

DATING VIOLENCE PREVENTION IN ETHNICALLY DIVERSE MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOLS: PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS AND PREVALENCE RATES AMONG ADOLESCENTS [611]

Elena Font-Calafell, M.A., Doctoral Candidate ^a
Trina Bauling, M.P.H. ^b

^a Cook County, Illinois Department of Public Health

^b Proviso Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative,
Proviso Township High Schools, District 209, Forest Park, IL

Abstract

This paper reports evaluation results for Teens Learning to Choose (TLC), an evidence-based prevention program for adolescent dating violence. Data on the prevalence of psychological, physical, and sexual violence in dating relationships as well as attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge with respect to dating violence were obtained from a modified version of a previously validated scale (Foshee et al. 1996). A pretest posttest convenient control group design was utilized. Data were collected during the 2003–2004 school year. A 12-session curriculum was provided to 977 students from grades 7 through 9 and the control group was formed by 129 students who did not receive the program. Pre- and post-questionnaires for the control group were administered following the same timeline as for the program group.

Results indicated that, among all program students, around 18 percent reported perpetrating physical violence (not in self-defense) during dating. Girls were 2.27 times more likely to be physical perpetrators than boys. Boys were 1.87 times more likely to be sexual perpetrators than girls. Program participants demonstrated many significant positive changes in knowledge, attitudes and beliefs. After TLC, youth were (1) less accepting of violence in relationships, (2) less willing to gender stereotype, and (3) more confident about being able to help a friend who was either a victim or a perpetrator of dating violence. Participating students were more aware of available community resources.

Introduction

There has been growing recognition that teen dating violence is a significant problem that poses serious psychological and physical health risks to youth (Halpern, Tucker, Oslak, Young, Martin, and Kupper 2001). Dating violence can result in injury, unwanted pregnancy, and homicide and victims of dating violence are more likely to engage in risky sexual behavior, unhealthy dieting behaviors, substance use, and suicidal ideation/attempts (Silverman, Raj, Mucci, Lorelei, and Hathaway 2001). Also, patterns established during adolescence can set the stage for later violence and abuse. The first episode of adult partner violence typically occurs by age 15 (Foshee et al. 1996). Approximately 25 percent of women will experience intimate partner violence at some point in their lifetimes (Silverman, Raj, Mucci, Lorelei, and Hathaway 2001) and 60 percent of women in abusive relationships report that the abuse began in high school (Kreiter, Krowchuk, Woods, Sinal, Lawless, and Durant 1999).

The majority of the research has focused on white, middle class college students (West and Rose, 2000). Studies that attempted to address intragroup differences have yielded mixed results (Makepeace 1987; Lewis and Fremouw 2001, Lane and Gibbs 1985; Clark, Beckett, Wells, and Dungee-Anderson 1994; White and

Koss 1991). For example, some studies indicated higher prevalence of violence among Blacks when compared to Whites (Makepeace 1987; Lewis and Fremown 2001) contrasting with others that suggested that violence may be more prevalent in Whites (Lane and Gibbs 1985), while other reports demonstrated no differences in dating violence as a function of race (Clark, Beckett, Wells, and Dungee-Anderson 1994; White and Koss 1991).

Only recently, however, has violence in adolescent dating relationships been examined. Limited research exists about the dating violence 1) among youth under 18 years, especially among adolescents aged 11 to 14 and 2) among Blacks and other minority adolescents (Lewis and Fremouw 2001; O’Keefe 1997). It appears that relationship violence among adolescents is more common than among married couples (Coker, McKeown, Sanderson, Davis, Valois, and Huebner 2000).

While there is a deficiency in data, there is a clear need for dating violence prevention programs. Relationship issues become important for adolescents as they develop and manifest their beliefs, attitudes, and expectations regarding gender roles and violence within dating relationships. Few programs have been adequately developed and even less have been evaluated for efficacy (Wekerly and Wolfe 1999; Lewis and Fremouw 2001). Adolescence is considered a developmental window of opportunity for learning and prevention (Kazdin 1993).

Available evaluations of dating violence programs (including sexual assault prevention) measure *intermediate* outcomes that is, those changes in knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, behaviors, or behavioral intentions that are theoretically related to dating violence (Schewe 2004). Few evidence-based dating violence prevention curriculums exist. One such curriculum is Dr. Vangie Foshee’s *Safe Dates* (Foshee et al. 1998). That includes a 10-session curriculum, a play, and a poster contest. Research on *Safe Dates* has demonstrated its effectiveness in preventing psychological, physical, and sexual abuse and found that “most effects were explained by changes in dating violence norms, gender stereotyping, and awareness of services” (Foshee et al. 1998, p. 45). A study of 18 dating violence prevention programs including *Safe Dates* was conducted in Illinois. Of these programs, *Safe Dates* achieved the greatest improvements in students’ attitudes, beliefs, and behavioral intentions (Schewe 2004).

