

## ABSTRACT

### Dating Violence Risk Factors of College Students Attending a Midwest Public University

Erin Nicole Benton, M.P.H.

Mentor: Beth A. Lanning, Ph.D.

The aim of this study was to evaluate the risk factors of dating violence at a non-faith-based, public university – University of Akron. This is phase II of an ongoing study to identify risk factors of dating violence for university students. Five hundred and fifty-seven undergraduates completed an online survey that analyzed demographic characteristics, alcohol use, pornography use, rape myth acceptance, hooking up behaviors, and history of dating violence. Overall, 8.8% of students reported being a victim of sexual assault, 9.3% were victims of physical abuse, and 32.7% were victims of emotional and verbal abuse. Being a female and ever engaging in a hookup were found to be risk factors for all forms of dating violence – victim and perpetrator. Future research is needed to identify other possible risk factors and to further explore the hypothesized risk factors of: pornography, hookup culture, and receiving sex education.

Dating Violence Risk Factors of College Students Attending a Midwest Public University

by

Erin Nicole Benton, B.S.

A Thesis

Approved by the Department of Health, Human Performance, and Recreation

---

Paul M. Gordon, Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of  
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree  
of  
Master of Public Health

Approved by the Thesis Committee

---

Beth A Lanning, Ph.D., Chairperson

---

M. Renee Umstatted Meyer, Ph.D.

---

Christie M. Sayes, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

May 2018

---

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2018 by Erin Nicole Benton

All rights reserved

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vii
DEDICATION.....	viii
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Significance of the Problem.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	6
Justification.....	6
Assumptions.....	7
Limitations.....	7
Delimitations.....	8
Research Questions.....	9
CHAPTER TWO.....	10
Review of the Literature.....	10
Review of the Literature.....	11
Future Research and Practice.....	14
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	15
CHAPTER THREE.....	17
Methods.....	17
Participants and Recruitment.....	17
Data Collection Procedure.....	18
Measures and Materials.....	19
Protecting Participants.....	21

Data Analytic Strategy.....	21
CHAPTER FOUR .....	23
Results .....	23
Descriptive Statistics.....	23
Multivariate Analyses .....	62
CHAPTER FIVE .....	69
Discussion .....	69
Discussions of Findings .....	69
Limitations .....	74
Recommendations and Conclusion.....	75
APPENDICES.....	77
Appendix A: Copy of Online Survey.....	78
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form .....	91
REFERENCES .....	93

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Sample Characteristics .....	25
Table 2. Sexual Assault - Victim.....	27
Table 3. Sexual Assault - Perpetrator .....	27
Table 4. Physical Abuse - Victim.....	28
Table 5. Physical Abuse - Perpetrator.....	28
Table 6. Emotional and Verbal Abuse - Victim.....	29
Table 7. Emotional and Verbal Abuse - Perpetrator.....	29
Table 8. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Sexual Assault Victims.....	33
Table 9. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Sexual Assault Perpetrators .....	34
Table 10. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Physical Abuse Victims.....	37
Table 11. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Physical Abuse Perpetrators.....	38
Table 12. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Emotional and Verbal Abuse Victims .....	41
Table 13. Selected Demographic Characteristics of Emotional and Verbal Abuse Perpetrators.....	42
Table 14. Hookup Characteristics.....	44
Table 15. Hookup Questionnaire.....	45
Table 16. Hookup Characteristics for Victims of Sexual Assault.....	46
Table 17. Hookup Characteristics for Victims of Physical Abuse.....	47
Table 18. Hookup Characteristics for Perpetrators of Physical Abuse.....	48
Table 19. Hookup Characteristics for Victims of Emotional and Verbal Abuse .....	49

Table 20. Hookup Characteristics for Perpetrators of Emotional and Verbal Abuse.....	50
Table 21. Sex Education Characteristics.....	52
Table 22. Sex Education Characteristics for Victims of Sexual Assault.....	52
Table 23. Sex Education Characteristics for Victims of Physical Abuse.....	53
Table 24. Sex Education Characteristics for Perpetrators of Physical Abuse.....	53
Table 25. Sex Education Characteristics for Victims of Emotional and Verbal Abuse...	54
Table 26. Sex Education Characteristics for Perpetrators of Emotional and Verbal Abuse .....	54
Table 27. Pornography Exposure Characteristics.....	56
Table 28. Pornography Characteristics for Victims of Sexual Assault .....	57
Table 29. Pornography Characteristics for Victims of Physical Abuse.....	57
Table 30. Pornography Characteristics for Perpetrators of Physical Abuse .....	57
Table 31. Pornography Characteristics for Victims of Emotional and Verbal Abuse.....	58
Table 32. Pornography Characteristics for Perpetrators of Emotional and Verbal Abuse .....	58
Table 33. Title IX Training .....	60
Table 34. Title IX Training Characteristics for Victims of Sexual Assault.....	60
Table 35. Title IX Training Characteristics for Victims of Physical Abuse.....	61
Table 36. Title IX Training Characteristics for Perpetrators of Physical Abuse.....	61
Table 37. Title IX Training Characteristics for Victims of Emotional and Verbal Abuse.....	62
Table 38. Title IX Training Characteristics for Perpetrators of Emotional and Verbal Abuse.....	62
Table 39. Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Sexual Assault Victims .....	64

Table 40. Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Physical Abuse Victims .....	65
Table 41. Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Physical Abuse Perpetrators.....	66
Table 42. Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Emotional and Verbal Abuse Victims .....	67
Table 43. Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Emotional and Verbal Abuse Perpetrators.....	68



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am thankful to: Dr. Lanning, my thesis advisor, for letting me continue this research and sticking with me through it all; my thesis committee for their support; all the MPH faculty for being a constant resource; Dr. Johnson at University of Akron for sticking with me and providing me with students to make this study happen; Alicia for letting me take over her “baby,” continue this much needed research, for answering every question, and being there every step of the way; Brendan for going thorough every step of this process with me and reminding me that we will finish; Gabe for being a constant listening ear and a SAS expert; my parents for answering my many frantic phone calls and reminding me to breathe and that I am capable; and to every friend and person who has listened to me, guided me and offered me support through this entire process, without every single one of you, this would not have been possible.

## DEDICATION

To every single survivor

To every person who blamed themselves

To every person who was told not to talk about it

To every person who was told it wasn't that bad

To every person who was told to get over it

#MeToo

## CHAPTER ONE

### Introduction

#### *Significance of the Problem*

Dating Violence is an ever-increasing societal issue. One in 10 men and three in 10 women will experience dating violence in their lifetime (Kelleher, Gardner, Coben, Barth, Edleson, & Hazen, 2006). Moreover, one in five women and one in 71 men will be raped in their lifetime (Black et al., 2010). Dating violence (DV) is defined as, “physical, sexual, psychological, or emotional violence within a dating relationship, including stalking” (CDC, 2017). Sexual assault (a form of DV) is defined as “any type of sexual contact or behavior that occurs without the explicit consent of the recipient. Falling under the definition of sexual assault are sexual activities such as forced sexual intercourse, forcible sodomy, child molestation, incest, fondling, and attempted rape.” (U.S. Department of Justice, 2017).

#### *College Students and Sexual Assault*

Students in college and students that are college-aged (18-24), are more likely to experience sexual assault and dating violence (RAINN, 2017). Sexual assault on college campuses in the United States has been labeled as a chronic public health crisis (Flack, et al., 2016). Chronic public health crisis is defined as a nationwide problem that affects the public’s health that is increasing at a drastic rate.

College students are particularly vulnerable to sexual assault. Approximately 11% of college students (undergraduate and graduate) between the ages of 18-24 will

experience sexual assault or dating violence (RAINN, 2017). However, there are discrepancies in the recent literature that say that the age range is closer to 18 to 25 or even older (Justice & Dornan, 2001). Specifically, one in four women and one in 16 men in college will be sexually assaulted before they graduate (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007). In the past decade, sexual assault reports on college campuses have increased (Anderson, 2016). This increase could reflect a growing positive trend in victims coming forward and reporting their experiences and not just an increase in the frequency of sexual assaults (Anderson, 2016).

In 2016, the Clery Act was updated to now classify and report rape in its own individual category. Universities previously reported dating violence, rape, or sexual assault of any sort under “forcible sex offenses” (Anderson, 2016). Just because a low number of rapes and incidences of dating violence on campus are reported, does not mean that dating violence and sexual assault is not occurring (Anderson, 2016). Most incidents of DV on campuses go unreported (Anderson, 2016). Three factors impact the rate and number of incidence reported: the number of students who attend a school, campus climate around sexual assault and accessibility and convenience of reporting (Anderson, 2016). A campus’ sexual assault climate can contribute to how sexual assault is portrayed and handled. Another possible factor that impacts the rate and number of incidences reported is a prominent hookup culture on a college’s campus (Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006).

### *Hookup Culture*

Hookup culture is a campus environment that gives the perception that hooking up is a normalized activity. Hookups are defined as “a sexual encounter between two

people who are brief acquaintances or strangers, usually lasting only one night without the expectation of developing a relationship” (Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000, p. 1). The presence of a hookup culture can look different depending on who is asked to define it. (Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012). Students often perceive the hookup rate to be higher than reported when students are asked their actual hookup rate (Garcia, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012). Much of this misconception about hookup rates may be driven by the campus party scene that promotes alcohol consumption and hooking up for the evening. (Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006). Hookup culture is a potential risk factor because hooking up more often is thought to increase the risk of sexual assault or being a victim of DV (Flack, et al., 2007).

Many sexual assaults on college campuses occur during a hookup (Flack, et al., 2008). Research also suggests that female students are at greater risk of sexual assault during the first few weeks of the first semester of college and the weeks following a break (Flack, et al., 2008). This period is often referred to as the “red zone” (Flack, et al., 2008). This could be because more parties occur at this time as well as for some women, it might be their first exposure to a college party scene and alcohol (Flack, et al., 2008). Furthermore, the “college party” scene and hookup culture is often portrayed positively in the media.

### *Sexual Assault in the Media*

DV (sometimes constituting graphic rape or attempted rape) is frequently portrayed in popular media (Elizabeth, 2015). In fact, in the first five seasons of the TV show *Game of Thrones*, rape and attempted rape are portrayed over 50 times (Tafkar, 2015). In other shows, such as *13 Reasons Why*, the main character’s sexual assault is one

of the 13 reasons she gives for committing suicide (Netflix, 2017). Several movies, like *Precious*, *The Kite Runner*, and *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo*, also depict sexual assault scenes (Elizabeth, 2015; IMDb, 2017). Other media forms such as songs (e.g., “Last Friday Night” by Katy Perry) and books (i.e., *Fifty Shades of Grey* by E.L. James) also allude to and add to the prominence of sexual assault in our culture (Garica, Reiber, Massey, & Merriwether, 2012). This gives viewers unrealistic expectations of what DV looks like and what the possible consequences of it could be.

Though sexual assault is often referenced in entertainment, few of these media outlets accurately depict the scenarios or the psychological trauma that may be experienced after sexual assault has occurred (Elizabeth, 2015). Instead, the entertainment industry portrays these as “normal relationships.” The industry is therefore desensitizing its viewers to what a healthy relationship looks like and promoting the spread and acceptance of rape myths (Elizabeth, 2015).

Another branch of the entertainment industry that normalizes dating violence and desensitizes its viewers, is the pornography industry (Ferguson & Hartley, 2009). In 2016, a popular pornography website received 23 billion visits, resulting in 64 million people visiting the site a day (Fight the New Drug, 2017). Furthermore, 4,599,000,000 hours of pornography were watched on the same website in one year (Fight the New Drug, 2017 & Ferguson & Hartley, 2009).

As the entertainment industry is inundated with portrayals of sexual assault, sexual assault is also occurring within the entertainment industry, becoming a constant topic in the news. Recently, college campuses (i.e., University of Tennessee, Baylor University, University of Texas at Austin, Stanford University), well-known companies

(i.e., Uber, The Weinstein Company) and even high-level politicians (Anthony Weiner, Donald Trump) have been featured in the news for sexual assault and sexual harassment claims (Kraemer, 2017; Rau & Wadhvani, 2016; Tracy & Barry, 2017; University of Texas Health Systems, 2017). University of Texas at Austin administrators even went so far as to declare sexual assault an epidemic on their campus (University of Texas Health Systems, 2017). An epidemic is defined as a higher than normal occurrence of a disease, or in this case, reports of sexual assault.

### *Current Response to Dating Violence*

In response to the growing incidence and media attention on sexual assault, several groups of people have launched nation-wide efforts aimed at helping victims and preventing dating violence and future sexual assaults. For example, American politician Joe Biden helped start a nationwide effort called It's On Us (It's On Us, 2014), implemented on college campuses across the country. It's On Us serves to reduce stigma associated with reporting sexual assaults and to debunk rape myths (i.e., because she was drinking, she's partly to blame) (Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006, It's On Us, 2014).

In 2006, the Me Too movement was started by Tarana Burke to help survivors of sexual violence find healing and as a resource for empowerment (Me too Movement, 2006). However, in 2017, the Me Too movement gained a larger following. In the fall of 2017, a large amount of woman came forward accusing many influential people in Hollywood, of sexual violence (Gilbert, 2017). The Me Too movement has started a trending hashtag, #MeToo, where survivors are sharing their stories and experiences with sexual violence.

Organizations such as The National Sexual Violence Resource Center (NSVRC), The Rape, Abuse, Incest National Network (RAINN), Time's Up, #MeToo movement, and It's On Us have a mission to help those who have been sexually assaulted, sexually harassed, victim of dating violence, as well as provide reliable resources for victims (NSVRC, 2107; RAINN, 2017; It's On Us, 2014). An amendment to the Clery Act, school administrators restructuring and revising their Title IX offices and reporting procedures, encourages normalizing reporting dating violence and creates an environment where it's safe and acceptable to do so (Anderson, 2016).

Besides all the available resources and support systems in place for victims, DV is still occurring. Possible risk factors of dating violence include media exposure, rape myths, hookup culture, alcohol consumption, campus environment, and receiving sex education. More possible risk factors exist; however, more studies are needed to identify further risk factors. Without more work and research being done, we will continue to see rates of DV increase.

### *Purpose of Study*

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the risk factors of dating violence at a non-faith-based, public university – University of Akron. This is phase II of an ongoing study to evaluate dating risk factors for university students. Phase I was conducted by Alicia Duval in 2017 (Duval, 2017).

### *Justification*

This thesis is phase II of, “Evaluating the Risk Factors of Dating Violence among Undergraduates Attending a Faith-Based University.” The purpose of phase I of the study



was to evaluate the risk factors of dating violence at a faith-based university – Baylor University. Phase one revealed several key risk factors of dating violence on a faith-based college campus such as witnessing an abusive father, being female, and engaging in hook up relationships. Additional research is needed to determine if risks factors related to DV are similar at non-faith based, public universities.

Further justification for this study include the increasing rate of dating violence – specifically among college-aged students (Black et al., 2010) and the recent public outcry and movements (i.e. Me Too, Times Up, It’s on Us).

#### *Assumptions*

There was an assumption that participants would answer the questions in the survey honestly and fully to the best of their knowledge. Another assumption is that the results and methodology of this research study will be replicable at other universities throughout the United States.

#### *Limitations*

Possible limitations to the study included self-reporting, the sensitive nature of the survey questions, and the recruitment tools used for participants in the study could lead to selection bias.

An online, self-report survey was used for this study. This survey was previously created in phase I and edited to and expanded on for phase II. Because of this, it was not possible to evaluate the accuracy of student’s responses. Students also had the choice to skip a question if they did not want to answer it or did not feel comfortable answering it.

Some of the questions on the survey asked about sensitive material. If students did not feel comfortable responding, they could leave the question unanswered.

The sample was a convenience sample of college students attending the University of Akron. The co-investigator at Akron recruited participants through the psychology department, targeting university students who were enrolled in general psychology classes. Students were also encouraged to recruit their University of Akron peers as to have as many students participate as possible. This limited survey participation only to those pursuing degrees that require psychology class requirements. However, a survey or research study had to be completed by all students in general psychology classes making it more likely for students to complete the survey due to class requirements.

#### *Delimitations*

Delimitations for phase II decreased the limitations of the study. The limitations include self-reporting, sensitive nature of study and recruitment tools for participation in the study. Self-reporting was accounted for by removing all students who completed less than 50% of the study. However, prevarication bias is hard to control for in an online, anonymous survey. A list of school-based and psychological health resources was provided for participants at the end of the completion of the survey. Participants were also reminded that they could quit and leave the survey anytime. Recruitment occurred through a general psychology course. The course was a required course for psychology majors as well as an elective option for other students.

## *Research Questions*

Research Question 1: What percentage of participants have experienced some form of dating violence?

1a. What is the frequency of sexual assault victimization and perpetration among University of Akron students?

1b. What is the frequency of physical abuse victimization and perpetration among University of Akron students?

1c. What is the frequency of emotional/verbal abuse victimization and perpetration among University of Akron students?

Research Question 2: What are the risk factors for dating violence among college students attending a public, non-faith-based university?

