The study evaluated the association between witnessing interparental violence as a child, being a victim of parental physical violence, and perpetrating violence in dating relationships. Witnessing interparental violence predicted the perpetration of physical dating violence in college men but not sexual aggression. However, attitudes supporting intimate partner violence were predictive of sexual aggression. In contrast to earlier studies, experiencing child abuse by a parental figure and adult perpetration were not significantly correlated. These findings support previous research that witnessing interparental violence has a detrimental effect and may lead to violent perpetration as an adult. Additional research is warranted to further isolate childhood variables that lead to specific types and levels of adult perpetration.

The Relationship Between Family of Origin Violence and Dating Violence in College Men

JOETTA L. CARR
KAREN M. VANDEUSEN
Western Michigan University

The prevention of intimate partner violence would be advanced if we could identify men at risk to become abusers at an earlier point in their lives (Finkelhor, Hotaling, & Yllo, 1988). Many researchers in the family violence field have hypothesized an intergenerational cycle of violence (Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1990; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1990; Lisak, Hopper, & Song, 1996; Marshall & Rose, 1988; Sappington, Pharr, Tunstall, & Rickert, 1997; M. A. Straus & Gelles, 1990). Green (1976) observed that younger children often internalize the hostility of their abusive parents. Adolescents who are abused are more likely to commit crimes involving interpersonal violence and may be unusually well trained in using force to obtain a desired end (M. B. Straus, 1988). One of the most widely supported constructs associated with male perpetration of relationship violence is experiencing and witnessing violence in one's family of origin (Doumas, Margolin, & John, 1994; O'Leary & Curley, 1986; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Riggs & O'Leary,

Authors' Note: Correspondence concerning this article can be sent to Joetta Carr, University Counseling and Testing Center, Western Michigan University, 2510 Faunce Student Center, Kalamazoo, MI 49008.

JOURNAL OF INTERPERSONAL VIOLENCE, Vol. 17 No. 6, June 2002 630-646

1989; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Widom, 1989b).

There is growing evidence that this cycle continues through the dating years and into marriage. O'Leary, Malone, and Tyree (1994) have found a strong link between premarital and marital aggression. College is a major arena for dating violence, defined as sexual, physical, and psychological aggression and stalking. The college setting provides unique challenges to study dating violence and opportunities for primary and secondary prevention of intimate partner abuse.

Two decades ago, Makepeace (1981) conducted a landmark study of the prevalence of courtship violence among college students and reported that 21% of his sample of 202 students had engaged in or sustained dating violence. Two years later, Bernard and Bernard (1983) reported that 30% of their sample of 461 college students had been involved in courtship violence. National incidence studies in the past decade have provided more representative and accurate estimates of dating violence. White and Koss (1991) surveyed 4,700 college students and reported that 37% of men and 35% of women inflicted and 39% of men and 32% of women sustained some form of physical aggression during the past school year.

Two longitudinal studies provide rich data on intimate partner violence. The National Youth Survey conducted interviews with a national cohort of approximately 1,000 cohabitating and married young adults every 3 years. Researchers included questions on frequency of physical conflict tactics and reported extensive prevalence of violent tactics by both men and women (Morse, 1995). The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development study in New Zealand also conducted interviews with a representative birth cohort of 861 adults, age 21, who had been involved in an intimate relationship in the past year (Magdol et al., 1997). Prevalence rates of perpetration by women were significantly higher than for men for verbal aggression, minor physical violence, and severe physical violence, and victimization rates were also higher in men.

In the most representative national survey to date, the National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000), phone interviews were conducted with 16,000 U.S. women and men. The prevalence of intimate partner physical assault against women was 22% and 7% for men. Of women who were physically assaulted by an intimate partner, 41% were injured during their most recent assault and averaged 6.9 assaults by the same partner. These results are in contrast to many other surveys and meta-analyses that report no gender differences in physical aggression between

spouses and dating partners (Archer, 2000; Harned, 2001; Morse, 1995; M. A. Straus & Gelles, 1990; White & Koss, 1991).

THE GENDERED NATURE OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Feminist researchers and clinicians who work with abused and battered girls and women argue against the idea of gender symmetry in intimate partner violence, citing data from the rigorous NVAW Survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000) and data on the context, impact, and outcomes of intimate partner violence (Anderson & Umberson, 2001; Beyers, Leonard, Mays, & Rosen, 2000; Harned, 2001; Morse, 1995; White, Smith, Koss, & Figueredo, 2000). Based on the NVAW Survey results, women are more likely than men to be victimized physically and sexually and stalked by intimate partners, to average significantly more assaults, and to experience more chronic and injurious physical assaults, whether the time frame is a lifetime or the previous 12 months (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1996, 1997; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). In addition, the NVAW Survey provides compelling evidence of the relationship between violence and emotionally abusive and controlling behavior in intimate relationships. Women whose partners verbally abused them and were jealous and possessive were more likely to report being raped, physically assaulted, and/or stalked by their male partners.

