How College Students Define Intimate Partner Violence

Georgella J. McRae
Concordia University - Portland, mcrae.gigi@gmail.com

Concordia University - Portland

CU Commons

2-2020

How College Students Define Intimate Partner Violence

Georgella J. McRae
Concordia University - Portland

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.cu-portland.edu/edudissertations

Part of the Education Commons

Concordia University–Portland

College of Education

Doctorate of Education Program

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE CERTIFY

THAT WE HAVE READ AND APPROVE THE DISSERTATION OF

Georgella Joyce McRae

CANDIDATE FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Rinyka Allison, Ph.D., Faculty Chair Dissertation Committee

Megan Cavalier, Ph.D., Content Specialist

Leavery Davidson, Ph.D., Content Reader

How College Students Define Intimate Partner Violence

Georgella Joyce McRae

Concordia University–Portland

College of Education

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the College of Education

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education in

Teacher Leadership

Rinyka Allison, Ph.D., Faculty Chair Dissertation Committee

Megan Cavalier, Ph.D., Content Specialist

Leavery Davidson, Ph.D., Content Reader

Concordia University–Portland

2020

Absract

The researcher designed this intrinsic qualitative single case study to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen, who attend schools that are Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), define and identify intimate partner violence (IPV). IPV is one of the most underreported crimes, and the prevention of IPV on college campuses relies on the students' ability to identify and report incidents. The study participants consisted of six male and nine female African American freshmen, between the ages of 18 and 19 years old. The researcher used the constructivist conceptual framework to place reliance on the participants' perspectives of what defines IPV. The researcher collected data using questionnaires and scenarios that contained closed questions to analyze how the participants define IPV in comparison to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention's definition. The researcher collected data using open-ended interview questions to gain an understanding of how the participants define and identify IPV. The key findings of this study were that participants define IPV comparatively to the CDC's definitions. The participants are willing to report IPV identified on campus and seek protection and support. However, the participants did not identify IPV the CDC defines as stalking and psychological aggression within the context of social interactions.

Keywords: Intimate Partner Violence (IPV), Domestic Violence (DV), college, safety, African American, Historical Black Colleges and Universities, HBCU, freshmen

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to the generation before me, my parents George McRae and Annie Bethea McRae, who gave me a foundation for learning but were gone too soon to see the vision become a reality. I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to the generation after me, my sons, Daniel and Nicholas Fordham, who I pray will learn from my research and never become victims or perpetrators of IPV or any other sort of violence. I dedicate this research to them.

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge my faculty chair, Dr. Rinyka Allison, for her encouragement and inspiration,

along with Dr. Megan Cavalier and Dr. Leavery Davidson, for coming together with Dr. Allison

to support my dissertation experience.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

According to a study reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in 2015, each year, there were 5.3 million occurrences of intimate partner violence (IPV) against women who were 18 years old and older in the United States, which resulted in 1,300 deaths. The injuries resulting from these occurrences amounted to 2 million, with 555,000 requiring medical attention (Breiding, Basile, Smith, Black, & Mahendra, 2015). IPV impacts the national economy due to victims losing an approximate total of 8 million days of paid work (the equivalent of over 32,000 full-time jobs) and 5.6 million days of household productivity each year, exceeding $5.8 billion annually (New Hope for Women, 2018). Converted to 2017 dollars, the estimated cost of IPV in the United States was $9.3 billion (Chen, 2017). The significance of college students' understanding of how IPV is defined is the impact their definition may have on their ability to identify it. Identifying and reporting IPV supports IPV prevention on campuses and reduces the likelihood of IPV occurrences (Hollister, Scalora, Hoff, Hodges, & Marquez, 2017). This qualitative intrinsic single case study gained an understanding of how first-generation African American first-year college students who attend a Historically Black College or University (HBCU) define and identify IPV.

Experiencing IPV discourages education attainment and successful employment. Based on study results gathered by Chen (2017), victims who experienced IPV during adolescence obtained, on average, 0.5 fewer years of education than those who did not experience IPV. An analysis of adolescents 11–17 years old, based on seven collections of data between 1976 and 1987 from the National Youth Survey (NYS), indicated that youths who experienced IPV had a higher likelihood of experiencing a decline in applying effort to schoolwork and inferior academic performance. Chen (2017) noted IPV impacts on the education of adolescents include

survey results from the 2013 Youth Risk Behavior Survey, which showed high probabilities of absenteeism for students who experienced dating and sexual violence because of safety concerns. Survey results from the Campus Sexual Assault web-based survey showed higher education disrupted due to victims dropping classes and moving their residence to avoid perpetrators of IPV (Chen, 2017). According to a 1998 study of 122 welfare recipients in western Pennsylvania enrolled in job training, the likelihood of victims dropping out of the program for participants who were experiencing IPV increased (Chen, 2017). Thirty percent of job training participants in the greater Cincinnati region reported that IPV deterred their enrollment in workforce development programs. Some said that experiencing physical violence prevented them from participating (Chen, 2017). IPV occurrences may be higher than reported due to the barriers victims may face when disclosing IPV (Ragavana, Fikreb, Millnerc, & Bair-Merritta, 2018).

There are differing definitions of IPV among local communities and federal agencies (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018). The differing interpretations may result in differences in identifying IPV to determine what to report as IPV. There is also ample research on the factors that may influence the normality and acceptance of IPV. Researchers have studied factors that influence individual perceptions of IPV, including demographics, religion, culture (Wells et al., 2013), early learning (Ragavana et al., 2018), and the media (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). However, there is a gap in the literature on how IPV is defined and identified by first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU, specifically. Closing this gap in knowledge may support college safety advocates to determine if there is a need to start or improve IPV awareness programs to provide students an understanding of a consistent definition of IPV that is by the comparable interpretation of IPV reported by the CDC (Breiding et al., 2015).

Background, Context, History, and Theoretical Framework for the Problem

Constructivists consider that people look for an understanding of their environments and create subjective perspectives of their experiences (Creswell, 2014). Hammersley (2012) describes this worldview as an undertaking to understand how others view the world and sense diverse perspectives in their world. Constructivists view the connections of attitudes, actions, causes, and effects as complex and changeable. They do not reduce them to statements about fixed relationships (Hammersley, 2012). The views or meanings of study participants are numerous and different, as people have multiple and different worldviews. Therefore the researcher looks for the complexity of pictures rather than forcing aspects to limited categories or concepts. The objective is to place reliance on the views of the participants being studied as much as possible (Creswell, 2014).

Constructivist researchers use general questions to allow participants to construct the meaning of the research problem, typically imitated based on discussions or interactions with others (Creswell, 2014). Through open-ended questioning, the researcher learns how participants interact in their environments and how participants negotiate perspectives socially and historically. Constructivist researchers find that the views of participants develop through interaction with others and historical and cultural norms that are the workings of their individual lives (Creswell, 2014).

The research of the constructivist addresses the interactions of participants, among others, and the specific contexts in the environments they live and work to comprehend the historical and cultural settings of the participants. Also, the constructivist may recognize that their backgrounds might shape their interpretation so they may position themselves in the research to acknowledge how their understanding might emerge from their personal, cultural, and historical

experiences. It is the intent of the constructivist to interpret the meanings others have about the world, rather than starting with theory. Instead, they inductively create an argument or pattern of definition (Creswell, 2014).

The researcher designed this case study to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). Researchers have studied factors that influence individual perceptions of IPV, including demographics, religion, culture (Wells et al., 2013), early learning (Ragavana et al., 2018), and the media (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). However, there are different definitions of IPV among local communities and federal agencies (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018), and a gap in the literature on how IPV is defined and identified by first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU, specifically. Students may converge on college campuses from various local communities, religions, and cultures, so their definitions of IPV may vary. Varied interpretations may result in differences in identifying IPV to determine what to report as IPV. This dissertation intricately considers worldviews and allowed participants to construct their meaning of IPV based on the context of their social and historical interactions. This dissertation compares the student definitions resulting from this study to the description of the main types of IPV as defined by Breiding et al. (2015) in a survey conducted for the CDC to determine if the definitions are consistent.

The researcher used the constructivist conceptual framework for this qualitative case study to place reliance on the participants' perspectives of what defines IPV. The questionnaires and scenarios presented to the participants contained closed questions to analyze how the participants define IPV in comparison to the CDC's definition. The interview questions were

4

open-ended to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American first-year college students define and identify IPV.

Statement of the Problem

There are different definitions of IPV among local communities (Mosher, 2015) and federal agencies (Fohring & Duggan, 2018). Other factors that may influence students' perceptions of IPV include IPV exposure as children (Haselschwerdt, Carlson, & Hlavaty, 2018), and through the media, including news and entertainment (Garland, Policastro, Branch, & Henderson, 2018). The problem of inconsistent definitions of IPV among localities and varying factors that may influence student perceptions of IPV may result in inconsistent definitions of IPV among first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU as they eventually merge onto college campuses. If first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU are unable to define IPV, they will not be able to identify IPV on college campuses. If they are unable to identify IPV, they will not be able to report IPV. Unidentified incidents of IPV and unreported incidents of IPV may hinder IPV prevention efforts on college campuses because the prevention of IPV on college campuses relies on the student's ability to identify IPV, as well as their willingness to report it (Hollister et al., 2017). The problem addressed in this case study is there is a lack of understanding about the perceptions of first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU regarding what defines IPV by the true definition of IPV reported by the CDC (Breiding et al., 2015) to identify and report IPV.

Purpose of the Study

The objective of this qualitative case study is to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define IPV to identify and report IPV. Studies have suggested the predicted probability of IPV perpetration increases during

5

adolescence and will reach its peak in the early twenties (Johnson, Giordano, Manning, & Longmore, 2015). Implications for identifying IPV during this period are essential for first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU as they learn to cope with transitioning into adulthood (Rennison & Addington, 2018). Some IPV behaviors may not be identified by participants as IPV in the everyday relationships of college students, due to the regularity of dealing with such behavior throughout the development from childhood to adulthood. While the law sanctions physical violence, verbal forms of aggression that do not contain threats, like name-calling, is not defined as IPV in some states (Hefner, Baboolal, Fleury-Steiner, & Miller, 2018; Robinson, Duke, Fendell, Jennings-Rampsi, & Wolf, 2009). Social norms and values may result in differing attitudes toward violence based on stereotypes of male and female roles (Lelaurain et al., 2018). IPV can range from one occurrence that may or may not have a lasting effect, and to recurring events that may last several years (Breiding et al., 2015). Sporadic incidents may lead to beliefs that occurrences are isolated events, or the incident will not happen again (Breiding et al., 2015). These beliefs may lead to unidentified and unreported incidents of IPV. Thus, it is essential to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU define IPV because how they define IPV may impact their ability to identify and report it.

Factors that influence individual perceptions of IPV include demographics, religion, culture (Berg, Lundborg, Nystedt, & Rooth, 2014), early learning (Bottoms, et al., 2016), and the media (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). The media typically reports the most extreme occurrences of IPV (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). Below is an example of an incident that gained media attention in 2005.

The last she remembers, Yvette Cade was working at her job at a T-Mobile store in Clinton, Md., on the morning of Oct. 10, 2005. But witnesses will never forget what happened next. Cade's estranged husband, Roger Hargrave, 34, entered the store carrying a Sprite bottle full of gasoline. Walking up to Cade, he doused her with the fluid. She bolted into the parking lot, where he caught up and touched a match to her, setting her afire. Stumbling back into the store, Cade was helped by customers who frantically tried to beat out the flames that almost engulfed her upper body. "Some of my nose melted off," says Cade, 32, who miraculously survived the attack despite being burned over 65% of her body. "I was told that I was dripping flesh." ("Burned Twice," 2006, para. 1).

Research indicates IPV starts before the extremes that get public attention, and before victims enter the workplace (Chen, 2017). For example, college students may not identify name-calling as IPV in everyday relationships. Still, name-calling is a common trait in cases of escalated IPV, as in the case of Yvette Cade. "He would call me fat, beached whale" ("Burned Twice," 2006, para. 3). While the law sanctions physical violence, verbal forms of aggression that do not contain threats to harm, like name-calling, are classified as emotional abuse and are not sanctionable in some states (Hefner et al., 2018; Robinson et al., 2009). These sorts of differing definitions and descriptions of IPV may influence how first-generation African American newcomers who attend an HBCU might define and identify IPV differently than the meaning of IPV provided by the CDC (Breiding et al., 2015).

The purpose of this qualitative case study is to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV as compared to the uniformed definition of IPV provided by the CDC (Breiding et al., 2015). Study participants may gain an understanding of acts of IPV to report to enhance campus safety.

College safety advocates may determine the need for starting or improving IPV awareness practices in their settings based on their understanding of how first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV learned from this study.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study are:

- How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

- How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

Rationale, Relevance, and Significance of the Study

The results of this intrinsic qualitative single case study may benefit other college campus safety advocates of HBCUs. Non-HBCUs may have a diverse mix of students that may include first-generation African American first-year students who may be residing outside of the local area of their family environment for the first time. Therefore, the results of this study may benefit college campus safety advocates of non-HBCUs, as well. For example, students at the local level for this study may define and identify IPV based on the dynamics of their parents' relationship, or acceptable dating practices at their local high school. Haselschwerdt and Hlavaty (2018) did a qualitative study of 23 young women who witnessed violence by their fathers against their mothers. At least 11 of the study participants reported having abusive relationships in high school, and none reported IPV during their early college years. The study participants may not

have reported violence in college due to their understanding of the factors associated with IPV as they matured (Haselschwerdt & Hlavaty, 2018). Similarly, the significance of first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU understanding of what defines IPV and their ability to identify it has the potential to break the cycle of IPV from being passed from generation to generation.

IPV is a problem that may pass from generation to generation in families (Kishor & Johnson, 2004). Often IPV is accepted due to barriers, such as lack of emotional or financial support (McLaughlin, Robbins, Bellamy, Banks, & Thackray, 2018). In such situations, children exposed to witnessing IPV may consider it acceptable and may repeat the behavior with their partners (Kishor & Johnson, 2004). IPV may also be defined based on cultural or religious beliefs (Zust, Flicek, Moses, Schubert, & Timmerman, 2018). The factors that may influence the misconceptions of IPV may result in differences in defining it, and the inability to identify it may cause problems that escalate from the family and local environment to schools and the workplace. Nationally, IPV impacts the attainment of education, school, and work attendance, and result in substantial medical costs (Breiding et al., 2015). The predicted probability of IPV surges during adolescence and reaches its highest point in the early twenties, then subsequently diminishes during the late twenties (Johnson et al., 2015). By understanding how first-generation African American newcomers who attend an HBCU understand IPV may help college safety advocates to support first-generation African American freshman who attends HBCUs to understand the factors that may influence their definition of IPV. College safety advocates may also assist students in understanding the CDC's uniform meaning of IPV as they transition into adulthood.

As first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU transition into adulthood, they may witness narratives reported by local and national media (Igartua & Fiuza, 2018). The significance at the national level may include campus safety advocates working within the confines of national press that may differ from the CDC's definition, to discourage profiling the IPV perpetrator as the protagonist in the media (Igartua & Fiuza, 2018). In this regard, this study's significance may benefit college safety advocates to also work with national news stations to ensure IPV as defined by the CDC is not glamourized. Other importance of this study includes working with federal policymakers and local law officials regarding campus safety.

In a 2015 study titled, "What do Parents Want From Colleges," the top-ranking survey response from parents for the most important factors was a safe environment, at 74.5%. In a student poll published in 2008 by the College Board and Art & Science Group, students ranked safety at 72%, and 86% of the students surveyed ranked that their parents were concerned with security as an essential factor for the school they chose. Student safety is of concern to families and likely of interest to college administrators that they may want not to disclose safety concerns to avoid decreases in student enrollment (Kassa, 2017). As a result of the Clergy Act, colleges and universities disseminate an annual report on the security of their campus communities to increase student safety (Kassa, 2017). The report shares crime statistics, policy statements, and details about endeavors to communicate, educate, and support efforts to improve and maintain campus safety. However, the 2015 Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education, which governs institutions that receive federal student aid, sited that many federal regulations for colleges and universities were unrelated to education, student safety, or stewardship of federal funds.

Policymakers in education may use the results of this study, along with the crime statistics and existing policy statements reported annually. They may use this data to work with local law officials for potential changes in local laws regarding IPV that may be inconsistent with federal IPV laws by distributing information to lawmakers for incorporation into legislative updates. An understanding of how first-generation African American first-year students define and identify IPV may contribute to gaining community support for the safety concerns of all college students. It may also gain support from other members of the community, including parents, local authorities, and federal communities, such as the Task Force on Federal Regulation of Higher Education.

Transferability relates to the reader (Creswell, 2014). The transferability of this study will give the potential for other researchers to determine if similar research techniques will work in their settings. Suitability depends on the similarity and differences of the context for this study to the sites for other research. The significance of the purpose of this study may benefit different settings, situations, times, and populations to include advocates for the safety of high school students, religious support groups, and private and government human resource offices. Contextual skills and awareness support high school students to understand the university system as a whole and their role within the university (Wiley, Wyatt, & Camara, 2010). Thus, advocates for the safety of high school students may consider this study to support IPV awareness programs for high school students to prepare them to transition into college or the workforce. In their research titled "By the Grace of God: Religiosity, Religious Self-Regulation, and Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence," Renzetti, DeWall, Messer, and Pond (2017) examined religious beliefs of male IPV perpetrators. They found that strong religious beliefs may result in either a risk or a protective factor for male perpetration of IPV against their female

partners. How first-generation African American students who attend HBCUs define and identify IPV may support local and national religious leaders to develop IPV awareness programs to help the young adults of their congregations.

On the federal level, President Clinton signed the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. It is a requirement for federal agencies to develop employee awareness campaigns as a result of the VAWA. Based on this requirement, national human resource offices and private human resource offices that may receive federal funding may benefit from this study to support developing awareness programs to transition first-generation African-American students into the workforce.

By gaining an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs define IPV may reveal what they know about IPV, what they do not know about IPV, their misconceptions about IPV, and their ability to identify and report IPV. The information provided by participants of this study may help to prevent IPV on college campuses through campus safety advocates who may be encouraged to develop more community partnerships to coordinate IPV awareness and prevention efforts. For this study, participants may gain an understanding of IPV to report to enhance their safety and the safety of their environments at home, school, and the workplace.

Definition of Terms

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). The CDC defines IPV as "physical violence, sexual violence, stalking and psychological aggression (including coercive tactics) by a current or former intimate partner (i.e., spouse, boyfriend/girlfriend, dating partner, or ongoing sexual partner)" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 11).

Physical violence. Physical violence is "The intentional use of physical force with the potential for causing death, disability, injury, or harm" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 11). Physical violence also includes coercing other people to commit acts to cause death, disability, injury, or harm (Breiding et al., 2015).

Sexual violence. Sexual violence per the CDC is "A sexual act that is committed or attempted by another person without freely given consent of the victim or against someone unable to consent or refuse" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 11). Sexual violence also includes sexual acts against someone by force or coercion to engage in sexual acts with a third party (Breiding et al., 2015).

Stalking. Stalking is a "pattern of repeated, unwanted, attention and contact that causes fear or concern for one's safety or the safety of someone else (e.g., family member, close friend)" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 14).

Psychological aggression. The CDC defines psychological aggression as "the use of verbal and non-verbal communication with the intent to: (a) harm another person mentally or emotionally, or (b) exert control over another person" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 15).

African American. For this study, an African American is a Black American citizen of the U.S. who is not of Hispanic origin.

First-generation. First-generation refers to a student whose parent(s)/legal guardian(s) have not completed a bachelor's degree and are the first in their family to attend a 4-year college/university to attain a bachelor's degree.

Historically Black College or University (HBCU). An HBCU is a college or university initially founded to educate students of African American descent.

Assumptions, Delimitations, and Limitations

Assumptions

For this study, the researcher presumed an intrinsic qualitative single case study was the best design for this research. This researcher chose this design to focus on the participants' worldviews and allow them to construct their meaning of IPV based on the context of their social and historical interactions. Researchers ordinarily use a case study design when exploring perceptions (Yin, 2014).

The goal of this research relied on participants' views of how IPV is defined and identified based on their past experiences and cultural factors. For this study, the researcher used the constructivist conceptual framework to place reliance on the participants' perspectives (Jennings, Surgenor, & McMahon, 2013). The researcher assumed the study participants would be honest in providing their perceptions of how they define, identify, and report IPV.

Delimitations

The scope of this study includes first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the United States. The delimited range for this study is first-generation African American freshmen in the eastern region of the U.S. who were enrolled full-time in a 4-year HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S. and were at least 18 years old. The participant must have responded to the recruitment flyer (see Appendix G), completed the Intimate Partner Violence Questionnaire (see Appendix B), and completed the Intimate Partner Violence Identification Scenarios (see Appendix C), and scheduled a face-to-face interview. The site selected was for the convenience to the researcher. Time limited this study to the 2020 winter semester. Resources further narrowed this study since it used a single researcher.

Limitations

This qualitative intrinsic case study was limited to a small sample of first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the United States. This small sample is not representative of all first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU and, therefore, is limited to only the information and experiences participants within the study sample provided. The accuracy participants' contributions vary depending on the overall willingness of each participant to respond adequately and to respond honestly. This study is specific to HBCUs in the eastern region of the U.S., which is not representative of all HBCUs. This qualitative intrinsic case study gleaned distinctive data from its initial questionnaires, scenarios, and follow up interviews. The information gathered from these sources of data may reflect the life experiences of the study participants, but not the life experiences of other college students.

Chapter 1 Summary

In this intrinsic qualitative single case study, the researcher explored the perceptions of African American first-year students' definitions of IPV, as compared to how the CDC defines IPV. Through the lens of constructivism theory, this researcher addressed the interactions of the study participants and the specific contexts in the environments they lived to comprehend their historical and cultural settings. This researcher was interested in the African American first-year students' perspectives of how IPV is defined, recognized, and disclosed. The negative impact IPV has on our nation's economy and the benefits of understanding students' views to support campus safety make how college students define IPV a necessity to explore. Chapter 1 introduced the study.

Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature to identify this qualitative intrinsic single case study position within the framework of previous research on IPV and includes a discussion

of the essential themes. It demonstrates the gaps and deficiencies found in the literature review regarding how first-generation African American newcomers who attend 4-year HBCUs define, identify, and report IPV. Chapter 3 provides the methodology and explains the steps used by the researcher to conduct this qualitative study, including the design and the procedures and measures used to collect data, which was analyzed to find the response to the research questions. Chapter 3 describes how and why the participants were selected and how data was collected and analyzed to identify common themes and a discussion of creditability, validity, and ethical issues concerning this study. Chapter 4 explains how the data was collected and organized in preparation for data analysis, how the data was analyzed, and the specific strategies used to enhance the reliability and validity of this study. Chapter 5 concludes the study with an interpretation of the results, using the research questions as the framework. Chapter 5 also provides reflections on the research and recommendations for future research.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this qualitative intrinsic case study was to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S. define and identify IPV by the definition of IPV provided by the CDC (Breiding et al., 2015). This chapter presents a review of the literature that contributes to previous research regarding the factors that influence how one might define and identify IPV. The significance of first-generation African American first-year students attending an HBCU understanding of how IPV is defined is the impact their definition may have on their ability to identify it. Identifying and reporting IPV supports IPV prevention on campuses and reduces the likelihood of IPV occurrences (Hollister et al., 2017). It is crucial for first-generation African American newcomers who attend an HBCU to identify IPV and report IPV to prevent IPV from happening on college campuses. If first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU have inconsistent definitions of IPV, they may identify it differently, and may not report it. An understanding of how first-generation African American first-year students attending HBCUs define and identify IPV may support college safety advocates to familiarize first-generation African American newcomers who attend an HBCU about IPV awareness. The goal of this literature review was to establish comprehensive coverage of the literature that pertains to the problem of unidentified and unreported IPV on college campuses. The literature review applies to the research on how first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S. may define, identify, and report IPV.

