

2017

# A Quantitative Examination of the Impact of Protective Orders on Teen Dating Violence

Sonia Ann Layne  
*Walden University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

---

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu](mailto:ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu).

# Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Sonia Layne

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. Clarence Williamson, Committee Chairperson,  
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Karel Kurst-Swanger, Committee Member,  
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Patricia Ripoll, University Reviewer,  
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer  
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University  
2017

Abstract

A Quantitative Examination of the Impact of  
Protective Orders on Teen Dating Violence

by

Sonia Layne

MPA, Long Island University, 2007

BS, College of Staten Island, 2004

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

August 2017

## Abstract

Teen dating violence is a national epidemic with prevalence similar to levels of adult dating and domestic violence. Some states order of protection laws currently fails to protect most teen victims experiencing dating violence. The purpose of this experimental, quantitative study was to determine to what extent domestic violence statutes impact the reporting of teen dating violence in states that provide statutory protection of teen dating violence victims. The advocacy coalition framework was used for the study's theoretical foundation. The research questions focused on differences between the strength of state's advocacy coalition programs, and the prevalence of female teens reporting dating violence. One-way ANOVAs and Games-Howell post hoc tests were used to analyze existing data acquired from Center for Disease Control 2011 State Youth Risk Behavioral Survey of 39,184 high school females from 43 states; 2010 Break the Cycle State Law Report Cards, and 2011-2015 Domestic Violence Counts: National Census of Domestic Violence Services. Findings indicate a statistically significant difference between states that do not provide statutory protection for teen victims and states that do provide statutory protection ( $p < .001$ ) and implied that stronger state advocacy and coalition programs resulted in higher reported incidents of physical dating violence among female teens. Implications for positive social change include recommendations to lawmakers and crime prevention specialists to consider changes in domestic violence statutes to protect teen victims, provide specific statutory remedy for teen victims and reduce the frequency of teen dating violence as result of increased reporting.

A Quantitative Examination of the Impact of  
Protective Orders on Teen Dating Violence

by

Sonia Layne

MA, Long Island University, 2007

BS, College of Staten Island, 2004

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

August 2017

## Dedication

I dedicate my dissertation in memory of my parents, George and Amy Mclean. Although they are no longer here with me, they are truly my inspiration. They have taught me the importance of discipline, determination, the desire to always work hard and that believing in myself will produce extraordinary results. I could not have accomplished this monumental task without the solid foundation and the teachings that they instilled in me. They always lay emphasis on the relevance of education and would be so proud that I achieved a doctorate degree. Papa and Mama, I will love and honor you both forever.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the people in my life who have been supportive and shared my joy and pain, ups and downs throughout the past years as I pursued obtaining my Ph.D. I owe my sincere gratitude to my dissertation chairperson and committee members, Walden professors and staff, colleagues, mentors, family, and friends. It would have been next to impossible in accomplishing this degree without their guidance, wisdom, support, motivation, and patience.

First, I would like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Clarence Williamson my dissertation chair for his supervision, guidance, and support given to me during this entire process. I could not have found a better chairperson than Dr. Williamson. He had complete confidence in me and that made all the difference. He always provided encouraging words and there were times when I was uncertain if I had made the correct decision or if I was heading in the right direction but he would provide guidance to help me discover my intended direction and the insight to find the answers myself. He challenged my critical thinking and assisted with enhancing my research knowledge and skills. Dr. Williamson I truly appreciate you and I owe my sincere gratitude to you for everything that you have done to assist me with completing my dissertation.

Next, I would like to thank Dr. Karel Kurst-Swanger for serving as my dissertation committee member. I was astounded at her concern and guidance. She was

always available and more than willing to answer questions for me whenever needed. She provided examples that helped me completely understand whatever I was having an issue with or needed assistance. She provided her exceptional expertise in the methodology and data collection phase. She helped me to understand and define my theoretical concept and always encouraging me to make my paper stronger. For that I am truly grateful.

To my sister-friends: Vicky, Marcia, Jewel, Shelly, Michelle, Sharon, Sharon-Usher, Dawn, Novelette, Charmaine, and Edward Jewel's husband who is no longer here with us. I thank you all for lending an ear when I needed someone to just listen and provide emotional support. Your friendships have meant so much and I appreciate everyone for helping me keep my perspective of what is important and always encouraged me to hang in there. I am forever grateful to Michelle Hayes for starting me on this journey. There are many others and far too many people to name (especially NYCTA Family) who have provided me some type of moral support or encouragement along this journey but to all of you, I give my sincere gratitude.

My family there are no words to say how much I appreciate your love and endless support - my four children: Stacey-Ann, Sakinah, Racine and Leon, my grandchildren: Shanesia Sashay, Shane, Leelu, Zaire, Minaii, Amora and Silver along with my God-children: Kameisha, and Nashaun for always believing in me and encouraging me to rise to my full potential. To my many other family members; Rose, Deshawn and Noma



Pennant who were supportive as well and I appreciate all of you. In conclusion, I give the praise to God for giving me the strength, wisdom, knowledge, understanding and patience to accomplish this monumental task.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Background.....	3
Problem Statement.....	7
Purpose of the Study.....	8
Theoretical Framework, Research Questions, and Hypothesis .....	9
Research Question 1 .....	11
Research Question 2 .....	12
Research Question 3 .....	12
Research Question 4 .....	13
Nature of the Study.....	15
Definition of Terms.....	16
Assumptions.....	19
Scope/Delimitations.....	20
Limitations .....	20
Significance.....	22
Summary.....	24

Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	25
Introduction.....	25
Literature Research Strategy.....	27
Theoretical Foundation .....	28
Literature Review Related to Key Variables .....	32
The Prevalence of Teen Dating Violence .....	32
Physical Dating Violence.....	33
Sexual Dating Violence .....	34
Risk Factors and Consequences.....	34
Gender Differences .....	38
Cost and Consequences of Dating Violence.....	38
State Laws and Teen Dating Violence.....	39
Barriers to Obtaining Orders Protection .....	40
Relationship Requirements .....	41
Age Requirements.....	41
Parental Consent Requirements .....	42
Study Justification.....	43
Summary .....	44
Chapter 3: Methodology .....	46

Introduction.....	46
Research Design and Rationale .....	46
The Youth Risk Behavior Survey.....	48
State Law Report Cards: A National Survey on Teen Dating Violence Laws .....	50
Domestic Violence Counts: National Census of Domestic Violence Services .....	52
Research Variables.....	56
Setting and Sample .....	57
Data Collection and Procedures.....	58
Review of the Hypotheses .....	59
Research Question 1 .....	60
Research Question 2 .....	60
Research Question 3 .....	61
Research Question 4 .....	61
Data Analysis.....	62
Secondary Data Analysis .....	64
Threat to Validity.....	65
Limitations .....	66
Ethical Procedures .....	67
Summary.....	67

Chapter 4: Results .....	69
Introduction.....	699
Data Collection .....	70
Results.....	73
Summary.....	87
Chapter 5: Recommendations and Conclusions .....	89
Introduction.....	89
Interpretations of Findings.....	90
Limitations of the Study.....	94
Recommendations for Future Research .....	96
Implications for Social Change.....	99
Conclusion .....	101
References.....	104
Appendix A: 2010 State Law Report Cards: An Overview of Grades .....	12424
Appendix B: CDC 2011 StateYouth Risk Behavior Survey .....	12525
Appendix C: SPSS Results.....	126

## List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of Application of ACF Applied to Teen Dating Violence .....	13
Table 2. Summary of Application of ACF Applied to Teen Dating Violence .....	30
Table 3. Break the Cycle State Law Report Card 2010 .....	41
Table 4. States with Statutes That Prohibits all Minors from Petitioning the Court .....	42
Table 5. States that Allow Minors to Petition the Court on Their Own Behalf for Orders of Protection .....	43
Table 6. Indicators Used to Evaluate States Domestic Violence Laws Concerning Teen Dating Violence and Civil Protection Orders .....	51
Table 7. Programs Used to Analyze States Advocacy Coalition's Strength in Domestic Violence Services and Support during Domestic Violence Counts: National 24 hour Census .....	54
Table 8. CDC YRBS, Break the Cycle State Law Report Card and NNDEV Census .....	56
Table 9. Participant Demographics .....	70
Table 10. Physical and Sexual Violence Reported by the Female Teens .....	72
Table 11. Summary Statistics for Reported Physical Violence by State .....	73
Table 12. Results of the Analysis for Physical Violence Based on Whether the State Allows Minors to Petition the Courts on their Own Behalf .....	74
Table 13. Summary Statistics for Reported Sexual Violence by State .....	75
Table 14. Results of the Analysis for Sexual Violence Based on Whether the State Allows Minors to Petition the Courts on Their Own Behalf .....	75
Table 15. Summary Statistics for Reported Physical Violence by State .....	77

Table 16. Results of the Analysis for Physical Violence Based on Whether the State Prohibited all Minors from Filing an Order of Protection .....	77
Table 17. Summary Statistics of Reported Sexual Violence by State .....	78
Table 18. Results of the Analysis for Sexual Violence Based on Whether the State Prohibits all Minors from Filing Orders of Protection.....	78
Table 19. Summary Statistics for Reported Physical Violence by State .....	80
Table 20. Results of the Analysis for Physical Violence Based on Whether the State Explicitly Excludes Persons in Dating Relationships from Filing an Order of Protection .....	80
Table 21. Summary Statistics for Reported Sexual Violence by State.....	81
Table 22. Results of the Analysis for Sexual Violence Based on Whether the State Explicitly Excludes Persons in Dating Relationships from Filing an Order of Protection .....	82
Table 23. Summary Statistics for Reported Physical Violence Depending on the Strength of State Advocacy and Coalition Programs and Services .....	844
Table 24. Results of the Games-Howell Post Hoc Test Depending on the Strength of State Advocacy Coalition Programs and Services .....	84
Table 25. Summary Statistics for Reported Sexual Violence Depending on the Strength of State Advocacies.....	86
Table 26. Results of the Games-Howell Post Hoc Test Depending on the Strength of State Advocacies.....	86

## Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

### **Introduction**

Teen dating violence in the United States is a health issue. It impacts victims physically and emotionally (Black et al., 2011; Foshee et. al, 2013; Exner-Cortens, Eckenrode & Rothman, 2013). In response to rising public awareness of teen dating violence, health education programs have been developed by various public organizations. Despite this increased awareness, little has been done to quantitatively analyze the prevalence of reporting teen dating violence and strategic choices to address the issue.

