**Supplemental Materials**

**Measure Validity Evidence**

***Outcome: Sexual Harassment Perpetration***

The AAUW Sexual Harassment Survey (Authors et al., 2015) has been used with middle and high school students in a number of studies (e.g., Authors et al., 2015; Gruber & Fineran, 2008; McMaster et al., 2002). Modifications to the quantity of items, response frequencies, and time frame for perpetration has occurred for particular samples. For instance, McMaster et al. (2002) used a 9-item version with five response options inquiring about perpetration in the last six weeks. Gruber and Fineran (2008), on the other hand, used 15 items and three response options when asking about perpetration over the last school year. Reported internal consistency reliability has been > .70 across studies, which is sufficient for our research purpose of examining associations between variables over time. In the present sample, the reliability at each of the four waves was α = .94, .91, .92, and .94, and ω = .77, .73, .75, and .78, respectively . Regarding structure, a unidimensional confirmatory factor analysis was run at each wave to evaluate its fit to responses from the six items. We ran the analyses in lavaan (Rossel, 2012) with listwise deletion. The items were dichotomized, so a DWLS estimator was used (Li, 2016). The results in Table 1 indicate a one-factor model adequately fit the data providing evidence for interpretation of the scale score as a measure of perpetrating sexual harassment behaviors.

**Table 1**

*One-factor Confirmatory Factor Analysis for Sexual Harassment Perpetration Scale*

| Wave | *n* | χ2 | *df* | *p* | *CFI* | *RMSEA* | [90% CI] | *SRMR* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1,534 | 14.58 | 9 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 0.02 | [0.00, 0.04] | 0.05 |
| 2 | 1,348 | 25.39 | 9 | 0.00 | 0.98 | 0.04 | [0.02, 0.05] | 0.09 |
| 3 | 1,089 | 8.80 | 9 | 0.46 | 1.00 | 0.00 | [0.00, 0.03] | 0.04 |
| 4 | 992 | 22.58 | 9 | 0.01 | 0.99 | 0.04 | [0.02, 0.06] | 0.06 |

***Hostile Home Environment (Wave 1)***

**Witnessing Parental Violence, Physical and Sexual Child Abuse.** These three items were initially from the adverse childhood experiences questionnaire (Felitti et al, 1998) with similar items present on CDC’s (2021) Violence Against Children and Youth Survey that continues to be administered to youth across the globe. The three adverse experiences could potentially influence sexual harassment perpetration through separate mechanisms. However, the prevalence of each experience in our sample was too low to examine them individually. Furthermore, the aim of the paper is to examine the overall impact of hostile home environments rather than the effect of a particular experience. Previous studies with adolescents have combined these three items into a single index and found positive associations with alcohol use (Hamburger et al., 2008) and dating violence perpetration (Ali et al., 2011).

**Family Conflict.** The Family Conflict and Hostility scale was originally designed for the Rochester Youth Development Study with a sample of 1,000 grade 7 and 8 students (Thornberry et al., 2003). The scale was included in the CDC compendium of assessment tools for measuring violence-related attitudes, behaviors, and influences among youth (Dahlberg et al., 2005). Subsequent studies using the scale with adolescent samples have found family conflict to be positively associated with perpetrating other aggressive behaviors, including bullying and cyberbullying (Author, 2012), fighting (Authors et al., 2013), and peer and sibling aggression (Authors et al., 2020) with internal consistency (α) reliability > .70.

**Sibling Aggression.** The Duncan Sibling Aggression Scale (Duncan, 1999) was originally administered to 375 middle school youth and found the majority of youth who reported being both perpetrator and victim of peer bullying were also a victim of sibling aggression. In a similar approach to the present study using the three most overtly aggressive items, Yu and Gamble (2008) found sibling aggression (α = .89) to be positively associated with internalizing problems in a sample of 433 middle and high school aged sibling dyads.

