Relationship Violence Among College Students: The Predictive Power Of Sociodemographic Characteristics and Domestic Violence Beli

Erin Nabors
University of Central Florida

Find similar works at: https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd

This Masters Thesis (Open Access) is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

STARS Citation
https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/1002
RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS: THE PREDICTIVE POWER OF SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE BELIEFS

by

ERIN L. NABORS
B.A. Marymount University, 2003

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Department of Sociology
in the College of Arts and Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2006
ABSTRACT

This study examines relationship violence among college students, focusing on the predictive roles of their sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs. College students experience an extremely high level of abuse among intimate partners, with prevalence rates ranging between 20 and 50%. Since relationship violence among college students is such a widespread problem, it is important to understand what lies at the foundation of this type of abuse. Findings from previous studies demonstrate correlations between sociodemographic characteristics and perpetration of relationship violence as well as correlations between beliefs supportive of abuse among intimate partners and perpetration of relationship violence. However, research to date fails to fully explore the potential interactions between these variables. In an attempt to fill this void, the current study uses data from the Relationship Characteristics Study conducted in 2001, which includes a sample of 1,938 college students, to provide a more comprehensive understanding of relationship violence among college students. This study examines the associations between students’ (1) sociodemographic characteristics, including race and ethnicity, university year, parents’ education, family income, parents’ marital status, and students’ relationship status as well as additional risk factors, consisting of alcohol consumption, drug use, and witnessing interparental violence, (2) domestic violence beliefs, including empirically-based and myth-based domestic violence causation endorsements as well as physical and sexual abuse, stalking, and verbal abuse definitions, and (3) relationship violence perpetration, including negotiation, psychological aggression, physical assault, sexual coercion, and injury. Separate analyses are conducted for male and female college students. Based on
previous research and theoretical foundations, it was expected that both college students’
sociodemographic characteristics and their domestic violence beliefs would be predictive of
relationship violence perpetration. It was further hypothesized that students’ sociodemographic
characteristics would impact their domestic violence beliefs. Findings generally support these
expectations. Implications for future research and policy are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Due, in part, to a large amount of research over the past three decades, domestic violence is now widely recognized as a serious problem (for review see Dulmus et al., 2004; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2005). Yet, despite existing research, it is not as well known that dating couples are significantly more likely to be violent in their relationships than married couples (e.g. Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). Specifically, college students experience an extremely high level of relationship violence, with prevalence rates ranging between 20 and 50% (e.g. Bethke & DeJoy, 1993; e.g. Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Clark et al., 1994; Makepeace, 1981, 1986; Shook et al., 2000; Straus, 2004b). Since relationship violence among college students is such a widespread problem, it is important to understand what lies at the foundation of this type of abuse.

Studies demonstrate correlations between college students’ sociodemographic characteristics, beliefs supportive of relationship violence, and perpetration of aggressive acts against intimate partners (e.g. Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003; Locke & Richman, 1999; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996). However, research to date fails to fully explore the potential interactions between these variables to provide a more comprehensive understanding of relationship violence among college students (e.g. Carlson & Worden, 2005). In an attempt to fill this void, the current study will provide an analysis of the correlations between college students’ sociodemographic characteristics, domestic violence beliefs and perceptions, and perpetration of relationship violence. With the knowledge provided by this research, college administrations
will be able to more effectively direct prevention programs toward students who are most likely to perpetrate relationship violence to eradicate this pervasive problem.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Relationship Violence among College Students

College students undeniably perpetrate high rates of verbal, physical, and sexual violence and stalking within their intimate relationships. Studies approximate that between 80 and 90% of students perpetrate verbal abuse against their partners (Clark et al., 1994; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996; Shook et al., 2000). In addition, Makepeace (1981) found that 62% of students have second hand experience with physical violence. Estimates of physical assault perpetration among college students range from 20 (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Makepeace, 1981, 1986; Shook et al., 2000) to 50% (Bethke & DeJoy, 1993; Clark et al., 1994; Straus & Ramirez, 2002), although most research indicates that approximately 30% of students are physically abusive toward their partners (Arias et al., 1987; Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996; Straus, 2004b; Straus & Yodanis, 1996). Violence occurs on more than one occasion in half of students’ physically violent intimate relationships and five or more times in 8% of their physically violent intimate relationships (Makepeace, 1981). Moreover, between 5 and 20% of college students engage in severe physical violence against their partners, perpetrating acts such as punching, choking, kicking, or attacking partners with a weapon (Arias et al., 1987; Makepeace, 1981; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996; Straus, 2004b; Straus et al., 1996). Although research investigating the prevalence of college students’ sexual violence among intimate partners is minimal, one study found that 0.3% of college students are sexually aggressive toward their partners (Bryant & Spencer, 2003). Additional studies indicate that between 17 and 25% of female students are victims of rape while they attend college (P. Finn, 1995; Fisher et al.,
Furthermore, Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000) suggest that 15% of attempted and 24% of completed sexual aggression against female students is perpetrated by a partner or ex-partner. Research investigating stalking rates among college students is also limited, primarily focusing on victimizations of female college students. These studies estimate that between 11 and 13% of female students experience this type of violence (Fisher et al., 2000; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999), with victims’ partners or ex-partners constituting almost half of the perpetrators (Fisher et al., 2000). Given the rates of psychological, physical, and sexual violence and stalking among college students, it is not surprising that 77% of students believe that relationship violence is a major problem (Knickrehm & Teske, 2000).

Sociodemographics and Relationship Violence

Studies exploring the associations between sociodemographic characteristics and relationship violence perpetration among both college students and the general population consider gender, race and ethnicity, age, and socioeconomic status. With the exception of age, correlations between sociodemographic characteristics and relationship violence perpetration vary by type of violence. Research delving into these relationships is generally more robust for perpetration of physical and sexual assault than it is for psychological abuse and stalking.

The majority of research investigating the correlations between sociodemographic characteristics and relationship violence perpetration focus on gender differences (e.g. Shook et al., 2000; Straus & Ramirez, 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b, 2000b). There are no differences between males’ and females’ perpetration of psychological abuse (Clark et al., 1994; Shook et al., 2000). In contrast, males are more likely to perpetrate both sexual assault (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 2000b) and stalking (Tjaden, 1997; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 1998b, 2000b) than females. However, findings regarding the correlation between gender and physical
aggression among intimate partners are contradictory. Whereas various studies conclude that men perpetrate up to 85% of physical violence within intimate relationships (Makepeace, 1981, 1986; Rennison, 2003; Rennison & Welchans, 2000; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 2000a, 2000b), additional research shows that women are more likely to be physically aggressive than men (Bowman & Morgan, 1998; Clark et al., 1994; Shook et al., 2000; Straus, 2004b), and still further explorations demonstrate that there is no gender difference related to acts of physical abuse committed against intimate partners (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Arias et al., 1987; Dibble & Straus, 1980; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996; Straus & Ramirez, 2002; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1997).

Researchers also consider race and ethnicity, age, and socioeconomic status as predictors of relationship violence perpetration (e.g. Anderson, 1997; Black et al., 2001; Cunradi et al., 2002; Johnson, 2000; Schumacher et al., 2001b; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 1998b). Studies lack an exploration of the association between race and ethnicity and perpetration of psychological abuse. Yet, researchers have shown that racial and ethnic minorities, especially African Americans, are more likely to physically assault intimate partners than Caucasians (Anderson, 1997; Mihalic & Elliott, 1997; O'Keefe, 1997). African Americans, Native Americans, and Alaskan Natives are most likely to be sexually aggressive against intimate partners, while Asians, Pacific Islanders, and Hispanics are least likely to perpetrate sexual violence in intimate relationships (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 2000a). Native Americans and Alaskan Natives are more likely to stalk their partners than any other racial and ethnic group (Tjaden, 1997; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). In addition, as with race and ethnicity, research lacks findings regarding the relationship between age and perpetration of psychological abuse. However, studies indicate that youth is associated with perpetration of physical (Anderson, 1997; Campbell et al., 1997; Cunradi et al., 2002; Johnson, 2000; Rennison & Welchans, 2000) and
sexual aggression against partners (Black et al., 2001) as well as stalking within intimate relationships (Tjaden, 1997; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998b). Furthermore, research indicates that socioeconomic status is not associated with perpetration of psychological aggression against intimate partners (Schumacher et al., 2001b) although low socioeconomic status is correlated with physical (Anderson, 1997; Caetano et al., 2001; Cunradi et al., 2002; Dibble & Straus, 1980; Johnson, 2000; Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1987; Mihalic & Elliott, 1997; Rennison & Welchans, 2000; Schumacher et al., 2001a) and sexual relationship violence perpetration (Black et al., 2001). More specifically, low income (Anderson, 1997; Cunradi et al., 2002; Dibble & Straus, 1980; McKenry et al., 1995; Rennison & Welchans, 2000) and low levels of education (Anderson, 1997; Cunradi et al., 2002; Schumacher et al., 2001a) are associated with physical relationship violence. However, evidence regarding the relationship between unemployment and violence is contradictory. For example, Johnson (2000) found that unemployment was associated with physical aggression toward intimate partners, but Cunradi and colleagues (2002) found that employment status is not predictive of physical assault against intimate partners. Low income and low levels of education as well as unemployment are also correlated with sexual violence perpetration (Black et al., 2001). To date researchers have failed to explore the association between socioeconomic status and perpetration of stalking within intimate relationships.

In addition to sociodemographic characteristics noted as risk factors, other factors unique to college students have been identified as potential risk factors for relationship violence. Studies identify Greek affiliation, athletic participation, alcohol consumption, and witnessing interparental violence as potential predictors of relationship violence perpetration among college students. Research investigating Greek affiliation and athletic participation is limited to male
physical and sexual perpetration. Worth and colleagues (1990) show that Greek affiliation is associated with physically abusing intimate partners. In fact, fraternity members make up half of the abusers in the study but only constitute eight percent of the non-abusers (Worth et al., 1990). The relationship between Greek affiliation and sexual aggression is not as clear. While some studies show that fraternity members are more likely to sexually abuse intimates than non-members (Brown et al., 2002; Lackie & de Man, 1997; Tyler et al., 1998), others demonstrate that there is no difference in sexual aggression between fraternity members and non-members (Koss & Gaines, 1993; Schwartz & Nogrady, 1996). Providing a more complex picture, Boeringer (1996) illustrates that fraternity members are more likely to use alcohol, drugs, and coercive strategies, but not physical force to obtain sex than non-members. In a study of nine universities, researchers show that athletes are more likely to commit physically violent acts against their partners than non-athletes (Crosset et al., 1996). Whereas athletes only represent 3% of the total male student population, they make up 35% of physically abusive perpetrators (Crosset et al., 1996). As with Greek affiliation, studies investigating the relationship between athletic involvement and sexual abuse provide contradictory results. Some research shows that athletes are more likely to rape their partners than non-athletes (Crosset et al., 1996; Koss & Gaines, 1993). For instance, Crosset and associates (1996) demonstrate that athletes constitute 3% of the total male student population and 19% of sexually abusive perpetrators. However, additional research illustrates that athletic involvement is not associated with sexual aggression (Boeringer, 1996; Brown et al., 2002). Studies show that alcohol consumption is not associated with psychological aggression (Lundeberg et al., 2004; Shook et al., 2000). Similarly, alcohol consumption is not related to physically abusing intimate partners among females (Lewis et al., 2002; Shook et al., 2000). However, it is predictive of male students physically (Lundeberg et
al., 2004; Shook et al., 2000) and sexually assaulting partners (Koss & Gaines, 1993; Schwartz & Nogrady, 1996). Researchers have not investigated the relationship between alcohol consumption and female sexual perpetration or male or female stalking within relationships. As with alcohol consumption, witnessing interparental violence during childhood is not associated with psychological aggression (Lundeberg et al., 2004; Shook et al., 2000). While some research shows similar results for physically abusing intimate partners (Alexander et al., 1991; Lundeberg et al., 2004), additional studies demonstrate that witnessing interparental violence during childhood is predictive of physical assault against partners (Breslin et al., 1990; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Riggs et al., 1990; Rosen et al., 2001; Worth et al., 1990). For example, Worth and colleagues (1990) report that respondents who witnessed violence between their parents as children constituted 54% of the study’s physically abusive group and only 32% of the non-abusive group. Studies have not investigated the correlations between witnessing interparental violence and sexual assault or the associations between witnessing interparental violence and stalking within relationships.

**Relationship Violence Beliefs and Perpetration**

Most research examining the association between beliefs supportive of relationship violence and perpetration among both college students and the general population investigates physical assaults against intimate partners (e.g. Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003; Dibble & Straus, 1980; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001). A limited amount considers the association between relationship violence beliefs and sexually assaulting intimate partners (e.g. Forbes et al., 2005). However, research lacks an exploration of the relationships between beliefs accepting relationship violence and perpetration of psychological aggression and stalking.
Studies sampling the general population indicate that beliefs accepting relationship violence are strongly correlated with physical aggression toward intimate partners (Archer & Haigh, 1997; Campbell et al., 1997; Cunradi et al., 2002; Dibble & Straus, 1980; J. Finn, 1986; Johnson, 2000; Kaufman Kantor et al., 1994; Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1987; Malamuth et al., 1991; O'Keefe, 1997; Russell & Hulson, 1992; Schumacher et al., 2001a; Stith & Farley, 1993). Dibble and Straus (1980) report that approximately 28% of respondents approved of physically abusing intimate partners. Although a much smaller percentage, 5% of participants were even accepting of severe relationship violence. Dibble and Straus (1980) additionally found that 33% of respondents who approved of physical aggression against intimate partners perpetrated relationship violence, while only 8% of respondents who were not supportive of physically abusing intimate partners reported perpetration, illustrating the predictive power of relationship violence beliefs.

Investigations delving into the association between relationship violence beliefs and perpetration among college students provide similar findings (Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003; Archer & Haigh, 1999; Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Knickrehm & Teske, 2000; Price et al., 1999; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996). Reitzel-Jaffe and Wolfe (2001) found that approximately 24% of students approve of physical relationship violence. Furthermore, Archer and Graham-Kevan (2003) found that beliefs supportive of relationship violence are more predictive of perpetrating physical assault against intimate partners among college students than among either respondents in domestic violence shelters or prisoners convicted of physically abusing intimate partners. Additional research demonstrates similar correlations between beliefs accepting relationship violence and sexual aggression against intimate partners among college students (Bachman et al., 1992; Forbes et al., 2005; Tyler et al., 1998). However, one study
shows that adherence to rape myths is not predictive of college students perpetrating sexual aggression (Schwartz & Nogrady, 1996).