In 2013, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that 9.8% of high school teens endured physical violence; 7.4% experienced forced sexual intercourse; and 28.5% had experienced violence consecutively during a 12-month period (CDC, 2013). In a 2011 survey, CDC also found that when divided by gender, 15.7% of female adolescents and 7.8% of male adolescents were affected by physical dating violence. Combined with sexual abuse, in dating relationships the figures rose to 24.4% for females, and 9.9% for males (CDC, 2013, p. 2).

Dating violence has many potential consequences and effects, including sexually transmitted diseases, substance and alcohol abuse, feelings of sadness, hopelessness, major depression, suicidal ideation, anger, and low self-esteem (CDC, 2013). Of female adolescents experiencing dating violence, “60% were more likely to report one or more attempted suicide than those in healthy relationships” (Olshen, McVeigh, Wunsch-Hitzig,



& Rickert, 2007, p. 543). Adolescents in dating relationships reported that they feared their dating partners and sustained destructive experiences and lasting trauma (Offenhauer & Buchalter, 2011). If such problems are not addressed at an early stage in a teen's relationship, they can normalize violence and abuse and create unhealthy power relations where one partner exerts dominance and control over the other (Cornelius & Resseguie, 2007; O'Leary & Gonzales, 2007). Although teen dating violence (the physical, sexual, psychological, or emotional violence within a dating relationship, including stalking) is a serious health problem, lawmakers have been slow to adjust state domestic violence statutes because teen dating violence goes unnoticed (CDC, 2006). Provisions and the resources needed for adolescent victims and perpetrators are necessary to combat the problem. Perpetrators should be required to mandatory counselling to help in deterring future violence. (Cornelius et al., 2009). Although teen and adult dating violence are similar, the protection provided by state laws for these categories of abuse are administered differently (Cornelius et al., 2009). The legal system's adult-centered approach eliminates teen victims from seeking protection because they are under age 18. Most states requires teens to be accompanied by a parent or care-giver to file an order of protection and often times they are reluctant to confide in their parents (Klien et al., 2013). As such, the purpose of this quantitative study was to analyze the differences in state domestic violence statutes that could create barriers for teens seeking orders of protection. The study also sought to gauge the impact of such legislation on female high school populations in heterosexual relationships between the ages of 14 and 17.

The following topics are presented in this chapter: background, problem statement, purpose, research questions and hypotheses, theoretical framework, nature of study, definitions, assumptions, scope, and delimitations, and significance.

### **Background**

In the United States, an order of protection is a viable tool for deterring and reducing domestic violence (Logan & Walker, 2011). Studies have shown that civil orders of protection prevent further occurrences of domestic violence for most victims (Carlson, Harris, & Holden, 1999; Harrell & Smith, 1996; Keilitz, Efke, & Hannaford, 1997; Logan & Walker, 2011; Logan et al., 2006). Among the orders of protection issued for domestic violence, between 30 and 77 percent were not violated (Carlson, Harris & Holden, 1999; Logan & Walker, 2010, p. 2). Most victims believe the orders of protection were effective and reported feeling less fearful after obtaining them.

Adults experiencing domestic violence can seek orders of protection to protect them from further abuse. Civil orders grant victims a sense of empowerment while providing an option for victims who are unwilling to press criminal charges (DeJong & Proctor, 2006). If both parties avoid or limit contact or communication, and the abusive party vacates the property and seeks counseling the order of protection is usually effective but that is not always the case. (Benitez et al., 2010). As of 2010, it was projected that only 20% of abused women sought civil orders of protection even though orders of protection have been shown to provide some degree of protection (Benitez, McNeil, & Binder, 2010). The number of women who would benefit from an order of

protection is much greater than the women that do not have orders of protection (Benitez et al., 2010).

Legal policies that do focus on teen dating violence are generally entrenched in domestic violence policies (Cornelius et al., 2009). Research linked to teen dating violence is usually centered on the victim and perpetrator's family history, social traits, and psychological effects (Foshee et al., 2010d). Acts of dating violence often occur out of public view, leading the public to believe its occurrence is minimal (Foshee et al., 2010d). Many believe that dating violence only occurs between teens from financially disadvantaged families, when, in fact, dating violence crosses genders, socioeconomic classes, communities, ethnic groups, and cultures (Foshee et al., 2008; Hamel & Nichols, 2006; Henry & Zeytinoglu, 2012). Among adolescent heterosexual couples, 15–40% experience dating violence. The effects range from minor physical or psychological damage to death (CDC, 2011; Foshee et al., 2008).

Experiencing teen dating violence is associated with the possibilities of re-victimization in their adult dating relationships. Teens' abusive relationships often mirror adult abusive relationships in many aspects, including type and severity of physical and sexual abuse (Shorey et al., 2008). A study conducted by Afifi et al. (2009) revealed an association between domestic violence, and women and men who have a history of child abuse. The authors conducted a study of 2,254 male and female participants who experienced sexual abuse as children and found that they were at greater risk of being victims of domestic violence as opposed to children who did not experience sexual abuse

as a child. Also, females who experienced sexual abuse as children had a prevalence rate of (AOR =2.01, 95% CI [1.16, 3.38]) and a physical abuse prevalence rate of AOR = 2.17, 95% [1.27- 5.76] are more likely to experience teen dating violence (Temple, Shorey, Tortolero, Wolfe, & Stuart, 2013).