The literature review begins with factors that may influence one's definition of IPV, including culture, law intervention, religious beliefs, IPV exposure as children or adolescents, IPV portrayals by the media, and the HBCU experience. The following databases accessed

through the Ed.D. Concordia University online library include ERIC, ProQuest, and ProQuest

Central, JSTOR, Sage Journals Online, and Taylor and Francis Online. Key terms of the

literature search included; *Coercive Control Violence (CCV), Intimate Partner Violence (IPV),*

Domestic Violence (DV), higher education, campus, students, university, and *college*. These

terms set the search parameters of the literature review. This review of the literature included an

examination of conceptual frameworks, research, and methods, and suggest differing definitions

for IPV and factors that may influence how one might define IPV based on theory, as well as a

uniformed description of IPV (Breiding et al., 2015). What the literature is lacking is how IPV is

defined by first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU in the eastern

region of the U.S., specifically. A consistent definition of IPV is vital to support campus safety

by using information about IPV that is collected systematically and comparably (Smith et al.,

2017).

IPV occurrences on college campuses may be higher than reported due to the barriers

victims may face when disclosing IPV (Ragavana et al., 2018). Victims may fear the stigma of

imperfection and community acceptance (Ragavana et al., 2018). When victims do not seek

support services, they often do not understand IPV and choose to blame themselves or choose

nondisclosure due to shame (Haselschwerdt & Hardesty, 2017). Often the IPV perpetrator is the

family's primary financial source, which may result in nondisclosure to prevent the law from

intervening. Law intervention may impact decisions to disclose due to community status,

separation of the family (Haselschwerdt & Hardesty, 2017), lack of family support (Goodkind,

Gillum, Bybee, & Sullivan, 2003) and the victim's perception of the best interest for their

children (Rasool, 2016). Working with multiple sectors, such as law enforcement and public

health, to enforce laws or policies, are essential components in a comprehensive approach to IPV

prevention (Smith et al., 2017). Haselschwerdt and Hardesty (2017) noted disclosure rates were higher for victims who chose to leave the relationship. In contrast, Eisikovits, Buchbinder, and Mor (1998) found some victims remain in the relationship but decide to search for assistance to end the abuse (Eisikovits et al., 1998).

Studies have implied the predicted probability of IPV perpetration increases during adolescence, reaches its peak in the early twenties, and subsequently declines during the latter half of the twenties (Johnson et al., 2015). Rennison and Addington (2018) noted an unintended consequence in their study on the focus of sexual violence and IPV involving college females. The researchers noted the possible misperception of how students perceive violence and their ability to identify it. Misconceptions of IPV may result in students not being able to identify it, which impacts IPV prevention. Implications for identifying IPV during this period are essential for first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU as they learn to cope with transitioning into adulthood (Rennison & Addington, 2018).

Conceptual Framework

IPV prevention is reliant on identifying IPV and reporting it (Hollister et al., 2017). The reason IPV may go unreported is due to many barriers to disclosure. Fear is a barrier to disclosure (Iratzoqui & McCutcheon, 2018). If the perpetrator is the victim's means for financial support, victims may be reluctant to report IPV because of fear of losing financial support (Iratzoqui & McCutcheon, 2018). If there are children involved, IPV may go undisclosed from fear of losing the children to social services (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017).

On the contrary, some women reported IPV for the safety of their children (Rasool, 2016). The strategy of disclosure proceeds conceptions of what happens next. Knowing the consequence that can result from reporting IPV helps to strategize whether or not to state it. For

19

example, the nondisclosure of IPV is due to the fear of not being believed in some cases (Hardesty, 2017), which results in the management of secrecy (Petronio & Venetis, 2017). This phenomenon is called *communication privacy management* (CPM) and forms the basis of the CPM theory (Petronio & Venetis, 2017).

Nondisclosure of IPV contributes to normalizing IPV (Ragavana et al., 2018). Individuals learn by observing others within the context of social interactions, experiences, and outside media influences, which forms the basis of the social cognitive theory (SCT) (De Graaf, Hoeken, Sanders, & Beentjes, 2012). IPV identified as sane goes unreported (McLaughlin et al., 2018). Individuals also mimic the actions of those who care for them, which forms the basis of the attachment theory (Kishor & Johnson, 2004; Bowlby, 1982). IPV as an extension of the control or power intention does not always take the form of physical abuse, sexual abuse, or stalking (Giorando, 2014). It may take the form of psychological aggression, which includes, but is not limited to, name-calling, humiliation, restricting access to transportation, money, friends, and family (Breiding et al., 2015). Nondisclosure of psychological aggression will also become normalized (Ragavana et al., 2018). The normalcy of IPV may result in unawareness or limited awareness of IPV.

This intrinsic qualitative single case study explored how first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs define and identify IPV using the socio-constructivist approach. It is the position of the constructivist that learning progresses through the construction of meanings. Meanings are constructed based on how a person may define their experience (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007). Persons bring previous knowledge to a state of learning in which they must assess and re-evaluate their understanding of it. Therefore, individuals will have a different interpretation and construction of what they know based on past

experiences and cultural factors. The social constructivist believes learning is a collaborative process and places emphasis on the importance of the cultural and social context. (Jennings, Surgenor, & McMahon, 2013). The goal of this research relied on participants' views of how IPV is defined and identified based on their past experiences and cultural factors. The constructivist approach allowed for the exploration of how first-generation African American freshmen define and identify IPV as viewed through their relationships with others. Using the socio-constructivist style supported the study of the meanings and logic specific to first-generation African American freshmen males and first-generation African American freshmen females on how they define and identify IPV and the basis for their definition.

Review of Research Literature and Methodological Literature

The CDC reports IPV as a public health problem. It is considered severe, but preventable. IPV is described as "physical violence, sexual violence, stalking and psychological aggression (including coercive acts) by a current or former intimate partner" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 11). Historically IPV was called domestic violence (DV) to describe physical, sexual, or psychological harm by a current or former intimate partner or spouse, including heterosexual or same-sex couples (U.S. Department of Justice, 2017). The IPV term for intimate partner extends beyond a current or former intimate partner or spouse to include relationships typically resonating on college campuses. An intimate partner within IPV is a person "with whom one has a close personal relationship," which may consist of emotional connectedness, regular contact, ongoing physical contact and/or sexual behavior, identity as a couple, and familiarity and knowledge about each other's lives" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 11). Intimate partners within IPV include current or former spouses, but also boyfriends or girlfriends, dating partners, or sexual partners. Similar to DV, IPV includes occurrences between heterosexual or same-sex couples.

21

The relationship may consist of all or some of these factors and does not require sexual intimacy (Fohring & Duggan, 2018). The CDC defines the main types of IPV as physical violence, sexual violence, stalking, and psychological aggression (Breiding et al., 2015).

Physical violence is the use of force with the intent to harm, injure, disable, or kill. It may or may not involve the use of a weapon. It may include the use of body size or strength. It may consist of striking, biting, scratching, pushing, shoving, throwing, grasping, shaking, slapping, burning, and hair-pulling, or forcing others to commit these acts against another person (Breiding et al., 2015).

Sexual violence is attempted or completed actions without consent, including vaginal, oral, or anal forced penetration, whether unwanted or facilitated by the use of drugs or alcohol. The forces used may be physical harm or threats to harm. Sexual violence also includes being forced to perform vaginal, oral, or anal penetration to someone else. It includes unwanted penetration resulting from coercion, misuse of power, touching of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks without consent. Touching includes the intentional touching of the victim or making the victim touch the perpetrator. Touching can be either directly or through the clothing, on the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks, directly or through the clothing, without consent, as well as unwelcome disclosure to sexual circumstances (e.g., pornography); also sexual harassment, intimidations of sexual violence, unwanted videos, and distributing sexual photos of another person (Breiding et al., 2015).

Stalking consists of uninvited phone calls, emails, or texts, as well as leaving correspondence, or items, such as flowers, that the victim does not want. Not only does it include following, spying, or showing up in places, like the victim's home or car, it also includes damaging personal property, harming or threatening pets, and making threats to harm physically.

It is a pattern of repeated, unwanted attention that causes fear or concern for the safety of an individual or their family or friends (Breiding et al., 2015).

Psychological Aggression consists of communication that focuses on harming mentally or emotionally or exercising control over another person. It may include name-calling, humiliation, limiting access to transportation, money, friends, and family; unwarranted observing of locations, pressures of physical or sexual violence; taking charge of reproductive or sexual health (e.g., rejecting the use of birth control; forced abortion), abuse of vulnerabilities, such as immigration status, or disabilities. It also includes providing false information or engaging in mind games to make one doubt their memory or awareness, known as gaslighting. It also includes acting dangerously angry toward a partner. Insulting and humiliating a partner in front of others, putting a partner down by calling him/her names like a loser, fat, crazy, or stupid and telling partner no one else would want him/her (Breiding et al., 2015).

IPV behaviors exist in the everyday relationships of first-generation African American freshmen, such as name-calling, due to the normalcy of dealing with such behavior throughout the development from childhood to adulthood. However, name-calling is a common trait in cases of escalated IPV. Such as the case of Yvette Cade, an African American Female, who was severely burned by her estranged husband, an African American male, in 2005. Her estranged husband verbally abused her from the start of her marriage. "He would call me fat, beached whale" ("Burned Twice," 2006, para. 3). The law sanctions physical violence, but not verbal forms of aggression like name-calling in some states (Hefner et al., 2018; Robinson et al., 2009). Attitudes toward violence differ in interaction with gender identities, regarding definitions of male and female roles based on stereotypes, social norms, and values (Lelaurain et al., 2018). Also, IPV can range from one occurrence that may or may not have a lasting effect, to recurring

events that may last several years (Breiding et al., 2015). Sporadic incidents may lead victims to believe occurrences are isolated incidents, or the incident will not happen again (Breiding et al., 2015). Victims did not identify IPV based on these beliefs. Thus, it is crucial to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen define IPV because how they define IPV may impact their ability to identify it.

The World Health Organization (WHO) (2012) identified consistent factors about the increased probability of male IPV perpetration. The factors identified consist of being young, having a low level of education. Other factors include witnessing or experiencing violence as a child, an unsafe use of alcohol and drugs, personality disorders, acceptance of violence (e.g., feeling it is acceptable for a man to beat his partner), and a history of abusing partners. The factors consistently associated with a woman's increased likelihood of experiencing IPV include a low level of education, exposure to violence between parents, sexual abuse during childhood, acceptance of violence, and exposure to other forms of prior abuse. Along with individual risk factors, the WHO (2012) noted societal factors across studies, such as inequitable social norms between males and females, mainly links to manhood and aggression. Others include poverty, women at lower social and economic status, feeble legal support against IPV in marriage, inequitable divorce and marriage laws, frail community support against IPV, deficient women's civil rights, social acceptance, and high levels of general violence in society. First-generation African American freshmen merge onto HBCU campuses from a myriad of environments that may follow similar social norms. However, breaking customs is not impossible, as demonstrated by the United States shifting from other negative behaviors, including smoking in public places and littering (O'Neil, 2016). Exposing first-generation African American freshmen to the risk

factors associated with IPV and creating a campus climate of non-tolerance may support breaking the cycle of IPV amongst high-risk college students.

Creating a community of IPV non-tolerance on HBCU campuses may involve multiple sectors to work together (Breiding et al., 2015). First-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU merging on campus from different communities will complicate the differences in community laws about violence. For example, the legal definition for rape as defined by the U.S. Department of Justice (2009 - 2017) is the penetration of the vagina or anus with any body part or object without consent or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person. This definition is used by the federal government to collect information about rape from local police but may be different from one community to another. The Office of Women's Health warns that some populations have limited sexual assault laws and differing definitions (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018).

IPV is not a discriminator of age, race, culture, gender, or socioeconomic background (Maryland National Network Against Domestic Violence, n.d.). Haselschwerdt and Hardesty (2017) studied how victims of IPV in an affluent community coped with the secrecy and exposure of IPV. Their findings showed the process influenced by society, culture, family status, and if the victims chose to remain part of the community. IPV victims in rural communities may lack support services due to factors such as geography, isolation, availability of services, enforcement officers, economic disadvantages, education level, and subcultural attitudes surrounding gender (Reckdenwald et al., 2018). Also, misunderstood social and religious beliefs impact the acceptance of IPV (Zust et al., 2018). HBCUs may enroll students from varying communities, religious backgrounds, and cultures. Thus, students may approach college learning about relationships based on social behaviors passed on between generations. Therefore, it is

essential to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen define and identify IPV as compared to the uniformed definition reported by the CDC (Breiding et al., 2015).

Demographics

Haselschwerdt and Hardesty (2017) conducted a qualitative study on IPV victims from an affluent community based on grounded theory to compare how they managed secrecy, disclosure, and help-seeking strategies. This phenomenon is called communication privacy management and forms the basis of the CPM theory. CPM, formerly known as communication boundary management, is a methodical research theory intended to create an evidence-based understanding of the methods people use to make decisions about divulging or hiding private information (Petronio & Venetis, 2017). The data revealed that the management of secrecy and disclosure functioned within gender and class associations. The study participants consisted of 17 mothers who resided in the community and 10 social service providers who worked with mothers or families that experienced IPV. The ongoing negotiations to conceal and reveal IPV depended on the victim's environment. Study results showed that disclosure rates were higher for victims who chose to leave the community.

IPV victims in rural areas have an increased frequency or threat of IPV due to a lack of health care, an environment of gender inequality and poverty, and are often overlooked or ignored in research (Reckdenwald et al., 2018). Reckdenwald et al. (2018) noted that studies linking IPV in rural and urban areas are affected by some significant concerns such as geography, inaccessibility, sociocultural attitudes surrounding masculinity and femininity, enforcement officers, economic disadvantages, education level, and availability of services. IPV research inclines to concentrate on urban settings, implying there is minimal difference between

rural and urban settings (Reckdenwald et al., 2018). However, Reckdenwald et al. (2018) noted that rural and urban violence is different in regards to the nature and harshness of the abuse, as well as the rural environment and culture associated with the rustic lifestyle. Physical abuse is higher for rural women, as compared to non-rural women. Also, the frequency and severity of female-victim IPV increase as rural localities become more isolated, as isolated rural women show an increased risk of violence based on a subculture of acceptance of IPV and the use of guns. Also, rural communities favor less government interference as compared to urban areas (Reckdenwald et al., 2018).

It is difficult to determine if IPV victims in rural communities seek support from health care professionals. Research indicates some rural women are afraid to use health services because of the close association with their doctor. Also, literature has shown many tactics IPV perpetrators use to isolate their partner, which may prevent IPV victims from visiting a doctor (Reckdenwald et al., 2018). Reckdenwald et al. (2018) did a quantitative study to connect rural IPV and homicide research with limited research on health care availability. They used information based on 961 counties from the 16 states. The study results suggested there is a positive relationship between female economic disadvantages and the theoretical concept of femicide, which is the killing of a woman or a girl by a man based on her gender (Corradi, Marcuello-Servós, Boira, & Weil, 2016). As women become more economically reliant on men, it makes it challenging to leave an abusive relationship (Reckdenwald et al., 2018). Also, Reckdenwald et al. (2018) found the appearance of a repercussion effect as females achieved equality relative to males across counties.

Other researchers found higher rates of illness among IPV victims based on demographics, such as the Zika virus. Quintana-Domeque, Carvalho, and De Oliveira (2018)

found that women who reported experiencing domestic sexual violence were more likely to report suffering from Zika. Gauthier et al. (2018) found that IPV victims who had adequate food and housing support and knowledge of public assistance sources were more capable of deciding to seek IPV support services than victims without knowledge of traditional support services. Reckdenwald et al. (2018) suggested addressing IPV in rural areas as a multidimensional process and tailor intervention and prevention efforts specific to each community. Likewise, IPV support services on college campuses may tailor IPV prevention efforts and support services based on the student demographics used for college recruitment and admissions. This qualitative case study considered demographics to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV.

Religion

Religious beliefs may support IPV victims not to accept abuse. Wells et al. (2013) studied what motivates change for a person experiencing IPV and found a renewal of a violence-free life was for multiple reasons, including religion. One of the study participants said her Roman Catholic faith renewed her. On the other hand, perception of IPV and decisions to leave an abusive marriage may be impacted by misunderstood social, religious beliefs (Wells et al., 2013; Zust et al., 2018). A masculine understanding of the Roman Catholic religion places women as subservient to their families, which may entrap IPV victims to remain in abusive relationships. In the study conducted by Wells et al. (2013), one participant considered the difficulty of understanding which part of IPV should be traditionally accepted and which part of IPV she should not take as tradition. "How do you know that you already need help compared to what is traditional . . . some traditions tell you that that's okay, that's part of it" (p 157). Zust et al. (2018) noted the need for the clergy to speak about IPV and the misunderstood social, religious

beliefs that may keep victims bound to violence. The researchers said that members of religious congregations sought support services for IPV from the clergy, but the clergy preferred referring members to professional counselors. The HBCU campus population may include students of different religious backgrounds. It is vital to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen define and identify IPV and the factors that influence their ability to identify it to promote the adherence of a uniformed definition (Breiding et al., 2015) on HBCU campuses. -

Culture

Ragavana et al. (2018) noted IPV programs tailored to some cultures, particularly Latina and African American, but not tailored to others, such as South Asian communities. Kapur et al. (2017) discussed existing literature on IPV among the Asian Indian community that identifies the differences between the experiences of Asian Indians and other groups and the lack of research on non-profit support services to migrant married IPV victims. In their study of nonprofit organizations providing services to Asian Indian women experiencing domestic violence, the researchers found that organizations catering to the intersectional needs of Asian Indian immigrants are needed to deliver social services, such as language services, outreach, transitional homes, counseling, pro-bono immigration services, and policy advocacy needs. Gaining an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen define and identify IPV may support organizations catering to the intersectional needs of African Americans. It may be found useful to organizations that support the intersectional needs of other cultures.

The nature of organizations catering to marginalized IPV victims is intersectional due to the characteristics of the group (Kapur et al., 2017). Intersectionality is a theoretical framework that suggests multiple social categories of race-ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, and

socioeconomic status. It transects and attempts to identify how interlocking systems of power impact those who are most marginalized in society (Bowleg, 2012). Since social work incorporates intersectional analysis, practitioners have been able to understand the relationship of larger social structures to the experiences of individuals. Relating larger social structures to individual experiences enables practitioners to apply core skills to larger social systems that may result in changes in laws and social conditions (Coker, 2016). Structural inequality simultaneously exposes the types of IPV enacted, individual and community responses to IPV, the connotations that victims attribute to abuse, and factors that increase the risks that IPV will occur. System intersectionality informs how the public supports systems, such as welfare, criminal justice, child welfare, and immigration. These systems intersect to form a mesh of control in poor communities that result in social conditions that nurture violence and obstructs efforts to prevent IPV or support victims of IPV (Coker, 2016). Colleges may consider working with public systems to develop policies using a structural intersectional framework for teaching awareness of IPV through coalition-building among social networks. The expected outcomes would not only be changed for individual students but also change for larger systems that may change laws and social conditions for college campuses and the surrounding local communities.

Research indicates that IPV may impact individuals from varying communities (Gauthier et al., 2018; Haselschwerdt & Hardesty, 2017; Kapur et al., 2017; Quintana-Domeque et al., 2018; Ragavana et al., 2018; Reckdenwald et al., 2018; Wells et al., 2013; Zust et al., 2018). IPV is not a discriminator of age, race, culture, gender or socioeconomic backgrounds (Maryland National Network Against Domestic Violence, n.d.), or religious beliefs (Wells et al., 2013; Zust et al., 2018). First-generation African American freshmen attending HBCUs in the eastern region of the U.S., from varying communities, may be impacted by IPV and may have different beliefs

and perceptions of accepting or not accepting abuse; based on behavior learned as a child (Kishor & Johnson, 2004). It is crucial to understand how first-generation African American freshmen attending HBCUs define and identify IPV to promote a consistent definition (Breiding et al., 2015) on HBCU campuses.

Children and Adolescents IPV Exposure

Research indicates demographics, culture, and social beliefs influence children exposed to IPV. Ragavana et al. (2018) studied the impact of domestic violence exposure on South Asian children in the United States from the perspectives of local violence agency staff. They noted abuse by other members of the family to be prevalent, especially in-laws. Violence in the home is an individual child characteristic that increases the risk of child maltreatment (Merrick & Latzman, 2014). Violence in the house is also a behavior repeated from one generation to the next (Kishor & Johnson, 2004).

Kishor and Johnson (2004) conducted a study for the WHO using data from the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) program to study the frequency of IPV and the relationship of IPV and health risks for women and their children. The comparative study included data for the countries of Cambodia, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Haiti, India, Nicaragua, Peru, and Zambia. Kishor and Johnson (2004) studied the risk of female children becoming victims of IPV if they saw their mother abused by their father. The researchers based the study on previous research conducted by Kalmuss (1984) and Seltzer and Kalmuss (1988) to determine if the study results were the same across countries. The researchers found the study results were the same across countries. Women whose mothers were beaten by their fathers experienced violence and reported current abuse at rates almost doubled those who said that their fathers did not hit their mothers, which supports evidence of attachment behavior

in mammals (Kishor & Johnson, 2004). For example, in Cambodia, 30% of women whose fathers beat their mothers experienced violence at 28%, almost the same rate as the mothers. In comparison, 15% of the women studied said their fathers did not beat their mothers, and 13% have not experienced violence (Kishor & Johnson, 2004).

In a study conducted by the WHO (2012) titled, "Understanding and Addressing Violence Against Women," results revealed that IPV against women in low-income countries harmed the social and health consequences for their children, to include anxiety, depression, poor school performance, and adverse health outcomes. The effects of childhood and adolescence IPV start from conception. Children of mothers who have suffered violence are at risk for poor health due to the likelihood of mothers not receiving prenatal care in the first trimester of pregnancy. Furthermore, the possibility of having had a non-live birth and death rates are higher for mothers who have undergone violence than for mothers who have not. The proportion of children age 12 to 35 months who are fully immunized is higher among mothers who have not experienced violence than among mothers who have experienced violence (WHO, 2012). Abused mothers who had children who were less likely to be immunized, had higher rates of diarrhoeal disease, and were at a greater risk of dying before the age of five. There was also an association between IPV and child abuse within the same household of children from low-income countries. (WHO, 2012).

In a quantitative study, Merrick and Latzman (2014) defined and described types of child maltreatment. Also, the field of medicine that deals with the incidence, distribution, and possible control of diseases and other factors relating to health. From public health evaluations, they considered incidence, prevalence, and consequences of child maltreatment. They discussed approaches for the prevention of child maltreatment, such as considerations for nurses to help

identify potential victims and provide treatment and referrals. Merrick and Latzman (2014) noted individual child characteristics that increase the risk of child maltreatment. Such components include being less than four years old and having special needs. Risks associated with the features of the parent include parents who lack an understanding of child development and parenting skills. Other risks consist of single parenting, numerous children, male partner in the home, a history of child abuse, substance abuse, mental health issues, young age, minimal education, and low income. These risks led to the likelihood of community violence and violence in the home (Merrick & Latzman, 2014).

Rasool (2016) conducted a qualitative study, "Help-Seeking After Domestic Violence: The Critical Role of Children," using data gathered from in-depth interviews with abused women in South African shelters. She argued that having children influenced the decisions of mothers to seek help after IPV. The mistreatment of their children and exposing them to danger motivated the women to seek advice (Rasool, 2016). Often, women remain in abusive relationships in hopes of providing a stable and nurturing family environment for the children's sake (Rasool, 2016). A study conducted by Kimball (2015), "Edleson Revisited: Reviewing Children's Witnessing of Domestic Violence 15 Years Later," revealed that such choices might repeatedly expose children to IPV and put children at risk to repeat the behavior as adults (Kimball, 2015). Rasool (2016) concluded, there is a need to advocate for policy that arranges for safety for both women and children. Strategies for security, stability, and nurturing environments for parents or caregivers and children could be significant in preventing children's exposure to violent behavior. These strategies may reduce violence throughout adulthood (National Institute of Justice, 2017).

As children grow to adolescence, exposure to violence may result in emotional problems (Merrick & Latzman, 2014). A quantitative study titled, "Longitudinal Associations Between Teen Dating Violence Victimization and Adverse Health Outcomes," was conducted by Exner-Cortens, Eckenrode, and Rothman (2013). The researchers studied the determinants of health and risk behaviors in a nationally representative sample of U.S. adolescents. They revealed that IPV is dating violence among adolescents as young as 12 years old. Exner-Cortens et al. (2013) studied adolescents from ages 12 to 18 years old who reported physical and psychological heterosexual dating violence and did a follow-up study five years later when participants were 18 to 25 years old. The participants reported adverse health conditions, including depressive symptomatology, self-esteem, antisocial behaviors, sexual risk behaviors, extreme weight control behaviors, suicidal thoughts and attempt, substance use, and IPV. Violence among adolescents escalated by factors similar to the escalating factors for IPV in adult relationships, including financial control and infidelity (Giorando, 2014).

