

## RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DETACHMENT AND DATING VIOLENCE AMONG UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS OF UNIVERSITY OF MAIDUGURI

**NUHU ROBERT KIRTANI<sup>1</sup>, NASHON H. LIKKI<sup>2</sup> AND STEPHEN S. HAMAFYELTO<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Department of Physical and Health Education, University of Maiduguri, Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria.

<sup>1</sup>kirtani83@yahoo.com

### ABSTRACT

*Dating violence is a serious and prevalent public health problem that is associated with numerous negative physical and psychological health outcomes Obi and Ozumba, (2007). There is limited research on prevention and intervention strategies to address the issue of dating violence Obi and Ozumba, (2007). The development and evaluation of evidence-based programs targeted at dating violence prevention is very important. The study was conducted to examine the relationship between detachment and dating violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri. The study used a descriptive research design. Three hundred and eighty-four (384) copies of questionnaires were administered but three hundred and fifty-six (356) copies were retrieved, making 93% return rate. The study was conducted to examine the relationship between emotional punishment, instrumental violence and dating violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri. The study used a descriptive research design. Three hundred and eighty-four (384) copies of questionnaires were administered but three hundred and fifty-six (356) copies were retrieved, making 93% return rate. The analysis of the data collected was done using descriptive statistics (charts, frequency counts and percentages) while, inferential statistics (Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient) was used to test the hypotheses. The result of the study revealed a significant relationship between detachment and dating violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri ( $r = 0.9889$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ). The researchers recommended that the safe dates program targeted to 100 and 200 levels, which reflects the suggested levels and age at which dating violence programs should be implemented by the Management of University of Maiduguri.*

**Key Words:** Detachment, Dating, violence.

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

Dating violence (DV) among college students is a pervasive problem that has far reaching consequences on society, with up to 22% of college students estimated to be victims of dating violence each year (Straus, 2004). Dating is defined as a relationship in which two individuals share an emotional, romantic, and/or sexual connection beyond a platonic friendship, but are not married, engaged, or in a similarly committed relationship (Murray & Kardatzke, 2007). The definition of DV (and/or dating abuse) is the use of physical force, or the threat of physical force or restraint, within a dating relationship (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). In more recent years, the scope of dating violence has been broadened to include psychological abuse – defined as verbal assaults between partners or from one partner to another (demeaning, degrading, or derogatory verbal terms) and sexual abuse that includes, but is not limited to, sexual coercion, rape, and molestation (Carr & VanDeusen, 2002).

Violence on the other hand is the intentional use of force (physical, psychological, verbal, etc.) or power which may be threat or actual, against oneself, another person or against a group of persons/community that either results in or has the likelihood of resulting in injury, psychological harm, mal-development or deprivation (Aminini-Philips, 2013). Violence includes any condition or act that creates a climate in which the individual feels fear or intimidation in addition to being a victim of assault, theft or vandalism (Aluede, 2011).

Youth are in a developmental period when courtship behavior is first initiated and the risk of abuse by a partner first emerges. The transition from childhood to adulthood leads to rapid change in behavior and strong emotions, changes such as having an intimate or close relationship with the opposite sex. Many youth enter into dating relationship without prior experience. So social media effect, lack of self concept and bad parenting style are some of the challenges faced by youth. According to Adamo (2014), maintaining a healthy relationship require skills that many adolescents are not patient enough to learn. The lack of conflict handling skills and growing up in environments that experience constant violence or in communities that experience high rates of violence, can lead to unhealthy and even violent relationships among adolescents (Adamo, 2014).

The following Socio-cognitive variables are examined visa-verse, the dating violence among undergraduate and college students in global and local settings. Globally, Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is recognized as a major public health problem that violates the fundamental human rights. The World Health Organization defines IPV as ‘behaviour within an intimate relationship that causes physical, sexual or psychological harm including acts of physical aggression, sexual coercion, and psychological abuses that controls behaviour. IPV can take several forms including physical violence such as pushing, shoving, slapping, punching,

burning, use of a weapon, sexual including coercion and psychological violence leading to acts of humiliation, intimidation, and other controlling behaviours. IPV occurs in both low and high income countries and about one in three women worldwide are reported to experience IPV at some point in her life (Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Ellsberg, Heise & Watts, 2006)

