

Lehrer, Jocelyn A.; Lehrer, Vivian L.; Lehrer, Evelyn Lilian; Oyarzun, Pamela

Working Paper

Sexual violence in college students in Chile

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3133

Provided in Cooperation with:

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Suggested Citation: Lehrer, Jocelyn A.; Lehrer, Vivian L.; Lehrer, Evelyn Lilian; Oyarzun, Pamela (2007) : Sexual violence in college students in Chile, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3133, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/34628>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

IZA DP No. 3133

Sexual Violence in College Students in Chile

Jocelyn A. Lehrer
Vivian L. Lehrer
Evelyn L. Lehrer
Pamela Oyarzun

October 2007

Sexual Violence in College Students in Chile

Jocelyn A. Lehrer

University of California, San Francisco

Vivian L. Lehrer

Urban Justice Center

Evelyn L. Lehrer

*University of Illinois at Chicago
and IZA*

Pamela Oyarzun

University of Chile

Discussion Paper No. 3133
October 2007

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Fax: +49-228-3894-180
E-mail: iza@iza.org

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of the institute. Research disseminated by IZA may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit company supported by Deutsche Post World Net. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its research networks, research support, and visitors and doctoral programs. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

Sexual Violence in College Students in Chile^{*}

Young women's experiences of sexual victimization can have far-reaching consequences, including unwanted pregnancy and increased risk of psychological, sexual, and reproductive health difficulties; these experiences can also limit young women's ability to achieve their educational potential. To date, no quantitative studies have examined sexual violence among college students in Chile. To address this gap, an anonymous survey was administered to students enrolled in General Education courses at a major public university in Santiago (n=455 female students). Rape, attempted rape, and other types of sexual victimization were reported by 9.4%, 6.2%, and 15.6% of respondents, respectively, as the most severe event experienced since age 14; 17.2% reported some form of sexual victimization in the past 12 months alone. Estimates based on ordered logit models show that low parental education, childhood sexual abuse, and witnessing inter-parental violence are associated with increased odds of sexual victimization since age 14; attendance to religious services and living with the parents while attending college have protective effects. The findings indicate a need to further investigate the prevalence of and risk factors for sexual violence in Chilean college students, and to begin to develop and evaluate theory-based programs to prevent and respond to this public health concern.

JEL Classification: J4, J16, I12, I18

Keywords: sexual victimization, gender based violence

Corresponding author:

Evelyn L. Lehrer
University of Illinois at Chicago
Economics Department (m/c 144)
601 South Morgan Street
Chicago, IL 60607-7121
USA
Email: elehrer@uic.edu

^{*} Partial support for this study was provided by the Center for Latin American Studies at Columbia University. We are indebted to Vaughn Rickert, Psy.D. for helpful suggestions on the study design and survey instrument, and to Sarah Ullman, Ph.D. for valuable comments on an earlier draft of this paper. We also benefited from discussions with participants in seminars presented at the University of Chile Medical School and Department of Social Sciences (Santiago, August 2006), and in a poster session at the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association (Boston, November 2006). Zhenxiang Zhao, M.A. and Ramona Krauss, M.A. at the University of Illinois at Chicago, Economics Department, provided skillful research assistance.

Sexual Violence in College Students in Chile

INTRODUCTION

A growing literature documents a high level of gender-based violence in Chile and other Latin-American countries.¹⁻⁷ Although there are some exceptions,^{8,9} the focus of the research to date has been on violence against women within the context of cohabitation or marriage.¹⁰ Substantially less is known about gender-based violence perpetrated against adolescent and young adult women. This is a concern, as previous research has shown that women's experiences of sexual victimization in late adolescence/ young adulthood can have far-reaching consequences, including unwanted pregnancy and increased risk of psychological, sexual, and reproductive health difficulties;¹¹⁻¹³ analyses in developing-country contexts have also found that these experiences can limit young women's ability to achieve their educational potential.¹⁴

The present study focused on college students. Approximately 46% of youths ages 20-24 in Chile are enrolled in an institution of higher education.¹⁵ To date, no published quantitative studies have examined dating violence or sexual assault in this population, and campuses across the country presently lack systematized programs to prevent or respond to these problems. We developed the 2005 Survey of Student Well-Being to begin to address this gap in knowledge. Administered to male and female students at a large public university in Santiago, the survey included questions on physical and psychological dating violence victimization, and sexual victimization within or outside the context of dating relationships. The survey also included questions on rape myth acceptance, childhood sexual abuse, witnessing of inter-parental violence, and socioeconomic and demographic characteristics.