Giorando (2014) conducted a quantitative longitudinal study, "Understanding Teen Dating Violence," about the romantic lives of adolescents, and later as young adults, which uncovered that although family history is essential, teen dynamics is the driving force for teen dating relationships. The National Institute of Justice (2017) funded a quantitative longitudinal study titled "Relationship Abuse During the Transition From Adolescence to Young Adulthood." The researchers of Bowling Green State University found that teenage males use social status as a controlling force in relationships. They use behaviors such as treating the mate like a servant, making all of the significant decisions, acting like the master, and being the one to outline men's and women's roles (National Institute of Justice, 2017). Since boys are usually less engaged in teenage relationships, they are less invested in the relationship than girls, and boys generally

have power over girls (National Institute of Justice, 2017). Such behavior aligns with IPV having the meaning as an extension of the control or power intention (Giorando, 2014). IPV escalated when communication involved the use of harmful forms of communication, like name-calling, ridicule, or hurtful statements. The recurrent factors of contention for teens are financial and economic concerns, time with peers, and infidelity, with infidelity being the main factor because money and time provide the opportunity for cheating (Giorando, 2014).

Giorando (2014) conducted a study for the National Institute of Justice, which measured social differences between boys' and girls' communication awkwardness and dating confidence. The study included concepts like knowing how to tell your partner how to treat you or knowing how to break up with a partner. For these scales, young men scored lower. Young men rated higher on the levels that measured the extent to which your partner tries to control you, tries to change you, and influencing your partner. Girls reported a more favorable power balance in the relationship. Since IPV is about regulating your partner, this finding challenged previous research findings on the dynamics of teen dating. Girls have more experience within relationships with other girls that involve private communications and are likely to make attempts within these new relationships. Therefore, they have more practice communicating than their male partners. Giorando (2014) noted that both male and female control attempts are frequent and may contribute to teenage IPV risk, along with negative emotions. The combination of anger and control, along with negative emotions, contributes to the risk of IPV escalating in teen relationships (Giorando, 2014).

IPV that escalates in teen relationships may continue to adulthood. A study conducted by the National Institute of Justice suggested the contrary. Few studies report men and women experiencing IPV in all relationships. The critical factors involved in stopping abusive behaviors

were the move to reject violence, improve communication styles, and address problem behaviors (National Institute of Justice, 2017). Understanding how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV may provide insight into what they consider to be healthy communications to address critical factors of finance, time, and infidelity in relationships. Understanding how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV may also provide insight into how public media may influence their perceptions.

Learning About IPV by Use of Media

The media can portray convincing perspectives of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) using pictures and text to grasp the attention and sell the story. The attitudes projected by the media may influence the public's understanding of IPV and the views of those who develop public policy (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). The press may project a civil position toward the IPV victim, or provide text or pictures leaning toward blaming the victim and giving the perspective of the victim deserving the inflicted violence (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). Research studies provide evidence that a form of learning takes place when people take on beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors after reading or watching a story (Hoeken et al., 2016). How public media depicts IPV may impact how first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs define and identify IPV. College safety advocates may consider the influence public media has on student learning when considering the ability of first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU to identify IPV to support IPV prevention.

When people connect with a character in a story, they are more likely to take on the perspective of the role they identify with (Igartua & Fiuza, 2018). Identification is taking on the objectives and strategies of the person portrayed as the protagonist in the narrative and

experiencing emotions when the protagonist's strategies are successful or unsuccessful (Hoeken et al., 2016). Viewing the behaviors of characters similar to oneself is more likely to increase confidence in the ability and willingness to attempt the action than seeing characters with fewer similarities, based on the phenomenon of the SCT, which provided evidence that narrative persuasion impacts learning skills (Slater & Rouner, 2002). De Graaf et al. (2012) studied the perspective from which a story was told to influence identification experimentally and tested the effects on attitudes. They used 1,120 participants to read a story that was told either from the perception of one individual or another character, with both individuals having differing goals. The results showed that perspective persuaded identification and story consistency of outlooks.

Moreover, identification with one of the characters resolved the effect of perspective on attitudes. The researchers repeated the experiment using 2, 200 participants and achieved the same results. The results of these experiments showed the identification used as a method of narrative persuasion (De Graaf et al., 2012). Since narrative persuasion impact learning skills (Slater & Rouner, 2002), it is essential to acknowledge how IPV is depicted by the media to consider how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU may perceive IPV. Lloyd and Ramon (2017) applied discourse analysis to articles on IPV in two United Kingdom national daily newspapers published in 2001−2002 and 2011−2012. The researchers evaluated evidence of change over the 10 years. Their analysis of the articles disclosed themes of blaming the victim, the "ideal" victim, IPV campaigning, sexualizing IPV, and scaremongering, as discussed below.

Blaming the victim. In the United States, victim-blaming is more prevalent in media reports of IPV than any other crime (Richards, Gillespie, & Smith, 2011). Lloyd and Ramon (2017) noted similar results in their study of media discourse in the United Kingdom and found

victim-blaming to remain constant over the 10 year time period they evaluated. Lloyd and

Ramon (2017) provided an example of an IPV reporting in the UK where a husband kills his

wife, his two children, his father-in-law, and a family friend and her daughter. The title of the

article, "BBQ Dad Killed 6 Over Wife's Affair" (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017, p. 122), stated the

husband "slaughtered six people at a family barbecue after he flipped over his wife's affair"

(Lloyd & Ramon, 2017, p. 122). The perpetrator was pictured beneath a photo of the couple's

children and described as a "doting dad." Although the wife and children were all victims of

IPV, the article described the children as "So innocent" and the wife as "cheating on him" (Lloyd

& Ramon, 2017, p. 122). The article appeared to persuade viewers to degrade the wife and

consider her the cause of the crime. Such a depiction is similar to the narrative persuasion used

fictionally in comic books, which is a type of media that has been unnoticed in regards to IPV

(Garland et al., 2018).

Garland et al. (2018) used a convenience sample taken from popular comic book series

and examined the frequency of IPV and the myths used to justify portrayals of IPV. Their

findings indicated that the underlining of IPV through tales is visibly apparent within mainstream

comic books. Anecdotes used to promote blaming the victim included victims provoking the

perpetrator and victims having the ability to leave, fight back, or walk away. Of the cases

analyzed by the researchers, 61.9% of the victims fought back or ran away. However, research

indicates it takes IPV victims an average of six occurrences before they can fight back or run

away (Garland et al., 2018). College students' identification with imagery and storylines that

promote IPV myths may influence how they define IPV and their ability to identify IPV.

The ideal victim. In contrast to the theme of blaming the victim, the theme of the ideal

victim portrays the victim using positive characteristics. Lloyd and Ramon (2017) provided an

example of a perfect victim identified in their research who was a police officer killed by her partner. The media showed photos of the couple's young children at the victim's funeral and quotes from a senior police officer at the funeral service, describing that she had received a commendation for her "professionalism, dedication and commitment" (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017, p. 126). The perpetrators of ideal IPV victims are described harshly by the media in comparison to the perpetrators of media that blame the victim (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). Women must tread carefully between being hardworking, but not so situated in their career that it may impact the family dynamics and financially emasculate husbands or partners, which may be viewed by the media as provoking IPV (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). Media portrayals of ideal IPV victims may influence how first-generation African American freshmen define and identify IPV by identifying it based on attributes, such as grade point average, popularity, the family's worth, or other attributes perceived as an ideal student.

      IPV campaigning. In the latter years of their study, Lloyd and Ramon (2017) found examples of the media giving a voice to IPV victims. The researchers studied the tailoring of dialogues of IPV through newspaper representations of victims, mainly women, and perpetrators, mostly men. One of the newspapers assumed a reverent position toward women victims. The other paper provided narrative and photos that appeared to blame the victim and sexualize violence, by denoting views of "deserving" or "undeserving" women victims (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017, p. 114). IPV campaigning promotes positive portrayals college students may identify. Students at Yale College in Wrexham host annual Anti-Domestic Violence Campaigns aimed to raise awareness of IPV, with media attention and local government participation. The expectation is to reduce the number of victims who suffer repeat incidents of IPV, increase reports of IPV and increase the number of perpetrators of IPV brought to justice (Anti-domestic

violence campaign launched in wales, 2013). IPV Campaigning may influence how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV by increasing awareness, which may support their ability to identify IPV to support prevention efforts.

Sexualizing IPV. Sexualizing IPV consist of media portrayals that comingle sex and violence. Lloyd & Ramon (2017) noted how newspapers reported the abuse of singer Rihanna by her boyfriend, singer Chris Brown. In 2009, the paper sympathetically reported the abusive treatment of Rihanna and criticized Chris Brown's attack on her (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). However, the articles also depicted sexualized images of Rihanna with erotic headlines several times a week during 2012, parallel to regular segments of a soap opera. They placed them next to photos of her injuries (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). Such headlines took place three years after the incident and are prevalent in media because they capture the viewer's attention and increase sales (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). The media portray IPV as a couples' problem, where love in the relationship dissipates and creates the dynamics of jealousy, depression, and anger on the part of the male, which contributes the cause of the breakdown to the female victim (Monckton-Smith, 2012). The belief that the resolution of IPV is through firming the notion of marriage and gender dynamics result from the depiction of IPV as a couple's problem (Monckton-Smith, 2012). This belief contradicts international solutions to violence against women and expounds on the injurious ideas that influence IPV (Monckton-Smith, 2012). However, its prevalence in the media may affect how first-generation African American freshmen define and identify IPV.

Scaremongering. The Merriam-Webster's Collegiate online Dictionary (n.d.) defines a scaremonger as "one inclined to raise or excite alarms, especially needlessly." Media scaremongering leans toward parental recklessness, which makes women reluctant to report

abuse in fear of losing their children (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). Lloyd and Ramon (2017) found in

their experience training women who experienced domestic violence and mental health issues

that women have trouble ending abusive relationships. They fall prey to self-blame, the stigma of

IPV, financial dependency, isolation, low self-esteem, the controlling influence of abusers, not

seeing themselves as a victim, and fear of losing their children.

Lloyd and Ramon (2017) noted that media coverage of IPV not only portrays blaming of

the victim actions as the cause of violence but also condemns the victim's inaction as acceptance

of abuse. Research shows the victim's inaction is not due to the approval of IPV. Victims of IPV

may not report violations because of fear of retaliation by the abuser or fear they might not be

believed (Iratzoqui & McCutcheon, 2018). IPV is one of the most underreported crimes due to

the victim's desire to avoid retribution, the victim's desire to protect the offender, the victim's

belief that law enforcement authorities are not able to do anything, and prior negative

experiences with reporting abuse. As many as one-third of IPV incidents go unreported

(Iratzoqui & McCutcheon, 2018). Older victims may fear the loss of financial independence,

their home, or being placed in a nursing home. Some elderly victims may have considered IPV

as usual and feel shame in reporting the abuse they had been enduring for so long (McLaughlin

et al., 2018). Cross-national data indicates when the victim leaves the relationship, they put

themselves at risk of severe or fatal injury (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). College student perceptions

of acceptance or non-acceptance of abuse may influence their definition of IPV and their ability

to identify it.

The perspectives projected by public media may influence the public's understanding of

IPV and the views of those who develop public policy (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). Colleges may

consider the influence public media has on students when developing campus policies and when

educating students on identifying IPV for reporting purposes. Research studies provided evidence that a form of learning takes place when people take on beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors after reading or watching a story (Hoeken et al., 2016). Colleges have media at their disposal to share stories to influence college students' perspectives of IPV and educate students about available support services. College media can counter the public media by identifying the IPV victim as the protagonist and remove the stigma associated with reporting IPV. College media raises awareness of IPV, with public media attention and local government participation, to reduce the number of victims who suffer repeat incidents of IPV, increase reports of IPV and increase the number of perpetrators of IPV brought to justice. College media may include college papers, college radio, and college social media to influence students' understanding of what IPV is, the consequences of IPV relationships, and that under no circumstances should IPV be tolerated or accepted.

The HBUC Experience

Kourtni Mason, a student who attended law school at an HBCU, described his HBCU experience to Oguntoyinbo (2012):

One of the great things is the familial side you feel when you walk through the door," says Mason. "There's not one person you don't feel comfortable going to. They put us in situations where we can succeed. The help you get here is unmatched. Talk to students from LSU, Tulane, and Loyola. None of them feel as connected. We are in a nurturing environment. (p. 13)

Van Camp, Barden, and Sloan (2010) conducted a study using a quantitative approach to explore the experiences and results of race-related reasons for why students choose to attend an HBCU. The researchers found that most students who had less contact with other African

Americans while growing up or more central racial identities chose an HBCU for race-related

reasons. They indicated higher predictions to engage in activities like race-oriented clubs and

personal reading to develop ethnic identity (Van Camp et al., 2010).

Today students may choose to attend an HBCU or may choose to attend a Predominantly

White Institution (PWI). During the period after the Civil War, known as the Reconstruction Era

in American (1865–1877), formal education at public institutions prohibited African Americans

from attending (Encyclopedia Britiannica, 2014). African Americans established HBCUs to

educate African Americans to construct human, social, and economic capital for African

Americans (Wiggan, 2011). The complex African American history and other present-day socio-

political and personal experiences influenced Kourtni Mason's HBCU experience (Oguntoyinbo,

2012) and the HBCU choices of today's African American freshmen (Van Camp et al., 2010).

Likewise, African Americans respond to violence as affected by their complicated history and

present-day socio-political and personal experiences (Breiding et al., 2015).

Previous studies show inconsistent findings on differences in IPV based on race. Some

studies found socioeconomic status and race independently linked with IPV, to include the

research of Breiding, Black, and Ryan, (2008) and Vest, Catlin, Chen, and Brownson (2002), (as

cited by Barrick et al., 2013). Other researchers found socioeconomic status independently

linked with IPV, but not race (López-Cepero, Fabelo, Rodríguez-Franco, & Rodríguez-Díaz,

2016). The data from National Alcohol Survey (NAS) of the year 2000, reported that the

pervasiveness of IPV was highest among Black couples (23%), followed by Hispanic couples

(17%) and White couples 12%; (Barrick, Krebs, & Lindquist, 2013). An earlier study by Coker

(2000) found White women more vulnerable to IPV (as cited by Barrick et al., 2013). In contrast,

previous studies conducted by Bachman and Saltzman, 1995, and Hathaway, Mucci, Silverman,

Brooks, Matthews, and Pavlos (2000) found no differences among race (as cited by Barrick, et al., 2013).

HBCU Assaults

In a study titled, "Intimate Partner Violence Victimization Among Undergraduate Women at HBCUs," the researchers estimated the pervasiveness of IPV and factors linked with experiencing IPV among undergraduate women attending HBCUs (Barrick, Krebs, & Lindquist, 2013). The study results indicated a high rate of victimization. Still, findings suggested that factors related to women victims who attended HBCUs were analogous to the elements related to women in the general population, as found in prior research. However, some risk factors were distinctively associated with undergoing specific kinds of IPV. The distinctive risk factors included marital status, race, attending bars or clubs, and prior physically forced sexual assault victimization.

Barrick et al. (2013) cited earlier research by Vest et al. (2002). Vest et al. (2002) indicated that women who are single, divorced, or separated are more likely to experience IPV than married women. Still, Barrick et al. (2013) concluded from their study that marital status or length of the relationship among Black women had no impact on IPV (Barrick et al., 2013). They also concluded that Black women who drank infrequently were more likely to experience IPV than White women who occasionally drank (Barrick et al., 2013). Muehlenhard, Peterson, Humphreys, & Jozkowski (2017) conducted a quantitative study titled, "Evaluating the One-in-Five Statistic: Women's Risk of Sexual Assault While in College. What percentage of women are sexually assaulted while in college?" The researchers compared the statistics of sexual assault victims who attended HBCUs and those who attended non-HBCUs. Their study results were similar to Barrick et al. (2013) regarding infrequent drinking and IPV. They used data from

the Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study and the HBCU-CSA Study conducted by Krebs, Barrick, Lindquist, Crosby, Boyd, and Bogan, (2011). They found the statistics for physically forced sexual assault the same for both HBCU victims and victims at other colleges and universities, at 4.7%. However, the statistic for women victims at other colleges and universities for incapacitated sexual assault of 11.1% is substantially more significant than the statistic for HBCU women of 6.4% (Muehlenhard et al., 2017). Incapacitated sexual assault is defined as being passed out, drugged, drunk, or asleep when the attack occurred (Muehlenhard et al., 2017).

HBCU IPV Disclosure

Lindquist, Crosby, Barrick, Krebs, and Settles-Reaves (2016) conducted a study, "Disclosure of Sexual Assault Experiences Among Undergraduate Women at HBCUs," to document sexual assault experiences that were disclosed by women who attended HBCUs. The researchers found the majority of students who attend HBCUs disclosed the incident informally, to someone close to them, and avoided formal reports to law enforcement agencies. The researchers used a qualitative approach for students to identify strategies to increase official reports. The students suggested education and awareness about sexual assault, which supports the need to understand how first-generation African American first-year students define and identify IPV. The students also identified more survivor services, other methods for reporting, and improved tactics for protecting the confidentiality of survivors. These strategies demonstrate the students were concerned with the potential consequences of reporting violence vs. the possible effort to manage secrecy as supported by the CPM theory. The researchers concluded there is a need for efforts to increase reporting of sexual assault on HBCU campuses, like peer education, and procedures to heighten confidentiality. However, the study did not address how students who attended HBCUs define and identify sexual assault.

Barrick et al. (2013) found childhood violence was also related to IPV among both Black and White women, as supported by the SCT (De Graaf et al., 2012) and the Attachment Theory (Bowlby, 1982; Kishor & Johnson, 2004). Barrick et al. (2013) attempted to fill gaps in the literature by identifying factors associated with experiencing physical, sexual, verbal, or controlling forms of IPV among undergraduates who attended HBCUs, considering that prevention and risk reduction are influenced by factors differently among African Americans than the general population. Barrick et al. (2013) did not address how first-generation African American males and females define and identify IPV. However, their results suggested the need to educate HBCU males about all forms of IPV.

Review of Methodological Issues

This intrinsic qualitative single case study considered the research methods used by previous researchers since, in most instances, the research methods previously used limit the literature on a topic (Boote & Beile, 2005). The review for this study considered methodological strengths and weaknesses and used methodologies that may offset the weaknesses and patterns based on qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods.

Lelaurain et al. (2018) used a mixed methodologies approach to conduct a correlational case study to gain an understanding of the reasoning that may lead to an acceptance of IPV in France, where IPV is the leading cause for disabilities and premature deaths (Lelaurain et al., 2018). The study, "One Doesn't Slap a Girl but . . .' Social Representations and Conditional Logics in Legitimization of Intimate Partner Violence" included 12 men and 12 women participants between the ages of 20 and 30 who expressed their opinion about a vignette depicting IPV by a male perpetrator on his girlfriend who was flirtatious at a party. The researchers used a qualitative method to interview participants to explore the attitudes of IPV

against women. A questionnaire followed as a quantitative method to analyze the participants'

reasons for IPV against women, as it relates to social representations and conditional reasoning.

The Lelaurain et al., (2018) study corresponds with the research questions for this proposed

study:

- How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college

  freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence

  (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions

  of IPV?

- How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college

  freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence

  (IPV)?

There is minimal research to create awareness campaigns and multidisciplinary research

for IPV (Lelaurain et al., 2018). In the United States, the VAWA of 1994 intended to address the

absence of legal response to violence against women across the United States. Many of the

VAWA directives summarize recommendations that states could choose to adopt into their state

laws, but state laws are inconsistent. For example, some states extend the definition of IPV to

include emotional abuse, and other locations do not (Hefner et al., 2018). The results of this

intrinsic case study gave insight for investing research on the national level in creating awareness

campaigns and multidisciplinary research among college communities, and federal, state, and

local governments, regarding a consistent definition for IPV.

The Lelaurain et al. (2018) study involved identifying the reasoning for validating IPV

against women and provided several recommendations toward prevention. The strength of the

study is the results may provide information to French authorities who implement public

awareness campaigns in France. This intrinsic case study gained an understanding of how African Americans, who are first-generation college freshmen and attend a 4-year university, define and identify IPV. Similarly, this may supports college safety advocates to implement or improve IPV awareness on college campuses. Lelaurain et al. (2018) did not intend to directly change the attitudes of individuals who justify IPV against women. Instead, they expected public awareness campaigns to indirectly destroy the beliefs and norms that contribute to justifying violence toward women. Another strength of this study is that it intended to change the mindset of blaming the victim and help individuals to identify abuse and report it (Lelaurain et al., 2018).

Lloyd and Ramon (2017) studied media implications on the public's understanding and policy development on domestic violence and intimate partner domestic violence involving family members, irrespective of gender and sexuality, aged 16 or above. The destruction included psychological, physical, sexual, financial, and emotional forms of abuse through an incident or patterns of incidents of controlling, coercive, or threatening behavior. In their review of the literature, they identified a gap in the research. Lloyd and Ramon (2017) noted a stigma attached to victims of IPV, whereas for other crimes, the stigma attached to the offender. The researchers stated this stigma as a barrier that stops women from accessing potentially supportive services. To explore whether attitudes of the media have changed during the first decade of the 21st century, the researchers studied how the media portrayed women who experienced IPV and the qualities attributed to them. They noted the conditions associated with the perpetrators, mostly men, and whether the experience is recognized as a social issue or only as a personal one.

Lloyd and Ramon (2017) conducted a qualitative study using the UK Newspapers, the Guardian, and the Sun from 2001 to 2002 and 2011 to 2012. They found that coverage was not reported as IPV. The terms used in articles were a domestic row, disturbance, argument, strife,

and marital difficulties, and the newspapers focused on severe incidents rather than typical everyday incidents of IPV. The themes noted were blaming the victim, the "ideal" victim, domestic violence campaigning, sexualizing domestic violence, and scaremongering. The researchers suggested that a lack of consistent language may cause public unconsciousness. The articles spoke of offenders having reason to abuse victims, blaming the abuse on victims cheating or causing financial problems in marriage. The strength of the research is its effectiveness to gather data as it compared the implications of the media regarding the public's understanding and policy development 10 years later. In analyzing the data, the researchers found that the number of articles reporting IPV rose during the 10 years with minimal change in the content coverage. They recommended future research to examine if debates on UK press regulations will have an impact on the UK news coverage on IPV and the perceptions of the public. The methodologies used for this research focused on how media coverage of IPV may impact public opinion.

The qualitative research conducted by Lloyd and Ramon (2017) to explore how media coverage of IPV may impact public perception aligns with the research questions for this intrinsic qualitative single case study. It explored the factors that influence how African Americans, who are first-generation college freshmen and attend a 4-year university, define and identify IPV. This study used questionnaires, scenarios, and interviews. Interviews gathered data from participants to determine if the media influenced how they define and identify IPV, resulting in differences in their definitions as influenced by the media compared to the meaning of IPV reported by the United States federal government CDC.

Lloyd and Ramon (2017) studied media implications on the public's understanding and policy development on IPV. The strength of the research is its effectiveness to gather data as it

compared the impact of the media regarding the public's understanding and policy development 10 years later. Another strength is the recommendation for further research to examine if debates on UK press regulations will have an impact on the UK news coverage on IPV and the perceptions of the public.

As a transformative author, Rasool (2016) used an exploratory qualitative research methodology based on the feminist standpoint theory to explore the experience of abused South African women to understand how battered women seek help. Rasool (2016) argued that the safety of the children of abused women motivated them to seek advice. The Rasool (2016) study coincides with the research questions for this study regarding the potential participants' local community and family environment, as South African migrants may be in the population of African Americans, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university.

Rasool (2016) collected data from 17 abused women in shelters in South Africa through interviewing and transcribing data in stages using ATLAS.ti, a computer package used to manage thematic data analysis. The main themes were developed based on the research questions and the first reading of the data. Next, the researcher allocated themes to codes and codes to chunks of data. Using ATLAS.ti, the researcher developed a diagram on how the various elements relate to each other. The researcher found that the women studied did not feel that seeking help for IPV was justifiable because of the extent to which abuse was normalized. Women remained in abusive relationships for the sake of the children (Rasool, 2016). Abuser's ill-treating children or exposing them to danger was the impetus for women to seek help. The research concluded that policy and practice need to encourage safety first rather than focus on perpetuating a particular family norm. Motivating women to deal with domestic violence at the onset is vital for the protection of both women and children, and a coordinated intervention

approach that deals with both women and children is needed. The researcher also noted that

society needs education about the effects on children living in IPV situations to spur action that

supports abused women's attempts to deal with domestic violence and to promote women to seek

help when subjected to IPV.

