



Research Article

Sexual Double Standard, Dating Violence Recognition, and Sexual Assertiveness among University Students in South Korea

Yujeong Kim,¹ Eunmi Lee,¹ Haeyoung Lee^{2,*,☆}¹ Department of Nursing, Hoseo University, Asan, Republic of Korea² Red Cross College of Nursing, Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Republic of Korea

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 3 May 2018

Received in revised form

3 December 2018

Accepted 4 January 2019

Keywords:

intimate partner violence

sexual behavior

sexual health

young adult

ABSTRACT

Purpose: This study aimed to examine the association among sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness among Korean university students.

Methods: Using a cross-sectional survey study in January 2018, Korean university students (N = 322, years; 54.3% female) completed structured questionnaires with the double standard scale, dating violence recognition index, and sexual assertiveness index. The relationship among the variables was analyzed with Pearson's correlations and multiple regression analyses.

Results: There were significant correlations among sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness. Sexual double standard ($\beta = .12, p = .043$) was determined to influence dating violence recognition. In addition, gender ($\beta = .63, p < .001$) and sexual double standard ($\beta = .11, p = .015$) were determined to influence dating violence recognition; the explanatory power was 43%.

Conclusion: These findings will serve as a basis for the development of education programs that help university students to establish appropriate sexual values and enjoy a healthy sex life.

© 2019 Korean Society of Nursing Science, Published by Elsevier Korea LLC. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

University students are regarded as a high-risk group when it comes to reproductive health due the risk of sexually transmitted diseases, unwanted pregnancies, and abortion [1]. One study reported that 33.6% of university students had unwanted sexual contact [2]. Such contact that arises from coercion or pressure and not from one's own volition has become an issue among university students.

One particular social issue is sexual violence during dating in which a partner uses psychological pressure or physical force in sexual situations and refuses to accept the other's refusal [3]. According to a survey in Korea [4], about 40% of university students experienced sexual violence, such as unwanted physical contact, forced sexual intercourse, sexual jokes, and rape. Among those female university students who had experienced dating violence, half said that they maintained the relationship because their partner did not always act that way. In contrast, 45.9% of male university

students stated that such things seemed natural between a couple in love. One of the main problems regarding dating violence is that often the offender, and even the victim, does not recognize it as a sexual crime. Such an inability to recognize these actions for what they are has major implications for the ability to prevent dating violence and the provision of opportunities to educate about this issue.

In situations of unwanted sexual contact, university students need to make decisions regarding their sexual situations in an autonomous and responsible manner. The ability to express one's feelings and will in a situation of unwanted sexual contact is called 'sexual assertiveness' [5]. Sexual assertiveness is a vital element to protect oneself and maintain sexual health in situations involving unwanted and unsafe sexual contact [6]. In sexually conservative cultures, not many university students are assertive in sexual situations, and one of the major causes is sexual double standard, according to which men take the lead in sex-related decisions, and stricter norms are applied to women than to men when it comes to sexual practices [7]. Sexual double standard implies that different sexual standards are applied to men and women [7]. It cultivates a culture that promotes aggressive sexual acts among men and distorted sexual values of treating women as sexual objects; as a result, it leads to dating violence even among adolescents [8].

* Correspondence to: Haeyoung Lee, PhD, RN, Chung-Ang University Red Cross College of Nursing, 84 Heuksok-ro, Dongjak-gu, Seoul, 06974, Republic of Korea.

E-mail address: im0202@cau.ac.kr

* ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6024-0039>

To understand the sexual behavior of specific groups, sexual script theory described by Gagnon and Simon [9] is frequently applied. From this perspective, sexuality is learned from culturally available messages that define what counts as sex, how to recognize sexual situations, and what to do in sexual encounters [10]. Sexual script theory explains sexual behavior through three aspects of sexual cultural scripts, interpersonal scripts, and intrapsychic scripts [10]. Therefore, in this study, to understand the sexual behavior of college students, sexual script theory was used as the theoretical basis, sexual double standard as sexual double scripts, sexual assertiveness as interpersonal scripts described patterns participating in interaction with people, and dating violence recognition as intrapsychic scripts (i.e., an individual's perception).

