

## **#16 Effectiveness of primary prevention efforts of intimate partner violence**

**Daniel J. Whitaker, Christopher M. Murphy, Christopher I. Eckhardt,**

**Amanda E. Hodges and Melissa Cowart**

Full article available in *Partner Abuse* Volume 4, Issue 2, 2013.

(Article available for free at: <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/springer/pa>)

### **Study Purpose**

The purpose of this review was to provide a comprehensive summary of prevention programs for intimate partner violence (IPV). A 2011 CDC sponsored national survey indicated that lifetime prevalence rates for IPV victimization are 35% for women and 28% for men. Victims of IPV can suffer a range of negative physical, psychological, and social consequences. The annual cost of IPV victimization has been estimated at \$5.8 billion. Given these data, the prevention of IPV is a strong public health priority.

Primary prevention of a problem involves intervening before a problem begins. IPV begins in adolescence as teens begin to form intimate relationships. A recent school based national survey indicated that 9.8% of teens of high school youth reported being a victim of IPV. Developmentally, IPV tends to peak in early adulthood and decrease in frequency. Given this trajectory and the prevalence of IPV among school-aged youth, IPV prevention would most likely need to begin early.

Interventions for IPV have traditionally focused on school-aged youth, and in fact, most have been set in school settings. Prior reviews of intervention effectiveness have failed to draw strong conclusions about the effectiveness of prevention programs because of the low number of rigorous studies.

The purpose of this paper was to conduct a comprehensive review of primary prevention studies of IPV. In this review, we did not take a strict definition of primary prevention. Specifically, studies were included as primary prevention study if the intervention targeted IPV, and did not select a sample of known victims or perpetrators. Studies included may have delivered interventions universally to a population, and that population may have included some prior victims and perpetrators. Or, the studies included may have targeted high risk, or “selected” populations for intervention some of whom may have already been victims or perpetrators.

### **Method**

Electronic databases were searched for IPV prevention studies. Two reviewers identified 19 articles published between 1993 and 2012 that were included in this review (see table 1.) Studies included (1) contained one or more interventions targeting physical or sexual partner violence perpetration or victimization, (2) used a experimental or quasi-experimental design study design that included a comparison or control group, and (3) measured at least one outcome relevant to IPV including behavior, knowledge, attitude, belief, or another related construct.

## **Findings**

Of the 19 studies, 15 used experimental designs, the strongest design for inferring causation. All but two studies tested a single intervention against a control group. One tested two interventions against a control group, and another tested a short versus long version of the same intervention. All studies used some form of a curriculum-based intervention to effect IPV outcomes. Curriculum approaches as IPV prevention change strategies included: focusing on IPV knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs from a feminist and/or cognitive behavioral perspective; using social norms to change behavior; promoting help seeking and peer support; promoting the development of specific relationship skills; and, focusing on the legal and judicial aspects of IPV. Several studies included important non-curriculum based activities (e.g., community activities, a microloan program), but no studies were designed to examine the different effects of curriculum vs. non-curriculum based activities. About two thirds (n = 13) of the interventions were conducted in school settings, and the rest were conducted in community settings. There was large variation in sample size with samples ranging from 37 to 2310 participants.

Of the 19 studies, 9 were determined to be methodologically strong in most aspects: use of randomized designs, acceptable retention rates, sufficient follow-up assessments, and use of valid measures of IPV behavior. Four of the studies were conducted in school settings, and five were conducted in non-school settings. Of the five school-based studies, only one found unqualified positive results on IPV behavior. Over four years, the Safe Dates program was shown to reduce IPV perpetration (psychological abuse, mild physical abuse, and sexual abuse) and victimization (physical IPV). The program was equally effective for boys and girls, for all race/ethnicities included, and for teens who had experienced IPV and those who had not.

Of the five non-school based studies, each showed some positive effect on IPV behaviors. The five studies included two community-based interventions with group curricula and non-curriculum based activities (one set in Limpopo Kenya), two interventions that worked

with couples (one in groups, one one-on-one), and one family-based intervention in which parents and teens discussed dating violence. Each of the five interventions found some reduction IPV following the intervention.

### **Implications for intervention and policy**

This review found several programs that were effective in prevention IPV. Community-based programs were particularly effective in this review. Although many research questions remain regarding prevention programming, it is not too early to consider implementing some programs broadly. Prevention activities have traditionally been underutilized compared to programs for identified perpetrators and victims. Because prevention is generally cost-effective, programming is badly needed to prevent IPV before it begins.

### **Recommendations for future research**

There are several areas of need for future work of IPV prevention studies. First, although several programs were found that affected IPV behavior, no studies were replicated. In addition, Second, several of the effective programs included multiple components (curriculum plus community activities) but no analyses were reported that determined which components accounted for the positive study findings. Third, future research will need to examine whether IPV prevention can be delivered with prevention programs that targeted other risk behaviors that emerge in adolescence such as risky sexual behavior, substance use, and peer violence. Last, if prevention programs will be implemented broadly, implementation and dissemination research is needed to understand how best to implement those programs with fidelity to maintain program effectiveness.

### **About the Authors**

**Daniel J. Whitaker** received his PhD in Psychology from the University of Georgia in 1996. He worked as a research scientist at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention from 1997 to 2007, and he was a Team Leader in the Division of Violence Prevention, leading a team in the prevention of partner violence and child maltreatment. In 2008, Dr. Whitaker became a Professor of Public Health at Georgia State University and the Director of the National SafeCare® Training and Research Center. Since then, his work has been funded by the Centers for Disease Control, the Department of Justice, the Doris Duke Charitable Foundation, and the Annie E. Casey foundation. Dr. Whitaker has published two books over 50 manuscripts and book chapters, including papers in the American Journal of Public Health, Child Maltreatment, and Aggression and Violent Behavior. He is on the editorial board for the journal Child Maltreatment and Partner Violence, and has served as the CDC advisor to the American Medical Association's National Advisory Committee on Violence and Abuse, and on the advisory board for Healthy Families Georgia and the National Family Preservation Network.

Contact:

<http://publichealth.gsu.edu/752.html>

[dwhitaker@gsu.edu](mailto:dwhitaker@gsu.edu)

**Christopher Murphy, Ph.D.** is Professor and Director of Clinical Training in the Department of Psychology at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County. He received his B.A. in Psychology at the University of New Hampshire and his Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology at Stony Brook University. His research focuses on the efficacy of cognitive - behavioral and motivational treatments for perpetrators of intimate partner abuse, the role of alcohol and drugs in partner abuse, motivation to change abusive behavior, and psychological abuse in dating and marital relationships. Dr. Murphy directs the New Behaviors Program for partner violent men at the Domestic Violence Center of Howard County, Maryland, where he is actively involved in clinical training and supervision. Dr. Murphy has over 50 publications, including the 2005 book, *Treating the Abusive Partner: An Individualized, Cognitive-Behavioral Approach* (co-authored with Christopher Eckhardt).