Sociodemographics and Relationship Violence Beliefs

Although studies illustrate that relationship violence beliefs are predictive of aggression against intimate partners, research lacks a comprehensive exploration of who is most likely to hold beliefs supportive of relationship violence. The majority of research dealing with this topic investigates correlations between gender and beliefs accepting relationship violence (e.g. Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Mwamwenda, 1999; Price et al., 1999). A limited amount also examines race and ethnicity, age, socioeconomic status, and relationship status as predictors of beliefs supportive of aggression against intimate partners (e.g. Carlson, 1999; Carlson & Worden, 2005; Locke & Richman, 1999; Miller & Bukva, 2001; Price et al., 1999; Simon et al., 2001).

Research investigating the relationship between gender and beliefs supportive of relationship violence varies by type of violence. Males are more likely to accept psychological (Beyers et al., 2000; Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Knickrehm & Teske, 2000; Price et al., 1999) and sexual aggression (Auster & Leone, 2001; Beyers et al., 2000; Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Kirkwood & Cecil, 2001; Price et al., 1999; Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997) among intimate partners than females. For instance, Bryant and Spencer (2003) found that two-thirds of female college students and less than one-half of male college students strongly believe that forcing a spouse to have sex constitutes rape. However, research examining the association between gender and beliefs regarding physical assault within intimate relationships is contradictory. While some studies indicate that men are more likely to accept physical aggression toward intimate partners than women (Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003; Beyers et al., 2000; Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Carlson, 1999; Carlson & Worden, 2005; Fitzpatrick et al., 2004; Locke &
Richman, 1999; Markowitz, 2001; Miller & Bukva, 2001; Price et al., 1999; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996; Simon et al., 2001; Wagner & Mongan, 1998; Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997), others show no correlation between gender and beliefs supportive of physical relationship violence (Archer & Haigh, 1997; Arias & Johnson, 1989; Dibble & Straus, 1980; Mwamwenda, 1999). Mwamwenda (1999), for example, found that approximately 25% of both male and female college students approve of domestic violence. Research lacks findings regarding the association between gender and beliefs related to stalking among partners.

Additional research delves into the associations between race and ethnicity, age, socioeconomic status, and relationship status and beliefs supportive of relationship violence. Racial and ethnic minorities are more likely to accept physical aggression (Locke & Richman, 1999; Markowitz, 2001; Miller & Bukva, 2001; Simon et al., 2001) and stalking (Carlson & Worden, 2005) within intimate relationships than Caucasians. More specifically, Locke and Richman (1999) found that African Americans are most likely to approve of physical relationship violence. Youth is also correlated with beliefs supportive of physical assault (Archer & Haigh, 1997; Campbell et al., 1997; Carlson, 1999; Carlson & Worden, 2005; Simon et al., 2001; Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997) and stalking (Carlson & Worden, 2005) perpetration against intimate partners. Studies fail to consider race and ethnicity and age as potential predictors of psychological and sexual aggression among partners. Additionally, socioeconomic status is not predictive of beliefs accepting psychological abuse in intimate relationships (Carlson & Worden, 2005; Miller & Bukva, 2001). Research regarding the associations between socioeconomic status and beliefs supportive of physical and sexual abuse against intimate partners is contradictory. Whereas some studies found that both low income (Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1987; Mihalic & Elliott, 1997; Simon et al., 2001) and low levels of
and are associated with beliefs accepting physical relationship violence, additional studies found that neither education (Miller & Bukva, 2001) nor income (Carlson & Worden, 2005; Dibble & Straus, 1980; Miller & Bukva, 2001) are predictive of these beliefs. Similarly, Price and colleagues (Price et al., 1999) show that low socioeconomic status is predictive of beliefs approving of sexual relationship violence, additional research indicates that socioeconomic status is not predictive of these beliefs (Carlson & Worden, 2005; Miller & Bukva, 2001). Research to date has yet to investigate the relationship between socioeconomic status and beliefs related to stalking among partners. As with socioeconomic status, the research regarding relationship status as a predictor of beliefs regarding physical assault against intimate partners is inconsistent.

Some studies show that respondents who were not currently in an intimate relationship were most likely to accept physical relationship violence (Carlson & Worden, 2005; Simon et al., 2001). Carlson (1999) conversely found that respondents who were currently in an intimate relationship were most likely to approve of physically abusing intimate partners. Furthermore, Miller and Bukva (2001) alternatively suggest that relationship status is not predictive of beliefs regarding physical aggression among partners. Studies fail to delve into relationship status as a potential predictor of beliefs related to psychological and sexual aggression as well as stalking within intimate relationships.

Research additionally recognizes Greek membership, athletic involvement, and witnessing interparental violence as predictors of beliefs supportive of relationship violence among college students. Studies delving into Greek membership and athletic involvement are limited to correlations with males’ beliefs regarding sexual aggression, demonstrating that males who participate in fraternities (Auster & Leone, 2001; Boeringer, 1999) and athletics (Boeringer,
1999) are more likely to hold rape supportive beliefs than those who do not belong to those
groups. Additionally, observing violence between parents during childhood is associated with
acceptance of physical aggression within relationships (Reitzel-Jaffé & Wolfe, 2001; Riggs &
O'Leary, 1996). Research to date fails to consider witnessing interparental violence as a
precursor to beliefs regarding psychological and sexual abuse or stalking.

Theoretical Background

**Feminist Theory**

Feminist theory suggests that societal norms of patriarchy allow for the systematic
oppression of women (Bersani & Chen, 1988; Jaffe et al., 1992; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999; Wolfe
& Jaffe, 1999). DeKeseredy and Kelly (1993) outline two types of patriarchy – social and
familial. Whereas social patriarchy allows males to dominate females at the societal level,
familial patriarchy supports males’ domination of females in intimate relationships (DeKeseredy
& Kelly, 1993). Feminist theory additionally suggests that women who either reject or fail to
meet familial patriarchal ideals of female behavior, such as subordination, respect, loyalty,
dependency, and sexual availability, violate patriarchal norms (Bersani & Chen, 1988; Jaffe et
Consequently, these women are viewed as appropriate victims of relationship violence (Bersani
& Chen, 1988; Jaffe et al., 1992; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999; Wolfe
& Jaffe, 1999). Therefore, feminist theory provides a theoretical explanation for gender
differences in both relationship violence beliefs and perpetration.
Subculture of Violence Theory

The subculture of violence theory proposes that violence is the result of commitment to subcultural values, attitudes, and norms (Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Bersani & Chen, 1988; Markowitz, 2001; Markowitz & Felson, 1998; Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967). Values are defined as beliefs related to desired goals or methods of achieving goals and attitudes are defined as organized beliefs regarding a specific topic (Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Bersani & Chen, 1988; Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967). The theory further suggests that members of violent subcultures evaluate each other in terms of conformity to a machismo or masculine lifestyle, which includes leading an exciting life, achieving status within the subculture, and protecting one’s honor (Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Bersani & Chen, 1988; Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967). Therefore, the subculture of violence theory postulates that values or beliefs are important predictors of attitudes which are, in turn, predictors of behaviors (Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Bersani & Chen, 1988; Markowitz, 2001; Markowitz & Felson, 1998; Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967). This theory is used to explain sociodemographic differences in the perpetration of violence, such as those related to gender, race and ethnicity, age, and socioeconomic status (Ball-Rokeach, 1973; Bersani & Chen, 1988; Markowitz, 2001; Markowitz & Felson, 1998; Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967). Relatedly, the attitude mediation thesis considers the causal structure of the subculture of violence theory, postulating that attitudes mediate sociodemographic variations in the perpetration of violence (Markowitz, 2001; Markowitz & Felson, 1998). Based on this thesis, the inclusion of relationship violence beliefs should enhance the predictive model addressing correlations between sociodemographic risk factors and perpetration of violence.
Theory of Reasoned Action

The theory of reasoned action closely mirrors the subculture of violence theory and attitude mediation thesis. It suggests that behaviors are shaped by intentions, which are influenced by attitudes (Roberto et al., 2003; Witte et al., 2001). This theory additionally indicates that attitudes are formed through specific beliefs, demonstrating that behaviors are ultimately the result of specific beliefs (Roberto et al., 2003; Witte et al., 2001). The theory of reasoned action provides an additional theoretical foundation explaining associations between beliefs supportive of violence and perpetration of violent acts.

Hypotheses

The present study builds on existing research by analyzing the correlations between sociodemographic characteristics, domestic violence beliefs, and relationship violence perpetration among college students. Based on prior research and theoretical foundations, it is hypothesized that students’ sociodemographic characteristics will be associated with domestic violence beliefs and relationship violence perpetration. It is further expected that students’ domestic violence beliefs will be correlated with relationship violence perpetration. More specific hypotheses for the subsequent analysis are listed below. Due to a lack of conclusive findings in previous studies and a dearth of theoretical explanations, no expectations are provided regarding respondents’ parents’ marital status, relationship status, or drug use.

- Models for male and female students will demonstrate gender differences similar to those evidenced in prior research and accounted for theoretically.
- Racial and ethnic minorities will be more likely to commit acts of aggression against their partners than Caucasians.
• Students who have completed fewer years at the university will be more likely to perpetrate relationship violence than those who have completed more years at the university.

• Students whose parents have lower educational achievements will be more likely to commit aggressive acts against their partners than those whose parents have higher educational achievements.

• Students who have lower family incomes will be more likely to perpetrate acts of violence against their partners than those who have higher family incomes.

• The more alcohol students consume, the more likely they will be to commit violent acts against their partners.

• Students who hear or see interparental violence during childhood will be more likely to perpetrate relationship violence than those who do not hear or see interparental violence.

• Students who score higher on the myth-based domestic violence causation scale will be more likely to act aggressively toward their partners than those who score lower on the scale.

• Students who score lower on the empirically-grounded domestic violence causation scale will be more likely to perpetrate relationship violence than those who score higher on the scale.

• Students who score lower on the physical and sexual abuse definition scale will be more likely to commit abusive acts within their intimate relationships than those who score higher on the scale.

• Students who score lower on the verbal abuse definition scale will be more likely to perpetrate violent acts against their partners than those who score higher on the scale.
• Students who score lower on the stalking definition scale will be more likely to abuse their partners than those who score higher on the scale.

• Racial and ethnic minorities will be more likely to hold beliefs accepting of domestic violence than Caucasians.

• Students who have completed fewer years at the university will be more likely to hold beliefs supportive of domestic violence than those who have completed more years at the university.

• Students whose parents have lower educational achievements will be more likely to accept domestic violence than those whose parents have higher educational achievements.

• Students who have lower family incomes will be more likely to support domestic violence than those who have higher family incomes.

• The more alcohol students consume, the more likely they will be to hold attitudes supportive of domestic violence.

• Students who hear or see interparental violence during childhood will be more likely to accept domestic violence than those who do not hear or see interparental violence.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Data

Data for this analysis are taken from the cross-sectional Relationship Characteristics Study (Dietz & Jasinski, 2003). Researchers collected these data using a convenience sample of 1,938 undergraduate students at a large university in Florida during the fall 2001 semester. Respondents were selected from introductory sociology and anthropology courses, which fulfill general education requirements for the university. This selection allowed for the inclusion of students from a variety of disciplines. Participants were informed of the procedures used to protect their anonymity and voluntarily completed the questionnaire during class in less than 75 minutes. After completing the questionnaire, respondents were given information sheets that detailed the purpose of the study and provided resources in the area that offer assistance with relationship violence problems.

The Relationship Characteristics Study included sociodemographic questions about respondents’ and partners’ gender, respondents’ age, race and ethnicity, educational level, family income, parents’ education, parents’ marital status, respondents’ relationship status, cohabitation, length of relationship, and sexual activity within their relationship. Participants also answered questions regarding video game use, family commitment, alcohol and controlled substance use, and pets. Additionally, the study included a short version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale, the BEM Sex-Role Inventory, and the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale. Finally, the Relationship Characteristics Study posed questions about participants witnessing
violence between parents or guardians, their victimization and help-seeking behaviors, and their beliefs toward domestic violence.

Measures

Sociodemographics

The sociodemographic characteristics included in this analysis consist of gender, race and ethnicity, university year, father’s education, mother’s education, family income, parents’ marital status, relationship status, alcohol consumption, drug use, and witnessing interparental violence. Participants indicated their gender as either (1) male or (2) female. Race and ethnicity was identified as (1) Asian, (2) African American, (3) Caucasian, (4) Native American, (5) Hispanic, or (6) other. Due to the relatively small percentages of Asian, Native American, and other respondents, these cases were collapsed, forming a new other category in the following investigation. Race and ethnicity was dichotomized in the subsequent analysis for African American, Caucasian, Hispanic, and other racial and ethnic groups. Although age was identified as a possible predictor of relationship violence beliefs and perpetration in earlier studies, age was not included in the following analyses because of the intrinsic lack of variance in age associated with college students as a population. The following exploration relied on university year instead. Participants’ specified their year at the university as (1) freshman, (2) sophomore, (3) junior, (4) senior, or (5) other. Those who indicated their university year as other were not included in the subsequent examination. Respondents denoted their fathers’ and mothers’ highest level of education as (1) less than high school, (2) high school graduate, (3) some college, (4) two-year college graduate, (5) four-year college graduate, (6) some graduate school, or (7) graduate degree. Participants estimated their families’ yearly income as (1) under $9,999, (2) $10,000 to 19,999, (3) $20,000 to 29,999, (4) $30,000 to 39,999, (5) $40,000 to 49,999, (6)
$50,000 to 59,999, (7) $60,000 to 69,999, (8) $70,000 to 79,999, or (9) $80,000 or more.

Participants specified their parents’ current marital status as (1) married to each other, (2) separated, (3) divorced, (4) never married to each other, or (5) one or both parents have died. Due to the relatively low percentages of respondents whose parents were either separated, never married to each other, or one or both parents had died as well as a lack of significant differences at the bivariate level between those respondents and respondents whose parents were divorced, parents’ marital status was recoded as either (0) currently married to each other or (1) not currently married to each other. Respondents indicated their relationship status by answering: (1) I am currently in a relationship that has lasted at least one month, (2) I have been in a relationship that has lasted at least one month, but am not now, or (3) I have never been in a relationship that has lasted at least one month. Since this study explores college students’ relationship violence perpetration, respondents who had never been in a relationship that lasted at least one month were not included in the subsequent analyses. Therefore, relationship status was recoded as (0) I am currently in a relationship that has lasted at least one month or (1) I have been in a relationship that has lasted at least one month, but am not now. Since the Relationship Characteristics Study did not pose questions regarding students’ Greek or athletic affiliations, these potential risk factors for relationship violence approval and perpetration were not assessed in the following analysis. Respondents indicated how often they drank alcohol on average in the previous year on a scale of zero (never) to nine (seven days a week). They additionally specified whether they tried marijuana, amphetamines, barbiturates, tranquilizers, cocaine, heroin, other opiates, psychedelics, steroids, ecstasy, inhalants, GHB, or rohypnol in the previous year by answering no (0) or yes (1) for each drug. For the purposes of this analysis, these answers were collapsed to form an overall drug use variable, with possible values of zero (did not try drugs in
the previous year) or one (did try drugs in the previous year). Finally, respondents answered questions about hearing and seeing interparental violence when they were children by replying no (0) or yes (1). With the exclusion of respondents indicating their university year as other and those specifying that they have never been in a relationship that has lasted at least one month, the final sample for this analysis included 1631 respondents.