This qualitative intrinsic case study considered the methodological strengths of Rasool

(2016) to manage thematic data analysis and develop main themes based on the research

questions, scenarios, and the first reading of the data. In gaining an understanding of how first-

generation African American freshmen attending HBCUs define and identify IPV, themes

emerged as aligned with the research questions. The patterns supported determining if definitions

of IPV from first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU coincide or

contradict the meaning of IPV reported by the CDC resulted from the influence of being exposed

as children to abuse that was normalized. Rasool, S. (2016) used a qualitative research

methodology to understand how abused women seek help and managed thematic data analysis

similar to the coding for this study to comprehend how first-generation African American

freshmen who attend HBCUs define and identify IPV.

Othman, Goddard, and Piterman (2014) conducted an exploratory qualitative study,

"Victims' Barriers to Discussing Domestic Violence in Clinical Consultations: A Qualitative

Enquiry." This study investigated the barriers women were subjected to when they discussed the

abuse with health care providers, specifically Malaysian women, with a history of IPV. The

researchers held interviews with 10 women they selected using purposive sampling until data

saturation. They further analyzed themes that emerged from the interviews to examine the

barriers the women faced. Some restrictions uncovered by the study included privacy, gender

roles, family unity, shame, self-blame, and fear of the abuser. The investigation disclosed

influenced decisions not to seek help. Muslim women discussed fate, and Buddhist women discussed karma. Othman et al. (2014) found religious beliefs have led to accepting abuse and have prevented victims from seeking help. The Othman et al. (2014) study aligns with the research questions for this study, as culture and religion may contribute to how African Americans, who are first-generation first-year college students define and identify IPV in ways that may compare or contrast with the CDC's definition of IPV.

On the national level, many colleges across the United States may have international students, which may include Malaysian students, who may have witnessed IPV and the acceptance of IPV; due to barriers to disclosure faced by women in their local environments. The weakness of the Othman et al. (2014) study is that it consisted of experiences of women who used the single shelter location of the study. It may be likely that the study participants suffered severe IPV, which led them to leave their homes. The women volunteered to participate in the study. Therefore, the researchers could not determine the differences between the participants and the non-participants who were using the shelter. Othman et al. (2014) recommended further research to assess the perspectives of Malaysian society and health care professionals regarding IPV and disclosing abuse. Such weaknesses are inherent in studies that use qualitative methods. The research strength that may overcome the inabilities to generalize the study results is to leave the usefulness of the study to the reader. The reader can extend findings from the research that is useful to their settings (Lodico, Spaulding & Voegtle, 2010).

Bottoms et al. (2016) used a quantitative correlational methodology to hypothesize that IPV victims would be more likely to disclose abuse to family and friends than to persons perceived as having official authority. Their study, "Abuse Characteristics and Individual Differences Related to Disclosing Childhood Sexual, Physical, and Emotional Abuse and

Witnessed Domestic Violence," corresponds with the research questions for this intrinsic qualitative single case study. The local laws of the community of the family residence of first-generation African American freshmen attending HBCUs may influence how they define, identify, and report IPV, as the hypothesis of the Bottoms et al. (2016) study has the family and law components.

The Bottoms et al. (2016) study included 1679 women undergraduates. The researchers used an anonymous survey methodology to give participants the confidence to provide honest answers. They defined abuse objectively by using a checklist and subjectively with a question about being perceived as a victim. Using multiple focused questions that define specific behaviors may have encouraged more respondents to acknowledge the abuse, reducing the tendency to underreport (Lyon, 2009, as cited in Bottoms et al., 2016). They found that victims who perceived themselves as victims were approximately twice more likely to disclose abuse than were victims who had similar experiences but did not consider themselves to be victims. Of the 1,679 participants, 853 (51%) had experienced some form of abuse.

Disclosure of physical abuse was related to experiencing more frequent abuse by the same and multiple perpetrators, being less emotionally close to the perpetrator, being older when the violence ended, being more worried and upset, and self-labeling as a victim. Disclosure of emotional abuse was associated with being older when the destruction ended and being more concerned and confused. The revelation was unrelated to victim demographic characteristics or defensive reactions, except that among physical and emotional abuse victims, victims that used repressive coping were less likely to disclose than those who did not use repressive coping. Disclosure of witnessing IPV was not significantly related to any factors measured. The Bottoms et al. (2016) study revealed that a significant number of victims never disclosed the abuse at all,

and even when they did, disclosure did not lead to a formal investigation and did not bring an end to the violence.

Bottom et al. (2016) provided their study participants with an objective definition of IPV, as well as a subjective interpretation for a quantitative study. The subjective definition may have required clarity, but without contacting participants, the researchers may not know if the participants fully understood the meaning. This weakness may be offset by conducting mixed methods research.

One of the methodological strengths of Bottoms et al. (2016) study is that the participants were provided the definition of abuse objectively by using a checklist. Another advantage is the research of Bottoms et al. (2016) was not only on the disclosure and nondisclosure of sexual and physical abuse as children but also the emotional harm resulting from witnessing IPV as children; not previously addressed in the literature. The study was further strengthened by the surveys being anonymous, which may have given the participants the confidence to provide honest answers. The quantitative study included a subjective question about the participants' perception of themselves as a victim. The strength of the study may have increased if it included further research using a mixed-method methodology to provide more insight into the responses to the subjective question about what may have influenced the perceptions of the participants (Bottoms et al., 2016).

The researcher for this study considered the research methods used and the strengths and weaknesses of the research methods in literature when selecting an intrinsic single case study. She used a qualitative methodology to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen attending HBCUs define and identify IPV. In her review, the researcher considered methodological strengths of the qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods

research, as well as the weaknesses, and used similar methodologies that may offset the weaknesses.

Synthesis of Research Findings

The focus of this literature review began with the prevalence of IPV and how it impacts families, education, and the U.S. economy. Studies show many factors may contribute to normalizing IPV to the extent that it has differing definitions and not routinely identified as IPV. Some elements found in the review of the literature for this study that may influence one's definition of IPV include demographics, culture, law intervention, religious beliefs, IPV exposure as children or adolescents, and depictions of IPV by the media.

Demographics may influence how an individual may define and identify IPV (Haselschwerdt & Hardesty, 2017). Nondisclosure of IPV contributes to normalizing IPV (Ragavana et al., 2018). However, the intended purpose for nondisclosure may not be to consider IPV as usual. Other factors may influence nondisclosure, include culture, religion, or financial security.

Culture and religious beliefs are factors that influence how IPV is defined and identified (Othman et al., 2014; Ragavana et al., 2018; Reckdenwald et al., 2018; Zust et al., 2018). Cultural influences may result in acceptance of IPV due to fear of the stigma of imperfection and community acceptance, or shame, resulting in managing IPV secrecy, which supports the CPM theory (Haselschwerdt & Hardesty, 2017). Some cultural norms that may influence how one might define and identify IPV include privacy, gender roles, family unity, shame, self-blame, and fear of the abuser (Ragavana et al., 2018). Religious influences include karma and fate (Othman et al., 2014). Often the IPV perpetrator is the family's primary financial source, which may result in nondisclosure to prevent the law from intervening, as support from family may dissipate from

reporting IPV (Haselschwerdt & Hardesty, 2017; Goodkind et al., 2003). Another reason for nondisclosure perceived as a family and cultural norms is for the security of having the needs of children satisfied (Rasool, 2016). The media may influence perceptions of IPV locally, nationally, and internationally (Hoeken, Kolthoff, & Sanders, 2016; Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). An example of an expansive media depiction of IPV is the Rhianna and Chris Brown story (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). IPV goes unidentified or not addressed due to the myriad of ways it may be normalized, but statistics provide an understanding of the impact IPV has on individuals, families, and economies (Breiding et al., 2015; New Hope for Women, 2018). However, there is a gap in the literature on how IPV is defined and identified by first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs in the eastern region of the U.S., specifically.

<h2 style="text-align:center">Critique of Previous Research</h2>

The research conducted by De Graaf et al. (2012) supported the SCT, and the research that was undertaken by Kishor and Johnson (2004) endorsed the attachment theory. Haselschwerdt and Hardesty (2017) conducted a study on IPV victims from an affluent community and compared how they managed secrecy, disclosure, and help-seeking strategies. This phenomenon is called communication privacy management and forms the basis of the CPM theory. The researchers' findings that the management of secrecy and disclosure functioned within gender and class associations and ongoing negotiations to conceal and reveal IPV depended on the victim's environment supported the CPM theory.

Other researchers focused on diverse groups and injustices based on gender, race, ethnicity, disability, sexual orientation, and socioeconomic class that results in unequal power relationships and connects political and social action to these inequities (Coker, 2016; Reckdenwald, Yohros, & Szalewski, 2018). They considered a theory of views about how a

program operates and why the problems of repression, supremacy, and power associations exist. Others, (Heffernan, Blythe, & Nicolson, 2014; O'Doherty, Taket, Valpied, & Hegarty, 2016) focused on the research problem and considered all available methodologies to understand the problem. By using multiple research methods, they discussed different assumptions, different perspectives, and used different types of data collection and analysis based on using a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods. Haselschwerdt et al., 2018 and Wells et al., 2013 addressed the interactions of participants among others and the specific contexts in the environments they lived and worked to comprehend the historical and cultural settings of the participants.

It is evident in the literature there are differing definitions of IPV among local communities and federal agencies (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018). The differing interpretations may result in differences in identifying IPV to determine what to report as IPV. There is ample research on the factors that may influence the normalcy and acceptance of IPV. However, there is a gap in the literature on how IPV is defined and identified by first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs, specifically.

Chapter 2 Summary

Students who emerge on HBCU campuses may come from diverse environments and backgrounds, with different views and beliefs about IPV. The results of this study are to be used by IPV support service providers on college campuses to tailor IPV prevention efforts by addressing contextual, cultural, social, legal, and other factors to provide a safe learning environment on college campuses. Providing first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU an understanding of IPV risk factors and the critical factors for stopping IPV behaviors may break the cycle of repeated IPV behavior and IPV occurrences on college campuses.

Campus policymakers may incorporate an intersectional analysis into IPV prevention to consider the relationship of larger social structures to the individual experiences of first-generation African American first-year students who attend HBCUs in the eastern region of the United States. The results of this study relate larger social structures to student experiences to enable college policymakers to consider broader social systems that may result in changes in laws and social conditions surrounding HBCU campuses, as well as support student safety and retention. The results of this study demonstrate the need for college media to work with local public media to publicize a consistent definition of IPV and non-tolerance of IPV. Advertising non-tolerance of IPV on college campuses and supporting IPV campaigning may increase IPV awareness and support IPV prevention on college campuses.

This review of the literature included a review of conceptual frameworks, research, and methods and suggested differing definitions for IPV and factors that may influence how one might define and identify IPV, as well as a uniformed description of IPV (Breiding et al., 2015). However, there is a gap in the literature for how by first-generation African American freshman who attends HBCUs define and identify IPV, specifically. This review of literature develops a unique conceptual framework based on the SCT, the attachment theory, and the CPM theory to understand how first-generation African American first-year students who are attending a 4-year HBCU define and identify IPV. There is sufficient reason for thinking that an investigation examining the impact of the factors that may influence their understanding would yield socially significant findings. The literature review has provided strong support for pursuing a research project to answer the following research questions:

- How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence

(IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

- How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

Chapter 3: Methodology

This intrinsic qualitative case study gained an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV. Constructivists believe that people search for an understanding of the world they live in and create broad implications based on their experiences (Creswell, 2014). The researcher used the constructivist perspective to frame the responses to questionnaires and interviews to study how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV. Since students may converge on college campuses from various local communities, religions, and cultures, their definitions of IPV may vary. The researcher intricately considered the worldviews of the participants to construct their meaning of IPV based on the context of their social and historical interactions. The student definitions resulting from this study were compared to the description of the main types of IPV as defined by Breiding et al. (2015) in a 2015 survey conducted for the CDC to determine if the definitions are consistent.

How college students define and identify IPV is significant to the prevention of IPV on college campuses, as identifying and reporting IPV supports IPV prevention (Hollister et al., 2017). Thus, IPV prevention is predicated on the assumption that first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU understand and can identify IPV. The results of this study may also be significant to other safety advocates, such as religious support groups, private and government human resource officials who support the safety of the work environment, and advocates for the protection of high school students. This chapter describes the research questions, statement of the problem, purpose, and design of the study, research population, and sampling method, instrumentation, data collection, identification of attributes, data analysis procedures, limitations, validation, expected findings, and ethical issues.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study are:

- How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

- How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

Purpose and Design of the Study

The purpose of this intrinsic qualitative case study is to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American Freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV. Hollister et al. (2017) noted the prevention of IPV on college campuses relies on the student's ability to identify IPV and their willingness to report it. Yet, IPV is one of the most underreported crimes (Iratzoqui & McCutcheon, 2018). It is crucial to understand how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define IPV because the key to IPV prevention assumes that first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU can define and identify IPV. Researchers have studied factors that influence individual perceptions of IPV, to include demographics, religion, culture, early learning (Wells et al., 2013; Othman et al., 2014; Rasool, 2016; Ragavana et al., 2018) and the media (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). There are differing definitions of IPV among local communities and federal agencies (Bottoms et al., 2016; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2018). Different meanings may result in

differences in identifying IPV to determine to report IPV; and a gap in the literature on how IPV is defined and identified by first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU, specifically.

The research design approach was selected based on the literature about the factors that may influence how first-generation African American newcomers who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV that aligns with the themes that may emerge from the research questions. Bottoms et al. (2016), Lloyd and Ramon (2017), and Lelaurain et al. (2018) conducted exploratory case studies that align with the research questions for this intrinsic qualitative single case study.

The problem addressed in this case study is the ability of first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU to identify IPV based on their understanding of how IPV is defined. Through an intrinsic qualitative case study, it was possible to learn more about the factors that may influence the first-generation African American freshmen,' who attend an HBCU, understanding of what defines IPV and their ability to identify IPV. The case study used individual questionnaires and scenarios followed by interviews with selected participants (see Appendices A, B, C, and D). Closing this gap in knowledge may support college safety advocates to determine if there is a need to start or improve IPV awareness programs to provide students an understanding of a consistent definition of IPV that is per the true meaning of IPV reported by the CDC.

Research Site, Research Population, and Sampling Method

Research Site and Research Population

This study took place in the community of an HBCU in the eastern part of the United States. The 2019–2020 student population was approximately 4,000 undergraduate students, of

which about 30% were first-generation undergraduates. Nearly 1,500 of the undergraduate students were between the ages of 18 and 19. The female undergraduate population is nearly double the male undergraduate population. The total student body consists of almost 60% females and about 40% males. By race/ethnicity, less than 50 students self-identified as White, over 1,000 Black, and less than 10 Asian.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2017), the number of African Americans, ages 25 and over who have completed 4 years of college practically doubled from 1993 to 2017 (Chen, 2017). This trend demonstrated the likelihood of an increase in first-generation African American freshmen to support this research. IPV exists across all races, ethnic groups, socioeconomic, and educational backgrounds, and all types of intimate relationships. The NISVS (2010) conducted for the CDC resulted in findings to support that Black communities mutually experience and respond to violence as affected by their complicated history and interconnects with other present-day socio-political and personal experiences. A homogenous selection of first-generation African American freshmen enrolled in a 4-year HBCU located in the eastern region of the U.S. provided for a careful selection of individuals that showed similar characteristics (Lodico et al., 2010). The similar features include age and similar perspectives about dating, including views on intimacy and gender roles and responsibilities in relationships.

The researcher distributed recruitment flyers to freshmen students at the research location, but every freshman on campus was not a first-generation African American. Sixteen hundred recruitment flyers were distributed, with an expected exposure to 160 first-generation African American students. A conservative estimate of 9% of the first-generation African American student population exposed to the recruitment flyer yielded 15 study participants, six males, and nine females, who consented to participate and completed the questionnaires and

63

scenarios, which aligns with the school's population of approximately 40% males and 60% females. Ten of the 15 participants met with the researcher for an interview. The 10 interviewees consisted of four males and six females.

Sampling Method

This intrinsic qualitative case study used purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling engages the selection of participants who have knowledge or information connected to the purpose of the research (Lodico et al., 2010). The objective of purposeful sampling is to choose persons, places, or things that can support rich and most comprehensive information to aid in answering the research question (Lodico et al., 2010). The goal of fundamental research is not to achieve a large representative sample, but to select persons who can support the rich and most detailed information to assist in answering the research questions (Wiebe, Durepos, & Mills, 2010).

Planned recruitment was for the distribution of 1,600 recruitment flyers on community boards at the 4-year HBCU located in the eastern region of the U.S. and on community boards of businesses surrounding the HBCU campus where students frequent, such as Starbuck's, Chipotle, and Panera Bread. Instead, the researcher distributed 1,600 recruitment flyers at the school's student union building, as an outreach event set up by the school's Director of Student Conduct.

<div align="center">

Instrumentation

</div>

The case study approach that uses a qualitative methodology comprises a collection of multiple sources of data, such as interviews, focus groups, and observations (Crowe et al., 2011). Unlike the quantitative research methodology that uses data gathering in the form of numbers, observations, interviews, documents, and artifacts are primarily used to gather qualitative data

(Polkinghorne, 2005). The use of various sources of data has been encouraged as a means of increasing the validity that the method is fitting to answer the research questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mason, 2002; Stake, 1995). In other words, the various methods used to collect data allows for studying an issue from different approaches to create a whole picture, as the data collected from each technique should lead to comparable conclusions (Crowe et al., 2011). To gain an in-depth understanding of how first-generation African American students who attend a 4-year HBCU define and identify IPV for this qualitative intrinsic case study, questionnaires and scenarios, followed by interviews, were used to gather data.

Questionnaire

A structured questionnaire was used for this intrinsic qualitative single case study, requiring the participants to check responses from a list of given answers (see Appendix B). The benefit that questionnaires add to research studies is that questions are standardized, and it asks all participants the same inquiries and in the same order (McLeod, 2018). Therefore, duplication of the questionnaire is possible to confirm its reliability and may be used by a second researcher to check that the results are consistent (McLeod, 2018).

The questionnaire uses responses from the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010–2012 State Report. Written permission was acquired from the researchers at the CDC to use the NISVS Victimization Survey, with the understanding of minor revisions to suit the research (see Appendix H). The NISVS Victimization Survey includes sexual violence, stalking, psychological aggression, and coercive control by an intimate partner and does not include items that are not IPV.

The questionnaire for this qualitative intrinsic case study was not a replica of the NISVS Victimization Survey. It is titled, The Intimate Partner Violence Questionnaire, and was not used

by the researcher as an extension of the CDC's NISVS study or to add participants to the State Report. The study participants who completed the NISVS Victimization Survey were identified as victims of IPV and completed the survey to determine the IPV they experienced. The research for this study is to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen, who attend HBCUs, define and identify IPV to support the prevention of becoming victims or perpetrators of IPV. As discussed in Chapter 1, identifying and reporting IPV supports IPV prevention. This study adds to the body of knowledge and understanding of IPV based on how first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs define and identify IPV.

Scenario

For this study, written scenarios were used as another document to collect data. Four of the scenarios described scenes that depict IPV, and one of the scenarios demonstrated a couple who had disagreements but made compromises, without resorting to IPV. The researcher requested the participants respond that the scene included IPV or did not include IPV. The researcher used scenarios as an additional way to collect data to provide readers the rationale that data collection procedures and analysis were credible and to increase the validity that the method was suitable to answer the research questions. The use of various sources of data is a way to increase the validity that the method was fitting to answer the research questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mason, 2002; Stake, 1995). By using scenarios as other documents to collect data, also allowed for studying how first-generation African American freshmen define and identify IPV from a different approach (Crowe et al., 2011).

Wobschall (2014) created five closed-question scenarios for her quantitative research study, "Recognition, and Attitudes Toward Intimate Partner Violence Among Sampled University Students," to explore university students' awareness of instances of intimate partner

66

violence and their attitudes toward this issue. Her research also investigated students' knowledge of resources for victims of IPV. For this qualitative intrinsic single case study, the scenarios gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs identify IPV to support IPV prevention. Rather than investigating participants' knowledge of resources for victims, this qualitative case study adds to the body of knowledge of awareness of IPV amongst first-generation African American freshmen.

Wobshall (2014) scenarios and findings were used later in the quantitative research of Larsen and Wobschall (2016), "Perceptions of Intimate Partner Violence among University Students: Situational and Gender Variables," which results indicated that identifying IPV becomes more complicated without physical violence. This qualitative case study used the five scenarios to gain an understanding if first-generation African American freshmen can identify IPV without physical abuse.

The scenarios consist of closed questions that have been vetted by researchers of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), Forum on Public Policy Online (Larsen & Wobschall, 2016). Strengths for using the scenarios created by Wobshall (2014) are that it is economical, the questions are standardized, all respondents were asked the same questions in the same order, and scenarios are easy to replicate (McLeod, 2018). The researcher obtained permission to use the scenarios for this study from the researcher/creator (see Appendix H).

Interviews

The researcher conducted face-to-face interviews using semistructured, open-ended questions. Qualitative research uses open-ended questions when issues are not in categories but require more detail and discussion. Unlike closed questions, open items do not have preset responses. Therefore, they allow the researcher to gather more in-depth responses from

participants than closed inquiries and collect rich data (Harrell & Bradley, 2009; McLeod, 2018). For this qualitative intrinsic single case study, using open-ended questions allowed participants to respond to inquiries in their own words about what influenced how they identified IPV on the questionnaire and the scenarios. The open semistructured interview consisted of questions regarding psychological-coercive and psychological-aggressive IPV to gain an understanding of the factors that influence how first-generation African American freshmen define and identify IPV (see Appendix E).

The researcher recorded and transcribed interviews using an app called Rev.com and handwritten notes in case of equipment failure (Creswell, 2013). Rev.com is a web-based service that audio records and transcribes recordings verbatim. Communications are encrypted using HTTPS and Transport Layer Security (TLS), which also supports encryption of e-mails. This study used pseudonyms for participants to further protect their identity and increase confidentiality. The researcher used the transcripts to analyze the content of the interviews. For member checks, summaries of the interview conclusions were provided to participants by e-mail with a request for the participants to review and confirm their responses to the interview questions (see Appendix I). The researcher requested the participants reply to the e-mail with a confirmation or an edited answer.

Data Collection

Other aspects of the participants' lives were investigated by this study to gather a comprehensive understanding of students' perspectives of IPV. Thick descriptions made it necessary to use questionnaires, scenarios, and interviews as essential instruments (Lodico et al., 2010; Polkinghorne, 2005). Data collection and analysis was inductive (Lodico et al., 2010). As

68

such, for this qualitative intrinsic case study, many fragments of data was collected and steadily pooled to form a broader description and conclusion.

Triangulation is the practice of comparing data obtained from different sources or comparing the perspectives of various participants (Creswell, 2014; Crowe et al., 2011; Lodico, 2010; Powers & Knapp, 2011). This intrinsic qualitative single case study provides for a comparison of the perspectives of all participants to the CDC's definitions of IPV, and the results of the male and female comparisons to the CDC's definitions.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were distributed by e-mail to the first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU who chose to participate in this study. The Intimate Partner Violence Questionnaire lists 26 items (see Appendix B). Instructions asked study participants to identify the issues that are IPV by placing an X under the "Yes" or "No" columns beside each of the 26 items. The questionnaire used closed questions because the possible answers to what defines IPV is limited; it either is or is not IPV.

The questionnaire includes items on stalking, psychological aggression, coercive control, control of reproductive and sexual health, and physical violence by an intimate partner. Collecting data on how the participants identify IPV gave an initial glimpse to support the response to the initial research question:

How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

Scenarios

The five scenarios were preceded by a request for participants to place an X under "Yes" to the right for any scenario where they identified IPV, or an X under "No" where they did not identify IPV. Four out of the five situations contained IPV as defined as physical, sexual, or psychological harm to a person by a current or former partner or spouse. Identifying IPV scenarios in part supported the research question, How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)? Data collection for reporting IPV requires using open-ended questions. The scenarios do not address the research question regarding reporting IPV. The interview questions addressed the reporting of IPV.