The WHO multi-country study found that the reported life time prevalence of IPV varied from 15% to 71% with the highest prevalence found in rural Ethiopia suffer detachment and humiliation, coercion, emotional punishment in their dating relationships. There are several theories about the causes and consequences of IPV against women. The risk factors that influence the occurrence of IPV which are classified as individual, relationship, community and societal level factors. These factors include young age, lower educational status, and unemployment, harmful use of alcohol and witnessing of parental violence, relationship quality and having multiple partners, poverty, and discriminatory societal gender norms. Nigeria currently has one of the highest populations on the Africa continent. The country is heterogeneous in composition, with wide geographical, cultural and ethnic diversity. The failure to domesticate the United Nations report on the Convention of Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) in spite of Nigeria being a signatory has been a lingering problem. Nigeria is a male dominated society where men are assigned more economic and political power and women are more dependent and this situation increases the risk of dating violence (Iconis, 2013).

In recent years, research examining intimate partner violence, and particularly violence that occurs in young dating relationships, has increased exponentially (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001). Physical aggression, which may include grabbing, slapping, and punching one's partner, occurs in approximately 20-37% of all dating relationships. Aggression, the most common form of violence that occurs between dating partners, includes verbal insults, threats, and degrading remarks, is estimated to transpire in 60-90% of dating relationships. Lastly, sexual aggression, which includes forcing unwanted sexual activities upon one's partner, occurs in approximately 2-14% of dating relationships. Additionally, it is not uncommon for individuals to experience more than one form of aggression (Jezl, Molidor, & White, 1996). There is also evidence to suggest that males and females perpetrate similar amounts of physical and psychological aggression against their dating partners with males routinely perpetrating more sexual aggression. Additionally, research has indicated that violence among adolescents and young adults in dating relationships can lead to severe violence later in life, such as in marital relationships. Therefore, it is clear that dating violence evidences itself in numerous topographies and affects a significant proportion of adolescents and young adults. Research consistently demonstrates that individuals experiencing dating violence evidence a number of adverse psychological and physical outcomes. The psychological correlates

of dating violence are numerous, with victims experiencing mental health problems that include depression, posttraumatic stress disorder, anxiety, increased substance abuse, and low self-esteem (Aguilar & Nightingale, 1994). Further, victims of dating violence often report injuries, such as facial and head trauma, and chronic gastrointestinal conditions. Lastly, it is not unheard of for homicide to result from these destructive relationships. In light of the prevalence of dating violence and its harmful correlates, there exists an urgent need for a thorough understanding of how these violent relationships operate. Students experience the same types of abuse in relationships as adults. This can include: Physical abuse - any intentional use of physical force with the intent to cause fear or injury, for example hitting, shoving, biting, restraining, kicking, strangling, or use of a weapon. Emotional /psychological abuse - non-physical behaviors such as threats, insults, constant monitoring, humiliation, intimidation, isolation, or stalking. Sexual abuse - any action that impacts a person's ability to control whether or not sexual activity occurs (Field & Caetano, 2005).

There are many forms of sexual abuse or assault, but at its basic, sexual assault is any form of unwanted sexual contact obtained without consent or through the use of force, threat of force, intimidation or coercion. A few examples of those forms may include: physically forcing a sexual act on another person, making a sexual partner feel guilty for not having sex until she "gives in.", continually begging for sexual interaction or wearing the person down until she agrees through coercion, forcing a partner to "make love" after a physical assault and taking a partner perform a sex act that she does not want to do (Cornelius, & Bell, 2008).

Despite the fact that women constitute half of the population, political appointments for women still fall short of the recommended 35% by the Beijing declaration .The early socialization process is also responsible for the entrenchment of certain norms and discriminatory gender specific codes of behaviour that have made women inferior than men. The national literacy rate for females is only 56%, compared to 72% for males and in certain states especially the northern states, the female literacy, enrolment and achievement rates are much lower. In studies conducted on DV in Nigeria, a prevalence of 28.2% to 47.3% for physical violence and 12.5% to 21.5% for lifetime prevalence of sexual violence has been reported.

In urban Pakistan, a lifetime prevalence of 57.6%, 54.5% and 83.6% was obtained for physical, sexual indulgence, coercion, gender based phenomenon and instrumental violence respectively. The problem with learning to detach emotionally from emotional trauma is that when we are in healthy relationships, that mistrust stays and at the slightest hint of hurt or rejection, a person with emotional detachment disorder will withdraw and become cold and unavailable for communication and sharing of feelings. This can interfere with healthy relationships (Ajuwon, Funmilayo & Osungbade, 2011).

