

FAMILY EXPERIENCE, ATTACHMENT TO PARENTS, AND LOW SELF-CONTROL IN
DATING VIOLENCE IN THE U.S. AND KOREA

By

MIRANG PARK

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2009

© 2009 MiRang Park

To my family, for sacrificing to provide me with opportunities to think, change, and grow
고민하고, 변화하고 성장할 수 있는 기회를 주신 부모님께 이 논문을 바칩니다

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank my parents and all of my family for believing not so much in the venture, but in the person. I am grateful to my Korean advisors (Dr. Minsik Lee) who mentally supported me to study Criminology in U.S.A.

I thank all of all my friends, colleagues and contemporaries in graduate school (especially Seokmin, Hee-Jung, Suchat, Jeff, Saskia, Krissy, and Q) for making my work more enjoyable and rewarding than I could have ever expected. I thank the current and former faculty in Criminology, Law and Society at the University of Florida for nurturing a hometown prospect and for always keeping their office doors open. I am very thankful and greatly indebted to my supervisory committee, to Ronald L. Akers, my major advisor and Chair, Angela Gover, co-Chair, Lonn Lanza-Kaduce, Karen Parker, and Ronald Randles) for their time, knowledge, accessibility, and most of all, patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	4
LIST OF TABLES.....	8
ABSTRACT.....	11
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	13
Introduction	13
Significance of the Study	14
2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	16
Definition of Dating Violence	16
Literature Review	17
Victim Characteristics	17
Demographic factors	18
Early family of origin experience.....	20
Dating relationship variables	24
Perpetrator Characteristics	25
Early family of origin experience.....	26
Dating relationship variables	30
Theoretical Models of Dating Violence.....	31
Self-Control Theory.....	31
Intergenerational Transmission Theory (Social Learning Theory)	33
Social Bonding (Attachment) Theory	37
3 METHODOLOGY	39
Data Collection Procedure	39
Measurement of Variables.....	42
Dependent Variables: Perpetration and Victimization in Dating Relationships.....	42
Independent Variables	45
Experience of violence in the family in childhood	45
Self-control	46
Attachment to parents	47
Control Variables.....	48
Data Analyses.....	50

4	RESULTS	54
	Korean Dating Violence	54
	Descriptive Statistics for the Korean Sample	54
	Results of Multivariate Analyses for the Korean Sample	57
	Perpetration of physical and psychological dating violence	57
	Physical and psychological victimization by dating partners.....	60
	Perpetration of physical and psychological dating violence: the subgroup of perpetrators only	63
	Victimization by physical and psychological dating violence: the subgroup of victims only.....	66
	Dating Violence by Gender in Korea	70
	American Dating Violence	72
	Descriptive Statistics for the American Sample	72
	Results of Multivariate Analysis for the American Sample	75
	Perpetration of physical and psychological dating violence	76
	Physical and psychological victimization by dating partner	79
	Perpetration of physical and psychological violence : the subgroup of perpetrators only	82
	Victimization by physical and psychological violence: the subgroup of victims only	85
	Dating Violence by Gender in the U.S.....	87
	Full Model Results (including U.S. and Korea).....	90
	Descriptive Statistics for the Full Sample	90
	Results of Multivariate Analyses for Full Model	93
	Physical and psychological perpetration of dating violence in the full model.....	93
	Physical and psychological victimization by dating partner in the full model	95
	Perpetration of physical and psychological violence among perpetrators.....	98
	Victimization by physical and psychological dating violence among victims	101
	Coefficient Comparison.....	104
	Comparison by Country	104
	Comparison by Gender.....	106
	Gender difference in Korea	106
	Gender difference in the U.S.	107
5	CONCLUSION	135
	Summary Discussion.....	135
	Self-Control Theory.....	136
	Direct and Vicarious Experience with Violence in the Family	137
	Attachment to Parents.....	140
	Control Variables.....	140
	Limitations.....	144
	Policy implication	145
	Future Research	146

APPENDIX

A SURVEY INSTRUMENT.....	148
B CODE BOOK.....	153
C CORRELATION CHARTS	157
D TABLES OF LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS	161
LIST OF REFERENCES	173
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	182

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>page</u>
4-1	Descriptive statistics for the Korean sample	109
4-2	OLS regression models for perpetration of physical violence (all students) in Korea	110
4-3	OLS regression model for victimization by psychological abuse (all students) in Korea.....	111
4-4	OLS regression model for perpetration of physical violence and psychological abuse (subgroup of perpetrators only) in Korea	112
4-5	OLS regression model for victimization by physical violence and psychological abuse (subgroup of victims only) in Korea	113
4-6	Descriptive statistics for the American sample	114
4-7	OLS regression models for perpetration of physical violence (all students) in the U.S..	115
4-8	OLS regression models for victimization (all students) in the U.S.	116
4-9	OLS regression model for perpetrators (subgroup of perpetrators only) in the U.S.....	117
4-10	OLS regression model for victimization by dating violence (subgroup of victims only) in the U.S.	118
4- 11	Descriptive statistics for full sample	119
4- 12	OLS regression models for perpetration of dating violence (full model) in the U.S. and Korea	120
4- 13	OLS regression models for victimization by dating violence (full model) in the U.S. and Korea.....	121
4- 14	OLS regression models for perpetration of dating violence in the U.S. and Korea (subgroup of perpetrators only)	122
4- 15	OLS regression models for victimization by dating violence in the U.S. and Korea (subgroup of victims only).....	123
4-16	OLS regression models for perpetration of psychological abuse by gender in Korea (overall model)	124
4-17	OLS regression models for victimization by psychological abuse by gender in Korea (overall model)	125

4-18	OLS regression models for victimization by psychological abuse by gender in Korea (subgroup of victims only).....	126
4-19	OLS regression models for perpetration of physical violence by gender in the U.S. (overall model)	127
4-20	OLS regression models for perpetration of psychological abuse by gender in the U.S. (overall model)	128
4-21	OLS regression models for victimization by psychological abuse by gender in the U.S. (overall model).....	129
4-22	OLS regression models for perpetration of physical violence by gender in the U.S. (subgroup of perpetrators only).....	130
4-23	OLS regression models for perpetration of psychological abuse by gender in the U.S. (subgroup of perpetrators only)	131
4-24	Significance of difference in OLS regression coefficients for male and female models in Korea.....	132
4-25	Significance of difference in OLS regression coefficients for male and female models in the U.S.	133
4-26	Significance of difference in OLS regression coefficients for Korean and American models	134
D- 1	Logistic regression model for perpetration of physical violence in Korea.....	161
D- 2	Logistic regression model for perpetration of psychological abuse in Korea	162
D- 3	Logistic regression model for victimization by physical violence in Korea	163
D- 4	Logistic regression model for victimization by psychological abuse in Korea	164
D- 5	Logistic regression model for perpetration of physical violence in the U.S.	165
D- 6	Logistic regression model for perpetration of psychological abuse in the U.S.....	166
D- 7	Logistic regression model for victimization by physical violence in the U.S.....	167
D- 8	Logistic regression model for victimization by psychological abuse in the U.S.	168
D- 9	Logistic regression result of full model-perpetration of physical violence	169
D- 10	Logistic regression result of full model-perpetration of psychological abuse	170
D- 11	Logistic regression result of full model-victimization by physical violence.....	171

D- 12 Logistic regression result of full model-victimization by psychological abuse.....172

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

**FAMILY EXPERIENCE, ATTACHMENT TO PARENTS, AND LOW SELF-CONTROL IN
DATING VIOLENCE IN THE U.S. AND KOREA**

By

Mi Rang Park

May 2009

Chair: Ronald Akers

Cochair: Angela Gover

Major: Criminology, Law and Society

Although many studies have been done about dating violence, only a few researchers have developed theoretical conceptualizations of factors such as these in dating violence (Sellers, 2005; Follingstad et al, 1999; Riggs and O'Leary, 1989; Luthra and Gidycz, 2006). This dissertation moves beyond these to draw on three prominent general theories of crime and deviance for its theoretical framework to understand the effects of early family experience with violence (social learning), current attachment to parents (social bonding), and self-control. The purpose of this study is to link theoretically relevant variables that are linked in some way to the respondents' family of origin that may account for the likelihood of perpetration of or victimization by dating violence in two different cultures. In using the same survey instrument for two countries, this study tested whether theoretical explanations developed in Western society could be applied to Eastern society. A sample of 1,400 young adults attending a university in Korea and a sample of 1,500 young adults attending a university in America were used in this dissertation. Findings indicate that experience of child abuse (social learning), low self-control (self-control), serious dating relationship and risky sexual behavior have significant effects on both the perpetration and victimization of dating violence in both countries. Self-

control has stronger effects in the American, and being the victim of violence in the home has more significant effects in the Korean sample.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The research reported in this dissertation investigated dating violence victimization and perpetration among sample university students in the United States and Korea. Dating violence includes: psychological or emotional violence, such as controlling behaviors or excessive expressions of jealousy; physical violence, such as hitting or punching; and sexual violence such as nonconsensual sexual activity and rape. While both females and males may suffer dating violence, females were more likely to be injured, more likely to be sexually assaulted, and more likely to suffer emotionally than males.

The Center of Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has reported that one in 11 adolescents report physical violence and one in five adolescents report emotional abuse. A separate research study indicated that approximately one in five female students report being physically or sexually abused by a dating partner (Silverman, Raj, Mucci, & Hathaway, 2001). In a study conducted in North Carolina, 66.7 % of the respondents reported sexual or physical violence with a partner while in high school (Smith, White, & Holland, 2003). In another study, over 70% of female students reported that they had experienced one or more incidents of unwanted sexual activity (Jackson, Cram, & Seymour, 2000). Physical and sexual dating violence against adolescent girls has been associated with increased risk of substance use, unhealthy weight control behaviors, risky sexual behaviors, pregnancy, and suicide attempts (Silverman et al., 2001). Moreover, because the students either did not tell anyone about the sexual violence, or only told a friend (Jackson et al., 2000), we can expect that an important aspect of dating violence is its hidden or veiled nature.

While preliminary research in the area of dating violence is promising and certainly a step in the right direction, the study of dating violence and aggression is limited by little theoretical development (Sellers, Cochran, & Branch, 2005). This dissertation will focus on the relationship between early family of origin experience, relationship with parents, issues of self-control, and both the perpetration of, and victimization by, dating violence in Korea and the U.S. Because male perpetrators of dating violence are usually younger than 25 years old (Hunnicutt, 1998), the college student is a good subject to study dating violence.

This project will investigate how these variables are linked with dating violence perpetration and victimization. Although the data do not allow adequate direct tests of social learning and social bonding theories, they provide theoretical frameworks for understanding effects of variables relating to the family of origin of the respondents. The data do allow a direct test of self-control theory that has been suggested in the literature as an explanation of dating violence (Sellers et al., 2005).

Significance of the Study

Violence has long been an area of interest for social scientists and practitioners (Lewis & Premouw, 2001). Recently, several studies have been conducted on dating violence behavior among young adults. These reports tend to be descriptive studies without attention to theoretical issues. This is true also of international studies of dating violence. One important contribution of this dissertation is to apply general criminological theories to explain the perpetration and victimization by dating violence. Most often applied in the literature are either the psychological or the youth development theories. This project will bring explanation of perpetration and victimization by dating violence closer to recognized criminological perspectives. Its other main contribution is to apply these theories to cross-national comparisons; specifically, between student populations in the United States and Korea. One of the main advantages of a cross-

national comparative study is the ability to investigate the extent to which general explanations of crime developed primarily in Western society can be generalized to behaviors in other societies.

The theoretical issue is what explanatory variables account for or predict variations in this form of violence. A considerable amount of research exists on the causes and consequences of intimate violence in the United States, with a major focus on commission of violence by males and victimization by females. Not much of this research focuses on victimization by males or on comparing male with female victimization and very little of it involves comparison with victimization in other societies. Therefore, another contribution of the dissertation is that it will fill lacunae not only in cross-cultural comparisons but also in gender comparisons. In brief, the dissertation addresses the questions of which set of factors might be reflective of how three major criminological theories: those of self-control, social learning, and social bonding, best account for dating violence, both for victim and offender. Further, are these factors the same or different in two different societies for both men and women?

This dissertation begins in Chapter 2 to detail the three theoretical perspectives that are of interest in this study. Chapter 3 discusses the data and methodology. Chapter 4 provides the result of the multivariate analysis. Chapter 5 contains a conclusion and discussion on direction for future research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Definition of Dating Violence

There is a fairly wide variation in estimates of frequency of intimate violence and that is in part the result of several definition and measurement issues in the literature. Although the majority of research has focused on physical violence, other studies have examined psychological/emotional abuse, threats of violence, verbal abuse, and sexual violence (Gover et al., 2008). Studies that only examine one type of abuse or use a narrow definition of abuse report lower estimates than studies that examine several types of abuse according to a broad definition. Some studies report lifetime prevalence estimates and other studies report dating violence experienced during the prior twelve months. Lack of consensus on operational definition of dating violence is a difficult issue, complicating the investigation of courtship battering. Dating violence is a vague term that can include threatening communication, verbal abuse, or physical aggression. Due to such ambiguity, prevalence rates widely fluctuate. Researchers have estimated that between 9% and 87% of high school and college students are involved in a violent dating relationship (Harned, 2002; Watson, Cascardi, Avedry-Leaf, & O'Leary, 2001). Harned (2002) reported over 80% of men and women were victims of psychological abuse and about 20% of men and women were victims of physical violence from a partner. However, Cercone, Beach, and Arias (2004) reported less than 30% of men and women were exposed to psychological abuse by their partner, and less than 20% of men and women were victims of physical violence from a partner.

The definition of dating violence used in this dissertation is based on the U.S. Department of Justice definition of dating violence as “the perpetration or threat of an act of violence by at least 1 member of an unmarried couple on the other member within the context of dating or

courtship" (Ramisetty-Mikler, Goebert, Nishimura, & Caetano, 2006, p.423). It is also derived from The Centers of Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) definition as encompassing "any forms of sexual assault, physical violence, and verbal or emotional abuse" within the dating or courtship relationship. In this dissertation dating violence is divided into physical dating violence, including physical violence and coercive sexual behavior, and psychological dating violence, including verbal abuse and emotional abuse.

Literature Review

A number of variables have been postulated in the literature as predisposing, moderating, or mediating factors related to dating aggression, including gender (Monson & Lanhinrichsen-Rohling, 2002; Gover et al., 2008); exposure to childhood violence (Follinstad, Bradely, Laughlin, & Burke, 1999; Gover et al., 2008; Shook et al., 2000); previous victimization (Banyard et al., 2006; Hickman et al., 2004; Smith, White, & Holland, 2003); attitudes about interpersonal aggression (Foshee et al., 2005); alcohol use (Gover, 2004; Gover et al., 2008; O'Keefe, 1997; Shook et al., 2000); and low self-esteem and depression (Foshee et al., 2004; Marshall & Rose, 1990). Much empirical research exists related to dating violence; however, most studies have reported results without separation of victimization and perpetration. Frequently results were reported for just victimization or perpetration of dating violence, not both. Although variables impacting victimization are often similar to those associated with perpetration, different factors for perpetration and victimization have been found in empirical research. Empirical researches will be reviewed separately for victimization and perpetration of dating violence.

Victim Characteristics

In this section, I will review the victim-specific variables to provide valuable information toward a better understanding of victimology and possible risk factors. In this section,

demographic information, early family of origin experience and dating relationship variables will be shown as victimization factors for dating violence.

Demographic factors

Demographic information helps identify individuals experiencing the phenomena in question. Demographics generally refer to gender, socioeconomic status, age, race, and area of residency. However, demographic variables have not been investigated separately for victims and perpetrators. As the result, information will be provided for individuals experiencing dating violence, either by initiation or victimization.

An examination by victim's gender yields vastly different perpetration rates of dating violence (Arias et al., 1987; Clark et al., 1994; Lane, & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Marshall & Rose, 1987; O'Keefe et al., 1986; Riggs et al., 1990). Early research on dating violence for adolescents has tended to report that females were more likely to be victims (Roscoe & Kelsey, 1986). For example, Bergman (1992)'s study reported that females are more often victimized by sexual and physical violence by their dating partner than are males. Similar studies have also shown a higher rate of female victimization (Arriaga & Foshee, 2004; Harned, 2002; Marshall & Rose, 1988).

More recent research, however, has reported equal or higher victimization rates for males. For example, Alexander, Moore and Alexander (1991) indicated males reported a higher rate of victimization by verbal and physical violence in dating violence than did females. In addition, other studies have found a higher level of male victimization in other countries. Schiff and Zeira (2005) explored experiences of dating violence in Israel using convenience sampling. They found a high rate of victimization by physical violence among boys. Lysova (2007) found a similar result in Russia: the victimization rate of males by female partners was greater than female victimization by male partners for both minor and severe forms of physical violence. In

terms of attitude toward violence perpetration, Jackson (1999) and O'Keefe (1997) found that females may not stigmatize their perpetration of dating violence as much as males who reported violence perpetration. As a result, higher rates of male victimization may be reflected by the fact that females feel more comfortable reporting their violent behavior than males do (Gover et al., 2008).

Age has traditionally not been found to be a significant predictor of dating violence (Arias et al., 1987; Marshall & Rose, 1987; Reuterman & Burcky, 1989), although this may be a function of limited empirical investigation (Stets & Henderson, 1991).

Much of the dating violence research excludes ethnic minorities due to small sample sizes (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). As a result, an accurate representation of dating violence in non-white groups is speculative. Several studies have directly attempted to address this question, with mixed results. Some researchers demonstrated higher rates of violence among African Americans when compared to Caucasians (Makepeace, 1987; O'Keefe, 1997; O'Keefe et al., 1986). Other researchers, by contrast, suggested that violence may be more prevalent among Caucasians (Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985), while other reports indicated there may be no differences in dating violence as a function of race (Clark et al., 1994; White & Koss, 1991).

Family structure also has been tested as a source of demographic information. Previous studies sought data regarding respondents' family structure in which they were raised. Usually the respondents selected their response from choices such as "lived with two biological parents," "lived with single parent," "lived with stepparents," and "lived with others, such as adoptive parents or other relatives." This area of investigation provides discrepant findings. Although previous findings did not support this proposition (Billingham & Gilbert, 1990), victims of dating violence appear to be more likely to grow up in families marked by parental divorce or

separation than to have grown up with both parents (Billingham & Notebaert, 1993). In a similar vein, Gover (2004) tested the impact of family structure on risk for victimization. She found that being raised by two parents decreased the odds of victimization among high school students in South Carolina (Gover, 2004). Similarly, other research has found that those students who were raised by a single parent were more likely to be a victim by dating partners (Chase, Treboux, & O'Leary, 2002; Makepeace, 1987; Malik et al., 1997).

However, Billingham and Gilbert (1990) reported a trend in their data. Males from divorced families reported levels of violence for themselves and their partners which approached significance. It is also more likely that victims of dating aggression had experienced periodic or total absence by either their mother or father figures (Makepeace, 1987; O'Keefe et al., 1986).

Early family of origin experience

Family of origin experience refers to the significant caretakers and siblings that a person grew up with, or the first social group a person belongs to, which is often a person's biological family or an adoptive family (Bandura, 1973). Many studies have supported the relationship between family of origin experience and dating violence in later life. Variables, such as experiencing child abuse, witnessing inter-parental violence, self-control, and attachment to parents, have been investigated regarding their effect on subsequent victimization.

Researchers have traditionally believed that experiencing physical abuse as a child increased the risk of later aggressive behaviors, based on social learning theory (Bandura, 1973). Social learning theory proposes that individuals acquire novel behaviors and explained their behavioral repertoires by observing the behavior of others. This model suggests that observational learning is equally as important in shaping new behavior as is classical and operant conditioning (Banduara, 1973). Individuals watch another person and then use imitation to perform novel behaviors.

Many scholars posit that a pattern exists between experiencing physical abuse as a child and being the recipient of dating violence. Experience of violence in childhood is one of the most frequently studied risk factors for general domestic violence including dating violence (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Hankla, & Stormberg, 2004). Makepeace (1987) found that victims of dating violence were more likely to report exceedingly harsh discipline by parents. O'Keefe et al., (1986) found that nearly half of their sample who was exposed to childhood physical abuse had experienced dating violence. Similarly, Smith and Williams (1992) reported that subjects who were raised by abusive parents had a significantly higher occurrence of dating violence. Two studies uniquely attempted to look at physical abuse separately for perpetration and victims. O'Keefe (1998) demonstrated that a history of childhood physical abuse significantly distinguished female victims of dating violence from individuals in nonviolent relationships. It is important to note, however, that experiencing child abuse was a risk factor for female, but not male victims. Gover et al. (2008) supported the gender specific effect of child abuse experience on victimization by dating violence. Childhood abuse was associated with the likelihood of dating violence victimization for females (Gover et al., 2008; Marshall & Rose, 1988). However, this gender specific effect was not found in victimization by psychological abuse (Gover et al., 2008). Coffey, Leitenberg, Henning, Bennett, and Jankowski (1996) demonstrated that the victims of dating violence were significantly more likely to have experienced child abuse, as compared to nonviolent controls.

Witnessing inter-parental violence has been proposed to be a risk maker for subsequent victimization. Several studies found evidence for a modeling conceptualization of dating aggression (Coffey et al., 1996; O'Keefe et al., 1986). In contrast, Marshall and Rose (1988) did not demonstrate support for the intergenerational transmission of violence. This research

indicated that the relation between dating violence and child abuse was significantly strengthened when victims also witnessed inter-parental violence (O'Keefe, 1998). Moreover, this result appears to have more sex specific effects. Gover et al., (2008) found mixed results compared to previous patterns. According to Gover and her colleagues, there was significant correlation between witnessing inter-parental violence and victimization by physical violence in dating violence. Moreover, this effect is greater for female students. However, they failed to find a significant impact of witnessing of parental violence on victimization by psychological abuse.

International studies also have reported a significant impact of the experience of child abuse on victimization by dating violence. A New Zealand study by Fergusson, Boden and Horwood (2005) and a Canadian study by Kwong, Bartholomew, Henderson, and Trinke (2003) reported significant impact of learned abusive behavior on victimization. Fergusson et al. (2005) examined whether exposure to inter-parental violence in childhood predicts subsequent involvement in inter-partner violence using a birth cohort of over 1000 New Zealand young adults. They found that exposure to inter-parental violence in childhood increased victimization by psychological abuse later. Although they failed to find the association between victimization and physical violence, previous research conducted in Canada by Kwong et al., (2003) found that learned abusive behaviors including physical violence and psychological abuse are transmitted across generations in both forms of victimization and perpetration.

Another variable related to early family of origin experience is self-control. Self-control is an individual trait that is developed in early childhood. Because low self-control is the result of ineffective socialization, especially due to ineffective parenting (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), it is strongly related to variables of early family of origin experience. Few studies have tested the application of this self-control to victimization by dating violence. Schreck, Steward and Fisher

(2006) studied the relationship between victimization and self-control. They found that low self-control measured at an earlier time is associated with later victimization and later risky lifestyles. Although the study was not directly related to dating violence victimization, it is an example suggesting the relationship between self-control formed in childhood and later victimization in life. Two recent studies further drew the relationship between self-control and victimization by dating violence. Gover et al., (2008) found that higher levels of self-control reduced the likelihood of victimization by physical violence and psychological violence among college students. In addition, Kerley, Xu and Sirisunyaluck (2008) supported the impact of self-control on victimization by intimate partner violence among married females in Bangkok, Thailand. However, their finding demonstrated that only certain dimensions of self-control, such as impulsivity and risk-taking, were significant predictors of intimate partner violence in Thailand.

In addition to self-control, attachment is an important factor related to early family of origin experience. Bowlby (1973) suggested that children form mental representation or prototypes of relationships based on their experiences with primary caregivers during childhood. According to his suggestion, the quality of the child-parent attachment relationship affects later psychological functioning (Bowlby, 1973; Sternberg, Lamb, Guterman, Abbott, & Dawud-Nouris, 2005). In a similar vein, Cleveland et al. (2003) studied the relationship between attachment to parents and victimization by dating violence. They reported that females who were attached to their mothers were less likely to experience dating violence victimization by their partner. Similarly, Gover et al., (2008) found that maternal attachment reduced the likelihood of physical violence victimization for males, but not for females. However, Gover et al., (2008) failed to establish the impact of parental attachment on victimization by psychological abuse.

Dating relationship variables

Dating relationship factors include the number of dating partners, the seriousness of the dating relationship, and the length of time of the dating relationship. Empirical studies have shown a positive relationship between those dating relationship factors and the incidence of victimization by dating violence. The association functions somewhat differently by gender. Commonly, previous research has explained relationship factors as one measure of sexual victimization, in addition to victimization by physical violence and psychological abuse. The depth or seriousness of a dating relationship may be associated with abuse: as the level of the relationship's perceived commitment deepens, both parties will also have more invested, emotions may become more intense, and the opportunities for conflict may increase (Cleveland et al., 2003).

Studies indicate that dating violence tends to occur more often in a serious dating relationship (Cate et al., 1982; Henton et al., 1983; Sigelman et al., 1984). Harned (2002) found that a greater number of casual dating partners as well as a history of sexual aggression toward dating partners were predictive of an increased risk of sexual victimization by dating partners among both men and women. In addition, psychological aggression toward dating partners was associated with an increased risk of sexual victimization of dating partners for women. However, Harned (2002) indicated that dating behaviors were significant predictors only of sexual and psychological victimization. Specifically, sexual victimization was associated with engaging in more casual dating relationships, whereas a greater number of serious dating partners predicted psychological victimization. These findings are consistent with previous research indicating that sexual victimization is more common when the dating partner is someone with whom the victim has had fewer dates (Muehlendahrd & Linton, 1987), whereas psychological victimization is associated with an increased duration of the dating relationship (Sharp & Taylor, 1999).

Perpetrator Characteristics

Identification of predictor variables or risk makers related to the perpetration of dating violence is important. In this section, I will review the perpetrator-specific characteristics associated with perpetration of violence. The variables will be presented similarly to those presented for victims, including demographics, early family of origin experience, and dating relationship variables. Because demographic information is similar to that provided for victims, only a cursory review of important demographic information will be provided.

Previous research indicated that perpetration rates vary by gender (Arias et al., 1987; Clark et al., 1994; Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Marshall & Rose, 1987; O'Keefe et al., 1986; Riggs et al., 1990). Early research on adolescent dating violence suggested that males were more likely to be perpetrators of dating violence (Roscoe & Kelsey, 1986). For example, Bergman (1992) reported that males were significantly more likely than females to be perpetrators of sexual and physical violence. Other studies have reported similar results in terms of gender difference on dating violence (Arriaga & Foshee, 2004; Marshall & Rose, 1988). Recent studies, however, have found contrary results: females were more likely to be perpetrators of physical and psychological abuse (Cercone et al., 2005; Foshee et al., 1996; Straus, 2004). Gover et al., (2008) supported the finding of a higher rate of female perpetration using a sample of college students. Gover and her colleagues found that males were significantly less likely than females to perpetrate physical violence, and specifically, that being male decreased the odds of physical violence perpetration by 50%. This gender effect was significant in the perpetration of psychological abuse as well. Specifically, male students were significantly less likely than female students to perpetrate psychological abuse, and being male decreased the odds of perpetration of psychological abuse by 35% (Gover et al., 2008).

There has been equivocal support for the relations between age and dating violence (Arias et al., 1987; Marshall & Rose, 1987; Reuterman & Burcky, 1989). Similarly, support for the association of ethnic minority status and dating violence has been inconclusive (Clark et al., 1994; Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Makepeace, 1987; O'Keefe, 1997; White & Koss, 1991). Akin to previous victimization studies that located a relationship between family structure and victimization and dating violence, the influence of family structure on perpetration of dating violence has also been supported in the literature. Research provides only marginal support for an association between parental divorce and the perpetration of dating violence. Tontodonato and Crew (1992) found an increased possibility of perpetration of dating violence in males with divorced parents. Similarly, Billingham and Notebaert (1993) demonstrated that individuals from divorced families employ dating violence as a conflict-resolution strategy more often than do individuals from intact families. Other findings, however, have demonstrated only a trend toward significance in their data. Males from divorced families reported initiating more violence in dating relationships than males from intact families (Billingham & Gilbert, 1990).

Early family of origin experience

Factors of early family of origin experience, such as child abuse, witnessing inter-parental violence, low self-control, and parental attachment are all believed to play a role in the perpetration of dating violence.

More scholars have focused on the perpetration of dating violence and its links to the experience of family violence in childhood than on victimization studies of dating violence. The experience of family violence usually refers to direct experience of child abuse and witnessing inter-parental violence. Bernard and Bernard (1983) indicated a direct mirroring, in that the exact type of aggression observed or experienced in the family was perpetrated in dating violence.

Experience of violence in childhood is one of the most frequently studied risk factors for general future violent behavior, including dating violence (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2004). While other researchers suggest there is no significant relation between child abuse and dating aggression (Carr & VanDeusen, 2002; Foo & Margolin, 1995; O'Keefe, 1997), most of researchers have documented a significant relation between experiencing child abuse and perpetrating dating violence (Laner & Thompson, 1982; Marshall & Rose, 1988). Parents who were physically punished as children showed a greater rate of frequent child abuse and spouse abuse (Straus & Gelles, 1986, 1990; Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980). Widom (1989) found that high proportion of those who had been physically, sexually 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 arrest for violent criminal behavior (Widom, 1989). Other studies have also supported this link between child abuse and violent behavior later in life (Doge et al, 1990; Lisak et al., 1996; Marshall & Rose, 1988).

While males and females who experienced child abuse in childhood were significantly more likely to perpetrate dating violence, many previous studies found a gender specific effect of child abuse on the perpetration of dating violence. Specifically, the impact of experience of child abuse is stronger for males. Alexander, Moore and Alexander (1991) found that there was a significant relationship between being abused as a child and perpetrating abuse only for those men who had received severe abuse from their fathers. Marshall and Rose (1988) found that being abused as a child was related to dating violence victimization and perpetration among males, but not for females. Similarly, Wekerle and Wolfe (1998) reported that the effect of childhood maltreatment applied to male perpetrators of physical violence. However, there are

different results that indicated reversed relationship between child abuse and gender specific effect on dating violence. Follette and Alexander (1992) and O'Keefe (1998) have found childhood abuse to be a risk factor for females initiating dating violence, but not so for males (Follette & Alexander, 1992; O'Keefe, 1998). Although discussion for gender specific effect is inconclusive, overall empirical support has been found for the influence of experience of child abuse and perpetration of dating violence. Moreover, Marshall and Rose (1988) argued that the influence of direct experience of child abuse is greater than witnessing of indirect experience of violence in the family.

Witnessing inter-parental violence is also believed to be associated with the perpetration of dating violence. Similar to the effects of childhood abuse, empirical support is indeterminate. There is, however, some evidence of a relation between witnessing of parents' violence and the perpetration of dating violence (Bernard & Bernard, 1983; Gwartney-Gibbs et al., 1987; Laner & Thompson, 1982; O'Keefe, 1997; Ronfeldt, Kimerling, & Arias, 1998). Gover et al. (2008) found that college students who witnessed maternally perpetrated violence during childhood were significantly more likely to perpetrate psychological abuse in dating violence. Specifically, respondents who witnessed their mother hit their father increased the odds of perpetration of psychological abuse by almost 60% (Gover et al., 2008). Still other data indicated the same trend for female-only perpetration of dating violence (Follette & Alexander, 1992; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996).

More specifically, O'Keefe (1998) found that for males who witnessed significant inter-parental violence, accepting the use of violence in relationships distinguished perpetrators from nonviolent males. Similarly, for females who witnessed high levels of inter-parental violence, the additional experience of childhood abuse distinguished perpetrators from nonviolent females.

Several researchers, however, have found no significant correlation between witnessing parental aggression and the expression of dating violence (Riggs et al., 1990; Tontodonato & Crew, 1992).

Maxwell and Maxwell (2003) found that child-directed and child-witnessed violence in the family influenced later adolescent violence among study groups in the Philippines. In their study, the effects of family violence measured on rates of aggression do not vary by gender, suggesting that forms of family violence have similar negative consequences for both boys and girls (Maxwell & Maxwell, 2003).

Another family related factor is self-control. Self-control is an individual trait that is developed in early childhood. Low self-control is the result of ineffective socialization, especially due to ineffective parenting (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). Sellers (1999) found low self-control to have a modest but significant influence on physical violence perpetration among college students. Using a sample of 985 college students, she found that self-control explained 10% of the variation in courtship violence, and when combined with measures of opportunity and rewards, explained about 17% of the variation (Sellers, 1999). Clapple and Hope (2003) reported that low self-control influenced significantly on perpetration of physical dating violence among high school students. A recent study conducted by Gover et al., (2008) supported the influence of self-control on perpetration of physical violence and psychological abuse among college students. Higher scores of self-control reduced the odds of perpetration of dating violence including both physical violence and psychological violence among college students (Gover et al., 2008). Kerley et al. (2008) tested the impact of low self-control on aggression and victimization by intimate partner violence among married females in Thailand. Like previous results of victimization, self-control moderately influenced the perpetration of dating violence.