Harned (2001) reported that gender moderated victimization and outcomes for physical and sexual aggression in her dating sample. Women's outcomes worsened significantly as victimization became more frequent, and women reported more psychological and physical damage than did similarly victimized men. Silverman, Raj, Mucci, and Hathaway (2001) reported lifetime prevalence rates of 20% of girls having experienced physical and/or sexual dating violence in two large representative samples of female students in Grades 9 through 12. Adolescent girls who reported dating abuse were at elevated risk for a broad range of serious health concerns, including drug and alcohol abuse, sexual risk behavior, pregnancy, unhealthy weight control, and suicidality.

Women's aggression is more likely to be an act of self-defense (Browne, 1987), inflicts less physical harm, creates less fear in men (Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994; O'Leary & Curley, 1986), and creates less anxiety in men (Magdol et al., 1997). DeKeseredy and Schwartz (1998) found that most women in their college sample who used physical aggression toward dating partners never initiated violence. Morse (1995) conducted an extensive gender analysis of the National Youth Survey partner violence data and reported

that although both men and women engaged in frequent minor aggressive tactics, women suffered more severe consequences. Women were more often beat up repeatedly, felt more physical danger in a fight, suffered more injury, and sought more medical treatment. Moffitt and colleagues' (Magdol et al., 1997; Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, & Silva, 1998; Moffitt & Caspi, 1999) analyses of gender differences in partner violence concluded that men who perpetrated severe physical violence scored higher on indicators of antisocial personality and depression, engaged in more stranger violence, had greater polysubstance use and chronic unemployment, and had less social support.

Anderson and Umberson (2001) conducted in-depth interviews with male batterers recruited through a family violence diversion treatment program. These batterers reported engaging in more serious, frequent, and injurious violence than their female partners committed, and they did not perceive themselves to be at risk from their partners' violence. Batterers depicted their violence as rational, effective, and explosive and described their partners' violence as ineffectual and hysterical.

WITNESSING INTERPARENTAL VIOLENCE

Witnessing violence in one's family of origin is the most consistently reported background factor among spouse abusers (Doumas et al., 1994; Finkelhor et al., 1988). In many American homes, parents model violence and children imitate violent tactics of their parents. Sappington et al. (1997) reported that 24% of 133 women college students observed their parents abuse each other. Blumenthal, Neemann, and Murphy (1998) reported that 32% of 326 college students witnessed physical violence between adults in their families, and interparental violence and parent-child aggression were significantly correlated. There is some evidence that male child witnesses to domestic violence tend to act out interpersonal aggression more than do females (Doumas et al., 1994; Stagg, Wills, & Howell, 1989). Doumas et al. (1994) reported that witnessing marital aggression in one's family of origin predicted being a perpetrator of marital aggression in second-generation men. M. A. Straus and Gelles's (1986) National Family Violence Survey of 6,000 adults found that wife beating is substantially greater for men who observed violence by their parents, especially if their mothers were violent. The arrest rates for men who witnessed interparental violence were three times higher than for women. McCord (1979) conducted a longitudinal study of high-risk boys involved in a treatment program to prevent delinquency. Thirty years later, criminal convictions for personal crimes were strongly associated with exposure to parental conflict and aggression.

O'Leary and colleagues (Breslin, Riggs, O'Leary, & Arias, 1990; O'Leary & Curley, 1986) reported that spousal violence in the family of origin is a critical factor distinguishing physically abusive men. Breslin et al. (1990) found that men in dating relationships who witnessed maternal violence against their fathers were more likely to report inflicting dating violence. Similarly, Ouimette and Riggs (1998) found that witnessing domestic violence perpetrated by fathers was associated with impulse control problems and sexual aggression. The National Survey of Adolescents (Kilpatrick et al., 2000) reported that 41% of 4,000 youths had observed violence, and 23% had experienced violence in the home.

CHILD ABUSE

In their landmark surveys of families, M. A. Straus and colleagues (M. A. Straus & Gelles, 1986, 1990; M. A. Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980) found strong support for the intergenerational cycle of violence. The physical punishment experienced by most children was related to more severe forms of family violence, and children who were repeatedly abused by their parents also repeatedly and severely assaulted a sibling (M. A. Straus, 1983; M. A. Straus et al., 1980). Fathers who frequently abused their wives also reported abusing their children, and mothers whose husbands beat them had elevated rates of abusing their children. In addition, parents who were physically punished as children showed a greater rate of frequent child abuse and spouse abuse.