Research conducted in South Africa reports different prevalence rates for dating violence, due to methodological and definitional differences. These authors indicate, however, that the phenomenon is widespread in the country. The level of dating violence perpetration among school-going adolescents in Cape Town was found to be 40%. Their findings were corroborated by a similar study, which found a prevalence rate of dating violence perpetration of 20.7% among school going adolescents in Cape Town (Cornelius, & Bell, 2008). The issue of dating violence is a particularly important one because of its association with the onset of sexual activity and consequently with STIs, including HIV. In a study conducted in KwaZulu Natal, South Africa, more than one third of girls aged between 15 and 19 reported that they had lost their virginity through force, coercion or trickery<sup>10</sup>. A related study of school-going adolescents in South Africa indicates that early onset of first sexual intercourse was more likely among males than females, and among older students and students of a lower socio-economic status (Jackson, 1999).

Intimate relationship violence has detrimental effects on the victims' physical and mental health. Physical violence from intimate partner violence (IPV) could lead to traumatic brain injuries, which increase risks of enduring negative complications such as residual scar tissue in the brain, memory loss, psychological scarring, and fatalities, amongst other consequences (Banks, 2007). Victims of violent intimate relationships have increased risks of poor mental health outcomes such as increased anxiety, higher rates of depressive symptomology, reduced self-esteem, and higher perceived stress (Gibb, Abramson, & Alloy, 2004). In addition, increased concerns of poor health outcomes, substance abuse, and development of chronic illnesses were found to be associated with survivors of IPV (Gibb, Abramson, & Alloy, 2004).

The varying nature of romantic relationships (casual dating, in a committed relationship, cohabiting, married, etc.) in a college student sample may make it difficult to clearly delineate between violence between dating couples (DV), and violence between long-term or married couples (IPV). Current studies focused on studying intimate relationship violence (DV) with college students who also identified as emerging adults, as it is hypothesized that most college students are in casual dating relationships, or in the beginning stages of committed relationships. Moreover, it is important that research address the issue of DV among college students, as violent behavioral patterns in current intimate relationships may become enduring features in future romantic relationships (Murphy & O' Leary, 1989; Straus, 2004).

## 1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Ideally dating supposed to be mutual, cordial, kind, friendly with exchange of gifts and certain duties and obligations, ante nuptial relationship between opposite sex youths. Culturally, dating is meant to be devoid of violence and full of social interactions. It is a means of bringing loved ones together and forming a lasting bond or relationships in diversity.

It has been observed that dating has departed from the above scenario. In recent times there have been cuprous reports, on the media, print electronic and social indicating dating violence among youth in colleges, universities and institutions of higher learning. In general, these violence take different forms, for examples physical violence, it includes a wide spectrum of activities such as scratching, slapping, pushing, slamming or holding someone against a wall, biting, choking, burning, raping, beating someone up, and assault with a weapon. Psychological, emotional, verbal abuse just like physical abuse encompasses a broad array of behaviours on dating violence. Such abuses may include insulting, criticizing, humiliating in front of friends. This paper is designed to examine the relationship between detachment and dating violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri.

## 1.3 HYPOTHESIS

The following hypothesis was formulated to guide the study

H0: Detachment is not a significant correlate of dating violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri Borno state.

## 2.1 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### 2.2 Empirical review

#### 2.2.1 Detachment as a Correlate of Dating Violence

Detachment in this sense is a decision to avoid engaging emotional connections, rather than an inability or difficulty in doing so, typically for personal, social, or other reasons. In this sense it can allow people to maintain boundaries, psychic integrity and avoid undesired impact by or upon others, related to emotional demands. As such it is a deliberate mental attitude which avoids engaging the emotions of others. This detachment does not necessarily mean avoiding empathy; rather, it allows the person to achieve the space needed to rationally choose whether or not to be overwhelmed or manipulated by such feelings. Examples where this is used in a positive

sense might include emotional boundary management, where a person avoids emotional levels of engagement related to people who are in some way emotionally overly demanding, such as difficult co-workers or relatives, or is adopted to aid the person in helping others such as a person who trains himself to ignore the "pleading" food requests of a dieting spouse, or indifference by parents towards a child's begging (Williams, Kipling D.; Nida, Steve A., 2011).

Emotional detachment can also be "emotional numbing", "emotional blunting", i.e., dissociation, depersonalization or in its chronic form depersonalization disorder. This type of emotional numbing or blunting is a disconnection from emotion; it is frequently used as a coping survival skill during traumatic childhood events such as abuse or severe neglect. Over time and with much use, this can become second nature when dealing with day to day stressors. Emotional detachment may allow acts of extreme cruelty, such as torture and abuse, supported by the decision to not connect empathically with the person concerned. Social ostracism, such as shunning and parental alienation, are other examples where decisions to shut out a person creates a psychological trauma for the shunned party (Williams et al, 2011).

