



National Institute of Justice

Teen Dating Violence: Developing a Research Agenda to Meet Practice Needs

December 4 – 5, 2007
Doubletree Hotel
Crystal City, Virginia

The opinions and conclusions expressed in this document are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Justice.

NCJ 242212

Teen Dating Violence: Developing a Research Agenda to Meet Practice Needs

December 4 – 5, 2007

Doubletree Hotel
Crystal City, Virginia
[Federal Sponsors](#)

Agenda

Tuesday, December 4, 2007

2:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m.

Part 1 — Conference Overview

- 1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Registration
[Welcome & Introductions](#)
- 2:00 p.m. – 2:15 p.m. Conference Co-Chairs:
Deborah Capaldi, Ph.D., Oregon Social Learning Center
Barri Rosenbluth, LCSW, Director of School-Based Services, SafePlace
Summary of Recent Federal TDV Activities
Moderated by Wanda Jones, Dr.P.H.
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Health (Women's Health), HHS
- [Genesis of this Workshop and Current Federal Activities; Role TDV Plays in National Advisory Committee](#)
Wanda Jones, Office on Women's Health, HHS
 - [NIH 2004 State of the Science Workshop on Youth Violence and Other Recent Research Activities](#)
LeShawndra Price, Ph.D., National Institute of Mental Health, NIH, HHS
 - [Teen Dating Violence Workshop hosted by NIJ, July 2006 — Themes and Recommendations](#)
Bernie Auchter, National Institute of Justice, DOJ

Part 2 — Frameworks for Understanding TDV — New Directions

Moderated by Lisa Jaycox, Ph.D., RAND

To be discussed: key research gaps, methodological challenges, contextual factors

- 2:45 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
- [Presentation 1: Development and Relation of TDV to Bullying](#)
Debra Pepler, Ph.D., York University
 - [Presentation 2: Models, Including Typology Approaches](#)
Deborah Capaldi, Ph.D., Oregon Social Learning Center
 - [Presentation 3: Relationships \(Dyads\) Context Within Couples; Mutuality and Gender Issues](#)
Peggy Giordano, Ph.D., Bowling State University

- [Discussion](#)
Barbara Shaw, Illinois Violence Prevention Authority

4:30 p.m. – 4:45 p.m. Coffee Break
Breakout Sessions

- 4:45 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.
- [Group 1: Assessment Challenges](#)
 - [Group 2: Adolescent Development Issues](#)
 - [Group 3: Dyads/Relationship Issues](#)
 - [Group 4: Contextual Influences](#)

6:00 p.m. – 6:30 p.m. Discussion and Wrap-Up
Moderated by Deborah Capaldi and Barri Rosenbluth, Co-Chairs

Wednesday, December 5, 2007
8:00 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.

8:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m. Continental Breakfast

8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m. Review of Day 1; Look Forward to Day 2
Moderated by Deborah Capaldi and Barri Rosenbluth, Co-Chairs

Part 3 – Programs Exemplifying Different Approaches to TDV Intervention

Moderated by Catherine Pierce, Office on Violence Against Women, DOJ

- 9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.
- [Presentation 1: School-Based Approaches – Review of Research](#)
Daniel Whitaker, Ph.D., HHS/CDC
 - [Presentation 2: Family Approach](#)
Vangie Foshee, Ph.D., University of North Carolina Chapel Hill
 - [Presentation 3: Community Approach – Choose Respect](#)
Rita Noonan, Ph.D., HHS/CDC

10:00 a.m. – 10:20 a.m. Coffee Break

Continuation of Part 3

- 10:20 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
- [Presentation 4: Multilevel Approach – Expect Respect](#)
Barbara Ball, Ph.D., LPC-AT, SafePlace
 - [Presentation 5: Justice Approach – Specialized Teen Dating Violence Courts](#)
Judge Miriam Cyrulnik and Amanda Cissner, Center for Court Innovation

[Plenary: Synthesis of Research and Practice Issues](#)

11:00 a.m. – Noon Group discussion designed to direct research questions for the afternoon session
Moderated by Jacquelyn C. Campbell, Ph.D., R.N., FAACP, Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing

Noon – 1:30 p.m. Working lunch – Vision for the Future

Breakout Sessions

Charge (to all groups): Focus on gaps, implications, methodological/measurements challenges (including cultural issues), next steps

- 1:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
- Group 1: Couples and Family Interventions
 - Group 2: Peer and School-Based Interventions
 - Group 3: Criminal Justice Interventions
 - Group 4: Community-Based, Multilevel Interventions
 - Group 5: Macrolevel (media, legislative/policy) Interventions

Reports from Breakout Sessions

Moderated by Deborah Capaldi and Barri Rosenbluth, Co-Chairs

- 2:30 p.m. – 3:15 p.m.
- 2:30 p.m. [Group 1 Report: Couples and Family Interventions](#)
 - 2:45 p.m. [Group 2 Report: Peer and School-Based Interventions](#)
 - 3:00 p.m. [Group 3 Report: Criminal Justice interventions](#)

- 3:15 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. Coffee Break
Reports from Breakout Sessions (continued)

- 3:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.
- 3:30 p.m. [Group 4 Report: Community-Based, Multilevel Interventions](#)
 - 3:45 p.m. [Group 5 Report: Macrolevel Interventions](#)

Closing Session

- 4:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
- [Reflections and Wrap-Up](#)
David Wolfe, Ph.D., University of Toronto
 - [Final Thoughts and Future Directions](#)
Deborah Capaldi and Barri Rosenbluth, Conference Co-Chairs

[See also summarized proceedings from Teen Dating Violence Workshop Proceedings, held July 24 – 26, 2006.](#)

Federal Sponsors

- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
 - Office on Women's Health, Office of the Secretary
 - National Institutes of Health
 - National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism
 - National Institute of Child Health and Human Development
 - National Institute on Drug Abuse
 - National Institute of Mental Health
 - National Institute of Nursing Research
 - National Library of Medicine
 - Office of Research on Women's Health, Office of the Director
 - Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research, Office of the Director
 - Administration on Children and Families

- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality
- Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
- Health Resources and Services Administration
- U.S. Department of Justice
 - Bureau of Justice Statistics
 - National Institute of Justice
 - Office for Victims of Crime
 - Office on Violence Against Women
- U.S. Department of Agriculture
- U.S. Department of Defense
- U.S. Department of Education

Part 1 — Conference Overview

Welcome & Introductions

Conference Co-Chairs-Deborah Capaldi, Ph.D. and Barri Rosenbluth, LCSW

Deborah Capaldi, Ph.D., Oregon Social Learning Center, noted that this meeting presents an opportunity to focus on issues related to Teen Dating Violence (TDV) and convene interested parties. In opening remarks, Dr. Capaldi reviewed the agenda and noted that the conference format allows participants to have ample time to engage in meaningful dialogue during the breakout sessions. She encouraged the attendees to become more than spectators and offer their input. Attendees were also asked to interface with people that offer different perspectives on related issues. She informed the meeting participants that insights would be shared from federal agency representatives and panelists would discuss the basic research findings and related gaps.

Barri Rosenbluth, LCSW, Director of School-Based Services, SafePlace, offered a brief introduction and told the participants that the TDV meeting provides a rare and exciting opportunity to closely examine teen relationships relative to dating violence. She noted that the ultimate goal of the conference is to help young people have safe and healthy relationships.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Summary of Recent Federal TDV Activities

Genesis of this Workshop and Current Federal Activities; Role TDV Plays in National Advisory Committee — Wanda Jones, Dr.P.H.

Wanda Jones, Dr.P.H., Office on Women's Health, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), said during opening remarks that the meeting provides an exciting opportunity to chart a new research agenda. She discussed joint efforts on behalf of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) to address this issue. Both of these agencies have examined the role of schools in prevention, the availability of safe places and the establishment of a national clearing house for teen dating violence. Dr. Jones cited the need to incorporate the voice of teens in efforts to create more effective tools. She also stated that the absence of funding and collaborations with key parties impact the services that are provided in relation to TDV. Dr. Jones addressed the critical role that the media plays in creating feasible solutions to address TDV. A vehicle is needed to help convey and reinforce positive messages to address cyclical, subculture-specific messages that promote or normalize violence. She expressed great excitement about the

agencies and organizations that will harness their resources and eventually turn the tide relative to TDV.

The panel noted that there is a need to address this issue from a gender-neutral perspective as we move forward in this arena. By so doing, more credence is given to the fact that males and females are both victims and perpetrators. One respondent noted that TDV is not a "women-only" topic.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

NIH 2004 State of the Science Workshop on Youth Violence and Other Recent Research Activities — LeShawndra Price, Ph.D.

LeShawndra Price, Ph.D., National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), NIH, shared that NIMH seeks to support and disseminate information on the best approaches for treating teens' early emotional and behavioral problems, and for families impacted by TDV. NIH held a State of the Science Conference on Youth Violence in 2004, which addressed youth violence issues more broadly. Experts convened to provide information regarding the present state of science so that research gaps can be filled. This conference focused on research related to the challenge of prevention and intervention of youth violence and priorities for future research. She added that state of the science conferences, in general, are a way to provide a progress report on a particular area of science that is of interest to the public.

One of the findings from the 2004 conference was that violence is a national public health issue and affects us all. A number of intervention programs have been shown to reduce violence precursors, violence and arrest. The panel noted that there are some programs that are harmful, some of which are used widely (e.g., the DARE program) and a few widely implemented programs have been found to be ineffective. The panel recommended that programs should be evaluated in different contexts for validity and potential efficacy.

Dr. Price noted follow-up activities that have been underway during the last three years. Many program announcements have been released that include bullying, child abuse and neglect, and other acts of violence in different arenas. One such announcement, sponsored by the National Institute of Child and Human Development (NICHD), specifically focused on children exposed to violence. Grantees funded under this announcement will convene for the third time in 2008. An NIMH program announcement focused on the mental health consequences of violence and trauma. NIMH also convened a workshop specifically focused on identifying target areas for new research in the field of disruptive behavior disorders, specifically related to conduct disorder and oppositional defiant disorder.

Several publications have been released to undergird these efforts and provide additional resources for those seeking information in this area. In addition, the NIH Child Abuse and Neglect Working Group, a federally mandated group with representatives from across NIH, has an interest in relationship violence and coordinates NIH-sponsored research and research training activities on prevention, treatment and services for child abuse and neglect and its negative health consequences. NIH and the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) have worked together in consultation on several activities relevant to youth violence.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Teen Dating Violence Workshop Hosted by NIJ July 2006 — Themes and Recommendations — Bernie Auchter

Bernie Auchter, NIJ, U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), provided some highlights from the NIJ Teen Dating Violence Workshop that was held July 2006.

In the most recent authorization of the Violence Against Women Act, TDV gained greater emphasis than before. There is a need to have a discussion with the experts. NIJ's Teen Dating Violence Workshop was convened July 24 – 25, 2006, to address these issues. The purpose of that meeting was to initiate ways to get the conversation started and assess and fill the gaps. There was a need to stimulate interagency collaboration and coordination. Topical areas that were discussed included measurement and scope of TDV, risk and protective factors associated with TDV, community and school-based prevention and intervention programs, justice system responses to TDV, and interagency coordination and collaboration.

Recommendations from the workshop are on the NIJ Web site. Among the recommendations are:

There is a need to begin intervention and prevention programs with younger youths, prior to adolescence. More research is needed to unpack interventions and assess what works; many interventions need to be rigorously evaluated; and there is a need to maximize the benefits of prevention efforts. It was noted that bullying can be a precursor to TDV.

The research issues that were raised during that meeting ranged from basic incidence data to the need for longitudinal studies. A host of evaluation questions were also raised within this setting. Regarding programmatic areas needing to be addressed, the workshop produced a listing of issues that ranged from funding to legislative issues, prevention, curricula and training.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Part 2 — Frameworks for Understanding TDV — New Directions

Moderated by Lisa Jaycox, Ph.D.