Widom (1989a) is conducting a prospective ongoing study of a cohort of more than 1,100 substantiated cases of physical and/or sexual child abuse processed through the courts. Compared to the control group, a higher percentage of those who had been sexually abused, physically abused, or neglected as children were arrested as adults for sex crimes. Abused or neglected males were almost twice as likely to be arrested for rape 20 years later. Similarly, victims of physical child abuse had the highest level of arrests for violent criminal behavior, followed by victims of neglect (Widom, 1989a). However, intimate partner violence was not reported separately in arrest data so that we cannot draw conclusions as to whether child abuse predicts later intimate partner violence from this study.

Other studies have supported this link between child abuse and intimate partner violence (Dodge et al., 1990; Lisak et al., 1996; Marshall & Rose, 1988). Dodge et al. (1990) found that children who had been physically abused in early life became more aggressive toward peers. Harmed children

were less attentive to relevant social cues, more biased toward attributing hostile intent, and were less socially competent. They concluded that child abuse leads a child to conceptualize the world in deviant ways that later perpetuate the cycle of violence. In their survey of college students, Marshall and Rose (1988) reported that being a victim of violence as a child predicted experiencing and perpetrating violence as an adult. Lisak et al. (1996) found that one third of 595 college men studied were physically abused before the age of 16, and 37% admitted to physically abusing a child or adult. The severity of physical abuse and physical abuse perpetration were significantly correlated. Besides abuse history, high masculine gender role stress differentiated perpetrators from nonperpetrators.

Witnessing violence and experiencing violence as a child are difficult to study separately because marital violence is highly correlated with parent-child aggression (Dodge et al., 1990; Hughes, 1988; Jouriles, Murphy, & O'Leary, 1989; M. A. Straus, 1983). For example, 43% of a community sample of more than 600 adult women who witnessed interparental physical violence reported also having been physically abused during childhood, compared to only 11% of the nonwitness group (Henning, Leitenberg, Coffey, Turner, & Bennett, 1996). Magdol et al. (1998) did not find a strong association between experienced violence as a child and later perpetration of physical partner violence.

Researchers have found strong links between parental violence, child abuse, negative masculinity, attitudes toward violence, and coerciveness against women (Johnson & Knight, 2000; Malamuth, Sockloskie, Koss, & Tanaka, 1991). Malamuth and colleagues have devised a confluence model to predict men's conflict with women specific to sexual aggression (Dean & Malamuth, 1997; Malamuth, 1998, 1999; Malamuth et al., 1991; Malamuth, Linz, Heavey, & Barnes, 1995). They have identified two pathways predicting sexual aggression in college men: (a) early risk factors, including exposure to domestic violence in childhood, physical and sexual abuse during childhood, and adolescent delinquency through sexual promiscuity; and (b) violent attitudes toward women through hostile masculinity. Johnson and Knight (2000) conducted a path analysis with juvenile sex offenders, reporting that childhood physical and sexual abuse along with childhood alcohol abuse were significant predictors of sexual coercion. Findings from the Dunedin prospective longitudinal study point to several developmental antecedents to adult partner violence, the most significant being adolescent conduct problems (Magdol et al., 1998). Protective factors were a close parent-child attachment at age 15 and parents who remained together (Moffitt & Caspi, 1999).

CURRENT STUDY

We propose extending this developmental model to the study of intimate partner physical violence. Based on previous research, we hypothesized that the early risk factors of family of origin violence, combined with attitudes associated with negative masculinity, would predict perpetration of sexual and physical dating violence in college men. We measured empirically supported risk factors for dating violence in college men that include child abuse, violence between parents, and hostile beliefs and attitudes toward women.

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 99 undergraduate men from a large Midwestern university with an average age of 20 years. Freshmen and sophomores constituted 58% of the sample, and 42% were juniors and seniors. Ninety percent of the men were Caucasian, 5% were African American, 2% were Asian American, and 2% were Hispanic. All participants were heterosexual, and 97% were unmarried. Nearly half of participants lived on campus, 36% lived off campus, 13% lived in a fraternity house, and 2% lived with family or parents.

Students were surveyed by mail and by soliciting volunteers from undergraduate classes. Surveys were mailed to a random sample of 150 fraternity men from a pool of 700 active members provided by the university registrar. In addition, men were recruited from two large Introductory History classes. Data were pooled for the purposes of the present study.

