ABSTRACT

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUBSTANCE USE AND TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AMONG URBAN HISPANIC AND AFRICAN AMERICAN YOUTH

by

Mayra Alejandra Hernandez

May 2015

Teen dating violence greatly differs from adult interpersonal violence and as such should be viewed from a biopsychosocial lens. The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between substance use and teen dating violence among Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino youth. A quantitative study was conducted with 24 youth attending an alternative charter high school in an urban city. The majority of the participants engaged in substance use with more than half using two or more substances within the past 30 days. Psychological teen dating violence was the most reported type of victimization and perpetration. Implications for social work and future research are discussed.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SUBSTANCE USE AND TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AMONG URBAN HISPANIC AND AFRICAN AMERICAN YOUTH

A THESIS

Presented to the School of Social Work

California State University, Long Beach

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Social Work

Committee Members:

Brian Trung Lam, Ph.D. (Chair)
Lisa Jennings, Ph. D.
Janaki Santhiveeran, Ph.D.

College Designee:

Nancy Meyer-Adams, Ph.D.

By Mayra Alejandra Hernandez

B.A., 2009, University of California, Davis

May 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Nationally, about 1 in 10 high school students have experienced physical victimization (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2014a). In a National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, female participants experiencing dating violence victimization during adolescence, reported increased use of heavy episodic drinking, symptoms of depression, suicidal ideation, smoking and intimate partner violence victimization 5 years later (18-25 years old) than compared to female participants who did not report teen dating victimization during adolescence (Exner-Cortens, Eckenrode, & Rothman, 2013). Similarly, male participants experiencing dating violence victimization in adolescence reported increased anti-social behaviors, suicidal ideation, marijuana use, and continued partner victimization 5 years later (Exner-Cortens et al., 2013).

In the United States, more than half of adolescents report alcohol use and about 1 in 4 adolescents report exposure to illicit drugs (Merikangas et al., 2010). It is estimated that lifetime prevalence for substance use disorders (dependence and abuse) are 6.5% for alcohol and 8.9% for drugs among adolescents (Merikangas et al., 2010). It is also estimated that more than 4,500 adolescents (aged 12 to 18) use drugs for the first time each day in the United Sates (Patnode et al., 2013). These findings are alarming since

substance use among youth has been associated with several health, social, and economic consequences. For example, underage drinking has been associated with the majority causes of death (motor vehicle crashes, unintentional injury, homicide, and suicide) among 10-24 years olds (Eaton et al., 2006). Substance use is also associated with dropping out of high school, being unemployed, being unmarried and having a child, teenage pregnancy, and high number of sexual partners (Cavazos-Rehg et al., 2011; Green & Ensminger, 2006; Townsend, Flisher, & King, 2007).

Added together the consequences of substance use and dating violence during adolescence can be detrimental. Several studies have found an association between dating violence and alcohol use among high school and middle school students (Howard, Qiu, & Boekeloo, 2003; Lormand et al., 2013). However, limitations to these studies do not reveal if substance use predicts dating violence or dating violence predicts substance use. It has been found that adolescents who use both alcohol and illegal drugs report dating violence victimization at a rate of 3-4 times more than adolescents who do not report any substance use (Temple & Freeman, 2011). In addition, Temple, Shorey, Fite, Stuart, and Le (2013) found that the use of alcohol predicted the future perpetration of physical dating violence among youth in longitudinal study with ninth and tenth grade students. A study by Epstein-Ngo and colleagues (2013) found that the two most common reasons for physical dating aggression and victimization was angry or bad mood and/or jealousy and substance use was higher on days dating violence occurred among 14-24 year olds. Since both adolescent substance use and dating violence predict future substance use and future dating violence early integrated intervention programs are needed to reach this high-risk population.

Problem Statement

The relationship between teen dating violence and substance use remains a complex societal problem with many unanswered questions, despite advances in research. More African American male and female (14.8-13.8%) and Hispanic male and female (11.4-11.7%) youth have a higher prevalence rate of teen dating violence victimization than White male and female students (7.2-8.8%; CDC, 2014a). In addition, despite the interest in perpetration behaviors among adults, national prevalence rates of perpetration are currently not available for youth, to the author's best knowledge. Given the negative outcomes and associations between substance use and teen dating violence, combined with the fact that Mexican American youth are more likely to engage in alcohol and illicit drug use than Non-Hispanic White youth (Fryar, Merino, Hirsch, & Porter, 2009), more research is needed in this area. This study examined the relationship between substance use and teen dating violence among Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino youth.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to add to the limited understanding of the interaction substance use has on teen dating relationships among low-income, minority youth. The intended outcome of this research is to better inform the patterns of behavior among this population. Specifically, this study will address the following research questions:

1. What is the rate of adolescents who engage in physical, psychological, and/or cyber abuse perpetration of dating violence?

2. What is the rate of adolescents who are victims of physical, psychological, and/or cyber abuse?

3. What is the difference between teen dating violence among youth who use a single type of alcohol/drugs compared to youth who are poly-drug users?

4. What is the association between the different subcategories of teen dating violence perpetration and victimization?

Definition of Terms

Adolescence: Period of transition from childhood to adulthood.

HIV: Human immunodeficiency virus.

Intimate partner violence (IPV): Physical, sexual, or psychological harm by a current or former partner or spouse (CDC, 2014c).

Perpetration: Refers to the aggressor (the one committing the actions/behavior).

Physical abuse: The intentional or unwanted contact with (or near) one's body (loveisrespect.org, n.d.).

Poly-drug use: The use of two or more drugs during a certain period (past 30 days in this paper).

Psychological (emotional) abuse: Refers to threats, humiliation, monitoring, insults and/or isolation that could lead to emotional pain or scarring (loveisrespect.org, n.d.).

Sexual abuse: Refers to actions that pressure someone to do something sexually that they do not want to do (loveisrespect.org, n.d.).

Teen dating violence (TDV): Refers to physical, sexual, and/or psychological violence that occurs between a current or former person the individual shared a dating relationship with (CDC, 2014b). TDV can occur both in person or electronically, such as over the phone or internet (CDC, 2014b).

Victimization: Refers to the individual that is the target of the actions or behaviors.

Social Work Relevance

Physical dating violence not only affects women, but adolescents of both gender as well. This is an important age group as previous dating violence predicts future dating violence and previous dating violence perpetration predicts future perpetration. In order to work effectively with adolescents it is important to be aware of the factors associated with teen dating violence to not only better address in the population, but work on proving effective and preventive, intervention programs for youth at risk at an early age. The results from this study will assist social workers to better understand the dynamics between dating violence and substance use.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teen dating violence is a complex societal problem associated with several negative outcomes such as witnessing family violence, low self-esteem, acceptance of dating violence, poor communication, and use of drugs and alcohol (CDC, 2009; O'Keefe, 2005). National prevalence rates for teen dating victimization stand approximately around 10% while currently national perpetration rates are not available (CDC, 2014a). Since teen dating averages affect Hispanic and African American youth at an increased proportion, Hispanic and African American Youth may represent an important sub-category of adolescents most at risk for experiencing TDV.

In the present paper, the relationship between substance use and teen dating violence is investigated. Specifically, this chapter will begin defining TDV victimization and perpetration, as well as the categories of abuse that may be displayed. Next, the role of age and the developmental perspective of TDV that makes adolescents susceptible to both adolescent dating violence and substance use/abuse will be addressed. A focus on domains and characteristics identified from previous studies as having important roles in understanding the risks of TDV, such as differences in perpetration and victimization among gender and ethnicity, will also be explored. Finally, findings regarding the scope of the problem of both substance use/abuse and TDV will be synthesized.

Teen Dating Violence

Teen dating violence (TDV) refers to physical, sexual, and/or psychological violence that occurs between a current or former person that the individual shared a dating relationship with (CDC, 2014a). The aggression can occur in person or electronically, such as over the phone or through the internet (CDC, 2014a). There are two roles in each situation, which consists of the perpetrator and the victim. Perpetration refers to the aggressor or the one committing the actions/behavior first (not in self-defense), while victimization refers to the individual that is the target of the aggressive actions or behaviors. Teen dating violence can be conveyed in many different forms. Physical abuse involves the intentional or unwanted contact with (or near) someone's body, which can include hitting, pushing, or biting (loveisrespect.org, n.d.). Nationally, about 1 in 10 students have experienced physical victimization in the form of being hit (CDC, 2014a). Sexual abuse refers to actions that pressure someone to do something sexually that they do not want to do (loveisrespect.org, n.d.). Psychological (also referred as "emotional") abuse refers to threats, humiliation, monitoring, insults and/or isolation that could lead to emotional pain or scarring (loveisrespect.org, n.d.).

It is difficult to compare adolescent TDV prevalence studies due to variation in terminology, type of measure used, and the relationship between youth that are included in the studies (Teten, Ball, Valle, Noonan, & Rosenbluth, 2009; Williams, Ghandour, & Kub, 2008). Some studies report on lifetime occurrences of dating violence, while other focus on the last year or past 30 days, or within the past year. Also some studies include all forms of dating violence (physical, psychological, sexual), while others report on the specific behavior or just one of the categories. In addition, there are also differences

when looking at a "dating" partner. Some studies only include the individual's current partner, while others include current and past dating partners, while also having different definitions for "dating" to include the different types of relationships youth commonly engage in (e.g., hook-up, casual, serious).

Role of Technology

Cyber abuse and the role of technology within dating violence context is fairly novel. However, the utilization of technology amongst adolescents is an important factor to consider since technology use among youth keeps increasing each year. As of 2012, it was reported that about 95% of adolescents (12-17 years old) are online, 78% own a mobile phone, with 37% having a smart phone (with internet and instant message capabilities; Madden, Lenhart, Duggan, Cortesi, & Gasser, 2013). Furthermore, the media accessed through the internet and popular social networks can potentially influence adolescents' dating violence attitudes, knowledge and behaviors.

Picard (2007) first examined the relationship between technology and dating violence finding that technology had made dating violence "more pervasive and hidden" (p. 5). Subsequent studies have found that a little more than one fourth of youth reported experiencing cyber dating violence victimization in their current or most recent relationship (Zweig, Dank, Yahner, & Lachman, 2013). In the same study, about 1 in 10 youth responded to participating in perpetrating cyber dating abuse (Zweig et al., 2013). These findings were significant since, the rate of average cyber victimization more than doubles when compared to steady physical violence victimization rates. Furthermore, there was an association between cyber abuse and physical dating violence, where,

physical violence was more likely to co-occur when cyber abuse was present (Zweig et al., 2013).