Presentation 1: Development and Relation of TDV to Bullying — Debra Pepler

Debra Pepler, Ph.D., York University, expressed excitement about meeting new people who are grappling with the same issue. She is looking at TDV from a developmental perspective. Some behaviors of children in elementary school may give cues and clues regarding how adolescent dating relationships will evolve. The "power advantage" some children use in bullying arises from skills, size and/or smarts, and knowledge of others' vulnerabilities. When children are bullying others, they learn how to use their power aggressively to control others. In turn, the child being victimized loses power in the relationship. Adults don't always see the power that children have over others. Sometimes children will tap into another's vulnerability, power dynamics begin to stabilize, and the person bullying increases in power. The victim repeatedly decreases in power.

During the presentation, Dr. Pepler showed the audience a video to more fully illustrate issues surrounding bullying. During the clip when children were playing, a boy was victimized but refused to remove himself from the situation. This child's reaction raises the question of victims' responses when being bullied. It was noted that the use of power and aggression in relationships is critical. Data reveal strong links between bullying, gangs, sexual harassment and TDV. These same power dynamics translate into all types of adult relationships (e.g., elder abuse, marital abuse).

The lessons that children learn translate into their intimate, emerging relationships. The gender issue surfaces as well. There is equal concern for boys and girls. Aggressive girls who do not know how to enter healthy relationships are also at risk. At this point in the presentation, Pepler showed a video clip of a girl who bullies another girl. Based on the clip, a trend was noted that many times the individual who bullies receives positive reinforcement and their interaction is therefore validated. Dr. Pepler noted that 85 percent of the time with playground bullying, other children are watching and thus differentially reinforcing the behavior.

Dr. Pepler conducted a study of children in grades five through 12, which allowed for an examination of developmental trajectories of different behavior styles using power and aggression. The definition of TDV in this study included physical aggression only. Some of the noteworthy findings include:

- "High bullying girls" tend to start adolescence with bullying behavior and then decrease in later adolescence.
- "High bullying boys" tend to start adolescence with low levels of bullying behavior and then increase in later adolescence.
- The role of parental monitoring for girls becomes weaker over time in adolescence, while for boys it becomes stronger.
- The overlap between bullying and dating aggression is greater for girls than boys.
- Girls who use aggression in their relationships with peers are at high risk for transferring those patterns to dating.
- The majority of bullies desist in bullying behavior toward the end of adolescence.

Family relationships and parental monitoring are keys in addressing patterns of bullying and TDV. The quality of these relationships is a telling piece of evidence relative to relationship development. Lower parental monitoring among boys has been associated with engagement in dating aggression. Friends of the youths, and their peer group(s), also influenced the bullies. This influence — for both boys and girls — changes the context and affects the level of acceptability.

Dr. Pepler offered the following insights during the conclusion of her presentation:

- There is an overlap in bullying and dating aggression.
- The association between perpetration and victimization of dating aggression is strong for both boys and girls.
- The association of dating aggression with exposure to peers' dating aggression becomes stronger over time during adolescence.
- Both boys and girls need the capacity to have and foster healthy relationships.
- How and why do power and aggression carry forward into adolescence in diverse ways?
- When and how can we intervene to address dating aggression with bullying prevention programs?

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Presentation 2: Models, Including Typological Approaches — Deborah Capaldi

Dr. Capaldi presented results from the Oregon Youth Study (OYS) of couples and discussed typological approaches to studying aggression in romantic relationships. The participants were boys ages 17-18 and their romantic partners. The boys have been in the OYS since fourth grade. This is a high risk sample, with 60 percent of males and 34 percent of females indicating a prior arrest. The OYS Couples Study involved a videotaped interactive problem-solving task, along with self-report and partner-report of physical and psychological aggression in relationships. Partner-reports and self-reports provided similar estimates of physical aggression, with 21 percent of young men

perpetrating physical aggression and 23 percent (based on partner-report) to 26 percent (based on self-report) of young women perpetrating physical aggression. In the observational task six percent of young men and 16 percent of young women perpetrated non-playful physical aggression. Overall, the girls initiated four times as much physical aggression as the boys, but boys and girls were equally likely to reciprocate physical aggression by their partner (one-fourth of the time). In 30 percent of couples there was some indication of physical aggression by both parties, in four percent the male was the sole perpetrator, and in 17 percent the female was the sole perpetrator.

Several key developmental and contextual findings from studies conducted over the last 10 years were discussed, including:

- Conduct problems in childhood are the strongest developmental risk factor for TDV perpetration for both boys and girls.
- Boys and girls with higher levels of conduct problems tend to date each other, adding to risk.
- Depressive symptoms predict TDV for girls.
- Hostile talk about women among male peers in mid-adolescence predicts male TDV in late adolescence.
- Substance use is associated with TDV, but its role as a risk factor for controlling antisocial behavior has not been well-established.
- Young men's physical aggression changed significantly with a new partner.
- The young woman's physical aggression was just as predictive of her partner's future physical aggression to her as was his own.

Thought needs to be given to the type of model to identify those at varying levels of risk for TDV. The typological approach is one approach that can provide information on the heterogeneous nature of partner violence and the importance of association with psychopathology. While this is a preferred method among some researchers, substantial problems arise with typological approaches, including the static nature of typologies (despite evidence that the behaviors change over time), the lack of adequate focus on dyadic interaction, and the lack of adequate testing to confirm the proposed typologies.

Varied and different approaches are needed to help conceptualize complex dyadic behavior and a host of other related issues. Notable key research gaps include: longitudinal research, theory-driven research, developmental risk and aggressive behavior in girls, and understanding contextual effects. Dr. Capaldi noted that self-reports tend to be overused in this area of research and should only be used in moderation given that any single measurement approach is always limited and subject to unique biases. Methods such as partner/family reports and observational data are needed and provide differing perspectives and important insights.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Presentation 3: Relationship (Dyads) Context within Couples; Mutuality and Gender Issues — Peggy Giordano

Carrie Mulford, Social Science Analyst, NIJ, DOJ, gave a presentation on behalf of Dr. Giordano.

