



Honors College Theses

11-16-2020

The Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence and Victim Resources at Georgia Southern University

Elizabeth Lacey
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses>



Part of the [Criminology Commons](#), and the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lacey, Elizabeth, "The Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence and Victim Resources at Georgia Southern University" (2020). *Honors College Theses*. 535.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/honors-theses/535>

This thesis (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by Georgia Southern Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College Theses by an authorized administrator of Georgia Southern Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

**The Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence and Victim Resources
at Georgia Southern University**

An Honors thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for Honors in
Criminal Justice and Criminology

By
Elizabeth Lacey

Under the mentorship of *Dr. Laurie Gould*

ABSTRACT

The goal of this project is to measure the prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) among young adults in a college setting. Using an anonymous, self-report survey, college students at a large university in the south were asked about their experiences with IPV, as well as their knowledge and perceptions of victim's services available on campus and in the community. Results reveal that IPV is more prevalent among females and technology-related IPV is more prevalent among males at Georgia Southern University. In addition, the study found that compared to women, men are more informed about existing victim services.

Thesis Mentor: _____

Dr. Laurie Gould

Honors Director: _____

Dr. Steven Engel

December 2020
School of Criminal Justice and Criminology
University Honors Program
Georgia Southern University

Acknowledgments

Thank you to everyone that I have met throughout my time at Georgia Southern University. I appreciate every one of them, I would not be the person I am today without them! I would like to extend a special thanks to several individuals who have been especially supportive in the process of writing this thesis.

First, I would like to express my deepest appreciation for my thesis mentor and professor, *Dr. Laurie Gould*. I am thankful for her dedication, recommendations, and advice throughout this process. It was an honor to work with her.

I am forever grateful for my family, specifically my parents, *Scott* and *Melissa Lacey*, and my brothers, *Kevin*, *Shane*, and *Colin Lacey*. My family has always believed in me and encouraged me. I am thankful for the experiences and unconditional love I have received. My entire family has been instrumental in shaping the person I am and the person I will always strive to be.

I want to thank my friends for always supporting me. A special thanks to *Erica Castro*, *Sierra Harbert*, *Daryl Rounds*, and *Megan DeLaigle* for being incredible people. They encourage me to be the best version of myself, show kindness to others, and never give up.

I cannot go without thanking *Dr. Miguel García*, who has played a huge part in my education at Georgia Southern. He instilled in me a desire to continue to study Spanish, cultures, and linguistics. *Estoy muy agradecida por todo. Espero que él siga siendo un mentor increíble para los estudiantes del futuro.*

Lastly, many thanks to Georgia Southern University and its professors for providing me with the opportunity to conduct this research and continue my education.

Introduction

Intimate partner violence (IPV), a subset of domestic violence, has received increased attention over the past several decades and has led to thousands of in-depth research studies. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, IPV is a national public health problem that continues to impact millions of people in the United States of America (CDC, 2018). It is a serious and preventable problem that demands our attention. Intimate partner violence is defined as “physical violence, sexual violence, stalking, or psychological harm by a current or former partner or spouse.” (CDC, 2018: para. 1). The CDC (2018) also notes that sexual intimacy is not a requirement for a couple to be considered intimate and violence can happen in both heterosexual and same-sex couples.

IPV is broken down into four smaller categories—sexual violence, stalking, physical violence, and psychological aggression (CDC, 2018). The CDC defines each of these behaviors thusly,

“Physical violence is when a person hurts or tries to hurt a partner by hitting, kicking, or using another type of physical force. Sexual violence is forcing or attempting to force a partner to take part in a sex act, sexual touching, or a non-physical sexual event (e.g., sexting) when the partner does not or cannot consent. Stalking is a pattern of repeated, unwanted attention and contact by a partner that causes fear or concern for one’s own safety or the safety of someone close to the victim. Psychological aggression is the use of verbal and non-verbal communication with the intent to harm another person mentally or emotionally and/or to exert control over another person.” (CDC, 2018: para. 2).

As of 2017, approximately 44,981,000 women and 35,236,000 men had reported experiencing IPV in their lifetime (Smith et al., 2017). IPV can happen to anyone of any background or lifestyle and while these crimes affect millions of people every year,

crimes involving sexual violence are among the most underreported crimes in the United States (Smith et al., 2017).

Given the pervasive nature of technology in young people's lives, as well as increases in cybercrime, examining the role of technology in IPV is especially important. In recent years, a growing body of literature has emerged examining the relationship between technology and crime. With regard to IPV specifically, research reveals that technology is being used more often among younger couples, including adolescents and young adults. Technology is used to the advantage of the perpetrator to give them even more control over their victim. Furthermore, abuse via cell phones is more likely to be committed by men with strong ideas of hostile sexism (Duerksen, 2019). Perpetrators who abuse technology often experience a sense of anonymity, invisibility, asynchronicity, dissociative imagination, and attenuated status and authority as they hide behind a device (Duerksen, 2019).

Although the criminal justice system is supposed to uphold the law and hold those who break it accountable, many victims feel as though they cannot go to the police for help and this is especially true in cases of IPV. Victims often experience high levels of fear surrounding the idea of asking for help (Smith et al., 2017). They may fear for their life or their children's lives if they contact the police (Smith et al., 2017). Other reasons to explain the underreporting of IPV include, improper law enforcement response (e.g. police do not always properly remove victims or offenders from the situation), failure to convict perpetrators, and when conviction does occur the sentences may be short (Smith et al., 2017). In an attempt to assist victims and control crime rates, specialized divisions of criminal justice agencies have been developed to handle IPV against women. In recent

years, more research has focused on IPV, with female victims receiving the most attention in the literature, likely owing to the increased likelihood of women to report victimization compared to men.