Exploring the role of technology further, Draucker and Martsolf (2010) conducted a retrospective qualitative study with 58 participants between 18 and 21year old who experienced TDV during their adolescence. Eight purposes of the role of technology (e.g., cellphone, voicemail, text messages, social networking sites, blogs, e-mails, computer websites) and ways in which electronics were used in dating violence were identified (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010). The study revealed that technology was a factor in different aspects of the life of the relationship, from beginning a relationship and assisting in the formation of that relationship to the end of the relationship and assisting to bring closure. Specifically, 11 participants identified the use of technology in their adolescent dating violence relationships as "establishing a relationship with a partner" such as talking on the phone, exchanging phone numbers, and becoming friends and "chatting" on Facebook (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010, p. 136). Technology was also used in the relationship as a means to communicate with their partner: 15 youth attributed the use of technology to day-to-day communication such as talk on the phone several times a day in a non-aggressive way and six cited technology as a method used when arguing with a partner. More than half of the participants mentioned technology as a function to monitor or control the partner (e.g., checking up on them), and/or perpetrate emotional or verbal aggression against a partner, such as sending putdowns (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010). Eight participants made mention to seeking help during a violent episode, either by utilizing the technology to call 911 or a friend, and 29 used technology to limit the partner's access to them, by not taking their calls or not responding to their messages.

Finally, 31 participants made mention about using technology to reconnect with a partner after a violent episode or break-up, by calling to reconcile or to remain friends (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010). As can be seen, technology not only gives dating violence another avenue in which to occur, but can also help in ending or stopping the behaviors.

Gender

Contrary to the domestic violence amongst adults, research suggests that perpetration and victimization is common among both adolescent males and females, despite studies showing mixed result effects across gender. A systematic review of female perpetration in heterosexual relationships found that the majority (14 out of 15) of the studies focused on physical perpetration, and relatively few (2) focused on psychological/emotional perpetration (Williams et al., 2008). Although many different definitions of physical abuse are included in different measures, the range of female adolescent perpetrators tends to be between 9% and 44.3%, and as high as 79% among adolescents girls at risk for violence (Williams et al., 2008). Among adolescent females, emotional abuse is the most frequently type of abuse perpetrated, ranging from 36.5% to up to 94%, depending on the type of aggression measured (Williams et al., 2008).

Among males, about 28% reported at least one form of violence (physical, emotional, sexual) perpetration, but increased to about 45% among boys who have ever had sex (Reed, Silverman, Raj, Decker, & Miller, 2011). Sexual abuse was the most frequent form of perpetration reported among boys who have ever had sex at 42%, physical violence perpetration ranged between 10 to 13%, and emotional abuse perpetration accounted for 7 to 11% (Reed et al., 2011).

As part of a study aimed at reducing supportive dating aggression attitudes through a five-session curriculum in high school health classes, baseline data was analyzed to assess the prevalence of physical dating aggression and victimization separated by male to female, female to male, and mutual aggression (O'Leary, Smith, & Avery-Leaf, 2008). The direction of aggression was determined by the student's responses on the Modified Conflict Tactics Scale, which measures how individuals resolve conflict when they are in an argument including psychological aggression and physical aggression. Responses were analyzed and categorized by male to dating partner physical and psychological aggression, female to dating partner physical and psychological aggression, and mutual aggression. Almost all (94%) of males and females reported that psychological aggression was mutual and two thirds (65-66%) reported mutual physical aggression (O'Leary et al., 2008). Females self-reported that they were the perpetrators more often (28%) than they reported they were the sole victim (5%; O'Leary et al., 2008). Supporting the data were the responses of the males, which reported that they most often received the aggression (27%) than they aggressed against their partner (5%; O'Leary et al., 2008). Taking injury into account, 36% of females in aggressive relationships reported being injured and 33% reported they injured their partner (O'Leary et al., 2008). Again males were more likely to report victimization than perpetration, specifically 30% of males in aggressive relationships reported being injured by their partners and 22% reported they injured their partner (O'Leary et al., 2008).

Windle and Mrug (2009) looked at severity among cross-gender (male-to-female and vice versa) violence and found that for more violent acts boys were still more likely to be victims, and girls more often reported being perpetrators. When assessing hostile

attitudes, there were significant differences. In nine items, girls reported being more hostile. Boys were more hostile in one item ("hit, punch, hit something else").

Ethnicity

There are mixed results on whether ethnicity is a risk factor in TDV. Most recently the CDC (2014b) reported more African American males and females (14.8-13.8%) and Hispanic males and females (11.4-11.7%) had a higher prevalence of experiencing TDV victimization than White male and female students (7.2-8.8%). O'Leary and colleagues (2008) found Asian students were the least likely to report engaging in physical aggression compared to Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, and Mixed Race and found no ethnic differences when it came to victimization. Similarly, Temple and Freeman (2011) also found no difference in ethnicity among their economically disadvantaged Black, Hispanic, and White sample.

Adolescents' Developmental Trajectory

Adolescence is considered a developmental period of transition from childhood to adulthood (Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 2013). Although adolescence does not follow a specific timeframe, it usually begins between 11 or 12 years old and runs into the late teens or early 20s (Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 2013). During this time, adolescents experience biological, psychological, and social system changes within their development. Boys and girls experience physical growth changes, including puberty, have changes in hormones, and peer social connections become the most important relationships for them during this transition time (Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 2013).

According to Erikson (1968), the key developmental task during this developmental stage is identity formation. Adolescents are exploring who they are and

who they want to become. They are establishing their identity by experimenting and exploring the different roles they take a part in (e.g., student, sibling, etc.) to get an understanding of who they are by refining their values and beliefs (Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 2013). During this time, youth strive for autonomy and independence by being less dependent on their parents and instead peers tend to have more influence on their decisions (Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 2013). "Falling in love" or being in a relationship also contributes in defining one's sense of self, especially within romantic contexts (Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 2013, p. 316). If teens have a positive experience in their relationships while they are forming their identity they are more likely to be confident in themselves, however a negative romantic experience can impact the formation of identity and result in low-self esteem (Furman & Shaffer, as cited in Orpinas, Hsieh, Song, Holland, & Nahapetyan, 2013).

Dating Relationships

Dating relationships are normative during adolescence. By the end of high school nearly three-fourths of all U.S. adolescents have been in a relationship within the previous 18 months (Bouchey & Furman, as cited in Smetana, Campione-Barr, & Metzger, 2006). Relationships during adolescence fluctuate in length; some dating relationships are short-lived (few weeks or months) while others turn into a long-term commitment (Furman & Shaffer, as cited in Orpinas et al., 2013). Relationships are central in an adolescent's life, depicted by the amount of time they spend on relationships as their major topic of conversation (Furman & Shaffer, as cited in Orpinas et al., 2013). An important factor of teen dating relationships is that they are the cause of strong positive and strong negative emotions, more so than relationships with friends and/or

parents (Furman & Shaffer, as cited in Orpinas et al., 2013). Positive aspects of dating relationships include a fulfillment for support or care giving, companionship, status, and opportunities for conflict resolution (Smetana et al., 2006; White, 2009).

Although teen dating is normative, there are many negative consequences associated with it, especially when adolescents become sexually active at an early age. By age 15 it is reported that 25% of males and 26% of females have had their first intercourse (Kinsey Institute, 2010). By age 18, these numbers increase to include 62% of males and 70% of females (Kinsey Institute, 2010). Furthermore, by their late teenage years about 2 out of 3 youth, who have been sexually active, have had two or more partners (Kinsey Institute, 2010). Negative associated outcomes include: experimentation with alcohol and tobacco, greater number of sexual partners, less likely to use condom, or more likely to be pregnant or cause a pregnancy (Coker et al., 1994). Initially, males between 14 to 17 years old report condom use 79% of the time, however these numbers drop to approximately 45% of the time when they are between 18-24 years old and continues to decrease with age (Reece et al., 2010). Women between 14-17 years old report condom use 58% of the time, which also decrease by age 18-24 to 38% of the time and also continues to decrease with age (Reece et al., 2010). Additionally, it has been found that females are more likely to have sexually transmitted diseases (STDs; Coker et al., 1994). The large number of youth engaging in sexual activity increases the risk level of contracting HIV/AIDS. Physical dating violence was more prevalent among adolescent females who have had sexual intercourse (about 1 in 5) than adolescent girls who did not report sexual experience (1 in 25; Silverman, Raj, & Clements, 2004).

Type of Relationship

O'Leary and colleagues (2008) also found a significant association when looking at the type of relationship (new, casual, steady, serious, engaged) among high school students. New was used to describe relationships where partners "just started seeing each other," casual included seeing other people in addition, steady described seeing only that person and "not anyone else," serious was used for partners who "make plans for the future together" and engaged described relationship statuses were they were engaged to be married (O'Leary et al., 2008, p. 474). Results indicated that perpetration of physical aggression was most often reported among "engaged" male (37%) and female (58%) students than in the other categories. In addition, as relationships became more serious (from new to engaged) female and male students self-reported more instances of perpetration and victimization violence.

Substance Use

Substance use is another common experimental occurrence during adolescences' quest for independence and autonomy. In the United States, more than half of adolescents report alcohol use and about 1 in 4 adolescents report exposure to illicit drugs (Merikangas et al., 2010). Although not all teens who use substances will develop substance use problems, it is estimated that lifetime prevalence for substance use disorders (dependence and abuse) are 6.5% for alcohol and 8.9% for drugs among adolescents (Merikangas et al., 2010). Decades of research support that the onset of substance use disorders begins during the youth developmental period (Dennis, Babor, Roebuck, & Donaldson, 2002) and escalates throughout transitional ages, especially among 18- through 21-year-olds (Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2010).

These findings are alarming since substance use among youth has been associated with several health, social, and economic consequences (Baskin-Sommers & Sommers, 2006; Gettig, Grady, & Nowosadzka, 2006; Keys, Brady, & Li, 2015).

A national survey found that during the past 30 days, almost 40 % of high school students reported drinking some alcohol (CDC, 2014b). Although, not all youth who first start drinking during adolescence will continue to drink or develop adverse effects, those who start drinking earlier are more likely to develop dependence problems later in life than individuals who start drinking later in life (CDC, 2014b). Brain development has been linked to impulsivity that is especially present in new and risky behavior during adolescence, since the brain is not fully developed (Romer, 2010). Romer (2010) argues that risk-taking tendencies are more the result of normal development and the inevitable lack of experience associated with engaging in these novel behaviors. However, research indicates that in 1 to 2 years of heavy drinking (20 days in a month) and/or heavy marijuana use, adolescents show abnormalities on brain functioning measures (Squeglia, Jacobus, & Tapert, 2009). Alcohol abuse may change the neurodevelopment and have overwhelming affects on life long development (Pascual, Boix, Fellipo, & Guerri, 2009).

Substance Use and Dating Violence

Adults

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) among adults has received more research attention than TDV among adolescents. Research among adults has produced vast knowledge, however as discussed above, youth are at a different developmental stage than adults and therefore the dynamic is different amongst teens. Still, information from adults potentially creates a starting point for research with a younger population. In a

meta-analytic review of 96 studies, information of over 79,000 individuals found that increases in drug use and drug-related problems were significantly associated with increases in aggression between partners (small effect size *d* =.27-.32; Moore et al., 2008). The review combined results from a variety of settings including substance abuse treatment facilities, medical settings, and community samples and found that the relationship between drugs and IPV was lower for psychological aggression than physical abuse, sexual abuse, and studies that included a mixed definition of IPV (Moore et al., 2008). The review also analyzed the effect based on eight drug categories (marijuana, cocaine, opiates, sedatives/anxiolytics, stimulants (other than cocaine), hallucinogens, other (e.g., steroids, inhalants, etc.) and mixed). When looking at the effect of drugs on all abuse (combined IPV) there was an overall small effect; however cocaine produced the strongest relationship (small to medium effect), followed by mixed drugs, marijuana, then opiates (Moore et al., 2008). Analyses were also conducted to see if certain types of drugs were more strongly associated with IPV than others (for all categories of drugs) across the four classes of aggression (physical, psychological, sexual coercion, mixed). Across all categories, cocaine had a larger effect size than other comparisons.