Contact:

[www.umbc.edu/psyc/personal/murphy/murphys.html](http://www.umbc.edu/psyc/personal/murphy/murphys.html)

[chmurphy@umbc.edu](mailto:chmurphy@umbc.edu)

**Christopher Eckhardt, Ph.D.** is an Associate Professor of Psychological Sciences at Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN. Dr. Eckhardt received his BA from the University of Michigan (1989) and his Ph.D. in Clinical/School Psychology from Hofstra University (1994). Prior to coming to Purdue, he was on the faculties of Southern Methodist University in Dallas, TX and the Univ. of North Carolina –Wilmington. Dr. Eckhardt’s research has investigated risk factors for intimate partner violence as well as factors that may predict successful/unsuccessful treatment outcomes among men assigned to partner violence abatement programs. His research has examined whether men who abuse their partners exhibit cognitive disturbances and intense emotional states (such as anger arousal problems) during emotionally charged relationship conflicts, including those that involve alcohol intoxication. A second line of research has investigated the relation between readiness to change and outcomes of treatment programs for abusive offenders. Dr. Eckhardt has published more than 40 scientific articles and books/book chapters on intimate partner violence, which has been supported by research grants from the National Institute of Mental Health, the H.F. Guggenheim Foundation, Alcoholic Beverage Medical Research Foundation, National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, US Department of Justice, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Contact:

<http://www2.psych.purdue.edu/~eckhardt/>

[ceckhard@purdue.edu](mailto:ceckhard@purdue.edu)

### **Amanda E. Hodges**

Amanda Hodges completed her Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology at Georgia State University in 2009. Her research as an undergraduate focused on assessing the prevalence of problem gambling behaviors among youth and adult offenders in Georgia’s juvenile and drug/DUI courts. In 2011, she earned a Master of Public Health degree from GSU where she focused on prevention science. Her research integrated nursing and neuroscience to examine the

health impact of sleep disorders. During Amanda's tenure in graduate school, she worked as a graduate assistant within the National SafeCare® Training and Research Center. Upon graduation in 2011, she joined NSTRC as a research coordinator.

Contact:

[Ahodges10@gsu.edu](mailto:Ahodges10@gsu.edu)

### **Melissa Cowart**

Melissa Cowart received a B.A. in Sociology from Berry College in 2007. Upon graduating, Melissa worked for the GA Department of Family and Children Services as a case manager in the Investigations Unit. In this capacity, she met with families to address allegations of child abuse and neglect, including families in which intimate partner violence was an issue. In the Fall of 2010, Melissa began pursuing a Master of Public Health (MPH) degree at Georgia State University. She joined the National SafeCare Training & Research Center at GSU as a project coordinator in August 2011 and continues to work toward an MPH.

Contact:

[Mcowart6@gsu.edu](mailto:Mcowart6@gsu.edu)

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
---------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------	---------

**Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>AveryLeaf, S., M. Cascardi, et al. (1997). "Efficacy of a dating violence prevention program on attitudes justifying aggression." <u>Journal of Adolescent Health</u> <b>21</b>(1): 11-17.</p>	<p>N= 193</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n=102</li> <li>• Control group n=90 (63% female)</li> </ul> <p>Age: grades 9-12 M=16.5</p> <p>Sex: 106 males; 87 females.</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity 79.8% white, 11.1% Hispanic, 3.8% black, and 1.4% Asian.</p> <p>Targeted Population: Students taking health classes in a high school</p> <p>Location: Eastern Long Island, New York.</p> <p>SES: Lower-middle-class households</p>	<p>Design: Quasi-experimental. Randomization occurred at the class level.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Physical aggression and victimization was measured by the Modified Conflict Tactics scale (MCTS).</p> <p>Attitude towards dating violence was assessed using the Justification of Interpersonal Violence questionnaire.</p> <p>Justification of violence was assessed using the Justification of Dating Jealousy and Violence scale (JDV).</p> <p>Social desirability was measured using the Social Desirability scale (SDS). Self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom setting; 5 sessions over one week. Curriculum focuses on attitude change and skill enhancement to promote equity in dating relationships and covered help-</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> There was a Group x Time interaction with the treatment group showing significant changes on attitudes justifying male-to-female dating aggression [t (1, 102)= 2.47, p = .015] and female-to-male dating aggression [t(1, 102) = 4.51, p = .000]. Control group showed no significant change.</p> <p>No changes were observed for justification of dating violence and dating jealousy (JDV scale).</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>Relationship status: Forty percent of all students were currently involved in a dating relationship</p>	<p>seeking for those involved in aggressive relationships and alternatives to a violent dating relationship.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: Not reported</p>	
<p>Florsheim, P., McArthur, L., Hudak, C., Heavin, S., &amp; Burrow-Sanchez, J. (2011). The Young Parenthood Program: Preventing Intimate Partner Violence Between Adolescent Mothers and Young Fathers. <i>Journal of Couple &amp; Relationship Therapy, 10</i>(2), 117-134.</p>	<p>N= 105</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treatment group n=53 couples</li> <li>• Control group n=52 couples</li> </ul> <p>Age: 14-18 years old</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pregnant adolescent: M=16.1</li> <li>• Partner: M=18.3</li> </ul> <p>Race/Ethnicity: 45% Latino/Hispanic, 42% White, 13% other</p> <p>Targeted Population: first-time pregnant adolescents and co-parenting partner</p>	<p>Design: Randomized trial. Randomization occurred at the couple level. Couples were recruited and assigned to treatment group or to control group.</p> <p>Outcome measures: intimate partner violence was assessed using a semistructured interview that focused on a number of issues including relationship conflict and physical aggression. An IPV score was assigned to each participant using a scale of 0 to 3, with “0” indicating no violence and “3” indicating serious violence. Self-report.</p> <p>Substance use was assessed using The Drug Use Index (DUI), a 15-item, self-report questionnaire modified from the National Youth Survey.</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Results suggested significant effect on change in IPV scores from T1 to T2, <math>F(1, 86) = 3.50, p = .065</math>; partial <math>\eta^2 = .04</math>; treatment-group IPV scores remained relatively steady while control-group IPV scores increased. At T3, this difference was not significant.</p> <p>Pregnant adolescent’s DUI lifetime scores were significantly correlated (<math>p &lt; .05</math>) with the couple’s IPV scores at T1, T2, and T3 (<math>r = .229, .244, \text{ and } .199</math>, respectively). Expectant fathers’ DUI scores were not significantly correlated with IPV scores but were significantly correlated with pregnant adolescents’ DUI scores (<math>r = .329; p &lt; .01</math>).</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
		<p>Intervention: Young Parenthood Program (YPP) program was administered either in our community-based clinic or in a couple’s home. Data were collected from participating couples at three time points: time 1 (T1) occurred in the second trimester of the pregnancy and prior to randomization; time 2 (T2) occurred at 2 to 3 months following childbirth; and time 3 (T2) occurred at 18 months following childbirth. Participants were administered a semistructured interview at each time point.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: 81.9%</p>	
<p>Foshee, V. A., K. E. Bauman, et al. (1998). "An evaluation of Safe Dates, an adolescent dating violence prevention program." <u>American Journal of Public Health</u> <b>88</b>(1): 45-50.</p> <p>Foshee, V. A., K. E.</p>	<p>N=1886 to 1965 (14 schools)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n=7 schools</li> <li>• Control group n=7 schools</li> </ul> <p>Age: 11-17 years old; M=13.8</p> <p>Sex: 51.5% female</p>	<p>Design: Experimental. Students stratified by grade and by school size. One school from each pair was randomized to treatment or control group.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Four victimization and four perpetration variables measured using self-report. The four types of perpetration and victimization were: psychological abuse, physical abuse, sexual abuse,</p>	<p><b><u>1-month follow up results (n = 1700)</u></b>  <b>Behavior:</b> Intervention group reported less psychological abuse and violence in current relationship than controls. No difference reported physical violence or sexual violence.</p> <p>Data were stratified into “primary prevention” and “perpetrator” samples according to whether the individuals reported any prior perpetration. Primary prevention sample showed less psychological abuse, but no difference on other variables. There were no significant differences in</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
<p>Bauman, et al. (2000). "The Safe Dates program: 1-year follow-up results." <u>American Journal of Public Health</u> <b>90</b>(10): 1619-1622.</p> <p>Foshee, V. A., K. E. Bauman, et al. (2004). "Assessing the long-term effects of the safe dates program and a booster in preventing and reducing adolescent dating violence victimization and perpetration." <u>American Journal of Public Health</u> <b>94</b>(4): 619-624.</p>	<p>Race/Ethnicity: 19.1% African American, 77.1% White</p> <p>Targeted Population: Eighth and ninth grade students of 14 public schools</p> <p>Location: Rural North Carolina</p> <p>Relationship status: Seventy percent of students reported a current dating relationship</p>	<p>and violence in the current relationship</p> <p>Several related constructs were measured: norms about dating violence; gender stereotyping, beliefs in need for help; awareness of community services; constructive communication skills; destructive communication skills; constructive responses to anger; destructive responses to anger</p> <p>Measurement time points were baseline, post-test, and follow ups at 1-month (1998 paper), 1-year (2000 paper), 2-years, and 4-years (2004 and 2005 papers)</p> <p>A booster was provided to half of the intervention participants about 3 years after the intervention.</p> <p>Intervention: School classrooms, and community-based setting, plus booster session delivered by phone to random subset of participants. Classroom activities consisted of 10, 45-min sessions (7.5 h total), a play performed by students, and a poster contest based on curriculum content.</p>	<p>the perpetrator sample.</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> Many of the proposed mediating variables were different between groups at follow up. Significant differences were found for: norm variables, positive consequences, constructive communication, constructive anger responses, gender stereotyping, and awareness of services for victims and perpetrators.</p> <p>There were no significant Treatment x Gender interactions</p> <p><b><u>1-Year follow up results (n=1603)</u></b> No significant Treatment x Gender effects were found.</p> <p><b>Behavior:</b> No significant differences between groups for any of the behavioral outcomes were found for either the full sample, or a primary prevention sample.</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> Several proposed mediating variables were differed by group in favor of the intervention group. Significant differences were found for acceptance of dating violence, perceived negative consequences, awareness of victim and perpetrator services.</p> <p><b><u>4-Year follow up (N = 460; post-booster)</u></b> No interactions between gender or race and</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
		<p>A 45-min booster session was randomly given by phone to half of intervention students. Focused on changes in norms regarding partner violence and gender roles and improvement in prosocial skills, as well as changing beliefs about need for help and awareness of services.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point:72.4%</p>	<p>treatment were found.</p> <p><b>Behavior:</b> On perpetration variables, intervention participants reported perpetrating less physical, serious physical, an sexual violence than control participants.</p> <p>On victimization variables, intervention participants reported less sexual victimization than controls. There was no difference in psychological abuse victimization. Differences in physical abuse victimization (both minor and severe) were found, and were stronger among participants reporting prior victimization at Wave 1.</p> <p>Comparing intervention with booster to intervention only participants, the booster had no effect on perpetration related variables, and minor impacts on victimization, but in the direction opposite of what was predicted. When booster was compared to control, there were differences in serious physical victimization and sexual victimization favoring the booster, but only for a primary prevention sample that had reported no prior victimization.</p> <p><b>2005 analyses using multiple imputation and random effects regression.</b></p> <p><b>Behavior:</b> <i>Perpetration:</i> Adolescents who were exposed to</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