As for the relationship among the sexual double standard, sexual perception, and sexual assertiveness, according to one qualitative research study conducted among university students, sex reminded male university students of accomplishment and female university students of ideology or confusion [11]. This indicates that university students also have incompatible sexual double standards. In another study, sexual double standard was shown to exert a significant relationship on sexual identity and sexual situations [12]. According to Danube et al [13], young women with a conservative sexual double standard tend to be reluctant to reject sexual situations and frequently end up in unsafe sexual situations.

The aforementioned findings imply that the sexual double standard is likely to be related to dating violence recognition and to sexual assertiveness, but there have been few studies conducted among Korean university students. Accordingly, the present study aims to examine the relationship among the sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness among Korean university students and to identify the influencing factors on dating violence recognition and sexual assertiveness.

Methods

Study design

A cross-sectional research design was investigated to identify the association among the sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness and to identify the influencing factors on dating violence recognition and sexual assertiveness among Korean university students.

Setting and samples

Data were collected from university students attending two universities in Korea between January 15 and January 31, 2018. The total number of enrolled students in both universities was more than 20,000. The inclusion criteria were eligible undergraduate students who agreed to participate in the study voluntarily. The students pursuing postgraduate coursework were excluded because of wide age variabilities. The researcher explained the study's objectives and questionnaire items to students enrolled in liberal arts classes after the approval of the professors in charge of the class. The liberal arts classes in the winter semester were chosen because students from various majors take courses. To respect the ethical rights of the participants, the fact that research participation was voluntary and that survey contents would be used only for the purpose of research was explained. Those who understood the objectives of this study and agreed to participate filled out the consent form, and the questionnaires were collected in a collection box. The survey took about 10 minutes for each person.

The sample size was calculated by means of a G*Power version 3.1.9.2 program (Copyright (c) by Franz Faul, Universität Kiel,

Germany). For linear multiple regression, the necessary sample size was 302 to account for .05 of significance, .85 of testing power, and .03 of effect size f^2 . To allow for 15% dropouts as a sensitive questionnaire related to sexual recognition, questionnaires were distributed to 350 individuals, and 335 were collected back. With 13 copies with incomplete answers excluded, the final number of participants was 322.

Ethical considerations

This study was approved by the university's institutional review board (Approval no. EU18-7). Ethical issues including plagiarism, informed consent, misconduct, data fabrication and/or falsification, double publication and/or submission, and redundancy were monitored by the author.

Measurements

General characteristics

Demographic characteristics that were considered were the participants' gender, age, grade, major, residence type, perceived economic status, and experience of being a couple.

Sexual double standard

"Sexual double standard" refers to the fact that men and women have different standards for their allowable range of sexual situations [7]. This is a traditional norm or attitude toward sex, viewing men as leading sexual situations and women as being passive. This study used Lee and Lee's [14] revised and validated scale of the double standard scale developed by Caron et al [15]. It includes 10 questions, each of which is scored on a five-point Likert scale from "completely agree" (1 point) to "completely disagree" (5 points). Lower scores indicate that the respondent's sexual double standard is more traditional and conservative. In terms of the reliability of this scale, its Cronbach's α was .72 in the study of Caron et al [15] and .82 in this study.

Dating violence recognition

"Dating violence recognition" indicates how well each respondent recognizes dating violence as an act of sexual offense. This study adopted the dating violence recognition index developed by Sugarman and Hotaling [16]. It consists of 11 questions, each of which is scored on a four-point Likert scale from "it is not a sexual offense" (1 point) to "it is a very serious sexual offense" (4 points). In terms of the reliability of this scale, its Cronbach's α was .85 in this study.

Sexual assertiveness

Sexual assertiveness was measured by means of the sexual assertiveness index developed by Morokoff et al [17]. This tool includes 12 questions: six questions about acts of rejection in response to unwanted sexual contact and six questions about the use of condoms to prevent pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases during sexual contact. Each question was scored on a five-point Likert scale from "not at all" (1 point) to "very much" (5 points). The score ranges between 12 and 60, with higher scores indicating higher sexual assertiveness. In terms of the reliability of this index, its Cronbach's α was .82 at the time of development and .88 in this study.