Similarly, in meta-analytic review of 50 studies involving male and female perpetrators 18 years of age and above, Foran and O'Leary (2008) found an overall small mean effect size (*r* = .14) for the association between alcohol use/abuse and female-to-male partner violence and a small to moderate mean effect size (*r* = .23) for the association between alcohol use/abuse and male-to-female partner violence, clearly indicating an association between alcohol and IPV. The effect size did not differ between married, co-habiting, dating, or divorced couples or when comparing who was reporting

the abuse (self-report vs. partner) but did find significant differences in clinical, community, or clinical versus non-clinical samples (Foran & O'Leary, 2008).

Fals-Stewart, Leonard, and Birchler (2005) looked at partners collectively, focusing on male-to-female aggression among men entering either a 12-week domestic violence outpatient treatment or 12-week alcoholism outpatient treatment. Specifically, couples were asked to record daily episodes of the male's drinking and physical aggression towards the female of the relationship during a 5-month period. They found that on 62% of the days when there was physical violence and 72% of the days when there was severe physical aggression, the male had drunk alcohol on that day before the aggression occurred (Fals-Stewart et al., 2005).

Youth

Research on teen dating violence has been conducted using various lenses, has looked at many possible contributing factors, and has also looked at the prevalence difference between gender and ethnicity, but few studies provide a full picture. Various theories have been found to underline the explanation for the relationship between substance use and dating violence. The first theory revolves around the notion that the relationship between alcohol and aggression are due to other factors (e.g., deviant behaviors, anti-personality traits) that correlate with both alcohol use and aggression (Foran & O'Leary, 2008). The second theory posits that a casual relationship exists through an indirect effect (Foran & O'Leary, 2008). The third theory states the psychopharmacological effects of alcohol allows for the aggression to occur (Foran & O'Leary, 2008).

Howard and Wang (2003, 2007) presented a profile of psychosocial factors that were reported by a nationally represented sample of adolescent males and females using a cross-sectional survey method. Although the authors do not state a theoretical framework to reference, important findings stand out in the research, including prevalence similar amongst adolescent male and female victims of close to 1 in 10 experiencing adolescent dating violence (Howard &Wang, 2003). Another important finding was that females and males that were victims of dating violence were also more likely to use illicit drugs. With the findings, the authors also listed important limitations to take into consideration. First, because of the cross-sectional design of the study, one cannot state causations, only causalities. Such as, the study inform us that TDV victims are more likely to use illicit substances, but not if the use of substances puts victims at risk for victimization, if the victimization influences substance use, or if the two are produced from a third unknown variable. Second, the study's operational definition of dating violence was very narrow. It was defined by participants responding to "having been hit, slapped, physically hurt on purpose" (Howard & Wang, 2003; 2007) The definition limits teen dating violence to only physical abuse, is open to respondent's subjective opinion, and can include respondent's bias. Nevertheless, the study informs of important factors associated with TDV that should not only be looked at more carefully, but should also be incorporated into prevention programs.

Furthermore, Letcher and Slesnick (2013) looked at adolescent dating violence through the attachment theory. Attachment theory (Bowlby) posits that depending on the socio-emotional relationship between a child and their caregiver, the child will develop different patterns of attachment (secure, anxious-avoidant, anxious-resistant, and

disorganized; Zastrow & Kirst-Ashman, 2013). The researchers predicted that high anxiety attachment predicted high sexual risk and substance use. Letcher and Slesnick used a self-report questionnaire, and a simple linear regression to analyze the data and test the hypothesis. This study focused on high-risk adolescents, particularly those whom were runaways and had been diagnosed with either substance dependence or abuse according to the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-IV-TR)* criteria. The study revealed no significant findings, only correlations, due to the study's limitations and design. However, the study adds to the research on TDV and suggests for further research to strengthen the significance in the findings.

Lormand et all (2013) and Temple and collegues (2013) look at adolescent dating violence with a similar framework. Both studies approach the subject from a social learning theory/social cognitive theory. Social learning theory (Bandura) identifies that children learn how to interact with others from observing others, particularly their parents. Through this theory, witnessing violence or being a victim of child abuse places the individual at risk for future interpersonal violence (Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999). In this frame of reference, behavior is looked at as being determined by the interaction of the individual, the environment and behavior factors. Whereas Lormand et all used a logistic regression model to analyze their data, Temple and colleagues (2013) used longitudinal study method. Lormand et all used the logistic regression model to compare the association of dating violence with other factors such as, alcohol and drug use. Limitations in this study include the definition of dating violence that limited their response to only people they were dating, which could have excluded violence by partners not classified as boyfriend. Also important to note, is that this study used a

younger population, students in middle school who still reported dating violence at a similar rate across different age groups, noting the importance of having prevention programs available at an earlier age. Temple and colleagues (2013) using an adaptation of the social learning model that includes motivating factors such as substance use, sampled high school students. They compared baseline to results collected at a later date and found substance use was associated to dating violence but also predicted future association with dating violence.

Black and Weisz (2005) and Rothman, Linden, Baughman, Kaczmarsky, and Thompson (2013) used qualitative methods. Black and Weisz (2005) explored the views of Mexican American youth's view of violence including dating violence. Through grounded theory the authors coded common themes from transcripts of focus groups and found that participants identified experiencing dating violence, and an acceptable attitude towards violence excusable by cultural factors such as infidelity and respect. Important limitations include that it was a convenience sample from a community center and church, participants knew each other and could have influenced them to withhold information for fear of their confidentiality. More importantly although the study did not target perpetrators or victims of dating violence, the youth were able to express how culture affects their views and beliefs in the topic. Culture is important when preparing a prevention program.

Similarly in approach, Rothman and all (2013) conducted individual semi-structured interviews to explore the views of adolescents, (18-25 years old) pertaining to the influence of alcohol and marijuana use has on dating violence. Again this study, had important themes to take into consideration when developing a prevention program, but

the limitations again imply for more research to be done. In an exploratory study, 18 youth (primarily Black and Hispanic between the ages of 14-20) reflected on what they believed the effect of alcohol and/or marijuana was in connection to the perpetration of dating violence (Rothman et al., 2013). The major themes that emerged included: alcohol escalated minor conflicts, alcohol intensified feelings of anger and irritation, marijuana reduced feelings of anger and irritation (Rothman et al., 2013).

Rothman et al. (2012) approached dating violence and substance use with a retrospective approach looking to examine the relationship between youth alcohol use and dating abuse at a daily level. This was accomplished using a convenience sample of 17- to 19-year olds waiting in an emergency department. Participants would first receive definitions (i.e. size of alcoholic drink, acts considered dating abuse), then using a 6-month calendar the days that behavior occurred was marked (different calendars for different behaviors were utilized; Rothman et al., 2012). About half (52%) of men and more than half (61%) of women reported dating violence victimization and 45 percent of men and 55 % of when reported dating violence perpetration at least once in the past 6 months (Rothman et al., 2012). Heavy drinking (more than 4-5 drinks per day) was common among both gender, but was more prominent among men (72%) than woman (66%). Furthermore, women were 1.26 times more likely to experience psychological victimization on days they had an alcoholic drink when compared to non-drinking days. Men were 1.71 times more likely to experience physical victimization on days they had an alcoholic drink versus non-drinking days (Rothman et al., 2012). Both men and women were 1.7 times more likely to engage in dating violence perpetration on a drinking day as opposed to a non-drinking day (Rothman et al., 2012).

Temple and Freeman (2011) looked at the association between substance use and dating violence. Their results showed that all alcohol, tobacco and drug use was significantly associated with dating violence victimization, specifically dating violence victims were 2.5 to 4 times more likely to report substance use than non-abused adolescents (Temple & Freeman, 2011). Recent inhalant use and any ecstasy use (during lifetime) were more strongly associated among substance use, whereas tobacco use had the weakest association (Temple & Freeman, 2011). Additionally, adolescents who use both alcohol and a controlled substance are almost 4 times more likely to report dating violence victimization that adolescent who report no substance use (Temple & Freeman, 2011). However, when multivariate analyses were applied, specific drugs became insignificant suggesting that there could be a third factor causing both the victimization and substance use (Temple & Freeman, 2011).

Dating Violence and HIV Risk

Dating violence has also been associated with behaviors that increase risk for contracting HIV. Adolescent girls who report experiencing dating violence are more likely to have had their first sexual experience before 15 years old and used substances before their most recent intercourse (Silverman, Raj, & Clements, 2004). Wingwood et al. (2001) found that Black adolescent females who had experienced teen dating violence victimization were more likely to demonstrate unhealthy sexual behaviors compared to Black female adolescents who had not experienced teen dating violence. Specifically, adolescents who had experienced dating violence abuse were more likely to have a sexually transmitted disease (STD), more likely to report nonmongouneous partners, more likely to use condoms inconsistently, more likely to be fearful of talking with their

partner about pregnancy prevention, and more likely to fear negotiating condom use (Wingwood et al., 2001). The authors of the study discussed the possibility that the effect of experiencing dating violence could produce passivity and helplessness which further increases sexual health risks. Since youth are already at an increased risk for HIV risk, their HIV knowledge, attitudes, and risky behaviors are important take into account for a fully comprehensive education and prevention program (Yen & Su, 2006).

Summary

The literature has shown that there is a relationship between dating violence and substance use that affects the development, mental health, and physical health of youth. This study examined the relationship between physical victimization dating violence, psychological victimization dating violence, cyber abuse victimization dating violence, physical perpetration dating violence, cyber abuse perpetration dating violence, HIV risk behaviors, and substance use.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Study Design

A descriptive cross-sectional survey was used to examine the relationship between substance use and teen dating violence among African American/Black and Hispanic/Latino youth, using an online self-administered questionnaire. There are several reasons for choosing this type of methodology. First, some of the questions are of a sensitive nature; therefore, the likelihood of respondents answering honestly is greater with anonymity that can be obtained by using self-administered questionnaires (Rubin & Babbie, 2012). Since respondents are not answering questions face to face with an individual they may be more likely to report behaviors that carry a negative stigma like substance use and dating violence behaviors. Additionally, this method has increased advantages of convenience for delivery, maintenance of privacy/anonymity, participant accessibility, it requires minimal financial resources to maintain, has greater ease of dissemination and replication, and allows for decreased time commitments/effort compared to traditional in-person delivery methods. The self-administered questionnaire is also more suitable because it enables the researcher to analyze several variables such as gender, ethnicity, and substance use in relation to adolescents and reported behaviors of dating violence (Rubin & Babbie, 2012).