2a. Which demographic characteristics (i.e. gender, race/ethnicity, classification, etc.) are related to dating violence?

2b. Is there a relationship between hookup culture and dating violence?

2c. Is there a relationship between receiving education on how to say no to sex and dating violence?

Research Question 3: Is exposure to pornography a risk factor for dating violence?

3a. Is there a relationship between viewing pornography and dating violence?

Frequency of viewing pornography and dating violence?

3b. What is the frequency of students who believe that pornography influences sexual encounters and sexual decision making?

Research Question 4: What is the frequency of students who have participated in Title IX training?

## CHAPTER TWO

### Review of the Literature

A literature review was conducted to examine the current research available on dating violence, sexual assault, risk factors for dating violence and sexual assault, and dating violence and sexual assault on college campuses. A full systematic literature review was conducted during phase I of this study. This literature review loosely examines five other risk factors of dating violence more in depth than phase I. Five general topic areas, based on findings from the previous study, were selected as guide for the literature review. The topics included: sexual assault, hookup culture, rape myths, pornography, and sex education.

The three databases used to conduct the review of literature were Google Scholar, Scopus, and PsycInfo. Only published peer-reviewed articles were used. The search terms included “sexual assault” AND “hookup culture,” “sexual assault” AND “pornography,” “sexual assault” AND “sex education,” “sexual assault” AND “rape myths,” “dating violence” AND “hookup culture,” “dating violence” AND “pornography,” and “dating violence” AND “sex education,” “dating violence” AND “rape myths.” Additional searches were conducted by adding “college students” and “college campus” to the previous search. A total of 7,812 articles were produced. Papers that didn’t match criteria included those older than the year 2000, those not involving college students, and non-peer-reviewed sources. Ten articles were reviewed that focused on risk factors for sexual assault and dating violence on college campuses.

### *Review of the Literature*

Alcohol use is a well-established risk factor for sexual assault, for both perpetrator and victim (Smith, White, & Holland, 2003). Therefore, the purpose of this literature review was to examine other possible risk factors related to sexual assault identified in the previous study, phase I. These risk factors include rape myths, hookup culture beliefs and norms on college campuses, exposure to pornography (internet, magazine, and/or video), and exposure to formal sex education or sexual assault-prevention education before the age of 18.

#### *Sexual Assault and Rape Myths*

One important factor related to sexual assault prevention is exposing rape myths. As defined by Lonsway & Fitzgerald (1994), “rape myths are attitudes and generally false beliefs about rape that are widely and persistently held, and that serve to deny and justify male sexual aggression against women. Common rape myth examples include people saying or believing, “it’s her fault, she dressed like that,” “she’s asking for it,” and “well he/she shouldn’t have drunk that much/gone to that party.” (Lonsway & Fitzgerald, 1994, p. 1). Rape myths are hurtful, wrong and support the current rape culture in America (Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006). Positively, younger generations are shying away from believing and condoning these rape myths (McMahon, 2010, Hayes, Lorenz, & Bell, 2013); however, Aronowitz, Lambert and Davidoff (2012) found that rape myths are still prevalent among college students and generally more widely accepted by males than females.

### *Sexual Assault and Hookup Culture*

Another risk factor of sexual assault is the hookup culture among college students (Reling, Barton, Becker, & Valasik, 2017). According to Urban Dictionary (2011), hookup culture is defined as, “the era that began in the early 1990’s and has since prevailed on college campuses and elsewhere when hooking up has replaced traditional dating as the preferred method of heterosexual liaison.” Hooking up includes everything from making out, to hand-genital contact, oral-genital contact, genital-genital, and genital-anal contact (Reling, Barton, Becker, & Valasik, 2017). One common theme in the literature is that most sexual assaults appear in the form of a hookup - they are one-time occurrences and frequently take place under the influence of alcohol. However, risk factors that were identified are all correlations and none have sufficient evidence for causation.

In one article, researchers examined how the Health Belief Model helps to understand what influences students to participate in riskier sexual behaviors (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger, 2009). The researchers found that engaging in risky sexual behaviors puts someone more at risk of dating violence (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger, 2009). Another common theme among hookups in college is that hookups are likely to involve friends (Fielder & Carey, 2010). Indeed, most sexual assaults occur with people who are acquaintances (Fielder & Carey, 2010). Overall, the literature supports the possibility of hookup culture being a risk factor for dating violence.

### *Sexual Assault and Pornography*

Results from research on the correlation between sexual assault and pornography are mixed. Two of the three articles on the topic of pornography and sexual assault were

studies that included college men only (Braithwaite, Coulson, Keddington, & Fincham, 2015; Foubert, Brosi, & Bannon, 2011; Ferguson & Hartley, 2009). Ferguson, and Hartley (2009), were not able to provide evidence supporting the hypothesis that pornography use increases sexual assault rates.

Two studies' researchers found that viewing pornography can increase intent to rape among both sexes, and that viewing pornography also makes men more likely to believe in rape myths (Braithwaite, Coulson, Keddington, & Fincham, 2015; Foubert, Brosi, & Bannon, 2011). Researchers also found that with frequent pornography viewing, typically more sexual partners were had, and the plan to have more sexual partners in the future was associated as well. When only men were studied, they found the men who frequently viewed pornography were less likely to intervene as a bystander in a situation such as sexual assault (Foubert, Brosi, & Bannon, 2011).

In another article, researchers stated there was no association between pornography and DV because the majority of the studies that prove causation focus only on college males therefore making the results not generalizable to the general public (Ferguson & Hartley, 2009). Ferguson, and Hartley (2009) also suggested that pornography usage is a hard study to conduct because the data being collected is self-reported data. Participants are likely to lie about their usage and frequency of using pornography (Ferguson & Hartley, 2009).

### *Sexual Assault and Sex Education*

In formal sex education (evidence-based information on sexual health & healthy relationships taught by qualified professional), how to say no, healthy relationships, and consent are taught. Formal sex education should occur during the years of kindergarten

through twelfth grade, however, most people do not receive it until their college years. There is a lack of evidence in the literature on whether or not being taught formal sex education before the age of 18 has any influence on the incidence rate of sexual assault.

Sexual assault prevention programs can be improved and updated. To be more effective, the curriculum needs to be more robust and perhaps, gender-focused. Abby and McAuslan (2004), studying male perpetrators of sexual assault, found that prevention and treatment programs need to occur early on in adolescence. They found that when prevention and treatment programs occurred earlier on in adolescences, the programs are effective in lowering the rate of male perpetrators of sexual assault (Abby & McAuslan, 2004).

Some other suggestions presented in the literature on possible improvements include implementing self-defense training that is specific to sexual assault situations. Self-defense training is currently not a component of typical programs, but should be included (Söchting, Fairbrother, & Koch, 2004). Another possible suggestion is the improvement of websites that schools have on the topic. Researchers from one studied looked superficially at the education materials that are available for women. Not many schools have women-specific resources (Hayes-Smith & Hayes-Smith, 2009). It is known that women are more likely to be sexually assaulted, especially in college so resources specifically for them that are accurate and useful are needed.

#### *Future Research and Practice*

Future research is needed to identify other potential risk factors for sexual assault and dating violence. From this review, it was found that men are more likely to have different rape myth attitudes than women, and rape and sexual assault-prevention



programs need to be improved (Aronowitz, Lambert, & Davidoff, 2012; Söchting, Fairbrother, & Koch, 2004). This review also revealed that there is both conflicting evidence and research on whether or not exposure to pornography can increase rates of sexual assault, and that there is a gap in the literature on whether or not formal sex education prior to starting college plays a role in sexual assault prevention (Ferguson & Hartley, 2009; Braithwaite, Coulson, Keddington, & Fincham, 2015; Foubert, Brosi, & Bannon, 2011).

Most researchers examining sexual assault on college campuses focused on women only. More college-based studies including both males and females are needed to determine risk factors for dating violence and sexual assault. There are little to no studies on the effects of formal sex education before the age of 18 and its influence on sexual assault later in life. Limited articles were found through an exhaustive search, nine were produced through the search, and only three were included in the review. In formal sex education taught by an educator, consent, and healthy relationships is covered. Future research should include studies analyzing the association between receiving formal sex education and being either a victim or perpetrator of DV.

### *Conclusion and Recommendations*

The purpose of this literature review was to examine the current research available on dating violence, sexual assault, risk factors for dating violence and sexual assault, and dating violence and sexual assault on college campuses. Five general topic areas, based on findings from the previous study, were selected as guide for the literature review. The topics included: sexual assault, hookup culture, rape myths, pornography, and sex education.

Limited evidence in the literature suggests that exposure to formal sex education prior to 18 is a protective factor. Gaps in the research include lack of true experimental studies, studies on perpetrators, inconclusive findings between viewing pornography and it increasing the risk for being a victim or perpetrator of DV, and studies that include data that are solely self-reported. Recommendations include conducting more true-experimental studies, and further studying the possible risk factor of pornography.

## CHAPTER THREE

### Methods

#### *Participants and Recruitment*

Participants for this study included male and female undergraduate students enrolled in a 4-year public institution of higher education. College students were chosen as potential participants because research shows that college students are at the highest risk for sexual assault. All male and female undergraduate students, aged 18-25 years, enrolled in 12 hours or more attending the University of Akron were eligible to enroll in the study. Students could be listed as 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, or 5<sup>th</sup> year students. Those enrolled in less than 12 hours and those under the age of 18 were not eligible to participate. In addition, graduate students, doctoral students, other professional school students, faculty, staff, and administration were not eligible to participate. These exclusions are permitted because those under the age of 18 require parental consent and those over the age of 25 are more likely to be graduate or doctoral students. The age range for this study includes 18-25. It was decided to include those that are 25 years old since University of Akron is a non-traditional school and includes students that may be older than those that attend a traditional four-year university.

A convenience sample of students enrolled at the University of Akron were recruited from general psychology courses. Students were encouraged to recruit students who were not currently enrolled in a psychology course. The study was approved through the University of Akron Institutional Review Board. The co-investigator at the

University of Akron contacted the psychology department instructors asking permission to advertise the study through their courses. The class instructor explained the study to the students and provided a hyperlink to the *Qualtrics* survey. The survey included an informed consent statement and mental health counseling services available for the students. The psychology classes served as a good sampling pool because each course has a variety of students, including classification and majors. Many students attending University of Akron take psychology classes, therefore using this sample will help minimize selection bias. Psychology is one of the core classes students can choose to take.

#### *Data Collection Procedure*

Data were collected through an online self-report survey using the online survey software, *Qualtrics* (2018, Provo, UT). A convenience sample of participants from all psychology courses will receive an e-mail from the course instructor or the co-investigator containing information about the purpose of the study and a link to the online survey. Participants voluntarily clicked the attached link, which directed them to an online *Qualtrics* survey. Before starting the survey, participants read the purpose of the study, the benefits of the study, any potential risks to the participants, and that participation is voluntary before starting the survey. Participants had the opportunity to digitally agree or disagree to complete the survey. The participants were reminded that they have the ability to withdraw from the study at any time. Upon agreeing to participating in the study, participants were given a second reminder that if they did not consent, to stop immediately and not finish the survey. The survey was mobile device, laptop, and desktop friendly making it easier for participants to complete the survey at

their convenience. If a participant decided to withdraw from the study before responding to at least 50% of the questions, the participant's survey data were eliminated from analysis and destroyed. There was no penalty for withdrawing from the study.

### *Measures and Materials*

The online survey included five parts: background information data, alcohol use data, pornography use data, attitudes data, and dating and sexual experiences data. The survey used in current study was the same as the survey used in the previous (phase I) study, except the addition of a fifth section (placed in section III of the new survey), which related to the students views on pornography and pornography usage. See Appendix A for a copy of the online survey. See Appendix B for the informed consent form.

#### *Part I: Background Information*

Background information about participants was collected using 16 questions. The demographic questions were similar to questions in other studies designed to collect demographic data. Participants were asked their age, gender, current enrollment status, school classification, race/ethnicity, family household income, Greek membership status, student-athlete status, home state, parent's relationship status, history of interpersonal violence, level of spirituality, and importance of religion as well as religious affiliation.

#### *Part II: Alcohol Use*

We used the *Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT)* to measure student's alcohol use. (Saunders, Aasland, Babor, de la Fuente & Grant, 1993). The AUDIT is a 10-item questionnaire that was used to measure student's alcohol

consumption, drinking behaviors, and alcohol-related problems. Students were also provided a visual representation of alcoholic drink serving sizes to use as a reference when answering the questionnaire. The AUDIT has been tested for reliability and validity and is an appropriate tool for this study. The test-retest correlation coefficient of the tool is 0.90 and the internal validity of the test is Cronbach's alpha = 0.86, these are both acceptable numbers (Rubio Valladolid, Bermejo Vicedo, Caballero Sánchez-Serrano, & Santo-Domingo Carrasco, 1998).

### *Part III: Pornography*

We used a possible three questions to measure student's pornography use. The questions selected are similar to others used in studies examining pornography use. Students were asked if they have ever viewed pornography as well as frequency of viewing. If students responded yes to ever viewing pornography, then they were prompted with a question about pornography's influence on their sexual encounters and decision making. Since the questions for this section were created, the validity and reliability of the tool is not available.

### *Part IV: Attitudes*

*The Updated Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (IRMA)* was used to measure the students' attitudes about rape (McMahon & Farmer, 2011). The IRMA is a 22-item self-report measure used to assess the participant's rape myth acceptance, and level of victim blaming. Since the IRMA has been used effectively in several studies, it is a reliable instrument. The Cronbach's alpha of the IRMA scale was found to be 0.87 (Hayes, Lorenz, & Bell, 2013; McMahon & Farmer, 2011).

### *Part V: Dating and Sexual Experiences*

Part V was used to measure and identify student's dating and sexual experiences. Included in this section were the *Hook-Up Questionnaire (HUQ)*, one free response question, questions on sex education, Title IX training, and additional questions about dating violence victimization and perpetration. The Hook-Up Questionnaire (HUQ) is a five-item self-report questionnaire used to measure sexual experiences among different hookup partners (Flack & Brian, 2007). The HUQ has an internal validity of 0.82 which was deemed acceptable for this study (Flack & Brian, 2007).

### *Protecting Participants*

All participants were given a link to an anonymous online survey. Participant's name, school ID number, address, phone number, and IP address were not collected. There were minimal risks to participating in this study. There was a potential risk for psychological discomfort due to the nature of some of the questions. More specifically, because this study was designed to investigate sexual assault, participants that may have been previously assaulted could be triggered by the items on this survey. Participants were afforded the opportunity to withdraw from the study at any point in the process. In addition, psychological resources (University of Akron Counseling & Testing Center) were provided for those who needed them or who wanted to learn more about them.

### *Data Analytic Strategy*

Data analysis included the following steps: data collection, developing a data analysis plan, data cleaning, addressing and accommodating missing data, and addressing

unclear responses. All data were downloaded as a CSV excel data file and stored on a password-protected computer.

After cleaning the data, the number of responses went from 638 to 557.

Responses were then analyzed using SAS version 9.4. Data were available immediately after the deadline set by the researchers was reached. Responses to demographic questions (e.g., age and classification) were used to eliminate participants who did not fall into the eligibility criteria. Responses were eliminated for those who were under the age of 18, and over the age of 25, and those who were not enrolled as fulltime students. Because participants could withdraw from the study at any time, those who completed less than 50% of the survey were eliminated. If a participant responded to 50% or more of the survey, unanswered questions were treated as missing data.

After the data were cleaned, the data set was first analyzed using descriptive statistics. Bivariate and multivariate logistic regression were used to analyze data after descriptive statistics were generated. For the entirety of the study, the alpha level was set at 0.05 and all confidence intervals were set at the 95% confidence level.



## CHAPTER FOUR

### Results

#### *Descriptive Statistics*

##### *Sample Characteristics*

Six-hundred and thirty-eight students participated in the survey. Participants who did not meet inclusion criteria or who did not complete 50% of the survey were removed from the study, resulting in final sample size of 557.

Participants ranged in age from 18 to 25 years ( $M=19.3$ ,  $SD=1.5$ ) and mostly identified as female (68.9%,  $n=384$ ). Five of the participants identified as “other” or “I prefer not to answer.” Those who identified as “other” were prompted to fill-in their response, the responses received were: gender fluid, non-binary, and transgender.

More than half of the sample (55.7%,  $n=310$ ) were in their first year of university. The remaining participants were classified as second year (19.0%,  $n=106$ ), third year (11.5%,  $n=64$ ), fourth year (9.5%,  $n=53$ ), and fifth year (4.3%,  $n=24$ ).

Most participants (68.9%,  $n=384$ ) identified as White Non-Hispanic. The remaining participants identified as Black Non-Hispanic (15.8%,  $n=88$ ), Asian or Pacific Islander (5.2%,  $n=29$ ), Biracial or Multiracial (5.0%,  $n=28$ ), Hispanic or Latino (2.7%,  $n=15$ ), Other (1.3%,  $n=7$ ), and Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian (0.5%,  $n=3$ ).

