

University of Nebraska - Lincoln
DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Sociology Theses, Dissertations, & Student
Research

Sociology, Department of

4-2018

Assessing Risks and Potential Protective Factors of Dating Violence Perpetration and Victimization

Brian Ermon Tussey

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, brian.tussey@huskers.unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologydiss>

 Part of the [Sociology Commons](#)

Tussey, Brian Ermon, "Assessing Risks and Potential Protective Factors of Dating Violence Perpetration and Victimization" (2018).
Sociology Theses, Dissertations, & Student Research. 50.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologydiss/50>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Sociology, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sociology Theses, Dissertations, & Student Research by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

ASSESSING RISKS AND POTENTIAL PROTECTIVE FACTORS OF DATING
VIOLENCE PERPETRATION AND VICTIMIZATION

by

Brian Ermon Tussey

A THESIS

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts

Major: Sociology

Under the Supervision of Professor Kimberly A. Tyler

Lincoln, Nebraska

April, 2018

TOWARD A COMPREHENSIVE MODEL OF DATING VIOLENCE
PERPETRATION AND VICTIMIZATION

Brian Ermon Tussey, M.A.

University of Nebraska, 2018

Advisor: Kimberly A. Tyler

Dating violence is prevalent among college students. While past studies have used multiple theories to explain risks for dating violence perpetration and victimization, the literature on dating violence remains disjointed, using only one or two theoretical perspectives in their models of dating violence. In this study, I examine dating violence perpetration and victimization from four key theoretical perspectives: the background-situational model of dating violence, social learning theory, attachment theory, and the antisocial orientation perspective. Analyses demonstrated that elements of all four theoretical perspectives were associated with dating violence perpetration and victimization. In addition, religiosity and maternal relationship quality were important protective factors against dating violence. Implications of the study findings on practice and future research are discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
CHAPTER 3: METHODS.....	12
CHAPTER 4: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS.....	18
CHAPTER 5: RESULTS.....	19
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION.....	25
CHAPTER 7: LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS.....	31
CHAPTER 8: REFERENCES.....	34
APPENDIX A: TABLES.....	40

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Dating violence, which can include physical or sexual violence, threats of violence, as well as psychological aggression, is widespread in college student dating relationships (Barnett, Miller-Perrin, and Perrin 2011). It is estimated that more than one-third of U.S. college students report both dating violence perpetration and victimization (Stappenbeck and Fromme 2010). Moreover, dating violence perpetration was found to range from 17% to 45% in a 17-country study of 33 universities, with almost identical levels found for dating violence victimization (Straus 2004). Dating violence perpetration and victimization are associated with numerous negative outcomes such as poor mental health (DeMaris and Kaukinen 2005), additional acts of perpetration and victimization (Gómez 2011; Vivian and Langhinrichsen-Rohling 1994), and problematic drug use (Exner-Cortens, Eckenrode, and Rothman 2013). Given these serious negative outcomes, dating violence is an important public health and human rights issue.

Though past studies have found several consistent correlates for both dating violence victimization and perpetration, the most consistent finding in the literature is the direct link between dating violence and adverse childhood experiences (Dube et al. 2001), such as child physical and/or sexual abuse (Foshee et al. 2004; Herrenkohl et al. 2004), witnessing family violence/aggression (Jouriles et al. 2012), and having poor relationship quality with one's parents (Cleveland, Herrera, and Stuewig 2003). Additionally, risk behaviors such as heavy drinking (Stappenbeck and Fromme 2010), drug use (McNaughton Reyes et al. 2012), sexual risk taking (Alleyne et al. 2011; Schiff and Zeira 2005), along with personality characteristics, such as attachment anxiety (Lee, Reese-Weber, and Kahn 2014) also have been found to be both directly associated with

dating violence, as well as mediating mechanisms through which family factors are linked to dating violence (Morris, Mrug, and Windle 2015). Other variables that have been examined in the study of dating violence, though to a lesser extent, include religiosity and entitlement. Religiosity has been negatively linked with dating violence attitudes (Berkel, Vandiver, and Bahner 2004), indicating that religiosity may be an important protective factor because of its focus on personal worth and the worth of others. Entitlement has been found to be associated with dating violence (Campbell et al. 2004; Tyler et al. 2017), and may relate to other personality factors such as attachment.

Though prior studies have examined many of these correlates individually, research has not looked at these risk factors simultaneously even though many of these variables are interrelated. For example, research shows that insecure attachment is positively associated with risk behaviors, including alcohol use and sexual risk behaviors (Golder et al. 2005; Rapoza and Baker 2008; Sutton and Simons 2015). As such, a more complete understanding of how these risk factors are interrelated with dating violence is needed. Another shortcoming in the literature is that many studies only examine one component of dating violence (i.e., victimization only or perpetration only). In this paper, I simultaneously examine a combination of well-studied risk factors of both dating violence perpetration and victimization (e.g., child physical abuse, poor parenting, and risk behaviors), as well as less-studied factors (e.g., entitlement, attachment style, and religiosity) to understand dating violence more completely.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this literature review, I discuss three categories of risk factors, that have *individually* been examined within the “correlates-only model.” These categories of risk factors also are associated with four primary theoretical frameworks, which I outline below. Previous research has determined that there are numerous key phenomena associated with dating violence. The perspective that primarily examines risk factors as standalone, without a strong commitment to a theoretical tradition, is often referred to as a “correlates-only” model (Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell 2008). These correlates can be divided into different categories, with *adverse childhood experiences* (Dube et al. 2001) being the first primary category of risk factors that are popularly studied. These adverse childhood experiences include child physical and/or sexual abuse (Foshee et al. 2004; Herrenkohl et al. 2004), witnessing family violence or aggression (Jouriles et al. 2012), and having poor relationship quality with one’s parents (Cleveland et al. 2003). In addition to adverse childhood experiences, insecure attachment is a second important risk factor for dating violence (Bookwala and Zdaniuk 1998; Rapoza and Baker 2008). A third category that has been examined is risk behaviors, which include risky or antisocial behaviors such as heavy drinking (Stappenbeck and Fromme 2010), drug use (McNaughton Reyes et al. 2012), and sexual risk taking behavior, such as having multiple sexual partners (Alleyne et al. 2011; Schiff and Zeira 2005).

While some dating violence research is characterized by the correlates-only model, theoretically driven analysis is important to understanding dating violence more broadly (Shorey et al. 2008). There are four primary theoretical frameworks that have been used to understand risk factors for dating violence. The first is the *background-situational model of dating violence*, which posits that those who are more accepting of

aggression as a result of their upbringing are more likely to engage in dating violence perpetration, and that acts of aggression are triggered by situational events (Foran and O’Leary 2008; Foshee, Bauman, and Linder 1999; McNaughton Reyes et al. 2016). The second is *social learning theory* (Bandura 1977), which theorizes that aggression is a socially learned behavior. Third, *attachment theory* (Hazan and Shaver 1987) posits that those with secure attachment to their dating partners are less likely to experience or perpetrate dating violence than those with insecure attachment styles. Finally, the *antisocial orientation perspective* (Simons, Burt, and Simons 2008; Simons, Lin, and Gordon 1998) is also used to explain how adverse childhood experiences are associated with dating violence perpetration and victimization through risk behaviors such as substance use and sexual risk taking behavior. Below I examine the literature that is linked with all four of these theoretical perspectives.

Background-Situational Model of Dating Violence

The background situational model of dating violence suggests that those who are more accepting of dating aggression are more likely to engage in dating violence perpetration and experience dating violence victimization (Foshee et al. 1999; McNaughton Reyes et al. 2016). Acceptance of aggression is assumed to derive from experiences of violence and poor parenting during childhood, such as child abuse and inconsistent discipline (Owens and Straus 1975; Simons et al. 1998; Windle and Mrug 2009). This level of acceptance is not restricted to being a victim of violence within the home, but may also be a result of exposure to other types of violence as a child (Owens and Straus 1975). For example, witnessing parental violence may lead children to view aggression as a normative aspect of relationships, and increase their tolerance for it

(Foshee et al. 1999). The tolerance for violence may be increased further by potential assessments of violent outcomes as effective or justified. For example, a situation in which a parent who uses violence to exert his/her decision-making authority and receive compliance from their partner may result in a child framing violence as an acceptable way to influence people. Additionally, those who have experienced violence from their parents are more likely to accept violence as a normative part of close relationships and as a way of showing love. That is, children who were hit by their parents because they were told they deserved it are likely to believe they deserve to be hit by others who love them as well. Previous work supports this notion of intergenerational violence, or the creation of expectations or norms related to interpersonal relationships based on experiences in childhood (Straus and Gelles 1990). Research finds that experiencing child abuse or neglect is associated with perpetration (Widom, Czaja, and Dutton 2014) within intimate relationships, and this normalization of violence is linked to experiencing violence in future dating relationships (McNaughton Reyes et al. 2016).