The Current Study

A review of the dating violence literature reveals a limitation of research on middle school students as well as with Blacks and other minorities. No consensus has emerged about the race and gender distribution and prevalence of dating violence among teenagers. Further, the few studies that have evaluated adolescent prevention programs are inconclusive about their efficacy. The *Safe Dates* program is promising in preventing dating violence, based on evaluations conducted among predominantly White rural adolescents. The current study addresses the need to validate the *Safe Dates* program in other populations by evaluating the program with an ethnically and socio-economically diverse population of suburban middle and high school students. It also reports the results of an evaluation of a modified version of the *Safe Dates* program in ethnically diverse middle and high schools.

The national Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative (SS/HSI) is funded through a collaboration of the U.S. Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice. Under a local Safe Schools/Healthy Students grant, Cook County Department of Public Health (CCDPH) implemented Teens Learning to Choose (TLC), a modified version of the *Safe Dates* program, with public school students in the suburbs of a large Midwestern city. The student demographics are predominantly minority and have low levels of academic achievement (Illinois State Board of Education 2005). These communities suffer high rates of juvenile and adult crime, poverty, unemployment, high school dropout, truancy, gang activity, and drugs (City-Data.com, Illinois State Board of Education 2004).

A descriptive analysis of the students indicated some differences in the general profiles of the junior high school students and students at East and West High Schools. For example, the demographics, English proficiency and mobility rates of students at East and West High Schools were different, and not equivalent in the economic background context. The junior high students were, obviously, younger in age and also had high mobility and poverty rates. Thus, we stratified the cases into different school groups to investigate the effect of the intervention by comparing pretest and posttest for each school separately. Control groups were utilized. Due to a small control size (33) at East H.S., all program and control comparisons were limited to West H.S.

TLC is composed of the *Safe Dates* classroom curriculum and two sessions on substance abuse risks. The main purposes were to prevent the initiation of teen dating violence and to promote healthy dating relationships. The program aims to (1) change norms regarding aggression in dating relationships, (2) confront traditional gender stereotypes, and (3) increase awareness of services for victims and perpetrators through a school-based strategy using classroom presentations. These intervention targets have been identified as mediators of dating violence (Foshee et al. 1998).

Methods

The survey was conducted in science, health and physical education classes at 10 schools with seventh-, eighth- and ninth-graders, ages ranged from 11 to 17. Data was collected during the 2003-2004 school year. In total 1,106 pre- and post-test questionnaires were collected; 977 students received the TLC intervention and 129 students from one high school formed a control group. Participation by schools and students was voluntary and passive parental consent was required.

CCDPH co-ed teams implemented the curriculum over twelve consecutive days in public school classrooms. In place of receiving the TLC program, the control group attended physical education classes. Pretests were administered before the first session and posttests immediately following the last session. The control group completed the surveys following the same timeline as the intervention group. Each test was a self-administered questionnaire designed to measure the dating violence attitudes and behaviors. Students provided initials, birthdate and mother’s name to allow for matching of pretests and posttests while maintaining confidentiality.

Among the 977 program attendees, 55.4 percent were female and 43.5 percent were male. About 69.2 percent were Black, 2.9 percent were White, 20.1 percent were Hispanic, and 6.6 percent were Asian. The age range was 11 to 17 years old. The mean age was 13.95. About 88.4 percent reported dating experience, and 10 percent reported that they “have never had a date”.

Measures

Data were obtained from a modified version of a valid and reliable scale (Foshee et al. 1996). The measures included were on dating violence norms (seven questions), gender stereotyping (eight questions), dating violence victimization (eleven questions) and dating violence perpetration (eleven questions). Additionally, questions were asked to assess the extent of dating violence and awareness of available services. *Demographics* consisted of ethnicity, grade, gender, school and age (see attached questionnaire).

Composite variables

Composite scores were generated following the guidelines of the original questionnaire developed by Dr. Foshee and colleagues (1996). The Cronbach alpha test was applied and the scales showed high or acceptable internal consistency. Thus, we were able to use the composite variables of dating violence norms acceptance ($\alpha = 0.60$), awareness of services ($\alpha = 0.73$), help ability ($\alpha = 0.73$), and gender stereotyping ($\alpha = 0.67$). Both

dating violence victimization and perpetration were measured and classified into three categories, psychological, physical, and sexual.

Analysis Strategy

The composite variables were obtained by averaging the individual items and were used as outcome variables. This was a repeated measure and therefore the t-test was used to compare the pretest and posttest from all participating students (N=977) to test the program effect. The assumption of normally distributed data was able to be used with the data from the entire program implementation group. To compare the subset of program participants with the control group from the same school, non-parametric statistical methods were used as the sample sizes were small and the data were not normally distributed. Non-parametric methods such as Wilcoxon was the analog to parametric method of paired t-test, which is used under the assumption of normal distribution for a two-time-point repeated measure study.

Thus, the Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to compare the pretest and posttest in program participants (N=193) with the control group (N=129) from West High School to evaluate the effects of the program. After that, the Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to compare the posttest from the program group (N=193) with the control group (N=129) to show that the program effect was not a result of random variance.

The Chi-square test was used to test the associations between dating experience and dating violence across the different schools and to test dating violence across gender and race. The odds ratio was calculated to show the strength of the association. All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS software.

Results

A pre- and post-test comparison was conducted to determine changes related to this program. To compare measures, summary score variables were created following the original *Safe Dates* evaluation, which combined related questions. The score of the questions ranged from 0 to 3 consistently. The results are presented in two major sections. The first section presents results according to program objectives. The second section presents results of dating violence prevalence across school level, gender and race. Frequencies and percentages of the different forms of dating violence victimization and perpetration are shown in Appendix A.