Emotional detachment often arises from psychological trauma in early years as well as throughout adulthood, and is a component in many anxiety and stress disorders. The person, while physically present, moves elsewhere in the mind, and in a sense is "not entirely present", making them sometimes appear preoccupied. Thus, such detachment is often not as outwardly obvious as other psychiatric symptoms; people with this problem often have emotional systems that are in overdrive. They may have a hard time being a loving family member. They may avoid activities, places, and people associated with any traumatic events they have experienced. The dissociation can also lead to lack of attention and, hence, to memory problems and in extreme cases, amnesia(Herman &Judith, 1992).

It is known that SSRI (selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor) antidepressants, after taken for a while or taken one after another (if the doctor is trying to see what works), can cause what is called "emotional blunting". In this instance, the individual in question is often unable to cry, even if he or she wants to. In other cases, the person may seem fully present but operate merely intellectually when emotional connection would be appropriate. This may present an extreme difficulty in giving or receiving empathy and can be related to the spectrum of narcissistic personality disorder (Herman &Judith, 1992).

Carney and Barner (2012) examined three aspects of IPV: emotional abuse, sexual coercion, and stalking/obsessive behavior. For emotional abuse, prevalence rates were high, averaging around 80%; 40% of

women and 32% of men reported expressive aggression, and 41% of women and 43% of men reported coercive control. Furthermore, new findings from the National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) by Black et al. (2011) found that approximately half of Americans reported experiencing lifetime emotional abuse by a partner. Psychological aggression was measured by combining questions based on both expressive aggression (e.g. name calling) and coercive control (e.g. isolation tactics or threats of harm). Psychological aggression by an intimate partner was reported by 48.4% of women and 48.8% of men. Consequently, emotional abuse appears to be the most common form of IPV.

Obi and Ozumba (2007) who examined dating violence prevention on a college campus. The study was carried out in Enugu State with one hundred and forty (140) questionnaires administered and distributed to both male and female students. The result of the study shows a significant relationship between humiliation and dating violence among undergraduate students of Enugu College of education. The study recommended that all educators be knowledgeable of the types of dating violence.

Foshee, (1996) examined the consequences of the violence have found gender differences with females reporting more negative emotional consequences of the violence including experiencing greater fear for their safety. Boys were less likely than girls to perceive incidents of dating violence as physically or psychologically threatening or damaging.

## **2.3 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **2.3.1 Attachment Theory**

Attachment theory was developed by John Bowlby as an attempt to link human social and psychological behaviour. Bowlby developed a model that includes self-important, others and their shared relationships. Bowlby (1979) posited an important part of healthy development was having a close and caring relationship with parents and other caregivers. Proximity to attachment figures helps infants to have increased chances of protection and survival from an evolutionary standpoint. In addition to the biological necessity of attachment, it is also satisfying for both the parents and the infant (Bretherton, 1992). As the bonds strengthen between infant and parents, the infant begins to grow an inner representation of the parent, which develops “internal working models” of self, others, and self-other relationships (Bowlby, 1973). The higher parental sensitivity and responsiveness are to the infant’s needs, the more secure and healthy the attachment that develops. Infants begin to feel they are deserving of their parents’ care-giving and that they have a secure base on which to rely in the future.



Parental insensitivity and unresponsiveness contribute to insecure attachment by the infant, leading the infant to internalize these experiences and find the world to be unsafe and rejecting, which makes forming relationships difficult and dangerous. Ainsworth (1978) developed a method for assessing infant attachment known as the “strange situation.” This experiment first separated infants from their parent, then exposed them to the presence of a stranger, and finally reunited them with their parent. The infant expressed proximity seeking behavior, a displayed desire or lack of desire for closeness, and the responses and behaviours were classified into patterns. Two dimensions were used to determine the infant’s attachment behavior classifications, anxiety and avoidance. The degree of anxiety experienced from abandonment and the avoidance of closeness to the stranger contributed to the classification.

