



Going beyond the individual: The evidence supporting multilevel adolescent dating abuse prevention

-Hello, this is David Lee from PreventConnect. Go ahead and please write down your name of your organization, the city and state and let us know what the weather is where you are. I'm in Sacramento, California and it is supposed to reach a 100 and be hot. This is David Lee from PreventConnect we are starting the web conference Going beyond the individual: The evidence supporting multilevel adolescent dating abuse prevention in a few minutes. Go ahead and please write into the text chat the name of your organization and the city and state. Sunny and 70 in pullman, Washington. Upper 90s in Austin, Texas. Great people are joining us from around the country. Let us know what the weather is like where you are. I hear it is nice in New Jersey. People are continuing to join us. This is David Lee from PreventConnect, we are starting at the top of the hour. Someone is asking how to connect to the audio. I will send the password. This is David Lee from PreventConnect. We are starting at top of the hour in a couple of minutes. Let us know what the weather is like where you are. I see Boston university school of public health, sunny but cool.

-Dave I can't find how to get on the computer and see the stuff.

-I sent a link with the confirmation called a join link.

-We have speakers to test their lines. I'm going to mute the lines. Okay. Speakers. Lindsay, you are on the line? Press star 6 to unmute your phone.

-Yes, I am.

-Perfect. Coming in clear. Emily, are you in?

-I'm here.

-You are clear. Renee, are you on? Renee, press star 6 to unmute your phone. And I will come back to you in a second. Luz, are you on the line? Hello, Luz, are you on the phone line? Renee, are you on the phone? You will need to press star 6. I am not hearing you. Renee, are you on the line? Luz, are you on the line?

-Someone is hearing smooth jazz.

-She's probably, have her call back in. She may have dialed the previous extension. Luz, are you on the line? Press star 6. Luz, are you on the line, go ahead and share that. Okay. Renee is trying again. And Luz, are you on the line now. Renee, are you on the line yet. This is David Lee from PreventConnect. We are starting in a moment. I am waiting for the speakers to get on the line. People are writing in where they are from and the weather. Beautiful in Haze, Kansas. Luz, are you on the line? Renee, are you on the line? You will need to press star 6, Luz, Renee. Hi, Renee, are you on the line? Luz, are you on the line. I'm hearing someone's voice. I am going ahead and seeing-- and Luz, are you on the line? Renee, are you on the line? I'm going to start now and we'll try to catch you as we get ready for your speaking. We hope you are joining us soon. This is David Lee. Welcome to PreventConnect web conference Going beyond the individual: The evidence supporting multilevel adolescent dating abuse prevention. Thank you for joining us. PreventConnect is a wide project that we are committed to advancing the primary prevention of dating violence, most violence and sexual violence. Great to have you joining us. Many have visited our website and we have E learning and we have WIKI, we have many ways of social media to like us, Facebook or follow on twitter. Thank you very much. I want to take about how to use the technology. The first piece is I want people to be able to raise their hand. The way you do that, look on my picture here, above on the screen, there is a hand saying my status. Go ahead and please click that so I can have people practice raising their hands. We ask for input and ask for the people to raise their hands. Thank you very much. I see I have 44, 43. I can lower your hands. So I will do that. That is a way we have this. We have the text chat. You can write it and press return and get a message. Many have you figured out how to do this. Luz, are you on the phone now?

-I am.

-You are on, perfect. You can always send a private text chat as Luz just did by clicking on the private and sending a message to someone. That is a great way to use the technology. We do have slides for the power point presentation today. The slides are available now on our website. I'm going to cut-- I'm going to add to the chat where the link is right now. It is the same page where you signed up and get a copy of the slides available today on the web conference right there. We have on the phone, many of you are listening on the computer. You can also dial into the phone if you want to. I will post that as the audio option in the text chat. If you are not able to listen on the computer, you can listen by doing that. I'm sending that right now. Thank you very much. We do closed captioning thanks Aberdeen captioning. Go to the upper right hand corner and click on the CC button. We do have ask that you practice good etiquette. We want conversation, we want questions, keep the side conversations in the private chat and that is a way to continue having a strong conversation with each other. You can also, if you have trouble with technology, Call iLinc at Technical Support at 800-799-4510. That is Call iLinc at Technical Support at 800-799-4510. PreventConnect is a national project of the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault sponsored by U.S. Centers for