The comparison of program and control groups was limited to West High School students. The control group was a convenience sample of students who did not attend the program because they were enrolled in a different class. Since this was not a randomized group we first compared demographic characteristics of the program group with the control group. Compared to program participants at West High School, the control group had a higher proportion of Hispanics than the program group.

What were the results of the program?

Decrease dating violence norms

The program met the goal of significantly decreasing acceptance of dating violence norms, as:

- Among all participating students, there was a statistically significant, decrease in the acceptance of dating violence (0.2007).
- Participating students at West high school demonstrated a significant decrease in the acceptance of dating violence (0.2253).
- Overall, non-participating students maintained and did not decrease their acceptance of dating violence.
- A comparison of program participants and controls found that participants showed significantly better results, suggesting that the change is a result of the program, not a random effect.

Decrease acceptance of traditional gender-role stereotypes

- The program results demonstrated that the program goal of decreasing the levels of acceptance of traditional gender roles was met, as detailed by the following:
 - Participating students showed a significant decrease in the acceptance of traditional gender roles (0.1428).
 - Participating students from West high school demonstrated a significant decrease in acceptance of traditional gender roles (0.1252)
 - Nonparticipating students did not decrease their acceptance of traditional gender-role stereotypes, as anticipated.
 - Program attendees showed significantly better results than non-participants, which suggests that the decrease is a result of the program, not a random effect.

Increase awareness of dating violence services

- Program participants demonstrated an increase in their awareness of dating violence services (0.3295).
- The West high school participants demonstrated an increase in the awareness of dating violence services (0.3553).
- Overall non-participating students maintained their awareness of dating violence services as expected.
- Program attendees’ demonstrated a significant increase compared to controls, suggesting that the increase in awareness of dating violence services was a result of the program, not a random effect. (0.3913).

Abilities to help a friend involved in dating violence

- Program participants demonstrated a significant increase in their ability to help a friend involved in dating violence (0.209)
- Program participants from West High School demonstrated a significant increase (0.1183) in the ability to help a friend involved in dating violence.
- Nonparticipating students reported a decrease in their ability to help a friend involved in dating violence. This was not expected and may be a result of students having answered the test more reflectively and honestly due to familiarity with the test.
- The comparison of participants and non-participants demonstrated that participants showed an average change that was 0.4885 larger. This indicates that the increase in ability to help a friend involved in dating violence appears to be a result of the program, not a random effect.

Other results

Approximately 90 percent of students reported dating experience. More than 87 percent of those students have had more than one boy/girl friends. Therefore, an analysis of dating violence in this population is warranted. Prevalence of dating experience and number of boy/girl friends was similar among students from the junior high and high schools.

Overall, 17.54 percent of participants reported perpetrating physical violence (not in self-defense) during dating. High school students might be more likely to be dating violence perpetrators (20.72 percent versus 14.29 percent for junior high students) though this result was not statistically significant.

To investigate the association between perpetrators, victims and gender effects, we defined perpetrator and victim and classified them into three categories, psychological, physical and sexual; details are provided in Tables 1 and 2, following the structure of the original questionnaire.

Table 1. Overall association of perpetrator and victim among program students

Dating violence victimization by perpetration		Frequency	Percentage	Chi-square P value
Psychological dating violence	Non-victim/non-perpetrator	403	46.27	0.000
	Non-victim/perpetrator	78	8.96	
	Victim/non-perpetrator	157	18.03	
	Victim/perpetrator	233	26.75	
Physical dating violence	Non-victim/non-perpetrator	524	60.58	0.000
	Non-victim/perpetrator	85	9.83	
	Victim/non-perpetrator	110	12.72	
	Victim/perpetrator	146	16.88	
Sexual dating violence	Non-victim/non-perpetrator	730	85.78	0.000
	Non-victim/perpetrator	26	3.06	
	Victim/non-perpetrator	58	6.82	
	Victim/perpetrator	37	4.35	

- Psychological victims were 7.67 times more likely to be psychological perpetrators compared to non-victims.
- Physical victims were 8.18 times more likely to be physical perpetrators as compared to non-victims.
- Sexual victims were 17.9 times more likely to be sexual perpetrators compared to non-victims.

Table 2. Victimization/perpetration by gender among program students

Dating violence victimization by gender		Frequency	Percentage	Chi-square P value
Psychological dating violence	Female non-victim	310	36.30	0.000
	Male non-victim	160	18.70	
	Female victim	165	19.30	
	Male victim	220	25.70	
Physical dating violence	Female non-victim	365	42.15	0.000
	Male non-victim	244	28.18	
	Female victim	116	13.39	
	Male victim	141	16.28	
Sexual dating violence	Female non-victim	426	49.36	0.643
	Male non-victim	336	38.93	
	Female victim	54	6.26	
	Male victim	47	5.45	

- Victim
 - Boys were 2.45 times more likely than girls to be psychological victims
 - Boys were also 1.82 times more likely than girls to be physical victims.