Data analysis

Collected data were analyzed with an IBM SPSS 20.0 statistical program (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). Frequency analysis was conducted on the participants' general characteristics, and

descriptive statistics of sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness were collected, and their distribution was analyzed. Differences in sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness depending on general characteristics were analyzed through independent two samples *t* tests and one-way analysis of variance with a Scheffe test conducted post hoc. The relationship among sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness was analyzed with Pearson's correlation coefficient and multiple regression analyses.

Results

General characteristics of participants

Of the participants, 147 were male students (45.7%), and 175 were female students (54.3%), while 227 were aged between 18 and 20 (70.5%; highest proportion), and 173 were in their second year (53.7%; highest proportion). In terms of areas of study, 125 were engineering science major students (38.8%), 125 (38.8%) were arts and sports science students, and 64 (19.9%) were life and health science students. As for types of residence, 151 were living with their parents or relatives (46.9%), and 137 were living alone (42.5%). A total of 236 described their economic condition as average (73.3%; highest proportion), and 248 stated that they had experience of being a couple (77.0%) (Table 1).

The levels of sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness

On average, the participants' sexual double standard score was 4.40 ± 0.52 (1 – 5), their dating violence recognition score was 3.26 ± 0.38 (1 – 4), and their sexual assertiveness score was 4.11 ± 0.67 (1 – 5) (Table 2).

Differences in the participants' sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness in relation to their general characteristics

Sexual double standard showed significant differences depending on the participants' gender ($t = -3.11, p = .002$), major

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics of Sexual Double Standard of Dating Violence Recognition and Sexual Assertiveness ($N = 322$).

Variables	M \pm SD	Min	Max
Sexual double standard	4.40 \pm 0.52	2.80	5.00
Dating violence recognition	3.26 \pm 0.38	2.09	4.00
Sexual assertiveness	4.11 \pm 0.67	2.42	5.00

Note. M = mean; Max = maximum value; Min = minimum value; SD = standard deviation.

($F = 2.94, p = .033$), residence type ($F = 3.36, p = .036$), and experience of being a couple ($t = -2.03, p = .044$). No significant difference was found among other variables. The level of dating violence recognition was significantly different depending on the participants' gender ($t = -3.05, p = .002$), age ($F = 3.09, p = .047$), grade ($F = 2.99, p = .031$), major ($F = 3.90, p = .009$), and experience of being a couple ($t = -2.90, p = .004$). No significant difference was found among other variables. The level of sexual assertiveness was significantly different depending on the participants' gender ($t = -14.53, p < .001$), age ($F = 19.37, p < .001$), major ($F = 6.76, p < .001$), residence type ($F = 4.58, p = .011$), and experience of being a couple ($t = -2.02, p = .047$). No significant difference was found among other variables (Table 3).

Relationship among the sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness

There was a significant positive correlation between sexual double standard and dating violence recognition ($r = .17, p = .003$), which indicates that the level of dating violence recognition increases with open ideas on sex. There was a significant positive correlation between sexual double standard and sexual assertiveness ($r = .23, p < .001$), which indicates that the level of sexual assertiveness is higher when conventional ideas on sex are more open. There was a significant positive correlation between the level of dating violence recognition and sexual assertiveness ($r = .20, p < .001$), which indicates that as the level of dating violence recognition increases, so does the level of sexual assertiveness (Table 4).

Multiple regression analysis was conducted (Table 5). As verified in the analysis of variance, sexual double standard, gender, age, grade, major, and experience of being a couple related to dating violence recognition and sexual assertiveness. Hence, these factors were included in the analysis as explanatory variables. When the sexual double standard became more open, the level of dating violence recognition was high, whereas the other variables had no significant relationships (Model 1). For sexual assertiveness in the model (Model 2), it turned out that when the sexual double standard became more open, the level of sexual assertiveness was high, particularly among women. The total explanatory power was 43%.