When participants were asked: “When you are not in school, where is home?” Most of the participants indicated Ohio (87.1%,  $n=485$ ), which is the location of the

university. The next most frequent home state was Pennsylvania (3.06%, n=17). Family household income breakdown was similar across the sample. Participants identified income as less than \$10,000 (5.3%, n=30), \$10,000 to \$39,999 (21.1%, n=118), \$40,000 to \$69,999 (26.6%, n=148), \$70,000 to \$99,999 (20.9%, n=116), and \$100,000 or more (25.2%, n=140).

The majority (55.4%, n=309) of participants were from households with married parents. The other responses included separated (10.6%, n=59), divorced (20.9%, n=116), other (8.8%, n=49), and prefer not to answer (4.3%, n=24). Out of those who indicated other, the most common answer was deceased. Eighty-nine percent of respondents (n=495) did not witness their father physically abuse his spouse, 7.9% (n=44) did, while 3.2% (n=18) didn't know or preferred not to answer. For witnessing interpersonal violence from their mother physically abusing her spouse, the responses were: no (89.4%, n=498), yes (6.1%, n=34), I don't know (2.7%, n=15), and I prefer not to answer (1.8%, n=10).

Religious importance varied considerably among the participants. Participants indicated importance of religion as very important (24.1%, n=134), fairly important (37.2%, n=207), and not very important (38.8%, n=216). The descriptive statistics of the sample are further summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. *Sample Characteristics*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=557)	Total, (%) (n=557)
Age (years), Mean, SD	-	19.3 (1.5)
Sex		
Male	168	30.2
Female	384	68.9
I don't know	4	0.7
Prefer not to answer	1	0.2
Class		
1 <sup>st</sup> year	310	55.7
2 <sup>nd</sup> year	106	19.0
3 <sup>rd</sup> year	64	11.5
4 <sup>th</sup> year	53	9.5
5 <sup>th</sup> year	24	4.3
Race		
White Non-Hispanic	384	68.9
Black Non-Hispanic	88	15.8
Hispanic or Latino	15	2.7
Asian or Pacific Islander	29	5.2
Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian	3	0.5
Biracial or Multiracial	28	5.0
Other	7	1.3
Prefer not to answer	3	0.5
State of Residence		
Ohio	485	87.1
Other	72	12.9
Family Income, (%)		
Less than \$10,000	30	5.3
\$10,000-39,999	118	21.1
\$40,000-69,999	148	26.6
\$70,000-99,999	116	20.9
\$100,000 or more		25.2
Parent's Relationship		
Married	309	55.4
Separated	59	10.6
Divorced	116	20.9
Other	49	8.8
Prefer not to answer	24	4.3
Interpersonal violence – Father		
No	495	88.9
Yes	44	7.9
I don't know	10	1.8

(Continued)

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=557)	Total, (%) (n=557)
Prefer not to answer	8	1.4
Interpersonal violence – Mother		
No	498	89.4
Yes	34	6.1
I don't know	15	2.7
Prefer not to answer	10	1.8
Religion Importance		
Very important	134	24.1
Fairly Important	207	37.2
Not very important	216	38.8

*Research Question 1: What Percentage of Participants have Experienced Some Form of Dating Violence?*

*Sexual assault.* When participants were asked if they were a victim of sexual assault the majority (87.3%, n=49) responded no, with 8.8% (n=49) responding yes, 2.0% (n=11) responding “I don’t know,” and 2.0% (n=11) responding prefer not to answer. The majority (98.9%, n=551) of participants had never sexually assaulted someone, while 0.2% (n=1) did not know and 0.5% (n=3) preferred not to answer. Of the 0.4% respondents who responded yes to sexual assault perpetration (n=2), all assaulted an acquaintance. Of those who were sexually assaulted (n=49), only 18.8% (n=9) were strangers to the perpetrator, while 18.8% (n=9) were acquaintances, 25.0% (n=12) were friends, and 25.0% (n=12) were boyfriend/girlfriend. Approximately 79% (n=38) of those sexually assaulted did not report their sexual assault and for those who did report their sexual assault, 33.3% (n=2) of cases were reported to city police. The descriptive statistics for sexual assault victimization and perpetration are summarized in Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. *Sexual Assault - Victim*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=557)	Total, (%) (n=557)
<b>Victim of Sexual Assault</b>		
No	486	87.3
Yes	49	8.8
I don't know	11	2.0
Prefer not to answer	11	2.0
<b>Relationship to Perpetrator, (n=49)</b>		
Stranger	9	18.8
Acquaintance	9	18.8
Friend	12	25.0
Boyfriend/Girlfriend	12	25.0
Husband/Wife	1	2.1
Relative	4	8.3
Prefer not to answer	2	4.2
<b>Reported Sexual Assault, (n=48)</b>		
No	38	79.2
Yes	6	12.5
Prefer not to answer	4	8.3
<b>Reported to whom, (n=6)</b>		
Campus police	1	16.7
City police	2	33.3
Counselor	1	16.7
Title IX representative	1	16.7
Other	1	16.7

Table 3. *Sexual Assault - Perpetrator*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=557)	Total, (%) (n=557)
<b>Perpetrator of Sexual Assault</b>		
No	551	98.9
Yes	2	0.4
I don't know	1	0.2
Prefer not to answer	3	0.5
<b>Relationship to Victim, (n=2)</b>		
Acquaintance	2	100.0

*Physical abuse.* Most participants (87.1%, n=485) responded never being physically abused by an intimate partner. Similarly, most participants (92.8%, n=517) had never physically abused an intimate partner. The descriptive statistics for physical abuse victimization and perpetration are summarized in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4. *Physical Abuse - Victim*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=557)	Total, (%) (n=557)
Victim of Physical Abuse		
No	485	87.1
Yes	52	9.3
I don't know	15	2.7
Prefer not to answer	5	0.9

Table 5. *Physical Abuse - Perpetrator*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=557)	Total, (%) (n=557)
Perpetrator of Physical Abuse		
No	517	92.8
Yes	28	5.0
I don't know	8	1.4
Prefer not to answer	4	0.7

*Emotional and verbal abuse.* When participants were asked if they have ever been a victim of emotional or verbal abuse by an intimate partner, the majority (63.4%, n=353) responded no. The rest of participants indicated yes (32.7%, n=182), I don't know (2.9%, n=16), and prefer not to answer (1.1%, n=6). For perpetrators of emotional or verbal abuse to an intimate partner, the majority (83.7%, n=466) responded no. The rest of participants indicated yes (12.6%, n=70), I don't know (2.9%, n=16), and prefer not to

answer (0.9%, n=5). The descriptive statistics for emotional and verbal abuse victimization and perpetration are summarized in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6. *Emotional and Verbal Abuse - Victim*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=557)	Total, (%) (n=557)
Victim of Emotional and Verbal Abuse		
No	353	63.4
Yes	182	32.7
I don't know	16	2.9
Prefer not to answer	6	1.1

Table 7. *Emotional and Verbal Abuse - Perpetrator*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=557)	Total, (%) (n=557)
Perpetrator of Emotional and Verbal Abuse		
No	466	83.7
Yes	70	12.6
I don't know	16	2.9
Prefer not to answer	5	0.9

*Research Question 2: What Are the Risk Factors for Dating Violence Among College Students Attending a Public, Non-Faith-Based University?*

*Selected Demographic Characteristics and DV*

Due to the results of phase I of this study, the demographic characteristics selected to use as possible risk factors of dating violence from this point forward in the study include sex, age, year in school, race/ethnicity, parent's relationship status, and witnessing interpersonal violence from either their father or mother on their spouse. For the bivariate analysis, only data from participants who responded yes or no to perpetration or victimization of DV were included. In addition, data from participants who answered, "other," and "prefer not answer" when asked what sex they identify as

were removed because of insufficient numbers. Data from 451 participants were included in all further analyses. Bivariate analyses were conducted using cross-tabulations and Pearson chi-squared to determine significance of the relationships.

*Sexual assault.* Of 49 self-declared victims of sexual assault, six (12.5%) were male, and 42 (87.5%) were female. The two self-declared perpetrators of sexual assault were both female. The relationship between sex and victims of sexual assault was significant ( $p = .006$ ). The relationship between sex and perpetration of sexual assault was not significant ( $p = .996$ ). However, this may be due to the low number of individuals indicating sexual assault perpetration.

The average age for victims of sexual assault ( $n=49$ ) was 19.8 years old ( $SD=1.9$ ). There was a significant relationship between age and victims of sexual assault ( $p = .010$ ). The average age for perpetrators ( $n=2$ ) of sexual assault was 19.0 ( $SD=0$ ). Age was not significantly related to perpetration of sexual assault ( $p = .790$ ).

Victims of sexual assault ( $n=49$ ) by year in school were reported as following: first year (40.8%,  $n=20$ ), second year (26.5%,  $n=13$ ), third year (8.2%,  $n=4$ ), fourth year (16.3%,  $n=8$ ), and fifth year (8.2%,  $n=4$ ). The two perpetrators of sexual assault were in their first and second year of studies at the university. There was a significant relationship between year in school and victims of sexual assault ( $p = .019$ ), but not for perpetrators of sexual assault ( $p = .665$ ).

Victims of sexual assault ( $n=49$ ) by race/ethnicity were reported as following: White Non-Hispanic (75.5%,  $n=37$ ), Black Non-Hispanic (6.1%,  $n=3$ ), Hispanic or Latino (6.1%,  $n=3$ ), Asian or Pacific Islander (4.1%,  $n=2$ ), Biracial or Multiracial (4.1%,  $n=2$ ), and other (4.1%,  $n=2$ ). Perpetrators of sexual assault ( $n=2$ ) identified as Black Non-



Hispanic (50%, n=1), and other (50%, n=1). The p-value ( $p = .993$ ) for race for victims of sexual assault was  $p = .993$ , indicating that race was not significantly associated with being a victim of sexual assault, however race was significantly associated with perpetration of sexual assault ( $p = .044$ ). Again, caution interpreting the results is warranted due to only two participants indicating perpetration.

Victims of sexual assault (n=49) by parent's relationship status were reported as following: married (46.9%, n=23), separated (2.0%, n=1), divorced (30.6%, n=15), other (10.2%, n=5), and I would prefer not to answer (10.2%, n=5). Perpetrators of sexual assault (n=2) by parent's relationship status was reported as divorced (100%, n=2). Parent's relationship status was significantly related to being a victim of sexual assault ( $p = .022$ ), but not for perpetration ( $p = .255$ ).

Victims of sexual assault (n=49) witnessing interpersonal violence by their father on a spouse indicated: no (85.7%, n=42), yes (10.2%, n=5), and I don't know (4.1%, n=2). Victims of sexual assault (n=49) witnessing interpersonal by their mother on a spouse indicated no (77.6%, n=38), yes (14.3%, n=7), I don't know (4.1%, n=2), and prefer not to answer (4.1%, n=2). Perpetrators of sexual assault (n=2) witnessing interpersonal violence by their father on a spouse indicated no (50.0%, n=1), and yes (50.0%, n=1). Perpetrators of sexual assault (n=2) witnessing interpersonal violence by their mother on a spouse indicated yes (50.0%, n=1), and I don't know (50.0%, n=1). For both victims ( $p = .633$ ) and perpetrators ( $p = .369$ ) of sexual assault, there was not a significant relationship for witnessing interpersonal violence from their father on a spouse. There was a significant relationship between victims ( $p = .015$ ) and perpetrators

( $p = .016$ ) of sexual assault and witnessing interpersonal violence from their mother on a spouse.

Only two students indicated yes for sexual assault perpetration, which is a small number, therefore no further statistical analyses were performed on sexual assault perpetrators. The descriptive statistics for sexual assault victimization and perpetration by selected demographic characteristics are summarized in Tables 8 and 9.

*Physical abuse.* Victims of physical abuse ( $n=52$ ) by gender were reported as the following: male (13.5%,  $n=7$ ), and female (86.5%,  $n=45$ ). Perpetrators of physical abuse ( $n=28$ ) by gender were reported as the following: male (7.1%,  $n=2$ ), and female (92.9%,  $n=26$ ). There was a significant relationship between victims ( $p = .006$ ) and perpetrators ( $p = .015$ ) of physical abuse and sex.

The average age for victims ( $n=52$ ) of physical abuse was 20.1 years old ( $SD=2.0$ ). There was a significant relationship between age and victims of physical abuse ( $p = .001$ ). The average age for perpetrators ( $n=28$ ) of physical abuse was 19.9 ( $SD=2.0$ ). The relationship between age and perpetration was significant ( $p = .032$ ).

Victims of physical abuse ( $n=52$ ) by year in school were reported as the following: first year (36.5%,  $n=19$ ), second year (21.2%,  $n=11$ ), third year (17.3%,  $n=9$ ), fourth year (13.5%,  $n=7$ ), and fifth year (11.5%,  $n=6$ ). Perpetrators of physical abuse ( $n=28$ ) by year in school were reported as the following: first year (50.00%,  $n=14$ ), second year (17.9%,  $n=5$ ), third year (7.1%,  $n=2$ ), fourth year (10.7%,  $n=3$ ), and fifth year (14.3%,  $n=4$ ). There was a significant relationship between year in school and being a victim of physical abuse ( $p = .001$ ), but not for perpetration ( $p = .128$ ).

Table 8. *Selected Demographic Characteristics of Sexual Assault Victims*

Characteristics	Total (n=451)	Victims (n=49)	P Value
Sex, (%)			.006*
Male	30.4	12.5	
Female	69.6	87.5	
Age (years), Mean, SD	19.3 (1.5)	19.8 (1.9)	.010*
Class, (%)			.019*
1 <sup>st</sup> year	55.7	40.8	
2 <sup>nd</sup> year	19.0	26.5	
3 <sup>rd</sup> year	11.5	8.2	
4 <sup>th</sup> year	9.3	16.3	
5 <sup>th</sup> year	4.3	8.2	
Race, (%)			.993
White Non-Hispanic	68.9	75.5	
Black Non-Hispanic	15.8	6.1	
Hispanic of Latino	2.7	6.1	
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.2	4.1	
Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian	0.5	-	
Biracial or Multiracial	5.0	4.1	
Other	1.3	4.1	
Prefer not to answer	0.5	-	
Parent's Relationship, (%)			.022*
Married	55.4	46.9	
Separated	10.6	2.0	
Divorced	20.9	30.6	
Other	8.8	10.2	
Prefer not to answer	4.3	10.2	
Interpersonal violence – Father, (%)			
No	88.9	85.7	
Yes	7.9	10.2	.633
I don't know	1.8	4.1	
Prefer not to answer	1.4	-	
Interpersonal violence – Mother, (%)			
No	89.4	77.6	
Yes	6.1	14.3	.015*
I don't know	2.7	4.1	
Prefer not to answer	1.8	4.1	

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

Table 9. *Selected Demographic Characteristics of Sexual Assault Perpetrators*

Characteristics	Total (n=451)	Perpetrators (n=2)	P Value
Sex, (%)			.996
Male	30.4	-	
Female	69.6	100.0	
Age (years), Mean, SD	19.3 (1.5)	19.0 (0)	.790
Class, (%)			.665
1 <sup>st</sup> year	55.7	50.0	
2 <sup>nd</sup> year	19.0	50.0	
3 <sup>rd</sup> year	11.5	-	
4 <sup>th</sup> year	9.3	-	
5 <sup>th</sup> year	4.3	-	
Race, (%)			.044*
White Non-Hispanic	68.9	-	
Black Non-Hispanic	15.8	50.0	
Hispanic of Latino	2.7	-	
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.2	-	
Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian	0.5	-	
Biracial or Multiracial	5.0	-	
Other	1.3	50.0	
Prefer not to answer	0.5	-	
Parent's Relationship, (%)			.255
Married	55.4	-	
Separated	10.6	-	
Divorced	20.9	100.0	
Other	8.8	-	
Prefer not to answer	4.3	-	
Interpersonal violence – Father, (%)			
No	88.9	50.0	
Yes	7.9	50.0	.369
I don't know	1.8	-	
Prefer not to answer	1.4	-	
Interpersonal violence – Mother, (%)			
No	89.4	-	
Yes	6.1	50.0	.015*
I don't know	2.7	50.0	
Prefer not to answer	1.8	-	

Victims of physical abuse (n=52) by race/ethnicity were reported as the following: White Non-Hispanic (76.9%, n=40), Black Non-Hispanic (13.5%, n=7), Hispanic or Latino (1.9%, n=1), Asian or Pacific Islander (1.9%, n=1), Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian (1.9%, n=1), Biracial or Multiracial (1.9%, n=1), and other (1.9%, n=1). Perpetrators of physical abuse (n=28) by race/ethnicity were reported as the following: White Non-Hispanic (82.1%, n=23), Black Non-Hispanic (14.3%, n=4), and Biracial or Multiracial (3.6%, n=1). There was no significant relationship between victims ( $p = .269$ ) and perpetrators ( $p = .139$ ) of physical abuse and race/ethnicity.