Usually the self-control proposed by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) reflects uni-dimensionality, however, Kerley et al. (2008) tested the separate effects of each of the six dimensions of self-control. As supporting the multi-dimensionality of self-control, they found that low self-control partially explained the aggression of dating violence. Impulsivity was a robust predictor of both types of intimate partner aggression. Risk-taking was a significant predictor only of physical forms of aggression. Low frustration tolerance was a predictor of both types of intimate partner aggression, but neither type of victimization (Kerley et al., 2008).

In addition to self-control, attachment is an important factor related to early family of origin experience. Clapple and Hope (2003) reported that high school students who scored higher attachment to their parents were less likely to perpetrate dating violence. Specifically, Gover et al. (2008) found the gender effect of parental attachment on perpetration of dating violence. Gover et al. (2008) reported that father attachment decrease the likelihood of perpetration of physical violence and psychological abuse for college students. In addition, they found that maternal attachment significantly reduced the likelihood of physical violence perpetration for male students. And strong attachment to father reduced the likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse for female students.

Dating relationship variables

Empirical studies have reported the positive relationship between dating relationship factors and perpetration of dating violence. O'Keefe (1997) found that the seriousness of the relationship, measured with a single item asking participants to rate the seriousness of their relationship from 1 (casual dating) to 7 (someone you are engaged to marry), was a significant predictor of perpetrating abuse for females, but not for males. Gover et al., (2008) found that having a steady or exclusive dating partner increased the risk of physical dating violence perpetration. Consistent with physical violence, students' engagement in a steady or exclusive

dating relationship increased the likelihood of perpetration of psychological violence (Gover et al., 2008). The seriousness of the dating relationship may be associated with abuse because as seriousness increases, both parties have more invested in the relationship, emotions may become more intense, and the opportunities for conflict may increase (Cleveland et al., 2003). Although it did not directly test the dating violence and dating relationship, Betheke and Dejoy (1993) examined the acceptability of dating violence. The result indicated that experimental subjects were more tolerant of violent behavior when the depicted relationship was serious and when the perpetrator was female (Detheke & Dejoy, 1993).

Theoretical Models of Dating Violence

However, only a few researchers have developed theoretical conceptualizations of factors such as these in dating violence (Sellers, 2005; Follingstad et al, 1999; Riggs & O'Leary, 1989; Luthra & Gidycz, 2006). This dissertation moves beyond these to draw on three prominent general theories of crime and deviance for its theoretical framework: social learning, self-control and social bonding theory. Of these the perspective that is best represented and measured in the data for the dissertation is self-control theory.

Self-Control Theory

According to Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990), crime is a result of a single underlying individual characteristic that they term criminal propensity or low self-control. They argue that low self-control is the result of ineffective child-rearing, and is essentially formed by age 8-10. In order to instill self-control in a child a parent must supervise the child, recognize acts of deviant behavior, and punish the child for those acts. If the parent is ineffective in these areas, the child will develop low self-control, and will have a propensity to commit crime. Low self-control is characterized by impulsivity, insensitivity, risk-taking or thrill-seeking, physicality, preference for easy rather than complex tasks or short-sightedness, and the preference for

nonverbal rather than verbal tasks¹. Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) argue that, once formed in childhood, self-control is relatively stable throughout the life course, and the cross-individual difference in self-control does not change. Someone with low self-control is more likely than one with high self-control to commit crime given the opportunity throughout life. Thus, although current self control may be measured at a later time, the assumption of the theory is that one's self-control was formed in childhood in the family of origin.

Although Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) developed their general theory to specifically explain crime and analogous behavior, they stated self-control can also explain¹ behavior such as accidents as well. Further, we know that the commission of crime and victimization by crime are related. Also, self-control theory expects versatility and a variety of behavior. Since low self-control is expected to account for commission of criminal violence, then, it should also be at least somewhat related to being the victim of violence. Then, this theory may also be useful for explaining victimization. Indeed, some studies have taken that approach and found support for hypothesized links between low self-control and an increase in crime victimization risk (Holtfreter, Reisig, & Pratt ,2008; Schreck, 1999; Schreck et al, 2002; Schreck et al., 2006; Stewart et al., 2004). Based on the inferences about victimization that can be made from the logic of self-control theory and the body of previous research that has tested low self-control explanations of crime victimization , self-control is expected to explain both perpetration and victimization of dating violence.

Few studies have tested the application of this theory to dating violence. Using data from a national probability sample of respondents, Avakame (1998a) examined the role that self-control plays in the processes by which violence is transmitted through generations. Self-control was

¹ The revised version of self-control theory by Hirschi (2004, p. 543) defined it as “the tendency to consider the full range of potential costs of a particular act”

found to mediate the relationship between witnessing violence between parents and intimate partner violence among males and females. Using these same data, Avakame (1998b) examined the relationship between violence in the family of origin and perpetration of psychological aggression. Support was not found for low self-control as a mediating variable in the relationship between violence in the family of origin and adulthood psychological aggression among males. Two other studies, however, reported that low self-control plays a role in the intergenerational transmission of violence. Sellers (1999) found low self-control to have a modest but significant influence on physical violence perpetration among college students. Clapple and Hope (2003) reported that low self-control was found to be a significant predictor of physical dating violence perpetration among high-school students. Kerley et al.(2008) tested the impact of low self-control on perpetration of and victimization by intimate partner violence in Thailand. Although their results did not account for the behavior of dating violence directly, they found that some parts of low self-control theory contributed to explain victimization and perpetration of intimate partner violence of married females (Kerley et al., 2008). Thus, there are some empirical as well as theoretical grounds for application of self-control theory to dating violence victimization and perpetration.

Intergenerational Transmission Theory (Social Learning Theory)

Researchers have traditionally believed that experiencing physical abuse as a child increased the risk of later aggressive behaviors, based on social learning theory (Bandura, 1973). Social learning theory proposes that individuals acquire novel behaviors and explained their behavioral repertoires by observing another's behavior. This model suggests that observational learning is equally as important in shaping new behavior as is classical and operant conditioning (Banduara, 1973). Individuals watch another person and then use imitation to perform novel behaviors. Bandura also asserts that individuals can learn new behaviors without performance

and without reinforcement. Simply stated, an observer may copy a model's behavior long after he or she saw the action performed and even though no immediate reinforcement was earned by the model or the observer (Lewis & Fremouw, 2002).

A number of studies have measured exposure to violence during childhood as witnessing violence between parents and/or as being the victim of violence by a parent or guardian. Most studies have used the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) or a modified version of the CTS to measure exposure to childhood physical violence (Jankowski, Leitenberg, Henning, & Coffey, 1999; Marshall & Rose, 1988). A number of recent studies have examined the link between witnessing inter-parental violence during childhood and experiencing violence. Early work by Bernard and Bernard (1983) indicated a direct mirroring, in that the exact type of aggression observed or experienced in the family was perpetrated in dating relationships. However, the study of intergenerational transmission of violence via exposure to violence in the family of origin has yielded inconclusive results. It appears that growing up in a violent home does not adequately predict who will perpetrate or experience violence in intimate, adult relationships. In fact, Kaufman and Zigler (1987) report that only about 30% of those who witness interpersonal violence or experience violence at the hand of their parents also perpetrate violence as adults. Of course this is much higher than of those who had not experience with violence in the family of origin, and in fact is one of the stronger predictors of later violence.

Several recent studies found that men who observed inter-parental violence were more likely to behave aggressively toward their girlfriends (Choice, Lamke & Littman, 1995; Riggs, O'Leary, & Breslin, 1990; Straus, 1992; Straus, Kaufman, & Kantor, 1994). In four studies, female participants were more likely to aggress against their partners if they witnessed inter-parental violence in the family. Using a telephone survey of 1,249 Canadian adults, Kwong,

Bartholomew, Henderson and Trinke (2003) supported a general social learning model of relationship violence. According to their findings, witnessing parents' violence, including physical and psychological abuse in the family, was predictive of relationship abuse later. Avakame (1998) discovered that a father's violence is more likely to be linked with violence in the current relationship than a mother's violence. Kwong et al. (2003) explored whether boys had learned their father's violence pattern against a partner.

The link between experiencing parental violence as a victim during childhood and adult, dating violence has been similarly reported. Straus and colleagues found strong support for the intergenerational cycle of violence (Straus & Gelles, 1986, 1990; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). Children who were repeatedly abused by their parents also repeatedly and severely assaulted a sibling. Parents who were physically punished as children showed a greater rate of frequent child abuse and spouse abuse.

Child abuse experience is another example of learning process. In one study there was a significant relationship between being abused as a child and perpetrating abuse only for those men who had received severe abuse from their fathers (Alexander et al., 1991). Widom (1989) found that higher percentage of those who had been physically or sexually 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. Other studies have supported this link between child abuse and violence later in life (Doge et al., 1990; Lisak et al., 1996, Marshall & Rose, 1988). Although the majority of previous research has supported the positive relationship between child abuse and future violence, Carr and VanDeusen (2002) did not find a significant

relationship between physical violence experienced in childhood and dating violence perpetration.

These studies have been seen as supporting the hypothesis of intergenerational transmission of violence as an explanation of dating violence (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). The hypothesis is that dating violence is transmitted from one generation to the next through exposure to violence in the family of origin during the formative years. These findings in the past have been seen as consistent with and supportive of social learning theory. Social learning theory suggests that one mechanism by which such behaviors may be learned is through observation and imitation of others and vicarious differential reinforcement. A child's early experience and exposure to models in the family may be a source of learning about gender role expectations, perceptions, and attitudes toward violence. Social learning theory therefore has a potentially significant contribution to make toward an explanation of dating violence (Jackson, 1999). The intergenerational transmission model and evidence of effects from childhood exposure to violence on experience with violence as a young adult are consistent with general social learning theory but cannot be considered a full test of the theory (Akers, 1998). This is true because imitation is only one element (and typically not the strongest part) of the social learning process, which also includes differential association, definitions (attitudes), differential reinforcement, discriminative stimuli, and other elements. Also, recent and current learning experiences would be expected to have greater impact than prior events that may have occurred many years ago. However the current dissertation studies only the learning processes in the family relationship that was completed in childhood. It is also limited to measuring experience of violence within the family.

Social Bonding (Attachment) Theory

Bowlby (1973) suggested that children form mental representations or prototypes of relationships based on their experiences with primary caregivers during childhood. These relationship prototypes are relatively consistent over time, and serve as templates for future relationships. He proposed what he calls “attachment theory” to suggest that adolescents tend to select dating partners based on these prototypes. According to attachment theory, children develop internal working models (IWMs) of their relationship from childhood experience mainly from attachment to parents, and their attachments play a crucial role in later psychological functioning (Bowlby, 1973; Sternberg, Lamb, Guterman, Abbott, & Dawud-Noursi, 2005). That is, the quality of the child-parent attachment relationship powerfully affects later social development (Bowlby, 1973; Cassidy, 1994; Sroufe, Clarson, Levy, & Egeland, 1999). Individuals with negative relationship templates may gravitate toward violent dating relationships. The expectation is that those with insecure attachment styles resulting from childhood mistreatment would be at particularly high risk for dating violence (Cicchetti & Howes, 1991; Critenden & Ainsworth, 1989; Schwatz, Hage, Bush & Burns, 2006).

Although the two are different, this “attachment theory” of Bowlby’s, has obvious similarity to Hirschi’s (1969) social bonding theory in which attachment to others is a key component of bonds for society hypothesized to control deviance. Hirschi’s proposed that the main reason of criminal behavior is weak social bond. Attachment, commitment, involvement and belief are key elements of social bond. However, this study only allows to test the attachment among Hirschi’s four concept of social bonding theory. Attachment in Hirschi’s theory refers to close, warm and affectionate ties to parents, peers and others. Parental attachment is especially important in the theory and most relevant to this dissertation project because it is related to the respondents’ relationships in their families of origin. Attachment to

parents is measured in the dissertation by current attachment. It is likely, however, that their current parental attachment was first formed or strongly influenced by attachment to parents in childhood.

Little use has been made of social bonding concepts in research on dating violence. Cleveland et al.(2003) reported that females who were attached to their mothers were less likely to experience dating violence victimization. Similarly, high school students who reported higher attachment to their parents were less likely to perpetrate dating violence (Chapple & Hope, 2003).

Despite a growing number of studies examining the early childhood experiences of dating violence, the relationship between childhood sexual, physical, and emotional victimization and neglect, as well as disturbances in the attachment relationship, and later perpetration and victimization by dating violence remains unclear.

This dissertation analyzes data from samples of university students in the United States and Korea for both cross-cultural and gender comparisons, both in witnessing of inter-parental violence and in experiencing child abuse in the family. It also examines the applicability of three general theories of crime and deviance (self-control, intergenerational transmission /social learning, and social bonding/attachment theory) to dating violence directly.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection Procedure

Data for this study comes from research conducted by Dr. Angela Gover and myself in 2005. The survey, entitled “Family and relationship experiences and attitudes among college students,” was created and administered to students at one university in the United States and one university in Korea.

The survey consisted of 167 questions on topics such as family of origin violence, attitudes toward women, stalking victimization and perpetration, fear of violence, dating relationship behaviors, sexual behaviors, substance use, parental attachment, and self-control. Students were provided with informed consent documentation, participated voluntarily, and were assured confidentiality through the withholding of identifying information (such as name and student identification number). Participants were provided with survey packets that contained the informed consent documentation, questionnaire, and the name of a contact person and telephone number for those who might have questions after completing the survey. Respondents returned completed surveys in the envelopes they were provided to ensure additional confidentiality. The importance of the research was explained orally to respondents by researchers, and students were not provided with extra course credit as an incentive for survey participation. The sampling method was convenience sampling in a classroom setting in both countries. The convenience sampling is a non-probability method with limitations on its ability to obtain a representative sample. The large sample size should mitigate those limitations to some extent but do not remove them. However, the focus of this dissertation research is not to make generalizations about the frequency or demographic distribution of dating violence in the two countries. Rather it is to examine the extent to which different theoretical perspectives apply to these particular samples

in the two countries. Samples nationally or categorically representative are less important for that purpose. The process of administering the questionnaire was the same in the United States and Korea.

U.S data collection by Gover was completed in a classroom setting between August and December of 2005 at the University of Florida. The final U.S. sample consisted of 1399 students taking liberal arts and sciences course such as criminology, psychology, economics, anthropology, English, and political science. The survey response rate was 98%.¹

The Korean data which I collected is a replication of the study by Gover et al. (2008). The contents of the questionnaire and the number of questions are exactly the same and the data collection procedures were identical. The original survey instrument was written in English; three translators, including me, who are fluent in both Korean and English, reviewed the translated Korean survey instrument.

IRB approval for the Korean study was obtained on May 18, 2007 from the University of Florida because Korean universities and research institutes are not required to obtain IRB approval in Korea. The survey was completed in a classroom setting between May and June of 2007. The sampling method used in this survey was convenience sampling, like the previous U.S. sampling method. Students at Kyonggi University in Korea were asked about their intention to participate in this survey before class started. Before the students were permitted to enter the class, the lecturers or professors in charge of the class obtained permission for each student to participate. Students participated in this survey voluntarily. There was no reward for participation nor penalty for withdrawal of the participation.

¹ The response rate was calculated by comparing the a total of number of completed surveys to the number of student present during class on the days surveys were administered in the United States.

Researchers selected classes from those that were included in the course schedule for the 2007 spring semester at Kyonggi University. Based on course information such as classroom size, major, and department offering the course, the classes that were selected had large numbers of students and were open to all students, regardless of their majors. These classes were selected so that students majoring in other fields were included. The average classroom size for courses open to all students was 150. In addition to these larger size classes, small courses having less than 50 students were selected as well. These courses were elective or core courses of their departments. Overall, data were collected from the colleges of humanities, law, social science, business, and natural sciences, and students from the departments of foreign languages, public administration, social work, police administration, youth studies, economics, applied statistics, industrial property, accounting, mathematics, physics, chemistry, and biology participated in this survey.

Similar to the Gover survey done in 2005, the Korean survey instruments had a total of 167 questions with topics such as basic social demographic factors, campus life, family of origin violence, perpetration, and victimization by stalking, attitudes toward women, fear of violence on campus, perpetration, and victimization by dating violence, religiosity, sexual behavior, substance use and drunk driving, attachment to parents, and self-control. Before distributing the survey, the purpose and importance of the survey was explained orally by the principal investigator in front of the students. Due to the sensitivity of some of the questions, participants were provided with survey packets that contained the informed consent documentation, the questionnaire, and the name of a contact person and telephone number for those who might have questions after completing the survey. Respondents returned completed surveys in the envelopes in which they were provided to ensure additional confidentiality. Although the included

informed consent documentation explained the participants' right to participate and their right to withdraw from the survey and included contact information regarding this research, all participants were offered the opportunity to have their rights and the contact information explained orally by a principal investigator before they started answering any questions. A total of 1,399 questionnaires were completed in the Korean survey. The response rate was 96.5%.²

Measurement of Variables

Dependent Variables: Perpetration and Victimization in Dating Relationships

The dependent variables in this study are: (1) perpetration of physical dating violence, (2) perpetration of psychological abuse/violence in dating relationships, (3) victimization by physical dating violence and (4) victimization by psychological abuse/violence in dating relationships. These were measured by items based on but modified from the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale, which is the most commonly used scale of intimate partner violence (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). Questions related to perpetration of and victimization by sexual abuse in dating relationships were also asked on the instrument, but not included in the statistic analysis for this dissertation. Respondents were asked how often those behaviors happened in the past year. They are ordinal variables and the answers were coded 0 to 4 (0=never happened, 1=once, 2=twice, 3=3-5 times, 4=6 or more times). All items measuring the dependent variables were added to create the score of dating violence: 0 means no experience and a higher score means more experience with dating violence. Each dependent variable was measured with selected items using factor analysis. Therefore the U.S. sample and the Korean sample have a possibility that they will have different number of items to measure the same dependent variable.

² The response rate was calculated by comparing a total of number of completed surveys to the number of distributed surveys in the classrooms in Korea.

Perpetration of physical violence in Korea was measured by a 9-item scale (see Appendix A, odd numbered items F1-F17), with scores of 0 to 32 (alpha = .857). Perpetration of psychological abuse was measured by 6 items. It included items on actions taken by the respondent against a dating partner: “I threatened to hit or throw something”, “I prevented my partner from seeing family or friend”, “I insulted or swore at my partner”, “I accused my partner of being a lousy lover”, “I called my partner bad names” and “I shouted or yelled at my partner.” (refer to F19, F21, F27, F29, F31, F33 in the Appendix A). The scale scores ranged from 0 to 24, with a moderate alpha coefficient of .652.

Victimization by physical violence was measured by 9 items. The items included descriptions of the partner’s behavior such as “my partner threw something that could hurt”, “twisted my arm or hair”, “kicked me”, “slapped me”, “pushed or shoved me”, “punched or hit me with hand or an object”, “choked me”, “slammed me against a wall” and “grabbed me” (refer to even number items from F2 to F18 in the Appendix A). Reliability of selected item is .878. The scores of victimization by physical violence ranged from 0 to 36.

Victimization by psychological abuse was measured using selected 6 items by factor analysis. The items included partner’s behaviors such as “my partner prevented me from seeing family or friend”, “insisted on knowing my whereabouts all the time”, “insulted or swore at me”, “insisted on knowing who I was talking to on the phone”, “insulted or swore at me”, “accused me of being a lousy lover” and “shouted or yelled at me” (refer to F22, F24, F26, F28, F30, F34 in the Appendix A). Reliability of selected item is .762. The scores of victimization by psychological abuse ranged from 0 to 20.

Perpetration of physical violence in the U.S. sample was measured by 9 items (odd numbered items F1-F17). Reliability of 9 questions is .864. All 8 questions were added up to

create a scale of perpetration of physical violence. The score is 0 to 32. Perpetration of psychological abuse was measured by 6 items. It included these behaviors that the respondent reported against their partner “I insulted or swore at my partner”, “I accused my partner of being a lousy lover”, “I called my partner bad names” and “I shouted or yelled at my partner.” (refer to F19, F25, F27, F29, F31, F33 in the Appendix). The alpha value is high ($\alpha=.818$). The score of perpetration of psychological abuse ranged from 0 to 24.

Victimization by physical violence was measured by 9 items. The items included descriptions of the partner’s behavior such as “my partner threw something that could hurt”, “twisted my arm or hair”, “kicked me”, “slapped me”, “pushed or shoved me”, “punched or hit me with hand or an object”, “choked me” and “slammed me against a wall” (refer to even numbered items from F2 to F18 in the Appendix A). Reliability of selected items is .845. The score of victimization by physical ranged from 0 to 36.

Victimization by psychological abuse was measured using 6 items. The items included partner’s behaviors such as “my partner prevented me from seeing family or friend”, “insisted on knowing me whereabouts all the time”, “insulted or swore at me”, “insisted on knowing who I was talking to on the phone”, “insulted or swore at me”, “my partner called me bad names” and “shouted or yelled at me” (refer to F22, F24, F26, F28, F30, F32 in the Appendix A). Reliability of selected items is .800. The score of victimization by psychological abuse ranged from 0 to 24.

All of the dependent variables were measured also for a full model including both U.S. and Korea samples. Items to measure each dependent variable were selected using factor analysis. Finally, nine items for perpetration of physical violence (Appendix A: F1-17 odd numbers), seven items for perpetration of psychological abuse (Appendix A: F19, F21, F25, F27, F29, F31, F33), nine items for victimization by physical violence (Appendix A: F2-F18 even numbers) and

seven items for victimization by psychological abuse (Appendix A: F20, F22, F26, F28, F30, F32, F34) were selected to measure dependent variables of the full model.

Independent Variables

Experience of violence in the family in childhood

It is important to measure exposure to violence during childhood, both witnessing violence between parents and experiencing violence as a victim, because research on the intergenerational transmission of violence has shown that there may be differential effects of witnessing violence versus directly experiencing violence (Stith et al., 2000). The measure of child abuse was created from 12 items of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus et al., 1996) to indicate whether a respondent had ever experienced any abusive incidents at the hands of a parent, guardian, or other caretaker. Students were asked to respond with “had not experienced” or “had experienced” childhood abuse by parents, stepparents or guardians on actions such as: throw something at you that could hurt you, push, grab or shove, pull your hair, slap or hit you, kick or bite, choke or attempt to drown you, hit with some object, punish you with a belt, board, cord, or hit you so hard that it left bruises or marks.

Although the 12 items for child abuse have been shown to make up a reliable and valid scale in most research there is a problem of using a scale without checking to see if it is reliable for the study sample. I conducted factor analysis for each sample and found the alpha values to be low in both samples. Therefore, as the result, direct experience of violence by Korean students was measured using 9 items selected by factor analysis among 12 Revised CTS items that were found to have acceptable alpha levels (refer to Appendix A:b1, b2, b3, b4, b5, b6, b7, b9,b10). Reliability of selected item for child abuse in Korea is high ($\alpha=.812$). The score ranged from 0 to 9 because responses for each question were coded dichotomously. U.S. students' direct experience with child abuse was measured by 7 items selected by factor analysis

(refer to Appendix A: b1, b2, b3, b4, b7, b9, b10). Reliability of the selected item for child abuse in the U.S. is very acceptable ($\alpha=.787$). The scores of direct experience of child abuse in the U.S. ranged from 0 to 8 because responses to the questions were coded as dichotomous responses. An 8-item scale of child abuse was recreated for the full model with both the Korean and American samples with an alpha value of .768 (Appendix A: b 1, b2, b3, b4, b5, b8, b9, b10). The score of direct experience of child abuse ranged from 0 to 7.

Indirect experience of violence was measured by father's violence against mother, and mother's violence against father. Respondents were asked whether they had ever witnessed the father hit the mother or whether they had ever witnessed the mother hit the father in childhood (see Appendix A: B13,B14). Each question was dichotomous variable coded 0 and 1 (0=no, 1=yes). The indirect experience of violence was measured with the same questions for the Korean, U.S. and full model.

Self-control

Self-control was measured by a 23-item scale identical to that utilized by Grasmick et al. (1993)³. This reflects the unidimensionality of self-control proposed by Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990). As a result of factor analysis for 23 items, alpha value of self-control for Korean sample is .871, and for American sample is .902. The items measured included impulsivity, preference for simple tasks, risk-seeking, physical activities, self-centeredness, and temper (see items H1 to H23 in Appendix). Respondents were presented with items on each of these dimensions (e.g., "I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think", "Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it") and asked to respond with one of the following: strongly agree, agree, disagree

³ This 23 items of self-control could not reflect Hirschi's (2004) reconceptualization of self-control. In addition, some studies, for example (Piqueor & Bouffard, 2007) have included risky sexual behavior as a measurement of self-control, this study used only Grasmick et al.'s (1993) self-control measurement. Risky sexual behavior were used as a control variable separately in this study.

or strongly disagree (coded from 1 to 4). The scores were added together to create a scale of self-control. Lower scores indicated lower self-control.

The analysis also tested the separate effects of each of the six dimensions of self-control as was done by Kerley et al. (2008). Using factor analysis and reliability test, all six dimensions have each scale⁴. However, the test result of six dimensions will not be reported mainly in this study since only temper dimension showed the significance⁵.

Attachment to parents

Attachment to others as a social bond was measured using two categories: attachment to mothers and attachment to fathers. To measure attachment to mothers and fathers, respondents were presented with 4 items (see items I1 to I 4 for attachment to mothers, I5 to I8 for attachment to fathers in Appendix A). The items include “How often do you trust your mom/female guardian?”, “How often do you feel you can talk to her about your problem?”, “How often do you think she is genuinely interested in you?”, and “How often do you feel that she supports you?” Response categories offered were never, sometimes, half of the time, usually, and always

⁴ Alpha value for Korean sample is: impulsivity =.716, simple tasks=.788, risk-taking =.803, physical activities=.719, self-centered=.782, temper=.744, alpha value for American sample is: impulsivity=.760, simple tasks=.803, risk-taking =.788, physical activities=.793, self-centered=.806, temper=.817

⁵ The analysis also tested the separate effects of each of the six dimensions of self-control as was done by Kerley et al. (2008). Using factor analysis and reliability test, all six dimensions each scale⁵. Impulsivity was measured using 4 items. Examples of questions are “I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think”, “I don’t devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future” (for impulsivity, see Appendix A: H1 to H4). Simple task preference was measured using 4 items such as “I frequently try to avoid projects that I know will be difficult”, “when things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw” (see Appendix A: H5 to H8). Risk-seeking was measured using 4 items such as “I like to test my-self every now and then by doing something a little risky”, “excitement and adventure are more important to me than security” (for risk- seeking, see Appendix A: H9 to H12). Preference for physical activities was measured using 3 items such as “if I had a choice, I would almost always rather do something physical than something mental”, “I like go out and do things more than I like to read or contemplate ideas” (for physical activities, see Appendix A: H13 to H15). Self-centeredness was measured using 4 items such as “I am not very sympathetic to other people when they are having problems”, “if things I do upset people, it is their problem not mine” (for self-centeredness, see Appendix A: H16 to H19). Temper was measured using 4 items such as “I lose my temper pretty easily”, “when I have a disagreement with someone, it is usually hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset” (for temper, see Appendix A: H20 to 23).

(coded from 1 to 5). Finally, the scores were added together to create a scale for attachment to mother and father. Higher scores indicated higher attachment. Alpha value of attachment to mother for Korean sample is .863, and attachment to father for Korean sample is .902. And alpha value of attachment to mother for American sample is .865 and attachment to father for American sample is .776.

Control Variables

Gender was coded with males as 0 and females as 1. **Family Structure** was measured by asking the student respondents about the family in which they were raised, “lived with two biological parents,” “lived with single parent,” “lived with stepparents,” and “lived with others, such as adoptive parents or other relatives.” The variables are nominal and coded from 1 to 4 (1=two biological parents, 2=single parent, 3=stepparents, and 4=others. However, these variables were coded into dummy variables in OLS regressions. The reference group is “two biological parents.”

Age response categories were 1=18; 2=19; 3=20; 4=21; 5=22 or older, but the responses were coded as a continuous variable because the age of most of college students ranged from 18 to 22. **Extent of Dating Involvement** was measured by asking respondents their current relational status. Students were asked to select their current dating status from the following choices: not currently dating, occasionally dating, steady/exclusively dating, and other. “Other” included more serious status options such as engaged, married, and divorced and others. The reference group is “not currently dating.” Alpha value of Korean sample is .752, and American sample is .779.

However, in using the “not currently dating” as a reference group some issues arose: 1) having a dating partner is a necessary condition for dating partner; 2) it is possible that the students have had experience of dating violence in the past although they do not have “current

dating partner"; 3) it is unclear whether previous bad experience of dating led the students to discontinue dating someone. Due to these problems, it may be right to ask the relationship between whether they experienced dating violence with current dating partner. Unfortunately, the survey instrument could not reflect this concern. If the net effect of the seriousness of dating relationship was strong, I ran additional OLS regression models for only those students who have a current dating relationship as a solution for this problem. However, the result of analysis for this group of respondents that excluded those without current dating relationship showed no big difference Therefore, the previous results without exclusion will be reported mainly. Additional discussion will be Chapter 4.

Three questions were asked regarding **risky sexual behavior**, such as, age at first sexual intercourse, a total number of sexual partners, and a total number of sexual partners during the last three months. Students were asked to select their age at first sexual intercourse among choices of no sexual intercourse; 18 and more, 17, 16, 15, 14, and 13 or younger, and this question was also coded from 0 to 6. Also, students were asked the number of sexual partners so far and during last three months as separate questions. Students selected their answers from among no experience, 1 partner, 2 partners, 3 partners, 4 partners, 5 partners and 6 or more. That is, all three questions were rated on a scale from 0 to 6 and the three questions were added to create a scale of risky sexual behavior. The score of risky sexual behavior ranged from 0 to 18. A higher score means more risky sexual behavior. This scale was applied to the Korean, U.S. and full model equally.

Care should be taken in using the variable of risky sexual behavior as a control variable because it is possible to present a tautological issue in explaining deviant behavior (dating violence) by using deviant behavior. However, it is less of a tautological issue because we

excluded questions related to sexual behavior as dependent variables. Moreover, because previous literature (Gover et al., 2008) has shown deviant behavior's powerful effect on dating violence, it was left as a control variable in this study.

Living on campus is coded 0 and living off-campus is coded 1. Although the University of Florida provides residence halls for most of its students, Korean universities have traditionally provided a very limited number of residence halls. Unlike the U.S. student group, most students in Korea were expected to answer that they lived off-campus. Because most of Korea is composed of Asians (Koreans), the Korean sample was not tested for race's impact on dating violence. Only the U.S. sample included the **race/ethnicity** variable on OLS regression. Although race categories were white, Hispanic, black, Asian, and other (Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native), race was used as a dummy variable in the regression models. The reference group was white. The full model combining two data groups had a **country** variable instead of race. Korea was coded 0 and the U.S. was coded 1.

Data Analyses

SPSS was used in the data analysis. Descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, and means were used to provide information on the characteristics of the respondents. Also, simple correlations among independent variables and dependent variables were carried out (see Appendix C). Multivariate regression models were run to analyze the net effects of the independent variables on dating violence. They were run for the Korean and U.S. samples separately and were then compared across the two samples to assess which of the theoretical models showed similar or dissimilar effects in the two countries. The models tested were divided into full model, Korean model, and U.S. model. Each of the three models was tested using the

Logistic Regression and Ordinary Least Square (OLS) Regression model⁶. Because the data of the dependent variables were clustered lower score, logistic regression analysis also was tested for all three models. Logistic regressions were explored to find the difference between two groups that had 1) never experienced dating violence in the past year and 2) who had experienced dating violence in the past year. However the results indicate there were no significant differences overall between logistic regression results and OLS regression results. Therefore, the results of OLS regression will be reported mainly to provide a clear explanation of net effect and R-square. Only significant results of logistic regression will be reported in this dissertation. Tables of Logistics regression are located in Appendix.

OLS regressions examined main theoretical factors among all students including the two groups in each model (full, Korean, and U.S.) first. However, this regression included many respondents who have ever experienced the dating violence. It means that it is hard to test the significant factors that affect seriousness of perpetration and victimization of dating violence. In addition to the initial OLS regressions for the entire samples of each model, additional OLS regressions were run for students who had experienced perpetration of or victimization by dating violence. These additional subgroup regressions will lead to examining significant factors that affect seriousness of perpetration and victimization of dating violence considering only those who had experienced any dating violence. That is, it allows testing the models to see if they can account for variation in seriousness only among those who had engaged in or been the victim of violence, excluding those who scored zero on the scales. Moreover, it allows comparison of

⁶ Because the data of the dependent variables were clustered toward lower scores, Logistic Regression analysis also was used for all three models. Logistic regressions were explored to find the difference between two groups: those respondents that had never experienced dating violence in the past year and those who did experience dating violence in the past year. There were no significant differences overall between Logistic regression results and OLS regression results. However, results of OLS regression will be reported mainly to provide a clear explanation of net effect and R-square. Only significant differences will be reported because there were no noteworthy differences from OLS regression.

differences or similarities between overall models that includes those who scored zero on the scales and the group that scored higher on the scales. In addition, both samples will have the full, female, and male models to study gender effects using OLS regression once gender effect is found on the entire sample in each country. The analysis should show which set of theoretical variables apply in both societies, as well as for males and females, and which have the strongest effects⁷.