The purpose of this study was to examine the prevalence of and risk factors for sexual victimization in the female sample, the extent of women's rape myth acceptance, and contexts of

sexual assault. In assessing risk factors, we considered two main domains: childhood experiences with violence, and socioeconomic and demographic factors. Our analysis was guided by an extensive U.S. literature regarding characteristics that augment young women's vulnerability to sexual assault, with the purpose of helping to design effective risk-reduction programs and provide information to health practitioners.^{11, 16-18.}

There is some evidence that witnessing inter-parental violence may augment vulnerability to subsequent sexual victimization.¹⁹ The evidence with regard to early experiences of sexual abuse is stronger. Both retrospective and prospective studies of U.S. college students have found an association between sexual abuse during childhood or adolescence and sexual revictimization later in life.¹⁹⁻²¹ It has been suggested that this association partly reflects psychological sequelae of childhood sexual abuse (e.g., negative self-image, depression, learned helplessness) and resulting behavioral manifestations (e.g., substance abuse, multiple sexual partners).^{17, 22, 23} As to the prevalence of childhood sexual abuse, a study of 19 countries around the world found rates for women ranging from 7% to 36%.²⁴ Similarly wide ranges reported in other research have been attributed to differences across studies in the upper age limit used in the definition of childhood, the types of behaviors included in the definition of abuse, and the composition of the samples analyzed;²⁵ differences in reporting methods and the anonymity of responses may also be expected to play a role. A recent study in urban areas of Peru found a prevalence of sexual abuse by age 15 of 19-20%.⁷

Although research findings are mixed, several studies in the U.S. and Latin America suggest that youth in socio-economically disadvantaged households are more likely to grow up in the midst of domestic violence.^{3, 26, 27} Low SES has also been linked with a higher prevalence of childhood sexual abuse, although this association may in part reflect the greater ease of

detecting such abuse in lower income groups.²⁸ To the extent that low SES is associated with a heightened risk of early experiences with aggression, it may be indirectly associated with greater vulnerability to sexual victimization later in life.

Youth raised with some participation in religious activities tend to engage in fewer risk behaviors, including use of alcohol and other drugs,^{29, 30} and are more likely to have friends who do not use substances.³¹ These patterns may partly account for findings that link religious participation to a lower risk of physical dating violence victimization;³²⁻³⁴ religiosity may be associated with a lower risk of sexual victimization for similar reasons.

Initiating sexual activity at a young age and having multiple sex partners have each been associated with heightened sexual victimization risk, results that have been interpreted within a situational vulnerability framework – i.e., these behaviors increase exposure to potential aggressors.^{16, 17, 35, 36} Although youths' living arrangements have received less attention in the literature, they can also be expected to affect exposure to risk of victimization; college students who live independently are likely to be more vulnerable than their counterparts who reside with their parents. Urban versus rural place of residence may also affect exposure to risk, but results to date, based on high school students, have been mixed.^{37, 38}

METHODOLOGY

Study Design and Survey Instrument

The survey instrument, a closed-ended questionnaire, was compiled in English by the lead author and translated to Spanish by the third author, a Chilean native. Back-translation to English was done to ensure accuracy. Items were adapted to the Chilean social context from scales validated in the U.S. and other countries, and revised further based on comments from

professors and students at the participating university with regard to content, cultural appropriateness, and wording. The second author conducted the field work upon approval from the university's Ethics Committee for Research on Human Subjects.

Located in Santiago, the public university is one of the largest and most prestigious in Chile, with students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. University officials demonstrated strong interest in participating in this research project and facilitated access to the 25 General Education courses offered during Winter 2005; all were surveyed except one that was affected by class cancellation. The resulting sample included male and female students enrolled in all educational programs of the university. A total of 2,451 students were enrolled in the courses, with some students taking more than one course. At the time of survey administration (which took place over several weeks) 1,193 students were present in the 24 classes, consistent with the typical attendance rate in General Education courses at the university; 970 students returned completed surveys, reflecting an 81% response rate. Students who had already completed the questionnaire in another class were instructed to not do so again, accounting for some of the non-response.

To introduce the study, the survey administrator explained its nature and relevance, noted that the questionnaire included sensitive items on experiences of sexual, physical, and psychological violence, and emphasized that all responses would be anonymous. Students provided written consent prior to completing the survey. A box was placed at the front of the room for students to deposit their completed, unsigned questionnaires. Professors were absent during survey administration.

Sample

The final survey item asked subjects to indicate how honest their responses had generally been. Two subjects who reported providing non-honest responses were dropped, as were another two whose survey responses indicated that they had not taken it seriously. Sixteen additional cases with missing data on student's sex were eliminated, yielding a base sample of 484 women and 466 men. The present study utilized the female sample. After eliminating 26 cases with missing data on sexual victimization since age 14 (the outcome variable) and three cases with four or more missing items in the 10-item rape myth scale, the final study sample had 455 subjects.