Disease Control and Prevention. The views and information provided in this web conference do not necessarily represent the official views of the U.S. Government, CDC or CALCASA. we look at violence across the life span prevent before the violence starts in the right place and seek to make connections and connect to other forms of violence. I think today as we are making the connections with researchers and we have four fabulous researchers on and are presenting their findings. This is a corner stone of what we do. PreventConnect has a wide variety of web conferences. I have one coming up next week. That is an exciting topic, on sexual abuse from the prison pipeline. We have a few spaces available. I'm going to post the link to do this. This is going to be on the 28th, a week from today. I encourage you to join the web conference. It is a great opportunity to explore how sexual abuse in prison and the links to those and think about that from a prevention perspective. I have just posted the link in the text chat. We are announcing the future series. Just to let you know starting in October, we are beginning a series of prevent campus, we are focussing on sexual violence prevention on college campuses and dating violence and dedicated series on that, that is coming soon. So with that, I'm going to go ahead and begin the recording. Hello, this is David Lee from PreventConnect. Welcome to the web conference Going beyond the individual: The evidence supporting multilevel adolescent dating abuse prevention. Thank you for joining us, we have people from around the country and joining us today in the conversation, I'm glad to be able to so many coming, to be able to participate in a very important topic and highlighting the new research out there. The objectives are ambitious and important. Summarize the research evidence that examines the association between neighborhood level factors and dating violence, identify contextual factors that may influence the likely of aggression. Discuss the approaches. This is an important topic that we have here. As we know, teen dating violence is a very important topic. We see that there is teen dating violence month is in February. There is a proclamation around that. The researchers are using a slightly different term than teen dating violence, that is one term that we are using. Now I am totally forgetting what my title was that we are using for this. Adolescent dating abuse.

-Thank you.

-There are many terms and there reasons for them, we want high light the theme as this topic the coming up. We are not going through everything how much it is taking place. This is audience that is aware of that. And there's many great resources. What we want to do is think about how to move to next level of conversation to be able to move forward. The way we are doing that, we are looking at the socio economic work. Focussed on the societal and community levels. So much of the work is done on the individual or the relationship level in the pieces and we are focussing on how we are doing that, but one of the gaps is we don't have as much research on this topic. What we are doing today is showing some of that research that is available to high light what is happening on this. So how many familiar where the social ECO logical model? I will share the results. As you can see the audience is available. I want to ask a couple of questions before going on, to know who is in the audience. The first is have you attended a web conference before today? On the screen, you will see four options. Go ahead and click on the one that applies to you. First time. Yes, first time attending

PreventConnect. 1-2 PreventConnect web conferences. Are you a regular? I will share the results. 21% are new to PreventConnect. I hope you find this helpful. It is a way to have a conversation and as you can see over 53% of the audience have been, including 37% been many PreventConnect web conferences or familiar with the work that we are doing. We are getting a sense of who is in the audience. So you are going to see a list of types of organizations. What organization best describes who you are. Go ahead and look. Pick the one that best fits your organization. I know that it is hard to be able to find these. Which one best-- keep on voting. What we are going to see is that 21% are from dual. 16% from domestic violence. 6% college. Public health department 6%. Community based organizations. Criminal justice. State territorial or federal government. Child abuse. Mental health and healthcare. So thank you all for doing that. I'm going to close this. With this, I want to ask a question of the audience, and this we are going to do a lot. What are some of the challenges to implement community and society level interventions to prevent adolescent dating violence. One is saying lack of funding. We see that often. What are some ones that are going to become barriers to challenges of why it is hard to be able to implement. Providing how do you get multiple exposures. Small communities of their own needs and values. Not wanting to talk about adolescent. Not wanting to talk about sex. Lack of understanding of the community. Lack of policies that protect teens. Parents are not looking at their teens through these lens. Adulthood. Lack of buy in. Hard to get access to the community outside of school. Hard to get in schools. Parental consent. Teen and dating violence is one and address the interconnectedness of them. Education. Faith groups may resist the idea that IPV is taking place in their community. A country of a million residents, in a county of a million residents, one full time person to address teen dating violence prevention. Hard to get in the schools. One of the challenges that I see also is that we want to be able to base the work that we are doing on what we know works, yet we have very little evidence research indicating what is defining the work and we want to be informed by the experience and research, but we don't have enough of that within the communities, so that's one of the challenges that we see and so what we want to do is find a way to help strengthen that. In this, I was very excited when I was talking to Emily Rothman, gosh, probably earlier in the year about a journal she was helping to edit and looking at the theme beyond the individual and state level influences on dating violence and Emily told me this was coming out, I said we need to do a web conference on this. It is an important topic and came out September 2015 issue and so, I do encourage people to check this out with the articles. There are many articles. Here is just a list of the titles of all of the articles you are able to see. We are going to talk three authors of the articles, many of the articles will give you a sense and share some of the findings with you today. With that, how many of you have read any of the articles in this issue of the American journal of preventive medicine? Go ahead, let us know and vote. I'm sharing the results live. They are a little harder to get access to. You do have to pay for them. The hints are contacting resource centers that are getting the copies of them. Contacting the authors of the articles or people at the universities that have access to the articles. 89% have not. 11% have read the articles. Thank you for sharing that. We'll clear that result and withdraw is question now. With that, I will introduce the guests that are joining us. I'm pleased to have this group of presenters. Lindsay Gressard from Georgia state university school of public health.

-I'm here.

-Great. How are you doing today?

-Great, great. How are you?

-Wonderful. We have Renee Johnson, are you on the line?