***Moderators***

**School Belonging (Waves 1-4).** The Psychological Sense of School Membership (PSSM; Goodenow, 1993) was refined through an iterative scale development process with multiple adolescent samples to parse an initial pool of items to the final 18-item scale. The PSSM has since been adapted for use with a variety of adolescent populations, including American Indian/Alaskan Native (Hussain et al., 2018), Chilean (Gaete et al., 2016), and South African (Cowden et al., 2018). In a review of the use of the PSSM, You and colleagues (2011) reported internal consistency reliability was between .78 and .95 and test-retest reliability between .56 (12-month interval) and .78 (4-week interval) in the 42 studies they examined, 15 of which used a shortened version of the scale. You and colleagues (2011) also examined the dimensionality of the PSSM with an exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis cross-validation approach on a sample of 504 Australian adolescents. They determined a 3-factor model best fit the data with 12 items grouped onto caring relationship, acceptance, and rejection factors and 6 items had high cross-loadings on multiple factors. With a sample of 890 adolescents in the United States, Ye and Wallace (2014) used a similar approach and concluded the best fitting model was a 3-factor model for 15 items grouped on identification and participation in school, perception of fitting in with peers, and generalized connection to teachers factors along with a fourth factor accounting for the residual variance from the negatively worded items. Both studies concluded the full PSSM to be a multidimensional scale. The CDC compendium of assessment tools for measuring violence-related attitudes, behaviors, and influences among youth included a 5-item version (p. 153, Dahlberg et al., 2005). From these items, the present study excluded the reversed scored item and used a 4-item subset. Confirmatory factor analysis for a unidimensional measure was performed at each wave using a DWLS estimator given the ordinal items (Li, 2016). The analysis was run with lavaan (Rosseel, 2012) using listwise deletion. The unidimensional model fit the data well in waves 1 and 2 with ambiguous results in waves 3 and 4 (Table 2).

**Table 2**

*One-factor Confirmatory Factor Analysis for School Belonging Scale*

| Wave | *n* | χ2 | *df* | *p* | *CFI* | *RMSEA* | [90% CI] | *SRMR* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 1,461 | 4.45 | 2 | 0.11 | 1.00 | 0.03 | [0.00, 0.07] | 0.01 |
| 2 | 1,402 | 9.16 | 2 | 0.01 | 0.99 | 0.05 | [0.02, 0.09] | 0.02 |
| 3 | 1,147 | 13.57 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.07 | [0.04, 0.11] | 0.03 |
| 4 | 987 | 19.44 | 2 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.09 | [0.06, 0.13] | 0.03 |

**Longitudinal Measurement Invariance**

To establish longitudinal measurement invariance with ordinal items, we ran models that sequentially imposed stricter constraints across waves (Liu et al., 2017). To identify the location and scale of the common factor (e.g., sexual harassment perpetration) at each time point, the first item’s intercept and factor loading were fixed to 0 and 1, respectively. The location and scale of each unique factor – the latent item-response underlying the ordinal responses – was identified using the theta parameterization, and the identification constraints proposed by Millsap & Tein (2004). The configural model was fit first with all parameters estimated freely across the four waves except those needed to identify the model. Next, the metric model constrained factor loadings to equality over time. The scalar model constrained factor loadings and the item thresholds. For sexual harassment perpetration, the metric and scalar models were equivalent given that all the items were dichotomous, and the only threshold was already constrained for model identification purposes.

**Table 3**

*Longitudinal Measurement Invariance of the Sexual Harassment Perpetration Scale (N = 732)*

| Model | χ2 | *df* | *p* | *CFI* | *RMSEA* | [90% CI] | *SRMR* | *Δ*χ2 | *Δdf* | *Δp* | *ΔCFI* | *ΔRMSEA* | *ΔSRMR* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Configural | 239.94 | 207 | 0.06 | 0.98 | 0.01 | [0.00, 0.02] | 0.11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metric/Scalar | 257.15 | 221 | 0.05 | 0.98 | 0.01 | [0.00, 0.02] | 0.11 | 21.930 | 14 | 0.080 | -0.002 | 0.005 | 0.004 |
| Strict | 278.21 | 237 | 0.03 | 0.98 | 0.02 | [0.00, 0.02] | 0.11 | 26.394 | 16 | 0.049 | -0.005 | 0.006 | 0.004 |

*Note.* 1 of 18 factor loading constraints were freed in the metric/scalar model. Additionally, 2 of 18 unique variance constraints were freed in the strict model.