Participants completed the anonymous survey independently during winter semester of the 1999 academic year and received $5 for their participation when they returned the survey. The researchers obtained approval from the Institutional Review Board and obtained written informed consent. A variety of debriefing materials were provided, including facts on sexual assault and dating violence as well as counseling center, university, and community resources.

Measures

The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). The 10-item physical violence scale of the CTS—1985 revision (M. A. Straus, 1979; M. A. Straus & Gelles, 1986) was administered as part of a 200-item survey comprised of well-known measures of rape attitudes and sexual experiences. The CTS is a widely used

self-report survey of tactics used during conflict with a partner, including various acts of psychological and physical coercion. Participants were asked how often they (a) experienced these acts as a child or teenager by a parent, (b) how often they observed these acts between parents, and (c) how often they used the tactics in a dating relationship. The CTS has high internal consistency with item-total correlations of .87 (M. A. Straus, 1979). Widom and Shepard (1996) conducted a large validity study of the CTS with adults who reported being physically abused as children and found very strong discriminant validity and predictive efficiency of the CTS when measuring retrospective self-reports of physical abuse. A pattern of underreporting their own abuse as children was noted.

Many researchers compare single episodes of relationship violence with higher frequencies of violence (Follingstad, Bradley, Laughlin, & Burke, 1999; Magdol et al., 1997) and categorize severity of violence as mild (push, grab, shove, throw something, slap) versus severe (hit, kick, punch, beat up, choke, burn, use knife or gun) (Burke, Stets, & Pirog-Good, 1988; Follingstad et al., 1999; Harned, 2001; Morse, 1995; Pan, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994; M. A. Straus & Gelles, 1986; Widom & Shepard, 1996). Mild physical aggression is common, but only a small percentage of couples use severe physical aggression tactics (O'Leary et al., 1989; M. A. Straus, 1979). In a factor analysis of the modified CTS, Pan and colleagues (1994) found support for psychological, mild physical, and severe physical aggression. We calculated two categories of severity—mild and severe—with mild defined as push, grab, shove, slap, and spank only and severe defined as all other acts.

The Sexual Experiences Survey, male version (SES). The SES is a widely used self-report measure of sexual behavior on a continuum from consensual sex to coercion to actual rape (Koss & Oros, 1982). It was slightly modified using a 10-item format. Koss and Gidycz (1985) reported that male responses to the SES correlated strongly with individual interviews ($r = .61$, $p < .001$). Construct validity was supported through evaluation of the item hierarchy and fit statistics, and a dimensional perspective on sexual aggression was confirmed corresponding with sexual contact, sexual coercion, attempted rape, and rape (Karabatsos, 1997). These categories are congruent with the legal definition of sexual assault.

Hostility Toward Women Scale (HTW). The HTW consists of 30 items that measure levels of hostile attitudes and behaviors directed at women (Check, Malamuth, Elias, & Barton, 1985). The HTW has an internal consistency reliability of .80 (Koss & Gaines, 1993).

TABLE 1: Level of Violence Witnessed or Experienced as a Child or Perpetrated on a Date (*N* = 99)

			Perpetrated	
Levels	*Witnessed*	*Experienced*	*Physical*	*Sexual*
Frequency				
Never	75	9	80	58
Once	10	5	10	
More than once	14	85	9	
Severity (Conflict Tactics Scale)				
Mild	13	56	13	
Severe	11	34	6	
Sexual Experiences Survey, male version, subscales				
Rape				4
Attempted Rape				0
Sexual Coercion				36
Sexual Contact				1

Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale (ASB). This is a commonly used nine-item measure of hostile beliefs directed toward women and has a Cronbach's alpha reliability of .80 (Burt, 1980).

Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Against Women Scale (AIV). This scale is a six-item measure of level of agreement with violent attitudes and behavior toward women found to have a Cronbach's alpha reliability of .59 (Burt, 1980).

Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (RMAS). This is a 19-item scale that measures level of belief in common rape myths, found to have a Cronbach's alpha reliability of .88 (Burt, 1980).

RESULTS

Levels of frequencies and severity of violent acts endorsed by this sample of college men on the CTS are reported in Table 1. Data are presented for violence experienced as a child by a parent, violence observed between parents or parental figures, and violence perpetrated on a date. Of the men, 87% were spanked as children, and 27% experienced no additional violence. Nine men reported no use of physical tactics by parents. Almost half of the men were

pushed, grabbed, shoved or slapped. Fifty-six of the 99 respondents received punishment no more severe than pushing, grabbing, shoving, spanking, or slapping.