			<p>Safe Dates in the eighth or ninth grade reported less psychological abuse perpetration (<math>p=.0005</math>), moderate physical perpetration (<math>p=.02</math>), and sexual dating violence perpetration (<math>p=.04</math>) at all four follow up time points.</p> <p>For severe physical perp, there was an interaction between baseline level of perpetration and (treatment x time). Compared to controls, adolescents exposed to Safe Dates and who reported at baseline no severe physical perpetration (<math>p=.001</math>) or average amounts of severe physical perpetration (<math>p=.005</math>) reported less severe physical perpetration at all four follow-up periods. No differences between groups among kids who reported severe physical perpetration at baseline.</p> <p><i>Victimization:</i> Adolescents who were exposed to Safe Dates in the eighth or ninth grade reported less moderate physical dating violence victimization (<math>p=.01</math>) at all four follow-up periods. There was a marginal program effect (<math>p=.07</math>) on sexual dating violence victimization at all four follow-up periods. No group x time differences were found for victimization of psychological abuse, or severe victimization</p> <p>Safe Dates had both primary and secondary prevention effects on all six of these outcomes and the program was equally effective for males and females and for whites and non-whites.</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
			<p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> For mediating variables, there were intervention effects favoring SafeDates for dating violence norms, gender role norms, beliefs in need for help, and awareness of community services (for awareness of community services, a significant quadratic effect was found). No intervention effects on conflict resolution were found.</p> <p>Mediation analyses suggested that the strongest mediators of behavioral differences between groups were dating violence norms, gender role norms, and awareness of community services.</p>
<p>Foshee, V. A., Reyes, H. L., Ennett, S. T., Cance, J. D., Bauman, K. E., &amp; Bowling, J. M. (In Press). Assessing the effects of <i>Families for Safe Dates</i>, a family-based teen dating abuse prevention. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health</i>.</p>	<p>N= 324 families</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treatment group n=140</li> <li>• Control group n=184</li> </ul> <p>Sex: 58% female</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: 12% black, and 8% other</p> <p>Targeted Population: English speaking families with at least one 13-15-year-old in residence.</p> <p>Location: nation wide</p>	<p>Design: Experimental. Randomization occurred at the family level. Pairs of families were matched and one family from each pair was assigned to treatment group and the other to control group. Recruited nationwide via telephone. Caregivers and teens completed both a baseline and a 3 mon follow-up interview.</p> <p>Outcome measures: <i>factors related to motivating and facilitating caregiver engagement in teen dating abuse prevention activities</i> and <i>targeted risk factors</i> were assessed by creating several new measures.</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> At follow-up treatment condition was significantly associated in direction hypothesized with caregiver use of negative communication with the teen (caregiver report) (<math>p &lt; .01</math>).</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> Treatment condition was significantly associated with three of the four Protection Motivation constructs for <i>factors motivating and facilitating caregiver engagement in teen dating abuse prevention activities</i>. At follow-up, treatment group caregivers reported significantly greater perceived severity of dating abuse (<math>p=.03</math>), response efficacy for preventing dating abuse (<math>p=.01</math>), and self-efficacy for talking about dating abuse (<math>p=.02</math>) compared with control group caregivers. Treatment condition was also significantly associated in directions</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>Relationship status: 64% of teens had been involved in a dating relationship</p>	<p><i>Psychological dating abuse perpetration</i> was assessed by 4 items, and <i>Psychological dating abuse victimization</i> was assessed by the same four items asking teens how many times they had ever had these things done to them. Response options ranged from “never” to “more than 4 times.” Self-report.</p> <p><i>Physical dating abuse perpetration</i> was assessed by 5 items. <i>Physical dating abuse victimization</i> was assessed by the same 5 items, asking how many times teens had ever had these things done to them. A 1 indicated any perpetration and a 0 indicated no perpetration. Self-report.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point:70%</p>	<p>hypothesized with caregiver knowledge of dating abuse (<math>p&lt;.001</math>) and acceptance of dating abuse (<math>p&lt;.001</math>). Belief in the importance of involvement in teen dating was modified by sex of the teen (<math>b=0.38</math>, <math>SE=0.16</math>, <math>p=.02</math>) such that the effect was significant for caregivers of male (<math>t=2.97</math>, <math>p=.004</math>, Cohen’s <math>d=.35</math>) but not female teens (<math>t=0.29</math>, <math>p=.78</math>).</p> <p>For <i>targeted risk factors</i>, treatment condition was significantly associated with teen acceptance of dating abuse (<math>p &lt; .01</math>; Cohen’s <math>d=.37</math>) in the expected direction.</p> <p>The effect of the program on the onset of <i>physical dating abuse victimization</i> was statistically significant; (<math>p=.04</math>): 3% (<math>n= 3</math>; all females) of the treatment teens but 11% (<math>n=14</math>; 9 females and 5 males) of the control teens became victims of physical dating abuse between baseline and follow-up.</p>
<p>Jaycox, L. H., D. McCaffrey, et al. (2006). "Impact of a school-based dating violence prevention program among Latino teens: Randomized controlled effectiveness trial." <u>Journal of Adolescent Health</u></p>	<p>N = 2540</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group <math>n=1384</math> in the</li> <li>• Control group <math>n=1156</math></li> </ul> <p>Age: <math>M=14.41</math></p> <p>Sex: 52% female</p>	<p>Design: Randomized experimental. Randomization occurred at the “track” (school schedul) level. Surveys were administered prior to and after curriculum was taught. Follow-up surveys were administered and collected 6 months after the curriculum ended. Self-report.</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b></p> <p>No group differences were found at posttest or follow up for either perpetration or victimization behavior.</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b></p> <p><i>Help-seeking:</i> Intervention participants reported higher likelihood of seeking help for violence at</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
<p><b>39(5): 694-704.</b></p>	<p>Race/Ethnicity: 92% Latino</p> <p>Targeted Population: Students in ninth grade health classes</p> <p>Location: Los Angeles United School District</p>	<p>Outcome Measures: Help-seeking was assessed by rating nine sources of potential help on two dimensions: helpfulness and likelihood of talking to each “if you experienced violence with a date.” Negative dating experiences in the prior six months was assessed by modifying eight items from the Women’s Experience of Battering Scale modified for use with both genders and teens, and adding three items about fear of physical assault, sexual coercion, and sexual force from a date. The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale assessed victimization and perpetration in dating relationships among those who dated. Acculturation was measure using two items on English proficiency from the Bidimensional Acculturation Scale for Hispanics. Self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom; three class period curriculum (3 h total). Curriculum focuses on legal aspects of domestic violence, and increases knowledge and help-seeking behavior.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point:</p>	<p>posttest relative to controls, but not at follow up. Police, lawyers, schoolteachers, counselors and school nurses were seen as more helpful and more likely to be consulted among intervention participants relative to controls (posttest). The program also increased reported likelihood of talking to a lawyer. The only group difference that maintained as follow up was the perceived helpfulness of speaking with a lawyer and the likelihood of doing so.</p> <p><i>Knowledge:</i> Experimental groups knew significantly more about laws related to dating violence at post-test and follow up compared to controls.</p> <p><i>Attitudes:</i> Intervention participants were less accepting of female-on-male violence at post-test, but not follow up</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