Discussion

Analyzing the differences in major variables according to general characteristics indicated that the sexual double standard score was higher among female students, students with experience of being a couple, students majoring in arts and sports science, and students living alone. Higher scores indicate that the sexual double standard is more open. Hence, female students' higher sexual double standard scores imply that their sexual double standard is more open than that of male students; this is interesting because most previous studies suggested that male students have more open attitudes toward sex [2]. This seems to be because the percentage of female students with sexual experience has increased in Korea [11] and because gender equality has become widely

Table 1 General Characteristics ($N = 322$).

Variables	Categories	n (%)
Gender	Men	147 (45.7)
	Women	175 (54.3)
Age (yrs)	18–20	227 (70.5)
	21–23	81 (25.2)
	≥ 24	14 (4.3)
Grade	1	123 (38.2)
	2	173 (53.7)
	3	22 (6.8)
	4	4 (1.3)
Major	Human and social science	8 (2.5)
	Life and health science	64 (19.9)
	Engineering science	125 (38.8)
	Arts and sports science	125 (38.8)
Residence	Living with parents or relatives	151 (46.9)
	Living in dormitory	34 (10.6)
	Living alone	137 (42.5)
Perceived economic status	High	46 (14.3)
	Middle	236 (73.3)
	Low	40 (12.4)
Experience of being a couple	No	74 (23.0)
	Yes	248 (77.0)

Note. yrs = years.

Table 3 Differences in Sexual Double Standard, Dating Violence Recognition, and Sexual Assertiveness according to General Characteristics (N = 322).

Variables	Categories	Sexual double standard		Dating violence recognition		Sexual assertiveness	
		M ± SD	t or F (p) Scheffe	M ± SD	t or F (p) Scheffe	M ± SD	t or F (p) Scheffe
Gender	Men	4.30 ± 0.41	-3.11 (.002)	3.19 ± 0.41	-3.05 (.002)	3.64 ± 0.58	-14.53 (<.001)
	Women	4.48 ± 0.35		3.31 ± 0.35		4.50 ± 0.46	
Age (yrs)	18–20 ^a	4.43 ± 0.48	1.64 (.197)	3.29 ± 0.37	3.09 (.047)	4.25 ± 0.62	19.37 (<.001) a>b,c
	21–23 ^b	4.31 ± 0.61		3.17 ± 0.39		3.76 ± 0.67	
	≥24 ^c	4.47 ± 0.55		3.16 ± 0.42		3.81 ± 0.62	
Grade	1 ^a	4.38 ± 0.50	1.54 (.203)	3.22 ± 0.35	2.99 (.031) a,b,c > d	4.09 ± 0.67	2.56 (.055)
	2 ^b	4.42 ± 0.53		3.27 ± 0.40		4.15 ± 0.66	
	3 ^c	4.26 ± 0.55		3.38 ± 0.32		3.95 ± 0.70	
	4 ^d	4.78 ± 0.22		2.64 ± 0.24		3.00 ± 0.68	
Major	Human and social science ^a	4.39 ± 0.52	2.94 (.033) d > a,b,c	3.34 ± 0.37	3.90 (.009) a,c > b,d	4.25 ± 0.64	6.76 (<.001) a>d
	Life and health science ^b	4.31 ± 0.59		3.19 ± 0.39		3.93 ± 0.69	
	Engineering science ^c	4.48 ± 0.43		3.30 ± 0.37		4.24 ± 0.62	
	Arts and sports science ^d	4.69 ± 0.50		3.02 ± 0.15		3.74 ± 0.73	
Residence	Living with parents or relatives ^a	4.34 ± 0.57	3.36 (.036)	3.27 ± 0.36	0.94 (.391)	4.03 ± 0.68	4.58 (.011) c > a
	Living in dormitory ^b	4.36 ± 0.47		3.34 ± 0.40		4.41 ± 0.50	
	Living alone ^c	4.49 ± 0.45		3.24 ± 0.38		4.14 ± 0.66	
Perceived economic status	High	4.34 ± 0.54	1.52 (.221)	3.20 ± 0.35	1.70 (.185)	4.03 ± 0.79	0.84 (.431)
	Middle	4.43 ± 0.48		3.28 ± 0.38		4.10 ± 0.66	
	Low	4.30 ± 0.66		3.19 ± 0.32		4.21 ± 0.52	
Experience of being a couple	No	4.29 ± 0.55	-2.03 (.044)	3.14 ± 0.39	-2.90 (.004)	3.95 ± 0.78	-2.02 (.047)
	Yes	4.43 ± 0.51		3.29 ± 0.37		4.15 ± 0.63	