**Domestic Violence Beliefs**

The domestic violence beliefs measures included in this analysis were comprised of two sets of variables developed by Carlson and Worden (2005; Worden & Carlson, 2005). The first set of variables consisted of 10 items evaluating respondents’ domestic violence causation endorsement. Respondents indicated whether they (0) disagree or (1) agree with each statement. Five of these items were myth-based causes of domestic violence. These variables included: (a) a lot of what is called “domestic violence” is really just a normal reaction to day-to-day stress and frustration; (b) some violence is caused by women starting physical fights; (c) some women who are abused secretly want to be treated that way; (d) most women could find a way to get out of an abusive relationship if they really want to; and (e) some violence is caused by the way women treat men. The remaining five items were empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence. These variables included: (a) people who are violent toward their family members are not likely to change; (b) husbands who shout, yell, and curse at their wives are likely to become physically violent eventually; (c) society teaches boys to be physically aggressive; (d) most men who act abusively toward family members have psychological or personality problems; and (e) much domestic violence is caused by alcohol and drugs.

The second set of variables contained 10 items investigating participants’ beliefs about what constitutes domestic violence. Respondents specified what they would define as domestic
violence by replying (0) no or (1) yes to five actions representing verbal, physical, and sexual abuse and stalking. These variables included: (a) a husband to insult his wife by calling her a “stupid slob”; (b) a husband to slap his wife during an argument; (c) a husband to punch his wife with his fist; (d) a husband to use physical force to make his wife have sex with him; and (e) a man to follow his former girlfriend all over town to try to get her to get back together with him. Each action was presented twice – once with a male perpetrator and once with a female perpetrator.

Using factor analysis, a subsequent exploration developed the five scales used in this analysis from the 20 domestic violence belief items (Nabors et al., 2006). The scales consist of myth-based and empirically-grounded domestic violence causation scales as well as physical and sexual abuse, verbal abuse, and stalking definition scales. Only one of the 10 domestic violence definition items, a wife slapping her husband during an argument, did not load on any of the factors identified and was therefore excluded from the definition scales. Researchers suggested that this item did not load on the physical and sexual abuse factor, even though the same item presented with a male perpetrator did load on that factor, because of the societal tendency to normalize and even trivialize females’ minor aggression against males (Nabors et al., 2006). The myth-based and empirically-grounded causation scales range from zero to five, with higher scores indicating more agreement with domestic violence causation. The physical and sexual abuse definition scale ranges from zero to five and the verbal abuse and stalking definition scales range from zero to two. Higher scores on these scales indicate more agreement with domestic violence definitions. The researchers reported coefficient alphas of .44 for the myth-based and .48 for the empirically-grounded causation scales and .68 for the physical and sexual abuse, .89 for the verbal abuse, and .94 for the stalking definition scales (Nabors et al., 2006).
Relationship Violence Perpetration

The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus et al., 1996) is a revised and expanded version of the original Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS1; Straus, 1979). The CTS1 contains 19 pairs of items that assess reasoning, verbal aggression, and violence among intimate partners. Building on the CTS1, the CTS2 consists of 39 pairs of items measuring negotiation, psychological aggression, physical assault, sexual coercion, and injury. Respondents answer questions regarding their partners’ as well as their own use of each conflict tactic. They indicate whether each action has happened in the past year, has not happened in the past year, but has happened before, or has never happened. Additionally, respondents specify how often each action occurred in the previous year on a scale of one (once in the past year) to six (more than 20 times in the past year). These responses can be used to calculate incidence (whether the action has occurred in the previous year), chronicity (how many times the action has occurred in the previous year), and prevalence scores (whether the action has ever occurred) for respondents’ relationship violence perpetration and victimization. Researchers reported that reliability for the CTS2 scores range from .79 to .95 (Straus et al., 1996). Various additional studies also demonstrate the reliability and validity of these scores (Straus, 1979, 1990, 2004a).

Four versions of the CTS2 were employed in the Relationship Characteristics Study. The first version used the original CTS2 ordering, inquiring about respondents’ behaviors and then their partners’ behaviors, while the second version asked respondents about their partners’ behaviors and then their own behaviors. The last two versions were unpaired randomized versions of the CTS2. The third version did not include any negotiation items and the fourth version only included two negotiation items.
This study investigates respondents’ relationship behaviors, so scores related to their partners’ relationship behaviors were not included in the following analysis. Since chronicity scores generally lack variance, this analysis only relied on incidence and prevalence scores. Total, emotional, and cognitive negotiation scores were taken into account in the subsequent exploration, as well as total, minor, and severe psychological aggression, physical assault, sexual coercion, and injury scores.

Social Desirability

To control for respondents’ potential response bias to perceived culturally unacceptable relationship violence beliefs and perpetration, the Marlowe-Crowne Form C (MC Form C; Reynolds, 1982), a shortened version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (MCSDS; Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), was included at the multivariate level in the following analysis. The MCSDS is composed of 33 culturally acceptable but relatively improbable behaviors with true and false response categories. Crowne and Marlowe (1960) report an internal consistency coefficient of .88 and a test-retest correlation of .89 for the scale. The abbreviated MC Form C consists of 13 of the original 33 items included in the MCSDS, with an internal consistency coefficient of .76 (Reynolds, 1982). The Relationship Characteristics Study presented these 13 items with a four point Likert scale with response categories ranging from one (strongly disagree) to four (strongly agree).

Analytic Strategy

Analyses of respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics, domestic violence beliefs, and relationship violence perpetration are conducted at univariate, bivariate, and multivariate levels. Due to the differences between men and women’s relationship violence beliefs and
perpetration illustrated in previous findings and theory, separate analyses are conducted for male and female students. Frequency distributions are provided for: (1) participants’ sociodemographic characteristics, including race and ethnicity, university year, fathers’ and mothers’ education, family income, parents’ marital status, relationship status, alcohol consumption, drug use, and witnessing interparental violence; (2) their domestic violence beliefs, which consist of myth-based causation, empirically-grounded causation, physical and sexual abuse definition, verbal abuse definition, and stalking definition scales; and (3) their relationship violence perpetration, containing incidence and prevalence scores for total, emotional, and cognitive negotiation and total, minor, and severe psychological aggression, physical assault, sexual coercion, and injury. Two-way contingency table analyses using cross-tabulations and independent-samples t tests are employed where appropriate to explore the associations between respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and relationship violence perpetration. Independent-samples t tests are used to assess the correlations between participants’ domestic violence beliefs and relationship violence perpetration. One-way analyses of variance (one-way ANOVAs), independent-samples t tests, and Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients are conducted where fitting to evaluate the relationships between respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs. Finally, multiple linear regressions are employed to examine the associations between sociodemographic characteristics, domestic violence beliefs, and relationship violence perpetration among college students, controlling for social desirability. A model of the analysis is provided in Figure 1.
Figure 1: Model of Analysis
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Frequency Distributions

Sociodemographics

The sample includes 1631 college students, with 635 males and 996 females. Table 1 presents the frequency distributions for male and female students’ sociodemographic characteristics. Approximately 73% of male respondents and 70% of female respondents are Caucasian. The remaining participants are relatively evenly distributed among racial and ethnic groups. The majority of male and female participants are freshman (65 and 62%, respectively), with only about 15% male and 14% female sophomores, 11% male and 12% female juniors, and 9% male and 12% female seniors. Mean fathers’ and mothers’ highest level of education for both males and females is an associate degree. Male and female students’ mean family yearly income is $60,000 to 69,999. The majority of both males’ and females’ parents are currently married to each other (69 and 62%, respectively). While only 46% of male students report currently being in a relationship that has lasted at least one month, 57% of female students report currently being in a relationship. Mean alcohol consumption during the previous year was one day per week for male participants and one day per month for female participants. Approximately half of males and females indicated trying drugs during the previous year (51 and 48%, respectively). More female students reported hearing (18%) and seeing (15%) their parents hitting each other when they were children than males (15 and 13%, respectively).
Table 1: Frequency Distributions for Sociodemographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male (N=635)</th>
<th>Female (N=996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>64.6%</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Father’s Education</strong></td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Mother’s Education</strong></td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Family Income</strong></td>
<td>$60,000 – 69,999</td>
<td>$60,000 – 69,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents’ Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in relationship</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously in relationship</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Alcohol Consumption</strong></td>
<td>1 day per week</td>
<td>1 day per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Use</strong></td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposure to Violence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear parents hitting</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See parents hitting</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
Domestic Violence Beliefs

Table 2 displays the frequency distributions for male and female students’ domestic violence causation belief items, with the five myth-based causes listed first, followed by the five empirically-grounded causes. The majority of males and females agreed with the myth-based causes of domestic violence, with two exceptions. Only about 15% of males and 5% of females agreed that a lot of what is called “domestic violence” is really just a normal reaction to day-to-day stress and frustration and roughly 32% of males and 23% of females agreed that some women who are abused secretly want to be treated that way. Males demonstrated more support for four of the five the myth-based causes of domestic violence than females. At least two thirds of both male and female students agreed with each of the empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence. Male respondents showed less agreement with all of the empirically-grounded causes than female respondents.
Table 2: Frequency Distributions for Domestic Violence Causation Belief Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male (N=635)</th>
<th>Female (N=996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot of what is called “domestic violence” is really just a normal reaction to day-to-day stress and frustration.</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some violence is caused by women starting physical fights.</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some women who are abused secretly want to be treated that way.</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most women could find a way to get out of an abusive relationship if they really wanted to.</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some violence is caused by the way women treat men.</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who are violent toward their family members are not likely to change.</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands who shout, yell, and curse at their wives are likely to become physically violent eventually.</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society teaches boys to be physically aggressive.</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most men who act abusively toward family members have psychological or personality problems.</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much domestic violence is caused by alcohol and drugs.</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.

Table 3 provides the frequency distributions for male and female students’ domestic violence definition belief items, with the six physical and sexual abuse items listed first, followed by the two verbal abuse items, and finally the two stalking items. A majority of males and females agreed that the physical and sexual abuse items constitute domestic violence. Less than one third of male and female students considered the verbal abuse items to be forms of domestic violence. Just under half of both males and females indicated that they considered the stalking
items to represent domestic violence. Males were less likely to agree with all of the domestic violence definition items than females.

Table 3: Frequency Distributions for Domestic Violence Definition Belief Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband to use physical force to make wife have sex.</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife to use physical force to make her husband have sex.</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband to punch wife with fist.</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife to punch husband with fist.</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband to slap wife during an argument.</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife to slap husband during an argument.</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband to insult wife by calling her “a stupid slob”.</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife to insult husband by calling him “a stupid slob”.</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man to follow former girlfriend all over town to try to get her back.</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman to follow former boyfriend all over town to try to get him back.</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.

Table 4 presents the means, standard deviations, and reliabilities for the domestic violence causation and definition belief scales for male and female respondents. Both the myth-based and empirically-grounded causation scales range from zero to five, with higher scores indicating a greater endorsement of domestic violence causes. Male respondents’ mean on the myth-based domestic violence causation scale is 2.74 with a standard deviation of 1.19 and a coefficient alpha of .47. Female respondents’ mean on the myth-based scale is slightly lower.
than that of male respondents at 2.44 with a standard deviation of 1.08 and coefficient alpha of .40, showing that female students are less likely to believe myth-based causes of domestic violence than male students. Males’ mean score on the empirically-grounded domestic violence causation scale is 3.57 with a standard deviation of 1.32 and a coefficient alpha of .53. Females’ mean score is higher than males’ mean score on the empirically-grounded scale at 4.00 with a standard deviation of 1.07 and a coefficient alpha of .41, demonstrating that female students are more likely to endorse empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence than male students.

Like the causation scales, the physical and sexual abuse scale ranges from zero to five. Higher scores on this scale indicate more endorsement of defining physical and sexual abuse as domestic violence. Whereas male students’ mean score on the physical and sexual abuse definition scale is 4.50 with a standard deviation of 1.05 and a coefficient alpha of .75, female students’ mean score is higher at 4.77 with a standard deviation of .64 and a coefficient alpha of .61. Both the verbal abuse and stalking definition scales range from zero to two and, as with the physical and sexual abuse scale, higher scores indicate that respondents are more likely to consider each type of aggression to be domestic violence. The verbal abuse definition scale mean for male participants is .49, the standard deviation is .81, and the coefficient alpha is .88. Only slightly higher, female participants’ mean score on the verbal abuse scale is .57 with a standard deviation of .86 and a coefficient alpha of .91. Males’ mean score on the stalking definition scale is .86 with a standard deviation of .96 and a coefficient alpha of .93. As with the verbal abuse scale, females’ mean score on this scale is marginally higher than that of males’ mean score at .91 with a standard deviation of .97 and a coefficient alpha of .95. Females’ consistently higher scores on the definition scales show that female students are more likely to consider physical and sexual abuse, verbal abuse, and stalking to be domestic violence than male students.
Independent-samples t tests were conducted to determine whether male and female students differ significantly on each of the domestic violence scales. Scales with significant differences in means are identified in Table 4. Tests were significant for the myth-based causation scale ($t(1574)=5.16$, $p=.000$), empirically-grounded causation scale ($t(1105.40)=-6.82$, $p=.000$), and the physical and sexual abuse definition scale ($t(908.58)=-5.84$, $p=.000$). These results demonstrate that male and female students’ mean scores are significantly different for both of the causation scales as well as the physical and sexual abuse definition scale. Males’ mean score on the myth-based causation scale is significantly greater than females’ mean score. The mean scores for the empirically-grounded causation scale and physical and sexual abuse definition scale are significantly higher for females than for males. These findings provide empirical evidence for conducting separate analyses for men and women. However, tests for the verbal abuse ($t(1389.87)=-1.88$, $p=.061$) and stalking definition scales ($t(1342.89)=-1.01$, $p=.313$) did not demonstrate significant differences in mean scores across respondents’ gender.

Table 4: Means, Standard Deviations, and Reliabilities for Domestic Violence Belief Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male (N=635)</th>
<th>Female (N=996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Myth-based, empirically-grounded, and physical and sexual abuse scales range 0-5; verbal abuse and stalking scales range 0-2. Higher scores indicate greater level of agreement. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 5 displays the frequency distributions for male and female participants’ relationship violence perpetration, providing percentages for both incidence (perpetration during the previous year) and prevalence (perpetration ever). Most male and female students, between 85 and 99%, use emotional and cognitive negotiation tactics with their partners, with females demonstrating slightly higher use of each negotiation tactic than males. The majority of male and female respondents perpetrate minor psychological aggression against a partner and roughly 20% perpetrate severe psychological aggression. While higher percentages of female students report using minor psychological aggression within their relationships than male students, higher percentages of males report using severe psychological aggression than females. More than one quarter of men and women perpetrate minor physical assault against their partners and between 10 and 13% perpetrate severe physical assault. As with psychological aggression, females demonstrate higher percentages of minor physical assault than males but males demonstrate higher percentages of severe physical assault. Approximately 30% of males use minor sexual coercion and 8% use severe sexual coercion. The corresponding sexual coercion rates for females are only half those of males, with roughly 15% using minor sexual coercion and 3% using severe sexual coercion. Males are also more likely injure their partners than females. Between 12 and 14% of males report inflicting minor injuries whereas only between 8 and 10% of females inflict minor injuries. Similarly, roughly 9% of males report inflicting severe injuries and just 2 to 3% of females inflict severe injuries.