Although the degree to which various factors such as experiencing physical or sexual abuse as a child, drugs, and alcohol can influence abusive behavior is widely debated (Afifi et al, 2009). Research has consistently shown that teens who experience severe parenting techniques and/or witness intimate partner, community, or family violence are more likely to perpetrate physical and sexual violence in their dating relationship, especially if they are male (Cochran, Sellers, Wiesbrock, & Palacios, 2011; Jouriles et al., 2012; Lavoie et al., 2011; O’Keefe, 1997; Wekerle et al., 2009). Unlike their adult counterparts who perpetrate violence in their intimate relationships to manipulate, govern, or terrorize their mate (Giordiano et al., 2005), adolescents model the violence learned in one relationship and act it out in their own relationship. Teens may also repeat adults’ harmful behaviors with the anticipation of the same favorable outcomes accepted by adult abusers (Foshee et al., 2010d).

Broader social learning backgrounds, which link behaviors of social norms such as drinking, smoking, and drugs also influence dating violence (Cornelius et al., 2009). The media plays a role in spreading imagery that normalizes acts of violence against women as acceptable. This may cause teens to “engage in aggressive behaviors, ranging from psychological abuse to physical altercations when they begin dating” (Henry &

Zeytinoglu, 2012, p. 21). Such social norms also compel teen victims to keep quiet about their experiences (Cornelius et al., 2009).

Studies on teen dating violence repeatedly put emphasis on the cause, the impact of victimization, and assessment of prevention programs but do not focus on the role the legal system plays (Tharp et al., 2012). Research identified the need to examine legal consequences for abusers to help deter and prevent future violence in teen dating relationships (Cornelius et al., 2009). Other studies have found that teenagers need skills to identify abusive behaviors before they occur and to seek help when warranted (Banyard & Cross, 2008; Weisz & Black, 2008). Teen victims are often unwilling to seek legal intervention or outreach community services because they do not see those services as feasible (Jaycox, McCaffery, Ocampo, Shelly, Blake & Peterson, 2006). Teens may perceive the abuse as minor, believe they will not be taken seriously, and/or fear repercussions from their abuser (Black et al., 2009; Duterte et al., 2008; Ocampo et al., 2007). Instead, adolescents are more willing to pursue help from their peers, who they believe provide more help and understand what they are enduring (Black, Tolman, Callahan, Saunders, & Weisz, 2008; Ocampo et al., 2007; Weisz et al., 2006). However, peers are often inadequate because they cannot provide the needed help; moreover, they may want to avoid becoming involved in severe dating violence issues (Ocampo et al., 2007).

State domestic violence policies includes the legal interventions of arrest and execution of an order of protection, as well as the provision of support to the victim and,

in some cases, the perpetrator (Benitez et al., 2010; Logan et al., 2006). These policies are especially important because they affect teen victims seeking an order of protection. A civil order of protection is a vital legal resource that effectively deters dating violence for adult couples (Largio, 2007; Logan et al., 2006). Forty-one states and the District of Columbia currently grant victims in dating relationships the right to petition the court for a civil order of protection under the domestic violence statutes (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). The remaining states do not allow persons in dating relationships to petition the court for an order of protection (Breakthecycle.org, 2010).

### **Problem Statement**

The availability of legal recourse to victims and mandatory counseling for perpetrators of teen dating violence is an important part of the minimization and eradication of future violence (Benitez et al., 2010). Although teens face the same extent of violence as their adult counterparts, these two forms of abuse are treated differently by most states (Logan et al., 2006). Some states order of protection laws currently fails to protect most teen victims experiencing dating violence, due to many barriers including the age of the victim, how a “relationship” is defined, parental involvement, the absence of teen domestic violence laws (Klien et al., 2013; Cornelius et al., 2009; Largio, 2007). According to Klein et al. (2013), the process of filing a report is time consuming and challenging, and adolescents may find it difficult to appear and testify at court hearings and/or serve the perpetrator with legal papers. Research has established the efficacy of protective orders for domestic violence victims (Benitez et al., 2010; Cornelius et al.,

2009; Largio, 2007). Research has also evaluated the variables of teen dating violence (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). To date, however, there is limited research on the relationship between teen dating violence and orders of protection except for Cornelius et al., 2009 and Klien et al., 2013). No research to date has been conducted on teens petitioning the court for orders of protection, specifically among female high school victims of dating violence in heterosexual relationships. Thus, the goal of this study was to examine the barriers faced by this population of teens regarding state domestic violence policies—when seeking an order of protection.

### **Purpose of the Study**

According to research, domestic violence laws need to be amended to afford protection for victims of teen dating violence (Largio, 2007; Cornelius, et al., 2009; Breakthecycle.org, 2010). Therefore, this study sought to produce research that would contribute to such changes, increasing the level of protection and resources.

The purpose of this study was to examine (a) the differences among domestic violence statutes across the United States to determine whether there was a difference in reported dating violence among states that do and do not provide victims of teen dating violence the same protections that have been traditionally provided to adult victims of domestic violence and (b) the role of advocacy coalitions. A quantitative research design was used to conduct a secondary analysis using (a) several data sets from the CDC's 2011 State Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System survey, including a representative,

population-based sample of adolescent high school girls, (b) an examination of State Law Report Cards 2010: A National Survey of Teen Dating Violence Laws of all 50 states, and (c) Domestic Violence Counts: National Census of Domestic Violence Services.

