

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

2010

Factors associated with intimate partner violence among college students

Shareela Marie Allen

Danielle Diane Moore

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Domestic and Intimate Partner Violence Commons](#), and the [Social Work Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Allen, Shareela Marie and Moore, Danielle Diane, "Factors associated with intimate partner violence among college students" (2010). *Theses Digitization Project*. 3857.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/3857>

This Project is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH INTIMATE PARTNER
VIOLENCE AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Social Work

by
Shareela Marie Allen
Danielle Diane Moore

June 2010

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH INTIMATE PARTNER
VIOLENCE AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Project
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Shareela Marie Allen
Danielle Diane Moore
June 2010

Approved by:



Dr. Janet C. Chang, Faculty Supervisor
Social Work

5/18/10

Date



Dr. Janet C. Chang,
M.S.W. Research Coordinator

ABSTRACT

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is a huge problem among college students both male and female of all ethnicities, socio-economic classes, sexual orientation, and social class. The purpose of this study was to explore what individual factors that were associated with IPV experiences among college students. This study focused on alcohol consumption and attitudes and beliefs of students to see if those two variables played a role in contributing to the rate of IPV occurring among college students. This study used a quantitative survey design due to the nature of the topic being discussed. This study was conducted on the campus of Cal State University San Bernardino. Data were collected from 124 students who were between the ages 18-24 that attended the campus. The results of the study showed that there was a correlation between alcohol consumption and IPV. The study also found that when alcohol was involved, people tended to be more verbally aggressive than when there was no alcohol involved. The study also showed that those who used reasoning were more likely to use verbal aggression and physical aggression. The results of this study suggest that students as well as administrators on

campus need to be educated as well as made conscious of the relationship between alcohol consumption and IPV on college campuses. One of the recommendations that was made in the study was that schools may consider eliminating pubs on campus to ensure that the school has no involvement in the amount of IPV occurring on college campuses among students

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to first thank God for giving me the strength and endurance to complete this program, without him I would not have succeeded thus far. I would like to gratefully acknowledge and thank our research advisor, Dr. Janet Chang, for her support and advisement throughout this research project. I would also like to thank California State University San Bernardino for aiding us in collecting data. I would like to give a special thanks to my husband, Bobby Moore Jr., for his love and support. Without you I would not have made it even half the way. I would like to thank my Mother, Carolyn Feast for always being hard on me and never letting me get away with just enough to get by. I would like to thank my sister, Lakeisha Feast, for always setting an example for me whether it was good or bad. As it turns out most of those examples were good. I want to thank my little brother and sister, Andrew and Victoria for always being available especially when I needed a babysitter. You guys are great and I love you. And lastly but certainly not least I would like to thank my father, Hubert Feast Jr., (Rest in Peace) for never letting me settle for less. He is a light in my heart and I know you

are and always have been proud of me. If I did not mention you by name, I did not forget about you I know I have been in your prayers and for that I am truly grateful. Thank you and I love you all.

By Danielle Moore

I'd like to first to thank God my king and my redeemer who sees me through all things. Thank you Lord for using me to do your will and continue to use me and push me in the direction you see fit. I'd also like to thank Dr. Janet Change for all of her support, advice, and encouragement during this whole process. It was never taken for granted and it will always be appreciated. To my mom and dad thank you for all your love and support. You both have always been supportive and have always told me I could do whatever I wanted and I thank you and love you for that. I also thank you for always believing in me and always being great role models and parents. You both mean the world to me and are the reason I have made it this far, so thank you. To my sister and brother thank you for your support and love. Lajona you have always been there for me encouraging me to claim my success and I thank you for that. Jon thanks for always being positive and maintaining a positive outlook on life, that

in itself was so helpful and encouraging. Thanks to all my family and friends for all their love and support, you all know who you are.

By Shareela Allen

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this project to my children. As you grow know that anything is possible. Braylon you are so outgoing and smart. You ask about a thousand questions a minute and I love you for that. I know no matter what you decide to do in life you will be extremely successful at it. Just don't be afraid to try new foods. Danyelle aka Mamacita you are so strong minded and such a character. Lone moment you are my friend and the next you are not. But that is ok as long as you are my baby I am fine. You are loving and thoughtful and always thinking of you brother and his needs. Just don't be afraid to consider yourself first once in a while. Although you are both really young you have had these amazing qualities since birth and I know you will develop in to two very wonderful people. I love you very much and I hope you accomplish everything you set out to do.

By Danielle Moore

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this to all the survivors and victims of Intimate Partner Violence. I would also like to thank all the participants in our study for their bravery and courage in taking our survey so willingly. I dedicate this to two strong women in my life who I miss dearly my grandmothers Effie Shaw, and Barbra Jones I love you both.

By Shareela Allen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v

LIST OF TABLES x

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

 Problem Statement 1

 Purpose of the Study 4

 Significance of the Project for Social Work 8

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

 Introduction 11

 Theories Guiding Conceptualization of This
 Project 11

 Factors Associated with Intimate Partner
 Violence among College Students 16

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

 Introduction 19

 Study Design 19

 Sampling 21

 Data Collection and Instruments 22

 Procedures 24

 Protection of Human Subjects 25

 Data Analysis 26

 Summary 27

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

 Introduction 29

Demographic Characteristics	29
Attitudes and Beliefs	32
Alcohol Consumption	38
Conflict Tactic Scale	40
Summary	51
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	
Introduction	52
Discussion	52
Limitations	55
Recommendations for Social Work Practice, Policy and Research	56
Conclusions	58
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE	60
APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT	65
APPENDIX C: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT	67
REFERENCES	70
ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES PAGE	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Demographics Characteristics	31
Table 2. Attitudes and Beliefs	35
Table 3. Alcohol Consumption	40
Table 4. Conflict Tactic Scale to Measure the Amount of Intimate Partner Violence	44

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

In order to fully grasp the concept of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) we must first define it. IPV is described physical, sexual, or psychological harm by a current or former partner or spouse. This abuse can occur among heterosexual and same sex couples and does not require sexual intimacy (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2008). College students in particular experience an extremely high rate of IPV while attending college (Nabors & Jasuinski, 2009). In the USA currently there are 15 million students currently enrolled in college (Ramirez, 2005). Three out of four students view relationship violence as a major problem, which in turn causes us to explore the reasoning for such a high number of students being victims of IPV (Nabors & Jasuinski, 2009). College females who are not living at home are more at risk to become victims of IPV. They lack parental supervision and are especially at risk due to peer pressure in drinking and trying drugs (Roberts, 2005). Approximately one third of college students experienced

violence in their dating relationships in 2006 (Fossos, Neighbors, Kaysen, & Hove, 2007), Not to mention that the estimates for physical assaults against another intimate partner ranges from 20% to 59% among college students (Ramirez, 2005).

In California alone in 1998 47,519 males were arrested due to IPV, and 9,373 women were arrested for IPV (California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, 1998). The arrest rates for both male and female are broken down by age. Males between the ages 18-24 accounted for 9,319 of those arrests made, and women accounted for 2,048. Now these numbers may not seem significant but these arrest rates were compiled over a ten year period from 1988 to 1998. Over that time period males percentage of arrest for IPV increased by 62%, while women's increased by 361%. These figures are also especially significant because college students account for about a third of those aged 18-22 year old (Ramirez, 2005). These statistics show that IPV is not reducing in anyway among this population in fact it is continuously rising.

On a micro level social workers that work with victims of IPV normally provide services such as crisis

intervention, crisis hotlines, individual, and group counseling (Roberts, 2005). A big part of micro level services to victims are referrals (Roberts, 2005). Many victims need referrals so they can reach safety. It is extremely important for not just social workers to know different resources, but police departments, hospitals, and human service agencies. Many victims rely on these referrals to access transitional housing, shelters, day care for their children, ongoing counseling, job placement, and vocational training (Roberts, 2005).