Approximately one fourth of the men witnessed domestic violence between parents growing up, which was more than pushing, grabbing, or shoving, in more than half of these cases. One fifth admitted to some form of dating violence, with 13 men acknowledging mild forms of physical violence and 6 men acknowledging severe forms of physical violence. Of the 19 men who acknowledged some form of physical violence on a date, 10 reported doing so once. A significant portion of this sample (81%) reported perpetrating no dating abuse.

Fifty-eight men reported no perpetration of sexual violence. Of the men who acknowledged perpetrating sexual violence, 4 admitted to rape, 1 admitted to forced sexual contact, and 36 admitted to sexual coercion. No men acknowledged perpetrating attempted rape.

Two simultaneous standard multiple regression analyses were performed on the dependent variables of perpetration of physical violence (DV^1) as measured by the CTS (M. A. Straus, 1979; M. A. Straus & Gelles, 1986) and perpetration of sexual aggression (DV^2) as measured by the SES (Koss & Oros, 1982). The independent variables were the same for both regression analyses and included witnessed interparental violence as a child, experienced physical abuse by caregivers as a child, and gender attitudes as measured by the ASB, AIV, and Rape Myth Acceptance Scale (Burt, 1980) and HTW (Check et al., 1985). Missing data were imputed using the mean. One outlier on the CTS was transformed by assigning a score one unit larger than the next most extreme score in the distribution.

Table 2 displays the correlations between the variables, the unstandardized regression coefficients (B), intercept, the standardized regression coefficients (β), the semipartial correlations (sr_i^2), and r^2 for DV^1 and DV^2. For DV^1, R for regression was significantly different from zero, $F(6, 92) = 6.46$, $p < .001$. For DV^2, R for regression was also significantly different from zero, $F(6, 92) = 6.20$, $p < .001$. For those independent variables that differed significantly from zero, 95% confidence limits were calculated, that is, .074 to .290 for witnessing interparental violence (DV^1) and .001 to .147 for the AIV scale (DV^2).

Results showed that only one independent variable, witnessing interparental violence, contributed significantly to prediction of perpetration of physical violence on a date as logarithmically transformed ($sr_i^2 = .09$). The remaining independent variables in combination contributed another .21 in shared variability. In total, 30% (adjusted 16%) of the variability in rate of

TABLE 2: Multiple Regression of Witnessed Interparental Violence, Experienced Child Abuse, and Gender Attitudes on Perpetration of Violence

Variable	*CTS* (DV^1)	*SES* (DV^2)	*WIT*	*EXP*	*ASB*	*AIV*	*HTW*	*RMAS*	B (DV^1)[a]	β (DV^1)	sr_i^2 (DV^1)	B (DV^2)[a]	β (DV^2)	sr_i^2 (DV^2)
CTS									6.11					
SES	.44**											8.59		
WIT	.40	.25							.18***	.32	.09	.09	.15	
EXP	.13	.07	.36**						.00	.02		.01	.03	
ASB	.41**	.45**	.20	.03					.04	.20		.04	.17	
AIV	.38**	.46**	.17	–.01	.58**				.04	.13		.07*	.24	.03
HTW	.23*	.28**	.16	.13	.48**	.38**			.01	–.03		.00	.01	
RMAS	.34**	.43**	.07	–.09	.67**	.64**	.49**		.01	.12		.02	.14	
									DV^1 intercept = .21	.		DV^2 intercept = .26		
Mean	9.5	12.0	9.9	18.0	18.3	12.9	38.7	39.9			DV^1R^2 = .296		DV^2R^2 = .288	
Standard deviation	1.3	1.3	2.3	7.2	5.9	4.4	4.8	11.3	DV^1 adjusted R^2 = .250			DV^2 adjusted R^2 = .241		
											DV^1R = .544		DV^2R = .537	

NOTE: CTS = Conflict Tactics Scale. SES = Sexual Experiences Survey, male version. WIT = Witnessed interparental violence. EXP = Experienced child abuse. ASB = Adversarial Sexual Beliefs Scale. AIV = Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Against Women Scale. HTW = Hostility Toward Women Scale. RMAS = Rape Myth Acceptance Scale. DV^1 unique variability = .09; shared variability = .21. DV^2 unique variability = .03; shared variability = .26.

a. Unique.

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$.

perpetration of physical violence on a date was predicted by the variables measured in this study.

Similarly, only one independent variable, acceptance of interpersonal violence, contributed significantly to prediction of perpetration of sexual violence as logarithmically transformed, ($sr_i^2 = .03$). The remaining independent variables in combination contributed another .26 in shared variability. In total, 29% (adjusted 21%) of the variability in rate of perpetration of sexual violence was predicted by the variables measured in this study.