**Table 4**

*Longitudinal Measurement Invariance of the School Belonging Scale (N = 763)*

| Model | χ2 | *df* | *p* | *CFI* | *RMSEA* | [90% CI] | *SRMR* | *Δ*χ2 | *Δdf* | *Δp* | *ΔCFI* | *ΔRMSEA* | *ΔSRMR* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Configural | 110.43 | 74 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.03 | [0.01, 0.03] | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Metric | 122.76 | 83 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.03 | [0.01, 0.03] | 0.03 | 13.746 | 9.000 | 0.132 | 0.000 | 0.008 | 0.000 |
| Scalar | 145.32 | 98 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.03 | [0.02, 0.03] | 0.03 | 25.487 | 15.000 | 0.044 | 0.000 | 0.002 | 0.001 |
| Strict | 199.26 | 109 | 0.00 | 0.99 | 0.03 | [0.03, 0.04] | 0.03 | 53.841 | 11.000 | 0.000 | -0.004 | 0.013 | 0.005 |

*Note.* 7 of 21 threshold constraints were freed in the scalar model and remained free in the strict model.

Finally, the strict model constrained the loadings, thresholds, and unique factor variances. Overall fit of the measurement invariance models was evaluated using typical guidelines of non-significant χ2 test, *CFI* > .95, *RMSEA* < .06, and *SRMR* < .08. The configural, metric, scalar, and strict models were also compared sequentially with a non-significant Satorra and Bentler (2001) χ2 scaled difference test statistic and change (Δ) in *CFI* < -0.01, *RMSEA* < 0.01, and *SRMR* < 0.01 suggesting measurement invariance (Chen, 2007; Svetina, Rutkowski, & Rutkowski, 2020). The χ2 (difference) test is known to be overly sensitive to large sample sizes (e.g., Bentler & Bonnett, 1980), which we have in the present study. Conversely, the fit indices (*CFI*, *RMSEA,* and *SRMR*) are known to be under-sensitive to model misfit (e.g., Savalei, 2021). Consequently, the common recommendation is to consider all available information rather than relying on a single statistic (Kline, 2015; Putnick & Bornstein, 2016). When full invariance was not achieved, we investigated partial invariance, which is sufficient for examining mean differences on the scale (Putnick & Bornstein, 2016).

For the sexual harassment perpetration scale, the change in fit indices were minimal, which indicated the scale was invariant across time. The χ2 difference test, however, was significant suggesting non-invariance. Thus, we examined which constraints needed to be released to achieve partial invariance. The χ2 difference test indicated that metric invariance was achieved after freeing 1 of the 18 factor loading constraints (item 4 in wave 2) and strict invariance was achieved after freeing only 2 of the 18 unique variance constraints (item 3 in waves 3 and 4; Table 3). This evidence shows the majority of the sexual harassment perpetration items were invariant across time and the scale is suitable for use in the latent growth models. The school belonging scale showed evidence of longitudinal invariance as little to no change occurred in the fit indices as constraints were added to the model and the non-significant χ2 difference test demonstrated metric invariance. Nonetheless, χ2 difference tests for scalar and strict invariance were significant, so we investigated partial invariance. The χ2 difference test indicated scalar partial invariance was achieved after freeing 7 of the 21 threshold constraints. Strict invariance was not achieved according to the χ2 difference test. Thus, the evidence for longitudinal measurement invariance for the school belonging scale was mixed. The evidence may not be sufficient for some uses of the scale. We are, however, only using the school belonging scale to crudely group students rather than requiring precise estimates of individual scores. Therefore, we contend the evidence is sufficient for our purposes.

**Cluster Analysis of School Belonging**

There is no definitive method for selecting the optimal *k*. Utilizing the factoextra package (Kassambara & Mundt, 2020) in R (R Core Team, 2021), we employed 3 methods 1) within sum of squares (wss) - similar to a scree plot, visual inspection of an “elbow” indicates the optimal *k* given the variance explained, 2) silhouette - incorporates average distance of observations to cluster center and distance between cluster centers with the optimal *k* maximizing the silhouette score, and 3) gap stat - compares the within cluster variation from the proposed clustering and a reference distribution with no clustering with the optimal *k* maximizing the gap.