Literature Review

Prevalence

While there is solid evidence that crime rates in North America and the United Kingdom have been steadily decreasing since 1994, there is a paucity of research related to crime, gender, and IPV (Walby, Towers, and Francis, 2016), thus making it difficult to know the actual prevalence of these crimes. Walby and colleagues (2016) analyzed the root causes of IPV and the characteristics of perpetrators. Walby and colleagues (2016) do not consider crimes against women to be a separate section from IPV because they believe the examination of violent crimes should include other factors such as gender. Crime is influenced by the intersection of three aspects: a possible offender with motivation, lack of supervision, and an appropriate target (Walby et al., 2016). However, it is important to note that many factors can lead to violent crime, including socioeconomic inequality and economic hardship related to gender-specific unemployment (Walby et al., 2016).

IPV is difficult to measure since many victims are repeat victims, and many times, there is a 'cap' to the number of times a victim will be counted, thus making it challenging to study IPV over time. However, when this 'cap' is removed, the drastic gender inequality of offenders is readily apparent (Walby et al., 2016). There was a reported drop in IPV from 1993 to 2010; although, there have been increases in reported rapes and sexual offenses from 2002 to 2014 (Walby et al., 2016). It is important to note that this is an increase in reports and not necessarily an increase in the number of crimes committed.

Breiding (2015) uses data from the 2011 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) to report on the prevalence of different types of IPV, as well as variations in prevalence, perpetrator types, and victimization ages. Three forms of violence are explored in this study including, sexual violence, stalking, and IPV (Breiding, 2015). The 2011 NISVS consists of responses from 12,727 phone interviews conducted with both English and Spanish speakers. The sample was selected using random digit dialing in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Respondents were asked about their experiences with IPV over the course of their lifetime, as well as victimization within the previous twelve months in the following categories stalking, rape, and domestic abuse. Demographic characteristics including race, sex, and ethnicity were also collected in order to look for variations in those areas.

The analysis revealed that in the United States, 19.3% of women and 1.7% of men have been raped in their lifetime. Moreover, 43.9% of women and 23.4% of men have experienced some kind of sexual violence in their lifetime (Breiding, 2015). This includes 5.7% of men and 15.2% of women that have been stalked, and 13.3% of men and 32.1% of women that have experienced noncontact unwanted sexual experiences (e.g. being forced to view sexually explicit media or getting flashed; Breiding, 2015). Sexual coercion, defined as non-physically pressured unwanted penetration, was reported by 12.5% of women and 10.8% of men in the sample (Breiding, 2015). An estimated 0.6% of women and 6.7% of men have been forced to penetrate and 10.8% of men and 27.3% of women have experienced unwanted sexual contact, including fondling and kissing (Breiding, 2015).

Breiding (2015) identified a few weaknesses in the study that may have influenced the findings. For example, there was a low response rate which likely underestimated the prevalence rate compared to estimated victimization rates (Breiding, 2015). Additionally, since not everyone has access to a telephone, the generalizability may be limited. Lastly, self-reported victimization has some inherent biases, which may call the study findings into question (Breiding, 2015). Despite these limitations, the study included a fairly equal distribution of female to male respondents, thus making a significant contribution to the literature in this area.

Victim Characteristics

The relationship between gender and IPV is one of the most disputed areas of this topic. The lack of equal status for women and available resources is likely what leads to increased IPV, however, Walby and colleagues (2016) do not provide a definitive answer to the gender question. The authors explore socioeconomic inequality as another societal factor that can help perpetuate violence in general and violence against women specifically (Walby et al., 2016). The connection between crime and socioeconomic inequality has been thoroughly studied in other literature; however, Walby and colleagues (2016) furthered the research by analyzing the link between socioeconomic inequality and IPV. The study found that higher levels of IPV perpetration coincide with greater levels of economic dispersion (Walby et al., 2016).

In 2018, Walby and Towers continued to further the literature on gender and IPV. Walby and Towers (2018) found that there are many methods to further divide IPV in order to study its gendered effects. One method is to separate violent cases of IPV from cases of coercion, but this can be challenging because the line dividing the two is easily

blurred and many victims experience both forms of IPV (Walby and Towers, 2018).

Another approach analyzes the relationship between society, the economy, and violence instead of the individual motives of offenders (Walby and Towers, 2018). According to Walby and Towers (2018), some researchers argue that IPV is rooted in men's control of women, while others believe that IPV is gender symmetrical, meaning that both males and females commit acts of IPV at the same rates. However, Walby and Towers (2018) found that IPV has a direct correlation with gender inequality and is untimely a negative consequence of the unequal representation of genders and gender roles in our society (Walby and Towers, 2018). The more severe forms of abuse are unequally committed by different genders, while less severe IPV has been found to be committed fairly equally by both genders (Walby and Towers, 2018).

The majority of the public believe that men are more likely to be violent against an intimate partner than women, however, research from Thornton, Graham-Kevan, and Archer (2016) indicate this may not be the case. While these findings appear to be contrary to other research in this area, the geographic location of their sample may help explain the difference; male and female participants were sampled from various British universities (Thornton et al., 2016). In countries with greater gender equality, such as Iceland, Norway, and Finland, women tend to be more violent towards intimate partners and men are more violent towards strangers. Therefore, in this study, women were more likely than men to commit a violent act in the context of an intimate relationship (Thornton et al., 2016). In addition to gender, this study observed the types of behavior, personalities, and risk factors associated with perpetrators of IPV. The study found that perpetrators of IPV often experience trait anger, low self-control, and psychopathic traits

(Thornton et al., 2016). Trait anger refers to a person's anger-proneness which is connected to higher levels of violent tendencies. Low levels of self-control reflect a greater chance of violence because the person is not able to control their emotions or actions as effectively as other people. Personality disorders such as psychopathic traits are linked to violence and IPV. The findings of Thornton and colleagues (2016) are not represented by statistics in law enforcement because women are more likely to report physical violence than men so even if men are victimized more often, there appears to be underreporting among men. According to Thornton and colleagues (2016) the ratio of male to female offenders increases as data is pulled from less gender-equal countries; while the ratio is more equal or higher for females in countries that place more value on gender equality.

