is a technique designed to ensure representativeness and avoid bias by use of a modified random sampling method. Stratification is a step in the direction of experimental control. It operates with sub-groups of more homogenous composition within the larger population. Subjects are considered with respect to any variable that is suspected of correlating appreciably with the variables being studied. Random selections of cases are done within the defined sub-populations in appropriate numbers. The total sampling procedure thus known as stratified random sampling is likely to be more representative of a total population than a purely random sample (Guilford & Fruchter, 1973).

4. Purposive Sampling: A purposive sample is one arbitrarily selected because there is good evidence that it is very representative of the total population. This is a
convenient procedure, but it has the disadvantage that much prior information must have been obtained. There is also a risk that conditions may change to the extent that the particular segment does not represent the total population.

6. **Incidental Sampling:** The term incidental sample is applied to those samples, which are taken because they are the most available. Results, thus obtained, can be generalized beyond such groups with some risk.

**The Stratification Procedure**

Among the various sampling techniques the Stratified Random Sampling technique was followed. Stratification was done in terms of age of the students, their educational status, length of their dating relationship, locality of the colleges. The list of colleges spread over Kolkata was prepared and a zone wise mapping was done. A random selection of 10 colleges from North, South, East, West and Central Kolkata was done. The college authorities and the Student Unions were approached and through them the students were contacted. They were asked to volunteer for the study and those who agreed were given the detailed information schedule and The GHQ-28. Those who met the criteria defined for the study were included as prospective subjects. This group was again randomly short listed to include approximately equal number of subjects from both sexes spread over the 5 zones.

The ideal sample consisted of 250 women and 250 men. To ensure the availability of at least this target number, 650 students were randomly chosen for final data collection.

**The Ideal sample:** - The ideal sample may be described with the help of the following table (Table 3.1)
Table 3.1: The Ideal Distribution of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total = 500

The Final Sample:

On the whole, however, 536 data could be collected from which 422 (207 women and 215 men) were ultimately retained. The rest 114 had to be eliminated because they fell above the cut off point in the GHQ-28 used for the purpose of psychiatric screening and also because some had submitted incomplete data.

Among them 207 were women and 215 men. To make the N equal for both women and men, 8 data were eliminated. Hence the final sample consisted of 207 women and 207 men. The two sexes were more or less evenly distributed across zones and were comparable in terms of relevant variables.

The final sample is represented in the Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: The Actual Distribution of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total = 414
The male and female subjects were comparable in terms of relevant variables, such as age, education, number of family members, total family income, length of the relationship, frequency of meeting the partner, etc.

**Sample Profile**

The demographic profiles of the two sexes have been presented in the following figures.

Figure 3.2 represents the *Mean Age* of the sample groups.

Figure 3.3 represents the *Mean Family Income* of the sample groups.

Figure 3.4 and Figure 3.5 represents the *Educational Qualification* of the *Women* and the *Men* sample respectively.

Figure 3.6 and Figure 3.7 represents the *Number of Siblings* of the *Women* and the *Men* sample respectively.

Figure 3.8 and Figure 3.9 represents the *Father's Occupation* of the *Women* and the *Men* sample respectively.

Figure 3.10 and Figure 3.11 represents the *Mother's Occupational Status* of the *Women* and the *Men* sample respectively.

Figure 3.12 and Figure 3.13 represents the *Family Structure* of the *Women* sample and the *Men* sample respectively.

It was observed that the two sexes were more or less comparable in terms of these demographic variables.
**Figure 3.2:** Figure showing *Mean Age* (in years) of Women and Men and their respective partners.

![Figure showing Mean Age (in years) of Women and Men and their respective partners.](image)

**Figure 3.3:** Figure showing *Mean Family Income* (Rupees/month) of the Women and the Men and their respective partners

![Figure showing Mean Family Income (Rs/month) of the Women and the Men and their respective partners.](image)
Educational Qualification

**Figure 3.4:** Figure showing the percentage of the Women sample, and their partners, studying in Undergraduate classes (UG) and Postgraduate classes (PG)

![Bar chart showing percentage of Women sample and partners in UG and PG classes.]