Interviews

The interview protocol included a heading, consisting of the date, place, and names of the interviewer and interviewee, along with a final statement of thanks acknowledging the time the interviewee provided to the interview (Creswell, 2014). The discussion began with asking questions to collect nominal data of gender, number of parents in the home, parent's marital status, number of adults living in the house, and parent's educational status, followed by eight semistructured, open-ended questions. The nominal data collection emerged themes for analysis.

The participants were given up to 1 hour to respond to the interview questions in their own words. The researcher asked probing questions to collect full descriptions to answer the research questions, using a checklist to stay within the parameters of the research questions (Berg, 2007, as cited by Alshenqeeti, 2014). Thick descriptions included the thoughts and feelings of participants that contributed to how they define, identify, and report IPV and the factors that influence their knowledge of IPV. Thick descriptions resulted in dense interpretation,

and the full meaning of the research findings for the researchers, participants, and readers of the study results (Ponterotto, 2006). The checklist for probing questions included the parameters of comparisons to CDC definitions, identifying IPV, and reporting IPV.

Once the study interviews were complete, the researcher provided the participants the main types of IPV as defined by Breiding et al. (2015), a letter of thanks, and a $20 VISA gift card gratuity for participating in the study. Students may later reflect on how they define and identify IPV as compared to the true definition of IPV reported by the CDC (Breiding et al., 2015).

The recruitment flyers explained that participation is confidential and voluntary and that the purpose of the study was to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs define and identify IPV to support the prevention of IPV on college campuses. The questionnaires and scenarios provided a statement that participation was confidential and voluntary. At the start of interviews, the researcher informed participants that participation was confidential and voluntary, and participants would receive a $20 Visa gift card upon completing the study.

All participants were given 10 days to complete and return the questionnaire, responses to the scenarios, and completed consent form to the researcher by e-mail, using the e-mail address provided on the recruitment flyer, from their campus e-mail address. The researcher notified participants in response to their e-mail of the time and place for the interview and that they would receive their $20 Visa gift card from the researcher after the meeting.

The consent form was provided to participants by e-mail (see Appendix F). It provided an introduction with specific detailed information about the researcher and the research. It also provided information about the nature of the involvement of the students. The consent form

explained when the study would take place, with samples of questions, and a statement indicating assurance that the college student may discontinue from participation at any stage of the research. The consent form contained language to guarantee the confidentiality of individual results, and the telephone number of the researcher should the college student wanted further information. The consent form concluded with a space to be signed by the college student. The signed consent forms were returned to the researcher by the college students by campus e-mail, along with the completed questionnaire and scenarios. The researcher extended appreciation to students for considering the request.

To triangulate the data for this intrinsic qualitative single case study, the researcher compared data obtained from different sources and compared the perspectives of male and female participants (Creswell, 2014; Crowe et al., 2011; Lodico, 2010; Powers & Knapp, 2011). The researcher compared the perspectives of all participants to the CDC's definitions of IPV and analyzed the CDC/participant comparisons by gender.

Identification of Attributes

For this qualitative study, first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU is the link between identifying and reporting IPV on HBCU campuses. The perceptions of how first-generation African American first-year college students who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV can bring awareness to campus safety advocates of students' ability to identify IPV. Campus safety advocates may then determine if there is a need to develop programs to help students to define, identify, and report IPV. This qualitative intrinsic single case study considered the interpretation and meaning of IPV among first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU. The attributes for this study are IPV, first-generation African American male college freshmen, and first-generation African-American female college

freshmen. The definition of the main types of IPV for this case study is the definition provided by Breiding et al. (2015) in research conducted for the CDC, presented in Chapter 1 of this dissertation, as well as the definitions for African Americans and HBCU.

Data Analysis Procedures

Coding was used by the researcher to capture meaningful data that was collected into units and to organize the units of useful data (Alshenqeeti, 2014). When all completed questionnaires and scenarios were received, the researcher organized the data into groups. The first group, Group 1, consisted of the surveys and scenarios received from male participants. Group 2 consisted of the surveys and scenarios received from female participants. The researcher purchased a qualitative data analysis computer software 4-month limited license of NVivo for the initial coding of the questionnaire results for this study. Coding consisted of coding the category of student perspectives, with the code names of males and females. Also, the category Social Structure, to capture the code names of the nominal data of the number of parents in the home, parents' marital status, number of adults living in the house, and parents' education level. The category of Perspectives of Participants captured code names of males and females, such as perspectives on physical and nonphysical forms of IPV. Other code categories included Relationships to capture gender differences in their views of what is an intimate partner and Actions to seize actions perceived as IPV. Other codes emerged based on patterns in the data. Interviews provided clarity and captured perspectives on the meaning IPV to determine if the participants had similar interpretations of IPV and how their meanings were derived, as well as views on when to report IPV and to whom.

Transcripts of the interviews supported the analysis of the content and alleviated the need to attempt to reconstruct communications from the meeting (Alshenqeeti, 2014). The codes were

combined to examine the qualitative sub-questions used to guide the research to find the research themes. Themes are ideas that connect several codes to permit the researcher to explore the qualitative sub-questions that govern the research (Lodico et al., 2010). An example of a theme that developed from this study was the combination of several codes due to the same responses to interview questions from participants of the same gender. Themes supported the organization of ideas to re-examine the data to help explain the learning from the study.

Reexamining the data from multiple participants supported confirming evidence through triangulation (Polkinghorne, 2005). For this study, comparisons of the data obtained from the two different gender groups of participants supported triangulation, as well as the different perspectives obtained from the participants within the nominal categories. The study findings are presented in the traditional style of research reports, including an introduction, review of literature, research method, results, and discussion sections, to include an analysis of themes (Lodico et al., 2010).

<div align="center">

Limitations and Delimitations of the Research Design

</div>

Limitations

Limitations are possible weaknesses in a study that the researcher cannot control (Simon, 2011). Time was a limitation for this study because the study was conducted over a definite period and was reliant on situations occurring during that time (Simon, 2011). For example, current events in media or scenes from a movie that was popular at the time of the study may have influenced participants' responses.

This qualitative intrinsic case study involved gaining an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV. The participants were first-generation, African American first-year students attending an HBCU in

the eastern region of the U.S. The views of the participants for this study may not reflect the understandings of all college students and cannot be generalized. The selection of participants for this study was from purposive sampling, which can lead to researcher bias (Hatch, 2002). The selected small sample of participants makes it so that the researcher cannot apply the study results to a larger population. Inferences cannot be made from the findings of case studies because other explanations for the study results cannot be dismissed (Simon & Goes, 2013). However, for this qualitative case study, the college students were selected based on the specific selection criteria needed for the research (Hatch, 2002), and knowledge acquired from this study may be transferred to similar settings based on the judgment of the reader (Creswell, 2014).

This study used the NISVS and scenarios previously used for the Larsen and Wobschall (2014) research (see Appendices A and B). The information obtained is partly limited to the accuracy of the instrument when using standardized instruments (Simon & Goes, 2013). Another limitation is that the questionnaire completed by participants may have led to inaccurate responses due to participant error or confusion. During the interviews, the researcher used opportunities to provide participants clarity for the questionnaire, scenario, and interview questions that may have caused erroneous responses or confusion.

Interviews pose the limitation of participants providing answers they think the researcher would like to hear (Hatch, 2002). To minimize this risk, the researcher avoided asking leading questions or responding to participants in ways that may have led them to specific responses. Interviews as data collection tools might also become limited by participants' reluctance to share information (Hatch, 2002) fully. The researcher minimized risk by reassuring confidentiality at the start of the interview, as well as during the meeting.

Delimitations

Delimitations are attributes that limit the scope of the research and define the boundaries of the research study (Simon, 2011). The researcher has control over delimitations as delimiting factors include the researcher's choice of objectives, research questions, variables, theoretical perspectives, research population, and research problem (Simon, 2011).

There are differing definitions of IPV and a gap in the literature on how IPV is defined by first-generation African American freshmen attending HBCUs, specifically. The participants for this study included college students who are already part of a college community. This qualitative case study does not include participants who are not the first-generation male and female freshmen enrolled as a full-time student at an HBCU in the eastern region of the United States. This study did not include participants that do not identify themselves as male or female. This qualitative case study did not seek out participants who have experienced IPV or were victims or perpetrators of IPV. The objective of this qualitative case study was to determine if first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU know the definition of IPV and can identify IPV for reporting IPV on college campuses. The researcher considered that if students cannot define IPV, they may not be able to identify and report IPV. Therefore, this qualitative case study did not include an exploration of student knowledge of IPV reporting procedures at their institutes of learning.

Validation

Dependability

Dependability refers to if the procedures and processes used to ensure that the collection and interpretation of data can be tracked (Powers & Knapp, 2011). It follows the concept of the audit trail, that if another researcher followed the same procedures and processes, they would get similar results. This qualitative intrinsic case study used questionnaires, and scenarios vetted in

previous research. The questionnaires and scenarios were followed by interviews that were audio-recorded and transcribed using an encrypted web-app to support dependability (Alshenqeeti, 2014).

Credibility

Credibility in a qualitative study demonstrates extensive evidence that the researcher accurately represents the perspectives of the participants (Lodico et al., 2010). A qualitative researcher will collect multiple sources of data to ensure a deep understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV. Taking part in meaningful exchanges with participants in the context of their social and historical interactions increases creditability (Lodico et al., 2010). The process of triangulation is to use more than one approach to data collection in the same study and compare the study results through these various methods and strategies to ensure validity (Creswell, 2014; Crowe et al., 2011; Lodico, 2010; Powers & Knapp, 2011). For this qualitative case study, the researcher collected data using questionnaires to include responses to scenarios, followed by interviews to seek out a balanced view of all perspectives. To further support credibility, the summaries of the interview conclusions were provided to the participants by e-mail for member checks to ensure researcher bias did not influence the perspectives of the participants (see Appendix I). The researcher used member checking to confirm that the data obtained were complete and accurate interpretations of participants' explanations (Creswell, 2014; Crowe et al., 2011; Lodico, 2010; Powers & Knapp, 2011).

Transferability

Although findings resulting from qualitative research are not to be generalized, knowledge acquired from studying one setting may be useful to similar settings based on the

judgment of the reader (Creswell, 2014). As such, transferability is not whether the study

contains a representative sample, it is how well the study gives the potential for readers to

determine if similar practices will work in their settings, by understanding how they may occur at

the research sites. Therefore, the researcher described the data and sources so that readers can

make judgments about the information provided (Ponterotto, 2006; Hatch, 2002). The researcher

included detailed descriptions to enable readers to make judgments about the similarities of the

study participants, schools, resources, policies, culture, and other characteristics of the research

site and their sites.

Expected Findings

The researcher expected to discover participants' perceptions of how IPV is defined as

the resulting research for this study. First-generation African American first-year students who

attend HBCUs may emerge on HBCU campuses from different localities. The literature

demonstrates several factors that contribute to inconsistent definitions of IPV, including differing

and contradictory interpretations of IPV among local communities and federal agencies (U.S.

Department of Health and Human Services, 2018). First-generation African American freshmen

who attend an HBCU may emerge on college campuses from different cultures and religions.

The literature shows that culture and religion are other factors that may influence the perceptions

of what defines IPV (Wells et al., 2013). Other factors noted in the literature that may influence

perceptions of IPV are based on IPV exposure as children (Ragavana et al., 2018) and through

the media, to include news and entertainment (Lloyd & Ramon, 2017). The results of this

qualitative case study add to the literature by disclosing if there is a consistent definition of IPV

amongst first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU and how first-

generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define, identify and report IPV.

This qualitative case study provides an understanding of how the participants define and identify IPV and what factors may influence their perceptions.

Ethical Issues

Conflict of Interest Assessment

There is no foreseeable conflict of interest associated with this qualitative case study. Informed consent was obtained from college participants to protect them from harm and to ensure confidentiality. The researcher has no affiliation with the recruitment college, which reduced the chance that the researcher is biased toward participants' knowledge of how to define and identify IPV. The researcher gave participants a $20 Visa gift card after interviews as a gratuity for their time. The researcher assured the college student participants that any personally identifying information, such as names and addresses, will not be reported, nor will the names of the affiliated school.

The data collected for this study are stored on the researcher's password-protected laptop by the number and pseudonym assigned to each participant. The data does not contain personally identifying information, such as names and addresses, or the name of the institution. The researcher backed the data into the Cloud and will permanently delete the data from the laptop and Cloud 3 years after the research completion date.

Researcher's Position

The researcher's responsibilities included telling the study participants the protocols involved in the research, the risks and benefits, and the purpose and duration of the study (Hatch, 2002). The researcher assigned the participants numbers and aliases to maintain confidentiality and only provided the region of the country the institution is located, but not the institution's name (Hatch, 2002).

Ethical Issues in the Study

The process for this research required imposing on the lives of the participants in regards to the time to respond to questionnaires, scenarios and interview questions, and the sensitive nature of the research topic. Accordingly, the researcher for this study maintained high ethical standards. The researcher considered ethical issues at all stages, including ensuring confidentiality throughout the research and beyond and obtained the participants' informed consent before conducting research (Lodico et al., 2010).

An ethical challenge to the researcher resulted from the candidness of the interview process as it led participants to disclose information that they may subsequently regret. There was also the risk that the interaction between the participants and the researcher may have become therapeutic, which the researcher is not qualified to support. To overcome these challenges, the researcher repeatedly assured participants that the data collected would remain strictly confidential; their participation was voluntary, and they could withdraw from the study at any time (Lodico et al., 2010). The researcher upheld the rights of the study participants as autonomous beings (Belmont Report, 1978) and thwarted attempts to support therapy by providing full disclosure of the intent of the research, reiterating the purpose of the study, the role of the researcher and participant (Lodico et al., 2010). The researcher guided interviews to collect data within the parameters of the study (Berg, 2007, as cited by Alshenqeeti, 2014) to ensure benefits to the participants of this study and minimized any harm (Belmont Report, 1978). The researcher also complied with Concordia University–Portland's Institutional Review Board policies for human research subjects.

This qualitative intrinsic single case study gained an understanding of how the participants define and identify IPV and the factors that may have influenced their perceptions.

Although the study was limited to participants who are not victims or perpetrators of IPV, there was a risk that participants may have learned from this study that they were victims or perpetrators of IPV. The researcher minimized this risk by giving the participants contact information for IPV support and setting protocol that if at any time during the study, the participant felt they were victims or perpetrators of IPV that they should seek help. The researcher provided all participants the CDC uniform definition of IPV and contact information for support after the study.

As an African American female and once first-generation freshmen, the researcher may have shown bias in some way. To lessen the negative impact of bias, the researcher coded the data collected by themes before placing the themes in the nominal category of gender.

Chapter 3 Summary

The purpose of this intrinsic qualitative single case study was to is to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs in the eastern region of the U.S. define and identify IPV. The benefits of a qualitative single case study design are to examine a variety of evidence, such as responses to questionnaires, scenarios, and interviews, appropriate to answer the research questions (Yin, 2014). A qualitative single case study design was the best method for this study because the researcher was able to compare the meanings of the main types of IPV as defined and identified by the CDC (Breiding et al., 2015) to determine if the definitions and identifications were consistent with the CDC's definition and NISVS. The researcher was also able to compare male and female student definitions and identifications of IPV resulting from this study to determine if their descriptions and identifications were consistent with each other (Creswell, 2014; Crowe et al., 2011; Lodico, 2010; Powers & Knapp, 2011).

Chapter 4 includes an analysis of the data. The data analysis consists of a description of the sample. It also includes the research methodology, a summary of the findings, and a presentation of the data and results. The outline of the findings includes data summaries used to identify patterns or comparisons gleaned from coding, organized into themes. It also includes a presentation of study results and the data that answers the research questions:

- How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

- How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

Chapter 4: Data Analysis and Results

The researcher designed this qualitative intrinsic single case study to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend HBCUs in the eastern region of the U.S. define, identify, and report IPV. As such, this case study provided an opportunity to consider the participants' worldviews used to construct their definition of IPV based on the context of their social and historical interactions (Creswell, 2014; Ponterotto, 2006). Through triangulation, this study provided a comparison of perspectives of all its participants to the CDC's definitions of IPV and the results of the male and female comparisons to the CDC's definitions. Triangulation is the practice of comparing data obtained from different sources or comparing the perspectives of various participants (Creswell, 2014; Crowe et al., 2011; Lodico, 2010; Powers & Knapp, 2011). Data collection and analysis was inductive to use many fragments of data collected (Lodico et al., 2010) and steadily pooled to produce thick and rich descriptive data to form a broader description and conclusion (Ponterotto, 2006; Wolcott, 2009). The researcher used 26 survey questions, five short scenarios, and conducted face-to-face interviews of up to an hour to collect data from four male and six female participants, to address the research questions:

- How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

- How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

The researcher describes the sample and research methodology in Chapter 4. Chapter 4 concludes with a summary of the findings and a presentation of the data results.

During her working career, the researcher participated in supporting the protection of a co-worker from an abusive partner. As a professor, the researcher's employer mandates training that addresses what domestic violence is, recognizing the effects of domestic violence, and responding appropriately to victims. Historically IPV was called domestic violence (DV) to describe physical, sexual, or psychological harm by a current or former intimate partner or spouse, including heterosexual or same-sex couples (U.S. Department of Justice, 2017). The IPV term for intimate partner extends beyond a current or former intimate partner or spouse to include relationships typically resonating on college campuses. IPV considers an intimate partner as a person "with whom one has a close personal relationship," which may consist of emotional connectedness, regular contact, ongoing physical contact or sexual behavior, identity as a couple, and familiarity and knowledge about each other's lives" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 11). The relationship may consist of all or some of these factors and does not require sexual intimacy (Fohring & Duggan, 2018). Considering that prior learning from college prepares students to enter the workforce, the researcher had questions concerning what college students understand about IPV before they enter the workplace and how they formed their definition of IPV.

The researcher intricately considered the participants' worldviews to construct their meaning of IPV based on the context of their social and historical interactions. The student definitions resulting from this study were compared to the description of the main types of IPV as defined by Breiding et al. (2015) in a 2015 survey conducted for the CDC to determine if the definitions are consistent. To address the research questions, the researcher used the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS)Victimization Survey from the 2010–2012

State Report as a questionnaire, with minor revisions to suit this research study (see Appendix B). The researcher used five scenarios with closed-questions created by Wobschall (2014) to collect data. These scenarios increased the validity that the data was suitable to answer the research questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mason, 2002; Stake, 1995), and to study how first-generation African American freshmen define and identify IPV from a different approach (Crowe et al., 2011). The researcher conducted face-to-face interviews using semistructured, open-ended questions to gather more in-depth responses from participants, than the closed questions presented by the questionnaire and scenarios and to collect rich data (Harrell & Bradley, 2009; McLeod, 2018). Once completed, this series of data collection led to the process of data analysis and findings, as presented in this chapter.

Description of the Sample

The purposeful sample for this case study consisted of six male and nine female, first-generation African American freshmen. They attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the United States. The researcher collected the sample by distributing 1,600 recruitment flyers to students at the campus student union as an outreach activity coordinated by the school's Director of Student Conduct. The Director of Student Conduct advised that Mondays and Wednesdays between the hours of 10 AM and 2 PM the path leading to the students' dining facility was most populated. So, the researcher conducted the outreach activity along the path between the hours of 10 AM and 2 PM on a Wednesday. The researcher explained the purpose of the study and the steps required to complete participation to students who approached the table. Thirty-two students expressed an interest in participating in the study, 15 males and 17 females, and provided their campus e-mail addresses to receive the consent form, questionnaire, and scenarios. The researcher used data from 15 students who consented to participate in the study

and responded to the questionnaires and scenarios. Five of the 15 participants did not show for the interview. Therefore, the researcher collected additional data from interviewing 10 study participants, four males and six females. The pseudonyms for the four male participants who met with the researcher for an interview are Malcolm, Ricky, Aaron, and Deon. The pseudonyms for the six females who completed the interview are Brianna, Donna, Nicole, Leslie, Brittney, and Cynthia.

The 2019–2020 student population is approximately 4,000 undergraduate students, of which about 30% are first-generation undergraduates. Nearly 1,500 of the undergraduate students were between the ages of 18 and 19. The sample of participants from this population shared characteristics related to the case study (Hatch, 2002; Yazan, 2015). All were currently attending an HBCU in the eastern region of the United States and first-generation African American first-year students, most between the ages of 18 and 19. Some shared commonalities of being from single-parent households, households with two parents, or a home that included a grandparent, as well as similar perspectives about dating, to include views on intimacy and gender roles and responsibilities in relationships. All the participants' parents or guardians graduated from high school. However, the participants had individual worldviews and perspectives.

<h3 style="text-align:center">Research Methodology and Analysis</h3>

The methodological approach for this study was selected based on the literature about the factors that may influence how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV that aligned with the themes expected to emerge from the research questions. The problem addressed in this case study is the ability of first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU to identify IPV based on their understanding

of how IPV is defined. The researcher used an intrinsic qualitative case study to learn more about

the factors that may influence first-generation African American first-year students who attend

an HBCU understanding of what defines IPV and their ability to identify IPV. The researcher

collected data by using individual questionnaires and scenarios followed by interviews with

selected participants (see Appendices B, C, and D). Closing this gap in knowledge may support

college safety advocates to determine if there is a need to start or improve IPV awareness

programs to provide students an understanding of a consistent definition of IPV according to the

true meaning of IPV reported by the CDC.

Qualitative Intrinsic Single Case Study

This intrinsic qualitative single case study considered the research methods used by

previous researchers since, in most instances, the research methods previously used limit the

literature on a topic (Boote & Beile, 2005). The case study approach that uses a qualitative

methodology comprises a collection of multiple sources of data, such as interviews, focus

groups, and observations (Crowe et al., 2011). Unlike the quantitative research methodology that

uses data gathering in the form of numbers, observations, interviews, documents, and artifacts

are primarily used to gather qualitative data (Polkinghorne, 2005). The review for this study

considered methodological strengths and weaknesses and used methodologies that may offset the

weaknesses and patterns based on methods of previous studies. To gain an in-depth

understanding of how first-generation African American students who attend a 4-year HBCU

define and identify IPV for this qualitative intrinsic case study, questionnaires and scenarios,

followed by interviews, were used to gather data. The use of various sources of data has been

encouraged as a means of increasing the validity that the method is fitting to answer the research

questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Mason, 2002; Stake, 1995). In other words, the various

methods used to collect data allows for studying an issue from different approaches to create a whole picture, as the data collected from each technique should lead to comparable conclusions (Crowe et al., 2011).

Coding

The researcher used coding to capture meaningful data that the researcher collected into units and to organize the units of useful data (Alshenqeeti, 2014). As the researcher received completed questionnaires and scenarios, the researcher ordered the data into groups. The initial review of the data was to get a sense of the data. As the participants submitted their responses to the questionnaires and scenarios through Qualtrics, Qualtrics summarized the answers to report the statistics for each response. From the Qualtrics report of the number of replies where the participants did not identify stalking, psychological aggression-coercive control, and psychological aggression-expressive aggression, the main themes emerged. By examining the different sources of data together, including the CDC definitions, the researcher gained insight into the scope of data before organizing through codes. According to the Chapter 3 protocol, the researcher used Rev.com to record and transcribe the interview sessions, and codes emerged from the transcripts (Jansick, 2011). Therefore the researcher deviated from the Chapter 3 protocol to use NVivo for coding.

Other facets of the participants' lives were investigated by this study to gather an extensive understanding of students' perspectives of IPV. Thick descriptions made it necessary to use questionnaires, scenarios, and interviews as essential instruments (Lodico et al., 2010; Polkinghorne, 2005). Data collection and analysis was inductive (Lodico et al., 2010). As such, for this qualitative intrinsic case study, many fragments of data was collected and steadily pooled to form a comprehensive description and conclusion.

