2020

The Relationship between Intimate Partner Violence and Youth Violence: A Systematic Literature Review

Donna M. Butler
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Donna Marie Butler

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Susana Verdinelli, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Derrick Copper, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Elisha Galaif, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2020

Abstract

The Relationship between Intimate Partner Violence and Youth Violence: A Systematic

Literature Review

By

Donna Marie Butler

MA, Spring Arbor, 2006

BS, Aquinas College, 1997

Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Ph.D. in Psychology

Walden University

Graduation Date August 2020

Abstract

Youth are responsible for a great number of violent acts committed in the United States. Experiencing or witnessing some type of violence at home during childhood increases the possibility of engaging in violent behaviors as a youth. At present, no systematic literature reviews examined the impact of intimate partner violence (IPV) on the development of youth violence. IPV includes various types of abuse that one member of a couple commits against the other member. The purpose of this systematic literature review was to examine the literature and analyze the relationship between IPV and youth violence. Bandura's social learning theory and Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory were the theoretical basis for this study. A search of relevant databases was conducted for studies published between 2008 and 2018. A total of 565 articles were reviewed for this study, and 19 articles met the criteria and were selected for analysis. Data were analyzed into a narrative synthesis. Results of this study indicated that witnessing IPV related to children's displays of aggression. The severity of violence exposure and types of abuse experienced were related to long-term consequences, such as becoming victims or perpetrators of violence or experiencing mental health consequences. Several other contextual factors were found to be related to youth violence. Results of this study can provide parents, teachers, school counselors, and other stakeholders information on how IPV relates to youth violence. Results of this study could be used to create contextualized programs designed to psychologically empower youth who have been exposed to IPV or create programs for the prevention of IPV.

The Relationship between Intimate Partner Violence and Youth Violence: A Systematic

Literature Review

By

Donna Marie Butler

MA, Spring Arbor, 2006

BS, Aquinas College, 1997

Proposal Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Ph.D. Psychology

Walden University

Graduation Date August 2020

Dedication

       This dissertation is humbly dedicated to all of those who have been victims of intimate partner violence. This dissertation is also dedicated to the children who have been exposed to the devastating adversities of intimate partner violence. Finally, this dissertation is dedicated to all of the frontline workers who devote their time, talents, and energies toward fighting against the debilitating impacts of intimate partner violence.

Acknowledgments

A very appreciative thanks goes out to my dissertation chair, Dr. Susana Verdinelli. I sincerely thank you for your genuine support, insight, and patience. Without your guidance this may not have been possible. I also would like to acknowledge the support of my other committee members: Dr. Derrick Copper, who supported me throughout the duration of my dissertation, Dr. Elisha Galaif, and Dr. Timothy Lionetti. I thank you all for working together to make this dissertation process bearable and achievable. Finally, I would also like to acknowledge the support of all my children, family members, and loved ones. I sincerely thank all of you for supporting me during this long and challenging educational journey.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

This systematic review focused on the relationship between intimate partner violence (IPV) and youth violence. Family conflict experienced in childhood increases the possibility of engaging in violent behaviors later in life (Andreas & Watson, 2009; Choe & Zimmerman, 2014; Jennings, Richards, Tomsich, & Gover, 2015; Millett, Kohl, Jonson-Reid, Drake, & Petra, 2013). IPV refers to emotional, verbal, psychological, physical, and/or sexual abuse that one member of a couple perpetrates against the other member (O'Leary, Foran, & Cohen, 2013). Children's exposure to this type of family conflict has been linked to youths' violent behaviors (Ferguson, San Miguel, & Hartley, 2009; Gage 2016; Jouriles, Mueller, Rosenfield, McDonald, & Dodson, 2012).

In the Unites States, a disproportionate amount of violent crimes are committed by individuals between the ages of 15 and 24. Young people are usually the ones hurting other youth (David-Ferdon & Simon, 2014). Youth violence is also a significant public health problem, and victims of violence are at a higher risk for many other mental or physical health problems. Experiencing IPV in childhood has a strong link with perpetrating violence in later years. Therefore, the prevention and treatment of IPV are important not only to optimize children's psychosocial development and wellbeing but also to prevent subsequent youth criminal behavior (Smith, Ireland, Park, Elwyn, & Thornberry, 2011). The purpose of this study was to perform a systematic and up-to-date review of scientific empirical research published in the last decade (2008-2018) that analyzed the relationship between IPV and youth violence. This systematic review

provides critical stakeholders with a body of evidence-based information on the social, psychological, and familial factors that impact youth violence, which has the potential to be used in developing IPV and youth violence prevention programs.

Major sections of this introduction include a summary of relevant research literature, as well as an explanation of the problem statement, purpose statement, and ultimate research question of this study. Other major sections of this introduction include a presentation of the theoretical background used in this study, the nature of the study, and definitions of key terms used in this study.

Background

Previous studies have examined the potential impact of IPV on youth violence. For example, Smith et al. (2011) found a significant relationship between dysfunctional interactions among family members and increased youth violence. Prior research has found that, in comparison to youth who are not exposed to IPV, youth who are exposed to such violence are more likely to engage in violent behaviors (Ireland & Smith, 2009; Sousa et al., 2010) and are more likely to be arrested for engaging in violent behaviors (Ireland & Smith, 2009).

Youth who are exposed to IPV have a higher likelihood of perpetrating physical dating violence, bullying, and sexual harassment (Fineran & Bolen, 2006). This may result from children exposed to IPV who may "witness positive outcomes from aggression (e.g., the aggressor gets what he/she wanted), which promotes the learning of aggression and development of the attitude that aggression is an acceptable (and even

preferable) means of interacting" (Foshe et al., 2016, p. 673). Other researchers have explained the relationship between intimate partner violence and youth violence as the result of the potential fact that "children exposed to youth violence often do not have the opportunity to observe the positive consequences of constructive conflict management techniques because adults who use violence to resolve conflict typically lack such skills" (Schwartz, Hage, Bush, & Burns, 2006).

Previous systematic literature reviews explored how various factors relate to either youth violence or IPV. For example, Garcia, Garcia, and Nunez (2015) explored predictor factors of school bullying, and Jennings et al. (2017) reviewed the factors that contributed to the development of IPV. Margolin et al. (2009) explored the impact of parental physical aggression and adolescent adjustment and behavior in a longitudinal study. To date, there are no systematic literature reviews that specifically examine the impact of IPV on the development of youth violence. Thus, the primary objective of this study is to bring together varying results and findings of previous studies that investigated the relationship between IPV and youth violence.

A systematic literature review was conducted to accomplish this objective. This systematic literature review involves accessing, reviewing, comparing, contrasting, and critiquing current empirical knowledge related to IPV and youth violence (Boland, Cherry, & Dickson, 2014). Such a study is needed as the results of this study provide a current review of the relationship between IPV and youth violence. Results of this study have the potential to be used in developing IPV and youth violence prevention programs.

They also have the potential to raise awareness about the strength and importance of the relationship between IPV and youth violence.

Problem Statement

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, 2016) indicated that youth younger than 18 accounted for 10.2% of all violent crime arrests and 14.3% of all property crime arrests in 2015. In this same year, 605 youth younger than 18 years were arrested for murder, 2,745 for forcible rape, and 21,992 for aggravated assault. Youth are not only perpetrators, but also victims of violence. The CDC (2016) also indicated that in 2014, 4,300 young people ages 10 to 24 were victims of homicide. Homicide is the third leading cause of death for young people ages 10 to 24 years old. Approximately one in four high school students or 23% of the student population is involved in a serious violent quarrel each year, and one in six or 16% reported carrying a weapon at least once per month (CDC, 2016; Salas-Wright, Nelson, Vaughn, Reingle Gonzales, & Cordova, 2017).

These current statistical trends point to a significant and profound national issue of youth violence in America. Such statistics indicate the need for current research to understand the phenomenon of youth violence. Salas-Wright, Nelson, Vaughn, Reingle Gonzales, and Cordoba (2017) indicated that there is a "lack of systematic research examining trends in violence among youth" (p. 977). Moreover, understanding a specific factor such as IPV as a strong contributor to youth violence is critical for the development of effective prevention and intervention efforts designed to inform and instruct stakeholders seeking to curtail the prevalence of youth violence.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to use the systematic literature review process to examine the relationship between IPV and youth violence (Boland, Cherry, & Dickson, 2014). This study located, appraised, and synthesized best available evidence-based literature related to IPV and youth violence. The results of this study may potentially provide varying stakeholders with information that validates the importance of providing developing youth with nurturing family environments that are free from debilitating levels of IPV.

Research Question

The main research question for this study is: What has been discovered through research about the relationship between IPV and youth violence?

Theoretical Framework

Two major theories served as the basis for this study: Albert Bandura's (1986) social learning theory and Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological systems theory (EST).

Theories on Aggression: Social Learning Theory

For this dissertation study, Albert Bandura's social learning theory was used as the explanatory framework for examining the emergence of violence, and specifically understanding how children learn violent behaviors. This theory posits that children learn to engage in specific behaviors through observation of other persons engaging in specific behaviors, both negative and positive (Bandura, 1986). Previous researchers have used social learning theory as a theoretical framework for examining and explaining the causes

and consequences of aggression. For example, Houston and Grych (2016) have used social learning theory to measure the potential for mother-child attachment styles to buffer the effects of violence on aggressive attitudes. These researchers found that youth who are exposed to violence are more likely to perceive aggression as acceptable (Houston & Grych, 2016). Other researchers have consistently validated that children who are exposed to violence are more likely to engage in violent and aggressive behaviors (e.g., Bandura, 1986).

Family Functioning: EST

The EST was also used in this study to understand different overlapping systems in which violence occurs. Originally proposed by Bronfenbrenner (1979), it postulates that different systems (microsystem, mesosystem, exosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem) interact and influence individual development. Bronfenbrenner's framework assesses the interplay of a range of elements, including family systems and social systems. A child's development is directly and indirectly impacted by the type of interactions he or she has with other members of the family system (microsystem). Bronfenbrenner viewed the family system as a setting, which he defined as "a place where people can readily engage in face to face interaction" (p. 22). He viewed the microsystem as a platform for interacting in which "a pattern of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations" are gaps experienced by the developing child. Neal and Neal (2013) defined the microsystem as "a setting where the focal individual plays a direct role

(e.g., daughter and sibling), has direct experiences (e.g., enjoying family meals), and has direct social interaction with others (reading with mom, teasing baby brother)" (p. 725). EST has been previously validated as an acceptable lens for investigating factors that impact youth development including youth violence (Bowen, Rose, Powers, & Glennie, 2008). The EST was the theoretical lens that was used in this study; it had the capacity to help evaluate the impact of IPV on youth violence. In the past, the EST has been used as a theoretical tool for developing prevention models (Williams, Rivera, Neighbours, & Reznik, 2007). The EST has also been used as a theoretical instrument for identifying risks and protective factors (Umemoto et al., 2009).

Relevance of Social Learning Theory and EST to the Current Research

In this study, Bandura's social learning theory was used as a basis to understand the relationship between IPV and youth violence. A violent act initiated by one member of a couple to the other member is initially acquired through modeling during childhood. Methods for solving family conflicts are often learned during childhood via observation of parents' behaviors. In this way, IPV that occurs at home teaches children to solve problems using violence. Bandura's theoretical principles have been used to support findings on intergenerational cycles of violence (Bell & Naugle, 2008). Considering the importance of family modeling, Bronfenbrenner's theory provides the platform to explore different and overlapping systems in which children and adolescents merge and interact. Thus, the EST and social learning theory provide the potential to reveal complex contextual relationships between IPV and diverse types of youth violence.

It is my personal assumption that the family system is the most impactful factor as it relates to childhood and adolescent development. The psychological impact of the family system on developing youth, without question, has substantial effects on the psychological development and functioning of evolving teens. In a family system where abuse acts as a force that drives, guides, and shapes social interactions within family systems, these abusive interactions will in turn drive, guide, and shape the behavior of developing youth.

Nature of the Study

I chose to use the systematic literature review design to examine the relationship between IPV and youth violence. A systematic review is a literature review that is designed to locate, appraise, and synthesize the best available evidence relating to a specific research question to provide informative and evidence-based answers (Boland et al., 2014). This information can then be combined with professional judgment to make decisions about how to deliver interventions or to make changes to policies that are directly related to phenomena of IPV and youth violence.

The criteria for reviewing articles when conducting a systematic literature review begin with identifying articles from databases that relate specifically to the topics of IPV and youth violence. Secondly, I sorted through and read all abstracts located through databases to identify relevant articles. If an article met the search criteria, I read it in its entirety. The specific criteria are described in the following section. Finally, the findings are brought together into a coherent synthesis (Gough, Oliver, & Thomas, 2012).

Definitions of Terms

Family conflict: Differences in opinions, values, needs, or expectations among family members can create interpersonal tension or struggle (Kramer et al., 2006). Relationship conflict can be overtly or covertly expressed through yelling or holding feelings of resentment among family members (Kramer et al., 2009). Although there are many varying circumstances, situations, events, and forms of communication that can take place in a family unit that can be perceived as family conflict, this study focused specifically on IPV as a form of family conflict.

Intimate partner violence (IPV): Involves emotional, verbal or psychological abuse, physical and sexual abuse that one partner inflicts on the other partner (O'Leary, Foran, & Cohen, 2013). Intimate partners can be current spouses, former spouses, spouses in the process of separating, and dating partners.

Partner economic abuse: Boyle, Robinson, and Atkinson (2004) defined economic abuse as occurring when one member of the couple is prevented from educating herself or himself or advancing in her or his career and is intrusively monitored in terms of spending.

Partner emotional/psychological abuse: Continued experiencing of criticism and/or verbal aggression towards an intimate partner. Rickert, Wiemann, Harrykisoon, Berenson, and Kolb (2002) defined psychological abuse as the reoccurrence of isolation and domination of an intimate partner. It has also been linked to harming an individual's

self-efficacy and self-esteem through the use of name calling, intimidation, and manipulation.

Partner physical abuse: Partner physical abuse can be a one-time occurrence of abuse or sustained and repeated occurrences. Partner physical abuse can be perpetrated by one or both partners (CDC, 2009). Physical violence refers to inflicting physical harm including slapping, pushing, punching, pulling, kicking, threats with a weapon, denial of medical care, scratching, burning, and forcing of drug use. Physical threat refers to intimidation through the use of words and/or weapons. It has further been defined as the occurrence of at least one major act of physical aggression over the course of 1 year (O'Leary & Jacobson, 1997). Physical abuse has also been defined as physical acts of aggression that lead to fear or injury that requires medical attention (O'Leary & Jacobson, 1997).

Partner sexual abuse: Sexual abuse occurs when an individual is forced to have sex, is inappropriately touched, is made to watch sexual acts, or is refused the option of using birth control (O'Leary, 1999). It refers to forcing a partner to engage in sexual activity against their will.

Partner verbal abuse: Partner verbal abuse refers to responses an intimate partner uses to coerce, criticize, humiliate, and ridicule the other partner (O'Leary, 1999). Partner verbal abuse leads to psychological and emotional abuse, and it usually precedes physical abuse. Verbal abuse can be as detrimental as physical abuse (Rickert et al., 2002). Verbal abuse includes name calling, scolding, and insulting statements.

Youth violence: Violence is the "intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against oneself, another person, or against a group or community, which either results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment or deprivation" (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, & Lozano, 2002, p. 4). Youth violence involving people between the ages of 10 and 29 includes acts that can range from severe, such as assault and homicide, to lesser, such as bullying or physical fighting. Thus, youth violent behaviors can include bullying, aggravated assault, harassment, intimidation, sexual assault, stalking burglary, robbery, and theft (Ferguson et al., 2009).

Scope and Delimitations

The systematic review criteria were limited to peer-reviewed articles published between January 2008 and December 2018. Key terms included *intimate partner violence, partner's verbal abuse, partner's physical abuse,* and *youth violence*, which were featured in the title, abstract, or keywords. Other specific criteria for articles included the following:

- Only empirical studies examining a relationship between intimate partner violence, partners' verbal/partners' physical abuse and youth violence were included.

- Only published peer-reviewed papers written in English language were included.

- Theoretical articles, literature reviews, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, revisions, books, dissertations, and similar writings were excluded.

Limitations

This systematic literature review concentrated on the particular relationship between IPV and youth violence; it is clear that violence in youth is a multilayer phenomenon and other factors contribute to this phenomenon (CDC, 2011). The researcher in this study analyzed only 19 articles selected based on research criteria. Considering the multilayered factors that contribute to the phenomenon of youth violence, this study does not represent an exhaustive or comprehensive review of the phenomenon. This study included only articles written in English. It is possible that relevant articles published in other languages exist, but they were excluded. Second, only evidence-based peer-reviewed published articles were included. It is possible that other sources such as dissertations or theses could contain significant information.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify, evaluate, and synthesize the best available research related to IPV and youth violence. The potential social change implications of this study include gathering and outlining information that may add to the body of evidence already available to parents, teachers, school counselors, principals, law officials, policy makers, and other stakeholders regarding the critical importance of providing developing youth with a nurturing family environment. The results of this study have the potential to contribute to the existing body of knowledge related to social,

psychological, and familial factors that impact youth violence. This potential contribution

may further inform and empower the practices and procedures parents, teachers,

counselors, social workers, and other professionals use to combat youth violence.

Summary

Current research is needed to more deeply understand the relationship between

youth violence and IPV. This study analyzed and contrasted many factors that contribute

to varying forms of youth violence. This chapter included a summary of previous

research relevant to this study and explained the study's problem statement, purpose

statement, and research question. Chapter 1 also included an introduction and explanation

of the rationale for the theoretical background, a summary of the nature of the study, and

brief definitions of the main terms used in this dissertation study. Chapter 2 involves

previous research that has been conducted regarding key concepts of youth violence and

IPV.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Violence is a relevant problem in the United States that carries social and health consequences (Salas-Wright, et al., 2017). The purpose of this study is to use the systematic literature review to examine the relationship between IPV and youth violence (Boland, Cherry, & Dickson, 2014). This study involved locating, appraising, and synthesizing available peer-reviewed literature related to IPV and youth violence. The results of this study may potentially provide varying stakeholders with information that validates the importance of providing developing youth with nurturing family environments that are free from debilitating levels of IPV.

Children who grow up in homes with high conflict are at the greatest risk of engaging in violent behaviors (Choe & Zimmerman, 2014). A past study found that family environments with low levels of conflict and high levels of cohesion produce children who have decreased tendencies to engage in violent behaviors (Andreas & Watson, 2009). Another study also found that children between the ages of 12 and 14 who are exposed to high levels of marital conflict are more likely to engage in violent behaviors (Cui, Donnellan, & Conger, 2007). Sheidow, Smith, Tolan, and Henry (2001) found a relationship between dysfunctional interactions between family members and increased frequency of youth violence. These authors specifically suggested that familial conflict may have an effect on youth violence.

Previous systematic reviews have examined the various factors that impact youth violence and the impact of various forms of IPV on youth violence. For example, Garcia, Garcia, and Nunez (2015) conducted a systematic review of predictor variables of school bullying in adolescence. This systematic review, however, was broad and it reviewed multiple categories of factors (21 total factors) that impact specific engagement in school bullying. Jennings et al. (2017) conducted a systematic review of factors impacting intimate partner violence. This systematic review, however, researched factors that predict specific engagement in intimate partner violence and also covered a wider age range, which included young adults (age range 15-30 years). Margolin et al. (2009) conducted a longitudinal study and evaluated the impact of marital physical aggression on adolescent adjustment and behavior. This research broadly examined the connection between exposure to violence across multiple interpersonal domains. Such research placed an empirical focus on investigating the duration of exposure to violence, co-occurrence on various types of exposures to violence, and the association with co-occurring risks. This research eventually focused on the impact of exposure to violence on general adolescent behavioral issues.

To date, there are no systematic literature reviews that specifically examine the impact of IPV on the development of youth violence. Major sections in this chapter include an outline of the literature search strategy used in this study, (an explanation of social learning theory and EST, an overview of the youth violence phenomenon, a review of social factors that impact youth violence, a review of psychological and family factors

that impact youth violence, and an overview of the relationship between IPV and youth violence.

Literature Search Strategy

The information included in this study was accessed from Walden University's library database. Specifically, PsycINFO and Criminal Justice/ProQuest were used in this study. Initial searches were cross-checked with Thoreau, which contributed to a multidatabase search. The key search terms used were as follows: *intimate partner violence and youth violence*, *partner's verbal abuse and youth violence age*, *partner's verbal abuse and youth violence age specified*, *domestic violence and youth violence*, *partner's physical abuse and youth violence unspecified*, *partner's physical violence and youth violence*, *domestic violence and youth assault*, *partner's physical abuse and youth assault*, *partner's verbal abuse and youth assault*, *domestic violence and youth bullying*, *domestic violence and youth bullying*, *partner's physical abuse and youth bullying*, and *partner's verbal abuse and youth bullying*.