Although significant bivariate correlations were found between scores on ASB and perpetration of physical violence on a date (.41) and between AIV and perpetration of physical violence on a date (.38), ASB and AIV did not contribute significantly to regression. Post hoc analyses of these correlations differed significantly from zero, that is, $F(1, 97) = 9.10$, $p < .001$, for ASB and $F(1, 97) = 15.26$, $p < .001$, for AIV.

Bivariate analyses also showed significant correlations between ASB and perpetration of sexual violence (.45) and between HTW and perpetration of sexual violence (.28), although ASB and HTW did not contribute significantly to regression. Post hoc analyses showed that these correlations differed significantly from zero, that is, $F(1, 97) = 22.721$, $p \leq .001$, for ASB and $F(1, 97) = 14.043$, $p < .01$, for HTW. These findings indicate that the relationships between ASB and AIV and perpetration of physical violence on a date and ASB and HTW and perpetration of sexual violence are mediated by the other variables measured in this study.

DISCUSSION

The early risk factor of witnessing interparental violence was a significant predictor of physical dating violence in the present study. The modeling of instrumental aggression between parents may be learned and later used with intimate partners. The intergenerational transmission of violence theory holds that through learning processes, witnessing and experiencing violence as a child leads to greater use of violence as an adult (Bandura, 1977; Widom, 1989a). Witnessing interparental violence was also significantly correlated with experiencing childhood violence, although child abuse did not add to the prediction of physical dating violence perpetration in the regression analyses, in contrast to earlier studies (Dodge et al., 1990; Lisak et al., 1996; Marshall & Rose, 1988). Although much of the violence witnessed and experienced as a child was mild, a number of men experienced severe violence. The current survey found similar rates of family of origin violence and physical dating violence reported in the literature.

Critics of using the CTS to measure intimate partner violence argue that it oversimplifies patterns of violence by emphasizing acts out of context and without regard to motives, outcomes, injury, and fear of partner, coercion, and assumptions of gender symmetry. We justify its use to assess male perpetration patterns because it delineates specific acts of violence on a continuum of severity that parents commonly do to children and intimate partners use on each other. In addition, it has been validated as a retrospective measure of child abuse (Widom & Shepard, 1996). We added measures of sexual dating violence and sexist, adversarial, and demeaning attitudes toward women that more reflect the ecology of women's violence. Ryan (1998) found that college dating partners' use of physical aggression was related to use of sexual aggression and that threats and verbal abuse were predictive of both forms of violence.

The only predictor of sexual aggression toward women that held up in multivariate space was Burt's (1980) brief Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale, which measures hostile masculinity attitudes related to wife beating and sexual violence. This link between sexual violence and negative beliefs about gender replicates Reitzel-Jaffe and Wolfe's (2001) recent findings reported in this journal about the mediational role of negative beliefs about gender and family of origin violence in the development of relationship abuse. A disturbing number of men admitted engaging in sexual coercion tactics.

This in-depth survey of a nonclinical sample measured intimate partner violence developmentally and used multiple measures of abuse, coercion, violence, and negative masculinity. In addition, the anonymous survey is an attempt to increase reporting because there is some evidence that men tend to underreport violence toward their partners. Limitations of this study include possible recall biases of self-report retrospective surveys. In addition, this sample is not nationally representative, and a random sample of fraternity men was combined with a convenience sample of nonfraternity men who were slightly older. These findings have limited generalizability due to the small sample assessed at only one site.

It is methodologically challenging to study the effects of child abuse on later violence because multiple forms of family violence tend to co-occur and may include spousal violence, sibling violence, and parent-to-child violence. It is likely that abusive socializing experiences in childhood are multifaceted and involve (a) observing and modeling aggression in families and society, (b) learning instrumental aggression, (c) empathy deficits, (d) hypervigilance toward hostile cues, and (e) intergenerational substance abuse (Dodge et al., 1990; Herzberger, 1983; Kilpatrick et al., 2000; Swinford, DeMaris, Cernkovich, & Giordano, 2000). Additional longitudinal, prospective stud-

ies are needed to trace the course of abusive behavior from childhood through courtship and marriage. Although family of origin violence is a risk factor for intimate partner violence, further research is necessary to determine how it contributes to partner violence and how the cycle is broken.

REFERENCES

Anderson, K. L., & Umberson, D. (2001). Gendering violence: Masculinity and power in men's accounts of domestic violence. *Gender & Society*, *15*(3), 358-380.

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 651-680.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bernard, M. L., & Bernard, J. L. (1983). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. *Family Relations*, *32*, 283-286.

Beyers, J. M., Leonard, J. M., Mays, V. K., & Rosen, L. A. (2000). Gender differences in the perception of courtship abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *15*(5), 451-466.