<p>Jones, L. (1991). The Minnesota School Curriculum Project: A statewide domestic violence prevention project in secondary schools. <i>Dating violence: Young women in danger</i>, 258-266.</p>	<p>N =1160</p> <p>Targeted Population: Junior and senior high students</p> <p>Location: Minnesota</p> <p>No demographics reported</p>	<p>76%</p> <p>Design: Quasi-experimental. Pre- and post-tests administered to experimental and control group.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Assessed knowledge about domestic violence, attitude, and knowledge of resources for help. Self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom; over 5-6 days. The curriculum focused on defining abuse, dispelling myths about abuse, information about why battering occurs, and information and skills to reduce likelihood of abuse.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: not reported</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> In the junior high group, there was a significant increase in the mean score on the true-false knowledge questions at post-test for the experimental group (p=.001). Of the students exposed to the curriculum, there was a significant difference in the answers for the five attitude items, with the female responses in the desired direction.</p> <p>The senior high group also showed a significant increase in the mean score on the true-false knowledge questions at post-test for the experimental group (p=.01). There was a significant difference between boys' and girls' answers for four of the five attitude items (p=.002).</p>
<p>Krajewski, S. S., M. F. Rybarik, et al. (1996). "Results of a curriculum intervention with seventh graders regarding violence in relationships." <u>Journal of Family Violence</u> <b>11</b>(2): 93-112.</p>	<p>N = 239</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: 78.8% European American</p> <p>Targeted Population: Seventh grade students in health education classes</p> <p>Location: Midwestern</p>	<p>Design: Quasi-experimental nonequivalent control group. All first semester classes at one school were comparison group; all first semester classes at another school were experimental group. Pretests, post-tests, and post post-tests (i.e., 5 month follow up) administered. Self-report.</p> <p>Outcome measures: The students'</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> Knowledge section and attitude scores showed significant change from pre- to posttest, between the experimental and control group.</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>city in the U.S.</p> <p>No demographics provided</p>	<p>knowledge of and attitudes toward woman abuse, demographics, and plans for developing safety plans were assessed using a measure developed for Skills for Violence-Free Relationships (SVFR). Self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom; 10 consecutive classes. The curriculum focused on defining abuse, dispelling myths about abuse, information about why battering occurs, and information and skills to reduce likelihood of abuse.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: not reported</p>	
<p>Lavoie, F., Vezina, L., Piche, C., &amp; Boivin, M. (1995). Evaluation of a prevention program for violence in teen dating relationships. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 10(4), 516-524.</p>	<p>N = 517</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School S: 279</li> <li>• School L: 238</li> </ul> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School S: M=14 years 11 months</li> <li>• School L: M=15 years</li> </ul> <p>Sex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School S: 160 girls, 119 boys</li> </ul>	<p>Design: The 2 schools were selected due to their equivalent size and SES status, and then they were randomly assigned to a condition. Knowledge and attitudes measured at pretest and posttest. Self-report.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Knowledge and attitudes were measured using a 25 item questionnaire. Self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom; Short version was 2–2.5 h, Long</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> For attitude scales, no differential intervention effects between short and long programs were reported. For both short and long programs, attitudes improved from pre to posttest. No interaction between Time x and Gender was found, indicating boys and girls changed similarly across the short and long program.</p> <p><i>Knowledge:</i> No differential intervention effects between short and long programs were found.</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>School L: 135 girls 103 boys</li> </ul> <p>Targeted Population: Tenth grade high school students of two high schools</p> <p>Location: Quebec City</p>	<p>version was 4–5 h. Intervention focused on control over one’s environment and other people, identifying different forms of control and denouncing them, understanding violence in relationships, respect and responsibility in relationships.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: not reported</p>	<p>Both School L and School S had significant change in 5 of the 9 on the knowledge items (School S: 8, 12, 16, 20, 25; School L: 8, 12, 16, 20, 4). No interactions between Gender and Time were observed.</p>
<p>Macgowan, M. J. (1997). An evaluation of a dating violence prevention program for middle school students." <i>Violence Vict</i> <b>12</b>(3): 223-235.</p>	<p>N = 440</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Intervention group n=241</li> <li>Control group n=199</li> </ul> <p>Age: 11-16; <i>M</i>=12.6</p> <p>Sex: 56.1% female</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: Non-Hispanic black 72.3%, Hispanic 18%, White Non-Hispanic 8/3%, Asian-American/Native American 1.3%</p> <p>Location: Dade County, FL</p> <p>Targeted Population:</p>	<p>Design: Experimental. Randomization occurred at the class level.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Attitudes and knowledge measured using a Composite Scale Score (22 items). Pretest and posttest administered. All measures collected via self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom; 5 h over 5 days. Intervention focused on violence in society, recognizing abuse, power and control in relationships, characteristics of strong relationships, and communication and problem solving skills.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: 59.4%</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> Using ANCOVA and adjusting for pretest scores, group differences were found treatment group scored significantly higher on posttest than control <math>F(1,435)=13.63</math>, <math>p&lt;.001</math>. The treatment group made significant gains from pretest to posttest (3.00 to 3.10) and the control group did not (2.93 to 2.94).</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>Students in 6<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> grade from one school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 33.9% 6<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>• 35.2% 7<sup>th</sup> grade</li> <li>• 30.9% 8<sup>th</sup> grade.</li> <li>• 57% regular level students</li> <li>• 43% advanced students</li> </ul>		
<p>Markman, H. J., M. J. Renick, et al. (1993). "Preventing marital distress through communication and conflict management training: a 4-and 5-year follow-up." <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</u> <b>61</b>(1): 70-77.</p>	<p>N = 114 couples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n=25 couples (completed intervention)</li> <li>• Control group n= 47</li> <li>• Declined n= 42</li> </ul> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Female: M=23</li> <li>• Male: M= 24</li> </ul> <p>Targeted Population: couples planning marriage for the first time</p>	<p>Design: Experimental. Subjects matched on relevant relationship variables then randomized to intervention or control. Recruited from community advertising.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Relationship satisfaction measured by Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test, self-report. Relationship distress measured using Relationship Problem Inventory, self-report. Conflict was assessed using Conflict Tactics Scale, Self-report.</p> <p>Communication and conflict management measured using The Interaction Dimensions Coding System. Pre-assessment research</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b></p> <p><i>Violence:</i> Frequency of self-reported physical violence as measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale. Intervention couples reported significantly fewer instances of physical violence than did control couples (p &lt; .05) at follow up 2-4.</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> not measured</p> <p><b>Other</b></p> <p><i>Positive Communication:</i> Intervention groups showed more observed positive communication than control groups at post-assessment, and follow up assessments 1, 2, and 3. Specifically, at follow up assessment 3, intervention couples showed greater use of communication skills, support and validation, problem solving, overall</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>SES: average individual income level \$10,500</p> <p>Relationship status: 39% lived together, 60% engaged, 40% planning marriage but not engaged</p>	<p>sessions included interviews, questionnaires, and 10-15 minute videotaped problem solving discussion script from the Inventory of Marital Conflicts. Follow up assessments same as pre-assessment conducted at 1.5, 3, 4, and 5 years after the beginning of the study.</p> <p>Intervention: Community setting; 5 3-hour sessions (15 h total). Curriculum teaches communication and conflict resolution skills; designed to enhance or modify those dimensions of couples' relationships that have been found through theory and empirical research to be linked to effective marital functioning. Targeted population: couples planning marriage for the first time.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: 100% for IPV measure; 60% for interaction task with apparent differences by intervention group</p>	<p>positive communication, and positive escalation. At follow up 4, effects were attenuated, and appeared to hold for men but not women.</p> <p><i>Negative communication:</i> Intervention couples showed less negative communication at posttest and the various follow up assessment points. At f-u 3, intervention couples had less withdrawal, dominance, negative affect, denial, and less overall negative communication. Effects were attenuated at f-u 4.</p>
