Published in final edited form as:

Addict Behav. 2011 April ; 36(4): 416–420. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2010.12.006.

Defending girlfriends, buddies and oneself: Injunctive norms and male barroom aggression

Samantha Wells^{a,b,c,*}, Clayton Neighbors^d, Paul F. Tremblay^{a,c,e}, and Kathryn Graham^{a,c,e,f}

^aSocial and Epidemiological Research Department, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 100 Collip Circle, London, Ontario, Canada, N6G 4X8

^bDepartment of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, University of Western Ontario, Kresge Building, Room K201, London, Ontario, Canada, N6A 5C1

^cDalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, 6th Floor, Health Sciences Building, 155 College Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M5T 3M7

^dDepartment of Psychology, University of Houston, 126 Heyne Building, TX 77204-5022, United States

^eDepartment of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, Social Science Centre, Room 7418, London, Ontario, Canada, N6A 5C2

^fNational Drug Research Institute, Curtin University of Technology, GPO Box U1987, Perth, Western Australia, 6845

Abstract

Objective—Research has demonstrated that young adults tend to overestimate their peers' approval of risky behaviors (i.e., injunctive norms) and that perceived peer approval is associated with actual behavior; however, no empirical studies have assessed injunctive norms in relation to male barroom aggression. The objectives of the present study were to compare young men's own approval of male barroom aggression with their perceptions of approval by male and female peers and to determine the extent that perceived peer approval of male barroom aggression was associated with self-reported physical aggression at a bar, controlling for own approval and heavy episodic drinking.

Method—525 young adult male university and community college students who reported drinking and going to a bar, club or pub rated their own approval and perceptions of peers' approval of bar aggression on items reflecting four domains of approval: (1) general approval, (2) defend self, (3) defend friend and (4) protect girlfriend.

*Corresponding author. Social and Epidemiological Research Department, Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, 100 Collip Circle, Suite 200, London, Ontario, Canada N6G 4X8. Tel.: +1 519 858 5010x22001; fax: +1 519 858 5199. swells@uwo.ca (S. Wells).

Contributors

Authors Wells, Graham and Tremblay designed the study and wrote the protocol. Author Wells conducted literature searches, conducted statistical analyses and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. Neighbors provided unique expertise regarding injunctive norms. All authors contributed to and have approved the final manuscript.

Conflict of Interest

All authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Results—For all four domains, participants attributed greater approval to male peers than to themselves. Aggression was positively associated with own approval for all domains and with perceived male peer approval for *general approval*, *defend self* and *defend friend*, controlling for heavy episodic drinking and own approval of aggression. Perceived approval by female peers was not associated with increased likelihood of aggression.

Conclusion—The findings suggest that both perceived male peer approval and personal approval are factors associated with male barroom aggression and that addressing approval of barroom aggression is a critical direction for prevention programming.

Keywords

Male barroom aggression; Injunctive norms; Peer approval; Alcohol and aggression; Attitudes and behavior

1. Introduction

Aggression and violence commonly occur in public drinking establishments (Archer, Holloway, & McLoughlin, 1995; Leonard, Quigley, & Collins, 2002; Pernanen, 1991; Stockwell, Lang, & Rydon, 1993) with men far more likely than women to engage in barroom aggression (Graham & Wells, 2001; Graham, Wells, & Jolley, 2002; Homel, Tomsen, & Thommeny, 1992). A growing body of research indicates that aggression by men in drinking establishments is often perceived by young men as being completely normative and acceptable (Benson & Archer, 2002; Graham & Wells, 2003; Tomsen, 1997) despite the many harms that can result (Hingson, Heeren, Zakocs, Kopstein, & Wechsler, 2002). Thus, social influences may be important in explaining male barroom aggression.

Research has demonstrated that young adults tend to overestimate their peers' approval of risky behaviors (Neighbors et al., 2008, 2007) and that perceived peer approval is associated with actual behavior. Perceptions regarding the extent to which important others approve of social behaviors (i.e., injunctive norms) (Ajzen, 1991; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975) have been shown to be important in explaining alcohol use (Borsari & Carey, 2003), gambling (Neighbors et al., 2007) and aggression (Henry et al., 2000; Huesmann & Guerra, 1997). Further, research on gender-specific norms indicates that normative perceptions for same-sex peers are more important than for opposite-sex peers (Lewis & Neighbors, 2004).