### **Theoretical Framework, Research Questions, and Hypothesis**

The advocacy coalition framework (ACF) established by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993, 1999) provided the theoretical groundwork for this study. ACF is a common and important practical theory for analyzing public policy and policy-change constructs that focus on the interaction of advocacy coalitions with competing core belief systems of actors within policy subsystems (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999). A fundamental ACF theory is that public policy change is made apparent within subsystems by undertaking advocacy coalitions that have similar core beliefs (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith 1993, 1999). The study's framework also assumed that advocacy-coalition members involve actors from various organizations, both internal and external to the government (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith 1993, 1999). The field of domestic violence is a similar and involves the participation of actors both nationally and locally at different levels of the political system who have conflicting priorities, limitations, and traditions, including professional values and organizational cultures (Abrar, Lovenduski, & Margetts, 2000).

The most pivotal ACF elements relevant to domestic violence are the inclusion of beliefs of the actors within the systems, and the significance is that it is belief systems that compel and necessitate policy change that draw from the competition between



opposing advocacy coalitions within and around state institutions (Abrar, Lovenduski, & Margetts, 2000). The show of strength within the states' Domestic Violence Coalitions' services and programs response to teen dating violence started with National Network to End Domestic Violence (NNEDV). This organization works to make domestic violence a national priority; change the way communities respond to domestic violence; and strengthen efforts against intimate partner violence at every level of government.

Their signature programs include

1. Empowering domestic violence survivors to lead independent lives, free from abuse;
2. Supporting the 56 statewide and territorial coalitions against domestic and sexual violence;
3. Advancing economic empowerment and financial literacy for domestic violence survivors and their allies;
4. Improving high-profile media coverage of domestic violence cases;
5. Educating survivors and their allies about safe technological practices and how batterers misuse technology to further abuse;
6. Building the capacity of local and statewide coalitions against domestic and sexual violence;
7. Providing state-specific legal information for domestic violence survivors; and
8. Promoting federal legislation that effectively holds perpetrators accountable and strengthens services for survivors and their children. ([www.nnedv.org](http://www.nnedv.org), 2016).

Additionally, the states' advocacy coalition services and programs were predicated on the hypothesis that advocates the substantial amount of time that is devoted to policy changes and that policy change is influenced by policy subsystems and its participants (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999). This framework and its components are defined and discussed in Chapter 3.

Usually there is a short introduction to the research questions. For example, at a minimum: This study was guided by four research questions. In any event, they need to be given separately.

### **Research Question 1**

Is there a difference in the rate of female teens reporting in CDC YRBS of experiencing physical and sexual violence between states that do not require parental consent when filing an order of protection and those that do require parental consent?

$H_{01}$ : There is difference in rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual violence between states that require parental consent when filing an order of protection and those that do not.

$H_{a1}$ : There is no difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual violence between states that require parental consent when filing an order of protection and those that do not.

**Research Question 2**

Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) between states that prohibit all minors from *filing an order of protection and those that do not?*

$H_{02}$ : There is a difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual violence between states that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection and those that do not.

$H_{a2}$ : There is no difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual violence between states that prohibit all minor from filing an order of protection and those that do not.

**Research Question 3**

Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual dating violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) between states that explicitly exclude persons in dating relationships from filling an order of protection and those that do not?

$H_{03}$ : There is a difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual dating violence between states that explicitly exclude persons in a dating relationship from filling an order of protection and those that do not.

$H_{a3}$ : There is no difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual dating violence between states that explicitly exclude persons in a dating relationship from filling an order of protection and those that do not.

#### Research Question 4

Does the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual dating violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) depend on the strength of a state's advocacy coalitions programs and services for persons in dating relationships when filling an order of protection and those that do not?

$H_{04}$ : The rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual dating violence does depend on the strength of a state's advocacy coalitions that provide services and programs persons in a dating relationship from filling an order of protection and those that do not.

$H_{a4}$ : The rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual dating violence depend on strength of a state's advocacy coalitions that provide services and programs for persons in a dating relationship from filling an order of protection and those that do not.

Table 1

#### *Summary of Application of ACF Applied to Teen Dating Violence*

ACF Component	Teen Dating Violence Laws Application
Relatively Stable Parameters	States Domestic Violence Statutes
Basic attribute of problem area	Lack of provision in law for teen victims
Basic distribution of state resources	Protection rights and access to PO's
Fundamental cultural values and social basic constitutional structure	Fragmented governance including the court system, 9 states and local governments
Policy Subsystem	
Territorial scope	50 U.S. states
Substantive scope	Domestic violence policy
Policy participants	Court system, elected officials, health services, criminal justice system, activists, feminist coalitions and media
Belief Systems	
Deep core beliefs	Teen dating violence victim's welfare and

Policy core beliefs	safety is a risk
Secondary beliefs	Teen victims have the right to be protected PO's and arrest policy, complaints treated and recorded, training for judges and court personnel
Advocacy Coalitions	(granting all minor victims access to PO's) Feminist coalitions vs. traditionalist coalitions
Policy broker	Late 1970s introduced Domestic Violence Laws
Resources	Scientific and technical information
Venues	Federal and state courts and collaborative institutions
Mechanisms for policy change/accumulation of evidence	Data showing the effects of teen dating violence
Hurting stalemate	President Obama's 2011 Presidential Proclamation declared February teen dating violence Month, led to policy change in a few states (i.e., Coalition compromise)
External shock	Growth of domestic violence movements

---

*Note.* Based on Sabatier, Hunter, and McLaughlin (1993); Sabatier and Brasher (1993) & Sabatier et al., (2004).