<p>Meraviglia, M. G., H. Becker, et al. (2003). "The Expect Respect Project. Creating a positive elementary school climate." <u>J Interpers Violence</u></p>	<p>N=740 students; 1122 staff members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n=6 schools</li> <li>• Control group n=6 schools</li> </ul>	<p>Design: Experimental. Schools were matched then randomized to treatment or control. Pre and posttest assessments. Self-report.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Students and staff completed similar 27-question</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> Students in the intervention group had a nominally larger increase (17% to 36%) over time in knowledge of sexual harassment than students in the control group (20% to 27%). However, no statistical test</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
<p><b>18(11): 1347-1360.</b></p>	<p>Race/Ethnicity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students: 16% African American, 25% Hispanic, 59% White/American Indian/Asian</li> <li>• Staff: 11% African American, 21% Hispanic, 65% White, 3.3% other</li> </ul> <p>Targeted population: Students (5<sup>th</sup> grade) and staff of school elementary school</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers were 72% of staff participation. Other staff: Counselors, administrators, teaching assistants,</li> <li>• clerical staff, custodians, cafeteria workers, bus</li> </ul>	<p>surveys. questions assessed knowledge and attitudes toward bullying and sexual harassment, incidence of bullying, and student and adult responses to inappropriate behaviors. The staff survey asked about attitudes and responses to domestic violence in the lives of students. Self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom and school wide setting. Involves all members of the school community with 5 components: classroom curriculum, staff training, policy development, parent education, and support services. Classroom curriculum had 12 weekly educational sessions. Intervention focuses on reducing bullying and sexual harassment and improving school climate.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: 68.8% for staff and 100% for students</p>	<p>of this difference was reported. Staff knowledge did not appear to change (68% to 71% in control; 70% to 70% in intervention).</p> <p>For attitudes about sexual harassment (or what would teachers do if they found out about sexual harassment), there appeared to be no group differences, although no statistical tests were reported.</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>drivers</p> <p>SES: 31.5% Low SES</p>		
<p>Pacifici, C., M. Stoolmiller, et al. (2001). "Evaluating a prevention program for teenagers on sexual coercion: A differential effectiveness approach." <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</u> <b>69</b>(3): 552-559.</p>	<p>N = 461</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n= 239</li> <li>• Control group n= 219</li> </ul> <p>Age: <i>M</i>=15.8</p> <p>Sex: 52% female 48% male</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: Native American 0.7%, Asian 0.9%, African American 0.9%, Hispanic 2.6%, Pacific Islander 0.4%, Caucasian 86%, Other 0.4% Mixed 6.8%</p> <p>Targeted population: Tenth graders enrolled in health education classes in two high schools</p>	<p>Design: Experimental .Classrooms assigned to intervention (n=11) or control (n=12).</p> <p>Students were recruited through health classes and participation was voluntary.</p> <p>Pre and post intervention questionnaires were administered and collected through an interactive computer program.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Questionnaires administered were The Sexual Attitude Survey, the Rape Myth Acceptance (RMA) subscale, Adversarial Sexual Beliefs (ASB) subscale, Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence (AIV) subscale, and background information questionnaire. All measures were self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom, 6.7 h. Intervention focused on increasing awareness of sexual coercion, exploring underlying</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> Initial exploration of gender interactions showed that there were no significant gender interactions with treatment, thus boys and girls were combined.</p> <p>Initial MANOVA showed no intervention effects over time.</p> <p>Latent variable analyses showed differential group effects based on initial starting point of attitudes. Teens in the intervention group who were above the prescore mean on CSA improved significantly more than teens in control group, and the effect sizes associated with these improvements ranged from small (0.25) for teens at the prescore mean, to moderate (0.50) for teens at 1 <i>SD</i> above the prescore mean, to very large (1.00) for teens at 2 <i>SDs</i> above the prescore mean.</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
		<p>thoughts, attitudes, and beliefs regarding sexual coercion, and building positive social skills to handle expectations and refusals about sex.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: 99.3%</p>	
<p>Pronyk, P. M., J. R. Hargreaves, et al. (2006). "Effect of a structural intervention for the prevention of intimate-partner violence and HIV in rural South Africa: a cluster randomised trial." <i>Lancet</i> <b>368</b>(9551): 1973-1983.</p>	<p>N = 843 (cohort 1 only)</p> <p>Intervention group: n=426 Sex: 100% female Age: <i>M</i>=41 Relationship status: , never married 104, currently married 187, divorced, separated, widowed 135</p> <p>Control group: N=417 Sex: 100% female Age: <i>M</i>=42 Relationship status: Never married 135, Currently married 174, Divorced, separated, or widowed 111</p>	<p>Design: Cluster randomized trial. Randomization to intervention or control occurred at the village level. Three groups (or cohorts) of participants were recruited, but only Cohort 1 included measures of partner violence. Cohort 1: applied for loan in the IMAGE program and attended ten 1-hour training sessions (Sisters for Life) training sessions or were matched controls.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Data collected by interviews and questionnaires. All measures collected via face-to-face interview (self-report). Measurement included baseline and one follow up measurement point which took place about 2.1 years after baseline. IPV measures not reported to be standard assessment tools. HIV status was tested using OraSure.</p>	<p><b>Behavior</b></p> <p>Women in intervention communities reported significantly less intimate-partner violence in the previous 12 months compared to women in control communities (aRR: 0.45, 95% CI: 0.23–0.91).</p> <p>No group differences reported for partner controlling behaviors (aRR = .80; 95% CI = 0.35 – 1.83)</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs</b></p> <p>No group differences between intervention and control for “more progressive attitude toward IPV” (aRR = 1.49, 95% CI = 0.86 – 2.60), or “greater challenge of established gender roles” (aRR = 1.57, 95% CI = 0.87 – 2.81),</p> <p><b>Other variables</b></p> <p>Significant effects were found for communication with household members about sexual matters</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>Targeted population: Residents of 8 villages</p> <p>Location: Limpopo, a rural province in South Africa.</p> <p>SES: High rates of poverty and unemployment</p>	<p>Intervention: Community setting; combined a poverty-focused microfinance initiative that targeted the poorest women in communities with a participatory curriculum of gender and HIV education. Participatory learning consists of a 12–15-month training curriculum called Sisters for Life (SFL) and had two phases. Phase one consisted of 10 1-hour training sessions (10 h total); phase two sought to include young people and men in the intervention communities. The aim was to determine whether the involvement of women in the program would improve household economic wellbeing, social capital, and Empowerment, thus reducing vulnerability to intimate partner violence.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: 75% for the intervention group and 68% for the control group</p>	<p>with greater communication reported by intervention versus control women (aRR: 1.58, 95% CI:1.21–2.07).</p> <p><b>Of note</b></p> <p>Measures are not well described so reliability and validity is unclear</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