On a macro level social workers working with victims of IPV provide advocacy, community outreach, police social service outreach and education programs (Stover & Kaufman, 2009). Police social service outreach allows police to be partnered with social workers to address the needs of the victims of IPV. Social workers able to follow up with victims and provide them with resources they can access for further assistance (Stover & Kaufman, 2009). Some social workers are also apart of the police department crisis intervention team who arrive directly on the scene of IPV incidents. Clinicians, who provide onsite crisis intervention, assess the situation, discuss

alternatives, form a plan, and help the victim to put the plan into action (Roberts, 2005).

A policy that facilitates the issue of IPV nationally is the Violence against Women Act (VAWA) of 1994. This act was created in response to the severity of crimes associated with domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking for women and men. This act administers financial and technical assistance to communities around the country. It facilitated the creation of programs, policies, and practices aimed at ending IPV, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The Office on Violence against Women (OVW) was created to implement VAWA. Since 1994 OVW has awarded more than 3 billion dollars in grant funds to state, tribal, and local governments, nonprofit victim services providers and universities. This policy continues to respond and create new ways of supporting and protecting victims and families of IPV (United States Department of Justice, 2009).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to explore what individual factors are associated with IPV experiences.

among college students. Currently most research conducted on IPV does not emphasize the large amount of IPV occurring among young adults (Spriggs, Halpern, Herring, & Schoenbach, 2009). According to the U.S. Department of Bureau of Justice Statistics (2007) both men and women ages 20-24 are at greater risk for nonfatal IPV. College student's account for about a third of the 18-22 year old population, meaning this is a huge problem occurring among this population (Ramirez, 2005). Not only do the numbers show that IPV is a problem among this population, but the college students themselves view IPV as a problem (Nabors & Jasuinski, 2009). In return these findings made the researchers explore the individual factors that are associated with college student's experiences with IPV. Once the researchers were able to identify the factors associated with IPV they are then able to further create effective preventions that will help in reducing the amount of IPV occurring among this population.

This research project was a quantitative research design. The researchers used convenient sampling to survey students on the campus of California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB). The researchers surveyed students that were between the ages of 18-24 for

this study. Some of the questions on the survey pertained to demographics, which provided the researchers with further information about the participants such as gender, age, and living arrangements. The other set of questions pertained to physical abuse, alcohol consumption, and attitudes and belief concerning IPV. The independent variables were alcohol consumption, and attitudes and beliefs concerning IPV. The dependent variables were the rate at which IPV was experienced. The quantitative method was chosen due to the nature of the topic, and because it was a great way to gather a lot of information concerning IPV victims. IPV is a traumatic experience and the researchers didn't want to create any discomfort to participants by asking them to discuss painful memories and or present violence that they may be experiencing. The researchers wanted to gain insight on the participants knowledge, exposure, and personal experience but not at the expense of their mental or emotional well being. By using self-administered questionnaire the researchers were still able to obtain the same information without having to cause such distress by interviewing participants, and were also able to ask a variation of questions to gain knowledge. Once

all the data was collected the researchers entered it into the program SPSS to run a data analysis. The researchers used a chi-square to see if specific values of one variable correlated with another. The researchers also ran a t test, which examined the mean and variances of both groups of scores to identify if they were significantly different from one another.

Currently, at Cal State University San Bernardino there are resources offered to victims of IPV. The Women's Resource Center that is located in Santos Manuel Student Union is where victims can find a list of resources; such as shelters and housing, pamphlets on IPV, a list of counseling centers, and crisis center hotline numbers. For victims coming in during a current crisis the center has personnel who are certified in crisis intervention. For victims coming in needing additionally support or needing someone to talk to they are referred to the counseling center on campus. Both sexes can receive resources at the Women's Resource Center. This research project will allow CSUSB the opportunity to see the steps it needs to take to ensure that students both male and female, who are victims of IPV have equal and adequate services that can be

utilized. That would mean the creation of a male's resource center where males could access resources from other males. This research will also help CSUSB to measure the amount of awareness that needs to be spread on campus concerning this issue. That might mean that at the beginning of each quarter sending students from the women's resource center to classes to make students aware of the services that they offer. At least this way student's will know where they can access services and resources in the event that they experience IPV.

Significance of the Project for Social Work

The significance of this study to social work practice is its ability in helping social work practitioners identify individual factors that are associated with IPV experiences among college students. Once these factors are targeted researchers can begin to implement prevention and intervention strategies that can be directed towards this population so their needs are being adequately met. Using these strategies effective programming can also be created based on these factors. Another reason this study is significant to social work practice is because it is spreading awareness of the

amount of IPV that is occurring among college students. By increasing awareness, social workers will be better equipped to serve this population, not to mention more focus can be directed toward this population and addressing their needs. Once factors associated with IPV are identified more creative and effective preventions and interventions can help in reducing the amount of IPV.

This study is also significant to research. Currently a lot of literature and research can be found regarding middle aged to older adults experiencing IPV, even though it is prevalent among younger adults; especially those aged 20-24 (U.S. Department of Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007). The research being conducted here is helping to add to the amount of research being conducted on college students and their experiences with IPV. It also encourages other social workers to conduct their own research on this population and explore their own findings. By doing this more research is being compiled and more factors are being discovered and explored. From this more prevention and interventions can be created. Lastly this study is significant because it will encourage college campuses to create more services on campus for IPV. These services include but are not

limited to: support groups for victims of IPV, crisis hotline, guest speakers who discuss IPV, and mass emails regarding the services that are offered on campus. This will create a way to reach out to students and inform them that there are places on campus to seek help for IPV. More has to be done on college campuses to prevent the high rates of IPV from continuing to occur and more has to be done so that students are aware of the services that are offered on campus.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter is focused on literature that is relevant to Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) on college campuses and the factors that are associated with it. The chapter is divided into two parts. The first part discusses theories guiding conceptualization of this project. The second part discusses the factors associated with IPV individually. After the examination of these two topics IPV will be further understood.

Theories Guiding Conceptualization
of This Project

There are several theories that currently exist that explain IPV and the reasons why IPV victims become victims. These theories of violence range from macro level violence to micro level violence. Some macro level theories of violence include culture of violence theory, ecological theory, evolutionary theory, and feminist theory. All of these theories help to explain things as big as war and even repression. Some micro level theories of violence include exchange theory, resource theory,

social learning theory, social constructivist theory, and traumatic bonding theory. All of these micro level theories of violence explain couple and individual violence. The focus of this project was the social learning theory and the social constructivist theory. Both of these theories explain how victims become victims and why they continue to remain victims.

The social learning theory was developed by Bandura (1962) and insists that people learn by watching others (also known as modeling). According to Sellers, Cochran, and Branch, (2005) social learning theory is comprised of four key elements: imitation, definitions, differential associations, and differential reinforcement. Imitation refers to the degree one is willing to mock a role model. Role models are often significant others, who are admired and have a personal relationship with the observer. If a child were to watch his or her mother being physically abused then that behavior is likely to be mocked as an adult.

Definitions refer to attitudes and values individuals attach to behaviors. The attitude could be approving, disapproving, or neutral towards the behavior. When observers observe violent behavior they form an

attitude and with that attitude a value is attached. Most victims are approving of violent behavior due to having been exposed to it as a child (Bandura, 1962).

Differential association refers to the influence the definitions (attitudes and values) have on the observer. According to the social learning theory being exposed to the definitions and behaviors of others with whom one has an intimate relationship with, will impact and affect the observers own definitions and behaviors (Bandura, 1962).

Lastly the fourth key element to the social learning theory is differential reinforcement. Differential reinforcement refers to the anticipated costs and rewards associated with a given behavior. If an observer is lead to believe that the rewards out weights the costs of the abuse the observer will be more inclined to become a victim (Bandura, 1962).