Measures

Dependent Variable

Unwanted sexual experiences since age 14. Five yes/no items were adapted from scales developed by Koss et al.³⁹ and Straus et al.,⁴⁰ pertaining to two time frames: the past 12 months and since age 14. The first item, regarding attempted rape, read: "Someone tried to make me have sex by using threats, arguments, or physical force, but this did not happen." The next three items, regarding rape, asked whether the subject had ever been forced to have sex (a) through physical force; (b) through verbal pressures; and (c) while being unable to resist due to the effects of alcohol or other drugs. "Sex" was defined in the survey instructions as referring to vaginal, oral, or anal sex. The fifth item inquired if the subject had experienced any other type of unwanted sexual contact, such as touching or forced kisses.

We created a trichotomous variable indicating the most severe type of unwanted sexual experience since age 14, if any, for use in analyses of risk factors for victimization. The mutually

exclusive categories indicate that the subject reported (a) attempted rape or rape; (b) less severe forms of sexual victimization; and (c) no unwanted sexual experience.

Independent Variables

Childhood sexual abuse = 1 if the subject responded affirmatively to at least one of the following questions: “Before age 14, did anyone make you have sex against your will?” and “Before age 14, did you ever have any other form of unwanted sexual experience, such as forced kisses, touching, etc.?” ; 0 otherwise.

Witnessed domestic violence = 1 if the subject ever witnessed physical violence (e.g., hitting, slapping) between her parents or other adults who raised her, before age 14; 0 otherwise.

Low parental education = 1 if the subject’s parental figure with the highest level of education had attained secondary schooling or less, or incomplete advanced technical schooling or less; 0 otherwise.

Religious participation = 1 if the subject reported attending religious services "several times per year" or more frequently at age 14; 0 otherwise.

Residence with parents = 1 if the subject had primarily lived with her parents since enrolling in the university; 0 otherwise.

Ever had sexual intercourse = 1 if the subject reported having ever had voluntary vaginal or anal intercourse; 0 otherwise.

Large city = 1 if the subject resided in Santiago or another large urban area at age 14; 0 otherwise.

Age = subject's age in years at the time of the survey. This continuous variable controls for length of exposure to victimization risk.

Statistical analysis

We first generated means and cross-tabulations for the independent variables, followed by descriptive statistics on sexual victimization prevalence, extent of rape myth acceptance, and characteristics of the most severe incident reported per subject.

Ordered logit models were used to examine factors associated with sexual victimization since age 14, using Proc Logistic in SAS, Version 9.1 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). This procedure utilizes information on the order of the three categories, i.e., the greater severity of rape or attempted rape as compared to other types of unwanted sexual contact. The ordered logit method assumes that the odds ratio is constant for all categories; score tests failed to reject the proportional odds assumption for all models that were estimated ($P < 0.05$).

We conducted multivariate analyses by building sequential models: the socioeconomic and demographic variables were included first, and the witnessing of domestic violence and childhood sexual abuse variables were added next, one at a time. Rape myth acceptance was examined only for descriptive purposes and not included in multivariate analyses because this variable was measured on the survey date, subsequent to any victimization experiences.

RESULTS

Sample Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the independent variables are presented in Table 1.^a Subjects ranged in age from 18 to 30 years with a median of 19 years, reflecting students' tendency to take General Education courses early in their studies. Approximately 30% of subjects came from homes with low parental education; 78.7% reported mainly living with their parents during the

college years, consistent with the norm for college students in Santiago (with the exception of students coming from other parts of the country).

Thirty-five percent of subjects reported having witnessed domestic violence before age 14, and approximately one-fifth reported some form of sexual abuse before age 14. Witnessing violence and experiencing childhood sexual abuse were each significantly more prevalent when parental education was low; subjects who reported witnessing domestic violence were more likely to also report childhood sexual abuse, a difference that was marginally significant (Table 2).

Prevalence and Contexts of Sexual Victimization

Panel A of Table 3 presents the percentage of subjects who reported each measured type of sexual victimization, since age 14 and in the past 12 months. Subjects who reported more than one type contribute to the percentages in each category. Experiences of rape, attempted rape, and other types of forced sexual contact since age 14 were reported by 12.3%, 10.8%, and 25.1% of subjects, respectively. Fifty-five percent of rapes since age 14 occurred in the context of the subject being unable to stop the perpetrator due to the effects of alcohol or other drugs.