While gender may appear to be the driving factor behind a person's likelihood of experiencing IPV, research has increasingly noted the intersectional nature of victimization. Tam, Tutty, Zhuang, and Paz (2015) examined the challenges that women of racial minorities face when dealing with IPV. In addition to gender, factors such as social class, race, and sexuality affect each individual case of IPV. No one single factor is by itself the cause, but when several risk factors intersect, they can give power to the offender and take it away from the victim (Tam et al., 2015).

There are many challenges and barriers that help explain why victims may not leave their abusers including economic insecurity, concerns over children, and social isolation (Tam et al., 2015). Women are typically not the "breadwinners" for a household, therefore leaving an abusive relationship can be financially impossible. In addition to facing the struggles of being a woman, immigrants experience hardships due

to where they are from and where they currently live. Female immigrants consider staying with their abusers because they depend on them economically (Tam et al., 2015). Other reasons listed by the women in this study include fear of confrontations with their partner prior to seeking law enforcement help, during investigations, and after criminal justice interference (Tam et al., 2015). Concerns about leaving children represent another barrier to leaving an abusive relationship. In the study, respondents indicated that they worried that tearing their family apart would be more detrimental than staying with the abuser. Although many victims stay with the offenders to avoid disrupting their children's lives, they almost always leave once a child is put in harm's way (Tam et al., 2015). Study respondents also expressed that they feared repercussions from their ethnic communities if they went to the police. The most commonly cited reasons for staying in an abusive relationship include fear of threats continuing, financial dependency, ideas of power and inferiority, children, and not having a safe place to go (Hamilton, 2010).

Victimization

Hamilton (2010) delves into the judicial aspect of IPV by studying court cases. She explains that judicial rulings shape the way law enforcement see victims and offenders of IPV because the courts often make a distinction between victims who leave their abusers and those who do not. A "true victim" is one who ends the relationship with the abuser, whereas those who elect to stay are referred to as "agents" and are not seen as being as vulnerable or innocent (Hamilton, 2010). Agents of the abuser lose credibility during judicial trials due to the erroneous belief that someone would make every effort to leave an abusive relationship.

Sex crimes in general, and IPV in particular, are vastly underreported to the police. For this reason, self-report victimization surveys such as the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) and The Crime Survey for England and Wales are used instead of police reports to more accurately measure the extent of these crimes. In cases of domestic disputes, the victims and offenders have an intimate relationship so there are extra precautions that must be taken compared to a dispute between strangers or acquaintances. Victims and abusers often live together, so victims need a place to stay away from their abusers once legal action has been taken. Furthermore, immigrant victims often face additional struggles. Tam and colleagues (2015) found that inadequate foreign government experiences cause some victims to be afraid that law enforcement will not sufficiently protect them. Victims of IPV with immigrant status often do not want judicial intervention and instead only want temporary relief (Tam et al., 2015).

Unfortunately, temporary relief is often followed by more abuse in the future as research has demonstrated the cyclical nature of violence. The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV) explains the cyclical patterns that are often experienced by victims. Phases in this cycle may include the honeymoon, tension building, and intense abuse periods (NCADV, n.d.). The cycle of violence not only refers to the phases of IPV but also to a person's entire life. Researchers have noted that victimization early in life is related to victimization in adulthood. Lundgren and Amin (2015) examine this phenomenon as it relates to IPV and sexual violence during adolescence and the impact of victimization later in life. Additionally, they examine gender inequality, marginalized groups, and at-risk youths. Lundgren and Amin (2015) performed a meta-analysis of 142

studies examining risk factors for IPV, as well as successful methods of prevention, and concluded that compared to boys, girls are disproportionately affected by sexual violence.

The intervention programs analyzed include sexual assault prevention among university students, prevention designed for children exposed to violence, economic empowerment, community-based prevention, and media components (Lundgren and Amin, 2015). School-based sexual violence prevention programs were found to be the most successful for adolescents. Adolescents are at a point in their life where they are easily influenced, therefore it is important to connect with the students. However, because gender inequality is the root cause of IPV, Lundgren and Amin (2015) conclude that no program will completely neutralize sexual violence until gender equality has been achieved.

Technology

Technological advancements are utilized by both victims and perpetrators. IPV occurs in many forms and the use of technology in IPV has been an increasing concern among researchers. Cyberviolence or technology-related IPV refers to IPV involving technology, electronic programs, software, and controlling behaviors over the internet (Al-Alosi, 2020: para. 9). Freed, Palmer, Minchala, Levy, Ristenpart, and Dell (2018) surveyed 89 people who previously experienced technology-related IPV and the analysis revealed that 33% of women and 16% of men have experienced technology-based IPV (Freed et al., 2018). Freed and colleagues (2018) categorized abuse into four groups, including “Ownership of devices or online accounts, compromise of devices or accounts, hurtful messages or posts, and exposure based harms” (Freed et al., 2018: pg. 4). In addition to identifying the many ways in which perpetrators abuse technology, Freed and

colleagues (2018) also discuss ways that victims can protect themselves. They point to a victim's need to know that spyware programs and keylogging software do not require the owner's consent in order to operate, meaning that a separate party can set up software to spy on the device's owner. Phones with pre-installed programs can be purchased or the spyware can be set up on an existing phone (Freed et al., 2018). Furthermore, victims should be aware of existing apps installed on their phones, as spyware can mask itself as other legitimate seeming programs (Freed et al., 2018). Anti-spyware software can be installed on any device that may need protection. Freed and colleagues (2018) recommend that victims reach out to voluntary sector organizations for support.