Victims of physical abuse (n=52) by parent's relationship status were reported as the following: married (46.2%, n=24), separated (1.9%, n=1), divorced (30.8%, n=16), other (15.4%, n=8), and I would prefer not to answer (5.8%, n=3). Perpetrators of physical abuse (n=28) by parent's relationship status were reported as the following: married (46.4%, n=13), separated (7.1%, n=2), divorced (35.7%, n=10), and other (10.7%, n=3). There was a significant relationship ( $p = .024$ ) between parent's relationship status and victims of physical abuse, but not with perpetration ( $p = .519$ ).

Victims of physical abuse (n=52) by witnessing interpersonal violence by their father on a spouse were reported as the following: no (80.8%, n=40), yes (15.4%, n=8), and I don't know (3.9%, n=2). Victims of physical abuse (n=52) by witnessing interpersonal violence by their mother on a spouse were reported as the following: no (84.6%, n=44), yes (9.6%, n=5), and I don't know (5.8%, n=3). Perpetrators of physical abuse (n=28) by witnessing interpersonal violence by their father on a spouse were reported as the following: no (82.1%, n=23), yes (14.3%, n=4), and I don't know (3.6%,

n=1). Perpetrators of physical abuse (n=28) by witnessing interpersonal violence by their mother on a spouse were reported as the following: no (85.7%, n=24), yes (10.7%, n=3), and I don't know (3.6%, n=1). There was no significant relationship between victims and interpersonal violence by father or mother ( $p = .300$ ,  $p = .567$ , respectively) and perpetrators and interpersonal violence for father ( $p = .51$ ) or mother ( $p = .895$ ).

The descriptive statistics for physical abuse victimization and perpetration by selected demographic characteristics are summarized in Tables 10 and 11.

*Emotional and verbal abuse.* Victims of emotional and verbal abuse (n=181) by gender were reported as the following: male (21.5%, n=39), and female (78.5%, n=142). Perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse (n=70) by gender were reported as the following: male (22.9%, n=16), and female (77.1%, n=54). There was a significant relationship ( $p = .001$ ) between sex and victims of emotional and verbal abuse, but not with perpetration ( $p = .157$ ).

The average age for victims (n=181) of emotional and verbal abuse was 19.6 years old ( $SD=1.7$ ) and 19.8 ( $SD=2.0$ ) for perpetrators (n=70). There was a significant relationship between age and both victims and perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse ( $p = .008$ ,  $p = .002$ ; respectively).

Victims of emotional and verbal abuse (n=181) by year in school were reported as the following: first year (49.1%, n=89), second year (20.4%, n=37), third year (13.2%, n=24), fourth year (11.6%, n=21), and fifth year (6.1%, n=11). Perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse (n=70) by year in school were reported as the following: first year (42.9%, n=30), second year (21.4%, n=15), third year (14.3%, n=10), fourth year (11.4%, n=8), and fifth year (10.0%, n=7). There was a significant relationship between both

Table 10. *Selected Demographic Characteristics of Physical Abuse Victims*

Characteristics	Total (n=451)	Victims (n=52)	P Value
Sex			.006*
Male	30.4	13.5	
Female	69.6	86.5	
Age (years), Mean, SD	19.3 (1.5)	20.1 (2.0)	.001*
Class			.001*
1 <sup>st</sup> year	55.7	36.5	
2 <sup>nd</sup> year	19.0	21.2	
3 <sup>rd</sup> year	11.5	17.3	
4 <sup>th</sup> year	9.3	13.5	
5 <sup>th</sup> year	4.3	11.5	
Race			.269
White Non-Hispanic	68.9	76.9	
Black Non-Hispanic	15.8	13.5	
Hispanic of Latino	2.7	1.9	
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.2	1.9	
Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian	0.5	1.9	
Biracial or Multiracial	5.0	1.9	
Other	1.3	1.9	
Prefer not to answer	0.5	-	
Parent's Relationship			.024*
Married	55.4	46.2	
Separated	10.6	1.9	
Divorced	20.9	30.8	
Other	8.8	15.4	
Prefer not to answer	4.3	5.8	
Interpersonal violence – Father			.300
No	88.9	80.8	
Yes	7.9	15.4	
I don't know	1.8	3.9	
Prefer not to answer	1.4	-	
Interpersonal violence – Mother			.567
No	89.4	84.6	
Yes	6.1	9.6	
I don't know	2.7	5.8	
Prefer not to answer	1.8	-	

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

Table 11. *Selected Demographic Characteristics of Physical Abuse Perpetrators*

Characteristics	Total (n=451)	Perpetrators (n=28)	P Value
Sex			.015*
Male	30.4	7.1	
Female	69.6	92.9	
Age (years), Mean, SD	19.3 (1.5)	19.9 (2.1)	.032*
Class			.128
1 <sup>st</sup> year	55.7	50.0	
2 <sup>nd</sup> year	19.0	17.9	
3 <sup>rd</sup> year	11.5	7.1	
4 <sup>th</sup> year	9.3	10.7	
5 <sup>th</sup> year	4.3	14.3	
Race			.139
White Non-Hispanic	68.9	82.1	
Black Non-Hispanic	15.8	14.3	
Hispanic of Latino	2.7	-	
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.2	-	
Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian	0.5	-	
Biracial or Multiracial	5.0	3.6	
Other	1.3	-	
Prefer not to answer	0.5	-	
Parent's Relationship			.519
Married	55.4	46.4	
Separated	10.6	7.1	
Divorced	20.9	35.7	
Other	8.8	10.7	
Prefer not to answer	4.3	-	
Interpersonal violence – Father			
No		82.1	
Yes	88.9	14.3	.518
I don't know	7.9	3.6	
Prefer not to answer	1.8	-	
Interpersonal violence – Mother			
No		85.7	
Yes	89.4	10.7	.895
I don't know	6.1	3.6	
Prefer not to answer	2.7	-	
	1.8		



victims ( $p = .012$ ) and perpetrators ( $p = .007$ ) of emotional and verbal abuse and year in school.

Victims of emotional and verbal abuse ( $n=181$ ) by race/ethnicity were reported as the following: White Non-Hispanic (77.9%,  $n=141$ ), Black Non-Hispanic (12.7%,  $n=23$ ), Hispanic or Latino (2.2%,  $n=4$ ), Asian or Pacific Islander (1.7%,  $n=3$ ), Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian (1.1%,  $n=2$ ), Biracial or Multiracial (2.8%,  $n=5$ ), other (1.7%,  $n=3$ ), and I would prefer not to answer (0.6%,  $n=1$ ). Perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse ( $n=70$ ) by race/ethnicity were reported as the following: White Non-Hispanic (74.3%,  $n=52$ ), Black Non-Hispanic (14.3%,  $n=10$ ), Asian or Pacific Islander (4.3%,  $n=3$ ), Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian (1.4%,  $n=1$ ), Biracial or Multiracial (2.9%,  $n=2$ ), other (1.4%,  $n=1$ ), and I would prefer not to answer (1.4%,  $n=1$ ). The relationship between race/ethnicity and victimization was significant ( $p = .027$ ), but not with perpetration ( $p = .555$ ).

Victims of emotional and verbal abuse ( $n=181$ ) by parent's relationship status were reported as the following: married (49.1%,  $n=89$ ), separated (9.9%,  $n=18$ ), divorced (24.3%,  $n=44$ ), other (12.2%,  $n=22$ ), and I would prefer not to answer (5.0%,  $n=9$ ). Perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse ( $n=70$ ) by parent's relationship status were reported as the following: married (42.9%,  $n=30$ ), separated (10.0%,  $n=7$ ), divorced (25.7%,  $n=18$ ), other (15.7%,  $n=11$ ), and I would prefer not to answer (5.7%,  $n=4$ ). There was a significant relationship between both victims ( $p = .019$ ) and perpetrators ( $p = .011$ ) of emotional and verbal abuse and parent's relationship status.

Victims of emotional and verbal abuse ( $n=181$ ) by witnessing interpersonal violence by their father on a spouse were reported as the following: no (85.6%,  $n=155$ ),

yes (11.6%, n=21), I don't know (2.2%, n=4), and prefer not to answer (1.1%, n=2). Victims of emotional and verbal abuse (n=181) by witnessing interpersonal by their mother on a spouse were reported as the following: no (85.0%, n=154), yes (10.5%, n=19), I don't know (3.3%, n=6), and prefer not to answer (1.7%, n=3). Perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse (n=70) by witnessing interpersonal violence by their father on a spouse were reported as the following: no (78.6%, n=55), yes (17.1%, n=12), and I don't know (4.3%, n=3). Perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse (n=70) by witnessing interpersonal violence by their mother on a spouse were reported as the following: no (81.4%, n=57), yes (15.7%, n=11), and I don't know (2.9%, n=2). There was no significant relationship between victims and interpersonal violence of father or mother ( $p = .371$ ,  $p = .105$ ; respectively) and perpetrators and interpersonal violence of father ( $p = .071$ ) or mother ( $p = .324$ ).

The descriptive statistics for emotional and verbal abuse victimization and perpetration by selected demographic characteristics are summarized in Tables 12 and 13.

### *Hookup Culture and DV*

Hookup culture was selected as one of the four potential risk factors for all forms of dating violence. The questions for this section included participants being able to respond either yes or no on their perception of a hookup culture on campus, as well as completing a five-question questionnaire on their hookup behaviors. Cross-tabulations, and Pearson chi-squared tests were used to analyze the strength of the relationship between perceived hookup culture, responses to individual questions of related to hookup behavior, and overall hookup behaviors and all forms of dating violence. For all forms of

Table 12. *Selected Demographic Characteristics of Emotional and Verbal Abuse Victims*

Characteristics	Total (n=451)	Victims (n=181)	P Value
Sex, (%)			.001*
Male	30.4	21.5	
Female	69.6	78.5	
Age, (years), Mean, SD	19.3 (1.5)	19.6 (1.7)	.008*
Class, (%)			.012*
1 <sup>st</sup> year	55.7	49.1	
2 <sup>nd</sup> year	19.0	20.4	
3 <sup>rd</sup> year	11.5	13.2	
4 <sup>th</sup> year	9.3	11.6	
5 <sup>th</sup> year	4.3	6.1	
Race, (%)			.027*
White Non-Hispanic	68.9	77.9	
Black Non-Hispanic	15.8	12.7	
Hispanic of Latino	2.7	2.2	
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.2	1.7	
Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian	0.5	1.1	
Biracial or Multiracial	5.0	2.8	
Other	1.3	1.7	
Prefer not to answer	0.5	0.6	
Parent's Relationship, (%)			.019*
Married	55.4	49.1	
Separated	10.6	9.9	
Divorced	20.9	24.3	
Other	8.8	12.2	
Prefer not to answer	4.3	5.0	
Interpersonal violence – Father, (%)			.371
No	88.9	85.6	
Yes	7.9	11.6	
I don't know	1.8	2.2	
Prefer not to answer	1.4	1.1	
Interpersonal violence – Mother, (%)			.105
No	89.4	85.0	
Yes	6.1	10.5	
I don't know	2.7	3.3	
Prefer not to answer	1.8	1.7	

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

Table 13. *Selected Demographic Characteristics of Emotional and Verbal Abuse Perpetrators*

Characteristics	Total (n=451)	Perpetrators (n=70)	P Value
Sex, (%)			.157
Male	30.4	22.9	
Female	69.6	77.1	
Age, (years), Mean, SD	19.3 (1.5)	19.8 (2.0)	.002*
Class, (%)			.007*
1 <sup>st</sup> year	55.7	42.9	
2 <sup>nd</sup> year	19.0	21.4	
3 <sup>rd</sup> year	11.5	14.3	
4 <sup>th</sup> year	9.3	11.4	
5 <sup>th</sup> year	4.3	10.0	
Race, (%)			.555
White Non-Hispanic	68.9	74.3	
Black Non-Hispanic	15.8	14.3	
Hispanic of Latino	2.7	-	
Asian or Pacific Islander	5.2	4.3	
Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian	0.5	1.4	
Biracial or Multiracial	5.0	2.9	
Other	1.3	1.4	
Prefer not to answer	0.5	1.4	
Parent's Relationship, (%)			.011*
Married	55.4	42.9	
Separated	10.6	10.0	
Divorced	20.9	25.7	
Other	8.8	15.7	
Prefer not to answer	4.3	5.7	
Interpersonal violence – Father, (%)			.071
No	88.9	78.6	
Yes	7.9	17.1	
I don't know	1.8	4.3	
Prefer not to answer	1.4	-	
Interpersonal violence – Mother, (%)			.324
No	89.4	81.4	
Yes	6.1	15.7	
I don't know	2.7	2.9	
Prefer not to answer	1.8	-	

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

dating violence, only those who answered yes or no as to victimization or perpetration were included in the analyses. Those who answered, “I don’t know,” and “prefer not to answer” were removed from the final sample for analysis because of the lack of uncertainty in their answers.

Students at University of Akron believed the hookup rate of their peers to be 47.9% engaging in a hookup relationship. When students were asked if they believe there is a hookup culture at the University of Akron, 26.1% (n=118) responded no and 73.9% (n=333) responded yes. A student’s hookup score was determined by calculating the score on five survey questions regarding a student’s frequency of hooking up. The students responded using a Likert scale of 0=never, 1=less than monthly, 2=monthly, 3=weekly. The total score was a range of zero (not hooking up) to 15 (hooking up weekly). The average hookup score was 1.92 ( $SD=2.5$ ).

Following are response frequencies for each question. *Question #1: I have engaged in a hookup with someone whom I had not met before* never (79.0%, n=356), less than monthly (18.1%, n=82), monthly (2.2%, n=10), and weekly (0.7%, n=3). *Question #2: I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend,* never (71.6%, n=323), less than monthly (24.2%, n=109), monthly (3.2%, n=14), and weekly (0.9%, n=4). *Question #3: I have engaged in a one-time hookup with a friend,* never (66.4%, n=299), less than monthly (30.0%, n=135), monthly (2.9%, n=13), and weekly (0.7%, n=3). *Question #4: I have engaged in a hookup with a friend with whom I have hooked up with more than once,* never (70.6%, n=318), less than monthly (18.9%, n=85), monthly (7.5%, n=34), and weekly (3.1%, n=14). *Question #5: I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic*

*relationship with*, never (64.7%, n=292), less than monthly (22.7%, n=102), monthly (7.0%, n=32), and weekly (5.6%, n=25).

The data was further classified into not engaging in hook up behavior (total score of 0) and engaging in some type of hook up behavior (total score > 0) to determine if the students to what extent students were hooking up. A total 52.8% (n=238) of students were classified as engaging in some type of hook up behavior. This percentage is similar to the perceived hookup rate of 47.9%. More than half of the students are hooking up, but infrequently. See Table 14 for hookup characteristics. See Table 15 for breakdown of hookup score.

Table 14. *Hookup Characteristics*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=451)	Total, (%) (n=451)
Perceived Hookup* Rate, Mean, SD	-	47.9 (23.0)
Perceived Hookup Culture**		
No	118	26.1
Yes	333	73.9
Total Hookup Score***, Mean, SD	-	1.93 (2.5)
Hookup Behavior****		
No	213	47.2
Yes	238	52.8

\*Hookup is defined as a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.

\*\*Hookup culture is defined as one that accepts and encourages casual sexual encounters, including one-night stands and other related activity, which focuses on physical pleasure without necessarily including emotional bonding or long-term commitment.

\*\*\*Hookup score is determined by taking student's total score on a 5-question hookup questionnaire. Possible score ranges from 0-15.

\*\*\*\*Hookup behavior is defined as a participant scoring 0 (no) or >0 (yes) on the 5-question hookup questionnaire.

Table 15. *Hookup Questionnaire*

Question	Response (n=451)			
	Never, (%)	Less than Monthly, (%)	Monthly, (%)	Weekly, (%)
HU Q1*	79.0	18.1	2.2	0.7
HU Q2**	71.6	24.2	3.2	0.9
HU Q3***	66.4	30.0	2.9	0.7
HU Q4****	70.6	18.9	7.5	3.1
HU Q5*****	64.7	22.7	7.0	5.6

\*HU Q1: I have engaged in a hookup with someone whom I had not met before

\*\*HU Q2: I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.

\*\*\*HU Q3: I have engaged in a one-time hookup with a friend.

\*\*\*\*HU Q4: I have engaged in a hookup with a friend with whom I have hooked up more than once.

\*\*\*\*\*HU Q5: I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic relationship.

*Sexual assault.* Victims of sexual assault (n=49) and their beliefs about a presence of a hookup culture at University of Akron provided the following results: 16.7% (n=8) indicated there was no hookup culture on campus and 83% (n=41) indicated there was a hookup culture. There was not a significant relationship (p= .125) between perceived hookup culture and being a victim of sexual assault. Analysis of sexual assault victimization and engaging in hook up behavior provided the following results: 24% (n = 12) indicated they were not hooking up and 75% (n=37) indicated they were engaging in hooking up behaviors. There was a significant relationship (p= .001) between hookup behavior and being a victim of sexual assault. Question #2, *I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend* was the only question significantly associated (p = .049) with being a victim of sexual assault. See Table 16 for further analysis.