Theoretical Framework

Social Learning Theory

Bandura's EST serves as an explanatory framework for understanding how children learn behaviors. Children learn to engage in specific behaviors via the observations of others performing specific behaviors (Bandura, 1963). Specifically, children learn behaviors by modeling the people in their surroundings such as parents, siblings, extended family members, and peers. Bandura (1988) indicated that children

who are exposed to violence are more likely to engage in violent and aggressive behaviors. Children who are exposed to violence during their formative years are more likely to mimic and model the behaviors of the people in their immediate familial and social surroundings (Bandura, 1988). Bandura (1963) asserted that people are not born aggressive, but acquire aggressive behaviors, violent attitudes, and emotional response patterns through modeling. Bandura (1971) posited that via social learning, patterns of behavior are acquired through modeling and these behavioral expressions are regulated by the interplay of behaviors that are self-generated or generated via external influences.

Previous researchers have used social learning theory as a theoretical framework for testing hypotheses and explaining results of their studies. For example, Houston and Grych (2015) used social learning theory to understand whether mother-child attachment styles buffer the effects of violence on aggressive attitudes; Slovak, Carlson, and Helm (2007) used social learning theory to understand the connection between exposure to violence and resulting attitudes towards violence. Earlier studies considered the family to be the earliest and most consistent socializing dimension (Hetherington & Parke, 1993), and children who witness or observe family behaviors within the family unit often generalize to the society at large (Pillari & Newsome, 1998). Most recently, Slovak, Carlson, and Helm (2007) showed that violence witnessed at home significantly influenced attitudes toward violence and firearms. Seemingly, Sims, Dodd, and Tejada (2008) used social learning theory as a framework to explore the relationship between childhood witnessing of parental violence and the later development of dating violence

perpetration. These researchers found that males who witness severe parental violence are more likely to evolve into perpetrators of dating violence.

According to Bandura (1977), human thinking, feeling, and behaving can be emulated in vicarious ways through observation. It can therefore be assumed or hypothesized that if children are exposed to models of violence during their formative and teenage years, they are more likely to mimic and model the behaviors of people in their immediate environment. This study involves using the social learning theory to investigate the relationship between partners' verbal and physical abuse and youth violence. I consider that this theory is a sound theoretical perspective often used to explain the phenomenon of youth violence (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001).

Ecological Systems Theory

Bronfenbrenner's (1979) EST helps to understand the relationship between IPV, particularly partner's verbal or physical abuse, and youth violence. Human development is impacted by five different systems: microsystem, mesosystem, ecosystem, macrosystem, and chronosystem. These different dimensions of family and social systems work together to influence the trajectory of a person's overall human development. Specifically, EST posits that the style of interaction in which a child's microsystem functions (i.e., communication amongst members of the family system) serves as a significant factor impacting a child's future behavior patterns. Bronfenbrenner (1979) viewed the family system as a "setting," which he defined as "a place where people can readily engage in face to face interaction" (p. 22). He viewed the family

system (microsystem) as a platform for interacting in which "a pattern of activities, roles, and interpersonal relations" are experienced by the developing child.

Past literature has underscored the utility of the ecological systems theory when evaluating factors that impact youth development including youth violence (Bowen, Rose, Powers, & Glennie, 2008). The ecological model is considered an effective theoretical perspective when understanding and explaining the phenomenon of youth violence, and it has been used to create prevention models (Williams, Rivera, Neighbours, & Reznik, 2007). For example, Umemoto et al. (2009) described efforts in using the ecological systems model to create youth violence prevention programs highlighting the importance of considering various systems (e.g., individual, family, peer, school, and community) when identifying risks and protective factors.

The family system is the most impactful factor as it relates to childhood and adolescent development. The psychological impact of the family system on the developing youth, without question, has substantial effect on the psychological development and functioning of the evolving teen. This impact on thinking, feeling, and behaving has great capacity as it relates to determining the possibility of a youth engaging in violent behaviors. In a family system where abuse acts as a force that drives, guides, and shapes the social interactions within the family system, these abusive interactions will, in turn, have the potential to drive, guide, and shape the behavior of the developing youth (Dahlberg & Potter, 2001).

Literature Review

Defining Youth Violence

Bushman and Huesmann (2010) defined violence as an act of aggression designed to cause physical harm or death. Youth violence has been defined as acts of violence committed by individuals who are not fully mature (i.e., ages 10-24; Bushman & Huesmann, 2016). Youth violence generally involves harmful and assaultive behaviors perpetrated by young people. These acts of aggression can start during early childhood and continue into young adulthood. According to the CDC (2015a), children and adolescents are often victims, offenders, and witnesses of violent behavior.

Types of Youth Violence

The CDC (2015a) indicated that there are numerous forms or types of youth violence from varying degrees of violence. These varying types of violent behavior include bullying, slapping, hitting, peer-to-peer violence, date violence, and self-directed violence. Other forms of youth violence also include robbery and assault (with or without weapons) and can all too often lead to serious injury and/or death. Youth who report observing violence via the internet are also at an increased likelihood (5 times more) of reporting personal engagement in seriously violent behavior in comparison to youth who do not report observing violence via the internet. All of these forms of violent behavior can produce both emotional and physical harm to its victims.

Prevalence of Youth Violence in the United States

Disproportionate amounts of violent crimes are committed by individuals between the ages of 15 and 24. Furthermore, homicide is one of the leading causes of death among American youth. American youth are more likely to perpetrate or experience violence than youth from other developed nations (David-Ferdon & Simon, 2014). Youth violence is widely considered to be a significant public health problem in the United States. In 2013, Zimring published a review of the history of youth violence in America and found that until the 1980s violence amongst youth offenders showed a tendency for committing less serious assaults and a decreased tendency to engage in violent acts that resulted in homicide (Zimring, 2013). Specifically, youth offenders of violent acts accounted for only less than 10% of total homicides. This specific review also focused on serious youth violence since 1975 and the epidemic of gun-related homicides amongst juveniles.

As it relates to cause of death, homicide ranks as the second leading cause of death in males and females between the ages of 18 and 24 (Zimring, 2013). In 2011, 738,000 males and females were reported to have been treated in emergency rooms across the country as a result of assaultive related injuries. A statistically alarming percentage (30%) of high school students have engaged in physical altercations. As it relates to high school bullying, 20% of high school students have been victimized by bullies while on school premises (CDC, 2011). Furthermore, a study conducted in May of 2011 that investigated deaths caused by the use of firearms found that the homicide rate

is significantly higher for youth between the ages of 10 and 19 who reside in metropolitan cities (CDC, 2011).

The CDC, the Department of Education, and the Department of Justice have been working together to collect data on school-related violent deaths since July 1992. The purpose of this partnership is to determine the exact patterns of frequency and rate of deaths that are associated with school-related violence. A secondary purpose of this partnership is to identify potential risk factors contributing to these school-related deaths. Preliminary data from July of 2011 relating to the death of youths between the ages of 5 and 18 were published by the Department of Education. According to the 2009-2010 Indicators of School Crime and Safety Report, there were 33 school-related deaths reported to have occurred in elementary and secondary schools across America (homicide = 25; suicide = 5; legal interventions = 3; CDC, 2011).

In the year 2012, 4,787 young people between the ages of 10 and 24 years were victims of homicide in the United States (CDC, 2015b). The CDC (2015b) said homicide was the third leading cause of death for youth between the ages of 15 and 24. Sugimoto-Matsuda, Hishinuma, and Chang (2013) analyzed gender and ethnic differences in youth violence using national data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Systems collected during 1999, 2001, 2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009. Overall, the total sample size for this study was 88,532 males and females. The ethnic make-up of the sample pool of youth included Native Americans, Native Alaskans, African Americans, Hispanic/Latino, Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islanders,

Multiple/Mixed Hispanic, and Multiple/Mixed Non-Hispanic. All participants were between the 9th grade and 12th grade and their ages ranged from 14 through 19. The participants provided responses to nine questions pertaining directly to youth violence. Results showed that 43.9% responded to at least one indicator of violence (i.e., carried a weapon, felt unsafe/threatened, was in a fight, and/or had their property stolen or damaged). Overall, males reported higher rates of violence than females. African Americans, American/Indians, Alaska Natives, and Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islanders all reported higher rates of violence than Asians and Caucasians. The researchers in this study implied that further studies are needed to determine if the current trend of youth violence will continue in future years. The researchers also specifically implied that the phenomenon of youth violence will ultimately have a direct impact on school attendance, truancy, and dropout rate (Sugimoto-Matsuda et al. 2013).

Social Factors that Impact Youth Violence

Ferguson, San Miguel, and Hartley (2009) examined multiple risk factors that directly and/or indirectly impacted youth violence. These factors included having associations with delinquent peers, being exposed to domestic violence in the home, elevated familial conflict, high-stress neighborhood environments, levels of depression, antisocial personality traits, and observation of violence via television and video games. The participant pool in this study consisted of 603 individuals, was primarily made up of Hispanic boys and girls between the ages of 10 and 14, and also included parents and guardians of the youth participants.

The dependent variables in this study were youth violence and aggression (Ferguson et al., 2009). The independent variables in this study included factors such as family, peers, depression, and media violence. The researchers used a Likert scale to measure 7 different forms of aggression. These seven forms of aggression were measured via data collected from the following five 5 scales: The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI), the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), the Normed Fit Index (NFI), and the Negative Life Events (NLE). Multiple regression and structural equation modeling (SEM) were used to analyze the data collected from the previously mentioned instruments. Results of this study indicated that delinquent peer influences, traits that are anti-social in nature, elevated levels of depression, and parents or guardians who use psychological abuse in intimate relationships were all steady risk factors for youth aggression and violence. Quality of neighborhood, parental domestic violence in intimate relationships, and observation of violence via video games and television were not predictive variables of youth aggression and violence in this study (Ferguson et al., 2009). The researchers further reported that other psychological and social dynamics connected to the typical youth's family, school, peer, and community influences should be examined in future studies on youth violence (Ferguson et al., 2009).

Community violence. Patchin, Huebner, McCluskey, Varano, and Bynum (2006) examined the relationship between childhood delinquency and violence in the community. The goal of this research was to expand on previous research that examined the potential impact of experiences of community violence on the well-being of children.

This study also sought to uncover an empirical explanation for why some children reared in communities with comparable high-risk structuring and economic disadvantages have involved themselves in delinquent/antisocial behaviors, while other children from the same types of communities have abstained from delinquent/antisocial behaviors.

Data were gathered from youth who lived in disorganized neighborhoods (Patchin et al., 2006). The youth in this study ranged between the ages of 9 and 15. The independent variable was exposure to community violence, and the dependent variable was childhood delinquency. The dependent variable was measured by participants' self-reports of weapons possession and engagement in assaultive-like behaviors. Personal assault was measured through self-reports of having assaulted a peer or an adult within the past 12 months. Weapon possession was measured by self-reports of having brought a weapon to school over the course of the past 12 months. Results of this study indicated that exposure to community violence was inversely connected to parental supervision. These researchers also discovered, however, that parental supervision in and of itself was not directly connected to participation in delinquent and antisocial behaviors. Finally, the results of this study also uncovered that engagement in organized exercises and activities could minimize exposure to violence, if parents, teachers, or other responsible and capable adults could effectively intervene and instruct children who are actively engaging in delinquent behavior.

Patchin et al. (2006) recommended that a strategic approach to preventing youth delinquency should be developed in an effort to prevent the dysfunction, deviance, and

chaotic events that happen in their communities on a day-to-day basis. Such protections

and buffers can function via the vehicles of increased adult supervision; after school

activities specifically designed for youth; and more positive, nurturing, and affirming

mentoring from parents and other concerned adults connected to these children. Overall,

parents and teachers can and should take the initiative and proactively approach the issue

of youth violence by openly talking about community violence in both the schools and

home environment. Such open discussion amongst community members and

neighborhood officials may help the youth growing up in the neighborhoods cope with

the psychological stress and strain they experience as a result of their disorganized living

environments.

Violence victimization. A study about the onset of aggression, violence, and

victimization was done in an effort to understand how violent acts impacted adolescents

(Aceves & Cookston, 2007). Previous research suggests that victims of violence are

statistically more prone to also engage in violent behaviors (Lopez & Emmer, 2002;

Singer, 1986). Aceves and Cookston (2007) used data from the Add Health Public Data

Set, which consisted of data from 6,504 male and female participants between the ages of

11 and 21 years old. Data were collected at Wave 1 and Wave 2. The data for this study

were gathered from participants at two separate points between 1994 and 1996. The data

were gathered via student responses to questionnaires that were distributed by their

classroom teachers during 60-minute class periods. In addition, in-home interviews were

used to gather qualitative data, and interviewees eventually recorded the gathered

information onto laptop computers. This research study evaluated violent victimization, violent aggression, and the overall quality of the relationship between the parent and the adolescent. The relationship between the parent and the adolescent was measured via an evaluation of the parental qualities such as warmth, communication style, and personal positive perceptions of the relationship between the parent and the adolescent. Furthermore, the quality of parent-adolescent relations was measured using a Likert scale method, which required the participant to rate their perceptions on six items with 1 = "strongly disagree" and 5 = "strongly agree." The victimization score was calculated by reviewing how many different forms of victimization experiences had happened over the course of the past 12 months, including three separate items that evaluated how often the individual was severely hurt as a result of an altercation, stabbing, or shooting.

The results of this study indicated that the relationship between violent aggression and violent victimization was even more multifaceted than previous studies have indicated and suggested. These researchers found that violence victimization was a predictor of future aggression and violence. The study also found that the experiencing of violence has a more influential impact on youth who had no history of engaging in violence and aggression. It was also determined that the quality of relationship between the parent and the adolescent male mediated the connection between violent victimization at Wave 1 and violent aggression at Wave 2. Overall, the researchers concluded that adolescents who were at an increased risk of manifesting in violent and aggressive behaviors were oftentimes young males who were previously victims of violence and

aggression. These young males were also found to be more likely to lack quality parent-adolescent relationships. This study also suggested that female adolescents who are victims of violence may benefit greatly from the buffering nature of quality interactions between a parent and the adolescent. The researchers in this study recommended that future research should intentionally examine the different ways in which the factors examined in this study impact male adolescents in contrast to female adolescents (Aceves & Cookston, 2007).

Gang violence. Gang violence and its impact on youth violence have been a growing public concern in the United States (Kelly, Anderson, Hall, Peden, & Cere, 2012). Kelly et al. (2012) explored the impact of exposure to gang violence on the mental health of adolescent boys. This research used a mixed-methods design to research the potential connection between these two variables. The participants in this study were recruited from three community centers located in large metropolitan areas. The male participants in this study were between the ages of 11 and 17. They were between the 6th and 12th grades. This study found that adolescents in this study encountered various forms of violence in their neighborhoods. The participants were exposed to community violence in the form of physical assaults via group beatings, knives, and guns. These forms of physical assault commonly ended in injury. These participants also reported observing gang members destroy neighborhood property. The findings further suggest that exposure to gang violence can affect the mental health of the adolescents exposed to such violence.

Recommendations in this study included intentional efforts of healthcare providers to educate adolescents on the effects of exposure to gangs and gang violence. Such information and psychoeducation can empower the thousands of youth who, for no fault of their own, are unable to escape or avoid exposure to gang violence. Furthermore, the researchers in this study strongly recommend that specific interventions be contextualized around the social and psychological experiences of youth who are routinely exposed to gang violence.

Psychological Factors that Impact Youth Violence

Mental health problems have been associated with youth perpetrators of violence. Benedict, Viver, and Gjelsvik (2014) examined the relationship between battling mental health issues and engaging in bully-related behaviors. This study used data from the 2007 National Survey of Children's Health in which over 90,000 random interviews were conducted in households with children ages birth to 17 years. Within this sample, 15.2% of U.S. children were identified as bullies. Results of this study indicated a relationship between being a bully and mental health issues. Children with a previous diagnosis of depression, anxiety, or attention deficit disorder were three times as likely of being identified as a bully. Implications and recommendations of this study included the importance of making psychological support available to both the bullying victims as well as the perpetrators of bullying. Another relevant recommendation was to gain a better understanding of the broader issue of youth violence.

Family Factors that Impact Youth Violence

This section reviews various family factors related to youth violence, including financial stress, parents' abusive discipline, child maltreatment, verbal aggression, and maternal attachment.

Financial strain. Paat (2011) conducted a study that had the primary goal of examining and exploring the influence of interparental discord on children's antisocial behaviors in families facing financial hardship (i.e., financial troubles caused by large household size and poverty). Family strain has been proposed to be significantly connected to level of family functioning. The participant pool in this study consisted of 1,222 pairs of parents (i.e., mothers and fathers). The original data were taken from the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study. This study followed 5,000 individual children who were born in 75 different hospitals across the United States since 1998 (Reichman, Teitler, Garfinkel, & McLanahan, 2001).

Results of this study indicated that financial strain can produce family hardship in families by increasing conflict between parents. The results also showed that financial strain works through interpersonal conflicts to negatively impact a child's behavior. Children who experienced interparental conflict have higher chances of showing antisocial behaviors. These findings are consistent with previous research that has reported a relationship between child exposure to inter-parental discord and increased risk for engaging in antisocial behaviors (Gulati & Dutta, 2008). The researchers suggested that future studies on this issue should be conducted to determine if there are

gender-related differences between a father's and a mother's perception of financial strain.

Child maltreatment and lack of parental warmth. A quantitative study was conducted to examine the relationship between child maltreatment and lack of parental warmth with dating violence perpetration among homeless young adults (Tyler & Melander, 2012). This research study was founded on the social learning approach. Data were collected among 172 homeless males and females ages 19 through 25. Forty percent of the respondents in this study were female and nearly 80% of the respondents were Caucasian. Several other racial groups made up the remaining racial make-up of this participant pool: African American (8.7%), Hispanic (3.5 %), American Indian (1.7%), Asian (1.2%), and Biracial (5.2%). Over 47% of the respondents reported having experienced at least one form of sexual abuse, 95% had been physically abused on at least one occasion in their lifetime, and 78% had experienced some kind of neglect. The dating violence scale uncovered that 59% of those individuals experienced and perpetrated dating violence. Furthermore, the results from this study partially supported the antisocial orientation perspective. This study asserted that youth who are parented by parents who engage in child maltreatment and low parental warmth may be placed at an increased likelihood for dating violence. According to the results of the study, negative family experiences are connected to behaviors that are considered to be antisocial (e.g., substance use and delinquency). These behaviors were in turn linked to violent behaviors. Furthermore, this study found that homeless youth were prone to engage in negative

behaviors, because many were unsupervised for long periods of a time as these youth often spent their days hanging out in the streets (Tyler & Melander, 2012).

The implications of these findings suggested that a generational pattern of antisocial behaviors is transmitted from the parent to their child. In addition, youth who do not receive adequate nurturing from their parents often engage in behaviors that are considered to be antisocial in nature. These behaviors serve as reinforcers to their deviant behaviors (Tyler & Melander, 2012). The findings suggested that a neglected child continues to be negatively impacted by neglect long after they have left home. The researchers in this study strongly stressed that early and immediate intervention with this population is essential, as early life mistreatment will continue to impact these psychologically vulnerable children and ultimately their continual abusive interactions with violent partners may result in long-term psychological distress and substance misuse. Other recommendations from the researchers in this study included the strategic use of interventions that detour youth from engaging in continual violent relationship patterns.

Maternal verbal aggression. Moore and Pepler (2006) conducted a quantitative study that investigated the impact of maternal verbal aggression and child adjustment. Its focus or goal was to compare the use of verbal aggression tactics among mothers from violent and nonviolent families. Data were collected from 200 children 6-12 years old and their mothers. Half of the children had mothers who were living in shelters, while the rest had mothers who were residing with intimate partners in non-violent relationships.

Maternal verbal aggression was defined as insulting or swearing, sulking or refusing to talk, stomping out of the room or house, doing or saying something to spite the other, threatening to hit or to throw something at the other, or throwing, smashing, hitting, or kicking something. Individual interviews were conducted separately with mothers and children. Verbal aggression and physical violence between family members were measured as well as children's different forms and degrees of behavior problems. Analysis uncovered that children who were raised in households with a history of violence were more likely to have adjustment issues. Overall, the results of this study suggested that maternal insults play a detrimental role especially when combined with family violence. Children who were raised in violent households, and whose mothers regularly used insults, were three times at a higher risk of having severe clinical issues in comparison to households where the mother did not routinely use insults. The result of this research indicated that a mother's remarks and style of communication may be more influential than that of the father. This further indicates that a mother's negative comments can have severely adverse psychological consequences, including self-blame and emotional insecurity (Moore & Pepler, 2006).

Maternal attachment. A study was undertaken to determine the degree to which maternal attachment buffered aggressive attitudes and behaviors in youth. The goal of this study was to determine if maternal attachment served as a protective factor against youth violence and aggressive behavior (Houston & Grych, 2015). The sample in this study consisted of 148 children ages 9 to 14. The participants in this study completed

measures of the quality of the relationship between parents, the quality of relationship between the parent and the child, and community aggression. Participants also completed measures that examined the quality of attachment between mothers and aggressive behaviors. Using written vignettes, participants also self-rated the personal perceptions on the appropriateness and acceptability of aggressive interactions between a pair of peers and a pair of siblings. Additionally, mothers completed a measure of their children's aggressive behaviors.