In recent years, research on cyberstalking and other forms of cyber abuse has increased drastically to provide information to protect current victims and prevent future victimization. Al-Alosi (2020) examined both the advantages of using technology to combat IPV, as well as the "limitations of technology in tackling these types of abuse" (Al-Alosi, 2020: para. 5). Examples of abusers using technology to further their control include downloading and installing hidden spyware and/or tracking applications on the victim's phone. According to Al-Alosi (2020: para. 13), "technology and IPV are 'inextricably intertwined.'" By using technology, the abuser hides behind the screen and feels a false sense of confidence and invincibility. While technology can certainly be used to inflict harm, Al-Alosi (2020) lists several ways that utilizing technology can benefit victims. For example, technology can be used to document evidence, empower victims of abuse, connect with support groups and victim resources, and research safety recommendations (Al-Alosi, 2020). However, these benefits are also some of the main reasons that abusers restrict or completely take away their victim's access to technology.

To further explore the effects of technology and IPV, Duerksen (2019) compiled a meta-analysis of a variety of studies relating to technology-based IPV. Duerksen (2019) found that social media has influenced the way IPV is perpetuated and technology-based IPV has increased in recent years. Duerksen (2019) also found that men with higher levels of hostile sexism are more likely to use cell phones to abuse their partners. The risk for IPV victimization peaks between ages 18 and 25; this means that this period of a person's life is the most important to receive information, resources, and support (Duerksen, 2019). Technology is a complicated tool because it is used by both victims and abusers; therefore, more research is needed to fully understand the role that technology plays in IPV (Duerksen, 2019).

Methodology

Sampling

The purpose of the current project is to measure the prevalence of IPV among a sample of young adults in a college setting. Additionally, this project examines the knowledge and perceptions of victim services available on campus. The survey (Appendix One) was administered to undergraduate students in fourteen classes during the spring of 2014 as a part of a larger project by Drs. Gould, Agnich, and Policastro. In-person, undergraduate classes were selected using stratified random sampling, and professors granted permission for their class to be surveyed. This led to a sample size of 786 responses.

Students were asked a variety of Likert scale questions relating to their experiences with IPV, since attending Georgia Southern University. The questions are divided into four sections related to the respondents' experiences with IPV, respondents' friends' experiences with IPV, knowledge of victim services, and demographic information.

Variables

The dependent variables in the current study are *Experience with IPV* and *Knowledge of Victim Services*. *Experience with IPV* was measured by asking participants a series of questions designed to assess whether they have been victimized by their significant other. Specifically, respondents were asked whether their significant other was verbally abusive, physically abusive, or psychologically controlling. Some questions

include “My boyfriend or girlfriend has acted aggressively toward me” and “My boyfriend or girlfriend monitors my text messages.” Next, respondents were asked whether any of their close friends had experiences with IPV, including past and present relationships. Some questions include “At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend purposely get them drunk to take advantage of them sexually” and “At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who threatened to harm them with a weapon.” (for a complete list of survey items please see Appendix One).

Knowledge of Victim Services was measured by asking respondents if they knew where to find help if they were victimized. Additionally, respondents were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with existing victim services (for a complete list of items please see Appendix One).

The primary independent variable in the current study is gender, which was asked as part of the section on respondent demographics.

Research Questions

The following research questions will be explored in the study:

RQ₁: What is the relationship between gender and IPV?

RQ₂: What role does technology play in IPV?

RQ₃: Are there gender differences in knowledge of existing victim services?

These research questions are based on gaps in the existing literature. Research Question One was developed to explore the relationship between gender and IPV. This study looks at whether males and females experience IPV at different rates. As identified by Walby and Towers (2018) IPV and gender inequality are directly correlated and IPV is a negative consequence of the inequality in our society. Research Question Two was

developed to explore the role that technology plays in IPV. This study looks at the use of technology by both victims and perpetrators of IPV. Research Question Three was developed to explore the knowledge of existing victim services by different genders. This study looks at whether gender is a factor in the knowledge of existing victim services. These research questions are intended to explore gaps in current literature and explore IPV at Georgia Southern University.

Analytic Plan

The data from the survey were analyzed using SPSS software. Independent samples t-tests were used to examine the relationship between experiences with IPV and gender. T-tests are a form of inferential statistics that are used to show if there is a significant difference between the two groups, in this case, gender. The data was also analyzed using descriptive statistics to compare the percentages of the responses.

Results

Overall, the sample of the respondents from the survey is 50.9% female (n=400), 45.7% male (n=359), .3% transgender (n=2), and .1% other (n=1). Given the low base rates of transgender and other respondents, the analysis will focus on differences between respondents who identified as either male or female. The analysis begins with a presentation of descriptive statistics about the respondent's personal experiences with IPV. As shown in Table One, when asked if their boyfriend or girlfriend had tried to intimidate them, 9.9% of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that they had. When asked if their boyfriend or girlfriend has ever yelled or screamed at them, 28.9% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed. Lastly, 4.9% of respondents stated that they strongly agree or agree that their boyfriend or girlfriend had threatened to harm them.

The next section of the survey asked about the respondent's friends' experiences with IPV. Table One also shows that 45% of the respondents have a friend who has been intimidated by an intimate partner, 62.4% know someone who has been yelled or screamed at, and 26.2% know someone who has been threatened with harm (for a complete list of responses please see Table One).

A series of independent samples t-tests were run to explore *RQ1: What is the relationship between gender and IPV?* (see Table Two). As shown, the variables that are statistically significant are personal experiences with partners engaging in *Intimidation* ($p > .000$); *Aggressive behavior* ($p > .000$); and *Physical restraint* ($p > .000$). Further, respondents reported that at least one of their friends had experienced romantic partners engaging in *Intimidation* ($p > .000$); *Yelling or screaming* ($p > .000$); *Aggressive behavior* ($p > .000$); *Possessive behavior* ($p = .004$); *False accusations of cheating* ($p = .003$);

Destroying important items ($p=.046$); *Physical restraint* ($p>.000$); and *Invasion of privacy* ($p=.025$; please see Table Two for a complete list of t-test values).