-I'm here.

-Wonderful.

-Renee is with the Johns Hopkins. We have Luz McNaughton REYES. We are joined by Emily Rothman. Thank you for taking the time to share the results of your work. Not many practitioners get a chance to read the articles. These articles are so important to influence our practice. And I'm pleased you are sharing the findings and have this discussion. I thank you all for joining us today. As we said, we are using this social Ecological model. I want to turn the podium over to Emily Rothman that is one of the co-editors. And Emily, I will give you the podium and you can advance the slides and maybe talk about why you were editing this issue and why it is important to listen to.

-Great, thank you David. So I was really happy when folks at the CDC told me they were putting this issue and wanted to think about what it means to do the dating prevention work. Part of that is because I know that for activists or advocates and people in the field, the idea that where you live or the context that you are matters when it comes to violence or dating violence perpetration is a no-brainer. Yet, the part that I think that research can add and that we can learn from it is exactly how is it impacting people and what little sub pieces of it could we do something about. So it is almost as if someone said, oh, you know, food impacts your health and we all say, of course it does. But dig to dig deeper and say how exactly does it do that and what should we be doing in response. And refine this and get more specific. That what is the people presenting today has to offer. The other thing that I wanted to tell you before they present is I think sometimes in the field it is hard to picture, well, how can we do things at these outer levels and for some of the reasons that people were talking about, fund to people in the community not necessarily being on board with some of the ideas. Just to give a little hope and inspiration, I wanted to share a community effort that is going on. Jessica Walsh is a prevention specialist in domestic violence that I met through the delta program. That is CDC funded initiative to prevent domestic violence through primary prevention. Well neighborhood efficacy is important too. She started to think what could I do that improves an entire neighborhood's efficacy. So what she decided to do was I'm going to get together with other people who share concerns about youth in our city and they decided to have the kids all come together to paint a mural. The mural wasn't about dating abuse, but the fact that people were coming together and hold side conversations about dating abuse, when they were painting, and they were able to create just that underlining feeling we are all working together to improve the

neighborhood. So it felt different to Jessica in terms of how kids are relating together in a real positive. I know that, Jessica and Lucy gave a pod cast on this topic. There's other ways besides getting people together through a neighborhood clean up or painting. Changing the community norms is something we talk about a lot. There are social norm campaigns that are more successful than others. I put this, this is some what innovative. The more people that look at this billboard, the more this woman's face changes into a healed face. If I back up, you will see she has bruises as people walk by and look it, she gets better. So you know, there's lots of different, I think, really creative approaches that people can take to trying to inspire people in communities to start conversations and think about what they can do. So if you are sitting there, as you are listening to this, you are thinking, all right, I'm sold and believing that neighborhood matters and the specific parts matter, context matters, what is it I can do at the outer layers and what does that really mean in real world terms. So we put together this list of six things you can think about doing, in combination with each other or individually. Of course, you can try to change laws and policies, that is working at the outer layer. You can go to specific work places or schools and work on their policies and procedures. Building neighborhood coalitions, this is one I encourage people to think about, it is like the mural painting, even if you are not talking overtly about violence prevention at all, working with other groups in your area that are simply trying to improve the togetherness of people in the neighborhood, that according to research, we think could boost, you know, any kind of prevention impact. So worth considering doing. Of course, there's all the educating of people who are in the systems that you are working, education forums which a lot of people do, and community campaigns. And so, to give a sense of talking about the outer layers, these are basically the things at least that I can think of that I would say count or you can try if you want to work on these issues. That's me.

-Thank you so much, Emily. We are going through three papers that we have discussed and then the opportunity to hear, I am putting the links in the chat and the slides on the PreventConnect website. We are starting with Lindsay Gressard and she's doing a presentation on gender inequity a contextual risk factor for dating violence. This is great topic and thank you for sharing the findings of your work.

-Great, I'm excited to be here. You can hear me right?

-Yes. Perfect.

-I'm Lindsay Gressard and from Georgia state university and I'm excited to be here today and talk about the study that we have done and finding out if gender inequality is on the outside edge associated with dating violence. We looking at the outside ring of that model. We are not looking within the individual relationship, we are looking at it in society and whether that influences dating violence. Before I start, I want to acknowledge my co-authors. So first, I want to give you a little background on why we decided to even try to look at risk factors at the societal level. One out of ten high school students has been a victim of adolescent dating violence. That comes from the youth risk behavior survey, that is a national wide survey conducted every other year and

asking the students about a variety of risk factors, drinking alcohol, risky sexual behaviors, texting and driving and dating violence. We all know the stats, but we are less sure about whether is this true for every state and rates vary across the states and what is causing the variation. Fortunately, the survey has a really sophisticated sampling methodology and we get a prevalence rate that is representative of the entire state. So we were actually able to look closer at this. So what'd we find. Well, there is variation among the states. So some states like the ones high lighted here in blue have a lower prevalence rate than the national percentage. Utah has the lowest rate at 7% and Vermont 7.4% and Nebraska, Kansas and South Dakota round out the five states with the lowest prevalence rate. On the other hand, we have states that have a higher prevalence rate of dating violence. In red the states, the five states that have the highest rates of dating violence especially will, Louisiana 14.8%. To complete the picture, I filled in the other states, light blue are the states below the national average of 10% dating violence prevalence. In light red are the ones above the national average of 10%. I'm sure you will notice that there are states that are white and those are the states that don't have state representative data for this measure. So they are not participating in the survey or don't have state represented data for the survey or omitted the dating violence question from the survey.