**Figure 3.5:** Figure showing the percentage of the Men sample, and their partners, studying in Undergraduate classes (UG) and Postgraduate classes (PG)

![Bar chart showing percentage of Men sample and partners in UG and PG classes.]
**Number of Siblings**

**Figure 3.6:** Figure showing the percentage of the Women sample, and their partners, those who were single child (0), had only one sibling (1), or had two siblings (2).

**Figure 3.7:** Figure showing the percentage of the Men sample, and their partners, those who were single child (0), had only one sibling (1), or had two siblings (2).
**Father's Occupation**

**Figure 3.8:** Figure showing the percentage of the Women sample, and their partners, who reported that their fathers were in Jobs/Services (S), doing Businesses (B), and Retired from Jobs (R).

**Figure 3.9:** Figure showing the percentage of the Men sample, and their partners, who reported that their fathers were in Jobs/Services (S), doing Businesses (B), and Retired from Jobs (R).
Mother's Occupational Status

Figure 3.10: Figure showing the percentage of the Women sample, and their partners, whose mothers were working outside (W), and not working or housewives (NW).

Figure 3.11: Figure showing the percentage of the Men sample, and their partners, whose mothers were working outside (W), and not working or housewives (NW).
Family Structure

**Figure 3.12:** Figure showing the percentage of the Women sample, and their partners, who came from Nuclear Families (NF) and from Extended Families (EF).

![Bar chart showing the percentage of the Women sample who came from Nuclear Families and Extended Families.](chart1.png)

**Figure 3.13:** Figure showing the percentage of the Men sample, and their partners, who came from Nuclear Families (NF) and from Extended Families (EF).

![Bar chart showing the percentage of the Men sample who came from Nuclear Families and Extended Families.](chart2.png)
The relationship profiles of the two sexes have been presented in Figure 3.14 (Length of Acquaintance) and Figure 3.15 (Frequency of Meeting and Exclusive Meeting) and in Table 3.3. It was observed that the two sexes were more or less comparable in terms of the Relationship Variables.

**Figure 3.14:** Figure showing the mean Length of Acquaintance with partners for Women and Men.

![Figure showing the mean Length of Acquaintance with partners for Women and Men.](image)

**Figure 3.15:** Figure showing the means of the Frequency of Meeting the partner (FM), and the Frequency of Exclusively Meeting the partner (EM), in days/month for Women and Men sample.

![Figure showing the means of the Frequency of Meeting the partner (FM), and the Frequency of Exclusively Meeting the partner (EM), in days/month for Women and Men sample.](image)
**Table 3.3:** Percentage of subjects responding in different categories of the Relationship Variables (Information Schedule Q.36 to Q.44)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. Were you involved in any other relationship of this kind before meeting your partner?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Does your partner know about your past life?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Do you know about your partner’s past life?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Is your partner your “best friend”?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Do you feel free with your partner in discussing personal matters?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Do you think that your partner can discuss his/her personal matters freely with you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42a. Do you exchange ideas regarding your partner’s personal matters?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42b. Do you exchange ideas regarding your partner’s financial matters?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42c. Do you exchange ideas regarding your partner’s career decision?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43a. Does your partner help you with ideas regarding your personal matters?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43b. Does your partner help you with ideas regarding your financial matters?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43c. Does your partner help you with ideas regarding your career decisions?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Are you satisfied with this relationship?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures Used in the Study

In the following section the selection and description of the measures of the variables have been presented.

Measures of the control variables

(1) *A detailed information schedule* for collecting personal and relevant familial information.

(2) *General health questionnaire (GHQ-28)* by Goldberg and Hiller (1979) for screening the subjects who have any physical and psychological disorder. Here the tools are being described in detail.

A Detailed Information Schedule

There were 3 sections in the Information Schedule. In the first part, information was asked about the subject’s age, number of siblings, occupation of father and mother, family income, family structure and family type. In the second part, all the above information was asked for the partner. The third part of the information schedule asked information regarding the length of the relationship, frequency of meeting, satisfaction level, etc. Copies of the Information Schedules are given in Appendix A.