Regarding the role of technology, descriptive statistics reveal that 6.6% of respondents have had a significant other demand the passwords to their email or social media accounts, 6.3% have had their Facebook accounts hacked by romantic partners, and 7.1% have had their text messages monitored. 31.9% know someone who has had a significant other demand passwords to their email or social media accounts, 31.7% of the respondents know someone who has had their Facebook accounts hacked by a romantic partner, and 41.5% know someone who has their text messages monitored (please see Table Three for a complete list of responses).

A series of independent samples t-tests were run to explore *RQ₂: What role does technology play in IPV?* (see Table Four). As shown, the variables that are statistically significant are *Demanding passwords to email or social media accounts* ($p=.011$) and *Text message monitoring* ($p=.046$; please see Table Four for a complete list of t-test values).

Descriptive statistics were used to answer the third research question, *Are there gender differences in knowledge of existing victim services?* As shown in Table Five, when asked if they would know where to seek help if they were sexually assaulted, 76.2% of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that they would. Similar results were found when respondents were asked if they would know where to find help if they were physically assaulted (83.3% agreed or strongly agreed); stalked (70% agreed or strongly agreed); and cyberstalked (50% agreed or strongly agreed). 45.8% of respondents either strongly agreed or agreed that Georgia Southern University provides

enough services for victims. When asked if they generally feel safe on campus, 81.8% of respondents stated that they either strongly agreed or agreed (for a complete list of responses please see Table Five).

A series of independent samples t-tests were run to explore *RQ₃: Are there gender differences in knowledge of existing victim services?* (see Table Six). As shown, there are statistically significant differences between males and females in virtually every category of knowledge of victim services. Males appear to be more knowledgeable than females about services for *Sexual assault* ($p=.015$); *Physical assault* ($p=.015$); *Stalking* ($p=.001$); and *Cyberstalking* ($p=.019$). When asked if Georgia Southern provides enough services for victims of physical and sexual assault, males were more likely to answer in the affirmative ($p=.004$). Lastly, males were more likely than females to indicate that they generally felt safe when on campus ($p>.000$; please see Table Six for the complete list of t-test values).

Discussion

The sample is considered representative of the student population at Georgia Southern University because of the sampling method and respondent characteristics. The data in Table One illustrates that the majority of respondents have not personally experienced IPV. Overall, students are experiencing acts of IPV at rates lower than 31.7% (Table One). However, many of the respondents know someone who has been the victim of IPV. These findings are similar to the statistics from Breiding in 2015 which show that around 44% of women and 23% of men have experienced sexual violence.

Table Two shows that with the exception of *frequent checkups by a significant other, being drugged or involuntarily intoxicated and then being taken advantage of sexually*, and *stalking* females reported higher rates of IPV compared to males. Table Four shows that with the exception of *hacking into accounts, demanding passwords to accounts, monitoring phone calls, and monitoring text messages* males reported higher rates of technology-related IPV compared to females. Lastly, Table Six shows that males reported higher rates of knowledge of victim services than females.

These findings are significant because they show that females experience physical and psychological acts of IPV at higher rates, but males experience technology-related acts of IPV at higher rates. In addition, male students are more knowledgeable about victim services available on campus. These findings run contrary to the extant literature in this area, as well as conventional wisdom. Traditionally, women know more about the resources available to victims because they are more often victimized. One explanation for these findings is the inclusion of criminal justice majors in the study. It is possible that, by virtue of the area of study, criminal justice majors are simply more

knowledgeable about victim services. This interpretation is somewhat speculative, however, as the survey was distributed equally to classes in several different fields of study.

Limitations

The reliability of this data is impacted by the age of the survey since it was conducted in 2014. This study is not fully generalizable to the current population of students because it is assumed that most of the respondents have graduated from the university since participating in the study. However, it presents a good analysis of the methods that Georgia Southern uses to prevent IPV and spread awareness about victim resources.

Recommendations

In the future, the university should continue to evaluate the resources that are available to students. As we see in Table Three, cyber-related IPV is a big issue that students at Georgia Southern face. Tables One and Three highlight that many students know someone who has experienced IPV. Therefore, the information should include advice on how to help a friend who is the victim of IPV, not just what to do if you are a victim.

Conclusion

This research examined the relationship between gender and IPV, the prevalence of technology-related IPV, and knowledge of victim services on campus. Finding revealed that women are more likely than men to experience physical and psychological based IPV, whereas men are more likely than women to experience technology-based IPV. These results indicate that, regardless of the gender of the offender, both men and women experience IPV, but the nature of the victimization is qualitatively different. Finally, this research explored knowledge of victim services and findings showed that men are more aware of victim services.

Future surveys should be conducted to ensure that services are effective at helping victims and reaching the student population. Previous research included in the literature review examines the prevalence of IPV on national and international scales. However, this research has contributed to the literature surrounding IPV by analyzing students at Georgia Southern University. It provides a new approach to identifying the prevalence of IPV and students' knowledge of services that are available on campus to help victims. As noted by Thornton and colleagues (2016), in countries with higher rates of gender equality, IPV is more likely to be committed by females. However, in countries with gender inequality and other gender issues, men are more likely to be the perpetrators and women are more often victims (Thornton et al., 2016). This corroborates the findings of this study, since the United States is not a gender-equal country it is not surprising that physical and psychological forms of IPV are more prevalent among women. Therefore, this research and the research done by Thornton and colleagues concur that when compared to men, women experience higher rates of IPV.