In addition to regression models, comparisons of regression coefficients will be tested for gender and country difference. Although the coefficient values obtained in each regression model allow checking the significant net relationship among independent variables, it is hard to compare the power of independent variables using b_i across models. Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle and Piquero (1998) provided the formula for a correct statistical test of effects in two samples. Using their formula (see below), I will explore the difference between two regression coefficients obtained for both male and female models and for U.S. and Korea models. The formula recommended by Paternoster et al. (1998) is as follows:

$$Z = \frac{b_1 - b_2}{\sqrt{SE b_1^2 + SE b_2^2}} \quad (3-1)$$

This will allow me to compare whether independently obtained coefficients are significantly different, both between female students versus male students, and between U.S. students versus Korean students. For instance, if the obtained coefficients of self-control effects on data violence in the Korean model is 1.54 with significant p-value, and the U.S. model has

⁷ Before testing OLS regression, three assumptions such as linearity, normality and independence of linear regression were tested. Although the data violated the normality, data transformation using natural log did not affect the result of regression model compared to using the original data without transformation. Therefore, the overall OLS regression will report the OLS regression models with original scales without natural log transformation.

1.79 for coefficient with significant p-value, the recommended formula will be used to decide whether the two coefficient values are significantly different or not.

CHAPTER 4 RESULTS

Korean Dating Violence

Descriptive Statistics for the Korean Sample

Table 4-1 presents the descriptive statistics for the Korean sample. The sample size of collected data is 1,399 students from Kyonggi University: 632 male (45.2%) and 767 female (54.8%) students participated in this survey. Among the participants, 202 students (14.4%) were 18 years of age, 322 students (23%) were 19, 245 students (17.5%) were 20, and 630 students (45%) were 21 years of age or older. Unlike students at the University of Florida, most students in Korea live off-campus as the university residence halls are usually either very small or not provided at all. Only 70 students (5%) in Kyonggi University lived in on-campus residence halls, almost 1,327 (95%) students lived off-campus. Nearly all students in the sample (1306, or 94.4%) answered that they were raised by two biological parents, 58 students (4.1%) stated that they were raised by single parents, 16 students (1.1%) were raised by stepparents and 19 students (1.4%) were raised by adoptive parents, other relatives and others. A total of 1,399 students responded to the survey question regarding current dating relationship status. Over half (50.7%) did not have a current dating partner at the time. The next largest group, 432 students (30.9%) answered they had a steady or exclusive dating partner. Roughly half that number, 211 students (15.1%) reported they were dating a partner occasionally. The balance (3.4 %) answered that they were engaged, married or divorced, or had other forms of dating. These 47 students were merged into “other” in the statistical analysis.

Three questions addressed risky sexual behavior such as age upon first sexual intercourse, a total of number of sexual partners and a total of number of sexual partners during the last three months. A majority (61.8 %) of students answered they had never had sexual intercourse in

response to the first question asking age upon first sexual intercourse, and nearly a third (28.1%) reported having had sexual intercourse at 18 years of age or older. 3 % had experienced sexual intercourse at the age of 17 and less than 5 % reported their first sexual intercourse took place when younger than 16. In response to the question regarding a total of number of sexual partners, almost 61% (849) of students answered they had never had sexual intercourse so far. Among 503 sexually active students, 173 reported only one sexual partner, 76 reported having two partners, 78 reported three partners, 51 reported four partners, 33 reported five partners and 92 reported six or more partners. Consistently, in response to the question of a total of number of sexual partners during the last three months, approximately two thirds (61.3%) answered they had never had sexual intercourse so far. 11 % answered they had not had sexual intercourse during the past three months. Among students reporting sexual activity in the past three months, 276 (19.7% of the total of sample) reported one partner, 28 students had two partners, and 26 students had three partners.

Child abuse was measured using 9 items, the scale of child abuse ranged from 0 to 9. Less than half of the survey group (610 students), had 0 score, meaning they had never experienced any abusive behavior by their parents in childhood, and the mean score was 1.52. In questions regarding parents' violence observed during childhood, 315 students (22.5%) answered they had witnessed their father's violence against their mother, and 118 students (8.4%) answered they had witnessed their mother's violence against the father.

Self-control was measured by a total of 23 items used by Grasmick et al. (1993). Students responded to a four answer scale (1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree) and a low score indicated low self-control. Self-control scores ranged from 23 to 115, and the mean score of self-control is 61.67. Attachment to parents was divided into two measures: attachment to mother

and attachment to father. The participants responded to four questions on a 5-point scale: (1) “how often do you trust your mother/female guardian?” (1=never; 5=always); the internal consistency of the scale was acceptable (alpha of attachment to mother = .863; alpha of attachment to father = .854). Scores of attachment to mother ranged from 4 to 24, and the mean score of attachment to mother is 16.63. Scores of attachment to father ranged from 4 to 24, and the mean score of attachment to father is 15.19.

The survey addressed four major forms of dating violence: perpetration of physical violence, perpetration of psychological abuse, victimization by physical violence and victimization by psychological abuse. Korean students were not frequently exposed to dating violence, yet the numbers who were involved in either perpetration of or victimization by dating violence are not insignificant. Perpetration of dating violence was measured using two forms. Perpetration of physical violence measures ranged from 0 to 32. The mean score of perpetration of physical violence was .63. The large majority, 1,153 students (85.4%) had not perpetrated physical violence against their partner in the past year, yet 197 students (14.5%) did perpetrate physical violence against their dating partner in the past year. Perpetration of psychological abuse measures ranged from 0 to 24, and the mean score of psychological abuse was 1.08. Roughly two thirds (64.9 %) of students had never perpetrated psychological abuse against their partner in the past year, and 416 students (29.7%) did perpetrate psychological abuse against their partner in the past year. Victimization by dating violence was also measured using two forms. Victimization by physical violence measures ranged from 0 to 36, and the mean score was .57. A not insignificant number of students (11.7%) reported experiencing physical violence by their partner in the past year. Victimization by psychological abuse measures ranged from 0 to 20, and the mean score of victimization by psychological abuse was 1.80. About a third (31.1 %)

of students were victimized by their dating partner in the past year. Consistently, scores of perpetration of and victimization by psychological abuse were higher than perpetration of and victimization by physical violence.

Results of Multivariate Analyses for the Korean Sample

The first step was to test the net effect of independent variables of the Korean sample. OLS regression analysis was run to examine the net effect of independent variables and covariates. Three social learning variables: direct experience of child abuse, witness of father's violence or witness of mother's violence, and low self-control, and two attachment variables were used as independent variables. Gender, age, family structure, current dating relationship, living on or off campus and risky sexual behavior were used as control variables. The results of perpetration of physical violence and perpetration of psychological abuse are explained separately.

Perpetration of physical and psychological dating violence

Table 4-2 shows the result of OLS regression of physical violence for the Korean sample. 1,304 students were used for OLS regression and non-perpetrators and perpetrators were not investigated as separate groups.

Overall, social learning theory and self-control theory were partly able to show predictive power regarding physical dating violence. Among three variables of social learning theory, only direct experience of child abuse showed significant influence on perpetration of physical violence. Those students who had ever been exposed to child abuse in childhood were more likely to be perpetrators than were other students ($b=.135$, $p=.00$). Low self-control was also significantly related to the higher likelihood of perpetration of physical violence ($b=-.037$, $p=.00$). All attachment variables failed to show a significant effect on physical violence. Age is another

significant factor on physical violence¹. Younger students were more likely to become involved in perpetration of physical violence than were older students ($b=-.133$, $p=.038$). Gender did not significantly account for the perpetration of physical violence. Although family structure failed to show a significant effect statistically under the criteria of p-value .05, being raised by other adoptive parents or relatives showed significant effect under .10. Students who were raised by adoptive parents or relatives were more likely to perpetrate physical violence against their dating partner compared to students who were raised by two biological parents ($b=1.118$, $p=.054$). Students engaged in risky sexual behavior were also more likely to be perpetrators than were students with lower scores in that area. As expected, having a dating partner increased the likelihood of perpetration of physical violence compared to students with no dating partner. Specifically, students having an occasional dating partner were more likely to become perpetrators of physical violence than students having no dating partner, and having a steady dating partner also was a significant predictor for the perpetration of physical violence. However, as mentioned earlier, obviously one has to be dating to have any dating violence; it is tautological to say that people who date have a greater chance of dating violence. Due to this tautological issue, an additional regression model was tested for students who reported a current dating relationship. Among 1,304 students, only 641 students were analyzed for the additional regression model to test net effect of dating seriousness on physical violence. Other variables used were identical to those used in the previous OLS regression model. The results of the subsample of students in a serious dating relationship, defined as engaged, married, or divorced, showed a significant positive effect on physical violence compared to those who reported having

¹ Age failed to show a significant impact in the logistic regression models.

an occasional dating partner ($b=1.38$, $p=.01$). However, there was no difference between students having a steady or exclusive dating partner and students having an occasional dating partner.

The OLS regression model of perpetration of psychological abuse (Table 4-2) shows similar net effects of independent variables with respect to physical violence. A total of 1,278 samples were used for this analysis. Only the direct experience of child abuse can offer a partial explanation for the perpetration of psychological abuse ($b=.163$, $p=.00$). Witnessing a father's violence against mother, or a mother's violence against father, as well as measures of attachment to mother, or attachment to father, all failed to show predictive powers in the identification of perpetration of psychological abuse. Low self-control is very significantly related to psychological abuse ($b=.041$, $p=.00$). As with the previous physical violence model, having a dating partner of any type increased the likelihood of being a perpetrator of psychological abuse, and risky sexual behavior plays a very significant role in predicting the perpetration of psychological abuse. Gender difference was found in measures of perpetration of psychological abuse. Females were more likely to perpetrate psychological abuse against their partners ($b=.361$, $p=.006$). Also, interestingly, age has a reverse effect on perpetration of psychological abuse compared to perpetration of physical violence. Unlike perpetration of physical abuse, which showed younger students were more likely to be a perpetrator, it was found that older students are more involved in perpetration of psychological abuse against their partner. Overall, R^2 is .151 and the model fits well. Risky sexual behavior also showed a significant effect on perpetration of psychological abuse ($b=.171$, $p=.00$). As expected, having a dating partner increased the likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse. Due to the tautological issues, the subsample of students having a dating partner was extracted to test the effect of dating seriousness on perpetration of psychological abuse. A total of 633 students were included in additional OLS

regression. Results failed to show a significant effect of the seriousness of a dating relationship on perpetration of psychological abuse.

In sum, perpetration among Korean students is significantly explained by direct experience of child abuse, self-control, age and having risky sexual behavior. Direct experience of child abuse, and risky sexual behavior are positively related to perpetration of physical violence and psychological abuse. Low self-control showed negative relationships with perpetration of physical violence and psychological abuse. Although the effects of age are found in both form of perpetration, the direction is reversed. Younger students were more likely to perpetrate physical violence against their dating partners, and older students were more likely to commit psychological abuse against their partners. Gender effects are found only in psychological abuse. Although both perpetration forms show the significance of dating relationships, the effect of being involved in a serious dating relationship (engaged, married or divorced) decreased or disappeared for the subsample, which selected only students having a dating partner currently. Attachment to parents and living on or off campus failed to show significance on perpetration of dating violence in the Korean sample.

Physical and psychological victimization by dating partners

A total sample of 1,308 respondents was used in the regression model of victimization by physical violence. Although the model fits well, the R^2 is relatively low ($R^2=.056$). On a limited basis, social learning theory and measures of self-control show significant predictive power regarding victimization by physical violence (see Table 4-3). Attachment to mother, attachment to father, and witness of parents' violence against their partners failed to show predictive power with respect to victimization by physical violence. Those students who had experienced child abuse by their parents were more likely to be victimized by physical violence than others ($b=.104$, $p=.005$). Those students who had lower scores on self-control were more likely to be

victimized by physical violence than others ($b=-.033$, $p=.000$). Nor was there found any effect of gender², age, family structure, and risky sexual behavior. However, living on-campus increased the likelihood of being a victim by physical violence ($b=-.787$, $p=.014$). Although having a steady or exclusive dating partner bore a significant relationship to being a victim by physical violence, having an occasional dating partner revealed no effect on victimization by physical violence. Due to the tautological issue inherent in comparisons between students without a dating partner and students having a dating partner, the seriousness of the dating relationship was tested additionally after selecting students who had a current dating partner. Neither having a steady or exclusive dating partner nor having more serious attachments such as engaged, married, or divorced showed a significant effect on victimization by physical violence compared to students having only an occasional dating partner.

Table 4-3 also presents the results of the OLS regression model in predicting victimization by psychological abuse. 1,275 samples were used for this analysis. Direct experience of child abuse by parents and low self-control scores consistently showed predictive power on victimization by psychological abuse. More students abused by parents in childhood were more likely to be victimized ($b=.199$, $p=.00$). Students having lower self-control were more likely to be victims of psychological abuse ($b=.056$, $p=.00$). Conversely, indirect experience of family violence, such as witnessing the father's or mother's violence, and insecure attachment to parents did not show a significant effect to predict victimization by psychological abuse. Although family structure cannot show a net effect under critical area .05 of p-value, being raised by single parents showed a significant effect under critical area .10 of p-value. Students who were raised

²Although OLS regression of victimization by physical violence failed to find a gender effect, logistic regression of victimization by physical violence in Korea found a significant gender effect. Being female increased the odds of being a victim by 71%.

by single parents were more likely to be victimized by psychological dating violence than students who were raised by two biological parents ($b=.884$, $p=.062$). Other covariates show very significant net effect on victimization by psychological abuse. Gender, age, involvement in dating, living off-campus, and risky sexual behavior are very useful predictive factors of victimization by psychological abuse. Females were more likely to report higher victimization by psychological abuse ($b=.820$, $p=.00$)³. Similar to the previous perpetration model of psychological abuse, older students showed higher victimization by psychological abuse ($b=.265$, $p=.003$). Also, students living on-campus were more exposed to psychological abuse by their partners than students who lived off-campus ($b=-.373$, $p=.003$). Risky sexual behavior is a very positive factor of victimization by psychological abuse ($b=.221$, $p=.00$). Having any dating partner, whether occasional or steady or exclusive increased the likelihood of being a victim by psychological abuse. Due to the tautological issue inherent in comparisons between students without a dating partner and students having a dating partner, the seriousness of the dating relationship was tested additionally after selecting students who had a current dating partner .A total of 627 students had a current dating partner in the Korean sample, the seriousness of the relationship failed to show a significant effect. Neither having a steady or exclusive dating partner nor having more serious attachments such as engaged, married, or divorced showed a significant effect on victimization by physical violence compared to students having only an occasional dating partner.

In sum, among three variables of social learning theory, direct experience of child abuse showed a significant effect on victimization by dating violence in Korea. Low self-control was also very significant to predict both victimizations by physical violence and psychological abuse.

³ In Logistic Regression of victimization by psychological abuse , being female increased the odds of victimization by psychological abuse by 65%.

Although age, sex, and being raised by single parents did not show the significance on victimization by physical violence, all variables were significant in the victimization by psychological abuse. The effect of seriousness of dating relationship disappeared after excluding students who did not have a dating partner. The results have reported the net effects of independent variables on perpetration and victimization by dating violence among Korean students regardless to exposure of dating violence in the past year.

Perpetration of physical and psychological dating violence: the subgroup of perpetrators only

The result of next analysis shows the effects independent variables only among subsample of students who had experience dating violence, excluding students in score “0” on dating violence.

Further regression analyses were run to test the net effect of dating violence for students who had ever been exposed to dating violence. Because there are two forms of physical violence and psychological abuse to measure the dating violence in this dissertation, each group of perpetrators of physical violence and perpetrators of psychological abuse was selected separately. Using OLS regression, this analysis found the significant factors to predict the perpetration among perpetrators of dating violence.

Table 4-4 shows the OLS regression result selected only for perpetrators of physical violence. Among the entire sample of 1,399, only 193 students perpetrated physical violence against their partner in the past year. This is the model of perpetration of physical violence among physical perpetrators. R^2 is .174 and model is very significantly fit.

Social learning variables, including direct child abuse experience, witness of parents' violence, attachment to parent, gender, family structures in which students were raised, and risky sexual behavior were not related to perpetration of physical violence. Among those students who

had committed physical violence against their partners, low self-control, age, and serious dating involvement were revealed as significant factors of level of dating violence. That is, students with low self-control were more likely perpetrators of dating violence ($b=-.108$, $p=.015$). Younger students were more frequently (seriously) to be perpetrators of physical violence than older students ($b=-.727$, $p=.032$). Also, reporting the “other” dating format such as engaged, married, or divorced, was a very significant factor in predicting the perpetration of physical violence. This analysis also has a tautological issue of the variable of dating involvement. Due to the tautological issue inherent in comparisons between students without a dating partner and students having a dating partner, the seriousness of the dating relationship was tested additionally after selecting students who had a current dating partner. A total of 140 students had a current dating partner in the Korean subsample of physical violence perpetrators, the seriousness of the relationship failed to show a significant effect. Those students having a serious dating involvement such as engaged, married, or divorced were more likely to perpetrate physical violence against their dating partner compared to students having only an occasional dating partner. However, there was no difference between the group having a steady or exclusive dating partner and the group having an occasional dating partner⁴.

Perpetration of psychological abuse was also tested. Table 4-4 shows the results of perpetration of psychological abuse by a psychological abuser. Among the entire sample, 400 students reported perpetration of psychological abuse against their partner in the past year. This is the model of perpetration of psychological violence among psychological perpetrators. R^2 is .169 and model fits well. In cases of perpetration of psychological abuse, more variables

⁴ In addition, age effect disappeared after selected students who have a dating partner currently. Only self-control and having serious dating involvement are significant under .05. However, the effect of direct experience of child abuse ($b=.420$, $p=.075$) and family structure (being raised by adoptive parents or relatives) ($b=6.57$, $p=.071$) increased the level of statistical significance.

contribute to predict the perpetration. In the perpetrator group of psychological abusers, direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, single parent upbringing, occasional dating, and “other” dating status (such as engaged, married, or divorced), and living off-campus showed significant net effects. Indirect experience of violence, attachment, gender, age, risky sexual behavior all failed to show significance. If students reported more experience of child abuse by parents in childhood, they were more likely to be perpetrators ($b=.199$, $p=.006$). Low self-control significantly increased the likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse ($b=-.079$, $p=.000$). Students who were raised by single parents were more exposed to perpetration of psychological abuse compared to students who were raised by two biological parents ($b=1.770$, $p=.009$). However, other family structures were not significant. Also, students living off-campus were more likely to be perpetrators of psychological abuse ($b=-1.161$, $p=.022$). In terms of dating involvement, having an occasional dating partner or other involvement such as engaged, married, or divorced increased the perpetration of psychological abuse compared to having no dating partner. No difference was found between having a steady or exclusive dating partner and not having a dating partner. Due to the tautological issue inherent in comparisons between students without a dating partner and students having a dating partner, the seriousness of the dating relationship was tested additionally after selecting students who had a current dating partner. A total of 271 students had a current dating partner in the Korean subsample of psychological abuse perpetrators, the seriousness of dating relationship showed a significant effect when comparing students who had an occasional dating partner to students who had other forms of attachment such as engaged, married, or divorced. That is, more serious dating relationships increased the likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse among perpetrators of

psychological abuse in Korea. However, the standardized coefficients (beta) decreased in the subsample model compared to the entire sample.

Victimization by physical and psychological dating violence: the subgroup of victims only

Further regression analyses were run to test the net effect of dating violence for students who had ever been exposed to victimization by dating violence. Because there are two forms of physical violence and psychological abuse to measure dating violence in this dissertation, each group of victims of physical violence and victims of psychological abuse was selected separately. Using OLS regression, this analysis was run to find the predictive factors of victimization among victims of dating violence.

Table 4-5 shows the OLS regression result selected only for victims of physical violence. Among the entire sample, 158 students were victimized physically by their partner in the past year. Victimization models show a similar pattern to the previous perpetrator models. This is the model of victimization by physical violence among victims by physical violence. Goodness of fit has significant score, and R^2 is .20. Theoretical factors failed to explain the victimization by physical violence under .05 of p-value. Only reporting “other” format of dating ($b=8.019$, $p=.001$) or on-campus living ($b=-5.030$, $p=.013$) had a significant net effect on victimization by physical violence under .05. However, direct experience of child abuse ($b=.395$, $p=.082$), low self-control ($b=-.089$, $p=.090$) and gender ($b=-1.737$, $b=.085$) are moderately significant under .10 criteria of p-value. The direct experience of child abuse influenced positively for physical victimization among victims. Low self-control influenced negatively for physical victimization among victims of physical violence. Being male increased the likelihood of victimization by physical violence among victims of physical violence. According to the results, reporting “other” dating status such as engaged, married, or divorced increased the likelihood of being a victim by physical violence. However, it also required additional analysis to solve tautological issues. Due

to the tautological issue inherent in comparisons between students without a dating partner and students having a dating partner, the seriousness of the dating relationship was tested additionally after selecting students who had a current dating partner. A total of 110 students had a current dating partner in the Korean subsample of physical violence victims. The seriousness of the dating relationship showed significant effect when comparing students who had an occasional dating partner to students who reported “other” relationships such as engaged, married, or divorced ($b=8.629$, $p=.001$)⁵. However, the standardized coefficients (beta) decreased in the subsample model compared to the entire sample.

Table 4-5 also shows the OLS regression result selected only for victims of psychological abuse. A total of 419 samples were used in this regression model. This is the model of victimization by psychological abuse among victims by psychological abuse R^2 is .147 and goodness of fit of this model is significant ($F=4.342$, $p=.000$). Victimization by psychological abuse is explained in part by social learning theory and in part by attachment theory and self-control. Those students who were abused in childhood were more likely to be victims of psychological abuse ($b=.208$, $p=.045$). Students with low self-control were more likely to be victims compared to those who reported higher self-control ($b=-.061$, $p=.022$). Although attachment to mother failed to provide a significant explanation, an unsecure attachment to father was significantly predictive of victimization by psychological abuse among victims of psychological abuse ($b=-.134$, $p=.024$). That is, those students who formed an unsecure attachment to the father were more likely to be victims than were other students having a higher score on attachment to the father. In addition to these independent variables, sex, dating

⁵ This regression model rather increased the significance of direct experience of child abuse ($b=.561$, $p=.063$) and self-control ($b=.213$, $p=.008$) as decreased the gender effect ($b=-.398$, $p=.742$) and living on or off-campus ($b=-4.325$, $p=.086$).

involvement, and risky sexual behavior are significant factors. Females were more likely to be victims in the victim group ($b=.992$, $p=.030$). Students having higher scores on risky sexual behavior were more involved in victimization by psychological abuse. Having a steady or exclusive dating partner or having another dating form such as engaged, married, or divorced affect victimization by psychological abuse compared to students having no dating partner. It is a similar pattern to the previous physical violence victimization model showing that students in serious relationships were exposed to serious victimization by physical violence. Once students become involved in more serious relationships beyond occasional dating, it is hard to discontinue the relationship even when their partner is violent or abusive.

Due to the tautological issue inherent in comparisons between students without a dating partner and students having a dating partner, the seriousness of the dating relationship was tested additionally after selecting students who had a current dating partner. A total of 289 students had a current dating partner in Korean subsample of psychological abuse victims. Either having a steady/exclusive dating partner or have other format such as engaged, married, or divorced failed to show a significant effect on victimization by psychological abuse compared to students having an occasional dating partner⁶.

We have tested the separated models for perpetrators and victims as excluding students who have not experienced dating violence. Obviously, there are some similarities and differences between the entire sample and subsamples of perpetrators and victims. In cases of perpetration of physical violence, low self-control, engaging in risky sexual behavior and younger age are common significant factors between the entire sample and the subsample of physical

⁶This model rather decreased the effect of direct effect of child abuse, attachment to father. Those two variables were not significant in this model. However, family structure showed the significant effect on victimization by psychological abuse among psychological victims when we selected only students who have a dating partner. Being raised by stepparents increased the odds of victimization by psychological abuse compared to being raised by two biological parents ($b=3.414$, $p=.056$).

perpetrators. However, direct experiences of child abuse, risky sexual behavior were not found to have significant effect in the group of perpetrators of physical violence. In cases of perpetration of psychological abuse, gender, risky sexual behavior and age explained differently, and direct experience of child abuse, self-control, being raised by single parents explained similarly perpetration of psychological abuse. Although previous entire model reported that being female, older students, engaging in risky sexual behavior increased the likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse, all three variables failed to show the significance in the model of perpetrators of psychological abuse.

Victimization models also have similarities and differences between the entire student sample and the subsample of perpetrators and victims. Direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, and living on-campus were significantly related to victimization by physical violence commonly in both samples. However, the victimization model among victims of physical violence lost the net effect of risky sexual behavior. On the other hand, the victimization model of physical victims showed the significant effect of gender. Male students were more likely to be a victim than females among victims of physical violence. In cases of victimization by psychological abuse, there is an interesting finding. The victim model among victims of psychological abuse found the effect of unsecure attachment to father. Child abuse, self-control, being female and risky sexual behavior commonly showed the influence on victimization by psychological abuse.

In sum, part of social learning theory (especially direct experience of child abuse) and self-control theory have provided significant explanations for the perpetration of and victimization by dating violence. However, attachment theory was supported by only victims of psychological abuse. Although all Korean models did not have gender effect on dating violence, some models

indicated the net effect of gender group. Next section will explore how they are different using the separated gender group.

Dating Violence by Gender in Korea

Gender effect was found in the perpetration of psychological abuse and victimization by psychological abuse for the entire sample, and victimization by psychological abuse for the victim group.

First, Table 4-16 is showing the separated gender group for perpetration of psychological abuse in Korea. The male perpetration model of psychological abuse correlated to direct experience of child abuse, attachment to mother, low self-control, having a serious dating partner, and risky sexual behavior. Interestingly, among male students, unsecure attachment to the mother was related to perpetration of psychological abuse. For female students, direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, having a serious dating partner and risky sexual behavior were as significant as they were to the male group. However, female students who were raised by single parents were more likely to become involved in perpetration of psychological abuse than were female students who were raised by two biological parents.

Second, Table 4-16 is showing the separated gender group for victimization by psychological abuse in Korea. The result of victimization by psychological abuse also showed gender effect. Predictive factors of male victimization by psychological abuse were direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, having a dating partner, and risky sexual behavior. Also, male students who were raised by single parents were more likely to be victimized compared to male students who were raised by two biological parents. The female victimization model of psychological abuse had different significant factors such as self-control and age in addition to common factors such as having a serious dating partner and risky sexual behavior. Whereas the male victimization model of psychological abuse was not affected by age, the

female's age was a predictive factor. Older female students were more likely to report victimization by psychological abuse. This might be related to the dating experience. As having a serious dating partner is significantly related to victimization, older female students might be exposed to more experiences of serious dating relationships compared to younger female students. Experience of child abuse was not a significant factor to be related to victimization by psychological abuse.

Third, Table 4-18 is showing the separated gender group for victimization by psychological abuse among victim group in Korea. The victimization by psychological abuse among students who had ever been victimized by their partner showed gender difference. Male victim group members were significantly predicted by direct experience of child abuse, as well as by serious dating relationships such as being engaged, married or divorced, or engaging in risky sexual behavior. Low self-control was never a factor for male victims of psychological abuse. However, female victims were defined by low self-control and risky sexual behavior. Unlike the male victim group, neither direct experience of child abuse nor reported dating involvement was significantly related to the model of female victims of psychological abuse.

I have investigated the perpetration and victimization of dating violence for Korean samples so far. In brief, Korean dating violence, theoretically, is explained by part of social learning and self-control. In particular, direct experience of child abuse and low self-control are very significant factors to explain the perpetration and victimization of dating violence. Female students are more likely to be a perpetrator and victim. And male students are less likely to perpetrate physical violence compared to female students. Younger students showed the tendency to get involved in physical violence either as a perpetrator or a victim, and older students showed the tendency to get involved in psychological violence. Although living on or

off campus was a meaningful variables, it is open to question due to small number of students who stay at residency halls in Korea university.

Now I will look at the same variables and conduct a similar statistical analysis for the American sample. Race variables will be examined in the American models.

American Dating Violence

Descriptive Statistics for the American Sample

Table 4-6 presents descriptive statistics for the U.S. sample. Of the total sample, 1,337 in the University of Florida, 41 were coded as missing value leaving the number of usable questionnaires as 1296. There were 446 male (34.4%) and 850 female respondents (65.6%). Among them, 64.7 % students were White, non-Hispanic; 182 (14%) were White, Hispanic; 168 (13 %) were black; 4.8 % were Asian, less than 1 % were Pacific Islander or American Indian / Alaskan Native; and 1.8 % of students' races were not known. Pacific Islander, American Indian/ Alaskan Native and other or unknown races will be shown as the "others" variable on the following results. In the sample group, 488 students (37.3%) lived in residence halls at the university and 808 students (62.3%) lived off-campus.

The distribution by class was, 449 (34.6%) freshmen, 302 (23.3%) sophomores, 314 (24.2 %) juniors, and 228 (17.6 %) seniors. The age distribution was very similar to the class distribution. 18 year-olds numbered 444 (34.3 %), 25.5 % were 19 years old, 18.6 % were 20 years old and 278 (21.5 %) were 21 years old and older.

A slight majority (39.5 %) of students did not have any dating partner at the time; 236 students (18.2%) reported an occasional dating partner, 490 students (37.8%) had a steady or exclusive dating partner. 58 students reported their dating status as engaged, married or divorced. The most common family structure in which the students were raised was an intact family with two biological parents: 977 students, or 75.4%, reported growing up in such a household, and

190 students (14.7 %) answered they were raised by a single parent. A smaller group of 101 students (7.8 %) were raised by a parent and a stepparent, and 28 students (2.2 %) were raised by adoptive parents or other relatives.

Three questions were posed to measure risky sexual behavior: the subject's age at the first sexual experience, a total of number of sexual partners so far, and the total number of sexual partners during the past three months.

Over one third of the respondents (464 students, or 36.6 %) did not have any previous experience of sexual intercourse, 286 students (22.6 %) had experienced sexual intercourse by 18 years of age, a smaller group (16.4%) reported sexual intercourse by 17 years, and 13.3 % of students reported sexual intercourse by 16 years age. Of the youngest group, 73 students (5.8%) identified their ages upon the first sexual experience as 15, 48 students (3.8%) were 14, and 19 students (1.5%) were 13 or younger. For the question of total number of sexual partner so far, consistently, about one third of students (461) answered they have not experienced sexual intercourse so far. About one-fifth, or 285 students, have had one partner, 136 students (10.5 %) have had two partners, 95 students (7.3%) have had three partners, 71 students (5.5%) have had four partners, 51 students (3.9%) have had five partners, 161 students (12.4%) have had six or more partners. Within the past three months, 602 students have had sexual intercourse, 529 students (40.9%) have had one sexual partner for past three months, and 79 students (6.1%) have had two sexual partners. Students who have had more than three sexual partners during the past three months are less than 5 %.

Child abuse was measured using seven items, the scale of child abuse measures ranged from 0 to 7. Less than half (544 students, or 42.5%) received a 0 score, meaning that they answered that they had never experienced any abusive behavior by their parents in childhood,

and the mean score was 1.50. Regarding questions about a parent's violence, 85 students (6.6%) answered that they had watched a father's violence against a mother, and 98 students (7.6%) stated they had witnessed a mother's violence against a father.

Self-control was measured by a total of 23 items used by Grasmick et al. (1993). Students responded to questions according to a four answer scale (1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree) and a low score indicated low self-control. The score of self-control measure ranged from 23 to 115, and the mean score of self-control is 68.43. Attachment to parents was divided into two measures: attachment to mother and attachment to father. To measure attachment to parents, participants responded to four questions on a 5-point scale: (1) "how often do you trust your mother/female guardian?" (1 = never; 5 = always). Internal consistency of the scale was acceptable (alpha of attachment to mother = .865; alpha of attachment to father = .776). Scores of attachment to mother ranged from 4 to 24, and the mean score of attachment to mother is 17.79. Scores of attachment to father ranged from 4 to 24, and the mean score of attachment to father is 16.27.