Based on observed patterns, Ainsworth divided infants into three categories: secure; two types of insecure, avoidant and anxious-ambivalent; and unclassifiable. Secure infants, who are low in avoidance and anxiety, showed signs of missing their parents upon leaving the room, greeted parents upon return, and used their parent as a secure base for exploring the room. Avoidant infants, who are high in avoidance and low in anxiety, explored the room without using their parents, showed little distress upon the parent leaving, and chose to play with toys over greeting their parents upon return. Anxious-ambivalent infants, who are low in avoidance and high in anxiety, did not explore the room, were distressed when their parents left the room, and were unable to be soothed upon their parents’ return to the room. The unclassifiable type could not be placed in any of these categories until 1990, when Main and Solomon named the third type of insecurely attached infants as disorganized/disoriented. These infants, found to be high in avoidance and high in anxiety, behaved with no intentional attachment strategy or intention, and it was hypothesized that these infants experienced the most interpersonal problems, such as childhood trauma, with their attachment figures.

This traditional approach to attachment theory analyzes the parent’s responsiveness in determining the child’s attachment, but others have also looked into the infant’s role in the attachment relationship. A meta-analysis by Goldsmith & Alansky, (1987) reviewed infant temperament as a predictor of insecure parent-infant attachment bonds. The strength of this association was low, and while infant temperament may play a role, parental behaviors have a stronger impact on parent-infant attachment.

### 3.1 MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study used a descriptive research design. The population for this study comprised all Undergraduate students in University of Maiduguri, Borno State, Nigeria. The total population of Undergraduate students in the

twelve Faculties of University of Maiduguri is 32,760 (Thirty two thousand seven hundred and sixty). A sample of 384(Three hundred and eighty four) following (krejcie and Morgan, 1970) who stated that with a population of 1,000,000 (one million) (384 three hundred and eighty four) can be used as representation of the population. Sampling techniques used are the simple random sampling to select four faculties out of the twelve faculties. This was followed, by sampling of convenience to draw 384 (three hundred and eighty four) respondents from four faculties and they are as follows faculty of Education, Arts, Sciences, and Social sciences. There after 96 respondents were sampled from each faculty using sample of convenience. Sample of convenience was preferred to enable the researcher selects young students who are in part one and part two because they are not well grounded with the rules and regulations of the university, on like the higher level students who are more experienced with the school regulation. This paper used structured questionnaire to collect data from the respondents. Three hundred and eighty-four (384) copies of questionnaires were administered but three hundred and fifty-six (356) copies were retrieved, making 93% return rate. This paper employed both descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics was used to compute the mean and standard deviation of the variables under study while inferential statistics (Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient) was used to test the hypothesis. The results were presented in tables and discussed according to the hypothesis.

**Table 4.1 Socio-Cognitive Factor Associated with Dating Violence**

S/N	Statement	SA	A	DA	SDA
	<b>Detachment</b>				
1	I detach from my friend/partner because he/she stops talking to me or disappears for several days without any explanation to show his/her annoyance	<b>170(47.6%)</b>	126(35.4%)	44(12.4%)	16(4.4%)
2.	I detach from my friend/partner because he/she always comes late to our appointments and does not fulfill his/her promises and is irresponsible	142(39.9%)	<b>190(53.4%)</b>	20(5.6%)	4(1.1%)
3.	I detach from my friend/partner because he/she does not acknowledge any responsibility regarding to our relationship or what happens to both of us.	<b>156(43.8%)</b>	166(46.6%)	24(6.7%)	10(2.8%)
4.	I detach from my friend/partner because he/she ignores my feelings most often.	120(33.7%)	194(54.5%)	28(7.7%)	14(3.9%)
5.	I detach from my friend/partner because he/she refuses to help me when am in real need	76(21.3%)	202(56.7%)	58(16.3%)	20(5.6%)
6.	I detach from my friend/partner because	78(21.9%)	<b>136(38.2%)</b>	<b>100(28.1%)</b>	22(6.2%)

he/she lies to me and manipulate me.

7. I detach from my friend/partner because he/she impose rules on the relationship (days, time types of outgoing) at his/her exclusive convenience	108(30.3%)	<b>206(57.9%)</b>	36(10.1%)	6(1.7%)
--	------------	-------------------	-----------	---------

