The power of family and community factors in predicting dating violence: A meta-analysis

Sihyun Park[a], Sin-Hyang Kim[b],*

[a] Department of Nursing, Inha University, Incheon 22212, South Korea
[b] Chung-Ang University, Seoul 06980, South Korea

A B S T R A C T

Dating violence (DV) has been well-documented as one of the serious public health problems leading various negative health consequences, such as physical injury, posttraumatic stress disorder, depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation and so on. Many factors predicting DV have been already identified; however, few papers presented the predicting power of those factors. Therefore, this study aims to identify the power of family- and community-related factors in predicting the perpetration and victimization of DV and to determine the strongest risk factors using a meta-analysis. Through a rigorous search procedure, a total of 131 correlates of DV perpetrators and 139 correlates of DV victims were identified in 27 studies. The results showed that "having deviant peers" was the strongest risk factor of DV perpetration, whereas "witnessing parental violence" was the strongest risk factor of DV victimization. Also, we found that the risk factors were more powerful predictors of DV perpetrators and victims than were the protective factors. Findings from this study provided valuable evidence to identify DV victimization and perpetration, and to develop intervention strategies preventing DV.

1. Introduction

Dating violence (DV), also called "dating abuse" or "dating aggression," can be defined as aggression in a dating relationship, and comprises various forms of violence, including physical/emotional violence, sexual coercion, verbal abuse, stalking, or threatening behaviors. While the definition does not specify the age of those involved, many researchers have focused on teens and young adults when examining DV and its related issues (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001). According to data from 2013, about 10% of high school students in the US reported experiencing physical violence, perpetrated by their dating partner, in the last year, while another 10% had experienced sexual violence (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2016). Furthermore, more recent longitudinal research (Richards, Branch, & Ray, 2014) showed that 22% of youth have engaged in physical violence towards their partners, whereas 16% reported being the victims of such violence by their partners. Moreover, 34% of youth reported engaging in emotional DV, and 39% reported being the victims of such violence.

The evidence suggests that DV is a serious ongoing problem that can have diverse, devastating results for victims, such as physical injury, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression, anxiety, substance abuse, and suicidal ideation (Ely, Nugent, Cerel, & Vimbba, 2011;

Eshelman & Levendosky, 2012; Kamimura, Nourian, Assasnik, & Franchek-Roa, 2016; Reidy et al., 2016; Swahn, Bossarte, & Sullivent 3rd., 2008). Moreover, DV during adolescence or young adulthood might lead to engagement in intimate partner violence (IPV) or domestic violence in adulthood (Furman, Brown, & Feiring, 1999).

Many researchers have tried to understand the various risk factors associated with the perpetration and victimization of DV in order to predict those most at risk of violence in intimate relationships and thereby devise measures for preventing DV or minimizing its consequences. The environment is a particularly important factor for one's development, and many previous studies have focused on the environmental circumstances of perpetrators and victims during development. The environmental factors most often considered are those related to families and parents (Gover, Jennings, Tomsich, Park, & Rennison, 2011; Maas, Fleming, Herrenkohl, & Catalano, 2010; Madruga, Viana, Abdalla, Caetano, & Laranjeira, 2017), although some studies have considered factors related to the communities to which participants belonged (Giordano, Kaufman, Manning, & Longmore, 2015; Johnson, Parker, Rinehart, Nail, & Rothman, 2015). It seems reasonable to suggest that both family and community constitute the environment where individuals learn how to behave or interact with others, and this assumption accords with the ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1986, 1994). Bronfenbrenner (1986, 1994) referred

Table 1
Included studies and quality appraisal.

Authors (year)	Perpetrators/victims	Target populations/mean age of the subjects	Measurements	Region of conducting study	Quality appraisal
Banyard, Cross, and Modecki (2006)	Perpetrators	Teenagers/age range 11–19]	Youth risk behavior survey	USA	3
Chang et al. (2015)	Perpetrators	Teenagers/[grade between 8–12]	Foshee et al. (1996)	USA	3.5
Chiodo et al. (2012)	Perpetrators	Teenagers/13.79	Conflict in Adolescent Relationship Inventory (CADRI)	Canada	4
De Puy, Hamby, and Lindemuth (2014)	Perpetrators/victims	Teenagers/17.75	National survey	Switzerland	4
Edwards, Desai, Gidycz, and Vanwynsberghe (2009)	Victims	Adults/18.54	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	2.5
Ely, Nugent, Cerel, and Vimbba (2011)	Victims	Teenagers & adults/18.7	Conflict in Adolescent Relationship Inventory (CADRI)	USA	2.5
Fineran and Bolen (2006)	Perpetrators/victims	Teenagers/15.9	Self-developed tool	USA	2
Foshee, Ennett, Bauman, Benefield, and Suchindran (2005)	Perpetrators	Teenagers/13.8	Foshee et al. (1996)	USA	3
Herrera, Wiersma, and Cleveland (2008)	Perpetrators	Adults/22	Self-developed tool	USA	3
Jouriles et al. (2012)	Perpetrators	Teenagers/15.9	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	3.5
Leadbeater, Banister, Ellis, and Yeung (2008)	Victims	Teenagers/15.05	Self-developed tool	Canada	3
Linder and Collins (2005)	Perpetrators/victims	Teenagers & adults/20.59	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	4
Melançon and Gagné (2011)	Perpetrators	Teenagers/14.2	Lavoie and Vezina (2002)	Canada	4
Palazzolo, Roberto, and Babin (2010)	Victims	Adults/20.16	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	3
Rivera and Fincham (2015)	Perpetrators/victims	Adults/19.45	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	4
Sabina (2013)	Perpetrators	Adults/21.5	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	2.5
Schnurr, Mahatmya, and Basche (2013)	Perpetrators/victims	Adults/20.17	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	3
Sears, Byers, and Price (2007)	Perpetrators/victims	Teenagers/14.64	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	Canada	3
Shen (2014)	Victims	Adults/21	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	Taiwan	3
Simons, Burt, and Simons (2008)	Perpetrators	Adults/19.5	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	3
Simons, Simons, Lei, Hancock, and Fincham (2012)	Victims	Adults/19.5	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	3
Sutton, Simons, Wickrama, and Futris (2014)	Perpetrators/Victims	Adults/[age below 25 (age was not collected)]	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	3
Vézina et al. (2011)	Victims	Teenagers/15	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	Canada	4
Windle and Mrug (2009)	Perpetrators/victims	Teenagers/14.14	Foshee et al. (1996)	USA	3
Yahner, Dank, Zweig, and Lachman (2015)	Victims	Teenagers/15	Foshee et al. (1996)	USA	3
Yalch, Lannert, Hopwood, and Levendosky (2013)	Victims	Adults/19.86	Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)	USA	2.5
Yarkovsky and Timmons Fritz (2014)	Victims	Adults/20.76	Conflict in Adolescent Relationship Inventory (CADRI)	Canada	3

The full citations of the included studies are provided on the reference lists with asterisk (*).