The ACF framework has elements that can analyze the process of policy changes pertaining to domestic violence because the framework integrates the concept of long-term interests that it is motivated through changes in belief by means of policy-oriented learning from the continuously gathering of information, such as a scientific study and policy analysis (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993). These components can be undertaken to help explain some states' existing domestic violence statutes, for example, the barriers that victims of teen dating violence have faced when petitioning the court for protection orders. Some teen victims sought help through the court system and are often discouraged by the lack of resources available to them (Klein et al., 2013). While some states do not allow minor victims to petition the court on their own behalf, other states have not yet

developed a methodical approach to working with minor petitioners and the process itself is complicated. According to Klein et al. (2013), that most respondents stated being overwhelmed; one female petitioner was petrified and could not speak after being placed together in a small room with her abuser for mediation with the court attorney. Based on a state's laws and regulations, including a lack of criminal justice resources, victims of teen dating violence are likely to face difficulties in handling the processes domestic violence law to obtain protection orders.

### **Nature of the Study**

To answer the research questions, this quantitative study used multiple data sets from three sources to assess the number of female teens who reported experiencing physical and/or sexual violence during the past 12 months: CDC's State YRBS (2011), the Break the Cycle State Law Report Cards 2010: A National Survey of Teen Dating Violence Laws of all 50 states, and Domestic Violence Counts: National Census of Domestic Violence Services. A quantitative approach allowed the researcher to focus on data from a group, rather than focusing on individuals. This study developed a linkage between the dependent variables (states that allow minors to petition on their own behalf, states that prohibit all minors from petitioning and states that prohibit persons in dating relationship from petitioning) and the independent variables (physical violence and sexual violence), ACF NNEDV data included: individual support/advocacy, court advocacy/legal, accompaniment, children's support/advocacy and support/advocacy to

teen/young adult victims of dating violence and (covariates) age, gender, race/ethnicity and grades (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). The outcomes aided in understanding the problem.

The use of secondary data involved accumulating CDC 2011 statistics and surveys to examine results to create data-driven analysis to prove the hypothesis. Break the cycle the cycle data sources were chosen because the study has investigated the exclusion of teen victims from states domestic violence laws. Break the Cycle and the CDC have done the most extensive research to date on teen dating violence and its effects. The study also made use of previous research “Exploration of a methodology aimed at exploring the characteristics of teenage dating violence and preliminary findings” as an empirical foundation to demonstrate that dating violence transpires irrespective of culture, gender, or economic status (see for example, Toscano, 2012). Break the cycle findings discussed the need for the accessibility of, and enforcement of orders of protection for teen victims involved in abusive relationships.

### **Definition of Terms**

*Age Requirement.* Age requirement for orders of protection differs from state to state (i.e. persons must be 18 or older, cohabitating or have a child in common). Some state laws are not specific about at what age a person can obtain an order. The vagueness in laws often leaves minors at the mercy of the court about whether to grant the order of protection. Inconsistencies in laws may frequently leave teens without legal protection (Breakthecycle.org, 2010).

*Civil Order of protection.* A legal document granted to domestic violence victims that includes explicit orders (i.e., the abuser cannot have any form of contact or communication with the victim). Orders of protection are designed to protect people from violence and “reduce the risk of future threat or harm by a person who is determined to pose a threat to another” (Benitez, McNeil, & Binder 2010, p. 242). These differ from criminal orders of protection and do not provide the same remedies or criminal consequence.

*Dating violence.* There appears to be no standard definition of dating violence. Some researchers include psychological and emotional abuse in their definition of dating violence (e.g., intimidation, verbal abuse, and constant checking of a partner’s location; (Halpern, Oslak, Young, Martin, & Kupper, 2001; O’Keeffe, Brockopp, & Chew, 1986) while others use a more restrictive definition that includes only physical or sexual acts of violence (e.g., slapping, pushing, hitting, kicking, choking, or forcing a partner to engage in sex when they do not want to) (Bennice & Resick, 2003; Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992; Cornelius, et al., 2009; DeMaris, 1992).

For the purposes of this study, *teen dating violence* is defined as "the physical, sexual, psychological, or emotional violence within a dating relationship, including stalking. It can occur in person or electronically and might occur between a current or former dating partner" (CDC, 2006).

*Domestic violence* differs from dating violence as it occurs largely among teens and young adults who live apart, whereas domestic violence refers to adults who are



either married or live together, have children in common and rely on their partner for financial support (CDC, 2006).

*Sexual violence* "refers to any action that pressures or coerces someone to do something sexually they don't want to do. It can also refer to behavior that impacts a person's ability to control their sexual activity or the circumstances in which sexual activity occurs, including oral sex, rape or restricting access to birth control and condoms" (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). "Intentional touching, either directly or through the clothing, of the genitalia, anus, groin, breast, inner thigh, or buttocks of any person without his or her consent, or of a person who is unable to consent or refuse" (CDC, 2014). Unwanted sexual contact can be perpetrated against a person or by making a person touch the perpetrator. Unwanted sexual contact could be referred to as "sexual harassment" in some contexts, such as a school or workplace" (CDC, 2014).