Two-way contingency table analyses using cross-tabulations were conducted to determine whether students’ gender was significantly correlated with each of the perpetration
scores. Twelve variables, which are noted in Table 5, demonstrated significant differences across respondents’ gender. The significant incidence variables are emotional and cognitive negotiation, minor and total psychological aggression, minor, severe, and total sexual coercion, and minor, severe, and total injury. Significant prevalence variables include emotional, cognitive, and total negotiation, minor and total psychological aggression, total physical assault, minor, severe, and total sexual coercion, and minor, severe, and total injury. These results provide additional empirical support for conducting separate analyses for male and female students.
Table 5: Frequency Distributions for Relationship Violence Perpetration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% Incidence</th>
<th>% Prevalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (N=635)</td>
<td>Female (N=996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>92.9*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>89.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Aggression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>70.8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>72.1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Coercion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>14.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>2.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>15.6***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>8.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.8**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Both male and female students’ prevalence of relationship violence closely mirrors their incidence of relationship violence. Additionally, incidence scores are more consistent with the measures for respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics than prevalence scores. Therefore, only incidence scores will be included in the subsequent bivariate and multivariate analyses.
Bivariate Analyses

Sociodemographics and Relationship Violence Perpetration

Tables 6 through 15 present the bivariate results analyzing the correlations between male and female college students’ sociodemographic characteristics and their relationship violence perpetration. Separate two-way contingency table analyses using cross-tabulations were conducted to examine whether students’ race and ethnicity, university year, parents’ marital status, relationship status, drug use, and exposure to interparental violence during childhood were significantly associated with relationship violence. Percentages for chi-squares are provided first in each table. Independent-samples t tests were performed to determine whether students’ parents’ educational achievements, family yearly income, and alcohol consumption were significantly associated with their use of relationship violence. Means for t tests are given after percentages for chi-squares at the bottom of each table.

Table 6 provides the bivariate results demonstrating the correlations between male respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and use of negotiation tactics within relationships. Only one variable, relationship status, was statistically significant. Males who were currently in a relationship were significantly more likely to use emotional ($\chi^2(1, 619)=15.67, p=.000$) and total negotiation tactics ($\chi^2(1, 620)=11.20, p=.001$) than males who had previously been but were not currently in a relationship.
Table 6: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Negotiation (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>84.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>95.1***</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>95.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear parents hitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See parents hitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 7 presents the bivariate results examining associations between female respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and use of negotiation tactics within relationships.
Two variables, including relationship status and drug use, were statistically significant. Similar to results for males, females who were currently in a relationship were significantly more likely to use emotional ($\chi^2(1, 978)=45.31, p=.000$), cognitive ($\chi^2(1, 975)=32.91, p=.000$), and total negotiation tactics ($\chi^2(1, 978)=45.90, p=.000$) than females who had previously been but were not currently in a relationship. Additionally, unlike male students, female students who tried drugs in the previous year were significantly more likely to use cognitive negotiation tactics with intimate partners than females who did not try drugs in the previous year ($\chi^2(1, 969)=4.27$, $p=.039$).
Table 7: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Negotiation (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>94.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>91.5</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Marital Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>94.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>97.7***</td>
<td>94.6***</td>
<td>98.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>92.1*</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 8 shows the bivariate results assessing the associations between male respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and psychological aggression against intimate partners. Three
variables, consisting of drug use, family yearly income, and alcohol consumption, were statistically significant. Males who tried drugs during the previous year were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor ($\chi^2(1, 615)=12.94, p=.000$) and total psychological aggression within relationships ($\chi^2(1, 615)=12.44, p=.000$) than males who did not try drugs during the previous year. Additionally, participants’ mean family yearly income was significantly higher for those perpetrating total psychological aggression against intimate partners than for those not perpetrating total psychological aggression ($t(374.11)=-2.22, p=.000$). Males’ mean alcohol consumption was also greater for those using minor ($t(612)=-3.61, p=.000$), severe ($t(206.57)=-2.42, p=.016$), and total psychological aggression within relationships ($t(612)=-3.40, p=.001$) than those not using minor, severe, and total psychological aggression.
Table 8: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Psychological Aggression (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Psychological Aggression</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.7***</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>72.6***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear parents hitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See parents hitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.60***</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

The bivariate results examining the relationships between female respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and psychological aggression within relationships are
presented in Table 9. Nine variables, including race and ethnicity, university year, parents’ marital status, relationship status, drug use, hearing interparental violence, seeing interparental violence, mothers’ education, and alcohol consumption, were statistically significant. Female students’ race and ethnicity was significantly related to their use of severe psychological aggression ($\chi^2(3, 967)=17.20, p=.001$). Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted to determine the differences among female students’ racial and ethnic groups. Pairwise differences were found between African American and Caucasian respondents ($\chi^2(1, 767)=15.11, p=.000$) as well as between African American and Hispanic respondents ($\chi^2(1, 206)=11.08, p=.001$), with African Americans more likely to perpetrate severe psychological aggression against intimate partners (35%) than either Caucasians (17%) or Hispanics (15%). Females’ year at the university was significantly associated with their perpetration of minor psychological aggression ($\chi^2(3, 970)=8.25, p=.041$). As with race and ethnicity, follow-up pairwise comparisons were performed to evaluate the differences among female students’ university year. Pairwise differences were found between freshmen and seniors ($\chi^2(1, 717)=4.19, p=.027$) as well as sophomores and seniors ($\chi^2(1, 206)=7.82, p=.005$). Both freshmen (70%) and sophomores (64%) were significantly less likely than seniors (80%) to report using minor psychological aggression within relationships. Students’ whose parents were currently married to each other were significantly less likely to report minor ($\chi^2(1, 970)=7.25, p=.007$), severe ($\chi^2(1, 968)=5.01, p=.025$), and total psychological aggression against intimate partners ($\chi^2(1,969)=6.22, p=.013$) than students’ whose parents were not currently married to each other. Female participants who were currently in a relationship were significantly more likely to use minor ($\chi^2(1, 970)=8.83, p=.003$) and total psychological aggression against their partners ($\chi^2(1,969)=9.44, p=.002$) than participants who had previously been but were not currently in a relationship. Similar to results
for male respondents, female respondents who tried drugs during the previous year were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor (χ²(1, 964)=25.78, p=.000), severe (χ²(1, 963)=9.63, p=.002), and total psychological aggression (χ²(1, 964)=22.55, p=.000) than respondents who did not try drugs during the previous year. Students who heard their parents hitting each other during childhood were significantly more likely to use minor (χ²(1, 935)=7.82, p=.005), severe (χ²(1, 933)=17.11, p=.000), and total psychological aggression within relationships (χ²(1, 934)=9.01, p=.003) than students who did not. Similarly, those who saw their parents hitting each other during childhood were also more likely to perpetrate minor (χ²(1, 966)=7.51, p=.006), severe (χ²(1, 964)=16.20, p=.000), and total psychological aggression (χ²(1, 965)=9.24, p=.002) than students who did not. Mean mothers’ highest level of education was significantly higher for respondents perpetrating severe psychological aggression against their partners than for respondents not perpetrating severe psychological aggression (t(963)=−2.04, p=.042). Finally, as with males, mean alcohol consumption was significantly higher for females using minor (t(544.69)=−4.95, p=.000), severe (t(962)=−3.04, p=.002), and total psychological aggression within relationships (t(530.19)=−5.14, p=.000) than females not using minor, severe, and total psychological aggression.
Table 9: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Psychological Aggression (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Psychological Aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>70.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>64.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Marital Status**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>67.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>75.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>74.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>78.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear parents hitting**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>79.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See parents hitting**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>80.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education**</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education**</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income**</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption**</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 10 shows the bivariate results assessing the associations between male respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and physical assault against intimate partners.
Four variables, including race and ethnicity, drug use, fathers’ education, and alcohol consumption, were statistically significant. Race and ethnicity was significantly correlated with male students’ minor ($\chi^2(3, 618)=12.33, p=.006$), severe ($\chi^2(3, 611)=9.98, p=.020$), and total physical assault ($\chi^2(3, 612)=15.12, p=.002$). Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted to assess the differences in physical assault among males’ racial and ethnic groups. Pairwise differences for minor perpetration were found between African Americans and Caucasians ($\chi^2(1, 511)=6.49, p=.011$), African Americans and other racial and ethnic groups ($\chi^2(1, 100)=4.67, p=.031$), Caucasians and Hispanics ($\chi^2(1, 518)=6.20, p=.013$), and Hispanics and other racial and ethnic groups ($\chi^2(1, 107)=4.38, p=.036$). African Americans (39%) were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor physical assault against partners than either Caucasians (23%) or other racial and ethnic groups (19%). Both Caucasians (23%) and other racial and ethnic groups (19%) were significantly less likely to use minor physical assault within relationships than Hispanics (38%). Additionally, pairwise differences for severe perpetration were found between African Americans and Caucasians ($\chi^2(1, 507)=8.24, p=.004$), with African Americans (24%) significantly more likely to use severe physical assault than Caucasians (10%). Finally, total perpetration pairwise differences were found between African Americans and Caucasians ($\chi^2(1, 508)=10.43, p=.001$), African Americans and other racial and ethnic groups ($\chi^2(1, 96)=7.01, p=.008$), and Caucasians and Hispanics ($\chi^2(1, 516)=4.91, p=.027$). African Americans (46%) were significantly more likely to perpetrate physical assault within relationships than either Caucasians (25%) or other racial and ethnic groups (20%). Furthermore, Caucasians (25%) were significantly less likely to physically assault their partners compared to Hispanics (38%). Participants who tried drugs during the previous year were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor ($\chi^2(1, 620)=6.60, p=.010$), severe ($\chi^2(1, 613)=4.48, p=.034$), and total physical assault.
($\chi^2(1, 614)=8.40, p=.004$) than participants who did not try drugs during the previous year. Mean fathers’ educational achievement was significantly greater for those who did not report minor 
($t(616)=2.23, p=.026$) and total physical assault ($t(610)=2.26, p=.024$) than for those who did report minor and total physical assault. Mean alcohol consumption was significantly higher for students who perpetrated minor ($t(617)=2.84, p=.005$), severe ($t(610)=2.47, p=.014$), and total physical assault ($t(611)=2.74, p=.006$) than for students who did not.
Table 10: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Physical Assault (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>38.6**</td>
<td>23.6*</td>
<td>45.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Marital Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30.1*</td>
<td>15.0*</td>
<td>32.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.43*</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.88**</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2.95*</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>2.88**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*<i>p < .05</i>, **<i>p < .01</i>, ***<i>p < .001</i>

Table 11 presents the bivariate results demonstrating associations between female students’ sociodemographic characteristics and physical assault within relationships. Six
variables, including race and ethnicity, parents’ marital status, drug use, hearing and seeing interparental violence, and alcohol consumption were statistically significant. As with males, race and ethnicity was significantly related to females’ use of minor ($\chi^2(3, 978)=12.71, p=.005$), severe ($\chi^2(3, 963)=9.26, p=.026$), and total physical assault ($\chi^2(3, 968)=9.23, p=.026$). Follow-up pairwise comparisons were used to determine the differences in physical assault among females’ racial and ethnic groups. Pairwise differences for minor physical assault were found between African Americans and Caucasians ($\chi^2(1, 774)=11.78, p=.001$), African Americans and Hispanics ($\chi^2(1, 212)=8.86, p=.003$), and for African Americans and other racial and ethnic groups ($\chi^2(1, 168)=4.99, p=.026$). African Americans (46%) were significantly more likely to perpetrate this type of abuse compared to Caucasians (28%), Hispanics (26%), or other racial and ethnic groups (29%). Additionally, pairwise differences for severe physical assault were found between African Americans and Caucasians ($\chi^2(1, 763)=5.91, p=.015$) as well as African Americans and Hispanics ($\chi^2(1, 209)=7.81, p=.005$), with African Americans (19%) significantly more likely to perpetrate severe physical assault than either Caucasians (11%) or Hispanics (7%). Finally, pairwise differences for total physical assault were found between African Americans and Caucasians ($\chi^2(1, 767)=7.32, p=.007$), African Americans and Hispanics ($\chi^2(1, 209)=7.41, p=.006$), and African Americans and other racial and ethnic groups ($\chi^2(1, 168)=4.99, p=.026$). Similar to results for minor perpetration, African Americans (46%) were significantly more likely to perpetrate total physical abuse than Caucasians (31%), Hispanics (27%), or other racial and ethnic groups (29%). Respondents whose parents were currently married to each other were significantly less likely to perpetrate minor ($\chi^2(1, 979)=6.96, p=.008$) and total physical assault against intimate partners ($\chi^2(1, 969)=6.40, p=.011$) than respondents whose parents were not currently married. Like male participants, female participants who tried drugs in the previous
year were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor ($\chi^2(1, 973)=20.63, p=.000$), severe ($\chi^2(1, 958)=7.87, p=.005$), and total physical assault ($\chi^2(1, 963)=21.41, p=.000$) than participants who did not try drugs. Females who heard their parents hitting each other during childhood were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor ($\chi^2(1, 944)=12.40, p=.000$), severe ($\chi^2(1, 930)=5.34, p=.021$), and total physical assault ($\chi^2(1, 935)=11.06, p=.001$) than females who did not hear their parents hitting each other. Similarly, those who saw their parents hitting each other were also significantly more likely to perpetrate minor ($\chi^2(1, 975)=10.79, p=.001$), severe ($\chi^2(1, 960)=10.57, p=.001$), and total physical assault ($\chi^2(1, 965)=9.72, p=.002$) than those who did not see their parents hitting each other. As with male respondents, female respondents’ mean alcohol consumption was significantly higher for those who reported using minor ($t(973)=-3.79, p=.000$), severe ($t(958)=-2.57, p=.010$), and total physical assault ($t(963)=-3.69, p=.000$) compared to respondents who did not report using minor, severe, and total physical assault.
Table 11: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Physical Assault (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Physical Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>45.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Marital Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>26.1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>39.8***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father’s Education&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother’s Education&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>6.79</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.29***</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.38*</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.29***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Consumption&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.29***</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.38*</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.29***</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.38*</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.29***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

