HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

J Interpers Violence. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2017 November 25.

The Development of Attitudes Toward Intimate Partner Violence: An Examination of Key Correlates Among a Sample of Young Adults

Jennifer E. Copp[1], **Peggy C. Giordano**[2], **Monica A. Longmore**[2], and **Wendy D. Manning**[2]

[1]Florida State University, Tallahassee, USA

[2]Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, USA

Abstract

Social learning theory remains one of the leading explanations of intimate partner violence (IPV). Research on attitudes toward IPV represents a logical extension of the social learning tradition, as it is intuitive to expect that individuals exposed to violence in the family of origin may internalize behavioral scripts for violence and adopt attitudes accepting of IPV. Yet despite this assumed link between family violence and attitudes toward IPV, few studies have empirically examined factors associated with the development of such attitudes. Using data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationship Study (TARS), we examine the role of family violence on the adoption of attitudes accepting of IPV among a sample of young adults ($n = 928$). The current investigation contributes to existing literature on attitudes toward IPV by (a) providing an empirical examination of factors associated with attitudes toward IPV in predictive models; (b) relying on a multifaceted index, describing specific conditions under which IPV may be deemed justifiable; (c) examining extra-familial factors, in addition to family violence exposure, to provide a more comprehensive account of factors associated with attitudes toward IPV; and (d) focusing particular attention on the role of gender, including whether the factors associated with attitudinal acceptance of IPV are similar for men and women. Findings indicated considerable variation in overall endorsement of attitudes regarding the use of violence across conditions, with greater endorsement among women. Consistent with social learning approaches to IPV, exposure to violence in the family of origin was associated with attitudes toward IPV. Yet findings also signaled the salience of factors beyond the family, including a range of sociodemographic, relationship, and adult status characteristics. We discuss the relevance of our findings for future theorizing and research in the area of attitudes toward IPV.

Reprints and permissions: sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Corresponding Author: Jennifer E. Copp, Florida State University, 112 S. Copeland St., Tallahassee, FL 32306, USA. jcopp@fsu.edu.

Authors' Note

The opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication/program/exhibition are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Department of Justice or National Institutes of Health.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Keywords

perceptions of domestic violence; domestic violence; children exposed to domestic violence; anything related to domestic violence

Social learning theory remains one of the foremost explanations of intimate partner violence (IPV), and accordingly, numerous investigations have examined the relationship between violence in the family of origin—both witnessing interparental violence and experiencing child abuse—and subsequent experiences with IPV (Foshee, Linder, MacDougall, & Bangdiwala, 2001; Kwong, Bartholomew, Henderson, & Trinke, 2003; White & Widom, 2003). Early theorizing on the etiology of partner violence, however, also acknowledged the role of social norms; Straus (1980) indicated that in addition to the direct observation of violence in the family of origin, a violent response must be "a culturally recognized script for behavior" (p. 233). Yet whereas scholars continue to unpack the processes underlying the intergenerational transmission of violent behavior (Stith et al., 2000), there is limited emphasis on the role of attitudes in those transmission processes (Eriksson & Mazerolle, 2014). Increasing attention has been paid to attitudes in research on intervention and prevention, as attitudes regarding the acceptability of IPV have become a central focus of programmatic efforts (Campbell & Manganello, 2006; Fincham, Cui, Braithwaite, & Pasley, 2008; Jewkes, Flood, & Lang, 2015). Few studies, however, have empirically examined predictors of attitudes toward IPV in their own right.

Social learning models link experiences in the family of origin to later partner violence (e.g., Ehrensaft et al., 2003; Foshee, Bauman, & Linder, 1999; Mihalic & Elliott, 1997; Riggs & O'Leary, 1989), suggesting that aggression is learned via direct observation of the behavior of others and its consequences (Bandura, 1977). But there is more to social learning than mimicry—individuals observe and may internalize complex scripts for violent behavior, and in some cases, develop attitudes accepting of violence. Despite intergenerational continuity in relationship violence, high-risk individuals (based on exposure to violence in the home) vary in their involvement in violent relationships both across time and romantic partners (Capaldi, Shortt, & Crosby, 2003), and further, the majority of individuals exposed to violence in the family of origin do not report IPV in adulthood (Smith, Ireland, Park, Elwyn, & Thornberry, 2011). Nevertheless, attitudes toward IPV have been found to influence perpetration (e.g., Bartholomew, Schmitt, Yang, & Regan, 2013; C. I. Eckhardt, Samper, Suhr, & Holtzworth-Munroe, 2012; Fincham et al., 2008; Simmons, Lehmann, & Cobb, 2008), often mediating the relationship between other social learning variables and IPV (Foshee et al., 1999). Yet several studies demonstrate that global endorsement of IPV (hitting a partner is ok/acceptable—see, for example, Simon et al., 2001) is relatively low, suggesting the need to develop more nuanced indicators that assess specific attitudes that support the use of violence under some conditions/circumstances.

Building on the existing body of literature on attitudes and IPV, the current investigation begins to unravel the associations between family history and the adoption of attitudes toward IPV among a sample of young adults. Several studies have examined attitudes in relation to partner violence, most often as a mediating variable. Yet despite strong theoretical underpinnings, typically rooted in social learning, these studies seldom examine a full range of predictors of attitudes toward IPV. Recognizing the immediacy of relationship dynamics as elucidated more fully in other studies (e.g., Giordano, Copp, Longmore, & Manning, 2015; Nemeth, Bonomi, Lee, & Ludwin, 2012; Shortt et al., 2012; Stets, 1992), in the current investigation we focus on a range of formative influences on these attitudes. In addition to assessing the link between early learning experiences (i.e., witnessing parental violence, coercive parenting) and attitudes toward IPV, this investigation considers the impact of structural disadvantage (neighborhood poverty, minority status) as well as experiences that occurred in other developmental contexts (prior relationship experiences), and current life status (becoming a parent, education, relationship status) on the adoption of such attitudes. In addition, the current investigation relies on a multifaceted indicator of attitudes toward IPV, recognizing that rates of outright endorsement or "approval" of IPV are relatively low. In contrast to prior work drawing on global assessments, the protocol for this study includes items assessing specific conditions under which violence may be seen as understandable, recognizing that it is unlikely to be viewed as a preferred behavior. Supplemental analyses examine the association between attitudes toward IPV and partner violence in predictive models to determine whether attitudinal acceptance of IPV is correlated with the use of violence in the dyadic context.

Background

Attitudes Toward IPV

There is a growing body of literature that examines attitudes regarding the use of violence toward an intimate partner. Consistent with a generality of deviance perspective, theory and research in this area often suggest an association between antisocial tendencies and partner violence. The implication of this approach is that violent individuals are inclined to choose violent methods to resolve conflict in intimate relationships (Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003; O'Leary, 1988; see also C. Eckhardt, 2011). Other scholars examine the role of attitudes from a feminist perspective, focusing on the link between male dominance or hostility toward women and IPV perpetration (e.g., Holtzworth-Munroe, 2000; Yllo & Straus, 1990). Others focus more specifically on attitudinal acceptance of IPV; for example, research on male-to-female spousal violence found that approval of marital violence influenced the use of violence among married couples (Crossman, Stith, & Bender, 1990; Stith, 1990; Stith & Farley, 1993). Similarly, attitudes toward IPV were associated with physical and verbal assault among a sample of college students (Fincham et al., 2008), and Côté, Vaillancourt, LeBlanc, Nagin, and Tremblay (2006) found that perpetration rates were highest among individuals with permissive attitudes toward IPV. Finally, scholars have examined cultural norms accepting of violence in relation to neighborhood levels of IPV, suggesting that attitudes toward IPV may help us understand contextual-level influences on partner violence (Browning, 2002; Pinchevsky & Wright, 2012; Uthman, Moradi, & Lawoko, 2009; Wright & Benson, 2010).

A related body of research examines public attitudes and beliefs about IPV. Findings from this research reveal how the public views the use of violence in the intimate context, including the types of behaviors that constitute IPV and their acceptability, potential causes of abuse, and attributions of responsibility (Carlson & Worden, 2005; Garcia & Tomas, 2014; Taylor & Sorenson, 2005; Worden & Carlson, 2005). Understanding whether the general public endorses the use of violence toward an intimate partner is not only theoretically important, but also helps guide primary prevention efforts aimed at changing public attitudes and norms about IPV (Campbell & Manganello, 2006; Jewkes et al., 2015). Although there is limited research on the effectiveness of educational campaigns targeting attitudes toward IPV, there is some evidence to suggest that raising public awareness can change attitudes and influence behaviors (Campbell & Manganello, 2006; Jewkes et al., 2015). Furthermore, some scholars have suggested that informal sanctions, including societal disapproval of IPV, may be a more effective deterrent than increasing criminal sanctions (see, for example, Taylor & Sorenson, 2005).