**Source:** Field Survey, 2018, SA= Strongly Agreed, A= Agreed, UD Undecided, SDA = Strongly Disagreed

Table 4.1 shows the socio-cognitive factor associated with dating violence in the study area. Item one above show that, (47.6%) and (35.4%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively with the statement, while 12.4% and 4.4% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the statement. One can conclude that the respondents detach from their friends/partners because they stop talking to them or disappear for several days without any explanation to show their annoyance. From statement two above, (39.9%) strongly agreed, (53.4%) agreed, while 5.6% disagreed and 1.1% strongly disagreed with the research statement respectively. One can infer that the respondents detach from their friends/partners because they always come late to appointments and do not fulfill their promises and are irresponsible. Item three above show that, (43.8%) and (46.6%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively with the statement, while 6.7% and 2.8% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the statement. One can conclude that the respondents detach from their friends/partners because they don't acknowledge any responsibility regarding to their relationship or what happens to both of them. From statement four above, 33.7% strongly agreed, 54.5% agreed, while 7.7% disagreed and 3.9% strongly disagreed with the research statement. One can infer that the respondents detach from their friends/partners because they ignore their feelings most often. Item five above show that, (21.3%) and (56.7%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively with the statement, while 16.3% and 5.6% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the statement. One can conclude that the respondents detach from their friends/partners because they refuse to help them when they are in real need. From question six above, 21.9% strongly agreed, 38.2% agreed, while 28.1% disagreed and 6.2% strongly disagreed with the research statement respectively. One can infer that the respondents detach from their friends/partners because they lie to them and manipulate them. Item seven above show that, (30.3%) and (57.9%) of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed respectively with the statement, while 10.1% and 1.7% disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the statement. One can conclude that the respondents detach from their friends/partners because they impose rules on the relationship (days, time types of outgoing) at their exclusive convenience.

**Table 4.2 Result of Pearson Product Moment Correlation on Relationship between Detachment and Dating Violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri Borno state**

Variable	n	$\bar{x}$	SD	DF	r	P-Value
<b>Detachment</b>	356	71.2111	2.1471	354	0.9889**	0.0000
<b>Dating Violence</b>	356	63.5781	2.1122			

Source: Field Survey, 2018

Table 4.2 indicates detachment was a significant correlate of dating violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri Borno state. This is because the probability value ( $P = 0.0000$ ) is less than alpha ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) level of significance at a correlation index  $r = (0.9889)$ , sample size ( $n = 356$ ), degree of freedom (354), mean (71.2111, 63.5781) and standard deviation (2.1471, 2.1122) respectively. Hence, the null hypothesis which stated that detachment is not a significant correlate of dating violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri Borno state is hereby rejected at 0.05 level of significant. Meaning there was a significant relationship between detachment and dating violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri Borno state ( $r = 0.9889$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ). This finding supports a study conducted by Carney and Barner (2012), who examined three aspects of IPV: emotional abuse/detachment, sexual coercion, and stalking/obsessive behavior. For emotional abuse, prevalence rates were high, averaging around 80%; 40% of women and 32% of men reported expressive aggression, and 41% of women and 43% of men reported coercive control. Furthermore, new findings from the National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) by Black et al. (2011) found that approximately half of Americans reported experiencing lifetime emotional abuse by a partner. Psychological aggression was measured by combining questions based on both expressive aggression (e.g. name calling) and coercive control (e.g. isolation tactics or threats of harm). Psychological aggression by an intimate partner was reported by 48.4% of women and 48.8% of men. Consequently, emotional abuse appears to be the most common form of IPV.

### 3.2 CONCLUSION

Based on the findings within the limitation of this study, it was concluded that there was a significant relationship between detachment and dating violence among undergraduate students of university of Maiduguri Borno State. Therefore, understanding the types of dating violence is an important piece to working as a competent and effective educator. Certain types of dating violence such as psychological abuse may be more difficult to identify as the symptoms and effects are not externally visible. Therefore, it is important to be aware of the predictors and

risk factors associated with dating violence to assist in determining if dating violence is present. Awareness of either a history of student maltreatment or early exposure to violence is essential as both are possible predicative factors of dating violence. The study by Wolfe et al. (2004) suggests it is important to recognize these warning signs because it not only added to previous research on examining predictors of dating violence, but identified the role and risk that trauma symptoms have in the possibility of dating violence to occur in adolescent relationships. It is imperative to be aware of how trauma symptoms present in adolescents to be able to identify and screen for this predictive factor.

### 3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on research, the following recommendations are presented to assist educators and other professionals in the field to be competent and effective helpers in dealing with teen dating violence.

1. The Safe Dates program targeted to 100 and 200 levels, which reflects the suggested levels and age at which dating violence programs should be implemented by the Management of University of Maiduguri.
2. Safe date's program should be added to preexisting curriculum to educate undergraduate students about the effect of dating violence.