Sample

A purposive nonprobability sampling method was used to recruit participants for the study. Participants were selected based on the criteria of age (15-20 years old) and identifying as being either African American/Back and/or Hispanic/Latino. The sample was recruited from a charter high school located in an urban city in California. There are many additional challenges that youth attending this charter school in the urban community face that are usually not representative in large national surveys on TDV. For example, school personal informed of an increased drug and crime presence in the community that directly affect the students attending the school (J. Hutcheson, personal communication September 2014). Additionally the charter school is intended to serve youth who have traditionally not been successful in traditional high schools, such as they have been expelled from previous schools and/or do not have sufficient credits to graduate in the allotted timeframe (J. Hutcheson, personal communication September 2014). The total sample size for this study was 24.

Data Collection

Written permission was obtained from the principal of the school to make short presentations during one of their classes and to post fliers in key areas around the school building (i.e., front office, bathrooms, main hallway). During the short presentations, students were informed of the purpose, risks, and benefits associated with the voluntary survey. Following the short presentations, interested participants were instructed to contact the researcher and set up an appointment (after-school) if they were interested in participating. Parental Consent Forms and Informed Consents (See Appendices) were made available in easy accessible (students did not have to ask for permission to obtain

consent from school personnel) locations for students to review and in order for minor students to share with their parent/guardian. Students under 18 years old were instructed to first consult their parent/guardian and obtain parent consent using the indicated form before contacting the researcher. Students over 18 were informed they could consent for themselves, but were encouraged to talk to family or friends if they were unsure about their participation. During the scheduled appointment, the researcher met with students in a private room that allowed for confidentiality and collected the Parental Consent Forms from students under 18, and reviewed the Assent Form/Consent Form with each individual participant. Participants then were given written instructions on how to access the online survey. Surveymonkey.com was used to post the survey instrument (See Appendix for instrument). Participants were not required to sign the consent form, as their signature was waived by California State University, Long Beach Institutional Review Board to maintain confidentiality of participants. Prior to beginning the survey, students were presented with the consent form online and their consent consisted of selecting the "agree" to participate option. This procedure ensured anonymity since the questionnaire would not be matched with the consent letter. Participants were informed they did not have to answer any question they were not comfortable in doing so, they were also informed that they could stop the survey at any point with no consequences to them or in connection with the school. Additionally, participants were provided resources within the survey should any of the questions trigger unpleasant thoughts.

Instrument

The instrument was a self-administered online survey, which was used to collect data on demographics, substance use, victimization in dating relationships, and perpetration in dating relationships. There were four parts to the questionnaire.

Part one was composed of demographics. The demographics section asked the participants to specify gender, age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, grade level, typical school attendance, and grade pattern (i.e. Mostly B's).

Part two measured substance use utilizing Communities that Care (2014) substance use question. Students were asked how many times in the last 30 days they have used alcohol and different illicit drugs (i.e. marijuana, inhalants, etc.). Answer choices included: Never, 1-3 times, 4-9 times, 10 or more times.

Part three contained three subscales. Foshee, Bauman, Arriaga, Helms, Koch and Linder's (2006) Physical Violence Victimization scale as well as their Psychological Victimization scale and a modified version of Zweig and colleagues'(2013) Cyber dating abuse scale will measure victimization in dating relationships. All three subscales asked "how many times" a person they were in a relationship with, or were in a relationship with previously, had done certain behaviors to them (i.e. kicked me, put down my looks, posted embarrassing photos of me online) in the past year. The scale asked them to include only the times their partner did the behavior first, and was not done as a result of self-defense. Responses were collected using a likert scale with responses including: never, 1-3 times, 4-9 times, and more than 10 times. Higher scores indicated a higher level of victimization in teen dating relationships. Scores were summed to create four categories: dating violence victimization, physical violence victimization, psychological

victimization, and cyber abuse victimization. The 16-item scale measures self-reported victimization of physical violence and has shown to have an internal consistency of .93. Psychological Abuse Victimization scale is an 14–item scale that measures psychological victimization in dating relationships with an internal consistency of .91 (Foshee et al., 2006).

Part four contained three subscales as well. Foshee and colleagues' (2006) Physical Violence Perpetration scale as well as their Psychological Perpetration scale and a modified version of Zweig and colleagues' (2013) Cyber dating abuse scale measured perpetration in dating relationships. All three subscales asked "how many times" they have done the listed behaviors to someone they were in a relationship with, or were in a relationship with previously, (i.e. kicked them, put down their looks, posted embarrassing photos of them online) in the past year. The scale asked them to include only the times they did the behavior first, and not in self-defense. Responses were also collected in a likert scale with responses including: very often, sometimes, rarely, and never. Lower scores indicated a higher level of perpetration in teen dating relationships. Scores were summed to create the following four categories: dating violence perpetration, physical violence perpetration, psychological violence perpetration, and cyber abuse perpetration. Physical Violence Perpetration (Foshee et al., 2006) is also a 16-item scale with an internal consistency of .95. Psychological Abuse Perpetration also contains 14 items. This scale measures psychological perpetration in dating relationships, as has been found to have an internal consistency of .95 (Foshee et al., 2006).

Data Analysis

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data for the current study. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percent, means, and standard deviations) were used to compile demographic characteristics of participants in this study. To analyze participants survey data in response to research questions, their self reported prevalence rates of violence experiences were examined as a full sample (total score) and across subcategories. Total scores for physical violence victimization, psychological violence victimization, cyber abuse victimization, violence perpetration, psychological violence perpetration, cyber abuse perpetration, and HIV risk behaviors were calculated. Pearson's *r* correlations were used to determine associations between physical violence victimization, psychological violence victimization, cyber abuse victimization, violence perpetration, psychological violence perpetration, cyber abuse perpetration, and HIV risk behaviors. Independent samples *t* tests were used to determine differences in physical violence victimization, psychological violence victimization, cyber abuse victimization, violence perpetration, psychological violence perpetration, cyber abuse perpetration, and HIV risk behaviors by substance use and multi-substance use.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The demographic characteristics of the respondents are reported in Table 1. The study included a total of 24 respondents, of which more than half were female (*n* = 15, 62.5%). The majority of the respondents were Latino/Hispanic (*n* = 20, 83.3%), over 18 years old (*n* = 20, 83.3%), and identified as heterosexual (*n* = 20, 83.3%). Half of the respondents were in an exclusive relationship, followed by "friends with benefits" (*n* = 4, 16.7%) and casual dating (*n* = 4, 16.7%).

Substance Use

Respondents rated their level of substance use from "never" to "10 or more times" during the previous 30 days using Communities that Care (2014) drug use scale to measure current drug use. Data was collapsed as having used any substance in the previous 30 days or not having used any substances for comparative purposes. Data was also grouped to compare poly-drug (two or more substances) to single drug use. As shown in Table 2, 75% (*n* = 18) of the participants had used alcohol in the past 30 days, and half (*n* = 12) reported binge drinking (more than 4 drinks at one sitting). A little over half (54.2%, *n* = 13) of the youth were current marijuana users, followed by non-prescription pain medication (29.2%, *n* = 7), cocaine (20.8%, *n* = 5), amphetamines (12.5%, *n* = 3) and hallucinogens (12.5%, *n* = 3). Participants reported no inhalant,

TABLE 1. Demographic Characteristics of Participants (n = 24)

Characteristic	n	%
Gender		
Male	9	37.5
Female	15	62.5
Age		
15-17	4	16.7
18-20	20	83.3
Race/Ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	20	83.3
African American/Black	4	16.7
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual/Straight	20	83.3
Bisexual	3	12.5
Gay	1	4.2
Relationship Status		
Just Friends	1	4.2
"Friends with Benefits"	4	16.7
Going out casually	4	16.7
Together exclusively	12	50
Engaged	3	12.5

tranquilizers, or heroin use. More than half (58.3%, *n* = 14) reported using two or more substances within the past 30 days.

TABLE 2. Substance Use Involvement (N=24)

	Yes		No	
	f	%	*f*	%
Alcohol	18	75	6	25
Binge Drinking	12	50	12	50
Marijuana	13	54.2	11	45.8
Hallucinogens	3	12.5	21	87.5
Amphetamines	3	12.5	21	87.5
Cocaine	5	20.8	19	79.2
Non-prescribed pain med	7	29.2	17	70.8
Total Substance use	19	79.2	5	20.8
Multi-drug use	14	58.3	10	41.7

Note: Yes: indicates has "never" used. No indicates has used between: "1-3 times," "4-9 times," and "10 or more."

Involvement in Teen Dating Violence Victimization

The respondents' level of teen dating physical violence victimization is presented in Table 3. For TDV physical victimization, total scores ranged from 16 to 27, with a mean of 18.25 (*SD* = 3.38). A little over half (*n* = 13, 54.2%) of the respondents reported

no physical victimization. The most frequent type of physical abusive behavior observed was biting (*n* = 10, 41.6%), followed by scratching (*n* = 7, 29.2%) and throwing something that hit them (*n* = 5, 20.9%).

The respondents' level of teen dating psychological violence victimization is presented in Table 4. For TDV psychological/emotional victimization, total scores ranged from 14 to 53, with a mean of 20.67 (*SD* = 8.89). The majority (*n* = 19, 79.2%) of respondents reported at least one abusive behavior of psychological/emotional victimization. The most frequent type of emotional abusive behavior observed was the respondents reported their partner did something intentionally to make them jealous (*n* = 13, 54.2%), followed by said things to hurt my feelings (*n* = 11, 45.8%), could not talk to someone of preferred dating gender (*n* = 10, 41.6%) and blamed them for the bad things they did (*n* = 10, 41.6%).

The respondents' level of teen dating cyber abuse violence victimization is presented in Table 5. For TDV cyber abuse victimization, total scores ranged from 9 to 17, with a mean of 11.08 (*SD* = 2.22). The majority (*n* = 16, 66.7%) of respondents reported at least one behavior of cyber abuse victimization. The most frequent (*n* = 10, 41.6%) type of cyber abusive behavior observed by the respondents was being sent multiple messages to check up on them.

As shown in Table 6, participants were most likely to experience emotional/psychological abuse (79.2%, *n* = 19) followed by cyber abuse (67%, *n* = 16). The least frequent form of teen dating violence was physical victimization (50%, *n* = 12).