Four major forms of dating violence were measured in questions in this study. They were perpetration of physical violence, perpetration of psychological abuse, victimization by physical violence and victimization by psychological abuse. The numbers of subjects who were exposed to perpetration of or victimization by dating violence are not insignificant. Perpetration of dating violence was measured using two forms. Perpetration of physical violence measure ranged from 0 to 36. The mean score of perpetration of physical violence is 1.25. Among the 1,192 valid samples, 895 students (75.1%) had never perpetrated violence against their partner in the past year, and 297 students (24.9%) have perpetrated physical violence by their dating partner in the past year. Perpetration of psychological abuse measures ranged from 0 to 24, and the mean score

of psychological abuse 3.83. Almost half of the respondents (537 students, or 47%) had never perpetrated psychological abuse against their partners in the past year, and just over half, 605 students (53 %) have perpetrated psychological abuse against their partner in the past year. Victimization by dating violence was also measured using two forms. Victimization by physical violence measures ranged from 0 to 36, and the mean score is .89. Some 226 students (18.9%) experienced physical violence by their partner in the past year. Victimization by psychological abuse measures ranged from 0 to 24, and the mean score of victimization by psychological abuse is 3.04. Under half (45.6 %) of students reported psychological victimization by their dating partner in the past year. Consistently, scores of perpetration and victimization by psychological abuse are higher than perpetration and victimization by physical violence.

Results of Multivariate Analysis for the American Sample

The result of multivariate analysis for the American sample will be reported similarly to the result of Korean sample. The first step was to test the net effect of independent variables of the Korean sample. OLS regression analysis was run to examine the net effect of independent variables and covariates. Three social learning variables such as direct experience of child abuse, witness of father's violence, witness of mother's violence, self-control, and two attachment variables were used as independent variables. Gender, age, family structure, current dating relationship, living on or off campus and risky sexual behavior were used as control variables. Additionally, the race variable was inserted for the U.S. analysis.

Like to Korean result of six-dimensionality of self-control, only "temper" was significantly related to four dependent variables in the U.S. Therefore, the result of six-dimensionality of self-control is not reported in dissertation as supporting for unidimensionality of self-control.

The result of perpetration of physical violence and perpetration of psychological abuse are explained separately.

Perpetration of physical and psychological dating violence

Table 4-7 shows the result of OLS regression of physical violence for American sample. A total of 1,158 samples were run to explore the net effect among variables of perpetration of physical violence, and it was not been investigated separately for non-perpetrators and perpetrators.

Direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, gender, race, dating involvement and risky sexual behavior were related to perpetration of physical violence in the U.S. Those students who had higher scores on child abuse experiences have shown higher scores on perpetration of physical violence than lower score students, and the relationship is statistically very significant($b=.208$, $p=.001$). Other social learning variables such as witnessing of father's violence and mother's violence did not show any significant relationship. However, consistently, low self-control played a significant role in predicting perpetration of physical violence ($b=-.068$, $p=.000$). Unlike previous studies that have reported that males were more likely to be a perpetrator, females were more likely to be a perpetrator in physical violence ($b=1.258$, $p=.000$)⁷. Compared to white students, black students were more likely to become engaged in perpetration of physical violence ($b=.742$, $p=.029$).⁸ This result is consistent with previous studies that reported a higher rate of perpetration of African American students (Makepeace, 1987; O'Keefe, 1997). Risky sexual behavior is a very significant factor to predict perpetration of physical violence ($b=.124$, $p=.000$). Although having an occasional dating partner did not explain the differences with those who reported no dating at all, more serious relationships such as steady or exclusive dating, and other relationships such as engaged, married, or divorced, were very

⁷ According to the logistic regression result of perpetration of physical violence, being female increased the odds by 150% than being male.

⁸ The result of logistic regression of perpetration of physical violence failed to show a significant race effect.

predictive for physical violence. That is, those students in serious dating relationships were more likely to perpetrate physical violence against their partner compared to other students who reported having no dating partner in the past year. However, the problem of the tautological issue required additional analysis that included only students who reported a current dating partner. Among 1,158 students, 670 students were selected for additional analysis, and it allowed testing whether or not the current dating relationship was related to past experience of dating violence. The result indicated that all significant factors were identical to the entire sample. Moreover, it showed that having a steady or exclusive dating partner increased the likelihood of perpetration of physical violence compared to having an occasional dating partner ($b=.688$, $p=.052$). Other dating formats such as engaged, married, or divorced showed a significant effect on perpetration of physical violence ($b=1.353$, $p=.049$). However, the standardized coefficients (beta) decreased in the subsample model compared to the entire sample.

This pattern was similarly found in perpetration of psychological abuse. Table 4-7 also shows the result of perpetration of psychological abuse for the U.S. sample. 1,111 samples were used for this model. Overall, direct experience of child abuse, self-control, gender, family structure, dating involvement and risky sexual behavior showed significant predictability. Those students who had experienced child abuse in childhood ($b=.389$, $p=.000$) were more likely to perpetrate their partner psychologically. Students with low self-control were more likely to be a perpetrator of psychological abuse compared to students with higher self-control ($b=-.086$, $p=.000$). Unlike previous research, however, including the perpetration of physical violence studied in the previous model, females were more likely to be perpetrators of psychological abuse against their dating partners ($b=.1636$, $p=.000$)⁹. Higher scores on risky sexual behavior

⁹The result of logistic regression indicated that being females increased the odds of perpetration of psychological abuse by 98% compared to being male.

are a very significant factor ($b=.382$, $p=.000$), and having a steady /exclusive ($b=1.781$, $p=.000$) or more serious dating relationship ($b=2.573$, $p=.000$) also increases the likelihood of being a perpetrator of psychological abuse. Although the family structure showed relatively weak relations statistically, those who were raised under stepparents were more likely to be a perpetrator than others who were raised under two biological parents ($b=.951$, $b=-.084$). Attachment to parents, race¹⁰, and the structure of family upbringing, and living on-campus were not factors related to being a perpetrator of psychological abuse. Goodness of fit of this model is very significant and the R^2 is .233. However, this model also requires additional analysis due to tautological issue of dating involvement. Additionally 681 students who had a dating partner were selected. The OLS regression indicated that having a steady/exclusive dating partner ($b=1.107$, $p=.013$) and/or having other format of dating ($b=1.980$, $p=.018$) increased the likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse compared to having an occasional dating partner. However, the standardized coefficients (beta) decreased in subsample model compared to the one of entire sample.

Although this study investigated the perpetration into two formats, the results indicate that the significant factors on perpetration is similar in the U.S. Direct experience of child abuse and low self-control showed significant power as theoretical variables, and other variables such as witness of inter-parental violence or attachment to parents failed to show the predictive power on perpetration of dating violence. Also, both models reported females were more likely to perpetrate violence against their partner either physically or psychologically, and engaging in risky sexual behavior was related to perpetration of both forms of dating violence. Significant

¹⁰ Although OLS regression of perpetration of psychological abuse failed to show the race difference, logistic regression of perpetration of psychological abuse reported that Hispanic students are less likely to perpetrate psychologically than white students.

differences between physical perpetration and psychological perpetration were the factors of race and family structure. The model of physical perpetration indicated that black students were more likely to be a perpetrator of physical violence than white students; however, the race difference was not found at OLS regression of psychological perpetration. In addition, being raised under stepparents influenced an increase in the likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse, but not for perpetration of physical violence.

Now I will look at the same variables and conduct a similar statistical analysis for victimization model of dating violence in the U.S.

Physical and psychological victimization by dating partner

Similarly, victimization by dating violence is explained by two forms of dating violence. Physical victimization and psychological victimization asked separately, and OLS regressions were run to find net effects on victimization by dating violence. The result of OLS regression showing here has not been investigated separately for non-victims and victims.

Table 4-8 shows the result of OLS regression of victimization by physical violence. Overall 1,161 samples were used for OLS regression, goodness of fit ($F=6.828$, $p=000$) and R^2 is moderate (.107). The result of victimization by physical violence reported that direct experience of child abuse, self-control, gender, race, risky sexual behavior and dating involvement are significant factor to predict the victimization by physical violence. Direct experience of child abuse showed the positive relation to victimization by physical violence, and very significant ($b=.188$, $p=.001$). Self-control showed the negative relation to victimization by physical violence. That is, students who had lower self-control were more likely to be a victim by physical dating violence than other students who had higher self-control ($b=-.041$, $b=.000$).

Although gender effect ($b=.334$, $p=.078$) is not strongly predictable statistically, still it showed the positive relationship to victimization by physical violence. Female students were more likely

to be a victim of physical dating violence than male students ($b=334$, $p=.078$)¹¹. In cases of victimization by physical abuse, members of the “other” race category (which includes Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native and other) were more likely to be victimized by physical violence compared to white students($b=1.118$, $p=.043$). Students engaged in risky sexual behavior were more likely to be victims of physical violence, and the Beta value (.156) of risky sexual behavior was the largest among the significant variables in this model. Having a serious relationship such as a steady or exclusive dating partner significantly increased the likelihood of victimization by physical violence, and other forms of relationships such as being engaged, married, or divorced sharply increased the likelihood of being a victim compared to having no dating partner.

Due to the tautological issue inherent in comparisons between students without a dating partner and students having a dating partner, the seriousness of the dating relationship was tested additionally after selecting students who had a current dating partner. A total of 701 students had a current dating partner in the U.S. subsample of physical dating violence victims. Having other format such as engaged, married, or divorced increase the likelihood of victimization by physical violence compared to having an occasional dating partner($b=1.396$, $p=.019$). However, or having a steady/exclusive dating partner failed to show the significant effect on victimization by psychological abuse compared to students having an occasional dating partner. Overall, the standardized coefficients (beta) decreased in subsample model compared to the one of entire sample. Moreover, gender effect and race effect (other variable) that has shown in OLS regression of entire sample disappeared in this subsample model.

¹¹ The result of logistic regression failed to find gender and race difference on victimization by physical violence.

The psychological victimization shows similar results to physical victimization (Table 4-8). A total of 1,118 samples were analyzed for the model of psychological victimization in the U.S. Model fit is good ($F=13.329$, $p=.000$), and R^2 is .195. The result of victimization by psychological victimization reports that indirect experience of child abuse, low self-control, gender, risky sexual behavior and dating involvement were related to psychological victimization. Indirect violence learning from parents, attachment to parents, age, race, family structure, and living on or off campus did not affect the likelihood of victimization by psychological abuse. Beta value (.326) of risky sexual behavior was largest among the significant variables in this model.

Students who had experienced more direct child abuse in childhood were more likely to be a victim of psychological dating violence ($b=.296$, $p=.000$). Lower self-control increased the likelihood of being a victim by psychological abuse ($b=-.056$, $p=.000$). Gender effect was also significant. Female students were more likely to be victimized than male students psychologically by their dating partner ($b=.720$, $p=.011$)¹². Engaging in risky sexual behaviors ($b=.383$, $p=.000$) significantly predicted victimization by psychological abuse. Also, dating involvement is a significant factor to predict victimization by psychological abuse. However, repeatedly, due to the tautological issue inherent in comparisons between students without a dating partner and students having a dating partner, the seriousness of the dating relationship was tested additionally after selecting students who had a current dating partner. A total of 686 students had a current dating partner in the Korean subsample of psychological abuse victims. Either having a steady or exclusive dating partner or having another format such as engaged,

¹²The result of logistic regression is that being female increased the odds by 58%. Also, the OLS regression failed to show the race difference, logistic regression finds that Hispanic students are less likely to be a victim of psychological abuse by their dating partner.

married, or divorced failed to show a significant effect on victimization by psychological abuse compared to students having an occasional dating partner¹³.

In sum, victimization models for the entire sample showed very significant results. Direct experience of child abuse in social learning theory and low self-control in self-control theory showed the very significant relationship to victimization in physical and psychological abuse. Gender effect was additionally significant in victimization by dating violence. Females were more likely to be victimized by their partner. The results of the subsample for students who had a dating partner indicated that serious dating relationships affected victimization. Overall R^2 has not changed a lot for the additional regression, however, the standardized coefficients (beta) decreased in the subsample model compared to the entire sample.

The results of perpetration and victimization by dating violence in the U.S. were not investigated separately for non-perpetrators and perpetrators, or for non-victims and victims. The next section will investigate the models of dating violence for perpetrators and victims. The following section will report the results of experience-specific models. For example, perpetration of physical violence was tested for perpetrators of physical violence, and victimization by physical violence was tested for victims of physical abuse.

Perpetration of physical and psychological violence: the subgroup of perpetrators only

To determine significant factors among perpetrator groups, students who had ever perpetrated abuse against their partners were selected. Table 4-9 shows the results of the subsample of perpetrators of physical violence in the U.S. Among 228 students who had ever perpetrated physical abuse against their partner, only low self-control was seen to affect

¹³ Additional result of OLS regression for subsample showed the influence of family structure. Being raised by adoptive parents or relatives increased the odds of being a victim by psychological abuse compared to being raised by two biological parents among students how have a dating partner.

perpetration of physical abuse as a theoretical variable ($b=-.174$, $b=.000$). All three variables of social learning failed to predict the perpetration of physical violence statistically. However, direct experience of child abuse and attachment to father showed moderate predictable power under .10 criteria of p-value. Direct experience of child abuse showed a positive relation to perpetrators of physical violence ($b=.360$, $p=.062$). Attachment to father showed a negative relation to perpetrator of physical violence ($b=-.147$, $p=.074$). Unsecure attachment to father increased the likelihood of perpetration of physical violence among physical perpetrators. We rather found that gender ($b=2.940$, $p=.001$), race ($b=2.160$, $p=.039$), and risky sexual behavior ($b=.223$, $p=.015$) were more significant factors among perpetrator groups. That is, students having higher scores on risky sexual behavior and older students were more likely to engage in perpetration of physical violence. Females were significantly more likely to engage in perpetration of physical violence compared to male students, and black students were more likely to be perpetrators compared to white students. Although previous OLS regression for the entire sample showed that having a serious dating partner was a significant factor, the variable was not significant among physical perpetrators. The most significant factor among those variables was low self-control, and the Beta value is .276. None of the other factors including witness of inter-parental violence, age, family structure or living on or off –campus affected perpetration of physical violence for physical perpetrators. Overall model has good fit ($F=3.791$, $p=.000$) and R^2 is relatively high ($R^2=.221$).

The perpetrator of psychological abuse also shows similar patterns to the perpetrator of physical violence. Table 4-9 also shows the results of perpetration of psychological abuse among psychological perpetrators. There was a relatively high number ($N=591$) of perpetration of psychological abuse than physical perpetrators. Direct experience of child abuse, low self-

control, gender, race, and risky sexual behavior influenced the perpetration of psychological abuse for perpetrators of psychological dating violence. Among students who had ever perpetrated psychological abuse against their partners, those students who had experienced direct violence by parents in childhood ($b=.446$, $p=.000$), and had low self-control ($b=-.107$, $p=.000$), increased the likelihood of perpetration. Females ($b=1.393$, $p=.003$) were more frequently perpetrators of psychological abuse against their partners, and risky sexual behavior ($b=.301$, $p=.000$) is still highly correlated to perpetration of psychological abuse. The interesting different factor is the effect of the “other” racial variable. Although black students showed stronger net effect on physical assault results, the “other” race category (including Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native and other) ($b=.096$, $p=.017$) was more involved in perpetration of psychological abuse than were white students. None of the other variables, including attachment to parents, witnessing inter-parental violence, age, family structure, dating involvement or living on or off-campus affected perpetration of physical violence among physical perpetrators. Overall model has good fit ($F=.5.593$, $p=.000$) and R^2 is .164.

This section showed the results of perpetration of dating violence for perpetrators. Theoretical factors such as direct experience of child abuse and low self-control showed a commonly significant effect on perpetration of dating violence in both physical violence and psychological abuse. Female students were more likely to perpetrate physically and psychologically than male students. Risky sexual behavior was also a significant factor for both forms of perpetration. Unsecure attachment to father was the significant effect for physical perpetrators, but not for psychological abusers. Although race difference was varied by the form of perpetration, white students were less likely to be a perpetrator than Hispanic (physical violence) and the “other” racial group (psychological abuse). Interestingly, dating involvement

was not significant for both models. In addition, although additional OLS regression was tested for students who did have a current dating partner, due to the tautological issue, the result failed to report a significant effect of the seriousness of the dating relationship.

The following section will cover the results conducted on the subsample which included only students who had ever experienced victimization by dating violence.

Victimization by physical and psychological violence: the subgroup of victims only

Table 4-10 shows the OLS regression result selected only for victims of physical violence. Within the U.S. study group, 218 students reported suffering physical violence by their dating partner. Low self-control, attachment to father, family structure and risky sexual behavior showed significant predictive power for victimization by physical violence among victims of physical violence. Among them, risky sexual behavior ($b=.263$, $p=.000$) most increased the likelihood of victimization by physical violence. Interestingly, the social learning variable lost the power to predict. Self-control and some part of attachment theory showed a significant relationship with victimization by physical violence. Among 218 students, lower self-control ($b=-.107$, $p=.042$) and insecure attachment to the father ($b=-.190$, $p=.042$) affected victimization by physical violence. However, attachment to mother, gender, age, race, family structure, and living on-campus did not show significant relationships with victimization by physical violence. Although p-value is slightly high ($p=.058$), students who were raised by single parents were more victimized than those raised by two biological parents. Overall model has good fit ($F=2.397$, $p=.01$) and R^2 is relatively high ($R^2=.196$).

Table 4-10 also shows the result of victimization by psychological abuse among victims of psychological abuse. Of the U.S. study group, 511 students reported that they were victims of psychological abuse. Low self-control ($b=-.056$, $p=.014$) and risky sexual behavior ($b=.330$, $p=.000$) were significantly predictive for victimization by psychological abuse. Although p-value

of attachment to father is slightly higher than .05, it showed negative relation to psychological victimization for victims of psychological abuse ($b=-.106$, $p=.057$). Other variables such as direct experience of child abuse, witness of inter-parental violence, attachment to mother, gender, age, race, family structure, living on or off- campus and dating involvement did not play a significant role in the model of victimization by psychological abuse among the subsample of psychological abuse. Overall model has good fit ($F=3.683$, $p=.000$) and R^2 is moderate ($R^2=.129$).

In addition, although additional OLS regression was tested for students who did have a current dating partner, due to the tautological issue, the results failed to report a significant effect of the seriousness of a dating relationship.

In sum, victimization by the subsample who had experienced dating violence showed different results compared to the entire student group. Low self-control, unsecure attachment to father, and highly risky sexual behavior all increased the likelihood to be a victim by psychological abuse among students who were ever victimized by psychological abuse by their dating partner. Direct experience of child abuse failed show a significant effect in both victimization models, nor was gender effect found among victims. Moreover, unlike previous the victimization model for the entire sample, subsample results reported that dating involvement did not affect physical or psychological victimization even among the additional group in a current dating relationship.

Although the net effect of gender was not found very frequently, five models of American sample indicated the gender effect on dating violence. The next section will investigate how differently or similarly dating violence is explained by gender in American sample based on the previous model that indicated gender effects.

Dating Violence by Gender in the U.S.

Gender effect was found in the perpetration of physical violence, perpetration of psychological abuse and victimization by psychological abuse for the entire model. Also, gender effect was found for the students group for at least 1 point on dating violence perpetration both in physical violence and psychological abuse.

Table 4-19 shows the result of for perpetration of physical violence by gender group in the U.S. According to the male group for the entire sample, the father's violence against the mother was a significant factor in explaining the perpetration of physical violence. Self-control was also very significant, hence, those who had lower self-control were more likely to be a perpetrator of physical violence. Those students raised by adoptive parents or relatives were more likely to be involved in perpetration of physical violence than those raised by two biological parents, and being engaged, married or divorced increased the likelihood of perpetration of physical violence. Also, members of the "other" racial group (including Pacific Islander, Native Indian and Alaska Natives) were more likely to become involved in physical violence. The female group showed slightly different patterns compared to the male group for perpetration of physical violence. Instead of the indirect violence experience of parents, direct experience of child abuse was a significant factor as was low self-control. Female students having a steady dating partner, living on-campus, or having high scores on risky sexual behavior were all more likely to be a perpetrator of physical violence. Black female students were more likely to become involved in perpetration of physical violence compared to white female students.

Table 4-20 shows the result of perpetration of psychological abuse by gender group. In the case of the male perpetration model of psychological abuse, instances of direct child abuse, low self-control, risky sexual behavior, or being black as a rule were factors more likely to predict psychological abuse against their dating partner. The female perpetration model of psychological

abuse showed similar predictable variables. Similar to the male model, direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, and risky sexual behavior played a significant role to predict perpetration of psychological abuse. In addition, unsecure attachment to the mother as well as having a steady dating partner, family structure and living on-campus were new predictable factors for the female perpetration model of psychological abuse. That is, those female students who formed unsecure attachments to the mother, had a steady or exclusive dating partner, or lived on-campus were more likely to be perpetrators of psychological abuse. Also, female students raised by stepparents were more likely to become perpetrators of psychological abuse compared to those raised by two biological parents. There was no racial difference.

The victimization model also showed gender differences (Table 4-21). In the case of victimization by psychological abuse, male groups were affected by direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, and risky sexual behavior. Also, black males were more likely to be victimized psychologically by their dating partner compared to white male students. In the female victimization model of psychological abuse, variables related to social learning could not explain the victimization. Rather, low self-control, having a steady or exclusive dating partner and engaging in risky sexual behavior were significantly related to female victimization by psychological abuse.

The gender difference was also found in student groups of perpetrators and victims. Table 4-22 shows the result of perpetration of physical violence among perpetrator group by gender. With regard to the male group of physical violence perpetrators, neither social learning variables nor self-control explained the relationship with perpetration of physical violence. Interestingly, only family structure and race could predict the perpetration of physical violence. Those students who were raised by adoptive parents or relatives were more often involved in perpetration of

physical violence. Asian male students were more likely to become involved in perpetration of physical violence compared to white male students. However, the female perpetrator group showed that direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, age, family structure, living on-campus, risky sexual behavior and race were significant factors to predict perpetration of physical abuse. Those who had direct experience of child abuse, lower scores on self-control, as well as older female students, black female students, female students who were raised by adoptive or relatives, lived on-campus, or had risky sexual behavior were all more likely to become involved in perpetration of physical violence.

Although the previous regression model for perpetrators and victims of psychological abuse shows the gender difference, the significant factors of perpetration of psychological abuse were direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, and risky sexual behavior in both females and males.

I have investigated the predictive factors of perpetration and victimization of dating violence in American society. In brief, unlike Korean model that indicated the age and living on-campus effect on dating violence, age and campus effect were not found in American samples. Social learning variables such as direct experience of child abuse and self-control are consistently significant factors for dating violence in the U.S. In addition, the effect of unsecure attachment to father was found among students who have ever experienced dating violence as a perpetrator or a victim, although it was not found among entire American students. Gender effect among American students was clearer than Korea students. Female students are more likely to perpetrate and to be victimized than male students in the U.S. There were partial race effects on dating violence in the U.S. Being a black student increased the likelihood of perpetration of physical violence compared to white student, and being a racial minority such as Pacific Islander

or native Indian increased the likelihood of victimization by physical violence and perpetration of psychological abuse among perpetrators. However the race effect is open to the question due to small numbers.

I have investigated the predictive factors of perpetration and victimization of dating violence in both societies separately so far. Now I will investigate net effect of independent variables in the full model using combined data. The analytical methods are identical to the previous separated country models, i.e., OLS regression for the entire group was run first and OLS regression for the subsample who had experienced dating violence was run later.

Full Model Results (including U.S. and Korea)

The following section reports the results of the full model. Korean and U.S. data were combined. The analytical methods are identical to the previous separated country models, i.e., OLS regression for the entire group was run first and OLS regression for the subsample who had experienced dating violence was run later. In addition, logistic regression for all students and OLS regression for students in a dating relationship were tested; however, OLS regression will be mainly reported and only significant differences of logistic regression will be reported. Scales of each of four dependent variables, child abuse, were re-created by factor analysis and other variables remained the same to previous OLS regression models. Instead of excluding the race variable, the country variable was added for full models.

Descriptive Statistics for the Full Sample

Table 4-11 presents the descriptive statistics for the combined full sample. The sample size of collected data is 2,695 students from Korea and the U.S: 1,399 Korean (51.1%) and 1,296 American (48.9%) students participated in this survey. Among them, 1,078 students were male (40%), and 1,617 students (60%) were female. Among the participants, 656 students (24.4%) were 18 years of age, 653 students (24.2%) were 19, 489 students (18%) were 20, and 908

students (33.7%) were 21 years of age or older. 554 students (20.6%) in the full model answered they lived in on-campus residence halls, almost 2,135 (79.2%) students lived off-campus. Nearly all students in the sample (2,283, or 84.7%) answered that they were raised by two biological parents, 248 students (9.2%) stated that they were raised by single parents, 117 students (4.3%) were raised by stepparents and 47 students (1.7%) were raised by adoptive parents, other relatives and others. A total of 2,695 students responded to the survey question regarding current dating relationship status. Near half (45.5%) did not have a current dating partner at the time. The next largest group, 992 students (34.2%) answered they had a steady or exclusive dating partner. 211 students (16.6%) reported they were dating a partner occasionally. The balance (3.9 %) answered that they were engaged, married or divorced, or had other forms of dating. These 105 students were merged into “other” in the statistical analysis.

Three questions addressed risky sexual behavior such as age upon first sexual intercourse, a total number of sexual partners and a total number of sexual partners during the last three months. The risky sexual behavior ranged from 0 to 18. Higher score meant more risky sexual behavior. Child abuse was measured using 8 items, the scale of child abuse ranged from 0 to 8. Less than half of the survey group, or 1,166 students, had a 0 score, meaning they had never experienced any abusive behavior by their parents in childhood, and the mean score was 1.39. In questions regarding parents’ violence observed during childhood, 400 students (14.95%) answered they had witnessed their father’s violence against their mother, and 216 students (8%) answered they had witnessed their mother’s violence against the father.

Self-control was measured by a total of 23 items used by Grasmick et al. (1993). Students responded to a four answer scale (1=strongly agree; 4=strongly disagree) and a low score indicated low self-control. Self-control scores ranged from 23 to 115, and the mean score of self-

control is 64.92. Attachment to parents was divided into two measures: attachment to mother and attachment to father. The participants responded to four questions on a 5-point scale: (1) "how often do you trust your mother/female guardian?" (1=never; 5= always). Scores of attachment to mother ranged from 4 to 24, and the mean score of attachment to mother is 17.19. Scores of attachment to father ranged from 4 to 24, and the mean score of attachment to father is 15.70.

The survey addressed four major forms of dating violence: perpetration of physical violence, perpetration of psychological abuse, victimization by physical violence and victimization by psychological abuse. Perpetration of dating violence was measured using two forms. Perpetration of physical violence measures ranged from 0 to 36. The mean score of perpetration of physical violence is .92. The large majority, 2,048 students (80.6%) had not perpetrated physical violence against their partner in the past year, yet 494 students (19.4%) did perpetrate physical violence against their dating partner in the past year. Perpetration of psychological abuse measures ranged from 0 to 28, and the mean score of psychological abuse 2.60. Roughly more than half (56.6 %) of student s had never perpetrated psychological abuse against their partner in the past year, and 1,066 students (43.4%) did perpetrated psychological abuse against their partner in the past year. Victimization by dating violence was also measured using two forms. Victimization by physical violence measures ranged from 0 to 36, and the mean score is .73. A not insignificant number of students (15.3%) reported experiencing physical violence by their partner in the past year. Victimization by psychological abuse measures ranged from 0 to 28, and the mean score of victimization by psychological abuse is 2.49. Less than half (40.8 %) of students were victimized by their dating partner in the past year. Consistently, scores

of perpetration of and victimization by psychological abuse are higher than perpetration of and victimization by physical violence.

Results of Multivariate Analyses for Full Model

Physical and psychological perpetration of dating violence in the full model

OLS regression analysis was run to find the net effects of variables among the entire student population from both groups regardless of the experience of dating violence. Among all students, regardless of their experience of perpetration or victimization by dating violence, this OLS regression will test significant factors that increase the likelihood of perpetration of or victimization by dating violence. Although logistic regression was run for full model, only significant difference will be reported.

Table 4-12 shows the result of perpetration of physical violence for combined full model. A total of 2,456 samples were used to test the perpetration of psychological abuse in the full model. Overall model fit is very significant ($F=16.886$) and $R^2=.105$. OLS results predicting the perpetration of physical violence show that direct experience, lower self-control, attachment to father, gender, a serious dating partner, and risky sexual behavior are commonly significant factors to predict perpetration of physical violence¹⁴. That is, more direct experience of child abuse increased the likelihood of being a physical perpetrator ($b=.192$, $p=.000$). Having more risky sexual behavior ($b=.100$, $p=.000$) and lower score of self-control ($b=-.052$, $p=.000$) are significantly predictive of a higher likelihood of perpetration of physical violence for both Korean and U.S. students. Unsecure attachment to father also affect perpetration of physical violence. Students who had lower score on attachment to father were more likely to perpetrate

¹⁴ According to our results of logistic regression of perpetration of dating violence, direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, gender, living in Korea versus living in the U.S., having a serious dating partner and risky sexual behavior are related to perpetration of dating violence for college students

their dating partner physically ($b=-.030$, $p=.048$). Females were more likely to be perpetrators against their dating partner of psychological abuse than are male students ($b=.704$, $p=.000$)¹⁵. U.S. students were more likely to be a perpetrator of physical violence than Korean students ($b=.459$, $p=.004$).¹⁶ In addition, interestingly, the full model combining both the Korean and U.S. group shows that the students who were raised by stepparents were more likely become involved in perpetration of physical violence compared to students who were raised by two biological parents ($b=.652$, $p=.037$). Although having a dating partner showed the significant effect on perpetration of physical violence compared to not having a dating partner, due to tautological issues, it required additional analysis. 1,332 students who had a dating partner were selected, and having an occasional dating partner is a reference group. Having other format of dating increased the likelihood of being a perpetrator of physical violence compared to having an occasional dating partner. Other variables such as witness of inter-parental violence, attachment to mother, age, and living on or off-campus failed to show the significant effect on perpetration of physical violence.

Perpetration of psychological abuse was tested similarly (Table 4-12). A total of 2,373 samples were used to test the perpetration of psychological abuse in the full model. Table 4-12 also shows the result of perpetration of psychological abuse in the full model. The variance explained by this model is 25.3% and model fits well ($F=46.95$).

OLS results predicting the perpetration by psychological abuse show more direct experience of child abuse, lower self-control, being female, being U.S. students, having a serious dating partner, and engaging in risky sexual behavior are related to perpetration of psychological

¹⁵ Logistic regression reported that being female increased the odds of perpetration of physical violence by 88.5%.

¹⁶ Logistic regression of physical perpetration reported that being U.S. student increased the odds of being a perpetrator of physical violence by 58.4%.

abuse. Students who experienced child abuse by parents were more likely to be a perpetrator of psychological dating violence ($b=.288$, $p=.000$). Lower self-control consistently showed significant power to explain the perpetration of psychological abuse ($b=-.068$, $p=.000$). Female students were more likely to perpetrate psychological abuse than male students ($b=1.148$, $p=.000$)¹⁷. Also, U.S. students were more likely to perpetrate psychological dating violence than Korean students ($b=2.144$, $p=.000$)¹⁸. In addition, being raised by stepparents increased the likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse compared to students raised by two biological parents. Witness of inter-parental violence, attachment to parents, age, and living on or off-campus was not significant factors. Although having a dating partner showed the significant effect on perpetration of physical violence compared to not having a dating partner, due to tautological issues, it required additional analysis. 1,301 students who had a dating partner were selected, and having an occasional dating partner is a reference group. Having other format of dating or steady/ exclusive dating partner increased the likelihood of being a perpetrator of psychological abuse compared to having an occasional dating partner in the subsample model.

Physical and psychological victimization by dating partner in the full model

Victimization by physical violence was tested similarly. A total of 2,463 samples were used to test the perpetration of physical abuse in the full model. Table 4-13 shows the result of victimization by physical violence in the full model. The variance explained by this model is 7.8% and model fits well ($F=12.123$).

OLS results predicting victimization by physical violence showed the direct experience of child abuse, lower self-control, having a serious dating partner, engaging in risky sexual

¹⁷ The factor of gender, especially among female students, increased the odds of being a perpetrator of psychological abuse by 76.5%.

¹⁸ The factor of country, especially among U.S. students, increased the odds of being a perpetrator of psychological abuse by 140%.

behavior, and country of residence were higher risk factors for being a victim. Students who had experienced abuse in childhood were more likely to be a victim by physical violence by their dating partner ($b=.164$, $p=.000$). Lower self-control influenced the likelihood of victimization by physical violence ($b=-.037$, $b=.039$). Country of residence also showed a significant effect on victimization by physical violence. Students in the U.S. were more likely to be victimized physically by their dating partner ($b=.377$, $p=.008$)¹⁹. Gender difference was not found in results on victimization by physical violence. However, an attachment effect was revealed. Attachment to the mother showed a negative relationship with victimization by physical violence ($b=-.037$, $p=.000$). That is, unsecured attachment to the mother affected victimization by physical violence. Although having a dating partner showed a significant effect on perpetration of physical violence compared to not having a dating partner, due to tautological issues, it required additional analysis. 1,337 students who had a dating partner were selected, and having an occasional dating partner was a reference group. Having “other” format of dating, such as engaged, married, or divorced, increased the likelihood of being a victim by physical violence compared to having an occasional dating partner. Other variables such as family structure, age, witness of inter-parental violence, or living on or off campus failed to show a significant effect on victimization by physical violence.