**Figure 1**
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**Alternative Growth Model Check**

An unconditional linear growth model and quadratic growth model were run to determine the functional form of sexual harassment perpetration in the entire sample. Both the linear (χ2 (5) = 4.17, p = .53; *CFI* = 1.00, *RMSEA* = 0.00, *SRMR* = 0.02) and quadratic (χ2 (1) = 0.40, p = .53; *CFI* = 1.00, *RMSEA* = 0.00, *SRMR* = 0.01) models fit the data well. A likelihood ratio test indicated the quadratic term did not improve model fit (χ2 (4) = 3.17, p = .49) and the BIC for the linear model was lower than the quadratic model (11659.5 to 11677.4). Additionally, the quadratic fixed effect (*b* = -0.02, *SE* = 0.02, *p* = .29) and random effect (σ2 = .03, *SE* = .04, *p* = .39) parameters were non-significant. This evidence suggested the linear model was more suitable for the analysis.

**Latent Growth Model Standardized Estimates**

**Table 5**

*Standardized Estimates from Latent Growth Model of Sexual Harassment Perpetration (n = 1564)*

| Predictor | Intercept | Slope |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Intercept term | 0.07 (0.04) | 0.41 (0.10)\*\* |
| Family Conflict | 0.01 (0.05) | 0.06 (0.09) |
| Abuse | 0.26 (0.06)\*\* | -0.19 (0.04)\*\* |
| Sibling Aggression | 0.04 (0.05) | -0.01 (0.04) |
| SH Victim | 0.41 (0.04)\*\* | -0.07 (0.08) |
| *R*2 | 0.29 (0.03) | 0.04 (0.03) |

*Note.* Parentheses contain cluster robust standard errors. SH = Sexual Harassment. Model fit was χ2 (13) = 23.96, *p* = 0.03; *CFI* = 0.97; *RMSEA* = 0.02 [0.01, 0.04]; *SRMR* = 0.02. \**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01

**Table 6**

*Standardized Estimates from Multigroup Analysis of Sexual Harassment Perpetration on Hostile Home Environment by Sex*

| Parameter | Girls  *n* = 761 | Boys  *n* = 797 | *Wald* χ2  *df = 1* | *p* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intercept on |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept term | -0.04 (0.05) | 0.16 (0.06)\* | 4.49 | 0.03 |
| Family Conflict | 0.06 (0.08) | 0.00 (0.08) | 0.21 | 0.64 |
| Abuse | 0.30 (0.06)\*\* | 0.20 (0.09)\* | 0.36 | 0.55 |
| Sibling Aggression | 0.01 (0.08) | 0.06 (0.05) | 0.45 | 0.50 |
| Slope on |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept term | 0.37 (0.09)\*\* | 0.44 (0.17)\* | 0.37 | 0.54 |
| Family Conflict | 0.05 (0.09) | 0.05 (0.14) | 0.00 | 0.99 |
| Abuse | -0.20 (0.10) | -0.18 (0.03)\*\* | 0.02 | 0.89 |
| Sibling Aggression | 0.01 (0.08) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.01 | 0.91 |

*Note.* Parentheses contain cluster robust standard errors. Model fit was χ2 (26) = 26.89, *p* = 0.42; *CFI* = 1.00; *RMSEA* [90% CI] = 0.01 [0.00, 0.03]; *SRMR* = 0.03. Omnibus Wald χ2 (8) = 55.81, *p* < .01.\**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01