Two perspectives guide most research on TDV. The first is social learning, which suggests that early family exposure increases risk, and the second is the feminist perspective, which posits that the school/peer climate fosters denigration of women and the subtle reinforcement of TDV. Traditional male perspectives view romance as a game and an opportunity to "score." Most boys don't focus on trust and loyalty and often transport their dominant style into relationships. People of both sexes

encounter new relationship challenges. Traditional perspectives for girls focus on the importance of relationships which, in turn, may increase opportunities for victimization. According to the traditional perspective, for boys dating is a disingenuous process that lacks sincerity and is deemed as a venue for conquest.

More emphasis needs to be placed on comprehensive couple-level dynamics. The next step is to examine more carefully general research on adolescent romantic relationships. Definitions of the situation and corresponding behaviors are influenced by earlier social influences and experiences. Dr. Giordano's presentation was based on data from the Toledo Adolescent Relationship Study (TARS), in which four waves of interviews were collected from 1,316 respondents in Lucas County, Ohio. Although the sample was based on school enrollment records, school attendance was not required for participation. The presentation focused on two waves of in-depth relationship history narratives that were provided by nearly 100 participants in each wave. The key findings were that boys who are more invested in romance are less confident in this new relationship arena than previous research would lead us to suspect. Boys scored higher on perceived communicational awkwardness and lower on a scale measuring "confidence navigating romantic relationships" than girls. Boys do not differ from girls in their feelings of passionate love and anticipated length of relationships.

Relationships where violence exists are longer in duration and involve more reported feelings of passionate love than nonviolent relationships. However, violent relationships are also characterized by more negative and problem dynamics, including jealousy and conflict. Among the girls who report some violence in their relationships, 51 percent report that the relationship is mutually violent, 36 percent report that they are the sole perpetrators of violence, and 13 percent say that their partner is the sole perpetrator. Among boys, the numbers are reflective of those reported by girls, with 47 percent reporting mutual violence, six percent reporting that they are the sole perpetrator, and 47 percent indicating their partner is the sole perpetrator.

With regards to power and influence, boys report that their partners make more influence attempts and have more actual influence within their relationships.

Even among the females who report victimization only, just 20 percent report that the male has more power. Similarly, in the few cases where the male reported that he was the sole perpetrator, only 25 percent indicated that they have more decision-making power than their partners.

Dr. Giordano emphasized that there is great utility in exploring couple dynamics and issues of mutuality in the relationships. It is important not to use adult models to understand the ways in which adolescents relate. There is a need to develop a teen-focused research agenda.

Changes in gender roles over time need to be examined. Current data suggest that these issues should be viewed within a modern context. Understanding perception of power in the minds of young men and women is also necessary. There is also value in discussing what shapes and frames adolescents' mindsets relative to their relationships, what each individual brings to the relationship, and how the violence quotient is impacted.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Discussion of Frameworks for Understanding TDV — Led by Barbara Shaw

Respondents raised the following questions and comments:

One attendee questioned how the research accounts for nonconforming youths. This participant noted that young females reported higher mutuality in abuse and how men reported being the target. She cited experiences in working with clients one-on-one (adults) who are homosexual and stated that many definitely believe there is no mutual abuse. Dr. Pepler responded to the question and noted that she did not recall any reporting on same-sex relationships. It was noted, however, that homosexual teens experience abuse from their peers and, in turn, may be more anxious and depressed. Youths who are undergirded by strong family and peer group support will handle the pressure differently.

One respondent commented that sexually-questioning youths are at a higher risk for suicide, depression and anxiety. There is a need to get teachers to recognize and understand kids who are "coming out." There is a lot of problematic research in TDV regarding these groups of individuals. There is a need to think about how to speak with teachers and parents in this present, very conservative environment.

Another respondent raised the issue of sexual abuse and assault relative to TDV. When we talk about bullying and sexual assault we are talking about different issues, Dr. Capaldi shared. She noted that high levels of sexual assaults in the samples are not apparent. Some work has been done surrounding "sexual coercion" issues. Dr. Pepler noted that sexual assault on a continuum can be viewed as a very extreme use of power. Having a conversation with young people about using their power non-aggressively, in a positive way, is critical to getting along with others in a healthy way. Youths at risk of taking their power to extremes need to be identified.

A participant highlighted the need to look at the age difference relative to physical violence within the context of dating relationships. Another respondent shared that in teen relationships, there is still someone with the clear control and power. She was a proponent of conducting research that compares the types of violence that are used in these relationships. The respondent also expressed the need for research to focus on other abusive tactics beyond the scope of force. Lastly, the attendee suggested the need for research on particular subcommunities-based on class, race and culture. There is also a need to look at these relational dynamics and examine how having a child impacts the trend.

Mutual couple violence was another topic raised by a conference attendee. Dr. Capaldi said that some of the murders occur at the hand of dangerous males who have a history of violence and arrests.

Another attendee questioned whether anything in the adult interaction literature can be used in the teen dating violence paradigm. Pepler confirmed the importance of this issue and said that children who are highly victimized switch roles and become victimizers. There are complex and important questions to ask. We need to ask the question, "What have we not put in place for these young people?" We have not been giving them the support they need to have healthy relationships.

The need for clarity with respect to dating terminology is needed. One respondent shared that adult views of dating and teen views may vary. As an example, for some teens their relationships last 20 minutes or can be defined as "hooking up" in the bathroom for 20 minutes. Additional conversations

need to convene regarding fear or the severity of injury, race and class issues. It was noted that many girls in relationships are not afraid until something negative has occurred. Many underestimate the possibility of what could happen.