Victimization by psychological abuse was tested similarly. A total of 2,384 samples were used to test the victimization by psychological abuse in the full model. Table 4-13 shows the results of victimization by psychological abuse in the full model. Overall model fits well ($F=44.288$) and used variables predicted 24.1% variance of victimization by psychological abuse.

¹⁹ Country effect increased the odds of victimization by physical violence by 70%.

Victimization by psychological abuse showed results similar to the previous three variables of dating violence. Victimization by psychological abuse is predicted by child abuse, low self-control, gender, having a serious dating partner, being among the U.S. students group, and risky sexual behavior. Direct experience of child abuse showed a positive relation to victimization by psychological abuse ($b=.259$, $p=.000$), low self-control showed a negative relation to victimization by psychological abuse ($b=-.063$, $p=.00$). Country of residence was a very significant factor. Being among the U.S. students group increased the likelihood of victimization by psychological abuse over Korean students ($b=1.887$, $p=.000$)²⁰. Female students were more likely to be a victim by psychological abuse by their dating partner than were male students ($b=.865$, $p=.000$)²¹. In addition, family structure showed a significant relationship with victimization by psychological abuse. That is, students who were raised by stepparents were more likely to be a victim by psychological abuse than students who were raised by two biological parents ($b=1.024$, $p=.013$). Although having a dating partner showed a significant effect on victimization by psychological abuse compared to not having a dating partner, due to tautological issues, it required additional analysis. A total of 1,301 students who had a dating partner were selected, and having an occasional dating partner was used as a reference group. Reporting another form of dating (such as engaged, married, or divorced) increased the likelihood of being a victim by psychological abuse compared to having an occasional dating partner.

In sum, victimization models for the full model sample indicated that direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, country of residence, and risky sexual behavior were commonly

²⁰ Country effect, U.S. students, increased the odds of victimization by psychological abuse by 48%.

²¹ Gender effect, being female, increased the odds of victimization by psychological abuse by 63%.

significant in both forms of dating violence. Child abuse showed a positive relationship and low self-control showed a negative relationship with physical and psychological victimization. Unsecure attachment to mother was significant factor for victimization by physical violence, and gender effect found at only psychological victimization. Females were more likely to be victimized psychologically. In addition, being raised by stepparents also increased the likelihood of being a victim by psychological abuse compared to being raised by two biological parents.

The result of perpetration and victimization by dating violence using combined data has not been investigated separately for non-perpetrators and perpetrators, and non-victims and victims. Now the next section will investigate the models of dating violence for perpetrators and victims. The following section will report the result of experience-specific models. For example, perpetration of physical violence was tested for perpetrators of physical violence, and victimization by physical violence was tested for victims of physical abuse.

Perpetration of physical and psychological violence among perpetrators

To determine significant factors among perpetrator groups, the students who had ever perpetrated abuse against their partners were selected. Table 4-14 shows the results of the subsample of perpetrators of physical violence in the full model. Among 480 students who had ever perpetrated physical violence against their partner, the result shows that direct experience of child abuse, self –control, and attachment to father were seen to affect perpetration of physical violence as a theoretical variable. The variance explained by this model is 14.1% and model fits well ($F=4.475$).

Students who had experienced child abuse in childhood were more likely to be a perpetrator of physical violence ($b=.446$, $p=.000$). Lower self-control influenced on perpetration of physical violence among physical perpetrators ($b=-.144$, $b=.000$). Country of residence failed to show a significant effect on perpetration of physical violence among perpetrators. Gender

difference was found in results on perpetration of physical violence. Among perpetrators, females were more likely to perpetrate physical violence against their partners than were male students ($b=1.363$, $p=.019$). In addition, an attachment effect was revealed. Attachment to the father showed a negative relationship with victimization by physical violence ($b=-.116$, $p=.057$). That is, unsecured attachment to the father increased the likelihood of perpetration of physical violence. Although having a dating partner showed a significant effect on perpetration of physical violence compared to not having a dating partner, due to tautological issues, it required additional analysis. Only 367 students who had a dating partner were selected, and having an occasional dating partner was a reference group. Having other format of dating or steady or exclusive dating partner increased the likelihood of being a perpetrator of physical violence compared to having occasional dating partner. Other variables such as family structure, age, witness of inter-parental violence, living on or off campus and risky sexual behavior failed to show a significant effect on perpetration of physical violence among physical perpetrators.

OLS Regression analysis for the group of perpetrators of physical violence was run to find the significant factors for perpetrators of physical violence. Among the perpetrators of physical violence, the risk factors increasing the likelihood of perpetration of physical violence were child abuse experience, low self-control, gender, and having a serious dating partner. That is, among students who had ever perpetrated physical violence against their partner, more experience of direct child abuse increased the likelihood of being a perpetrator of physical violence. If students had lower self-control, they were more likely to be a perpetrator compared to students having higher self-control. Having a serious dating relationship also increased the likelihood compared to students having no dating partner. Also, females were more likely to be perpetrators than male students even among the perpetrator group. National factors failed to show the significance for

perpetration of dating violence for the group of perpetrators. Although it is not statistically strongly significant under .05, attachment to the father showed a negative relationship with perpetration of physical violence among the perpetrator group. Those students with unsecure attachment to the father were more likely to perpetrate physical violence against their dating partner ($p=.057$).

Table 4-14 shows the results for the subsample of perpetrators of psychological abuse in the full model. Among 1,030 students who had ever perpetrated psychological abuse against their partner, the results indicated that direct experience of child abuse, self –control, and country, gender, and risky sexual behavior were seen to affect perpetration of psychological abuse.

Students who had experienced child abuse in childhood were more likely to be a perpetrator of psychological abuse ($b=.364$, $p=.000$). Lower self-control influenced on perpetration of physical violence among physical perpetrators ($b=-.103$, $b=.000$). Country of residence showed a significant effect on perpetration of psychological abuse among perpetrators. U.S. students were more likely to perpetrate physical violence against their dating partner than were Korean students ($b=3.209$, $p=.000$). Gender difference was found in results on perpetration of psychological abuse. Among perpetrators, females were more likely to perpetrate their dating partner psychologically than male students ($b=.904$, $p=.002$). Higher risky sexual behavior was related to a higher likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse among psychological abusers ($b=8.24$, $p=.000$). Although having a dating partner showed a significant effect on perpetration of psychological abuse compared to not having a dating partner, due to tautological issues, it required additional analysis. Only 762 students who had a dating partner were selected, and having an occasional dating partner was a reference group. Having another format of dating

or a steady or exclusive dating partner increased the likelihood of being a perpetrator of psychological abuse compared to having an occasional dating partner. Other variables such as family structure, age, witness of inter-parental violence, living on or off campus and dating involvement failed to show significant effect on perpetration of psychological abuse among psychological perpetrators.

Although it showed similar results to the previous model of perpetration of physical violence, the national factor and risky sexual behavior showed a more significant relationship with perpetration of psychological abuse compared to that of having a serious dating partner. More direct experience of child abuse, lower self-control, being female, U.S. students, and engaging in risky sexual behavior were significantly related to perpetration of psychological abuse.

Victimization by physical and psychological dating violence among victims

Table 4-15 shows the results of the subsample of victims of physical violence in the full model. OLS regression for victimization by physical violence has 376 samples. The variance explained by this model is 11.2% and model fits well ($F=2.648$). Although it showed similar results to the previous model of perpetration of physical violence, OLS regression for victims of physical violence indicated that only child abuse, low self-control and having a serious dating partner affect victimization by physical violence. Among students who had ever experienced victimization by physical violence by their dating partner, students who had more experience of child abuse ($b=.410$, $p=.012$) were more likely to be victims than students with less experience of child abuse. Students with lower self-control were more likely to be victimized by physical violence by their partner. Having a more serious dating partner also increased the risk of victimization by physical violence. Like the previous model for the perpetrator of physical violence, the national factor failed to show significance. Although it is not statistically strongly

significant under .05, attachment to the father showed a negative relationship with perpetration of physical violence among victims of physical violence ($b=-.136$, $p=.061$). Those students with unsecure attachment to the father were more likely to be victim by their dating partners physically ($p=.061$). However, risky sexual behavior failed to show a significant effect on this model for victims. In addition, none of the other variables, including witness of inter-parental violence, attachment to mother, country, gender, age, family structure or living on or off-campus were related to victimization by physical violence for victims of physical violence in the full model.

Table 4-15 also shows the result of subsample of victims of psychological abuse in the full model. OLS regression for victimization by psychological violence has 974 samples. The variance explained by this model is 20.7% and model fits well ($F=14.660$). OLS regression for victims by psychological abuse indicated child abuse, low self-control, U.S. students, engaging in risky sexual behavior and having a serious dating partner affect victimization by psychological abuse. Among students who had ever been victimized by psychological abuse by their dating partner, direct experience of child abuse increased the likelihood compared to students with less experience of child abuse ($b=.340$, $p=.000$). Those students having lower self-control significantly increased the likelihood of victimization by psychological abuse than students with higher self-control ($b=-.086$, $p=.000$). Although it is not statistically strongly significant under .05, attachment to the father showed the negative relationship with victimization by psychological abuse among victims by psychological abuse. Those students with unsecure attachment to the father were more likely to be psychologically victimized by their dating partners ($b=-.066$, $p=.092$). Serious dating relationships increased the likelihood of victimization by psychological abuse over other dating formats. Students having higher scores on risky sexual

behavior were more likely to be a victim than other students with lower score on risky sexual behavior ($b=.285$, $p=.000$). Although gender difference was not found, national difference was found. U.S. students were more likely to be victims than Korean students ($b=.285$, $p=.000$). None of the other factors including witness of inter-parental violence, attachment to mother, gender, age, family structure, and living on or off-campus was significant to predict the victimization by psychological abuse for psychological dating violence victims in the full model.

I have investigated significant factors for full model so far. In short, the significance of direct experience of child abuse, self-control, and risky sexual behavior are consistent to separate U.S. and Korean models. Consistently, other variables of social learning such as witnessing of father's violence against mother, and witnessing of mother's violence against father failed the significance in the full models. Female students are more likely to get involved in dating violence than male students in the full mode. Unsecure attachment to father affect the perpetration of physical violence, perpetration of physical violence among perpetrators, and victimization by psychological abuse among victims by psychological abuse. Unsecure attachment mother influenced victimization by physical violence in the full model. Family structure also showed the significance in the psychological aspect of dating violence. Being raised by step parents increased the likelihood of perpetration and victimization by psychological abuse.

As mentioned earlier, country of residence was a significant factor to predict dating violence in the full model. If it is true that the country is a significant factor to explain dating violence in the full model, then, the next question will be "how differently the factors explain the dating violence." Unfortunately, although current OLS regression could explain the net effect of country, it is not allowed to compare the power of significant independent variables in both

countries. The next section will investigate how differently or similarly each significant factor explains dating violence in both countries. In addition, gender difference will be investigated as far as the net effect of gender has been found on the previous models in each country.

Coefficient Comparison

Paternoster et al. (1998) suggested a formula (see Equation 3-1) for two-sample comparison. It allows comparing whether independently obtained coefficients are significantly different. Using this formula, I will compare two countries to test how significant factors explain differently in each country. In addition, the recommended formula by Paternoster et al. (1998) will be used to compare gender difference. For comparison by country, regression coefficients obtained in the separate country models have been compared to find differences in the predictive power in each society. After running OLS regression in each country model for the entire student sample as well as the perpetrator and victims group, the commonly significant factor in each model were selected.

Comparison by Country

Perpetration of physical violence for the entire student model regardless of experience of dating violence had five common significant factors: direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, having a steady dating partner, having another dating partner format, and risky sexual behavior. Among them, only low self-control showed different predictive powers in each country. That is, low self-control had more predictive power on the perpetration of physical violence in the U.S. compared to its effect in Korea.

Although I conducted coefficient comparison tests for coefficients for U.S. scales and Korean scales using two sample t-test, it can be argued that it is a problem to use the formula for two scales that are not comprised of the same items. Most of scales of Korean and American samples have the same items, but one independent variable (child abuse) and one dependent

variable (victimization by psychological abuse) have different number of items. A private communication from one of authors of the article (Paternoster et al., 1998), Robert Brame indicates that the coefficient comparison in the case of scales with different items should not be made. Therefore, comparison results that included child abuse and victimization of psychological abuse will not be reported in this study. However, other variables with the same scale items will be discussed in this chapter.

Table 4-26 shows the significance of difference in OLS regression coefficients for Korean and American models. Perpetration of psychological abuse had six common factors: direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, gender, having a steady dating partner, having another format of dating, and risky sexual behavior. It is very interesting that all factors predicted differently in each society. Direct experience of child abuse is more predictive of the perpetration of psychological abuse in Korean society, however, the comparison is not valid due to different number of items in both countries. Lower self-control is more predictive of the perpetration of psychological abuse in U.S. society. Gender effect on perpetration of psychological abuse is larger in Korean society. Also, having a serious dating partner and engaging in risky sexual behavior proved a higher predictive power on the perpetration of psychological abuse in Korea than in the U.S.

Victimization by physical violence had four common factors: direct experience of child abuse, low self-control, having a steady dating partner, and having another format of dating. However, t-test result is not significant. This means all four factors explain the victimization by physical violence similarly in both societies.

Victimization by psychological abuse has commonly six significant factors in each country. Most of the factors failed to show different effects in each country, but risky sexual

behavior showed a significant difference in both countries. Students' risky sexual behavior affects victimization by psychological abuse among Korean students more so than among U.S. students. However, I had different number of item to measure victimization of psychological abuse in both samples, so this comparison may not be useful.

Perpetration of physical violence for the perpetrator group had two common factors. Low self-control on perpetration of physical violence among perpetrators played a similar role in both countries. However, direct experience of child abuse showed a stronger effect on the perpetration of physical violence among the Korean perpetrator group.

Victimization by psychological abuse among victims had two common factors, low self-control and risky sexual behavior. These factors failed, however, to show differences in results between the two countries.

Throughout this country comparison, the sharp different power of explanation of significant factors in each country is remarkable for perpetration of psychological abuse. The power of self-control is stronger in the U.S. and the power of social learning is stronger in Korea.

Comparison by Gender

Gender difference in Korea

Gender difference was found in the perpetration of psychological abuse and victimization by psychological abuse for the entire sample, and victimization by psychological abuse for the victim group. Table 4-24 shows the significance of difference in OLS regression coefficients for male and female models in Korea.

Child abuse was commonly found in both gender groups to predict perpetration of psychological abuse in Korea. However, it is hard to say the power of prediction is different (z-score=.0714). Victimization by psychological abuse has four common factors between male students and female students such as child abuse, self-control, having a steady dating partner and

risky sexual behavior. Interestingly, child abuse, self-control and risky sexual behavior are showing the significance of difference to predict the victimization by psychological abuse in both gender groups. Of course, these variables are very significant factors in both groups, the power of explanation is different. Whereas child abuse ($z=1.765$) and self-control($z=1.785$) were more powerful factor for male students to predict victimization by psychological abuse compared to female students, risky sexual behavior was more powerful predictors for female students to predict victimization by psychological abuse. The variable of risky sexual behavior was found as a common factor in the model of victimization by psychological abuse among victims, the power of explanation is not different in both gender groups.

Gender difference in the U.S.

While Korean gender differences are found only in the model of psychological abuse, the gender difference in the American samples are found in the both form of physical and psychological abuse. Five models showed the gender difference in previous OLS regression models; perpetration of physical violence, perpetration of psychological abuse, victimization by psychological abuse, perpetration of physical violence among perpetrators and perpetration of psychological abuse among perpetrators. Table 4-25 is showing the significance of difference in OLS regression coefficients for male and female models in the U.S. perpetration of physical violence has self-control commonly in both gender groups. Because the z-score (1.35) is below than 1.96, low self-control affect similarly perpetration of physical violence for male and female students. While, perpetration of psychological abuse and perpetration of psychological abuse among perpetrators have three variables as common factors equally (child abuse, self-control, and risky sexual behavior), different power of each variable was not found. That is, experience of child abuse in childhood, lower self-control, and higher risky sexual behavior similarly increased the likelihood of perpetration of psychological abuse for male and female students. Moreover,

victimization by psychological abuse also failed the different power of significant variable. Self-control was the common significant factor in male and female group, the t- test result improved no difference of the power of explanation. Only the model of perpetration of physical violence among perpetrators showed the gender difference in the U.S. models. The both gender groups have family structure (other format) as common factor to predict perpetration of physical violence among perpetrators. The effect of being raised by adoptive parents or relatives is more powerful to predict perpetration of physical violence (perpetrator group) among male students than female students. However, it needs to take the small number of students who were raised by adoptive parents and relatives into consideration. Then, there might be no factors that are explaining dating violence differently in the two gender group in the U.S.

Throughout this gender comparison, I found that Korean gender difference is remarkable at victimization by psychological abuse. To predict victimization by psychological abuse, the power of child abuse and self-control was notable for male students, and the power of risky sexual behavior is more notable for female students. Other models did not indicate the different power of significant factors by gender. However, it is very remarkable that there was no significant power difference by American gender groups. The theoretical factors that were applied to this dissertation did not showed the different power by gender group to explain dating violence. Although the reason has not discussed, the possible explanation of equality of explanation power by gender among American students is that most of criminological theories have been developed in western society. If the measure of criminological theories could reflect the cultural different for Eastern society, I expect that the result of Korean might not be different from American result.

Table 4-1. Descriptive statistics for the Korean sample

Variables	Mean	Median	Mode	Sd	Min	Max
<u>Dependent Variables</u>						
Perpetration of physical violence	.63	.00	.00	2.49	.00	32.00
Perpetration of psychological violence	1.08	.00	.00	2.36	.00	24.00
Victimization by physical violence	.57	.00	.00	2.50	.00	36.00
Victimization by psychological violence	1.80	.00	.00	3.62	.00	20.00
<u>Independent Variables</u>						
Victim of child abuse	1.52	1.00	.00	2.00	.00	9.00
Witnessed father's violence	.23	.00	.00	.42	.00	1.00
Witnessed mother's violence	.085	.00	.00	.28	.00	1.00
Self-Control scale	61.67	61.00	59.00	9.01	23.00	115.00
Attachment to mother	16.63	17.00	20.00	3.35	4.00	24.00
Attachment to father	15.19	16.00	20.00	4.21	4.00	24.00
<u>Control Variables</u>						
Sex	.55	1.00	1.00	.50	.00	1.00
Age	2.93	3.00	4.00	1.12	1.00	4.00
Class attending	2.14	2.00	1.00	1.05	1.00	5.00
Family structure	1.10	1.00	1.00	.45	1.00	4.00
Dating involvement	1.87	1.00	1.00	.97	1.00	4.00
Campus	.95	1.00	1.00	.22	.00	1.00
Risky sexual behavior	2.21	.00	.00	3.60	.00	18.00

N=1399

Table 4-2. OLS regression models for perpetration of physical violence (all students) in Korea

	Model A(perpetration of physical violence) N=1304			Model B(perpetration of psychological abuse) N=1278		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>						
Victim of child abuse	.135**	.107	.000	.163**	.139	.000
Witnessed father's violence	.082	.014	.648	.106	.019	.514
Witnessed mother's violence	.131	.014	.622	.055	.007	.816
Self-control scale	-.037**	-.117	.000	-.041**	-.142	.000
Attachment to mother	-.021	-.028	.398	-.039	-.056	.078
Attachment to father	-.008	-.013	.699	.006	.010	.753
<u>Control Variables</u>						
Sex	3.146	.029	.318	.361**	.077	.006
Age	-.133*	-.059	.038	.137*	.065	.018
Family structure†						
Single parents	-.028	-.081	.936	.754	.064	.015
Step parents	.706	1.106	.269	.349	.016	.541
Others	1.118	1.926	.054	.220	.011	.671
Dating involvement††						
Occasionally	.465**	.066	.020	.811**	.124	.000
Steady	.524**	.100	.001	.774**	.153	.000
Others	1.851**	.125	.000	1.240**	.092	.001
Campus	-.539	-.046	.090	-.492	-.011	.092
Risky sexual behavior	.056**	.079	.008	.114*	.171	.000
Constant	3.501**		.000	3.093**		.000
	F = 6.826			F = 13.985		
	p = .000			p = .000		
	$R^2 = .078$			$R^2 = .151$		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-3. OLS regression model for victimization by psychological abuse (all students) in Korea

	Model A(victimization by physical violence) N=1308			Model B (victimization by psychological abuse) N=1275		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>						
Victim of child abuse	.104**	.083	.005	.199**	.110	.000
Witnessed father's violence	-.074	-.012	.681	-.225	-.026	.364
Witnessed mother's violence	.188	.021	.481	.001	.000	.998
Self-control scale	-.033**	-.105	.000	-.056**	-.124	.000
Attachment to mother	-.037	-.049	.137	-.011	-.010	.742
Attachment to father	.000	-.001	.987	-.034	-.040	.211
<u>Control Variables</u>						
Sex	-.004	-.001	.981	.820**	.113	.000
Age	-.049	-.022	.444	.265**	.082	.003
Family structure†						
Single parents	.057	.004	.870	.884	.049	.062
Step parents	.957	.041	.870	1.290	.093	.138
Others	-.002	.000	.997	-.143	-.005	.856
Dating involvement††						
Occasionally	.277	.040	.165	1.175**	.116	.000
Steady	.455**	.084	.004	1.478**	.191	.000
Others	1.556**	.107	.000	.691	.033	.215
Campus	-.787*	-.068	.014	-.373**	.082	.003
Risky sexual behavior	.040	.057	.062	.221**	.217	.000
Constant	3.598**		.000	3.588**		.000
	F = 4.802 p = .000 $R^2 = .056$			F = 15.536 p = .000 $R^2 = .165$		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-4. OLS regression model for perpetration of physical violence and psychological abuse (subgroup of perpetrators only) in Korea

	Model A(perpetration of physical violence) N=193			Model B(perpetration of psychological abuse) N=400		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
Independent Variables						
Victim of child abuse	.295	.129	.107	.199**	.142	.006
Witnessed father's violence	-.043	-.004	.962	-.291	-.043	.425
Witnessed mother's violence	-.476	-.031	.690	.565	.056	.267
Self-control scale	-.108*	-.183	.015	-.079**	-.217	.000
Attachment to mother	-.013	-.009	.911	.000	.000	.998
Attachment to father	-.055	-.047	.580	-.018	-.024	.669
Control Variables						
Sex	-.242	-.023	.765	.321	.052	.307
Age	-.727*	-.161	.032	.110	.039	.432
Family structure†						
Single parents	.713	.029	.687	1.770**	.126	.009
Step parents	.498	.015	.833	1.042	.045	.357
Others	2.157	.060	.415	2.359	.077	.110
Dating involvement††						
Occasionally	-.171	-.015	.865	.916*	.120	.027
Steady	1.050	.100	.246	.665	.108	.052
Others	6.328**	.244	.001	3.321**	.186	.000
Campus	-2.092	-.094	.199	-1.616*	-.110	.022
Risky sexual behavior	-.078	-.057	.453	.061	.076	.153
Constant	14.93**		.000	8.20**		.000
	F = 2.312 p = .004 R^2 = .174			F = 4.874 p = .000 R^2 = .169		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-5. OLS regression model for victimization by physical violence and psychological abuse
(subgroup of victims only) in Korea

	Model A(victim of physical violence) N=158			Model B (victim of psychological abuse) N=419		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>						
Victim of child abuse	.395	.162	.082	.208*	.102	.045
Witnessed father's violence	-1.909	-.156	.102	-.693	-.068	.191
Witnessed mother's violence	-.802	-.049	.582	.257	.018	.728
Self-control scale	-.089	-.138	.090	-.061*	-.113	.022
Attachment to mother	-.032	-.022	.816	.016	.012	.820
Attachment to father	-.071	-.055	.557	-.134*	-.124	.024
<u>Control Variables</u>						
Sex	-1.737	-.150	.085	.992*	.111	.030
Age	-.185	-.037	.657	.317	.079	.106
Family structure†						
Single parents	2.305	.078	.323	1.618	.076	.108
Step parents	1.260	.039	.631.	1.387	.046	.335
Others	-2.694	-.065	.443	.420	.010	.825
Dating involvement‡‡						
Occasionally	-.609	-.045	.623	.538	.049	.364
Steady	.738	.065	.479	.971*	.110	.047
Others	8.019**	.271	.001	3.113*	.097	.046
Campus	-5.030*	-.206	.013	-1.463	-.067	.160
Risky sexual behavior	-.136	-.092	.289	.250**	.215	.000
Constant	17.498*		.000	8.863**		.000
*						
	F = 2.205			F = 4.342		
	p = .007			p = .000		
	R ² = .200			R ² = .147		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

‡‡reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-6. Descriptive statistics for the American sample

Variables	Mean	Median	Mode	Sd	Min	Max
Dependent Variables						
Perpetration of physical violence	1.25	.00	.00	3.67	.00	36.00
Perpetration of psychological violence	3.83	1.00	.00	5.22	.00	24.00
Victimization by physical violence	.89	.00	.00	3.03	.00	36.00
Victimization by psychological violence	3.04	.00	.00	4.73	.00	24.00
Independent Variables						
Victim of child abuse	1.50	1.00	.00	1.82	.00	7.00
Witnessed father's violence	.065	.00	.00	.24	.00	1.00
Witnessed mother's violence	.075	.00	.00	.26	.00	1.00
Self-control scale	68.43	68.00	68.00	10.77	23.00	115.00
Attachment to mother	17.79	19.00	20.00	3.23	4.00	24.00
Attachment to father	16.28	18.00	20.00	4.93	4.00	24.00
Control Variables						
Sex	.66	1.00	1.00	.47	.00	1.00
Age	2.28	2.00	1.00	1.53	1.00	4.00
Class attending	2.25	2.00	1.00	1.11	1.00	5.00
Family structure	1.36	1.00	1.00	.71	1.00	4.00
Dating involvement	2.07	2.00	1.00	.97	1.00	4.00
Campus	.62	1.00	1.00	.48	.00	1.00
Risky sexual behavior	4.09	1.00	1.00	4.07	.00	18.00

N=1296

Table 4-7. OLS regression models for perpetration of physical violence (all students) in the U.S.

	Model A(perpetration of physical violence) N=1158			Model B(perpetration of psychological abuse) N=1111		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>						
Victim of child abuse	.208**	.101	.001	.389**	.132	.000
Witnessed father's violence	.001	.000	.998	-.407	-.019	.534
Witnessed mother's violence	-.404	-.029	.367	.568	.029	.355
Self-control scale	-.068**	-.172	.000	-.086**	-.155	.000
Attachment to mother	.016	.013	.655	.045	.027	.355
Attachment to father	-.036	-.048	.125	-.034	-.030	.326
<u>Control Variables</u>						
Sex	1.25**	.160	.000	1.636**	.148	.000
Age	.053	.016	.618	.083	.018	.563
Race†						
Hispanic	.067	.006	.827	-.580	-.039	.162
Black	.742*	.066	.029	-.529	-.033	.248
Asian	.459	.027	.345	-.992	-.042	.127
Other	.912	.040	.155	.765	.024	.375
Family structure‡‡						
Single parents	.018	.002	.955	-.577	-.038	.191
Step parents	.531	.038	.186	.951	.047	.084
Others	-.163	-.006	.822	.392	.011	.690
Dating involvement†††						
Occasionally	.254	.026	.406	.670	.048	.108
Steady	.920**	.121	.000	1.781**	.167	.000
Others	1.692**	.089	.003	2.573**	.099	.000
Campus	-.368	-.048	.133	.256	.024	.441
Risky sexual behavior	.124**	.133	.000	.382**	.294	.000
Constant	4.060**		.000	5.146**		.000
	F = 8.716			F = 16.549		
	p = .000			p = .000		
	R ² = .133			R ² = .233		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "White"

‡‡reference group: "two biological parents"

†††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-8. OLS regression models for victimization (all students) in the U.S.

	Model A(victimization by physical violence) N=1161			Model B(victimization by psychological abuse) N=1118		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>						
Victim of child abuse	.188**	.109	.001	.296**	.111	.000
Witnessed father's violence	-.102	-.008	.804	-.219	-.011	.723
Witnessed mother's violence	.281	.024	.447	.250	.014	.654
Self-control scale	-.041**	-.124	.000	-.056**	-.113	.000
Attachment to mother	-.045	-.046	.134	.015	.010	.736
Attachment to father	-.028	-.045	.156	-.022	-.021	.491
<u>Control Variables</u>						
Sex	.334	.052	.078	.720*	.072	.011
Age	.066	.025	.457	.050	.012	.712
Race†						
Hispanic	-.117	-.013	.651	-.297	-.022	.440
Black	.163	.017	.564	-.590	-.041	.160
Asian	.009	.001	.981	-.341	-.015	.585
Other	1.118*	.058	.043	.814	.027	.331
Family structure ‡‡						
Single parents	-.276	-.031	.311	-.370	-.027	.363
Step parents	-.442	-.038	.185	.460	.026	.361
Others	.032	.001	.959	.700	.021	.453
Dating involvement†††						
Occasionally	.185	.023	.468	.915*	.073	.018
Steady	.470*	.075	.023	1.089**	.112	.000
Others	1.651**	.102	.001	1.327	.056	.052
Campus	-.090	-.014	.659	.017	.002	.955
Risky sexual behavior	.120**	.156	.000	.383**	.326	.000
Constant	3.594**		.000	3.871**		.002
	F = 6.828			F = 13.329		
	p = .000			p = .000		
	R ² = .107			R ² = .195		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "White"

‡‡reference group: "two biological parents"

†††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-9. OLS regression model for perpetrators (subgroup of perpetrators only) in the U.S.

	Model A(perpetrator of physical violence) N=228			Model B(perpetrator of psychological abuse) N=591		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>						
Victim of child abuse	.360	.118	.062	.446**	.157	.000
Witnessed father's violence	-.532	-.025	.394	-.662	-.034	.439
Witnessed mother's violence	-.843	-.039	.542	-.050	-.003	.949
Self-control scale	-.174**	-.276	.000	-.107**	-.200	.000
Attachment to mother	.041	.025	.683	.056	.036	.399
Attachment to father	-.147	-.115	.074	-.046	-.040	.367
<u>Control Variables</u>						
Sex	2.940**	.205	.001	1.393**	.122	.003
Age	.599	.117	.101	.144	.033	.485
Race†						
Hispanic	.759	.043	.457	-.228	-.015	.711
Black	2.160*	.128	.039	-.356	-.023	.585
Asian	2.338	.89	.111	-1.272	-.055	.168
Other	2.835	.073	.217	3.515*	.096	.017
Family structure‡						
Single parents	-.804	-.050	.428	-.068	-.055	.916
Step parents	-.980	-.053	.364	.981	.055	.174
Others	-2.312	-.063	.290	.090	.003	.942
Dating involvement†††						
Occasionally	.141	.009	.898	-1.133	-.087	.074
Steady	1.184	.098	.180	-.151	-.015	.774
Others	2.307	.098	.131	-.103	-.005	.912
Campus	-1.352	-.108	.127	.084	.008	.866
Risky sexual behavior	.223*	.148	.015	.301**	.230	.000
Constant	12.38**		.000	10.84**		.000
	F = 3.791** p = .000 R^2 = .221			F = 5.593** p = .000 R^2 = .164		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "White"

‡reference group: "two biological parents"

†††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-10. OLS regression model for victimization by dating violence (subgroup of victims only) in the U.S.