Table 16. *Hookup Characteristics for Victims of Sexual Assault*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=49)	Total, (%) (n=49)	P Value
Perceived Hookup** Culture***			.125
No	8	16.7	
Yes	41	83.3	
Hookup Behavior****			.001*
No	12	24.5	
Yes	37	75.5	
HUQ1*****	-	-	.083
HU Q2	-	-	.049*
HU Q3	-	-	.537
HU Q4	-	-	.619
HU Q5	-	-	.064

\* Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level-

\*\*Hookup is defined as a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.

\*\*\*Hookup culture is defined as one that accepts and encourages casual sexual encounters, including one-night stands and other related activity, which focuses on physical pleasure without necessarily including emotional bonding or long-term commitment.

\*\*\*\*Hookup behavior is defined as a participant scoring 0 (no) or >0 (yes) on the 5-question hookup questionnaire.

\*\*\*\*\*HU Q1: I have engaged in a hookup with someone whom I had not met before. HU Q2: I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend. HU Q3: I have engaged in a one-time hookup with a friend. HU Q4: I have engaged in a hookup with a friend with whom I have hooked up more than once. HU Q5: I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic relationship.

*Physical abuse.* Victims of physical abuse (n=52) and their beliefs about a presence of a hookup culture at University of Akron provided the following results: 18.0% (n=9) indicated there is no hookup culture and 82.0% (n=43) indicated there was a hook up culture on campus. There was not a significant relationship ( $p= .163$ ) between perceived hookup culture and being a victim of physical abuse. Analysis of physical abuse victimization and engaging in hooking up behaviors provided the following results: 17.3% (n=9) indicated not hooking up and 82.7% (n=47) indicated they were hooking up. There was a significant relationship ( $p= <.001$ ) between hookup behavior and being a victim of physical abuse. Hook up questions #1, #2, #4, and #5 were significantly



associated with being a victim of physical abuse ( $p = .013$ ,  $p = .012$ ,  $p = 0.040$ ,  $p = .013$ ; respectively). See Table 17 for hookup characteristics for victims of physical abuse.

Table 17. *Hookup Characteristics for Victims of Physical Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=52)	Total, (%) (n=52)	P Value
Perceived Hookup** Culture***			.163
No	9	18.0	
Yes	43	82.0	
Hookup Behavior****			<.001*
No	9	17.3	
Yes	43	82.7	
HU Q1*****	-	-	.013*
HU Q2	-	-	.012*
HU Q3	-	-	.089
HU Q4	-	-	.040*
HU Q5	-	-	.013*

\* Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

\*\*Hookup is defined as a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.

\*\*\*Hookup culture is defined as one that accepts and encourages casual sexual encounters, including one-night stands and other related activity, which focuses on physical pleasure without necessarily including emotional bonding or long-term commitment.

\*\*\*\*Hookup behavior is defined as a participant scoring 0 (no) or >0 (yes) on the 5-question hookup questionnaire.

\*\*\*\*\*HU Q1: I have engaged in a hookup with someone whom I had not met before. HU Q2: I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend. HU Q3: I have engaged in a one-time hookup with a friend. HU Q4: I have engaged in a hookup with a friend with whom I have hooked up more than once. HU Q5: I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic relationship.

Perpetrators of physical abuse ( $n=28$ ) and their beliefs about a presence of a hookup culture at University of Akron provided the following results: 21.4% ( $n=6$ ) of perpetrators indicated there was no hookup culture and 78.6% ( $n=22$ ) indicated there was a hookup culture on campus. There was not a significant relationship ( $p= .546$ ) between perceived hookup culture and being a perpetrator of physical abuse. Comparison of perpetrators of physical abuse and hooking up behavior provided the following results:

21.4% (n=6) indicated they are not hooking up, whereas 78.6% (n=22) indicated they were engaging in hook up behavior. There was a significant relationship (p= .008) between hookup behavior and being a perpetrator of physical abuse. None of the hookup questionnaire questions was statistically associated with perpetration. See Table 18 for hookup characteristics for perpetrators of physical abuse.

Table 18. *Hookup Characteristics for Perpetrators of Physical Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=28)	Total, (%) (n=28)	P Value
Perceived Hookup** Culture***			.546
No	6	21.4	
Yes	22	78.6	
Hookup Behavior****			.008*
No	6	21.4	
Yes	22	78.6	
HU Q1*****	-	-	.221
HU Q2	-	-	.060
HU Q3	-	-	.264
HU Q4	-	-	.626
HU Q5	-	-	.357

\* Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

\*\*Hookup is defined as a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.

\*\*\*Hookup culture is defined as one that accepts and encourages casual sexual encounters, including one-night stands and other related activity, which focuses on physical pleasure without necessarily including emotional bonding or long-term commitment.

\*\*\*\*Hookup behavior is defined as a participant scoring 0 (no) or >0 (yes) on the 5-question hookup questionnaire.

\*\*\*\*\*HU Q1: I have engaged in a hookup with someone whom I had not met before. HU Q2: I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend. HU Q3: I have engaged in a one-time hookup with a friend. HU Q4: I have engaged in a hookup with a friend with whom I have hooked up more than once. HU Q5: I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic relationship.

*Emotional and verbal abuse.* Victims of emotional and verbal abuse (n=181) and their beliefs about a presence of a hookup culture at University of Akron provided the following results: 23.9% (n=43) reported there is no hookup culture and 76.1% (n=138)

reported there is a hookup culture on campus. The relationship was not statistically significant ( $p = .274$ ). Further analysis of emotional and verbal abuse victimization and hooking up behavior provided the following results: 30.2% ( $n=55$ ) indicated they were not hooking up, while 69.8% ( $n=126$ ) responded they were engaging in hook up behavior. There was a significant relationship ( $p < .001$ ) between hookup behavior and being a victim of emotional and verbal abuse. Hook up questions # 3 and #5 were significantly related to being a victim of emotional and verbal abuse ( $p = .027$ ,  $p = .008$ ; respectively). See Table 19 for hookup characteristics for victims of emotional and verbal abuse.

Table 19. *Hookup Characteristics for Victims of Emotional and Verbal Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=181)	Total, (%) (n=181)	P Value
Perceived Hookup** Culture***			.274
No	43	23.9	
Yes	138	76.1	
Hookup Behavior****			<.001*
No	55	30.2	
Yes	126	69.8	
HU Q1*****	-	-	.512
HU Q2	-	-	.121
HU Q3	-	-	.027*
HU Q4	-	-	.241
HU Q5	-	-	.008*

\* Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

\*\*Hookup is defined as a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.

\*\*\*Hookup culture is defined as one that accepts and encourages casual sexual encounters, including one-night stands and other related activity, which focuses on physical pleasure without necessarily including emotional bonding or long-term commitment.

\*\*\*\*Hookup behavior is defined as a participant scoring 0 (no) or >0 (yes) on the 5-question hookup questionnaire.

\*\*\*\*\*HU Q1: I have engaged in a hookup with someone whom I had not met before. HU Q2: I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend. HU Q3: I have engaged in a one-time hookup with a friend. HU Q4: I have engaged in a hookup with a friend with whom I have hooked up more than once. HU Q5: I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic relationship.

Perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse (n=70) and their beliefs about a presence of a hookup culture at University of Akron provided the following results: 18.6% (n=13) reported there is no hookup culture and 81.4% (n=57) reported there is a hookup culture on campus. The relationship was not statistically significant ( $p = .148$ ). Further analysis of emotional and verbal abuse perpetration and hooking up behavior provided the following results: 27.1% (n=19) indicated they were not hooking up, while 72.9% (n=51) responded they were engaging in hook up behavior. There was a significant relationship ( $p < .001$ ) between hookup behavior and being a perpetrator of emotional and verbal abuse. None of the hookup questionnaire questions produced statistically significant p-values. See Table 20 for hookup characteristics for perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse.

#### *Sex Education and DV*

Sex education was selected as one of the four potential risk factors for all forms of dating violence. The questions for this section included participants being able to respond either yes or no on receiving sex education. If a participant responded yes to receiving sex education, then he/she was asked to select what grade he/she received sex education in. Cross-tabulations and Pearson chi-squared tests were used to analyze the strength of the relationship between receiving sex education and all forms of dating violence. For all forms of dating violence, only those who answered yes or no as to victimization or perpetration were included in the analyses. Those who answered, "I don't know," and "prefer not to answer" were removed from the final sample for analysis because of the lack of uncertainty in their answers.

Table 20. *Hookup Characteristics for Perpetrators of Emotional and Verbal Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=70)	Total, (%) (n=70)	P Value
Perceived Hookup** Culture***			.148
No	13	18.6	
Yes	57	81.4	
Hookup Behavior****			<.001*
No	19	27.1	
Yes	51	72.9	
HU Q1	-	-	.641
HU Q2	-	-	.587
HU Q3	-	-	.603
HU Q4	-	-	.703
HU Q5	-	-	.524

\* Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

\*\*Hookup is defined as a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.

\*\*\*Hookup culture is defined as one that accepts and encourages casual sexual encounters, including one-night stands and other related activity, which focuses on physical pleasure without necessarily including emotional bonding or long-term commitment.

\*\*\*\*Hookup behavior is defined as a participant scoring 0 (no) or >0 (yes) on the 5-question hookup questionnaire.

\*\*\*\*\*HU Q1: I have engaged in a hookup with someone whom I had not met before. HU Q2: I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend. HU Q3: I have engaged in a one-time hookup with a friend. HU Q4: I have engaged in a hookup with a friend with whom I have hooked up more than once. HU Q5: I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic relationship.

Approximately 73.4% (n=331) of participants had received some form of sex education. For those that indicated that they had received some type of formal sex education (n=409), most indicated receiving sex education in 5<sup>th</sup> (20.1%, n=82), and 6<sup>th</sup> (18.1%, n=74) grade. See Table 21 for sex education characteristics.

*Sexual assault.* Victims of sexual assault (n=49) and the relationship between receiving sex education provided the following results: 36.7% (n=18) indicated not ever receiving sex education, and 63.3% (n=31) indicated yes to receiving sex education.

There was not a significant relationship ( $p= .082$ ) between receiving sex education and

being a victim of sexual assault. See Table 22 for sex education characteristics for victims of sexual assault

Table 21. *Sex Education Characteristics*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=451)	Total, (%) (n=451)
Sex Education*		
No	120	26.6
Yes	331	73.4
Grade Sex Education Received, (n=409)		
Before 5 <sup>th</sup> grade	20	5.0
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	82	20.1
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	74	18.1
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	64	15.7
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	56	13.7
9 <sup>th</sup> grade	49	12.0
10 <sup>th</sup> grade	20	4.9
11 <sup>th</sup> grade	2	0.5
12 <sup>th</sup> grade	4	1.0
College	1	0.2
I don't know	35	8.6

\*Sex education is defined as any formal education on the topic of sexual healthy, healthy relationships, and how to say no to sex that was received either at school, church, a community center, or some other place

Table 22. *Sex Education Characteristics for Victims of Sexual Assault*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=49)	Total, (%) (n=49)	P Value
Sex Education*			.082
No	18	36.7	
Yes	31	63.3	

\*Sex education is defined as any formal education on the topic of sexual healthy, healthy relationships, and how to say no to sex that was received either at school, church, a community center, or some other place.

*Physical abuse.* Victims of physical abuse (n=52) and the relationship between receiving sex education provided the following results: 36.5% (n=19) indicated no to

receiving sex education, and 63.5% (n=33) indicated yes to receiving sex education. There was not a significant relationship (p= .069) between receiving sex education and being a victim of physical abuse. Perpetrators of physical abuse (n=28) and the relationship between receiving sex education provided the following results: 42.9% (n=12) indicated no to receiving sex education, and 57.1% (n=16) indicated yes to receiving sex education. There was a significant relationship (p= .045) between receiving sex education and being a perpetrator of physical abuse. See Table 23 and 24 for sex education characteristics for victims and perpetrators of physical abuse.

Table 23. *Sex Education Characteristics for Victims of Physical Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=52)	Total, (%) (n=52)	P Value
Sex Education*			.069
No	19	36.5	
Yes	33	63.5	

\*Sex education is defined as any formal education on the topic of sexual healthy, healthy relationships, and how to say no to sex that was received either at school, church, a community center, or some other place.

Table 24. *Sex Education Characteristics for Perpetrators of Physical Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=28)	Total, (%) (n=28)	P Value
Sex Education**			.045*
No	12	42.9	
Yes	16	57.1	

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

\*\*Sex education is defined as any formal education on the topic of sexual healthy, healthy relationships, and how to say no to sex that was received either at school, church, a community center, or some other place.

*Emotional and verbal abuse.* Victims of emotional and verbal abuse (n=181) and the relationship between receiving sex education provided the following results: no 29.1% (n=53) indicated no to receiving sex education, and 70.9% (n=128) indicated yes to receiving sex education. There was not a significant relationship (p= .342) between receiving sex education and being a victim of emotional and verbal abuse. Perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse (n=70) and the relationship between receiving sex education provided the following results: 38.6% (n=27) indicated no to receiving sex education, and 61.4% (n=43) indicated yes to receiving sex education. There was a significant relationship (p= .016) between receiving sex education and being a perpetrator of emotional and verbal abuse. See Tables 25 and 26 for sex education characteristics for victims and perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse.

Table 25. *Sex Education Characteristics for Victims of Emotional and Verbal Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=181)	Total, (%) (n=181)	P Value
Sex Education*			.342
No	53	29.1	
Yes	128	70.9	

\*Sex education is defined as any formal education on the topic of sexual healthy, healthy relationships, and how to say no to sex that was received either at school, church, a community center, or some other place.



Table 26. *Sex Education Characteristics for Perpetrators of Emotional and Verbal Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=70)	Total, (%) (n=70)	P Value
Sex Education**			.016*
No	27	38.6	
Yes	43	61.4	

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

\*\*Sex education is defined as any formal education on the topic of sexual healthy, healthy relationships, and how to say no to sex that was received either at school, church, a community center, or some other place.

*Research Question 3: Is Exposure to Pornography a Risk Factor for Dating Violence?*

Pornography was selected as one of the four potential risk factors for all forms of dating violence. The questions for this section included participants being able to respond either yes or no to ever viewing pornography. If participants responded yes to ever viewing pornography, then they were asked to select how frequently they had viewed it in the past month as well as indicating yes or no to if they thought viewing pornography influences their sexual decision making. Cross-tabulations and Pearson chi-squared tests were used to analyze the strength of the relationship between viewing pornography and all forms of dating violence. For all forms of dating violence, only those who answered yes or no as to victimization or perpetration were included in the analyses. Those who answered, “I don’t know,” and “prefer not to answer” were removed from the final sample for analysis because of the lack of uncertainty in their answers.

Participants were asked if they have ever viewed any form of pornography, 65.5% (n=295) responded yes. The results were further stratified by gender. For men, 87.5% (n=147) said yes to ever viewing pornography. For women, 55.7% (n=214) said yes to ever viewing pornography. For those who responded yes to ever viewing pornography,

they were then asked frequency of viewing pornography in the past 30 days. The results for all genders are the following: never (47.0%, n=139), once (13.5%, n=40), a few times a month (16.7%, n=49), about weekly (6.6%, n=19), a few times a week (10.6%, n=31), daily (3.4%, n=10), a few times a day (0.5%, n=1), and several times a day (1.6%, n=5). See Table 27 for pornography characteristics.

Table 27. *Pornography Exposure Characteristics*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=451)	Total, (%) (n=451)
Ever View Pornography*		
No	156	34.5
Yes	295	65.5
Frequency of Pornography Viewing in the last 30 days, (n=295)		
Never	139	47.0
Once	40	13.5
A few times a month	49	16.7
About weekly	19	6.6
A few times a week	31	10.6
Daily	10	3.4
A few times a day	1	0.5
Several times a day (>2)	5	1.6
Pornography Influence, (n=295)		
No	192	65.2
Yes	103	34.8

\*Pornography is defined as printed or visual material containing the explicit description or display of sexual organs or activity, intended to stimulate erotic rather than aesthetic or emotional feelings. Can be in the form of video, magazine, or internet.

### *Viewing Pornography and Dating Violence*

*Sexual assault.* For victims of sexual assault (n=49), 67.3% (n=33) responded yes to ever viewing pornography. There was not a significant relationship ( $p = .745$ ) between viewing pornography and being a victim of sexual assault. See Table 28 for pornography characteristics for victims of sexual assault.

*Physical abuse.* For victims of physical abuse (n=52), 76.9% (n=40) responded yes to ever viewing any form of pornography. There was not a significant relationship (p= .065) between viewing pornography and being a victim of physical abuse. For perpetrators of physical abuse (n=28), 82.1% (n=23) responded yes to ever viewing pornography. There was not a significant relationship (p= .068) between viewing pornography and being a perpetrator of physical abuse. See Table 29 and 30 for pornography characteristics for victims and perpetrators of physical abuse.