In addition to background factors detailing who is at risk for dating violence, the background-situational model also examines situational factors that detail when dating violence is likely to take place. Based on this model, dating violence is likely to occur when drinking or other judgement-impairing or aggression-inducing substances have been used, creating a link between the background-situational model and antisocial orientation perspective (Riggs and O'Leary 1989; Vagi et al. 2013). With the combination of background characteristics and situational factors, some relationships are at high risk for dating violence perpetration and victimization. Based on this model, relationships in which both partners have had adverse childhood experiences and where

alcohol and drug use are present are likely to be characterized by dating violence perpetrated by both partners. Additionally, aggressive behavior is another key situational factor directly tied to background factors in that those who previously experienced aggression are more likely to believe aggression is acceptable, leading to more situations in which aggression is present. This combination of past aggression, aggressive attitudes, and the presence of aggressive behavior may lead to an increased likelihood of dating violence.

Social Learning Theory

In addition to the background-situational model, social learning theory is also used to understand how family violence is linked to young adult relationship violence. Social learning theory holds that violence directed at others is learned from one's social environment through the process of observational learning (Bandura 1977). Gelles (1997) argued that children who grow up in violent homes learn the techniques of being violent and the justifications for this behavior. Moreover, early exposure to distinctive types of family violence and abuse are related to the development of unique, and sometimes more severe, forms of aggression in later life (Bevan and Higgins 2002; Straus, Douglas, and Medeiros 2013) Children exposed to violence in their family may later imitate the behavior they have observed, especially if they witness positive outcomes, such as compliance with demands. Additionally, children exposed to violence may learn to accept violence as their fate, remaining in situations of victimization. Owens and Straus (1975) also hold that children exposed to interpersonal violence at a young age, either as victims or perpetrators, report greater approval of interpersonal violence as adults. This

heightened approval may lead to continuation of violent relationships in which the partners would otherwise split up.

More recently, entitlement has been explored as another potential risk factor of dating violence perpetration, especially among college students (Tyler et al. 2017). Entitled attitudes consist of beliefs that certain individuals deserve privileges because of their social status and that they do not need to conform to society's expectations for behavior (Greenberger et al 2008). Entitled attitudes are associated with early childhood exposure to many of the same risk factors associated with dating violence, including child abuse and domestic violence. In one study, men in college who experienced abuse as a child and witnessed domestic violence in their families felt entitled to perpetrate violence against their partners (Silverman et al. 2001). Witnessing or experiencing family violence is associated with aggression and beliefs that violence is justified, which can be labeled as an entitled attitude as it involves a belief that the individual does not need to conform to society's norms of appropriate behavior (Tyler et al. 2017).

Attachment Theory and Dating Violence

In addition to the background-situational model of dating violence and social learning theory discussed above, attachment theory is also useful for understanding early relationships with parents and its link to dating violence. Attachment theory posits that the parent-child relationship gives the child a framework for interacting with others. While originally used to describe parent-child relationships, research recognizes that this framework persists into adolescence and adulthood, where it affects the expectations of dating relationships (Hazan and Shaver 1987). According to attachment theory, children who experienced nurturing care while growing up learn a model of interpersonal

relationships and a positive model of the self that views themselves and others as worthy of love and affection (Bartholomew and Horowitz 1991; Bowlby 1988); these individuals would be deemed as having a secure attachment style. Conversely, children who experience harsh parenting or child abuse while growing up develop relationships that are hostile and distrusting, in addition to developing a negative self-concept of oneself and of others (Bartholomew and Horowitz 1991; Simons et al. 2008). In much of the literature, this is referred to as insecure attachment, which is split into two categories: anxious and avoidant (Brennan, Clark, and Shaver 1998; Fraley and Waller 1998). Individuals who have higher levels of attachment anxiety are afraid of being abandoned, rejected, or unloved by their romantic partners and they worry about the personal availability of their dating partners (Brennan et al. 1998; Fraley and Waller 1998). On the other hand, attachment avoidance holds that certain individuals are uncomfortable when a partner is too attached or too close to them, or when they feel that they depend too much on their partner. Attachment avoidance is characterized by one distancing themselves from others or concealing strong feelings out of worry associated with being too close to other people, especially their dating partners (Brennan et al. 1998; Fraley and Waller 1998).

Research also shows that individuals with secure attachment have relationships of higher quality in adulthood than those with insecure attachment (Lee et al. 2014). Those with insecure attachment styles often have more difficulty managing conflict with their dating partners (Creasey and Hesson-McInnis 2001) and have more negative experiences during separation from their partners (Fraley and Shaver 1998). Anxious attachment is an especially important correlate of dating violence, with many studies showing a positive association between the two (Bookwala and Zdaniuk 1998; Rapoza and Baker 2008). In

terms of attachment avoidance, however, studies show mixed results. Some studies have found a positive association between attachment avoidance and dating violence, especially when the attachment styles of dating partners are mismatched (Doumas et al. 2008), while other studies have found no association (Bookwala and Zdaniuk 1998; Rapoza and Baker 2008), or a negative association (Lee et al. 2014).

Antisocial Orientation Perspective

The final theory is the antisocial orientation perspective. According to this theory, children exposed to poor parenting, such as physical abuse, are at greater risk for dating violence through delinquent behavior and substance use. Therefore, according to this perspective, a general pattern of antisocial behavior is passed from parents to their children and because the children's antisocial tendencies persist throughout the lifespan, this affects the probability that they will engage in dating violence (Tussey, Tyler, and Simons 2018). Negative or abusive early family experiences have been found to be associated with risk-taking behaviors, especially heavy drinking (Clark et al. 2003; Kilpatrick et al. 2003). For example, research demonstrates that greater familial conflict is associated with an increase in risk-taking behaviors later in life (Feldstein and Miller 2006; Igra and Irwin 1996). Additionally, parent-child relationships marked by emotional distance, non-responsiveness, and greater conflict are associated with more risk-taking behaviors (Baumrind 1991; Huebner and Howell 2003). Conversely, research shows that positive mother-child relationships are associated with lower rates of dating violence perpetration (Cleveland et al. 2003), with less known about the father-child relationship's role in dating violence given the paucity of research in this area.

Though some college students engage in numerous risk behaviors, alcohol use and its relationship with dating violence has been studied most frequently (Shorey, Stuart, and Cornelius 2011; Tyler et al. 2017), while drug use and risky sexual behavior (Gover, Kaukinen, and Fox 2008; Sutton and Simons 2015) have been studied to a lesser extent. All three risk taking behaviors, however, have been shown to be associated with dating violence (Foran and O’Leary 2008; Nabors 2010; Shorey et al. 2011). Much of the literature examining alcohol use and dating violence focuses on the relationship between alcohol and aggression, as well as alcohol’s effect on the quality of relationships (Foran and O’Leary 2008; Shorey et al. 2011). For example, engaging in heavy drinking behavior may cause aggressive behavior in situations that would otherwise be benign, leading to acts of perpetration and victimization. The impaired judgement that stems from alcohol may also exacerbate the risk of victimization for cases in which a sober person would leave a situation in which they are at risk for experiencing dating violence from a partner, while someone under the influence of alcohol may not.