To date, no empirical studies have assessed injunctive norms in relation to male barroom aggression. While ethnographic and qualitative studies on barroom violence indicate that young men perceive a great deal of peer approval for bar aggression as well as peer pressure to respond aggressively in certain provoking situations in bars (Benson & Archer, 2002; Tomsen, 1997; Tuck, 1989; see also Wells, Graham, & Tremblay, 2007), the extent to which these perceptions actually influence male barroom aggression is unknown.

The present study addressed two objectives. The first objective was to compare young men's own approval of male barroom aggression with perceptions of their male and female peers' approval of such behavior, thus providing an assessment of the discrepancy between one's own approval and perceived approval of others. The second objective of the present study

was to examine the extent to which perceived male and female peer approval of male barroom aggression was associated with the likelihood of engaging in aggression, controlling for the effects of personal approval of aggression and heavy episodic drinking, a known correlate of aggression (see Wells, Mihic, Tremblay, Graham, & Demers, 2008; Wells, Speechley, Koval, & Graham, 2007).

2. Method

2.1. Participants

A random sample of 2500 young adult male students (ages 19 to 25) registered at a local university or a community college in a mid-sized city in Southwestern Ontario, Canada was selected for recruitment to participate in an online survey. In March 2009 these students were sent an e-mail invitation and non-respondents were sent up to four follow-up e-mail reminders. Participants were paid \$20 for completing the questionnaire and were entered into a draw for cash prizes (i.e., two cash prizes of \$500 and five cash prizes of \$200). A total of 794 students participated in the survey (response rate=32%). Excluded from analyses were participants who provided invalid data ($n=25$, 3%) and those who reported that they had never had an alcoholic drink in their life and/or had never been to a bar, club or pub ($n=70$, 9%). Data analyses were restricted to complete data, resulting in a final sample size of 525.

2.2. Measures

2.2.1. Approval of male barroom aggression—Participants rated their own approval and perceptions of male and female peers' approval of bar aggression on items (rated on a 5-point scale) reflecting four domains of approval: 1) *general approval* (7 items), 2) *defend self* (i.e., approval when defending oneself) (4 items), 3) *defend friend* (i.e., approval when defending a friend) (3 items), and 4) *protect girlfriend* (i.e., approval when protecting or defending a girlfriend) (3 items). The latter three domains were based on typical provoking situations in the barroom (Graham & Wells, 2003; Wells, Graham, & Tremblay, 2009). Cronbach's alpha for own approval was .84, .74, .75 and .80 for *general approval*, *defend self*, *defend friend*, and *protect girlfriend*, respectively. Similarly, Cronbach's alpha across the four domains respectively was .83, .80, .79 and .71 for perceived male peer approval and .78, .82, .72 and .68 for perceived female peer approval.

2.2.2. Heavy episodic drinking—Participants were asked how many times they had consumed 5 or more alcoholic drinks in a single day in the previous 12 months. Due to the skewed distribution of this variable, it was dichotomously coded as any consumption of five or more drinks approximately once a week or more (i.e., 52 or more times in the past 12 months) versus no heavy episodic drinking or infrequent heavy episodic drinking (i.e., less than 52 times).

2.2.3. Male barroom aggression—Participants were asked to report the number of times in the previous 12 months they had experienced an incident at a bar, club or pub in which they had grabbed, pushed, shoved, hit or kicked someone or did something else to the

person that was physically aggressive. This was coded as no aggression versus one or more incidents of aggression.

2.2.4. Age and institution—Participants were asked to report their age (categorized as 18 to 21 versus 22 to 25). A dichotomous variable was included reflecting the institution (community college versus university) the student was attending.

2.3. Statistical analyses

For comparisons of own approval of male barroom aggression with perceived approval of male and female peers, within-subjects analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were computed, with degrees of freedom adjusted for sphericity where appropriate (i.e., Greenhouse–Geisser) and post-hoc contrasts adjusted for multiple comparisons. Effect sizes for within-subject differences were evaluated with Cohen's d ($<.20$ =small, $.20$ – $.80$ =medium, and $>.80$ =large; Cohen, 1988) calculated using original standard deviations as recommended by Dunlop, Cortina, Vaslow, and Burke (1996) for more conservative estimates.

A series of hierarchical multiple logistic regression models was computed to assess the extent to which perceived peer approval of male barroom aggression was associated with the likelihood of engaging in physical aggression at a bar, with and without controls for own approval. First, heavy episodic drinking, age and campus (i.e., community college versus university) were entered. Second, perceived approval of male and female peers were entered into separate models for each approval domain (i.e., *general approval*, *defend self*, *defend friend*, and *protect girlfriend*). Finally, own approval was entered for each domain.