Table 28. *Pornography Characteristics for Victims of Sexual Assault*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=49)	Total, (%) (n=49)	P Value
Ever View Pornography*			.745
No	16	32.7	
Yes	33	67.3	

\*Pornography is defined as printed or visual material containing the explicit description or display of sexual organs or activity, intended to stimulate erotic rather than aesthetic or emotional feelings. Can be in the form of video, magazine, or internet.

Table 29. *Pornography Characteristics for Victims of Physical Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=52)	Total, (%) (n=52)	P Value
Ever View Pornography*			.065
No	12	23.1	
Yes	40	76.9	

\*Pornography is defined as printed or visual material containing the explicit description or display of sexual organs or activity, intended to stimulate erotic rather than aesthetic or emotional feelings. Can be in the form of video, magazine, or internet.

Table 30. *Pornography Characteristics for Perpetrators of Physical Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=28)	Total, (%) (n=28)	P Value
Ever View Pornography*			.068
No	5	17.9	
Yes	23	82.1	

\*Pornography is defined as printed or visual material containing the explicit description or display of sexual organs or activity, intended to stimulate erotic rather than aesthetic or emotional feelings. Can be in the form of video, magazine, or internet.

*Emotional and verbal abuse.* For victims of emotional and verbal abuse (n=181), 76.3% (n=138) responded yes to ever viewing any form of pornography. There was a significant relationship ( $p < .001$ ) between viewing pornography and being a victim of emotional and verbal abuse. For perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse (n=70), 77.1% (n=54) responded yes to ever viewing any form of pornography. There was a significant relationship ( $p = .024$ ) between ever viewing pornography and being a perpetrator of emotional and verbal abuse. See Table 31 and 32 for pornography characteristics of victims and perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse.

Table 31. *Pornography Characteristics for Victims of Emotional and Verbal Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=181)	Total, (%) (n=181)	P Value
Ever View Pornography**			<.001*
No	43	23.7	
Yes	138	76.3	

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

\*\*Pornography is defined as printed or visual material containing the explicit description or display of sexual organs or activity, intended to stimulate erotic rather than aesthetic or emotional feelings. Can be in the form of video, magazine, or internet.

Table 32. *Pornography Characteristics for Perpetrators of Emotional and Verbal Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=70)	Total, (%) (n=70)	P Value
Ever View Pornography**			.024*
No	16	22.9	
Yes	54	77.1	

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

\*\*Pornography is defined as printed or visual material containing the explicit description or display of sexual organs or activity, intended to stimulate erotic rather than aesthetic or emotional feelings. Can be in the form of video, magazine, or internet.

*Pornography Influence and Sexual Encounters and Decision Making*

If participants responded yes to ever viewing any form of pornography (n=295), they were prompted with a question on the influence pornography has on sexual encounters and sexual decision making. Most participants (65.2%, n=192) indicated that pornography did not influence their decision making about sexual encounters. When stratified by gender, 67.2 % (n=144) of females and 61.9 % (n=91) of males did not believe viewing pornography affected their ability to make sexual decisions. The descriptive statistics are summarized in Table 27 for pornography characteristics.

*Research Question 4: What is the Frequency of Students who have Participated in Title IX Training?*

*Title IX*

Title IX training was selected as one of the four potential risk factors for all forms of dating violence. The questions for this section included participants being able to respond either yes or no to ever participating in Title IX training. Cross-tabulations and, Pearson chi-squared tests were used to analyze the strength of the relationship between participating in Title IX training and all forms of dating violence. For all forms of dating

violence, only those who answered yes or no as to victimization or perpetration were included in the analyses. Those who answered, “I don’t know,” and “prefer not to answer” were removed from the final sample for analysis because of the lack of uncertainty in their answers. Of all participants (n=451), 56.0% (n=253) had not participated in any type of Title IX training. The descriptive statistics are summarized in Table 33.

Table 33. *Title IX Training*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=451)	Total, (%) (n=451)
Participation in Title IX Training		
No	253	56.0
Yes	198	44.0

*Sexual assault.* Comparison of victims of sexual assault (n=49) and their participation in Title IX training revealed 57.1 % (n=28) indicating they did not participate in Title IX training. There was not a significant relationship (p= .921) between participating in Title IX training and being a victim of sexual assault. See Table 34 for Title IX training characteristics for victims of sexual assault.

Table 34. *Title IX Training Characteristics for Victims of Sexual Assault*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=49)	Total, (%) (n=49)	P Value
Title IX Training			.921
No	28	57.1	
Yes	21	42.9	

*Physical abuse.* Victims of physical abuse (n=52) and participation in Title IX training provided the following results: 63.5% (n=33) indicated no to participating in Title IX training, and 36.5% (n=19) indicated yes to participating in Title IX training. There was not a significant relationship (p= .272) between participating in Title IX training and being a victim of physical abuse. Perpetrators of physical abuse (n=28) and participation in Title IX training provided the following results: 64.3% (n=18) indicated no to participating in Title IX training, and 35.7% (n=10) indicated yes to participation in Title IX training. There was not a significant relationship (p= .387) between participating in Title IX training and being a perpetrator of physical abuse. See Table 35 and 36 for Title IX training characteristics for victims and perpetrators of physical abuse.

Table 35. *Title IX Training Characteristics for Victims of Physical Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=52)	Total, (%) (n=52)	P Value
Title IX Training			.272
No	33	63.5	
Yes	19	36.5	

Table 36. *Title IX Training Characteristics for Perpetrators of Physical Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=28)	Total, (%) (n=28)	P Value
Title IX Training			.387
No	18	64.3	
Yes	10	35.7	

*Emotional and verbal abuse.* Victims of emotional and verbal abuse (n=181) and participation in Title IX training provided the following results: 57.7% (n=104) indicated no to participation in Title IX training, and 42.3% (n=77) indicated yes to participation in

Title IX training. There was not a significant relationship ( $p = .875$ ) between participating in Title IX training and being a victim of emotional and verbal abuse. Perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse ( $n=70$ ) and participation in Title IX training provided the following results: 68.6% ( $n=48$ ) indicated no to participation in Title IX training, and 31.4% ( $n=22$ ) indicated yes to participation in Title IX training. There was a significant relationship ( $p = .034$ ) between participating in Title IX training and being a perpetrator of emotional and verbal abuse. See Table 37 and 38 for Title IX training characteristics for victims and perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse.

Table 37. *Title IX Training Characteristics for Victims of Emotional and Verbal Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=181)	Total, (%) (n=181)	P Value
Title IX Training			.875
No	104	57.7	
Yes	77	42.3	

Table 38. *Title IX Training Characteristics for Perpetrators of Emotional and Verbal Abuse*

Characteristics	Total, (n) (n=70)	Total, (%) (n=70)	P Value
Title IX Training			.034*
No	48	68.6	
Yes	22	31.4	

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

### *Multivariate Analyses*

Multivariate analysis was conducted using binary logistic regression. The models for each form of DV were created by including variables found to be significantly related



to DV. As with the bivariate analyses, only data from participants indicating yes or no regarding DV victimization or perpetration were included in the analyses. Further, only data from participants indicating male or female were included due to the lack of adequate sample size for categories of 'other' and 'prefer not to answer.' The final sample size for multivariate analyses was 451.

### *Sexual Assault*

The statistically significant predictors of being a victim of sexual assault were: age, sex, class (year in school), parent's relationship status, witnessing their mother abuse her spouse, ever participating in a hookup and the second question from the hookup questionnaire. A multivariate analysis was conducted to determine which predictors were most significant. The overall model was significant in predicting sexual assault victimization ( $\chi^2(8) = 34.968, p = <.001$ ) and explained 14.0% (Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .140$ ) of the variance. The most significant predictors were sex ( $p = .001, OR = 3.253, 95\% CI [1.534, 6.896]$ ), and ever hooking up ( $p = .010, OR = 2.588, 95\% CI [1.258, 5.323]$ ). Participants who identified as a female were 3.253 times more likely to be a victim of sexual assault. Participants who hooked up were 2.588 times more likely to be a victim of sexual assault. Sex and ever participating in a hookup were the most influential predictor when controlling for the other variables. See Table 39 for multivariate analysis of sexual assault victims.

### *Physical Abuse*

The statistically significant predictors of being a victim of physical abuse were: age, sex, class (year in school), parent's relationship status, ever participating in a

hookup, and the first, second, fourth and fifth question from the hookup questionnaire. The overall model was significant in predicting physical abuse victimization ( $\chi^2(8) = 34.968, p = <.001$ ) and explained 17.8% (Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .178$ ) of the variance. The most significant predictors were sex ( $p = .003, OR = 3.729, 95\% CI [1.560, 8.916]$ ), and ever hooking up ( $p = .002, OR = 3.574, 95\% CI [1.619, 7.890]$ ). Participants who identified as a female were 3.729 times more likely to be a victim of physical abuse. Participants who hooked up were 3.574 times more likely to be a victim of physical abuse. Sex and ever participating in a hookup were the most influential predictor when controlling for the other variables. See Table 40 for multivariate analysis of physical abuse victims

Table 39. *Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Sexual Assault Victims*

Characteristics	OR	95% CI	P Value
Age	1.249	[0.947, 1.648]	.116
Sex			
Male (ref)	1.00	-	-
Female	3.253	[1.534, 6.896]	.002*
Class	0.977	[0.681, 1.401]	.977
Parents	1.135	[0.893, 1.441]	.301
Interpersonal violence - Mother			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	1.531	[0.999, 2.345]	.051
Hookup			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	2.588	[1.258, 5.323]	.010*
HU Q2**	1.462	[0.890, 2.401]	.133

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$  level

\*\*HUQ2: I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.

The statistically significant predictors for being a perpetrator of physical abuse were: age, sex, ever participating in a hookup, and receiving sex education. The overall model was significant in predicting physical abuse perpetration ( $\chi^2(8) = 24.990, p =$

<.001) and explained 13.5% (Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .135$ ) of the variance. The most significant predictors were sex ( $p = .011$ ,  $OR = 6.682$ , 95% CI [1.548, 28.834]), and ever hooking up ( $p = .012$ ,  $OR = 3.302$ , 95% CI [1.297, 8.411]). Participants who identified as a female were 6.682 times more likely to be a perpetrator of physical abuse. Participants who hooked up were 3.302 times more likely to be a perpetrator of physical abuse. Sex and engaging in hook up behaviors were the most influential predictors when controlling for the other variables. See Table 41 for multivariate analysis of physical abuse perpetrators.

Table 40. *Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Physical Abuse Victims*

Characteristics	OR	95% CI	P Value
Age	1.282	[0.974, 1.687]	.076
Sex			
Male (ref)	1.00	-	-
Female	3.729	[1.560, 8.916]	.003*
Class	1.000	[0.704, 1.419]	.999
Parents	1.164	[0.917, 1.477]	.212
Hookup Behavior			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	3.574	[1.619, 7.890]	.002*
HU Q1**	1.385	[0.718, 2.674]	.332
HU Q2***	1.291	[0.692, 2.408]	.422
HU Q4****	0.878	[0.551, 1.399]	.584
HU Q5*****	1.180	[0.812, 1.714]	.386

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$  level

\*HU Q1: I have engaged in a hookup with someone whom I had not met before

\*\*HU Q2: I have engaged in a hookup with a person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.

\*\*\*HU Q4: I have engaged in a hookup with a friend with whom I have hooked up more than once.

\*\*\*\*HU Q5: I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic relationship.

### *Emotional and Verbal Abuse*

The statistically significant predictors of being a victim of emotional or verbal abuse were: age, sex, class (year in school), parent's relationship, race, ever viewing

pornography, ever participating in a hookup, and question three and five from the hookup questionnaire. The overall model was significant in predicting emotional and verbal abuse victimization ( $\chi^2(8) = 72.779, p = <.001$ ) and explained 17.8% (Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .178$ ) of the variance. The most significant predictors were sex ( $p = <.001, OR = 2.942, 95\% CI [1.845, 4.689]$ ), race ( $p = .025, OR = 0.841, 95\% CI [0.723, 0.979]$ ), ever viewing

Table 41. *Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Physical Abuse Perpetrators*

Characteristics	OR	95% CI	P Value
Age	1.228	[0.984, 1.508]	.071
Sex			
Male (ref)	1.00	-	-
Female	6.682	[1.548, 28.834]	.011*
Hookup Behavior			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	3.302	[1.297, 8.411]	.012*
Sex Education			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	0.492	[0.222, 1.090]	.081

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$  level

pornography ( $p = <.001, OR = 2.294, 95\% CI [1.458, 3.609]$ ), and ever participating in a hookup ( $p = .001, OR = 2.418, 95\% CI [1.540, 3.796]$ ). Participants who identified as females were 2.942 times more likely to be a victim of emotional and verbal abuse when controlling for all other variables. Participants were 84.1% less likely to be a victim of emotional and verbal abuse if they did not identify as Non-Hispanic White. Participants who ever viewed pornography were 2.294 times more likely to be a victim of emotional or verbal abuse. Participants who ever participated in a hookup were 2.418 times more

likely to be a victim of emotional and verbal abuse. Sex, race, ever viewing pornography, and ever participating in a hookup were the most influential predictors when controlling for the other variables. See Table 42 for multivariate analysis of emotional and verbal abuse victims.

Table 42. *Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Emotional and Verbal Abuse Victims*

Characteristics	OR	95% CI	P Value
Age	1.114	[0.904, 1.372]	.312
Sex			
Male (ref)	1.00	-	-
Female	2.942	[1.845, 4.689]	<.001*
Class	1.004	[0.768, 1.311]	.979
Parents	1.123	[0.959, 1.315]	.150
Race	0.841	[0.723, 0.979]	.025*
Ever View Pornography			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	2.294	[1.458, 3.609]	<.001*
Hookup Behavior			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	2.418	[1.540, 3.796]	<.001*
HU Q3**	0.936	[0.645, 1.356]	.725
HU Q5***	1.097	[0.860, 1.399]	.456

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level

\*\*HUQ3: I have engaged in a one-time hookup with a friend.

\*\*\*HUQ5: I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic relationship.

The statistically significant predictors for being a perpetrator of emotional or verbal abuse were the following: age, class (year in school), parent's relationship status, ever participating in a hookup, ever receiving sex education, ever viewing pornography, and ever participating in Title IX training. The overall model was significant in predicting emotional and verbal abuse perpetration ( $\chi^2(8) = 33.852$ ,  $p = <.001$ ) and explained 11.4% (Nagelkerke  $R^2 = .114$ ) of the variance. The most significant predictors were parents

relationship status ( $p = .032$ ,  $OR = 1.246$ , 95% CI [1.020, 1.522]), ever participating in a hookup ( $p = .011$ ,  $OR = 2.135$ , 95% CI [1.191, 3.828]), and ever receiving sex education ( $p = .028$ ,  $OR = 0.541$ , 95% CI [0.313, 0.936]). If a participant's parents were married or divorced, they were 1.246 times more likely to be a perpetrator of emotional or verbal abuse. Participants who ever engaged in a hookup were 2.135 times more likely to be a perpetrator of emotional or verbal abuse. Participants who ever received sex education were 54.1% less likely to be a perpetrator of emotional or verbal abuse. Parent's relationship status, ever participating in a hookup, and ever receiving sex education were the most influential predictors when controlling for the other variables. See Table 43 for multivariate analysis of emotional and verbal abuse perpetrators.

Table 43. *Multivariate Logistic Regression to Evaluate Risk Factors of Emotional and Verbal Abuse Perpetrators*

Characteristics	OR	95% CI	P Value
Age	1.170	[0.923, 1.483]	.194
Class	1.013	[0.746, 1.376]	.932
Parents	1.246	[1.020, 1.522]	.032*
Hookup Behavior			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	2.135	[1.191, 3.828]	.011*
Sex Education			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	0.541	[0.313, 0.936]	.028*
Ever View Pornography			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	1.541	[0.827, 2.871]	.174
Title IX Training			
No (ref)	1.00	-	-
Yes	0.644	[0.366, 1.134]	.128

\*Statistically significant at  $\alpha = 0.05$  level

## CHAPTER FIVE

### Discussion

#### *Discussion of Findings*

##### *Participants and Dating Violence*

In regard to all forms of dating violence, participants were more likely to be victims of physical abuse (9.3%) or emotional and verbal abuse (32.7%) rather than sexual assault (8.8%). This finding is consistent with existing literature (Mason & Smithy, 2012; Zurbriggen, Gobin, & Freyd, 2010). Participants were also more likely to be a victim of all forms of dating violence rather than a perpetrator of any form of dating violence. We also found that women were more likely to be victims of all forms of dating violence. However, twice as many females as males completed the survey so this may affect the data and interpretation of the data. This finding is consistent with current statistics and literature as well (Kelleher, Gardner, Coben, Barth, Edleson, & Hazen, 2006). However, the sexual assault rate (8.8%) that was found at University of Akron was below the national average of one in four women being sexually assaulted during college (RAINN, 2017).