**Table 7**

*Standardized Estimates from Multigroup Analysis of Sexual Harassment Perpetration on Hostile Home Environment by Race/Ethnicity*

| Parameter | Black  *n =* 460 | White  *n =* 298 | Hispanic  *n =* 605 | *Wald* χ2  *df = 1* | *p* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intercept on |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept term | 0.03 (0.07) | 0.05 (0.08) | 0.07 (0.04)\* | 0.44 | 0.80 |
| Family Conflict | 0.09 (0.07) | 0.02 (0.07) | 0.00 (0.07) | 0.99 | 0.61 |
| Abuse | 0.12 (0.08) | 0.21 (0.12) | 0.36 (0.05)\*\* | 3.16 | 0.21 |
| Sibling Aggression | 0.10 (0.05) | 0.00 (0.14) | -0.01 (0.07) | 2.11 | 0.35 |
| Slope on |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept term | 0.45 (0.16)\*\* | 0.22 (0.16) | 0.33 (0.09)\*\* | 2.76 | 0.25 |
| Family Conflict | 0.08 (0.14) | 0.08 (0.12) | 0.07 (0.08) | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Abuse | -0.07 (0.10) | -0.40 (0.15)\*\* | -0.28 (0.09)\*\* | 3.16 | 0.21 |
| Sibling Aggression | -0.04 (0.08) | 0.05 (0.10) | 0.02 (0.07) | 0.44 | 0.80 |

*Note.* Parentheses contain cluster robust standard errors. Model fit was χ2 (39) = 48.05, *p* = 0.15; *CFI* = 0.98; *RMSEA* = 0.02 [0.00, 0.04]; *SRMR* = 0.03. Omnibus Wald χ2 (16) = 10759.10, *p* < .01. \*\**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01

**Table 8**

*Standardized Estimates from Multigroup Analysis of Sexual Harassment Perpetration on Hostile Home Environment by School Belonging*

| Parameter | Higha  *n =* 932 | Moderate  *n =* 629 | *Wald* χ2  *df = 1* | *p* |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intercept on |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept term | 0.13 (0.06)\* | 0.07 (0.07) | 0.00 | 0.98 |
| Family Conflict | -0.03 (0.08) | 0.04 (0.06) | 0.53 | 0.47 |
| Abuse | 0.21 (0.12) | 0.30 (0.08)\*\* | 2.40 | 0.12 |
| Sibling Aggression | 0.02 (0.06) | 0.05 (0.04) | 0.85 | 0.36 |
| Slope on |  |  |  |  |
| Intercept term | 2.27 (1.27) | 0.39 (0.07)\*\* | 4.02 | 0.04 |
| Family Conflict | 0.38 (0.75) | 0.01 (0.06) | 0.06 | 0.80 |
| Abuse | -0.72 (0.63) | -0.19 (0.06)\*\* | 1.39 | 0.24 |
| Sibling Aggression | 0.02 (0.38) | 0.00 (0.10) | 0.00 | 0.96 |

*Note.* Parentheses contain cluster robust standard errors. aSlope variance was constrained to 0. Model fit was χ2 (28) = 53.50, *p* = 0.00; *CFI* = 0.93; *RMSEA* = 0.03 [0.02, 0.05]; *SRMR* = 0.04. Omnibus Wald χ2 (8) = 114.23, *p* = 0.\**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01

**Table 9**

*Standardized Estimates from Latent Growth Model of Sexual Harassment Perpetration Stratified by Sex*