References

- Al-Alosi, H. (2020). Fighting fire with fire: Exploring the potential of technology to help victims combat intimate partner violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1359178919301223>
- Breiding, M. J. (2015). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization—national intimate partner and sexual violence survey, United States, 2011. *American Journal of Public Health, 105*(4). doi: 10.2105/ajph.2015.302634
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2018). Intimate Partner Violence |Violence Prevention|Injury Center|CDC. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/>
- Duerksen, K. N. (2019). Technological intimate partner violence: Exploring technology-related perpetration factors and overlap with in-person intimate partner violence. *Computers in Human Behavior*. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747563219301761>
- Freed, D., Palmer, J., Minchala, D., Levy, K., Ristenpart, T., & Dell, N. (2018). “A stalker's paradise.” *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems - CHI '18*, 1–13. doi: 10.1145/3173574.3174241
- Hamilton, M. (2010). Judicial discourses on women's agency in violent relationships: Cases from California. *Women's Studies International Forum*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2010.09.007>

- Lundgren, R., & Amin, A. (2015). Addressing intimate partner violence and sexual violence among adolescents: emerging evidence of effectiveness. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 56*(1). doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.08.012
- NCADV. *Dynamics of Abuse*. <https://ncadv.org/dynamics-of-abuse>.
- Smith, S.G., Chen, J., Basile, K.C., Gilbert, L.K., Merrick, M.T., Patel, N., Walling, M., & Jain, A. (2017). The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey (NISVS): 2010-2012 State report. *Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/NISVS-StateReportBook.pdf>
- Tam, D. M. Y., Tutty, L. M., Zhuang, Z. H., & Paz, E. (2015). Racial minority women and criminal justice responses to domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9794-7>
- Thornton, A. J. V., Graham-Kevan N., & Archer J. (2016). Intimate partner violence: Are the risk factors similar for men and women, and similar to other types of offending? *Aggressive Behavior*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.21635>
- Walby, S., & Towers J. (2018) Untangling the concept of coercive control: Theorizing domestic violent crime. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1748895817743541>
- Walby, S., Towers J., & Francis B. (2016). Is violent crime increasing or decreasing? A new methodology to measure repeat attacks making visible the significance of gender and domestic relations. *British Journal of Criminology*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv131>

Tables

Table 1.0 Characteristics of Sample

	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree Somewhat</i>	<i>Uncertain</i>	<i>Agree Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree Strongly</i>
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has tried to intimidate me.</i>	74.6%	7.8%	4.3%	7.0%	2.9%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has yelled or screamed at me.</i>	51.3%	13.5%	3.3%	19.1%	9.8%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has acted aggressively toward me.</i>	68.7%	10.1%	3.9%	9.4%	4.2%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend is overly possessive of me.</i>	60.5%	14.0%	7.8%	11.5%	5.9%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has falsely accused me of cheating on them.</i>	68.4%	8.4%	4.8%	9.4%	7.8%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend often interferes with my social life.</i>	56.0%	13.6%	7.0%	15.0%	5.3%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has threatened to harm me.</i>	82.7%	5.7%	3.6%	3.1%	1.8%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has threatened to harm me with a weapon.</i>	90.3%	3.1%	2.0%	1.1%	0.3%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has destroyed things or objects that are important to me.</i>	85.6%	4.3%	3.1%	2.2%	1.5%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has physically restrained me.</i>	84.7%	4.6%	2.2%	2.7%	2.8%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has forced me to do things that I didn't want to do.</i>	81.8%	5.5%	3.6%	3.8%	2.0%

<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has purposely gotten me drunk to take advantage of me sexually.</i>	87.7%	3.3%	3.1%	1.9%	0.9%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has drugged me to take advantage of me sexually.</i>	91.7%	1.9%	1.9%	1.0%	0.3%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has stalked me.</i>	83.3%	3.9%	4.5%	3.1%	1.8%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend checks up on me often.</i>	43.9%	12.7%	8.7%	21.9%	9.8%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has invaded my privacy</i>	73.2%	6.0%	7.6%	6.5%	3.6%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has threatened an ex dating partner</i>	80.4%	5.0%	5.0%	3.6%	3.1%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has tried to intimidate an ex dating partner</i>	77.4%	4.7%	6.0%	6.0%	2.9%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who tried to intimidate them.</i>	29.5%	7.1%	17.8%	29.4%	15.6%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who yelled or screamed at them.</i>	19.5%	6.0%	11.6%	34.4%	28.0%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who acted aggressively toward them.</i>	26.1%	6.0%	19.1%	26.2%	21.6%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who was overly possessive of them.</i>	20.5%	5.7%	13.9%	30.3%	28.9%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who falsely accused my friend of cheating on them.</i>	23.3%	6.2%	17.8%	25.7%	25.6%

<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who interfered with their social life.</i>	18.7%	5.3%	14.5%	31.6%	29.1%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who threatened to harm them.</i>	38.0%	8.8%	26.2%	13.6%	12.6%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who threatened to harm them with a weapon.</i>	57.1%	7.4%	25.7%	3.7%	4.7%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who destroyed things or objects that were important to my friend.</i>	40.5%	7.1%	24.0%	15.8%	12.0%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend physically restrain them.</i>	44.4%	6.5%	24.6%	13.1%	10.7%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who forced my friend to do things that they didn't want to do.</i>	41.9%	8.1%	28.1%	11.8%	9.3%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend purposely get them drunk to take advantage of them sexually.</i>	50.3%	6.4%	27.2%	8.5%	7.1%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend drug them to take advantage of them sexually.</i>	56.5%	6.7%	27.2%	4.5%	4.6%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who stalked them.</i>	41.7%	7.4%	21.8%	16.0%	12.6%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who checks up on them often.</i>	23.0%	4.3%	15.6%	31.0%	24.9%

<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who invaded their privacy.</i>	30.9%	5.0%	21.6%	23.8%	18.1%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend threaten their ex dating partner(s).</i>	40.7%	6.5%	27.4%	13.6%	11.5%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who tried to intimidate their ex dating partner(s).</i>	40.1%	5.2%	27.0%	15.5%	11.6%