3. Results

The within-subjects ANOVAs revealed significant differences between participants' own approval and perceived male and female peer approval for each of the four domains, *general approval* ($F=291.54$, $2/1036$ df , $p<.001$), *defend self* ($F=118.49$, $2/1029$ df , $p<.001$), *defend friend* ($F=208.74$, $2/975$ df , $p<.001$), and *protect girlfriend* ($F=163.50$, $2/1048$, $p<.001$) (see Fig. 1). Post-hoc contrasts indicated that all differences between own approval and perceived male and female peer approval were significant for each approval domain ($d=.13$ to $.82$), with the exception of the contrast between own approval and perceived female peer approval for the *protect girlfriend* domain ($d=.07$, $p=.14$). Large and medium effect sizes were found for the following comparisons: own approval versus perceived male peer approval for the *general approval* domain ($d=.82$, $p<.001$), *protect girlfriend* domain ($d=.58$, $p<.001$) and *defend self* domain ($d=.39$, $p<.001$) and for own versus perceived female peer approval for the *defend friend* ($d=.57$, $p<.001$) and *general approval* domains ($d=.23$, $p<.001$). Overall, perceived male peer approval was higher than own approval for all four domains. Own approval was higher than female approval for defending self and defending a friend and lower for general approval.

Multivariate logistic regression results revealed that perceived male peer approval was significantly and positively associated with male barroom aggression in all models, controlling for heavy episodic drinking, age and campus (see Table 1, Models 2 to 5, Step 1). The effect of perceived male peer approval was reduced when own approval was added to

the models (see Models 2 to 5, Step 2), but remained significant in all models with the exception of Model 5 for the *protect girlfriend* domain.

Perceived female peer approval was non-significant in each of the four models in which it was tested prior to entering the score for own approval (see Models 2 to 5, Step 1). However, for the *defend self* explanatory model (Model 3), the effect of perceived female peer approval became significantly but *negatively* associated with male barroom aggression, controlling for own approval (Step 2).

4. Discussion

The present study compared young men's own approval of male barroom aggression with perceptions of their peers' approval of such behavior in four domains of approval: *general approval*, *defend self*, *defend friend* and *protect girlfriend*. Similar to evidence regarding perceived peer approval of drinking behavior (Neighbors et al., 2008), young men perceived greater approval of male barroom aggression by male peers compared with their own approval. The difference between own approval and perceived male peer approval was especially large for general approval of aggression as well as aggression when protecting a girlfriend. Overall, these findings suggest that young men may overestimate the extent to which their male peers approve of male barroom aggression.

The present study also examined the extent to which norm perceptions regarding aggression in bars were related to the likelihood of engaging in male barroom aggression. The findings revealed that perceived male peer approval was significantly associated with male barroom aggression for each approval domain, controlling for heavy episodic drinking. In models that controlled for respondents' own approval, the effect of perceived male peer approval was attenuated but remained significant in three of the four domains (i.e., *general approval*, *defend self*, *defend friend*). Overall, these findings are congruent with qualitative research on barroom aggression suggesting that young men feel they are expected, even required, to behave aggressively when provoked or threatened and behave accordingly in order to avoid social sanctions (Benson & Archer, 2002; Tomsen, 1997; Tuck, 1989; Wells et al., 2009). This appears to be especially true when coming to the defense of a friend but also in defense of oneself.

Consistent with research on gender-specific norms (Lewis & Neighbors, 2004), perceived female peer approval was not associated with increased likelihood of male aggression. In fact, for the *defend self* domain, a negative association was found between perceived female peer approval and aggression when personal approval was controlled. This finding is consistent with other studies where injunctive norms for more distal referent groups become negatively associated with the outcome when norms for more proximal referents are controlled (e.g., Neighbors et al., 2008). The present results suggest that perceived female peer approval is of little importance to young adult men in terms of whether they engage in barroom aggression.

This study has some limitations. The response rate, although comparable to other large national surveys of university students (Adlaf, Demers, & Gliksman, 2005), was lower than

desirable (32%) for concluding generalizability of findings. Nevertheless, the consistency with prior qualitative research indicating the importance of male peer approval supports its validity. Additionally, the present study was cross-sectional, making it impossible to determine the true direction of relationships between aggression and approval. Longitudinal research is needed to provide additional clarification regarding temporal precedence (Kazdin, 2007).

Despite these limitations, this research makes an important contribution to the literature on social norms and male barroom aggression. To our knowledge, this is the first study to assess injunctive norms relating to male barroom aggression and to evaluate their role in explaining the occurrence of this important social problem. The present study suggests that personal approval of male barroom aggression as well as perceived male peer approval of aggression may be important influences in barroom aggression among men. Therefore, addressing general approval of aggression as well as possible overestimations of peer approval of aggression may be critical directions for prevention programming.