|  | Girls | | Boys | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intercept | Slope | Intercept | Slope |
| Intercept term | 0.07 (0.18) | 0.22 (0.43) | 0.24 (0.10)\* | 0.61 (0.27)\* |
| Family Conflict (FC) | -0.02 (0.20) | 0.81 (0.47) | 0.13 (0.20) | 0.20 (0.32) |
| Abuse | 0.96 (0.35)\*\* | -1.51 (0.40)\*\* | 0.07 (0.31) | -0.05 (0.40) |
| Sibling Aggression (SA) | 0.43 (0.15)\*\* | 0.24 (0.44) | 0.03 (0.08) | -0.53 (0.27)\* |
| Sexual Harassment Victim | 0.36 (0.06)\*\* | -0.09 (0.09) | 0.42 (0.07)\*\* | -0.11 (0.08) |
| Black | -0.12 (0.04)\*\* | 0.19 (0.10) | -0.01 (0.04) | 0.01 (0.11) |
| White | -0.10 (0.05) | 0.03 (0.07) | -0.07 (0.03)\* | 0.04 (0.07) |
| Other Race | -0.05 (0.04) | 0.19 (0.10) | -0.03 (0.05) | 0.10 (0.11) |
| High School Belonging (HSB) | -0.06 (0.05) | -0.22 (0.10)\* | 0.02 (0.08) | -0.11 (0.09) |
| Academic Grades (AG) | 0.03 (0.06) | 0.08 (0.14) | -0.02 (0.05) | -0.03 (0.07) |
| FC x HSB | -0.02 (0.12) | 0.04 (0.17) | -0.14 (0.09) | -0.07 (0.14) |
| Abuse x HSB | -0.11 (0.14) | 0.14 (0.12) | -0.25 (0.09)\*\* | 0.12 (0.14) |
| SA x HSB | -0.02 (0.07) | -0.06 (0.14) | -0.05 (0.09) | 0.15 (0.18) |
| FC x AG | 0.10 (0.17) | -0.81 (0.49) | -0.03 (0.22) | -0.13 (0.27) |
| Abuse x AG | -0.60 (0.31) | 1.21 (0.36)\*\* | 0.33 (0.41) | -0.20 (0.38) |
| SA x AG | -0.45 (0.14)\*\* | -0.16 (0.33) | 0.08 (0.16) | 0.45 (0.26) |
| *R*2 | 0.40 (0.09) | 0.25 (0.08) | 0.36 (0.05) | 0.09 (0.04) |
| χ2 (35) | 42.88 | | 39.52 | |
| *n* | 761 | | 797 | |
| *CFI* | .98 | | .98 | |
| *RMSEA* | 0.02 [0.00, 0.03] | | 0.01 [0.00, 0.03] | |
| *SRMR* | 0.02 | | 0.02 | |

*Note.* Parentheses contain cluster robust standard errors. \**p* < .05, \**p* < .01

**Table 10**

*Standardized Estimates from Latent Growth Model of Sexual Harassment Perpetration Stratified by Race*

|  | Black | | Whitea | | Hispanic | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intercept | Slope | Intercept | Slope | Intercept | Slope |
| Intercept term | 0.22 (0.24) | 0.01 (0.35) | 0.29 (0.25) | 0.80 (0.54) | 0.40 (0.16)\* | 0.67 (0.26)\* |
| Family Conflict (FC) | 0.26 (0.13)\* | 0.60 (0.26)\* | -0.09 (0.10) | 0.18 (0.16) | -0.07 (0.34) | 0.23 (0.46) |
| Abuse | -0.11 (0.26) | -0.48 (0.24)\* | 0.09 (0.20) | -0.58 (0.20)\*\* | 0.56 (0.31) | -0.84 (0.35)\* |
| Sibling Aggression (SA) | -0.03 (0.16) | 0.69 (0.34)\* | 0.20 (0.10)\* | 0.07 (0.09) | 0.04 (0.12) | -0.38 (0.26) |
| Sexual Harassment Victim | 0.40 (0.07)\*\* | -0.10 (0.06) | 0.22 (0.08)\*\* | 0.21 (0.10)\* | 0.44 (0.06)\*\* | -0.17 (0.06)\*\* |
| Girls | -0.18 (0.07)\*\* | 0.09 (0.09) | -0.10 (0.07) | -0.10 (0.10) | -0.07 (0.05) | -0.10 (0.06) |
| High School Belonging (HSB) | 0.00 (0.10) | -0.09 (0.08) | -0.19 (0.07)\*\* | 0.05 (0.11) | 0.01 (0.06) | -0.13 (0.08) |
| Academic Grades (AG) | 0.00 (0.09) | 0.13 (0.11) | 0.03 (0.06) | -0.15 (0.19) | -0.09 (0.04)\* | -0.02 (0.07) |
| FC x HSB | -0.20 (0.11) | -0.01 (0.15) | 0.18 (0.09)\* | -0.11 (0.15) | -0.08 (0.18) | -0.10 (0.23) |
| Abuse x HSB | -0.08 (0.18) | 0.08 (0.17) | 0.15 (0.24) | 0.23 (0.23) | -0.28 (0.16) | 0.15 (0.22) |
| SA x HSB | 0.04 (0.09) | 0.07 (0.14) | -0.29 (0.10)\*\* | -0.03 (0.21) | 0.01 (0.09) | 0.15 (0.19) |
| FC x AG | -0.04 (0.16) | -0.55 (0.24)\* |  |  | 0.12 (0.19) | -0.06 (0.22) |
| Abuse x AG | 0.30 (0.23) | 0.38 (0.25) |  |  | -0.01 (0.25) | 0.45 (0.21)\* |
| SA x AG | 0.09 (0.20) | -0.89 (0.43)\* |  |  | -0.07 (0.13) | 0.29 (0.28) |
| *R*2 | 0.36 (0.08) | 0.20 (0.14) | 0.19 (0.05) | 0.22 (0.12) | 0.51 (0.09) | 0.20 (0.14) |
| χ2 | 43.14; *df* = 31 | | 36.39; *df* = 25 | | 47.78\*; *df* = 31 | |
| *n* | 460 | | 298 | | 605 | |
| *CFI* | .94 | | .94 | | .96 | |
| *RMSEA* | 0.03 [0.00, 0.05] | | 0.04 [0.00, 0.06] | | 0.03 [0.01, 0.05] | |
| *SRMR* | 0.02 | | 0.03 | | 0.02 | |