### REFERENCES

1. Adams AE, Sullivan CM, Bybee D, Greeson M. (2008). Development of the scale of economic abuse. *Violence Against Women*.14:563–588.
2. Archer J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*.126:651–680.
3. Archer J.( 2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology*.8:291–32.
4. Babcock JC, Jacobson NS, Gottman JM, Yerington TP. (2000). Attachment, emotional regulation, and the function of marital violence: Differences between secure, preoccupied, and dismissing violent and nonviolent husbands. *Journal of Family Violence*. 15:391–409.
5. Black MC, Basile KC, Breiding MJ, Smith SG, Walters ML, Merrick MT, et al. (2010). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): summary report.
6. Blosnich J, Bossarte R. (2009). Comparisons of intimate partner violence among partners in same-sex and opposite-sex relationships in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health*.99:2182–2184.

7. Brown GW, Moran PM. (1997). Single mothers, poverty, and depression. *Psychological +Medicine*.27:21–33.
8. Byrne B. (2010). *Structural Equation Modeling with Amos*. Ottawa: Routledge.
9. Campbell JC. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *Lancet*;359:1331–1336.
10. Carlson BE, McNutt L, Choi DY, Rose IM. (2002).Intimate partner abuse and mental health: The role of social support and other protective factors. *Violence Against Women*;8:720–745.
11. Carney MM, Barner JR. Prevalence of partner abuse: Rates of emotional abuse and control. *Partner Abuse*. 2012;3(3):286–335.
12. Catalano S. (2000). *Intimate partner violence in the United States*. Bureau of Justice Statistics.
13. Coker AL, McKeown RE, Sanderson M, Davis KE, Valois RF, Huebner ES. (2000a ). Severe dating violence and quality of life among South Carolina high school students. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*.;19:220–227.
14. Coker AL, Derrick C, Lumpkin JL, Aldrich TE, Oldendick R. (2000b ). Help-seeking for Intimate partner violence and forced sex in South Carolina. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*.19:316–20.
15. Coker AL, Davis KE, Arias I, Desai S, Sanderson M, Brandt HM, Smith PH.( 2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*.23:260–268.
16. Crick NR, Grotpeter JK. (1995)Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*. 66:710–722.
17. Engel B. *The emotionally abusive relationship: How to stop being abused and how to stop abusing*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Son.
18. Faver C, Strand E. Fear, guilt, and grief. (2002): Harm to pets and the emotional abuse of women. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*. 2007;7:51–70.
19. Flitcraft A.(1995). Project SAFE: Domestic violence education for practicing physicians *Women’s Health Issues*.183–188.
20. Follingstad DR, Coyne S, Gambone L. A representative measure of psychological aggression and its severity. *Violence and Victims*. 2005;20:25–38.
21. Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, Heise L, Watts CH. (2006). Prevalence of intimate partner violence: Findings from the WHO multi-country study on women’s health and domestic violence. *Lancet*.368 (9543):1260–1269.
22. Goetting A. (1991). Female victims of homicide: A portrait of their killers and the circumstances of their duties. *Violence and Victims*;6:159–168.

23. Gondolf EW, Heckert DA, Kimmel CM.( 2002). Nonphysical abuse among batterer program participants. *Journal of Family Violence*.17:293–314.
24. Hamberger LK. (2005). Men’s and women’s use of intimate partner violence in clinical samples: Toward a gender sensitive approach. *Violence and Victims*.2(2):131–151.
25. Harned M. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims*.16:269–285.
26. Hines DA, Saudino KJ. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence and Victims*.18(2):197–217.
27. Jacobson N, Gottman JM, Gortner E, Berns S, Shortt JW.(1996). Psychological factors in the longitudinal course of battering: When do couples split up? When does the abuse decrease? *Violence and Victims*.11:371–392.
28. Jacobson N, Gottman J. (1998).When men batter women: New insights into ending abusive relationships. New York: Simon & Schuster.
29. Johnson MP. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*.57:283–294.
30. Johnson H. (1996). *Dangerous Domains: Violence Against Women in Canada*. Scarborough, Ontario: International Thomas Publishing.
31. Kocot T, Goodman L. (2003). The roles of coping and social support in battered women’s mental health. *Violence Against Women*.9:323–346
32. Lammers M, Ritchie J, Robertson N. (2005).Women’s experience of emotional abuse in intimate relationships: A qualitative study. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*. 5(1):29–64.
33. Loring MT. (1994). *Emotional abuse*. New York: Lexington Books.
34. Lynch JW, Kaplan GA, Shema SJ. (1997). Cumulative impact of sustained economic hardship on physical, cognitive, psychological, and social functioning. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 337:1889–1895. [PubMed]
35. Marshall L. (1996). Psychological abuse of women: Six distinct clusters. *Journal of Family Violence*.11(4):379–409.
36. McCloskey LA, Treviso M, Scionti T, daPozzo G. (2002). A comparative study of battered women and their children in Italy and the United States. *Journal of Family Violence*.17:53–74.
37. Mezey NJ, Post LA, Maxwell CD. (2002). Redefining intimate partner violence: Women’s experiences with physical violence and non-physical abuse by age. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*.22:122–154.