Triangulation is the practice of comparing data obtained from different sources or comparing the perspectives of various participants (Creswell, 2014; Crowe et al., 2011; Lodico, 2010; Powers & Knapp, 2011). This intrinsic qualitative single case study provides for a comparison of the perspectives of all participants to the CDC's definitions of IPV, and the results of the male and female comparisons to the CDC's descriptions.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires were distributed by e-mail through Qualtrics to the first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU who chose to participate in this study. The Intimate Partner Violence Questionnaire listed 26 items (see Appendix B). The instructions asked the participants for this study to identify the issues that are IPV. To identify IPV, the participants placed an X under the "Yes" or "No" columns beside each of the 26 items. The questionnaire used closed questions because the possible answers to what defines IPV is limited; it either is or is not IPV. The participants responded to the surveys and submitted their responses to the researcher through Qualtrics. Qualtrics provided statistics for each answer and a summary of the number of participants who identified IPV for each of the 26 IPV items listed.

The questionnaire included items on stalking, psychological aggression, coercive control, control of reproductive and sexual health, and physical violence by an intimate partner. Collecting data on how the participants identified IPV gave an initial glimpse to support the response to the initial research question:

How do African American males' and females', who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

Scenarios

Five scenarios were distributed by e-mail through Qualtrics to the first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU who chose to participate in this study. The researcher requested the participants to place an X under "Yes" to the right for any scenario where they identified IPV, or an X under "No" where they did not identify IPV. Four out of the five situations contained IPV as defined as physical, sexual, or psychological harm to a person by a current or former partner or spouse. The participants responded, whether or not they identified IPV in each scenario and submitted their responses to the researcher through Qualtrics. Qualtrics provided statistics for each answer and a summary of the number of participants who identified IPV or did not identify IPV in each scenario. Identifying IPV in situations in part supports the second research question:

How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

Interviews

Ten of the participants attended interview sessions to provide their perspectives for their selections on the questionnaires and scenarios. The participants responded to open-ended questions to define IPV. They replied based on their worldviews and perspectives. They addressed the second research question for this study:

How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

The interview protocol was to include a heading, consisting of the date, place, and names of the interviewer and interviewee, along with a final statement of thanks acknowledging the time the interviewee provided to the interview (Creswell, 2014). The researcher deviated from this protocol by not including the names of the interviewee in the heading. The researcher identified each interviewee by an assigned number, to further protect the confidentiality of the participants. The researcher assigned each participant number to a name the researcher used as a pseudonym for this study.

The discussions began with asking questions to collect nominal data of gender, number of parents in the home, parent's marital status, number of adults living in the house, and parent's educational status, followed by eight semistructured, open-ended questions. The researcher used the nominal data to describe the sample population and to determine if themes emerged for further analysis. The participants were given up to 1 hour to respond to the interview questions in their own words. The researcher asked probing questions to collect full descriptions to answer the research questions, using a checklist to stay within the parameters of the research questions (Berg, 2007, as cited by Alshenqeeti, 2014). The list for probing questions included the boundaries of comparisons to CDC definitions, identifying IPV, and reporting IPV. Thick descriptions included the thoughts and feelings of participants that contributed to how they define, identify, and report IPV and the factors that influenced their knowledge of IPV. Thick description resulted in dense interpretation, and the full meaning of the research findings for the researcher, participants, and readers of the study results (Ponterotto, 2006). The researcher continued to look for patterns within each participant's response to the interview questions and compared responses to examine commonalities.

Summary of the Findings

The findings suggest the student participants do not identify IPV the CDC defines as stalking. Particularly, unwanted phone calls or messages, hang-ups, text, or voice messages. Seven of the 15 participants who responded to the questionnaire did not identify this IPV item. Five of the 15 participants did not identify unwanted cards, letters, flowers, or presents. Six of the 15 participants did not identify unsolicited emails, instant messages, or sent messages through websites like MySpace or Facebook as IPV. During interviews, Malcolm stated, "Well, say that I did not list those as IPV because I can decide the inflow of certain things. I can block you and prevent both of those from happening. And if you create another, I can block that too."

Five of the 15 participants who responded to the scenarios did not identify psychological aggression-coercive control IPV, and three of the 15 participants who responded to the situations did not identify psychological aggression-expressive aggression IPV. The initial data generated by Qualtics from the participants' submission of responses to questionnaires and scenarios emerged psychological aggression-coercive control, psychological aggression-expressive aggression, and stalking as the main themes.

The participants' responses to the interview questions suggest they can define IPV and are willing to report IPV. They discussed who they would report IPV to, based on the context, as aligned with the CPM theory. However, where the participants did not identify IPV, the participants would not be able to report it. For example, Nicole defined how name-calling, humiliating, degrading, or acting angry in a way that seems dangerous is IPV. She did not identify the psychological aggression-expressive aggression IPV item "tell you that you are a loser, a failure, or not good enough" as IPV on the questionnaire. Nor did she identify "call you

names like ugly, fat, crazy, or stupid," and "insult, humiliate, or make fun of you in front of others" as IPV on the questionnaire.

When the researcher compared the participant responses to each other, there were no apparent differences in the results, resulting from differences in nominal data. Overall, the three main themes that emerged from the initial reading of the data are stalking, psychological aggression-coercive control, and psychological aggression-expressive aggression.

Presentation of Data and Results

The researcher organized the analysis of the data collected by research questions in which the themes emerged, supported by the codes the researcher used for data analysis (see Tables 1 and 2). The researcher explains each theme to help to answer both research questions and how she identified each theme from the data. The main themes emerged from the first reading of the data summarized through Qualtrics. Seven of the 15 participants who responded to the questionnaire did not identify stalking IPV. Three of the 15 participants who responded to the scenarios did not identify psychological aggression–coercive control IPV and, three of the 15 participants who responded to the scenarios did not identify psychological aggression – expressive aggression IPV. The researcher provides the scenarios in Appendix C.

The researcher interviewed the student participants to ask them open-ended questions to gain an understanding of how they define IPV to support the first research question:

How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

The researcher conducted interviews with 10 of the participants and asked open-ended questions to gain an understanding of how they define IPV. The researcher audio-recorded and

93

transcribed the interview sessions and coded the data from the transcriptions. For each of the main themes, stalking, psychological aggression-coercive control, and psychological aggression-expressive aggression, the codes control, and mistrust appeared. The researcher provides the interview questions in Appendix E.

Table 1

Definitions

Research Question Theme	Emergent Code
Stalking	Control, Privacy Invasive, Mistrust
Psychological Aggression- Coercive Control	Control, Emotional Abuse, Verbal Abuse, Mental Abuse, Manipulation, Fear, Mistrust
Psychological Aggression- Expressive Aggression	Control, Mental Abuse, Fear, Self-Esteem, Red Flag, Mistrust

The participants defined stalking as a form of control, lack of trust, and a violation of privacy. Leslie described stalking as controlling and emotionally and mentally harmful, as it "takes away your rights as an individual." Donna explained stalking as a violation of privacy, and Cynthia said stalking could limit your contacts and support if you need help. "It may isolate you from being able to talk to family or friends without the stalker being present." She described stalking as suffocating. Deon explained, "You should be able to trust your partner if you want to be in a relationship. And no one should have the most control."

The researcher asked four questions relating to psychological aggression-coercive control IPV. The participants also defined psychological aggression-coercive control IPV as controlling. Leslie described it as "being a toddler all over again, and you're not your own person. It could hurt you emotionally and mentally." When Brianna described how the exploitation of

vulnerabilities such as immigration status, disability, and undisclosed sexual orientation is IPV, she explained it in the following manner: "It's kind of like you're blackmailing them into getting what you want." Leslie responded similarly, " basically, you're blackmailing somebody if you use their immigration status." Other participants related psychological aggression-coercive control to manipulation and a lack of trust. Ricky said, "once you limit transportation or money or things that you know, your partner lacks just to prove a point or to send a message; it shows manipulation." Brittney explained gaslighting, which is psychological aggression- coercive control, as manipulative. She said, "They're trying to move you to think a certain way or be a certain way." When presented an example of an IPV perpetrator saying, "if you call the police, I could be deported," Brittney described it as "fear of the unknown." Deon expressed psychological aggression-coercive control regarding control of reproductive or sexual health as verbally and mentally abusive. He said, "by telling them that either you want to have children or I don't want to have children can play on their mental state, their emotional state." "you can be the main factor that gives someone a choice." "you both have to agree or not at all." Aaron described limiting access to money and transportation as a lack of trust, "So you can't tell somebody they can't do certain things or watch everything they do. You should be able to trust them."

Three of the interview questions pertained to psychological aggression-expressive aggression. Ricky described psychological aggression-expressive aggression IPV as controlling, mentally abusive, and fearful. Donna explained how expressive aggression lowers the self-esteem of the mate. When discussing psychological aggression-expressive aggression in a relationship, Malcolm said, "I would say it shows a red flag. I should be concerned regarding how you're thinking." "especially if you're my intimate partner. Because that means I've trusted

you to some regard." When defining IPV, Malcolm, Deon, and Aaron revealed an intimate partner as someone they should trust and who trusts them. The codes of control and mistrust emerged most frequently among the main themes.

The researcher used the participants' responses to the questionnaires and scenarios to collect data on how the participants identify IPV, as well as an interview question regarding reporting IPV to support the second research question:

How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

The analysis of the data collected from these sources emerged the codes in Table 2.

Table 2

Identify and Report

Research Question Theme	Emergent Code
Stalking	Unwanted Communications, Unwanted Articles
Psychological Aggression- Coercive Control	Control
Psychological Aggression- Expressive Aggression	Dangerously Angry, Insulting, Humiliating, Name-Calling
Report	Campus Police, Residence Advisor, Counselor, Title 9, Abuser/Abused Person, Friend, Mother, Director of Student Conduct, Trusted Adult

Questionnaires

Male participants response to the questionnaire. Malcolm identified 22 of the 26 IPV items on the survey as IPV. The four elements he did not identify involved nonphysical IPV:

1. Unwanted phone calls or messages This includes hang-ups, text, or voice messages.

2. Unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through websites like MySpace or Facebook.

3. Unwanted cards, letters, flowers, or presents.

4. {If female: try to get you pregnant when you do not want to become pregnant; If male: try to get pregnant when you do not want them to get pregnant} or try to stop you from using birth control.

During his interview session, Malcolm discussed how unwanted messages could be blocked. He considered cards and flowers and letters as IPV because it is harder to stop. When the researcher asked when you're blocking it, does it stop what they (stalker) are thinking? He responded with his perspective.

> I watched a Ted talk once, and a young lady, she was a librarian and had several degrees regarding library science, but she mentioned how she gets so frustrated when like on Facebook or social media are, what her friends call grammar Nazis. Her argument was if people are using it, and there's an understanding of it, it's a word regardless of it being in the dictionary or not. I would say the same thing about the CDCs definitions versus what people functioning would say is a definition. However, if people are going by this, then perhaps we should pay more attention to this versus what the definition is on paper.

Malcolm considered the fourth item listed above as IPV and said he missed selecting it.

Ricky identified 23 of the 26 IPV items on the questionnaire. The three IPV items he did not recognize are the first three items Malcolm did not identify, as listed above. Ricky stated he did not perceive the communications as constant. His perception was one party was trying to make contact after an argument. Aaron and Deon identified all 26 IPV items on the questionnaire as IPV.

Female participants response to the questionnaire. Brianna identified all 26 IPV items on the questionnaire as IPV, except the first item:

1. Unwanted phone calls or messages This includes hang-ups, text, or voice messages.

Donna, who identified 25 of the 26 IPV items on the questionnaire, did not identify the first item as IPV either. Nicole identified 22 of the 26 IPV items on the survey. She did not identify the second item:

2. Unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through websites like MySpace or Facebook.

Nicole defined psychological aggression-expressive aggression IPV during the interview, but she did not identify the following psychological aggression-expressive aggression IPV items listed as questions 9 through 11 on the questionnaire:

9. Tell you that you are a loser, a failure, or not good enough

10. Call you names like ugly, fat, crazy, or stupid

11. Insult, humiliate or make fun of you in front of others

Leslie, Brittney, and Cynthia identified all 26 IPV items on the questionnaire as IPV.

Scenarios

      Male participants response to scenarios. Malcolm did not identify IPV for three out of four scenarios that contained IPV. He did not identify psychological aggression-coercive control IPV in the scenario that described a male, Ben, who has requested his mate, Tammy, to change her clothing on several occasions. Malcolm explained that some might perceive provocative clothing as "an invitation." "So if you're with me, my responsibility is to protect you as best as I can. And so I want to control as many contributions and contributors to whatever may happen while you're with me so that I know that I can keep you safe, cause no problems with nobody." Malcolm did not identify psychological aggression-coercive control IPV in the scenario with Jessica and Tanner, where Tanner is consistently late to take Jessica to campus and says her degree isn't as important as their relationship right now. Malcolm explained that he does consider IPV in the scenario with Jessica and Tanner, and he might have missed identifying it as IPV in a rush. Malcolm did not identify psychological aggression–expressive aggression in the scenario with James and Stephanie, where James raises his hand to Stephanie and says she deserves to be slapped. He pointed out how he defined this form of IPV when answering the interview questions. Therefore, Malcolm demonstrated that he could define psychological aggression–expressive aggression IPV. However, he did not identify psychological aggression–expressive aggression IPV as presented in the scenario.

      Aaron identified IPV in all five situations, including the scene describing a compromising relationship between Steve and John. When we looked at that scenario during his interview, Aaron stated, "Honestly. I don't see IPV in that scenario." Ricky and Deon identified IPV in all four situations that contain IPV and did not identify IPV in the Steve and John scenario that does not include IPV.

Female participants response to scenarios. Brianna did not identify the psychological aggression-coercive control IPV in the scenario with Ben and Tammy, where Tammy often worries about what Ben's reaction will be to the outfits she chooses to wear. She said she pictured Tammy dressed inappropriately. "It's the same as if you wouldn't want him going out shirtless." Brianna did not identify IPV because she did not consider that Tammy was worried on several occasions. Brittney did not identify psychological aggression-coercive control IPV in the scenario with Jeffery and Stacy, which described Stacy as very jealous and possessive. Brittney said her thoughts were that Stacey and Jeffrey communicated what they wanted in their relationship. After reading the scenario during the interview, she concluded, "Yeah. That's, that's a little obsessive and controlling." Cynthia did not identify psychological aggression–expressive aggression IPV in the scenario with James and Stephanie, where James raises his hand to Stephanie and says she deserves to be slapped. After hearing the situation read aloud during the interview, she said, "That is (IPV), that is cause he raised his hand at her, and he told her she deserves to be slapped because he thinks she flirted."

Donna and Nicole identified IPV in the four scenarios that contained IPV. Leslie also identified IPV in the four situations that included IPV, but Leslie identified IPV in the Steve and John compromising scenario that does not include IPV. Leslie explained the context that she considered the third scenario is IPV.

> I feel like if they haven't come to an understanding together, they should look for an understanding. Let's say if one wants to have sex, and the other one doesn't. I think that instead of just coming to a compromise, you should be like, no altogether. Not saying, okay, I'll do this. Like I find that to be unfair because you're doing something with your

100

body that you don't want to do. But like if it's something lighter, like picking a restaurant or something, then that's fine. But like I just looked at it from that standpoint.

Reporting IPV

During the interview, the researcher asked the participants if they identified IPV on campus who would they report it and why? The participants told me numerous sources to include, the campus police, Residence Advisor (RA), a Counselor, the Director of Student Conduct, and Title 9 (referring to the Student Health Department). The researcher also asked the participants who would they report subtle forms of IPV, like gaslighting and mind games. They responded they would disclose it to a friend, their mother, or a trusted adult. A male participant said he would approach the abuser about being manipulative, and if the abuser does not positively respond, he would make the abused person aware. Another male participant considered the context. He said if a Counselor can handle it, he would not get the police involved. He also said he would go to someone trained to handle such matters or a trusted adult or mentor who could refer him to someone for help.

The participants disclosed they are willing to report IPV on campus, and they are aware of the reporting sources. However, the prevention of IPV on college campuses also relies on the student's ability to identify IPV (Hollister et al., 2017).

Chapter 4 Summary

Interpretation of the findings for this study is a multi-step process that began in Chapter 4, by describing the sample, the research methodology and analysis, summarizing the findings, and describing the presentation of data results. This chapter introduced the purpose of this study, along with the two central research questions. It contained a description of the sample and the steps to collect data. The researcher used questionnaires to compare how the participants defined

IPV to the CDC's definition. The researcher used scenarios to capture how participants identified

nonphysical IPV. The researcher interviewed participants face to face to obtain their worldviews

and perspectives on how they define, identify, and report IPV.

The selection of the case study as the study methodology was also justified in Chapter 4.

The researcher addressed a summary of the study findings. The researcher provided a detailed

presentation of the data and results with in-depth information as to how data were collected and

analyzed, step by step. The researcher organized the arrangement of these data and the results of

the research questions and emergent themes. The researcher explained the specific codes in detail

that emerged from the themes. The researcher presented the study data and findings as an

overview to provide detail of what happened during data collection and analysis. This chapter

established connections and explored understanding but did not draw conclusions. The

researcher presents the discussion and interpret the results and conclusions in Chapter 5. In

Chapter 5, the researcher discusses transferability and confirmability. The researcher also

provides conclusions and inferences that move beyond the data.

Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of Chapter 5 is to present the overall discussion of this study, the conclusions, and its implications. The researcher gives the key findings as related to the literature discussed in Chapter 2 and through the lens of constructivism, the conceptual framework that grounded this study. The researcher presents recommendations for future research and practice, policy, and theory as well.

Summary of the Results

Two central research questions guided this study:

- How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

- How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

The researcher created these questions to address the topic of inquiry: How college students define Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). The interviews provided rich and descriptive information about the sample of students. The results suggest that first-generation African American males and females can define IPV, and are aware of the sources to report or disclose IPV if they identify it on campus. However, they did not identify nonphysical IPV the CDC defines as stalking, psychological aggression–coercive control, and psychological aggression–expressive aggression.

Results: Research Question 1

The first question was, How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

The CDC defines stalking as a "pattern of repeated, unwanted, attention and contact that causes fear or concern for one's safety or the safety of someone else (e.g., family member, close friend)" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 14). The participants defined IPV involving stalking and provided descriptions, examples, and similarities, which emerged codes of control, privacy invasion, and mistrust (see Chapter 4, Table 1). Control emerged through discussions with the participants in regards to the stalker invading privacy and imposing on the rights of their mate, which compares to the CDC's definition of unwanted attention. Cynthia explained how staking controls communication with others who are outside of the relationship. "It may isolate you from being able to talk to family or friends without the stalker being present," Cynthia explained stalking could limit your contacts and support if you need help. Cynthia's explanation aligns with the CDC's definition of attention and communication that causes fear or concern for one's safety or the safety of someone else. Deon defined staking as control and distrustful, "You should be able to trust your partner if you want to be in a relationship. And no one should have the most control." These results demonstrate the participants define stalking as compared to the CDC's definition and respond to the first research question.

The CDC defines psychological aggression as "the use of verbal and non-verbal communication with the intent to: a) harm another person mentally or emotionally, or b) exert control over another person" (Breiding et al., 2015, p. 15). When the participants described

104

psychological aggression-coercive control, the codes control, emotional abuse, verbal abuse, mental abuse, manipulation, fear, and mistrust emerged (see Chapter 4, Table 1). Leslie described it as "being a toddler all over again, and you're not your own person. It could hurt you emotionally and mentally." Ricky said, "once you limit transportation or money or things that you know, your partner lacks just to prove a point or to send a message; it shows manipulation." When presented an example of an IPV perpetrator saying, "if you call the police, I could be deported," Brittney described it as "fear of the unknown." Deon expressed psychological aggression-coercive control regarding control of reproductive or sexual health as verbally and mentally abusive. He said, "by telling them that either you want to have children or I don't want to have children can play on their mental state, their emotional state." "you can be the main factor that gives someone a choice." "you both have to agree or not at all." Aaron described limiting access to money and transportation as a lack of trust, "So you can't tell somebody they can't do certain things or watch everything they do. You should be able to trust them." These results demonstrate the participants define psychological aggression-coercive control IPV comparable to the CDC's definition of psychological aggression and respond to the first research question.

When the participants described psychological aggression-expressive aggression, the codes control, mental abuse, fear, self-esteem, red flag, and mistrust emerged (see Chapter 4, Table 1). Ricky described psychological aggression-expressive aggression IPV as controlling, mentally abusive, and fearful. Donna explained how expressive attacks lower the self-esteem of the mate. When discussing psychological aggression-expressive aggression in a relationship, Malcolm said, "I would say it shows a red flag. I should be concerned regarding how you're thinking." "especially if you're my intimate partner. Because that means I've trusted you to some

regard." These results demonstrate the participants define psychological aggression-expressive aggression IPV comparable to the CDC's definition of psychological aggression and respond to the first research question.

Results: Research Question 2

How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

The codes that emerged for stalking were unwanted communications and unwanted articles (see Chapter 4, Table 2), which result from the participants not identifying these items as stalking. The CDC includes these IPV items as stalking in its full definition. Stalking is uninvited phone calls, emails, or texts, as well as leaving correspondence, or items, such as flowers, that the victim does not want. Not only does it include following, spying, or showing up in places, like the victim's home or car, it also includes damaging personal property, harming or threatening pets, and making threats to harm physically. It is a pattern of repeated, unwanted attention that causes fear or concern for the safety of an individual or their family or friends (Breiding et al., 2015).

During his interview session, Malcolm discussed how unwanted messages could be blocked. However, blocked or not, unwanted messages is stalking as defined by the CDC. Seven of the 15 participants who responded to the questionnaire did not identify stalking IPV. These results demonstrate the participants did not identify stalking IPV comparable to the CDC's definition of stalking to respond to the second research question.

When participants attempted to identify psychological aggression-coercive control IPV, the code control emerged (see Chapter 4, Table 2). The participants did not identify control as

IPV. When the researcher presented the participants with a scenario with psychological aggression-coercive control IPV, they did not identify control or condoned it. For example, Malcolm explained that some might perceive provocative clothing as "an invitation," when discussing Ben requesting Tammy to change her attire on several occasions. Malcolm condoned the control in this situation and suggested he would exert control in this situation. "So if you're with me, my responsibility is to protect you as best as I can. And so I want to control as many contributions and contributors to whatever may happen while you're with me so that I know that I can keep you safe, cause no problems with nobody." Brianna did not identify psychological aggression-coercive control IPV in the Ben and Tammy scenario either. She assumed that if Ben asked Tammy to change, Tammy was dressed inappropriately and compared her attire to not have on clothing. "It's the same as if you wouldn't want him going out shirtless." Brittney did not identify psychological aggression-coercive control IPV in the scenario with Jeffery and Stacy, which describes Stacy as very jealous and possessive. Brittney said her thoughts were that Stacey and Jeffrey communicated what they wanted in their relationship. However, if psychological aggression-coercive control IPV is communicated or not, Brittney did not identify it as IPV. These results demonstrate the participants do not identify psychological aggression-coercive control IPV comparable to the CDC's definition of psychological aggression to respond to the second research question.

The codes dangerously angry, insulting, humiliating, name-calling, and threatening emerged for psychological aggression-expressive aggression (see Chapter 4, Table 2). In the scenario with Steve and Stepanie, participants did not identify Steve raising his hand and telling Stephanie she deserves to be slapped as acting dangerously angry toward a partner, as defined by the CDC. Insulting, humiliating, and name-calling codes also emerged because although

107

participants could determine these items as IPV, all participants did not identify these items as IPV. For example, Nicole defined how name-calling, humiliating, degrading, or acting angry in a way that seems dangerous is IPV. She did not identify the psychological aggression-expressive aggression IPV item "tell you that you are a loser, a failure, or not good enough" as IPV on the questionnaire. Nor did she identify "call you names like ugly, fat, crazy, or stupid," and "insult, humiliate, or make fun of you in front of others" as IPV on the questionnaire. These results demonstrate the participants do not identify psychological aggression-expressive aggression IPV comparable to the CDC's definition of psychological aggression to respond to the second research question.

The codes campus police, residence advisor, counselor, Title 9, Director of Student Conduct, and trusted adult emerged from the theme to report IPV. The codes abuser/abused person, friend, and mother emerged to disclose subtle forms of IPV, like gaslighting. These results demonstrate the participants are willing to report IPV on campus, and they are aware of reporting sources. However, the prevention of IPV on college campuses also relies on the student's ability to identify IPV (Hollister et al., 2017).