*Note.* Parentheses contain cluster robust standard errors. aInteractions of home hostility and academic grades yielded poor model fit and were removed. \**p* < .05, \**p* < .01

**Table 11**

*Standardized Estimates from Latent Growth Model of Sexual Harassment Perpetration Stratified by School Belongingness*

|  | Higha | | Moderate | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Intercept | Slope | Intercept | Slope |
| Intercept term | 0.35 (0.18) | 1.92 (1.55) | 0.25 (0.19) | 0.28 (0.24) |
| Family Conflict (FC) | 0.10 (0.18) | 1.19 (1.74) | 0.02 (0.23) | 0.12 (0.28) |
| Abuse | -0.24 (0.22) | -0.39 (0.94) | 0.46 (0.26) | -0.56 (0.30) |
| Sibling Aggression (SA) | -0.14 (0.17) | 0.11 (1.00) | 0.31 (0.17) | -0.04 (0.38) |
| Sexual Harassment Victim | 0.38 (0.07)\*\* | -0.46 (0.41) | 0.44 (0.05)\*\* | -0.06 (0.10) |
| Girls | -0.13 (0.04)\*\* | -0.26 (0.31) | -0.12 (0.06)\* | 0.03 (0.05) |
| Black | -0.02 (0.03) | 0.49 (0.30) | -0.08 (0.05) | 0.04 (0.08) |
| White | -0.09 (0.04)\* | 0.24 (0.23) | -0.11 (0.06) | 0.01 (0.07) |
| Other Race | -0.01 (0.07) | 0.23 (0.30) | -0.05 (0.03) | 0.16 (0.09) |
| Academic Grades (AG) | -0.01 (0.04) | -0.14 (0.26) | 0.01 (0.06) | 0.00 (0.09) |
| FC x AG | -0.11 (0.19) | -1.10 (1.64) | 0.04 (0.24) | -0.11 (0.30) |
| Abuse x AG | 0.45 (0.28) | -0.19 (1.05) | -0.18 (0.28) | 0.40 (0.28) |
| SA x AG | 0.16 (0.21) | -0.03 (0.90) | -0.27 (0.20) | 0.01 (0.35) |
| *R*2 | 0.24 (0.07) | - a | 0.40 (0.06) | 0.08 (0.05) |
| χ2 | 45.12; *df* = 31 | | 49.23\*; *df* = 29 | |
| *n* | 932 | | 629 | |
| *CFI* | .94 | | .94 | |
| *RMSEA* | 0.02 [0.00, 0.04] | | 0.03 [0.02, 0.05] | |
| *SRMR* | 0.02 | | 0.02 | |

*Note.* Parentheses contain cluster robust standard errors. aSlope variance was constrained to 0. \**p* < .05, \*\**p* < .01
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