	Model A(victims of physical violence) N=218			Model B(victims of psychological abuse) N=511		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
Independent Variables						
Victim of child abuse	.297	.109	.152	.095	.036	.458
Witnessed father's violence	-.645	-.033	.658	-.576	-.030	.531
Witnessed mother's violence	1.758	.095	.205	.101	.006	.903
Self-control scale	-.107**	-.188	.007	-.056*	-.111	.014
Attachment to mother	-.078	-.053	.487	-.096	-.062	.198
Attachment to father	-.190*	-.158	.042	-.106	-.093	.057
Control Variables						
Sex	1.002	.085	.231	.165	.015	.734
Age	.627	.132	.123	.100	.024	.655
Race†						
Hispanic	-.625	-.040	.561	.496	.034	.450
Black	1.371	.083	.242	-.210	-.014	.768
Asian	1.547	.066	.329	-.285	-.013	.775
Other	2.277	.067	.352	2.185	.063	.147
Family structure‡‡						
Single parents	-1.969	-.136	.058	-.194	-.014	.775
Step parents	-2.449	-.129	.065	.144	.008	.850
Others	-1.551	-.045	.534	-.012	.000	.993
Dating involvement†††						
Occasionally	.429	.031	.721	-.124	-.010	.849
Steady	.960	.086	.341	.148	.015	.791
Others	1.917	.097	.226	.248	.011	.809
Campus	-1.333	-.110	.204	-.382	-.036	.485
Risky sexual behavior	.263*	.183	.011	.330**	.226	.000
Constant	12.17**		.000	11.71**		.000
	F = 2.397** p = .01 R^2 = .196			F = 3.683** p = .000 R^2 = .129		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "White"

‡‡reference group: "two biological parents"

†††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4- 11. Descriptive statistics for full sample

Variables	Mean	Median	Mode	Sd	Min	Max
<u>Dependent Variable</u>						
Perpetration of physical violence	.92	.00	.00	3.11	.00	36.00
Perpetration of psychological violence	2.61	.00	.00	4.45	.00	28.00
Victimization by physical violence	.72	.00	.00	2.77	.00	36.00
Victimization by psychological violence	2.49	.00	.00	4.38	.00	28.00
<u>Independent Variables</u>						
Victim of child abuse	1.39	1.00	.00	1.75	.00	8.00
Witnessed father's violence	.15	.00	.00	.36	.00	1.00
Witnessed mother's violence	.080	.00	.00	.27	.00	1.00
Self-control scale	64.91	64.00	63.00	10.46	23.00	115.00
Attachment to mother	17.19	18.00	20.00	3.34	4.00	24.00
Attachment to father	15.71	17.00	20.00	4.60	4.00	24.00
<u>Control Variables</u>						
Sex	.60	1.00	1.00	.49	.00	1.00
Age	2.62	3.00	4.00	1.18	1.00	4.00
Class attending	2.20	2.00	1.00	1.08	1.00	5.00
Family structure	1.23	1.00	1.00	.61	1.00	4.00
Dating involvement	1.96	2.00	1.00	.97	1.00	4.00
Campus	.79	1.00	1.00	.40	.00	1.00
Risky sexual behavior	3.11	2.00	.00	3.95	.00	18.00

N=2736

Table 4- 12.OLS regression models for perpetration of dating violence (full model) in the U.S. and Korea

	Model A(perpetration of physical violence) N=2456			Model B(perpetration of psychological abuse) N=2373		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
Independent Variables						
Victim of child abuse	.192**	.106	.000	.288**	.112	.000
Witnessed father's violence	.056	.006	.771	-.127	-.010	.614
Witnessed mother's violence	-.153	-.013	.532	.256	.016	.422
Self-control scale	-.052**	-.154	.000	-.068**	-.143	.000
Attachment to mother	.002	.002	.941	-.006	-.004	.827
Attachment to father	-.030*	-.044	.048	-.021	-.021	.325
Control Variables						
Country	.459**	.073	.004	2.144**	.240	.000
Sex	.704**	.109	.000	1.148**	.126	.000
Age	-.035	-.013	.549	.145	.038	.061
Family structure†						
Single parents	.138	.012	.541	-.135	-.009	.650
Step parents	.652*	.041	.037	1.031*	.046	.013
Others	.504	.021	.281	.735	.022	.233
Dating involvement††						
Occasionally	.331	.039	.063	.917**	.076	.000
Steady	.710**	.107	.000	1.518**	.163	.000
Others	1.812**	.103	.000	1.948**	4.372	.000
Campus	-.330	-.042	.058	.090	.080	.697
Risky sexual behavior	.100**	.123	.000	.297**	12.64	.000
Constant	3.486**		.000	3.228**		.000
	F = 16.830			F = 47.004		
	p = .000			p = .000		
	$R^2 = .105$			$R^2 = .253$		
				4		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4- 13. OLS regression models for victimization by dating violence (full model) in the U.S. and Korea

	Model A(victimization by physical violence) N=2463			Model B(victimization by psychological abuse) N=2384		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
Independent Variables						
Victim of child abuse	.164**	.102	.000	.259**	.102	.000
Witnessed father's violence	-.102	-.013	.557	-.094	-.008	.708
Witnessed mother's violence	.213	.021	.330	.124	.008	.695
Self-control scale	-.037**	-.122	.000	-.063**	-.134	.000
Attachment to mother	-.039*	-.046	.039	-.020	-.015	.468
Attachment to father	-.016	-.026	.244	-.013	-.013	.533
Control Variables						
Country	.377**	.068	.008	1.887**	.214	.000
Sex	.169	.030	.144	.856**	.095	.000
Age	.019	.008	.719	.100	.027	.194
Family structure†	-					
Single parents	-.091	.009	.654	-.065	-.004	.825
Step parents	-.156	.011	.574	1.024*	.046	.013
Others	.159	.007	.706	.664	.020	.279
Dating involvement††						
Occasionally	.221	.029	.164	.939**	.078	.000
Steady	.453**	.078	.000	1.328**	.144	.000
Others	1.649**	.105	.000	1.952**	.081	.000
Campus	-.132	-.019	.395	.061	.006	.791
Risky sexual behavior	.085**	.118	.000	.320**	.282	.000
Constant	3.058**		.000	3.355**		.000
F = 12.123			F = 44.300			
p = .000			p = .000			
R ² = .078			R ² = .241			

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4- 14 OLS regression models for perpetration of dating violence in the U.S. and Korea
(subgroup of perpetrators only)

	Model A(perpetration of physical violence) N=480			Model B(perpetration of psychological abuse) N=1030		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
Independent Variables						
Victim of child abuse	.446**	.153	.000	.364**	.133	.000
Witnessed father's violence	-.275	-.019	.720	-.365	-.027	.407
Witnessed mother's violence	-.914	-.049	.316	.207	.012	.683
Self-control scale	-.144**	-.250	.000	-.103**	-.199	.000
Attachment to mother	.041	.026	.595	.021	.014	.656
Attachment to father	-.116	-.095	.057	-.045	-.039	.228
Control Variables						
Country	.810	.070	.218	3.209**	.317	.000
Sex	1.363*	.110	.019	.964**	.092	.002
Age	-.002	.000	.992	.228	.055	.096
Family structure†						
Single parents	.167	.009	.843	.272	.016	.589
Step parents	-.283	-.014	.766	.634	.031	.287
Others	.040	.001	.981	.965	.027	.340
Dating involvement††						
Occasionally	-.077	-.006	.919	-.324	-.026	.436
Steady	1.076	.094	.095	.405	.040	.244
Others	3.735**	.151	.002	.999	.041	.169
Campus	-1.010	-.075	.143	-.288	-.023	.466
Risky sexual behavior	.106	.075	.124	.247**	.198	.000
Constant	12.394**		.000	8.247**		.000
	F = 4.475 p = .000 $R^2 = .141$			F = 17.157 p = .000 $R^2 = .224$		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4- 15.OLS regression models for victimization by dating violence in the U.S. and Korea
(subgroup of victims only)

	Model A(victimization by physical violence) N=376			Model B(victimization by psychological abuse) N=974		
	B	β	P	B	β	P
Independent Variables						
Victim of child abuse	.410*	.147	.012	.340**	.124	.000
Witnessed father's violence	-.1.076	-.074	.226	-.458	-.033	.322
Witnessed mother's violence	.304	.017	.759	.309	.018	.572
Self-control scale	-.104**	-.185	.001	-.086**	-.167	.000
Attachment to mother	-.016	-.011	.852	-.057	-.039	.243
Attachment to father	-.136	-.112	.061	-.066	-.056	.092
Control Variables						
Country	.466	.041	.524	2.585**	.255	.000
Sex	-.507	-.043	.414	.445	.042	.166
Age	.237	.050	.386	.122	.029	.387
Family structure†						
Single parents	-.1043	-.060	.266	.409	.024	.429
Step parents	-.1016	-.046	.387	.461	.023	.446
Others	-.259	-.007	.896	.217	.006	.828
Dating involvement‡‡						
Occasionally	-.228	-.017	.791	.058	.005	.893
Steady	.689	.061	.340	.372	.037	.300
Others	3.442**	.150	.008	1.562*	.064	.040
Campus	-1.492	-.106	.073	-.455	-.037	.270
Risky sexual behavior	.076	.054	.338	.285**	.230	.000
Constant	12.811**		.000	9.712**		.000
	F = 2.648			F = 14.660		
	p = .000			p = .000		
	$R^2 = .112$			$R^2 = .207$		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

‡‡reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-16. OLS regression models for perpetration of psychological abuse by gender in Korea
(overall model)

	Full Model A(ppsy) N=1278			Male Model B(ppsy) N=577			Female Model C(ppsy) N=713		
	B	β	P	B	β	P	B	β	P
Independent Variables									
Victim of child abuse	.163**	.139	.000	.215**	.159	.000	.162**	.137	.000
Witnessed father's violence	.106	.019	.514	-.134	-.020	.651	.068	.013	.748
Witnessed mother's violence	.055	.007	.816	.448	.045	.303	-.244	-.030	.431
Self-control scale	-.041**	-.142	.000	-.022	-.072	.085	-.061**	-.187	.000
Attachment to mother	-.039	-.056	.078	-.093*	-.105	.041	.019	.028	.495
Attachment to father	.006	.010	.753	.006	.155	.877	-.004	-.007	.861
Control Variables									
Sex	.361**	.077	.006	---			---		
Age	.137*	.065	.018	-.179	-.070	.110	.204**	1.00	.005
Family structure†									
Single parents	.754*	.064	.015	.000	.000	1.00	1.061*	.090	.010
Step parents	.349	.016	.541	-.147	-.005	.897	.273	.013	.700
Others	.220	.011	.671	.947	.031	.444	-.565	-.032	.348
Dating involvement‡‡									
Occasionally	.811**	.124	.000	-.011	-.031	.976	.975**	.158	.000
Steady	.774**	.153	.000	.260	.044	.322	.823**	.165	.000
Others	1.240**	.092	.001	2.867**	.203	.000	-.216	-.014	.693
Campus	-.492	-.011	.092	-.740	-.070	.086	.235	.016	.636
Risky sexual behavior	.114**	.171	.000	.021	.029	.507	.162**	.198	.000
Constant	3.093**		.000	4.101**		.000	2.949**		.002
	F = 13.985			F = 4.437			F = 11.006		
	p = .000			p = .000			p = .000		
	$R^2 = .151$			$R^2 = .143$			$R^2 = .191$		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: “two biological parents”

‡‡reference group: “currently not dating”

Table 4-17. OLS regression models for victimization by psychological abuse by gender in Korea
(overall model)

	Full Model A(vpsy) N=1275			Male Model B(vpsy) N=562			Female Model C(vpsy) N=713		
	B	β	P	B	β	P	B	β	P
Independent Variables									
Victim of child abuse	.199**	.110	.000	.304**	.176	.000	.123	.066	.083
Witnessed father's violence	-.225	-.026	.364	-.321	-.038	.387	-.153	-.018	.645
Witnessed mother's violence	.001	.000	.998	.004	.000	.994	-.063	-.005	.898
Self-control scale	-.056**	-.124	.000	-.038*	-.099	.017	-.081**	-.155	.000
Attachment to mother	-.011	-.010	.742	-.072	-.066	.199	.025	.024	.559
Attachment to father	-.034	-.040	.211	.003	.003	.957	-.048	-.057	.165
Control Variables									
Sex	.820**	.113	.000	---			---		
Age	.265**	.082	.003	.256	.078	.069	.317**	.097	.005
Family structure†									
Single parents	.884	.049	.062	1.372*	.079	.049	.730	.039	.260
Step parents	1.290	.093	.138	-.136	-.004	.922	1.741	.054	.118
Others	-.143	-.005	.856	1.350	.039	.334	-.783	-.028	.410
Dating involvement††									
Occasionally	1.175**	.116	.000	.412	.040	.347	1.539**	.155	.000
Steady	1.478**	.191	.000	1.377**	.183	.000	1.505**	.190	.000
Others	.691	.033	.215	1.405	.078	.057	-.561	-.022	.514
Campus	-.373**	.082	.003	-.888	-.064	.106	.745	.033	.514
Risky sexual behavior	.221**	.217	.000	.158**	.175	.000	311**	.242	.000
Constant	3.588**		.000	3.643**		.005	4.339**		.004
	F = 15.536			F=6.701			F=12.166		
	p = .000			p=.000			p=.000		
	$R^2 = .165$			$R^2 = .155$			$R^2 = .207$		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-18. OLS regression models for victimization by psychological abuse by gender in Korea (subgroup of victims only)

	Full Model A(vpsy) N=419			Male Model B(vpsy) N=178			Female Model C(vpsy) N=241		
	B	β	P	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>									
Victim of child abuse	.208*	.102	.045	.453**	.226	.004	-.010	-.005	.947
Witnessed father's violence	-.693	-.068	.191	-1.508	-.146	.068	-.070	-.007	.947
Witnessed mother's violence	.257	.018	.728	.165	.011	.885	.250	.018	.806
Self-control scale	-.061*	-.113	.022	-.025	-.051	.507	-.113**	-.185	.005
Attachment to mother	.016	.012	.820	.026	.020	.826	-.002	-.002	.980
Attachment to father	-.134*	-.124	.024	-.121	-.103	.265	-.133	-.128	.070
<u>Control Variables</u>									
Sex	.992*	.111	.030	---			---		
Age	.317	.079	.106	.520	.121	.115	.249	.064	.313
Family structure†									
Single parents	1.618	.076	.108	2.482	.118	.108	.782	.037	.562
Step parents	1.387	.046	.335	-.838	-.027	.713	3.461	.116	.069
Others	.420	.010	.825	.904	.025	.735	-.780	-.017	.788
Dating involvement‡‡									
Occasionally	.538	.049	.364	-.704	-.058	.485	.846	.082	.258
Steady	.971*	.110	.047	1.152	.125	.146	.644	.075	.307
Others	3.113*	.097	.046	4.298*	.168	.030	.617	.013	.835
Campus	-1.463	-.067	.160	-.1824	-.113	.123	.976	.021	.737
Risky sexual behavior	.250**	.215	.000	.197*	.171	.030	.277**	.214	.001
Constant				6.079*		.039	11.35**		.005
	F = 4.342			F = 2.722			F = 2.920		
	p = .00			p = .001			p = .00		
	R ² = .147			R ² = .201			R ² = .163		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

‡‡reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-19. OLS regression models for perpetration of physical violence by gender in the U.S. (overall model)

	Full Model A(ppv) N=1158			Male Model B(ppv) N=393			Female Model B(ppv) N=765		
	B	β	P	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>									
Victim of child abuse	.208**	.101	.001	.077	.061	.247	.262**	.110	.005
Witnessed father's violence	.001	.000	.998	1.496**	.147	.007	-.649	-.038	.332
Witnessed mother's violence	-.404	-.029	.367	.265	.033	.528	-.945	-.053	.167
Self-control scale	-.068**	-.172	.000	-.048**	-.086	.000	-.075**	-.163	.000
Attachment to mother	.016	.013	.655	-.040	-.052	.309	.063	.048	.194
Attachment to father	-.036	-.048	.125	.020	.041	.438	-.054	-.063	.105
<u>Control Variables</u>									
Sex	1.258**	.160	.000	--			---		
Age	.053	.016	.618	-.002	-.001	.986	.103	.028	.485
Race†									
Hispanic	.067	.006	.827	.013	.002	.969	.183	.015	.664
Black	.742*	.066	.029	-.163	-.020	.683	1.257**	.103	.006
Asian	.459	.027	.345	.657	.059	.207	.369	.019	.586
Other	.912	.040	.155	1.954**	.154	.001	-.124	-.004	.899
Family structure††									
Single parents	.018	.002	.955	-.003	.000	.993	-.096	-.008	.832
Step parents	.531	.038	.186	-.414	-.040	.391	.828	.055	.118
Others	-.163	-.006	.822	3.413**	.185	.000	-.1.582	-.057	.103
Dating involvement†††									
Occasionally	.254	.026	.406	-.085	-.014	.786	.369	.033	.402
Steady	.920**	.121	.000	.482	.093	.070	1.089**	.128	.002
Others	1.692**	.089	.003	2.439**	.198	.000	1.095	.051	.159
Campus	-.368	-.048	.133	.136	.027	.625	-.655*	-.076	.050
Risky sexual behavior	.124**	.133	.000	.051	.091	.074	.168**	.171	.000
Constant	4.060**		.000	3.140**		.002	4.941**		.001
	F = 8.716**			F = 6.328			F = 6.573		
	p = .000			p = .000			p = .000		
	R ² = .133			R ² = .244			R ² = .144		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "White"

††reference group: "two biological parents"

†††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-20. OLS regression models for perpetration of psychological abuse by gender in the U.S. (overall model)

	Full Model A(ppsy) N=1111			Male Model B(ppsy) N=371			Female Model B(ppsy) N=740		
	B	β	P	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>									
Victim of child abuse	.389**	.132	.000	.425**	.167	.002	.344**	.109	.003
Witnessed father's violence	-.407	-.019	.534	.235	.012	.841	-.651	-.030	.411
Witnessed mother's violence	.568	.029	.355	-.360	-.023	.684	1.291	.058	.111
Self-control scale	-.086**	-.155	.000	-.078**	-.155	.002	-.088**	-.149	.000
Attachment to mother	.045	.027	.355	-.079	-.052	.345	.128*	.075	.033
Attachment to father	-.034	-.030	.326	-.008	-.007	.907	-.037	-.033	.372
<u>Control Variables</u>									
Sex	1.636**	.148	.000	---			---		
Age	.083	.018	.563	.095	.023	.686	.076	.016	.677
Race†									
Hispanic	-.580	-.039	.162	-.231	-.017	.745	-.674	-.044	.188
Black	-.529	-.033	.248	-.1893*	-.123	.021	.319	.020	.569
Asian	-.992	-.042	.127	-.1358	-.064	.198	-.875	-.035	.288
Other	.765	.024	.375	.283	.012	.815	1.264	.034	.298
Family structure††									
Single parents	-.577	-.038	.191	-.177	-.013	.806	-.781	-.051	.161
Step parents	.951	.047	.084	-.483	-.024	.621	1.465*	.073	.028
Others	.392	.011	.690	2.166	.057	.250	-.147	-.004	.899
Dating involvement†††									
Occasionally	.670	.048	.108	.497	.041	.444	.710	.049	.191
Steady	1.781**	.167	.000	.855	.084	.120	2.260**	.207	.000
Others	2.573**	.099	.000	1.335	.058	.260	3.164**	.116	.001
Campus	.256	.024	.441	.674	.067	.237	-.076	-.007	.853
Risky sexual behavior	.382**	.294	.000	.328**	.301	.000	.443**	.312	.000
Constant	5.146**		.000	6.846**		.001	5.186**		.004
	F = 16.549			F = 5.368			F = 12.992		
	p = .000			p = .000			p = .000		
	R ² = .233			R ² = .225			R ² = .255		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "White"

††reference group: "two biological parents"

†††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-21. OLS regression models for victimization by psychological abuse by gender in the U.S. (overall model)

	Full Model A(vpsy) N=1111			Male Model B(vpsy) N=376			Female Model B(vpsy) N=742		
	B	β	P	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>									
Victim of child abuse	.296**	.111	.000	.491**	.191	.000	.173	.064	.089
Witnessed father's violence	-.219	-.011	.723	1.023	.048	.384	-.572	-.030	.434
Witnessed mother's violence	.250	.014	.654	-.134	-.009	.878	.372	.019	.616
Self-control scale	-.056**	-.113	.000	-.058*	-.117	.018	-.056**	-.109	.002
Attachment to mother	.015	.010	.736	-.069	-.045	.409	.065	.044	.223
Attachment to father	-.022	-.021	.491	.027	.024	.675	-.028	-.029	.441
<u>Control Variables</u>									
Sex	.720*	.072	.011	----			----		
Age	.050	.012	.712	.119	.029	.614	.016	.004	.922
Race†									
Hispanic	-.297	-.022	.440	-.295	-.021	.676	-.250	-.019	.587
Black	-.590	-.041	.160	-2.052**	-.133	.010	.295	.022	.554
Asian	-.341	-.015	.585	-1.569	-.071	.145	.351	.016	.648
Other	.814	.027	.331	-.033	-.001	.979	1.427	1.125	.205
Family structure††									
Single parents	-.370	-.027	.363	-.474	-.034	.506	-.278	-.021	.578
Step parents	.460	.026	.361	-.938	-.047	.325	.946	.055	.110
Others	.700	.021	.453	1.445	.037	.441	.485	.015	.652
Dating involvement†††									
Occasionally	.915*	.073	.018	.337	.028	.600	1.220*	.096	.012
Steady	1.089**	.112	.000	.366	.036	.500	1.549**	.163	.000
Others	1.327	.056	.052	1.134	.047	.347	1.526	.065	.067
Campus	.017	.002	.955	.704	.069	.217	-.433	-.045	.242
Risky sexual behavior	.383**	.326	.000	.369**	.339	.000	.408**	.330	.000
Constant	3.871**		.002	4.497*		.031	3.727*		.019
	F = 13.329			F = 5.865			F = 9.763		
	p = .000			p = .000			p = .0000		
	$R^2 = .195$			$R^2 = .238$			$R^2 = .204$		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "White"

††reference group: "two biological parents"

†††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-22. OLS regression models for perpetration of physical violence by gender in the U.S. (subgroup of perpetrators only)

	Full N=288			Male Model B(ppv) N=65			Female Model B(ppv) N=223		
	B	β	P	B	β	P	B	β	P
<u>Independent Variables</u>									
Victim of child abuse	.360	.118	.062	.002	.001	.995	.523*	.160	.024
Witnessed father's violence	-.532	-.025	.394	-.419	-.026	.824	-1.706	-.075	.295
Witnessed mother's violence	-.843	-.039	.542	.206	.015	.893	-1.980	-.078	.270
Self-control scale	-.174**	-.276	.000	-.039	-.072	.493	-.154**	-.233	.001
Attachment to mother	.041	.025	.683	.253	.181	.147	.081	.046	.496
Attachment to father	-.147	-.115	.074	-.001	.000	.997	-.130	-.102	.166
<u>Control Variables</u>									
Sex	2.940**	.205	.001	---			---		
Age	.599	.117	.101	-.074	-.016	.883	1.035*	.196	.019
Race†									
Hispanic	.759	.043	.457	1.347	.096	.328	.782	.042	.525
Black	2.160*	.128	.039	1.015	.054	.600	2.509*	.152	.033
Asian	2.338	.89	.111	3.636*	.173	.049	1.857	.068	.300
Other	2.835	.073	.217	.443	.023	.835	.750	.011	.856
Family structure‡‡									
Single parents	-.804	-.050	.428	.999	.068	.472	-1.212	-.074	.317
Step parents	-.980	-.053	.364	-.838	-.035	.701	-.772	-.043	.524
Others	-2.312	-.063	.290	35.02**	.855	.000	-5.650*	-.159	.020
Dating involvement†††									
Occasionally	.141	.009	.898	1.020	.083	.435	-.189	-.012	.891
Steady	1.184	.098	.180	1.058	.104	.328	.759	.061	.484
Others	2.307	.098	.131	2.192	.126	.321	1.145	.045	.541
Campus	-1.352	-.108	.127	.854	.070	.528	-2.183*	-.173	.038
Risky sexual behavior	.223*	.148	.015	-.113	-.094	.376	.277*	.175	.013
Constant	12.38**		.000	-.176		.971	12.689**		.001
	F = 3.791			F = 6.312			F = 3.024		
	p = .000			p = .000			p = .000		
	R ² = .221			R ² = .727			R ² = .221		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "White"

‡‡reference group: "two biological parents"

†††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-23. OLS regression models for perpetration of psychological abuse by gender in the U.S. (subgroup of perpetrators only)

	Full N=591	Model A(ppsy)			Male Model B(pppsy)			Female Model B(ppsy)		
	B	β	P	B	β	P	B	β	P	
<u>Independent Variables</u>										
Victim of child abuse	.446**	.157	.000	.593**	.234	.006	.365*	.122	.020	
Witnessed father's violence	-.662	-.034	.439	-.573	-.029	.735	-.683	-.035	.499	
Witnessed mother's violence	-.050	-.003	.949	-.930	-.062	.483	.373	.019	.703	
Self-control scale	-.107**	-.200	.000	-.133**	-.258	.001	-.097**	-.174	.000	
Attachment to mother	.056	.036	.399	-.096	-.059	.505	.117	.076	.129	
Attachment to father	-.046	-.040	.367	-.014	-.013	.892	-.058	-.049	.350	
<u>Control Variables</u>										
Sex	1.393**	.122	.003	---			---			
Age	.144	.033	.485	-.067	-.015	.856	.250	.056	.324	
Race†										
Hispanic	-.228	-.015	.711	.274	.019	.811	-.413	-.027	.580	
Black	-.356	-.023	.585	-2.134	-.128	.122	.371	.024	.628	
Asian	-1.272	-.055	.168	-2.122	-.090	.243	-1.010	-.044	.358	
Other	3.515*	.096	.017	1.654	.061	.459	4.590*	.104	.026	
Family structure††										
Single parents	-.068	-.055	.916	1.311	.088	.284	-.484	-.032	.536	
Step parents	.981	.055	.174	-.468	-.025	.756	1.578	.090	.063	
Others	.090	.003	.942	.287	.010	.899	.031	.001	.984	
Dating involvement†††										
Occasionally	-1.133	-.087	.074	-1.035	-.088	.325	-1.258	-.093	.123	
Steady	-.151	-.015	.774	-1.028	-.102	.263	.323	.031	.627	
Others	-.103	-.005	.912	-.330	-.015	.845	.100	.005	.929	
Campus	.084	.008	.866	.267	.023	.779	-.219	-.020	.715	
Risky sexual behavior	.301**	.230	.000	.296**	.256	.002	.324**	.231	.000	
Constant	10.84**		.000	15.45**		.000	10.20**		.000	
	F = 5.593			F = 2.668			F = 4.062			
	p = .000			p = .000			p = .000			
	$R^2 = .164$			$R^2 = .253$			$R^2 = .161$			

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "White"

††reference group: "two biological parents"

†††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table 4-24. Significance of difference in OLS regression coefficients for male and female models in Korea

Korea	Variables	Male (b1)	Male (SEb1)	Female (b2)	Female (SEb2)	Z-score
<u>Dependent Variables</u>		<u>Independent and Control Variables</u>				
Perpetration of psychological abuse	Child abuse	.215	.059	.162	.045	.714
Victimization by psychological abuse	Child abuse	.304	.074	.123	.071	1.765*
	Self-control	-.038	.016	-.081	.018	1.785*
	Dating steady	1.377	.33	1.505	.291	-.291
	Risky sexual behavior	.158	.039	.311	.046	-2.537**
Victimization by psychological abuse (victim group)	Risky sexual behavior	.197	.09	.277	.085	-.646

*90% (z=1.65) **95% (z=1.96) ***99%(z=2.58)

Table 4-25. Significance of difference in OLS regression coefficients for male and female models in the U.S.

U.S.	Variables	Male (b1)	Male (SEb1)	Female (b2)	Female (SEb2)	Z-score
<u>Dependent Variables</u>	<u>Independent and Control Variables</u>					
Perpetration of physical violence	Self-control	-.048	.012	-.075	.016	1.35
Perpetration of psychological abuse	Child abuse	.425	.139	.344	.114	.451
	Self-control	-.078	.025	-.088	.02	.312
	Risky sexual behavior	.328	.057	.443	.053	-1.478
Victimization by psychological abuse	Self-control	-.058	.024	-.056	.018	-.067
	Risky sexual behavior	.369	.056	.408	.047	-.533
Perpetration of physical violence (perpetrator group)	Family (other)	35.021	5.306	-5.65	2.402	6.983***
Perpetration of psychological abuse (perpetrator group)	Child abuse	.593	.212	.365	.156	.866
	Self-control	-.133	.039	-.097	.027	-.759
	Risky sexual behavior	.296	.092	.324	.07	-.242

*90% (z=1.65) **95% (z=1.96) ***99%(z=2.58)

Table 4-26. Significance of difference in OLS regression coefficients for Korean and American models

	Variables	KR(b1)	KR(SEb1)	US(b2)	US(SE b2)	Z-score
Dependent Variables	Independent and Control Variables					
Perpetration of physical violence	Child abuse	.135	.037	.208	.101	-.679
	Self-control	-.037	.009	-.068	.012	2.067**
	Dating steady	.524	.100	.92	.247	-1.486
	Dating other	1.851	.125	1.692	.558	.278
	Risky sexual behavior	.056	.079	.124	.029	-.808
Perpetration of psychological abuse	Child abuse	.163	.034	.389	.088	-2.396**
	Self-control	-.041	.008	-.086	.016	2.516**
	Sex	.361	.131	1.636	.306	-3.830***
	Dating steady	.774	.144	1.781	.167	-4.567***
	Dating other	1.24	.358	2.573	.099	-3.589***
	Risky sexual behavior	.114	.019	.382	.039	-6.178***
Victimization by physical violence	Child abuse	.104	.037	.188	.054	-1.283
	Self-control	-.033	.009	-.041	.019	.381
	Dating steady	.455	.159	.47	.207	-.057
	Dating other	1.556	.401	1.651	.481	-.152
Victimization by psychological abuse	Child abuse	.199	.051	.296	.036	-1.554
	Self-control	-.056	.012	-.056	.014	.000
	Sex	.82	.2	.72	.284	.288
	Dating occasionally	1.175	.276	.915	.385	.549
	Dating other	1.478	.218	1.089	.31	1.026
	Risky sexual behavior	.221	.029	.383	.036	-3.504***
Perpetration of physical violence (perpetrator group)	Self-control	-.108	.044	-.174	.037	1.148
Perpetration of psychological abuse (perpetrator group)	Child abuse	.199	.072	.446	.124	-1.723*
	Self-control	-.079	.018	-.107	.022	.985
Victimization by psychological abuse (victim group)	Self-control	-.061	.026	-.056	.023	-.144
	Risky sexual behavior	.25	.06	.33	.057	-.967

*90% (z=1.65) **95% (z=1.96) ***99 % (z=2.58)

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Summary Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate theoretically relevant variables that are linked in some way to the respondents' family of origin that may account for the likelihood of both perpetration of and victimization by dating violence in two different cultures. In using the same survey instrument for two countries, this study proposed to test whether theoretical explanations developed in Western society could be applied to Eastern society. A childhood experience of family violence is expected to be positively related to both committing violence and being the victim of violence in a dating relationship for both male and female respondents in both in the U.S. and Korea. Parental attachment and self-control (assumed by the theory to be formed in the family of origin at an early age and to be relatively stable throughout the life course) are hypothesized to be negatively related to dating violence, again for both perpetrators and victims, and male and female respondents in both countries. The major theory examined is self-control theory which would predict that persons with low self-control are more likely to engage in violence against another person and more likely to be a victim of violence by another person.

The research was designed to test this theory and the concept of self-control was measured in a fairly complete and thorough way. Therefore, this is the only theoretical perspective about which firm conclusions can be reached from the findings. However, the variables of direct (being the victim of violence) and vicarious experience of violence (witness violence committed by one family member against another) in the family of origin were seen as consistent with social learning theory and the variable of parental attachment (how close are the relationship with one's parents) was seen as consistent with or derivable from social bonding theory. Therefore, the findings were seen as somewhat relevant to these two additional theories and some conclusions

can be offered regarding how well the prior experience with violence and attachment to parents account for dating violence. The results of relating the empirical measures of the explanatory variables to the measures of perpetration and victimization of dating violence will be summarized for the combined samples from the US and Korea, by each country, and by gender. Similarities and differences will be discussed.

Self-Control Theory

The finding that when the different dimensions of self-control were measured separately only the dimension of impulsivity has a significant effect on dating violence is partially consistent with Kerly et al. (2008). When the different dimensions are placed into a single scale that scale had significant main and net effects on both for both the Korean and American samples and for the combined samples. That is, those students who had low self-control were more likely to be both perpetrators and victims of both physical and psychological dating violence. Significant predictive power was found in most models except for the subgroup of victims in Korea. In particular, the victims of physical violence in Korea had no lower levels of self-control than those who had not been victims. However, all models of American sample showed a significant relationship between low self-control and perpetration of and victimization by dating violence. Additional comparisons for gender difference in the U.S. and Korea were run to find the different effect in each gender group. However, the results failed to report a significant difference. That is, the strong likelihood of low self-control to predict perpetration of and victimization by dating violence has been shown similarly not only among Korean female and male students but among U.S. female and male students as well.

Another main purpose of this dissertation was to test whether criminological theories developed in Western societies can explain the dating violence in an Eastern society. These measures of low self-control have an effect in both societies and therefore have some

generalizability from American to Korean society. In comparing the effect coefficients for the Korean and American samples, the power of self-control to predict dating violence is found to be almost same in both societies. However, the significant difference between the magnitudes of the coefficients in the two samples indicates that there are some societal or cultural moderation or conditioning of the effects that low self-control has on current dating violence among university students. That is, although self-control is consistently related to perpetration of physical violence and perpetration of psychological abuse in both countries, the effects are stronger for U.S. students' perpetration of dating violence than for Korean students, but not for victimization of dating violence¹.