Hypotheses

Based on the above literature and theoretical perspectives, I hypothesized the following: *Hypothesis #1*: those who experienced poor parenting growing up (i.e., witnessing parental violence, more child physical abuse, and more inconsistent discipline) would be more likely to perpetrate and be a victim of dating violence. *Hypothesis #2*: those who had strong supportive ties with parents while growing up (i.e., higher maternal and paternal relationship quality and stronger subjective religious beliefs) would be less likely to perpetrate and be a victim of dating violence. *Hypothesis #3*: those with more entitled attitudes, and more anxious or avoidant attachment styles would be

more likely to perpetrate and be a victim of dating violence. *Hypothesis #4*: those who engage in more risky behaviors (i.e., more heavy drinking, more sexual risk behavior and more drug use) would be more likely to perpetrate and be a victim of dating violence. I also include respondents' gender as a control variable in all models as many of the hypothesized relationships are expected to vary for males and females. Finally, school location is also used as a control variable in all models.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Study Site and Participants

Data were gathered in the 2013-2014 academic year at two large public universities in the U.S., one in the Midwest and one in the Southeast. Both universities are public land-grant institutions with undergraduate enrollment ranging from 20,000 to 25,000 students. Racial composition at both locations was approximately 80% White. The combined sample consisted of 1,482 undergraduate college students, including 778 (52.5%) from the Southeast and 704 (47.5%) from the Midwest. The sample was split between males (48.8%) and females (51.2%). Most respondents were White (80%), followed by Black/African American (7.3%); Hispanic or Latino (3.6%); Asian (6.6%); and 2.4% identified their race as “other.” Final analyses included 1,285 cases after doing listwise deletion, with approximately 14% of cases removed from final analyses.

Procedure

Undergraduate students enrolled in social science courses completed a paper and pencil survey of attitudes and experiences about dating, sexuality, and substance use. Every student was eligible to participate. Students were informed that their participation was voluntary and their responses were anonymous. They had the option of filling out the survey for course credit. If they did not wish to complete the survey, they were given another option. Students were told that if they chose not to fill out the survey or do the alternative extra credit assignment, it would not affect their course grade. Approximately 98% of all students in attendance across both institutions completed the survey while the remaining students opted for the alternative assignment. The Institutional Review Board at both institutions approved this study for their respective location.

Measures

Dependent variables

Dating violence perpetration (adapted from Straus et al. 1996) included five items from the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2), which asked respondents, “During the past 12 months, how many times have you done each of the following to a current or former partner:” (1) threw something that could hurt, (2) kicked your partner, (3) punched or hit your partner with something that could hurt, (4) choked your partner, and (5) insulted or swore at your partner (0 = never to 4 = more than 10 times). All items loaded on a single factor ($\alpha = .65$). Due to skewness, this variable was dichotomized (0 = never; 1 = at least once).

Dating violence victimization (adapted from Straus et al. 1996) included five items from the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2), which asked respondents “During the past 12 months, how many times has your current or former partner done each of the following to you:” (1) threw something that could hurt, (2) kicked you, (3) punched or hit you with something that could hurt, (4) choked you, and (5) insulted or swore at you (0 = never to 4 = more than 10 times). All items loaded on a single factor ($\alpha = .71$). Due to skewness, this variable was dichotomized (0 = never; 1 = at least once).

Independent variables

Witnessing parental violence was measured using four questions that asked whether one parent or caregiver did any of the following toward another parent or caregiver: (1) pushing, shoving, or grabbing, (2) throwing an object at the other person in anger, (3) threaten to hit the other person, and (4) hitting or punching the other person using their hand, fist, or another object. Due to skewness, this variable was dichotomized (0 = never; 1 = at least once).

Child physical abuse included four items adapted from the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scale (PC-CTS; Straus et al.1998). Respondents were asked how often a parent/caregiver had ever: (1) thrown something at them in anger, (2) pushed, shoved or grabbed them in anger, (3) slapped or spanked them with their hand, and (4) hit them with an object (0 = never to 4 = frequently or always). Items were summed and then the variable was logged (due to skewness), whereby a higher score indicates more physical abuse as a child ($\alpha = .82$).

Inconsistent discipline included three items that asked about parent discipline. Respondents were asked how often the following statements applied to them growing up: (1) sometimes one parent/caregiver would give me permission to do something after the other parent/caregiver said no, (2) my parents/caregivers had two different standards or sets of expectations for my behavior, and (3) my parents argued about how rules around issues such as my curfew, friends, or how I should be disciplined (0 = never to 5 = always). The three items were summed where a higher score indicates more inconsistent discipline ($\alpha = .76$).

Maternal relationship quality included six items that asked respondents what their relationship with their mother was like when they were growing up at home. Items asked how often did your mother/female caregiver: (1) listen carefully to your point of view, (2) shout or yell because she is mad at you, (3) act loving and affectionate toward you, (4) criticize you or your ideas (5) have a good laugh with you about something that is funny, and (6) insult or swear at you or call you bad names (1 = always to 5 = never). Certain items were reverse coded and then a mean scale was created such that a higher score indicates a more positive relationship with their mother ($\alpha = .80$).

Paternal relationship quality included six items that asked respondents what their relationship with their father was like when they were growing up at home. Items asked how often did your father/male caregiver: (1) listen carefully to your point of view, (2) shout or yell because he is mad at you, (3) act loving and affectionate toward you, (4) criticize you or your ideas (5) have a good laugh with you about something that is funny, and (6) insult or swear at you or call you bad names (1 = always to 5 = never). Certain items were reverse coded and then a mean scale was created such that a higher score indicates a more positive relationship with their father ($\alpha = .76$).

Religiosity included two items, which asked how often respondents attended religious services (0 = never to 5 = more than once per week) and the influence of religious beliefs on their daily life (0 = none, 1 = something I sometimes consider when making decisions, and 2 = my religious beliefs guide nearly every decision I make). The two items were first standardized, and then summed such that a higher score indicates higher religiosity ($\alpha = .72$).

Entitlement included six items adapted from the Psychological Entitlement Scale (Campbell et al. 2004) such as “I honestly feel I’m just more deserving than others,” “Things should go my way,” and “It is hard for me to resist acting on feelings,” (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Items loaded on one factor. A mean scale was created where a higher score indicates higher entitlement ($\alpha = .73$).

Attachment anxiety was measured using four items from the Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised Questionnaire (Fraley, Waller, and Brennan 2000): (1) I worry that romantic partners won’t care about me as much as I care about them, (2) I worry a fair amount about losing my partner, (3) I resent it when my partner spends time away

from me, and (4) I worry about being abandoned or rejected by my partner (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). A mean scale was created such that a higher score indicates more attachment anxiety ($\alpha = .82$).

Attachment avoidance was assessed using four items (adapted from Fraley et al. 2000): (1) I don't like showing a partner how I feel deep down, (2) when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away, (3) I avoid sharing personal feelings with romantic partners, and (4) I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). A mean scale was created such that a higher score indicates more attachment avoidance ($\alpha = .84$).

Heavy drinking included two items (adapted from Testa, Livingston, and Leonard 2003), which asked respondents, During the past 12 months, "how many times have you gotten drunk on alcohol" and "how many times have you consumed five or more (if you're a man)/four or more (if you're a woman) drinks in a single sitting" (0 = never to 5 = five or more days per week). The two items were averaged such that a higher score indicates more frequent heavy drinking (Testa et al. 2003). The correlation between the two items is .87.

Sexual risk behavior included three items, which asked (1) how old they were the first time they had sexual intercourse (1 = less than 14 years old to 5 = never experienced sexual intercourse); (2) the number of people they have had sexual intercourse with (vaginal or anal penetration; 1 = none to 5 = 10 or more); and (3) how often they use condoms during sexual intercourse (1 = always to 3 = never; 4 = never had sexual intercourse). Item 1 was recoded such that a higher score indicates earlier sexual initiation. Additionally, respondents who reported never having sex for item 3 were

coded as “1.” The three items were standardized and then a mean scale was created where a higher score indicates riskier sexual behavior ($\alpha = .71$).

Drug risk behavior included two items, which asked respondents how often they ever smoked marijuana and how often they ever used prescription drugs (e.g., Adderall) that were not prescribed for them or used them in a way other than how the doctor prescribed their use (0 = never to 4 = more than 10 times). A mean scale was created where a higher score indicates more frequent lifetime drug risk behavior. The correlation between the two items is .65.

Gender was self-reported and was coded as 0 = male and 1 = female.