Another attendee focused on the apparent disconnect when discussing bidirectional issues. More discussions around more normative types of aggression and their outcomes (e.g., maiming, killing, suicide) need to be addressed.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Breakout Sessions

Group 1 — Assessment Challenges

- There is a need for more federal dollars to be spent on assessment issues. This funding allocation is necessary to complete the outstanding empirical work and secure the basic measurement tools.
- More clear and precise definitions and measurements are needed relative to substantive issues (e.g., sexual violence, same-sex relationship violence, power). Clarity is needed regarding definitions of power in an adolescent context. Terms such as developmentally appropriate behaviors and developmental context of dating/relationships meaning for youths need to be examined.
- Measurement strategies/rigorous research on methods of reporting, multimethod are critical. Studies of relationship between methods and measures, language-developmentally appropriate definitions of culture and context are needed. Classical test theory can be problematic, as the behavioral measures do not adequately address all of the relational dynamics.
- Practical issues-IRB concerns, mandated reporting.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Group 2 — Adolescent Development Issues

- Need for more developmental studies to document the context of dating, risk factors and aggression (i.e., may require coordinated, collaborative, multisite studies).
- Impact of maturational processes (e.g., brain development, timing of puberty, hormonal shifts) on relationship dynamics, risk behaviors and aggression.
- More studies on developmental context, precursors (e.g., sibling aggression, close relationships, genetic influences).
- Examination of the implications of teen development for mandatory reporting.
- Assess whether there is something about children and teens that are implicitly and explicitly taught regarding power and strength in the context of TDV.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Group 3 — Dyads/Relationship Issues

- Examination of relationship issues and gaps of understanding.
- The dynamics of relationship interactions during adolescence — including nature and intensity of feelings and change over time.
- Nature of violence and bidirectionality.

- Social/emotional skills that adolescents need for a healthy relationship.
- Examine the association to later adult romantic relationships — what knowledge can be applied from one to other.
- Outcomes: What is the function of the violence and differences between males and females?

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Group 4 — Contextual Influences

- Cultural context.
- Youth subculture: How do teens define the problem, peer pressure/knowledge, normalization, influence/benefits of technology, homelessness?
- Gangs.
- Role of schools: best ways to educate staff, parents, youths.
- Media: positive and negative aspects.
- Family context: domestic violence, child abuse, ways to educate/involve parents.
- Policies: mandated education, public health strategies, universal versus targeted.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Part 3 — Programs Exemplifying Different Approaches to TDV Intervention — *Moderated by Catherine Pierce*

Presentation 1: School-Based Approaches — Review of Research — Daniel Whitaker, Ph.D.

Dr. Whitaker, HHS/CDC, presented a review of evaluations of 11 school-based Teen Dating Violence (TDV) programs. All but one of the interventions was universal, that is targeted to everyone in the school/setting; all included both males and females and the mean age of the targeted population was 14.6. All evaluations measured knowledge and attitudes; four measured behavior change, of these only two appeared to have a positive impact. Only four of the interventions followed the youths for more than four months. After Dr. Whitaker concluded the review, he had an opportunity to review three more ongoing school-based programs and concluded the following:

- Most dating violence prevention programs have focused on dating behavior and gender roles.
- Are there underlying skill deficits that need to be addressed, as well? If so, the dating age (i.e., middle school) is probably too late to intervene.
 - We could intervene earlier, but we can't "see" dating violence.
- Several longitudinal studies find that early conduct disorder/generalized violence predicts dating violence perpetration.
 - Lavoie, et. al (2002); Capaldi & Owen (2005); Ehrensaft, et. al (2003); Magdol, et. al (1998); Brendgen, et. al (2001)
- Would preventing conduct problems prevent dating violence?

Dr. Whitaker's slides were made available to the attendees.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Presentation 2: Family Approach — Vangie Foshee, Ph.D.

Dr. Foshee, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, presented on her program, Families for Safe Dates, which is based on Family Matters, a family-targeted program originally developed to prevent substance abuse among youths. Family Matters was evaluated in a national randomized trial and was found to reduce the prevalence of adolescent substance use. In the Families for Safe Dates program, 12- to 14-year-old adolescents and their families were targeted and sent four booklets over the course of a few months. These booklets included material based on the Safe Dates curriculum and activities for families to do together. Families were identified by Random Digit Dialing (RDD). Each mailing was followed two weeks later by a telephone call from a health educator. Dr. Foshee noted that it is uncommon for prevention programs to involve family intervention as a critical component of overall prevention among youth. Nevertheless, the approach of intentional parental interaction has resulted in a marked improvement. A CDC-funded evaluation of Families for Safe Dates is currently underway.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Presentation 3: Community Approach — Choose Respect — Rita Noonan, Ph.D.

CDC's Choose Respect Initiative was highlighted by Rita Noonan, Ph.D., HHS/CDC, who has worked on this project for six years. The program was highlighted as an example of a community-based approach to prevent teen dating violence. The framework speaks to different levels of social ecology. It started as a media campaign and is designed to promote positive behavior. There are challenges in media that prompt us to see how we can prevent dating violence; however, this is still uncharted territory for the most part. Based on research and focus data, it was decided that the target audience for Choose Respect would be children 11-14 years of age. While this is the target group and age, there is a need for efforts to reach younger children. While many children at this time are not dating, there is an opportunity to create an environment for prevention. Input from parents, caring adults and caregivers should be considered when developing solutions. Statistics speak to the alarming rates at which TDV occurs: one in four youths reports verbal, physical, emotional or sexual abuse each year. Consequences include physical injury, illness, psychological symptoms, economic costs and death. It was also noted that the kids who talked about TDV are at risk for a wide range of health risk behaviors, including sexual activity and suicide.

Outreach efforts were conducted in conjunction with marketing and consumer research. While a top-tier marketing agency was employed to move the efforts forward, greater value was placed on feedback from young people. These findings revealed that many youths resent "middle-aged" paradigms that are used in the context of TDV; thus consideration needs to be given to gossiping, pushing and other behavioral trends that are related to levels of violence. The tagline for the effort was "choose respect," which has proven over time to be an effective theme with the target audience. Technology was also noted as a critical piece in developing youth programs that address TDV. Public service announcements are another tool used to disseminate a clear message and appropriate approaches for solutions.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Presentation 4: Multilevel Approach — Expect Respect — Barbara Ball, Ph.D., LPC-AT

Barbara Ball, Ph.D., LPC-AT, SafePlace, discussed Expect Respect: Taking an Ecological Approach to Prevention. This multilevel, ecological program partners closely with schools and emphasizes strengthening relationships. The program includes statewide collaboration, community engagement

and three school-based components: 1) school-wide prevention, 2) youth leadership training, and 3) support groups for at-risk youths who have been exposed to violence in their lives.