Blumenthal, D. R., Neemann, J., & Murphy, C. M. (1998). Lifetime exposure to interparental physical and verbal aggression and symptom expression in college students. *Violence and Victims*, *13*(2), 175-196.

Breslin, C. F., Riggs, D. S., O'Leary, K. D., & Arias, I. (1990). Family precursors: Expected and actual consequences of dating aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *5*(2), 247-258.

Browne, A. (1987). *When battered women kill*. New York: Free Press.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1996). *National crime victimization survey: Preliminary reports* (NCJ 158022). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. (1997). *Bureau of Justice Statistics Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics* (NCJ 171147). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Burke, P. J., Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *51*, 272-285.

Burt, M. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *38*, 217-230.

Cantos, A. L., Neidig, P. H., & O'Leary, K. D. (1994). Injuries of women and men in a treatment program for domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *9*(2), 113-124.

Check, J.V.P., Malamuth, N. M., Elias, B., & Barton, D. (1985). On hostile ground. *Psychology Today*, pp. 56-61.

Dean, K. E., & Malamuth, N. M. (1997). Characteristics of men who aggress sexually and of men who imagine aggressing: Risk and moderating variables. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*(2), 449-455.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (1998). *Women abuse on campus: Results from the Canadian National Survey.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (1990). Mechanisms in the cycle of violence. *Science*, *250*, 1678-1683.

Doumas, D., Margolin, G., & John, R. S. (1994). The intergenerational transmission of aggression across three generations. *Journal of Family Violence*, *9*(2), 157-175.

Finkelhor, D., Hotaling, G. T., & Yllo, K. (1988). *Stopping family violence: Research priorities for the coming decade*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Follingstad, D. R., Bradley, R. G., Laughlin, J. E., & Burke, L. (1999). Risk factors and correlates of dating violence: The relevance of examining frequency and severity levels in a college sample. *Violence and Victims*, *14*(4), 365-380.

Green, A. (1976). Self-destructive behavior in battered children. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *135*(5), 579-582.

Harned, M. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence & Victims*, *16*(3), 269-285.

Henning, K., Leitenberg, H., Coffey, P., Turner, T., & Bennett, R. T. (1996). Long-term psychological and social impact of witnessing physical conflict between parents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *11*(1), 35-51.

Herzberger, S. D. (1983). Social cognition and the transmission of abuse. In D. Finkelhor, R. Gelles, G. Hotaling, & M. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families* (pp. 316-329). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. B. (1990). Prevention of wife assault. In R. T. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Treatment of family violence: A sourcebook* (pp. 3-14). New York: Plenum.

Hughes, H. M. (1988). Psychological and behavioral correlates of family violence in child witnesses and victims. *American Orthopsychiatric Association*, *58*, 7-90.

Johnson, G., & Knight, R. (2000). Developmental antecedents of sexual coercion in juvenile sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: Journal of Research & Treatment*, *12*(3), 165-178.

Jouriles, E., Murphy, C. M., & O'Leary, D. O. (1989). Interspousal aggression, marital discord, and child problems. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, *57*(3), 453-455.

Karabatsos, G. (1997). The Sexual Experiences Survey: Interpretation and validity. *Journal of Outcome Measurement*, *1*(4), 305-328.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Acierno, R., Saunders, B., Resnick, H. S., Best, C. L., & Schnurr, P. P. (2000). Risk factors for adolescent substance abuse and dependence: Data from a national sample. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *68*(1), 19-30.

Koss, M. P., & Gaines, J. A. (1993). The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *8*(1), 94-108.

Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). Sexual Experiences Survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *50*, 455-457.

Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). The Sexual Experiences Survey: A research instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *50*, 455-457.

Lisak, D., Hopper, J., & Song, P. (1996). Factors in the cycle of violence: Gender rigidity and emotional constriction. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, *9*(4), 721-743.

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Newman, D. L., Fagan, J., & Silva, P. A. (1997). Gender differences in partner violence in a birth cohort of 21-year-olds: Bridging the gap between clinical and epidemiological approaches. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, *65*(1), 68-78.

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., & Silva, P. A. (1998). Developmental antecedents of partner abuse: A prospective-longitudinal study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *107*(3), 375-389.

Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. *Family Relations*, *30*, 97-102.

Malamuth, N. M. (1998). The confluence model as an organizing framework for research on sexually aggressive men: Risk moderators, imagined aggression, and pornography consumption. In R. G. Geen & E. L. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Human aggression: Theories, research, and implications for social policy* (pp. 229-245). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Malamuth, N. (1999). An evolutionary-based model integrating research on the characteristics of sexually coercive men. In J. Adair, K. Dion, & D. Belanger (Eds.), *Advances in psychological science: Vol. 2. Personal, social and developmental aspects* (pp. 151-184). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Malamuth, N. M., Linz, D., Heavey, C. L., & Barnes, G. (1995). Using the confluence model of sexual aggression to predict men's conflict with women: A 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *69*(2), 353-369.