-Lindsay, one second. Some people are not familiar with this survey. Can you describe how the survey is done, reports or survey of people and what type of question is being asked around dating violence.

-That is a great question. The risk youth behavior survey is anonymous but taking in school. It is a paper questionnaire where they self-report their behaviors on a variety of behaviors. So physical dating violence is measured by one question and that is in the past 12 months how many times did someone you were dating or going out physically hurt you on purpose. It gives examples, being hit, slammed into something or injured with an object or weapon. And then, for the survey, for the prevalence rates on the map here, they broke it down into saying one time or more and the people saying no it never happened. Then there is another question that actually asks about sexual dating violence, in the past 12 months how many times did someone you were dating or going out forced you to do sexual things, kissing, touching or forced to have sexual intercourse.

-For this, you looked at state data but there is more data that can be reached. You can also get more localized data too?

-Yes, you can. Yes, it depends on the state, some states will give that information broken by city and others will not. Of course others do analysis using individual reports on the survey. So after we saw there was definitely various among the states, this really made us wonder why and what us driving this variation among the states. So first we looked into the research to see whether there was anything done looking at different societal influences on dating violence. The shelves were empty. Not a lot out there that looked at the contextual factors that influenced dating violence. Gender inequality has been looked at. Essentially, research has shown that societies in which women have

less political or economic or social equality, and those society the rates of violence against women are higher. This made us wonder whether gender inequality is connected to rates among violence in adolescents as well. First, you have to look at how you are going to measure gender inequality. How we can get a hard and fast number representing gender inequality. There is an index of gender inequality in a human development report and they are gather the data from different countries around the world and creating indexes. So they have index that measures the level of development in a country. They have index measuring the level of poverty in a country. And now, recently they have added index that measures the level of gender inequality in a country. So they have basically decided that gender inequality is made up of three dimensions. First is reproductive health. The second is empowerment. That is looking at empower of women versus men and the third is labor market participation. And that's looking again at the comparison between men and women. So those three dimensions are further broke down into five different indicators. They are what they are getting the data for. The first is the adolescent birth date for each country. Then there's the maternal mortality rate. Within the empowerment, you have the government representation and female education attainment versus male. Finally, for labor market participation there is one indicator they have used and that is how many females are participating in the labor force versus males that is based on the number of people employed and the number of people that are looking for employment. So once they have obtained the data if the indicators there is a series of calculations. So this score ranges from 0-1. Perfect score of 0 means that the females and males equal. A score of 1, meaning that females and males are unequal as possible can be in that country. So how did we use this to look at the association between gender inequality and dating violence. We decided to use the U.S. states as a unit of analysis. We looked at the state prevalence rates. Again, physical and sexual dating violence victimization is measured. And as I have talked about, they added that sexual dating violence item to be surveyed. I want to point out that the youth risk survey is not measuring perpetration. So then again, gender inequality was used. The biggest caveat with that, they only calculate the index for countries. So we had to find the data sources that are comparable, and make our own calculations for each state in the U.S. so for most of these indicators we were able to find good reliable data from the vital statistics, but maternal mortality was a challenge, it is measured differently in each state. We department feel confident that measures for each state were reliable, so we decided to take the maternal mortality rate for the U.S. as a whole and plug that into each state. Once we had the data together, we used the correlation coefficients. If higher scores on the index in states would also be associated with higher rates of dating violence in those states.

-Lindsay?

-Yes. Go ahead.

-So is it, is there is a tool to determine the inequity in the city or county or state.

-It is not super easy process. It is possible. So the human development report does publish the formulas that they have used to calculate the rates. They are a little

complicated. Then the next trick is finding data sources that are comparable and reliability and consistent, so it is challenging, but it can be done. We did it using all publicly available data. So it can be done. All right. That was a great question. So we used coefficients to determine the strength and relationship between the dating violence rate and the gender inequality index. So before I do get to findings, I want to put this up and that answers the question if they are curious about the index for their own state or other states. This is the index score that we have calculated for each state. And they are organized from lowest to highest. So again, the lower score of the gender inequality means more gender equal. Vermont is the lowest, .18. Oklahoma is the highest with score of .33. I wanted to point out at the top of the screen that we calculated gender inequality index for the U.S. as a whole and that is the same number that the human development report calculated. So we felt after that, we felt confident that our calculations are parallel to those that the human development report used. Now to the results.