TABLE 3. Teen Dating Violence Physical Victimization

	Never		1-3 times		4-9 times		10 or more	
Behavior	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
Scratched me	17	70.8	6	25	0	0	1	4.2
Slapped me	22	91.7	1	4.2	1	4.2	0	0
Physically twisted arm	22	91.7	2	8.3	0	0	0	0
Slammed or held against wall	21	87.5	2	8.3	0	0	1	4.2
Kicked	24	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bit me	14	58.3	8	33.3	0	0	2	8.3
Tried to choke	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0	0	0
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved	20	83.3	3	12.5	1	4.2	0	0
Dumped out of car	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0	0	0
Threw something and hit me	19	79.2	4	16.7	1	4.2	0	0
Burned me	24	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hit with fist	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0	0	0
Hit with something hard besides fist	21	87.5	3	12.5	0	0	0	0
Beat me up	24	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assaulted with a knife	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0	0	0

TABLE 4. Teen Dating Violence Psychological Victimization

	Never		1-3 times		4-9 times		10 or more	
Behavior	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
Damaged something	17	70.8	6	25	1	4.2	0	0
Said things to hurt my feelings	13	54.2	8	33.3	1	4.2	2	8.3
Insulted me	19	79.2	3	12.5	0	0	2	8.3
Threw something at me	20	83.3	3	12.5	0	0	1	4.2
Could not do things with others	16	66.7	5	20.8	2	8.3	1	4.2
Threatened to date someone else	18	75	3	12.5	2	8.3	1	4.2
Could not talk to person	14	58.3	5	20.8	3	12.5	2	8.3
Started to hit	20	83.3	4	16.7	0	0	0	0
Did something to make jealous	11	45.8	9	37.5	3	12.5	1	4.2
Blamed me	14	58.3	7	29.2	1	4.2	2	8.3
Threatened to hurt me	20	83.3	1	4.2	2	8.3	1	4.2
Monitoring	18	75	2	8.3	2	8.3	2	8.3
Brought up something from the past	13	54.2	7	29.2	3	12.5	1	4.2
Put down my looks	18	75	4	16.7	1	4.2	1	4.2

TABLE 5. Teen Dating Violence Cyber Abuse Victimization

	Never		1-3 times		4-9 times		10 or more	
Behavior	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
Posted embarrassing photos	22	91.7	1	4.2	1	4.2	0	0
Took video and sent	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0	0	0
Used my social networking	19	79.2	4	16.7	1	4.2	0	0
Wrote nasty things on my social network sites	21	87.5	3	12.5	0	0	0	0
Created a profile page	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Used information to put me down	21	87.5	3	12.5	0	0	0	0
Sent multiple texts	14	58.3	5	20.8	3	12.5	2	8.3
Spread rumors	22	91.7	2	8.3	0	0	0	0
Pressured to send pics	18	75	5	20.8	1	4.2	0	0

TABLE 6. TDV Victimization (N=24)

	Yes		No	
	f	%	f	%
Physical	12	50	12	50
Emotional/Psychological	19	79.2	5	20.8
Cyber	16	67	8	33

Note: Yes indicates at least one incident of victimization. No indicates no instances of victimization.

Involvement in Teen Dating Violence Perpetration

The respondents' level of teen dating physical violence perpetration is presented in Table 7. For TDV physical perpetration, total scores ranged from 16 to 64, with a high number indicating no engagement in perpetration behavior. The mean of the scale 56.08 (*SD* = 14.90). A little under half (*n* = 11, 45.8%) of the respondents reported no physical perpetration. The most frequent type of physical abusive perpetration behavior observed was biting (*n* = 10, 41.6%) followed by slapping (*n* = 8, 33.3%).

The respondents' level of teen dating psychological violence perpetration is presented in Table 8. For TDV psychological/emotional perpetration, total scores ranged from 24 to 56, with a mean of 49.33 (*SD* = 9.21). The majority (*n* = 15, 62.5%) of respondents reported perpetrating at least one psychological/emotional abusive behavior. The most frequent types of emotional abusive behavior perpetrated that was reported by the respondents were intentionally saying things to hurt their partner's feelings (*n* = 14, 41.7%), intentionally making them jealous (*n* = 14, 41.7%), and blaming their partner for the bad things they did (*n* = 14, 41.7%).

The respondents' level of teen dating cyber abuse violence perpetration is presented in Table 9. For TDV cyber abuse perpetration, total scores ranged from 24 to 36, with a mean of 34.42 (*SD* = 3.35). The majority (*n* = 15, 62.5%) of respondents did not report any cyber abuse perpetration. The most frequent type of cyber abuse perpetration that was recorded included sending multiple messages to check on them (*n* = 7, 29.2%) followed by writing "nasty things" on their social networking profiles (*n* = 4, 16.7%) and pressuring them to send sexual pictures of themselves (*n* = 4, 16.7%).

TABLE 7. Teen Dating Violence Physical Perpetration

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Very Often	
Behavior	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
Scratched them	18	75	0	0	3	12.5	3	12.5
Slapped them	16	66.7	2	8.3	3	12.5	3	12.5
Physically twisted arm	18	75	1	4.2	3	12.5	2	8.3
Slammed or held against wall	20	83.3	1	4.2	0	0	3	12.5
Kicked	19	79.2	0	0	1	4.2	4	16.7
Bent fingers	18	75	1	4.2	3	12.5	2	8.3
Bit me	14	58.3	4	16.7	2	8.3	4	16.7
Tried to choke	19	79.2	2	8.3	0	0	3	12.5
Pushed, grabbed, or shoved	17	70.8	3	12.5	1	4.2	3	12.5
Dumped out of car	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0	2	8.3
Threw something and hit me	18	75	2	8.3	0	0	4	16.7
Burned me	21	87.5	0	0	1	4.2	2	8.3
Hit with fist	21	87.5	0	0	1	4.2	2	8.3
Hit with something hard besides fist	20	83.3	0	0	2	8.3	2	8.3
Beat me up	21	87.5	0	0	1	4.2	2	8.3
Assaulted with a knife	21	87.5	0	0	1	4.2	2	8.3

TABLE 8. Teen Dating Violence Psychological Perpetration

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Very Often	
Behavior	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
Damaged something	18	75	4	16.7	2	8.3	0	0
Said things to hurt their feelings	14	58.3	5	20.8	5	20.8	0	0
Insulted them	19	79.2	2	8.3	3	12.5	0	0
Threw something at them	20	83.3	1	4.2	2	8.3	1	4.2
Could not do things with others	17	70.8	1	4.2	5	20.8	1	4.2
Threatened to date someone else	15	62.5	5	20.8	2	8.3	2	8.3
Could not talk to person	16	66.7	2	8.3	4	16.7	2	8.3
Started to hit	21	87.5	1	4.2	1	4.2	1	4.2
Did something to make jealous	14	58.3	4	16.7	4	16.7	2	8.3
Blamed them	14	58.3	7	29.2	3	12.5	0	0
Threatened to hurt them	22	91.7	1	4.2	0	0	1	4.2
Monitoring	17	70.8	4	16.7	2	8.3	1	4.2
Brought up something from the past	17	70.8	2	8.3	4	16.7	1	4.2
Put down my looks	17	70.8	4	16.7	2	8.3	1	4.2

TABLE 9. Teen Dating Violence Cyber Abuse Perpetration

	Never		Rarely		Sometimes		Very Often	
Behavior	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
Posted embarrassing photos	22	91.7	1	4.2	1	4.2	0	0
Took video and sent	22	91.7	1	4.2	1	4.2	0	0
Used my social networking	22	91.7	1	4.2	1	4.2	0	0
Wrote nasty things on my social network sites	20	83.3	3	12.5	1	4.2	0	0
Created a profile page	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0	0	0
Used information to put me down	22	91.7	1	4.2	1	4.2	0	0
Sent multiple texts	17	70.8	2	8.3	4	16.7	1	4.2
Spread rumors	23	95.8	1	4.2	0	0	0	0
Pressured	20	83.3	2	8.3	2	8.3	0	0

As shown in Table 10, participants were most likely to self disclose emotional/psychological perpetration (58.3%, $n = 14$) followed by physical abuse perpetration (50%, $n = 12$). Cyber abuse perpetration was also self disclosed by 33% ($n = 8$).

Internal Consistency of Scales

The means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alpha of the scales are reported in Table 11. For Physical Dating Violence Victimization, the Cronbach's alpha was .81, indicating good reliability. For both Psychological Dating Violence Victimization scale

TABLE 10. TDV Perpetration ($N = 24$)

	Yes		No	
	f	%	*f*	%
Physical	12	50	12	50
Emotional/Psychological	14	58.3	10	41.6
Cyber	8	33	16	67

Note: Yes indicates at least one incident of perpetration. No indicates no instances of perpetration.

and Psychological Dating Violence Perpetration scale, the Cronbach's alpha was .95, indicating excellent reliability. Cyber Dating Violence Victimization scale resulted to be inadequate to measure what it was intended to, with the Cronbach's alpha at .63. For Physical Dating Violence Perpetration, the Cronbach's alpha was .99, indicating excellent reliability. For Cyber Dating Violence Perpetration, the Cronbach's alpha was .87, indicating excellent reliability.

Correlations Among Teen Dating Violence Victimization and TDV Perpetration

Pearson's *r* correlations were used to determine associations between Teen Dating Violence physical victimization, psychological victimization, cyber abuse victimization, Teen Dating Violence physical perpetration, psychological perpetration, cyber abuse perpetration, and HIV risk behaviors. Table 12 presents the findings. A person's *r* data analysis revealed a strong positive correlation ($r = .702$, $p = .000$) between physical victimization and psychological victimization. Respondents who reported more instances

TABLE 11. Means, Standard Deviations, and Cronbach's Alpha of Scales

Scale	Possible Range	Respondents' Range	*M*	*SD*	Cronbach's Alpha
Physical Victimization[a]	16-64	16-27	18.25	3.38	.81
Psychological Victimization[a]	14-56	14-53	20.67	8.89	.95
Cyber Victimization[a]	9-36	9-17	11.08	2.22	.63
Physical Perpetration[b]	16-64	16-64	56.08	14.90	.99
Psychological Perpetration[b]	14-56	24-56	49.33	9.21	.95
Cyber Perpetration[b]	9-36	24-36	34.42	3.35	.87
HIV Risk Behaviors[c]	6-20	10-19	13.10	2.38	.38

[a] Scale: 1 = never, 2 = 1-3 times, 3= 4-9 times, and 4 = 10 or more. Higher scores indicate a higher level of victimization.
[b] Scale: 1 = very often, 2 = sometimes, 3 = rarely, and 4 = never. Higher scores indicate a lower level of perpetration.
[c] Scale: Higher scores indicate higher HIV risk behaviors.

of physical victimization also reported more instances of psychological victimization. A person's *r* data analysis revealed a moderate positive correlation ($r = .610$, $p = .002$) between physical victimization and cyber abuse victimization. Respondents who reported more instances of physical victimization also reported more instances of cyber abuse victimization. A person's *r* data analysis revealed a moderate positive correlation ($r = .477$, $p = .033$) between physical victimization and HIV Risk Behaviors. Respondents who reported more instances of physical victimization also reported more HIV risk behaviors. A person's *r* data analysis revealed a moderate positive correlation ($r = .668$, $p = .000$) between physiological victimization and cyber abuse victimization.

Respondents who reported more instances of physiological victimization also reported more instances of cyber abuse victimization. A person's *r* data analysis revealed a strong positive correlation ($r = .894$, $p = .000$) between psychological perpetration and cyber abuse perpetration. Respondents who reported more instances of psychological perpetration also reported more instances of cyber abuse perpetration. A person's *r* data analysis revealed a moderate negative correlation ($r = -.595$, $p = .006$) between cyber abuse perpetration and HIV risk behaviors. Respondents who reported more instances of cyber abuse perpetration also reported HIV Risk Behaviors.