- Boys and girls had a relatively equal probability of being sexual victims.
- Perpetrator
 - Boys and girls had relatively equal probability to be psychological perpetrators.
 - Girls were 2.27 times more likely than boys to be physical perpetrators.
 - Boys were 1.87 times more likely than girls to be sexual perpetrators.

To investigate the association between perpetrator, victim and race among program students, the data were categorized by the three types of violence, and differences by ethnicity were compared.

Table 3. Race difference on dating violence

Dating violence victimization, perpetration by race (Black vs. White, Hispanic, and Asian)		Chi-square P value	
Psychological dating violence	Victimization	Black vs. White	0.027**
		Black vs. Hispanic	0.837
		Black vs. Asian	0.366
	Perpetration	Black vs. White	0.087**
		Black vs. Hispanic	0.027**
		Black vs. Asian	0.029*
Physical dating violence	Victimization	Black vs. White	0.663
		Black vs. Hispanic	0.001**
		Black vs. Asian	0.194
	Perpetration	Black vs. White	0.276
		Black vs. Hispanic	0.007**
		Black vs. Asian	0.151
Sexual dating violence	Victimization	Black vs. White	N/A
		Black vs. Hispanic	0.566
		Black vs. Asian	0.075*
	Perpetration	Black vs. White	0.528
		Black vs. Hispanic	0.106
		Black vs. Asian	0.879

N/A = sample cell < 5

* = Negatively associated

** = Positively associated

As indicated in Table 3, above, Blacks were more likely to be psychological victims than Whites. Blacks also were more likely to be psychological perpetrators compared to either Whites or Hispanics. However, Asians were more likely than Blacks to be psychological perpetrators.

Compared to Hispanics, Blacks were more likely to be psychological victims and perpetrators. There was no significant difference between Blacks, Whites and Hispanics on sexual dating violence. In contrast, Asians were more likely than Blacks to be sexual victims.

Discussion

This study confirmed previous research findings on the need for primary and secondary prevention programs for dating violence. Consistent with other studies, this study found that teen-dating violence is present and relatively common at the seventh, eighth, and ninth grade levels. 17.54 percent of participants reported perpetrating physical violence during dating. In 2004, Foshee et al. found that between 8 percent and 20 percent of adolescents have been victims of serious physical dating violence. In the present study the age of participants was younger, yet found that 45 percent reported psychological victimization, 28.8 percent reported physical victimization, and 11.7 percent reported sexual victimization against their dating partners. Also, 38.1 percent reported psychological perpetration, 26.7 percent physical perpetration, and 7.3 percent sexual perpetration. Consistent with this study, other studies have found perpetration estimates from 26 percent to 46 percent (Hickman, Jaycox, and Aronoff 2004). The 7.3 percent prevalence found in this study is consistent with reports of sexual violence among high school students have ranged from 3 percent to 23 percent, and 34 percent use sexual or severe physical violence (Bennett and Fineran 1998).

This study also examined ethnic differences in prevalence of adolescent dating violence, particularly for Blacks. In this study, Blacks were more likely to report psychological victimization and perpetration than were Whites and Hispanics. This result is consistent with one of the few studies that examined dating violence in an ethnically diverse population (Watson, Cascardi, Avery-Leaf, and O’Learn 2001). Although this finding may represent a true difference, it is important to take into consideration other variables that may account for this racial difference. For instance, the ethnic difference in this study may be due to the effects of family violence. In fact, Malik, Sorenson, and Aneschensel (1997) found that, whereas higher rates of dating violence were reported among Black teens, the effect of ethnicity disappeared once the level of exposure to community and family violence was considered.

Strikingly, girls were significantly more likely than boys to report perpetration of physical violence. This contradicts clinical assumptions that males are the perpetrators of violence and females are the victims and presents a new picture of mutual violence between the sexes. Foshee et. al (1996) reported no significant gender differences in dating violence victimization, but found girls significantly more likely to report perpetration of physical violence. In contrast, Molidor and Tolam (1998) found that 70 percent of the girls that reported their partners initiated the violence compared to 27 percent of the boys. Yet, given the greater physical power of men or boys over women or girls in general, male adult violence carries a distinct differential in physical consequences. Therefore, in addressing this issue, the meaning and consequences of violence needs to be taken into consideration.

Findings of the TLC program indicated many significant positive changes in knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs. All categories moved in the direction intended by the program. According to Foshee and colleagues (2004), the *Safe Dates* program had been used in different geographic areas but the only published evaluation of this program has been in a rural, predominantly white community. In fact, these investigators agreed that “future studies are needed to determine the effectiveness of *Safe Dates* for adolescents living in other locales” and that “the design of our evaluation did not allow assessment of the effectiveness of individual components” (p. 624). This study reports the results of an evaluation of a modified version of the *Safe Dates* program in ethnically diverse middle and high schools from a suburban community. The classroom curriculum component of the *Safe Dates* was intended to influence attitudes and beliefs that are theoretically related to dating violence and to increase student knowledge of dating violence services and abilities to help friends involved in dating violence.

The results indicated that participating students positively shifted their knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes from pretest to posttest and significantly more than students who did not receive the program. As a result of changes in attitudes and knowledge, the program expects to influence behavior. However, methodological limitations prevented us from assessing the impact of the program on behavior. The findings suggest that the program met its objectives through positive impacts on knowledge and attitudes as well as in help-seeking abilities. It remains an open question whether the program’s impact on behavior is lasting and significant.