In conclusion according to Roberts (2002), men and women exposed to violence in their families are more likely to become victims of IPV. Based on this theory those who see violent behavior while growing up have a much greater chance than those who do not see violence in becoming a victim in their own relationships.

Another source that supports the social learning theory is Sellers, Cochran, and Branch (2005). These researchers applied the social learning theory to partner aggression. The results showed that the prevalence of such violence is greater among those who have witnessed others who they admire in a relationship where intimate partner violence is taking place. The article relays the critical nature role models play in the lives of children. by witnessing violent behavior the observer can become a victim themselves.

The social constructivist theory also known as the cognitive behavioral constructivist theory (Lesser & Pope, 2007) also offers explanations of IPV. The social constructivist theory deals with reality construction. A victim can construct whatever reality they want and remain in an abusive relationship. Peled, Eisikovits, Enosh, and Winstok (2000), provides three interconnected factors through which reality is shaped. The first factor, reality perception, involves acknowledging the presence of an occurrence of ontologically (meaning existence or reality in general) and attempting to locate it within one's existing mental categories. This

perception of reality makes the victim question the occurrence of the violence and the severity.

The second factor relates to the meaning attributed to an act; that is, how one evaluates, explains, and controls an incident. In doing so, this makes it significant on a personal, organizational, or cultural level. The assignment of significance is based on earlier knowledge gained, as well as pre-existing morals and attitudinal structures.

The third factor includes the behaviors and action experienced as a consequence of the reconstruction process. These three processes suggests that reality construction is intended to expand women's freedom of choice by turning staying in an abusive relationship into a legitimate option. Reality construction is rooted deep within the victim and only with the reconstruction of the victim's reality can the victim truly be free of IPV.

According to Lesser and Pope (2007), the constructivist theory focuses on important stories the client has about themselves or their lives. Theorists believe that clients do not distort reality but instead construct their own reality. The main goal in this theory for therapist is to help the client to understand why

they constructed that particular reality and the consequences that come from that construction. In the case of IPV the victim could construct a story about why they are being abused and why they stay in the abusive situation. As well as constructing a story of why they stay with the abusive spouse the victim could construct stories about why they don't seek help with the abuse.

Factors Associated with Intimate Partner Violence among College Students

As defined in chapter one intimate partner violence is described as physical, sexual, or psychological harm by a current or former partner or spouse. This abuse can occur among heterosexual and same sex couples and does not require sexual intimacy (Center for Disease Control and Prevention, 2008). There are several factors that are associated with IPV among college students. These factors include alcohol consumption and attitudes and beliefs concerning IPV. Both of these factors can individually be linked to increased rates of IPV among college students.

In a quantitative research study among college students Hines and Straus (2007), found that there is a significant association between problem drinking and IPV perpetration. The study was done in the United States and

research was collected from 38 sites worldwide. The researchers found that for every point increase of drinking on a four-point scale, IPV perpetration increased 26%. Fossos et al. (2007) also found similar results from their research. Their research suggested that alcohol is positively associated with IPV among college students. They also found that students who use alcohol and engage in IPV perpetration are less aware of the connection between alcohol and aggressive behavior. According to Hines and Straus IPV and alcohol are interchangeable. Those in college who engage in IPV perpetration use alcohol and vice versa, those who drink in college often engage in IPV perpetration.

Three out of four students believe that IPV is a major problem with the college population (Nabors & Jasinski, 2009). One factor that contributes to that problem is the attitudes and beliefs among college students concerning IPV. According to Nabors and Jasinski, (2009), there is a strong correlation between acceptance of violence and IPV perpetration. Acceptance can take on many different form, students can believe in traditional gender roles and may uphold those attitudes and beliefs. This can be exhibited by wanting to have

control over their spouses' whereabouts, finances, and socially isolating them. Acceptance may also include the victim feeling that violence is normal causing them to continue to tolerate it. According to Debbles and Straus, over 28% of the subjects they interviewed found that slapping their intimate partner was not only necessary but normal and good (as cited in Nabors & Jasinski, 2009). They also found that 5% of their participants thought that slapping, shoving, grabbing, and throwing things at their intimate partner were common and acceptable. These findings show how huge a role attitudes and beliefs play in IPV within the college campus population.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

Introduction

This chapter presents the methods and procedure that were be used to conduct this study. This study Included a study design, a sample population, data collection and instruments, procedures, the protection of human subjects, and methods for data analysis.

Study Design

The purpose of this research project was to explore the individual factors associated with Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) experiences among college students aged 18-24. A quantitative survey design using self-administered questionnaires was employed in this study. The questionnaire measured the rate at which college students experience IPV. A package was given to each participant including informed consent, a debriefing statement, and the survey. Participants were able to complete the survey and return it anonymously to the researchers. The sampling criteria for the study consisted of college students who range between the ages of 18 to 24. 124 students participated in this study.

The rationale for choosing a quantitative survey design was particularly due to the nature of this project. Face to face interviews are extremely personal, and discussions about sensitive issues can be difficult for participants. Additionally a survey questionnaire design is useful when trying to collect data from a rather large population.

Although quantitative research design has its strengths it also bears some limitations. One limitation is convenient sampling. Researchers will be surveying only willing participants and will make survey accessibility as convenient as possible. Other limitations include potential participants may be biased, untruthful, or intentionally leave the survey blank. Lastly the survey design limits the potential interaction between the subject and the researcher. The researcher is unable to record non-verbal behavior or address different concerns that arise during the time spent together. Lacking that insight may be one crucial weakness to using the survey design.

Sampling

The sample for this study was drawn from students who attend California State University San Bernardino (CSUSB). A demographic criterion in terms of ethnicity, gender, level of education, employment, and marital status is not set, but they must be between the ages of 18 to 24 and currently attend CSUSB. For the purposes of selecting participants convenience sampling was employed. The researchers set up a physical table on the college campus and solicited participation from students as they passed by. Data collection was conducted February 8 2010 through March 4, 2010 on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays from 8:00am to 12:00 pm. The researchers also passed out questionnaires in classrooms with prior approval from the teacher. This ensures that students eligible for this study would be given the opportunity to participate. As subjects approached the table researchers first made sure they met the criteria before they participated. One challenge researchers encountered with respect to obtaining a reliable sample is that some students did not have the time to take the survey.

Data Collection and Instruments

Data were collected through self-administered questionnaires. Questions (see Appendix A) focused on the individual factors that were associated with intimate partner violence (IPV). The questionnaire was broken up into four sections. The first section was demographics. In this section researchers gathered the gender, ethnicity, age, marital status, educational level, and the sex of their intimate partner. The second section covered the attitudes and beliefs concerning IPV. The participants were asked their opinion of IPV and reasons they feel it occurs. The third section covered the participants and their intimate partner's alcohol consumption. This section included questions on how often they consumed alcohol and if the consumption was before or after the conflict. Finally the fourth section was a Conflict Tactic Scale containing questions that measure the amount of IPV victim's experience.

Several independent variables were tested in this survey questionnaire, including the subject's use of alcohol and how that affects the likeliness of IPV and the student's attitudes and beliefs about IPV. The dependent variable was the rate at which IPV was

experienced on a college campus. These variables were measured at nominal, ordinal, and interval levels.