For participants who responded yes to being sexually assaulted, they were also asked to identify their relationship to the perpetrator and if they reported their sexual assault. Sexual assault victims reported their perpetrators as either a friend (25.0%) or a boyfriend/girlfriend (25.0%). Previous research has found that the closer a victim is to the perpetrator, that more psychological and physiological trauma can occur (Culbertson, &

Dehle, 2001). It has also been found that victims are less likely to report their assault if their perpetrator is a friend or intimate partner (Felson, & Pare, 2005). Of the 49 sexual assault victims, only 12.5% reported their assault with the most common reporting source being the city police (33.3%). A common barrier to reporting among college students is confidentiality and not believing the victim (Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallagher, 2006). This might be why a majority (33.3%) of sexual assault were reported to the city police instead of any campus resource.

We also found that for all forms of dating violence – sexual assault, physical abuse, and emotional and verbal abuse, victims are more likely to be in their first year of college. Literature supports this with findings that most dating violence happens during the first and second year of college (Flack, et al., 2008).

One of our most interesting findings was that the majority of perpetrators for all forms of dating violence were women. The breakdown for physical abuse perpetrators based on gender was 92.9% female, and for emotional and verbal abuse perpetrators, was 77.1% female. However, this finding should also be interpreted with caution since twice the number of females than males answered the survey. All participants who responded yes to being a perpetrator of sexual assault were women, however, only two participants indicated they were perpetrators of sexual assault so this finding should be interpreted with caution as well.

Several researchers have found that men tend to be more likely to be perpetrators of dating violence (Foshee, 1996; Hines & Saudino, 2003). Yet, this might not be reflected in the literature because women are more likely to report being perpetrators due to less stigma associated with women reporting female-male dating violence (Whitaker,



2013). Women perpetrating DV may be viewed as self-defense (Whitaker, 2013). One reason why all the perpetrators in this study reported as female could be because women might be more likely to be honest when completing a self-reported survey on dating violence and men are less likely to report due to the stigma associated with male-female dating violence (Johnson, 1995). However, the sample size being two makes it hard to truly know if that is the cause.

### *Risk Factors for Dating Violence*

The purpose of this study was to identify risk factors of dating violence among college students. Risk factors differed based on the form of dating violence and whether or not the participant was a victim or perpetrator. Ever participating in a hookup was a risk factor for all forms of dating violence – victim and perpetrator. For all forms of dating violence, except being a perpetrator of emotional and verbal abuse, identifying as female made participants more at risk for being a victim and/or perpetrator. The risk factors being explored in this study included hookup culture, sex education, pornography, and Title IX training.

### *Hookup Culture and DV*

Ever participating in a hookup was a risk factor for all forms of dating violence – victims and perpetrators. It was found that engaging in a hookup increased your risk for being a victim or perpetrator of all forms of dating violence from two to three times what it would be if the participant had never engaged in a hookup before. This finding is consistent with literature that supports the fact that if people hookup more frequently, they are more likely to be a victim or perpetrator of dating violence (Flack, et al., 2007).

It is also suggested that hooking up leads to being more at risk because participants are engaging in riskier sexual behaviors (Downing-Matibag & Geisinger, 2009).

When students were asked what they thought the perceived hookup rate was on campus, the average rate was 47.9%, yet the actual hookup was 52.8%. Students at University of Akron's perception of the hookup rate was very similar to the actual hookup rate. Previous literature suggested that at most universities students tend to overestimate the hookup rate (Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006), however, that was not the case at University of Akron.

Another interesting finding was the frequency of students participating in any form of hookup scenarios. Even though 52.8% of students reported hooking up, the average total score on the five-question hookup questionnaire was 1.93 indicating that students were not hooking up with any frequency. Existing literature supports the finding that even though students are hooking up, they are doing so infrequently (Penhollow, Young, & Bailey, 2007).

### *Sex Education and DV*

The majority (73.1%) of the participants indicated they had received sex education yet receiving sex education was only found to be a protective factor for being a perpetrator of emotional and verbal abuse. Conversely, having received sex education was associated with a lower risk emotional or verbal abuse perpetration.

There is a lack of literature and research on receiving sex education being a risk factor or protective factor for dating violence (Hayes-Smith & Hayes-Smith, 2009). In the current study, there was insufficient evidence to determine if receiving sex education was a risk factor or protective factor of DV. Sex education is a difficult topic to study

because most students receive sex education when they are young, typically in elementary school or middle school. In this study, most students indicated they received sex education in 5<sup>th</sup> grade (20.1%) and 6<sup>th</sup> (18.1%) grade. Since the average age of participants was 19.3, 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> grade for them was an average of eight years ago. Therefore, many people struggle to recall what and when they learned sex education (Pingel, Thomas, Harmell, & Bauermesiter, 2013).

### *Pornography and DV*

Based on the literature review, there is a lack of evidence supporting the association between pornography use and being a victim or perpetrator of dating violence. Viewing pornography was only found to have a significant relationship with victims and perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse. It was found that not viewing pornography decreased participants risk for being a victim of emotional and verbal abuse. However, when pornography was modeled with other predictors of being a perpetrator of emotional and verbal abuse, it was no longer a significant predictor. However, future research should be conducted to determine if viewing pornography is a risk factor or protective factor for other forms of DV.

The majority (65%) of the students reported viewing pornography. When stratified by gender, more males (87.5%) than females (55.7%) reported viewing pornography. Previous literature has found that more males view pornography than women (Braithwaite, Coulson, Keddington, & Fincham, 2015). However, pornography use among young women is increasing (Carroll, Padilla-Walker, Nelson, Olosn, McNamara Barry, & Madsen, 2008). Even though the use of pornography was found to be a predictor of emotional and verbal abuse victimization, most participants (65.2%) did

not think that viewing pornography affected their sexual behaviors and sexual decision-making. This finding is not consistent with the current body of literature on the subject. Previous literature found that viewing pornography increased intent for dating violence as well as plans to have more sexual partners (Braithwaite, Coulson, Keddington, & Fincham, 2015; Foubert, Brosi, & Bannon, 2011). Future research investigating the impact of viewing pornography on sexual decision making is warranted.

### *Title IX Training and DV*

This study provided little evidence that participating in Title IX training was a potential risk factor or protective factor for dating violence. However, it was found that less than half (44%, n=245) of the participants had ever participated in any form of Title IX training. A potential recommendation could be making Title IX training required for all students, however, little evidence was found on Title IX training being a protective factor.

### *Limitations*

The limitations of the study were self-reporting, survey responses, the nature of the survey questions, and sampling method and size. Due to self-reporting, it is hard to verify student's responses. Also, a few of the questions in the survey were fill-in-the-blank, which made it more difficult to clean the data and get consistent similar responses. Because of the nature of the survey questions, a lot of responses for questions included the answer choices of: I don't know and prefer not to answer. Because of this as well as the survey being on the topic of dating violence, we don't have an accurate account for some of the more sensitive natured questions. This could make the data under or

overestimated for the number of victims and perpetrators for each form of DV. The sample size as well as the surveying method – convenience sampling, also limited the generalizability of the results.

### *Recommendations and Conclusions*

The purpose of this study was to identify potential risk factors for dating violence among university students. The risk factors found were consistent with the current body of literature on the topic.

Recommendations for future studies and research include conducting more research on pornography use, hooking up, and sex education. There is a lack of research on the influence of pornography in dating violence. However, pornography, like dating violence, is a sensitive topic to study. Further research also needs to explore the relationship between hookup culture and risk of DV. A recommendation could include teaching students either in their first year of college or when they are in high school on what is normal in a healthy relationship. This study included two questions on the role of prior sex education and dating violence. Receiving sex education was only found to be a protective factor for perpetrators of emotional and verbal abuse. Very little literature exists on the possible protective nature of sex education and dating violence. A recommendation would be to further study the relationship between the receiving sex education and being a victim or perpetrator of DV, and to even see if there is a relationship.

Another recommendation would be to study the impact of media (not pornography) on dating violence and healthy relationships. With the current movement around sexual assault and dating violence, the climate of our country is changing, and

rates of DV could be changing as well due to increased awareness and presence around preventing DV.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### Copy of Online Survey

Note: This instrument will be distributed online using Qualtrics. This is the formatting for the paper version. The instrument has been copied and pasted to this document. The actual survey is larger in font and does not split questions in half at page breaks.

Thank you so much for participating in this study! This study will help me understand more about relationships on University of Akron's campus. There are five parts to this survey. Please answer every question in all five parts and answer as honestly as possible.

**All of the information you provide will remain anonymous.**

**Part 1: Background Information.** In this section, please answer each question about yourself.

Your information will be kept strictly anonymous.

1. How old are you? Answer in years. \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. What is your gender?
  - a. Male
  - b. Female
  - c. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. I would prefer not to answer
  
3. What is your classification? Please select one.
  - a. 1<sup>st</sup> year
  - b. 2<sup>nd</sup> year
  - c. 3<sup>rd</sup> year
  - d. 4<sup>th</sup> year



e. 5<sup>th</sup> year

4. How would you describe your race/ethnicity? Please select one.
- a. White Non-Hispanic
  - b. Black Non-Hispanic
  - c. Hispanic or Latino
  - d. Asian or Pacific Islander
  - e. Native American or Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian
  - f. Biracial or Multiracial
  - g. Other, please specify

---

h. I would prefer not to answer.

5. Please indicate your family's household income.
- a. Less than \$10,000
  - b. \$10,000 to \$19,000
  - c. \$20,000 to \$29,999
  - d. \$30,000 to \$39,000
  - e. \$40,000 to \$49,000
  - f. \$50,000 to \$59,000
  - g. \$60,000 to \$69,000
  - h. \$70,000 to \$79,000
  - i. \$80,000 to \$89,000
  - j. \$90,000 to \$99,000
  - k. \$100,00 to \$149,000
  - l. \$150,000 or more

6. Are you a member of a fraternity or sorority on campus?
- a. No
  - b. Yes
  - c. No longer affiliated

7. Are you a student-athlete?
- a. No
  - b. Yes
    - i. Please specify sport: \_\_\_\_\_

8. When you are not in school, where is home? Please write the name of the state or country: \_\_\_\_\_
9. How would you describe your parent's relationship?
- a. Married
  - b. Separated
  - c. Divorced
  - d. Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. I would prefer not to answer
10. If your parents are divorced, how old were you when they divorced? \_\_\_\_\_
11. Have you ever witnessed your father physically abuse his spouse?
- a. No
  - b. Yes
  - c. I don't know
  - d. I would prefer not to answer
12. Have you ever witnessed your mother physically abuse her spouse?
- a. No
  - b. Yes
  - c. I don't know
  - d. I would prefer not to answer
13. Do you consider yourself spiritual (defined as: the quality of being concerned with the human spirit or soul as opposed to material or physical things)?
- a. No
  - b. Yes
14. Was religion an important part of your up-bringing?
- a. No
  - b. Yes
15. How important is religion in your life today?
- a. Very
  - b. Fairly
  - c. Not very
16. What is your religious affiliation? (Please be specific)
- \_\_\_\_\_

## Part II. Alcohol Use

For each question in the chart below, place an X in one box that best describes your answer. Your answers will remain anonymous, so please be honest.

NOTE: In the U.S., a single drink serving contains about 14 grams of ethanol or “pure” alcohol. Although the drinks below are different sizes, each one contains the same amount of pure alcohol and counts as a single drink:

**12 oz. of beer** (about 5% alcohol) = **8-9 oz. of malt liquor** (about 7% alcohol) = **5 oz. of wine** (about 12% alcohol) = **1.5 oz. of hard liquor** (about 40% alcohol)

1. How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?	Never	Monthly or less	2 to 4 times a month	2 to 3 times a week	4 or more times a week
2. How many drinks containing alcohol do you have on a typical day when you are drinking?	1 or 2	3 or 4	5 or 6	7 to 9	10 or more
3. How often do you have 5 or more drinks on one occasion?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily
4. How often during the last year have you found that you were not able to stop drinking once you had started?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily
5. How often during the last year have you failed to do what was normally expected of you because of drinking?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily

6. How often during the last year have you needed a first drink in the morning to get yourself going after a heavy drinking session?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily
7. How often during the last year have you had a feeling of guilt or remorse after drinking?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily
8. How often during the last year have you been unable to remember what happened the night before because of your drinking?	Never	Less than monthly	Monthly	Weekly	Daily or almost daily
9. Have you or someone else been injured because of your drinking?	No		Yes, but not in the last year		Yes, during the last year
10. Has a relative, friend, doctor, or other health care worker been concerned about your drinking or suggested you cut down?	No		Yes, but not in the last year		Yes, during the last year

### Part III: Pornography

In this section, please answer each question about yourself. Your information will be kept strictly confidential.

In this section, *pornography*, is defined as “**printed or visual material containing the explicit description or display of sexual organs or activity, intended to stimulate erotic rather than aesthetic or emotional feelings.**”

1. Have you ever viewed pornography (e.g., video, magazine, Internet)?
  - a. No
  - b. Yes
  
2. Do you believe that pornography use influences your sexual encounters and decision making?
  - a. No
  - b. Yes
  
3. Approximately how many times in the past 30 days have you viewed pornography (e.g., video, magazine, Internet)?
  - a. Never
  - b. Once
  - c. A few times a month
  - d. About weekly
  - e. A few times a week
  - f. Daily
  - g. A few times a day
  - h. Several times a day (>2)

#### **Part IV: Attitudes**

Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the statements below by circling the corresponding number. There is no right or wrong answer, only opinions. Your answers are completely anonymous.

1=Strongly Agree

2=Moderately Agree

3=Neutral; Neither Agree nor Disagree

4=Moderately Disagree

5=Strongly Disagree

1. If a girl is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of hand.  
1 2 3 4 5
2. When girls go to parties wearing slutty clothes, they are asking for trouble.  
1 2 3 4 5
3. If a girl goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped.  
1 2 3 4 5
4. If a girl acts like a slut, eventually she is going to get into trouble.  
1 2 3 4 5
5. When girls get raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was unclear.  
1 2 3 4 5
6. If a girl initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a guy assumes she wants to have sex.  
1 2 3 4 5
7. When guys rape, it is usually because of their strong desire for sex.  
1 2 3 4 5
8. Guys don't usually intend to force sex on a girl, but sometimes they get too sexually carried away.  
1 2 3 4 5
9. Rape happens when a guy's sex drive goes out of control.  
1 2 3 4 5
10. If a guy is drunk, he might rape someone unintentionally.  
1 2 3 4 5
11. It shouldn't be considered rape if a guy is drunk and didn't realize what he was doing.  
1 2 3 4 5
12. If both people are drunk, it can't be rape.  
1 2 3 4 5
13. If a girl doesn't physically resist sex—even if protesting verbally—it can't be considered rape.  
1 2 3 4 5
14. If a girl doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape.  
1 2 3 4 5
15. A rape probably doesn't happen if a girl doesn't have any bruises or marks.  
1 2 3 4 5
16. If the accused "rapist" doesn't have a weapon, you really can't call it rape.  
1 2 3 4 5
17. If a girl doesn't say "no" she can't claim rape.  
1 2 3 4 5
18. A lot of times, girls who say they were raped agreed to have sex and then regret it.  
1 2 3 4 5
19. Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at guys.  
1 2 3 4 5
20. A lot of times, girls who say they were raped often led the guy on and then had regrets.  
1 2 3 4 5
21. A lot of times, girls who claim they were raped have emotional problems.

- 1 2 3 4 5  
 22. Girls who are caught cheating on their boyfriends sometimes claim it was rape.  
 1 2 3 4 5

**Part V: Dating and Sexual Experiences**

The following questions concern dating and sexual experiences. We know these are personal questions, so we do not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely anonymous. We hope this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly. Place a check mark in the box indicating the frequency of each experience.

\*In this situation, a hookup is defined as **“a mutually entered sexual encounter between two people that can range from kissing to sexual intercourse with or without the potential for future commitment.”**

	Frequency			
Hook-Up* Scenario	Never	Less than Monthly	Monthly	Weekly
I have engaged in a hookup with someone whom I had not met before.				
I have engaged in a hookup with a				

person I consider an acquaintance, but not a friend.				
I have engaged in a one-time hookup with a friend.				
I have engaged in a hookup with a friend with whom I have hooked up more than once.				
I have engaged in a hookup with someone with whom I was previously in a romantic relationship				

Do you believe that there is a “hookup culture” (defined as: one that accepts and encourages casual sexual encounters, including one-night stands and other related activity, which focuses on physical pleasure without necessarily including emotional bonding or long-term commitment) at the University of Akron?

- a. No
- b. Yes

What percent of students would you say hookup at University of Akron (0-100%)?