Consistent with literature indicating that men maintain attitudes that promote male dominance and control over women (e.g., Coleman & Straus, 1986; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1997; Yllo & Straus, 1990), much of the work on attitudes has focused on the acceptance of male violence against women (Lichter & McCloskey, 2004). In an examination of both male and female attitudes, however, Simon and colleagues (2001) found that both genders were more likely to endorse women's use of violence. Similarly, Simmons and colleagues (2008) found that among a sample of men and women arrested for domestic violence, women reported greater endorsement of violence than men. Although the question of whether men or women are more accepting of partner violence remains unclear, perhaps reflecting differences in the perceived meaning, impact, and consequences of men's versus women's violence, the work reviewed above has revealed the potential for greater endorsement of women's use of violence toward an intimate partner (see also Waltermaurer, 2012). Building on prior work examining attitudes toward partner violence, the current study assesses men and women's level of agreement with a roster of specific conditions under which it might be understandable that *someone* could hit a partner.

Although the above studies provide insight as to the general association between attitudinal acceptance of IPV and the use of partner violence, this prior research has limitations, including a lack of detailed measures of attitudes toward IPV, reliance on college samples, and a focus on male-to-female violence in marital relationships. More fundamentally, even though it is generally well accepted that individuals act on the basis of meanings (Mead, 1934), little research has directly examined how people develop attitudes accepting of violence—a surprising omission given the central role of social learning explanations in the etiology of partner violence.

The Origins of Attitudes Toward IPV

Violence in the family of origin—Social learning theory indicates that aggression is learned via observation of the behavior of others and its consequences. Learning also occurs via interaction and communication about the acceptability of the behavior, and about specific conditions under which it may be seen as desirable, or in the case of violence, necessary or understandable in light of the circumstances (Bandura, 1973). Social learning theory posits that parents are one of the main sources of learning, as exposure is early and recurrent, and parents are most often perceived as having high status and power by their children (Bandura, 1977). Because the family is the primary agent of socialization for children, violence in the family of origin has been commonly linked to processes of intergenerational transmission (Foshee et al., 1999; Kernsmith, 2006; Lichter & McCloskey, 2004; Mihalic & Elliott, 1997; O'Keefe, 1998; Petersen, 1980; Simons, Lin, & Gordon, 1998; Stith et al., 2000). Consistent with social learning perspectives, interparental violence and corporal punishment have been linked to more accepting attitudes toward violence within relationships (Lichter & McCloskey, 2004; Simons et al., 1998).

Scholars most often focus on direct modeling and imitation to understand mechanisms of intergenerational transmission, but it is important to consider processes of both direct and indirect transmission (Akers, 1998; Bandura, 1977; Giordano, 2010; see also Brauer & Tittle, 2012). Beyond the direct transmission that takes place when children are exposed to interparental violence or when they themselves are victims of coercive parenting, those who witness violence in the family of origin observe behavioral scripts for the use of violence (Foshee et al., 1999). Nevertheless, research has demonstrated that not all children who are exposed to violence in the family go on to use violence, suggesting that the experience is more salient for some than others. A number of factors—including the consequences of the behavior and whether the behavior is reinforced—help determine whether these socially scripted methods of dealing with conflict are learned, and whether individuals adopt attitudes that support the use of violence. Moreover, violence can be learned absent exposure in the family of origin, suggesting the need to look beyond the family to understand learning processes. In this study, we draw on longitudinal data measuring family experiences in adolescence as predictors of attitudes about IPV.

Structural influence factors—Criminological research on subcultural values highlights that the difficult life conditions characterizing disadvantaged contexts may be associated with the view that violence may be called for or understandable in specific situations (e.g., Anderson, 1999; Cohen, 1955; Messerschmidt, 1993; Willis, 1977). Accordingly, individuals in contexts of disadvantage may rely on a unique set of cognitive scripts to guide their behavior in social interactions (Luckenbill & Doyle, 1989; Wilkinson & Fagan, 1996; see also McGloin, Schreck, Stewart, & Ousey, 2011), including a heightened likelihood of resorting to aggression in conflict situations. However, most social structural explanations of partner violence draw on strain theories or stress perspectives (e.g., Benson, Fox, DeMaris, & Van Wyk, 2003; Fox, Benson, DeMaris, & Van Wyk, 2002), whereas attitudes, norms, and values are typically linked to social learning experiences (e.g., Stith & Farley, 1993). Thus, the link between structural and cultural processes as they relate to partner violence is incomplete, as socioeconomic status may indirectly affect IPV by influencing the adoption of attitudes regarding the use of violence. That is, the cultural contexts (i.e., family, school, and neighborhood) in which young people conduct their daily lives influences the learning of certain cultural understandings regarding violence. Youth may learn, for example, that coercive or forceful measures are acceptable means of resolving problems (Bandura, 1986). Coercive conflict resolution techniques may later carry over into other settings, including relationship disputes. Parents also teach their children definitions about violence, and in disadvantaged settings, parents are less likely to closely monitor their children, and consequently, less likely to communicate disapproval of violent behavior (Klebanov, Brooks-Gunn, & Duncan, 1994; Pinderhughes, Nix, Foster, & Jones, 2001; Taylor, 2000). Subcultural definitions may also emerge (Heimer, 1997; Sykes & Matza, 1957; see also Sampson & Bartusch, 1998), further shaping the beliefs of youth from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Research evidence suggests that attitudes about IPV may vary across race/ethnic groups, and household income (Flood & Pease, 2009; Joseph, 1997; Simon et al., 2001; Straus, Kantor, & Moore, 1997). In an examination of neighborhood effects on attitudes about IPV, Button (2008) found, using a single-item measure of overall approval of IPV, that those living in high-crime neighborhoods were more accepting of partner violence. Individuals embedded in social contexts of disadvantage may not reject norms regarding the acceptability of violence outright, but rather other norms may take precedence (Sykes & Matza, 1957), leading to the view that violence is justifiable under certain conditions (e.g., to maintain respect, in response to a threat or provocation, in defense of family and loved ones, etc.; see, for example, Anderson, 1999; Brezina, Agnew, Cullen, & Wright, 2004; Stewart & Simons, 2006). Thus the development of a set of attitudes accepting of violence appears to be a critical juncture at which to examine the shared contribution of structure and culture as it relates to attitudes toward IPV. Yet few studies have empirically examined the origin of attitudes toward IPV in predictive models. Accordingly, the current study examines a roster of sociodemographic and background characteristics including race/ethnicity, family structure, family income, and neighborhood poverty.

Prior relationship experiences—Social learning explanations of IPV and the development of attitudes accepting of violence focus almost exclusively on individuals' early formative experiences. Yet learning is not confined to the family of origin. Rather, individuals continue to develop and alter behavioral scripts based on experiences in other contexts. It is intuitive to expect that a particularly important context for further learning and adjustment is the world of romantic relationships itself (Collins, 2003; Collins, Welsh, & Furman, 2009; Giordano, Longmore, & Manning, 2006). Whereas most research on adolescent romantic relationships is conducted by scholars who consider relationships "as an end-point of research, rather than constituting a set of experiences that uniquely influence and structure subsequent life course trajectories" (Manning, Longmore, Copp, & Giordano, 2014: p. 18), others have emphasized the notion of "carryover" across relationships (Manning et al., 2014; Raley, Crissey, & Muller, 2007; Schulman, Collins, & Knafo, 1997). Thus, while the idea of relationship carryover is consistent with much research on family effects on later IPV, the learning process continues beyond the confines of the family. This notion aligns with theorizing in the area of adolescent romantic relationships suggesting that individuals develop relationship competence and hone their relationship skills over time and across the course of relationships with different partners (Connolly & McIsaac, 2011).

Similarly, negative experiences in prior relationships may contribute to a form of relationship "baggage" that is carried forward into subsequent romantic partnerships. In addition to involvement with a partner who has perpetrated violence, other features of the relationship, including control and infidelity, may create a climate of mistrust that carries over into the new relationship. Thus, these early experiences are potentially important not only as direct guides to behavior within the romantic realm, but because they influence attitudes about the acceptability of violence within this context that serve as the cognitive underpinnings of future behavioral choices. To capture these early experiences, we include indicators of prior relationship experiences including IPV and sexual non-exclusivity, consistent with a family violence perspective, in addition to controlling behaviors as elucidated by prior feminist treatments.