CHAPTER 4: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

All analyses were conducted in IBM SPSS Version 25. I first ran bivariate correlations to show the relationship between the dependent variables with each of the independent variables. Next, I used logistic regression for my multivariate analyses. I chose logistic regression for my analytic strategy because this is the appropriate statistical procedure when the dependent variables (i.e., dating violence victimization and dating violence perpetration) are dichotomous. I ran five models for each of the two dependent variables (i.e., dating violence victimization and dating violence perpetration). I stepped in each block of variables so I could see the effect of each block. The first model included gender. The second model added three variables for adverse childhood experiences, including witnessing parental violence, child physical abuse, and inconsistent discipline. Next, I included the protective variables of religiosity, as well as maternal and paternal relationship quality in model 3. The fourth model included the personality variables, entitlement, attachment anxiety, and attachment avoidance. Finally, the last model (full model) added risky behaviors (i.e., heavy drinking, sexual and drug risk behaviors) and contained all study variables. Although I tested interactions for gender with all study variables, no significant interactions were found. Additionally, all multivariate analyses controlled for school location even though this variable is not included in the tables. All values in Tables 2 and 3 are reported in odds ratios (OR). A p value of less than or equal to .05 is considered significant for these analyses.

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

Bivariate Correlations

The bivariate correlations, means, and standard deviations are provided in Table 1. Results of the bivariate correlations show that dating violence perpetration and victimization are highly correlated ($r = .79$; $p \leq 0.01$). Additionally, dating violence perpetration is significantly correlated with every variable except for school location. That is, those students who have perpetrated dating violence are more likely to be female ($r = .12$; $p \leq 0.01$), to have witnessed parental violence ($r = .11$; $p \leq 0.01$), to have experienced more child physical abuse ($r = .11$; $p \leq 0.01$), and more inconsistent discipline ($r = .09$; $p \leq 0.01$), to have more entitled attitudes ($r = .11$; $p \leq 0.01$), higher attachment ($r = .07$; $p \leq 0.01$), and higher rates of heavy drinking ($r = .15$; $p \leq 0.01$), sexual risk behavior ($r = 0.14$; $p \leq 0.01$), and drug risk behavior ($r = .22$; $p \leq 0.01$). Students who have perpetrated dating violence are less likely to be religious ($r = -.14$; $p \leq 0.01$), have poorer relationship quality with both their mother ($r = -.11$; $p \leq 0.01$) and their father ($r = -.06$; $p \leq 0.01$), and these students also have lower avoidant attachment style ($r = -.07$; $p \leq 0.01$).

In terms of dating violence victimization, students who report being victims of dating violence are more likely to be female ($r = .06$; $p \leq 0.05$), to have witnessed parental violence ($r = .10$; $p \leq 0.01$), to have experienced more child physical abuse ($r = .10$; $p \leq 0.01$) and more inconsistent discipline ($r = .08$; $p \leq 0.01$), to have more entitled attitudes ($r = .08$; $p \leq 0.01$) and higher attachment anxiety ($r = .10$; $p \leq 0.01$), and higher rates of heavy drinking ($r = .16$; $p \leq 0.01$), sexual risk behavior ($r = .16$; $p \leq 0.01$), and drug risk behavior ($r = .21$; $p \leq 0.01$). Finally, students who were victims of dating

violence were less likely to be religious ($r = -.12$; $p \leq 0.01$) and had poorer relationship quality with both their mother ($r = -.09$; $p \leq 0.01$) and their father ($r = -.06$; $p \leq 0.05$).

Results of the logistic regression analysis are shown in Tables 2 and 3. Table 2 shows the results of the models examining *dating violence victimization*, while Table 3 shows results for those models examining *dating violence perpetration*. The odds ratios are provided for each model. As can be seen in the tables, there is significant overlap between the two sets of models for dating violence victimization and perpetration.

Dating Violence Victimization

The results for the dating violence victimization logistic regression models are found in Table 2. In Model 1, being female was associated with an increased likelihood of experiencing dating violence victimization (OR = 1.288; $p \leq 0.05$). That is, the odds of being a victim of dating violence were elevated by 29% for females compared to males.

Model 2, which included the adverse childhood experiences variables, revealed that child physical abuse was positively associated with dating violence victimization (OR = 1.786; $p \leq 0.01$). That is, experiencing more frequent child abuse was associated with a 79% increase in the odds of experiencing dating violence victimization. Inconsistent discipline was positively associated as well (OR = 1.040; $p \leq 0.05$). Those who indicated more frequent parental discrepancies in discipline had a 4% higher odds of experiencing dating violence victimization. Witnessing parental violence was not significantly associated with dating violence victimization. Similar to Model 1, gender (OR = 1.381; $p \leq 0.01$) was associated with dating violence victimization. Inclusion of the adverse childhood experiences variables increased the level of variance explained to 3%.

Model 3, which added the protective factors, revealed that religiosity was significantly associated with dating violence victimization (OR = 0.873; $p \leq 0.01$) indicating that each standardized unit increase on the religiosity scale was associated with a 13% lower odds of experiencing dating violence victimization. Neither maternal nor paternal relationship quality were significant. All other variables that were significant in Models 1 and 2, remained significant in this model with the exception of inconsistent discipline. The level of variance explained in Model 3 was 5%.

Model 4, which included the personality variables, revealed that attachment anxiety was positively associated with dating violence victimization (OR = 1.254; $p \leq 0.01$). That is, each unit increase on the attachment anxiety scale was associated with a 25% higher odds of being a victim of dating violence. Attachment avoidance was negatively associated with dating violence victimization (OR = 0.786; $p \leq 0.01$) indicating that each unit increase on the attachment avoidance scale was associated with a 21% lower odds of experiencing dating violence victimization. Entitlement was not associated with dating violence victimization. Child physical abuse remained significantly associated with dating violence victimization (OR = 1.804; $p \leq 0.05$). Similar to prior models, maternal and paternal relationship quality and inconsistent discipline were not significantly associated with dating violence victimization whereas gender (OR = 1.349; $p \leq 0.05$) and religiosity (OR = 0.870; $p \leq 0.01$) remained significant correlates. The addition of the personality variables increased the explanation of variance to 7% in Model 4.

The final (full) model added the risky behavior variables in Model 5. Results showed that heavy drinking was positively associated with dating violence victimization

(OR = 1.314; $p \leq 0.05$). That is, those who reported heavier drinking had a 31% higher odds of experiencing dating violence victimization. Sexual risk behavior was also associated with an increased odds of dating violence victimization (OR = 1.280; $p \leq 0.05$). In other words, higher rates of sexual risk taking behavior was associated with a 28% higher odds of being a victim of dating violence. Also, drug risk behavior was positively associated with dating violence victimization (OR = 1.285; $p \leq 0.01$) indicating that more drug risk behavior was associated with a 29% higher odds of being a victim of dating violence. Like prior models, gender, child physical abuse, and attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance remained associated with dating violence victimization. However, religiosity was no longer significant in the final model. The addition of the risky behavior variables increased the explained variance to 15% for dating violence victimization.

Dating Violence Perpetration

The results for the dating violence perpetration logistic regression models are found in Table 3. In Model 1, being female was associated with an increased likelihood of perpetrating dating violence (OR = 1.688; $p \leq 0.01$). That is, the odds of perpetrating dating violence were elevated by 69% for females compared to males. Gender alone accounted for 2% of the variance in dating violence perpetration.

Model 2, which included the adverse childhood experiences variables, revealed that child physical abuse was positively associated with dating violence perpetration (OR = 1.978; $p \leq 0.01$). In other words, experiencing more frequent child abuse was associated with a 98% increase in the odds of perpetrating dating violence. Inconsistent discipline also was positively associated with dating violence perpetration (OR = 1.049; p

≤ 0.05). That is, those who indicated more frequent parental discrepancies in discipline had a 5% higher odds of perpetrating dating violence. Parental violence was not significantly associated with dating violence perpetrating. Similar to Model 1, gender remained a significant correlate of dating violence perpetration. The inclusion of the adverse childhood experiences variables increased the level of variance explained to 6%.