TABLE 12. Correlations Among Scales

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Physical Victimization	__						
2. Emotional/Psychological	.702**	__					
3. Cyber Victimization	.610**	.668*	__				
4. Physical Perpetration	-.125	-.034	-.057	__			
5. Emotional/Psychological	-.285	-.360	-.220	.199	__		
6. Cyber Perpetration	-.263	-.241	-.057	.252	.894**	__	
7. HIV Risk Behaviors	.477*	.374	.055	-.350	-.404	-.595**	__

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

Differences in Teen Dating Violence Victimization, Teen Dating Violence Perpetration, and HIV Risk Behaviors by Substance Use

Independent samples *t* tests were used to determine differences in Dating Violence Victimization (physical, psychological, cyber), Dating Violence Perpetration (physical, psychological, cyber), and HIV risk behaviors by Substance use ("never" vs. "1-more than 10 times) and Poly-Drug Use (use of two or more substances vs. no use/single type of substance used). Significant differences in substance use and multi-substance use were found for Physical Perpetration, HIV Risk Behaviors, Emotional Victimization, Emotional Perpetration, and Cyber abuse Perpetration (Tables 13 and 14). An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare Physical Abuse Perpetration rates in substance-using youth and non-substance-using youth. Respondents who reported substance use had a significantly higher rate of physical perpetration ($t = 2.53$, $p = .02$) and HIV risk behaviors ($t = -2.08$, $p = .05$) than did respondents who did not report substance use. Respondents who reported use of more than one type of substance use (Poly-drug) had a significantly higher rate of emotional victimization ($t = -2.29$, $p = .03$), emotional perpetration ($t = 2.61$, $p = .02$), cyber abuse perpetration ($t = 2.47$, $p = .03$), and HIV risk behaviors ($t = -2.99$, $p = .01$) than did respondents who did not have more than one type of substance use. No other significant differences were found.

TABLE 13. Group Differences for Dating Violence Victimization and Perpetration Between Substance-Using and Non-Substance Using Youth

	Substance Use (n=19)		Non- Substance Use (n=5)			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Physical Victimization	18.21	3.07	18.40	4.83	.11	.91
Emotional Victimization	20.21	5.87	22.40	17.16	.28	.79
Cyber Abuse Victimization	11.21	2.25	10.60	2.30	-.54	.60
Physical Perpetration	54.11	16.24	63.60	0.89	2.53	.02*
Emotional Perpetration	48.16	9.79	53.80	4.92	1.23	.23
Cyber Abuse Perpetration	34.16	3.69	35.40	1.34	.73	.47
HIV Risk Behavior	13.53	2.32	10.67	0.58	-2.08	.05*

TABLE 14. Group Differences for Dating Violence Victimization and Perpetration Between Multi Substance-Using and Non-Multi-Substance Using Youth

	Poly-drug use (n=10)		Non-multi drug use (n=14)			
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*t*	*p*
Physical Victimization	18.93	3.51	17.11	2.98	-1.30	.21
Emotional Victimization	23.13	10.33	16.56	3.17	-2.29	.03*
Cyber Victimization	11.53	2.50	10.33	1.50	-1.29	.21
Physical Perpetration	56.07	14.44	56.11	16.54	.01	.99
Emotional Perpetration	46.47	10.43	54.11	3.48	2.61	.02*
Cyber Perpetration	33.47	3.98	36.00	0.00	2.47	.03*
HIV Risk Behavior	14.08	2.54	11.63	1.06	-2.99	.01*

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

This study examined the relationship between substance use and teen dating violence among African American/Black and Hispanic/Latino youth. This chapter addresses the significant findings, the limitations, the implications for social work practice and policy, and the implications for future research.

Significant Findings

Teen dating violence and substance use continue to be prevalent societal issues. As indicated in this sample (n = 24), approximately 80% (n = 19) had used a substance within the last 30 days and psychological abuse was the most prevalent form of victimization experienced by 80% (n = 19) of this sample, followed by cyber abuse victimization (67%, n = 16). Almost 60% (n = 14) of the respondents reported engaging in psychological abuse and half (n = 12) also reported perpetrating physical abuse.

Substance use frequency rates were higher in this sample than rates reported in previous research, supporting the need to further look into this vulnerable population. Currently, the research on teen dating violence is mixed. The CDC (2014b) reported more physical victimization behaviors among African American/Black and Hispanic/Latino youth, yet O'Leary et al. (2008) and Temple and Freeman (2011), found no differences among ethnicities. National samples report about one in ten high school students experience physical victimization and Rothman et al. (2012) found teen dating

victimization rates between 52-61%. Results in this sample ranged from 50-80%. Frequency of dating violence perpetration is consistent with research. Rothman (2012) found teen dating perpetration rates between 45-55%, while the current sample ranging from 33-58%. Psychological victimization is consistent with research as the type of victimization most often experienced. In particular, Zweig and colleagues (2013) found cyber abuse rates stood at 25% for victims of cyber abuse and 10% participated in perpetration compared to 67% and 33%, respectively in this sample. Monitoring, sending/receiving multiple messages to check up on their partner, was the most frequent behavior reported in the cyber abuse victimization scale and the cyber abuse perpetration scale in this study. This finding is consistent with research were the role of using technology to control or check on a partner was identified qualitatively (Draucker & Martsolf, 2010). Due to the small sample size, differences by gender and ethnicity could not be completed.

Correlations Among Teen Dating Violence Victimization and TDV Perpetration

Associations were found between Teen Dating Violence physical victimization, psychological victimization, cyber abuse victimization, Teen Dating Violence physical perpetration, psychological perpetration, cyber abuse perpetration, and HIV risk behaviors. Specifically, more instances of physical victimization also reported more instances of psychological victimization and cyber abuse victimization, indicating that the three types of behaviors occur together. This finding is consistent with research. Zweig and collegues (2013) found that physical violence was more likely to occur when cyber abuse was present. This is important when developing prevention programs or when working with youth to educate and expand on all different forms teen dating

violence may take, especially when working with minority youth. Similarly, associations were statistically significant amongst psychological perpetration and cyber abuse perpetration.

Differences in Teen Dating Violence Victimization, Teen Dating Violence Perpetration, and HIV Risk Behaviors by Substance Use

Significant differences in substance use and multi-substance use were found for Physical Perpetration, HIV Risk Behaviors, Emotional Victimization, Emotional Perpetration, and Cyber abuse Perpetration. Substance use had a significantly higher rate of physical perpetration and HIV risk behaviors. Using more than one type of substance had a significantly higher rate of emotional victimization, emotional perpetration, cyber abuse perpetration, and HIV risk behaviors. This finding is consistent with research. Increases in drug use were significantly associated with increases in aggression between partners (Moore et al., 2008). Moore et al. (2008) found a large effect size among cocaine and physical, psychological, sexual coercion, mixed aggression. This is important to take into consideration and monitor as 20% of the sample reported cocaine use. Foran and O'Leary (2008) found an association between alcohol and intimate partner violence. With more than 75% (n = 18) of the population reporting alcohol use, 50% (n = 12) binge drinking, this is also an important area to further monitor and attempt to see if the higher levels of alcohol use resulted in the higher levels of teen dating violence victimization and perpetration observed in this study.

Limitations

A number of limitations to this study are worth highlighting. First, the sample was not representative of the general population due to the researcher utilizing a

purposive sample from a local charter high school. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalized across all youth in the United States. Second, the total sample size was small. This study focused on a very sensitive topic, which could have lead, many participants not to feel comfortable taking part in the survey. Despite the confidentiality measures taken by the researcher potential participants might have not felt safe in disclosing their personal experiences.

Implications for Social Work

Physical dating violence not only affects women, but adolescents of both gender as well. This is an important age group as previous dating violence predicts future dating violence and previous dating violence perpetration predicts future perpetration. In order to work effectively with adolescents it is important to be aware of the factors associated with teen dating violence to not only better address in the population, but work on proving effective and preventive, intervention programs for youth at risk at an early age. The results from this study will assist social workers to better understand the dynamics between dating violence and substance use.

This study found a relationship between teen dating violence and substance use. Specifically, youth who used substances where more likely to be victims and perpetrators of teen dating violence, especially when more than one type of substance was used. Despite the growing interest and research of adult domestic violence, teen dating violence remains a complex societal problem with many unanswered questions. The results from this study are important to take into consideration when working with vulnerable marginalized populations. Social Workers can use this information in their interventions with youth (e.g. group therapy) and during assessment. If one of the behaviors described

throughout the study is present, probing to see if the other related variables are present as well can further inform the treatment course and provide best practice for optimal results. By educating African American and Hispanic adolescents on the different categories and behaviors associated with teen dating violence perpetration and victimization, a move towards lower frequency can begin to take place.

Future Research

Additional research needs to be done to further explore the relationship between substance use and teen dating violence. There is little research on substance use and teen dating violence victimization and perpetration. This study provided some promising findings that can help future researchers develop a more extensive study. A focus on a national representation of teen dating violence perpetration is needed since it differs greatly from the information available from adults. It is also important to further research the influence drugs and alcohol may have on both perpetration and victimization of teen dating violence across different substances. Possible future studies can include a triangulation for a more informed look at the problem incorporating information from teachers, parents, and/or other involved parties.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Dating Relationships and Youth (18 years old and above)

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Mayra Hernandez, a graduate student from the Social Work Department at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB). Your participation will contribute to the completion of a thesis study. You are being asked to volunteer since you meet the requirements for enrollment into this study. Your participation is voluntary which means you can choose whether or not you want to participate. If you choose not to participate, your school grades and status will not be affected in any way. Before you can make your decision, you will need to know what the study is about, the possible risks and benefits of participating in this study, and what you will have to do in this study. The researcher is going to talk to you about the study, and will give you this consent form to read. You may also decide to discuss it with your family. If you find some of the language difficult to understand, please ask the researcher about this form.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The proposed study seeks to explore the relationship between alcohol/drug use and behaviors in dating relationships. You have been selected as a potential participant in this research because you are within a particular age range (18 to 20 years old), are enrolled in high school, and identify as Hispanic/Latino and/or African American/Black.

PROCEDURES

If you decide to voluntarily participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following things:

1) You will read this Informed Consent and contact the researcher to set up an appointment.
2) The researcher will review the consent form and answer any questions you might have.
3) The researcher will provide you with a web link and password to access the survey online at a later time (within two weeks) in a space you feel comfortable and allows privacy.
4) Before you begin the survey, this consent will appear on the first page and you will be asked if you agree or disagree to be part of the research. Please note: You agree if you select the agree option and your name or signature will not be collected.
5) If you agree, you will be able to begin a one-time anonymous survey (online) that may last an estimated 25-40 minutes. The questionnaire will ask about your age, gender, substance use, and behaviors in your dating (i.e. slap, insulted me, etc).