Panel B, where subjects reporting more than one type of sexual victimization were categorized only in the most severe type, shows that 9.4% (n=43), 6.2% (n=28), and 15.6% (n=71) of subjects, respectively, reported rape, attempted rape, and other types of unwanted sexual contact as the most severe event experienced since age 14. Overall, 17.2% (n=74) of subjects reported at least one form of sexual victimization in the past 12 months alone.

The survey included items assessing rape myth beliefs adapted from scales developed by Lanier & Elliott⁴¹ and Barnett & Felld;⁴² the results are presented in Table 4. Approximately 28%

of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that "the degree of resistance that a woman presented should be the main factor in determining whether what happened was a rape," and 13.6% strongly disagreed or disagreed with the statement that "a man can control his behavior regardless of how sexually excited he is." Ancillary analyses of the male sample revealed a higher rate of rape myth acceptance for each item; differences by sex were statistically significant and large in magnitude (Authors, unpublished data, 2007).

The survey items regarding characteristics of the most severe incident of sexual victimization since age 14 were left unanswered by approximately one-fifth of subjects reporting sexual victimization; these cases were excluded in calculating the descriptive statistics that follow. Use of alcohol or other drugs by the victim alone, the perpetrator alone, and both victim and perpetrator, respectively, was reported in 5.5%, 9.1%, and 56.4% of cases of rape or attempted rape. The corresponding figures for other forms of unwanted sexual contact were 2.0%, 17.7%, and 23.5%. Incidents were reported to the police in 2.3% of cases of rape or attempted rape, and in no instances of less severe victimization. Sexual assault most commonly occurred at the home of the subject or perpetrator (38.0%), and at parties at a home (30.6%). Most subjects identified the perpetrator as someone they knew: an acquaintance (27.5%), friend (9.2%), casual date (12.8%), or steady dating partner (26.6%); 7.3% and 16.5% of the cases involved a family member and stranger, respectively.

Ordered Logit Analyses

Bivariate analyses found significant associations of sexual victimization since age 14 with low parental education, religious participation at age 14, witnessing domestic violence, and childhood sexual abuse, and a marginally significant association with age (Table 5). Residence in

a large city was not significant in bivariate analyses, and having ever had sexual intercourse-- the only available measure of consensual sex-- was marginally significant. These two variables failed to attain marginal significance in preliminary multivariate regressions, and were excluded from further analyses.

The first multivariate model shows that subjects raised in low parental education households had 1.58 times the odds of reporting sexual victimization since age 14. For subjects raised with some participation in religious services, the odds of victimization were 0.65 times lower (Model 1).

Witnessing domestic violence was marginally associated with 1.44 times the odds of victimization (Model 2, $P=0.08$) and childhood sexual abuse was associated with 5.12 times the odds (Model 3). As noted earlier, these two forms of early experiences with violence were correlated, and the effect of witnessing domestic violence lost statistical significance when both were included (Model 4). The association between low parental education and victimization risk decreased markedly in size and statistical significance when witnessing domestic violence and especially childhood sexual abuse were added (Models 2, 3, 4), suggesting that childhood experiences with violence act as a mediator between low SES in the family of origin and subsequent sexual victimization.

In ancillary analyses we re-estimated the models in Table 5, excluding the eight cases in which a family member was identified as the perpetrator of the most severe incident of sexual victimization since age 14. The estimates for Models 3 and 4 (not shown) indicate slightly smaller odds ratios associated with childhood sexual abuse, suggestive of long-term abuse in those cases (i.e., abuse by a family member both before and after age 14). Further, the odds ratio associated with residence with parents attained marginal significance in Model 1 (AOR 0.67,

95% CI 0.42-1.08, P=0.10), providing some evidence that this living arrangement has a protective effect when the home environment is free of assailants.

DISCUSSION

In the U.S., numerous studies conducted in the 1980s and 1990s revealed a high prevalence of sexual victimization among female college students, spurring initiatives to address this issue.⁴³ Sexual assault prevention and education programs were instituted in colleges across the country, in part due to a mandate that campuses receiving federal funding sponsor such programs.⁴⁴ Evidence from the present study suggests the importance of initiating similar efforts in Chile: 31.2% of the female respondents reported some form of sexual victimization since age 14, and 17.2% in the past 12 months alone.

Regarding the prevalence of rape, our finding of 9.4% since age 14 is lower than the 15.4% prevalence for the same time frame reported for U.S. college women using a similar definition of rape.⁴⁵ A more recent national U.S. study of college students found a rape prevalence of 15.0% since age 15 in female respondents.⁴⁶ In interpreting the present findings, it should be noted that our sample was disproportionately comprised of students in their first or second academic year. Caution is also required in international comparisons, given cultural differences in various factors including the propensity to disclose sexual victimization incidents to researchers;¹³ such propensity is likely to be comparatively low in the socially conservative Chilean context.