Model 3, which added the protective factors variables, revealed that religiosity was associated with a reduced likelihood of dating violence perpetration (OR = 0.841; $p \leq 0.01$). That is, each standard unit increase on the religiosity scale resulted in a 16% lower odds of perpetrating dating violence. Neither maternal or paternal relationship quality were associated with dating violence perpetration. Like the prior models, gender, and child physical abuse remained significant correlates of dating violence perpetration while inconsistent discipline was no longer significant. The level of variance explained in Model 3 was 9%.

The personality variables were added in Model 4. Results revealed that entitlement was positively associated with dating violence perpetration (OR = 1.307; $p \leq 0.01$). That is, each single-unit increase in entitlement was associated with a 31% higher odds of perpetrating dating violence. Also, attachment anxiety was positively associated with dating violence perpetration (OR = 1.157; $p \leq 0.05$) indicating that each unit increase on the attachment anxiety scale was associated with a 16% higher odds of perpetrating dating violence. Attachment avoidance was negatively associated with dating violence perpetration (OR = 0.741; $p \leq 0.01$) revealing that each unit increase on the attachment avoidance scale was associated with a 26% lower odds of perpetrating dating violence. Additionally, gender, child physical abuse, and religiosity remained

significant correlates. The addition of the personality variables increased the explained variance to 12%.

Model 5, the full model, added the risky behavior variables. Results revealed that heavy drinking was positively associated with dating violence perpetration (OR = 1.316; $p \leq 0.01$). That is, those who reported heavier drinking had a 32% higher odds of perpetrating dating violence. Also, drug risk behavior was positively associated with dating violence perpetration (OR = 1.355; $p \leq 0.01$). That is, more drug risk behaviors were associated with a 36% higher odds of perpetrating dating violence. Sexual risk behavior was not significantly associated with dating violence perpetration. Additionally, maternal relationship quality was significant in the full model (OR = 0.778; $p \leq 0.05$). In other words, a more positive relationship with one's mother reduced the likelihood of dating violence perpetration by 22%. Finally, similar to Model 4, gender, child physical abuse, religiosity, and the personality variables all remained significantly associated with dating violence perpetration. The addition of the risky behavior variables increased the explained variance to 19% for dating violence perpetration.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of adverse childhood experiences, protective factors, personality characteristics, and risky behaviors on dating violence victimization and perpetration. Overall, there was significant overlap in the risk factors for dating violence perpetration and victimization. I found that experiencing more child physical abuse, having a more anxious attachment style, and having more heavy drinking and drug risk behaviors were positively associated with both dating violence perpetration and victimization. Attachment avoidance was negatively associated with both dating violence perpetration and victimization. In terms of protective factors, religion and having more positive maternal relationship quality while growing up were negatively associated with dating violence perpetration. Finally, females were more likely than males to perpetrate and experience dating violence.

The findings as a whole are generally consistent with all four theoretical perspectives. First, the results support the background-situational model of dating violence (Riggs and O’Leary 1989) in that both background, such as child physical abuse, and situational factors, including heavy drinking, drug risk behavior, and/or sexual risk behavior, were associated with dating violence perpetration and victimization. Second, these findings also support social learning theory (Bandura 1977), such that children who grew up in violent homes likely learn techniques of being violent and may accept violence as a normal part of life. Attachment theory (Bowlby 1988) is also supported by the findings given that insecure attachment styles (i.e. attachment anxiety and avoidance) are associated with dating violence perpetration and victimization. Lastly, the findings also are consistent with the antisocial orientation perspective (Simons, Burt, and Simons 2008) such that risky behaviors are associated with dating violence

perpetration and victimization. The consistency of the findings with all four theoretical perspectives with the similarity in risk factors between perpetration and victimization supports past findings that dating violence is bi-directional, with individuals being likely to act as perpetrators and experience victimization at the same time (Dardis et al. 2015).

Hypothesis one, that those who experienced poor parenting growing up would be more likely to perpetrate and be a victim of dating violence, was partially supported in that child physical abuse was positively associated with dating violence perpetration and victimization whereas inconsistent discipline and witnessing parental violence were not. The first finding is consistent with previous research (Lee, Reese-Weber, and Kahn 2014; Simons et al. 2008; Tussey et al.2018). Experiencing more child physical abuse was positively associated with both dating violence perpetration and victimization. This finding is supportive of both the background-situational model of dating violence and social learning theory. It is possible that those who experience physical abuse in childhood learn to commit acts of violence toward those for whom they care, especially if violence is associated with compliance (Foshee, Bauman, and Linder 1999). Additionally, children may learn to accept violence from those whom they love because violence is often “deserved” or viewed as a sign of intimacy (McNaughton Reyes et al. 2016). In addition to child physical abuse, inconsistent discipline was significant in Model 2 in both perpetration and victimization models. This is consistent with past findings (Simons, Lin, and Gordon 1998; Windle and Mrug 2009). Witnessing parental violence is not significantly associated with perpetration or victimization as hypothesized. This lack of a significant finding could result from respondents not directly

witnessing conflicts between parents, even if they occurred in the home when they were growing up.

The second hypothesis, which was that those with stronger supportive ties and stronger subjective religious beliefs (religiosity) would be less likely to perpetrate and be a victim of dating violence, was partially supported. Consistent with the research on religiosity and violence attitudes (Berkel, Vandiver, and Bahner 2004), higher levels of religiosity were associated with a lower likelihood of perpetrating dating violence. Individuals who report that they have stronger religious beliefs tend to be less likely to perpetrate dating violence as a result of positive religious values. It is possible that those with stronger religious beliefs attend church or other places of worship more often and thus have stronger supportive ties. Having these supportive ties may increase the likelihood that the young adult will reach out to them for guidance when relationship problems arise, lowering the risk of the young adult resorting to violence to solve the problem. Further, those who are more religious might also be subjected to more social controls which keeps their behavior “in check” and lowers their risk for perpetrating dating violence.

The findings also reveal that the relationship between religiosity and dating violence victimization disappears when risky behaviors are included in the models, which suggests that perhaps more religious students are not engaging in these types of risky behaviors. These students may also avoid situations where drugs and alcohol are present and thus lowers their risk of partaking in these activities. Additionally, it is possible that risky behaviors have a stronger association with dating violence than religiosity, overshadowing the positive influence of religion in the model. This finding could also

indicate that those with stronger religious beliefs are less likely to place themselves in risky situations where there is the possibility of aggression and violence. Consistent with past research (Cleveland, Herrera, and Stuewig 2003; Tussey et al. 2018), higher maternal relationship quality was associated with a reduced likelihood of dating violence perpetration in the full model. This finding indicates that maternal relationship quality is a protective factor against dating violence perpetration. Positive parenting that is characterized by good communication between mothers and children could lead to an improved understanding of appropriate and inappropriate dating behaviors, leading to a reduction in the likelihood of dating violence perpetration in young adulthood. Relatedly, having a strong relationship with a maternal figure may increase the likelihood that when problems do arise in the young adult's life, they will be more likely to confide in their mother about the issue compared to young people without this supportive attachment. Paternal relationship quality was not significantly associated with dating violence victimization or perpetration. This could be a result of fewer students having fathers in their lives than mothers, reducing the overall variance, as children of single parents are more likely to live with their mothers than their fathers (Vespa, Lewis, and Kreider 2013).

The third hypothesis, those with more entitled attitudes, and more anxious or avoidant attachment styles, would be more likely to perpetrate and be a victim of dating violence, was partially supported. Consistent with the hypothesis and literature (Silverman et al. 2001; Tyler et al. 2017), more entitled attitudes were associated with an increased likelihood of dating violence perpetration. Those with entitled attitudes may feel that they do not have to abide by societal norms surrounding the use of violence in

their dating relationships. Thus, some individuals may be more likely to use dating violence to control their partners “because they can.” More entitled individuals may also feel as though they alone are entitled to the love and attention of their partner, causing higher levels of conflict, which can lead to violence. Consistent with the literature and theoretical perspectives (Bookwala and Zdaniuk 1998; Bowlby 1988), more attachment anxiety was associated with both dating violence perpetration and victimization. This suggests that those who have an anxious attachment style feel preoccupied about “losing” their partners to other individuals and activities. As a result, they may be more likely to use violent tactics in response to perceived loss. Thus, individuals with anxious attachment styles use violence as a tactic to prevent what they perceive as loss of control of their partners. Additionally, those with anxious attachment styles may tolerate violence from their partner because they fear that their partner would leave if they were not compliant. Accepting violence in the situation of anxious attachment could be a tactic of self-preservation and peace-keeping in the relationship. Contrary to this hypothesis, more attachment avoidance was associated with a *lower* likelihood of dating violence victimization and perpetration. This could result from the fact that individuals with avoidant attachment styles may not form close connections in the first place. Since the connection with their dating partner is weaker, they may break off their relationships at the first sign of conflict, avoiding situations that may lead them to experience dating violence. Additionally, those who have more avoidant attachment styles may hide strong emotions, such as anger, preventing dating violence perpetration.