Table 2.0 Independent Samples T-Test

	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Male Mean</i>	<i>Female Mean</i>
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has tried to intimidate me.</i>	-4.763	684.099	.000	-.3615	1.309	1.671
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has yelled or screamed at me.</i>	-1.939	736.811	.053	-.2107	2.078	2.288
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has acted aggressively toward me.</i>	-3.783	715.898	.000	-.3229	1.474	1.797
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend is overly possessive of me.</i>	-.164	726.951	.870	-.0158	1.880	1.895
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has falsely accused me of cheating on them.</i>	-.735	726.040	.463	-.0734	1.763	1.836
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend often interferes with my social life.</i>	-.492	732.796	.623	-.0483	1.934	1.982
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has threatened to harm me.</i>	-1.495	727.555	.135	-.0896	1.242	1.332
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has threatened to harm me with a weapon.</i>	-.138	736.254	.891	-.0050	1.112	1.117
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has destroyed things or objects that are important to me.</i>	.412	728.922	.681	.0228	1.248	1.225
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has physically restrained me.</i>	-5.052	571.150	.000	-.3076	1.124	1.431
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has forced me to do things that I didn't want to do.</i>	-.077	726.535	.939	-.0050	1.327	1.332
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has purposely gotten me drunk to take advantage of me sexually.</i>	-.842	722.183	.400	-.0463	1.178	1.224
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has drugged me to take advantage of me sexually.</i>	-1.296	711.451	.195	-.0433	1.069	1.112
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has stalked me.</i>	-.048	731.378	.962	-.0030	1.301	1.304

<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend checks up on me often.</i>	.683	725.580	.495	.0751	2.432	2.357
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has invaded my privacy</i>	-.173	733.558	.863	-.0143	1.555	1.569
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has threatened an ex dating partner</i>	-1.301	737.998	.194	-.0924	1.336	1.429
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has tried to intimidate an ex dating partner</i>	-1.809	737.708	.071	-.1388	1.399	1.538
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who tried to intimidate them.</i>	-5.858	749.326	.000	-.6155	2.620	3.236
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who yelled or screamed at them.</i>	-4.058	718.207	.000	-.4252	3.246	3.672
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who acted aggressively toward them.</i>	-4.637	738.768	.000	-.5004	2.862	3.363
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who was overly possessive of them.</i>	-2.911	737.832	.004	-.3112	3.272	3.583
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who falsely accused my friend of cheating on them.</i>	-2.985	731.969	.003	-.3259	3.082	3.408
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who interfered with their social life.</i>	-1.931	743.736	.054	-.2014	3.387	3.588
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who threatened to harm them.</i>	-1.779	752.933	.076	-.1853	2.454	2.639
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who threatened to harm them with a weapon.</i>	-.677	744.089	.499	-.0587	1.865	1.924

<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who destroyed things or objects that were important to my friend.</i>	-1.999	747.498	.046	-.2107	2.403	2.614
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend physically restrain them.</i>	-4.124	752.881	.000	-.4232	2.166	2.589
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who forced my friend to do things that they didn't want to do.</i>	-1.639	750.452	.102	-.1631	2.302	2.465
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend purposely get them drunk to take advantage of them sexually.</i>	.254	749.791	.799	.0245	2.165	2.140
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend drug them to take advantage of them sexually.</i>	.461	746.113	.645	.0399	1.950	1.910
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who stalked them.</i>	.805	749.468	.421	.0863	2.547	2.461
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who checks up on them often.</i>	-1.461	744.289	.144	-.1582	3.225	3.383
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who invaded their privacy.</i>	-2.248	747.701	.025	-.2459	2.807	3.053
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend threaten their ex dating partner(s).</i>	-.555	754.128	.579	-.0575	2.453	2.510
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who tried to intimidate their ex dating partner(s).</i>	-.275	749.383	.783	-.0287	2.514	2.543

Table 3.0 Characteristics of Sample

	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree Somewhat</i>	<i>Uncertain</i>	<i>Agree Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree Strongly</i>
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has hacked into my email accounts.</i>	83.7%	3.8%	4.5%	2.7%	1.9%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has demanded passwords to my email or social media accounts</i>	80.8%	6.1%	3.1%	3.8%	2.8%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has hacked into my Facebook account.</i>	81.6%	4.7%	4.2%	3.6%	2.7%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend monitors my cell phone calls</i>	77.9%	6.1%	5.0%	4.2%	2.9%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend monitors my text messages</i>	72.0%	8.3%	5.3%	7.1%	4.1%
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has posted negative things on my Facebook page.</i>	88.4%	2.9%	2.4%	1.8%	1.0%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who hacked into their email accounts.</i>	40.1%	6.6%	28.8%	11.7%	12.0%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who demanded passwords to their email or social media accounts.</i>	35.2%	5.7%	26.5%	16.3%	15.6%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who hacked into their Facebook account.</i>	36.0%	6.2%	25.1%	16.4%	15.3%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who monitors their cell phone calls.</i>	34.7%	5.9%	25.2%	19.3%	14.1%

<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who monitors their text messages.</i>	30.2%	5.0%	22.6%	22.4%	19.1%
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend post negative things on their Facebook page.</i>	45.3%	6.9%	26.6%	9.7%	10.6%

Table 4.0 Independent Samples T-Test

	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Male Mean</i>	<i>Female Mean</i>
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has hacked into my email accounts.</i>	.402	729.932	.688	.0247	1.298	1.273
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has demanded passwords to my email or social media accounts</i>	.100	729.104	.920	.0070	1.364	1.357
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has hacked into my Facebook account.</i>	.740	718.697	.459	.0513	1.374	1.322
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend monitors my cell phone calls</i>	1.009	706.377	.313	.0749	1.458	1.383
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend monitors my text messages</i>	.628	721.276	.530	.0534	1.612	1.559
<i>My boyfriend or girlfriend has posted negative things on my Facebook page.</i>	1.090	703.937	.276	.0524	1.193	1.141
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who hacked into their email accounts.</i>	-.797	748.320	.426	-.0828	2.440	2.523
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who demanded passwords to their email or social media accounts.</i>	-2.555	746.806	.011	-.2757	2.571	2.847
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who hacked into their Facebook account.</i>	-1.470	747.096	.142	-.1596	2.607	2.766