-We have a question of what's the standard deviation?

-I don't have that in front of me. It is in the paper. I don't have that in front of me.

-That is fair.

-Here are our results. On this slide you can see we have a correlation matrix. To break it down, basically the numbers here show the strength of the relationship between the two variables that intersect at that point. So for each number, you will have a variable in the row and a variable in the column and where they intersect is the measure of the two. A correlation can range between 0-1, with anything closer to 1 or negative 1, meaning that the relationship is stronger between the two variables. So you can see at the top we have the different aspects of dating violence. On left, physical dating violence, on the right sexual dating violence. Each of those are broken down so we have total dating violence, which includes both females and females and then broken down by gender. On the left, you are seeing the rows representing, top row is gender inequality index and subsequent rows are different rows of the index. So 2 most important part of this is the top row, it is here in purple. As you will see in the circle, that is where you can see that the gender inequality index is related to female physical dating violence. I do want to draw your eye down and see that two of the indicators were also actually associated with female dating violence, victimization. And educational attainment, so looking at female educational attainment versus male associated. I'm going to talk more about the main finding. So based on the association between the two, we wanted to map them out and visualize the relationship a little better. As you can see here, there are similarities between the two variables. So both gender inequality and female dating violence victimization are concentrated in the southern regions. So now that we have the statistics and the correlation and what does it mean? At the most basic level, our study found that states with higher level of gender inequality are associated with higher rates of physical dating violence among female teens specifically. And so we know this is demonstrated adult women some what, this is extending our knowledge of the relationship between gender inequality and violence against women and extending it to

explore it more among teens. So more importantly, what disease it mean for prevention. First, there is a relationship between gender stereotyping and dating violence at the individual level. There are programs out there, safety and four R's that address the gender stereotyping. Of course, we don't think society with gender inequality is the only thing influencing those beliefs but it is a contributing factor. So also this study suggests that maybe societal level interventions may positively affect dating vie especially will and may help prevent dating violence. On the right is an example of one such effort through a 2013 presidential memorandum that intends to better coordinate the programs. This points to examining more closely the societal efforts to promote gender inequality and whether those efforts are related to dating violence prevention. And finally, we recognize that the findings of this study are preliminary. This is first time it is examined in relation to dating violence and we think that the findings can be a starting point to examine it further and for also evaluating the affects of policies and programs that address gender inequality and dating vie especially will. We think that the study could be a model for studies to look at other societal influences on dating violence. On the left is the health impact pyramid and created by the CDC director and it is showing the further you move down the pyramid in the types of interventions, your population level will increase while the effort of the individuals that you are trying to reach, their effort to try to change the behavior will decrease. If we turn our attention to the social factors, is it possible to increase the impact and decreasing the efforts that we need to influence individual behaviors. So of course, I would remiss if I department point out the limitations of the study. It included high school students only. It is missing the students that dropped out of high school or who are absent a lot or not there the day that the survey was administered. Some of the states department report, or department participate in the youth risk survey fully, or department report the data for this particular survey item. This made the sample size a little low. The sample size is 38 states for the physical dating violence and 31 states for the sexual dating violence question. It is possible there were other relationships there that we were not able to determine because we didn't have the statistical power to do so. Third, we didn't control for any potential confounding factors. So there's the saying that correlation doesn't mean causation. Just because there is a correlation here, it is not one causing the other. It is a starting point to looking at gender inequality. Maternal mortality was a constant in all states. So once the data is more consistently collected among the states, it is interesting to look at how that affects the scores and then how that is related to dating violence. So that is all for me. I'm going to turn it back over the David. And if there are questions to the audience and how this could impact your work.

-David, are you there?

-I'm sorry, I was on mute. Now I'm back. I want to get a sense from the audience to hear from the audience a little bit about what they want to be able to think about what are some of the ways you can do prevention work that will be going on and maybe novel approaches to looking at the society level. This is exciting, suggesting the possibility of looking at gender inequality at the society level and this gives a stronger sense of that's something we need to explore further. So what are potential activities that people can do. Someone said use of the world peace game. I don't know what the world peace

game is. What are some ideas about doing work on the societal level or novel approaches to do to look at gender inequity. What are some of the things coming to your mind? Gender equality social norm campaigns. Letter writing to the politicians.

-What is VBAC? Media campaigns on gender. Oh vaginal birth after cesarean birth. And so there's 4 levels of the world you set up, there are roles consequences and problem solving at societal level to improve the world as a whole. While we need more research and learning more, as you said, Lindsay, this is an a correlation, not a causation. Thank you all for sharing. Thank you Lindsay for a great presentation. Now to Renee Johnson. Taking about the neighborhood context and dating violence among adolescents.

-Hello. Is the sound okay?

-Perfect.