Note. ^{a,b,c,d}Scheffe test; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; yrs = years.

Table 4 Correlations Among Sexual Double Standard, Dating Violence Recognition, and Sexual Assertiveness (N = 322).

Variables	Sexual Double Standard r (p)	Dating Violence Recognition r (p)
Dating violence recognition	.17 (.003)	
Sexual assertiveness	.23 (<.001)	.20 (<.001)

Table 5 The Influencing Factors of Dating Violence Recognition and Sexual Assertiveness (N = 322).

Response variable	Dating violence recognition		Sexual assertiveness	
	Model 1		Model 2	
	β	t (p)	β	t (p)
Sexual double standard	.12	2.03 (.043)	.11	2.45 (.015)
Gender	.06	0.93 (.355)	.63	12.61 (<.001)
Age	-.16	-1.93 (.055)	.06	0.89 (.373)
Grade	.16	1.94 (.053)		
Major	.02	0.36 (.721)	.05	1.17 (.241)
Residence	.04		-.08	-1.82 (.070)
Experience of being a couple	.08	1.31 (.192)	-.04	-0.77 (.445)
F (p)	2.71 (.010)		33.18 (<.001)	
Adjusted R ²	.06		.43	

recognized across society. However, male students' sexual double standard score was low in this study, which implies that a sexual double standard—recognizing sexual freedom but requiring one's partner to be chaste—is still more prevalent among men than women. According to one recent qualitative study, sexual double standard was found to affect perceptions of sex and sexual situations among university students, both male and female [11]. Thus, gender normative situations can be a major factor in coping with sexual situations, and the gap between values and situations may result in gender role conflicts related to sexual assertiveness [18].

In the analysis of differences in levels of dating violence recognition depending on the participants' general characteristics, female students' dating violence recognition was higher than that of

male students. The score for dating violence recognition of students with experience of being a couple was relatively higher than that of students without such experience. This corresponds to the findings of a cross-sectional study (237 students from one university) that a sexual double standard based on fixed ideas of traditional gender roles affects dating violence recognition among male university students [19]. In a study [20] that examined recognition and experience of dating violence among single men and women, it was reported that victims or perpetrators of sexual violence tended to underrecognize the seriousness of dating violence and to be more tolerant of violent situations. In other words, those who have experienced dating violence tend to have a lower level of dating violence recognition and are likely to allow such violence when it recurs. Although the present study does not include a direct survey on sexual violence experience, the fact that students with experience of being a couple had higher scores of dating violence recognition can be viewed as positive, especially considering the aforementioned findings of previous studies.

When differences in sexual assertiveness depending on general characteristics were analyzed, the score for sexual assertiveness was higher among female students, students with experience of being a couple, and students living with parents or relatives than it was for students living alone. In addition, the score for sexual assertiveness was higher among students majoring in human and social sciences than students majoring in arts and sports science. In one previous cross-sectional study on factors affecting university students' sexual assertiveness (n = 468, 225 men and 243 women) [21], the level of sexual assertiveness was higher among male than female students and among students majoring in public health and humanities, thus agreeing with the findings of this study. Sexual assertiveness is an effective communication skill that is developed along with inherent sexual autonomy. This element is consistent with sexual self-determination [22]. Persons with high sexual autonomy can control and moderate sexual desires or urges, maintaining safe sexual health without being easily affected by internal or external conditions [23]. In a review of the adolescent dating abuse, however, it was reported that young women tended to maintain a good relationship with their partners by controlling their own desires and longings [18]. According to a cross-sectional study of 700 college students, as people viewed the relationship as

important and strived to maintain it, violent situations that might occur between the two would be more tolerated [24]. It is also reported to be highly likely that even unwanted sexual intercourse would be tolerated to maintain the relationship in a qualitative study of young adults [25].