*Physical violence* is any intentional and unwanted contact with you or something close to your body" (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). Physical violence includes, but is not limited to, "scratching, punching, biting, strangling or kicking, forcing you to have sex or perform a sexual act, grabbing you to prevent you from leaving or to force you to go somewhere, using a gun, knife, box cutter, bat, mace or other weapon" (Breakthecycle.org, 2010 & CDC, 2006).

*Relationship requirement.* Relationship must be established in some states to file an order of protection (i.e. married, cohabitating, lived together in the past, or have children together (Breakthecycle.org, 2010).

*Parental Consent Requirement.* Majority of the states' statutes requires parental consent to file for a civil order of protection. Although teens have access to orders of protection, a parent or caregiver must be present. If teens can file on their own behalf their parents or caregivers may be notified of the proceedings (Breakthecycle.org, 2010).

*Teen victims of dating violence.* For the purposes of this study, this refers to female adolescents 14-17 years old who are enrolled in high school, are involved in a heterosexual relationship and who experience "at least one act of physical or sexual abuse" (CDC, 2011; Foshee, 2008).

### **Assumptions**

This study was based on 4 assumptions:

- Self-reported data was used with the assumption that respondents understood the questions being asked and were honest. The students who responded correctly must also be self-confident to report on their own actions and experiences for data to be valuable.
- Data collected was presumed respondents retained the same level of attention throughout the completion of the survey. For example, participants may lose interest due to the length of the survey making some of their answers inaccurate.
- The outcomes of the current survey were acquired from a random sample of females who experienced physical and sexual violence during the 12 months before the survey.

- Respondents were asked to answer the questionnaire truthfully and to the best of their knowledge and ethical guidelines were also exercised when collecting the sample.

### Scope/Delimitations

Currently, some states' domestic violence laws do not address dating violence among teens (Cornelius et al., 2009.; Largio, 2007). Therefore, the results of this study may not be generalizable to male victims of dating violence. Although some studies have demonstrated that males are also victims of teen dating violence, females are more severely victimized than their male counterparts (Foshee et al., 2012). Individuals who are violent or abusive toward their dating partners should be held accountable for their actions within the structure of the legal protection policies for victims of domestic violence, regardless of their age (Largio, 2007). At the same time, it is necessary to provide resources for teen victims of dating violence, including allowing them to petition the court for an order of protection against their teen abusers. Some changes have been made to domestic violence laws, however, an assessment and comparison of state laws regarding teen dating violence and the impacts OP's has yet to be conducted (Largio, 2007) except for Klein et al. (2013). An Exploratory Study of Juvenile Orders of Protection as a Remedy for Dating Violence in New York State (Klien et al.).

### Limitations

This quantitative study utilized a cross-sectional study of female high school students aged 14-17 years old. The YRBS is a large-scale national survey and is larger in

scope than most research related to teen dating violence. The 2011 YRBS state survey included private and public high school in 43 states (California, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Washington did not participate). In addition, the use of a large-scale population survey permits comparisons between respondents who reported physical and sexual violence and those who participated in the survey but did not report any physical and sexual violence.

This study limited the sample size to females who responded to the survey questions about physical and sexual violence. Participants in the survey were selected on a random basis from students who attended school on the day the survey was administered (CDC YRBS, 2011).

There were many significant limitations to this study:

- (a) The dependence on a single item (2011 CDC YRBS survey) to evaluate dating violence.
- (b) The dependence on a single item from Break the Cycle State Law Report Card 2010.
- (c) The dependence on a single item from Domestic Violence Counts: A National Census of Domestic Violence Services.
- (d) The lack of information on the detailed forms or the harshness of the reported violence.
- (e) The extent and current situation of the violence limits the hypotheses tested and the interpretation of results.

- (f) Victims of teen dating violence assessed in this study may be more prevalent among adolescents who live in those states that allow teens to file an order of protection.
- (g) The barriers examined may be underestimated; the relationships examined and the services and programs rendered were? biased because of the non-representative nature of this sample.
- (h) The findings from this sample of public high school female students were simplified to other grouping of adolescents, such as private high school students or individuals who had dropped out of high school.
- (i) I was also unable to openly identify the sex of the abusers involved in reported violence. However, most sexual partners reported by participants were male.
- (j) States laws are always being amended and the domestic violence census was only conducted for a 24-hour period. States with fewer resources and personnel were not able to provide the same program and services as the other states. However, that may have limited how the problem investigated may differ.

### **Significance**

Based on the data collected by CDC YRBS survey 2011 and Break the Cycle State Law Report Card 2010, this study explored whether the prevalence of reporting of physical and sexual violence in a relationship varies among states' domestic violence laws, and (1) whether these laws prohibit all minors from obtaining orders of protection,

(2) whether these laws allow minors to petition on their own behalf and (3) whether state's courts that do not allow persons in dating relationships to obtain order of protection (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). As such, this study sought to create positive social change and contribute to the body of research on teen dating violence and influence policy changes by informing domestic violence policymakers about the lack of provisions in teen dating violence laws. This would further support law enforcement, researchers, practitioners, and educators who believe that despite awareness campaigns the legal retort to teen dating violence has not been efficient (Largio, 2007).

Results from this study may provide government, health care providers, and the public with vital statistics, protective procedures, and intervention methods that help to promote universal health. Chronic issues, such as teen dating violence, are of concern. Further research is needed to bring about awareness of violence teens in dating relationships are faced with, because victims are rarely acknowledged by family, friends, educators, and/or health care providers (Thompson, McGee, & Mays, 2012).