-Okay, great. Today I will be talking about neighborhood context and adolescent dating violence. So just to start out, I wanted to remind you that adolescent dating violence is a fairly new field of inquiry. Advocacy work has been going for a while with young people. The first research papers on adolescent dating violence in the 80s and the first in the early 90s. In a review, they identified the important risk factors of dating violence. What they found was there was little research at the outer levels, including neighborhood. This is unfortunate, because characteristics of neighborhoods could influence the dating violence. The context could impact how they are supported. Today I am talking about what is known about the neighborhood context of adolescent dating violence. There is a premise. What is happening in larger society impacts health. Sometimes that is to model or assess. I mean put in some formula to understand how one factor is related to another factor. So if you think of the social ecological model is you go out to the outer levels, the measurement and modelling is harder, it is harder to link a structural factor to the individual factor like dating violence, there are more possibilities what caused this violence at all these different levels. Okay, so I'm saying larger societal factors impact neighborhoods as well as people. Structural factors globalization or the loss of manufacturing jobs in American cities impacts the number of jobs in the U.S. think about where you are from, there are different levels of joblessness in different cities. This impacts the level of unemployment. This type of approach, looking at the large structural factors and link them to individual behavior is called structuralism. So globalism is a phenomenon that impacts neighborhoods. It may affect people leaving the neighborhood in mass, such as in Detroit after general motors left and results in social phenomenon like large amounts of vacant housing. With higher levels of poverty, schools have less fund and that is because the schools are primarily funned by housing. There maybe fewer teachers to invest in youth and net loss of human capital for the young people. Also, you know, I'm just talking about different ways that structural factors impact neighborhoods. In neighborhoods with higher levels of joblessness there they are likely to get married but not less likely to have children. So it is likely there are more households with single parents versus two parents. There may be less capital, human capital for young people in the family setting. So neighborhood context and social processes impact behavior. We know that for other topics, school performance, vie

especially will, chances of graduating from high school. The question I wanted to ask myself in the paper that I'm talking about today is could these neighborhood factors be associated with dating violence. David's question to the group was what are the challenges to implementing community and society level intervention and what should we be doing. I think the one challenge is we don't know what is the best thing to do. So I think if the neighborhood factors are associated with dating violence, think about the structural factors that influence the neighborhoods and what mediate the dating violence association and from there develop appropriate intervention strategy behavior policies or both. So before I talk about the result of the paper, I just wanted to talk about how we classify neighborhood factors. And the first box, the red box is demographic and structure factors. The definition is summary features of the social and organizational structure and composition of the neighborhood. Level of homeownership, the number of residents living below the poverty level, composition of the community and these things are measured from using the data from the U.S. census. As we talked about in the previous slide, these factors are indicators of what's going on structurally and impact individual behavior. So they really relate and reflect the resources at the neighborhood level. In the second box, the green box, is neighborhood disorder. This is lack of order and adherence to social norms in the community. There are two types of neighborhood disorder. One is physical disorder and including like high levels of vandalism, rodents, litter, trash within a given community. And social disorder reflects public levels of violence especially will, drug selling and drug use. So broken windows theory relates to neighborhood disorder and this says that in neighborhoods with high levels of social disorder it communicates to the people there that no one is in charge and invites the criminal behavior. Think about the littering. If you are at beach with lots of trash and soda cans and old flip flops or things like that, you would be sad, but much more likely to litter on that beach, where if you go a pristine and beautiful beach and not one piece of litter, you are clearly knowing this is not a place to litter. In terms of measurement, in some aspects it is difficult to measure the neighborhood disorder. They administer the surveys to the people. How big of a problem the vandalism in your neighborhood. This is subjective. So person ABC and so on will respond to the question differently and this makes kind of understanding the research findings difficult. Another thing that makes the measurement difficult is there no one survey. So again, it is hard to compare. Finally, one way because violence is aspect of the neighborhood disorder, some look at the crime rates. It will be from the police data. So that's one option. Then purple box. The ability of a community to realize common values and address common problems. Social disorganization is an old concept dating back to work in Chicago in the 1900s. Within the past couple of decades, it is redone as collective efficacy and presented an updated definition, and ten item scale for measurement. And the tools are widely used in neighborhood research in particularly in the housing field. Two important concepts within the concept of collective efficacy is social cohesion, shared values among the neighbors. This addresses do you like and enjoy your neighbors, do you share similar values, do you feel supported by the community members. The second concept is informal social control. And what this is getting at is willingness to improve the whole neighborhood. So examples of supervision and monitoring of views. If two people got into a fight on a street, would an adult take notice or action. Control, this is not control in the sense of abusive behavior, but in the sense of recognizing and addressing behavior.