Risky behaviors were significantly associated with a higher likelihood of dating violence perpetration and victimization, which partially supports the fourth hypothesis,

which was that those who engage in more risky behaviors (i.e., more heavy drinking, more sexual risk behavior and more drug use) would be more likely to perpetrate and be a victim of dating violence. This finding is consistent with prior research using the antisocial orientation perspective, which holds that risky behaviors are a component of a larger repertoire of antisocial behaviors (Simons et al. 2008; Tussey et al. 2018). Heavy drinking and drug risk behaviors are associated with an increased likelihood of dating violence perpetration. One possible explanation for this association is that alcohol and drugs increase the likelihood of aggression (Shorey, Stuart, and Cornelius 2011), leading to dating violence perpetration. Thus, conflicts that occur under the influence of alcohol and drugs may be more likely to become violent. Alcohol and drugs may impair judgement, leading individuals to escalate conflicts when they otherwise would decide not to. Additionally, heavy drinking, sexual risk behavior, and drug risk behavior are associated with an increased likelihood of dating violence victimization. This finding is consistent with the background-situational model (Riggs and O'Leary 1989), in which risky situations facilitate the occurrence of dating violence. The use of alcohol and drugs may impair judgement, leading individuals to find themselves in a situation while they are impaired in which they are at risk for being victimized. Under the influence of alcohol and drugs, individuals may unknowingly or unintentionally provoke their partners through aggressive behavior, leading them to become victims of dating violence.

CHAPTER 7: LIMITATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

Limitations

This study is not without limitations. First, all information comes from self-reports, which leaves the potential for underreporting or misreporting due to the sensitive nature of the questions or the reference periods used. Second, all data come from the same time-period, so inferences about causal ordering cannot be made with regards to risk behaviors and dating violence experiences. Finally, because students were not randomly selected, findings cannot be generalized to all undergraduate students enrolled in social science courses in the Midwest and Southeast.

Policy and Practice Implications

Given the current findings regarding protective factors, namely that higher maternal relationship quality and religiosity lowers the likelihood of dating violence, this study has important implications on policy and practice. First, practitioners who work with populations who are at-risk for dating violence, especially young adults, should help to encourage positive parenting practices, especially improved communication between parents and children. By ensuring that children have open and honest means of communicating with their parents about relationship concerns, the likelihood of dating violence perpetration and victimization may decrease. Moreover, the protective factors of religion should be explored by practitioners, especially the social ties within the religious community. Practitioners may work closely with religious leaders to develop dating violence prevention programs that are culturally relevant for students with strong religious beliefs. Future researchers and practitioners could also explore partnerships with religious communities to gain more information about prevention and treatment of victims of dating violence.

In addition to protective factors, working with attachment and entitlement behaviors are another way of exploring dating violence prevention. Practitioners may work to introduce a more positive, secure model of adult attachment in therapeutic work, potentially preventing or reducing future acts of dating violence. By working with clients to improve self-concept and perception of self-worth, they may improve how the client forms bonds with their romantic partner, reducing the likelihood of relationship conflict and dating violence. By nurturing a secure attachment style, practitioners may give young adults the confidence they need to leave abusive partners. In addition to attachment, practitioners may work to reduce entitled behaviors through therapy, reducing the likelihood that clients will commit acts of dating violence against their partners.

Finally, individuals who work with young adults should continue to advocate for a reduction in risky behaviors to prevent dating violence perpetration and victimization. By encouraging young adults to stay away from excessive drinking, drugs, and risky sex, dating violence perpetration and victimization could be reduced. In addition to risk, my findings reveal that early childhood experiences are particularly important in setting the stage for future relationships. Practitioners should continue working with parents to model healthy parenting while their children are very young, increasing the likelihood that their children will practice safe relationship behaviors in the future.

Conclusions

This research makes several meaningful contributions to the literature. First, I based this work on four primary theories of dating violence, using measures of poor parenting, protective factors, entitlement, attachment, and risky behaviors. Past research on dating violence has been fragmented, with studies focusing on only one or two key

theories at a time. Thus, the current results provide a more comprehensive understanding of dating violence perpetration and victimization. The findings reveal that an integration of all relevant theories is necessary when studying dating violence. Second, this study included protective factors and demonstrated that religiosity and strong maternal relationship quality have the potential for protecting young adults from perpetrating dating violence and becoming a victim of dating violence. These protective factors emphasize the importance of social ties in the lives of young adults. In addition, these protective factors lead to important practical and policy implications. Third, childhood experiences continue to impact the lives of young people and the quality of their relationships. Adverse childhood experiences set the stage for potential relationship problems in the future, further highlighting the importance of good parenting in the future adjustment of children. Finally, the findings demonstrate that risky behaviors raise the likelihood of experiencing dating violence, reiterating the importance for programs devoted to the reduction of risky behaviors in young adulthood.

Future research should continue to utilize a multi-perspective model of dating violence, as components of all four theories had associations with dating violence perpetration and victimization. Future studies may also wish to include a comparison of different types of violence, such as victimization only or perpetration only, as the risk factors for these specific types may also vary. In addition, practitioners should recognize the many factors, as well as the relationships between them, that raise or lower the likelihood of dating violence. Importantly, in addition to examining maternal relationship quality and religiosity, practitioners and researchers could also examine other potential protective factors in the development of dating violence prevention programs and in

therapeutic treatment. Finally, examining potential partnerships between religious leaders and experts in the field of dating violence may be beneficial in the prevention of dating violence.

CHAPTER 8: REFERENCES

- Alleyne, Binta, Victoria H. Coleman-Cowger, Laurel Crown, Maya A. Gibbons, and Linda Nicole Vines. 2011. "The Effects of Dating Violence, Substance Use and Risky Sexual Behavior among a Diverse Sample of Illinois Youth." *Journal of Adolescence* 34(1):11–18.
- Bandura, Albert. 1977. *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barnett, Ola W., Cindy L. Miller-Perrin, and Robin D. Perrin. 2011. *Family Violence across the Lifespan: An Introduction*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Bartholomew, K. and L. M. Horowitz. 1991. "Attachment Styles among Young Adults: A Test of a Four-Category Model." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 61(2):226–44.
- Baumrind, Diana. 1991. "The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence and Substance Use." *The Journal of Early Adolescence* 11(1):56–95.
- Berkel, LaVerne A., Beverly J. Vandiver, and Angela D. Bahner. 2004. "Gender Role Attitudes, Religion, and Spirituality as Predictors of Domestic Violence Attitudes in White College Students." *Journal of College Student Development* 45(2):119–33.
- Bevan, Emma and Daryl J. Higgins. 2002. "Is Domestic Violence Learned? The Contribution of Five Forms of Child Maltreatment to Men's Violence and Adjustment." *Journal of Family Violence* 17(3):223–45.
- Bookwala, Jamila and Bozena Zdaniuk. 1998. "Adult Attachment Styles and Aggressive Behavior within Dating Relationships." *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships* 15(2):175–90.
- Bowlby, John. 1988. *A Secure Base: Parent-Child Attachment and Healthy Human Development*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Brennan, Kelly A., Catherine L. Clark, and Phillip R. Shaver. 1998. "Self-Report Measurement of Adult Romantic Attachment: An Integrative Overview." Pp. 46–76 in *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships*, edited by J. A. Simpson and W. S. Rholes. New York: Guilford.