This study also confirms that the sexual double standard is associated with dating violence recognition and that females with a more open sexual double standard tend to have higher sexual assertiveness. This is similar to the findings of other study [19,21] that sexual assertiveness is significantly correlated with conservative ideas of gender roles and traditional sexual attitudes and that fixed ideas of gender roles and traditional sexual attitudes could affect sexual assertiveness. Conservative ideas of traditional gender roles and men-centered perceptions of rape were found to significantly weaken sexual assertiveness and cause damage in dating situations [22]. Among 499 female university students with high awareness of gender equality, the level of sexual assertiveness was relatively high [26]. In another study ($n = 360$), it was reported that young women with conservative sexual double standards were likely to be reluctant to reject sexual situations and more likely to experience unsafe sexual situations [13]. All of this establishes beyond a doubt that conservative sexual double standards are related to low sexual assertiveness, while gender equality is related to sexual assertiveness.

When it comes to sexual situations, the most serious consequence of a patriarchal double standard is sexual violence, and dating violence, in particular, can cause more serious psychological trauma than other types of interpersonal violence because it occurs between persons who love each other. Because such situations occur between intimate persons, it tends to be private, and repeated, and may lead to family violence after marriage. Thus, this is more serious than other types of interpersonal violence. As dating violence occurs more frequently and affects sexual self-determination and romantic relationships [27], it is necessary to raise awareness of violence in dating situations and to provide university students with education on proper ways of coping. In addition, it is important to enhance university students' sexual assertiveness to promote healthy sexual situations with no dating violence.

Despite some limitations, this study is of significance in that it analyzes issues that could be somewhat sensitive for university students, such as sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness. As mentioned in a recent qualitative research [11], in the case of Korea, the double standard of adolescence cannot be overcome even after becoming a college student, and it becomes serious after adulthood because it is fixed and operates extensively as a micromechanism of female repression. Considering this situation, it is a positive outcome that the sexual double standard score was higher among female students in this study. Because the sexual double standard is associated with dating violence recognition, in this study, females with a more open sexual double standard tended to have higher sexual assertiveness. However, the double standard is a powerful social norm, and the existence of the sexual double standard is obvious to the vast majority of individuals in our society [28]. Through the results of this study, there is a glimpse over the perception of sex among Korean university students who became more open than before. As mentioned in the recent qualitative research results for Korean college students [11], it is positive that these changes in the times enable a crack in the sexual double standard and a more gender-equal society view. Sexual attitudes and sexual behaviors may differ between men and women, but even in the case of the United States, where the discriminatory double standard is believed to have disappeared from the relationship of lovers, in a recent study of university students [12], there was a sexual double standard and

a gender difference in attitudes toward casual sex. The sexual double standard is a concept that is highly affected by sociocultural factors, and the sexual double standard is important because it can act as a discriminative criterion of social gender roles or act as a distorted form such as dating violence rather than simply the cultural difference or gender difference of the sexual double standard. As it is clear that the sexual double standard is one of the important determinants, even if it is not the only factor that determines one's own sexual assertion or attitudes toward sex [12], it is necessary to pay attention to how to guide students to have the right sexual standards in the sociocultural environment experienced by university students.

Limitations and recommendations

This study involves the following limitations. First, although various characteristics of the participants, such as gender, grade, major, and residence type, were taken into consideration, it is difficult to generalize the findings because the participants were selected through convenience sampling, not on a national scale. Second, as this is a cross-sectional study, it is difficult to explain the causality among variables, although the correlations among sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness were verified. Third, the implicit reverse double standard may have been missed in the measurement because the double standard scale measured the traditional double standard in this study. Explicit measures indicated the existence of a traditional sexual double standard, whereas implicit measures indicated the existence of a reverse sexual double standard among women [28]. Fourth, the possibility of confirmation bias, which is pointed out as a problem of existing research methods on sexual double standard [29], cannot be ruled out. Finally, the validation of the tools has not been verified in the Korean version. There are national or cultural differences regarding dating violence recognition and sexual assertiveness, so the study is needed to validate in Korean version.