Expect Respect is responsive to students' and schools' needs by fitting into the school environment, building capacity in the schools and integrating prevention into existing school programs. The extent of each program component is tailored to students' needs. Support groups provide an intensive 24-week program for vulnerable youths (selective prevention), whereas school-wide prevention activities (universal prevention) are designed to engage all students with a minimum of two classroom lessons. Youth leadership training (eight lessons) is a critical component of Expect Respect because students are most likely to confide in peers, listen to them and are strongly influenced by their peer groups. Teen leaders educate and support their peers and mobilize the "silent majority" to take a stand against interpersonal violence. Key strategies in all program components include experiential learning, skill-building, mentoring and opportunities for developing strong, positive relationships among youths and adults.

Over the last five years, Expect Respect support groups were the focal point for program evaluation. The support group curriculum for at-risk youths focuses on increasing social support, recognizing abusive relationships and learning skills for healthy relationships. Youths meet in separate gender groups for 24 sessions that take place during regular school days. A mixed-gender meeting is included toward the end of the program so that boys and girls can discuss and hear the others' perspective. The evaluation of Expect Respect support groups included group interviews and a quantitative evaluation. Pre- and post-test scores were reviewed on a number of issues, including sexual victimization, aggressive and healthy conflict resolution, constructive coping skills, relational insecurity and identification of abuse. Preliminary analyses and findings were culled and begin to indicate that support groups are a promising intervention with vulnerable youth. Mediators were examined as well. Some of the challenges regarding this evaluation were cited, such as reliance on self-report data, and lack of control group and follow-up data.

The evaluation of all components of the Expect Respect program is ongoing. Slides of the presentation were made available to the attendees. More information is available at www.SafePlace.org

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Presentation 5: Justice Approach — Specialized Teen Dating Violence Courts — Judge Miriam Cyrulnik and Amanda Cissner

Judge Miriam Cyrulnik, Criminal Court of the City of New York, and Amanda Cissner, Center for Court Innovation, gave a presentation about the development and ongoing evaluation of the Brooklyn Youthful Offender Domestic Violence Court (YODVC), a pilot specialized court for teen offenders. Judge Cyrulnik indicated that 10 percent of the domestic violence cases involve people under the age of 20. Prior to December 2003, the TDV cases were treated as any domestic violence case. Many times the cases would just be dismissed. In 2002, a brief review revealed 67 cases involving teens. Many involved allegations of injury, use of a weapon, included partners who had a child in common or the woman was expecting a child. Seventy-three percent of these cases were dismissed. After one year of planning, the YODVC opened in 2003 to hear cases of defendants specifically between the ages of 16 and 19. The court hears misdemeanor cases that involve intimate partner violence and convenes every Thursday at 2:15 p.m. The court has adopted a schedule that accommodates school schedules. Additionally, there is a dedicated judge who hears all of the cases and has a specialized teen victim advocate. Her job is to connect them with resources and encourage these witnesses to sign a supporting deposition. This statement is needed in order for the case to move forward. The court refers youths to a 12-week long specialized, free program — STEPS to End Family Violence

(STEPS). While STEPS has been helpful, the program is only available in English and has only been developed for men. In this construct, the participants discuss gender roles, communication, power and control, the impact of behavioral trends on children and elements of a healthy relationship. Youths are referred to the program based on their criminal history and the type of charges. Many first-time offenders are afforded an opportunity to participate in the program.

Before individuals accept a plea, they are interviewed by a STEPS representative. The judge then reviews the cases and clearly relays to adolescents the expectations and related consequences. If the adolescents are compliant (i.e., getting to court and to the program at the scheduled time) their specific cases are reviewed first. Those who are not compliant do not receive priority attention. In an effort to make a difference in the future of the young people, Judge Cyrulnik indicated that she will speak more with a teen offender than an adult offender. She makes it clear to the offender that violence is unacceptable, and that all court orders and mandates must be obeyed. She referred to herself as being tough, but wants to be considered fair. She expressed excitement about the work being done as a result of the conference and is hopeful that future efforts will minimize the cases that ultimately come through her office.

In the 16 months between December 2003 and March 2005, 360 cases involving 279 defendants were heard. Eighty-eight percent of defendants were male, and the average age was 18.3. Nearly half of the defendants had a child in common with the complaining witness. Of the 130 complaining witnesses contacted, 85 percent reported a history of prior abuse, although not necessarily with the defendant.

Lessons learned from the STEPS program included:

- Complaining witnesses with whom the victim advocate was able to contact at least once were much more likely to sign corroborative affidavits than those witnesses never successfully contacted.
- Beyond signed corroborative affidavits, much of the success achieved by the victim advocate came in the form of unmeasured service referrals.
- Program participants reported that both personal interactions with the YODVC judge and a set jail alternative motivated them to complete the STEPS program.
- Defendants generally felt that they were treated fairly and with respect in the YODVC.

Evaluation of the program is continuing. In addition, the Center for Court Innovation made their slides available to participants. More information can be found at www.courtinnovation.org

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Plenary: Synthesis of Research and Practice Issues — Jacquelyn Campbell, Ph.D.

Dr. Jackie Campbell, Johns Hopkins University School of Nursing, led a lively discussion that focused on questions and issues raised by the presentations and breakout sessions so far. Issues and concerns raised during the plenary included:

- Which teen batterer intervention programs work, and what do they look like? How long should they be? What components are necessary for a successful program? Does it work best if the program is court-ordered? Do different programs work better for boys vs. girls?