The findings are subject to several limitations. The survey demonstrated good internal reliability and high construct validity (Foshee et. al 2004), nevertheless, it was a self-report survey and the extent of under- or over-reporting cannot be determined. Both participants and the comparison group were not randomly selected and were not matched on gender or ethnicity. The greatest limitation was that the project’s design did not allow for a long-term evaluation of its impact.

This study has several strengths. Most research in this area have a small sample size, with predominantly white, middle class, college or high school students (West and Rose 2000), neglecting minority groups. These studies limit the generalizability of their findings. The current study however, used a large sample size from an ethnically and socio-economically diverse population of middle and high school adolescents. As past *Safe Dates* studies report on the program in its entirety, this study demonstrates that the curriculum component is effective in improving the attitudes, knowledge and helping skills of male and female White, Black, and Hispanic students in suburban communities.

Conclusion

The findings validate that the TLC program made a positive impact on knowledge and attitudes as well as help seeking abilities. The findings confirmed that dating violence is experienced by adolescents as young as eleven years old and middle school boys and girls experience dating violence at similar rates to high school and college students. While both boys and girls are involved in inflicting and receiving physical violence, girls were more likely to be perpetrators of physical violence. This finding contradicts the perception that girls are the victims and demonstrates that violence is bidirectional, which is important for identification and early intervention. It suggests important clinical implications and indicates the need for further public health research, such as experimental studies on the long term effects of dating violence prevention programs as we expand our knowledge of risk and protective factors of dating violence.

References

- Bennett, L. and Fineran, S. (1998). Sexual and severe physical violence of high school students: Power beliefs, gender, and relationship. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 68, 645–652.
- City-Data.com. [On-line]. Available: <http://www.city-data.com>.
- Clark, M., Beckett, J., Wells, M., and Dungee-Anderson, D. (1994). Courtship violence among African–American college students. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 20, 264–281.
- Coker, A.L., McKeown, R.E., Sanderson, M., Davis, K.E., Valois, R.F. and Huebner, S. (2000). Severe dating violence and quality of life among South Carolina high school students. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 19, 220–227.
- Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16, 297–334.
- Foshee, V.A., Bauman, K.E., Ennett, S.T., Linder, F., Benefield, T. and Suchindran, C. (2004). Assessing the long-term effects of the safe dates program and a booster in preventing and reducing adolescent dating violence victimization and perpetration. *American Journal of Public Health*, 94(4), 619–624.
- Foshee, V., Bauman, K., Arriaga, X., Helms, R., Kock, G., and Linder, G. (1998). An evaluation of Safe Dates, an adolescent dating violence prevention program. *American Journal of Public Health*, 88(1), 45-50.
- Foshee, V. A., Linder, G. F., Bauman, K. E., Langwick, S. A., Arriaga, X. B., Heath, J. L., McMahon, P.M., and

- Bangdiwala, S. (1996). The safe dates project: Theoretical basis, evaluation design, and selected baseline findings. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 12(5), 39–47.
- Halpern, C., Tucker, C., Oslak, S., Young, M., Martin, S., and Kupper, L. (2001). Partner violence among adolescents in opposite-sex romantic relationships: findings from the national longitudinal study of adolescent health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91(10), 1679–1685.
- Hickman, L.J., Jaycox, L.H., and Aronoff, J. (2004). Dating violence among adolescents: Prevalence, gender distribution, and prevention program effectiveness. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, 5(2), 123–142.
- Illinois State Board of Education. 2005 school report cards [On-line]. Available: <http://www.isbe.state.il.us>.
- Illinois State Board of Education. 2004 school report cards [On-line]. Available: <http://www.isbe.state.il.us>.
- Kazdin, A. E. (1993). Adolescent mental health: Prevention and treatment programs. *American Psychologist*, 48, 127–141.
- Kreiter, S., Krowchuk, D., Woods, C., Sinal, S., Lawless, M., and Durant, R. (1999). Gender differences in risk behaviors among adolescents who experience date fighting. *American Academy of Pediatrics*, 104(6), 1286–1292.
- Lane, K., and Gwartney-Gibbs, P. (1985). Violence in the context of dating and sex. *Journal of Family Issues*, 6, 45–59.
- Lewis, S., and Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 21(1), pp. 105–127.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1987). Social factors and victim offender differences in courtship violence. *Family Relations*, 36, 87–91.
- Malik, S., Sorenson, S.B., and Aneschensel, C.S. (1997). Community and dating violence among adolescents: Perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 21(5), 291–302.
- Molidor, C., and Tolman, R.M. (1998). Gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence. *Violence Against Women*, 4, 180–194.
- O’Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 546–568.
- Schewe, P.A., (2004, April). *Best practices for school-based sexual assault and teen dating violence prevention programs*. Paper presented at the 2004 Illinois Prevention First Conference, Rosemont, IL.
- Silverman, J., Raj, A., Mucci, L., Lorelei, A., and Hathaway, J., (2001). Dating violence against adolescent girls and associated substance use, unhealthy weight control, sexual risk behavior, pregnancy and suicidality. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 286(5), 572–579.
- Watson, J.M., Cascardi, M., Avery-Leaf, S., and O’Learn, K.D. (2001). High school students’ responses to dating aggression. *Violence and Victims*, 16(3), 339–348.
- Wekerle, C., and Wolfe, D.A. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 19(4), 435–456.
- West, C., and Rose, S. (2000). Dating aggression among low income African American youth. *Violence Against Women*, 6(5), 470–494.
- White, J., and Koss, M. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students. *Violence and victims*, 6, 247–256.