Acknowledgments

Role of Funding Sources

Funding for this study was provided by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (MOP-82872). CIHR had no role in the study design, collection, analysis or interpretation of the data, writing the manuscript, or the decision to submit the paper for publication. We also acknowledge that support to the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health for the salary of scientists and infrastructure has been provided by the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care. The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care.

The authors wish to thank Scott Macdonald, Tim Stockwell and Brian Quigley who provided feedback on the questionnaire items assessing injunctive norms (as well as additional attitudinal items). Special thanks are extended to Roseanne Pulford for coordinating data collection and to Peter Fewster and Heather Stevens at Social Science Network and Data Services, University of Western Ontario, for programming the web-based questionnaire for this study.

The research was supported by the Canadian Institutes for Health Research (CIHR), Operating Grant MOP-82872. In addition, support to CAMH for salary of scientists and infrastructure has been provided by the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long Term Care. The views expressed here reflect those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Ministry of Health and Long Term Care or the CIHR. The authors would like to thank Roseanne Pulford who provided assistance on data collection.

References

- Adlaf, EM.; Demers, A.; Gliksman, L., editors. Canadian campus survey, 2004. Toronto: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health; 2005.
- Ajzen I. The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 1991; 50:179–211.
- Archer J, Holloway R, McLoughlin K. Self-reported physical aggression among young men. *Aggressive Behavior*. 1995; 21:325–342.
- Benson D, Archer J. An ethnographic study of sources of conflict between young men in the context of the night out. *Psychology, Evolution & Gender*. 2002; 4:3–30.
- Borsari B, Carey KB. Descriptive and injunctive norms in college drinking: A meta-analytic integration. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 2003; 64:331–341. [PubMed: 12817821]
- Cohen, J. Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. 2. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates; 1988.

- Dunlop WP, Cortina JM, Vaslow JB, Burke MJ. Meta-analysis of experiments with matched groups or repeated measures designs. *Psychological Methods*. 1996; 1:170–177.
- Fishbein, M.; Ajzen, I. *Belief, attitude, intention and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley; 1975.
- Graham K, Wells S. Aggression among young adults in the social context of the bar. *Addiction Research and Theory*. 2001; 9:193–219.
- Graham K, Wells S. “Somebody’s gonna get their head kicked in tonight!”: Aggression among young males in bars — A question of values. *British Journal of Criminology*. 2003; 43:546–566.
- Graham K, Wells S, Jelley J. The social context of physical aggression among adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2002; 17:64–83.
- Henry D, Guerra N, Huesmann R, Tolan P, VanAcker R, Eron L. Normative influences on aggression in urban elementary school classrooms. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2000; 28:59–81. [PubMed: 10824274]
- Hingson RW, Heeren T, Zakocs RC, Kopstein A, Wechsler H. Magnitude of alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among U.S. college students ages 18–24. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 2002; 63:136–144. [PubMed: 12033690]
- Homel R, Tomsen S, Thommeny J. Public drinking and violence: Not just an alcohol problem. *Journal of Drug Issues*. 1992; 22:679–697.
- Huesmann LR, Guerra NG. Children’s normative beliefs about aggression and aggressive behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1997; 72:408–419. [PubMed: 9107008]
- Kazdin AE. Mediators and mechanisms of change in psychotherapy research. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*. 2007; 3:1–27.
- Leonard KE, Quigley BM, Collins RL. Physical aggression in the lives of young adults: Prevalence, location, and severity among college and community samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2002; 17:533–550.
- Lewis MA, Neighbors C. Gender-specific misperceptions of college student drinking norms. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2004; 18:334–339. [PubMed: 15631605]
- Neighbors C, Lostutter TW, Whiteside U, Fossos N, Walker DD, Larimer ME. Injunctive norms and problem gambling among college students. *Journal of Gambling Studies*. 2007; 23:259–273. [PubMed: 17394053]
- Neighbors C, O’Conner RM, Lewis MA, Chawla N, Lee CM, Fossos N. The relative impact of injunctive norms on college student drinking: The role of reference group. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2008; 22:576–581. [PubMed: 19071984]
- Pernanen, K. *Alcohol in human violence*. New York: The Guilford Press; 1991.
- Stockwell T, Lang E, Rydon P. High risk drinking settings: The association of serving and promotional practices with harmful drinking. *Addiction*. 1993; 88:1519–1526. [PubMed: 8286997]
- Tomsen S. A top night out — Social protest, masculinity and the culture of drinking violence. *British Journal of Criminology*. 1997; 37:90–102.
- Tuck, M. *Drinking and disorder: A study of non-Metropolitan violence*. London: Her Majesty’s Stationary Office Home office research study #108; 1989. Disorder in the paired towns; p. 11-103.
- Wells S, Graham K, Tremblay PF. Beliefs, attitudes, and male-to-male barroom aggression: Development of a theoretical predictive model. *Addiction Research and Theory*. 2007; 15:575–586.
- Wells S, Graham K, Tremblay PF. ‘Every male in there is your competition’: Young men’s expectations of the role of the drinking setting in male-to-male barroom aggression. *Substance Use & Misuse*. 2009; 44:1434–1462. [PubMed: 19938926]
- Wells S, Mihic L, Tremblay PF, Graham K, Demers A. Where, with whom, and how much alcohol is consumed on drinking events involving aggression? Event-level associations in a Canadian national survey of university students. *Alcoholism, Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2008; 32:1–12.
- Wells S, Speechley M, Koval JJ, Graham K. Gender differences in the relationship between heavy episodic drinking, social roles, and alcohol-related aggression in a U.S. sample of late adolescent and young adult drinkers. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*. 2007; 33:21–29. [PubMed: 17366243]