Discussion of the Results as Related to Literature

Studies have indicated the expectancy of IPV perpetration increasing during adolescence, reaching its pinnacle in the early twenties, and later declining during the latter half of the twenties (Johnson et al., 2015). Repercussions for identifying IPV during this period are essential for first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU as they learn to cope with growing into adulthood (Rennison & Addington, 2018). Identifying and reporting IPV supports IPV prevention on campuses and reduces the likelihood of IPV occurrences (Hollister et al.,

2017). Rennison and Addington (2018) noted that misconceptions of IPV might result in students not being able to identify it, which impacts IPV prevention.

Nondisclosure of IPV leads to regularizing IPV (Ragavana et al., 2018). Individuals learn by observing others within the context of social interactions, experiences, and outside media influences, which forms the basis of the SCT (De Graaf et al., 2012). IPV identified as acceptable goes unreported (McLaughlin et al., 2018) and thwarts IPV prevention (Hollister et al., 2017). IPV as an extension of the control or power intention does not always take the form of physical abuse, sexual abuse, or stalking (Giorando, 2014). It may take the form of psychological aggression, which includes, but is not limited to, name-calling, humiliation, restricting access to transportation, money, friends, and family (Breiding et al., 2015). The normalcy of IPV may result in unawareness or limited awareness of IPV. Acceptance of IPV leads to its escalation. For example, name-calling is a common trait in cases of escalated IPV, as in the case of Yvette Cade, whose estranged husband doused her with gasoline and set her on fire while she was working at a T-mobile store. "He would call me fat, beached whale" ("Burned Twice," 2006, para. 3). Research indicates IPV starts before the extremes that get public attention (Chen, 2017).

Nondisclosure of psychological aggression will also become normalized (Ragavana et al., 2018). First-year students who are new to the campus environment may seek care from students who are senior to them. Individuals imitate the actions of those who care for them, which forms the basis of the attachment theory (Bowlby, 1982; Kishor & Johnson, 2004). Newcomers to the University may also be concerned with the potential consequences of reporting violence vs. the possible effort to manage secrecy as supported by the CPM theory.

Haselschwerdt and Hardesty (2017) conducted a study on IPV victims from an affluent community and compared how they managed secrecy, disclosure, and help-seeking strategies.

This phenomenon is called communication privacy management and forms the basis of the CPM theory. The control of nondisclosure and disclosure functions within gender and class associations and ongoing negotiations to conceal and reveal IPV depends on the victim's environment. Thus, the benefits to the participants to report IPV should outweigh any perceived consequences.

This intrinsic qualitative single case study explored how first-generation African American first-year students who attend HBCUs define and identify IPV using the socio-constructivist approach. It is the position of the constructivist that learning progresses through the construction of meanings. Meanings are constructed based on how a person may define their experience (Merriam, Caffarella, & Baumgartner, 2007). The participants brought previous knowledge to assess and re-evaluate their understanding of IPV. Each participant had a different interpretation and construction of what they know based on past experiences and cultural factors. The social constructivist believes learning is a collaborative process and places emphasis on the importance of the cultural and social context. (Jennings, Surgenor, & McMahon, 2013). The goal of this research was to rely as much as possible on the participants' views. The participants disclosed their perspectives of how IPV is defined and identified based on their past experiences and cultural factors. The constructivist approach allowed for the exploration of how participants defined and identified IPV as viewed through their relationships with others. Using the socio-constructivist approach supported the study of the meanings and logic specific to first-generation African American freshmen males and first-generation African American freshmen females on how they define and identify IPV and the basis for their definition.

The participants of this study demonstrated alignment with the SCT. When the researcher asked about disclosing IPV, the code word *friend* emerged. One participant discussed going to a friend for validation.

We tend to go to friends to make sure that we're not crazy. Like we need the validation of what's going on in order to, you know, to make sure that we are, okay. I know I'm not crazy. I know this person is doing me wrong, and it's like we look for validation from other people.

Another participant managed to report IPV based on the context. If it were something that could be resolved by a counselor, he would not go to the police. This decision demonstrates the benefits of reporting IPV should outweigh any perceived consequences. The results indicated the participants could define IPV as compared to the CDC's definition and are willing to disclose IPV. However, they did not identify IPV items, which does not support the ability to report IPV on campus.

<center>**Limitations**</center>

Limitations are possible weaknesses in a study that the researcher cannot control (Simon, 2011). Time is a limitation for this study because it is a study conducted over a definite period and was reliant on situations occurring during that time (Simon, 2011). For example, current events in media or scenes from a movie that is popular at the time of the study may have influenced how participants responded.

This qualitative intrinsic case study involved gaining an understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV. The participants were first-generation, African American first-year students attending an HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S. The views of the participants for this study may not reflect the

<center>111</center>

perspectives of all college students and cannot be generalized. The selection of participants for this study was from purposive sampling, which could lead to researcher bias (Hatch, 2002). The selected small sample of participants makes it so that the researcher cannot apply the study results to a larger population. Inferences cannot be made from the outcomes of case studies because other explanations for the study results cannot be dismissed (Simon & Goes, 2013). For this qualitative case study, the college students were selected based on the specific selection criteria needed for the research (Hatch, 2002). Readers may transfer knowledge acquired from this study to similar settings based on the judgment of the reader (Creswell, 2014).

This study used the NISVS and scenarios previously used for the Larsen and Wobschall (2014) study (see Appendices C and D). The information obtained is partly limited to the accuracy of the standardized instruments used for this study (Simon & Goes, 2013). Another limitation is the participants completed the questionnaires and scenarios, which may have incorrect responses due to participant error or confusion. During the interviews, the researcher used opportunities to provide participants clarity for the questionnaire, scenarios, and interview questions that may have caused erroneous responses or confusion. The researcher included their retorts in the discussion of results.

Interviews pose the limitation of participants providing answers they think the researcher would like to hear (Hatch, 2002). To minimize this risk, the researcher avoided asking leading questions or responding to participants in ways that may have led them to specific responses. Interviews as data collection tools might also become limited by participants' reluctance to share information (Hatch, 2002) fully. The researcher minimized this risk by reassuring confidentiality and anonymity. The researcher reduced this risk at the start of the interview, as well as during the meeting.

Study Design

The information the researcher gathered and analyzed during this qualitative case study limited the specific questions the participants responded to on the questionnaire, scenarios, and interviews. The researcher collected, analyzed, and reported all data, thus limiting the interpretation through the experience of a novice researcher.

Participants

The participants for this study consisted of 15 African American first-year students who attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S. The study generated a distinctive set of data through participant responses to closed question questionnaires and scenarios. Ten of the 15 students participated in a face-to-face interview with open-ended questions. The information obtained from the participants reflects only their life experience and not the life experiences of all first-generation African-American first-year students who attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S.

Research Method

This intrinsic qualitative single case study considered the research methods used by previous researchers since, in most instances, the research methods previously used limit the literature on a topic (Boote & Beile, 2005). The case study approach that uses a qualitative methodology comprises a collection of multiple sources of data, such as interviews, focus groups, and observations (Crowe et al., 2011). The methodological approach for this study was selected based on the literature about the factors that may influence how first-generation African American newcomers who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV that aligned with the themes expected to emerge from the research questions. The problem addressed in this case study is the ability of first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU to identify IPV

based on their understanding of how IPV is defined. This study used questionnaires, scenarios, and interviews (see Appendices B, C, D, and E) to learn more about the factors that may influence how first-generation African American first-year students describe IPV.

Data Collection

The data the researcher collected is limited in scope. The information came from one small group of students. They were first-generation African American freshmen that attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S. The participants in this purposeful sample served as the nucleus of this case study (Suri, 2011). These data account for the shared experiences of this group of participants. The time the researcher spent collecting data presents another limitation. The researcher sent the questionnaires and scenarios to the participants through their campus e-mail addresses and allowed them 10 days to respond. The researcher limited the individual participant interviews to 1 hour, as transcribing interviews can take from 3 to10 hours per each 1-hour session (Harding & Whitehead, 2013). Large volumes of data result in storage and filing challenges and cause difficulties in recording and analyzing the data (Harding & Whitehead, 2013). The time the researcher spent analyzing the data collected from questionnaires, scenarios, face-to-face interviews, and member checking were limited to the HBCU's 2020 winter semester since the participants would likely be sophomores by the end of the semester.

<center>**Implication of the Results for Practice, Policy, and Theory**</center>

In this section, the researcher discusses the implications of the results of this study. The researcher considers the associations in the context of practice, policy, and theory. The researcher relates the results to the conceptual framework constructivism and explains the propositions of this study to practice and policy in connection to the literature.

Practice

This qualitative case study adds to the body of knowledge of awareness of IPV amongst first-generation African American freshmen. African Americans respond to violence as affected by their complicated history and present-day sociopolitical and personal experiences (Breiding et al., 2015). This intrinsic qualitative case study disclosed the factors that influence first-generation African American first-year students who attend an HBCU understanding of what defines IPV and their ability to identify IPV. Closing the gap in knowledge about the perceptions of how first-generation African American first-year college students who attend an HBCU define and identify IPV can bring awareness to campus safety advocates of students' ability to identify IPV. Campus safety advocates may determine if there is a need to develop or improve programs to help students to define, identify, and report IPV.

As first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU transition into adulthood, they may witness narratives reported by local and national media (Igartua & Fiuza, 2018). Campus safety advocates may work within the confines of local and national press to discourage profiling the IPV perpetrator as the protagonist in the media (Igartua & Fiuza, 2018), and with national stations to ensure IPV as defined by the CDC is not glamourized. This study may also benefit other practices to include advocates for the safety of high school students, religious support groups, and industry and government human resource offices.

Contextual skills and awareness support high school students to understand the university system as a whole and their role within the university (Wiley et al., 2010). Thus, advocates for the safety of high school students may consider this study to support IPV awareness programs for high school students to prepare them to transition into college or the workforce.

In their study, "By the Grace of God: Religiosity, Religious Self-Regulation, and Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence," Renzetti et al., (2017) examined religious beliefs. They studied how religious beliefs may result in either a risk or a protective factor for male perpetration of IPV against their female partners. Considerably, how first-generation African American students who attend HBCUs define and identify IPV may support local and national religious leaders to develop IPV awareness programs to help the young adults of their congregations.

President Clinton signed the VAWA as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. It is a requirement for federal agencies to develop employee awareness campaigns as a result of the VAWA. Based on this requirement, government human resource offices, and industry human resource offices that receive federal funding may benefit from this study to support developing awareness programs to transition first-generation African American students into the workforce.

Policy

Policymakers in education may use the results of this study to work with local law officials. They may use crime statistics and existing policy statements reported annually for potential changes in local laws regarding IPV that may be inconsistent with federal IPV laws, by distributing information to lawmakers for incorporation into legislative updates. An understanding of how first-generation African American first-year students define and identify IPV may contribute to gaining community support for the safety concerns of all college students, their parents, local authorities, and federal communities.

Campus policymakers may incorporate an intersectional analysis into IPV prevention to consider the relationship of larger social structures to the individual experiences of first-

generation African American first-year students who attend HBCUs in the eastern region of the United States. The results of this study relate larger social structures to student experiences to enable college policymakers to consider broader social systems that may result in changes in laws and social conditions surrounding HBCU campuses, as well as support student safety and retention.

Policymakers in education may work with public systems to develop policies using a structural intersectional framework for teaching awareness of IPV through coalition-building among social networks. The nature of organizations catering to marginalized IPV victims is intersectional due to the characteristics of the group (Kapur et al., 2017). Relating larger social structures to individual experiences enables practitioners to apply core skills to larger social systems that may result in changes in laws and social conditions (Coker, 2016). System intersectionality informs how the public supports systems, such as welfare, criminal justice, child welfare, and immigration. These systems intersect to form a web of control in poor communities that result in social conditions that nurture violence and obstructs efforts to prevent IPV or support victims of IPV (Coker, 2016). Working with public systems to develop policies using a structural intersectional framework for teaching awareness of IPV through coalition-building among social networks would support individual students. Also, more substantial structures may change laws and social conditions for college campuses and the surrounding local communities.

Theory

The researcher used the constructivist conceptual framework for this qualitative case study to place reliance on the participants' perspectives of what defines IPV. Through open-ended questioning, the researchers learned how participants interact in their environments and how they negotiate perceptions socially and historically. The researcher found the views of the

117

participants developed through interaction with others, and historical and cultural norms are the workings of their individual lives (Creswell, 2014). The researcher addressed the interactions of participants, among others, and the specific contexts in the environments they live and work. By considering the interactions of the participants, the researcher was able to comprehend the historical and cultural settings of the participants on SCT (De Graaf et al., 2012), the Attachment Theory (Bowlby, 1982; Kishor & Johnson, 2004) and the CPM theory (Petronio & Venetis, 2017).

Recommendations for Further Research

The researcher believes a study on how college students define IPV would benefit Predominantly White Institutions (PWI). Student safety is of concern to families and likely of interest to college administrators that they may want not to disclose safety concerns to avoid decreases in student enrollment (Kassa, 2017). Identifying and reporting IPV supports IPV prevention on campuses and reduces the likelihood of IPV occurrences (Hollister et al., 2017). However, if students can define IPV, but cannot identify IPV, they cannot report IPV.

The researcher believes a study on how high school students define IPV would benefit high school safety advocates to prepare high school students for college or to enter the workforce. College students may come from diverse, high school environments with different views and beliefs about IPV. The researcher recommends high school safety advocates study how students define IPV as compared to the CDC's definition to determine what to include in IPV awareness education to prepare high school students for college.

It is a requirement for federal human resource offices and private industry human resource offices that receive federal funding to develop employee awareness campaigns as a result of the VAWA. The researcher recommends high schools and colleges to study how

students define IPV as compared to the CDC's definition to support developing or improving programs to prepare students to enter the workforce.

Conclusion

The objective of this qualitative case study was to gain an understanding of how first-generation African American newcomers who attend an HBCU define IPV to identify and report IPV. Some IPV behaviors were not identified by participants as IPV in the everyday relationships of college students, such as name-calling, due to the acceptance of such actions as usual (Ragavana et al., 2018). While the law sanctions physical violence, state laws restrict verbal abuse inconsistently. For example, some states extend the definition of IPV to include emotional abuse, such as name-calling, and other locations do not (Hefner et al., 2018; Robinson et al., 2009). Social norms and values result in differing attitudes toward violence based on stereotypes of male and female roles (Lelaurain et al., 2018). This study educated first-generation African American newcomers who attend an HBCU of the CDC's consistent definition of IPV (Breiding et al., 2015). How they define IPV may impact their ability to identify and report it. The perceptions of how first-generation African American first-year college students who attend an HBCU define IPV can bring awareness to campus safety advocates of students' ability to identify IPV. This awareness will help to determine if there is a need to develop or improve programs to help students to define, identify, and report IPV.

The purpose of this intrinsic qualitative case study allowed first-generation African American newcomers who attend an HBCU to demonstrate how their understanding of how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU define IPV compares to the CDC's uniformed definition (Breiding et al., 2015). The responses the participants provided to questionnaires and scenarios shared how their understanding of how to identify IPV compares to

119

the CDC's definition. The interview questions allowed the participants to share their perceptions of why they agreed with the CDC's definitions of IPV for some actions, or why not.

This study provides comprehensive coverage of the literature that pertains to the problem of unidentified and unreported IPV on college campuses that applies to how first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S. may define, identify, and report IPV. The literature covers the factors that may influence one's definition of IPV, such as culture, law intervention, religious beliefs, IPV exposure as children or adolescents, IPV portrayals by the media, and the HBCU experience. What the literature is lacking is how IPV is defined by first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S., specifically. A consistent definition of IPV is vital to support campus safety by using information about IPV that is collected systematically and comparably (Smith et al., 2017). The problem addressed in this case study is the ability of first-generation African American freshmen who attend an HBCU to identify IPV based on their understanding of how IPV is defined. From the problem statement, the researcher developed the research questions as follows:

- How do African American males' and females,' who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, definitions of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) compare to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention definitions of IPV?

- How do African American males and females, who are a first-generation college freshman and attend a 4-year university, identify and report Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)?

A thorough literature review demonstrated the need for individual questionnaires and scenarios followed by interviews (see Appendices B, C, D, and E). The utilization of surveys and scenarios followed by discussions allowed the researcher to code the data and develop themes to compare the participants' definitions of IPV to the CDC's standard definition and to compare participant definitions by gender. This chapter presents the overall discussion of this study, the conclusions, and its implications. The researcher provided the key findings as related to the literature discussed in Chapter 2 through the lens of constructivism, the conceptual framework that grounded this study. The researcher presented recommendations for future research and practice, policy, and theory, as well.

The researcher look forward to contributing to future studies, and is hopeful for additional studies within the community of scholars.

References

Alshenqeeti, H. (2014). Interviewing as a data collection method: A critical review. *English Linguistics Research, 3*(1), 39–45. doi:10.5430/elr.v3n1p39

Anonymous. Anti-domestic violence campaign launched in wales. (2013). *Community Practitioner, 86*(7), 7–8. Retrieved from http://cupdx.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.cupdx.idm.oclc.org/docview/1406225956?accountid=10248

Bachman, R., & Saltzman, L. E. (1995). *Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey*. US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Barrick, K., Krebs, C. P., & Lindquist, C. H. (2013). Intimate partner violence victimization among undergraduate women at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). *Violence Against Women, 19*(8), 1014–1033. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801213499243

Berg, G. J., Lundborg, P., Nystedt, P., & Rooth, D. (2014). Critical periods during childhood and adolescence. *Journal of the European Economic Association. V12* (6), 1521–1557. https://doi.org/10.1111/jeea.12112

Boote, D. N., & Beile, P. (2005). Scholars before researchers: On the centrality of the dissertation literature review in research preparation. Educational Researcher, 34(6), 3–15. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.cupdx.idm.oclc.org/stable/3699805

Bottoms, B., Peter-Hagene, L., Epstein, M., Wiley, T., Reynolds, C., & Rudnicki, A. (2016). Abuse characteristics and individual differences related to disclosing childhood sexual, physical, and emotional abuse and witnessed domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31*(7), 1308–1339.

Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment by John Bowlby.* (2nd Ed.). New

York, NY: Basic Books. Original work published 1969.

Bowleg, L. (2012). The problem with the phrase women and minorities: Intersectionality—an

important theoretical framework for public health. *American Journal of Public Health,*

102(7), 1267–1273. http://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2012.300750

Breiding, M. J., Basile, K. C., Smith, S. G., Black, M. C., & Mahendra, R. R. (2015). *Intimate*

partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements,

Version 2.0. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention.

Burned twice. (2006, June 19). *People Magazine.* Retrieved from

http://people.com/archive/burned-twice-vol-65-no-24/

Chen, M. (2017). The economic cost of intimate partner violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

Institute for Women Policy and Research. Retrieved from

https://iwpr.org/publications/economic-cost-intimate-partner-violence-sexual-assault-

stalking/#_edn22

Coker, D. (2016). Domestic violence and social justice: A structural intersectional framework for

teaching about domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 22*(12), 1426–1437. doi:

10.1177/1077801215625851.

Corradi, C., Marcuello-Servós, C., Boira, S., & Weil, S. (2016). Theories of femicide and their

significance for social research. *Current Sociology, 64*(7), 975–995.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*

(3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., Robertson, A., Guro, H, Avery, A, & Sheikh, A. (2011). The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 11*(1), 100–109. https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-11-100

De Graaf, A., Hoeken, H., Sanders, J., & Beentjes, J. (2012). Identification as a mechanism of narrative Persuasion. *Communication Research, 39*(6), 802–823.

Eisikovits, Z., Buchbinder, E., & Mor, M. (1998). "What it was won't be anymore": Reaching the turning point in coping with intimate violence. *Affilia, 13*(4), 411–434.

Exner-Cortens, D., Eckenrode, J., & Rothman, E. (2013). Longitudinal associations between teen dating violence victimization and adverse health outcomes. *Pediatrics*, *131*(1), 71–78. http://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2012-1029

Fohring, S., & Duggan, M. (2018). Victim hierarchies in the domestic violence disclosure scheme. *International Review of Victimology, 24*(2), 199–217.

Garland, T. S., Policastro, C., Branch, K. A., & Henderson, B. B. (2019). Bruised and battered: Reinforcing intimate partner violence in comic books. *Feminist Criminology*, *14*(5), 584–611.

Gauthier, G. R., Francisco, S. C., Khan, B., & Dombrowski, K. (2018). Social integration and domestic violence support in an Indigenous community: Women's recommendations of formal versus informal sources of support. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, *00*(0), 1–25.

Giorando, P. C. (2014). *"The real world of dating violence in adolescence and young adulthood."* U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from https://nij.ojp.gov/media/video/24051

Goodkind, J., Gillum, T., Bybee, D., & Sullivan, C. (2003). The impact of family and friends' reactions on the well-being of women with abusive partners. *Violence Against Women, 9*(3), 347–373. doi/abs/10.1177/1077801202250083

Hammersley, M. (2012). Methodological paradigms in educational research. *British Educational Research Association*. Retrieved from https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Methodological-Paradigms.pdf?noredirect=1

Harding, T., & Whitehead, D. (2013). Analysing data in qualitative research. *Nursing & midwifery research: Methods and appraisal for evidence-based practice*, 141–160.

Harrell, M. C., & Bradley, M. A. (2009). *Data collection methods: Semistructured interviews and focus groups*. Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2009/RAND_TR718.pdf

Haselschwerdt, M. L., Carlson, C. E., & Hlavaty, K. (2018). The romantic relationship experiences of young adult women exposed to domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518771679

Haselschwerdt, M., & Hardesty, J. (2017). Managing secrecy and disclosure of domestic violence in affluent communities. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 79*(2), 556–570. doi-org.cupdx.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/jomf.12345

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hathaway, J. E., Mucci, L. A., Silverman, J. G., Brooks, D. R., Mathews, R., & Pavlos, C. A. (2000). Health status and health care use of Massachusetts women reporting partner abuse. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 19*(4), 302–307. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(00)00236-1

Heffernan, K., Blythe, B., & Nicolson, P. (2014). How do social workers understand and respond to domestic violence and relate this to organizational policy and practice? *International Social Work*, *57*(6), 698–713.

Hefner, M. K., Baboolal, A. A., Fleury-Steiner, R. E., & Miller, S. L. (2018). Mediating justice: Women's perceptions of fairness in the civil protection order process. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 1–22. doi.org/10.1177/0886260518775749

Hoeken, H., Kolthoff, M., & Sanders, J. (2016). Story perspective and character similarity as drivers of identification and narrative persuasion. *Human Communication Research, 42*(2), 292–311.

Hollister, B. J., Scalora, M. A., Hoff, S. M., Hodges, H. J., & Marquez, A. (2017). College student reporting responses to hypothetical and actual safety concerns. *Journal of School Violence*, *16*(4), 331–348.

Igartua, J. J., & Fiuza, D. (2018). Persuading with narratives against gender violence. Effect of similarity with the protagonist on identification and risk-perception. *Palabra Clave, 21*(2), 499–523. doi: 10.5294/pacla.2018.21.2.10

Iratzoqui, A., & McCutcheon, J. (2018). The influence of domestic violence in homicide cases. *Homicide Studies, 22*(2), 145–160.

Jansick, V.J., (2011). *Stretching exercises for qualitative researchers* (3rd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jennings, D., Surgenor, P., & McMahon, T. (2013). Education theory/constructivism and social

    constructivism in the classroom. *UCD Dublin.* Retrieved from

    http://www.ucdoer.ie/index.php/Education_Theory/Constructivism_and_Social_Construc

    tivism_in_the_Classroom

Johnson, W., Giordano, L., Manning, P., & Longmore, C. (2015). The age–IPV curve: Changes

    in the perpetration of intimate partner violence during adolescence and young adulthood.

    Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 44(3), 708–726.

Kapur, S., Zajicek, A. M., & Gaber, J. (2017). Nonprofit organizations serving domestic violence

    survivors: Addressing intersectional needs of Asian Indians. *Affilia, 32*(1), 50–66.

Kassa, J., (2017). Advice on supporting campuses' safety and reputational goals (essay). *Inside

    Higher Ed*. Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com

Kimball, E. (2015). Edleson revisited: reviewing children's witnessing of domestic violence 15

    years later. *Journal of Family Violence, 31*, 625–637. doi:10.1007/s10896-015-9786-7

Kishor, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). *Profiling domestic violence – a multi-country study*. Calverton,

    MD, ORC Macro.