<p>Salazar, L. and S. Cook (2006). "Preliminary findings from an outcome evaluation of an intimate partner violence prevention program for adjudicated, African American, adolescent males." <u>Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice</u> 4(4): 368.</p>	<p>N = 37</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n=21</li> <li>• Control group n=16</li> </ul> <p>Age:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group M=14.81</li> <li>• Control group M= 15.06</li> </ul> <p>Sex: 100% Male</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: majority (92%) African American</p> <p>Targeted population: adjudicated males referred by their probation officer to attend the program</p> <p>Education:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group M= 9.05 grade level</li> <li>• Control group M= 8.45 grade level</li> </ul>	<p>Design: Randomized trial. Recruited through parole officer referrals to the program for mild violent and abusive behavior toward a female, victim or perpetrator of violence within the home, behavior influenced by violence.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Knowledge of IPV and patriarchal attitudes was assessed using scale from Violence in relationships: A Seventh Grade Inventory of Knowledge and Attitudes and the Inventory of Beliefs about Wife Beating. Prevalence and frequency of witnessing parental violence was measured using The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2). Violent behavior was also assessed using the CTS2. Self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: Participation required as part of probation. Intervention consists of 5 session intimate partner violence prevention program: Stage Setting, The Court Classes, The Batters intervention Classes (session 3&amp;4), and The Review Class. Minimum participation was 3 of 5 2-hour sessions (6 h minimum total). Focuses on changes in knowledge of</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> For knowledge of IPV the intervention group scored significantly higher (77%) following the intervention than did participants in the control group (63%) (<math>R^2 = .12</math>, <math>p &lt; .05</math>). There were no significant changes at the 3-month follow-up period on any of the variables, indicating that the significant changes observed at post-intervention were sustained at 3 months.</p> <p>Patriarchal Attitudes were assessed using the attitude portion from Seventh Grade Inventory. No significant difference between intervention and control was found.</p> <p>There were significant differences (<math>p &lt; .05</math>, one-tailed) in the Wife Beating Is Justified Subscale between the adjusted mean for the intervention group (M = 51.80) and the adjusted mean for the control group (M = 62.75).</p> <p>There were no significant changes at the 3-month follow-up period on any of the variables, indicating that the significant changes observed at post intervention were sustained at 3 months (but n = 9).</p> <p>The intervention group held significantly lower patriarchal attitudes than did the control group, but only for those participants who had witnessed high levels of parental violence (opposite of</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
		IPV and patriarchal attitudes.  Retention at last follow up point: 42.8%	prediction).
Schwartz, J. P., M. M. Magee, et al. (2004). "Effects of a group preventive intervention on risk and protective factors related to dating violence." <u>Group Dynamics-Theory Research and Practice</u> 8(3): 221-230.	N = 58 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n=28</li> <li>• Control group n=30</li> </ul> Intervention group: Sex: 16 female 12 male Age: M=20.39 Race/Ethnicity: 14 white, 8 African American, 4 Hispanic American, 1 Native American, 1 other  Control group: Sex: 18 female, 12 male Age: M=20.88 Race/Ethnicity: 22 white, 7 African	Design: Randomized trial. Participants volunteered to participate for extra credit for psychology class. Randomly assigned to experimental intervention or control group.  Outcome measures: Gender-role conflict was measured using the male and female versions of the Gender Role Conflict Scale.  Entitlement was assessed using the Entitlement Attitudes Scale.  Gender-role change and transition was measured using the Gender Role Journey Measure.  Ability to handle anger was assessed via self-report using the Anger Management Scale	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> Significant differences between experimental and control groups on the gender role conflict factor of Restrictive Emotionality (<math>p &lt; .0001</math>); the Anger Management Scale subscales of Escalating Strategies (<math>p = .012</math>), Negative Attributions (<math>p = .013</math>), and Self-Awareness (<math>p = .005</math>); the GRJM subscale of Acceptance of Traditional Gender Roles (<math>p = .038</math>); and the Entitlement Scale subscale of Self-Reliance/Self-Assurance (<math>p = .009</math>). All significant results were in the predicted direction.</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>American, 1 Asian American.</p> <p>Targeted population: Undergraduates at a medium sized university</p> <p>Location: southern United States</p>	<p>Intervention: University classroom, setting; group intervention with 4-6 people per group. Intervention consists of a series of 4 1.5-hour psychoeducational group sessions (6 h total). The intervention was designed to reduce risk factors and increase protective factors associated with dating and domestic violence in college students.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: Not reported</p>	
<p>Taylor, B., N. Stein, et al. (2010). "The effects of gender violence/ harassment prevention programming in middle schools: a randomized experimental evaluation." <i>Violence Vict</i> 25(2): 202-223.</p>	<p>N = 1639 (123 classes)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group 1 n=29 classes</li> <li>• Intervention group 2 n=29 classes</li> <li>• Control group n=65 classes</li> </ul> <p>Sex: 52% girls</p> <p>Age: 11-13</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: African American 27%, White 52%, Asian 3%, Hispanic</p>	<p>Design: Randomized control trial. Randomization occurred at the class level.</p> <p>Classes randomly assigned to one of two intervention groups (interaction group, law and justice group) or to control group.</p> <p>Three surveys administered at baseline, posttest, and 5-6 months after baseline.</p> <p>Outcome measures: sexual and non-sexual violence perpetration and victimization; sexual harassment victimization and perpetration; attitudes toward gender violence and sexual harassment; knowledge</p>	<p><b>Behavior: Victimization</b>  <i>Interaction group:</i> Significantly lower rates of sexual victimization 6-months post-intervention than controls and lower total incidences of sexual victimizations than controls</p> <p><i>Law and Justice group:</i> No differences</p> <p><i>Combined treatments:</i> No differences</p> <p><b>Behavior: Perpetration</b>  <i>Interaction group:</i> More likely to perpetrate higher rates of violence, commit more acts of violence, and perpetrate higher rates of nonsexual violence compared to control at post-intervention.</p> <p><i>Law and Justice group:</i> Committed more violent acts against dates post-intervention &amp; 6 month follow up, committed more individual acts of</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>3%, Native American 2%, other 13%.</p> <p>Targeted population: sixth and seventh grade classes across three school districts</p> <p>Location: Ohio</p> <p>Relationship status: 56% had been in a prior relationship lasting longer than a week; 28% had experienced prior dating violence</p>	<p>related to gender violence and sexual harassment.</p> <p>All measures collected via self- report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom; the intervention consists of two different curricula: interaction-based curriculum and law and justice curriculum. Each curriculum contained 5 40-min sessions (3.33 h total). The interaction-based curriculum was designed to address negative attitudes and beliefs about dating violence, through interaction skill building, leading to behavioral change. The law and justice curriculum was designed to change behavior more directly through a fact-based curriculum on the laws pertaining to dating violence.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: 70.9%</p>	<p>violence and more acts of sexual violence at 6 month follow up, and had significantly fewer nonsexual violent acts at 6 month follow up.</p> <p><i>Combined treatment:</i> More likely to have higher prevalence of violence and more incidences of violence against dates post-intervention, and more likely to commit more sexually violent and non-sexually violent acts against dates immediately after the intervention</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b> <b>Attitudinal:</b> <i>Interaction group:</i></p> <p><i>Disposition About Own and Others' Personal Space Factor:</i> Significantly better attitudes toward personal space post-intervention and at 6 month follow up</p> <p><i>Law and Justice group:</i></p> <p><i>Inappropriate Attributions of Girls' Fault in Sexual Harassment:</i> more likely to disagree with statements that girls were at fault post- intervention, but no longer significant at 6 month follow up</p> <p><i>Belief That GV/SH Is Not a Problem:</i> More likely to perceive GV/SH as a serious problem post- intervention, but no longer significant at 6 month</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
			<p>follow up.</p> <p><i>Attitudes That Reduce Sexual Harassment:</i> Significantly better attitudes toward the reduction of GV/SH at 6 month follow up</p> <p><i>Attitude Toward Preventing Sexual Harassment:</i> More likely to have better attitudes about preventing sexual harassment post-intervention.</p> <p><i>Disposition About Own and Others’ Personal Space Factor:</i> Significantly better attitudes toward personal space post-intervention and at 6 month follow up</p> <p><i>Knowledge Related to GV/SH Prevention:</i> Higher level of GV/SH knowledge at 6 month follow up.</p> <p><i>Combined treatment:</i></p> <p><i>Inappropriate Attributions of Girls’ Fault in Sexual Harassment:</i> No differences.</p> <p><i>Belief That GV/SH Is Not a Problem:</i> No differences</p> <p><i>Attitudes That Reduce Sexual Harassment:</i> No differences</p> <p><i>Attitude Toward Preventing Sexual Harassment:</i> More likely to have better attitudes about preventing sexual harassment at 6m follow up</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