Adult status and (current) relationship characteristics—In addition to social learning and other structural considerations, it is important to direct attention to the respondents' current life status (i.e., education, employment, relationship status) as these more proximate circumstances likely influence complex understandings about the acceptability of violence under certain circumstances. For example, education level and employment status have been linked to attitudes about IPV (Joseph, 1997; Simon et al., 2001). Parents are more likely to share an ethos of caring and may strive to foster a home environment without violence; however, entry into parenthood may be associated with attitudes consistent with the use of violence under certain circumstances (i.e., a partner hurts your child). Relationship characteristics have the potential to influence attitudes about the acceptability of violence such that involvement in relationships with high levels of commitment (i.e., marriage) and relationships of longer duration are likely associated with lower attitudinal acceptance of IPV as violence may be viewed as a more serious violation of the relationship under these conditions. In our analyses, to tap into proximate life course conditions we control for relationship status, relationship duration, the respondent's level of education, and employment status, as well as whether the respondent is a parent.

Conditional Acceptance of IPV

Recognizing that prior research has documented that global endorsement of IPV is low, the current investigation draws on an index describing specific conditions under which engaging in IPV may be more understandable in light of the circumstances. It is important to explore attitudes toward IPV in more detail as individuals act on the basis of these understandings or meanings. Thus, even though violence may not constitute a preferred behavior, the behavior occurs within a framework of attitudes that recognize its acceptability in specific contexts (Greenblat, 1983; Straus et al., 1997). We move beyond prior work focused on global assessments of these attitudes and direct attention to more context-specific approval of IPV ranging from direct physical threats to self and others (i.e., a partner hits you first or a partner hurts your child, a family member, or loved one) to factors such as infidelity that are perceived as threats to the relationship, to other behaviors engaged in by one's partner that are viewed as generally unacceptable (i.e., a partner steals from you, a partner is drunk or using drugs). Furthermore, we examine whether this multifaceted indicator of attitudes toward IPV is associated with self-reported partner violence among a large, heterogeneous sample of young adults.

Current Study

This investigation examines the predictors of attitudes toward IPV among a sample of young adults. Attitudes toward IPV are an outgrowth of the social learning tradition; the underlying assumption is that individuals who either experience or witness violence in the family of origin develop a set of attitudes accepting of violence, thus heightening their risk for partner violence. Despite this assumed link, few studies have provided an empirical examination of the predictors of attitudes toward IPV. Further, assessments of attitudes toward IPV often use global measures, and in most cases, focus on male-to-female partner violence. This study builds on previous research in the area of IPV and attitudes accepting of violence, but contributes to the current body of research in four key ways. First, the current investigation examines factors associated with attitudes toward IPV in predictive models. As compared with studies incorporating a global measure of attitudes accepting of violence, this study relies on a more multifaceted index, describing specific conditions under which IPV may be deemed justifiable. It also looks beyond the family to incorporate other factors, including structural factors and prior relationship experiences. Finally, it focuses particular attention on the role of gender, and considers whether the factors influencing the adoption of a set of attitudes consistent with the use of violence differ for men and women. After establishing several key correlates of attitudinal acceptance of IPV, we consider whether such attitudes are associated with heightened odds of partner violence in predictive models.

Based on extant theory and prior research, we expect that family violence, including witnessing parental violence and coercive parenting, will be positively associated with attitudes toward IPV. We expect an association between indicators of structural disadvantage and attitudes toward IPV such that racial minorities (Black, Hispanic), as compared with their White peers, will report a higher level of endorsement. Further, those raised in a two-parent family structure, with higher levels of family income, in low-poverty neighborhoods, will report a lower level of endorsement of attitudes toward IPV. In addition, we expect a positive association between each of the prior relationship experiences (partner non-exclusivity, partner verbal abuse, partner perpetration, partner controlling behaviors) and attitudes toward IPV. Of the adult status characteristics, we expect those with higher levels of education and those participating in part- or full-time employment to be less accepting of partner violence. We also expect that respondents who are themselves parents will report higher levels of endorsement of attitudes toward IPV. Respondents in married and cohabiting relationships (as compared with daters), and those in relationships of longer duration, will be less accepting of attitudes toward IPV. Finally, we expect higher acceptance of pro-violent attitudes among women.

Data and Method

This research draws on data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study (TARS), which is based on a stratified random sample of 1,321 adolescents and their parents/guardians. The TARS data were collected in the years 2001, 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2011. The current analyses relied on structured interviews conducted at Waves 1 through 5, and a parent questionnaire administered at the first interview provided additional sociodemographic and family background information. The sampling frame of the TARS study encompassed 62 schools across seven school districts. The initial sample was drawn from enrollment records for seventh, ninth, and 11th grades, but school attendance was not a requirement for inclusion in the study. The stratified, random sample was devised by the National Opinion Research Center and includes over-samples of Black and Hispanic adolescents. The initial sample included 1,321 respondents and Wave 5 retained 1,021 valid respondents, or 77% of

Wave 1. Respondents' ages ranged from 12 to 19 at Wave 1, to 22 to 29 at Wave 5. The analytic sample ($n = 928$) consisted of all respondents from the fifth interview with a few exclusions including respondents who did not report on a current/most recent relationship ($n = 70$) and those reporting their race as "other" ($n = 23$). The TARS data are particularly well-suited for these analyses as they include detailed information about the family backgrounds and sociodemographic characteristics of respondents, as well as questions assessing their attitudes and beliefs regarding the use of violence.

Dependent Variable

Attitudes toward IPV—Respondents were asked a roster of questions at the time of the fifth interview, specifically designed for the TARS study, assessing their level of agreement with the following 13 reasons why it might be understandable that someone could hit a partner: "A partner hurts your child, either physically or emotionally," "A partner hits you first," "A partner cheats on you," "A partner steals from you," "A partner is drunk or using drugs," "A partner embarrassed or belittled you in front of others," "A partner destroyed your property," "A partner continually nags you," "A partner threatened to hit you," "A partner tried to keep you from doing something," "A partner forces you to have sex with him or her," "A partner hurts a family member or loved one," and "A partner brings up something from the past to hurt you." Attitudes toward IPV was taken as the mean across all items ($\alpha = .93$). To examine whether the index assessing attitudes toward IPV exhibited a high level of internal consistency for both men and women, Cronbach's alpha was computed separately by gender. Results indicated that the items described above provide a reliable measure of attitudes toward IPV for both men and women ($\alpha = .929$ and .927, respectively).

IPV—During the fifth interview, respondents were asked a series of questions from the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) in relation to experiences with the current/most recent partner, including whether the respondent had "thrown something at," "twisted arm or hair," "used a knife or gun," "punched or hit with something that could hurt," "choked," "slammed against a wall," "beat up," "burned or scalded on purpose," "kicked," "pushed, shoved, or grabbed," "slapped in the face or head with an open hand," and "hit" ($\alpha = .91$). A similar set of questions assessed IPV victimization. We used a dichotomous measure of IPV, distinguishing between those who reported *any* violent behaviors (perpetration, victimization, and mutual) and those who reported no violence (1 = IPV, 0 = no IPV).

Independent Variables

Family violence—Coercive parenting was measured at Wave 1 using a single item from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus et al., 1996) asking respondents "When you and your parents disagree about things, how often do they push, slap, or hit you?" Responses were dichotomized to indicate any coercive parenting. Witnessing parental violence was based on the respondent's retrospective report at the fifth interview on a series of items from the CTS (Straus et al., 1996) in which we asked, "How often did either one of your parents:" "throw something at the other," "push, shove, or grab the other," "slap the other in the face or head with an open hand," and "hit the other" ($\alpha = .92$). We dichotomized scores (1 = yes) to indicate any parental violence.