Appendix A

Dating violence prevalence (1 of 3)

Dating violence		Characteristic	Total			Male			Female		
			%	(95% CI)		%	(95% CI)		%	(95% CI)	
Psychological victimization*	Overall		45.2	42.1	48.3	58.2	53.5	62.9	35.0	31.1	38.9
	Grade	7	37.6	27.8	47.4	62.2	48.0	76.4	14.6	4.6	24.6
		8	41.0	35.7	46.3	55.0	47.0	63.0	27.5	20.8	34.2
		9	48.8	44.7	52.9	59.5	53.2	65.8	41.4	36.2	46.6
	Race	Black	45.1	41.4	48.8	56.9	51.4	62.4	35.9	31.2	40.6
		White	21.7	7.5	43.7	30.8	9.1	61.4	10.0	0.3	44.5
		Hispanic	45.9	38.9	52.9	64.9	54.0	75.8	33.9	25.5	42.3
		Asian	50.7	39.1	62.3	70.0	53.6	86.4	36.6	21.9	51.3
Psychological perpetration	Overall		38.1	35.1	41.1	36.8	32.2	41.4	39.2	35.2	43.2
	Grade	7	37.0	27.1	46.9	38.6	24.2	53.0	35.4	21.9	48.9
		8	35.3	30.1	40.5	35.4	27.7	43.1	35.3	28.1	42.5
		9	39.9	35.9	43.9	37.4	31.1	43.7	41.6	36.4	46.8
	Race	Black	39.4	35.8	43.0	38.9	33.4	44.4	39.7	34.9	44.5
		White	21.7	7.5	43.7	30.8	9.1	61.4	10.0	0.3	44.5
		Hispanic	30.8	24.3	37.3	28.0	17.8	38.2	32.8	24.4	41.2
		Asian	52.9	41.2	64.6	41.4	23.5	59.3	61.0	46.1	75.9

*Psychological victim was defined on the responses to, *How often has a boyfriend or girlfriend done following things to you?* The responses to those questions ranged from *never, rarely, and sometimes to many times*. The student was defined as a psychological dating violence victim if the student’s boy/girlfriend *damaged something belong to him/her* sometimes or many times, or has ever *threatened to hurt him/her*, or if his/her boy/girlfriend has rarely done two or more, or sometimes done one or more of following four behaviors to him/her: *would not let me do things with other people, insulted me in front of others, told me I could not talk to someone of the opposite sex, made me describe where I was every minute of the day*. Psychological perpetrator was defined similarly, except for asking whether the student performed those behaviors to his/her boy/girlfriend.

Appendix A

Dating violence prevalence (2 of 3)

Dating violence		Characteristic	Total			Male			Female		
			%	(95% CI)		%	(95% CI)		%	(95% CI)	
Physical victimization*	Overall		28.8	26.0	31.6	35.3	30.8	39.8	24.1	20.6	27.6
	Grade	7	33.7	24.2	43.2	53.3	38.7	67.9	16.0	5.8	26.2
		8	25.5	20.8	30.2	35.3	27.7	42.9	16.6	11.1	22.1
		9	29.9	26.2	33.6	31.6	25.6	37.6	29.0	24.3	33.7
	Race	Black	30.5	27.1	33.9	35.4	30.1	40.7	26.6	22.3	30.9
		White	34.8	15.3	54.3	38.5	13.9	68.4	30.0	6.7	65.3
		Hispanic	19.1	13.6	24.6	26.7	16.7	36.7	14.6	8.4	20.8
Asian		38.0	26.7	49.3	53.3	35.4	71.2	26.8	13.2	40.4	
Physical perpetration	Overall		26.7	24.0	29.4	17.3	13.8	20.8	33.4	29.6	37.2
	Grade	7	23.7	15.1	32.3	17.8	6.6	29.0	29.2	16.3	42.1
		8	24.1	19.6	28.6	17.9	11.9	23.9	28.3	21.8	34.8
		9	28.7	25.1	32.3	16.8	12.1	21.5	36.6	31.6	41.6
	Race	Black	28.1	24.8	31.4	17.3	13.1	21.5	36.6	31.9	41.3
		White	18.5	6.3	38.1	21.4	4.7	50.8	15.4	1.9	45.5
		Hispanic	18.9	13.6	24.2	11.4	4.4	18.4	23.5	16.3	30.7
Asian		36.1	25.0	47.2	30.0	13.6	46.4	40.5	25.7	55.3	

*Physical victim was defined on the responses to *How often has a boyfriend or girlfriend done following things to you?* The responses to those questions ranged from *never*, *rarely*, or *sometimes* to *many times*. The student was defined as a physical dating violence victim if the student’s boyfriend/girlfriend has ever done any of following four behaviors: *pushed, grabbed, or shoved me in a hurtful way, threw something at me in order to hurt or scare me, slapped me, and pushed me or held me against my will*. Physical perpetrator was defined similarly, except for asking whether the student performed those behaviors to his/her boyfriend/girlfriend.