General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28)

Description of the tool: GHQ was designed to be a self-administering screen test aimed at detecting short-term changes in mental health among respondents. It was designed by Goldberg and Hiller (1979) as a state measure. The questionnaire was objective in the sense that it did not require the person administering it to make subjective assessment about respondents. There are different versions of GHQ available, depending upon the nature of items. GHQ-28 containing 28 items was derived from factor analysis of GHQ-60. It consists of 4 subscales for somatic...
symptoms, anxiety and insomnia, social dysfunction and severe depression. It is as good as any other version of GHQ as a case detector; at the same time it gives scaled sub-scores. Each item has 4 response alternatives. Its sensitivity was found to be 0.8, and specificity 0.88.

The GHQ-28 has been adapted in Bengali culture by Basu and Dasgupta (1996). There was no difficulty in its applicability in this culture. In this adaptation each item significantly contributed to total score as correlation coefficient of each item with the total score was found to be significant at 0.01 level. Its split half reliability has been found to be 0.97. Its sensitivity and specificity were 1 and 0.88 respectively.

Administration: The GHQ-28 is a self-administering screening test. There is no time limit to complete it. The instruction precedes the inventory.

Scoring and Interpretation: Scoring was done by GHQ method (0-0-1-1) as suggested by Goldberg and Williams (1988). Threshold for case identification was taken as 4/5, i.e. a score upon 4 signifies a non-psychiatric case. Total score ranges from 0 to 28.

Selection of the tool: In the present study, the General Health Questionnaire was used among normal subjects to eliminate the subjects who have any psychiatric disorder. This particular test was selected because

(i) Among the entire screening tests used in India, it is one of the most comprehensive and compact ones. The GHQ-28 also a popular one with only 28 items, yet including 4 sub scales.

(ii) It is quite easy to administer and the scoring procedure is also very simple.

(iii) A number of earlier studies in Kolkata have used this version (Chaudhuri, Dasgupta & Basu, 2002, Dasgupta & Basu, 1997) and have found it satisfactory.
Measures of Dependent Variable

Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)

Description of the Tool: Murray A. Straus designed the Conflict Tactics Scale in 1979. The scale has four sub scales and these are – Reasoning, Verbal Aggression, Minor Violence and Severe Violence. The scale has 19 items. First 3 items constitutes Reasoning, Verbal Aggression has 7 items, Minor Violence has items, and Severe Violence has 6 items. Thus altogether violence scale has 9 items. Straus (1979) developed the CTS based on the assumption that there is a gradual increase in coerciveness and aggression across all of the items. The CTS items are in statement form and the subjects responded in a 8-point scale and accounted the incidents of conflicts that took place with partner in a span of last one year. The scale is like – Once in the past year, Twice in the past year, 3 to 5 times in the past year, 6 to 10 times in the past year, 11 to 20 times in the past year, More than 20 times in the past year, Not in the past year but before, and Never. The subjects informed about both the incidents done by her/him as well as done by her or his partner. The scale has high internal consistency, reliability and coefficient alpha (coefficient alpha for couple scores is 0.76 for Reasoning, 0.88 for Verbal Aggression and 0.88 for Violence). The scale has content validity, construct validity as well as concurrent validity. In the present study the CTS for couple Form R was used (Straus, 1979). This form is used for non-clinical sample.

Administration: This is a self administering questionnaire. There is no time limit to complete it. The instruction is given in the beginning of the scale.

Scoring and Interpretation: There are several methods of scoring the CTS. The simplest method is to add the response category code values (0 to 6) for the items making up each sub-scale. Thus, the Reasoning score can range from 0 to 18 because it consists of the sum of question no. 1, 2 and 3, each of which can be scored 0 to 6. This is the straight scoring method and in the present study this method was used for the Reasoning sub-scale and the Psychological Aggression sub-scale. Following the
manual, item No.7 or ‘Cried’ in the Psychological Aggression sub-scale was not scored.