Prior relationship experiences—Partner non-exclusivity was a dichotomous variable indicating any reports of partner non-exclusivity at a prior wave (Waves 1 through 4) based on the following question: “How often do you think X has gotten physically involved with other girls/guys?” We created an indicator variable where 1 = “hardly ever” to “very often” and 0 = “never.” Similarly, partner verbal abuse was a dichotomous variable taken from the CTS (Straus et al., 1996) measuring any experience of verbal abuse across Waves 1 through 4 in which respondents were asked, “During this relationship, how often did X:” “ridicule or criticize your values or beliefs,” “put down your physical appearance,” and “put you down in front of other people.” Partner perpetration was taken from the physical victimization items of the CTS including whether a previous partner had “thrown something at you,” “pushed, shoved, or grabbed you,” “slapped you in the face or head with an open hand,” and “hit you” based on the respondent’s self-report at Waves 1 through 4. Partner controlling behaviors was taken as the mean level of partner control attempts across the prior waves (1-4) based on responses to the following questions: “X sometimes wants to control what I do” and “X always tries to change me” (responses ranged from 1 “strongly disagree” to 5 “strongly agree”).

Sociodemographic, Adult Status, and Relationship Variables

We included a series of sociodemographic indicators: gender and age, measured in years using a continuous variable reported from respondent’s age at Wave 5, as well as three dichotomous variables to measure race/ethnicity including non-Hispanic White (contrast category), non-Hispanic Black, and Hispanic. Family structure (Wave 1) included the following categories: two biological parents (contrast category), step-family, single-parent family, and any “other” family type. To control for socioeconomic status, we used the family income reported in the Wave 1 parent questionnaire (ranges from 1 “less than $10,000” to 9 “$75,000 and over”). Neighborhood poverty was from U.S. census data at the time of the first interview, and indicated the “percent of population living below the poverty level” in the respondent’s census tract while growing up. Neighborhood poverty was logged in the multivariate analyses to correct for skewness.

The respondent’s level of education was represented by the following indicators: less than high school, high school (contrast category), some college, and college or more. Additional adult status characteristics included dichotomous indicators of employment at Wave 5 (full-time, part-time, and unemployed [contrast category]), and status as a parent was determined by a question asking whether the respondent has any biological children. We included a series of basic relationship variables in the models. Three dichotomous indicators distinguished whether the relationship of interest is dating (contrast category), cohabiting, or married. In addition, a dichotomous variable was used to denote whether responses reference a current relationship or their most recent romantic relationship (1 = current). Relationship duration was based on responses to items assessing the length of the relationship with the focal partner and is measured in years.

Analytic Strategy

We began by presenting mean levels of endorsement of the individual items comprising the attitudes toward IPV scale for the full sample, as well as by gender and the experience of violence. Then, the data were analyzed in several steps beginning with bivariate associations followed by a series of multivariate models. First, descriptive analyses examined the mean, standard deviation, and range for the dependent and independent variables for the full sample and by gender. Significant differences on the study variables between men and women were identified. Next, multivariate analyses were performed examining the associations between family violence, sociodemographic characteristics, prior relationship experiences, adult status, relationship characteristics, and attitudes toward IPV.

Because the measure of attitudes toward IPV was based on an interval scale, models predicting variation in the dependent variable employed ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. First, we presented the zero-order associations between family violence, sociodemographic characteristics, prior relationship experiences, adult status characteristics, relationship characteristics, and attitudes toward IPV. Subsequent analyses introduced a series of nested models; the first examined the association between family violence and attitudes toward IPV, followed by a model examining these associations net of sociodemographic characteristics, and a third assessing prior relationship experiences on attitudes toward IPV net of family violence and sociodemographic characteristics. In the final two models, an additional block of variables was added to each respective model beginning with adult status characteristics and followed by relationship characteristics. To determine whether these processes differed for men and women, and whether these relationships should be examined in gender-stratified models, we performed a Chow test. Supplemental analyses examined the association between attitudes toward IPV and reports of partner violence. The results of these analyses are described below.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the mean levels of endorsement of attitudes toward IPV across each of the individual items comprising the scale. Results are displayed for the full sample and the subgroup reporting IPV, by gender. Across the sample as a whole, respondents reported a relatively low level of endorsement of attitudes accepting of violence. The mean level of attitudes toward IPV for the full sample is 2.10, indicating that roughly 86% of the sample either disagree or strongly disagree with the use of violence toward an intimate partner. The level of endorsement, however, varied across the individual items included in the scale; 89% of the sample disagreed with the use of violence under the following condition: “A partner continually nags you,” whereas a minority of respondents (41%) viewed violence as unacceptable in the following situation: “A partner forces you to have sex with him or her.” Finally, although not generally a desired behavior, respondents reported the highest level of endorsement of attitudes regarding the use of violence for situations in which a partner hurt a family member, loved one, or child, and instances of sexual coercion.

For the full sample, women, compared with men, reported significantly higher levels of endorsement across all items. Among the IPV subgroup, the results were similar, with women scoring significantly higher on 10 of the 13 items. Supplemental analyses examined mean levels of endorsement of attitudes toward IPV by gender and the specific nature of the IPV experience (perpetration and victimization) (results not shown), and the same general pattern emerged. That is, the rank ordering of items comprising the attitudes toward IPV scale for men and women reporting perpetration and victimization experiences was consistent with the results described above. In addition, within the perpetration and victimization subgroups, women reported higher levels of endorsement of attitudes toward IPV as compared with their male counterparts.

Table 2 shows the means/percentages and standard errors of all variables used in the analysis, as well as the range of each variable. Roughly a quarter of the sample (23%) reported IPV at the time of the fifth interview. Approximately 31% of the sample reported witnessing parental violence during adolescence, whereas 22% experienced coercive parenting.Approximately 55% of the sample was female, whereas 67% was White, 21% Black, and 11% Hispanic. The average age of the sample was roughly 25. The majority of respondents reported living with two biological parents during adolescence. In terms of prior relationship experiences, a substantial minority either experienced non-exclusivity or had been physically victimized by a previous partner, totaling 34% and 48% respectively. The majority of respondents had experienced verbal abuse from a partner in the past (71%), and the average level of partner use of controlling behaviors across prior relationships was 1.95, indicating a relatively moderate level of partner control attempts. The modal category of respondent education was “some college,” and most respondents reported full-time employment at the time of the fifth interview. About 44% of sample was dating, 32% cohabiting, and 23% married, and the average duration of these relationships was approximately 3 years. Nearly 26% of the sample had become a parent (i.e., reported at least one biological child). We also compared means/percentages by gender across all study covariates (see Table 2).

Multivariate Analysis

To examine predictors of variation in attitudes toward IPV in specific circumstances, we estimated an OLS regression model examining the association between family violence, sociodemographic/background characteristics, prior relationship experiences, adult status characteristics, relationship characteristics, and attitudes toward IPV (see Table 3). At the zero order, witnessing parental violence and coercive parenting were positively associated with variations in endorsement of attitudes that support the use of violence within intimate relationships under specific circumstances. Women reported higher levels of endorsement of attitudes accepting of violence, as did younger respondents, and Black respondents. Growing up in a single parent or “other” family structure, compared with two biological parents, was related to higher levels of endorsement of attitudes toward IPV. Family income was negatively related to attitudes toward IPV such that those with higher levels of family income reported, on average, lower levels of endorsement of attitudes toward IPV. Similarly, neighborhood levels of poverty were positively related to attitudes accepting of violence. Of the prior relationship experiences, partner sexual non-exclusivity, partner violence perpetration, and partner controlling behaviors were all related to higher levels of endorsement of attitudes accepting of violence. Respondents with less than a high school education reported higher, whereas those with at least a college education reported lower, average levels of attitudes accepting of violence. The link between participation in full-time employment and attitudes toward IPV was negative. Parents reported greater endorsement of attitudes toward IPV than their peers without children of their own. Finally, those in marital relationships, compared with daters, reported lower levels of endorsement of attitudes toward IPV.

In the second column, when entered as a block, the associations between witnessing parental violence, coercive parenting, and attitudes toward IPV remained significant and positive. Similarly, both indicators of family violence were positively associated with the endorsement of attitudes toward IPV net of sociodemographic characteristics (Model 2). Prior relationship experiences were entered into Model 3, and partner controlling behaviors were associated with greater endorsement of attitudes toward IPV net of other factors. In Model 4, net of family violence, sociodemographic characteristics, and prior relationship experiences, respondent's level of education was negatively associated with the endorsement of attitudes toward IPV. Specifically, respondents with at least some college education reported lower endorsement of attitudes toward IPV net of other factors. Further, several of the other associations persisted; however, after controlling for adult status characteristics, the positive association between neighborhood poverty and attitudes toward IPV was attenuated, and this was driven by respondent's education (results not shown).