Results of this study indicated that inadequate levels of secure attachment and exposure to community violence were connected to an increased likelihood of violence acceptance in youth. This indicated that children exposed to community violence were less likely to engage in youth violence if they had a secure attachment to their maternal figure. These children also displayed fewer aggressive behaviors. Further implications of this study included the critical relevance of pinpointing factors that buffer the debilitating impact of risk factors on youth violence and development (Fergus, Zimmerman, & Caldwell, 2005; Howard, Budge, & McKay, 2010). The Houston and Grych study (2015) reinforced the pivotal function of the mother-child relationship as a buffering element that has the capacity to reduce aggressive beliefs and attitudes in youth. It is believed that strengthening the parent-child relationship can be an effective means of changing aggressive attitudes. Finally, due to the harsh reality that some children are not privileged to have a warm, patient, and accepting caregiver, it may be highly beneficial for children to be provided with opportunities to form supportive relationships with other

important adult figures in their lives (i.e., teachers, coaches, neighbors). Such relationships can effectively function to decrease the potential for the development of aggressive attitudes in youth who lack a warm and nurturing parent and yet are exposed to violence (Houston & Grych, 2015).

IPV and Youth Violence

This final section of the literature review involves the relationship between IPV and youth violence. This section includes a description of consequences that this abuse has on victims and minors, and how the abuse is linked to youth violence. Victims of physical and/or psychological abuse experience high rates of physical injury and poor overall health (Lawrence, Orengo-Aguayo, Langer, & Brock, 2012). Furthermore, victims of partners' physical abuse have both lower physical functioning and poorer psychological functioning in comparison to those who do not experience this type of abuse. Women are more likely to be victims of partners' physical abuse than men. Consequences for female victims of partners' physical abuse were also found to be significantly worse for victims who report lower income or unemployment and are ethnic minorities (Lawrence et al., 2012).

Renner, Reese, Peek-Asa, and Ramirez (2015) conducted a study that included 1,034 participants (517 heterosexual partners from rural areas) to evaluate the reporting patterns of physical and verbal abuse between couples/partners. Both members of each couple reported aggressive acts between the partners. Results of the study indicated that more females reported being perpetrators of verbal abuse than their male partners

reported being a victim of verbal abuse. In contrast, male participants reported being a victim of physical abuse more than their female partners reported engaging in physical abuse. Furthermore, female partners reported being the victim of both verbal and physical abuse at higher levels than their male partners reported being the victim or perpetrator of physical abuse.

Different studies have explored the relationship between partner's abuse and the development of different types of youth violence. Moretti, Obsuth, Odgers, and Reebye (2006) conducted a study to understand the association between adolescents' exposure to maternal vs. paternal physical interparental violence and adolescents' aggressive reactions toward mothers, fathers, friends, and romantic partners. The study also explored the influence of post-traumatic stress disorder on the connection between being exposed to interparental violence and aggressive behavior. The sample in this study consisted of 112 youths ($N = 63$ girls and $N = 29$ boys) between the ages of 13 and 18 (mean = 15.4). The results of this study indicated that both boys and girls who are exposed to interparental violence are at an increased risk for engaging in aggressive acts. Adolescents who were exposed to interparental violence were also found to have more social and academic problems in comparison to adolescents who were not exposed to interparental violence. This study found that one third of the participants in this study met the diagnostic criteria for PTSD and the relationship between exposure to interparental violence and showing aggression was significantly strong in participants who met the

diagnostic criteria for PTSD. The researchers in this study provide various approaches for

helping families effectively break intergenerational patterns of violence and aggression.

Kim, Jackson, Hunter, and Conrad (2009) examined the relationship between

interparental conflict (IPC) and adolescent dating behavior. They specifically

hypothesized that self-blame and threat appraisals could mediate the association between

IPC and adolescents' conflictive dating behaviors. The participants in this study included

169 male and female high school students. Their grade levels ranged from 9th through

12th grade, and their ages ranged from 14 to 19 (mean age = 16.02). The pool of students

consisted of various races (African American, Hispanic, Asian, European American,

Biracial, and Multiracial). Of the 169 students in this study, all reported being exposed to

IPC, and 91 of these students reported that they had already begun dating. Results of this

study indicated that children exposed to IPC are at risk for experiencing conflicts within

their own relationships. Results indicated that self-blame partially mediated the

relationship between IPC and sexual aggression as well as the relationship between IPC

and adolescent threatening behaviors. The researchers in this study implied that

adolescents may be taught or coached on how to observe their parents' relational

behaviors and use it as a framework for knowing what not to do in relationships (i.e.,

better handle their own relational conflicts).

Voisin and Hong (2012) conducted a thorough review and critique of the literature

exploring the relationship between youth witnessing IPV and their subsequent

engagement in bullying and peer victimization. They conducted a sweeping search of 8

different databases over the course of a 12-year period (1999-2011). All of the studies included in this research were quantitative and involved multivariate analysis. The findings of the body of studies provided evidence that youth who witness IPV are at an increased risk for engaging in bullying behaviors and peer victimization. Youth who witness IPV were also found to have lower levels of academic achievement and higher levels of social issues. Youth who witness IPV were also found to have difficulty with peer interactions. Finally, youth who witnessed IPV were also at an increased risk for having mental, emotional, and behavioral challenges (i.e., depression, anxiety, aggression, and PTSD). The researchers in this study concluded that factors such as age, gender, ethnicity, parenting practice, and parent-child relationship all contribute to the strength of the relationship between IPV exposure, and bullying and peer victimization.

Jouriles, Mueller, Rosenfield, McDonald, and Dodson (2012) explored IPV and teen dating violence. Specifically, this study explored if youth exposure to severe IPV and harsh parenting practices each contributed to the prediction of dating violence perpetration, and to what extent youth trauma symptoms mediated these associations. There were a total of 88 participants in this study. Their ages ranged from 14-17 (mean age = 15.9). The participants in this study were recruited from juvenile justice centers. The racial make-up of the pool of participants included African American, Caucasian, Hispanic, Asian, and Native American. All study participants had to report being in a current relationship. At the beginning of the study, the mothers of the youth participants

reported IPV in their past or current relationships, and youth reported on their experiences of harsh parenting and trauma symptoms.

After three months, teens were interviewed on their dating violence perpetration. The results of this study indicated that adolescents who are exposed to severe IPV and recent harsh parenting are significantly more likely to engage in dating violence perpetration. In addition, results indicate that harsh parenting is linked to anger-related trauma symptoms, while trauma symptoms contribute to the relationship between harsh parenting and dating violence perpetration. However, trauma symptoms did not mediate the relationship between teens' exposure to severe IPV and teen dating violence perpetration. Ultimately the researchers in this study concluded teen exposure to severe IPV and harsh parenting are both predictors of youth violence. The study also discovered that prior IPV exposure can have a debilitating impact on youth development and, therefore, clinical workers should work diligently to minimize or eliminate this negative impact when working with youth who have been exposed to severe IPV. In sum, these studies reveal that IPV not only has devastating effects for the victim, but spreads its consequences to children at home. One of the strengths of these studies is the strong relationship that has been demonstrated between IPV and physical and psychological consequences for victims. One of the weaknesses of these studies is that they mainly focused on female victims (Lawrence, Orengo-Aguayo, Langer, & Brock, 2012). While the majority of IPV victims are women, less attention was given to male victims.

Another challenge in these groups of studies is the different terminology used in describing IPV (Ali, Dhingra, & McGarry, 2016). Within the definition of IPV commonly used, which refers to violence perpetrated by one member of the couple to the other member (O'Leary, Foran, & Cohen, 2013), a broader range of typologies of IPV based on form of abuse, type of perpetrator (male or female), or type of violence emerges. Studies reviewed in this chapter used different terminology to refer to IPV; for example, Kim, Jackson, Hunter, and Conrad (2009) referred to interparental conflict (IPC), and Moretti, Obsuth, Odgers, and Reebye (2006) referred to interparental violence. Ali, Dhingra, and McGarry (2016) reviewed different IPV typologies revealing that reported research on IPV does not refer to the same equal concept across studies. A further exploration on the impact of IPV based on different typology of IPV is needed (Renner & Boel-Studt, 2017).

Summary and Transition

This literature review included information and evidence regarding how several social, community, and family factors negatively impact youth and may lead to the development of youth violence. As demonstrated in this literature review, parental verbal and physical abuse has been linked to the development of different types of youth violence. However, there is not a current systematic literature review that specifically examines the impact of IPV on the development of youth violence. This systematic literature review allows researchers and practitioners to access one body of recent literature devoted to understanding the relationship between youth violence and familial

conflict. Chapter 3 includes the methodology used and outlines and summarizes the

contents of various articles included in this systematic review.

Chapter 3: Research Method

Introduction

The focus of this systematic literature review is the relationship between IPV and youth violence. This relationship has been investigated and there are indications that IPV experienced during childhood years increases the chances of engaging in violent behaviors later in life (Andreas & Watson, 2009; Choe & Zimmerman, 2014; Jennings, Richards, Tomsich, & Gover, 2015; Millett, Kohl, Jonson-Reid, Drake, & Petra, 2013). The purpose of this study was to perform a systematic and up-to-date review of the scientific empirical research published between 2008 and 2018 that involved the relationship between IPV and youth violence. This chapter includes a description of the systematic literature review methodology that was used to understand the relationship between IPV and youth violence. It includes a description of databases used for identifying articles, the inclusion/exclusion criteria for selecting articles, procedures for selecting and evaluating articles, and articles selected for the review.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to use the systematic literature review process to examine the relationship between IPV and youth violence. This study involved locating, appraising, and synthesizing the best available evidence-based literature related to IPV and youth violence. The results of this study may potentially provide varying stakeholders with information that validates the importance of providing developing youth with nurturing family environments that are free from IPV.

Research Design and Rationale

The main research question for this study is: What has been discovered through research about the relationship between IPV and youth violence?

Central Concepts

Two main concepts were explored in this study: IPV and youth violence. is created when there is partner violence and children get involved in these family dynamics. Partner violence occurs when one member of a couple acts in a way that hurts the other member without explicit consent (Winstok, 2016). Youth violence involves a spectrum of hurting behaviors inflicted by persons between the ages of 10 and 24 that can result in psychological harm, injury, or death. Youth violent behaviors can include bullying, aggravated assault, harassment, intimidation, sexual assault, stalking, burglary, robbery, and theft (Ferguson et al., 2009).

Methodology

I used a systematic literature review design to examine the relationship between IPV and youth violence. A systematic review is a literature review that is designed to locate, appraise, and synthesize the best available evidence relating to a specific research question to provide information and evidence-based answers. This information can be combined with professional judgment to make decisions about how to deliver interventions or make changes to policy (Boland, Cherry, & Dickson, 2014).

Search Criteria

I conducted a comprehensive article search in two specific scientific databases:

PsycINFO and Criminal Justice/ProQuest. I verified and expanded the searches with

Thoreau, which is a multi-database search engine. Furthermore, I specifically searched

for peer-reviewed articles published in English between January 2008 and December

2018. The key concepts being investigated in this study are youth violence, and IPV—

intimate partner violence, partner's verbal and/or physical abuse. The first broad search

involved the keywords *intimate partner violence, partner's verbal abuse*, *partner's*

physical abuse, and *youth violence*. There were no other restrictions to this search.

Results of this initial search are outlined in Table 1. Keywords related to family conflict

included *intimate partner violence, partner's verbal abuse*, *domestic violence*, *partner's*

verbal abuse, and *partner's physical violence.* Specific keywords related to youth

violence included *youth violence*, *youth assault*, and *youth bullying*.

Procedures for Including and Excluding Articles

      After conducting all searches, duplicate articles were removed. Only empirical

studies examining relationships between IPV, partners' verbal abuse/ physical abuse, and

youth violence were included. To determine which articles met the criteria for this

review, I read the title, abstract, and methods section of each retrieved article. Theoretical

articles, literature reviews, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, revisions, books,

dissertations, and similar writings were also excluded.

Table 1

Articles Searched and Identified to Be Included in the Systematic Review

Database	Search term A	Search term B	Parameters	Results from A and B	Included/Excluded articles
PsycINFO	Intimate Partner Violence	Youth Violence (*n*=117)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total:117	Included: 1 Excluded: 116
ProQuest	Partner's Verbal Abuse	Youth Violence Age (ages 10-29) (*n*=132)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 132	Included: 2 Excluded: 130
PsycINFO	Domestic Violence	Youth Violence (ages unspecified) (*n*=27)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 27	Included: 1 Excluded: 26
ProQuest	Partner's Physical Abuse	Youth Violence (ages unspecified) (*n*=2)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 2	Included: 1 Excluded: 1
PsycINFO	Partner's Physical Violence	Youth Violence (ages unspecified) (*n*=52)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 52	Included: 2 Excluded: 50
ProQuest	Domestic Violence	Youth Assault (*n*=15)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 15	Included: 2 Excluded: 13
ProQuest	Partner's Physical Abuse	Youth Assault (*n*=81)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 81	Included: 2 Excluded: 79
PsycINFO	Partner's Verbal Abuse	Youth Assault (*n*=44)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 44	Included: 2 Excluded: 42 *(table continues)*

Database	Search term A	Search term B	Parameters	Results from A and B	Included/Excluded articles
ProQuest	Domestic Violence	Youth Bullying (*n*=2)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 2	Included: 1 Excluded: 1
ProQuest	Domestic Violence	Youth Bullying (*n*=50)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 50	Included: 3 Excluded: 47
ProQuest	Partner's Physical Abuse	Youth Bullying (*n*=5)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 5	Included: 1 Excluded: 4
ProQuest	Partner's Verbal Abuse	Youth Bullying (*n*=38)	English 2008-2018 Journal Articles	Total: 38	Included: 1 Excluded: 37
					Total articles: 565 Excluded articles: 546 Total usable articles after refinement: 19

Categorization

      Once the final number of studies was identified, selected papers were read entirely. Subsequently, the papers were categorized and reviewed according to author(s), year of publication, country where the study was conducted, method of inquiry, type of family violence exposure, type of violence manifested in youth, sample characteristics, and main findings, as shown in Table 2. By developing this table, reviewing the papers, and identifying relevant data, further refining and selection of articles occurred. Some articles that were previously identified as articles that met the criteria were excluded due to not specifically addressing the research question. The articles included in Table 2 represent the final sample included in the review.

Table 2
Summary of Selected Studies

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Fergusson, Boden, & Horwood, 2008	Quantitative	Exposure to abuse in childhood, family dysfunction and adversity.	High levels of IPV perpetration were associated with aggressive behavior early in life (ages 7-13), as well as conduct problems and conduct disorder in adolescents ages 15-18. Witnessing IPV may lead to a higher risk of IPV later in life.	N=828 A birth cohort of 391 men and 437 women all aged 25. All reported being in a close or intimate relation in the past 12 months. Adulthood. (New Zealand)	Participants who report IPV victimization and/or perpetration during childhood are more likely to report IPV victimization and/or perpetration during adulthood. The antecedents of IPV were the same for both male and females. The effects of these antecedents did vary by gender. Conduct disorder increased chances of IPV in females while childhood abuse predicted IPV for males.
Ferguson, San Miguel, & Hartley, 2009	Quantitative	Delinquent peer aggression, domestic violence, family conflict, neighborhood stress, antisocial personality traits, depression level and exposure to television and video game violence.	Violence and nonviolent criminal activity, bullying behavior, aggression and rule-breaking behavior	N=603 This was a multivariate study of Hispanic youths ages 10-14. The mean age was 12.35. Study measured factors of youth violence (i.e., delinquent peer aggression, domestic violence, neighborhood stress, antisocial personality traits, depression level, and television and video game exposure). (United States)	Results indicated that delinquent peer influences, antisocial personality traits, depression, and parents/guardians who use psychological abuse in intimate relationships constituted risk factors for youth violence and aggression. *(table continues)*

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Gage, 2016	Quantitative	Students exposed to spousal violence.	Personal and peer attitudes with dating violence.	N=342, high school students grades 10-12. (Haiti)	Findings showed that personal acceptance of DV mediated the association between exposure to wife perpetrated and husband perpetrated spousal violence, and DV perpetration for girls. Boys who were exposed to husband-perpetrated spousal violence had significantly higher levels of psychological DV perpetration than those who were not exposed.
Graham-Bermann & Perkins, 2010	Quantitative	Exposure to domestic violence in family system.	Adjustment problems and externalizing behavioral problems.	N=190 children between the ages of 6-12 years. (United States)	Accumulated violence exposure points to greater variance in adjustment and externalizing behavioral problems. The results indicated that cumulative exposure to IPV outweighed the age of first exposure in the effects of child adjustment.

(table continues)

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Haj-Yahia & Abdo-Kaoloti, 2008	Quantitative	Exposure of father to mother psychological and physical violence.	Children and adolescents who witness domestic violence are at a higher risk for delinquent behavior, and aggressive behavior. Additionally, they are also at higher risk for somatization, anxiety and depression, social problems, and thought problems.	N=1,185 Sample consisted of Palestinian males and females. Ages ranged from 14-20. The sample was drawn from 13 secondary schools from the West Bank of East Jerusalem. Grades ranged from 10-12. Participants were recruited from urban and rural areas, and refugee camps. (Israel)	Results indicated that there were significant amounts of variance in withdrawal, somatic complaints, anxiety, depression, social problems, thought problems, attention issues, delinquent behavior, and aggressive behavior among Palestinian adolescents exposed to domestic violence.

(table continues)

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Ireland & Smith, 2009	Quantitative	Exposure to partner-violent homes during adolescence.	Antisocial behavior and relationship violence.	*N*=1,000 African American, Hispanics, and White urban youths male and female. Longitudinal study in which youth were assessed from age 14 through adulthood. (United States)	Exposure to parental violence is related to early adulthood violent crimes and intimate partner violence.
Jouriles, Mueller, Rosenfield, McDonald, & Dodson, 2012	Quantitative	Exposure to harsh parenting and IPV.	Increased dating violence perpetration.	Sample consisted of *N*=88 adolescents (45 females and 43 males). Ages ranged from 14-17 years old. Participants were of African American, White, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, and Native American descent. Participants were recruited from truancy courts, juvenile probation, and victim services offices. (United States)	It was discovered that adolescents who have past exposure to harsh parenting and IPV were at an increased risk of engaging in teen dating violence.

(table continues)

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Jouriles, Vu, McDonald, & Rosenfield, 2014	Quantitative	Children living in households were severe intimate IPV has occur.	Examined for the early onset of conduct problems as well as investigate whether or not exposure to severe IPV predicted children's externalizing problems.	*N*=106 families were selected for this study. There were 62 boys and 44 girls ages 7 through 10 included in this study. Participants were recruited during their stay at a domestic violence shelter. This study measured threat, self-blame, and justifiability of aggression. (United States)	Beliefs about justifiability of aggression were positively associated with children's reports of externalizing behaviors. Self-blame was positively associated with mother's reports of externalizing behaviors.
Knous-Westfall, Ehrensaft, MacDonell, & Cohen, 2012	Quantitative	Intimate partner violence.	Relational bullying and victimization behavior.	The study measured samples in their communities *N*=396 parents, their children their offspring of *N*=129 for over 25 years and 7 separate assessments. A mean age of 12.8. Range 12-18. (United States)	Parental reports of any IPV resulted in an increased likelihood of offspring engaging in overt peer victimization. Severe IPV reports resulted in the increased likelihood of offspring engaging in relational peer bullying and overt peer victimization. Female offspring that reported any level of IPV demonstrated higher engagement in peer victimization. In contrast, male offspring who reported severe IPV had a higher likelihood of engaging in overt peer bullying.

(table continues)

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Latzman, Vivolo, Holditch, & Ghazarian, 2015	Quantitative	Adult IPV	Exposure to IPV results in increased perpetration of adolescent dating violence (ADV).	The study used data collected from 19 different middle schools. *N=417* subjects participated in this study. Participants lived in economically disadvantaged communities with above average crime rates. (United States)	The results revealed that exposure was related to relational abuse. Adolescents who reported that their parents had less knowledge of their dating partners were more likely to report perpetration of physical, verbal, and emotional abuse.

(table continues)

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Lee, Walters, Hall, & Basile, 2013	Quantitative	Exposure to childhood family violence/IPV	Engagement in antisocial behaviors such as anger, controlling behaviors, violent behaviors, substance abuse, and negative attitudes toward women.	The sample was *N*=340 men who were charged with assault against a female partner. The men were recruited from a corrections probation department in a metropolitan area of Texas. (United States)	Perpetrators of family violence are more likely to endorse ideas that place women and feminine figures in a negative light. Exposure to family violence may also be indicative of severe attitudinal and behavior problems.

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Liu, Mumford, & Taylor (2018)	Quantitative	Exposure to intimate verbal and physical violence	Dating abuse experiences and behaviors	Participants were 610 parents (42% male and 67% white) and their dating adolescent children (ages 12-21). The study had three waves of measurements. A grand total of 2354 parent-child dyads completed the original survey. These surveys were collected between October 2013 and January 2014. 62% completed the wave 2 survey one year after, and 66.0% completed the wave 3 survey 2 years after the original survey. The final sample that completed the three waves was 610.	Findings indicate there is a relationship between what children witnessed during their childhood and what they experienced later in their own relationships. Children of parents who experienced verbal abuse were more likely to experience a similar pattern in their own relationships; and children who witnessed physical and verbal abuse experienced psychological, physical and sexual abusive encounters in their relationships. In sum, findings indicate that parents' relationship quality and abusive behaviors has a long-lasting effect on their children.