The items can also be weighted in accordance with the frequencies indicated by the response categories presented to the respondent. For response in ‘Once in the past year’ and ‘Twice in the past year’ the score is 1, for ‘3 to 5 times in the past year’ the score is 4, for ‘6 to 10 times in the past year’ the score is 8, for ‘11 to 20 times in the past year’ the score is 15, for ‘More than 20 times in the past year’ the score is 25, and ‘Not in the past year but before’ and ‘Never’ category the score is 0. The range of total score is 0 to 475. Higher score indicates much use of conflict tactics.

Another method of scoring is calculating the **chronicity** score. Straus et al. (1996) had suggested that to deal with an extremely skewed distribution of violence sub-scale, chronicity scores could be used. Chronicity statistics are “the mean number of times the acts or events in each index occurred among those who experienced at least one violent act (Straus et al., 1996, p. 299). Hence to calculate the chronicity scores, only weighted responses of those subjects were taken those who had used violence at least once in the past year (i.e., category ‘Once in past year’ to ‘More than 20 times in past year’). Others were omitted for the Violence calculation. In the present study this method of scoring was used for the Violence sub-scale.

**Selection of this tool:** The scale was chosen for the following reason.

(i) This scale assesses Conflict Tactics which is one of the dependent variable of choice in this study.

(ii) The scale is fairly short, yet compact and includes various tactics to deal with conflict.

(iii) Administration and scoring of the scale is simple and uncomplicated.

Previous researches (Chatterjee, Chaudhuri & Basu, 1999) administered this scale to the same ethnic group being inquired currently and its applicability and accuracy was vindicated.

The CTS was considered the best choice in the present study although CTS-2, a more recent version, was available. CTS-2 incorporates an additional domain of sexual coercion. Since sexual intimacy is minimum among dating couples in India, sexual coercion was not considered as a conflict resolving tactics in the present study.
Measures of Independent Variable

1. Aggression Questionnaire by Buss and Perry (1992)
2. Bern Sex Role Inventory

Aggression Questionnaire (AQ)

Description of the Tool: The Aggression Questionnaire was designed by A.H. Buss and M. Perry in 1992. Apart from measuring an overall aggression, the scale also assess the individual components of aggression. Hence this scale has four sub scales and these are – Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger and Hostility. The scale has 29 items. Nine items for measuring Physical Aggression, 5 for Verbal aggression, 7 for Anger and 8 for Hostility. The items were scrambled so as to avoid piling up of any one factor. The items are in statement form and the subjects responded in a 5 point scale. Namely: 1 – ‘Very often applies to me’; 2 – ‘Often applies to me’; 3 – ‘Sometimes applies to me’; 4 – ‘Usually does not apply to me’; and, 5 – ‘Never or hardly ever applies to me’. The test-retest correlations were as follows: Physical Aggression, 0.80; Verbal Aggression, 0.76; Anger, 0.72; and Hostility, 0.72 (total score = 0.80). For scales with a relatively small number of items, these coefficients suggest adequate stability over time. Reliability of this scale for Kolkata sample was 0.79 (Basu, 2002).

Administration: This is a self-administering questionnaire. There is no time limit to complete it. The instructions are printed in the answer sheet.

Scoring and Interpretation: For response category ‘1’, that is ‘Very often applies to me’ the score is 1; for ‘2’ or ‘Often applies to me’ the score is 2; for ‘3’ or ‘Sometimes applies to me’ the score is 3; for ‘4’ or ‘Usually does not apply to me’ the score is 4; and for ‘5’ or ‘Never or hardly ever applies to me’ the score is 5.

For item number 4 and 19 the scores are reversed, that is for response ‘1’ or ‘Very often applies to me’ the score is 5; for ‘2’ or ‘Often applies to me’ the score is 4; for ‘3’ or ‘Sometimes applies to me’ the score is 3; for ‘4’ or ‘Usually does not
apply to me' the score is 2; and for '5' or 'Never or hardly ever applies to me' the score is 1.