In Model 5, relationship characteristics were entered as a block, and net of the other covariates, the characteristics of the current relationship (i.e., relationship status, current relationship, duration) were unrelated to levels of attitudes toward IPV. In this final model, the association between age and attitudes toward IPV was attenuated. Witnessing parental violence was positively associated with attitudes toward IPV. Net of these other factors, the association between gender and attitudes toward IPV remained significant. That is, net of controls for social learning, sociodemographic, adult status, and relationship characteristics, women reported greater endorsement of attitudes accepting of violence. The association between partner controlling behaviors and attitudes regarding the use of violence remained significant and positive. As in previous models, those with some college education reported lower levels of attitudes accepting of violence.

Because there have been few empirical examinations of the factors predicting attitudes toward IPV, an important question was whether the correlates differed for men and women. Three models were estimated; one for each gender and one for the pooled sample. A Chow test was performed based on the sum of squared errors from each of the three regressions. Results indicated that the relationships between the focal variables and attitudes toward IPV did not differ by gender, $F(26, 856) = .63$, $p = .92$, and thus we have focused on the results of the OLS regressions for the pooled sample.

A supplemental set of analyses examined the association between attitudes toward IPV and reports of partner violence (Table 4). Consistent with prior research on the link between attitudes and behaviors, the bivariate association between attitudes toward IPV and partner violence was significant and positive. This association persisted net of the full range of study variables.

Discussion

Generally speaking, societal norms strongly oppose the use of violence in intimate relationships, and accordingly, most adults view IPV as unacceptable (Bartholomew et al., 2013)—especially when that violence is perpetrated by a man against a woman (e.g., Simon et al., 2001; Sorenson & Taylor, 2005). But there is nevertheless variability in the endorsement of attitudes accepting of this form of violence. There are, for example, certain conditions under which acceptance of IPV is relatively high, including situations involving a precipitating act of violence (i.e., “a partner hits you first” or “a partner forces you to have sex with him or her”) or direct harm to a family member or loved one (“a partner hurts your child, either physically or emotionally” or “a partner hurts a family member or loved one”). Moreover, women were more inclined to endorse the use of violence under each of the circumstances described in the current investigation. Mean comparisons between the full sample of men and women revealed that women scored significantly higher across all 13 items. Limiting these comparisons to the subgroup reporting IPV, women in this subgroup scored significantly higher on all but three of the items. These gender differences persisted in the multivariate models net of controls for family violence, sociodemographic characteristics, prior relationship experiences, adult status characteristics, and relationship characteristics, clearly highlighting distinctive views about the meaning(s) of men’s and women’s use of violence. To the extent that these attitudes do in fact influence behavioral choices, these findings have important implications for both male and female victimization. The general recognition that female perpetration is less problematic, or more acceptable, may minimize its role in sequences stemming from female initiation and perpetration of partner violence that are not only harmful, but are linked to retaliation and violence escalation (Winstok, 2008).

Theoretical treatments posit that attitudes regarding the use of violence are learned within the family of origin, suggesting that individuals who experience coercive parenting or witness parental violence are more likely to condone the use of violence in their own relationships (Lichter & McCloskey, 2004). Others have indicated that individuals who are exposed to violence in general are more likely to be guided by norms consistent with the use of violence, and thus are more violence prone (Mills, 2003). Although the family of origin is a critical site of socialization for youth, learning and socializing also occurs outside the family context. Thus while recognizing the family’s role and influence, it is important to consider how broader contexts shape attitudes regarding the use of violence. Accordingly, the current investigation examined family violence, sociodemographic characteristics, prior relationship experiences, adult status characteristics, and relationship characteristics as factors associated with the endorsement of attitudes toward IPV. Consistent with prior theorizing on the link between social learning and IPV, exposure to family violence was associated with attitudes about the acceptability of violence. In addition, a number of sociodemographic characteristics were related to the endorsement of attitudes regarding the use of violence. Specifically, women and Black respondents, as well as respondents raised in single parent or “other” family structures, were more accepting of violence. Older respondents, and those reared in more advantaged households and neighborhoods with lower levels of poverty, reported lower levels of endorsement of attitudes toward IPV. Thus, in addition to the formative experiences in the family of origin (witnessing parental violence and coercive parenting), individuals' attitudes regarding the use of violence toward an intimate partner were further shaped by their socioeconomic backgrounds.

Despite the continued focus on social learning factors in the etiology of IPV, there has been little attention to later experiences that nevertheless shape individuals' attitudes and styles of interaction. In addition to the direct and indirect transmission of attitudes toward IPV from parent to child, later relationship experiences were found to further shape the extent to which individuals endorsed the use of violence under certain conditions. Specifically, the current study directed attention to different forms of relationship carryover, including prior partner non-exclusivity, verbal abuse, physical victimization, and controlling behaviors. Of the prior relationship experiences, partner non-exclusivity, partner perpetration, and partner controlling behaviors were positively related to attitudes regarding the use of IPV. These findings underscore the need to further consider other developmental contexts associated with attitudes and beliefs about partner violence.

Although social learning and sociodemographic background factors are key correlates of individual attitudes regarding the use of IPV, individual trajectories are not set in stone. That is, attention to respondents' current life circumstances helped explain some of the associations between sociodemographic characteristics and attitudes toward IPV. That education largely attenuated the effect of neighborhood poverty reflects its salience as a more proximal determinant of attitudes toward IPV. Individuals from more disadvantaged neighborhoods are less likely to pursue advanced levels of education, and education is negatively related to attitudes accepting of violence. But this finding may suggest a more optimistic implication in terms of the malleability of attitudes toward IPV; despite exposure to risk factors (violence in the family of origin, neighborhood poverty), individuals may have experiences, such as those associated with post-secondary education, that influence these attitudes and beliefs about the acceptability of violence. Although family violence, sociodemographic characteristics, prior relationship experiences, and adult status characteristics appeared to play an important role in the endorsement of attitudes about the acceptability of violence, net of other factors, witnessing parental violence, gender (female), partner controlling behaviors, and respondent education (some college) were particularly salient. Analyses of the role of gender suggest that even though there are differences in levels of endorsement, the processes leading to the adoption of specific attitudes and beliefs regarding the use of IPV appear to be similar for men and women. Finally, consistent with prior research on attitudes and IPV, results indicated that greater endorsement of the use of partner violence was associated with increased odds of IPV among this large, diverse sample of young adults.

This research builds on the current body of literature by providing an empirical examination of correlates of attitudes about the use of IPV among a large, heterogeneous sample of men and women. Despite its contribution to our understanding of attitudes about IPV, there are a few limitations. First, the current investigation was based on a regional sample of young adults in Lucas County, OH. Yet despite the regional nature of the sample, individuals selected for inclusion in the study were reflective of the U.S. population in terms of their sociodemographic profiles. Second, attitudes toward IPV were measured at one point in time. The theoretical perspective guiding this investigation suggests that attitudes and beliefs about the use of violence are developed and further shaped throughout the life course, and thus future research should examine these patterns longitudinally. Third, although several of the variables (e.g., sociodemographic characteristics, prior relationship experiences) were measured at earlier waves, attitudes toward IPV, relationship characteristics, and adult status characteristics were all measured at the time of the fifth interview. Thus, it is important that future work examine these associations over a longer period of time to provide more conclusive evidence regarding the causal order and also to examine the potential for reciprocal effects.

The link between violence in the family of origin and later IPV has been well documented in the literature. Further, theoretical accounts of partner violence have often discussed attitudes regarding the acceptability of violence as a potential mechanism by which early exposure to family violence translates to IPV in adulthood. Although these linkages are implicit in the literature, they are seldom tested empirically. The current study sheds light on the factors associated with the endorsement of attitudes about the use of IPV among a sample of young adults. The findings indicated that in addition to family violence, individuals' structural position was associated with attitudinal acceptance of IPV, and women were more accepting of the use of violence toward an intimate partner than their male counterparts. Attitudes about IPV also appeared to be shaped by prior relationship experiences (i.e., partner controlling behaviors) and current life status (i.e., respondent education). Moreover, these attitudes were highly correlated with self-reports of partner violence. Future work should consider a broader range of factors and developmental contexts to provide a more complete life course perspective on factors influencing attitudes accepting of IPV, including contexts and experiences that modify earlier beliefs and behavioral repertoires. An important next step is to link these attitudes and beliefs about the acceptability of relationship violence to behavior longitudinally. In addition to examining the causal link between attitudes and IPV, future research should also assess the extent to which attitudinal acceptance of IPV mediates the association between known risk factors and IPV.