Rape Myth Acceptance and the Context of Assault

Beliefs that men may demonstrate their love through violent behaviors are pervasive in Chilean society, creating an environment in which violence against women can thrive.^{4, 47} Chilean national laws have both reflected and reinforced social conservatism and traditional gender-role norms: divorce remained illegal until 2004, and legislation against sexual harassment in the workplace was not passed until 2005. The data collected in this study identified a high level of acceptance of certain rape myths among female students; this information may help inform education programs. Rape myth acceptance was higher by large margins in male students. Although previous study findings regarding the nature of the relationship between women's rape myth acceptance and vulnerability to sexual victimization are mixed,^{18, 20, 48} acceptance of rape myths among men has been found to be a strong predictor of aggressive behavior.^{49, 50} Studies have shown that rape myth acceptance can be reduced through prevention programs; however thus far, favorable attitudinal changes have been short-lived.^{17, 51}

Consistent with findings for U.S. college students,³⁶ substance use by the victim and/or perpetrator was involved in most instances of rape or attempted rape, suggesting that it would be beneficial to focus on substance use awareness in the context of sexual assault prevention and risk-reduction programs in Chile.⁵² Our finding that the perpetrators were mainly acquaintances, dating partners, or friends of the victims was also consistent with results for U.S. college students,^{36, 53} as was our finding that rape is a highly underreported crime.⁴⁵

Risk and Protective Factors

About one fifth of respondents reported childhood sexual abuse. This high prevalence underscores the importance of further public health attention to this issue in Chile, given the

seriousness of potential immediate and long-term consequences. Childhood sexual abuse was the strongest predictor of sexual victimization since age 14 in this study: experiencing sexual abuse as a child was associated with approximately 5 times the odds of subsequent sexual victimization. Witnessing inter-parental violence before age 14 was also found to be a predictor, but this association was weaker in both magnitude and significance. In addition, youth raised in low SES homes were found to have elevated odds of sexual victimization since age 14. Although causal mechanisms cannot be inferred from the present analyses, the sequential models suggest that the greater vulnerability of low SES students was related to their higher levels of childhood sexual abuse and witnessing of domestic violence.

Some attendance to religious activities had a protective effect, consistent with study findings documenting an association of religiosity with a broad range of beneficial outcomes for youth.^{29, 30, 32-34} Our study also provides some evidence for a lower risk of sexual victimization among students who live with their families. This may be due in part to higher levels of parental supervision and less opportunity for exposure to risk; there may also be unobserved differences in the characteristics and risk behaviors of students who live with versus without their parents. In either case, the findings suggest that it would be helpful to address safe living outside of the parental home in Chilean risk-reduction programs.

Limitations and Conclusions

Some limitations of this study should be noted. Although the sample was broad, it was not random and the study findings cannot be generalized to the full student body. The estimates of sexual assault prevalence are likely to be conservative, as victims of gender-based violence commonly underreport it due to factors including denial, not interpreting victimization as such,

recall error, and social desirability bias.^{54, 55} Similarly, childhood sexual abuse and witnessing inter-parental violence were also likely underreported, leading to underestimates of associations between these factors and subsequent sexual victimization. To the extent that the sizable number of eligible subjects who did not attend class on the day of survey administration were disproportionately higher-risk individuals, victimization prevalence may have been further underestimated.

Overall, this study provides the first evidence on prevalence of and risk factors for sexual victimization among female college students in Chile. Our findings indicate a need for additional public health attention to sexual violence in Chilean college campuses, through further research on prevalence and on risk factors for victimization and perpetration, and the development of theory-based programs to prevent and respond to this problem.

ENDNOTES

^a To minimize loss of information, instances of missing data for the independent variables were addressed by imputing measures of central tendency (median for age; modal category for other variables). Twenty-nine cases were imputed for the variable regarding whether the subject had ever had sexual intercourse. For the other variables, the number of observations with imputations ranged from 2 cases for low parental education to 13 cases for witnessing domestic violence.