- Research is needed that targets interventions for girls who are already experienced with the juvenile justice and/or child advocacy system. Similarly, research linking prior post-traumatic stress disorder with current TDV needs to be explored.
- Programs — both existing and promising new programs — need to be rigorously evaluated.
- High-risk youth in correctional settings or clinical settings need special attention. We need to determine how to work with this particular population and consider not only the immediate problem of TDV, but also the potential public health consequences this could have for them and their children.
- We need to develop good data on both TDV within and programs targeting runaway and homeless youth.
- Programs need to move beyond curricula and school-based interventions. Skill-building models need to be explored. What works? How do we take what has been learned about building healthy relationships and apply it?
- What about integrating sports leagues, churches and other community institutions into combating TDV? What about the secondary impact of these institutions on rates of TDV?
- We need to evaluate programs that focus on youth leadership — what is impact of peer-led programming vs. adult-led programming?
- Is existing curricula being used repeatedly (with impact) over time? Are we using the tools we have? More money will be needed to look at curricula (evidence-based).
- What about adolescent intimate partner homicide? Are there enough of these to be able to evaluate the data, or to better understand what factors lead to the escalation of violence.
- What impact does access to technology (or the lack thereof) have? For example, we need data on stalking, emotional abuse, etc., that is playing out in technology, including instant messaging, etc.
- How can schools be used to address TDV beyond curriculum development? For example, could school counselors be recruited to intervene?
- We need to remember to include and not marginalize gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered youths. We need to examine the impact of bullying and isolation on all youth, regardless of sexual orientation.
- We need to look beyond our own borders and learn from the experiences of other countries.
- We need to look at a restorative justice approach.
- Family Violence Prevention Fund's "coaching boys into men" is another approach that needs to be considered.
- Can we leverage public fascination with this issue as part of the research agenda?
- We need to think about this in terms of costs. If we deal with this problem strategically, what will be the overall economic impact? From an advocacy and funding perspective, that can help us make the case.
- More research needed to help us understand the heterogeneity typology of dating violence.
- We will also need better longitudinal studies and trajectory analyses, as well as examinations of dosage effects of various interventions.
- We need to assist communities in providing direct services to teens who have come forward to report abuse. If services exist already, they need to be publicized.
- We need to carefully consider how to manage responses to outreach campaigns by victims. For example, one victim service provider was unclear how to respond to girls who had come forward.
- How can adults legally do no harm when teens disclose to them? Further, adults can inadvertently do more harm by their actions. What impact do adult beliefs and actions have?
- What impact on communities do school policies have?
- We need to develop outreach programs to unskilled, dysfunctional parents.
- As we develop interventions and test them, we also need to consider how, if appropriate, to scale up these efforts.
- What are the multiple, comprehensive strategies we need for implementation?

- We need to keep the link between researchers and practitioners. Would a national clearinghouse to partner practitioners with researchers be possible?
- We need to think carefully about the challenges of limited funding and innovation requirements of funding institutions.
- We need to think about piggybacking on other adolescent programming such as HIV prevention activities. How do we expand those interventions and test their impact on teen dating violence?
- What are the physical and mental health outcomes of TDV (e.g., eating disorders)? We need to explore these linkages and develop effective interventions that target a broad range of outcomes.
- We know that dating violence is more prevalent among populations with disparate health outcomes (unplanned pregnancy, suicide, substance abuse). These linkages with dating violence have not been established. How can we help incorporate our evidence-based interventions into these other interventions?
- We need to think about the overlap between teen dating violence and autism, conduct disorders, ADHD and the like. Are there different interventions that need to be developed for youth with those problems?
- How do we account for dwindling variables (number of kids engaged)? (Partner with researcher so that design is rigorous from the beginning.)
- How do we incorporate flexibility and innovation into curriculum development?
- We need to consider the role of the overall level of violence in a community to the level of dating violence.
- What is the role of prior victimization in dating violence, and who do the interventions work for?
- We need to look at the work of the McArthur Foundation on incarcerated girls.
- What kinds of interventions work after someone has been victimized? What models can we develop based on group counseling and similar therapeutic interventions, particularly those that provide girls with support. For example, look at empowerment intervention at primary and secondary stages.

A series of breakout sessions followed Dr. Campbell's plenary. Summary points developed and presented to the larger group from each breakout session are listed below.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Breakout Sessions

Group 1 – Couples and Family Interventions

Family-Based Program Research

- No evaluations of family-based programs for addressing teen dating violence.
- More research to understand family-based processes that influence TDV (i.e., is it good parenting vs. violent-specific parenting practices).
- Take advantage of opportunities to determine whether programs that have been evaluated for preventing other behaviors (e.g., conduct disorder, youth aggression, teen pregnancy) influence TDV.
- Do family-based risk factors that influence TDV vary across adolescent stages?
- More research to identify moderators of the associations between poor family processes and TDV (e.g., child abuse, domestic violence).
- More research to determine what types of families are appropriate for intervention (vs. which ones need alternative interventions).
- More research that compares the effectiveness of different modes of family-based interventions (e.g., FSD with booklets vs. coming to a central location).

- More research to determine potential iatrogenic effects (negative side effects) of intervening with families.
- More research to determine if effectiveness varies by gender of the parent and teen match.
- More TDV intervention research with teens and children who have been exposed to domestic violence.

[Couples-Based Programs](#)

- More research to determine if couples programs are appropriate for teens in violent relationships.
- No evaluations of couples-based program for teen dating violence prevention.
- Do more research to understand the relationship context, risks and relationship dynamics — including gender dynamics — that can inform intervention.
- More research to understand dynamics of relationship transitions (e.g., break ups).
- More research to determine what types of couples are appropriate for intervention (vs. which ones need alternative interventions).
- More research to determine potential iatrogenic effects (negative side effects) of intervening with couples.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Group 2 — Peer and School-Based Interventions

- What impact do multilevel programs have on dating violence prevalence (e.g., policy, state legislation, teacher/administration training, plus programs, SROs)?
- Need to focus our school-based prevention/intervention with middle school students.
- Consider addressing healing trauma beyond attitude/knowledge change as attitude change is limited in changing behavior.
- Need to consider pre-service teacher training models of prevention/intervention.
- Extent to which universal programs have an impact on a wide range of outcomes.
- How can we influence social norms regarding violence toward girls and women?
- How do we, as a research community, advocate for the "waiver-off active consent" and address the need to ask the right questions, despite inherent sensitivity?
- Need to have a clearinghouse of items, measures, ideas for asking difficult/challenging questions.
- How can you build comfort-level and capacity among school administrators/schools to increase sustainability?
- Studies need to focus on the distribution of prevention programming across middle and high school years (e.g., delayed delivery of program, longitudinal dose).
- The value of afterschool programs.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Group 3 — Criminal Justice Interventions

- How involved are justice systems regarding the issues related to TDV? Is intervention being measured or tracked?
- Who owns the TDV problem at the justice level and who should respond?
- Given the small number of cases that end up in court, what is the response to cases that do not reach the court level? What makes the cases that reach the court level different?