Acknowledgments

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This research was supported by grants from The Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (HD036223 and HD044206), the Department of Health and Human Services (5APRPA006009), the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice (Award Nos. 2009-IJ-CX-0503 and 2010-MU-MU-0031), and in part by the Center for Family and Demographic Research, Bowling Green State University, which has core funding from The Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (R24HD050959).

Biographies

Jennifer E. Copp, PhD, is an assistant professor in the College of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Florida State University. Her research focuses on crime and other problem behaviors during adolescence and young adulthood, with a particular emphasis on intimate partner violence (IPV).

Peggy C. Giordano, PhD, is a distinguished research professor in the Department of Sociology at Bowling Green State University. Her research focuses on qualities and dynamics of close relationships during adolescence and young adulthood, and the influence of these close ties on a range of developmental outcomes, including juvenile delinquency and intimate partner violence.

Monica A. Longmore is a professor in the Department of Sociology at Bowling Green State University. She is a social psychologist with interests in identity, dating and sexual relationships during adolescence and adulthood, and the ways in which these self and social processes influence emotional well-being.

Wendy D. Manning, PhD, is a distinguished research professor in the Department of Sociology at Bowling Green State University. She is the co-director of the National Center for Family and Marriage Research and director of the Center for Family Demographic Research. She is a family demographer with a research emphasis on family structure, union formation, and stability and relationships among adolescents as well as adults.

References

Akers, RL. Social learning and social structure: A general theory of crime and deviance. Transaction; New Brunswick, NJ: 1998.

Anderson, E. Code of the street: Decency, violence, and the moral life of inner city. Norton; New York, NY: 1999.

Archer J, Graham-Kevan N. Do beliefs about aggression predict physical aggression to partners? Aggressive Behavior. 2003; 29(1):41–54.

Bandura, A. Aggression: A social learning analysis. Prentice Hall; Oxford, UK: 1973.

Bandura, A. Social learning theory. Prentice Hill; Englewood Cliffs, NJ: 1977.

Bandura, A. Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Prentice Hall; Englewood Cliffs, NJ: 1986.

Bartholomew K, Schmitt MT, Yang L, Regan KV. Norms regarding the acceptability of abuse in heterosexual dating relationships. Partner Abuse. 2013; 4:463–481.

Benson ML, Fox GL, DeMaris A, Van Wyk J. Neighborhood disadvantage, individual economic distress and violence against women in intimate relationships. Journal of Quantitative Criminology. 2003; 19:207–235.

Brauer JR, Tittle CR. Social learning theory and human reinforcement. Sociological Spectrum: Mid-South Sociological Association. 2012; 32:157–177.

Brezina T, Agnew R, Cullen FT, Wright JP. The code of the street a quantitative assessment of Elijah Anderson's subculture of violence thesis and its contribution to youth violence research. Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice. 2004; 2:303–328.

Browning CR. The span of collective efficacy: Extending social disorganization theory to partner violence. Journal of Marriage and Family. 2002; 64:833–850.

Button DM. Social disadvantage and family violence: Neighborhood effects on attitudes about intimate partner violence and corporal punishment. American Journal of Criminal Justice. 2008; 33:130–147.

Campbell JC, Manganello J. Changing public attitudes as a prevention strategy to reduce intimate partner violence. Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma. 2006; 13:13–40.

Capaldi DM, Shortt JW, Crosby L. Physical and psychological aggression in at-risk young couples: Stability and change in young adulthood. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly. 2003; 49:1–27.

Carlson BE, Worden AP. Attitudes and beliefs about domestic violence: Results of a public opinion survey I. Definitions of domestic violence, criminal domestic violence, and prevalence. Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 2005; 20:1197–1218. [PubMed: 16162486]

Cohen, AK. Delinquent boys: The culture of the gang. Free Press; Glencoe, IL: 1955.

Coleman DH, Straus MA. Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. Violence and Victims. 1986; 1:141–157. [PubMed: 3154145]

Collins WA. More than myth: The developmental significance of romantic relationships during adolescence. Journal of Research on Adolescence. 2003; 13(1):1–24.

Collins WA, Welsh DP, Furman W. Adolescent romantic relationships. Annual Review of Psychology. 2009; 60:631–652.

Connolly, J.; McIsaac, C. Romantic relationships in adolescence. In: Underwood, MK.; Rosen, LH., editors. Social development: Relationships in infancy, childhood, and adolescence. Guilford Press; New York, NY: 2011. p. 180-206.

Côté S, Vaillancourt T, LeBlanc JC, Nagin DS, Tremblay RE. The development of physical aggression from toddlerhood to pre-adolescence: A nationwide longitudinal study of Canadian children. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology. 2006; 34(1):68–82.

Crossman RK, Stith SM, Bender MM. Sex role egalitarianism and marital violence. Sex Roles. 1990; 22:293–304.

Eckhardt, C. Intimate partner violence: Cognitive, affective, and relational factors. In: Forgas, J.; Kruglanski, A.; Williams, K., editors. The psychology of social conflict and aggression. Psychology Press; New York, NT: 2011. p. 167-184.

Eckhardt CI, Samper R, Suhr L, Holtzworth-Munroe A. Implicit attitudes toward violence among male perpetrators of intimate partner violence: A preliminary investigation. Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 2012; 27:471–490. [PubMed: 22333320]

Ehrensaft MK, Cohen P, Brown J, Smailes E, Chen H, Johnson JG. Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: A 20-year prospective study. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 2003; 71:741–753. [PubMed: 12924679]

Eriksson L, Mazerolle P. A cycle of violence? Examining family-of-origin violence, attitudes, and intimate partner violence perpetration. Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 2014; 30(6):1–20.

Fincham FD, Cui M, Braithwaite S, Pasley K. Attitudes toward intimate partner violence in dating relationships. Psychological Assessment. 2008; 20:260–269. [PubMed: 18778162]

Flood M, Pease B. Factors influencing attitudes to violence against women. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse. 2009; 10:125–142.

Foshee VA, Bauman KE, Linder GF. Family violence and the perpetration of adolescent dating violence: Examining social learning and social control processes. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1999; 61:331–342.

Foshee VA, Linder F, MacDougall JE, Bangdiwala S. Gender differences in the longitudinal predictors of adolescent dating violence. Preventive Medicine. 2001; 32:128–141. [PubMed: 11162338]

Fox GL, Benson ML, DeMaris AA, Van Wyk J. Economic distress and intimate violence: Testing family stress and resource theories. Journal of Marriage and Family. 2002; 64:793–807.

Garcia E, Tomas JM. Correlates of victim-blaming attitudes regarding partner violence against women among the Spanish general population. Violence Against Women. 2014; 20:26–41. [PubMed: 24476756]

Giordano, PC. Legacies of crime: A follow-up of the children of highly delinquent girls and boys. Cambridge University Press; 2010.

Giordano PC, Copp JE, Longmore MA, Manning WD. Contested domains, verbal “amplifiers,” and intimate partner violence in young adulthood. Social Forces. 2015; 94(2):923–951.

Giordano PC, Longmore MA, Manning WD. Gender and the meanings of adolescent romantic relationships: A focus on boys. American Sociological Review. 2006; 71:260–287.

Greenblat, CS. A hit is a hit. Or is it? Approval and tolerance of the use of physical force by spouses. In: Finkelhor, D.; Gelles, RJ.; Hotaling, GT.; Straus, MA., editors. The dark side of families. Sage; Beverly Hills, CA: 1983. p. 235-260.

Heimer K. Socioeconomic status, subcultural definitions, and violent delinquency. Social Forces. 1997; 75:799–833.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A. Social information processing skills deficits in maritally violent men: Summary of a research program. In: Vincent, JP.; Jouriles, EN., editors. Domestic violence: Guidelines for research informed practice. Jessica Kingsley; London, England: 2000. p. 13-36.

Jewkes R, Flood M, Lang J. From work with men and boys to changes of social norms and reduction of inequalities in gender relations: A conceptual shift in prevention of violence against women and girls. The Lancet. 2015; 385:1580–1589.

Joseph, J. Women battering: A comparative analysis of black and white women. In: Kantor, GK.; Jasinski, JL., editors. Out of the darkness: Contemporary perspective on family violence. SAGE; Thousand Oaks, CA: 1997. p. 3-15.

Kernsmith P. Gender differences in the impact of family of origin violence on perpetrators of domestic violence. Journal of Family Violence. 2006; 21:163–171.

Klebanov PK, Brooks-Gunn J, Duncan GJ. Does neighborhood and family poverty affect mothers' parenting, mental health, and social support? Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1994; 56:441–455.