REFERENCES

1. Larrain SH, *Violence Behind Doors: The Battered Woman* [in Spanish]. Santiago, Chile: Editorial Universitaria, 1994.
2. Morrison AR and Orlando MB. Social and economic costs of domestic violence: Chile and Nicaragua. In: Morrison AR, Biehl ML, eds. *Too Close to Home: Domestic Violence in the Americas*. Washington D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, 1999,51-80.
3. Urzua R et al. *Detection and Analysis of the Prevalence of Intrafamily Violence* [in Spanish]. Santiago, Chile, SERNAM, 2002.
4. Ceballo R et al. Domestic violence and women's mental health in Chile, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 2004, 28(4):298-308.
5. Rivera-Rivera L et al. , Prevalence and determinants of male partner violence against Mexican women: A population-based study. *Salud Publica de Mexico*, 2004, 46(2):113-121.
6. Flake DF, Individual, family, and community risk markers for domestic violence in Peru, *Violence Against Women*, 2005, 11(3):353-373.
7. Garcia Moreno et al., *WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women*. World Health Organization, 2005. Available at http://www.who.int/gender/violence/who_multicountry_study/en/ Accessed September 30, 2007.
8. Krugman S, Mata L and Krugman R. Sexual abuse and corporal punishment during childhood: A pilot retrospective survey of university students in Costa Rica. *Pediatrics*, 1992 (July), 90:157-161.

9. Olsson A et al. Sexual abuse during childhood and adolescence among Nicaraguan men and women: A population-based anonymous survey, *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 2000, 24(12):1579-1589.
10. Almeras D, Bravo R, Milosavljevic, Montano S, et al. *Intimate Partner Violence Against Women: Latin America and the Caribbean* [in Spanish], CEPAL, United Nations, 2002. Available at: <http://www.isis.cl/temas/vi/doc2.htm>. Accessed November 30, 2006.
11. Rickert VI, Vaughan RD, Wiemann CM. Adolescent dating violence and date rape, *Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 2002,14(5):495-500.
12. Rickert VI, Vaughan RD, Wiemann CM. Violence against young women: implications for clinicians. *Contemporary Ob/Gyn*, 2003 (February), 2:30-45.
13. Krug EG et al. *World Report on Violence and Health*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2002. Available at http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/en/ Accessed April 24, 2007.
14. Mirsky J. *Beyond Victims and Villains: Addressing Sexual Violence in the Education Sector*. Panos Report #47. London: Panos Institute, 2003. Available at: <http://www.panos.org.uk/> Accessed April 24, 2007.
15. IESALC (International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean), *Report on Higher Education in Latin-America and the Caribbean 2000-2005* [in Spanish], Caracas: Editorial Metropolis, 2006.
16. Rickert VI, Wiemann CM. Date rape among adolescents and young adults, *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*, 1998, 11:167-175.

17. Bachar K, Koss MP. From prevalence to prevention: closing the gap between what we know about rape and what we do. In Renzetti, CM, Bergen RK & Edelson JL (eds.) *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 2001, 117-142.
18. Vezina J and Hebert M. Risk factors for victimization in romantic relationships of young women: A review of empirical studies and implications for prevention, *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 2007;8(1):33-66.
19. Koss MP and Dinero TE. Discriminant analysis of risk factors for sexual victimization among a national sample of college women, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1989,57(2):242-250.
20. Himelein MJ, Risk factors for sexual victimization in dating: A longitudinal study of college women, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 1995,19(1):31-48.
21. Gidycz CA, Hanson K and Layman M. A prospective analysis of the relationships among sexual assault experiences: An extension of previous findings, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 1995,19(1):5-29.
22. Browne . and Finkelhor D. Impact of child sexual abuse: A review of the research, *Psychological Bulletin*. 1986; 99(1):66-77.
23. Messman TL and Long PJ. Child sexual abuse and its relationship to revictimization in adult women: A review, *Clinical Psychology Review*,1996;16(5):397-420.
24. Finkelhor D. The international epidemiology of chil sexual abuse, *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 1994, 18(5): 409-417.
25. Ferguson AG, How good is the evidence relating to the frequency of childhood sexual abuse and the impact such abuse has on the lives of adult survivors? *Public Health*, 111, 387-391.

26. Kantor GK, Jasinski JL. Dynamics and risk factors in partner violence. In Jasinski JL & Williams LM, eds. *Partner Violence: A Comprehensive Review of 20 Years of Research*. London: Sage Publications, 1998:1-43.
27. Gonzalez de Olarte E and Gavilano Llosa P. Does poverty cause domestic violence? Some answers from Lima. In Morrison AR & Loreto Biehl M (eds) *Too Close to Home: Domestic Violence in the Americas*. Washington D.C.: Inter-American Development Bank, 1999, 35-50.
28. Finkelhor D. Current information on the scope and nature of child sexual abuse, *The Future of Children*, 1994, 4(2):31-53.
29. Donahue MJ, Benson PL. Religion and the well-being of adolescents, *Journal of Social Issue*., 1995, 51(2):145-160.
30. Koenig HG., McCullough ME, Larson DB. *Handbook of Religion and Health*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
31. Bahr JS et al. Family, religiosity, and the risk of adolescent drug use, *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1998, 60(4):979-992.
32. Makepeace JM. Social factor and victim-offender differences in courtship violence, *Family Relations*, 1987, 36:87-91.
33. Howard D, Qiu Y, Boekeloo B. Personal and social contextual correlates of adolescent dating violence, *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 2003, 33(1):9-17.
34. Gover AR. Risky lifestyles and dating violence: A theoretical test of violent victimization, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 2004 32(2):171-180.
35. Wyatt GA, Newcom MD and Riederle MH. *Sexual Abuse and Consensual Sex: Women's Developmental Patterns and Outcomes*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1993.