- How does the system define TDV and count it? For example, it may be recorded as another type of crime.
- How does the crafting of legislation affect the way we track, define and respond to the problem? Is there an effect due to the lack of legislation (silence on the issue)?
- What is the threshold where there is law enforcement, criminal justice or juvenile justice responses to dating violence issues?
- Need to consider adult juvenile justice literature for both successful and unsuccessful interventions.
- What are the benefits of a justice response?
- Under or over response-dosage question.
- Victim safety and message that behavior is wrong.
- What is the effect of a justice system response to the natural trajectories of perpetrators/victims of teen dating violence? Might there be deleterious affects from a justice system intervention?
- Justice and other system coordination.
- How do the different courts coordinate cases (i.e., adult and family court)?
- Coordination with other systems, such as schools. Is this research already happening?
- Is there a different response role for the justice system for victims or perpetrators? How is this complicated by the issue of bidirectionality?

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Group 4 – Community-Based, Multilevel Interventions

- To what extent do practitioners understand teen dating violence and/or need training?
- Needs assessment.
- Impact on the community/health care sector, school nurses, nurses in the community; prenatal and postnatal care for pregnant and parenting teens; involve mental health professionals (need assessment and intervention skills)/law enforcement/child protective services.
- Impact of mandatory reporting on youth behavior.
- Barriers to reporting, study to compare states with different mandatory reporting laws, legislative efforts to change mandatory reporting laws.
- Services for kids outside of school.
- What are the best places to reach kids who are not in school? In what context does dating violence occur (i.e., homeless and runaway youth, community, cyber community)?
- Informative research.
- Law enforcement's response.
- Law enforcement is not taking teen dating violence seriously.
- What is the victim's experience when reporting to law enforcement?
- What do law enforcement personnel need to know to respond more appropriately?
- Look at judicial responses and need for services.
- Innovative evaluation needed.
- Community level change.
- What collaborations are needed to develop developmentally appropriate services (SA/DV agencies and youth serving organizations)?
- What is the availability of services?
- Evaluate youth-led approaches, activism and civic engagement.
- Collaboration among community partners.
- Local community.
- Look internationally at communities with lower rates of violence.
- Address individuals as potential victims and perpetrators.

- Developmentally appropriate interventions with youths.
- What are we learning from working with youths that may lead us to rethink how we work with adults?
- What are we learning from working with adults that transfers to youths?
- Labels (e.g., victim, perpetrator) and their impact.
- Don't play the blame game.
- Developmentally appropriate services.
- How do you measure developmental stage?

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Group 5 – Macrolevel (media, legislative/policy) Interventions

- Very little research in this area.
- What are intended and unintended outcomes and processes?
- Process of implementing policies.
- Need to educate people to get them on board.
- How do policies get implemented on the ground; do they compete with other policies?
- How to make them fit within unique environments.
- How to get effective implementation and sustainability. What mechanisms are in place for implementation?

Policy Linkages: Outcomes

- Shared risk factors-we need to collaborate. Reproductive health professionals should screen for violence.
- Child protective systems (disclosure, services).

Policies

- Mini-policies: confidentiality, reaching youths.
- Social-emotional learning.
- What is the effect of requiring parental consent?
- Primary prevention policies.
- Many kids in institutionalized care settings. Opportunity to design policies in these settings.
- How to get people to buy into policy initiatives that can prevent violence.
- FCPF work to give simple steps that they can take.
- Effects of policies on services.
- Policies regarding resources.
- Policy creation without youth voices.

Adoption Issues

- Early adopters, innovators.
- Targeting players who have a stake in it.
- Changing hearts and minds. How to make adoption more attractive.

Media

- Background.
- Kaiser Family Foundation's work on media and children's outcomes.

- Responsibility rests on parents to regulate children's exposure.
- AMA, APA, violence in the media is "causal."
- Educate the media and advocates to make better use of these resources.
- Policy: could tax a product to decrease profit motives. Fines for selling to minors.
- Incentives for creation of health promotion and safety.
- Music, artistic expression may have outlets to use technology productively.
- What makes some of these products so attractive?
- More research on positive deviance.
- What about exposure is really harmful? Can we refine the critique?

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Closing Sessions

Reflections and Wrap-Up — David Wolfe, Ph.D.

David Wolfe, Ph.D., University of Toronto, offered the following comments. He noted that how you form relationships will impact future relationships. We've discovered environmental changes carry a lot of weight on how young people enter into violent relationships. The majority of kids may have discontinuity versus continuity. There are multiple causes and influences. Most if not all of these are cultural and familial. Dr. Wolfe noted that engaging men and boys in TDV exercises has been challenging. There is rampant ignorance of the problems and related issues. People just do not understand the importance. Youths are interested in their issues and they are a necessary part of the solution. Violence is easier to prevent than it is to treat, and it is a lot more effective to prevent something than to try to change a pattern of behavior. We learned that methods of prevention rely on ongoing skill development. Too much emphasis is placed on quick fixes and trying to find the bad guys. Public health strategies are also needed. He then described the 21-lesson curriculum he has developed called "The Fourth R" — the "R" stands for relationships. The curriculum, which is being used in some Ontario schools, aims to teach ninth-graders about healthy relationships and includes information on violence prevention. The curriculum is based on the idea that, like the other "R's," reading, writing and arithmetic, relationships should be taught as part of the core curriculum for middle schoolers.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Final Thoughts and Future Directions — Conference Co-Chairs: Deborah Capaldi, Barri Rosenbluth

- Start early (integrate health curricula).
- Add on to the training periodically.
- It should be developmentally informed (basic information).
- We need to be strategic...girls and boys have different needs and one size does not fit all.
- We need it to be culturally sensitive...each community has to have some input.
- Centered on building relationship skills.
- We shouldn't wait until it is a crisis.
- Involve more youths in the solution to make it more relevant to them.
- Need to involve men, parents, our community partners in a more meaningful way.
- Need to add information on media literacy and educate the educators.
- We need to build positive networks to make sure we are not just repeating the same mistakes.

- Optimistic that the next generation of kids will be introduced to this information at an early age.

[Back to Agenda.](#)

Date Created: July 17, 2008