\_\_\_\_\_ %

1. Before you were 18, did you ever have any formal instruction at school, church, a community center, or some other place on how to say no to sex?
  - a. No
  - b. Yes



2. Please specify what grade you were in when you first received instruction on how to say no to sex
  - a. 1<sup>st</sup> grade
  - b. 2<sup>nd</sup> grade
  - c. 3<sup>rd</sup> grade
  - d. 4<sup>th</sup> grade
  - e. 5<sup>th</sup> grade
  - f. 6<sup>th</sup> grade
  - g. 7<sup>th</sup> grade
  - h. 8<sup>th</sup> grade
  - i. 9<sup>th</sup> grade
  - j. 10<sup>th</sup> grade
  - k. 11<sup>th</sup> grade
  - l. 12<sup>th</sup> grade
  - m. College
  - n. I don't know
  
3. Have you ever been physically abused by an intimate partner?
  - a. No
  - b. Yes
  - c. I don't know
  - d. I would prefer not to answer
  
4. Have you ever physically abused an intimate partner?
  - a. No
  - b. Yes
  - c. I don't know
  - d. I would prefer not to answer
  
5. Have you ever been emotionally/verbally abused by an intimate partner?
  - a. No
  - b. Yes
  - c. I don't know
  - d. I would prefer not to answer
  
6. Have you ever emotionally/verbally abused an intimate partner?
  - a. No
  - b. Yes
  - c. I don't know
  - d. I would prefer not to answer
  
7. Since the age of 18, have you ever been a victim of sexual assault, attempted rape, or completed rape?
  - a. No
  - b. Yes
  - c. I don't know

- d. I would prefer not to answer
8. If you answered “Yes” to #7, please specify your relationship to the perpetrator?
- a. Stranger
  - b. Acquaintance
  - c. Friend
  - d. Boyfriend/Girlfriend
  - e. Husband/Wife
  - f. Relative
  - g. I would prefer not to answer
  - h. I have never been a victim of attempted rape or completed rape
9. Since the age of 18, have you ever been a perpetrator of sexual assault, attempted rape, or completed rape?
- a. No
  - b. Yes
  - c. I don’t know
  - d. I would prefer not to answer
10. If you answered “Yes” to #9, please specify your relationship to the victim.
- a. Stranger
  - b. Acquaintance
  - c. Friend
  - d. Boyfriend/Girlfriend
  - e. Husband/Wife
  - f. Relative
  - g. I would prefer not to answer
  - h. I have never been a perpetrator of attempted rape or completed rape
11. Have you ever participated in Title IX training?
- a. No
  - b. Yes

**You have completed the survey. Thank you for your participation!**

The purpose of this study is to identify patterns in dating violence risk factors among undergraduate students. Also, the project will explore how the context of college dating relationships (i.e. relationship type) contribute to perceptions of dating violence among undergraduate students. Dating Violence is highly prevalent in college students. For further information, please see the following resources.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). 2016. Injury Prevention & Control. Available at:<http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/sexualviolence/definitions.html> (accessed on June 17, 2016).

Kaukinen, C. (2014). Dating Violence Among College Students: The Risk and Protective Factors. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 15*(4), 283–296.  
<http://doi.org/10.1177/1524838014521321>

Roudsari, B. S., Leahy, M. M., & Walters, S. T. (2009). Correlates of dating violence among male and female heavy-drinking college students. *Journal Of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(11), 1892-1905. doi: 10.1177/0886260508325492

Watkins, L. E., Maldonado, R. C., & DiLillo, D. (2014). Hazardous alcohol use and intimate partner aggression among dating couples: The role of impulse control difficulties. *Aggressive Behavior, 40*(4), 369-381. doi: 10.1002/ab.21528

**Counseling services are available through The University of Akron Counseling Center in Simmons Hall, 306 (330-972-7082) or the Department of Psychology's Counseling Clinic in College of Arts and Sciences, 342 (330-972-6714). You may also find information about The University of Akron's procedures about report sexual assault and Title IX at <http://uakron.edu/title-ix/> or by contacting the Dean of Students and Deputy Title IX Coordinator for Students Mike Strong at 330-972-6593 or [mstrong@uakron.edu](mailto:mstrong@uakron.edu).**

**For immediate assistance, contact a community resource as listed below:**

**Suicide Prevention Hotline- 1-800-273-TALK**

**Crisis Text Line - text START to 741-741**

**Rape Crisis Hotline- 330-434-7273**

**Battered Women's Shelter Crisis Hotline -330-374-1111**

**Portage Path Psychiatric Emergency Services- 330-762-6110**

**Portage Path Psychiatric Support Hotline- 330-434-9144**

## APPENIDX B

### Informed Consent Form

#### **Informed Consent – University of Akron**

You are about to participate in a web-based online survey that is intended to clarify and explore the contextual aspects of dating relationships in college students. The information collected from this study will be used to help create an environment that promotes safe and healthy relationships among college students. This research project is coordinated by Psychology faculty member Dr. Dawn Johnson.

Taking part in this study is your choice. You are free not to take part or to withdraw at any time for any reason. No matter what you decide, there will be no penalty or loss of benefit to which you are entitled. If you decide to withdraw from this study, the information that you have already provided will be kept confidential. You cannot withdraw information collected prior to your withdrawal.

If you choose to participate, you must be between the ages of 18 and 25 and enrolled as an undergraduate student at the University of Akron. The survey is made up of various questionnaires for you to answer and it is estimated that it will take you 15-20 minutes to complete.

Possible risks completing the survey include psychological stress, possibility of embarrassment, loss of confidentiality, and loss of time. However, the survey is anonymous. You may feel stress or embarrassment answering personal questions regarding relationships and dating violence. You may stop answering the survey if necessary. Additionally, you may choose to end the survey or take a break at any time during the process.

While there are no benefits to you personally from taking part in this study, others may benefit in the future from the information learned as part of the study.

You may choose not to take part in this research study. If your professor is providing extra credit for participation in this survey, he/she will also have an alternative assignment you can complete for the extra credit.

Your response to the questions in this survey will be kept confidential. For those of you completing the survey for extra credit, at the end of the survey you will be asked to click on a link that will bring you to a separate web page not connected to your survey materials. Therefore, your name, student ID, or other identifying material will not be associated with your responses to the surveys. Only research staff will have access to the

data files. Data from this study may be used for teaching, publications, or presentations at professional meetings. All data obtained will be aggregated and identifiable information removed before presentation of results.

If you have any questions about this study, you may contact Dr. Dawn Johnson via email at [johnsod@uakron.edu](mailto:johnsod@uakron.edu). This project has been reviewed and approved by The University of Akron Institutional Review Board. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call the IRB at (330)-972-7666.

By clicking the arrow below, you are certifying that you have read this consent, understand the potential risks, and are consenting to participate in this online study.

## REFERENCES

- Abbey, A., & McAuslan, P. (2004). A longitudinal examination of male college students' perpetration of sexual assault. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 72*(5), 747.
- Anderson, Nick. (2016). *These colleges have the highest reports of rape*. The Washington Post. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2016/06/07/these-colleges-have-the-most-reports-of-rape/?utm\\_term=.9fa7b172edc4](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/grade-point/wp/2016/06/07/these-colleges-have-the-most-reports-of-rape/?utm_term=.9fa7b172edc4).
- Armstrong, E. A., Hamilton, L., & Sweeney, B. (2006). Sexual assault on campus: A multilevel, integrative approach to party rape. *Social problems, 53*(4), 483-499.
- Aronowitz, T., Lambert, C. A., & Davidoff, S. (2012). The role of rape myth acceptance in the social norms regarding sexual behavior among college students. *Journal of community health nursing, 29*(3), 173-182.
- Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., & Stevens, M. R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2010 summary report*.
- Braithwaite, S. R., Coulson, G., Keddington, K., & Fincham, F. D. (2015). The influence of pornography on sexual scripts and hooking up among emerging adults in college. *Archives of sexual behavior, 44*(1), 111-123.
- Carroll, J.S., Padilla-Walker, L.M., Nelson, L.J., Olson, C.D., McNamara Barry, C., & Madsen, S.D. (2008). Generation XXX: Pornography acceptance and use among emerging adults. *Journal of adolescent research, 23*(1), 6-30.
- Center for Disease Control. (2017). *Teen Dating Violence*. Retrieved from [https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/teen\\_dating\\_violence.html](https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/teen_dating_violence.html)
- Culbertson, K. A., & Dehle, C. (2001). Impact of sexual assault as a function of perpetrator type. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(10), 992-1007.
- Downing-Matibag, T. M., & Geisinger, B. (2009). Hooking up and sexual risk taking among college students: A health belief model perspective. *Qualitative Health Research, 19*(9), 1196-1209.

- Duval, A. (2017). Evaluating the risk factors of dating violence among undergraduate students attending a faith-based university.
- Elizabetb, D. (2015). *7 rape culture storylines in tv and movies that get the issue right*. Teen vogue. Retrieved from <http://www.teenvogue.com/gallery/rape-culture-in-tv-movies>
- Felson, R. B., & Paré, P. P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of marriage and family*, *67*(3), 597-610.
- Ferguson, C. J., & Hartley, R. D. (2009). The pleasure is momentary... the expense damnable?: The influence of pornography on rape and sexual assault. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *14*(5), 323-329.
- Fielder, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2010). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual hookups among first-semester female college students. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, *36*(4), 346-359.
- Fight the New Drug. (2017). *How many people are watching porn right now? (hint: it's a lot)*. Retrieved from <https://fightthenewdrug.org/by-the-numbers-see-how-many-people-are-watching-porn-today/>.
- Fisher, B., Cullen, F., & Turner, M. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women* (NCJ 182369). The National Criminal Justice Reference Service.
- Flack Jr, W. F., Hansen, B. E., Hopper, A. B., Bryant, L. A., Lang, K. W., Massa, A. A., & Whalen, J. E. (2016). Some types of hookups may be riskier than others for campus sexual assault. *Psychological trauma: theory, research, practice, and policy*, *8*(4), 413.
- Flack Jr, W. F., Caron, M. L., Leinen, S. J., Breitenbach, K. G., Barber, A. M., Brown, E. N., ...& Schatten, H. T. (2008). "The red zone" temporal risk for unwanted sex among college students. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *23*(9), 1177-1196.
- Flack, W. F., & Brian, L. (2007). Contexts of Intimacy and Unwanted Sex in a U.S. University Sample. Unpublished. Paper presented at the 23<sup>rd</sup> annual meeting of the International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies.
- Flack Jr, W. F., Daubman, K. A., Caron, M. L., Asadorian, J. A., D'Aureli, N. R., Gigliotti, S. N., ... & Stine, E. R. (2007). Risk factors and consequences of unwanted sex among university students: Hooking up, alcohol, and stress response. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*(2), 139-157.
- Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types and injuries. *Health education research*, *11*(3), 275-286.



- Foubert, J. D., Brosi, M. W., & Bannon, R. S. (2011). Pornography viewing among fraternity men: Effects on bystander intervention, rape myth acceptance and behavioral intent to commit sexual assault. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity, 18*(4), 212-231.
- Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: a review. *Review of General Psychology, 16*(2), 161.
- Hayes, R. M., Lorenz, K., & Bell, K. A. (2013). Victim blaming others: Rape myth acceptance and the just world belief. *Feminist Criminology, 8*(3), 202-220.
- Hayes-Smith, R., & Hayes-Smith, J. (2009). A website content analysis of women's resources and sexual assault literature on college campuses. *Critical criminology, 17*(2), 109-123.
- Hines, D. A., & Saudino, K. J. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence and victims, 18*(2), 197.
- IMDB. (2017). *Movies with disturbing rape/sexual abuse*.
- It's On Us. (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.itsonus.org>
- James, E.L. (2011). *Fifty shades of grey*. Vintage Books
- Johnson, M.P. (1995). Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence against Women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*(2), 283-294.
- Kelleher, K., Gardner, W., Coben, J., Barth, R., Edleson, J., & Hazen, A. (2006). *Co Occurring Intimate Partner Violence and Child Maltreatment: Local Policies/Practices and Relationships to Child Placement, Family Services and Residence*. National Institute of Justice.
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C., Warner, T., Fisher, B., & Martin, S. (2007). *The campus sexual assault (CSA) study: Final report*. The National Criminal Justice Reference Service.
- Kraemer, H. (2017, March 1). Don't let Travis Kalanick off the hook for Uber's sexual harassment culture. *Fortune*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2017/03/01/traviskalanick-uberceo-amit-singhal-sexual-harassment/>.
- Lady Gaga. (2015). *Til it happens to you*.

- Lisak, D., Gardinier, L., Nicksa, S. C., & Cote, A. M. (2010). False allegations of sexual assault: An analysis of ten years of reported cases. *Violence Against Women, 16*, 1318-1334.
- Littleton, H., Tabernik, H., Canales, E. J., & Backstrom, T. (2009). Risky situation or harmless fun? A qualitative examination of college women's bad hook-up and rape scripts. *Sex Roles, 60*(11-12), 793-804.
- Lonsway, K. A., & Fitzgerald, L. F. (1994). Rape myths in review. *Psychology of women quarterly, 18*(2), 133-164.
- Mason, B., & Smithey, M. (2012). The Effects of Academic and Interpersonal Stress on Dating Violence Among College Students: A Test of Classical Strain Theory. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(5), 974-986.  
<http://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511423257>
- McMahon, S., & Farmer, G. L. (2011). An Updated Measure for Assessing Subtle Rape Myths. *Social Work Research, 35*(2), 71-81.
- McMahon, S. (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students. *Journal of American College Health, 59*(1), 3-11.
- Netflix. (2017). *13 reasons why*.
- NSVRC. (2017). Retrieved from <http://www.nsvrc.org>
- Paul, E. L., McManus, B., & Hayes, A. (2000). "Hookups": Characteristics and correlates of college students' spontaneous and anonymous sexual experiences. *Journal of Sex Research, 37*(1), 76-88.
- Paul, E. L., & Hayes, K. A. (2002). The casualties of casual sex: A qualitative exploration of the phenomenology of college students' hookups. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 19*(5), 639-661.
- Penhollow, T., Young, M., & Bailey, W. (2007). Relationship between religiosity and "hooking up" behavior. *American Journal of Health Education, 38*(6), 338-345.
- Perry, K. (2010). *Last Friday Night*.
- Pingel, E.S., Thomas, L., Harmel, C., & Bauermesiter, J.A. (2013). Creating comprehensive, youth centered, culturally appropriate sex education: What do young gay, bisexual, questioning men want? *Sexuality Research and Policy, 10*(4), 293-301.
- RAINN. (2017). *Campus Sexual Violence*. Retrieved from <https://www.rainn.org>

- Rau, N., & Wadhvani, A. (2016, July 5). Tennessee settles sexual assault law for \$2.48 million. *The Tennessean*. Retrieved from <http://www.tennessean.com/story/news/crime/2016/07/05/tennessee-settles-sexual-assault-suit-248-million/86708442/>
- Rubio Valladolid, G., Bermejo Vicedo, J., Caballero Sánchez-Serrano, M. C., & Santo Domingo Carrasco, J. (1998). Validation of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) in primary care. *Revista Clinica Espanola*, 198(1), 11–14.
- Reling, T. T., Barton, M. S., Becker, S., & Valasik, M. A. (2017). Rape Myths and Hookup Culture: An Exploratory Study of US College Students' Perceptions. *Sex Roles*, 1-14.
- Sable, M. R., Danis, F., Mauzy, D. L., & Gallagher, S. K. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 55(3), 157-162.
- Saunders, J. B., Aasland, O. G., Babor, T. F., de la Fuente, J. R., & Grant, M. (1993). Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO Collaborative Project on Early Detection of Persons with Harmful Alcohol Consumption--II. *Addiction (Abingdon, England)*, 88(6), 791–804.
- Söchting, I., Fairbrother, N., & Koch, W. J. (2004). Sexual assault of women: Prevention efforts and risk factors. *Violence Against Women*, 10(1), 73-93.
- Sorenson, S. B., Stein, J. A., Siegel, J. M., Golding, J. M., & Burnam, M. A. (1987). The prevalence of adult sexual assault: The Los Angeles epidemiologic catchment area project. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 126(6), 1154-1164.
- Smith, P. H., White, J. W., & Holland, L. J. (2003). A longitudinal perspective on dating violence among adolescent and college-age women. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(7), 1104-1109.
- Stinson, R. D. (2010). Hooking up in young adulthood: A review of factors influencing the sexual behavior of college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*, 24(2), 98-115.
- Tafkar. (2015). *Rape in ASOIAF vs. game of thrones: a statistical analysis*. Tumblr.
- Tracy, M., & Barry, D. (2017, March 9). The rise, then shame, of Baylor nation. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/09/sports/baylor-footballsexualassault.html>
- University of Texas Health Systems. (2017). *Cultivating learning and safe environments*.

- United States Department of Justice. (2017). *Sexual assault*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/sexual-assault>.
- Urban Dictionary. (2011). Hookup culture.
- Whitaker, M. P. (2013). Motivational Attributions About Intimate Partner Violence Among Male and Female Perpetrators. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(3), 517–535. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505211>
- Yeater, E. A., & O'Donohue, W. (1999). Sexual assault prevention programs: Current issues, future directions, and the potential efficacy of interventions with women. *Clinical psychology review, 19*(7), 739-771.
- Zurbriggen, E. L., Gobin, R. L., & Freyd, J. J. (2010). Childhood Emotional Abuse Predicts Late Adolescent Sexual Aggression Perpetration and Victimization. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 19*(2), 204–223. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10926770903539631>