Malamuth, N. M., Sockloskie, R. J., Koss, M. P., & Tanaka, J. S. (1991). Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *59*, 670-681.

Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1988). Family of origin violence and courtship abuse. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, *66*, 414-418.

McCord, J. (1979). Some child rearing antecedents of criminal behavior in adult men. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*(9), 1477-1486.

Moffitt, T. E., & Caspi, A. (1999). Findings about partner violence from the Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study (National Institute of Justice). *Research in Brief*, pp. 1-12.

Morse, A. (1995). Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scale: Assessing gender differences in partner violence. *Violence and Victims*, *10*(4), 251-272.

O'Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *57*(2), 263-268.

O'Leary, K. D., & Curley, A. D. (1986). Assertion and family violence: Correlates of spouse abuse. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *12*, 281-290.

O'Leary, K. D., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1994). Physical aggression in early marriage: Prerelationship and relationship effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *62*, 594-602.

Ouimette, P. C., & Riggs, D. (1998). Testing a mediation model of sexually aggressive behavior in nonincarcerated perpetrators. *Violence and Victims*, *13*, 117-130.

Pan, H. S., Neidig, P. H., & O'Leary, K. D. (1994). Male-female and aggressor-victim differences in the factor structure of the modified Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *9*(3), 366-382.

Reitzel-Jaffe, D., & Wolfe, D. A. (2001). Predictors of relationship abuse among young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*(2), 99-115.

Riggs, D. S., & O'Leary, K. D. (1989). A theoretical model of courtship aggression. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 55-71). New York: Praeger.

Ryan, K. M. (1998). The relationship between courtship violence and sexual aggressiveness in college students. *Journal of Family Violence*, *13*, 377-394.

Sappington, A. A., Pharr, R., Tunstall, A., & Rickert, E. (1997). Relationships among child abuse, date abuse, and psychological problems. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *53*(4), 319-329.

Silverman, J. G., Raj, A., Mucci, L. A., & Hathaway, J. E. (2001). Dating violence against adolescent girls and associated substance use, unhealthy weight control, sexual risk behavior, pregnancy, and suicidality. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *286*(5), 572-579.

Stagg, V., Wills, G. D., & Howell, M. (1989). Psychopathology in early childhood witnesses of family violence. *Topics of Early Childhood Special Education*, *9*(2), 73-87.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactic (CT) Scales. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *41*, 5-88.

Straus, M. A. (1983). Ordinary violence, child abuse, and wife-beating: What do they have in common? In D. Finkelhor, R. Gelles, G. Hotaling, & M. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families* (pp. 213-235). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *48*, 465-479.

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1990). *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Straus, M. B. (1988). Abused adolescents. In M. B. Straus (Ed.), *Abuse and victimization across the life span* (pp. 107-124). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, C. T. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues*. New York: Praeger.

Swinford, S., DeMaris, A., Cernkovich, S., & Giordano, P. (2000). Harsh physical discipline in childhood and violence in later romantic involvements: The mediating role of problem behaviors. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62*, 508-519.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000, July). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and the Centers for Disease Control.

White, J. W., & Koss, M. P. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students. *Violence and Victims*, *6*(4), 247-256.

White, J. W., Smith, P. H., Koss, M. P., & Figueredo, A. J. (2000). Intimate partner aggression—what have we learned? Comment on Archer (2000). *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(5), 690-696.

Widom, C. S. (1989a). The cycle of violence. *Science*, *244*, 160-166.

Widom, C. S. (1989b). Does violence beget violence? A critical examination of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, *106*(1), 3-28.

Widom, C. S., & Shepard, R. L. (1996). Accuracy of adult recollections of childhood victimization: Part 1. Childhood physical abuse. *Psychological Assessment*, *8*(4), 412-421.

Joetta L. Carr, Ph.D., is an associate professor and licensed psychologist at the Counseling and Testing Center at Western Michigan University. She specializes in the treatment of sexual assault survivors and has developed innovative group treatment strategies. Her research interests are in studying risk factors that predispose men to rape and rape prevention programs for men.

Karen M. VanDeusen, Psy.D., ACSW, is an assistant professor in the School of Social Work at Western Michigan University. Her research interests and clinical experience are in the areas of childhood sexual abuse and sexual assault, posttraumatic stress, and vicarious traumatization in therapists who work with traumatized clients.