In consideration of the limitations mentioned previously, this study presents the following suggestions. The scope of research should be expanded nationwide so that the sample can represent the entirety of Korean university students. It is also important to include a large number of individuals, but it is necessary to include individuals with various social characteristics. By including participants from varying social positions, this research also helps portray the variety of socially constructed double standards [30]. In addition, we suggest that a triangulation method is applied considering the merits of quantitative research and qualitative research to identify implicit attitudes that the participants could not express through questionnaire. Future research should focus on exploring the social and cognitive mechanisms that underlie the sexual double standard. Although it is important to view the study findings within their appropriate context, the results can be used as an evidence for understanding the relationship among the sexual double standard, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness. Moreover, we hope that the findings can be used as a basis for the development of educational programs that help university students to establish appropriate sexual values and sexual identity and to live a healthy sexual life.

Conclusion

The scores of female students' sexual double standards, dating violence recognition, and sexual assertiveness were all higher than those of male students. The evidence indicates that the double standards on social roles and the expected sexual roles of men and women have become less extreme than before. It is a positive change that women's recognition has become more open and that

their sexual assertiveness has improved. In addition, as the sexual double standard has become far more open than before among university students, they have developed a more open attitude toward sexual behaviors. However, differential evaluation of women's and men's sexual behavior has an important impact on women's lives. As such, there is a need for more research on how sexual double standards affect women emotionally and behaviorally by addressing the problems of existing research methods. In addition, it is necessary to develop practical and systematic education programs to promote healthy sexual practices and education among college students.

Conflicts of interest

The authors report no actual or potential conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgment

All authors would like to acknowledge the cooperation of the students for participating in this study. This work was supported by the Academic Research Fund of Hoseo University in 2017 [2017-0305].

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2019.01.003>.