So with that as the background we'll talk about the study that we did. I wanted to give you an example. If you think about one factor being the neighborhood factors and the outcome being dating violence especially will, it is hard sometimes to think how did we get from one place to another. Neighborhood violence is a common aspect of neighborhood disorder. Neighborhood violence, what does that do in the minds of young people. It disrupts the development of empathy. It creates frustration and normalizes the behavior. Desensitizes the youth to violence. What we are saying here, that neighborhood violence, indicator of neighborhood disorder, there are pathways to understand how that would impact the dating violence. So now I will talk about the paper. Before I start I want to acknowledge my co-authors that worked hard with me. Elizabeth Parker... We conducted review of the existing research literature to summarize what is known about the neighborhood context. A measure of association between a neighborhood factor and dating violence. A measure of association is simply a statistic telling us the extent to which two variables are associated. Because young people and adults are different in the way that violence happens in partnerships, we focused just on those younger than 25. There were only 20 studies and so most of those focused on physical dating violence especially will. From the start, it is clear that we actually don't know a lot about neighborhood context and dating violence. So now I will talk about what we found. The first aspect we looked at the articles that looked at demographic and structural characteristics and recall that definition is features of the social and organizational structure and composition of a neighborhood. Only 11 studies that looked at and insufficient evidence to suggest an association between the neighborhood level factors and dating violence. The problem wasn't so much that the studies showed no association, but rather they just weren't designed to answer this question. Rather than being primary focus of the study, it is an after thought and being in the model. So as a result, the studies with respect designed to answer the question that I'm interested in and don't know about the association. So this an example where more research would tell us more information. The second area was neighborhood disorder and dating violence. Neighborhood disorder is lack of order and add herein to social norms in a community. We found about 12 studies and half of them showed that low perceived neighborhood disorder is protective for dating violence. If a person reports that the neighborhood has low levels of neighborhood disorder they are less likely to engage in dating violence. There's an important point to this, that is people engaged in violence are more likely to rate their neighborhoods as more ordered. Think about depression, if there is a depressed person to ask about how cheerful that the people are in the neighborhood, they are likely to say they are not cheerful. So there is a real research limitation. For example, need to look at violent crime rates and objective measured neighborhood disorder. Collective efficacy is the ability of the community to realize common values and address the community values. There were 8 studies that looked at this and nearly all showed that high levels of collective efficacy is protective for dating violence. What is better in the research, is that most of the studies. However there is the research limitations remain that reporting on collective efficacy is a subjective process and people vary in how they report on their community. Okay. So in summary, there's limited evidence linking to neighborhood factors to dating violence, however, we know that neighborhood factors impact interpersonal violence among adults and neighborhood factors are associated with violence among adults. There is reason to

keep looking. But because you are a practitioner, I want to end with the questions how can the neighborhoods be provided with the support they need to promote health relationships. I have three things for you. One, efforts to reduce physical disorder may reduce. They cleaned up, got the litter out, redid the builds in Philadelphia and found a drop in shootings. Community level violence prevention efforts may impact dating violence. So this means that you don't have to do something specific, there may be something going on and add a little DV prevention there. Strengthening the collective efficacy and increasing the supervision of youth. If we continue to work in the communities and remind the adults and they are important sources of human capital for the young people, we may make a difference. Thank you.

-Thank you, Renee. This makes me think about a good solution may solve multiple problems in that. You are using dating violence, DV to represent dating violence?

-Correct.

-Thank you very much. I really appreciate your presentation and really raising a lot of questions to think about as we look at neighborhood levels and there's so many levels to look at this on the neighborhood level. That was really very helpful. Thank you, Renee. We are going to continue now with Luz. She's talking about the social context influencing substance related dating violence. This is an important topic and sometimes a little date, dating violence and substance abuse, we are get aware of cautions that can happen. So maybe, Luz, start by exploring a little bit of how sometimes that conversation if not thoughtfully can be problematic. Let's start with the question, what the challenges in talking about alcohol and dating violence? What are the challenges when they have this conversation. It is important to have this conversation, but we have the acknowledge the challenges. What are some of the challenges that you see? This is a question of there's the role, cause domestic violence. Deny the behavior. Sometimes it is focussing on preventing victimization. And that, you know, there's sometimes if other reasons for dating violence rather than alcohol or drugs. Don't put the fault on the victim. So they are separate issues and that we want to want to look at separately but we have to look at the overlap, that over lap is sometimes there. I see lots of conversation of we don't want to interpret this as victim blaming. We have to recognize that many people self-medicate when they have been abused. Alcohol is widely used. It is a common social norm. So Luz, we see a lot of these questions that are coming up. Anything you want to say about the challenges, Luz?

-I will get into that when we start, if that is okay.

-That's great. What do you see, given those, what are you seeing as the links? Trauma associated with this. Lower inhibitions. Force victim to take or sell drugs. Victims blame themselves because they were drinking. Impact of trauma. Coping pieces. May not want to come forward if under age and involved with drinking. Alcohol causing it was their fault. So Luz, with that, why don't you talk, we are passing the podium to you.

-Thank you, David. I'm going back to the slides. go back to the very first slide. Thanks.

