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Intimate partner violence (IPV)

- is a global issue that impacts all levels of society
- affects people regardless of background
- impacts families, communities, and societies
- is influenced by a web of risks and protective factors
  - Sociocultural factors
    - Gender norms
    - Partnership stereotypes
    - Religion
    - Family background
    - Context
- (Araya & Salazar, 2000; Campbell, 2002; Carlyle et al., 2014; Flood & Pease, 2009; FVPF, 2004; Guruge, 2012; Gustafsson et al., 2012; Hatcher et al., 2013; PAHO, 2003; Rodriguez et al., 2012; Yoshihama et al., 2014; WHO, 2010, 2013)
Attitudes toward IPV

- IPV behaviors are associated with beliefs, opinions, and perceptions
  - Approval of IPV increases risks of IPV
  - Attitudes are shaped by experiences

- Attitudes no static and are shaped by multiples factors

- ATIPV is a promising area to address IPV

- In Costa Rica
  - 2012 Survey about Perceptions of the Costa Rican Population about VAW (n=800)
    - IPV is considered the most prevalent manifestation of VAW
    - It has existed for many years
    - Cultural myths support IPV

(Fincham, et al., 2008; Lawoko, 2008; Mata, 2002; Rodriguez et al., 2012 Rani & Bonu, 2009; Wubs et al., 2013)
The Problem

• Studies including non-collegiate samples
  • No studies of neither ATIPV of college students nor the effect of multi-level factors
  • Any experience linked to IPV during this period might have greater impact than at a later stage

• Intersectionality of multilevel factors
  • Among adolescents and young adults
  • Cultures where gender norms are rapidly changing and less IPV research has been conducted

• Contribution
  • Understanding of the role of multilevel factors on behaviors and attitudes linked to IPV
  • This knowledge will help researchers, policy makers, and health care providers to improve the efforts addressing IPV in the country.

• (Nabors & Jasinski, 2009; O’Keefe, 2005)
Purpose

• To assess the attitudes toward IPV among college students in Costa Rica and to explore how different factors influence these attitudes. To better understand IPV and attitudes toward IPV in Costa Rica.
Study Hypotheses
• H 1: College students in Costa Rica who report their area of origin outside of the great metropolitan area (GMA), higher religious commitment, lower parents’ SES, more traditional gender stereotypes and/or more traditional partnership stereotypes are more likely to approve IPV.

• H 2: Religious commitment, gender stereotypes, and partnership stereotypes mediate the relationship between sociodemographic factors and approval of IPV among college students in Costa Rica.
Methods
Study Design

S-CAB
N=6

Pilot Study
N=19

Quantitative Phase
N= 249

- Online survey
- Qualtrics
- Effect of religious commitment, parents’ SES, area of origin, gender and relationship stereotypes on ATIPV
Methods

Sample and Setting
- Convenience sample of 249 undergraduate students at the UCR
  - currently enrolled in at least one course at the UCR
  - self-identify as Costa Rican
  - between 18 and 26 years old
  - have lived in another country for > 6 months (exclusion)
- Recruited through multiple strategies

Procedures
- UM and UCR IRB approval
- S-CAB (n=6) of undergraduate students
- Pilot study
- Main study
  - Online survey
- Data analysis at the UM SON
- Audit by UM SONHS QA team
# Measures

*Mean, Standard Deviation, Range, and Reliability Coefficients for the Study Measures (N=224)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPVAS (Smith et al., 2005)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>15-48</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEM Inventory (Bem, 1974)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>-27-40</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEM-Masculinity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>22-68</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEM-Femininity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.54</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>16-70</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Religious Motivation Scale (Hoge, 1972)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.28</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>10-40</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory of Specific Relationship Standards (Baucom, 1996)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56.66</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>42-60</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Analysis

Quantitative Phase

• Qualtrics to SPSS 22.0
• Generate descriptive statistics
  • Frequencies of targeted variables
  • Scores on instruments
  • Assumptions
• Mplus 7.0.
  • Hypothesis testing
    • Structural equation modeling
    • Measurement model + 5 models
Results
Demographic Characteristics

- $N=249$, 21.7± 2.3 years
- Women (63.45%, $n=158$), Men (36.15%, $n=90$)
- Heterosexual (82.3%, $n=205$)
- Full-time students (77.1%, $n=192$)
- Single (95.6%, $n=238$), currently in a romantic relationship (52.2%, $n = 130$)
- Living with their parents and/or family (70.3%, $n=175$)
- Catholic (49%, $n=122$)
- School year
  - First year (13.3%, $n=33$), second year (18.5%, $n=46$), third year (21.3%, $n=53$), fourth year (21.7%, $n=54$), fifth year (18.9%, $n=47$), sixth year or higher (3.2%,$n=8$)
- Degree sought
  - Health-related degree (55.8%, $n=139$), engineering (18.5%, $n=46$), social sciences (16.9%, $n=42$), arts and letters (5.2%, $n=13$), basic sciences (2%, $n=5$), and agriculture and agri-food (.8%, $n=2$)
H 1: College students in Costa Rica who report area of origin outside of the great metropolitan area (GMA), higher religious commitment, lower parents’ SES, more traditional gender stereotypes and/or more traditional partnership stereotypes are more likely to approve IPV.