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Narayan, Englund, & Egeland, 2013	Quantitative	Interparental violence.	Early and middle childhood and externalizing behavior in middle childhood and adolescence as developmental predictors of dating violence. Perpetration and victimization at age 23 and 26 years.	*N*=168 participants. A longitudinal study of risk and adaptation. It started with high risk mothers ages 12-34 years. The sample had a mean age of 20.5 years. (United States)	Developmental perspective that negative early experience and children with externalizing behavior are powerful influences for dating violence in early adulthood.
Narayan, Labella, Englund, Carlson, & Egeland, 2017	Quantitative	Interparental violence.	Dating violence at age 23.	*N*=179 participants. A subset sample of the Minnesota Longitudinal Study of Risk and Adaptation (MLSRA). (United States)	Results indicated that interparental violence experienced in toddlerhood/preschool but not in infancy predicted both IPV perpetration and victimization at age 23.
Okour & Hijazi, 2009	Quantitative	Family dysfunction and domestic violence.	Violent behaviors	*N*=1,560 college students from 3 universities male and female students from different department and academic years over a period of 3 years. (Jordan)	Participation of students in quarrels was significantly affected by witnessing and exposure to domestic violence

)

(table continues

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Park, Smith, & Ireland, 2012	Quantitative	Child maltreatment and exposure to intimate partner violence.	Effects on young adult violence, criminality, and adult relationship violence.	This survey utilized data accumulated from the Rochester Youth Development Study (RYDS). The data consisted of longitudinal data from *N*=1,000 diverse urban youth followed from age 14 to adulthood. (United States)	The results indicated that children who are exposed to maltreatment are more likely to engage in antisocial adult behaviors than children exposed to IPV. Results also indicate that exposure to maltreatment and IPV is more predictive of adult antisocial behaviors than either one in isolation.
Renner & Boel-Studt, 2017	Quantitative	Exposure to IPV, exposure to the physical abuse of a sibling and child physical abuse	Externalizing behaviors including temper tantrums, fidgets, argues with others, disturbs ongoing activities, is aggressive toward people/objects, and disobeys rules among others.	A sample of 2,402 children and adolescents (data from the Illinois Families Study and administrative Child Protective Services data) (United States)	Results indicated that a unique form of family violence victimization was associated with increased externalizing behaviors among children at each age group: exposure to IPV among children ages 3–5, exposure to the physical abuse of a sibling among children ages 6–12, and child physical abuse among adolescents ages 13–18.

(table continues)

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Smith, Ireland Park, Elwyn, & Thornberry, 2011	Quantitative	Children and adolescents exposed to caregiver and intimate partner violence and whether or not there is a causative difference in gender.	Increased involvement in IPV during early adulthood (21-23) and adulthood (29-31).	This study analyzed data from the Rochester Youth Development Study (RYDS). $N=1,000$ urban youth ages 14 to adulthood. 73% of the participants in this study were men, and 85% were Hispanic or African American. The longitudinal study consisted of three phases (phase 1, ages 14-18; phase 2, ages 21-23; phase 3, ages 29-31). The adolescents were all in grades 7 or 8 and were 68% African American, 17% Hispanic, and 15% White American. (United States)	Findings suggest that exposure to severe caregiver IPV leads to an increased likelihood of an individual engaging in relationship violence in early adulthood (ages 21-23). The study also uncovered that exposure to IPV has an indirect influence on later adult development (ages 29-31). This relationship is mediated by involvement in a violent relationship in early adulthood. The researchers in this study indicate that the results were "largely invariant" by gender but also stated that a direct link between IPV exposure and adult IPV for women was discovered.

(table continues)

Reference	Study design	Type of family violence exposure	Type of violence manifested in youth	Sample characteristics	Results
Sousa, Herrenkohl, Moylan, Tajima, Klika, Herrenkohl, & Russo, 2011	Quantitative	Combined impact of child abuse and exposure to domestic violence on attachment to parents and antisocial behavior during adolescence. Child abuse and children exposure to domestic violence, also, exposure to low attachment.	Level of parental attachment and antisocial behavior during adolescence.	This longitudinal study began in 1976. The families participating in this study were recruited from various programs in counties including urban, rural, and suburban counties. There were N=457 participants originally in this study. The children's ages ranged from 18 months to 4 years. The mothers participating in this study had an average age of 28. A second assessment was conducted on the original study participants at age 8, and a third assessment was conducted by age 18. Over the course of time, the number of study participants decreased to N=297. (United States)	Results uncovered that children exposed to both child abuse and domestic violence were less attached to their parental figures during adolescence. For children who were exposed to only child abuse or domestic violence (not both), there appeared to be no significant difference in level of parental attachment. The study further found that level of parental attachment did decrease the likelihood of children engaging in antisocial behaviors independent of exposure status.

Data Analysis: Narrative Synthesis

The articles described in Table 2 comprised the data that were analyzed

into a narrative synthesis (Boland, Cherry, & Dickson, 2014; Petticrew & Roberts,

2006) and are reported in the following chapter. The first task in generating this

synthesis included generating a more thorough report of these studies, including a

description of the most important features, the population, the methodology used

and methodological problems that might have affected the results (if

presented/described), and results. Thus, I examined the studies in a descriptive

way to understand similarities and differences in the data (Gough, Oliver, &

Thomas, 2012). Potential discrepancies that arose in comparing results were

analyzed and concurrent information was grouped. After a description of the data

was achieved, a process of identifying patterns began. Identifying the patterns and

establishing relationships among the studies led me to respond to the research

question and to understand to what extent these patterns respond to the research

question.

<div align="center">

Summary

</div>

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between IPV and youth

violence. This systematic literature review focused on youth who were raised in or

exposed to intimate partner violence, partner's physical and/or verbal abuse. The research

question investigated in this study was: What has been discovered through research about

the relationship between IPV and youth violence? My primary role in this study was to

gather peer-reviewed articles, analyze previously established research, and integrate into one study the results of the gathered data. The primary source of data collection for this study included only peer-reviewed articles published between 2008 and 2018. Results of this systematic literature review are reported in Chapter 4.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study was to use the systematic literature review process to examine the relationship between IPV and youth violence. The research question addressed in this study was: What has been discovered through research about the relationship between IPV and youth violence? This study involved locating and synthesizing available evidence-based literature related to IPV and youth violence. Results of this study have the potential to inform various programs that promote the prevention of IPV as well as those designed to psychologically empower youth who have been exposed to IPV. This chapter includes the data analysis and results of narrative synthesis.

Data Analysis

Consistent with the narrative synthesis approach (Boland, Cherry, & Dickson, 2014; Petticrew & Roberts, 2006), data were analyzed for patterns of occurrence: differences and similarities across studies were compared, the relevant instruments used to measure the two variables IPV and youth violence were explored, and the theoretical frameworks used in these studies to understand the relationship between IPV and youth violence were identified. Finally, results of the reviewed studies were compared and synthesized to respond to the research question. Tables were created to compare and to contrast the different areas.

Results

Results of the study are organized under different sections. The first section provides empirical evidence that there is indeed a relationship between IPV and youth violence. Table 2 located in Chapter 3 presented a summary of each study's characteristics. In the first portion of this results section, a more thorough review of each study and its findings are presented. In the last portion of the results section, the theoretical frameworks used in the included studies are outlined.

Evidence of the Link Between IPV and Youth Violence

The 19 articles included in this systematic review provided empirical evidence that exposure to IPV is associated with the likelihood of youth engaging in some type of social or behavioral violence. All the articles included were quantitative in nature. Eight of them were longitudinal studies (Table 2). All the studies pointed at the relationship between IPV and youth violence.

Intergenerational Transmission of Violence

The longitudinal studies included in this systematic review uncovered that there was an association between exposure to IPV during childhood or adolescence and engaging in some form of relationship violence (perpetration or victimization) later in life. Seven of these longitudinal studies are specifically discussed in this section. Three of these longitudinal studies (Ireland & Smith, 2009; Park, Smith, & Ireland, 2012; Smith, Ireland, Park, Elwyn, & Thornberry, 2011) used data from the Rochester Youth Development Study (RYDS). The RYDS collected information on 1,000 youth (72.9 %

male and 27.1 % female) who were followed from age 14 thru adulthood. The racial make-up of this study was diverse in nature (68% African American, 17% Hispanic, and 15% White participants). All participants attended public school in Rochester, New York. The data were collected from various measures administered to adolescents and their parents. Official records were also used. The RYDS is a multi-wave panel type of study. This type of study required youth and their caretakers to be interviewed every six months. Phase 1 consisted of youth of ages 14-18. Phase 2 consisted of young adults ages 21-23. Phase 3 of this study consisted of adults ages 29-31. During Phase 2, participants took part in three annual interviews. At Phase 3 participants took part in two annual interviews. Data from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Straus, 1979) was utilized to measure past youth IPV exposure. The CTS presented questions that pertained to the prevalence and frequency of IPV exposure. The types of IPV assessed included violent perpetration and victimization. This data was gathered through caretakers' self-report. The subscale utilized to assess IPV was based on 6 items on the CTS (e.g., McDonald, Jouriles, Ramisetty-Mikler, Catano & Green, 2006).

Under the framework of the "cycle of violence," Ireland and Smith (2009) tested the relationship between living in partner-violent homes during adolescence and developing antisocial behavior and relationship violence later in adulthood. Results indicated that exposure to parental partner violence earlier in life was related to later antisocial behavior, conduct problems, and relationship violence. This relationship dissipates in early adulthood; nevertheless, exposure to severe parental violence was still

significantly related to violent crime and IPV in early adulthood. Park, Smith, and Ireland (2012) explored to what extent two types of family violence—child maltreatment and exposure to IPV—had an impact on criminality and young adult violence. Results of this longitudinal study uncovered that maltreated children were more likely to demonstrate adult antisocial behavior than children exposed to IPV. Thus, child maltreatment seemed more harmful than exposure to IPV in generating subsequent youth violent behavior. Additionally, children who experienced both types of violence were at a major risk for showing antisocial behaviors in young adulthood compared to experiencing either one in isolation.

Smith, Ireland, Park, Elwyn, and Thornberry (2011) conducted the last study that used the RYDS data. The purpose of this study was to answer the question as to whether or not there is a generational continuity in violent partner relationships. They explored whether exposure to caregiver IPV during adolescence lead to increased involvement in IPV during early adulthood. This longitudinal study posited that children who come from violent homes typically begin to model the violent behaviors they observed and also begin to perceive violent behavior as a family norm (Smith, et al., 2011). The researchers in this study found that there is indeed and intergenerational continuity in partner violence in both men and women who were exposed to IPV during their adolescent years. Also, findings uncovered that adolescents who are exposed to severe IPV were more likely to engage in relationship violence in early adulthood (ages 21-23). Researchers in this study concluded that IPV is passed on from generation to generation whether or not

family violence comes from maltreatment or IPV. The researchers in this study indicated that women are at a higher risk for experiencing multiple forms of IPV (Smith, et al., 2011).

Sousa et al. (2011) was the fourth longitudinal study in this review that confirmed the intergenerational transmission of violence. Using the attachment theory framework (Bowlby, 1969), the authors sought to determine the connection between child abuse and exposure to IPV and parent-child attachments and antisocial behavior in adolescence. The researchers in this study also examined if youth who are exposed to both abuse and domestic violence demonstrated lower levels of attachment to their caregivers. The data in this study came from the Leigh Longitudinal Study (Herrenkohl & Herrenkohl, 2007; Herrenkohl, Herrenkohl, Egolf, & Wu, 1991). In the original study (1976) there were 457 participants. The children in this study ranged in ages (18 months to 6 years of age). There was a total of 297 families included in this study. The participants were recruited from various community programs (welfare systems, head start centers, child and day care centers, and handicapped centers). Varying racial groups participated in the study. After the initial assessment, the participants were reassessed during their adolescent years.

Parent-child attachment was measured using the Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). This inventory measures a child's sense of trust, communication, and alienation between themselves and their caregivers. In this study, child abuse was measured using three sources of information: (a) official records

of child abuse cases, (b) mother's self-report of disciplining style towards their preschool and school-aged children and (c) adolescent retrospective self-reports of the discipline methods utilized by their mother.

The results of this study indicated that there is no statistically significant difference in the levels of antisocial behavior in youth who are exposed to both child abuse and domestic violence and those who are exposed to either abuse or domestic violence. However, dual exposure to child abuse and domestic violence predict youth behavior more consistently than child abuse or domestic violence exposure alone.

Knous-Westfall, Ehrensaft, MacDonell, & Cohen (2012) explored the link between parental IPV and offspring peer bullying and victimization. This longitudinal study took information from the Children in the Community Study which followed samples of parents and their offspring located in two upstate New York counties for a period of 25 years. There were multiple assessments used to measure the relationship between IPV, parenting practices, and their adolescent children's behaviors. This study explored the relationship between reports of IPV and parenting practices among original study members (N=396) and their adolescent offspring's reports of overt and relational bullying and victimization behaviors on average 6-7 years later (N=129). Adolescents' age ranged from 10-18 at the time of data collection.

Initial data were collected in 1975 and consisted of interviews with parents on a range of topics including health, behavioral, and environmental factors. These parents (considered generation 1), and their children (considered generation 2) were subsequently

assessed on different topics from 1985 through 2004. From 2002 to 2006, offspring of generation 2 (considered generation 3) who were between the ages of 10-18 were invited to participate in the Teen and Pre-Teen study. This study was a telephone-based interview geared at exploring opposite sex relationship development, peer relations, and self-regulation.

In the year 1999 (generation 2) the responders received a questionnaire which assessed whether or not they had been in an intimate relationship in the past year. If the participant responded "yes", they were asked to answer a series of questions from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Straus et al. 1996). Parental practices were assessed using two separate parenting assessments. The Disorganizing Poverty Interview (DPI) (Avager et al. 1977; Kogan al. 1977; Schaefer, 1965) was one scale used to measure parental childrearing attitudes and behaviors. The second part of the 2001-2004 assessment consisted of parents receiving by mail, a Parenting Questionnaire. For generation 3, the Peer Bullying and Peer Victimization Scales (PBPVS) was administered (Olweus, 1978; Pepler et al., 2002). Further assessments of generation 3 were conducted using maternal report from the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) for externalizing and internalizing symptoms (Achenbach, 1991). The DPI (Avgar et al. 1977; Kogan et al, 1977; Schafer 1965) was utilized to measure childhood adversities for generation 2.

The authors tested separate effects for what they considered any IPV vs. severe IPV. Results indicated that experiencing any IPV predicted overt peer victimization for both sexes. However, severe IPV predicted relational peer bullying for both sexes, overt

peer bullying for males, and overt peer victimization for both sexes. These authors pointed at different outcomes depending on severity of IPV.

Finally, Narayan and colleagues (Narayan, Englund, & Egeland, 2013; Narayan, Labella, Englund, Carlson, & Egeland, 2017) conducted the last two longitudinal studies included in this systematic review. Narayan et al. (2013) examined whether continued exposure to interparental violence in early and middle childhood and externalizing behavior in middle childhood and adolescence were developmental predictors of dating violence perpetration and victimization at ages 23 and 26. In a following study, Narayan et al. (2017) extended the goals of the previous study and explored developmental timing effects of physical exposure to interparental violence (EIPV) within early childhood. Particularly, they examined the distinct contribution of EIPV in infancy vs. toddlerhood.

Exposure to physical EIPV in the context of these studies referred to witnessing throwing something, pushing, slapping, kicking, hitting, among other forms of physical violence between a child's parents or parental figures. Both studies used data from the Minnesota Longitudinal Study of Risk and Adaptation, a study that included young, high-risk mothers aged 12-34 and their firstborn children. The mothers in this study were categorized as high-risk participants due to the fact that they were of poverty, unmarried, teenaged mothers, and had low education levels. The participants in this study were ultimately infants and toddlers followed into adulthood. Data were gathered via observation, caregiver interviews, reviews of child protection records, and a review of

medical records. Mothers were the primary source of data related to exposure to interparental violence during childhood.

Narayan et al. (2017) utilized developmental psychopathology as a framework for this study. There were 179 participants in the study. Exposure to inter-parental violence during early childhood was measured by using open-ended questions related to physical violence victimization in the family system. The participant's responses were coded by two raters for EIPV. The interviewees were rated on a 0 to 7 Likert scale (0=No evidence of violence and 7=Most severe form of violent interaction) (Yates, Dodds, Sroufe, & Egeland, 2003). A 10-item Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Straus, 1979) was implemented to measure intimate partner violence. Two of the questions deliberately focused on verbal aggression and 8 of the questions focused on physical aggression. The CTS was administered to participants at ages 23, 26, and 32 years of age. The Life Events Scale was used to measure experienced life stressors. Research participants were administered the Life Events Scale at ages 26 and 32. The scale consisted of 41 items that reflect stressful events and life transitions. Each response was weighted on a 0 to 3 point scale (Egeland, Breitenbuncher & Rosenberg, 1980). A subset of 50 cases were coded by two trained raters.

At age 26 years, participants were administered the Young Adults Self Reports (132 items). This instrument was used to measure externalizing and internalizing behavior (Achenback, 1997). At age 32 participants were administered the Adults Self Reports (126 items) to assess externalizing and internalizing behaviors. The Duncan

Socioeconomic Index was used to gather data on educational attainment, annual income, and head of the household occupation status. The Childhood Experiences of Adverse Caregiving rubric was used as a general term to refer to various forms of parental to child abuse (i.e. physical abuse, physical neglect, and sexual abuse). Data on physical abuse was collected from birth to 17.5 years (up to 25 assessments).

This study used two approaches to the relationship between early childhood violence exposure and adulthood intimate partner violence. The first approach was a variable-oriented approach. This variable-oriented approach was used to examine the impact of exposure to IPV on infants (ages 0-24 months) and toddlers (ages 25-64 months). The second approach utilized was a person-oriented approach. This approach was used to evaluate whether developmental timing of EIPV predicted continuity and change in IPV across the transition from early adulthood to adulthood (ages 26 to 32 years).

The variable-oriented approach uncovered that higher severity EIPV during toddler/preschool years, but not in infancy, predicted both IPV perpetration and victimization by age 23. This prediction is maintained into adulthood. EIPV in toddler/preschool years also predicted IPV perpetration and victimization in adulthood. Regarding the person-oriented approach, results indicated that EIPV during toddler/preschool years also predicted change in IPV involvement from early adulthood to adulthood. Specifically, EIPV during toddler/preschool years, but not in infancy, predicted new-onset cases of IPV across early adulthood to adulthood. This study also

explored the impact of contemporaneous factors such as stress and externalizing

behaviors on IPV perpetration and victimization. Results indicated that those participants

that showed highest mean levels of perpetration and victimization at ages 26 and 32, had

the highest levels of life stress and externalizing behavior. High contextual stress and

behavioral dysregulation played a role in IPV changes. Narayan et al. (2017) suggested

that contemporary factors should be analyzed in conjunction with family of origin

experiences of violence to understand present IPV.

      Liu, Mumford, and Taylor (2018) is the last article discussed in this section. They

conducted a cross sectional study investigating the concurrent relationship between

profiles of verbal and physical IPV reported by parents and different forms of abuse

reported by children within their own dating relationships. The sample consisted of 610

parents based on a nationally representative sample of households and their children ages

12-21 years. The original contribution of this study was the exploration of how

witnessing current inter-parental violence relates to exhibiting violence in adolescents'

own intimate relationships. Results of this study indicated that adolescent and young

adults involved in similar behaviors as their parents when it came to intimate

partnerships. That is, children of parents who experienced verbal abuse were more likely

to experience the same type of abuse in their own relationships; and children whose

parents engaged in both verbal and physical abuse were more likely to report

psychological, physical and sexual abusive encounters in their intimate relationships.

Age and severity of IPV exposure. The seven longitudinal studies reviewed gave strong support to the relationship between witnessing IPV and later involvement in aggressive behaviors. The collection of these studies pointed at three vulnerability factors that strengthen the relationship between IPV and youth violence: (a) the exposure to more than one type of violence, (b) the severity of violence, and (c) the age of exposure. Park et al. (2012) indicated that dual exposure to child maltreatment and IPV increases the risk of antisocial outcomes; and Sousa et al. (2010) also revealed that dual exposure to child abuse and domestic violence appeared to increase risk levels for antisocial behavior in youth. This study also indicated that dual exposure related to decrease attachment to their caregivers. The second issue identified in these articles, severity of violence exposure, seemed to be a significant predictor of youth violent behaviors. Ireland and Smith (2009) indicated that exposure to severe parental violence relates to violent interactions in adulthood; and Knous-Westfall et al. (2012) tested the difference between being exposed to any IPV vs. severe IPV concluding that severe IPV was directly linked to a larger number of behavioral outcomes among youth. The age of exposure to IPV also seemed to be a salient factor in considering the relationship of IPV and youth violence. Narayan et al. (2017) indicated that witnessing IPV during the toddler/preschool years has a long lasting and stronger outcome in youth violence when compared to witnessing IPV during infancy.