Kwong MJ, Bartholomew K, Henderson AJ, Trinke SJ. The inter-generational transmission of relationship violence. Journal of Family Psychology. 2003; 17(3):288–301. [PubMed: 14562454]

Lichter EL, McCloskey LA. The effects of childhood exposure to marital violence on adolescent gender-role beliefs and dating violence. Psychology of Women Quarterly. 2004; 28:344–357.

Luckenbill DF, Doyle DP. Structural position and violence: Developing a cultural explanation. Criminology. 1989; 27:419–436.

Manning, WD.; Longmore, MA.; Copp, JE.; Giordano, PC. The complexities of adolescent dating and sexual relationships: Fluidity, meaning(s), and implications for young adults' well-being. In: Lefkowitz, ES.; Vasilenko, SA., editors. New directions for child and adolescent development: Positive and negative outcomes of sexual behaviors. Jossey-Bass; San Francisco, CA: 2014. p. 53-69.

Mead, GH. Mind, self, and society from the standpoint of a social behaviorist. University of Chicago Press; Chicago, IL: 1934.

Messerschmidt, JW. Masculinities and crime: Critique and reconceptualization of theory. Rowman & Littlefield; Lanham, MA: 1993.

McGloin JM, Schreck CJ, Stewart EA, Ousey GC. Predicting the violent offender: The discriminant validity of the subculture of violence. Criminology. 2011; 49:767–794.

Mihalic SW, Elliott D. A social learning theory model of marital violence. Journal of Family Violence. 1997; 12(1):21–47.

Mills, LG. Insult to injury: Rethinking our responses to intimate abuse. Princeton University Press; Princeton, NJ: 2003.

Nemeth JM, Bonomi AE, Lee MA, Ludwin JM. Sexual infidelity as trigger for intimate partner violence. Journal of Women's Health. 2012; 21(9):942–949.

O'Keefe M. Factors mediating the link between witnessing interparental violence and dating violence. Journal of Family Violence. 1998; 13(1):39–57.

O'Leary, KD. Physical aggression between spouses: A social learning theory perspective. In: Van Hasselt, VB.; Morrison, R.; Bellack, A.; Hersen, M., editors. Handbook of family violence. Plenum; New York, NY: 1988. p. 31-55.

Petersen R. Social class, social learning, and wife abuse. The Social Service Review. 1980:390–406.

Pinchevsky GM, Wright EM. The impact of neighborhoods on intimate partner violence and victimization. Trauma Violence Abuse. 2012; 13:112–132. [PubMed: 22589222]

Pinderhughes EE, Nix R, Foster EM, Jones D. Parenting in context: Impact of neighborhood poverty, residential stability, public services, social networks, and danger on parental behaviors. Journal of Marriage and Family. 2001; 63:941–953.

Raley K, Crissey S, Muller C. Of sex and romance: Adolescent relationships in the transition to adulthood. Journal of Marriage and Family. 2007; 69:1210–1226. [PubMed: 20221420]

Riggs, DS.; O'Leary, KD. A theoretical model of courtship aggression. In: Pirog-Good, MA.; Stets, JE., editors. Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues. Praeger; New York, NY: 1989. p. 53-71.

Sampson RJ, Bartusch DJ. Legal cynicism and (subcultural?) tolerance of deviance: The neighborhood context of racial differences. Law & Society Review. 1998:32, 777–804.

Schulman S, Collins WA, Knafo D. Afterword: Romantic relationships in adolescence—More than casual dating. New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development. 1997; 78:105–110.

Schwartz, M.; DeKeseredy, WS. Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support. SAGE; Thousand Oaks, CA: 1997.

Shortt JW, Capaldi DM, Kim HK, Kerr DCR, Owen LD, Feingold A. Stability of intimate partner violence by men across 12 years in young adulthood: Effects of relationship transitions. Prevention Science. 2012; 13:360–369. [PubMed: 21311973]

Simmons CA, Lehmann P, Cobb N. A comparison of women and men charged with intimate partner violence: General risk factors, attitudes regarding violence, and readiness to change. Violence and Victims. 2008; 23:571–585. [PubMed: 18958986]

Simon TR, Anderson M, Thompson MP, Crosby AE, Shelley G, Sacks JJ. Attitudinal acceptance of intimate partner violence among U.S. adults. Violence and Victims. 2001; 16:115–126. [PubMed: 11345473]

Simons RL, Lin KH, Gordon LC. Socialization in the family of origin and male dating violence: A prospective study. Journal of Marriage and the Family. 1998:467–478.

Smith CA, Ireland TO, Park A, Elwyn L, Thornberry TP. Intergenerational continuities and discontinuities in intimate partner violence: A two-generational prospective study. Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 2011; 26:3720–3752. [PubMed: 21810795]

Sorenson SB, Taylor CA. Female aggression towards male intimate partners: An examination of social norms in a community-based simple. Psychology of Women Quarterly. 2005; 29:78–96.

Stets JE. Interactive processes in dating aggression: A national study. Journal of Marriage and Family. 1992; 54:165–177.

Stewart EA, Simons RL. Structure and culture in African American adolescent violence: A partial test of the "code of the street" thesis. Justice Quarterly. 2006; 23(1):1–33.

Stith SM. Police response to domestic violence: The influence of individual and familial factors. Violence and Victims. 1990; 5(1):37–49. [PubMed: 2278948]

Stith SM, Farley SC. A predictive model of male spousal violence. Journal of Family Violence. 1993; 8:183–201.

Stith SM, Rosen KH, Middleton KA, Busch AL, Lundeberg K, Carlton RP. The Intergenerational Transmission of Spouse Abuse: A Meta-Analysis. Journal of Marriage and Family. 2000; 62:640–654.

Straus MA. Social stress and marital violence in a national sample of American families. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 1980; 347(1):229–250. [PubMed: 6930906]

Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, Sugarman DB. The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2) development and preliminary psychometric data. Journal of Family Issues. 1996; 17:283–316.

Straus, MA.; Kantor, GK.; Moore, DW. Change in cultural norms approving of marital violence. In: Kantor, GK.; Jasinski, JL., editors. Out of the darkness: Contemporary perspective on family violence. SAGE; Thousand Oaks, CA: 1997. p. 3-15.

Sykes GM, Matza D. Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. American Sociological Review. 1957; 22:664–670.

Taylor RD. An examination of the association of African American mothers' perceptions of their neighborhoods with their parenting and adolescent adjustment. Journal of Black Psychology. 2000; 26:267–287.

Taylor CA, Sorenson SB. Community-based norms about intimate partner violence: Putting attributions of fault and responsibility into context. Sex Roles. 2005; 53:573–589.

Uthman OA, Moradi T, Lawoko S. The independent contribution of individual-, neighbourhood-, and country-level socioeconomic position on attitudes towards intimate partner violence against women in sub-Saharan Africa: A multilevel model of direct and moderating effects. Social Science & Medicine. 2009; 68:1801–1809. [PubMed: 19303687]

Waltermaurer E. Public justification of intimate partner violence: A review of the literature. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse. 2012; 13:167–175.

White HR, Widom CS. Intimate partner violence among abused and neglected children in young adulthood: The mediating effects of early aggression, antisocial personality, hostility and alcohol problems. Aggressive Behavior. 2003; 29:332–345.

Winstok Z. Conflict escalation to violence and escalation of violent conflicts in intimate relationships. Children and Youth Services Review. 2008; 30:297–310.

Wilkinson DL, Fagan J. The role of firearms in violence “scripts”: The dynamics of gun events among adolescent males. Law and Contemporary Problems. 1996; 59:55–90.

Willis, PE. Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs. Columbia University Press; New York, NY: 1977.

Worden AP, Carlson BE. Attitudes and beliefs about domestic violence: Results of a public opinion survey II. Beliefs about causes. Journal of Interpersonal Violence. 2005; 20:1219–1243. [PubMed: 16162487]

Wright EM, Benson ML. Immigration and intimate partner violence: Exploring the immigrant paradox. Social Problems. 2010; 57:480–503.

Yllo, K.; Straus, MA. Patriarchy and violence against wives: The impact of structural and normative factors. In: Straus, MA.; Gelles, RJ., editors. Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence. Transaction; New Brunswick, NJ: 1990. p. 383-399.

Table 1

Mean Levels of Endorsement of Attitudes Toward IPV for the Full Sample and Subgroup Reporting IPV, by Gender ($N = 928$).