In this research project the dependent variable was measured by the Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS). The CTS was developed by Murray Straus as a way to ask families about violent behavior within the home without asking "do you abuse your spouse or children?" (Gelles & Straus, 1988). The scale is a series of questions ranging from calm discussion to abusive behavior. The CT scale is a valid and reliable scale. According to Corcoran and Fischer (2000),

Six studies have supported the internal consistency of the reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical aggression subscale. For the reasoning subscale, 12 alpha coefficients range from .42 to .76. For the verbal aggression subscale 16 alphas are available and range from .62 to .88. Seventeen alphas are available on the physical aggression subscale and range from .42 to .96. The CT scales have received extensive support regarding their validity. First, several studies support the factor structure of reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical aggression. Extensive construct validity data are

also available, including correlations between CT scores and risk factors of family violence, antisocial behaviors by child victims, levels of affection between family members, and self esteem. (p. 229-230)

Hegarty, Sheehan, and Schonfeld (1999) also agree with Corcoran and Fischer (2000) that the CTS scale presents preliminary evidence that it is valid and has a high scale of reliability.

Procedures

The data were collected on the campus of Cal State University of San Bernardino. Both researchers obtained permission from the Student Union to set up a booth on campus and obtained permission from professors concerning soliciting surveys to students in their classrooms. Researchers set up a booth in front of the Santos Manuel Student Union, and walked up to students on campus to encourage them to participate in the survey. Participants had to be between the ages of 18-24 to participate in the study. Once the researchers assessed whether participants met the criteria of the study, they then were given a informed consent to complete followed by the survey. The

survey didn't take longer than 15 minutes to complete. Once complete the researchers collected the surveys and placed them in a sealed envelope. Each participant upon completion of the survey was given a debriefing statement and was thanked for their participation in the study. The data collection began in February and ended the second week of March on a Thursday. Once all the data were collected it was entered into SPSS and a data analysis was ran.

Protection of Human Subjects

Participant's anonymity was protected by not requiring them to sign the consent form or write their name on their survey. Participants were asked to sign their consent form with an "X" on the signature line which constituted as their signature. No identifiable information was asked on the survey (e.g. name, birth date, etc). A number is assigned to each survey, which is how it is identifiable. Participants were simply asked to answer the survey and once complete to turn it back into the researchers. Participant's confidentiality was protected by the 2 researchers being the only two to have access to the data. As surveys were completed they were

placed in an envelope which was sealed upon completion. From there the surveys were placed in a locked file cabinet that only the 2 researches had the key to. Once all the data was collected it was entered into the software program SPSS and a data analysis was ran. After the research study was complete all surveys were shredded. All participants were advised of their right to withdraw from this study at anytime, to skip any question they felt uncomfortable answering, and were encouraged to stop the researcher anytime they needed clarity on a question or a word.

Data Analysis

The data gathered in this study used quantitative data analysis to assess relationships among the different variables in the study. Descriptive statistics was used to summarize our demographic questions asked in the survey, using measures of tendency (mean, median, and mode) and measures of variability. Inferential statistics (Pearson's r) was used to see if there was a correlation between alcohol consumption, attitudes, and beliefs concerning IPV (independent variables), and IPV rates (dependent variable). We were stating that those involved

in relationships where their intimate partners consume alcohol are more likely to be victims of IPV. Researches were also stating that attitudes and beliefs of IPV affect those that become victims of IPV. Inferential statistics showed the researchers that there was a correlation once data was processed and examined. The test that was used to measure the variables was the Pearson's r. This test was used to measure the variables to see if specific values of one variable were associated with another. A t test was also ran to examine the means and variances of both groups of scores to identify if they are significantly different from one another.

Summary

The research method being utilized in this study is quantitative. Participants were surveyed on the campus of Cal State University San Bernardino, and in various classrooms on the campus. The sample consisted of 124 participants both male and female aged 18-24 that attended CSUSB. The survey consisted of a variation of questions that range from demographics to specific questions regarding physical abuse, alcohol consumption, and attitudes and beliefs concerning IPV. Once all the

data were collected it was entered into SPSS and a data analysis ran.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Introduction

The sample consisted of 124 students both male and female who attend Cal State University San Bernardino. This chapter will cover a) the demographic characteristics of the participants, b) attitudes and belief concerning Intimate Partner Violence, c) Alcohol Consumption, and d) Intimate Partner Violence experiences.

Demographic Characteristics

Demographic information for this study is presented in Table 1. The total sample size consisted of 124 participants and included 60% female and 40% males. Out of those participants 40 percent of them were Hispanic/Latino/Chicano, 29% were African American, 22% were white, 5% were Asian/Pacific Islander and 4% of them were bi-racial and other. The age range in the study varied from 18 years old to 24 years old. Nearly 27% of the participants were 19 years old, 19% of them were 18 years old, both ages 20 and 21 each represented 15% of the participants, 10% of the participants were 22 years

old, 8% of the participants were 23 years old and 5% were 24 years old. Similar to the ages of the participants approximately 29% of the participants were freshman, 27% were sophomores, 21% were juniors, 19% were seniors and 4% were graduate students at Cal State San Bernardino.

Approximately 76% of them live off campus and 24% of them live on campus. Just under half of the participants (48%) still live at home with parents, 31% live with roommates, 11% live alone, 5% live off campus with spouse and 6%, marked other living arrangements. The great majority of the participants (82%) have never been married, 3% of them are married and 5% of them are co-habiting.

When asked about their knowledge of intimate partner violence, over 70% of the participants knew what intimate partner violence was and 28% of them did not know what intimate partner violence was. And when asked about their knowledge of intimate partner violence services on campus only 10% of the participants knew about intimate partner violence services on campus and 90% of the participants did not know about intimate partner services on campus.

Table 1. Demographics Characteristics

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender (N=124)		
Female	77	62
Male	47	38
Ethnicity (N=124)		
African American	36	29
Asian/Pacific Islander	6	5
Hispanic/Latino/Chicano	49	39
White	27	22
Bi-Racial	3	2
Other	3	2
Age (N=124)		
18	24	19
19	34	27
20	19	15
21	19	15
22	12	10
23	10	8
24	6	5
Marital Status (N=124)		
Never married	100	82
Married	4	3
Divorce	0	0
Widowed	0	0
Co-habiting	6	5
Other	12	10
Currently Reside (N=124)		
On campus	30	24
Off campus	94	76
Live With (N=124)		
Alone	14	11
With Parents	59	48
With Roommates	38	31
Off campus With Spouse	6	5
Other	7	6

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
College Status (N=124)		
Freshman	36	29
Sophomore	34	27
Junior	26	21
Senior	23	19
Graduate Student	5	4
Sex of Intimate Partner (N=124)		
Female	45	37
Male	76	63
Familiar with IPV services on Campus (N=124)		
Yes	12	10
No	112	90
Knowledge of IPV (N=124)		
Yes	87	71
No	35	29

Attitudes and Beliefs

Attitudes and beliefs among college students about intimate partner violence were shown in Table 2. Sixteen different questions were asked and the outcomes are as follows. Just under half (49%) of the participants view IPV as a problem among college students, "some of the time", 23% views it as a problem, "all of the time" and 17% responded that it is rarely a problem. When asked if they felt the victim was to blame for the abuse, 38% of the participants felt that they were never to blame, 23% said that they were rarely to blame and a shocking 35%

felt that they were to blame, "some of the times". On the flip side of that question participants were asked if perpetrators were the ones to blame only 30% felt they were to blame "all of the time", 33% responded, "most of the time", and 32% said, "some of the time".

Approximately 43% of the participants felt that the victims provoked their attacker, "some of the times", 26% felt they rarely provoke their attacker and 22% said victims never provoke their attacker.

When participants were asked if IPV more likely when alcohol was involved, over half (52%) responded. "all of the time", 22% responded, "most of the time" and 24% responded "some of the time". Although they felt that alcohol was most likely to be involved, 80% of the participants felt that alcohol was still no excuse for IPV. When asked if batterers' purposely hurt their victims half of the participants answered "sometimes", 27% felt they did "most of the time", and 11% felt they did "all of the time".