Regarding the age of exposure and youth behavioral outcomes, Graham-Bermann and Perkins' (2010) study gave support to the relevance of early and lifetime exposure to

IPV. They conducted a study in which they found that the effects of early exposure and lifetime IPV exposure significantly impacted child adjustment. Further, the results of this research indicated that exposure to early lifetime IPV may increase the risk for problems in adjustment. Children who were exposed to family violence at birth were at a 64% higher risk for exhibiting adjustment problems, whereas children 6 to 12 years of age were at a 12% higher risk for problems in adjustment. Thus, this study indicated that younger age of first exposure was associated with greater problems in adjustment. Additionally, it pointed at the deteriorating effects of the length of exposure. The longer children were exposed to violence, the more externalizing behaviors they showed.

This study consisted of 190 children between the ages of 6-12 years. The children in this study, along with their mothers were all exposed to IPV in the past year. The majority of children in this study were first exposed to IPV as infants (64%). This study used the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) to measure domestic violence perpetrated on the mother of the participants. The Child Behavior Checklist was used to examine child adjustment. This scale had three omnibus scales: (a) the externalizing scale which measures delinquency, aggression, and conduct disorder; (b) the internalizing scale which measures anxiety, depression, withdrawal, and somatic complaints; and (c) the total behavior problems scale includes both the internalizing and externalizing scales, which measures additional child behavior, such as social, thought, and attention problems.

Type of Family Violence and Developmental Timing

Efforts in research have been made to identify and narrow down the impact of specific types of family violence in developmental outcomes. Two studies reported on the relationship between family violence and developmental timing. In a previously discussed study, Park et al. (2012) explored whether child maltreatment and exposure to domestic violence lead to equivalent developmental harm. They indicated that child maltreatment bears a more profound harm on negative behavioral outcomes increasing antisocial behaviors in adulthood than exposure to domestic violence.

Renner and Boel-Studt's (2017) study also explored the impact of different types of family violence and developmental outcomes. They explored the impact of three forms of physical violence (physical abuse, exposure to IPV, and exposure to physical abuse of a sibling) on externalizing and internalizing behaviors among children and adolescents. This study included a sample of 2,402 children and adolescents; and used data from the Illinois Families Study and administrative Child Protective Services data. Results of the study indicated that no form of family violence victimization was uniquely associated with internalizing behaviors; however, relevant differences were found in relation to type of family violence and increased externalizing behaviors among children and adolescents. Children ages 3-5 were more vulnerable to exposure to physical IPV, children ages 6-12 were more vulnerable to exposure to the physical abuse of a sibling, and adolescents ages 13-18 were more vulnerable to child physical abuse.

Attitudes and Beliefs in the Context of IPV

Two of the articles reviewed reported on attitudes and beliefs developed in the context of IPV. Lee, Walters, Hall, and Basile (2013) reported that males exposed to IPV during childhood most strongly endorse ideas that present women and feminine attributes in a negative light in adulthood. Jouriles, Vu, McDonald, and Rosenfield (2014) described that children exposed to IPV develop beliefs about the justifiability of aggression. This was particularly observed among children who develop externalizing problems.

Lee, Walters, Hall, and Basile (2013) assessed the differences among IPV perpetrators who experienced childhood family violence and those IPV perpetrators who did not experience this type of family violence. The sample in this study consisted of 340 men charged with assault against a female partner. The instrument used to measure childhood family violence (CFV) was the Straus et al. (1996) Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). Those participants who experienced physical and/or emotional abuse, witnessed IPV, or experienced maltreatment were categorized as having CFV. On the other hand, participants who did not experience/witness abuse or IPV were regarded as not having CFV. These participants were asked to rate the frequency with which their father/mother or male/female used conflict tactics against each other and/or against the participant. Such tactics could be psychological or physical, including severe physical abuse. Further measures included (a) Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992), (b) Perceived Self-Control (Tolman et al., 1996), (c) Ineffective Arguing (Kurdek, 1994), (d) Power

and Control (Hamby, 1996), (e) Adversarial Sex Beliefs (Burt, 1980), and (f) Sex Role

Hostility (Check et al., 1985).

Besides endorsing more negative attitudes toward female figures, results indicated

that those exposed to IPV and family violence showed higher levels of substance use,

involved in a higher number of aggressive incidents, and presented general displays of

anger. Findings of this study are consistent with social learning theory (Bandura, 1977),

which suggests exposure to childhood family violence is a risk factor for adapting violent

behavior such as anger, controlling, or substance-related type behaviors. According to

this study, the majority of the measures indicated that there are significant differences

between perpetrators with and without a history of family violence suggesting that those

exposed to family violence experienced more challenges in dealing with anger and

hostility, particularly as it relates to women; and may have more difficulty developing

and maintaining healthy relationships.

Jouriles, et al. (2014) examined the impact of living in households characterized

by severe intimate IPV. This study tested the hypothesis that children's threat appraisals,

self-blame appraisals, and beliefs about the justifiability of aggression would contribute

to predict their externalizing problems. There were 106 participants in this study. There

were 62 boys and 44 girls ages 7 through 10 included in this study. Participants were

recruited during their stay at a domestic violence shelter. This study measured threat,

self-blame, and justifiability of aggression. The instruments used were (a) Children's

Perception of Interparental Conflict Scales (CPIC-Y) (Grych, 2000); (b) Normative

Belief About Aggression Scale (Husemann & Guerra, 1997); and (c) Child Behavior

Checklist (CBCL) (Achenbach, 1991), which was the externalizing scale completed by

the mothers. The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) (Straus et al., 1996) (the

physical assault subscale) was used to measure severe IPV that occurred within a period

of six months. Results of the study indicated that threat and beliefs about the justifiability

of aggression were positively related to children's reports of externalizing problems.

Contextual Factors Contributing to Youth Violence

The focus of this systematic review was to understand the link between IPV and

youth violence. The articles that constituted this review confirmed this relationship.

Nevertheless, the articles reviewed revealed that other factors also contributed to youth

violence. In this section, two articles are reviewed. Based on New Zealand's longitudinal

data, Fergusson, Boden, and Horwood (2008) explored developmental antecedents of

IPV victimization and perpetration. Data reported in this study were obtained from the

Christchurch Health and Development Study. Unselected birth cohort of 1,265 children

born in the Christchurch (New Zealand) urban region were followed from birth to 25

years. The first assessment occurred in 1977. At age 25, 828 persons were assessed, and

this constituted the sample of this study. This study focused on the specific psychosocial

risk factors that are related to IPV perpetration or victimization in adulthood. Separate

analyses were undertaken to assess multiple behaviors exhibited by parents, guardians,

and children.

Results of this study indicated that predictors of IPV in young adulthood perpetration were similar to those of IPV victimization. The authors identified four clusters of factors that increased risks of later IPV. The first domain referred to socioeconomic challenges including disadvantaged parental background, multiple changes of parents, and poor pre-natal health practices. The second cluster referred to having greater exposure to child abuse and family violence. The third group of factors referred to having a pervasive history of conduct problems during middle childhood; and the fourth cluster referred to showing higher rate of alcohol abuse and dependence in adolescence. In sum, this study identified that having witnessed family violence is not the only predictor of future IPV perpetration or victimization; the study pointed at a myriad of contextual and personal factors that contribute to youth IPV.

Ferguson, San Miguel and Hartley (2009) conducted a study on multivariate risk factors that contribute to youth violence. The authors contended that the effect sizes of univariate for single or univariate predictors of youth violence tend to be small; thus, they proposed a multivariate analysis to predict risk factors for youth violence. Factors included exposure to domestic violence, family conflict, delinquent peer aggression, neighborhood stress, antisocial personality traits, depression level, exposure to television, and video game violence. Youth violence described as behaviors that range from homicide to lesser types of aggression. This was a cross sectional study of 603 primarily Hispanic children aged 10 to 14 years and their parents or guardians who were administered multiple behavioral measures.

Separate analyses were performed to measure multiple behaviors of parents, guardians, and children. The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) measures the related outcomes of delinquency and aggression. The Olweus Bullying Questionnaire was used to measure bullying behavior, and the Negative Life Event Questionnaire (NLE) is a subscale that was used to measure general delinquency. A parent or guardian of each participant was asked to complete the Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS), which can measure conflict and aggression within the caregiver, who is in a marital or romantic relationship. The CTS also provides a sense of the child's exposure to domestic violence to determine the outcome of youth violence.

The findings indicated that children delinquent peer influences, antisocial personality traits, depression, and parents who use psychological abuse in intimate relationships were contributing factors to youth violence and aggression. Particularly, they indicated that children's depressed mood and delinquent peer associations were the most consistent and strongest predictors of youth violence. Other factors such as negative relations with adults and antisocial personality traits were also relatively consistent, but weaker predictors of youth violence. While this study highlighted that children's depression and peer influences are predictive of aggression; it is relevant to consider that data in this study were collected at one time. Since this is not a longitudinal study, there is no information on how these factors evolved or relate through time. Children's depression could be the consequence of several factors including physical or

psychological IPV. The strength in this study is the importance of considering multiple factors and how they interplay in conceptualizing and understanding youth violence.

Parenting Practices

Parenting practices was one of the strongest contextual factors related to youth violent outcomes. Two articles included in this review explored the relationship between parenting style and IPV and youth violence. Jouriles, Mueller, Rosenfield, McDonald, and Dodson (2012) conducted a study investigating the potential relationship between adolescent experiences with harsh parenting and exposure to severe IPV and teen's propensity to engage in dating violence perpetration. Participants of this study were 88 adolescents and their mothers; they were recruited from the juvenile justice system. In this study, baseline data consisted on mothers' report of severe IPV with any current or past male partner, and adolescents' report on their experiences of harsh parenting and trauma symptoms. Harsh parenting referred to receiving physical and/or verbal aggression. In a 3-month follow up, teens reported on their dating violence perpetration. Results of this study indicated that both exposure to severe IPV and recent harsh parenting positively associated with adolescents' dating violence perpetration while controlling for the effects of the other.

In a related study, Latzman, Vivolo-Kantor, Niolon, and Ghazarian (2015) conducted a prospective study on the joint effects of IPV exposure and parenting practices on adolescent dating violence. The sample consisted of 417 adolescents from middle schools in high-risk urban communities. Adolescents reported on two types of

parenting practices and five types of adolescent dating violence at baseline in 2012 and 5 months later. The parenting practices were positive parenting and/or involvement and parental knowledge of their child's dating. Threatening behaviors, verbal/emotional abuse, relational abuse, physical abuse, and sexual abuse were the five types of adolescent dating violence. Results indicated that IPV exposure was positively associated only to relational abuse at follow-up. Regarding parenting practices, parents who had less knowledge of dating partners were more likely to report perpetrating two types of adolescent dating violence: physical and verbal/emotional abuse at follow up.

Exposure to IPV and Mental Health Related Issues

The focus of this study related to exposure to IPV and youth violence. All of the studies reviewed accounted for this relationship. However, some of the articles reviewed reported on youth mental health. Mental health issues may be considered an antecedent of youth violence or be associated with experiencing IPV in the family. As discussed above, Fergusson, Boden, and Horwood (2008) indicated that having a history of conduct problems during middle childhood and showing high rates of alcohol abuse and dependence in adolescence related to youth violence. Depression during childhood was also linked to youth violence (Ferguson, San Miguel, & Hartley, 2009); and higher levels of drug abuse was reported among those who experienced IPV in childhood (Lee, Walters, Hall, & Basile, 2013).

HajYahia and Abdo-Kaoloti (2008) conducted a study that examined the effects of psychological abuse and family violence on the psychological development and

functioning of Palestinian adolescents. This study used a cross-sectional design on a sample of 1,185 Palestinian adolescents. The sample was made up of students from 13 different secondary schools. The participants were all from the West Bank and East Jerusalem. The students in the sample were in the 10th, 11th, and 12th grade. Their ages ranged from 14 to 20 years. These participants were recruited from various areas, such as urban, rural, and refugee camps. Most of the participants in the study were Muslim. Twenty percent reported being Christian.

Results of this study indicated that exposure to IPV and other forms of family violence accounted for significant amounts of the variance not only in delinquent and aggressive behaviors, but also in withdrawal, somatic complaints, anxiety and depression, social problems, and thought and attention problems. A myriad of psychological problems was associated with exposure to family violence. It is relevant to understand that the Palestinian context and violence in this area is different from other studies conducted with U.S. population. For example, HajYahia and Abdo-Kaoloti (2008) indicated that adolescents from Muslim families and those who live in rural areas and refugee camps witnessed and experienced high levels of different patterns of family violence. Thus, results of this study may not be fully generalizable to the U.S. population, but highlight contextual variables that are highly relevant to understand the psychological well-being of Palestinian children and adolescents.

Gender Differences

A thorough review of the articles included in this systematic review uncovered that there were gender differences as it relates to IPV and youth violence. Three of the articles reviewed discussed gender differences. In Knous-Westfall, Ehrensaft, MacDonell, and Cohen's (2012) study reviewed in previous sections, gender differences were reported. They explored the relationship between parental IPV and children peer bullying and victimization, gender differences were reported. Experiencing any parental IPV predicted higher relational peer victimization among female youth; and experiencing severe IPV predicted higher overt peer bulling among male youth.

Gage (2016) conducted a study that examined the associations between exposure to spousal violence and attitudes towards dating violence perpetration amongst 342 high school students in grades 10-12 located in Port-au-Prince, Haiti. This study uncovered gender-specific differences in responses to IPV exposure; and indicated that boys exposed to husband-perpetrated spousal violence showed significantly higher scores on psychological domestic violence perpetration scales that those who were not. However, girls who witnessed wife-perpetrated spousal violence were no more likely to perpetrate dating violence than girls who did not witness wife-perpetrated spousal violence. An interesting finding indicated that boys who were exposed to wife-perpetrated spousal violence showed significantly lower levels of psychological and physical/sexual domestic violence (DV) perpetration that those who were not. Thus, this study showed a lack of

evidence on gender-specific modeling; and showed that boys reacted differently when considering exposure to wife vs. husband DV perpetration.

Okour and Hijazi (2009) investigated the relationship between family dysfunction and domestic violence and violent behaviors of university students in North Jordan. A cross sectional study was used to ascertain the prevalence of violence among youth attending universities in North Jordan. There were 1560 college students from 3 universities included in this study. The participants were male and female students from different departments and academic years. Results of this study indicated that 11.9% (185 students) reported participating in violent actions occurring in university campus. The majority of those (183 students, 98.9% of the sample) were males and only 2 students were females. Students who participated in violence on campus were significantly affected by witnessing domestic violence. Okour and Hijazi concluded that males exhibit a greater propensity for violence in comparison to females.

Theoretical Framework Used Across Studies

In this last section of the results, a review of the theoretical framework used across the reviewed articles was relevant to understand how researchers theoretically relate children's experiences of witnessing IPV with expressing violence later in life (Table 3).

Table 3

Theoretical Frameworks Used Across Studies

	Article	**Theoretical Framework Used**
1.	Fergusson, et al., 2008	1. No Theory Used
2.	Ferguson, et al., 2009	1. No Theory Used
3.	Gage, 2016	1. Social Learning Theory
4.	Graham-Bermann & Perkins, 2010	1. No Theory Used
5.	HajYahia & Abdo-Kaoloti, 2008	1. Learned Helplessness
6.	Ireland & Smith, 2009	1. Social Learning Theory
7.	Jouriles et al., 2012	1. Social Development Theory
8.	Jouriles, et al., 2014	1. No Theory Used
9.	Knous-Westfall, et al., 2012	1. Social Learning Theory
10.	Latzman, et al., 2015	1. Social Learning Theory
11.	Lee, et al., 2013	1. Social Learning Theory
12.	Liu, et al., 2018	1. Family system theory. 2. Social learning theory
13.	Narayan, et al., 2013	1. Social Learning Theory 2. Risk and Resilience Theory 3. Attachment Theory
14.	Narayan, et al., 2017	1. Developmental Psychopathology

15.	Okour & Hijazi, 2009	1. Social Learning Theory
16.	Park, et al., 2012	1. Social Learning Theory
		2. Attachment Theory
		3. Risk and Resilience Theory
17.	Renner, & Boel-Studt, 2017	1. Social Ecological System Perspective
18.	Smith, et al., 2011	1. Social Learning Theory
19.	Sousa, et al., 2011	1. Attachment Theory

Of the 19 articles evaluated in this study, there were three that used a combination of more than one theory to conceptualize the relationship between witnessing IPV and showing violence later in life. Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) was the most widely used theoretical framework; 11 articles used them. Other theories used were attachment theory (Bowlby, 1951), social development (Vygotsky, 1978). developmental psychopathology (Cicchetti & Toth, 2009), socioecological perspective (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), and risk and resilience (Rutter, 1981). Four studies included in this sample did not utilize a specific theoretical component to frame the relationship between IPV and youth violence.

Summary

This systematic literature review explored the relationship between IPV and youth violence. Nineteen articles published in peer reviewed journals during 2008-2018 were identified and comprised the date range for this systematic review. The collection of these

articles provided evidence to the link between IPV and youth violence. Seven

longitudinal studies that tracked youth from childhood to an older age confirmed the

relationship between experiencing IPV during the childhood years and showing signs of

aggression later in life. Other trends in the data indicated that exposure to more than one

type of violence and the severity of IPV witnessed increased the violent behavior

portrayed. Results also indicated that contextual factors such as growing up in an unstable

family environment, stress, or certain parenting practices contributed to showing violent

behaviors during childhood and adolescence. Finally, results indicated that social learning

theory was the most frequently theoretical framework used to explain the relationship

between children's experiences of witnessing IPV and expressing violence later in life.

In Chapter 5, an interpretation of the findings of this study, a discussion of the

limitations of this study, and recommendations for future research are outlined. Practice

implications and concluding remarks are also presented.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this systematic review was to examine the relationship between intimate partner violence and youth violence. This systematic review located and synthesized available evidence-based literature that related IPV and youth violence. The findings of this systematic review broaden the knowledge base on the relationship between intimate partner violence and youth violence. This final chapter presents an interpretation of the findings of this study, followed by a discussion on the limitations of this study. The chapter concludes with a discussion of recommendations for future research, implications for practice, and final concluding remarks.

Interpretation of Findings

The findings of this study both confirmed and extended knowledge about the intersection of IPV and youth violence. Several trends emerged in this systematic literature review. All trends that originated from this systematic review are supported by findings in the existing literature. Each major trend is discussed and interpreted in the context of existing literature on the topic.

Intergenerational Transmission of Violence

One of the most consistent findings from this study was that witnessing parents' or caregivers' IPV during childhood related to perpetrating some type of violence later in life. Results of this systematic review indicated that being exposed to IPV resulted in a range of possible outcomes such as the displays of antisocial behavior (Sousa et al.,

2011), conduct problems, relationship violence (Ireland & Smith, 2009), IPV perpetration (Smith, Ireland, Park, Elwyn, & Thornberry, 2011), or IPV victimization (Narayan et al., 2017), overt peer victimization and relational peer bullying (Knous-Westfall, Ehrensaft, MacDonell, & Cohen, 2012). The pattern of partner violence exposure and witnesses' displays of aggression is also well-represented in the existing literature; and the concept of the cycle of violence has a long history (Widom & Wilson, 2015). It has been researched and confirmed from various angles. For example, a number of studies established a relationship between persons who were incarcerated for committing violent crimes (Ball, 2009; Byrd & Davis, 2009) or for engaging in domestic violence (Askeland et al., 2011) and having experienced high levels of victimization during childhood.

Voisin and Hong (2012) conducted a comprehensive review and critique of the literature exploring the potential relationship between youth witnessing IPV and their eventual engagement in bullying and peer victimization. The overall findings of this review provided empirical evidence that youth who observe IPV are at an increased risk of engaging in bullying behaviors and peer victimization. Research reviewed in this study confirmed the cycle of violence pattern and indicated that, despite location where the study was conducted, children's age range, participants' gender, instruments used to assess IPV and youth violence, witnessing IPV increases the likelihood and risk of later youth violence.

Results of this study also indicated that being exposed to more than one type of violence besides IPV, increased the likelihood of engaging in violent behaviors. The dual

exposure to different types of violence was early identified and coined as the "double whammy" phenomenon (Hughes, Parkinson, & Vargo, 1989). Current research gave support to the double whammy effect (Wood & Sommers, 2011). Thus, those witnessing IPV and being target of aggression were more severely affected than those who witnessed violence but were not physically abused (Moylan et al., 2010).

The double whammy was also related to the severity of violence exposure. Articles reviewed in this study indicated there was an outcome difference between being exposed to any IPV vs being exposed to severe IPV (Ireland & Smith, 2009; Knous-Westfall et al., 2012). Being exposed to severe IPV related to a higher number of expressions of violence among youth. The dose of violence was related to the harshness of the response (Wood & Sommers, 2011). That is, more exposure or direct experience of violence generated more expressions of violence later in life. Moylan and colleagues (2010) conducted a longitudinal study comparing children exposed to witnessing domestic violence and child abuse vs children exposed to only one form of violence and concluded that those dually exposed were at a higher risk for displaying an entire range of internalizing and externalizing behavior problems.