The bivariate results assessing the relationships between male respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and sexual coercion are presented in Table 12. Three
variables, including relationship status, drug use, and alcohol consumption, were statistically significant. Male students who were currently in a relationship were significantly more likely to use minor ($\chi^2(1, 617)=5.24, p=.022$) and total sexual coercion within relationships ($\chi^2(1, 617)=4.11, p=.043$) compared to students who had previously been but were not currently in a relationship. Those who tried drugs during the previous year were also significantly more likely to use minor ($\chi^2(1, 616)=25.85, p=.000$), severe ($\chi^2(1, 617)=4.76, p=.029$), and total sexual coercion against intimate partners ($\chi^2(1, 616)=29.81, p=.000$) than those who did not try drugs. Male participants’ mean alcohol consumption was significantly greater among participants perpetrating minor ($t(613)=-4.20, p=.000$), severe ($t(614)=-4.49, p=.000$), and total sexual coercion ($t(613)=-5.42, p=.000$) compared to participants not perpetrating this type of abuse.
Table 12: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Sexual Coercion (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sexual Coercion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents’ Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>34.0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38.5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hear parents hitting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See parents hitting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>7.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 13 displays the bivariate results examining the correlations between female students’ sociodemographic characteristics and sexual coercion. Six variables, including race
and ethnicity, university year, drug use, hearing and seeing interparental violence, and alcohol consumption were statistically significant. Race and ethnicity was significantly associated with minor (χ²(3, 972)=14.70, p=.002) and total (χ²(3, 971)=13.74, p=.003) sexual coercion among female students. Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted to assess the differences in sexual coercion among female respondents’ racial and ethnic groups. Pairwise differences for minor sexual coercion were found between Caucasians and other racial and ethnic groups (χ²(1, 763)=12.09, p=.001), with Caucasians (12%) significantly less likely to perpetrate this type of abuse than other racial and ethnic groups (26%). Pairwise differences for total sexual coercion were also identified between Caucasians and other racial and ethnic groups (χ²(1, 762)=11.68, p=.001), again with Caucasians (13%) significantly less likely than other racial and ethnic groups (28%) to perpetrate this type of abuse. Participants’ year at the university was also significantly associated with total sexual coercion (χ²(3, 972)=7.96, p=.047). Follow-up pairwise comparisons were used to identify the differences in total sexual coercion among females’ year at the university. Pairwise differences were found between sophomores and juniors (χ²(1, 205)=6.85, p=.009) as well as juniors and seniors (χ²(1, 235)=4.05, p=.044), with juniors (23%) significantly more likely to use sexual coercion against their partners than either sophomores (11%) or seniors (13%). Similar to results for males, females who tried drugs during the previous year were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor (χ²(1, 967)=13.46, p=.000) and total sexual coercion (χ²(1, 966)=12.50, p=.000) than females who did not try drugs. Additionally, female students who heard their parents hitting each other during childhood were significantly more likely to use minor (χ²(1, 938)=9.98, p=.002) and total sexual coercion against their partners (χ²(1, 937)=11.38, p=.001) than students who did not hear their parents hitting each other. Those who saw their parents hitting each other were also significantly more likely to perpetrate minor (χ²(1,
969)=4.41, p=.036), severe ($\chi^2(1, 968)=11.08, p=.001$), and total sexual coercion ($\chi^2(1, 968)=8.60, p=.003$) than those who did not see their parents hitting each other. Like males, females’ mean alcohol consumption was significantly greater among those reporting minor ($t(967)=-3.60, p=.000$) and total sexual coercion ($t(966)=-3.67, p=.000$) compared to those not reporting minor and total sexual coercion.
Table 13: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Sexual Coercion (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sexual Coercion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong>^a**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>19.3**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Year</strong>^a^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents’ Marital Status</strong>^a^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong>^a^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Use</strong>^a^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hear parents hitting</strong>^a^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See parents hitting</strong>^a^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20.3*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s Education</strong>^b^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s Education</strong>^b^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong>^b^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol Consumption</strong>^b^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.35***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 14 provides the bivariate results determining the relationships between male college students’ sociodemographic characteristics and injury of intimate partners. Three
variables, including drug use, fathers’ educational achievement, and alcohol consumption, were statistically significant. Males who tried drugs during the previous year were significantly more likely to severely injure their partners than males who did not try drugs ($\chi^2(1, 618)=4.54$, $p=.033$). Mean fathers’ highest level of education was significantly higher for respondents who did not inflict minor ($t(614)=2.19$, $p=.029$) and total injury ($t(614)=2.19$, $p=.029$) than for respondents who did inflict minor and total injury. Students’ mean alcohol consumption was significantly higher among those who reported minor ($t(93.06)=-3.34$, $p=.001$), severe ($t(60.42)=-3.36$, $p=.001$), and total injury ($t(103.83)=-3.37$, $p=.001$) than those not reporting minor, severe, and total injury.
Table 14: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Injury (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Severe</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Marital Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.1*</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.40*</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>2.91**</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 15 displays the bivariate results for associations between female respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and injury of intimate partners. Only two variables, drug use
and alcohol consumption, were statistically significant. Similar to results for males, females who tried drugs during the previous year were significantly more likely to report minor ($\chi^2(1, 963)=6.91, p=.009$) and total injury of intimate partners ($\chi^2(1, 960)=7.90, p=.005$) compared to females who did not try drugs. Additionally, as with male respondents, female respondents’ mean alcohol consumption was significantly greater for those perpetrating minor ($t(963)=-2.58, p=.010$) and total injury ($t(960)=-2.91, p=.004$) than for those not perpetrating minor and total injury.
Table 15: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Injury (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ Marital Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship Status&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10.6*</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See parents hitting&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.39*</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. percentages provided for chi-squares; b. means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Domestic Violence Beliefs and Relationship Violence Perpetration

Tables 16 through 25 display the bivariate results examining the relationships between male and female college students’ domestic violence beliefs and their relationship violence perpetration. Independent-samples t tests were conducted to assess the correlations between students’ scores on myth-based and empirically-grounded causation scales as well as physical and sexual abuse, verbal abuse, and stalking definition scales and their use of relationship violence. Means for t tests are provided in each table.

The bivariate results assessing the correlations between male respondents’ domestic violence beliefs and negotiation within relationships are presented in Table 16. Only one scale, the empirically-grounded causation scale, was statistically significant. Students’ mean score on the empirically-grounded causation scale was significantly higher for male students who use cognitive negotiation tactics within relationships than for male students who do not use cognitive negotiation tactics ($t(114.70)=-2.41$, $p=.018$).

Table 16: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Negotiation (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Emotional Yes</th>
<th>Emotional No</th>
<th>Cognitive Yes</th>
<th>Cognitive No</th>
<th>Total Yes</th>
<th>Total No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.22*</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Table 17 provides the bivariate results examining the relationships between female respondents’ domestic violence beliefs and use of negotiation with intimate partners. In contrast to the results for males, for females two scales, including the verbal abuse and stalking definition scales, were statistically significant. Female students’ mean scores on the verbal abuse definition scale ($t(958)=2.01, p=.044$) and the stalking definition scale ($t(962)=2.45, p=.014$) were significantly higher among those who do not use cognitive negotiation tactics within relationships than those who do use cognitive negotiation tactics.

Table 17: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Negotiation (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Negotiation</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 18 displays the bivariate results assessing the relationships between male respondents’ domestic violence beliefs and psychological aggression. Three scales, the myth-based and empirically-grounded causation scales and the physical and sexual abuse definition scale, were statistically significant. Males’ mean score on the myth-based causation scale was
significantly higher for males perpetrating severe psychological aggression than for males not perpetrating this type of abuse (t(593)=−2.54, p=.011), whereas participants’ mean score on the empirically-grounded causation scale was significantly lower for participants using severe psychological aggression against intimate partners compared to participants not using severe psychological aggression (t(593)=2.08, p=.038). Respondents’ mean score on the physical and sexual abuse definition scale was significantly lower for respondents who use severe (t(166.25)=3.73, p=.000) and total psychological aggression within relationships (t(463.25)=1.99, p=.047) than for respondents who do not engage in this type of abuse.

Table 18: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Psychological Aggression (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Psychological Aggression</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.66*</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.63*</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.61***</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 19 presents the bivariate results examining associations between female students’ domestic violence beliefs and psychological aggression against intimate partners. Three scales, consisting of the myth-based causation scale and the physical and sexual abuse and verbal abuse definition scales, were statistically significant. Similar to results for male students, female
students’ mean score on the myth-based causation scale was significantly higher for those perpetrating minor \((t(943)=-3.08, p=.002)\) and total psychological aggression \((t(942)=-3.13, p=.002)\) than for those not perpetrating minor and total psychological aggression. Also like male respondents, female respondents’ mean score on the physical and sexual abuse definition scale was significantly lower for respondents who use severe psychological aggression against intimate partners than for respondents who do not \((t(222.83)=2.51, p=.013)\). Differing from males, females’ mean score on the verbal abuse definition scale was significantly lower for those reporting minor \((t(461.54)=3.69, p=.000)\), severe \((t(298.12)=2.35, p=.019)\), and total psychological aggression \((t(431.88)=3.51, p=.000)\) than for those not reporting this type of abuse.

Table 19: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Psychological Aggression (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Psychological Aggression</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.27**</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.80*</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.74***</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.74***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*\(p < .05\), **\(p < .01\), ***\(p < .001\)

Table 20 provides the bivariate results identifying the correlations between male students’ domestic violence beliefs and physical assault against intimate partners. Two scales,
including the empirically-grounded causation scale and the physical and sexual abuse definition scale, were statistically significant. Males’ mean score on the empirically-grounded causation scale was significantly lower for those who severely physically assault their partners than for those who do not severely physically assault their partners (t(86.73)=2.75, p=.007).

Additionally, male respondents’ mean score on the physical and sexual abuse definition scale was significantly lower for males who engage in minor (t(208.95)=2.80, p=.006), severe (t(77.78)=3.14, p=.002), and total physical assault (t(222.94)=3.23, p=.001) compared to males who do not.

Table 20: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Physical Assault (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Physical Assault</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Sev.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Sev.</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.36**</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.58**</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.57**</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

The bivariate results assessing the relationships between female respondents’ domestic violence beliefs and physical assault are displayed in Table 21. Three scales, including the myth-based causation scale and the physical and sexual abuse and verbal abuse definition scales, were statistically significant. Differing from males, females’ mean score on the myth-based
causation scale was significantly higher among those who perpetrate minor \( (t(952)=-2.77, p=.006) \), severe \( (t(937)=-2.69, p=.007) \), and total physical assault within relationships \( (t(942)=-3.03, p=.002) \) compared to those who do not perpetrate this type of abuse. Corresponding with the results for male respondents, mean scores on the physical and sexual abuse definition scale were significantly lower among female respondents engaging in minor \( (t(388.27)=2.84, p=.005) \) and total physical assault against intimate partners \( (t(442.78)=2.85, p=.005) \) than among female respondents not engaging in minor and total physical assault. Similarly, the mean scores of female students using minor \( (t(594.58)=3.32, p=.001) \) and total physical assault against intimate partners \( (t(671.25)=3.52, p=.000) \) were significantly lower on the verbal abuse scale than female students not using minor and total physical assault, differing from the results for males.

Table 21: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Physical Assault (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cause of Physical Assault</th>
<th>Physical Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 22 presents the bivariate results determining the associations between male respondents’ domestic violence beliefs and use of sexual coercion within relationships. Three
scales, consisting of the empirically-grounded causation scale and the physical and sexual abuse and verbal abuse definition scales, were statistically significant. Males engaging in severe sexual coercion scored significantly lower on the empirically-grounded causation scale than males not engaging in severe sexual coercion (t(52.17)=3.51, p=.001). Respondents’ mean score on the physical and sexual scale was also significantly lower among respondents reporting use of severe (t(46.04)=3.75, p=.000) and total sexual coercion against their partners (t(309.89)=2.31, p=.021) compared to those not reporting use of this type of violence. Male participants perpetrating severe sexual coercion scored significantly lower on the verbal abuse scale than participants not perpetrating severe sexual coercion (t(609)=-2.11, p=.035).

Table 22: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Sexual Coercion (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sexual Coercion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.64**</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.57***</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.48*</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 23 provides the bivariate results illustrating the relationships between female students’ domestic violence beliefs and sexual coercion. Two scales, the myth-based and empirically-grounded causation scales, were statistically significant. Unlike male participants,
female participants’ mean scores on the myth-based causation scale were significantly higher for participants reporting using minor \( (t(946)=-3.86, p=.000) \) and total sexual coercion within relationships \( (t(945)=-3.66, p=.000) \) than for participants not reporting using minor and total sexual coercion. In contrast to findings related to male respondents, female respondents’ mean score on the empirically-grounded causation scale was also significantly higher for respondents who perpetrate minor sexual coercion compared to respondents who do not \( (t(951)=-2.13, p=.034) \).

Table 23: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Sexual Coercion (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sexual Coercion</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.39***</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.98*</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.  
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

The bivariate results investigating the correlations between male respondents’ domestic violence beliefs and inflicting injury are given in Table 24. Two scales, including the empirically-grounded causation scale and physical and sexual abuse definition scale, were statistically significant. Mean scores for the empirically-grounded causation scale were significantly lower among males who report inflicting minor \( (T(86.94)=2.89, p=.005) \), severe
(t(57.23)=4.47, p=.000), and total injury against their partners (t(97.41)=3.37, p=.001) compared
to those who do not report inflicting minor, severe, and total injury. Correspondingly, males’
mean scores were significantly lower for those reporting minor (t(77.16)=3.86, p=.000), severe
(t(51.78)=3.76, p=.000), and total injury within relationships (t(85.20)=3.97, p=.000) than for
those not reporting minor, severe, and total injury.

Table 24: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Injury
(N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.63**</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.65***</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.59***</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.58***</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests.
Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 25 displays the bivariate results identifying correlations between female students’
domestic violence beliefs and injuring intimate partners. Only the empirically-grounded
causation scale was statistically significant. Like males, females’ mean score on the empirically-
grounded causation scale was significantly lower among females reporting inflicting injury
compared to females not reporting inflicting injury.
Table 25: Bivariate Results for Female Respondents’ Domestic Violence Beliefs and Injury (N=996)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causation Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-based</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-grounded</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.02*</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and sexual abuse</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Means provided for t tests. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Sociodemographics and Domestic Violence Beliefs

Tables 26 and 27 provide the bivariate results analyzing the correlations between male and female college students’ sociodemographic characteristics and their domestic violence beliefs. One-way analyses of variance (one-way ANOVAs) were conducted to assess the relationships between students’ race and ethnicity and university year and their domestic violence beliefs. Means for ANOVAs are displayed first in each table. Independent-samples t tests were used to determine the correlations between students’ parents’ marital status, relationship status, drug use, and witnessing interparental violence during childhood and their domestic violence beliefs. Means for t tests are given following means for ANOVAs in each table. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were performed to examine the associations between students’ parents’ educational achievements, family yearly income, and
alcohol consumption and their domestic violence beliefs. Pearson correlation coefficients are provided last in each table.