References

- Finer LB, Henshaw SK. Disparities in rates of unintended pregnancy in the United States, 1994 and 2001. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2006;38(2):90–6. <https://doi.org/10.1363/psrh.38.090.06>
- Shin KR, Park H, Cha C. Sex education during the school-aged years influences sexual attitudes and sexual health in college: a comparative study from Korea. *Nurs Health Sci*. 2011;13(3):328–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-2018.2011.00622.x>
- Rapaport K, Burkhart B. Personality and attitudinal characteristics of sexually coercive college males. *J Abnorm Psychol*. 1984;93(2):216–21. <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-843X.93.2.216>
- Korea Women's Hot Line. Reality of dating violence and suggestions against it. *Asia Women's Network Forum*. Seoul: Korea Women's Hot Line; 2009. p. 306.
- Muehlenhard CL, Linton MA. Dating rape and sexual aggression in dating situations; incidence and risk factors. *J Couns Psychol*. 1987;34(2):186–96. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.34.2.186>
- Zerubavel N, Messman-Moore TL. Sexual victimization, fear of sexual powerlessness, and cognitive emotion dysregulation as barriers to sexual assertiveness in college women. *Violence Against Women*. 2013;19(12):1518–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801213517566>
- Reiss IL. The social context of premarital sexual permissiveness. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston; 1967. p. 256.
- Rickert VI, Vaughan RD, Wiemann CM. Adolescent dating violence and date rape. *Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol*. 2002;14(5):495–500.
- Gagnon JH, Simon W. Sexual conduct: the social sources of human sexuality. 2nd ed. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction Publishers; 2005. p. 61–82.
- Wiederman MW. Sexual script theory: past, present, and future. In: DeLamater J, Plante RF, editors. *Handbook of the sociology of sexualities*. New York, NY: Springer; 2015. p. 7–22.
- Choo B. A qualitative analysis of college students' sexual script: maintenance of and cracks in the double standard. *Forum Youth Cult*. 2015;42:130–56. <https://doi.org/10.17854/ffyc.2015.04.42.129>. Korean.
- England P, Bearak J. The sexual double standard and gender differences in attitudes toward casual sex among U.S. university students. *Demogr Res*. 2014;30(46):1327–38. <https://doi.org/10.4054/DemRes.2014.30.46>
- Danube CL, Norris J, Stappenbeck CA, Davis KC, George WH, Zawacki T, et al. Partner type, sexual double standard endorsement, and ambivalence predict abdication and unprotected sex intentions in a community sample of young women. *J Sex Res*. 2016;53(4-5):601–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2015.1061631>
- Lee JY, Lee ES. The explanatory models of dating violence and victimization with dating partners among college students. *Kor J Counsel Psychother*. 2005;17(2):419–36. Korean.
- Caron SL, Davis CM, Halteman WA, Stickle M. Predictors of condom-related behaviors among first-year college students. *J Sex Res*. 1993;30(3):252–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499309551709>
- Sugarman DB, Hotaling GT. Dating violence: prevalence, context, and risk markers. In: Pirog-Good MA, Stets JE, editors. *Violence in dating relationships*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger; 1989. p. 32.
- Morokoff PJ, Quina K, Harlow LL, Whitmire L, Grimley DM, Gibson PR, et al. Sexual assertiveness scale for women: development and validation. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1997;73(4):790–804. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.4.790>
- Burton CW, Halpern-Felsher B, Rankin SH, Rehm RS, Humphreys JC. Relationships and betrayal among young women: theoretical perspectives on adolescent dating abuse. *J Adv Nurs*. 2011;67(6):1393–405. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2010.05565.x>
- Aronowitz T, Lambert CA, Davidoff S. The role of rape myth acceptance in the social norms regarding sexual behavior among college students. *J Community Health Nurs*. 2012;29(3):173–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07370016.2012.697852>
- Shorey RC, Zucosky H, Brasfield H, Febres J, Cornelius TL, Sage C, et al. Dating violence prevention programming: directions for future interventions. *Aggress Violent Behav*. 2012;17(4):289–96. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.03.001>
- Kim YH, Moon ST, Kang HS. Factors influencing on sexual assertiveness of college students. *Kor J Women Health Nurs*. 2013;19(3):166–75. <https://doi.org/10.4069/kjwhn.2013.19.3.166>. Korean.
- Manago AM, Ward LM, Lemm KM, Reed L, Seabrook R. Facebook involvement, objectified body consciousness, body shame, and sexual assertiveness in college women and men. *Sex Roles*. 2015;72(1-2):1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-014-0441-1>
- Riley BH, McDermott RC. Applying self-determination theory to adolescent sexual-risk behavior and knowledge: a structural equation model. *J Am Psychiatr Nurses Assoc*. 2018;24(6):482–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1078390318776369>
- Kelmendi K, Baumgartner F. Exploring violence socialization and approval of intimate partner violence among university students in Kosovo. *J Interpers Violence*. Forthcoming 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517692336>
- Vannier SA, O'Sullivan LF. Sex without desire: characteristics of occasions of sexual compliance in young adults' committed relationships. *J Sex Res*. 2010;47(5):429–39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490903132051>
- Zerubavel N, Messman-Moore TL. Sexual victimization, fear of sexual powerlessness, and cognitive emotion dysregulation as barriers to sexual assertiveness in college women. *Violence Against Women*. 2013;19(12):1518–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801213517566>
- Santos-Iglesias P, Sierra JC, Vallejo-Medina P. Predictors of sexual assertiveness: the role of sexual desire, arousal, attitudes, and partner abuse. *Arch Sex Behav*. 2013;42(6):1043–52. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-9998-3>
- Sakaluk JK, Milhausen RR. Factors influencing university students' explicit and implicit sexual double standards. *J Sex Res*. 2012;49(5):464–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2011.569976>
- Marks MJ, Fraley RC. Confirmation bias and the sexual double standard. *Sex Roles*. 2006;54(1-2):19–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-8866-9>
- Crawford M, Popp D. Sexual double standards: a review and methodological critique of two decades of research. *J Sex Res*. 2003;40(1):13–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490309552163>