Appendix A

Dating violence prevalence (3 of 3)

Dating violence		Characteristic	Total			Male			Female		
			%	(95% CI)		%	(95% CI)		%	(95% CI)	
Sexual victimization*	Overall		11.7	9.7	13.7	12.1	9.0	15.2	11.5	8.9	14.1
	Grade	7	9.5	3.6	15.4	13.3	3.4	23.2	6.0	1.3	16.6
		8	7.8	4.9	10.7	11.2	6.2	16.2	4.6	1.5	7.7
		9	14.3	11.5	17.1	12.4	8.2	16.6	15.7	11.9	19.5
	Race	Black	11.5	9.2	13.8	13.2	9.4	17.0	10.2	7.2	13.2
		White	8.7	1.1	28.0	15.4	1.9	45.5	0.0	NA	NA
		Hispanic	10.1	5.9	14.3	2.7	0.3	9.1	14.6	8.4	20.8
		Asian	18.8	9.6	28.0	20.7	8.6	42.3	17.5	5.7	29.3
Sexual perpetration	Overall		7.3	5.7	8.9	9.5	6.7	12.3	5.7	3.8	7.6
	Grade	7	10.0	3.8	16.2	13.6	3.5	23.7	6.5	1.4	17.9
		8	7.0	4.2	9.8	10.1	5.3	14.9	4.7	1.5	7.9
		9	7.1	5.0	9.2	8.3	4.7	11.9	6.1	3.6	8.6
	Race	Black	7.9	5.9	9.9	10.6	7.1	14.1	5.9	3.6	8.2
		White	4.3	0.1	22.0	7.7	0.1	36.0	0.0	NA	NA
		Hispanic	4.6	1.7	7.5	4.0	0.8	11.3	5.0	1.1	8.9
		Asian	8.5	2.0	15.0	10.0	2.1	26.5	7.3	1.5	19.9

*Sexual victim was defined on the responses to *How often has a boyfriend or girlfriend done following things to you?* The response to the question ranged from *never*, *rarely*, or *sometimes* to *many times*. The student was defined as a sexual dating violence victim if the student’s boyfriend/girlfriend has ever *convinced me to get physical when I said no*. Sexual perpetrator was defined similarly, except for asking whether the student performed those behaviors to his/her boyfriend/girlfriend.

Appendix B

TLC Survey

ID _____

Date _____

Pre-Test __ Post-test __ Follow up __

Purpose: The purpose of this survey is to find out your thoughts and feelings about things that have to do with dating relationships.

Directions: Circle or check the response that best reflects how you feel about each question. There are no right or wrong answers. All answers are confidential, so please answer honestly.

1. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Please circle one number on each line.

	Yes, I definitely agree!	yeah, I basically agree.	no, I don't really agree.	No, I definitely don't agree!
a. It's OK for a boy to hit his girlfriend if she did something to make him mad.	3	2	1	0
b. Sometimes boys deserve to be hit by their girlfriends.	3	2	1	0
c. It's OK for a boy to hit a girl if she hits him first.	3	2	1	0
d. It's OK for a girl to hit a boy if he hits her first.	3	2	1	0
e. If a girl flirts with a boy, he has the right to get physical with her (even if she doesn't want to).	3	2	1	0
f. If a boy flirts with a girl, she has the right to get physical with him (even if he doesn't want to).	3	2	1	0
g. Sometimes it's O.K. to call your girl/boyfriend names, like 'stupid' or 'ugly'.	3	2	1	0

2. Do you know of any services that help teenagers who are being physically, emotionally and/or sexually abused by their boyfriend or girlfriend?

1. _____ no

2. _____ yes

3. Do you know of any services that help teenagers who are physically, emotionally and/or sexually abusing their boyfriend or girlfriend?

1. _____ no
2. _____ yes

**The following questions are about your experiences with dating.
A boyfriend or girlfriend is a special friend that you have a romantic feeling for.**

4. Have you ever had a girlfriend or boyfriend?

1. _____ no (if no, skip to question 9)
2. _____ yes

5. About how many different girlfriends or boyfriends have you had?

1. _____ One
2. _____ 2 to 3
3. _____ 4 to 9
4. _____ 10 or more

6. How often have you hit a person that you were on a date with out of self-defense?

1. _____ never
2. _____ once
3. _____ 2 to 3 times
4. _____ 10 or more times

7. How often has a **boyfriend or girlfriend** done the following **things to you**? *Please circle one number on each line. Please indicate with an X if he/she did it in self-defense or not.*

	Many times	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Self- defense	
a. Damaged something that belonged to me.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
b. Would not let me do things with other people.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
c. Told me I could not talk to someone of the opposite sex.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
d. Threatened to hurt me.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
e. Insulted me in front of others.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
f. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved me in a hurtful way.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
g. Threw something at me in order to hurt or scare me.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO

	Many times	Sometimes	Rarely	Never	Self- defense	
h. Convinced me to get physical when I said no.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
i. Made me describe where I was every minute of the day.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
j. Slapped me.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
k. Pushed me or held me against my will.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO

8. About how long ago did you experience any of the things above?

a. ___ less than 3 months ago. b. ___ more than 6 months ago c. ___ more than 1 year ago.