When asked if they think perpetrators can control their violent behavior responses were very mixed. Approximately 26% of them reported "all of the time", 13% reported "most of the time", 34% reported "sometimes",

21% reported "rarely", and 6% reported "never". Unlike the results to the last question over half (52%) of the participants responded that perpetrators should go to jail "all of the time", 23% responded, "most of the time", 18% responded, "some of the time" and only 1% responded, "never". Approximately 55% of the participants felt that IPV could be avoided all of the time, 18% reports it can be avoided most of the time and 21% reports it can be avoided some of the time. When asked if victims over exaggerate their abuse, a shocking 54% responded "some of the time", 32 % reported "rarely" and 14% reported "never".

When participants were asked if they thought sex and violence in the media influenced IPV, 23% answered "all of the time", 15% answered "most of the time", 44% answered "some of the time", 16% answered "rarely" and 2% said never. Approximately 40% of the participants reported that IPV among women and men are the same, "some of the time", 21% reported it is the same "all of the time" and 20% reported it is the same "rarely". But when asked if IPV was a product of a male dominated society 45% of them reported, either all of the time, or "most of the time", 34% answered, "some of the time", 13% answered

"rarely" and 8% answered "never". Nearly 40% of participants reported that women perpetrators were "rarely" viewed equally when compared to men perpetrators, 30% reported they were "some of the time", 12% reported "all of the time", and 9% reported most of the time and 8% said they never are. When participants were asked if they feel women can be perpetrators of IPV and 67% said, either all of the time, or "most of the time", 25% said, "some of the time", 8% said "rarely" or "never".

Table 2. Attitudes and Beliefs

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
IPV a problem among students (N=124)		
All of the time	29	23
Most of the time	10	8
Sometimes	61	49
Rarely	21	17
Never	3	2
Victims are to blame (N=124)		
All of the time	2	2
Most of the time	3	2
Sometimes	43	35
Rarely	29	23
Never	47	38

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Perpetrators are to blame (N=124)		
All of the time	37	30
Most of the time	41	33
Sometimes	40	32
Rarely	2	2
Never	3	2
Victims provoke (N=124)		
All of the time	5	4
Most of the time	6	5
Sometimes	52	43
Rarely	32	26
Never	26	22
IPV likely with alcohol (N=124)		
All of the time	63	52
Most of the time	27	22
Sometimes	29	24
Rarely	1	1
Never	2	2
Alcohol good excuse (N=124)		
All of the time	7	6
Most of the time	5	4
Sometimes	4	3
Rarely	9	7
Never	99	80
Perpetrators IPV purposely (N=124)		
All of the time	13	11
Most of the time	33	27
Sometimes	62	50
Rarely	14	11
Never	2	2

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Perpetrators can control violence (N=124)		
All of the time	32	26
Most of the time	16	13
Sometimes	41	34
Rarely	26	21
Never	7	6
Perpetrators should go to jail (N=124)		
All of the time	64	52
Most of the time	28	23
Sometimes	22	18
Rarely	8	7
Never	1	1
IPV can be avoided (N=124)		
All of the time	68	55
Most of the time	22	18
Sometimes	26	21
Rarely	4	3
Never	4	3
Victims exaggerate (N=124)		
All of the time	9	7
Most of the time	8	7
Sometimes	49	40
Rarely	39	32
Never	17	14
Media influence (N=124)		
All of the time	29	23
Most of the time	18	15
Sometimes	54	44
Rarely	20	16
Never	3	2

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
IPV same among men and woman (N=124)		
All of the time	26	21
Most of the time	18	15
Sometimes	50	40
Rarely	25	20
Never	5	4
Male dominated society (N=124)		
All of the time	21	17
Most of the time	34	28
Sometimes	42	34
Rarely	16	13
Never	10	8
Women and men perpetrators viewed equally (N=124)		
All of the time	15	12
Most of the time	11	9
Sometimes	37	30
Rarely	50	40
Never	10	8
Women can be IPV perpetrators (N=124)		
All of the time	67	54
Most of the time	16	13
Sometimes	31	25
Rarely	10	8
Never	0	0

Alcohol Consumption

The first question asked in this survey was if there had ever been conflict where alcohol was involved (See Table 3). This question was designed to see if there is a

relationship between alcohol consumption and Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). When asked if there had been alcohol involved in the conflict 14% of the participants answered yes, while 86% answered no to alcohol being involved in their conflict. The next question was designed to see if the participant taking the survey had been drinking before the conflict started, 14% answered yes, while 87% responded no that there had not been any drinking before the conflict. The next question asks if the intimate partner was drinking before the conflict began, 16% of the participants answered yes, while 82% of the participants responded no to their intimate partner drinking before the conflict began. The last question of this section was designed to measure the amount of alcohol consumed by participants, 34% responded they never drink, 17% consumed less than one alcoholic beverage a month, 29% consumed alcohol 1-3 times a month, 11% consumed alcohol 1-2 days a week, 5% 3-4 days a week, 2% 5-6 days a week, and 1% consumed alcohol on a daily basis.

Table 3. Alcohol Consumption

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Alcohol involved in conflict (N= 124)		
Yes	17	14
No	106	86
Missing	1	1
Drinking before conflict (N=116)		
Yes	16	13
No	100	81
Partner drinking before conflict (N=111)		
Yes	18	15
No	93	75
Alcohol consumption (N=123)		
Never	42	34
Less than 1 day a month	21	17
1-3 days a month	36	29
1-2 days a month	14	11
3-4 days a month	6	5
5-6 days a month	2	5
Daily	1	1

Conflict Tactic Scale

Table 4 presents the frequency distribution of the Conflict Tactics Scale item. When participants were asked if they had ever discussed an issue calmly with their partner, a third (33%) responded, "they didn't know" or "never", 17% responded, "once" or "twice", while 31% responded more than 3 times. When participants were asked

if their intimate partner had ever brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things, almost two thirds (64%) responded, "they didn't know" or "never", 22% responded, "once" or "twice", 11% responded, more than 3 times, and 4% more than 11 times. When asked if their intimate partner every insulted or swore at them, half the participants (50%) responded, "they didn't know" or "never", 24% responded, "once" or "twice", while 18% responded, more than 3 times, and 8% responded, more than 11 times. When participants were asked if there intimate partner had ever sulked or refused to talk, over one third of the participants (36%) replied "they didn't know", or "never", 21% responded, "once" or "twice", while a quarter (27%) responded, more than 3 times, and 4% more than 11 times. When asked if they every cried due to intimate partner, more than half the participants (56%) replied, "they didn't know", or "never", 19%, responded, "once" or "twice", 15% responded, more than 3 times, and 12% responded, more than 11 times. When participants were asked if there intimate partner every said something to spite them, more than half (58%) responded, "they didn't know" or "never", 18% responded,

"once" or "twice", 18% responded, more than 3 times, and 6% more than 11 times.

When participants were asked if their intimate partner ever hit or threw something at them, more than three quarters (85%) responded, "they didn't know" or "never", 6% responded, "once" or "twice", 9% responded, more than 3 times, and 1% responded, more than 11 times. Participants were asked if their intimate partner ever threw, smashed, hit or kicked something, more than three quarters (82%), responded, "they didn't know" or "never" 11% responded, "once" or "twice", 4% responded, more than 3 times, and 2% more than 11 times. When asked if their intimate partner ever threw something, almost all the participants (90%), responded, "they didn't know" or "never", 5% responded, "once" or "twice", and 6% responded, more than 3 times. When participants were asked if their intimate partner ever pushed or grabbed them more than three quarters (88%), responded, "they didn't know" or "never" 7% responded, "once" or "twice", 4% responded, more than 3 times, and 2% more than 20 times.