- Campbell, W.Keith, Angelica M. Bonacci, Jeremy Shelton, Julie J. Exline, and Brad J. Bushman. 2004. "Psychological Entitlement: Interpersonal Consequences and Validation of a Self-Report Measure." *Journal of Personality Assessment* 83(1):29–45.
- Clark, Duncan B., Michael D. De Bellis, Kevin G. Lynch, Jack R. Cornelius, and Christopher S. Martin. 2003. "Physical and Sexual Abuse, Depression and Alcohol Use Disorders in Adolescents: Onsets and Outcomes." *Drug and Alcohol Dependence* 69(1):51–60.
- Cleveland, H.Harrington, Veronica M. Herrera, and Jeffrey Stuewig. 2003. "Abusive Males and Abused Females in Adolescent Relationships: Risk Factor Similarity and Dissimilarity and the Role of Relationship Seriousness." *Journal of Family Violence* 18(6):325–39.
- Creasey, Gary and Matthew Hesson-McInnis. 2001. "Affective Responses, Cognitive Appraisals, and Conflict Tactics in Late Adolescent Romantic Relationships: Associations with Attachment Orientations." *Journal of Counseling Psychology* 48(1):85–96.
- DeMaris, Alfred and Catherine Kaukinen. 2005. "Violent Victimization and Women's Mental and Physical Health: Evidence from a National Sample." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 42(4):384–411.
- Doumas, Diana M., Christine L. Pearson, Jenna E. Elgin, and Lisa L. McKinley. 2008. "Adult Attachment as a Risk Factor for Intimate Partner Violence: The 'mispairing' of Partners' Attachment Styles." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 23(5):616–34.
- Dube, S. R. et al. 2001. "Childhood Abuse, Household Dysfunction, and the Risk of Attempted Suicide throughout the Life Span: Findings from the Adverse Childhood Experiences Study." *JAMA* 286(24):3089–96.
- Exner-Cortens, Deinera, John Eckenrode, and Emily Rothman. 2013. "Longitudinal Associations between Teen Dating Violence Victimization and Adverse Health Outcomes." *Pediatrics* 131(1):71–78.
- Feldstein, Sarah W. and William R. Miller. 2006. "Substance Use and Risk-Taking among Adolescents." *Journal of Mental Health* 15(6):633–43.
- Foran, Heather M. and K.Daniel O'Leary. 2008. "Alcohol and Intimate Partner Violence: A Meta-Analytic Review." *Clinical Psychology Review* 28(7):1222–34.
- Foshee, Vangie A., Karl E. Bauman, and G.Fletcher Linder. 1999. "Family Violence and the Perpetration of Adolescent Dating Violence: Examining Social Learning and Social Control Processes." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 61(2):331–42.

- Foshee, Vangie A., Thad Steven Benefield, Susan T. Ennett, Karl E. Bauman, and Chirayath Suchindran. 2004. "Longitudinal Predictors of Serious Physical and Sexual Dating Violence Victimization during Adolescence." *Preventive Medicine* 39(5):1007–16.
- Fraley, R.Chris and Phillip R. Shaver. 1998. "Airport Separations: A Naturalistic Study of Adult Attachment Dynamics in Separating Couples." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 75(5):1198–1212.
- Fraley, R.Chris and Niels G. Waller. 1998. "Adult Attachment Patterns: A Test of the Typological Model." Pp. 77–114 in *Attachment Theory and Close Relationships*, edited by J. A. Simpson and W. S. Rholes. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Fraley, R.Chris, Niels G. Waller, and Kelly A. Brennan. 2000. "An Item Response Theory Analysis of Self-Report Measures of Adult Attachment." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 78(2):350–65.
- Gelles, Richard J. 1997. *Intimate Violence in Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Golder, Seana, Mary Rogers Gillmore, Susan Spieker, and Diane Morrison. 2005. "Substance Use, Related Problem Behaviors and Adult Attachment in a Sample of High Risk Older Adolescent Women." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 14(2):181–93.
- Gómez, Anu Manchikanti. 2011. "Testing the Cycle of Violence Hypothesis: Child Abuse and Adolescent Dating Violence as Predictors of Intimate Partner Violence in Young Adulthood." *Youth & Society* 43(1):171–92.
- Gover, Angela R., Catherine Kaukinen, and Kathleen A. Fox. 2008. "The Relationship between Violence in the Family of Origin and Dating Violence among College Students." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 23(12):1667–93.
- Hazan, Cindy and Phillip Shaver. 1987. "Romantic Love Conceptualized as an Attachment Process." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 52(3):511–24.
- Herrenkohl, Todd I. et al. 2004. "Pathways from Physical Childhood Abuse to Partner Violence in Young Adulthood." *Violence and Victims* 19(2):123–36.
- Huebner, Angela J. and Laurie W. Howell. 2003. "Examining the Relationship between Adolescent Sexual Risk-Taking and Perceptions of Monitoring, Communication, and Parenting Styles." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 33(2):71–78.
- Igra, Vivien and Charles E. Irwin. 1996. "Theories of Adolescent Risk-Taking Behavior." Pp. 35–51 in *Handbook of Adolescent Health Risk Behavior, Issues in Clinical Child Psychology*, edited by R. J. DiClemente, W. B. Hansen, and L. E. Ponton. Springer US. Retrieved June 9, 2017 (http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-1-4899-0203-0_3).

- Jouriles, Ernest N., Renee McDonald, Victoria Mueller, and John H. Grych. 2012. "Youth Experiences of Family Violence and Teen Dating Violence Perpetration: Cognitive and Emotional Mediators." *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review* 15(1):58–68.
- Kilpatrick, Dean G. et al. 2003. "Violence and Risk of PTSD, Major Depression, Substance Abuse/Dependence, and Comorbidity: Results from the National Survey of Adolescents." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 71(4):692–700.
- Lee, Mary, Marla Reese-Weber, and Jeffrey H. Kahn. 2014. "Exposure to Family Violence and Attachment Styles as Predictors of Dating Violence Perpetration among Men and Women: A Mediational Model." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 29(1):20–43.
- McNaughton Reyes, H.Luz, Vangie A. Foshee, Daniel J. Bauer, and Susan T. Ennett. 2012. "Heavy Alcohol Use and Dating Violence Perpetration during Adolescence: Family, Peer and Neighborhood Violence as Moderators." *Prevention Science : The Official Journal of the Society for Prevention Research* 13(4):340–49.
- McNaughton Reyes, H.Luz, Vangie A. Foshee, Phyllis Holditch Niolon, Dennis E. Reidy, and Jeffrey E. Hall. 2016. "Gender Role Attitudes and Male Adolescent Dating Violence Perpetration: Normative Beliefs as Moderators." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 45(2):350–60.
- Morris, Anjana Madan, Sylvie Mrug, and Michael Windle. 2015. "From Family Violence to Dating Violence: Testing a Dual Pathway Model." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 44(9):1819–35.
- Nabors, Erin L. 2010. "Drug Use and Intimate Partner Violence Among College Students: An In-Depth Exploration." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 25(6):1043–63.
- Owens, David J. and Murray A. Straus. 1975. "The Social Structure of Violence in Childhood and Approval of Violence as an Adult." *Aggressive Behavior* 1(3):193–211.
- Rapoza, Kimberly A. and Alison T. Baker. 2008. "Attachment Styles, Alcohol, and Childhood Experiences of Abuse: An Analysis of Physical Violence in Dating Couples." *Violence and Victims* 23(1):52–65.
- Riggs, David S. and K.Daniel O'Leary. 1989. "The Development of a Model of Courtship Aggression." Pp. 53–71 in *Violence in Dating Relationships: Emerging Social Issues*, edited by M. A. Pirog-Good. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Schiff, Miriam and Anat Zeira. 2005. "Dating Violence and Sexual Risk Behaviors in a Sample of at-Risk Israeli Youth." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 29(11):1249–63.