Table 26 displays the bivariate results assessing the relationships between male students’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs. Six variables were statistically significant. Respondents’ race and ethnicity was significantly correlated with their physical and sexual abuse definition beliefs ($F(3, 609)=2.72, p=.044$) as well as their verbal abuse definition beliefs ($F(3, 618)=4.12, p=.021$). Bonferroni follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among respondents’ race and ethnicity. Significant differences were found between African Americans and other racial and ethnic groups for physical and sexual abuse definition beliefs ($p=.048$) and Caucasians and other racial and ethnic groups for verbal abuse definition beliefs ($p=.030$). These findings illustrate that other racial and ethnic groups (mean=4.80) were significantly more likely to endorse physical and sexual abuse definitions than African Americans (mean=4.24). Other racial and ethnic groups (mean=.79) were also significantly more likely to endorse verbal abuse definitions than Caucasians (mean=.43). Male student’s who were currently in a relationship were significantly more likely to endorse verbal abuse definitions than male students who had previously been but were not currently in a relationship ($t(583.50)=2.32, p=.021$). Participants who tried drugs during the previous year were more likely to endorse myth-based causes of domestic violence ($t(607)=-1.98, p=.048$) and less likely to support empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence ($t(605.96)=1.98, p=.048$) as well as physical and sexual abuse definitions ($t(590.11)=2.62, p=.009$) than participants who did not try drugs during the previous year. Males who heard ($t(568)=-2.84, p=.005$) as well as males who saw their parents hitting each other during childhood ($t(598)=-2.05, p=.040$) were more likely to endorse myth-based causes of domestic violence than males who did not hear or
see their parents hitting each other. Negative correlations were demonstrated between male respondents’ alcohol consumption and support of empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence ($r(607)=-.10$, $p=.017$) and physical and sexual abuse definitions ($r(612)=-.11$, $p=.009$), indicating that the more alcohol males consume the less likely they are to support those causes and definitions.
Table 26: Bivariate Results for Male Respondents’ Sociodemographic Characteristics and Domestic Violence Beliefs (N=635)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Causation Scales</th>
<th>Definition Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myth-Based</td>
<td>Empirically-Grounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity(^a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Year(^a)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents’ Marital Status(^b)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status(^b)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Use(^b)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.83*</td>
<td>3.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hear parents hitting(^b)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.07**</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See parents hitting(^b)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.00*</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s Education(^c)</strong></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s Education(^c)</strong></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income(^c)</strong></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol Consumption(^c)</strong></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. means provided for ANOVAs; b. means provided for t tests; c. Pearson correlation coefficients provided. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 27 provides the bivariate results determining the correlations between female respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs. Four variables
were statistically significant. Similar to findings for males, females’ race and ethnicity was significantly associated with their verbal abuse definition beliefs (F(3, 972)=3.57, p=.014). Bonferroni follow-up tests were performed to determine the pairwise differences among females’ racial and ethnic groups. A significant difference was found between Caucasian and Hispanic respondents (p=.014), illustrating that Caucasians (mean=.52) were significantly less likely to endorse verbal abuse definitions than Hispanics (mean=.78). Unlike male participants, female participants’ year at the university was also significantly related to their myth-based causation beliefs (F(3, 962)=4.90, p=.002). As with race and ethnicity, Bonferroni follow-up tests were conducted to determine the pairwise differences among participants’ university year. A significant difference was identified between freshmen and seniors (p=.002), demonstrating that freshmen (mean=2.53) were significantly more likely to endorse myth-based causes of domestic violence than seniors (mean=2.14). Respondents who tried drugs in the previous year were significantly more likely to support myth-based causes of domestic violence than those who did not try drugs in the previous year (t(958)=−2.73, p=.006), closely reflecting results for male respondents. Female students’ alcohol consumption was significantly positively correlated with their endorsement of myth-based causes of domestic violence (r(960)=.10, p=.002), demonstrating that the more alcohol students consume, the more likely they are to endorse myth-based causes of domestic violence. As with males, females’ alcohol consumption was also significantly negatively correlated with their support of physical and sexual abuse definitions (r(964)=−.08, p=.020), illustrating that the more alcohol females consume, the less likely they are to support physical and sexual abuse definitions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Causation Scales</th>
<th>Definition Scales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Myth-Based</td>
<td>Empirically-Grounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Year</strong>&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>2.53**</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parents’ Marital Status</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently married</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not currently married</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationship Status</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current relationship</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous relationship</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Use</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.54**</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hear parents hitting</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>See parents hitting</strong>&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father’s Education</strong>&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother’s Education</strong>&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong>&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alcohol Consumption</strong>&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. means provided for ANOVAs; b. means provided for t tests; c. Pearson correlation coefficients provided. Sample size varies slightly for select variables due to missing cases.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
Multivariate Analyses

Multiple linear regressions were conducted to assess the relationships between college students’ sociodemographic characteristics, domestic violence beliefs, and relationship violence perpetration. As with previous analyses, separate regressions were performed for male and female participants. Due to the similarities between students’ minor and total perpetration and the relatively small number of students’ reporting severe perpetration, only total incidence scores for relationship violence perpetration were included in the following analyses. Two multiple linear regressions were completed to determine the predictors for each perpetration variable (negotiation, psychological aggression, physical assault, sexual coercion, and injury). First, regressions were calculated with respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics (race and ethnicity, university year, fathers’ education, mothers’ education, family income, parents’ marital status, relationship status, alcohol consumption, drug use, hearing parents hitting each other, and seeing parents hitting each other) included as the independent variables. Second, regressions were conducted with participants’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs (myth-based causes, empirically based causes, physical and sexual abuse definitions, verbal abuse definitions, and stalking definitions) included as the independent variables. Because of students’ potential response bias to perceived culturally unacceptable domestic violence beliefs and relationship violence perpetration, social desirability was included as a control variable in each regression. Tolerances for the independent variables were examined to ensure against multicollinearity.

A multiple regression analysis was completed to assess the correlations between male college students’ sociodemographic characteristics and their use of negotiation with intimate partners. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 28. The regression equation was
significant (R²=.048, F(14, 481)=1.747, p=.004). Only one variable, relationship status, was statistically significant (β=.155, p=.001), showing that males who were currently in a relationship were significantly more likely to use negotiation tactics compared to males who had previously been but were not currently in a relationship.

A second analysis was conducted to determine the combined effect of male students’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on their use of negotiation within relationships. However, the regression equation was not significant (R² change =.006, (F19, 476)=1.453, p=.097).

Table 28: Regression Results for Male Respondents’ Negotiation (N=496)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Negotiation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americana</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic ab</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race a</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Currently Marriedb</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Relationshipc</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.155**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Parents Hitting</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-Based Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-Grounded Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Sexual Abuse Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. compared to Caucasian; b. compared to parents not currently married; c. compared to previously in relationship.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
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Table 29 provides the results of a multiple regression analysis performed to determine the associations between female college students’ sociodemographic characteristics and their use of negotiation tactics. The regression equation was significant ($R^2=.072$, $F(14, 814)=4.483$, $p=.000$). Two variables, including university year and relationship status, were statistically significant. Females’ year at the university was significantly negatively associated with their use of negotiation within relationships ($\beta=-.077$, $p=.028$). Like male respondents, female respondents who were currently in a relationship were significantly more likely to use negotiation tactics with their partners compared to respondents who had previously been but were not currently in a relationship ($\beta=.238$, $p=.000$).

A second analysis was completed to assess the effects of females’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on their use of negotiation within relationships. Table 29 presents the results for this regression. The regression equation was significant ($R^2$ change=.007, $F(19, 809)=3.629$, $p=.000$). Two variables, including relationship status and stalking definition beliefs, were statistically significant. Although females’ university year was significantly correlated with their use of negotiation tactics in the previous regression, females’ university year was no longer significantly related to their use of negotiation when domestic violence beliefs were added to the analysis. As in the previous regression, respondents who were currently in a relationship were significantly more likely to use negotiation tactics compared to respondents who had previously been but were not currently in a relationship ($\beta=.239$, $p=.000$). Additionally, the more likely female students were to endorse stalking definitions, the less likely they were to use negotiation with their partners ($\beta=-.074$, $p=.038$).
A multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the associations between male respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and their psychological aggression against intimate partners. Results for this regression are displayed in Table 30. The regression equation was significant ($R^2=.061$, $F(14, 478)=2.203$, $p=.007$). Two variables, including family yearly income and parents’ marital status, were statistically significant. The higher students’ family income was the more likely they were to use psychological aggression within relationships ($\beta=.123$, $p=.019$). Males whose parents were currently married to each other were significantly less likely than males whose parents were not currently married to each other to report using psychological aggression ($\beta=-.100$, $p=.039$).
A second analysis was performed to evaluate the effects of male participants’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on their use of psychological aggression against intimate partners. Table 30 shows the results for this regression. The regression equation was significant ($R^2$ change=.019, $F(19, 473)=2.155$, $p=.003$), with three statistically significant variables. Mirroring the results of the previous regression, family yearly income ($\beta=.113$, $p=.031$) and parents’ marital status ($\beta=-.103$, $p=.034$) were again significantly associated with respondents’ perpetration of psychological aggression. In addition, students who supported physical and sexual abuse definitions were significantly less likely to use psychological aggression within relationships than students who did not support physical and sexual abuse definitions ($\beta=-.110$, $p=.021$).
Table 30: Regression Results for Male Respondents’ Psychological Aggression (N=493)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Psychological Aggression</th>
<th>Psychological Aggression</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Currently Married</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Relationship</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear Parents Hitting</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-Based Causation</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-Grounded Causation</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Sexual Abuse Definition</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse Definition</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking Definition</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. compared to Caucasian; b. compared to parents not currently married; c. compared to previously in relationship.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Table 31 provides the results of a multiple regression analysis conducted to assess the correlations between female respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and their use of psychological aggression within relationships. The regression equation was significant (R²=.063, F(14, 808)=3.875, p=.000), with three statistically significant variables. Females who were currently in a relationship were significantly more likely than females who had previously been but were not currently in a relationship to use psychological aggression against their partners (β=.094, p=.007). The more alcohol participants consumed the more likely they were to perpetrated psychological aggression (β=.133, p=.002). Social desirability was negatively
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associated with psychological aggression among female students. None of these variables were significantly associated with males’ use of psychological aggression within relationships.

A second analysis was conducted to examine the effects of female students’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on their use of psychological aggression. The results for this regression are displayed in Table 31. The regression equation was significant (R² change=.063, F(19, 803)=3.801, p=.000), with five statistically significant variables. Consistent with the previous regression, female participants’ relationship status (β=.095, p=.007), alcohol consumption (β=.115, p=.002), and social desirability scores (β=.084, p=.016) were again significantly associated with their use of psychological aggression against intimate partners. Additionally, females who endorsed myth-based causes of domestic violence were significantly more likely to use psychological aggression than females who did not endorse myth-based causes (β=.072, p=.039). Students who supported verbal abuse definitions were significantly less likely compared to students who did not support verbal abuse definitions to use psychological aggression within relationships (β=-.104, p=.004). As with the previous regression, the variables significantly associated with females’ use of psychological aggression differ from those associated with males’ use of psychological aggression.
A multiple regression analysis completed to determine the relationships between male respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and their physical assault against intimate partners yielded a significant regression equation \((R^2=.085, F(14, 479)=3.194, p=.000)\) with three statistically significant variables. These results are presented in Table 32. African American (\(\beta=.137, p=.003\)) and Hispanic students (\(\beta=.114, p=.012\)) were significantly more likely to physically assault their partners compared to Caucasians. Additionally, participants’ fathers’ level of education was significantly negatively correlated with participants’ use of physical assault (\(\beta=-.148, p=.004\)).
A second analysis was performed to assess the effects of male students’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on their use of physical assault against intimate partners. Table 32 illustrates the results of this regression. The regression equation was significant ($R^2$ change=.017, $F(19, 474)=2.859, p=.000$), with four statistically significant variables. As in the previous regression African American ($\beta=.129, p=.005$) and Hispanic students ($\beta=.107, p=.019$) were significantly more likely to use physical assault compared to Caucasian students. Respondents’ fathers level of education also mirrored results from the previous regression ($\beta=-.143, p=.006$). Additionally, males who endorsed physical and sexual abuse definitions were significantly less likely to physically assault their partners than males who did not endorse physical and sexual abuse definitions ($\beta=-.132, p=.005$).
Table 32: Regression Results for Male Respondents’ Physical Assault (N=494)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Americana</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.137*</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.129**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanicb</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.114*</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.107*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Racec</td>
<td>-.112</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.148**</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.143**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Currently Marriedb</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Relationshipc</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Parents Hitting</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-Based Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-Grounded Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Sexual Abuse Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.132**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse Definition</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. compared to Caucasian; b. compared to parents not currently married; c. compared to previously in relationship.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

A multiple regression analysis was conducted to assess the relationships between female respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and use of physical assault within relationships.

Results for this regression are presented in Table 33. The regression equation was significant (R²=.060, F(14, 807)=3.690, p=.000). Two variables, including university year and drug use, were statistically significant, differing from results for males. Female students’ year at the university was significantly negatively correlated with students’ use of physical assault (β=-.077, p=.031). Females who tried drugs during the previous year were significantly more likely to physically assault intimate partners compared to those who did not try drugs during the previous year (β=.098, p=.017)
A second analysis was completed to determine the effect of female students’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on their perpetration of physical assault. Table 33 displays the results for this regression. The regression equation was significant (R² change=.026, F(19, 802)=3.967, p=.000), with four statistically significant variables. Although university year was significantly associated with female students’ physical assault in the previous regression, students’ year at the university was not statistically significant in this regression. However, drug use was significantly associated with physical assault as in the previous regression (β=.102, p=.013). Additionally, female respondents who supported myth-based causes of domestic violence were significantly more likely to physically assault their partners than female respondents who did not support myth-based causes (β=.089, p=.011). Females who endorsed physical and sexual abuse definitions (β=.078, p=.026) as well as females who endorsed verbal abuse definitions (β=.100, p=.006) were significantly less likely to use physical assault within relationships compared to females who did not endorse those definitions. The only common statistically significant variable for male and female respondents was the physical and sexual abuse domestic violence definition score.
### Table 33: Regression Results for Female Respondents’ Physical Assault (N=822)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Physical Assault</th>
<th>Physical Assault</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americana</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanicb</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Racec</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Currently Marriedb</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Relationshipc</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-Based Causation</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-Grounded Causation</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Sexual Abuse Definition</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse Definition</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking Definition</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. compared to Caucasian; b. compared to parents not currently married; c. compared to previously in relationship.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Results for a multiple regression analysis performed to demonstrate the correlations between male college students’ sociodemographic characteristics and their use of sexual coercion are presented in Table 34. The regression equation was significant (R²=.119, F(14, 478)=4.609, p=.000) and four variables were statistically significant. African American (β=.125, p=.006) and Hispanic respondents (β=.127, p=.004) were significantly more likely to use sexual coercion with their partners compared to Caucasian respondents. Students’ alcohol consumption was significantly positively correlated with sexual coercion (β=.187, p=.000). Males who reported trying drugs during the previous year were also significantly more likely to use sexual
coercion within relationships compared to males who did not report trying drugs ($\beta=.131, p=.011$).