Each subject receives a total score and four sub scale scores, based on the mean score for a particular sub scale. The scores demonstrate the division of the personality trait of aggression. The range of the total aggression score is 29 to 145. For Physical Aggression the range is 9 to 45; for Verbal aggression the range is 5 to 25; for Anger the range is 7 to 35; and for Hostility the range is 8 to 40. Higher scores indicated less aggression.

Selection of the tool: This particular scale was selected for the purpose of the study for the following reasons:

(i) The scale assesses personality trait of aggression, which is one of the independent variable of choice.
(ii) The scale though short, it contains all the sub traits of aggression.
(iii) Administration of the scale and scoring is very simple.
(iv) This version of the scale has been standardized on the student population.
(v) Earlier studies in Kolkata have used this scale (Basu, 2002; Sanyal, Basu & Das, 2002), and have found reliable and satisfactory.

**Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)**

Description of the Original Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI): The scale was originally constructed by Bem (1981). In this study, culturally adapted version had been used, as there may be some variations in gender role identity owing to culture. The inventory consists of 60 adjectives or phrases printed in a test booklet, among which 20 items are masculine, 20 are feminine and rest 20 are neutral. Each item is accompanied by a 7-point scale on which the subject indicates how well each of the 60 characteristics describes herself or himself. High score indicates existence of that trait in a high degree.

Coefficient alpha for the femininity scale was 0.78 for males as well as for females. The coefficient alpha for the masculinity scale was 0.87 for males and 0.86 for females. The test-retest reliability for femininity scale was 0.89 for males and 0.82 for females. For the masculinity scale it was 0.76 for males and 0.94 for females. The
femininity and masculinity scales were independent, i.e. correlated insignificantly with each other.

Description of Indian Modification of Bem Sex Role Inventory: In this study, a modified Indian version (Dasgupta, 2000) of the Bem Sex Role Inventory or BSRI (1984) applicable for the present age group has been used. This version consists of 48 items (adjectives reflecting masculine or feminine traits). Out of 48 items, 16 items reflect masculine traits, 16 reflect feminine traits and the rest 16 are buffer items. Each item is accompanied by a 7-point scale, in which '1' indicates presence of the particular trait to an extremely low degree, and '7' indicates presence of the trait to a very high degree and '4' lies in between. The reliability for the items reflecting Masculine (M) traits are as follows; for split-half reliability it is 0.86, Chronbach's alpha is 0.84 and test-retest reliability is 0.79. The reliability for the items reflecting Feminine (F) traits are as follows; split-half reliability is 0.79, Chronbach's alpha is 0.75 and test-retest reliability is 0.85. The construct validity of the scale was found out to show that the masculine and feminine scales were orthogonal, with a correlation coefficient value of 0.02.

Administration: The BSRI is essentially self-administering and may be given to large groups as well as to individuals. There is no time limit to complete it. The instruction is given in the beginning of the scale.

Scoring and Interpretation: Hand-scoring of BSRI is a relatively simple task that may be facilitated by the use of calculator. The responses for the masculine items and feminine items were summed separately. Each individual were given a Masculine score and a Feminine score. The maximum score possible in each category is 112 indicating the presence of that gender role identity in the individual in the highest degree. The minimum score possible in each category is 16 indicating the presence of that gender role identity in the individual in the lowest degree. Each subject's femininity and masculinity scores are the average of the subject's ratings of the feminine and masculine adjectives on the BSRI.

The scores can be used in two ways. One is to use median split technique and obtain 4 groups namely masculine, feminine, androgynous and undifferentiated.
Another technique is the use the scores of M and F as continuous variables. The last procedure was followed here.

Selection of the tool: The BSRI was selected for this study because:

(i) It considered masculinity and femininity as two independent dimensions rather than as two poles of a single continuum.
(ii) It defines masculinity and femininity as cultural prototypes and subsequently assesses the presence of these prototypes in one's description of oneself. Thus it captures the representation of culture within one's self image. Thus an impact cast by the constructs used here may be interpreted as the effect of cultural imperatives operating through an individual within that culture. This is in line with the basic intention of the present study.
(iii) It is less time consuming than other personality tests. The adjectives given in the scale in terms of items are easy to understand.
(iv) It is an widely accepted measure despite a few criticisms. Numerous studies abroad have been conducted with it and a few studies in India (Ghadially, 1996; Basu, 1991; Datta et al. 1995; Dasgupta & Basu, 1997) also have been reported.