- Shorey, Ryan C., Tara L. Cornelius, and Kathryn M. Bell. 2008. "A Critical Review of Theoretical Frameworks for Dating Violence: Comparing the Dating and Marital Fields." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 13(3):185–94.
- Shorey, Ryan C., Gregory L. Stuart, and Tara L. Cornelius. 2011. "Dating Violence and Substance Use in College Students: A Review of the Literature." *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 16(6):541–50.
- Silverman, Silverman, A. Raj, LA Mucci, and JE Hathaway. 2001. "Dating Violence against Adolescent Girls and Associated Substance Use, Unhealthy Weight Control, Sexual Risk Behavior, Pregnancy, and Suicidality." *JAMA* 286(5):572–79.
- Simons, Leslie Gordon, Callie Harbin Burt, and Ronald L. Simons. 2008. "A Test of Explanations for the Effect of Harsh Parenting on the Perpetration of Dating Violence and Sexual Coercion among College Males." *Violence and Victims* 23(1):66–82.
- Simons, Ronald L., Kuei-Hsiu Lin, and Leslie C. Gordon. 1998. "Socialization in the Family of Origin and Male Dating Violence: A Prospective Study." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 60(2):467–78.
- Stappenbeck, Cynthia A. and Kim Fromme. 2010. "A Longitudinal Investigation of Heavy Drinking and Physical Dating Violence in Men and Women." *Addictive Behaviors* 35(5):479–85.
- Straus, Murray A. 2004. "Prevalence of Violence Against Dating Partners by Male and Female University Students Worldwide." *Violence Against Women* 10(7):790–811.
- Straus, Murray A., Emily M. Douglas, and Rose Anne Medeiros. 2013. *The Primordial Violence: Spanking Children, Psychological Development, Violence, and Crime*. New York: Routledge.
- Straus, Murray A. and Richard J. Gelles. 1990. *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*. Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, Murray A., Sherry L. Hamby, Sue Boney-McCoy, and David B. Sugarman. 1996. "The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2) Development and Preliminary Psychometric Data." *Journal of Family Issues* 17(3):283–316.
- Sutton, Tara E. and Leslie Gordon Simons. 2015. "Sexual Assault Among College Students: Family of Origin Hostility, Attachment, and the Hook-Up Culture as Risk Factors." *Journal of Child and Family Studies* 24(10):2827–40.

- Testa, Maria, Jennifer A. Livingston, and Kenneth E. Leonard. 2003. "Women's Substance Use and Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence: A Longitudinal Investigation among a Community Sample." *Addictive Behaviors* 28(9):1649–64.
- Tussey, Brian Ermon, Kimberly A. Tyler, and Leslie Gordon Simons. 2018. "Poor Parenting, Attachment Style, and Dating Violence Perpetration Among College Students." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Retrieved February 27, 2018 (<http://journals.sagepub.com/eprint/KDBAPIVCdA5qrCRvzY9H/full>).
- Tyler, Kimberly A., Rachel M. Schmitz, Colleen Ray, and Leslie Gordon Simons. 2017. "The Role of Entitlement, Self-Control, and Risk Behaviors on Dating Violence Perpetration." *Violence and Victims*.
- Vagi, Kevin J. et al. 2013. "Beyond Correlates: A Review of Risk and Protective Factors for Adolescent Dating Violence Perpetration." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 42(4):633–49.
- Vivian, D. and J. Langhinrichsen-Rohling. 1994. "Are Bi-Directionally Violent Couples Mutually Victimized? A Gender-Sensitive Comparison." *Violence and Victims* 9(2):107–24.
- Widom, Cathy Spatz, Sally Czaja, and Mary Ann Dutton. 2014. "Child Abuse and Neglect and Intimate Partner Violence Victimization and Perpetration: A Prospective Investigation." *Child Abuse & Neglect* 38(4):650–63.
- Windle, Michael and Sylvie Mrug. 2009. "Cross-Gender Violence Perpetration and Victimization Among Early Adolescents and Associations with Attitudes Toward Dating Conflict." *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* 38(3):429.

APPENDIX A: TABLES

Table 1: Bivariate Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1 DV perpetration	1	.79**	.12**	-.26	.11**	.11**	.09**	-.11**	-.06*	-.14**	.11**	.07**	-.07**	.15**	.14**	.22**
2 DV victimization		1	.06*	.00	.10**	.10**	.08**	-.09**	-.06*	-.12**	.08**	.10**	-.05	.16**	.16**	.21**
3 Female			1	.16**	-.00	-.12**	-.10**	.06*	.12**	.09**	-.04	.12**	-.07*	-.26**	-.16**	-.24**
4 School location				1	.03	-.10**	.06**	-.06*	-.07*	.02	-.00	.08**	.04	-.18**	.06*	-.09**
5 Parental violence					1	.35**	.30**	-.33**	-.31**	-.13**	.11**	.09**	.02	-.03	.11**	.03
6 Child physical abuse						1	.18**	-.40**	-.32**	.00	.11**	.10**	.12**	.00	.11**	.08**
7 Inconsistent discipline							1	-.29**	-.31**	-.11**	.18**	.05	.10**	.06*	.13**	.11**
8 Maternal rel. quality								1	.41**	.13**	-.11**	-.13**	-.20**	.01	-.10**	-.06*
9 Paternal rel. quality									1	.13**	-.08**	-.11**	-.17**	.03	-.09**	-.04
10 Religion scale										1	-.09**	-.06**	-.10**	-.28*	-.11**	-.25**
11 Entitlement											1	.10**	.10**	.09**	.18**	.07**
12 Attachment anxiety												1	.31**	-.01	.04	-.02
13 Attachment avoidance													1	.16**	.09**	.04
14 Heavy drinking														1	.26**	.45*
15 Sexual risk behavior															1	.42**
16 Drug risk behavior																1
Mean	0.40	0.37	0.53	0.49	0.12	0.35	2.90	4.19	4.01	0.00	2.23	2.70	2.46	1.24	0.34	1.88
Standard deviation	0.49	0.48	0.50	0.45	0.24	0.29	1.80	0.62	0.72	1.00	0.72	0.89	1.02	1.00	0.59	1.26

Note: DV = Dating Violence; Rel = Relationship. * $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p \leq 0.01$
N=1,285

Table 2: Logistic Regression Models for Correlates of Dating Violence Victimization

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	<i>n</i> = 1,285									
	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR
Female	.253	1.288*	.323	1.381**	.369	1.447**	.299	1.349*	.620	1.858**
Parental violence			.414	1.513	.274	1.315	.135	1.144	.184	1.202
Child physical abuse			.580	1.786**	.611	1.842**	.590	1.804*	.526	1.692*
Inconsistent discipline			.039	1.040*	.033	1.033	.031	1.032	.018	1.018
Maternal rel. quality					-.063	.939	-.092	.912	-.117	0.889
Paternal rel. quality					.014	1.014	-.006	.994	-.067	0.935
Religiosity					-.136	.873**	-.139	.870**	-.059	.942
Entitlement							.165	1.179	.114	1.121
Attachment anxiety							.226	1.254**	.248	1.281**
Attachment avoidance							-.240	.786**	-.299	.742**
Heavy drinking									.273	1.314*
Sexual risk behavior									.247	1.280*
Drug risk behavior									.251	1.285**
Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ²	.00		.03		.05		.07		.15	

Note: Rel. = relationship. ***p* ≤ .01; **p* ≤ .05. Models control for school location.

Table 3: Logistic Regression Models for Correlates of Dating Violence Perpetration

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	<i>n</i> = 1,285									
	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR	B	OR
Female	.524	1.688**	.615	1.850**	.679	1.972**	.636	1.888**	.994	2.703**
Parental violence			.486	1.626	.297	1.346	.130	1.139	.188	1.206
Child physical abuse			.682	1.978**	.698	2.009**	.695	2.004**	.633	1.883*
Inconsistent discipline			.048	1.049*	.039	1.040	.034	1.035	.021	1.021
Maternal rel. quality					-.160	.852	-.217	.805	-.251	.778*
Paternal rel. quality					.059	1.061	.026	1.026	-.036	.964
Religion					-.174	.841**	-.180	.835**	-.096	.908*
Entitlement							.268	1.307**	.230	1.258**
Attachment anxiety							.146	1.157*	.165	1.180*
Attachment avoidance							-.299	.741**	-.359	.698**
Heavy drinking									.274	1.316**
Sexual risk behavior									.172	1.188
Drug risk behavior									.304	1.355**
Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ²	.02		.06		.09		.12		.19	

Note: Rel. = relationship. ***p* ≤ .01; **p* ≤ .05. Models control for school location.