Direct and Vicarious Experience with Violence in the Family²

Having witnessed father's violence against mother, and witness of mother's violence against father was a measure of prior exposure or indirect experience with violence. Having been abused as child was a measure of direct prior experience with violence. Overall, direct experience of child abuse showed a very significant relationship with both perpetration of and victimization by dating violence in both Korea and the U.S. Indirect or vicarious experience of inter-parental violence did not have significant effects on dating violence. The significant predictive power was found in most models except for the subgroup of those who had perpetrated violence in a dating situation in the past year (versus the subgroup who reported no such behavior in that time period) and the subgroup of only those who had been victims of such violence in the past year. In particular, the relationship was not found among the perpetrators and victims of physical violence subgroups in Korea. In the U.S., prior experience with violence

1 T-test reports that score of self-control of American students are significantly higher than Korean students.

2 Although I refer to this exposure to violence in the home as reflective of social learning concepts it is proper to refer to it only "intergenerational transmission theory."

in the family failed to predict the relationships between physical and psychological abuse in the subgroup of victims of physical violence

As mentioned, the effect of direct experience of child abuse is significantly related to dating violence in both countries. Additional comparison of coefficients helped to investigate how differently this variable assumed to be consistent with social learning theory explains dating violence. Comparison of results of z-scores between the two countries showed that direct experience of child abuse has a more powerful effect on perpetration of psychological abuse among Korean college students compared to U.S. college students. This result is repeated for perpetrator group of psychological abuse. Direct experience of child abuse differently explains the perpetration of psychological abuse in the subgroup of perpetrators in Korea and in the U.S. It means that psychological abuse in dating is explained much more by victimization of child abuse among Korean college students than among American college students.

In addition, child abuse showed the different power by gender to predict dating violence in comparison of coefficients in Korea. In particular, gender effects in Korea were found in victimization by psychological abuse for all students and in victimization by psychological abuse for the subgroup of psychological victims. Direct experience of child abuse has a fairly strong correlation to victimization by psychological abuse for Korean male students compared to Korean female students. Gender effect in the U.S was found in both perpetration of physical and psychological violence for all students and for the subsample of perpetrators. However, there is no significant difference between the two gender groups the effects of direct experience of child abuse in the U.S.

The stronger effect of child abuse on dating violence in college is probably related to the higher frequency of child abuse among Korean students. They have been educated to accept the

physical punishment as a form of discipline since childhood. Moreover, they have little chance to be educated how serious psychological abuse can be in dating relationships. There is an old Korean saying “little strokes fell great oaks.” This saying is commonly cited for dating relationship. It makes people recognize the abusive relationship as expression of love and passion. Therefore many people do not identify their wrong relationship as dating violence. It is naturally related to need of education or program of dating violence for college students in Korea. And I hope this dissertation could give an impetus to set up the future education and policy of dating violence.

Nevertheless, this measure of prior experience as the victim of violence in the home has an effect in both societies and therefore has shows some generalizability of findings from American to Korean society. However, the significant difference between the magnitude of the coefficients in the two samples indicates that there some societal or cultural moderation or conditioning of the effects such prior experience has on current dating violence among university students.

The effect of observing inter-parental violence as a child showed influence only for American male perpetration of physical violence. Specifically, watching a father's violence against the mother affected perpetration of physical violence only for American male students. Although this is the only finding of gender-specific behavior, it is consistent with previous research of O'Keefe (1998). This indicates that observation of violence between parents has differential effects on violent outcomes later in dating relationships among young adults. This would suggest that there are limitations on the cross-cultural applicability of this as an explanation of dating violence. We have seen its effect in previous research in American samples and we see it again in this study. But it does not apply in Korean sample in this study.

Attachment to Parents

Attachment to parents failed to show a significant effect on most models of perpetration of and victimization by dating violence. This was true in cases of physical as well as psychological abuse. Although the effect was not found frequently as often as social learning and self-control variables, some model reported the effect of attachment to parents. Interestingly, the effect of lack of attachment to father was applied for victimization model of victim groups in both countries. Negative effect of attachment to father was observed in case of entire Korean victimization by psychological abuse for victim group of psychological abuse. Similarly, the negative effect of attachment to father was found in the U.S. among victims group by physical violence and psychological abuse.

The effect of attachment to mother was applied for gender model. Although the statistical power is weak relatively, low attachment to mother showed the relation to perpetration of psychological abuse for Korean male students. The effect of attachment to mother was significant for U.S. female student to predict a perpetration of psychological abuse. However, it the direction was reversed. That is, higher score of attachment to mother was related to perpetration of psychological abuse for U.S. female students.

Control Variables

In addition to the theoretical or explanatory variables, the statistical models included control variables of gender, age, family structure, dating involvement, living campus and risky sexual behavior. Although previous research has reported that females were more likely to be victimized in dating partner, female students reported they have more exposure to dating violence as both perpetrators and victims in this research. This is consistent with Gover et al. (2008) finding. Gover et al (2008) interpreted this result as a change of pattern of dating. Other plausible explanation is that females' initiation of violence more related to proximal variables,

such as self-defense, as opposed to historical variables, such as child abuse, or inter-parental violence. Some research provided support for this contention, demonstrating that the receipt of violence from a partner was a significant predictor of female's dating violence (Bookwala et al., 1992; O'Keefe, 1997).

Although age effect was not found as often as gender effect, the pattern that younger students are more involved in perpetration of physical violence, and older students are involved in perpetration and victimization by psychological abuse was found. Older females reported more experiences of victimization by dating violence. The reason older students might be related to more chance to have a dating partner and to have longer period of dating than younger students. In terms of number of dating partner and dating duration, it is possible that this variable has a problem of multicollinearity with a variable of risky sexual behavior because risky sexual behavior is asking the number of sexual partner so far.

Students engaged in risky sexual behavior are consistently more likely to experience dating violence as both perpetrator and victim, both in Korea and the U.S and for both female and male. It is very consistent with previous research showing that extensive dating increases the likelihood of having been in an abusive relationship (Bergman, 1992; Reuterman & Burcky, 1989; Sugarman & Hoteling, 1989). It is unclear, however, whether extensive dating is a risk because frequently dating students' extensive dating experience simply increase their probability of pairing with at least one abusive partner among their many partners or whether the extensive dating histories of some individuals are proxies for other factors that increase the likelihood of abuse in relationship (Cleaveland et al., 2003; Lewis & Fremouw, 2001; Rowe et al., 2997). Although there are previous researches that have indicated the effect of divorced parents and single parents on dating violence (Billingham & Notebart, 1993; Gover, 2004), most models did

not indicate a relationship between family structures growing up and dating violence, with these exceptions: the Korean male group and the Korean victim groups showed the relationship between perpetration of psychological abuse and family structure. Those students who were raised by single parents were more likely to become involved in perpetration of psychological abuse than were other victims. However, one should be careful when examining the effect of being raised by single parents because over the 95% of Korean students answered that they were raised by in a family with both biological parents. Also, U.S. female students showed the link between perpetration of psychological abuse and stepparents. Those female students who were raised by stepparents were more likely to become involved in perpetration of psychological abuse. Although the effects of family structure were not found as frequently as other independent variables, it did seem to affect the incidence of psychological abuse against their partners. Being raised by a single parent was a significant predictive factor for Korean students³, as was being raised by stepparents for U.S. students. This family effect is found on full model including U.S. and Korea sample together. Although the effect of family structure in which students were raised is not found frequently in separate model, the full model shows the effect of family structure. Especially being raised under step parents has significant effect on perpetration and victimization by dating violence in the full model.

Dating relationship factors mean a number of dating partner, seriousness of dating relationship, period of dating relationship, and empirical researches have reported the positive relationship between those dating relationship factors and perpetration of dating violence. Moreover, the association is sometimes functioning differently by gender. Consistently to

³ Most of Korean students (95%) responded that they were raised by both biological parents. It may reflect the low divorce rate at 1980s and early 1990s in Korea. However, the number of who are raised by single parents, stepparents or other relatives are relatively very small, this question may not a good measure for Korean sample.

previous research that reported extensive dating increases the likelihood of having been in an abusive relationship as well (Bergman, 1992; Reuterman & Burcky, 1989; Sugarman & Hoteling, 1989), this dissertation found that having a serious dating partner has a positive effect on perpetration and victimization by dating violence. However it is dangerous to say that having a serious dating partner increased the likelihood of perpetration and victimization by dating violence based on this dissertation. As stated above, having a dating partner is a necessary condition for dating violence; used control variable was “current dating status” and dependent variable was “past experience of dating violence.” I cannot say positively for certain the unclear relationship if students who answered “not currently dating” were significantly involved in dating violence as a perpetrator or a victim in the past 2) used reference group was “currently not dating.”

Korean results show that that living on-campus actually increased the likelihood of perpetration of and victimization by dating violence. Although the reasons will need to be investigated in the future, two possible explanations exist for the high numbers of perpetration and victimization among students living on campus in Korea. The first reason for these results is the location of Kyonggi University. Because Kyonggi University is located in a metropolitan area, many students might commute from their own homes and continue to live with their parents. Only students who came from out of town might be eligible to be admitted to residence halls. And living on-campus increased the risky campus life than commuting from own house living with family. Second reason is small number of students belonged to “living on-campus” in Korean sample. Due to the limited number of students admitted to residence halls, the sample size for living on-campus, especially in subsample models, might be invalid for comparison.

The both data set of Korean and American samples shows some missing variables. Although the missing variables are less than 10% of overall data, the reason should be considered for future research. although the reason of missing variables are not clear, the reason of missing might be related to sensitive questions such as experience of child abuse, sexual behavior and/or other perpetration or victimization of sexual abuse on dating violence. In addition, I found the number of missing variables increase at the end of questions of survey instruments and at the questions having long items such as dating violence. Therefore another possible reason of missing variables is from fatigue of long questions.

Limitations

Although this study contributes to the study of dating violence in both countries, and to knowledge of what factors account for this behavior across two different societies, its limitations could not be avoided. The data collected in the project do not allow measurement of all relevant dimensions of social learning theory such as differential association, definition, differential reinforcement and imitation. Early childhood imitation or violence was measured indirectly by asking about observation of intra-family violence and to a less extent being the victim of intra-family violence. Moreover, while the dimensions of Akers's social learning theory relies on both past and present operation of the learning process to account for current behavior the only measurements in this study were of past events as predictors of current deviant behavior. Also, the full examination of social bonding may require reflecting all dimensions such as attachment, commitment, involvement and belief. Moreover, attachment dimension may need to include several close relationships such as family, friend, or peers. However, this study had not only had only attachment dimension, but also measured one dimension of attachment, namely to parents. The result of factor analysis for self-control showed good reliability in this study. However, Higgins (2007) did not find unidimensionality of the Gransmick et al. (1993) scale with 4-point

Likert-type response categories. That is, although the Grasmick et al. (1993) scale of self-control showed reliability, validity is still open to question.

Therefore the findings cannot be considered adequate tests of all three theories. The findings here are at best partial and suggestive with regard to how well these theoretical perspectives can account for dating violence. Second, the sample that I used cannot be considered to be representative because it was conducted among college students in only one university in Korea and just one university in the U.S. In addition, the sampling method was convenience sampling, hence it is not random sampling. Third, the main dependent variables were measured using the Revised Conflict Tactic Scale, which, although the most commonly used to measure domestic violence, does not reflect expanded definitions of dating violence such as digital dating violence. Moreover, although the items on experience of violence in childhood refer to an earlier time period and supposedly self-control was formed in childhood prior to the current time, the research is cross-sectional, and this places limitations on interpretations of causal order. In addition, as previously mentioned, the items measuring dating violence asked about such experiences in the past year while the items on being in a dating relationship and how much one is involved in such relationship asked only about “current” relationships. The proper measure would be to make the time frame items measuring victimization by and perpetration of dating violence the same as the time frame for items measuring not being in a dating relationship, dating to some extent, and being more extensively involved in dating.,

Policy implication

Overall findings of this study emphasize the role of family experience in childhood to predict future dating violence. All of main independent variables such as direct experience of child abuse, low self-control and attachment to parents is formed in the family in childhood. Especially,

the most significant factor in this study was self-control, and this self-control is set up by proper parenting in childhood. Low self-control is formed, according to the theory in childhood, and remains stable thereafter. Therefore, only policies that take effect early in life and have a positive impact on families have much chance of affecting self-control reducing crime and delinquency (Akers & Sellers, 2004).

However, there are some possible suggestions for programs and policies based on the findings of this study that go beyond early childhood intervention. One finding indicates that experience of dating violence among college students was high that cannot be ignored on the campus. Moreover, female students' perpetration is higher than male students in the U.S. Although many universities have provided the education program or victim service for college students, the education or the program may need to be designed to encourage the participants of male students. For the Korean situation, this study may be a pioneering study to examine Korean dating violence among college students. Due to lack of awareness of seriousness of dating violence in Korea, there is probably no university which has provided an education or prevention program for college students regarding dating violence. The findings in this research showing both male and female involvement and some similarity in predictive variables in both countries I would like to suggest developing education programs on campus in Korean university that borrow from programs that may already be in place in the United States and that programs in each country reflect knowledge of the predictive and causative factors in the behavior.

Future Research

Future research on dating violence could take many directions. Although I included the variable of risky sexual behavior as a control variable in this study, it is possible the inclusion of this variable unduly weakens the net effect of other independent variables because it still retains some vulnerability to measurement tautology. I suggest testing the power of independent

variables without risky sexual behavior for future research. Although the current dissertation can contribute to building a theoretical background of dating violence, it did not reflect theoretical perspectives very well beyond self-control theory. Future research could develop good measures of social learning and bonding theory as well as measures of strain, social disorganization, feminist, and other theories that have potential to shed light on accounting for variations in dating violence and provide tests of these criminological theories as explanations of dating violence. It will also be important to examine dating violence experienced through electronic media. Many students have shared their pictures and routines with their students and dating partners; however, the research related to cyber-violence such as cy-defamation, either by dating violence or by ex-partners, has not been studied. Future research is recommended to include those factors related to digital dating violence. Furthermore, it would be important to develop more adequate scales to reflect cultural difference for dating violence or child abuse and to more adequately test the cross-cultural validity of different theoretical models of dating violence.

APPENDIX A SURVEY INSTRUMENT

DEMOGRAPHICS – SECTION A

Please answer the following questions about your background. Circle the number that corresponds to the answer that you select.

A1 What is your sex?

- 1 Male
- 2 Female

A2 What is your age?

- 1 18 years old
- 2 19 years old
- 3 20 years old
- 4 21 or older

A3 What is your class standing?

- 1 Freshman
- 2 Sophomore
- 3 Junior
- 4 Senior
- 5 Graduate

A4 What type of household did you mostly live in while you grew up?

- 1 I lived with my two biological parents
- 2 I lived with a single parent
- 3 I lived with a parent and a stepparent
- 4 I lived with adoptive parents
- 5 Other relatives (grandparents, aunt/uncle, siblings, etc.)
- 6 Other

A5 Where do you live?

- 1 on campus
- 2 off campus

A6 What is your current relational status?

- 1 Not currently Dating
- 2 Occasionally Dating
- 3 Steady/Exclusively Dating
- 4 Engaged
- 5 Married
- 6 Divorced
- 7 Other

A7 How often do you see the person you are dating?

- 1 Not currently dating
- 2 A few times a year
- 3 Once or twice a month
- 4 Once a week
- 5 Twice a week
- 6 Three or more times a week

A8 Are you currently living with the person you are dating?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No
- 3 I am not currently dating someone

A9 What is your race?

- 1 White, non-Hispanic
- 2 White, Hispanic

- 3 Black or African-American
- 4 Asian
- 5 Pacific Islander
- 6 American Indian or Alaskan Native
- 7 Other

FAMILY OF ORIGIN VIOLENCE – SECTION B

Now we are going to ask you some questions about violence you may have experienced as a child. Think back to your childhood for how often each of the following behaviors occurred. If your mother or father did not raise you, please answer the questions about the person who did raise you.

<i>When you were a child did any parent, stepparent or guardian ever...</i>	Yes	No
B1 Throw something at you that could hurt you?	1	2
B2 Push, grab, or shove you?	1	2
B3 Pull your hair?	1	2
B4 Slap or hit you?	1	2
B5 Kick or bite you?	1	2
B6 Choke or attempt to drown you?	1	2
B7 Hit you with some object? (not including spanking)	1	2
B8 Beat you up?	1	2
B9 Punish you with a belt, board, cord, or other hard object? (not including spanking)	1	2
B10 Hit you so hard that it left bruises or marks?	1	2
B11 Touched you in a sexual way when you did not want that to happen?	1	2
B12 Hurt you in a sexual way?	1	2

B13 When you were a child, did you ever see your father hit your mother?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

B14 When you were a child, did you ever see your mother hit your father?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

B15 When you were a child, did any parent, stepparent, or guardian ever spank you as a form of discipline?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

RELATIONSHIP BEHAVIORS – SECTION F

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood. This is a list of things that might happen when you and your partner are not getting along. Please circle how many times you did each of these things in the past year, and how many times your partner did them to you in the past year. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before that, circle “5.”

How often did this happen in the past year?

- 0 = This has never happened
- 1 = Once in the past year
- 2 = Twice in the past year
- 3 = 3-5 times in the past year
- 4 = 6 or more times in the past year
- 5 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

		This has never happened	Once in the past year	Twice in the past year	3-5 times in the past year	6 or more times in the past year	Not in the past year, but it did happen before
F1	Threw something at my partner that could hurt.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F2	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F3	Twisted my partner's arm or hair.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F4	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F5	I kicked my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F6	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F7	I slapped my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F8	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F9	I pushed or shoved my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F10	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F11	I punched or hit my partner with my hand or an object.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F12	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F13	I choked my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F14	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F15	I slammed my partner against a wall.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F16	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F17	I grabbed my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F18	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F19	I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F20	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F21	I prevented my partner from seeing family or friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F22	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F23	I insisted on knowing my partners whereabouts all the time.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F24	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F25	I insisted on knowing who my partner was talking to on the phone.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F26	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F27	I insulted or swore at my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F28	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F29	I accused my partner of being a lousy lover.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F30	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F31	I called my partner bad names.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F32	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F33	I shouted or yelled at my partner.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F34	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F35	I used threats to make my partner have sex.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F36	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F37	I made my partner have sex without a condom.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F38	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F39	I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex (vaginal, oral, and/or anal).	0	1	2	3	4	5
F40	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
F41	I insisted on sex (vaginal, oral, and/or anal) when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force).	0	1	2	3	4	5
F42	My partner did this to me.	0	1	2	3	4	5

SELF CONTROL—SECTION H

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
H1 I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.	1	2	3	4
H2 I don't devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future.	1	2	3	4
H3 I often do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal.	1	2	3	4
H4 I'm more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run.	1	2	3	4
H5 I frequently try to avoid projects that I know will be difficult.	1	2	3	4
H6 When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw.	1	2	3	4
H7 The things in life that are easiest to do bring me most pleasure.	1	2	3	4
H8 I dislike really hard tasks that stretch my abilities to the limit.	1	2	3	4
H9 I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky.	1	2	3	4
H10 Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it.	1	2	3	4
H11 I sometimes find it exciting to do things for which I might get in trouble.	1	2	3	4
H12 Excitement and adventure are more important to me than security.	1	2	3	4
H13 If I had a choice, I would almost always rather do something physical than something mental.	1	2	3	4
H14 I almost always feel better when I am on the move than when I am sitting and thinking.	1	2	3	4
H15 I like to get out and do things more than I like to read or contemplate ideas.	1	2	3	4
H16 I often look out for myself first, even if it means making things difficult for other people	1	2	3	4
H17 I'm not very sympathetic to other people when they are having problems.	1	2	3	4
H18 If things I do upset people, its their problem not mine.	1	2	3	4
H19 I will try to get the things I want even when I know it causes problems for other people.	1	2	3	4
H20 I lose my temper pretty easily.	1	2	3	4
H21 Often, when I'm angry at people I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I am angry.	1	2	3	4
H22 When I'm really angry, other people better stay away from me.	1	2	3	4
H23 When I have a serious disagreement with someone, it's usually hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset.	1	2	3	4

RISK FACTORS – SECTION G

The next set of questions asks you about your past behavior. Again, please remember that this is a confidential survey and your answers can't be linked to you. Please answer the following questions honestly.

G1 How old were you when you had sexual intercourse for the first time?

- 1 Thirteen or younger
- 2 Fourteen
- 3 Fifteen
- 4 Sixteen
- 5 Seventeen
- 6 Eighteen or older
- 7 I have never had sexual intercourse

G2 During your life, how many people have you had sexual intercourse with?

- 1 1 partner
- 2 2 partners
- 3 3 partners
- 4 4 partners
- 5 5 partners
- 6 6 partners or more
- 7 I have never had sexual intercourse

G3 During the last three months, how many people have you had sexual intercourse with?

- 1 1 partner
- 2 2 partners
- 3 3 partners
- 4 4 partners
- 5 5 partners
- 6 6 partners or more
- 7 I did not have sexual intercourse during the past 3 months
- 8 I have never had sexual intercourse

ATTACHMENT TO PARENTAL FIGURES—SECTION I

Please answer the following questions about your current relationship with your parents, step-parents, or guardians.

ATTACHMENT TO MOM

<i>Please answer these questions about your mom/female guardian...</i>					
	Never	Sometimes	Half of the Time	Usually	Always
I1 How often do you trust your mom/female guardian?	1	2	3	4	5
I2 How often do you feel you can talk to her about your problems?	1	2	3	4	5
I3 How often do you think she is genuinely interested in you?	1	2	3	4	5
I4 How often do you feel that she supports you?	1	2	3	4	5

ATTACHMENT TO DAD

<i>Please answer these questions about your dad/male guardian...</i>					
	Never	Sometimes	Half of the Time	Usually	Always
I5 How often do you trust your dad/male guardian?	1	2	3	4	5
I6 How often do you feel you can talk to him about your problems?	1	2	3	4	5
I7 How often do you think he is genuinely interested in you?	1	2	3	4	5
I8 How often do you feel that he supports you ?	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX B CODE BOOK

1) Categorical data information

VARIABLES		
Gender	Male Female	0 1
Age	18 19 20 21	1 2 3 4
Family structure	Two biological parents Single parents Step parents other	Reference group
Dating	No current dating Occasional Steady/serious dating Other (engaged, married, divorced)	Reference group
Living on/off campus	On campus Off campus	0 1
Race	white Black Hispanics Asian Others	Reference group
Country	Korea America	0 1
Witnessed father's violence	No Yes	0 1
Witnessed mother's violence	No Yes	0 1

2) Scale information

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES				
Child abuse (KOREA)	No Yes	0 1	1. Throw something at you that could hurt you? 2. Push, grab, or shove you? 3. Pull your hair? 4. Slap or hit you? 5. Kick or bite you? 6. Choke or attempt to drown you? 7. Hit you with some object? (not including spanking) 8. Punish you with a belt, board, cord, or other hard object? (not including spanking) 9. Hit you so hard that it left bruises or marks?	
Child abuse (USA)	No Yes	0 1	1. Throw something at you that could hurt you? 2. Push, grab, or shove you?	

			<p>3. Pull your hair? 4. Slap or hit you? 5. Hit you with some object? (not including spanking) 6. Punish you with a belt, board, cord, or other hard object? (not including spanking) 7. Hit you so hard that it left bruises or marks?</p>
Self-control	<p>Strongly agree Agree disagree Strongly disagree</p>	<p>1 2 3 4</p>	<p>1. I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think. 2. I don't devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future. 3. I often do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal. 4. I'm more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run. 5. I frequently try to avoid projects that I know will be difficult. 6. When things get complicated, I tend to quit or withdraw. 7. The things in life that are easiest to do bring me most pleasure. 8. I dislike really hard tasks that stretch my abilities to the limit. 9. I like to test myself every now and then by doing something a little risky. 10. Sometimes I will take a risk just for the fun of it. 11. I sometimes find it exciting to do things for which I might get in trouble. 12. Excitement and adventure are more important to me than security. 13. If I had a choice, I would almost always rather do something physical than something mental. 14. I almost always feel better when I am on the move than when I am sitting and thinking. 15. I like to get out and do things more than I like to read or contemplate ideas. 16. I often look out for myself first, even if it means making things difficult for other people. 17. I'm not very sympathetic to other people when they are having problems. 18. If things I do upset people, it's their problem not mine. 19. I will try to get the things I want even when I know it causes problems for other people. 20. I lose my temper pretty easily. 21. Often, when I'm angry at people I feel more like hurting them than talking to them about why I am angry. 22. When I'm really angry, other people better stay away from me. 23. When I have a serious disagreement with someone, it's usually hard for me to talk calmly about it without getting upset.</p>
Attachment to mother	<p>Never Sometimes</p>	<p>1 2</p>	<p>1. How often do you trust your mom/female guardian?</p>

	Half of the times usually Always	3 4 5	2. How often do you feel you can talk to her about your problems? 3. How often do you think she is genuinely interested in you? 4. How often do you feel that she supports you?
Attachment to father	Never Sometimes Half of the times usually Always	1 2 3 4 5	1. How often do you trust your dad/male guardian? 2. How often do you feel you can talk to him about your problems? 3. How often do you think he is genuinely interested in you? 4. How often do you feel that he supports you ?
Risky sexual behavior	No experience 1 partner (13yrs) 2 partners (14yrs) 3 partners(15yrs) 4 partners(16yrs) 5 partners (17yrs) 6 partners or more (18 yrs or older)	0 1 2 3 4 5 6	1. How old were you when you had sexual intercourse for the first time? 2. During your life, how many people have you had sexual intercourse with 3. During the last three months, how many people have you had sexual intercourse with

DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Perpetration of physical violence (KOREA)	Never happened Once in the past yr Twice in the past yr 3-5 times in the past yr 6 or more times in the past year	0 1 2 3 4	1. I threw something at my partner that could hurt. 2. Twisted my partner's arm or hair. 3. I kicked my partner. 4. I slapped my partner. 5. I pushed or shoved my partner. 6. I punched or hit my partner with my hand or an object. 7. I choked my partner. 8. I slammed my partner against a wall. 9. I grabbed my partner.
Perpetration of psychological abuse (KOREA)			1. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner. 2. I prevented my partner from seeing family or friends. 3. I insulted or swore at my partner. 4. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover. 5. I called my partner bad names. 6. I shouted or yelled at my partner.
Victimization of physical violence(KOREA)			1. My partner threw something at me that could hurt. 2. My partner twisted my arm or hair. 3. My partner kicked me. 4. My partner slapped me. 5. My partner pushed or shoved me. 6. My partner punched or hit me with my hand or an object. 7. My partner choked me. 8. My partner slammed me against a wall. 9. My partner grabbed me.

Victimization of psychological violence (KOREA)			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My partner insisted on knowing me whereabouts all the time. 2. My partner prevented me from seeing family or friends. 3. My partner insisted on knowing who I was talking to on the phone. 4. My partner insulted or swore at me. 5. My partner accused me of being a lousy lover. 6. My partner shouted or yelled at me.
Perpetration of physical violence (US)			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I threw something at my partner that could hurt. 2. Twisted my partner's arm or hair. 3. I kicked my partner. 4. I slapped my partner. 5. I pushed or shoved my partner. 6. I punched or hit my partner with my hand or an object. 7. I choked my partner. 8. I slammed my partner against a wall. 9. I grabbed my partner.
Perpetration of psychological abuse (US)			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner. 2. I insisted on knowing who my partner was talking to on the phone. 3. I insulted or swore at my partner. 4. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover. 5. I called my partner bad names. 6. I shouted or yelled at my partner.
Victimization of physical violence (US)			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My partner threw something at me that could hurt. 2. My partner twisted my arm or hair. 3. My partner kicked me. 4. My partner slapped me. 5. My partner pushed or shoved me. 6. My partner punched or hit me with my hand or an object. 7. My partner choked me. 8. My partner slammed me against a wall. 9. My partner grabbed me.
Victimization of psychological abuse (US)			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My partner prevented me from seeing family or friends. 2. My partner insisted on knowing me whereabouts all the time. 3. My partner insisted on knowing who I was talking to on the phone. 4. My partner insulted or swore at me. 5. My partner accused me of being a lousy lover. 6. My partner called me bad names.