According to the articles reviewed, the age of exposure to IPV influenced the outcome of youth's behaviors (Graham-Bermann & Perkins, 2010; Narayan et al., 2017). According to Narayan and colleagues, witnessing IPV during the preschool years (25-64 months) had a longer lasting effect when compared to children who witnessed IPV during infancy (birth to 24 months). Graham-Bermann and Perkins compared a different age

range indicating that those exposed during 6-12 years of age had a lower risk for adjustment problems than those who had a lifetime of IPV exposure. These studies pointed at how the effects of IPV exposure varied depending on the age of children at which they are exposed.

In an earlier review, Sternberg, Baradaran, Abbott, Lamb, and Guterman (2006) conducted a revision of 15 articles on children's exposure to violence; and indicated that preschool children exposed to violence were more likely to show externalizing behavior issues and older grade school children exposed to violence tended to show more internalizing behavior problems. It has been hypothesized that the negative outcome of violence exposure differs by age at the time of exposure due to the varying cognitive development skills associated with age. For example, children in infancy have less mature cognitive skills and are less able to codify and understand the violence around them than older children (Bell & Wolfe, 2004). From a developmental perspective, Narayan et al. (2017) indicated that children in infancy are tasked with establishing a sense of safety and developing secure attachment while children in toddlerhood are tasked with forming social relationships, increasing autonomy, and developing self-regulation skills. Children affected by IPV exposure during toddlerhood may model poor conflict management becoming a predictor of behavioral dysregulation during relational conflict in adulthood. Children affected by IPV exposure during infancy may be related to attachment-specific issues during adulthood such as mistrust or perceived insecurity in romantic relationships.

Attitudes and Beliefs in the Context of IPV

Results of this review indicated that being exposed to IPV had an impact on attitudes and beliefs about the use of violence in conflict resolution and in gender stereotyping (Jouriles, Vu, McDonald, & Rosenfield, 2014; Lee, Walters, Hall, & Basile, 2013). Using a modified cognitive-contextual framework (Fosco, DeBoard, & Grych, 2007), Jouriles and colleagues suggested that believing that aggression was justified increased the risk for behaving violently. Being exposed to IPV was related to perceiving aggression as more acceptable (Houston & Grych, 2016). From a social learning perspective (Bandura, 1973), it is understood that children who observe IPV and violence between parents learn and incorporate these unhealthy conflict resolution strategies. As children form expectations about behavior from observing their parents, they may come to endorse beliefs about acceptability of violence.

Findings of this review were consistent with the literature. Witnessing IPV seemed to be a strong message towards developing beliefs that justified the use of violence in relationships (Galano, Grogan-Kaylor, Stein, Clark, & Graham-Bermann, 2016a; 2016b). Foshee and colleagues (2016) explored risk factors for the perpetration of physical dating violence, bullying and sexual harassment among adolescents exposed to domestic violence; they indicated that acceptance of dating violence was a significant predictor of dating violence and bullying.

The justifiability of aggression has been positively correlated with youth's externalizing problems (Farrell, Henry, Schoeny, Bettencourt, & Tolan, 2010; Orue et al.,

2011). Orue and colleagues tested whether children who are exposed to a significant dose of violence come to perceive it as normal behavior; and, in turn, behave more aggressively themselves. Results of this study indicated that witnessing violence predicted an increase in aggression 6 months later; this increase in aggression was mediated by changes in normative beliefs. The study revealed that when children thought violence was commonplace, they were more likely to behave violently against others.

Contextual Factors Contributing to Youth Violence

This review revealed that beyond IPV, a number of factors surrounded and contributed to youth's violence. Parenting practices stood out as one of the more significant factors. Jouriles, Mueller, Rosenfield, McDonald, and Dodson (2012) concluded that harsh parenting (receiving physical and/or verbal aggression) was related to adolescents' dating violence perpetration. Latzman, Vivolo-Kantor, Niolon, and Ghazarian (2015) also explored parenting practices in relation to adolescent dating violence; they revealed the importance of parents' involvement in their children's lives. Adolescents whose parents were less involved and did now know about their dating practices reported perpetrating physical and verbal or emotional abuse in their relationships.

The link between domestic violence or marital discord and poor parenting practices and negative parent-child relationship has been established (Gustafsson, Cox, & Blair, 2012). Several explanations to this link have been proposed. It has been suggested that negative interactions between parents includes anger and frustration, which, in turn,

spillover into harsh interactions with their children (Krishnakumar & Buehler, 2000). Gerard, Krishnakumar, and Buehler (2006) suggested that all parents' energy is used in dealing with marital problems and other issues such as economic stability; parents feel depleted of energy to monitor and interact with their children. Beyond the explanation of this link, research suggested that children and adolescents growing up in a context of IPV tended to be parented in a way that put them at risk to developing different problems and reactions including violence and a range of problematic behaviors (Jouriles et al., 2012).

Exposure to IPV and Mental Health Related Issues

Results of this review indicated that a number of mental health related problems were linked to IPV exposure. Incidence of alcohol or drug abuse has been correlated with IPV exposure during childhood (Fergusson, Boden, & Horwood, 2008; Lee, Walters, Hall, & Basile, 2013); and mental health problems such as withdrawal, somatic complaints, anxiety and depression, social problems, and thought and attention problems were also related to IPV exposure (HajYahia and Abdo-Kaoloti, 2008). These negative outcomes of IPV exposure have been documented in the literature (Wright, Fagan, & Pinchevsky, 2013). Roustit et al. (2009) conducted a retrospective cohort study in Paris and concluded that children exposed to domestic violence were 44% more likely to develop symptoms of depression, and 75% more likely to develop alcohol dependency in adulthood. Smith, Elwyn, Ireland, and Thornberry (2010) used a prospective design to study whether adolescent exposure to IPV increased the risk for problem substance use in early adulthood and whether this relationship differs by gender. They concluded that

exposure to severe IPV during adolescence increased the likelihood of alcohol-use problems among women during early adulthood.

In subsequent studies, Kennedy, Bybee, Sullivan, and Greeson (2009, 2010) investigated the impact of family and community violence on children's anxiety and depression trajectories. They conducted a 2-year longitudinal study within a sample of 100-school age children. They explored the relations between witnessing IPV, community and school violence exposure, family support, and anxiety and depression over two years. They found that in the two-year period, depression was positively associated with change in witnessing IPV and exposure to community and school violence. Similar results were reported in the study that measured children's anxiety levels (Kennedy et al., 2009). They found that change in both witnessing IPV and community and school violence exposure positively covaried with anxiety. In their systematic review of the literature on consequences of witnessing IPV, Wood and Sommers (2011) concluded that children exposed to IPV during childhood were at a high risk of engaging in health-compromising behaviors during adolescence and adulthood such as problematic alcohol use, cigarette smoking, drug use and abuse, and risky sexual behaviors.

Gender Differences

Results of this review indicated that the outcome of being exposed to IPV seemed different for girls and boys. Knous-Westfall, Ehrensaft, MacDonell, and Cohen (2012) explored the association between parental IPV and children's peer bullying and

victimization; they concluded that experiencing any parental IPV predicted higher relational peer victimization among female youth; and experiencing severe IPV predicted higher overt peer bulling among male youth. Thus, the outcome of the youth violence displayed varied according to youth's gender. In Gage's (2016) study, boys exposed to husband-perpetrated spousal violence showed significantly higher scores on psychological domestic violence perpetration scales that those who were not; and in Okour and Hijazi's (2009) study on college students in North Jordan, men showed a greater propensity for violence when compared to women.

The exploration of gender differences on the impact of exposure to violence has a long history (Wood & Sommers, 2011); and there seemed to be a tendency for girls to show more internalizing responses including depression or PTSD than boys did (Moylan et al., 2010). Boys and girls seemed to react differently to exposure to parental violence, and the gender of the perpetrator seemed to trigger varied responses; however, caution has been recommended in analyzing gender effects of IPV exposure as the effects were considered multilayered and contextual (Wood & Sommers, 2011).

Theoretical Framework

This systematic review explored the relationship between IPV and youth violence. There were two separate theoretical orientations used as frameworks for this project: social learning theory (Bandura, 1986) and ecological systems theory (1979). First, social learning theory was used to explain how youth develop violent behaviors as a result of observing violent behavior. Furthermore, after observing violent behaviors, social

learning theory asserts that children eventually model or mimic the violent behaviors in which they observe. This observing and modeling sequence serves as a social force driving, guiding, and shaping the violent behaviors of youth who are exposed to IPV.

The results of this systematic review were consistent with the postulations of social learning theory as the articles reviewed in this study highlighted the impact of parents' modeling conflict resolution through aggression. Violence is a learned behavior acquired through witnessing or interacting with family members who regularly use violence in their relationships. While the articles reviewed in this study used a broad range of theoretical frameworks to explain the connection between parents' IPV and youth violence; most of them included social learning theory to explain this connection. According to Widom and Wilson (2015) social learning theory is likely to be the most popular theory that has been used to explain the intergenerational transmission of violence. Children who were exposed to parental violence were more likely to endorse accepting attitudes and beliefs about violence in relationships.

Secondly, ecological systems theory was used in this systematic review to explain why children who are exposed to IPV are more likely to engage in youth violence. Ecological systems theory was used to explain how different social dimensions (i.e. microsystem, mesosystem, ecosystem, macro system, and chronosystem) interact and overlap and ultimately influence individual growth and development. Specifically, the microsystem of the ecological theory, was utilized as a framework for explain how youth

who are routinely exposed to IPV eventually learn to interact with others in a violent manner.

The results of this systematic review are consistent with the assertions of ecological systems theory as the studies included in this systematic review consistently uncovered a relationship between IPV and youth violence. Ecological systems theory's assertion that the pattern of interactions within the developing individual's micro/family system serves as a learning environment for how a developing child should interact with others is consistent with many of the findings in this systematic review. Specifically, the findings of this systematic review indicate that youth who develop in micro/family systems where IPV is present demonstrate a personal acceptance of violence. Finally, ecological systems theory's assertion that micro/family system has a direct psychological impact on the evolving child echoes the findings of the articles included in this study which uncovered that children who developed in micro/family systems where IPV was present were more likely to engage in violent behaviors in their adult interactions.

Limitations of the Study

The focus of this systematic literature review was to review the relationship between IPV and youth violence in the current empirical research. While a number of articles identified in this review directly confirmed the relationship between IPV and youth violence, it was clear that a number of other contextual factors such as parenting style or being exposed to other types of family violence besides IPV among other factors also contributed to youth violence. Hence, it is essential to analyze this phenomenon as

multilayered and with overlapping influences. A more comprehensive review that included more than 19 articles could have provided more robust information. In turn, this more extensive review could have revealed more deeply how the various factors intertwined and contributed to youth violence.

Several databases were used to retrieve peer reviewed articles; however, it is possible that some articles covering the relationship between IPV and youth violence were not targeted through these searches. Therefore, there might be more research available on the relationship between IPV and youth violence that were not included in this study. Additionally, this systematic review only targeted articles written in English and excluded theses and dissertations. It is possible that if more articles would have been gathered in other languages, from dissertations, or from other databases, the resulting findings would have been more thorough. This study might not represent an exhaustive or comprehensive review of the phenomenon.

Recommendations for Practice

Results of this study revealed that witnessing IPV related to multiple negative consequences for children including different types of behavioral expressions of violence, mental health consequences, biased attitudes and beliefs towards the use of violence, and engagement in risk-taking behaviors. These results provide evidence to the legacy of witnessing violence across the various developmental stages. Policy and prevention efforts should focus on identifying at-risk children who witness violence or experience trauma at any stage of their children and adolescent years. Couples and family focused

intervention efforts such as couples or family therapy or psychoeducational workshops should become available at no or low cost to prevent violence at home, reduce stress, and teach self-regulation skills in handling conflict. Furthermore, expectant parents could engage in therapy during the middle and later months of pregnancy to prepare them for the stress of childbearing.

Counselors and clinicians who treat IPV exposed children and their families can intentionally implement counseling models that are contextualized around the psychosocial experiences of youth who are developing in family systems where IPV is present. Therapy models such as child-parent psychotherapy based on attachment-based therapy can help in restoring feelings of trust, security, and support (Egeland & Erickson, 2004; Lieberman, Van Horn, & Ghosh, 2005) or trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy that has been used in the treatment of children who showed signs of posttraumatic stress symptoms after exposure to domestic violence (Cohen, Manarino, Murray, & Igleman, 2006). These contextualized approaches can work to improve the developmental outcomes of youth who are exposed to IPV. Results of this study may also be used in couples or family therapy sessions to recognize and address challenging familial patterns. Clinicians can become more aware of the long-lasting effects of witnessing IPV; an understanding of these effects is relevant in treating adults who experienced IPV during their childhood years. Additionally, clinicians working in implementing prevention family violence programs may use the findings of this study to support the justification for developing and implementing these programs.

Psychoeducation and information about the cycle of violence and the effects of witnessing violence on children should be made available not only to families where IPV occurs, but also to the general population at large. The message that children need to feel safe and protected from the negative effects of violence is essential to prevent modeling and learning unhealthy coping skills. Multi-media campaigns should be taken to intentionally educate the general community about the debilitating impact of IPV on youth outcomes. These campaigns can work effectively to increase community awareness.

A significant amount of IPV and violence at home is generated as a result of financial stress. It is therefore recommended that couples experiencing financial stress should participate in workshops, classes, and seminars that teach financial literacy. Resources and help should be provided to families under financial stress, poverty, or unemployment.

Recommendations for Future Research

The search for articles on the topic of IPV and youth violence yielded no qualitative or descriptive study. Qualitative data might be gathered from parents and children who are situated in family systems where IPV is present to learn about their lived experiences and specific contextual issues. This data might serve the purpose of telling the stories behind the quantitative data and could be used to inform interventions designed to buffer the negative effects of IPV exposure.

Another line of research should relate to identifying protective and resilient factors. While there is evidence of the cycle of violence and the negative consequences of witnessing IPV, there are children and adolescents who did not develop internalizing or externalizing behaviors as a result of IPV exposure (Narayan, Labella, Englund, Carlson, & Egeland, 2017). Future research should identify what factors protect youth from engaging in violence or becoming a victim of violence. Given the interplay of factors contributing to aggression in youth, the use of multivariate analyses has been recommended in studying youth violence (Ferguson et al., 2009). In understanding protective factors, multivariate statistics can also be used. It can be helpful in discerning which factors are relevant and important in protecting children from the effects of IPV exposure. Many factors related to schools, families, peer, personality, and communities may bear examining.

The results of this study indicated there are various elements associated with youth violence including parents' financial stress, SES, or parenting skills, among others. Future systematic reviews should focus on identifying these multilayer components and the impact of these components on youth violence. Finally, although there is no rule of thumb as it relates to the number of articles that should be included in a systematic review (Boland, Cherry, & Dickson, 2014; Petticrew & Roberts, 2006), a study that includes more than 19 articles can be assumed to provide an even better understanding of the extent to which various factors contribute to youth violence.

Implications

Finding ways to curtail youth violence have been a longstanding problematic undertaking. The task of curtailing youth violence can become less problematic if stakeholders become more enlightened on the impacts of IPV on youth violence. The results of this systematic review indicate that an intentional effort to expand the breadth of knowledge related to IPV exposure and youth violence must be carried out. This expansion of knowledge can work to inform stakeholders on practical approaches for addressing IPV exposure and youth violence. As it relates to educators, an intentional effort to integrate information and activities into their classroom curriculum should be undertaken. Such curricular content should serve the purpose of fostering adaptive coping in children who may be experiencing IPV exposure. Implications for therapists include researching and designing therapeutic models that instill in youth the psychological coping necessary to avoid becoming a victim of the cycle of IPV violence. Therapeutic models targeting prevention of cycle of violence can work effectively to buffer the damaging impact of IPV exposure on youth development. Therapeutic interventions should target the utilization of counseling models that are contextualized around the psychosocial experiences of youth who are developing in family systems where IPV is present.

The results of this study contribute to the current knowledge base and promote positive social change by raising awareness of the importance of making a deliberate effort to develop a nurturing family environment for both youth and caregivers. As

communities began to have more homes absent of IPV, community betterment will follow. This improvement of individual households and communities will inevitably result in the betterment of the society at large.

Findings in this study outline information that may add to the body of evidence-based information already available to parents, teachers, school counselors, principals, law officials, policy makers, and other stakeholders on the critical importance of providing developing youth with a caring family environment. The results of this study have the potential to contribute to the existing body of knowledge related to the social, psychological, and familial factors that impact youth violence. This potential contribution to the already available body of knowledge may further inform and empower the practices and procedures parents, teachers, counselors, social workers, and other professionals utilize to combat youth violence.

Conclusion

This systematic literature review examined the relationship between intimate partner violence and youth violence. It uncovered the significant impact that IPV exposure has on subsequent youth perpetration or victimization. The analyzed articles provided clear evidence that exposure to IPV is internalized and reactivated across generations. Various risk factors to youth violence were also identified and discussed including parents' stress, inadequate parenting practices, and unstable family environment among others. The severity of the violence exposure and doubling up on the

types of abuse experienced are likely to lead to more negative and long-term consequences.

There is an undeniable need for further studies that investigate the impact of various factors on youth violence. This research provides support to the negative impact of IPV on youth violence; and has the potential to inform the development of therapeutic models, programmatic interventions, community programs, and various other forms of interventions and preventative measures. In turn, these interventions can play a critical role in curtailing youth violence. This research study contributed to the collective knowledge based that relates to the psychological development and functioning of youth. This added knowledge can potentially assist educators, therapists, and social scientists in their efforts to improve the life outcomes of developing youth who are exposed to IPV. By increasing the breadth of empirical understanding of the developing youth experiences with IPV, stakeholders will be made more competent at identifying and bringing to a resolution unresolved issues related to prolonged submersion in family settings where IPV is present.

References

Abajobir, A. A., Kisely, S., Williams, G. M., Clavarino, A. M., & Najman, J. M. (2017). Substantiated childhood maltreatment and intimate partner violence victimization in young adulthood: A birth cohort study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 46,* 165-179.

Abdo-Kaloti, R., & Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2008). Mental health consequences of Palestinian adolescents' exposure to family violence. *Journal of Loss and Trauma, 13*, 1-41.

Abidin, R. (1983). *The Parenting Stress Index*. New York, NY: Pediatric Psychology Press.

Aceves, J., & Cookston, T. (2007). Violent victimization, aggression, and parent-adolescent relations: Quality parenting as a buffer for violently victimized youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 36,* 635-647.

Achenbach, T. M. (1991a). *Child Behavior Checklist/4-18*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Press.

Achenbach, T. M. (1991b). *Manual for the Youth Self Report and 1991 profile*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Press.

Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. (1986). *Manual for the teacher report form and teacher version of the Child Behavior Profile.* Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Press.

Achenbach, T. M., & Edelbrock, C. S. (1987). *Manual for the Youth Self Report and profile.* Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Press.

Achenbach, T. M., & Edlebrock, C. S. (1997). *Manual for the Youth Self Report and profile.* Burlington, VT: University of Vermont Press.

Achenbach, T. M., Howell, C. T., Quay, H. C., & Conners, C. K. (1991). National survey of problems and competencies among four- to sixteen-year-olds: Parent reports for normative and clinical samples. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 56*(3), 1-120.

Ali, P. A., Dhingra, K., & McGarry, J. (2016). A literature review of intimate partner violence and its classifications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 31*, 16-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.06.008

American Psychiatric Association (APA). (1994). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

American Psychiatric Association. (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed., rev.). Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, C. A., Benjamin, A. J., Wood, P. K., & Bonacci, A. M. (2006). Development and testing of the Velicer Attitudes Toward Violence Scale: Evidence for a four-factor model. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*(2), 122-136. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20112

Andreas, J. B., & Watson, M. W. (2009). Moderating effects of family environment on the association between children's aggressive beliefs and their aggression trajectories from childhood to adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology, 21,* 189-205.

Armsden, G. C., & Greenberg, M. T. (1987). The Inventory of Parent and Peer

Attachment: Individual differences and their relationship to psychological well-

being in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 16,* 427-454.

Askeland, I. R., Evang, A., & Heir, T. (2011). Association of violence against partner and

former victim experiences: A sample of clients voluntarily attending therapy.

Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26, 1095–1110.

Avgar, A., Bronfenbrenner, U., & Henderson, C. R. (1977). Socialization practices of

parents, teachers, and peers in Israel: Kibbutz, moschav, and city. *Child

Development, 48,* 1219- 1227.

Ball, J. D. (2009). Intergenerational transmission of abuse of incarcerated fathers. *Journal

of Family Issues, 30*, 371–390.

Bandura, A. (1963). *Theories of crime.* Retrieved December 14, 2010, from

http://homepage.ntlworld.com/gary.sturt/crime/theocrim.htm

Bandura, A. (1971a). *Psychological modeling*. Chicago, IL: Aldine & Atherton.

Bandura, A. (1971b). *Social learning theory.* New York, NY: General Learning Press.

Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:

Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice -Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundation of thoughts and actions: A social cognitive theory.*

Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bell, K. M., & Naugle, A. E. (2008). Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28,* 1096-1107.

Bell, M. A., & Wolfe, C. D. (2004). Emotion and cognition: An intricately bound developmental process. *Child Development, 75*(2), 366−370.

Bender, D., & Losel, F. (2014). Aggressive, delinquent, and violent outcomes of school bullying: Do family and individual factors have a protective function? *Journal of School Violence, 13,* 59-79.

Benedict, F. T., Vivier, P., & Gjelsvik, A. (2015). Mental health and bullying in the United States among children age 6 to 17 years. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(5), 782-795.

Blumberg, S. J., Frasier, A. M., Foster, E. B., Nysse-Carris, K. L., O'Connor, K. S., Satorius, J., & Skalland, B. J. (2012). Design and operation of the National Survey of Children's Health, 2007. *Vital Health Statistics, 1*(55), 1-149. Washington, DC: National Center for Health Statistics.

Boland, A., Cherry, G., & Dickson, R. (2014). *Doing a systematic review: A student guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Borst, J. (2015). A systematic review of family conflict: Focusing on divorce infidelity and attachment style. *Master of Social Work Clinical Research Papers* (Paper 426). Retrieved from http://sophia.stake.edu./msw_papers/426

Bowen, G. L., Rose, R. A., Powers, J. D., & Glennie, E. J. (2008). The joint effects of neighborhoods, schools, peers, and families on changes in the school success of middle school students. *Family Relations, 57,* 504-516.

Bowlby, J. (1951). *Maternal care and mental health.* World Health Organization Monograph (Serial No. 2). Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Maternal care and mental health.* A report prepared on behalf of the World Health Organization as a contribution to the United Nations programmer for the welfare of homeless children. New York, NY: Schocken Books.

Bowlby, J. (1982). *Attachment and loss. Vol. 1: Attachment.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1996). *Attachment and loss. Vol. 1: Attachment.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Boyle, A., Robinson, S., & Atkinson, P. (2004). Domestic violence in emergency medicine patients. *Emergency Medicine Journal, 21*, 9-13.

Brendgen, M., Vitaro, F., Tremblay, R. E., & Wanner, B. (2002). Parent and peer effects on delinquency-related violence and dating violence: A test of two mediational models. *Social Development, 11,* 225-244. https:// doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00196

Bretherton, I. (1985). Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 50*(1/2), 3-35.

Briere, J. (1996). *Trauma Symptom Checklist for Children: Professional manual.* Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. (1998). The ecology of developmental process. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *The handbook of child psychology* (5th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 993-1029). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Burt, C. H., Simons, R. L., & Simons, L. G. (2006). A longitudinal test of the effects of parenting and the stability of self-control: Negative evidence for the general theory of crime. *Criminology, 44,* 353-396.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and support for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38,* 217-230.

Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The Aggression Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63,* 452-459.

Buttram, W., & Mackey, W. (2012). Father presence in a community and levels of violent crime: A dynamic beyond the arm of the law. *The Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies, 37,* 2.

Byrd, P. M., & Davis, J. L. (2009). Violence behavior in female inmates: Possible predictors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 379–392.

Cairns, R. B., Leung, M.-C., Gest, S. D., & Cairns, B. D. (1995). A brief method for assessing social development: Structure, reliability, stability, and developmental

validity of the Interpersonal Complete Scale. *Behavior Research & Therapy, 33*, 725-736.

Carlson, B., E. (1991). Outcomes of physical abuse and observation of marital violence among adolescents in placement. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6,* 526534.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2006). Measuring intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration: A compendium of assessment tools. Retrieved from http://www.cde.gov/ncipc/pub-res/IPV_-Compendium.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2009). *Understanding intimate partner violence*. Retrieved February 12, 2012, from saveservices.org

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2011). *Understanding youth violence fact sheet.* Retrieved from http://cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/YV-FactSheet-a.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2015a). Understanding youth violence: Fact sheet. Retrieved July 4, 2017, from http://cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/YV-FactSheet-a.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2015b). *Youth violence prevention: A report of the Surgeon General.* Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2016). Youth violence: Fact sheet. Retrieved December 5, 2017, from https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/yv-datasheet.pdf

Chang, J., Hisinuma, E., & Sugimoto-Matsuda, J. (2013). Prevalence of youth violence in the U.S., 1999-2009: Ethnic comparison and disaggregating Asians Americans and Pacific Islanders. *Journal of Maternal and Child Health, 17,* 1802-1816.

Check, J. C., Malamuth, N. M., Elias, B., & Barton, S. A. (1985). On hostile ground. *Psychology Today, 19,* 56-61.

Choe, D. E., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2014). Transactional process of African American adolescents' family conflict and violent behavior. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 24,* 591–597. https://doi.org/10.1111/jora.12056

Christopher, F. S. (1988). An initial investigation into a continuum of premarital sexual pressure. *Journal of Sex Research, 23,* 255-266.

Cicchetti, D., & Toth, S. L. (2009). The past achievements and future promises of developmental psychopathology: The coming of age of a discipline. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 50,* 16–25. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469 7610.2008.01979.x

Cohen, J. A., Mannarino, A. P., Murray, A. K., & Igelman, R. (2006). Psychosocial interventions for maltreated and violence-exposed children. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 737–766.

Conners, C. K. (1969). A teacher rating scale for use in drug studies with children. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 126*(6), 884-888.

Conners, C. K. (1970). Symptom patterns in hyperkinetic, neurotic and normal children. *Child Development, 41*(3), 667-682. https://doi.org/10.2307/1127215

Costello, A., Edelbrock, C., Kalas, R., Kessler, M., & Klaric, S. A. (1982). *Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children (DISC).* Bethesda, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.

Cuellar, I., Arnold, B., & Maldonado, R. (1995). Acculturation rating scale for Mexican Americans-II. A revision of the original ARSMA scale. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 17,* 275-304.

Cui M, Donnellan, M, & Conger, R. (2007). Reciprocal influences between parents' marital problems and adolescent internalizing and externalizing behavior. *Developmental Psychology 43*, 1544– 1552.

Dahlberg, L. L., & Potter, L. B. (2001). Youth violence: Developmental pathways and prevention challenges. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 20*(1S), 3-14.

David-Ferdon, C., & Simon, T. R. (2014). *Preventing youth violence: Opportunities for action.* Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

DeMaris, A., Giordano, P. C., Kaufman-Parks, A. M., Manning, W. D., & Longmore, M. A. (2018). Intimate partner violence perpetration from adolescence to young adulthood: Trajectories and the role of familial factors. *Journal of Family Violence, 33,* 27-41. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s10896-017-9924-5

DeNavas-Walt, C., Proctor, B., & Smith, J. (2009). *Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States, 2008* (P-60-236(RV)). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

Derogatis, L. R., & Melisaroto, N. (1983). The Brief Symptom Inventory: An inventory report. *Psychological Medicine, 13*, 595-605.

Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (1990). Mechanisms in the cycle of violence. *Science, 250,* 1678-1683.

Dollard, J., Miller, N., Sears, R., Mowrer, O., & Doob, L. O. (1939). *Frustration and aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dong, M., Anda, R. F., Felitti, V. J., Dube, S. R., Williamson, D. F., Thompson, T. J., Loo, C. M., & Giles, W. H. (2004). The interrelatedness of multiple forms of child abuse, neglect, and household dysfunction. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 28*(7), 771-784. https://doi.org/10.1016.chiabu.2004.0 .008

Dowd, L. S., Leisring, P. A., & Rosenbaum, A. (2005). Partner aggressive women: Characteristics and treatment attrition. *Violence and Victims, 20*(2), 219-233.

Duncan, O. D. (1961). A socioeconomic index for all occupations. In J. A. J. Reiss (Ed.), *Occupations and social status.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Edgeland, B., Breitenbucher, M., & Rosenberg, D. (1980). Prospective study of the significance of life stress in the etiology of child abuse. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48*, 195-205. https:// doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.48.2.195

Egeland, B., & Erickson, M. F. (2004). Lessons from STEEP: Linking theory, research, and practice for the well-being of infants and parents. In A. Sameroff, S. McDonough, & K. Rosenblum (Eds.), *Treating parent–infant relationship problems: Strategies for intervention* (pp. 213–242). New York: Guilford Press

Elley, W. B., & Irving, J. C. (1976). Revised socio-economic index for New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 11*(1), 25-36.

Elliott, D. S., Huizinga, D., & Menard, S. S. (1985). *Explaining delinquency and drug use.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Elliott, D. S., & Huizinga, D. (1989). Improving self-reported measure of delinquency. In M. W. Klein (Ed.), *Cross-national research in self-reported crime and delinquency* (pp. 155-186). Boston, MA: Kluwer.

Fagan, A. A. (2003). The short and long-term effects of adolescent violent victimization experienced within the family and community. *Violence and Victims, 18*(4), 445-458.

Fang, X., & Corso, P. (2007). Child maltreatment, youth violence, and intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine, 33*(4), 281-290.

Farrell, A. D., Henry, D. B., Schoeny, M. E., Bettencourt, A., & Tolan, P. H. (2010). Normative beliefs and self-efficacy for nonviolence as moderators of peer, school, and parental risk factors for aggression in early adolescence. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 39,* 800–813. https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2010.517167

Farrington, D. P. (1998). Predictors, causes and correlates of male youth violence. *Crime and Justice, 24,* 421-475.

Fergus, S., Zimmerman, M., & Caldwell, C. (2005). Psychosocial correlates of smoking trajectories among urban African American adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 20,* 423-452.

Ferguson, C. J., San Miguel, C., & Hartley, R. D. (2009). A multivariate analysis of youth violence and aggression: The influence of family, peers, depression and media violence. *Journal of Pediatrics, 155*(6), 904-908.

Fergusson, D. M., Boden, J., & Horwood, L. (2008). Developmental antecedents of interpartner violence in a New Zealand birth cohort. *Journal of Family Violence, 23,* 737-753.

Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L., & Lynskey, M. T. (1994). The childhoods of multiple problem adolescents: A 15-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, and Allied Disciplines, 35*(6), 1123-1140.https://doi.org/10.1111j.1469-76-7610.1994.tb01813.x

Fergusson, D. M., & Lynskey, M. T. (1997). Physical punishment/maltreatment during childhood and adjustment in young adulthood. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 21*(7), 617-630. https://doi.org/1016S0145-2314(97)00021-5

Fergusson, D. M., Lynskey, M. T., & Horwood, L. J. (1996). Childhood sexual abuse and psychiatric disorder in young adulthood: I. Prevalence of sexual abuse and factors associated with sexual abuse. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 35*(10), 1355-1364.

Fineran, S., & Bolen, R. M. (2006). Risk factors for peer sexual harassment in schools. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*(9), 1169-1190.

Fosco, G. M., DeBoard, R. L., & Grych, J. H. (2007). Making sense of family violence: Implications of children's appraisals of interparental aggression for their short- and long-term functioning. *European Psychologist, 12*, 6–16.

Foshee, V. A., & Langwick, S., (2010). *Sage dates: An adolescent dating abuse prevention circulation* (2nd ed.). Center City, MN: Hazelden Foundation.

Foshee, V., McNaughton Reyes, H., Chen, M., Ennett, S., Basile, K., DeGue, S., Vivolo-Kantor, A., Moracco, K., & Bowling, M. (2016). Shared risk factors for the perpetration of physical dating violence, bullying, and sexual harassment among adolescents exposed to domestic violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 4,* 672-686.

Foy, D. W., Wood, J. L., King, D. W., King L. A., & Resnick, H. S. (1997). Los Angeles Symptom Checklist: Psychometric evidence with an adolescent sample. *Assessment, 4,* 377-384.

Freud, S. (1961). *Beyond the pleasure principle*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton.

Frick, P. J. (2014). *The Alabama Parenting Questionnaire.* University of New Orleans; Labs. Uno. Edu developmental-psychopathology/APQ.html.

Gage, A. (2016). Exposure to spousal violence in the family, attitudes and dating violence perpetration among high school students in Port-au-Prince. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 31*(14), 2445-2474.

Galano, M. M., Grogan-Kaylor, A. C., Stein, S. F., Clark, H. M., & Graham-Bermann, S. A. (2016a). Conflict appraisals in a multiethnic sample of children exposed to intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 31*(5), 655–665. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-016-9805-3

Galano, M. M., Grogan-Kaylor, A. C., Stein, S. F., Clark, H. M., & Graham-Bermann, S. A. (2016b). Posttraumatic stress disorder in Latina women: Examining the efficacy of the Moms' Empowerment Program. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy.* https://doi.org/10.1037/tra0000218

Garcia, D., Garcia, T., & Nunez, J. (2015). Predictors of school bullying perpetration in adolescence: A systematic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 23,* 126-136.

Gerard, J. M, Krishnakumar, A., & Buehler, C. (2006). Marital conflict, parent-child relations, and youth maladjustment a longitudinal investigation of spillover effects. *Journal of Family Issues, 27*(7), 951–975.

Gorman-Smith, D., Henry, D. B., & Tolan, P. H. (2010). Exposure to community violence and violence perpetration: The protective effects of family functioning. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 33*(3), 439-449. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1537442jccp3303_2

Gough, D., Oliver, S., & Thomas, J. (2012). *An introduction to systematic reviews.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Graham-Bermann, S., & Perkins, S. (2010). Effects of early exposure and lifetime exposure to intimate partner violence (IPV) on child adjustment. *Violence and Victims, 25*, 427-439.

Graham-Bermann, S., Lynch S., Banyard, V., Devoe, E., R., & Halabu, H. (2007). Community based intervention for children exposed to intimate partner violence: An efficacy trial *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 75*(2) 199-209. https://doi.org/101037/0022-006X,75.2.199

Granot, D., & Mayseless, O. (2001). Attachment security and adjustment to school in middle childhood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 25,* 530-541. https://doi.org/10.1080=01650250042000366

Gresham, F. M., & Elliot, S. N. (1990). *Social Skills Rating System manual.* Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Service.

Grest, A. V., Amaro, H., & Unger, J. (2018). Longitudinal predictors of intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization in Latino emerging adults. *Journal Youth Adolescence, 47,* 560-574. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s10964-017-0663-y

Grogan-Kaylor, A. C., Stein, S. F., Clark, H. M., Galano, M. M., & Graham-Bermann, S. A. (2017). Profiles of children's thinking about violence in families exposed to intimate partner violence. *Journal Child Family Studies, 26,* 2824-2833. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0787-4

Grych, J. H. (2000). *The Young Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scales.* Unpublished manuscript.

Grych, J. H., & Fincham, F. D. (1990). Marital conflict and children's adjustment: A

cognitive–contextual framework. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*, 267–290.

Grych, J. H., Fincham, F. D., Jouriles, E. N., & McDonald, R. (2000). Interparental

conflict and child adjustment: Testing the mediational role of appraisals in the

cognitive-contextual framework. *Child Development, 71*(6), 1648-1661.

https://doi.org/l0.1111/1467-8624.00255

Gulati, J. K., & Dutta, J. (2008). Risk, conflict between parents and child adjustment in

families experiencing persistent poverty in India. *Journal of Family Studies, 14,*

107-123.

Gustafsson, H. C., Cox, M. J., & Blair, C. (2012). Maternal parenting as a mediator of the

relationship between intimate partner violence and effortful control. *Journal of*

Family Psychology, 26, 115–123.

Haj-Yahia, M. M. (1991). *Perceptions about wife beating and the use of different conflict*

tactics among Arab-Palestinian engaged males in Israel. Unpublished doctoral

dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Haj-Yahia, M., & Abdo-Kaloti, R. (2008). Mental health consequences of Palestinian

adolescents' exposure to family violence. *Journal of Loss and Trauma, 13*(1), 1-41.

https://doi.org/10.1080/15325020701429130

Halliday-Hardie, J. H., & Lucas, A. (2010). Economic factors and relationship quality

among young couples: Comparing cohabitation and marriage. *Journal of Marriage*

and Family, 72(5), 1141-1154. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00755.x

Hamby, S. L. (1996). The Dominance Scale: Preliminary psychometric properties. *Violence and Victims, 11,* 199-212.

Hamby, S., Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., & Kracke, K. (2011). *The Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire toolkit.* Crimes Against Children Research Center: www.unh.edu/ccrc/jvq/index_new.html

Harris, K. M., Halpern, C. T., Whitsel, E., Hussey, J., Tabor, J., Entzel, P., & Udry, J. R. (Producer). (2009). The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health: Research design. Retrieved from http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design

Hazen, C., & Shaver, R. (1987). Conceptualizing romantic love as an attachment process *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52,* 511-524.

Henry, D., Sheldow, A., Smith, G., & Tolan, P. (2001). Family and community characteristics: Risk factors for violence exposure in inner-city youth. *Journal of Community Psychology, 29*(3), 345-360.

Herrenkohl, R. C., Herrenkohl, E. C., Egolf, B. P., & Wu, P. (1991). The developmental consequences of child abuse: The Lehigh Longitudinal Study. In R. H. Starr, Jr., & D. A. Wolfe (Eds.), *The effects of child abuse and neglect: Issues and research* (pp. 57-81). New York: Guilford.

Herrenkohl, T. I., & Herrenkohl, R. C. (2007). Examining the overlap and prediction of multiple forms of child maltreatment, stressors, and socioeconomic status: A longitudinal analysis of youth outcomes. *Journal of Family Violence, 22,* 553-562.

Herrenkohhl, T. I., Huang, B., Tajima, E., & Whitney, S. (2003). Examining the link

between child abuse and youth violence: An analysis of mediating mechanisms.

Journal of International Violence, 18(10), 1189-1208.

Herrera, V. M., & McCloskey, L. A. (2001). Gender differences in the risk for

delinquency among youth exposed to family violence. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 25,*

1037-1051.

Hetherington, E., & Parke, R. (1993). *Child psychology: A contemporary viewpoint.* New

York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three sub-

types and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin, 116,* 476-497.

Houston, J., & Grych, J. (2016). Maternal attachment buffers the association between

exposure to violence and youth attitudes about aggression. *Journal of Clinical Child

& Adolescent Psychology, 45*(5), 605-613.

Howard, K., Budge, S., & McKay, K. (2010). Youth exposed to violence: The role of

protective factors. *Journal of Community Psychology, 38*(1), 63-79.

Huesmann, L. R., & Guerra, N. G. (1997). Children's normative beliefs about aggression

and aggression behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72,* 408-

419. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.72.2.408

Hughes, H. M., Parkinson, D., & Vargo, M. (1989). Witnessing spouse abuse and

experiencing physical abuse: A "double whammy"? *Journal of Family Violence, 4,*

197–209.

Hussey, N. L., & Marshall, J. M., English, D. J., Knight, E. D., Lau, A. S., Dubowitz, H.,
& Kotch, J. B. (2005). Defining maltreatment according to substantiation:
Distinction without a difference? *Child Abuse & Neglect, 29,* 479-492.

Ireland, T., & Smith, C. (2009). Living in partner-violent families: Developmental links
to antisocial behavior and relationship violence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence,
38,* 323-339.

Jaffe, P., Wilson, S., & Wolfe, D., A. (1986). Promoting changes in attitudes and
understanding of conflict resolution among child witnesses of family violence.
Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 18(4), 356-366.

Jennings, W., Okeem, C., Piquero, A., Sellers, C., Theobald, D., & Farrington, D. (2017).
Dating and intimate partner violence among young persons ages 15-25: Evidence
from a systematic review. *Elsevier, 33,* 107-125.

Jennings, W. G., Richards, T., Tomsich, E., & Gover, A. (2015). Investigating the role of
child sexual abuse in intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration in
young adulthood from a propensity score matching approach. *Journal of Child
Sexual Abuse, 24*, 659-681.

Jouriles, E., Mueller, V., Rosenfield, D., McDonald, R., & Dodson, M. (2012). Teens'
experiences of harsh parenting and exposure to severe intimate partner violence:
Adding insult to injury in predicting teen dating violence. *Psychology of Violence,
2*(2), 125-138.

Jouriles, E., Vu, N., McDonald, R., & Rosenfield, D. (2014). Children's appraisals of conflict, and externalizing problems in families characterized by severe intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 28*(6), 915-924.

Kelly, S., Anderson, D., Hall, L., Peden, A., & Cerel, J. (2012). The effects of exposure to gang violence on adolescent boys' mental health. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 33,* 80-88.

Kennedy, A. C., Bybee, D., Sullivan, C. M., & Greeson, M. (2009). The effects of community and family violence exposure on anxiety trajectories during middle childhood: The role of family social support as a moderator. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 38*, 365–379.

Kennedy, A. C., Bybee, D., Sullivan, C. M., & Greeson, M. (2010). The impact of family and community violence on children's depression trajectories: Examining the interactions of violence exposure, family social support, and gender. *Journal of Family Psychology, 24*(2), 197–207. http://doi.org/10.1037/a0018787

Khamis, V. (1995). *Coping with stress: Palestinian families and intifada-related trauma.* Unpublished manuscript.

Kim, L., Jackson, Y., Hunter, L., & Conrad, S. (2009). Interparental conflict and adolescent dating relationships: The role of perceived threat and self-blame appraisals. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(5), 844-865.