9. How often **have you done** the following things **to your boyfriend or girlfriend**? *Please circle one number on each line. Please indicate with an X if you did it in self-defense or not.*

	A lot of times	Once in a while	Hardly ever	Never	Self- defense	
a. Damaged something that belonged to them.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
b. Would not let them do things with other people.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
c. Told them they could not talk to someone of the opposite sex.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
d. Threatened to hurt them.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
e. Insulted them in front of others.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
f. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved them in a hurtful way.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
g. Threw something at them in that was meant to hurt or scare them.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
h. Convinced them to get physical when they said no.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
i. Made them describe where they were every minute of the day.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
j. Slapped them.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO
k. Pushed them or held them against their will.	3	2	1	0	YES	NO

10. About how long ago have you done any of the things above?

a. ___ less than 3 months ago. b. ___ more than 6 months ago c. ___ more than 1 year ago.

The following questions are about your thoughts on boys and girls:

11. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements? *Please circle one number on each line.*

	Yes, I definitely agree!	yeah, I basically agree.	no, I don't really agree.	No, I definitely don't agree!
a. In a dating relationship, the boy should be smarter than the girl.	3	2	1	0
b. Girls are always trying to mess with boys' minds.	3	2	1	0
c. In a dating relationship, the boy and girl should have about equal power.	3	2	1	0
d. Swearing is worse for a girl than for a boy.	3	2	1	0
e. In general, the father should have more power than the mother in making family decisions.	3	2	1	0
f. It is more important for boys than girls to do well in school.	3	2	1	0
g. If both husband and wife have jobs, the husband should do a share of the house-work such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.	3	2	1	0
h. Girls should have the same freedom as boys..	3	2	1	0

12. During the last 6 months, when you had a disagreement with someone, how much of the time did you do the following things? *Please circle one number on each line.*

	Most of the time	some of the time	Not much of the time	Never
a. Told the person how I felt.	3	2	1	0

	Most of the time	some of the time	Not much of the time	Never
b. Hung-up the phone on them.	3	2	1	0
c. Tried to calm down before I talked to them.	3	2	1	0
d. Refused to talk to them about the problem.	3	2	1	0
e. Asked lots of questions so that I could get the whole story.	3	2	1	0
f. Gave them the silent treatment.	3	2	1	0
g. Asked them what they were feeling.	3	2	1	0
h. Let them know what was important to me.	3	2	1	0
i. Tried to find a solution that suited both of us.	3	2	1	0
j. Stomped off during arguments.	3	2	1	0
k. Listened to their side of the story.	3	2	1	0
l. Acted like nothing was wrong.	3	2	1	0

13. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements? *Please circle one number on each line.*

	Yes, I definitely agree!	yeah, I basically agree.	no, I don't really agree.	No, I definitely don't agree!
a. Most boys hit their girlfriends.	3	2	1	0
b. Most girls hit their boyfriends.	3	2	1	0
c. Teens who are violent towards their boyfriend or girlfriend need to get help from others.	3	2	1	0
d. Teens who are victims of violence by a girlfriend or boyfriend need to get help from others.	3	2	1	0
e. It is normal for a husband to get violent with his wife.	3	2	1	0

	Yes, I definitely agree!	yeah, I basically agree.	no, I don't really agree.	No, I definitely don't agree!
f. It is normal for a wife to get violent with her husband.	3	2	1	0
g. I could help a teen who was being abused by their girlfriend or boyfriend.	3	2	1	0
h. I could help a teen who was abusing their girlfriend or boyfriend.	3	2	1	0

14. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements? *Please circle one number on each line*

	Yes, I definitely agree!	yeah, I basically agree.	no, I don't really agree.	No, I definitely don't agree!
a. The majority of teens use either alcohol or drugs.	3	2	1	0
b. Smoking marijuana is less harmful than smoking cigarettes.	3	2	1	0
c. Inhalants are more dangerous than hard drugs.	3	2	1	0
d. According to most hard drug addicts, drinking alcohol is the first step on the path to drug abuse.	3	2	1	0

These last few questions are information about you. Because this survey is confidential, we ask these questions so we can match this survey with another one you will complete at the end of the T.L.C program.

15. Please write the first letter of your first name _____
and the first letter of your mother's first name _____

16. What month and day were you born? _____ / _____ Example: 3/15
month/day

17. How old are you?

1. _____ 11 years old 4. _____ 14 years old

2. _____ 12 years old 5. _____ 15 years old

3. _____ 13 years old 6. _____ 16 years old

18. What is your sex?

1. _____ Female

2. _____ Male

19. What is your race?

1. _____ Black

4. _____ Asian

2. _____ White

5. _____ American Indian

3. _____ Hispanic

6. _____ Other _____

20. Does your mother, or a woman like a mother, live in your house?

1. _____ no

2. _____ yes

21. Does your father, or a man like a father, live in your house?

1. _____ no

2. _____ yes

Thank you!