Thank you so much. Okay. Thanks, David. First of all, I would like to say thank you to PreventConnect for hosting this and to you for all of the fabulous work. You all deserve a big thank you for doing you do. This study that I'm talking about today is the about the influence of the role of social context in influencing substance related dating violence. Substance use and dating violence perpetration and not victimization. In contrast from the previous studies, victimization. Mine is focussed on perpetration. I'm going to talk about rather than talking about neighborhoods, I'm talking about if neighborhoods, the family context and the peer context. I'm going to be focussing on how the social context, the environment can make a difference in whether an individual risk factor, substance use or family violence or child maltreatment influences child perpetration or not. I'm not sure, I can't move the slides. Can you move them forward. Thank you. So this study I would like to acknowledge your comments about the different linkages between the substance abuse and dating violence and say up front that this study took the perspective which is based on a lot of experimental research, with college age students and adults. We can't do substance abuse research with the adolescents because it is unlawful for them. There is a lot of research that suggests that substance use and intoxication influences our brain functioning. Intoxicated individuals may retaliate strongly and they may not perceive the cues that tell them to stop. There is research suggesting that the way that intoxication works it is leading to nearsightedness, you are focussed on the immediate and forgetting about the long term consequences. Many, many, many individuals that engage in substance use†-- there are some studies showing association, and associations and that has led the researchers to think about this relationship as being something that is a little more complicated. Move forward, David. The link between substance use and dating violence perpetration may be moderated by or depend on social contextual factors. Neighborhoods, families or peers. So it may have affects on the brain that facilitate the aggressive behavior. The factors in the social environment including neighborhoods, family and peer level factors may make it less likely that substance use leads to abuse. So what aspects of the social environment work. Move forward, David, if you will. There is a broad category of factors. You can think of social control as including rules, sanctions and reactions of others, including praise that encourage and discourage. Essentially to the extent to which your social environment constrains you from being involved. So the example at the neighborhood level is a community members intervening to prevent kids on the playground from fighting. An example of the family level, parent rule setting and monitoring of the adolescent behavior. The contexts that promote social control, promote prosocial norms and discourage antisocial behavior. More likely to report the behaviors. The other category of factors that we looked at we called contextual violence. Teens that are exposed to peer neighbor had or family violence view the behaviors as acceptable. Contextual violence may strengthen the abuse. So when adolescents use substances they are more likely to report the dating aggression. So these are just two graphs depicting the two hypothesis. Substance use going from low to high. Frequency of dating violence perpetration. The on the left side, depicts contextual social control. Increases in substance use increase in the dating violence and perpetration and white line goes up as substance use goes up. The graph on the right hand side, following a similar logic is about contextual violence. Again, the association the white lines go up as substance use goes up.

-Luz, can you speak just a little louder, please?

-Sure. So test this, we used data from longitudinal support study of adolescents surveys. Collected four grades of data. 47% of the adolescents were black 48% male and 40% reported highest parent education was less than high school. Multilevel models assess influence of substance use and trajectories across grades 8-12. So to give you a sense of the measures T outcome was physical, [inaudible] we looked at three use variables. Heavy alcohol use, such as having three or four drinks in the row, having gotten drunk, hung over, marijuana use and other hard drug use. Our contextual [inaudible]

-Your voice is sliding away.

-[Inaudible] these are the results. Overall, consistent with the hypothesis. We found that associations between substance use and ADC are lower with high levels of social control. Here the vertical axis is the effect of the heavy alcohol use and stronger effect of heavy alcohol use going up. This is effect differs from whether the neighborhood social control is high or low. Low levels there is a strong affect of heavy alcohol use. You can see by the bars on the graph. High levels of social control, there's no significant effect. We found this moderating affect for all three substance use variables. Consistent we found that associations between substance use and dating violence is stronger when nested in family and peer family environments with high levels of alcohol use. For exposed to high levels of family use, the affects are stronger. So the prevention implications of the findings relate to are really focussed on how intervening at the social context can reduce substance related dating violence perpetration. Our findings suggest that interventions that foster neighborhood social control, supervising the youth and promoting social behavior, the norms campaigns, that those sorts of efforts may prevent substance related dating violence. Within friend networks could also prevent substance related dating violence. And that interventions that prevent or reduce family violence could also work to prevent substance related dating violence perpetration. And with that, I tried to go fast so we would be done by 3:30. How we'd do?

-You have done well. We don't have time for the next question, what are the implications, but we'll ask that in the evaluation. What are the next steps are you going to take. So you can contact each of everyone here. This is also on the PreventConnect website. I encourage you to think about the neighborhood pieces and I think that research provides the direction. I want to thank you all for what you are able to do. We are doing a recording of this and available probably in the next couple of days and this is something that other people can watch. If you have colleagues to share this with. This is a very helpful context. With this, I'm going to thank you for joining us on today's PreventConnect conference. I want to thank all of the speaks, Emily, Renee and Luz and Lindsay. We continue to look how to make social changes that can lead towards prevention of dating violence, most violence and sexual assault. I will keep the text chat open for a few minutes. This is concluding the audio portion of the web conference.

Thank you. Have a good day.