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

The research (online survey) does not involve any physical risks to you directly; however it is possible that you might feel some discomfort (embarrassment) due to the personal nature of some of the questions. If you feel, at any time, uncomfortable answering any of the questions then please feel free to skip that question or if you wish to stop the survey all together, you can do so by exiting out of the webpage (answers collected thus far will be discarded by the researcher). The survey also asks about possible incriminating information (such as underage drinking). However, because your name will not be collected it is highly unlikely that your responses will be tied back to you.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Although there is no direct benefit to you, you may enjoy the feeling of contributing to society by participating in this study as it is hoped that the results will contribute to a better understanding of relationship between substance use and dating relationships, helping social workers and other professionals work towards providing effective and preventative services.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

As a token of appreciation for your participation, you will be provided with an opportunity to enter into a raffle to win a $20 ITunes or Starbucks gift card at the end of the survey. For every 20 completed surveys, one gift card will be awarded.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Data (your responses) will not be linked directly to any of your personal identification information. Please note that anonymity will be maintained to the extent that on-line information is completely secure, the researcher has disabled collecting IP addresses and your responses are sent over a secure, SSL encrypted connection (the link for the survey will begin with https://). However, the researcher cannot guarantee confidentiality; confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used to complete the survey; no guarantee can be made regarding the tracking or interception of responses by any third parties (Survey Monkey or its affiliated partners). Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will be disclosed by the researcher only with your permission or as required by law. Only the researcher and thesis advisor will have access to the completed online questionnaires. Your name will not be collected during the survey and will not appear in any report of the study.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. Participation or non-participation will not affect your status, grade, or relationship with your high school or any other personal consideration or right you usually expect. You may also refuse to

answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which in the opinion of the researcher warrant doing so.

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Mayra Hernandez at (323) 744-0796 or at ysurvey2014@gmail.com or Brian Lam at (562) 985-4625 or at brian.lam@csulb.edu.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Office of University Research, CSU Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840; Telephone: (562) 985-5314. eMail: ORSP-Compliance@csulb.edu

APPENDIX B

PARENT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

PARENT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Dating Relationships and Youth (15-17 years old)

Your child was asked to participate in a research study conducted by Mayra Hernandez, a graduate student from the Social Work Department at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB). Your child's participation will contribute to the completion of a thesis study. Your child is being asked to volunteer since they meet the requirements for enrollment into this study. Your child's participation is voluntary which means he/she can choose whether or not you want to participate. Additionally, although you may sign this consent your child may still decide not to participate. If your child chooses not to participate, your child's school grades and status will not be affected in any way. Before you can make your decision, you will need to know what the study is about, the possible risks and benefits of being in this study, and what your child will have to do in this study. If you find some of the language difficult to understand, please ask the researcher about this form.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The proposed study seeks to explore the relationship between alcohol/drug use and behaviors in dating relationships. Your child has been selected as a potential participant in this research because he/she is within a particular age range (15 to 17 years old), is enrolled in high school, and identifies as Hispanic/Latino and/or African American/Black

PROCEDURES

If you agree to allow your child to voluntarily participate in this study, he/she will be asked to do the following things:

1) Your child will bring this consent form home for you to review and sign.
2) Your child will contact the researcher to set up an appointment and turn in this signed consent.
3) The researcher will review the Assent form (attached for your review) and answer any questions he/she might have.
4) The researcher will provide your child with a web link and password to access the survey online at a later time (within two weeks) in a space he/she feels comfortable and allows privacy.
5) Before your child begins the survey, the assent form will appear on the first page and your child will be asked if he/she agrees or disagrees to be part of the research.
6) If your child agrees, your child will be able to begin a one-time anonymous survey (online), which may last an estimated 25-40 minutes. The questionnaire will ask about your child's age, gender, substance use, and behaviors in your dating (i.e. slap, insulted me, etc).

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

The research (online survey) does not involve any physical risks to your child directly; however it is possible that your child might feel some discomfort (embarrassment) due to the personal nature of some of the questions. If your child feels, at any time, uncomfortable answering any of the questions they will be instructed to skip that question or if your child wishes to stop the survey all together, your child can do so by exiting out of the webpage (answers collected thus far will be discarded by the researcher). The survey also asks about possible incriminating information (such as underage drinking). However, because your child's name will not be collected it is highly unlikely that your child's responses will be tied back to him/her.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Although there is no direct benefit to your child, your child may enjoy the feeling of contributing to society by participating in this study as it is hoped that the results will contribute to a better understanding of relationship between substance use and dating relationships, helping social workers and other professionals work towards providing effective and preventative services.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

As a token of appreciation for your child's participation, your child will be provided with an opportunity to enter into a raffle to win a $20 ITunes or Starbucks gift card at the end of the survey. For every 20 completed surveys, one gift card will be awarded.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Data (your child's responses) will not be linked directly to any of your child's personal identification information. Please note that anonymity will be maintained to the extent that on-line information is completely secure, the researcher has disabled collecting IP addresses and your child's responses are sent over a secure, SSL encrypted connection (the link for the survey will begin with https://). However, the researcher cannot guarantee confidentiality; confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used to complete the survey; no guarantee can be made regarding the tracking or interception of responses by any third parties (Survey Monkey or its affiliated partners). Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with your child will be disclosed by the researcher only with your child's permission or as required by law. Only the researcher and thesis advisor will have access to the completed online questionnaires. Your child's name will not be collected during the survey and will not appear in any report of the study.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

Your child can choose whether to be in this study or not. If your child volunteers to be in this study, your child may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. Participation or non-participation will not affect your child's status, grade, or relationship

with his/her high school or any other personal consideration or right your child will usually expect. Your child may also refuse to answer any questions he/she does don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw your child from this research if circumstances arise which in the opinion of the researcher warrant doing so.

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Mayra Hernandez at (323) 744-0796 or at ysurvey2014@gmail.com or Brian Lam at (562) 985-4625 or at brian.lam@csulb.edu.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Office of University Research, CSU Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840; Telephone: (562) 985-5314. eMail: ORSP-Compliance@csulb.edu

SIGNATURE OF LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.

SIGNATURE OF PARENT OR LEGAL GUARDIAN

_____

Name of Child

_____

Name of Parent or Legal Guardian

_____ _____

Signature of Parent or Legal Guardian Date

APPENDIX C

ASSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

ASSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Dating Relationships and Youth (15-17 years old)

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Mayra Hernandez, a graduate student from the Social Work Department at California State University, Long Beach (CSULB). Your participation will contribute to the completion of a thesis study. You are being asked to volunteer since you meet the requirements for enrollment into this study. Your participation is voluntary which means you can choose whether or not you want to participate. If you choose not to participate, your school grades and status will not be affected in any way. Before you can make your decision, you will need to know what the study is about, the possible risks and benefits of being in this study, and what you will have to do in this study. The researcher is going to talk to you about the study, and they will give you this consent form to read. Please talk this over with your parents before you decide whether or not to participate. We will also ask your parents to give their permission (consent) for you to take part in this study. But even if your parents say "yes" you can still decide not to do this. If you find some of the language difficult to understand, please ask the researcher about this form.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The proposed study seeks to explore the relationship between alcohol/drug use and behaviors in dating relationships. You have been selected as a potential participant in this research because you are within a particular age range (15 to 17 years old), are enrolled in high school, and identify as Hispanic/Latino and/or African American/Black.

PROCEDURES

If you decide to voluntarily participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following things:

1) You will bring the Parent consent form home for your parent/guardian to review and sign.
2) Your will contact the researcher to set up an appointment and turn in the signed Parent consent.
3) The researcher will review this Assent form and answer any questions you might have.
4) The researcher will provide you with a web link and password to access the survey online at a later time (within two weeks) in a space you feel comfortable and allows privacy.
5) Before you begin the survey, this assent form will appear on the first page and you will be asked if you agree or disagree to be part of the research. Please note:

You agree if you select the agree option and your name or signature will not be collected.

6) If you agree, you will be able to begin a one-time anonymous survey (online) that may last an estimated 25-40 minutes. The questionnaire will ask about your age, gender, substance use, and behaviors in your dating (i.e. slap, insulted me, etc).

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

The research (online survey) does not involve any physical risks to you directly; however it is possible that you might feel some discomfort (embarrassment) due to the personal nature of some of the questions. If you feel, at any time, uncomfortable answering any of the questions then please feel free to skip that question or if you wish to stop the survey all together, you can do so by exiting out of the webpage (answers collected thus far will be discarded by the researcher). The survey also asks about possible incriminating information (such as underage drinking). However, because your name will not be collected it is highly unlikely that your responses will be tied back to you.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS

Although there is no direct benefit to you, you may enjoy the feeling of contributing to society by participating in this study as it is hoped that the results will contribute to a better understanding of relationship between substance use and dating relationships, helping social workers and other professionals work towards providing effective and preventative services.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

As a token of appreciation for your participation, you will be provided with an opportunity to enter into a raffle to win a $20 ITunes or Starbucks gift card at the end of the survey. For every 20 completed surveys, one gift card will be awarded.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Data (your responses) will not be linked directly to any of your personal identification information. Please note that anonymity will be maintained to the extent that on-line information is completely secure, the researcher has disabled collecting IP addresses and your responses are sent over a secure, SSL encrypted connection (the link for the survey will begin with https://). However, the researcher cannot guarantee confidentiality; confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used to complete the survey; no guarantee can be made regarding the tracking or interception of responses by any third parties (Survey Monkey or its affiliated partners). Any

information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will be disclosed by the researcher only with your permission or as required by law. Only the researcher and thesis advisor will have access to the completed online questionnaires. Your name will not be collected during the survey and will not appear in any report of the study.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. Participation or non-participation will not affect your status, grade, or relationship with your high school or any other personal consideration or right you usually expect. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which in the opinion of the researcher warrant doing so.

IDENTIFICATION OF INVESTIGATORS

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Mayra Hernandez at (323) 744-0796 or at ysurvey2014@gmail.com or Brian Lam at (562) 985-4625 or at brian.lam@csulb.edu.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. You are not waiving any legal claims, rights or remedies because of your participation in this research study. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the Office of University Research, CSU Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840; Telephone: (562) 985-5314. eMail: ORSP-Compliance@csulb.edu

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Baskin-Sommers, A., & Sommers, I. (2006). The co-occurrence of substance use and high-risk behaviors. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *38*(5), 609-611.

Cavazos-Rehg, P. A., Krauss, M. J., Spitznagel, E. L., Schootman, M., Cottler, L. B., & Bierut, L. J. (2011). Number of sexual partners and associations with initiation and intensity of substance use. *AIDS and Behavior*, *15*(4), 869-874.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). *Understanding teen dating violence: Fact sheet*. Retrieved from http://www. cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/Teen DatingViolence2009-a.pdf.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2014a). *Understanding teen dating violence: Fact sheet.* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention /pdf/teen-dating-violence-2014-a.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014b). Youth risk behavior surveillance—United States, 2013. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Reports, Surveillance Summaries, 63*(SS-04), 1-168.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014c). *Intimate partner violence: Definitions.* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimate partnerviolence/definitions.html

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014d). *Your behaviors, measures HIV-risk behavior: The handbook of evaluating HIV education—booklet 6, assessment instruments for measuring student outcomes grades 7–12.* Retrieved from http:// www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/publications/hiv_handbook.

Coker, A., Richter, D., Valois, R., McKeown, R., Garrison, C., & Vincent, M. (1994) Correlates and consequences of early initiation of sexual intercourse. *Journal of School Health, 64*, 372–377.