<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who monitors their cell phone calls.</i>	-1.624	747.888	.105	-.1735	2.646	2.820
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who monitors their text messages.</i>	-1.997	741.609	.046	-.2187	2.854	3.073
<i>At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend post negative things on their Facebook page.</i>	1.089	744.005	.277	.1115	2.380	2.268

Table 5.0 Characteristics of Sample

	<i>Disagree Strongly</i>	<i>Disagree Somewhat</i>	<i>Uncertain</i>	<i>Agree Somewhat</i>	<i>Agree Strongly</i>
<i>If I were sexually assaulted, I would know where to seek help.</i>	3.9%	6.4%	12.7%	34.6%	41.6%
<i>If I were physically assaulted, I would know where to seek help.</i>	2.8%	4.5%	8.5%	35.0%	48.3%
<i>If I were being stalked, I would know where to seek help.</i>	6.1%	6.0%	15.4%	29.3%	40.7%
<i>If I were being cyberstalked, I would know where to seek help.</i>	9.2%	11.3%	26.8%	20.7%	29.3%
<i>Georgia Southern provides enough services for victims of physical and sexual assault.</i>	2.7%	3.4%	46.9%	22.4%	23.4%
<i>I generally feel safe while on campus at Georgia Southern.</i>	3.3%	6.5%	7.5%	41.6%	40.2%

Table 6.0 Independent Samples T-Test

	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig. (2-tailed)</i>	<i>Mean Difference</i>	<i>Male Mean</i>	<i>Female Mean</i>
<i>If I were sexually assaulted, I would know where to seek help.</i>	2.433	752.978	.015	.1887	4.148	3.960
<i>If I were physically assaulted, I would know where to seek help.</i>	2.979	750.114	.003	.2102	4.336	4.126
<i>If I were being stalked, I would know where to seek help.</i>	3.243	739.190	.001	.2769	4.089	3.812
<i>If I were being cyberstalked, I would know where to seek help.</i>	2.353	735.853	.019	.2212	3.631	3.410
<i>Georgia Southern provides enough services for victims of physical and sexual assault.</i>	2.896	740.997	.004	.2056	3.730	3.524
<i>I generally feel safe while on campus at Georgia Southern.</i>	4.827	751.952	.000	.3474	4.292	3.945

Appendix One

Survey

In this survey, we will be asking some sensitive questions about your past and current relationships, your upbringing, and current activities. All of your answers will be kept confidential and none of your individual answers will be released. Please answer all questions as honestly and openly as possible. If you do not feel comfortable answering a particular question, you can skip it. If you would rather not participate in this study, please return your blank survey to the researchers at this time.

In the section, we are interested in learning about your current and past relationships with your boyfriend(s) or girlfriend(s) since you arrived at Georgia Southern. Please read each question and answer each according to your experiences.

6) Please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly, or are uncertain about the following statements.

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Uncertain	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has tried to intimidate me.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has yelled or screamed at me.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has acted aggressively toward me.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend is overly possessive of me.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has falsely accused me of cheating on them.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend often interferes with my school life.	1	2	3	4	5

My boyfriend or girlfriend often interferes with my social life.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has threatened to harm me.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has threatened to harm me with a weapon.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has destroyed things or objects that are important to me.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has physically restrained me.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has forced me to do things that I didn't want to do.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has purposely gotten me drunk to take advantage of me sexually.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has drugged me to take advantage of me sexually.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has stalked me.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend checks up on me often.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has hacked into my email accounts.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has invaded my privacy	1	2	3	4	5

My boyfriend or girlfriend has demanded passwords to my email or social media accounts	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has hacked into my Facebook account.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend monitors my cell phone calls	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend monitors my text messages	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has posted negative things on my Facebook page.	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has threatened an ex dating partner	1	2	3	4	5
My boyfriend or girlfriend has tried to intimidate an ex dating partner	1	2	3	4	5

In this section we are interested in your friend's experiences with dating violence. Please read each question and answer each according to your personal knowledge about your friend's current and past relationships.

7) Please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly, or are uncertain about the following statements.

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Uncertain	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who tried to intimidate them.	1	2	3	4	5

At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who yelled or screamed at them.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who acted aggressively toward them.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who was overly possessive of them.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who falsely accused my friend of cheating on them.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who interfered with their school life.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who interfered with their social life.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who threatened to harm them.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who threatened to harm them with a weapon.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who destroyed things or objects that were important to my friend.	1	2	3	4	5

At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend physically restrain them.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who forced my friend to do things that they didn't want to do.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend purposely get them drunk to take advantage of them sexually.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend drug them to take advantage of them sexually.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who stalked them.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who checks up on them often.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who hacked into their email accounts.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who invaded their privacy.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who demanded passwords to their email or social media accounts.	1	2	3	4	5

At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who hacked into their Facebook account.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who monitors their cell phone calls.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who monitors their text messages.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend post negative things on their Facebook page.	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend threaten their ex dating partner(s).	1	2	3	4	5
At least one of my friends has had a boyfriend or girlfriend who tried to intimidate their ex dating partner(s).	1	2	3	4	5

In this section we are interested in your knowledge of victim services. Please read each question and answer each according to your personal knowledge

8) Please indicate whether you agree strongly, agree somewhat, disagree somewhat, disagree strongly, or are uncertain about the following statements.

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree Somewhat	Uncertain	Agree Somewhat	Agree Strongly
	1	2	3	4	5
If I were sexually assaulted, I would know where to seek help.	1	2	3	4	5

If I were physically assaulted, I would know where to seek help.	1	2	3	4	5
If I were being stalked, I would know where to seek help.	1	2	3	4	5
If I were being cyberstalked, I would know where to seek help.	1	2	3	4	5
Georgia Southern provides enough services for victims of physical and sexual assault.	1	2	3	4	5
I generally feel safe while on campus at Georgia Southern.	1	2	3	4	5

35) What is your gender?

_____ Male

_____ Female