Love Attitude Scale (LAS)

Description of the Tool: The Love Attitude Scale was constructed by Hendrick, Hendrick and Dicke (1998). The scale consists of 6 sub scales – Eros, Ludus, Storge, Pragma, Mania and Agape. The scale consists of 24 items, 4 items in each sub scale. The items are in statement form and the subjects responded in a 5-point scale: ‘A’ – ‘Strongly agree with the statement’; ‘B’ – ‘Moderately agree with the statement’; ‘C’ – ‘Neutral’ or ‘Neither agree or disagree’; ‘D’ – ‘Moderately disagree with the statement’; and, ‘E’ – ‘Strongly disagree with the statement’.

The scale has high inter-item correlation (range – 0.39 to 0.58), high standardized alphas (range – 0.72 to 0.86) and high form correlation (range – 0.42 to 0.70).

Administration: This is a self-administering questionnaire. There is no limit to complete it. The instructions are printed in the answer sheets.
Scoring and Interpretation: For response A the score is 1, for B it is 2, for C it is 3, for D it is 4, and for E it is 5. Each subject receives 6 sub scale scores, based on the mean score for a particular sub scale. Thus apart from an overall scale score, this scale gives a love profile of each subject. The range of the mean sub scale score in case of each and every sub scale is 1 – 5. Lower score indicates the presence of that particular love attitude.

Selection of the tool: This particular scale was selected for the purpose of the study for the following reasons:
(i) The scale assesses love attitude, which is one of the independent variable of choice.
(ii) It gives the total love profile of each and every person.
(iii) The scale though short, it contains all the intricate aspects of love attitude in it.
(iv) Administration of the scale and scoring is very simple.
(v) Earlier studies in Kolkata have used this scale (Chaudhuri, et al., 2002) and have found reliable and satisfactory.

A note on the language of the questionnaires

All the questions of all the inventories were in English. Study of English is compulsory as second language from class IV in all schools of Kolkata, and hence the educated people in this city is more or less at home with this language. Since the subjects of the study were undergraduate or postgraduate students, they did not have any difficulty with the items. However if occasionally they faced some problems they were helped out by providing a standard translation of the words/items.

The Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted on 60 college students (30 women and 30 men) who were dating for the past one year. They completed an information schedule, the Conflict Tactics Scale I (by Straus, 1979), Bem Sex Role Inventory (adapted version in Bengali by Chakraborty, 1996), Love Attitude Scale – short form (Hendrick et al.,
1998) and Aggression Questionnaire (by Buss & Perry, 1992). The subjects were individually asked whether they had encountered any difficulty in understanding the instruction or the meaning of the test contents. Since no considerable difficulty was encountered the data were scored and the obtained results are presented in Table 3.4.

**Table 3.4:** Means and Standard Deviations (SD) for the CTS variable (Reasoning, Psychological Aggression, Minor Violence and Severe Violence) as judged for self and for partner by women (N=30) and men (N=30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Tactics</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>10.60</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>12.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Violence</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Violence</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Partner</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Tactics</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>11.17</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>11.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Aggression</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Violence</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Violence</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01**

**p < 0.05**

The study revealed sex difference in conflict tactics and showed that women used conflict tactics at a greater extent and components of aggression, gender role
identity, and love attitudes influenced the conflict tactics differently. The findings of the Pilot Study were published as Chatterjee et al. (1999).

So final data collection was attempted. Certain changes were made during the final data collection. A portion containing 12 questions on the relationship was added to the information schedule. During the pilot study, it was observed that the dating relationship of the subjects differed in several aspects, like knowledge of the partner's past life, previous involvement in any other relationship of similar nature, exchanging ideas with the partner regarding personal, financial or career matters, satisfaction with the present relationship, etc.