Communities that Care. (2014). *Youth health surveys.* Retrieved from http://www.comm unitiesthatcarecoalition.org/surveys

Dennis, M.L., Babor, T., Roebuck, M.C., & Donaldson, J. (2002) Changing the focus: The case for recognizing and treating marijuana use disorders. *Addiction, 97*(Suppl 1), S4–S15.

Draucker, C.B. & Martsolf, D.S. (2010). The role of electronic communication technology in adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing, 23*(3), 133-142.

Eaton, D. K., Kann, L., Kinchen, S. A., Ross, J., Hawkins, J., Harris, W. A., & Wechsler, H. (2006). Youth risk behavior surveillance— United States, 2005. *Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report*, *55*(SS-5). 353-372.

Epstein-Ngo, Q.A., Cunningham, R.M., Whiteside, L.K., Chermack, S.T., Booth, B.M., Zimmerman, M.A., & Walton, M.A. (2013). A daily calendar analysis of substance use and dating violence among high risk urban youth. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 130,* 194-200.

Erikson, E.H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis.* New York, NY: Norton.

Exner-Cortens, D., Eckenrode, J., & Rothman, E. (2013). Longitudinal associations between teen dating violence victimization and adverse health outcomes. *Pediatrics, 131*(1), 71-78. doi:10.1542/peds.2012-1029

Fals-Stewart, W., Leonard, K.E., & Birchler, G.R. (2005). The occurrence of male- to-female intimate partner violence on days of men's drinking: The moderating effects of antisocial personality disorder. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*, 239-248.

Foran, H. M., & O'Leary, K. D. (2008). Alcohol and intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*, 1222-1234.

Foshee V.A., Bauman, K.E., Arriaga, X. B., Helms, R. W., Koch, G.G., & Linder, G.F. (2006). An evaluation of Safe Dates, an adolescent dating violence program. In M.P. Thompson, K. C. Basile, M. F. Hertz, & D. Sitterle (Eds.), *Measuring intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration: A compendium of assessment tools* (pp. 5-136). Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control.

Fryar, C. D., Merino, M. C., Hirsch, R., & Porter, K. S. (2009). *Smoking, alcohol use, and illicit drug use reported by adolescents aged 12–17 years: United States, 1999–2004* (National Health Statistics Report 15). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Gettig, J. P., Grady, S. E., & Nowosadzka, I. (2006). Methamphetamine: Putting the brakes on speed. *The Journal of School Nursing*, *22*(2), 66-73.

Green, K.M., & Ensminger, M.E. (2006). Adult social behavioral effects of heavy adolescent marijuana use among African Americans. *Developmental Psychology, 42*(6),1168–1178.

Howard, D., Qiu, Y., & Boekeloo, B. (2003). Personal and social contextual correlates of adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 33*, 9-17.

Howard, D.E., & Wang, M.Q. (2003). Psychosocial factors associated with adolescent boys' reports of dating violence. *Adolescence, 38*(151), 519-533.

Howard, D.E., & Wang, M.Q. (2007). Psychosocial factors associated with reports of physical dating violence among U.S. adolescent females. *Adolescence, 42*(166), 311-324.

Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., Bachman, J.G., & Schulenberg, J.E. (2010). *Monitoring the future: National survey results on drug use, 1975-2009. Volume I: Secondary school students*. (NIH Publication No. 10-7584.) Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA).

Keys, K. M., Brady, J. E., & Li, G. (2015). Effects of minimum legal drinking age on alcohol and marijuana use: evidence from toxicological testing data for fatally injured drivers aged 16 to 25 years. *Injury Epidemiology, 2*(1), 1-10. doi: 10.1186/s40621-014-0032-1

Kinsey Institute. (2010). *Frequently asked sexuality questions to the Kinsey Institute*. Retrieved from: http://www.kinseyinstitute.org/resources/FAQ.html.

Letcher, A., & Slesnick, N. (2013). Romantic attachment, sexual activity, and substance use: Findings from substance-using runaway adolescents. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*(7), 1459-1467. doi:10.1111/jasp.12102

Lormand, D. K., Markham, C. M., Peskin, M. F., Byrd, T. L., Addy, R. C., Baumler, E., & Tortolero, S. R. (2013). Dating violence among urban, minority, middle school youth and associated sexual risk behaviors and substance use. *Journal of School Health, 83*(6), 415-421.

loveisrespect.org. (n.d.). *Is this abuse?* Retrieved July 2, 2014, from http://www.loveis respect.org/is-this-abuse/is-this-abuse

Madden, M., Lenhart, A., Duggan, M., Cortesi, S., & Gasser, U. (2013). *Teens and technology.* Retrieved from: http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports /2013/Teens-and-Tech/Summary-of-Findings.aspx

Merikangas, K.R., He, J.P., Burstein, M., Swanson, S.A., Avenevoli, S., Cui, L., … Swendsen, J. (2010). Lifetime prevalence of mental disorders in US adolescents: Results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication–Adolescent Supplement (NCS-A). *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry 49*(10), 980–989. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2010.05.017

Moore, T.M., Stuart, G.L., Meehan, J.C., Rhatigan, D.L., Hellmuth, J.C., & Reed, S.M. (2008). Drug abuse and aggression between intimate partners: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*, 247–274.

Montoya, T.A., Coker-Appiah, D.S., Eng, E., Wynn, M.R., & Townsend, T.G. (2013). A qualitative exploration of rural African American youth perceptions about the effect of dating violence on sexual health. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 22*(1), 48-62.

O'Keefe, M. (2005). *Teen dating violence: A review of risk factors and prevention efforts.* Retrieved from VAWnet: The National Online Resource Center on Violence Against Women website: http://www.vawnet.org/applied-research-papers/print-document.php?doc_id=409

O'Leary, K.D., Smith, A.M., & Avery-Leaf, S. (2008). Gender differences in dating aggression among multiethnic high school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 42*, 473–479.

Orpinas, J., Hsieh, H.-L., Song, X., Holland, K., & Nahapetyan L. (2013). Trajectories of physical dating violence from middle to high school: Association with relationship quality and acceptability of aggression. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence. 42*, 551-565.

Pascual, M., Boix, J., Felipo, V., & Guerri, C. (2009). Repeated alcohol administration during adolescence causes changes in the mesolimbic dopaminergic and glutamatergic systems and promotes alcohol intake in the adult rat. *Journal of Neurochemistry, 108*(4), 920-931.

Patnode, C. D., O'Connor, E., Rowland, M., Burda, B. U., Perdue, L. A., & Whitlock, E. P. (2013). *Primary care behavioral interventions to prevent or reduce illicit drug and nonmedical pharmaceutical use in children and adolescents: A systematic evidence review for the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force*. (Evidence Synthesis No. 106.) Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality.

Picard, P. (2007). *Tech abuse in teen relationships*. Chicago, IL: Teen Research Unlimited. Retrieved from http://www.loveisrespect.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/03/liz-claiborne-2007-tech-relationship-abuse.pdf

Reece, M., Herbenick, D., Schick, V., Sanders, S. A., Dodge, B., & Fortenberry, J. D. (2010). Condom use rates in a national probability sample of males and females ages 14 to 94 in the United States. *The Journal of Sexual Medicine, 7*(s5), 266-276.

Reed, E., Miller, E., Raj, A., Decker, M. R., & Silverman, J. G. (2014). Teen dating violence perpetration and relation to STI and sexual risk behaviours among adolescent males. *Sexually Transmitted Infections*, *90*(4), 322-324.

Reed, E., Silverman, J. G., Raj, A., Decker, M. R., & Miller, E. (2011). Male perpetration of teen dating violence: Associations with neighborhood violence involvement, gender attitudes, and perceived peer and neighborhoods norms. *Journal of Urban Health, 8*(2), 226-239.

Romer, D. (2010). Adolescent risk taking, impulsivity, and brain development: Implications for prevention. *Developmental Psychobiology, 52*(3), 263–276. doi:10.1002/dev.20442.

Rothman, E. F., Linden, J. A., Baughman, A. L., Kaczmarsky, C., & Thompson, M. (2013). "The alcohol just pissed me off": Views about how alcohol and marijuana influence adolescent dating violence perpetration, results of a qualitative study. *Youth & Society*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1177/0044118X13491973.

Rothman, E., Stuart, G., Winter, M., Wang, N., Bowen, D., Bernstein, J., & Vinci, R. (2012). Youth alcohol use and dating abuse victimization and perpetration: A test of the relationships at the daily level in a sample of pediatric emergency department patients who use alcohol. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *27*(15), 2959-2979.

Rubin, A., & Babbie, E. (2014). *Research methods for social work* (8th ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Smetana, J. G., Campione-Barr, N., & Metzger A. (2006). Adolescent development in interpersonal and societal contexts. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 255-284.

Silverman, J. G., Raj, A., & Clements, K. (2004). Dating violence and associated sexual risk and pregnancy among adolescent girls in the United States. *Pediatrics, 114*(2), e220-e225.

Squeglia, L. M., Jacobus, J., & Tapert, S. F. (2009). The influence of substance use on adolescent brain development. *Clinical EEG and Neuroscience, 40*(1), 31–38.

Temple, J., & Freeman, D. H. (2011). Dating violence and substance use among ethnically diverse adolescents. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(4), 701-718.

Temple, J., Shorey, R., Fite, P., Stuart, G., & Le, V. (2013). Substance use as a longitudinal predictor of the perpetration of teen dating violence. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 42*(4), 596-606. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9877-1

Teten, A. L., Ball, B., Valle, L. A., Noonan, R., & Rosenbluth, B. (2009). Considerations for the definition, measurement, consequences, and prevention of dating violence victimization among adolescent girls. *Journal of Women's Health, 18*(7), 923-927.

Townsend, L., Flisher, A. J., & King, G. (2007). A systematic review of the relationship between high school dropout and substance use. *Clinical Child and Family Psychological Review, 10*(4), 295-317.

Vagi, K. J., Rothman, E., Latzman, N. E., Tharp, A. T., Hall, D. M., & Breiding, M. J. (2013). Beyond correlates: A review of risk and protective factors for adolescent dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 42*(4), 633-649.

White, J. W. (2009). A gendered approach to adolescent dating violence: conceptual and methodological issues. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 33*, 1-15.

Williams, J. R., Ghandour, R. M., & Kub, J. E. (2008). Female perpetration of violence in heterosexual intimate relationships: Adolescence through adulthood. *Trauma Violence Abuse, 9*(4), 227-249.

Windle, M., & Mrug, S. (2009). Cross-gender violence perpetration and victimization among early adolescents and associations with attitudes toward dating conflict. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *38*(3), 429-439.

Wingood, G. M., DiClemente, R. J., McCree, D. H., Harrington, K., & Davies, S. L. (2001). Dating violence and the sexual health of Black adolescent females. *Pediatrics, 107*(5), e72-e72.

Zastrow, C., & Kirst-Ashman, K. (2013). *Understanding human behavior and the social environment* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Zweig, J., Dank, M., Yahner, J., & Lachman, P. (2013). The rate of cyber dating abuse among teens and how it relates to other forms of teen dating violence. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *42*(7), 1063-1077. doi:10.1007/s10964-013-9922-8