38. Mills L, Mills T, Taliaferro E, Zimble A, Smith D. (2003). The prevalence of female-to-male intimate partner violence in an urban emergency department. *Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 25(2):215–218.
39. Molidor C, Tolman R. Gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence. *Violence Against Women*. 1998;4:180–194.
40. O’Leary KD, Maiuro RD, editors. *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations*. New York: Springer; 2001.
41. O’Leary KD, Maiuro RD. *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations*. New York: Springer; 2001.
42. Rivara FP, et al. Age, period, and cohort effects on intimate partner violence. *Violence and Victims*. 2009;24:627–638.
43. Rusbult CE, Martz JM. Remaining in an abusive relationship: An investment model analysis of non-voluntary commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 1995;21:558–571.
44. Sackett LA, Saunders DG. The impact of different forms of psychological abuse on battered women. *Violence and Victims*. 1999;14:105–117.
45. Schumacher JA, Leonard KE. Husbands’ and wives’ marital adjustment, verbal aggression, and physical aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2005;73:28–37.
46. Shepherd MF, Campbell JA. The Abusive Behavior Inventory: A Measure of psychological and physical abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 1992;7(3):291–305.
47. Smith PH, Earp JA, DeVellis R. Measuring battering: Development of the women’s experience with battering (WEB) scale. *Women’s Health*. 1995;1(4):273–288.
48. Smith PH, Smith JB, Earp JA. Beyond the measurement trap: A reconstructed conceptualization and measurement of battered women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 1999;23:177–193
49. Smith PH, Tessaro I, Earp JA. Women’s experiences with battering: A conceptualization from qualitative research. *Women’s Health Issues*. 1995;5:173–182.
50. Sprey J. Family dynamics: An essay on conflict and power. In: Sussman MB, Steinmetz SK, Peterson G, editors. *Handbook of marriage and the family*. 2. New York: Plenum; 1999. pp. 667–685. .
51. Straus MA. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 1979;41(1):75–88.
52. Straus MA. Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide. *Violence Against Women*. 2004;10:790–811
53. Straus MA. (2005) Women’s violence toward men is a serious social problem. In: Loseke DR, Gelles RJ, Cavanaugh MM, editors. *Current controversies on family violence*. 2. Newbury Park: Sage Publications. pp. 55–77



54. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Bonney-McCoy S, Sugarman DB. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2) *Journal of Family Issues*.17:283–316
55. Tan C, Basta J, Sullivan CM, Davidson WS. (1995). The long-term effects of battering on women's health. *Women's Health: Research on Gender, Behavior, and Policy*.4:41–70.
56. Tjaden P, Thoennes N. (2000). Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey(NCJ Report No 183781)Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
57. Tolman RM. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims*.4(3):159–177.
58. United States Census Bureau. [Accessed April 15, 2012];Educational Attainment in the United States. 2011 From <http://www.census.gov/hhes/socdemo/education/data/cps/2011>.
59. Van Houdenhove B, et al.( 2001). Victimization in chronic fatigue syndrome and fibromyalgia In tertiary care: A controlled study on prevalence and characteristics. *Psychosomatics*.42:21–28.
60. Walker A. (1999). *Gender and family relationships*. In: Sussman MB, Steinmetz SK, Peterson G, editors. *Handbook of marriage and the family*. 2. New York: Plenum. pp. 439– 474.
61. Waltermaurer E. (2005) Measuring intimate partner violence (IPV): You may only get what you ask for. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*.20:501–506.
62. Waltz J, Babcock JC, Jacobson NS, Gottman JM.( 2000). Testing a typology of batterers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*.68:658–669.
63. White J, Klein D. (2002). *Family Theories*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
64. Williams JR, Ghandour RM, Kub JE. (2008). Female perpetration of violence in heterosexual intimate relationships: Adolescence through adulthood. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*. 9:227–24
65. Wilson MI, Johnson H, Daly M. (1995). Lethal and nonlethal violence against wives. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*.37:331–361