**Procedure for Final Data Collection**

The colleges selected on the basis of the stratification technique stated earlier were visited. The Principal or the Vice Principal and the Secretary of the Student Unions were approached and the purpose and relevance of the study was explained. After getting permission from the college authorities, the students were approached. They were asked to volunteer for the study and it was assured that their responses will be strictly confidential and it won't be used in any other way apart from using in the present study. Those who agreed, rapport was established and were asked to fill up the detailed information schedule. Then the GHQ-28 was given. Those who met the criteria defined for the study were included as prospective subjects.

On the next day the Aggression Questionnaire, the Bem Sex Role Inventory, the Conflict Tactics Scale and the Love Attitude Scale were given one after another to the selected subjects. Instructions were given according to the manuals of the respective scales, and the subjects were requested to respond in the answer sheets. The order of presentation of the scales were fixed on Day 1, but randomized on Day 2. The time schedules for the scales are presented in Table 3.5.
Table 3.5: Time schedule for the scales used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the tool / activity</th>
<th>Approximate time taken (in minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 1:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Rapport</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Schedule</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-28)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Day 2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression Questionnaire (AQ)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Attitude Scale (LAS)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (Day 1 + Day 2):</strong></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before leaving the testing session it was ensured that each item has been understood and responded to. Finally the students, the student union and the college authorities were thanked for their co-operation.
Examination, Scoring and Treatment of Data

After completion of data collection, the responses were scrutinized and scored. It has already been stated that out of 536 subjects, 114 were rejected due to reasons mentioned earlier. Among them 207 were women and 215 men. To make the N equal for both women and men, 8 data were eliminated. Hence finally 414 data were utilized.

Scoring for all the scales were done by hand according to the manuals. The Information Schedule was coded and a profile of the sample was drawn from it. Then the statistical treatment of the scores was attempted.

Apart from a qualitative analysis of the data the following 6 types of statistical technique were used. The statistical tools were selected in accordance with the objectives of the study.

Descriptive Statistics: Means and Standard Deviations of all the variables were calculated for the total sample, as well as for the women and men group separately.

Percentage & Venn Diagrams: To understand the nature of the dependent variable percentages were calculated and Venn diagrams were drawn. A Venn diagram is a visual representation consisting of shapes (rectangles, circles, etc) that show by their inclusion, exclusion and intersection the relationship between the classes or sets. It is easier to explain a set of data through Venn diagrams when there are overlapping regions.

Independent samples t-test: Independent samples t-tests were calculated to determine the sex difference in the usage of Reasoning tactics, Psychological Aggression and Violence.

Correlation Statistics: Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were calculated to determine the association of between the dependent and independent variables, and thus with the help of this the research hypotheses were tested.

Multiple Regression Analyses: Forward Stepwise Multiple Regression Analyses were done to predict the dependent variable from all the independent variables. Stepwise regression is a technique for choosing the variables, i.e., terms, to include in a multiple regression model. Forward stepwise regression starts with no model terms.
At each step it adds the most statistically significant term (the one with the highest F statistic or lowest p-value) until there are none left (Berry, 1993; Allison, 1999). Stepwise Regression Analysis was chosen owing to its applicability for exploratory research (Menard, 1995) and undoubtedly, the present study is exploratory in nature. In the last section the purpose is to identify those variables, which best predict the dependent variables, and no theory testing is involved.

Logistic Regression Analyses: Binomial (or binary) logistic regression is a form of regression, which is used when the dependent is a dichotomy and the independents are of any type. Logistic regression can be used to predict a dependent variable on the basis of independents and to determine the percent of variance in the dependent variable explained by the independents; to rank the relative importance of independents; to assess interaction effects; and to understand the impact of covariate control variables. Logistic regression has a less stringent requirements as it does not assume linearity of relationship between the independent variables and the dependent, does not require normally distributed variables and does not assume homoscedasticity. In the present study logistic regression was used to analyze and predict the extremely skewed violence scores (Cox & Snell, 1989; Kleinbaum, 1994).

The results of the analyses are delineated in detail in the next chapter.