A second analysis illustrating the effects of male students’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on their use of sexual coercion was performed and yielded a significant regression equation ($R^2$ change=.012, $F(19, 473)=3.747, p=.000$). Table 34 presents the results of this regression. The same four statistically significant variables from the previous regression were statistically significant in this regression. Again, African Americans ($\beta=.108, p=.018$) and Hispanics ($\beta=.115, p=.010$) were more likely to perpetrate sexual coercion compared to Caucasians. Students’ alcohol consumption ($\beta=.172, p=.001$) and drug use ($\beta=.128, p=.013$) were still significantly positively associated with sexual coercion. Male respondents’ scores on the domestic violence causation and definition scales were not statistically significant.
Table 34: Regression Results for Male Respondents’ Sexual Coercion (N=493)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American(^a)</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.125**</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.108*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic(^a)</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.127**</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.115*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race(^a)</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Currently Married(^b)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Relationship(^c)</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.187***</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.172**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.131*</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.128*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear Parents Hitting</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Parents Hitting</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>-.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-Based Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-Grounded Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Sexual Abuse...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td></td>
<td>.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R(^2)</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td></td>
<td>.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. compared to Caucasian; b. compared to parents not currently married; c. compared to previously in relationship.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

The multiple regression analysis assessing the relationships between female students’ sociodemographic characteristics and sexual coercion produced a significant regression equation (R\(^2\)=.053, F(14, 809)=3.244, p=.000). The results for this regression are displayed in Table 35. Three variables were statistically significant. Hispanic females (β=.072, p=.043) and females from other racial and ethnic backgrounds (β=.082, p=.022) were significantly more likely to use sexual coercion with their partners compared to Caucasian females. As with male respondents, female respondents alcohol consumption was significantly positively correlated with their use of sexual coercion (β=.142, p=.001).
A second analysis revealed the combined effects of females’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on their use of sexual coercion. Results for this regression are given in Table 35. The regression equation was significant ($R^2$ change=.018, $F(19, 804)=3.250$, $p=.000$) and five variables were statistically significant. African American students ($\beta=.071$, $p=.048$), Hispanic students ($\beta=.084$, $p=.019$), and students from other racial and ethnic groups ($\beta=.077$, $p=.032$) were significantly more likely to use sexual coercion within relationships compared to Caucasian students. Alcohol consumption was significantly positively associated with sexual coercion ($\beta=.127$, $p=.003$), similar to results in the previous regression. In addition, differing from male participants, female participants who endorsed myth-based causes of domestic violence were significantly more likely to use sexual coercion against their partners than participants who did not endorse myth-based causes ($\beta=.130$, $p=.000$).
Table 35: Regression Results for Female Respondents’ Sexual Coercion (N=824)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.071*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.072*</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.084*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.082*</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.077*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Currently Married</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Relationship</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.142**</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.127**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-Based Causation</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.130***</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.130***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-Grounded Causation</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Sexual Abuse Definition</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse Definition</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking Definition</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.164</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td></td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. compared to Caucasian; b. compared to parents not currently married; c. compared to previously in relationship.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

In order to determine the associations between male students’ sociodemographic characteristics and injuring intimate partners, a multiple regression analysis was performed.

Table 36 provides the regression results. The regression equation was significant (R²=.056, F(14, 480)=2.029, p=.014). Only one variable, alcohol consumption, was statistically significant. The more alcohol males consumed the more likely they were to injure their partners (β=.203, p=.000).

Table 36 displays the results of a second analysis examining the combined effect of male respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on their perpetration of injury within relationships. The regression equation was significant (R²
change=.061, F(19, 475)=3.314, p=.000) and four variables were statistically significant. As in the previous regression, alcohol consumption was significantly correlated with injury (β=.186, p=.001). In addition, respondents’ fathers’ level of education was significantly negatively associated with injuring intimate partners (β=-.102, p=.046). Students who supported empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence (β=-.095, p=.041) and physical and sexual abuse definitions (β=-.202, p=.000) were significantly less likely to injure their partners compared to students who did not support those causes and definitions.

Table 36: Regression Results for Male Respondents’ Injury (N=495)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Injury B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>Injury B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.102*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Currently Married</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Relationship</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.203***</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.186**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear Parents Hitting</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-Based Causation</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-Grounded Causation</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.095*</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.202***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Sexual Abuse Definition</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>-.202***</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse Definition</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. compared to Caucasian; b. compared to parents not currently married; c. compared to previously in relationship.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
A multiple regression was conducted to determine the associations between female respondents’ sociodemographic characteristics and their use of injury within relationships. The results for this regression are given in Table 37. The regression equation was significant ($R^2=0.029$, $F(14, 803)=1.740$, $p=0.044$). Two variables, including parents’ marital status and alcohol consumption, were statistically significant. Female college students whose parents were currently married to each other were significantly less likely to injure their partners than students whose parents were not currently married to each other ($\beta=-0.074$, $p=0.048$), differing from male college students. Alcohol consumption was significantly positively correlated with females’ use of injury ($\beta=0.096$, $p=0.029$), similar to results for males.

The regression equation for a second analysis addressing the effects of sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on females’ use of injury was also significant ($R^2$ change=0.009, $F(19, 798)=1.659$, $p=0.038$). The results for this regression are presented in Table 37. Only one variable, parents’ marital status, was statistically significant in this regression. Mirroring results from the previous regression, female respondents whose parents were currently married to each other were significantly less likely to injure their partners compared to respondents whose parents were not currently married to each other ($\beta=-0.081$, $p=0.032$). Although alcohol consumption was identified as a predictor of females’ use of injury in the previous regression, it was not significantly associated with females’ use of injury in this regression. Unlike males, scores on the domestic violence beliefs scales were not significantly correlated with females injuring intimate partners.
Table 37: Regression Results for Female Respondents’ Injury (N=818)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Injury</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Race&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Year</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father’s Education</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Currently Married&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.074*</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.081*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently in Relationship&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Consumption</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.096*</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Use</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hear Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See Parents Hitting</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Desirability</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myth-Based Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirically-Grounded Causation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and Sexual Abuse Definition</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Abuse Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking Definition</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R² Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: a. compared to Caucasian; b. compared to parents not currently married; c. compared to previously in relationship.
*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

The purpose of the present study is to explore the potential correlations between sociodemographic characteristics, domestic violence beliefs, and relationship violence perpetration to provide a more comprehensive understanding of relationship violence among college students than current research allows. Based on previous studies and theoretical explanations, it was expected that students’ sociodemographic characteristics would be related to their domestic violence beliefs and relationship violence perpetration. Additionally, it was hypothesized that students’ domestic violence beliefs would be associated with their relationship violence perpetration. The bivariate and multivariate results provided above generally support these expectations.

As hypothesized, male and female college students demonstrate differences in domestic violence beliefs and relationship violence perpetration throughout this study. Differences are evident in the frequency distributions as well as the bivariate and multivariate analyses. For example, the frequency distributions reveal that male and female respondents’ domestic violence beliefs are dissimilar. Males are more likely than females to endorse myth-based causes of domestic violence, while females are more likely than males to endorse empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence. Findings also show that females are more likely to support physical and sexual definitions than males. These results are consistent with previous literature showing that males are more likely to accept psychological (e.g. Beyers et al., 2000), physical (e.g. Beyers et al., 2000; Carlson & Worden, 2005), and sexual assault (e.g. Auster & Leone, 2001; Beyers et al., 2000; Kirkwood & Cecil, 2001) among intimate partners compared to females. The
frequency distributions also demonstrate differences between male and female participants’ use of relationship violence. This analysis shows that females are more likely to use negotiation within their relationships compared to males. Additionally, female respondents are more likely to perpetrate psychological aggression than male respondents, contradicting prior research that demonstrates no gender differences in psychological aggression (e.g. Shook et al., 2000). Females in this study are also more likely than males to physically assault their partners, which is consistent with previous studies suggesting that females were more likely than males to perpetrate this type of abuse (e.g. Bowman & Morgan, 1998; Shook et al., 2000; Straus, 2004b). This analysis also shows that males are more likely to use sexual coercion against their partners than females, which is compatible with previous findings (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998a, 2000b). Furthermore, males in this study are more likely to injure their partners than females. Whereas findings regarding psychological and physical assault are divergent from theoretical explanations for gender differences provided by feminist theory, results related to sexual aggression and injury closely follow the theory.

While the bivariate and multivariate analyses in this study show gender similarities in domestic violence beliefs and relationship violence perpetration, the analyses also demonstrate gender differences, providing partial support for the expectation that analytic models for male and female students would differ. For instance, findings at the bivariate level suggest that race and ethnicity, alcohol consumption, and drug use are associated with domestic violence beliefs for both males and females. However, relationship status and exposure interparental violence are only correlated with male respondents’ domestic violence beliefs, whereas university year is only correlated with female respondents’ beliefs. In addition, bivariate and multivariate analyses demonstrate that variables such as alcohol consumption and drug use are associated with
relationship violence perpetration for both males and females. On the other hand, variables like fathers’ educational achievement and family yearly income as well as beliefs related to empirically-grounded domestic violence causes and physical and sexual abuse definitions impact males’ perpetration of relationship violence, while variables like beliefs related to myth-based domestic violence causes and verbal abuse and stalking definitions impact on females’ perpetration. Based on these findings, it is important to continue to take gender differences into account for future research and policy regarding college students’ domestic violence beliefs and relationships violence perpetration.

Initial hypotheses suggested that racial and ethnic minorities would be more likely to commit acts of aggression against their partners compared to Caucasians. Results provided in the bivariate and multivariate analyses support this hypothesis among both male and female participants. For example, findings at the bivariate level show that African American female students are most likely to use psychological aggression within relationships. African American and Hispanic male respondents are more likely to report physically assaulting their partners than Caucasian respondents or respondents of other racial and ethnic groups. Similarly, African American female respondents are most likely to physically assault their partners. Females with other racial and ethnic backgrounds are more likely to use sexual coercion within their relationships compared to Caucasian females. In addition, findings at the multivariate level also demonstrate that African American and Hispanic males are more likely to use physical assault and sexual coercion compared to Caucasian males. African American females, Hispanic females, and females from other racial and ethnic groups are more likely to sexually coerce their partners compared to Caucasians. These results demonstrate that racial and ethnic minorities are at increased risk for relationship violence perpetration compared to Caucasians.
It was also expected that the fewer years students had completed at the university, the more likely they would be to perpetrate relationship violence. The preceding analyses provide partial support for this hypothesis. Contrary to expectations, the bivariate results show that senior females are more likely than freshmen and sophomores to use psychological aggression against their partners. Female juniors are also more likely to sexually coerce their partners compared to sophomores. However, in support of the hypothesis, female juniors are also more likely to sexually coerce their partners than seniors. Also differing from expectations, at the multivariate level the more years female students complete at the university, the less likely they are to use negotiation tactics within relationships. On the other hand, female students who have completed more years at the university are also less likely to physically assault their partners than female students who have completed fewer years at the university. Unlike female respondents, university year is not correlated with male respondents’ relationship violence perpetration at either the bivariate or multivariate level. These results suggest that university year is not an important risk factor for college students’ perpetration of relationship violence.

It was also hypothesized that students whose parents had lower educational achievements would be more likely to commit aggressive acts against their partners compared to students whose parents had higher educational achievements. The bivariate and multivariate analyses regarding fathers’ level of education provide partial support for this hypothesis. Male respondents whose fathers have lower levels of education are more likely to physically assault and injure their partners than male respondents whose fathers have higher levels of education. However, differing from male respondents, fathers’ education is not associated with female respondents’ perpetration of relationship violence. One explanation for this finding is that male respondents are modeling the behaviors of their fathers. In contrast to results for fathers’ level of
education, the results for mothers’ level of education do not support the hypothesis. Bivariate analyses show that female participants whose mothers have lower educational achievements are less likely to use psychological aggression against their partners compared to participants whose mothers have higher educational achievements. Mothers’ education is not correlated with females students’ use of relationship violence at the multivariate level or male students’ use of relationship violence at either the bivariate or multivariate level. These findings demonstrate that fathers’ level of education is a risk factor for males’ relationship violence perpetration, but mothers’ level of education is not a risk factor for perpetration among college students.

Results related to college students’ family yearly income contradict the hypothesis that students with lower family incomes would be more likely to perpetrate acts of violence against their partners compared to students who had higher family incomes. Contrary to expectations, the bivariate and multivariate analyses demonstrate that males with higher family incomes are more likely to use psychological aggression within relationships compared to males with lower family incomes. These results may reflect the propensity for males with higher socioeconomic status to rely on psychological aggression as opposed to physical assault within relationships compared to males with lower socioeconomic status. Unlike males, family income is not related to females’ perpetration of relationship violence. These results suggest that family income is only a risk factor for male college students’ use of psychological aggression.

The lack of support for hypotheses regarding parents’ educational achievements and family yearly income may be due to the fact that students were asked to estimate the values for each of these responses. If students provided incorrect estimates, the results regarding associations between students’ parents’ education and family income and their relationship violence perpetration may not be valid.
Due to a lack of prior research and theoretical explanations, no predictions were given regarding the relationship between college students’ parents’ marital status and perpetration of relationship violence. The bivariate results illustrate that female students whose parents are currently married to each other are less likely to use psychological aggression and physical assault within relationships compared to students whose parents are not currently married to each other. In addition, findings at the multivariate level show that male respondents whose parents are currently married are less likely to use psychological aggression against their partners compared to respondents whose parents are not currently married. Similarly, female participants whose parents were currently married were less likely to injure their partners than participants whose parents were not currently married. These findings suggest that college students whose parents are not currently married to each other are at higher risk for relationship violence perpetration than students whose parents are currently married to each other.

As with parents’ marital status, no expectations were provided for college students’ relationship status. The bivariate and multivariate analyses reveal that males and females who are currently in a relationship are more likely to use negotiation tactics compared to those who have previously been but are not currently in a relationship. Yet, female students who are currently in a relationship also demonstrate higher levels of psychological aggression compared to students who have previously been but are not currently in a relationship. In addition, the bivariate results show that male respondents are more likely to use sexual coercion against their partners if they are currently in a relationship than if they have previously been but are not currently in a relationship. These findings suggest that college students who are currently in a relationship are at greater risk for relationship violence perpetration those who have previously been but are not currently in a relationship. However, these results may reflect the enhanced
opportunity for any type of interaction with intimate partners among students who are currently in a relationship, especially at the multivariate level where only incidence scores for relationship violence were assessed.