When asked if their intimate partner ever slapped them, more than three quarters (88%), responded, "they

didn't know" or "never" 11%, responded, "once" or "twice", 1% responded, more than 3 times, and 2% more than 11 times. When participants were asked if there intimate partner had ever kicked bit or hit with a fist almost three quarters of the participants (91%), responded, "they didn't know" or "never", 8% responded, "once" or "twice", and 1% more than 11 times. When asked if there partner had ever tried to hit them with something almost all the participants (90%), responded, "they didn't know" or "never" 5%, responded, "once" or "twice", 2% responded, more than 3 times, and 1% more than 11 times. When participants were asked if they had ever been beat up by their intimate partner almost all the participants (96%), responded, "they didn't know" or "never" 1%, responded, "once", and 1% more than 20 times.

When asked if there partner had ever choked them three quarters of the participants (99%), responded, "they didn't know" or "never", and 1% responded, "once". When participants were asked if they had ever been threatened or choked by their intimate partner three quarters (99%), responded they, "they didn't know" or "never", and 1% responded, "once". When asked if there partner had ever used a knife or fired a gun all the

participants (100%), responded, "they didn't know" or "never".

Table 4. Conflict Tactic Scale to Measure the Amount of Intimate Partner Violence

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Discussed Calmly (N=123)		
Once	7	6
Twice	14	11
3-5 times	28	22
6-10 times	11	9
11-20 times	10	8
More than 20 times	31	25
Don't know	8	7
Never	14	11
Brought someone in to help (N=124)		
Once	15	12
Twice	13	10
3-5 times	7	6
6-10 times	6	5
11-20 times	1	1
More than 20 times	4	3
Don't know	6	5
Never	72	59

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Insulted or swore at you (N=123)		
Once	12	10
Twice	17	14
3-5 times	13	11
6-10 times	9	7
11-20 times	4	3
More than 20 times	6	5
Don't know	10	8
Never	52	42
Sulked or refused to talk (N=124)		
Once	16	13
Twice	10	8
3-5 times	15	12
6-10 times	18	15
11-20 times	4	3
More than 20 times	5	4
Don't know	12	10
Never	44	36
Cried due to spouse (N=121)		
Once	14	11
Twice	10	8
3-5 times	12	10
6-10 times	6	5
11-20 times	5	4
More than 20 times	7	6
Don't know	7	6
Never	60	50
Missing	3	2

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Intimate Partner said something to spite you (N=122)		
Once	9	7
Twice	13	11
3-5 times	15	12
6-10 times	7	6
11-20 times	5	4
More than 20 times	2	2
Don't know	13	11
Never	58	47
Threatened to hit or threw something at you (N=123)		
Once	5	4
Twice	2	2
3-5 times	8	7
6-10 times	2	2
11-20 times	1	1
Don't know	6	5
Never	99	80
Threw, smashed, hit, or kicked (N=123)		
Once	7	6
Twice	6	5
3-5 times	3	2
6-10 times	2	2
11-20 times	3	2
More than 20 times	0	0
Don't know	6	5
Never	96	77

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Threw something (=124)		
Once	5	4
Twice	1	1
3-5 times	5	4
6-10 times	2	2
11-20 times	0	0
More than 20 times	0	0
Don't know	2	2
Never	109	88
Pushed or grabbed you (N=124)		
Once	5	4
Twice	4	3
3-5 times	3	2
6-10 times	2	2
More than 20 times	2	2
Don't know	2	2
Never	106	86
Slapped you (N=124)		
Once	8	7
Twice	5	4
3-5 times	1	1
6-10 times	0	0
11-20 times	2	2
More than 20 times	0	0
Don't know	2	2
Never	106	86

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Kicked bit or hit with fist (N=124)		
Once	7	6
Twice	3	2
3-5 times	0	0
6-10 times	0	0
11-20 times	1	1
More than 20 times	1	1
Don't know	2	2
Never	110	89
Tried to hit with something (N=124)		
Once	5	4
Twice	1	1
3-5 times	1	1
6-10 times	1	1
11-20 times	0	0
More than 20 times	1	1
Don't know	2	2
Never	110	88
Beat you up (N=124)		
Once	5	4
Twice	0	0
3-5 times	0	0
6-10 times	0	0
11-20 times	0	0
More than 20 times	1	1
Don't know	2	2
Never	120	96

Variable	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Chocked you (N=124)		
Once	1	1
Twice	0	0
3-5 times	0	0
6-10 times	0	0
11-20 times	1	1
More than 20 times	0	0
Don't know	2	2
Never	120	97
Threatened you with a knife or a gun (N=124)		
Once	1	1
Twice	0	0
3-5 times	0	0
6-10 times	0	0
11-20 times	0	0
More than 20 times	0	0
Don't know	2	2
Never	121	98
Used knife or fired a gun (N=123)		
Once	0	0
Twice	0	0
3-5 times	0	0
6-10 times	0	0
11-20 times	0	0
More than 20 times	0	0
Don't know	2	2
Never	121	98

This study found that when alcohol was involved people tended to be more verbally aggressive then when

there was no alcohol involved. The findings were statistically significant ($t = 2.960$, $df = 116$, $p < .001$). Findings also show that people tend to be physically aggressive when alcohol is involved. However, the finding is not statistically significant. This study found that when a intimate partner in the relationship has been drinking before a conflict has started, then they are also more verbally aggressive ($t = 2.744$, $df = 106$, $p < .01$).

A Pearson Correlation Coefficient test was used to analyze a relationship between using reasoning and verbal aggression. The results from the Pearson test showed that those that used reasoning were more likely to be verbally aggressive (Pearson's $r = .592$, $p = .000$). It also showed that those that used reasoning were more likely to be physically aggressive (Pearson's $r = .269$, $p < .01$). Both test were statistically significant in displaying that those that use reasoning were more likely to be aggressive in some form, whether it be physical or verbal. The test also indicated that those that are verbally aggressive are also physically aggressive (Pearson's $r = .611$, $p = .000$). This too was statically significant and it corresponds with the data on intimate

partner violence that discusses the cycle of abuse and how it normally begins verbal abuse (Spardling, 2009). Lastly the study showed a correlation between the frequency of alcohol consumption and physically aggression and these results were also found to be statistically significant (Pearson's $r = .208$, $p < .01$). These results coincide with our hypothesis that alcohol consumption does contribute to the amount of intimate partner violence that occurs among those aged 18-24.

Summary

This chapter has presented the results of the study. The frequency statistics were presented in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4. The significant findings of this study were reported. The next chapter provides a detailed discussion based on the results this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This study sought to examine the relationship between alcohol consumption, attitudes and beliefs and Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). This chapter will discuss the key finding of the study, its limitations, and the recommendations for social work practice, policy and research.

Discussion

This study sample of 124 students came from California State University San Bernardino in San Bernardino County. Due to time constraints and other limitations, we used convenience sample and, therefore, our sample cannot be considered a representative of the student population of the entire school. This sample method and the resulting non-representative sample may limit the generalizability of our findings.

The average age of the participants in our sample was 20 years old with over 60% of the participants falling between the ages of 18 and 20. Other ages were fairly adequately represented in the sample. Over 20% of

the participants were between the ages of 21 to 22, and 15% were between the ages of 23 to 24. Our study was fairly evenly divided among both male and female, with most of the participants being female.

The ethnic makeup of the study is relatively diverse. Although Hispanics accounted for 40% of the sample, African Americans, 30%, Whites, 20% and all others, 10%. Asian Pacific Islander, however, was not well represented, making up less than 5% of the sample. The marital status of our sample also varied from that of the general school population. Only 7% of our sample size claimed to be married or co-habitationg with a spouse. This in itself is not surprising due to the fact that 60% of the participants were in either their first (freshman) or second (sophomore) year of college

The study found that 70% knew what IPV was. However, shockingly, less than 10% knew of IPV services here on campus. Ninety-one percent of our sample did not know of any IPV services at Cal State University San Bernardino. Although no previous research has been conducted on this issue, it is important for students to be aware of what IVP services are available to them as students.