Kinsfogel K. M., & Grych, J. H. (2004). Interparental conflict and adolescent dating relationships: Integrating cognitive, emotional and peer influences. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*(3), 505-515. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20137

Knous-Westfall, H. M., Ehrensaft, M. K., MacDonell, K. W., & Cohen, P. (2012). Parental intimate partner violence, parenting practices, and adolescent peer bullying: A prospective study. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 21*(5), 754-766. https://doi.org/10.1007/s108-011-9528-2

Kogan, L. S., Smith, J., & Jenkins, S. (1977). Ecological validity of indicator data as predictors of survey findings. *Journal of Social Service Research, 1,* 117-132.

Kramer, B., Boelk, A., & Auer, C. (2006). Family conflict at the end-of-life: Lessons learned in a model program for vulnerable older adults. *Journal of Palliative Medicine, 9,* 791-801.

Kramer, B., Kavanaugh, M., Trentham-Dietz, A., Walsh, M., & Yonker, J. (2010). Predictors of family conflict at the end of life: The experience of spouses and adult children of persons with lung cancer. *The Gerontologist, 50*, 215-225.

Krishnakumar A, & Buehler, C. (2000). Interparental conflict and parenting behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Family Relations, 49*(1), 25–44.

Krug, E. G., Dahlberg, L. L., Mercy, J. A., Zwi, A. B., & Lozano, R. (Eds.). (2002). *World report on violence and health*. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.

Kurdek, L. A. (1994). Conflict resolution styles in gay, lesbian, heterosexual nonparents, and heterosexual parent couples. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 56,* 705-722.

Kwong, M. J., Bartholomew, K., Henderson, A. J. A., & Trinke, S. (2003). The intergenerational transmission of relationship violence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 17*(3), 288-301.

Landor, A., M., Hurt, T., Futris, T., Barton, A.,W., McElroy S., E., & K., Sheats, (2017). Relationship contexts sources of socialization: An exploration of intimate partner violence experiences of economically disadvantaged African American adolescents. *Journal Child Family Studies, 26,* 1274-1284. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s10826-016-0650-z

Laporte, L., Jiang, D., Pepler, D. J., & Chamberland, C. (2009). The relationship between adolescents' experience of family violence and dating violence. *Youth and Society, 43*(1), 3-27. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0044118X09336631

Latzman, N. E., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Holditch Niolon, P., & Ghazarian, S. R. (2015). Predicting adolescent dating violence perpetration: Role of exposure to intimate partner violence and parenting practices. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 49*(3), 476-482. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.06.006

Lawrence, E., Orengo, A., Langer, A., & Brock, R. (2012). The impact and consequences of partner abuse on partners. *Partner Abuse, 3*(4), 406-428.

Lee, R. D., Walters, M. L., Hall, J. E., & Basile, K. C. (2013). Behavioral and attitudinal factors differentiating male intimate partner violence perpetrators with and without

a history of childhood family. *Journal of Family Violence, 28,* 85-94.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-012-9475-8

Lewis, S., & Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review, 21,* 105-127.

Lieberman, A. F., Van Horn, P., & Ippen, C. G. (2005). Toward evidence-based treatment: Child–parent psychotherapy with preschoolers exposed to marital violence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 44*(12), 1241–1248.

Lim, S. H., & Aug, R. P. (2009). Relationship between boys' normative beliefs about aggression and their physical, verbal, and indirect aggressive behaviors. *Adolescence, 44,* 635-650.

Linder, J. R., & Collins, W. A. (2005). Parent and peer predictors of physical aggression and conflict management in romantic relations in early adulthood. *Journal of Family Psychology, 19*(2), 252-262.

Liu, W., Mumford, E. A., & Taylor, B. G. (2018). The relationship between parents' intimate partner victimization and youths' adolescent relationship abuse. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 47*(2), 321-333. doi:10.1007/s10964-017-0733-1

Locke, L. F., Silverman, S. J., & Waneen, W. S. (2004). *Reading and understanding research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lopez, V. A., & Emmer, E. T. (2002). Influences of beliefs and values on male

adolescents' decision to commit violent offenses. *Psychology of Men and

Masculinity, 3*(1) 28-40.

Luthra, R., & Gidyez, C. A. (2006). Dating violence among college men and women:

Evaluations of a theoretical model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21*(6), 717-

731.

Manly, J. T., Kim, J. E., Rogosch, F. A., & Cichetti, D. (2001). Dimensions of child

maltreatment and children's adjustment: Contributions of developmental timing and

subtype. *Development and Psychopathology, 13,* 750-782.

Margolin, G., Vikerman, K. A., Ramos, M. C., Duman Serrano, S., Gordis, E. B.,

Itturalde, E., Oliver, P. H., & Spies, L. A. (2009). Youth exposed to violence:

Stability, co-occurrence and context. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review,

12*, 39-54.

McDonald, R., Jouriles, E. N., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Caetano, R., & Green, C. E. (2006).

Estimating the number of American children living in partner-violent families.

Journal of Family Psychology, 20, 137-142.

Mikulineer, M., Florian, V., & Tolmacz, R. (1990). Attachment styles and fear of death:

A case study of affect regulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,

58*(2), 273-280.

Millett, L., Kohl, P., Jonson-Reid, M., Drake, B., & Petra, M. (2013). Child maltreatment victimization and subsequent perpetration of young adult intimate partner violence: An exploration of mediating factors. *Child Maltreatment, 18*, 71-84.

Moffit, T. E., & Silva, P. A. (1988). Self-reported delinquency: Results from an instrument for New Zealand. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 21,* 227-240.

Moore, T., & Pepler, D. J. (2006). Wounding words: Maternal verbal aggression and children's adjustment. *Journal of Family Violence, 21*(1), 89-93. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-005-9007-x

Moos, R., & Moos, B. (2002). *Environment Scale Manual.* Palo Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Moretti, M., Obsuth, I., Odgers, C., & Reebye, P. (2006). Exposure to maternal vs. paternal partner violence, PTSD, and aggression in adolescent girls and boys. *Aggressive Behavior, 32,* 385-395.

Moylan, C. A., Herrenkohl, T. I., Sousa, C., Tajima, E. A., Herrenkohl, R. C., & Russo, M. J. (2010). The effects of child abuse exposure to domestic violence on adolescent internalizing and externalizing behavior problems. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*, 53–63.

Murray, C. E. (2006). Controversy, constraints, and context: Understanding family violence through family systems theory. *The Family Journal, 14*(3), 234-239.

Nansel, T. R., Overpock, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. I., Simons-Moarton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behavior among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *JAMA, 285*(16)*, 2094-2100.

Narayan, A., Englund, M., & Egeland, B. (2013). Developmental timing and continuity of exposure to interparental violence and externalizing behavior as prospective predictors of dating violence. *Development and Psychopathology, 25,* 973-990. https://doi.org/10.1017/8095457941300031X

Narayan, A., Labella, M., Englund, M., Carlson, E., & Egeland, B. (2017). The legacy of early childhood violence exposure to adulthood intimate partner violence: Variable- and person-oriented evidence. *Journal of Family Psychology 31*(7), 833-843.

National Commission on Children. (1991). *Speaking of kids: A national survey of parents and children.* Washington, D.C.: U S. Government Printing Office.

Neal, J., & Neal, Z. (2013). Nested or networked? Future directions for ecological systems theory. *Social Development, 22*(4)*, 722-737.

Okour, A. M. & Hijazi, H. H. (2009). Domestic violence and family dysfunction as risk factor for violent behavior among university students in North Jordan. *Journal of Family Violence, 24,* 361-366.

O'Leary, K. D. (1999). Psychological abuse: A variable deserving critical attention in domestic violence. *Violence and Victims, 14,* 3-23.

O'Leary, K. D., & Jacobson, N. S. (1997). Partner relational problems with physical abuse. *DSM-IV Sourcebook, 4,* 701-721. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

O'Leary, K. D., Foran, H., Cohen, S. (2013). Validation of fear of partner scale. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 39, 502-514. doi:10.1111/j.1752-0606.2012.00327.x

Olweus, D. (1996). *The Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire.* Bergen, Norway: University of Bergen.

Olweus, E. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Orue, I., Bushman, B. J., Calvete, E., Thomaes, S., de Castro, B. O., & Hutteman, R. (2011). Monkey see, monkey do, monkey hurt: Longitudinal effects of exposure to violence on children's aggressive behavior. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 2,* 432–437. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550610396586

Paat, Y. (2011). The link between financial strain, interparental discord and children's antisocial behaviors. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*(3), 195-210.

Park, A., Smith, C., & Ireland, T. (2012). Equivalent harm? The relative roles of maltreatment and exposure to intimate partner violence in anti-social outcomes for young adults. *Children and Youth Services Review, 34,* 962-972.

Patchin, J., Huebner, B., McCluskey, J., Varano, S., & Bynum, T. (2006). Exposure to community violence and childhood delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency, 52*(2), 307-332.

Patterson, G. R., & Yoerger, K. (1993). Development models for delinquent behavior. In Hodgins (Ed.), *Mental disorder and crime* (pp. 140-172). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Patterson, G. R., Ried, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys.* Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Pepler, D. J., Craig, W. M., Connolly, J. A., & Henderson, K. (2002). Bullying sexual harassment, dating violence, and substance use among adolescents. In C. Wekerle & A. M. Wall (Eds.), *The violence and addiction equation: Theoretical and clinical issues in substance abuse and relationship violence* (pp. 143-168). Philadelphia, PA: Brunner/Mazel.

Peterson, J. (2015). *The State of Americans* by Urie Bronfenbrenner, Peter McClelland, Elaine Wethington, Phyllis Moen, and Stephen J. Ceci [Book review]. *Journal of Economic Issues, 31,* 863-865.

Petticrew, M., & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic reviews in the social sciences.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Pillari, V., & Newsome, M. (1998). *Human behavior in the environment: Families, groups, and communities.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Racz, S. J., & McMahon, R. J. (2011). The relationship between parental knowledge and monitoring and child and adolescent conduct problems: A 10-year update. *Clinical*

Child and Family Psychology Review, 14(4), 377-398.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10567-011-0099-y

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for researched in

the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*(3), 385-401.

https://doi.org/101177/014662167700100306

Rapoza, K. A., & Baker, A. T. (2008). Attachment styles, alcohol, and childhood

experiences of abuse: An analysis of physical violence in dating couples. *Violence

and Victims, 23*, 52-65. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.23.1.52

Reichman, N., Teitler, J., Garfinkel, I., & McLanahan, S. (2001). Fragile families:

Sample and design. *Children and Youth Services Review, 23*(4-5), 303-326.

Reiss, L. L., & Lee, G. R. (1988). *Family system in America.* New York, NY: Holt,

Rinehart, & Winston.

Renner, L. M., & Boel-Studt, S. (2017). Physical family violence and externalizing and

internalizing behaviors among children and adolescents. *American Journal of

Orthopsychiatry*, *87*(4), 474-486. https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000260

Renner, L., Reese, L., Peek-Asa, C., & Ramirez, M. (2015). Reporting patterns of

unidirectional and bidirectional verbal aggression and physical violence among

rural couples. *Journal of Family Violence, 30*(8), 1069-1078.

Rickert, V. I., Wiemann, C. M., Harrykissoon, S. D., Berenson, A. B., & Kolb, E. (2002).

The relationship among demographics, reproductive characteristics, and intimate

partner violence. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology, 187*(4), 1002-1007.

Roscoe, B., & Callahan, J. E. (1985). Adolescents self-report of violence in families and dating relationships. *Adolescence, 20*(79), 545-553.

Roustit, C., Renahy, E., Guernec, G., Lesieur, S., Parizot, I., & Chauvin, P. (2009). Exposure to interparental violence and psychosocial maladjustment in the adult life course: Advocacy for early prevention. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 63*(7), 563–568. https://doi.org/10.1136/jech.2008.077750

Rutter, M. (1981). Stress coping and development: Some issues and some questions. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 22,* 323-356.

Rutter, M., Tizard, M., & Whitmore, K. (1970). *Education, health and behaviour.* London, UK: Longmans.

Salas-Wright, C. P., Nelson, E. J., Vaughn, M. G., Reingle Gonzalez, J. M., & Cordova, D. (2017). Trends in fighting and violence among adolescents in the United States, 2002–2014. *American Journal of Public Health*, *107*, 977-982.

Schaefer, E. S. (1965). Children's reports of parental behavior: An inventory. *Child Development, 36,* 646-662.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1997). The early socialization of aggressive victims of bullying. *Child Development, 68,* 665-675. https://doi.org/10.2371132117

Schwartz, J. P., Hage, S. M., Bush, I., & Burns, L. K. (2006). Unhealthy parenting and

potential mediators as contributing factors to future intimate violence: A review of

the literature. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 7*(3), 206-221.

Seligman, M. E. (1975). *Helplessness: On depression, development, and death*. San

Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Shaffer, J. N., & Ruback, R. B. (2002). Violent victimization as a risk factor for violent

offending among juveniles. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin.* Retrieved October 14, 2003,

from http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/ojjdp/195737.pdf

Sheidow, A. J., Gorman-Smith, D., Tolan, P. H., & Henry, D. B. (2001). Family and

community characteristics: Risk factors for violence exposure in inner-city youth.

Journal of Community Psychology, 29(3), 345-360.

Simons, R. L., Lin, K., & Gordon, L. C. (1998). Socialization in the family of origin and

male dating violence: A prospective study. *Family Relations, 60,* 467-478.

Simons, R. L., Simons, L. G., & Wallace L. E. (2004). *Families, delinquency, and crime:

Linking society's most basic institution to antisocial behavior*. Los Angeles, CA:

Roxbury.

Sims, E., Dodd, V. J. N., & Tejeda, M. (2008). The relationship between severity of

violence in the home and dating violence. *Journal of Forensic Nursing, 4*(4), 166-

173.

Singer, S. (1986). Victims of serious violence and their criminal behavior: Subcultural

theory and beyond. *Violence and Victims, 1*(1), 61-70.

Slovak, K., Carlson, K., & Helm, L. (2007). The influence of family violence on youth attitudes. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 24*(1), 77-99.

Smith, C. A., Elwyn, L. J., Ireland, T. O., & Thornberry, T. P. (2010). The impact of adolescent exposure to intimate partner violence on substance use in early adulthood. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 71*, 219-230.

Smith, C. A., Ireland, T. O., Park, A., Elwyn, L., & Thornberry, T. P. (2011). Intergenerational continuities and discontinuities in intimate partner violence: A two generational prospective study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(18), 3720-3752.

Smith, C. A., & Thornberry, T. P. (1995). The relationship between childhood maltreatment and adolescent involvement in delinquency. *Criminology, 33,* 451-481. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1995.tb01186.x

Sousa, C., Herrenkohl, T. I., Moylan, C. A., Tajima, E. A., Klika, J. B., Herrenkohl, R. C., & Russo, M. J. (2010). Longitudinal study on the effects on child abuse and children's exposure to domestic violence, parent-child attachments, and antisocial behavior in adolescence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26,* 111-136. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510362883

Sternberg, K. J., Baradaran, L. P., Abbott, C. B., Lamb, M. E., & Guterman, E. E. (2006). Type of violence, age, and gender differences in the effects of family violence on children's behavior problems: A mega-analysis. *Developmental Review, 26*, 89–112

Straus, M., & Douglas, E. M. (2004). A short form of the revised Conflict Tactics Scales, and typologies for severity and mutuality. *Violence and Victims. 19, 507-520.*

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intra-family conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 41,* 75-88. https://doi.org/10.2307/351733

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17,* 283-316. https://doi.org/10.1177/019251396017003001

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Finkelhor, D., Moore, D. W., & Runyan, D. (1998). Identification of child maltreatment with the Parent-Child Conflict Tactics Scales: Development and psychometric data for a national sample of American parents. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 22,* 249-270. https://doi.org/10.1016=S0145-2134(97)00174-9

Sugimoto-Matsuda, J., Hishinuma, E., & Chang, J. (2013). Prevalence of youth violence in the U.S. 1999-2009: Ethnic comparisons and disaggregating Asian Americans. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 17*(10), 1802-1816. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10995-012-1200-y

Swan, S. C., Gambone, L. J., Fields, A. M., Sullivan, T. P., & Snow, D. L. (2005). Women who use violence in intimate relationships: The role of anger, victimization, and symptoms of posttraumatic stress and depression. *Violence and Victims, 20*(3), 267-285.

Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2003). A typology of women's use of violence in intimate relationships. *Violence Against Women, 8*(3), 286-319.

Tajima, E. A., Herrenkohl, T. I., Huang. B., & Whitney, S. (2004). Measuring child maltreatment: A comparison of prospective parent reports and retrospective adolescent report. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 74*, 424-435.

Thornberry, T. P., Freeman-Gallant, A., Lizotte, A. J., Krohn, M. D., & Smith, C. A. (2003). Linked lives: The intergenerational transmission of antisocial behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 31,* 171-184.

Thornberry, T. P., Ireland, T. O., & Smith, C. A. (2001). The importance of timing: The varying impact of childhood and adolescent maltreatment on multiple problems outcomes. *Development and Psychopathology, 13,* 957-979.

Thornberry, T. P., & Krohn, M. D. (2001). The development of delinquency: An interactional perspective. In S. O. White (Ed.), *Handbook of youth and justice.* New York, NY: Plenum.

Thornberry, T. P., Krohn, M. D., Lizette, A. J., Smith, C. A., & Tobin, K. (2003b). *Gangs and delinquency in developmental perspective.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Tolman, R. M., Edleson, J. L., & Fendrich, M. (1996). The applicability of the theory of planned behavior to abusive men's cessation of violent behavior. *Violence and Victims, 11,* 341-354.

Truman, J. (2010). *Criminal victimization, 2010*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice.

Tyler, K., & Melander, L. (2012). Poor parenting and antisocial behavior among homeless young adults: Links to dating violence perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(7), 1357-1373.

Tyler, K. A., & Cauce, A. M. (2002). The impact of childhood sexual abuse on later sexual victimization among runaway youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 11,* 151-176.

Tyler, K. A., Hoyt, D. R., & Whitbeck, L. B. (1998). Coercive sexual strategies. *Violence and Victims, 13,* 47-61.

Udry, J. R. (2003). *The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (AddHealth), Waves I and II, 1994-1996, and Wave III, 2001-2002*. Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina. Retrieved from http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design

Umemoto, K., Baker, C. K., Helm, S., Miao, T., Goebert, D., & Hishinuma, E. (2009). Moving toward comprehensiveness and sustainability in a social ecological approach to youth violence prevention: Lessons from the Asian/Pacific Islander

Youth Violence Prevention Center. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 44,* 221-232.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). *U.S. decennial census*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Voisin, D., & Hong, J. (2012). A meditational model linking witnessing intimate partner violence and bullying behaviors and victimization among youth. *Educational Psychology Review, 24,* 479-489.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walker, I. (1977). The battered women and learned helpless. *Victimology, 78*(2), 525-534.

Wekerle, C., Leung, E., Wall, A. M., MacMillan, H., Boyle, M., Trocme, N., & Waechter, R. (2009). The contribution of childhood emotional abuse to teen dating violence among child protective services-involved youth. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 33,* 45-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2008.12.006

Widom, C. S. (1989). The cycle of violence. *Science, 244,* 160-166. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.2704995

Widom, C. S., & Wilson, H. W. (2015). Intergenerational transmission of violence. *Violence and Mental Health,* pp. 27-45.

Williams, K., Riveras, L., Neighbours, R., & Reznik, V. (2007). Youth violence

   prevention comes of age: Research, training and future directions. *Annual Review of*

   Public Health, 28, 195-211.

Winstok, Z. (2007). Toward an interactional perspective on intimate partner violence.

   Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12(3), 348-363.

Wolfe, D., Scott, K., Straatman, A., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., Wekerle, C., Grasley, C., &

   Straatman, A. (2001). Development and validation of Conflict in Adolescent Dating

   Relationship Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 13*(2), 277-293.

Wood, S. L., & Sommers, M. S. (2011). Consequences of intimate partner violence on

   child witnesses: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of Child and*

   Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing, 24, 223–236. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-

   6171.2011.00302.x

World Health Organization. (1996). *Violence: A public health priority: WHO Global*

   Consultation on Violence and Health (Document WHO/EHA/SPI.POA.2). Geneva,

   Switzerland: Author.

World Health Organization. (2003). *World report on violence and health.* Geneva,

   Switzerland: Author.

Wright, E. M., Fagan, A. A., & Pinchevsky, G. M. (2013). The effects of exposure to

   violence and victimization across life domains on adolescent substance use. *Child*

   Abuse Neglect, 37(11), 899–909.

Yates, T. M., Dodds, M. F., Stroufe, L. A., & Egeland, B. (2003). Exposure to partner violence and child behavior problems: A prospective study controlling for child physical abuse and neglect, child cognitive ability, socioeconomic status, and life stress. *Development and Psychopathology, 15,* 199-218. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0954579403000117

Zimring, E. (2013). American youth violence: A cautionary tale. *Crime and Justice in America, 42,* 265-2