	Full Sample (N = 928)	Full Sample, by Gender (n = 928)		IPV, by Gender (n = 216)	
		Males (n = 422)	Females (n = 506)	Males (n = 101)	Females (n = 115)
Attitudes toward IPV					
A partner hurts your child, either physically or emotionally	2.79	2.56^{***}	2.99	2.90^{**}	3.41
A partner hits you first	2.40	2.04^{***}	2.71	2.49^{***}	3.37
A partner cheats on you	2.06	1.89^{***}	2.21	2.33^{***}	2.89
A partner steals from you	1.88	1.74^{***}	2.00	2.14^{*}	2.53
A partner is drunk or using drugs	1.81	1.72^{**}	1.89	1.93^{*}	2.24
A partner embarrassed or belittled you in front of others	1.75	1.65^{***}	1.84	1.92^{*}	2.25
A partner destroyed your property	1.90	1.76^{***}	2.03	2.07^{**}	2.50
A partner continually nags you	1.65	1.57^{**}	1.72	1.83	2.00
A partner threatened to hit you	1.77	1.66^{***}	1.87	1.90^{**}	2.27
A partner tried to keep you from doing something	1.73	1.63^{***}	1.82	1.89	2.12
A partner forces you to have sex with him or her	3.04	2.48^{***}	3.50	2.60^{***}	3.72
A partner hurts a family member or loved one	2.76	2.52^{***}	2.96	2.91^{**}	3.48
A partner brings up something from the past to hurt you	1.80	1.71^{**}	1.87	2.00	2.23

Source. Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study.

Note. IPV = intimate partner violence.

$^{*}p < .05.$

$^{**}p < .01.$

$^{***}p < .001.$

Table 2

Means/Percentages and Standard Deviations for Attitudes Toward IPV, Family Violence, Sociodemographic Characteristics, Prior Relationship Experiences, Adult Status Characteristics, and Relationship Characteristics for the Full Sample and by Gender (*N* = 928).

Dependent Variables	**Full Sample (*N* = 928)**	***SD***	**Range**	**Males (*n* = 422)**	**Females (*n* = 506)**
Attitudes toward IPV	2.10	0.78	1-5	1.92***	2.26
Intimate partner violence	23.28%			23.93%	22.73%
Independent Variables	Mean/ Percentage				
Family violence					
Witnessing parental violence	31.25%			31.28%	31.23%
Coercive parenting	22.41%			21.09%	23.52%
Sociodemographic characteristics					
Female	54.53%				
Age	25.42	1.83	22-29	25.47	25.39
Race					
White	67.35%			66.30%	67.40%
Black	21.34%			21.33%	21.34%
Hispanic	11.31%			11.37%	11.26%
Family structure					
Two biological parents	53.45%			58.05%*	49.61%
Single parent	21.01%			19.91%	21.94%
Step-parent	13.58%			12.32%	14.62%
Other	11.96%			9.72%	13.83%
Family income	3.80	1.80	1-9	3.80	3.80
Neighborhood poverty	14.07	14.34	0-70.13	13.62	14.45
Prior relationship experiences					
Partner non-exclusivity	34.27%			34.60%	33.99%
Partner verbal abuse	70.91%			76.07%**	66.60%
Partner perpetration	47.63%			60.66%***	36.76%
Partner controlling behaviors	1.95	0.61	1-5	2.12***	1.82
Adult status characteristics					
Respondent’s education					
Less than HS	8.19%			8.53%	7.91%
High school	21.99%			25.60%*	18.97%
Some college	41.16%			38.86%	43.08%
College or more	28.66%			27.01%	30.04%
Respondent’s employment					
Unemployed	24.89%			21.80%*	27.47%
Part-time	19.18%			15.17%**	22.53%

Dependent Variables	**Full Sample (*N* = 928)**	***SD***	**Range**	**Males (*n* = 422)**	**Females (*n* = 506)**
Full-time	55.93%			63.03% ***	50.00%
Parent	25.65%			20.38% ***	30.04%
Relationship characteristics					
Union status					
Dating	44.39%			46.21%	42.88%
Cohabiting	32.33%			34.83%	30.24%
Married	23.28%			18.96% **	26.88%
Current relationship	79.96%			75.83% **	83.40%
Duration	3.42	2.88	0.08-14	3.15 **	3.65

Source. Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study.

Note. IPV = intimate partner violence.

$^{*}p < .05$.

$^{**}p < .01$.

$^{***}p < .001$.

Table 3

OLS Regression Coefficients for the Association Between Family Violence, Sociodemographic Characteristics, Prior Relationship Experiences, Adult Status Characteristics, and Relationship Characteristics and Attitudes Toward IPV ($N = 928$).

	Zero Order	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**
Family violence						
Witnessing parental violence	0.26***	0.23***	0.17**	0.14**	0.12*	0.12*
Coercive parenting	0.24***	0.20**	0.15*	0.09	0.10	0.10
Sociodemographic characteristics						
Gender (female)	0.34***		0.33***	0.43***	0.43***	0.44***
Age	−0.03*		−0.03*	−0.03*	−0.03*	−0.02
Race (White)						
Black	0.31***		0.12	0.10	0.12	0.10
Hispanic	0.10		−0.03	−0.05	−0.07	−0.08
Family structure (Two biological parents)						
Single parent	0.21**		0.04	0.03	0.01	0.00
Step-parent	0.05		−0.08	−0.09	−0.10	−0.10
Other	0.25**		0.05	0.05	−0.00	−0.01
Family income	−0.06***		−0.02	−0.02	−0.01	−0.01
Neighborhood poverty	0.12***		0.07**	0.06*	0.03	0.04
Prior relationship experiences						
Partner non-exclusivity	0.11*			−0.01	−0.01	−0.01
Partner verbal abuse	0.10			0.02	0.04	0.04
Partner perpetration	0.16**			0.10	0.07	0.08
Partner controlling behaviors	0.20***			0.21***	0.20***	0.19***
Adult status characteristics						
Respondent’s education (high school)						
Less than HS	0.28**				0.13	0.13
Some college	−0.13				−0.16*	−0.16*
College or more	−0.29***				−0.13	−0.13
Respondent’s employment (Unemployed)						
Part-time	−0.10				−0.04	−0.05
Full-time	−0.23***				−0.03	−0.03
Parent	0.29***				0.08	0.10
Relationship characteristics						
Union status (dating)						
Cohabiting	−0.01					−0.00

	Zero Order	**Model 1**	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**
Married	−0.16 *					−0.12
Current relationship (most recent)	−0.08					−0.04
Duration	−0.04					−0.00
R^2		.04	.12	.15	.17	.17

Source. Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study.

Note. IPV = intimate partner violence.

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

Table 4

Odds Ratios for the Association Between Attitudes Toward IPV, Family Violence, Sociodemographic Characteristics, Prior Relationship Experiences, Adult Status Characteristics, and Relationship Characteristics and Intimate Partner Violence (*N* = 928).

	Zero Order	Model 1
Attitudes toward IPV	2.26 ***	2.08 ***
Family violence		
Witnessing parental violence	3.59 ***	2.66 ***
Coercive parenting	1.71 **	1.01
Sociodemographic characteristics		
Gender (female)	0.94	0.71
Age	0.98	0.92
Race (White)		
Black	2.17 ***	0.98
Hispanic	2.31 ***	1.48
Family structure (two biological parents)		
Single parent	2.74 ***	1.89 **
Step-parent	1.53	0.88
Other	2.67 ***	1.73
Family income	0.84 ***	1.03
Neighborhood poverty	1.45 ***	1.02
Prior relationship experiences		
Partner non-exclusivity	1.95 ***	1.57 *
Partner verbal abuse	2.10 ***	1.79 *
Partner perpetration	2.44 ***	1.44
Partner controlling behaviors	1.69 ***	0.97
Adult status characteristics		
Respondent’s education (high school)		
Less than high school	1.03	0.57
Some college	0.71	0.94
College or more	0.25 ***	0.61
Respondent’s employment (unemployed)		
Part-time	0.51 **	0.53 *
Full-time	0.38 ***	0.44 ***
Parent	2.31 ***	1.07
Relationship characteristics		
Union status (dating)		
Cohabiting	1.99 ***	2.02 **
Married	1.32	1.46

	Zero Order	Model 1
Current relationship (most recent)	0.87	0.72
Duration	1.09 **	1.13 **
χ^2		211.57

Source. Toledo Adolescent Relationships Study.

Note. IPV = intimate partner violence.

$^{*}p < .05$.

$^{**}p < .01$.

$^{***}p < .001$.