Alcohol consumption was consistently correlated with relationship violence perpetration throughout this study, providing support for the prediction that the more alcohol students consumed, the more likely they would be to commit violent acts against their partners. The bivariate results demonstrate that students who perpetrate psychological aggression, physical assault, sexual coercion, and injury against their partners consume more alcohol on average than students who do not perpetrate those violent acts. The multivariate analyses provide similar findings. The more alcohol female students consume the more likely they are to use psychological aggression, sexual coercion, and injury within intimate relationships. Correspondingly, males who consume more alcohol are also more likely to sexually coerce and injure their partners compared to males who consume less alcohol. These results are consistent with prior research indicating that alcohol consumption is a risk factor for college students’ relationship violence perpetration (e.g. Koss & Gaines, 1993; Lundeberg et al., 2004).

Since research to date has not assessed the correlations between drug use and relationship violence, no expectations related to college students’ drug use were provided in this study. However, the bivariate and multivariate analyses demonstrate that drug use may be an important risk factor for relationship violence perpetration among college students. For example, the bivariate results show that college students who tried drugs in the previous year are more likely to use psychological aggression, physical assault, sexual coercion, and injury within relationships compared to students who did not try drugs. Findings at the multivariate level additionally reveal that females who tried drugs are more likely to physically assault their partners and males...
who tried drugs are more likely to use sexual coercion against their partners than those who did not try drugs. Although the body of literature on relationship violence does not address drug use as a potential predictor of perpetration, a limited number of researchers delving into the correlations between drug use and general violent crime demonstrate results similar to the findings in this study (e.g. McCoy et al., 2001; Weiner et al., 2005).

It was expected that college students who were exposed to interparental violence during childhood would be more likely to perpetrate relationship violence than those who were not exposed to interparental violence. The bivariate analyses provide support for this hypothesis. Female students who heard or saw their parents hitting each other during childhood are more likely to use psychological aggression, physical assault, sexual coercion, and injury within relationships than students who did not hear or see their parents hitting each other. However, findings at the multivariate level do not support the hypothesis. Neither males’ nor females’ exposure to interparental violence is correlated with their perpetration of violent acts. These results suggest that exposure to interparental violence is not an important risk factor for relationship violence perpetration among college students, contrary to previous findings (e.g. Rosen et al., 2001; Worth et al., 1990).

The preceding analyses provide support for the hypothesis that students who scored higher on the myth-based domestic violence causation scale would be more likely to act aggressively toward their partners compared to students who scored lower on the scale. The bivariate analyses demonstrate that students’ mean score on the myth-based causation scale is higher among those reporting psychological aggression than among those not reporting psychological aggression. Female students’ mean score on the myth-based causation scale is additionally higher for students who perpetrate physical assault and sexual coercion than for...
students who do not. Similarly, the multiple regressions revealed that females’ score on the myth-based causation scale is positively correlated with their use of psychological aggression, physical assault, and sexual coercion within relationships. These results demonstrate that college students who endorse myth-based causes of domestic violence are at an increased risk for relationship violence perpetration compared to students who do not endorse these causes, especially among females.

It was also expected that students scoring lower on the empirically-grounded domestic violence causation scale would be more likely to perpetrate aggressive acts against their partners than those scoring higher on the scale. The bivariate findings for male college students support this hypothesis. Males scoring higher on the scale are more likely to use negotiation tactics within their relationships compared to males scoring lower on the scale. Male respondents who score lower on the empirically-grounded causation scale are also more likely use psychological aggression, physical assault, and sexual coercion, and injury against their partners than respondents who score higher on the scale. However, the bivariate results for female college students only partially support the hypothesis. Female students who score lower on the empirically-grounded causation scale are more likely to injure their intimate partners compared to students who score higher on the scale. On the other hand, female participants who score higher on the empirically-grounded causation scale are more likely to report perpetrating sexual coercion than participants who score lower on the scale, contrary to expectations. The multiple regressions show that male respondents’ score on the empirically-grounded causation scale is negatively correlated with injuring intimate partners, providing additional support for the hypothesis. These findings suggest that male college students who do not endorse empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence are at greater risk for relationship violence perpetration.
compared to those who endorse these causes of domestic violence. On the other hand, female students’ beliefs regarding empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence do not appear to be risk factors for their perpetration relationship violence.

The previous analyses also provide support for the hypothesis that students who scored lower on the physical and sexual abuse definition scale would be more likely to commit abusive acts within their relationships than those who scored higher on the scale. The bivariate analyses illustrate that college students’ mean score on the physical and sexual abuse definition scale is lower for students who perpetrate psychological aggression and physical assault compared to students who do not. Additionally, males’ mean physical and sexual abuse definition score is lower among males who sexually coerce and injure their partners than among males who do not sexually coerce or injure their partners. At the multivariate level, male respondents’ scores on the physical and sexual abuse definition scale are negatively correlated with their use of psychological aggression, physical assault, and injury within relationships. Female respondents’ scores are also negatively correlated with their perpetration of physical assault against intimate partners. These findings indicate that college students who do not define physical and sexual abuse as domestic violence, especially males, are at risk for perpetrating relationship violence.

It was also proposed that students who scored lower on the verbal abuse definition scale would be more likely to perpetrate violent acts against their partners compared to those who scored higher on the scale. The bivariate analyses partially support this hypothesis. Females’ mean score on the verbal abuse definition scale is lower among those who report using psychological aggression and physical assault against their partners than among those who do not report using psychological aggression and physical assault. However, female respondents’ mean score on the scale is also lower for respondents who use negotiation tactics within their
relationships than for respondents who do not. Also contrary to expectations, males who sexually coerce their partners have a higher mean score on the verbal abuse definition scale than males who do not sexually coerce their partners. The multiple regressions provide additional support for the hypothesis. Females’ verbal abuse definition scores are negatively correlated with psychological aggression and physical assault. These results reveal that female college students who do not endorse verbal abuse definitions of domestic violence are at a higher risk for relationship violence perpetration compared to those who endorse verbal abuse definitions, while male students’ beliefs regarding verbal abuse do not appear to be risk factors for their relationship violence perpetration.

The bivariate and multivariate results related to the stalking definition scale do not support the hypothesis that students who scored lower on the stalking definition scale would be more likely to abuse their partners than those who scored higher on the scale. Lower scores on the scale are correlated with female students’ use of negotiation within relationships. However, stalking definition scores are not associated with psychological aggression, physical assault, sexual coercion or injury for college students, demonstrating that endorsement of stalking definitions is not an important factor in predicting these types of relationship violence perpetration. Since stalking perpetration was not assessed in this project, it is possible that beliefs related to stalking are risk factors for stalking perpetration, but not for other types of relationship violence.

Although beliefs related to stalking are not identified as risk factors for relationship violence perpetration, beliefs regarding myth-based and empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence as well as beliefs related to physical and sexual abuse and verbal abuse are identified as risk factors in this study. These findings are consistent with previous research (e.g.
Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003; Knickrehm & Teske, 2000) as well as the theoretical foundations provided by the subculture of violence theory and the theory of reasoned action.

Initial hypotheses also proposed that racial and ethnic minorities would be more likely to hold beliefs accepting domestic violence than Caucasians. Conversely, the preceding analyses do not support this hypothesis. For example, males from other racial and ethnic groups were more likely to endorse verbal abuse definitions compared to Caucasian males and female Hispanic students were more likely to endorse verbal abuse definitions than female Caucasian students. These findings contradict those of previous studies (e.g. Carlson & Worden, 2005; Locke & Richman, 1999). However, there are a number of potential explanations for these results. This study assesses the risk factors for beliefs related to each type of domestic violence separately, while the majority of prior research assesses domestic violence beliefs more generally. In addition, this project includes more racial and ethnic categories compared to most of the previous studies examining the correlations between race and ethnicity and domestic violence beliefs. Previous research also demonstrates that individuals from Hispanic racial and ethnic groups, particularly Cubans, are less likely to approve of domestic violence compared to individuals from other racial and ethnic groups (e.g. Kaufman Kantor et al., 1994). Since the data for this project were collected at a Florida university with a relatively large Hispanic population, it is possible that the sample includes an extraordinarily high percentage of Cuban respondents, which would explain the findings regarding correlations between race and ethnicity and domestic violence beliefs.

Results provide partial confirmation for the prediction that students who have completed fewer years at the university would be more likely to hold beliefs supportive of domestic violence than those who have completed more years at the university. Although there are no
correlations between male college students’ university year and domestic violence beliefs, findings demonstrate that female freshmen are more likely to endorse myth-based causes of domestic violence compared to female seniors. These results suggest that university year is a potential risk factor for domestic violence beliefs among female students, but not among male students, indicating that females’ domestic violence beliefs improve during their college careers, but males’ beliefs do not.

It was additionally expected that students whose parents had lower educational achievements would be more likely to accept domestic violence than those whose parents had higher educational achievements. However, findings do not support this hypothesis. Neither fathers’ nor mothers’ level of education is associated with college students’ domestic violence beliefs, revealing that parents’ level of education is not a risk factor for beliefs supportive of domestic violence among college students.

Similarly, the hypothesis that college students with lower family yearly incomes would be more likely to support domestic violence than those with higher family incomes is not supported in the previous analyses. Since family income is not correlated with students’ domestic violence beliefs, this variable does not appear to be a risk factor for college students’ acceptance of domestic violence.

As previously noted for expectations regarding relationship violence perpetration, the lack of support for these expectations regarding parents’ educational achievements and family yearly income may be explained by the fact that students were asked to approximate their responses for each question. If students provided incorrect approximations, the results regarding associations between students’ parents’ education and family income and their domestic violence beliefs may not be valid.
Due to a lack of previous research and theoretical explanations, no expectations were provided for the possible relationship between college students’ parents’ marital status and their domestic violence beliefs. This study demonstrates that there is no correlation between students’ parents’ marital status and their domestic violence causation and definition endorsements, suggesting that parents’ marital status is not a risk factor for beliefs supportive of domestic violence among college students.

As with parents’ marital status, no predictions were given regarding the potential association between college students’ relationship status and domestic violence beliefs. However, the preceding analyses illustrate that males who are currently in a relationship are more likely to endorse verbal abuse definitions compared to males who were previously but are not currently in a relationship, showing that male college students who are not currently in a relationship are at greater risk of holding beliefs supportive of domestic violence compared to those who are currently in a relationship.

The previous analyses provide support for the expectation that the more alcohol students consume, the more likely they would be to hold beliefs supportive of domestic violence. College students’ alcohol consumption is negatively correlated with their endorsement of physical and sexual abuse definitions. In addition, males’ alcohol consumption is negatively associated with endorsing empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence and females’ alcohol consumption is positively associated with endorsing myth-based causes of domestic violence. These results suggest that college students’ alcohol consumption is a risk factor for accepting domestic violence.

Because of the lack of previous research and theoretical explanations, no hypothesis was given regarding the potential relationship between college students’ drug use and domestic
violence beliefs. However, students’ drug use appears to be an important risk factor for their acceptance of domestic violence, especially among males. Results demonstrate that both male and female respondents who tried drugs during the previous year are more likely to endorse myth-based causes of domestic violence compared to respondents who did not try drugs. Furthermore, males who tried drugs are less likely to endorse empirically-grounded causes of domestic violence and physical and sexual abuse definitions.

Finally, it was predicted that students who were exposed to interparental violence during childhood would be more likely to accept domestic violence compared to those who were not exposed to interparental violence. This study provides support for this hypothesis. Male participants who heard or saw their parents hitting each other during childhood are more likely to endorse myth-based causes of domestic violence compared to participants who did not hear or see their parents hitting each other. These results suggest that witnessing interparental violence during childhood is a risk factor for male college students’ acceptance of domestic violence, which is consistent with previous results (e.g. Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996).

Although social desirability was included in the multiple linear regressions as a control variable, it emerged as a significant factor in the multiple linear regressions assessing female respondents’ use of psychological aggression within relationships. The results of this regression are provided in Table 31. Females’ score on the social desirability scale is negatively correlated with their perpetration of psychological aggression against intimate partners, which is consistent with previous studies demonstrating that individuals reporting intimate partner violence perpetration scored lower on measures of social desirability (Lewis et al., 2002; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1997).
In conclusion, the domestic violence belief variables added to the regression models, but generally did not emerge as major factors in predicting relationship violence among college students. Instead, sociodemographic characteristics played a more important role in predicting perpetration, with one exception. The regression model assessing the combined effects of sociodemographic characteristics and domestic violence beliefs on male students’ use of injury explained more than double the variance of the model without beliefs. These results differ from theoretical explanations provided by the attitude mediation thesis and theory of reasoned action.

Although the size and diversity of the sample are strengths of this study, there are weaknesses as well. For instance, the geographically-isolated sample is a limitation of the current project. The regression equations also produced relatively low R² values, only explaining between 5 and 13% of the variance among the relationship violence perpetration variables. Since the Relationship Characteristics Study did not include questions regarding participants’ Greek and athletic affiliations, these potential risk factors for domestic violence beliefs and relationship violence perpetration among college samples were not examined in the current project. Additionally, the Relationship Characteristics Study did not pose questions related to respondents’ stalking perpetration, which was not assessed in the present study although stalking has been noted as a serious problem among college students (e.g. Fisher et al., 2000).

Further research should attempt to address the weaknesses of this project. For example, it is recommended that future studies draw samples from other geographic regions. It is also important to incorporate factors in addition to those included in this study, such as Greek and athletic participation, in subsequent investigations. Since drug use emerged as a risk factor for college students’ beliefs supportive of domestic violence as well as their perpetration of relationship violence, further research needs to pinpoint the specific drugs that are most
problematic, which will allow college administrations to develop more appropriate relationship violence prevention strategies. Future studies should also assess the relationships between students’ sociodemographic characteristics, domestic violence beliefs, and stalking perpetration, which has been identified as a serious problem among college students.

This project contributes to the body of literature on relationship violence among college students by analyzing the correlations between sociodemographic characteristics, domestic violence beliefs, and relationship violence perpetration, producing a more comprehensive overview of the interactions between these variables than current research provides. With the knowledge provided by this research, college administrations can more effectively direct prevention programs toward the subpopulations of students who are most likely to perpetrate relationship violence as identified in this study to eliminate this pervasive problem. For example, administrations can develop primary prevention measures targeting subpopulations at risk for relationship violence perpetration, such as racial and ethnic minorities and students with relatively high levels of alcohol consumption. College administrations can also implement primary prevention programs designed to improve the domestic violence beliefs associated with relationship violence perpetration, like myth-based causation and physical and sexual abuse definition endorsements. Additionally, this project demonstrates the importance of granularly investigating the relationships between sociodemographic characteristics, domestic violence beliefs, and relationship violence perpetration, with different risk factors identified for each dependent variable. It is essential to keep this in mind during the development of future research and policy.
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