Krebs, C. P., Barrick, K., Lindquist, C. H., Crosby, C. M., Boyd, C., & Bogan, Y. (2011). The

    sexual assault of undergraduate women at Historically Black Colleges and Universities

    (HBCUs). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(18), 3640–3666.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511403759

Larsen, D., & Wobschall, S. (2016). Perceptions of intimate partner violence among university

    students: Situational and gender variables. *Forum on Public Policy Online*, *6*(2), 1–8.

    Retrieved from http://forumonpublicpolicy.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Larsen-

    WobshallORTSub2016.pdf

Lelaurain, S., Fonte, D., Aim, M., Khatmi, N., Decarsin, T., Lo Monaco, G., & Apostolidis, T.

    (2018). "One doesn't slap a girl but. . ." social representations and conditional logics in

    legitimization of intimate partner violence. *Sex Roles, 78*(9), 637–652.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Lindquist, C. H., Barrick, K., Krebs, C., Crosby, C. M., Lockard, A. J., & Sanders-Phillips, K.

    (2013). The context and consequences of sexual assault among undergraduate women at

    Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). *Journal of Interpersonal*

    Violence, 28(12), 2437–2461. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513479032

Lindquist, C. H., Crosby, C. M., Barrick, K., Krebs, C. P., & Settles-Reaves, B. (2016).

    Disclosure of sexual assault experiences among undergraduate women at historically

    black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Journal of American College Health, 64*(6),

    469–480. https://doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2016.1181635

Lloyd, M., & Ramon, S. (2017). Smoke and mirrors: U.K. newspaper representations of intimate

    partner domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 23*(1), 114–139

Lodico, M. G., Spauding, D. T., & Voegtle, K. H. (2010). *Methods in educational research from*

    theory to practice (2nd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, John Wiley and Sons.

López-Cepero, J., Fabelo, H., Rodríguez-Franco, L., & Rodríguez-Díaz, F. (2016). The dating

    violence questionnaire: Validation of the Cuestionario de Violencia de Novios using a

    college sample from the United States. *Violence and Victims, 31*(3), 438–456.

    https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-14-00077

Maryland National Network Against Domestic Violence, (n.d.). Retrieved from

    https://mnadv.org/_mnadvWeb/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/2016-Purple-Book.pdf

Mason, J. (2017). *Qualitative researching*. Sage. Thousand Oaks, CA.

McLaughlin, H., Robbins, R., Bellamy, C., Banks, C., & Thackray, D. (2018). Adult social work

    and high-risk domestic violence cases. *Journal of Social Work, 18*(3), 288–306.

McLeod, S. A. (2018). Questionnaire. Retrieved from

    https://www.simplypsychology.org/questionnaires.html

Merriam, S.B., Caffarella, R.S., & Baumgartner, L.M. (2007). *Learning in adulthood: A*

    comprehensive guide (3rd Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, John Wiley and Sons,

    Inc.

Merrick, M., & Latzman, N. (2014). Child maltreatment: A public health overview and

    prevention considerations. *OJIN: The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing, 19*(1),

    Manuscript 2. doi: 10.3912/OJIN.Vol19No01Man02

Miller, E., Decker, M. R., Raj, A., Reed, E., Marable, D., & Silverman, J. G. (2010). Intimate

    partner violence and health care-seeking patterns among female users of urban adolescent

    clinics. *Maternal and child health journal*, *14*(6), 910–917.

Monckton-Smith, J. (2012). *Murder, gender and the media: Narratives of dangerous love*.

    Palgrave MacMillan. New York, NY.

Mosher, J. E. (2015). Grounding access to justice theory and practice in the experiences of

    women abused by their intimate partners, *Windsor Yearbook Distinguished Lecture in*

    Access to Justice, 32(2)*,* 149–179.

Muehlenhard, C. L., Peterson, Z. D., Humphreys, T. P., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2017). Evaluating

    the one-in-five statistic: Women's risk of sexual assault while in college. *The Journal of*

    Sex Research, *54*(4–5), 549–576.

National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomed Behavior. (1978). *The*

    Belmont Report: Ethical principles and guidelines for the protection of human subjects of

research-the national commission for the protection of human subjects of biomedical and

behavioral research. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office

National Institute of Justice (NIJ), US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, &

United States of America. (2017). *Relationship abuse during the transition from*

adolescence to young adulthood. Retrieved from

https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/relationship-abuse-during-transition-adolescence-young-

adulthood

New Hope for Women. (2018). The cost of domestic violence. Retrieved from

https://newhopeforwomen.org/cost-of-domestic-violence

O'Doherty, L., Taket, A., Valpied, J., & Hegarty, K. (2016). Receiving care for intimate partner

violence in primary care: Barriers and enablers for women participating in the weave

randomised controlled trial. *Social Science & Medicine, 160*, 35–42.

Oguntoyinbo, L. (2012). Social justice. *Diverse Issues in Higher Education, 29*(4), 12–13.

Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1010057302/

O'Neil, J. (2016, February). Domestic violence statistics: The horrific reality. *Good*

Housekeeping. Retrieved from

https://www.goodhousekeeping.com/life/relationships/a37005/statistics-about-domestic-

violence/

Othman, S., Goddard, C., & Piterman, L. (2014). Victims' barriers to discussing domestic

violence in clinical consultations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 29*(8), 1497–1513.

Petronio, S., & Venetis, M. K. (2017). Communication privacy management theory and health

and risk messaging. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication.* doi:

10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.513

Polkinghorne, D. E. (2005). Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative

research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*(2), 137–145.

http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.137

Ponterotto, J. G. (2006). Brief note on the origins, evolution, and meaning of the qualitative

research concept thick description. *The qualitative report*, *11*(3), 538–549. Retrieved

from

http://link.galegroup.com.cupdx.idm.oclc.org/apps/doc/A172554568/AONE?u=conu&sid

=AONE&xid=7fdc8b74

Powers, B. A., & Knapp, Thomas R. (2006). *Dictionary of nursing theory and research* (3rd ed.).

New York, NY: Springer Pub.

Próspero, M., & Vohra-Gupta, S. (2008). The use of mental health services among victims of

partner violence on college campuses. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*,

16(4), 376–390, doi:10.1080/10926770801926450

Quintana-Domeque, C., Carvalho, J., & De Oliveira, V. (2018). Zika virus incidence, preventive

and reproductive behaviors: Correlates from new survey data. *Economics and Human

Biology, 30*, 14–23.

Ragavana, M. L., Fikreb, T., Millnerc, U., & Bair-Merritta, M. (2018). The impact of domestic

violence exposure on South Asian children in the United States: Perspectives of domestic

violence agency staff. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 76*, 250–260.

Rasool, S. (2016). Help-Seeking after domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,

31*(9), 1661–1686

Reckdenwald, A., Yohros, A., & Szalewski, A. (2018). Health care professionals, rurality, and

intimate femicide. *Homicide Studies, 22*(2), 161–187.

Rennison, C., & Addington, L. (2018). Comparing violent victimization experiences of male and

female college-attending emerging adults. *Violence Against Women, 24*(8), 952–972.

Renzetti, C. M., DeWall, C. N., Messer, A., & Pond, R. (2017). By the grace of God: Religiosity,

religious self-regulation, and perpetration of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family

Issues*, *38*(14), 1974–1997. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192513X15576964

Richards, T., Gillespie, K .L., & Smith, D. M. (2011). Exploring news coverage of femicide:

Does reporting the news add insult to injury? *Feminist Criminology, 6*(3), 178–202.

Robinson, C., Duke, A., Fendell, S., Jennings-Rampsi, M., & Wolf, J. (2009). *Criminal

complaints.* Retrieved from https://www.masslegalhelp.org/domestic-violence/criminal-

complaints

Scaremongering. (n.d.). In Merriam-Webster's online dictionary (11th ed.). Retrieved from

http://www.m-w.com/dictionary/scaremongering

Simon, M. K., & Goes, J. (2013). Assumptions, limitations, delimitations, and scope of the

study. Retrieved from https://www.dissertationrecipes.com/wp-

content/uploads/2011/04/Assumptions-Limitations-Delimitations-and-Scope-of-the-

Study.pdf

Simon, M. K. (2011). *Dissertation and scholarly research: Recipes for success.* Seattle, WA:

Dissertation Success.

Slater, M. D., & Rouner, D. (2002). Entertainment-education and elaboration likelihood:

Understanding the processing of narrative persuasion, *Communication Theory*, *12*(2),

173–191

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.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Suri, H. (2011). Purposeful sampling in qualitative research synthesis. *Qualitative Research

Journal, 11*(2), 63–75. doi:http://dx.doi.org.cupdx.idm.oclc.org/10.3316/QRJ1102063

United Nations Corporate Author. (n.d.). *The world's women 2010: Trends and statistics.* Place

of publication not identified: United Nations Publications.

U.S. Department of Justice. (2009 - 2017). *Accomplishments of the office on violence against

women.* Retrieved from https://www.justice.gov/ovw/page/file/929506/download

U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. (2017). *Relationship abuse during the

transition from adolescence to young adulthood.* Retrieved from

https://nij.gov/topics/crime/intimate-partner-violence/teen-dating-

violence/Pages/relationship-abuse-during-transition-from-adolescence-to-young-

adulthood.aspx

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office on Women's Health in the U.S.

Department of Health and Human Services. (2018). *Relationships and safety: Laws on

violence against women.* Retrieved from https://www.womenshealth.gov/relationships-

and-safety/get-help/laws-violence-against-women

Van Camp, D., Barden, J., & Sloan, L. R. (2010). Predictors of Black students' race-related

reasons for choosing an HBCU and intentions to engage in racial identity—relevant

behaviors. *Journal of Black Psychology, 36*(2), 226–250.

https://doi.org/10.1177/0095798409344082

Wells, L., Hurlock, D., Lantion, V., Abboud, R., Claussen, C., & Lorenzetti, L. (2013). A
context of domestic violence learning from Calgary Filipino community. *International
Journal of Child, Youth & Family Studies, 4*(1), 147–165.

Wiebe, E., Durepos, G., &. Mills, A. (2010). *Encyclopedia of case study research*. Thousand
Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wiggan, G. A. (2011). *Education for the new frontier race, education, and triumph in Jim Crow
America* (1867–1945). Hauppauge, N.Y.: Nova Science Publishers.

Wiley, A., Wyatt, J., & Camara, W. J. (2010). *The development of a multidimensional college
readiness index* (Research Report 2010-3). New York, NY: The College Board.
Retrieved from
https://research.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/publications/2012/7/researchreport-
2010-3-development-multidimensional-college-readiness-index.pdf

World Health Organization. (2012). *Understanding and addressing violence against women.*
Retrieved from
http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/en/index.html

Yazan, B. (2015). Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam, and
Stake. *The Qualitative Report, 20*(2), 134–152.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:
Sage Publications.

Zust, B., Flicek, B., Moses, K., Schubert, C., & Timmerman, J. (2018). 10-year study of
Christian church support for domestic violence victims: 2005–2015. *Journal of
Interpersonal Violence*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260518754473

Appendix A: Statement of Original Work

The Concordia University Doctorate of Education Program is a collaborative community of scholar-practitioners who seek to transform society by pursuing ethically-informed, rigorously- researched, inquiry-based projects that benefit professional, institutional, and local educational contexts. Each member of the community affirms throughout their program of study, adherence to the principles and standards outlined in the Concordia University Academic Integrity Policy. This policy states the following:

Statement of academic integrity.

> As a member of the Concordia University community, I will neither engage in fraudulent or unauthorized behaviors in the presentation and completion of my work nor will I provide unauthorized assistance to others.

Explanations:

What does "fraudulent" mean?

> "Fraudulent" work is any material submitted for evaluation that is falsely or improperly presented as one's own. This includes, but is not limited to texts, graphics, and other multi-media files appropriated from any source, including another individual, that are intentionally presented as all or part of a candidate's final work without full and complete documentation.

What is "unauthorized" assistance?

> "Unauthorized assistance" refers to any support candidates solicit in the completion of their work, that has not been either explicitly specified as appropriate by the instructor, or any assistance that is understood in the class context as inappropriate. This can include, but is not limited to:

> - Use of unauthorized notes or another's work during an online test
> - Use of unauthorized notes or personal assistance in an online exam setting
> - Inappropriate collaboration in preparation and/or completion of a project
> - Unauthorized solicitation of professional resources for the completion of the work.

Statement of Original Work

I attest that:
1. I have read, understood, and complied with all aspects of the Concordia University-Portland Academic Integrity Policy during the development and writing of this dissertation.
2. *Where information and/or materials from outside sources has been used in the production of this dissertation, all information and/or materials from outside sources has been properly referenced and all permissions required for use of the information and/or materials have been obtained, in accordance with research standards outlined in the Publication Manual of The American Psychological Association*

Georgella McRae

_____

Digital Signature

Georgella McRae

_____

Name (Typed)

April 22, 2020

_____

Date

Appendix B: Intimate Partner Violence Questionnaire

Which of the following actions would you consider to be Intimate Partner Violence? Please place an X in the box next to each action of IPV.

Unwanted phone calls or messages This includes hang-ups, text or voice messages	
Unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through websites like MySpace or Facebook	
Unwanted cards, letters, flowers, or presents	
Watch or follow from a distance, or spy with a listening device, camera, or GPS (global positioning system)	
Approach or show up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you do not want them to be there	
Leave strange or potentially threatening items for you to find	
Sneak into your home or car and do things to scare you by letting you know they had been there	
Act very angry towards you in a way that seem dangerous	
Tell you that you are a loser, a failure, or not good enough	
Call you names like ugly, fat, crazy, or stupid	
Insult, humiliate, or make fun of you in front of others	
Tell you that no one else would want you	
Try to keep you from seeing or talking to your family or friends	
Make decisions for you that are yours to make, such as the clothes you wear, things you eat, or the friends you have	

Keep track of you by demanding to know where you are and what you were doing	
Make threats to physically harm you	
Threaten to hurt him or herself or commit suicide when he or she is upset with you	
Threaten to hurt a pet or threaten to take a pet away from you	
Threaten to hurt someone you love	
Hurt someone you love	
Threaten to take your children away	
Keep you from leaving the house when you want to go	
Keep you from having money for your own use	
Destroy something that is important to you	
{If female: try to get you pregnant when you do not want to become pregnant; If male: try to get pregnant when you do not want them to get pregnant} or try to stop you from using birth control	
Refuse to use a condom when you want them to use one	

Appendix C: Intimate Partner Violence Identification Scenarios

In the following scenarios please indicate whether the individual was a victim of Intimate Partner Violence. Please only mark one box with an X for each scenario.

	Yes	No
Jeffery and Stacy have been dating for 1 year. Stacy has a tendency to be very jealous and possessive. If Stacy is at work Jeffery is not supposed to have friends at their apartment. Jeffery has to ask Stacy if he can go out with friends. If he goes out without asking her, she often times ignores his text and phone calls.		
Tammy and Ben have been dating one another for 4 months. Tammy often times worries what Ben's reaction will be to the outfits she chooses to wear. Ben has told Tammy to change before they go out on several occasions.		
Steven and John have had an on again, off again relationship for the past 2 years. When they are together they believe that they should have equal say in the decisions they make. Often times they will not agree, but will come to a compromise.		
James and Stephanie have been married for 3 months. James has a history of fighting, losing his temper quickly and often time's brags about how many fights he has "won". While dating he had never hit Stephanie or been physically violent towards her. After a friend's birthday party, where drinks were consumed, James becomes angry at Stephanie for "flirting" with his friend. When they arrive home James raises his hand to		

Stephanie and says she deserves to be slapped, however never actually slaps her.		
Jessica is routinely late to class. Her boyfriend Tanner says he will give her rides to campus but is late on a consistent basis. Jessica suggest getting to campus another way, but Tanner apologizes and says it won't happen again. When Jessica states it's an issue Tanner suggest she stop going to school so they can spend more time together. Tanner says her degree isn't as important as their relationship right now.		

Appendix D: Intimate Partner Violence Identification Scenarios Key

In the following scenarios please indicate whether the individual was a victim of

Intimate Partner Violence. Please only mark one box with an X for each scenario.

	Yes	No
Jeffery and Stacy have been dating for 1 year. Stacy has a tendency to be very jealous and possessive. If Stacy is at work Jeffery is not supposed to have friends at their apartment. Jeffery has to ask Stacy if he can go out with friends. If he goes out without asking her, she often times ignores his text and phone calls.	X	
Tammy and Ben have been dating one another for 4 months. Tammy often times worries what Ben's reaction will be to the outfits she chooses to wear. Ben has told Tammy to change before they go out on several occasions.	X	
Steven and John have had an on again, off again relationship for the past 2 years. When they are together they believe that they should have equal say in the decisions they make. Often times they will not agree, but will come to a compromise.		X
James and Stephanie have been married for 3 months. James has a history of fighting, losing his temper quickly and often time's brags about how many fights he has "won". While dating he had never hit Stephanie or been physically violent towards her. After a friend's birthday party, where drinks were consumed, James becomes angry at Stephanie for "flirting" with his friend. When they arrive home James raises his hand to	X	

Stephanie and says she deserves to be slapped, however never actually slaps her.		
Jessica is routinely late to class. Her boyfriend Tanner says he will give her rides to campus but is late on a consistent basis. Jessica suggest getting to campus another way, but Tanner apologizes and says it won't happen again. When Jessica states it's an issue Tanner suggest she stop going to school so they can spend more time together. Tanner says her degree isn't as important as their relationship right now.	X	

Appendix E: Interview Questions

What is your age? _____

What is your race? _____

Have you ever lived in a single parent household? _____

    Yes___ No ___

    If yes, please explain _____.

Were there any adults living in your household other than your parents (relative or friend)?

    Yes___ No ___

    If yes, please explain _____.

Education Level of Parents/Guardians in the household?

One Parent/Guardian in the household graduated from High School?

    Yes___ No ___

Both Parents/.Guardians in the household graduated from High School

    Yes___ No ___

1. How is name-calling, humiliating, degrading, or acting angry in a way that seems dangerous IPV?

2. How is limiting access to transportation, money, friends, and family; excessive monitoring of a person's whereabouts and communications; monitoring or interfering with electronic communication (e.g., emails, instant messages, social media) without permission IPV?

3. How is making threats to harm self or making threats to harm a loved one or possession IPV?

4. How are threats of physical or sexual violence or use of words, gestures, or weapons to communicate the intent to cause harm or death IPV (e.g., "I'll kill you;" "I'll beat you up if you don't have sex with me;" brandishing a weapon)?

5. How is control of reproductive or sexual health (e.g., refusal to use birth control; coerced pregnancy termination) IPV?

6. How is the exploitation of the vulnerability, such as immigration status, disability, undisclosed sexual orientation IPV? For example, telling a partner, "if you call the police, I could be deported."

7. How is gaslighting or mind games, such as presenting false information to a partner with the intent of making him/her doubt their memory and perception IPV?

8. If you identify IPV on campus, who would you report it, and why?

Appendix F: Consent Form

Research Study Title: How do college students define Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)
Principal Investigator: Georgella McRae
Research Institution: Concordia University - Portland
Faculty Advisor: Rinkya Allison, Ph.D

Purpose and what you will be doing:
The purpose of this proposed qualitative case study is to determine if first-generation African- American freshman who attend a four-year HBCU define IPV consistent to the uniformed definition reported by the Centers of Disease Control (CDC) and Prevention and can identify IPV. We expect approximately 12 to 16 volunteers. No one will be paid to be in the study, but participants who complete the study will receive a $20 Visa gift card for their time. We will begin enrollment in December, 2019 and end enrollment in February 2020. To be in the study, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire, respond to short written scenarios, and complete a face-to-face interview.

You will be asked to provide a semi-structured individual interview, which will be audio-recorded and transcribed by a transcriptionist via a web-based service. The researcher will also use handwritten notes in case of equipment failure. Completing the questionnaire and scenarios should take less than one half-hour of your time. The interview is expected to take up to an hour and will take place at a semi-private location.

Risks:
The risks to participating in this study are participants may become aware that they have experienced or are experiencing IPV. All participants will be provided resources to overcome these risks to include contacts for local counseling and reporting agencies. If the participant experiences anxiety or stress the interview will stop immediately and the participant will be referred to counseling. Participant information will be kept private at all times, and all study documents will be destroyed three years after we conclude this study.

Interviews will be recorded and transcribed using an app called Rev.com. Rev.com is a web-based service that audio records and transcribes recordings verbatim. The risks to participating in this study include the risk for deductive disclosure. Rev.com mitigates this risk by encrypting communications using HTTPS and Transport Layer Security (TLS), which also supports the encryption of e-mails. This proposed study will also use pseudonyms for participants to further protect identity and increase confidentiality.

Any personal information you provide will be coded so it cannot be linked to you. Any name or identifying information you give will be kept securely in a locked safe held by the researcher. When the researcher or any of our investigators look at the data, none of the data will have your name or identifying information. The researcher will only use codes to analyze the data and will not identify you in any publication or report. Your information will be kept private at all times, and then all study documents will be destroyed three years after the conclusion of this study.

Benefits:
Information you provide may help to prevent IPV on college campuses. By participating in this study

you may gain an understanding of acts of IPV that should be reported to enhance the safety of your environment at home, school, and the workplace.

Confidentiality:
This information will not be distributed to any other agency and will be kept private and confidential. The only exception to this is if you tell us abuse or neglect that makes us seriously concerned for your immediate health and safety.

Right to Withdraw:
Your participation is greatly appreciated, but we acknowledge that the questions we are asking are personal in nature. You are free at any point to choose not to engage or stop the study. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer. This study is not required, and there is no penalty for not participating. If at any time you experience a negative emotion from answering the questions, we will stop asking you questions. You may withdraw data you provide for this study up to the point of data analysis by contacting the researcher to request to retract your data.

Contact Information:
If you have questions you can contact the principal investigator, Georgella McRae, at email gmcrae@mail2.cu-portland.edu. If you want to talk with a participant advocate other than the investigator, you can write or call the director of our institutional review board, Dr. OraLee Branch (email obranch@cu-portland.edu or call 503-493-6390).

Your Statement of Consent:
I have read the above information. I asked questions if I had them, and my questions were answered. I volunteer my consent for this study.

_____   _____
Participant Name   Date

_____   _____
Participant Signature   Date

_____   _____
Investigator Name   Date

_____   _____
Investigator Signature   Date

Investigator: Georgella McRae; email: [redacted]
c/o: Professor Rinkya Allison, Ph.D.
Concordia University–Portland
2811 NE Holman Street
Portland, Oregon 97221

Appendix G: Recruitment Flyer

VOLUNTEERS WANTED

FOR A RESEARCH STUDY

How first-generation African-American Freshman attending a four-year Historically Black College or University (HBCU) define Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

We are conducting a research study about how first-generation African American freshmen attending a 4-year HBCU define and identify Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). IPV is one of the most underreported crimes. The prevention of IPV on college campuses relies on your ability to identify IPV and your willingness to report it. There are differing definitions of IPV among local communities and federal agencies, which may result in differences in identifying IPV. We hope this study leads to an understanding of how IPV is defined by first-generation African American freshmen to support college safety advocates to develop and/or improve IPV awareness programs to help students understand how to identify IPV.

The study requires the completion of a questionnaire and responses to five short scenarios, which should take less than one half-hour, followed by a face-to-face interview that may take up to an hour. We are looking for first-generation African American freshmen attending a 4-year HBCU in the eastern region of the U.S. and are at least 18 years old.

The risks to participating in this study are participants may become aware that they have experienced or are experiencing IPV. All participants will be provided resources to overcome these risks to include contacts for local counseling and reporting agencies. If the participant experiences anxiety or stress the interview will stop immediately and the participant will be referred to counseling. Participant information will be kept private at all times, and all study documents will be destroyed three years after we conclude this study.

Participants will receive a $20 VISA gift card for completing the study.

This research is conducted under the direction of Rinyka Allison, Ph.D., Education Department.

(IRB number: #xxxxxxx)

Contact: [redacted] to request a questionnaire

Appendix H: Permission to use NISVS and Scenarios

The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). The NIVS was used for this study by permission.

Five scenarios were created by Samantha Maureen Wobschall, Minnesota State University – Mankato. Copyright 2005, SAGE Publications. The five scenarios were used for this study by permission.

Appendix I: Member Check Questions

1. Have I presented your responses fairly?

2. Have I presented your responses accurately?

3. Is there anything else you would like me to add to your responses?