36. Abbey A and McDuffie D. Alcohol and dating risk factors for sexual assault among college women, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 1996, 20(1):147-169.
37. Bergman L. Dating violence among high school students, *Social Work*, 1992, 37(1):21-27.
38. Spencer GA and Bryant SA. Dating violence: A comparison of rural, suburban, and urban teens, *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 2000, 27(5):302-305.
39. Koss MP et al., *The Sexual Experiences Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV)*. Tucson, Arizona: University of Arizona, 2006.
40. Straus MA, Hamby SL and Warren WL. *The Conflict Tactics Scales Handbook: Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2); CTS: Parent-Child Version (CTSPC)*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services, 2003.
41. Lanier AA and Elliott MN. A new instrument for the evaluation of a date rape prevention program, *Journal of College Student Development*, 1997, 38(6):673-676.
42. Barnett NJ and Felld HS, Sex differences in university students' attitudes toward rape. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 1977 (March): 93-96.
43. Rozee PD and Koss MP. Rape: a century of resistance. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 2001, 25(4):295-311.
44. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. *Complying with the Final Regulations: The Student Right to Know and Campus Security Act*. Washington D.C., 1994.
45. Koss MP, Gidycz CA and Wisniewski N. The scope of rape: incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1987, 55(2):162-170.

46. Brener ND, McMahon PM, Warren CW, Douglas KA. Forced sexual intercourse and associate health-risk behaviors among female college students in the United States, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 1999, 67(2):252-259.
47. McWhirter PT. La violencia privada: domestic violence in Chile. *American Psychologist*. 1999; 54(1):37-40.
48. Muehlenhard CL and Linton MA. Date rape and sexual aggression in dating situations: incidence and risk factors, *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1987,34(2):186-196.
49. Malamuth NM. Factors associated with rape as predictors of laboratory aggression against women, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1983, 45(2):432-442.
50. Craig ME. Coercive sexuality in dating relationships: a situational model, *Clinical Psychology Review*, 1990,10:395-423.
51. Breitenbecher KH. Sexual assault on college campuses: Is an ounce of prevention enough? *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 2000, 9:23-52.
52. Ullman SE. A critical review of field studies on the link of alcohol and adult sexual assault in women, *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 2003, 8:471-486.
53. Koss, MP. Hidden rape: sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of students in higher education. In Odem ME & Clay-Warner J, eds. *Confronting Rape and Sexual Assault*. Wilmington, DE: Scholarly Resources Inc. 1998, 51-70.
54. Koss MP et al. *No Safe Heaven: Male Violence Against Women at Home, at Work and in the Community*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1994.
55. Lewis SF, and Fremouw W. Dating violence: a critical review of the literature, *Clinical Psychology Review*, 2001, 21:105-127.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Independent Variables^a

| | (n=455) |
|-----------------------------|---------|
| Age | 19.0 |
| Low parental education | 30.5 |
| Religious participation | 58.7 |
| Residence with parents | 78.7 |
| Ever had sexual intercourse | 61.8 |
| Large city | 78.0 |
| Witnessed domestic violence | 35.2 |
| Childhood sexual abuse | 20.9 |

^a The estimates represent the median of the continuous age variable and the percentage of cases in which the variable equals 1 for all others.

Table 2. Selected Cross-Tabulations

| (n=455) | | |
|--|------|----------|
| | % | χ^2 |
| <hr/> | | |
| % who reported having witnessed domestic violence by parental education | | P<0.01 |
| Low | 44.6 | |
| High | 31.0 | |
| <hr/> | | |
| % who reported experiencing child abuse by parental education | | P<0.01 |
| Low | 28.8 | |
| High | 17.4 | |
| <hr/> | | |
| % who reported experiencing child abuse by whether subject reported witnessing domestic violence | | P=0.11 |
| Yes | 25.0 | |
| No | 18.6 | |
| <hr/> | | |