Both of the main hypotheses were partially supported by this study. The study found that when alcohol was involved in a conflict, people tended to be more verbally aggressive. This finding was consistent with previous research that linked problem drinking and IPV aggression (Hines & Straus, 2007). The study also found that people tended to be physically aggressive when alcohol was involved. This showed that those who were verbally aggressive were also physically aggressive. These findings were consistent with (Spardling, 2009).

This study found that there was no significant correlation between acceptance of the use of violence and IPV perpetration. This finding was not consistent with Nabors and Jasinski (2009) who also found that there was a strong correlation between attitudes and beliefs of the victim and IPV perpetration. However, interestingly we found that 70% of our sample population felt that at some point victims could be the blame for their own abuse. It's possible that the participants blaming victim attitude may translate into involvement of IPV.

Although we expected to find that college students tended to be more physically aggressive to their intimate partner we found that they tended to be more verbally

aggressive and that verbal aggression can then turns into physical aggression.

Limitations

There were several limitations to the study. The first limitation was the wording of some of the questions asked on the survey. Some questions didn't apply to all participants, which in turn made some participants choose options that may not have necessarily applied. For example one question asked participants the sex of their partner. That question assumed that participants were in current relationships, which was not the case for every participant, so some participants answered that questions even though it may not have necessarily applied to them. Most likely those that were single applied that question to their last relationship, but that was not how the question was intended to be answered.

Second, there were a higher percentage of those between the ages of 18-21 years of age in our study. We surveyed 124 students between the ages of 18-24 years of age, 40% of the participants were between the ages 21-24, while 60% of the participants were between the ages 18-20 years of age (U.S. Department of Bureau of Justice

Statistics, 2007). Those between the ages of 20-24 are at higher risk for IPV, so it would have been beneficial to have been able to survey those students between those ages to measure the rate of IPV, attitudes and belief, and alcohol consumption.

Third, the study used convenience sampling. Convenient sampling in itself is very biased because it may not represent the entire campus. It is only a representation of the students that could be accessed on campus to take the survey. In addition our sample size was small compared to the entire population of Cal State University San Bernardino. Therefore, the results of our study cannot be generalized to the whole campus of Cal State University of San Bernardino. However, that doesn't mean the data isn't of value or beneficial.

Recommendations for Social Work Practice, Policy and Research

There are several recommendations for social work practice, policy, and research based on the results of our study. The first recommendation is that more research be conducted on IPV on college campuses. College students on college campuses aged 20-24 are at higher risk for IPV than any other population, so there definitely needs to

be more research done on this topic and the contributing factors associated with it, in an effort to eliminate this type of violence from continuing (U.S. Department of Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007).

Second, social workers could start visiting campuses and running campaigns to spread awareness of the relationship between alcohol use and the amount of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) occurring on campus. They could come on campuses and have speakers come and talk to students on the topic and have victims also come and talk to students to spread awareness of the issue. The social worker could also come onto campuses to spread awareness of the resources available on campus. In our study almost all the students (90%) were unaware of the resources available to them at the Women's Resource Center. Perhaps they could even partner up with the Women's Resource Center to ensure that students are made aware of the service offered on campus. By spreading awareness they could not only direct them to the resources that are available on campus, but also other resources available within the community that can be accessed.

Third, social workers could start addressing college campuses about eliminating pubs on campuses. Alcohol has

been found in our study to be correlated with the use of IPV. Eliminating the pubs would help in ensuring that the campus has no involvement with the use of IPV occurring on college campuses. There are plenty of businesses nearby most college students that students can purchase alcohol from.

Fourth, social workers could also begin to educate other social workers on the matter. Perhaps they could run various studies and compare there findings. In doing so they would be able to further address the needs of victims, create or add to interventions to address contributing factors, spread more awareness, and share information on interventions, program development, and prevention.

Conclusions

This study explored what individual factors are associated with IPV experiences among college student. The study used quantitative methods using a survey questionnaire design. Data was collected on the campus, both male and female that were between the ages of 18-24 years of age. The results of the study showed that there was a correlation between alcohol consumption and IPV.

The study also found that when alcohol was involved people tended to be more verbally aggressive than when there is no alcohol involved. Last the study showed that those who used reasoning were more likely to use verbal aggression and physical aggression. We recommend that more research be conducted on IPV on college campuses, and that social workers become involved on campuses to increase awareness of the correlation between alcohol consumption and IPV among college students.

APPENDIX A
QUESTIONNAIRE

Intimate Partner Violence Survey

Please read each question carefully and answer to the best of your ability. Please keep in mind there are no right or wrong answers.

1. Do you know what Intimate Partner Violence is?
1. Yes or 2. No

Intimate partner violence is described physical, sexual, or psychological harm by a current or former partner or spouse.

Demographics

2. What is your gender?
1. Female 2. Male
3. What is your ethnicity?
1. African American 2. Asian Pacific Islander
3. Hispanic/Latino/Chicano 4. White
5. Other, specify _____
4. How old are you? AGE: _____
5. What is your current marital status?
1. Never married 2. Married
3. Divorced 4. Widowed
5. Co-habiting 6. Other, specify _____
6. Where do you currently reside?
1. On campus 2. Off campus
7. Who do you live with?
1. Alone 2. With parents
3. With roommates 4. Off campus with spouse
5. Other, specify _____
8. Do you currently consider yourself a.....
1. Freshman 2. Sophomore
3. Junior 4. Senior
5. Graduate student
9. What is the sex of your intimate partner?
1. Female or 2. Male
10. Are you familiar with any Intimate Partner Violence services here on campus?
1. Yes or 2. No

These next questions are asked to gain information on your attitudes and beliefs concerning Intimate Partner Violence

In this section please answer

1 = Yes

2 = Most of the time

3 = Sometimes

4 = Rarely

5 = Never

		Yes	Most of the time	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1.	You think Intimate Partner Violence is a problem among college students?	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Do you think the victims are to blame for Intimate Partner Violence?	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Do you think perpetrators are to blame for Intimate Partner Violence?	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Do you think victims provoke Intimate Partner Violence?	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Do you think Intimate Partner Violence is more likely to occur with the use of alcohol?	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Do you think alcohol use is a good reason to EXCUSE a perpetrators violent behavior?	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Do you think perpetrators purposely mean to hurt victims?	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Do you think perpetrators can control their violent behavior?	1	2	3	4	5
9.	Do you think perpetrators should go to jail for their crime?	1	2	3	4	5
10.	Do you think IPV can be avoided?	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Do you think victims over exaggerate their abuse?	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Do you think sex and violence in the media influence IPV?	1	2	3	4	5
13.	Do you view Intimate Partner Violence among women and men the same?	1	2	3	4	5
14.	Do you feel Intimate Partner Violence is a product of a male dominated society?	1	2	3	4	5
15.	Do you feel in society women who are perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence are viewed as equally as men perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence?	1	2	3	4	5
16.	Do you feel women can be perpetrators of Intimate Partner Violence?	1	2	3	4	5

The following questions are asked to gain information on you and your intimate partners Alcohol Consumption

1. Have you and your partner ever been in a conflict where alcohol was involved?

1. Yes 2. No

2. Were you drinking before the conflict started?

1. Yes 2. No

3. Was your intimate partner drinking before the conflict started?

1. Yes 2. No

4. In general, how often do you consume alcoholic beverages –that is, beer, wine, or liquor?

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------|
| ___ 1. Never | ___ 2. Less than 1 day a month |
| ___ 3. 1-3 days a month | ___ 4. 1-2 days a week |
| ___ 5. 3-4 days a week | ___ 6. 5-6 days a week |
| ___ 7. Daily | |

This set of questions have been taken from the Conflict Tactic Scale and are asked to measure the amount of Intimate Partner Violence you have experiences.