			<p><i>Disposition About Own and Others' Personal Space Factor:</i> Significantly better attitudes toward personal space post-intervention and at 6 month follow up</p> <p><i>Knowledge Related to GV/SH Prevention:</i> Higher level of GV/SH knowledge at 6 month follow up</p>
<p>Weisz, A. N. and B. M. Black (2001). "Evaluating a sexual assault and dating violence prevention program for urban youths." <u>Social Work Research</u> <b>25</b>(2): 89-100.</p>	<p>N = 66</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n=46</li> <li>• Control group n=20</li> </ul> <p>Age: M=12.84</p> <p>Sex: 42% male</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: 100% African American</p> <p>Targeted population: Seventh grade students at an urban public charter middle school</p>	<p>Design: Quasi-experimental. Control students selected from the same school</p> <p>Pretest, posttest and 6-month follow-up administered. Only 26 completed all instruments.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Four instruments measured knowledge of sexual assault, Rape Attitudes , behavior or intended behavior, and victimization and perpetration in the past 6 months (behavior outcomes not reported, however). All measures were self-report.</p> <p>Intervention: School classroom; 18 h over a 6- or 12-week period. Focuses on increasing knowledge about sexual assault and dating violence and community resources, increasing intolerance for sexual</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b> Not measured</p> <p><b>Attitudes, Knowledge, Beliefs:</b>  <i>Knowledge:</i> From pre- to post, study reports a main effect of Time but no group x time interaction. From pre- to follow-up, study reports, in repeated measures ANOVA, there was a significant Group x Time interaction when gender was controlled. The intervention group improved attitudes (8.12 to 9.88) more than the control group (9.89 to 8.67)</p> <p><i>Attitude:</i>            From pre-test to follow-up, there was a significant Group x Time interaction showed that the intervention groups attitudes changed in the desired direction (82.4 to 91.7) relative to the control group (91.0 to 86.4).</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
		<p>assault and dating violence, and increasing behavior appropriate to prevent sexual assault and dating violence. Targeted population: 7<sup>th</sup> grade.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: 45%</p>	
<p>Wolfe, D. A., C. Wekerle, et al. (2003). "Dating violence prevention with at-risk youth: a controlled outcome evaluation." <u>J Consult Clin Psychol</u> <b>71</b>(2): 279-291.</p>	<p>N = 158</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n=96</li> <li>• Control group n=62</li> </ul> <p>Sex:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention: 52% female</li> <li>• Control: 47% female</li> </ul> <p>Age: 14-16 M=15.18</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: 85% Caucasian, 8% First Nations, 3% Asian, and 4% African Canadian</p> <p>Targeted population: adolescents considered at risk for developing</p>	<p>Design: Experimental. Randomly assigned to intervention or control group.</p> <p>Outcome measures: Abuse perpetration and victimization was assessed using Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory. Physical abuse perpetration, threatening behaviors, and emotional abuse were considered as separate dependent measures. Likewise physical abuse victimization, emotional abuse victimization, and threatening behaviors were considered separately</p> <p>Five domains of relationship skills were assessed using the Adolescent Interpersonal Competence Questionnaire and the CADRI: Self-disclosure, providing emotional</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b></p> <p><i>Abuse perpetration:</i> Intervention status was a significant predictor of the magnitude of change in youths' physical abuse perpetration (<math>\beta = -.01, p &lt; .05</math>), but not threatening behaviors. Effects appeared different by gender. Girls reported higher initial levels of physical abuse perpetration (<math>\beta = .32, p &lt; .01</math>) and showed steeper declines in physical abuse over time than boys (<math>\beta = .01, p &lt; .05</math>). Girls also reported more emotional abuse and threatening behaviors initially than boys (<math>\beta = .28</math> for emotional abuse and; <math>\beta = .19</math> for threatening behaviors, <math>p &lt; .01</math>). Girls showed greater reductions in their threatening behaviors over time than boys (<math>\beta = -.007, p &lt; .05</math>).</p> <p><i>Abuse victimization:</i> The treatment group showed greater declines in experiencing emotional abuse (<math>\beta = -.02, p &lt; .01</math>) and threatening behavior (<math>\beta = -.007, p &lt; .05</math>) by a dating partner compared to the control group. Girls reported higher levels of emotional abuse victimization initially (<math>\beta = .29, p &lt; .01</math>) and had steeper declines over time in</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
	<p>abusive relationships due to a history of child maltreatment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 60% of the participants lived outside the home</li> <li>• 40% lived with one or more natural/adoptive parents</li> </ul> <p>90% of participants came from CPS agencies, others came from programs within schools in the community</p> <p>SES: lower income families: 85%</p>	<p>support, management of conflict, assertion, conflict resolution.</p> <p>Childhood Trauma Questionnaire assessed past maltreatment</p> <p>Intervention: Group setting, 18 2-h sessions over a 4 month period (36 h total). Focuses on alternatives to aggression-based interpersonal problem solving and gender-based role expectation. Classroom activities included didactic presentations, guest speakers, videos, modeling and role-playing, and skill-building activities. Community based activities included action planning, visiting community agencies, fund raising, and community awareness.</p> <p>Retention at last follow up point: 92% completed at least 2 assessments; 75% completed at least 4 assessments; 50% completed at least 6 assessments</p>	<p>experiencing threats (<math>\beta=-.0002, p &lt;.05</math>). For physical abuse victimization, there was an interaction between gender and intervention status for physical abuse (<math>\beta=.004, p &lt;.05</math>), with greater treatment effects shown for boys than girls.</p> <p>No intervention effects were found for five healthy relationship skill variables: emotional support, assertion, self-disclosure, conflict management, positive conflict resolution.</p>
<p>Wolfe, D. A., Crooks, C., Jaffe, P., Chiodo, D., Hughes, R., Ellis, W., et al. (2009). A School-Based Program to Prevent Adolescent</p>	<p>N = 1722</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention group n=754</li> <li>• Control group n=968</li> </ul>	<p>Design: Cluster randomized trial with 2.5 year follow-up. Schools stratified by rural or urban and <math>\leq 500</math> or <math>\geq 500</math>. Schools randomly assigned by coin toss to intervention or control by strata. Students were</p>	<p><b>Behavior:</b></p> <p>PDV was assessed using 8 items from the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory. PDV was significantly higher for students in control schools at 3 year follow-up</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
<p>Dating Violence: A Cluster Randomized Trial. <i>Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine</i>, 163(8), 692-699.</p>	<p>Sex: 52.8 % female Age: 14-15 Targeted population: 9<sup>th</sup> grade health classes Location: Southwest Ontario</p>	<p>blinded to condition. Outcome measure: Physical dating violence assessed using 8 items from the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory. Physical peer violence assessed using the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth delinquent behavior inventory. Alcohol and drug use assessed using the National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth. All assessments and follow-ups were self-report.  Several other secondary outcomes were measured including physical peer violence, substance abuse, and condom use  Intervention: School classroom and school community setting. Individual level consisted of 3 units: personal safety and injury prevention, healthy growth and sexuality, and substance use and abuse. The 3 units each had 7 75-min classes (26.25 h total). School-level intervention included additional teacher training on dating violence and healthy relationships (6 h workshop), information for</p>	<p>than for those in intervention schools (9.8% vs. 7.4%, adjusted OR, 2.42; 95% CI, 1.00-6.02; <math>P=.05</math>).  Effect of intervention differed significantly between boys and girls. Boys in intervention schools were less likely than boys in control schools to engage in dating violence (2.7% vs 7.1%; adjusted OR, 2.77; 95% CI, 1.39-5.29). Girls had similar rates of PDV in both groups (11.9% vs 12.0%, adjusted OR, 1.02; 95% CI, 0.61-1.72).  Among students dating in the year before follow-up, the difference between the control and intervention groups was not significant (adjusted OR, 2.13; 95% CI, 0.81-5.66; <math>P=.12</math>).  <b>Other behaviors</b> No interventions differences reported for physical peer violence or substance use.  The effect of the intervention on condom use differed by sex. Condom use among sexually active boys was greater in intervention schools, OR, 1.70; 95% CI, 1.10- 2.66). Condom use by partners was less for girls in the intervention group than in the control group, OR, 0.76; 95% CI, 0.50-1.16).</p>

**PASK#16 Online Table –Table 1. IPV Prevention studies**

Study (full reference)	Sample Size and Characteristics	Study Type	Results
		parents, and student-led “safe school committees.” Targeted population: 9 <sup>th</sup> grade students.  Retention at last follow up point: 88.3%	