Table 3. Percentage of Subjects Reporting Sexual Victimization

| | Since Age 14 (<i>n</i> =455) | Past 12 months (<i>n</i> =430) ^a |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| PANEL A: Multiple occurrences per subject included - categories not mutually exclusive | | |
| Rape—physical force | 2.0 % | 0.9 % |
| Rape—verbal pressure | 3.5 | 1.2 |
| Rape—alcohol/other drugs | 6.8 | 4.2 |
| Attempted rape | 10.8 | 4.2 |
| Other forced sexual contact | 25.1 | 12.8 |
| PANEL B: Summary measure placing each subject in one category based on most severe event | | |
| Rape | 9.4 % | 5.6 % |
| Attempted rape | 6.2 | 2.1 |
| Other forced sexual contact | 15.6 | 9.5 |
| No sexual assault | 68.8 | 82.8 |
| TOTAL | 100 | 100 |

^a 25 observations with missing data on sexual victimization in the past 12 months were dropped.

Table 4. Rape Myth Acceptance: Percentage of Subjects Responding "Strongly Agree" or "Agree"^a

(*n*=455)

| | |
|--|------|
| a. In most cases, when a woman is raped, she was looking for it | 1.1% |
| b. Women provoke rape by their appearance or behavior | 3.1 |
| c. A man can control his behavior regardless of how sexually excited he is | 86.4 |
| d. The degree of resistance that a woman presented should be the main factor in determining whether what happened was a rape | 27.7 |
| e. If someone makes a rape charge two weeks after it happened, it probably was not a rape | 3.7 |
| f. Women often lie about having been raped | 21.5 |
| g. If a woman goes to the home of her date, this means she is consenting to have sex | 2.0 |
| h. If a woman fondles a man's genitals, this means she is consenting to have sex | 41.5 |
| i. If a couple have had sex before, the man should be able to have sex when he wants to | 2.4 |
| j. A man is justified in having sex if his partner agreed to but changed her mind at the last minute | 1.8 |

^a Subjects with four or more missing items were excluded. For those with 1-3 missing items, the mean of their completed items (taking into account reverse scoring for item c) was imputed for each missing item.

Subjects were asked to indicate strong agreement (scored as 3), agreement (2), disagreement (1), or strong disagreement (0) with each item. Cronbach's alpha: 0.69.

Table 5. Associations Between Independent Variables and Sexual Victimization Since Age 14: Ordered Logit Estimates^a

Odds Ratio (P- value) [95% CI]
(n=455)

| | <i>Bivariate Models</i> | <i>Multivariate Models</i> | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 |
| Age | 1.08 (0.10) [0.99 – 1.17] | 1.07 (0.12) [0.98 – 1.17] | 1.07 (0.15) [0.98 – 1.17] | 1.02 (0.65) [0.93 – 1.12] | 1.02 (0.72) [0.92 – 1.12] |
| Low parental education | 1.55 (0.04)* [1.03 – 2.35] | 1.58 (0.03)* [1.04 – 2.39] | 1.50 (0.06) [0.98 – 2.28] | 1.28 (0.28) [0.82 – 1.98] | 1.22 (0.38) [0.78 – 1.90] |
| Religious participation | 0.65 (0.03)* [0.44 – 0.96] | 0.65 (0.03)* [0.44 – 0.96] | 0.65 (0.03)* [0.44 – 0.96] | 0.69 (0.08) [0.46 – 1.05] | 0.69 (0.08) [0.46 – 1.05] |
| Residence with parents | 0.71 (0.14) [0.45 – 1.12] | 0.70 (0.13) [0.44 – 1.11] | 0.72 (0.17) [0.45 – 1.15] | 0.70 (0.16) [0.43 – 1.15] | 0.72 (0.20) [0.44 – 1.19] |
| Ever had sexual intercourse | 1.41 (0.10) [0.94 - 2.13] | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Large city | 0.78 (0.29) [0.49-1.23] | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Witnessed domestic violence | 1.58 (0.03)* [1.06 – 2.35] | -- | 1.44 (0.08) [0.95 – 2.17] | -- | 1.39 (0.13) [0.90 – 2.14] |
| Childhood sexual abuse | 5.51 (<.01)** [3.50 – 8.68] | -- | -- | 5.12 (<.01)** [3.23 – 8.14] | 5.09 (<.01)** [3.20 – 8.09] |
| log L | | -373.96 | -372.47 | -349.10 | -347.97 |
| χ^2 (P value, df) | | 13.83 (<.01, 4)** | 16.80 (<.01, 5)** | 63.54 (<.01, 5)** | 65.80 (<.01, 6)** |

^a Dependent variable equals 3 (rape or attempted rape); 2 (other sexual victimization); or 1 (no victimization)

* p< 0.05; ** p< 0.01