Think back over the last 12 months you've been together, was there ever an occasion when your intimate partner...

1 = Once

3 = 3-5 times

5 = 11-20 times

7 = Don't know

2 = Twice

4 = 6-10 times

6 = More than 20 times

8 = Never

		Once	Twice	3-5 times	6-10 times	11-20 times	More than 20 times	Don't know	Never
1.	Discussed an issue calmly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2.	Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle thing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3.	Your intimate partner insulted you or swore at you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4.	Your intimate partner sulked or refused to talk about an issue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5.	You cried due to your spouse	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6.	Your intimate partner did or said something to spite you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7.	Your intimate partner threatened to hit you our throw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8.	Your intimate partner threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9.	Your intimate partner threw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10.	Your intimate partner pushed grabbed or shoved you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11.	Your intimate partner slapped you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12.	Your intimate partner kicked, bit or hit you with a fist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
13.	Your intimate partner hit or tried to hit you with something	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
14.	Your intimate partner beat you up	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
15.	Your intimate partner choked you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
16.	Your intimate partner threatened you with a knife or gun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
17.	Your intimate partner used a knives or fired a gun	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

APPENDIX B
INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMED CONSENT

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate the factors associated with Intimate Partner Violence experiences among college students. This study is being conducted by Danielle Moore and Shareela Allen, Master of Social Work graduate students under the supervision of Professor Janet Chang, school of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino. This study has been approved by the school of social work sub-committee Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

PURPOSE: The purpose of this research project is to investigate the individual factors associated with Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) experiences among college students

DESCRIPTION: You are being asked to take part in a written survey. You will be asked questions about your background, your alcohol consumption, your attitude and belief on IPV and the amount of IPV you have experienced.

PARTICIPATION: Participation is completely voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled and you may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits, to which you are otherwise entitled.

CONFIDENTIALITY OR ANONYMITY: This research is completely anonymous. It will be stored in locked filing cabinet that only the researchers have access to. After the researchers no longer need the results of this survey the instrument will be shredded.

DURATION: The survey will approximately take 10 to 15 minutes.

RISKS: Although there are no foreseeable risks, there is a possibility for participants to feel some emotional discomfort as a result of participating in this research.

BENEFITS: Although there are no direct benefits to the subjects who are participating in this survey, a benefit of taking part in this research survey will be to have a role in raising awareness of IPV with college students between the ages of 18 to 24.

CONTACT: If you have any questions about this project, please contact my research supervisor professor Janet Chang, school of Social Work, California State University, San Bernardino, 5500 University Parkway, San Bernardino, CA 92407, jchang@csusb.edu 909-573-5184.

RESULTS: The results of this project will be available at the Pfau Library, California State University, San Bernardino after September 2010.

Place a check mark below to agree to participate in this survey

 Place a check mark here

 Date

APPENDIX C
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for participating in this study examining the individual factors associated with Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) among college students. We used surveys as our method in an effort to better understand these factors and their association with IPV. No deception of any sort was used in this research project.

If your participation in this study has raised any issues or has caused you any stress and you feel like you would like to talk to someone further concerning this, there are resources available to you. A list of resources has been attached.

If you have any questions about the study please feel free to contact Professor Chang at the Department of Social Work at (909) 537-5184. If you would like more information on the results of this study, a copy will be available in the Pfau Library here at Cal State University, San Bernardino on the 3rd floor, (909)537-5090, after September 2010.

Resource List

If your participation in this study has raised any issues or has caused you any stress and you would like to discuss this further with someone, please contact one of the agencies or call the number 211 for help and referrals.

Cal State University San Bernardino Psychological Counseling Center
(909) 537-5040

National Domestic Violence Hotline
800-799-7233

House of Ruth 24-Hour Hotline
(909) 988-5559

Antelope Valley Domestic Violence Council 24- Hour Hotline
(805) 945-6736

Option House Inc
(909) 381-3471

Haley House
(760) 256-3441

Alternative to Domestic Violence 24-Hour Hotline
(909) 683-0829

Doves
(909) 866-5723

Victor Valley
(760) 955-8010

Inland Empire United Way
(909) 98011-1994

Olive Branch Counseling Center
(909) 989-9030

Caritas Counseling
(909) 370-1293

REFERENCES

- Bandura, A. (1962). *Social learning through imitation*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- California Department of Justice. (1998). Reports on arrest for domestic violence in California (1998): Criminal justice statistics center report series 1(3) 1999. Retrieved September 30, 2009, from <http://ag.ca.gov/cjsf/publications/misc/dv98pdf>
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2008). *Intimate partner definitions*. Retrieved September 28, 2009, from <http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/intimatepartnerviolence/defintions.html>
- Corcoran, K., & Fischer, J. (2000). *Measures for clinical practice, a source book* (3rd ed.). New York: the Free Press
- Fossos, N., Neighbors, C, Kaysen, D., & Hove, C. (2007). Intimate partner violence perpetration and problem drinking among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 68(5), 706-713.
- Gelles, R., & Straus, M. (1988). *Intimate violence*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Hegarty, K., Sheehan, M., & Sxchonfeld, C. (1999). A multidimensional definition of partner abuse: Development and preliminary validation of the composite abuse scale. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14(4), 399-415.
- Hines, D., & Straus, M. (2007). Binge drinking and violence against dating partners: The mediating effect of antisocial traits and behaviors in a multinational perspective. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 441-457.
- Lesser, J., & Pope, D. (2007). *Human behavior and the social environment theory and practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

- Nabors, L, E., & Jasinski, L, J. (2009). Intimate partner violence perpetration among college students. *Feminist Criminology*, 4(1), 57-82.
- Pled, E., Eisikovits, Z., Enosh, G., & Winstok, Z. (2000). Choice and empowerment for battered women who stay: Toward a constructivist model. *Social Work*, 45(1), 9-25.
- Ramirez, I. (2005). Criminal history and assault on intimate partner by Mexican American and No-Mexican American White college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(12), 1628-1647.
- Roberts, A. (2002). *The handbook of domestic violence intervention strategies: Policies, programs, and legal remedies*. New York: Oxford United Press.
- Roberts, R. A. (2005). *Crisis intervention handbook. Assessment, treatment and research* (3rd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sellers, C. S., Cochran, J. K., & Branch, K. A. (2005). Social learning theory and partner violence: A research note. *Deviant Behavior*, 26(4), 379-395.
- Spardling, J. (2009). *The cycle of violence*. Office of the Kansas Attorney General. Retrieved April 25, 2010, from <http://www.ksag.org>
- Spriggs, L, A., Halpern, T, C., Herring, H, A., & Schoenbach, J, V. (2009). Family and school socioeconomic disadvantage: Interactive influences on adolescent dating violence victimization. *Social Sciences and Medicine*, 68, 1956-1965.
- Stover, S. C., Meadows, L. A., & Kaufman, J. (2009). Interventions for intimate partner violence. Review and implications for evidence based practice. *Professional Psychology*, 40(3), 223-233.
- United States Department of Justice (2009). Intimate partner violence in the United States, 2007. Retrieved October 15, 2009, from <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/intimate/victims.htm>

ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES PAGE

This was a two-person project where authors collaborated throughout. However, for each phase of the project, certain authors took primary responsibility. These responsibilities were assigned in the manner listed below.

1. Data Collection:

Team Effort: Shareela Allen & Danielle Moore

2. Data Entry and Analysis:

Team Effort: Shareela Allen & Danielle Moore

3. Writing Report and Presentation of Findings:

a. Introduction and Literature

Team Effort: Shareela Allen & Danielle Moore

b. Methods

Team Effort: Shareela Allen & Danielle Moore

c. Results

Team Effort: Shareela Allen & Danielle Moore

d. Discussion

Team Effort: Shareela Allen & Danielle Moore