Fig. 1.

Mean levels of men's own approval as well as perceived male and female approval in four domains: general approval, defend self, defend friend and protect girlfriend. **Statistically significant difference from own approval at $p < .01$. ***Statistically significant difference from own approval at $p < .001$.

Table 1

Multiple regression models assessing the roles of own approval and perceived male and female peer approval in explaining male barroom aggression.

Model and variable	Step 1		Step 2	
	OR	CI	OR	CI
<i>Model 1: Control variables only</i>				
Campus	.75	.51, 1.11	–	–
Age (1=ages 18 to 21, 0=22 to 25)	1.92**	1.18, 3.10	–	–
Heavy episodic drinking	3.48***	2.28, 5.31	–	–
Nagelkerke R^2	.11			
<i>Model 2: General approval</i>				
Campus	.86	.57, 1.29	.85	.56, 1.29
Age	1.58	.95, 2.63	1.31	.78, 2.20
Heavy episodic drinking	3.00***	1.92, 4.68	2.62***	1.67, 4.13
Perceived male peer approval — general	2.46***	1.74, 3.47	1.71**	1.15, 2.54
Perceived female peer approval — general	1.22	.84, 1.76	.87	.57, 1.33
Own approval — general	–	–	2.19***	1.45, 3.31
Nagelkerke R^2	.22		.26	
<i>Model 3: Defend self</i>				
Campus	.84	.56, 1.27	.84	.55, 1.29
Age	1.75*	1.06, 2.90	1.63	.97, 2.73
Heavy episodic drinking	3.50***	2.23, 5.48	3.32***	2.10, 5.27
Perceived male peer approval — defend self	3.09**	2.10, 4.53	2.05**	1.33, 3.17
Perceived female peer approval — defend self	.82	.59, 1.14	.58**	.40, .85
Own approval — defend self	–	–	2.65***	1.73, 4.04
Nagelkerke R^2	.23		.28	
<i>Model 4: Defend friend</i>				
Campus	.77	.51, 1.15	.70	.46, 1.06
Age	1.89*	1.14, 3.12	1.77*	1.06, 2.95
Heavy episodic drinking	3.05***	1.96, 4.76	2.94***	1.88, 4.60
Perceived male peer approval — defend friend	2.22***	1.63, 3.03	1.56*	1.06, 2.29
Perceived female peer approval — defend friend	1.04	.78, 1.39	.95	.70, 1.28
Own approval — defend friend	–	–	1.71**	1.20, 2.45
Nagelkerke R^2	.21		.23	
<i>Model 5: Protect girlfriend</i>				
Campus	.85	.57, 1.26	.85	.56, 1.27
Age	1.72*	1.04, 2.83	1.47	.88, 2.45
Heavy episodic drinking	3.51***	2.26, 5.43	3.27***	2.10, 5.12
Perceived male peer approval — protect girlfriend	1.60**	1.15, 2.22	1.19	.82, 1.72

Model and variable	Step 1		Step 2	
	OR	CI	OR	CI
Perceived female peer approval — protect girlfriend	1.30	.95, 1.77	1.00	.71, 1.41
Own approval — protect girlfriend	—	—	1.92***	1.38, 2.68
Nagelkerke R^2	.18		.22	

*
 $p < .05$.

**
 $p < .01$.

 $p < .001$.