APPENDIX C
CORRELATION CHARTS

Correlation chart for Korean sample

	1 child abuse	2 Dad violence	3 Mom's violence	4 self control	5 Att mom	6 Att dad	7 gender	8 age	9 campus	10 risky sex	11 family	12 dating	13 ppv	14 ppsy	15 vpv	16 vpsy
1	1.00															
2	.29**	1.00														
3	.27**	.36**	1.00													
4	-.073**	-0.02	-0.02	1.00												
5	-.18**	-.08**	-.073**	.22**	1.00											
6	-.22**	-.17**	-.097**	.21**	.56**	1.00										
7	0.02	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	-.06*	-.15**	1.00									
8	-0.04	0.00	0.02	.13**	.09**	.08**	-.15**	1.00								
9	0.01	-.08**	-0.01	-0.01	-.04	-.06*	.10**	0.00	1.00							
10	.10**	0.02	0.03	-.07**	-.01	0.02	-.31**	.26**	-.02	1.00						
11	0.04	10**	-0.01	0.05	-.09**	-.05	0.02	0.02	0.00	.05*	1.00					
12	0.05	0.05	.062*	0.02	0.05	0.01	-.07**	.16**	0.03	.22**	-0.03	1.00				
13	.14**	.07**	.064*	-.11**	-.06*	-.07**	0.00	-0.04	-0.04	.10**	.05*	.13**	1.00			
14	.18**	.07**	.070*	-.12**	-.09**	-.07**	0.00	.09**	-.02	.23**	0.05	.21**	.60**	1.00		
15	.10**	0.04	.055*	-.07**	-.05*	-.05	-0.04	-0.01	-.05*	.09**	0.02	.12**	.87**	.54**	1.00	
16	.14**	0.02	0.04	-.12**	-.06*	-.07**	0.02	.12**	0.00	.27**	0.04	.23**	.44**	.74**	.42**	1.00

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Correlation chart for American sample

	1 child abuse	2 Dad violence	3 Mom's violence	4 self control	5 Att mom	6 Att dad	7 gender	8 age	9 race	10 campus	11 risky sex	12 family	13 dating	14 ppv	15 ppsy	16 vpv	17 vpsy
1	1																
2	.28**	1.00															
3	.25**	.39**	1.00														
4	-.10**	0.01	0.00	1.00													
5	-.22**	-0.05	-.09**	.24**	1.00												
6	-.21**	-.17**	-.08**	.16**	.31**	1.00											
7	-.07**	0.01	-.07**	.10**	-.01	-.09**	1.00										
8	.07**	-0.03	-0.01	-0.01	-0.02	-0.05	-.05*	1.00									
9	.21**	.12**	.11**	.05*	-.04	-.082**	-.02	0.02	1.00								
10	0.04	0.00	-0.01	-0.02	0.01	-0.04	-0.02	.48**	0.02	1.00							
11	.13**	0.05	.07*	-.14**	-.06*	-.08**	-.07**	.27**	-0.01	.17**	1.00						
12	.12**	.10**	.06*	-0.02	-.14**	-.18**	0.02	.05*	.057*	0.04	.202**	1.00					
13	.05*	0.03	0.05	0.05	-0.02	-0.02	0.06*	.17**	-0.02	.10**	.293**	.057*	1.00				
14	.15**	0.04	0.01	-.17**	-.07**	-.12**	.13**	0.05	.072*	0.00	.196**	.09**	.17**	1.00			
15	.17**	0.04	.07*	-.17**	-.06*	-.08**	.09**	.13**	0.00	.09**	.373**	.11**	.27**	.56**	1.00		
16	.16**	0.05	.06*	-.16**	-.12**	-.10**	0.0	.08**	.058*	0.04	.209**	0.04	.14**	.81**	.48**	1.00	
17	.15**	0.04	.06*	-.15**	-.07*	-.07*	0.0	.11**	0.01	.07**	.387**	.10**	.21**	.45**	.84**	.46**	1.00

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Correlation chart for full model

	1 Child abuse	2 Dad's violence	3 Mom's violence	4 Self control	5 Attach mom	6 Attach dad	7 Gender	8 Age	9 Country	10 campus	11 Risky sex	12 Family	13 Dating	14 Enppv	15 Enppsy	16 Envpv	17 Envpsy
1	1.00																
2	.27**	1.00															
3	.26**	.36**	1.00														
4	-.07**	-.07**	-0.02	1.00													
5	-.19**	-.10**	-.08**	.27**	1.00												
6	-.21**	-.18**	-.09**	.21**	.44**	1.00											
7	-0.02	-0.03	-.04*	.09**	-0.02	-.10**	1.00										
8	0.01	.049*	0.01	-0.04	-0.01	-0.02	-.13**	1.00									
9	0.02	-.22**	-0.02	.32**	.17**	.11**	.11**	-.27**	1.00								
10	0.02	.06**	0.00	-.14**	-.07**	-.08**	-.03	.38**	-.40**	1.00							
11	.11**	-0.03	.04*	-0.02	0.00	-0.01	-.16**	.18**	.23**	0.00	1.00						
12	.09**	.040*	0.02	.07**	-.07**	-.10**	.04*	-0.02	.21**	-.06**	.19**	1.00					
13	.05**	0.01	.05**	.06**	0.03	0.01	0.00	.12**	.10**	0.03	.27**	.04*	1.00				
14	.14**	0.03	0.03	-.10**	-.05**	-.09**	.08**	-0.02	.09**	-.04*	.17**	.09**	.16**	1.00			
15	.16**	-0.02	.05**	-.05**	-0.02	-.05*	.08**	0.03	.27**	-.05**	.37**	.14**	.26**	.56**	1.00		
16	.14**	0.02	.05**	-.09**	-.08**	-.07**	-0.01	0.03	.05**	-0.01	.16**	.042*	.14**	.83**	.48**	1.00	
17	.15**	-0.02	.04*	-.06**	-0.03	-.044*	.047*	0.03	.25**	-.05*	.38**	.14**	.25**	.51**	.90**	.50**	1.00

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

APPENDIX D
TABLES OF LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODELS

Table D- 1 Logistic regression model for perpetration of physical violence in Korea

Variables	Valid N:1304		
	B	P	OR
Independent Variables			
Victim of child abuse	.128**	.002	.1.136
Witnessed father's violence	.224	.277	1.251
Witnessed mother's violence	.115	.687	1.122
Self-control scale	-.037**	.001	.964
Attachment to mother	-.007	.818	.993
Attachment to father	-.024	.278	.976
Control Variables			
Sex	.306	.093	1.358
Age	-.011	.886	.989
Family structure†		.506	
Single parents	.175	.659	1.191
Step parents	.676	.260	1.966
Others	.628	.316	1.874
Dating involvement††		.000	
Occasionally	1.318**	.000	3.738
Steady	.927**	.000	2.528
Others	.993*	.026	2.699
Campus	-.440	.229	.644
Risky Sexual behavior	.087**	.000	1.091
Constant	.058	.948	1.060
Model Chi-Sq	121.520		
-2LL	971.845		
Cox&Snell R Square	.089		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: “two biological parents”

††reference group: “currently not dating”

Table D- 2 Logistic regression model for perpetration of psychological abuse in Korea

Variables	B	N=1399 Missing:121	P	Valid N:1278	OR
Independent Variables					
Victim of child abuse	.137**		.000		1.147
Witnessed father's violence	.249		.140		1.283
Witnessed mother's violence	-.245		.140		1.283
Self-control scale	-.023**		.008		.977
Attachment to mother	-.043		.067		.958
Attachment to father	.009		.641		1.009
Control Variables					
Sex	.445**		.002		1.577
Age	.171**		.007		1.187
Family structure†			.703		
Single parents	.231		.474		1.259
Step parents	.004		.995		1.004
Others	-.560		.335		.571
Dating involvement††			.000		
Occasionally	.888**		.000		2.430
Steady	1.004**		.000		2.730
Others	.352**		.000		1.422
Campus	-.160		.611		.852
Risky sexual behavior	.116**		.000		1.123
Constant	-.449		.519		.638
Model Chi-Sq		183.855			
-2LL		1404.625			
Cox&Snell R Square		.134			

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: “two biological parents”

††reference group: “currently not dating”

Table D- 3 Logistic regression model for victimization by physical violence in Korea

Variables	N=1399	Missing:91	Valid N:1308	OR
	B	P		
<u>Independent Variables</u>				
Victim of child abuse	.111*	.011		1.117
Witnessed father's violence	.128	.571		1.136
Witnessed mother's violence	.165	.592		1.179
Self-control scale	-.051**	.000		.950
Attachment to mother	-.049	.103		.952
Attachment to father	-.007	.779		.993
<u>Control Variables</u>				
Sex	.536**	.007		1.710
Age	.010	.905		1.010
Family structure†		.413		
Single parents	-.101	.827		.904
Step parents	.910	.130		2.484
Others	0.497	.459		1.644
Dating involvement‡‡		.000		
Occasionally	.906**	.000		2.474
Steady	.865**	.000		2.374
Others	.718	.150		2.050
Campus	-.521	.189		.594
Risky sexual behavior	.091**	.000		1.095
Constant	10141	.233		3.129
Model Chi-Sq	104.150			
-2LL	859.863			
Cox&Snell R Square	.077			

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

‡‡reference group: "currently not dating"

Table D- 4 Logistic regression model for victimization by psychological abuse in Korea

Variables	B	P	OR
N=1399 Missing:124 Valid N:1275			
<u>Independent Variables</u>			
Victim of child abuse	.112**	.001	1.118
Witnessed father's violence	.506	.745	1.057
Witnessed mother's violence	-.035	.888	.966
Self-control scale	-.033**	.000	.967
Attachment to mother	-.019	.419	.981
Attachment to father	.014	.477	1.014
<u>Control Variables</u>			
Sex	.503**	.000	1.653
Age	.179**	.004	1.196
Family structure†		.599	
Single parents	.124	.703	1.132
Step parents	.747	.206	2.112
Others	-.209	.714	.812
Dating involvement‡‡		.000	
Occasionally	1.059**	.000	2.884
Steady	1.202**	.000	3.327
Others	-.135	.757	.874
Campus	-.180	.570	.836
Risky sexual behavior	.101**	.000	1.106
Constant	-.239	.734	.787
Model Chi-Sq	197.902		
-2LL	1416.764		
Cox&Snell R Square	.144		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: “two biological parents”

‡‡reference group: “currently not dating”

Table D- 5 Logistic regression model for perpetration of physical violence in the U.S.

Variables	Valid N:1158		
	B	P	OR
<u>Independent Variables</u>			
Victim of child abuse	.126**	.004	1.134
Witnessed father's violence	.145	.653	1.156
Witnessed mother's violence	.004	.994	1.004
Self-control scale	-.028**	.001	.972
Attachment to mother	.007	.759	1.007
Attachment to father	-.020	.258	.980
<u>Control Variables</u>			
Sex	.875**	.000	2.399
Age	-.056	.458	.945
Family structure†		.430	
Single parents	.059	.794	1.060
Step parents	.421	.102	1.524
Others	-.075	.878	.927
Dating involvement††		.000	
Occasionally	.654**	.004	1.924
Steady	1.033**	.000	2.810
Others	1.435**	.000	4.201
Campus	-.083	.683	.920
Risky Sexual behavior	.087**	.000	1.091
Race†††		.790	
Hispanic	-.247	.268	.781
Black	.089	.701	1.093
Asian	.067	.844	1.069
Other	.004	.994	1.004
Constant	-.688	-.353	.503
Model Chi-Sq	152.569		
-2LL	1146.493		
Cox&Snell R Square	.123		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table D- 6 Logistic regression model for perpetration of psychological abuse in the U.S.

Variables	Valid N:1111		
	B	P	OR
<u>Independent Variables</u>			
Victim of child abuse	.130**	.003	1.139
Witnessed father's violence	-.058	.860	.943
Witnessed mother's violence	.344	.261	1.411
Self-control scale	-.017*	.030	.983
Attachment to mother	.012	.641	1.012
Attachment to father	-.009	.608	.991
<u>Control Variables</u>			
Sex	.684**	.000	1.982
Age	-.048	.505	.953
Family structure†		.253	
Single parents	-.395	.072	.674
Step parents	.138	.630	1.148
Others	.188	.721	1.207
Dating involvement‡‡		.000	
Occasionally	.996**	.000	2.708
Steady	1.339**	.000	3.816
Others	1.842**	.000	6.308
Campus	.271	.096	1.312
Risky sexual behavior	.160**	.000	1.173
Race†††		.314	
Hispanic	-.398	.055	.672
Black	-.123	.589	.884
Asian	-.118	.716	.888
Other	-.528	.231	.590
Constant	-.756	.269	.470
Model Chi-Sq	282.634		
-2LL	1252.999		
Cox&Snell R Square	.225		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

‡‡reference group: "currently not dating"

Table D- 7 Logistic regression model for victimization by physical violence in the U.S.

Variables	B	P	OR
Valid N:1161			
<u>Independent Variables</u>			
Victim of child abuse	.173**	.000	1.189
Witnessed father's violence	.211	.535	1.235
Witnessed mother's violence	.013	.966	1.013
Self-control scale	-.029**	.002	.971
Attachment to mother	-.009	.718	.991
Attachment to father	.000	.986	1.000
<u>Control Variables</u>			
Sex	.207	.244	1.230
Age	.027	.742	1.027
Family structure †		.737	
Single parents	.224	.353	1.251
Step parents	-.063	.830	.939
Others	-.251	.654	.778
Dating involvement‡‡		.000	
Occasionally	.665**	.009	1.945
Steady	1.031**	.000	2.805
Others	1.796**	.000	6.026
Campus	.104	.601	1.109
Risky sexual behavior	.100**	.000	1.106
Race†††		.976	
Hispanic	-.104	.663	.901
Black	-.087	.740	.917
Asian	.109	.762	1.115
Other	.122	.820	1.189
Constant	-1.095	.168	.335
Model Chi-Sq	134.100		
-2LL	987.361		
Cox&Snell R Square	.109		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

‡‡reference group: "currently not dating"

Table D- 8 Logistic regression model for victimization by psychological abuse in the U.S.

Variables	Valid N:1118		
	B	P	OR
Independent Variables			
Victim of child abuse	.198**	.000	1.220
Witnessed father's violence	-.007	.983	.993
Witnessed mother's violence	.023	.937	1.023
Self-control scale	-.022**	.005	.979
Attachment to mother	.044	.065	1.045
Attachment to father	.017	.312	1.017
Control Variables			
Sex	.460**	.002	1.584
Age	-.028	.695	.973
Family structure†		.621	
Single parents	-.186	.386	.830
Step parents	.163	.541	1.177
Others	.318	.538	1.374
Dating involvement‡‡		.000	
Occasionally	.980**	.000	2.664
Steady	.986**	.000	2.679
Others	1.003**	.004	2.726
Campus	.161	.321	1.174
Risky sexual behavior	.166**	.000	1.181
Race†††		.234	
Hispanic	-.428*	.037	.652
Black	-.328	.141	.721
Asian	-.041	.902	.960
Other	-.171	.706	.843
Constant	-1.580*	.018	.206
Model Chi-Sq	246.362		
-2LL	1295.261		
Cox&Snell R Square	.198		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

‡‡reference group: "currently not dating"

Table D- 9 Logistic regression result of full model-perpetration of physical violence

Variables	B	P	OR
Valid N:2456			
<u>Independent Variables</u>			
Victim of child abuse	.131**	.000	1.140
Witnessed father's violence	.220	.196	1.247
Witnessed mother's violence	-.084	.686	.920
Self-control scale	-.029**	.000	.971
Attachment to mother	-.002	.918	.998
Attachment to father	-.022	.113	.979
<u>Control Variables</u>			
Country	.460**	.001	.1584
Sex	.634**	.000	1.885
Age	-.029	.586	.972
Family structure†			
Single parents	.073	.700	1.076
Step parents	.433	.066	1.541
Others	.151	.699	1.163
Dating involvement‡‡			
Occasionally	.933**	.000	2.543
Steady	1.003**	.000	2.728
Others	1.267**	.000	3.551
Campus	-.182	.228	.833
Risky sexual behavior	.091**	.000	1.095
Constant	-.842	.107	.431
Model Chi-Sq	293.046		
-2LL	2133.557		
Cox&Snell R Square	.112		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

‡‡reference group: "currently not dating"

Table D- 10 Logistic regression result of full model-perpetration of psychological abuse

Variables	B	P	OR
Valid N:2383			
<u>Independent Variables</u>			
Victim of child abuse	.127**	.000	1.136
Witnessed father's violence	.177	.236	1.194
Witnessed mother's violence	-.020	.914	.980
Self-control scale	-.018**	.002	.982
Attachment to mother	-.022	.179	.982
Attachment to father	.000	.996	1.000
<u>Control Variables</u>			
country	.882**	.000	2.417
Sex	.568**	.000	1.765
Age	.071	.129	1.073
Family structure†			
Single parents	-.205	.243	.815
Step parents	.147	.556	1.158
Others	-.115	.758	.891
Dating involvement††			
Occasionally	.929**	.000	2.532
Steady	1.172**	.000	3.230
Others	1.024**	.000	2.784
Campus	.095	.481	1.099
Risky sexual behavior	.143**	.000	2.417
Constant	-1.113*	.012	.329
Model Chi-Sq	551.810		
-2LL	2682.563		
Cox&Snell R Square	.207		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

Table D- 11 Logistic regression result of full model-victimization by physical violence

Variables	Valid N:2463		
	B	P	OR
Independent Variables			
Victim of child abuse	.150**	.000	1.162
Witnessed father's violence	.146	.427	1.157
Witnessed mother's violence	.075	.727	1.078
Self-control scale	-.036**	.000	.965
Attachment to mother	-.033	.086	.968
Attachment to father	-.006	.691	.994
Control Variables			
Country	.521**	.001	1.684
Sex	.381**	.004	1.464
Age	.021	.716	1.021
Family structure†			
Single parents	.138	.498	1.148
Step parents	.058	.824	1.060
Others	-.011	.979	.989
Dating involvement‡‡			
Occasionally	.740**	.000	2.096
Steady	.913**	.000	2.491
Others	1.347**	.000	3.844
Campus	.065	.703	1.067
Risky sexual behavior	.097**	.000	1.102
Constant	-.615	.278	.541
Model Chi-Sq	240.821		
-2LL	1864.031		
Cox&Snell R Square	.093		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

‡‡reference group: "currently not dating"

Table D- 12 Logistic regression result of full model-victimization by psychological abuse

Variables	Valid N:2386		
	B	P	OR
<u>Independent Variables</u>			
Victim of child abuse	.141**	.000	1.151
Witnessed father's violence	.038	.799	1.039
Witnessed mother's violence	.000	1.000	1.000
Self-control scale	-.026**	.000	.975
Attachment to mother	.007	.656	1.014
Attachment to father	.014	.250	.975
<u>Control Variables</u>			
Country	.397**	.001	1.487
Sex	.491**	.000	1.634
Age	.088	.053	1.092
Family structure†			
Single parents	-.100	.561	.904
Step parents	.224	.345	1.251
Others	.095	.796	.1.100
Dating involvement††			
Occasionally	1.023**	.000	2.782
Steady	1.101**	.000	3.008
Others	.547*	.032	1.728
Campus	.046	.732	1.047
Risky sexual behavior	.134**	.000	1.143
Constant	-1.156**	.009	.315
Model Chi-Sq	454.180		
-2LL	2734.802		
Cox&Snell R Square	.173		

*p<.05. **p<.01.

†reference group: "two biological parents"

††reference group: "currently not dating"

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Alexander, P. C., Moore, S., & Alexander, E. (1991). What is transmitted in the intergenerational transmission of violence? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 53, 657-668.
- Arias, I., Samios, L., & O'Leary, K. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2, 82-90.
- Arias, I., & Johnson, P. (1989). Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 298-307.
- Avakame, E. F. (1998a). Intergenerational transmission of violence, self-control, and conjugal violence: A comparative analysis of physical violence and psychological aggression. *Violence and Victims*, 13, 301-316.
- Avakame, E. F. (1998b). Intergenerational transmission of violence and psychological aggression against wives. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 30, 193-202.
- Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of models' reinforcement contingencies in the acquisition of imitative responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1, 589-595.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unified theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Reviews*, 84, 191-215.
- Bergman, L. (1992). Dating violence among high school students. *Social Work*, 37, 21-27.
- Bernard, M. & Bernard, J. (1983). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. *Family Relations*, 32, 283-286.
- Bethke, T., & DeJoy, D. (1993). An experimental study of factors influencing the acceptability of dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8, 36-51.
- Billingham, R. (1987). Courtship violence: The patterns of conflict resolution strategies across seven levels of emotional commitment. *Family Relations*, 36, 283-289.
- Billingham, R., & Gilbert, K. (1990). Parental divorce during childhood and use of violence in dating relationships. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 1003-1009.
- Billingham, R., & Notebaert, N. (1993). Divorce and dating violence revisited: Multivariate analyses using Straus' Conflict Tactics subscores. *Psychological Reports*, 73, 679-684.
- Banyard, V. L., Cross, C. & Modecki, K. L. (2006). Ecological Correlates of Self-Reported Perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 1314-1332.
- Bergman, L. (1992). Dating violence among high school students. *Social Work*, 37, 21-27.

- Bernard, J. L., Bernard, S. L., & Bernard, M. L. (1985). Courtship violence and sex-typing. *Family Relations*, 34, 573-576.
- Brener, N.D., McMahon, P. M., Warren, C. W., & Douglas, K. A. (1999). Forced sexual intercourse and associated health risk behaviors among female college students in the United States. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 67, 252-259.
- Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol.2, Separation*. New York: Basic
- Cassidy, J. (1994). Emotion regulation: Influences of attachment relationships. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 59, 228-283.
- Cassidy, J. (2000). Adult romantic attachments: A developmental perspective on individual differences. *Review of General Psychology*, 4, 11-131.
- Cate, R. M., Henton, J.M., Koval, J., Christopher, F. S., & Lloyd, S. (1982). Premarital abuse: A social psychological perspective. *Journal of Family Issues*, 3, 79-90
- Carr, J., & VanDeusen, K. M. (2002). The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence in college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 630-646.
- Cicchetti, D., & Howes, P. W. (1991). Developmental psychopathology in the context of the family: Illustrations from the study of child maltreatment. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 23, 257- 281.
- Centers for Disease Control. *Dating Abuse Fact Sheet*.
<http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/dvp/DatingViolence.htm>. Accessed on August 10, 2006.
- Chapple, C. L., & Hope, T. L. (2003). An analysis of the self-control and criminal versatility of gang and dating violence offenders. *Violence and Victims*, 18, 671-690.
- Chase, K. A., Treboux, D., & O'Leary, K. D. (2002). Characteristics of high-risk adolescents' dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 33-49.
- Cleveland, H., Herrera, V. M. & Stuewig, J. (2003). Abusive males and abused females in adolescent relationships: Risk factor similarity and dissimilarity and the role of relationship seriousness. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18, 325-339.
- Crittenden, P.M & Ainsworth, D.S. (1989). *Child maltreatment theory*. Cicchetti & Carlson (eds), *Handbook of child maltreatment* (pp. 432-246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dodge, K. A., Petit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & Valente, E. (1995). Social information processing patterns mediate the effect of early physical abuse on later conduct problems. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 104, 632-643.
- Eisikovits, Z., Winstok, Z., & Fisher, G. (2004). The first Israeli national survey on domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 729-748.

- Coffey, P., Leitenberg, H., Henning, K., Bennett, R., & Jankowski, M. (1996). Dating violence: The association between methods of coping and women's psychological adjustment. *Violence and Victims*, 11, 227–238.
- Ferguson, D.M. ,Boden, J.M. & Horwood, L.J. Circumcision Status and Risk of Sexually Transmitted Infection in Young Adult Males: An Analysis of a Longitudinal Birth Cohort. *Pediatrics* (2006), 118, 1971-1977.
- Follette, V. (1992). The effect of violence in the family of origin on problem-solving strategies in dating couples. *Behavioral Assessment*, 14, 1–3.
- Follette, V., & Alexander, P. (1992). Dating violence: Current and historical correlates. *Behavioral Assessment*, 14, 39–52.
- Follingstad, D., Rutledge, L., Polek, D., & McNeill-Hawkins, K (1988). Factors associated with patterns of dating violence toward college women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 3, 169–182.
- Follingstad, D. R., Bradley, R. G., Laughlin, J. E., & Burke, L. (1999). Risk factors and correlates of dating violence: The relevance of examining the frequency and severity levels in a college sample. *Violence and Victims*, 14, 365–380.
- Higgins, G. E. (2007). Examining the original Grasmick scale: A Rasch model approach. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 157-178.
- Holtfreter, K. ,Reisig, M., & Pratt, T. (2008). Low self-control, routine activities, and fraud victimization. *Criminology* 46 (1): Accepted & forthcoming.
- Foo, L, & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10, 351–377.
- Foshee, V. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types, and injuries. *Health Education Research*, 11, 275–286.
- Foshee, V. , Bauman, K E., & Linder, G. F. (1999). Family violence and the perpetration of adolescent dating violence: Examining social learning and social control processes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 331-342.
- Foshee, V., Benefield, T., Ennett, S., Bauman, K., & Suchindran, C.(2004). Longitudinal predictors of serious physical and sexual dating violence victimization during adolescence. *Preventive Medicine*, 39, 1007–1016.
- Foshee, V., Bauman, K., Linder, F., Rice, J., & Wilcher, R. (2007). Typologies of adolescent dating violence: Identifying typologies of adolescent dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 489–519.
- Goldstein, D., & Rosenbaum, A. (1985). An evaluation of the self-esteem of maritally violent men. *FamilyRelations*, 34, 425–428.

- Gottfredson, M. & Hirschi, T. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Palo Alto: CA. Stanford University Press.
- Gover, A. R. (2004). Risky lifestyles and dating violence: A theoretical test of violent victimization. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 171-180.
- Gover, A. R. Kaukinen, C. & Fox, K. (2008) The Relationship Between Violence in the Family of Origin and Dating Violence Among College Students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 1667-1693.
- Grasmick, H. G., Tittle,C., Bursik, R. J., & Arneklev, B. K.(1993) Testing the Core Empirical Implications of Gottfredson and Hirschi's General Theory of Crime." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 30, 5-29.
- Gray, H., & Foshee, V. (1997). Adolescent dating violence: Differences between one-sided versus mutually violent profiles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 126–141.
- Gross, A. M., Winslett, A., Roberts, M. ,& Gohm, C. L (2006) An examination of sexual violence against college women. *Violence Against Women*. 12, 288-300.
- Gwartney-Gibbs, P., Stockard, J., & Brohmer, S. (1987). Learning courtship violence: The influence of parents, peers, and personal experiences. *Family Relations Journal of Applied Family and Child Studies*, 36, 276–282.
- Hanley, M. J., & O'Neill, P. (1997). Violence and commitment: A study of dating couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 685–703.
- Harned, M. S.(2002). A multivariate analysis of risk marker for dating violence victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 1179-1197.
- Henton, J. M., Cate, R. M., Koval, J., Lloyd, S., & Christopher, F. S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 4, 467-482.
- Hickman, L. J , Jaycox L. H., & Aronoff, J (2004) Dating Violence among Adolescents. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 5, 123-142.
- Hirschi T (2004) *Self-control and crime*. In: Baumeister RF, Vohs KD (eds) Handbook of self-regulation. Guilford Press, New York
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 476–497
- Jackson, S. M. (1999). Issues in the dating violence research: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 4, 233–247.
- Jaffe, P.G., Wolfe, D.A., & Wilson, S.K. (1990). *Children of Battered Women*, Sage. Newbury Park, CA.

- Jankowski, M. K., Leitenberg, H., Henning, K., & Coffey, P. (1999). Intergenerational transmission of dating aggression as a function of witnessing only same sex parents vs. opposite sex parents vs. both parents as perpetrators of domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 267-279.
- Kaufman, J. and Zigler, E. (1993), The Intergenerational Transmission of Abuse is Overstated', in R. J. Gelles and D. R. Loseke (eds), *Current Controversies on Family Violence*, Newbury Park, Calif.; London, Sage.
- Kerley, K. R., Xu, X., & SirisunyaluckB. (2008) Self-Control, Intimate Partner Aggression, and Intimate Partner Victimization: Testing The General Theory of Crime in Thailand *Deviant Behavior*, 29,503-532.
- Kwong, M. J., Bartholomew, K., Henderson, A. J. Z., & Trinke, S. J. (2003).The intergenerational transmission of relationship violence. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 17, 288-301.
- Lewis, S. F., & Fremouw, W. (2000). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 21, 105-127.
- Luthra, R. &. Gidycz G A (2006). Dating Violence Among College Men and Women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21,717-731
- Lysova, A. V. (2007). Dating violence in Russia. *Russian Education and Society*, 49, 43–59.
- Lloyd, S. (1991). The dark side of courtship: Violence and sexual exploitation. *Family Relations*, 40, 14–20.
- Magdol, L., Moffitt, T., Caspi, A., Newman, D., Fagan, J., & Silva, P. (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 and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 68–78.
- Magdol, L., Moffitt, T., Caspi, A., & Silva, P. (1998). Hitting without a license: Testing explanations for differences in partner abuse between young adult daters and cohabitators. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 41–55.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. *Family Relations*, 30, 97–102.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1983). Life events, stress, and courtship violence. *Family Relations*, 32, 101–109.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. *Family Relations*, 35, 383–388.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1987). Social factors and victim offender differences in courtship violence. *Family Relations*, 36, 87–91.

- Marshall, L., & Rose, P. (1987). Gender, stress, and violence in adult relationships of a sample of college students. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 4, 299–316.
- Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1988). Family of origin violence and courtship abuse. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 66, 414-418.
- Mawell, C. D. & Maxwell, S. R. (2003). Experiencing and witnessing familial aggression and their relationship to physically aggressive behaviors among Filipino adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 1432-1451.
- Migcot, M.,& Lester, D. (1996). Psychological abuse in dating, locus of control, depression, and suicidal preoccupation. *Psychological Rep.* 79, 682.
- Mills. C.S., & Granoff, B.J. (1992). Date and acquaintance rape among a sample of college students. *Social Work*, 27, 504-509.
- Monson, C. M., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2002). Sexual and nonsexual dating violence perpetration. *Violence and Victims*, 17, 403-428.
- Muehlenhard, C. L., & Linton, M. A. (1987). Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: Incidence and risk factors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34, 186-196.
- O'Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 546-568.
- O'Keefe, M. (1998). Factors mediating the link between witnessing interparental violence and dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 13, 39-57.
- O'Keefe, M. & Treister, L. (1998). Victims of dating violence among high school students: Are the predictors different for males and females? *Violence Against Women*, 4, 195-223.
- O'Leary, K. D. (1999). Psychological abuse: A variable deserving critical attention in domestic violence. *Violence and Victims*, 14, 3–23.
- Paternoster, B., Brame,R., Mazerolle, P. & Piquero, A.(1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficient. *Criminology*,36, 859 - 866
- Raj, A. & Silverman, J. G. (2003). Immigrant South Asian women at greater risk for injury from intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, 435-437.
- Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Goebert, D., Nishimura, S., & Caetano, R. (2006). Dating violence victimization: Associated drinking and sexual risk behaviors of Asian, Native Hawaiian, and Caucasian high school students in Hawaii. *Journal of School Health*, 76, 423-429.
- Reuterman, N. A., & Burcky, W.D. (1989). Dating violence in high school: A profile of the victim. *Psychology Journal of Human Behavior*, 26, 1-9.

- Riggs, D., O'Leary, K. & Breslin, F. (1990). Multiple correlates of physical aggression in dating couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 61-73.
- Riggs, D. (1993). Relationship problems and dating aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8, 18-35.
- Riggs, D., & O'Leary, K. (1996). Aggression between heterosexual dating partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 11, 519-540.
- Riggs, D., & Caulfield, M. (1997). Expected consequences of male violence against their female dating partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 229-240.
- Riggs, D. S., Caulfield, M. B., & Street, A. E. (2000). Risk for domestic violence: Factors associated with perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 56, 1289-1316.
- Rowe, D.C., Vazsonyi, A. T., & Figueiredo, A.J. (1997). Mating –effort in adolescence: A conditional or alternative strategy. *Personal Individual Differences*, 23, 105-115.
- Schiff, M. & Zeira, A. (2005). Dating violence and sexual risk behaviors in a sample of at-risk Israeli youth. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29, 1249-1263.
- Schreck, C., Stewart E. A. & Fisher, B.S. (2006). Self-control, victimization, and their influence on risky lifestyles: A longitudinal analysis using panel data. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 22, 319-340.
- Schwartz, J. P., Hage, S. M., Bush, I., & Bruns, L K. (2006). Unhealthy Parenting and Potential Mediators as Contributing Factors to Future Intimate Violence: A Review of the Literature. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 7, 206-221
- Sellers, C. (1999). Self-control and intimate violence: An examination of the scope and specification of the general theory of crime. *Criminology*, 37, 375-404.
- Sellers, C., Cochran, J. & Branch, K. (2005). Social Learning Theory and Partner Violence: A Research Note. *Deviant Behavior*, 26, 379-395
- 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 sociality. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 286, 572-579.
- Sharpe, D., & Taylor, J. K(1999). An examination of variables from a social-developmental model to explain physical and psychological dating violence. *Canadian Journal of behavioral Science*, 31, 165-175
- Smith, J., & Williams, J. (1992). From abusive household to dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 7, 153-165.

- 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, 1104-1109.
- Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Guterman, E., Abbott, C.B., & Dawud-Noursi, S. (2005) Adolescents' perceptions of attachment to their mothers and fathers in families with histories of domestic violence: a longitudinal perspective. *Child Abuse Neglect*, 29,853-869.
- Sroufe, L. A., Carlson, E. A., Levy, A. K., & Egeland, B. (1999). Implications of attachment theory for developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 11, 1–13.
- Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Greenbaum, C., Cicchetti, D., Dawud, S., Cortes, R. M., & Lorey, F. (1993). Effects of domestic violence on children's behavior problems and depression. *Developmental Psychology*, 29, 44–52.
- Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Greenbaum, C., Dawud, S., Cortes, M., & Lorey, F. (1994). The effects of domestic violence on children's perceptions of their perpetrating and nonperpetrating parents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 17, 779–795.
- Stets, J., & Straus, M. (1989). The marriage license as a hitting license: A comparison of assaults in dating, cohabiting, and married couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 4, 161–180.
- Stith, S., Jester, S., & Bird, G. (1992). A typology of college students who use violence in their relationships. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 411–421.
- 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*, 41, 75–88.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family* 17, 283–316.
- Straus, M. A. (2004). Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 790-811.
- Sugarman, D., & Hotaling, G. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In M. Pirog-Good & J. Stets (Eds.), *Violence and dating relationships* (pp. 3 –32). New York: Praeger.
- Sugarman, D.A., & Hoteling,G. T. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk makers. In Pirog-Good, M.A., & Stets, J.E. (eds), *Violence in Dating Relationships: Emerging Social Issues*, Praeger, New York, Pp. 3-3
- Tontodonato, P., & Crew, B. (1992). Dating violence, social learning theory, and gender: A multivariateanalysis. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 3–14.

- Watson, J. M., Cascardi, M., Avery-Leaf, S., & O'Leary, K. D. (2001). High school students' responses to dating aggression. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 339–348.
- White, J. W., & Koss, M. P. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students. *Violence and Victims*, 6, 247-256.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

MiRang Park grew up in Seoul, Korea. After graduation from high school she obtained her bachelor's degree in Journalism with minor in sociology from Ewha Womans University in Seoul, Korea. After completing her undergraduate degree in 2003, she moved to East Lansing, Michigan and later her master's degree in criminal justice from the Michigan State University. In 2009 she completed her Ph.D in criminology, law and society at the University of Florida in Gainesville, Florida.

Her interests include 10-mile running, kayaking, traveling, and rice noodle.

She is still young and beautiful.

FAMILY EXPERIENCE, ATTACHMENT TO PARENTS, AND LOW SELF-CONTROL IN DATING VIOLENCE IN THE U.S. AND KOREA

MiRang Park

352-262-0949

Department of Sociology, Criminology and Law & Society

Supervisory chair: Ronald Akers

Co-char: Angela Gover

Ph.D

May, 2009

Although many studies have been done about dating violence, only a few researchers have developed theoretical conceptualizations of factors such as these in dating violence (Sellers, 2005; Follingstad et al, 1999; Riggs and O'Leary, 1989; Luthra and Gidycz, 2006). This dissertation moves beyond these to draw on three prominent general theories of crime and deviance for its theoretical framework to understand the effects of early family experience with violence (social learning), current attachment to parents (social bonding), and self-control. The purpose of this study is to link theoretically relevant variables that are linked in some way to the respondents' family of origin that may account for the likelihood of perpetration or victimization by dating violence in two different cultures. In using the same survey instrument for two countries, this study tested whether theoretical explanations developed in Western society could be applied to Eastern society. A sample of 1,400 young adults attending a university in Korea and a sample of 1,500 young adults attending a university in America were used in this dissertation. Findings indicate that experience of victim of child abuse (social learning), low self-control (self-control), serious dating relationship and risky sexual behavior have significant effects on both the perpetration and victimization of dating violence in both countries. Self-control has stronger effects in the American, and being the victim of violence in the home has more significant effects in the Korean sample.