H 2: Religious commitment, gender stereotypes, and partnership stereotypes mediate the relationship between sociodemographic factors and approval of IPV among college students in Costa Rica.
Measurement Model. Parents’ SES explains the variance in mother’s occupation, mother’s education, father’s occupation, father’s education, and family income.

$\chi^2 (df = 5) = 10.36, p = .066, \text{ CFI} = .987, \text{ RMSEA} = .066.$

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are shown. *$p<.05$, **$p<.001$
Attitudes toward IPV

Parents’ SES

Mother’s Education
Mother’s Occupation
Father’s Occupation
Father’s Education
Area of Origin
Covariates

Gender Norms
Partnership Stereotypes
Religious Commitment

Family Income

Attitudes toward IPV

Covariates
Model 5. Integration of Model 2 and Model 4. Regression of gender norms, partnership stereotypes, and religious commitment on parents’ SES and area of origin, controlled by religious attendance. And regression of attitudes toward intimate partner violence on parents’ SES, gender norms, partnership stereotypes, religious commitment, and area of origin, controlled by gender and marital status.

\[ \chi^2 (df = 58) = 66.82, p = 0.20, CFI = .975, \text{RMSEA} = .026. \]

This model accounted for 20% of the variance in attitudes toward IPV.

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are shown. \(* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.001\)
Model 5. Integration of Model 2 and Model 4. Regression of gender norms, partnership stereotypes, and religious commitment on parents’ SES and area of origin, controlled by religious attendance. And regression of attitudes toward intimate partner violence on parents’ SES, gender norms, partnership stereotypes, religious commitment, and area of origin, controlled by gender and marital status.

$\chi^2 (df = 58) = 66.82, p = .20, CFI = .975, \text{RMSEA} = .026.$ This model accounted for 20% of the variance in attitudes toward IPV

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are shown. *$p<.05$, **$p<.001$
• H 1: College students in Costa Rica who report their area of origin outside of the great metropolitan area (GMA), higher religious commitment, lower parents’ SES, more traditional gender stereotypes and/or more traditional partnership stereotypes are more likely to approve IPV.
  • Therefore, H1 was partially supported

• H 2: Religious commitment, gender stereotypes, and partnership stereotypes mediate the relationship between sociodemographic factors and approval of IPV among college students in Costa Rica.
  • Therefore, H2 was rejected
Discussion

• Egalitarian partnership stereotypes $\rightarrow$ healthy IPV attitudes
  • Egalitarian gender norms promoted through egalitarian experiences and expectations about dating.

• Women $\rightarrow$ attitudes disapproving IPV
  • Women’s empowerment supported through education, legislation, and access to information focused in women’s rights.

• Frequent religious attendance $\rightarrow$ healthy IPV attitudes
  • Person’s spiritual wellbeing promoted through adherence to religious practices.
  • *** Ind effect of attendance to IPV attitudes through partnership stereotypes
    • Religious attendance has both positive and negative effects on IPV
Discussion

• Parents who did not live together → approval of IPV
  • Lack of interest on formal relationships encouraged through conflictual marital relationships.

• Living with a partner → healthy attitudes regarding IPV
  • Desirability of traditional family norms.
Limitations

• Convenience sample
• Cross-sectional design
• Limitations to access the survey
• Cultural equivalence
• Relationship of the researcher and the UCR
• Sensibility of the topic and disclose of the approval of IPV
• Biased responses due to fatigue and recall bias
• Ceiling and floor effect in the IPVAS and the ISRS
• Other factors may be involved (20% of the variance in IPV attitudes)
Implications and Recommendations

• IPV among college students is prevalent, but no programs in the country
• Evidence-based policies and interventions
• Policies to implement screening and prevention programs
• Unique experiences of dating and IPV.
  • E.g., programs should address the effect of peers on dating relationships.
• IPV programs based on educational strategies
  • E.g., lectures for programs without IPV curricula
• Multiple sociocultural factors when developing cultural specific interventions
  • Consider differences found by gender, marital status, study program, parents’ marital status
• Further research to understand the complex and unique experiences of IPV
  • Results and the model may be used as a foundation
• Nursing knowledge
• Nursing practice
• Nursing participation in policy
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