The results obtained from this study could be used to make recommendations to help policymakers, educators, crime prevention specialists, and social services to change domestic violence policy to aide teen victims of dating violence. Moreover, this information could provide teens, family members, counselors, law enforcement professionals, social workers, educators, and the public with insight into possible changes in domestic violence laws that need to be made to accommodate teen victims, as well as information about state domestic violence policies and the rights of teen.

### **Summary**

Teen dating violence crosses race, gender, and socioeconomic lines. Females and males are equally victims of abuse though girls are more frequently victimized (Foshee et al., 2012). While teen dating violence is a component of domestic violence, it is excluded from the domestic violence statutes in many states. An order of protection is an important intervention tool against future domestic violence (Cornelius et al., 2009).

The following chapters review the nature of teen dating violence as it relates to domestic violence policy and the debates surrounding its legislation guided by ACF. Chapter 2 outlines a review of the relevant literature and theoretical framework of the study. Chapter 3 discusses the study's design and methodology, including the sample size and setting, research method, data collection, variables, analysis, and ethical concerns. Chapter 4 analyzes the study's data using descriptive statistics. Chapter 5 discusses the conclusions and recommendations of the study based on the data analysis.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

### **Introduction**

Teen dating violence has been ignored for decades by legislators and educators because of its direct association with school violence and child abuse. Some states categorize the teen dating violence as either school violence or teens abusing each other because often both the victim and perpetrator attends the same school (Klein et al., 2013; Logan & Walker, 2010; Tharp, 2012). This association has created erroneous statistics, making it difficult to capture the attention of lawmakers and the domestic violence movement. State domestic violence laws provide the necessary resources for adult victims in abusive relationships (Klein et al., 2013; Logan & Walker, 2010 & Tharp, 2012). Under domestic violence statutes, adults have the right to file an order of protection; however, most statutes create barriers for teens to obtain civil protection orders due to their age, relationship requirements (providing proof of co-habitation and dating relationship) with their abuser, and parental consent requirements (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). Filing a protection order requires parties to stay away each other. However, most dating teens attend the same schools creating a difficult situation for victim. The existing policies in most states pertaining to an order of protection specify that the abuser avoid “contacting, harassing, or threatening the victim; submit to counseling or alcohol or substance abuse classes; or provide economic relief to the victim” (Foshee et al, 2013e, p.725). This study examined the context of domestic violence policies in the 50 states. It sought to determine whether the prevalence of



physical and sexual violence varies among (a) state domestic violence laws that prohibit all minors from obtaining orders of protection; (b) states that allow minors to petition on their own behalf and, (c) states that do not allow persons in dating relationships to obtain an order of protection (Breakthecycle.org, 2010).

The literature reflects a practical dilemma (age, relationship and parental consent requirement) of not having protection and necessary resources regarding teen dating violence inclusions in state's domestic violence policies. If the state's domestic violence laws do not provide the same protections to teens involved in dating violence, it may be because some states do not identify teen dating violence as a criminal offense (Klein et al., 2013). Klein et al. (2013) reported that only 11 states' domestic violence laws have structured their civil protection orders to account for teen victims of dating violence. While other state laws do not specifically include teen victims, in their domestic violence statutes they do not deny teen victims legal protection either.

The purpose of this literature review was to better understand the policy-change process of states' domestic violence statutes regarding teen dating violence. The review includes: (a) studies on teen dating violence and its prevalence among teens 14-17 years old; (b) the examination of 50 states' domestic violence statutes to assess the provisions and resources allowable to victims of teen dating violence; (c) analysis of the amendments to domestic violence statutes that would grant all victims of teen dating violence access to PO's—a vital tool for deterring the violence (Breakthecycle, 2010 & Klien et al., 2013).

A review of the literature revealed studies on teen dating violence that have focused on rates and the types of violence endured (Bonomi, Anderson, Nemeth, Bartle-Haring, Buettner, & Schipper, 2012; Carroll & Raj, 2012; Foshee et al., 2012c; Henry & Zeytinoglu, 2012; Miller, Decker, Raj, Reed, Marable, & Silverman, 2010; Taylor, Stein, Woods & Mumford, 2011). The only studies found on the legal consequences for adolescent perpetrators or the services offered to the victims, except for Cornelius et al., (2009), Klein et al. (2013) and breakthecycle.org (2010) found that legal consequences for teen perpetrators and services for teen victims are vital to deter or eradicate violence in present and future relationships. Moreover, no research was found that examines the use of an order of protection as an interceding factor in deterring teen dating violence for the demographic in this study.

### **Literature Research Strategy**

The searches for relevant data involved the following databases: EBSCO Psychology and Behavioral Science Collection, Academic Research Premier, Sage, SocINDEX with full text, Science Direct, and CINAHL with full text. The following keywords were used: *teen dating, teen dating violence, teen dating violence prevention, teen dating violence awareness, teen dating violence prevention awareness, building healthy teen relationships, adolescents and dating, adolescents and dating violence, domestic violence prevention, orders of protection, orders of protection effectiveness, orders of protection awareness.*

The review covers the following topics: theoretical foundation, ACF, prevalence of dating violence, gender differences, domestic violence, risk factors and effects, barriers to legal response for dating violence, and the cost and consequences of orders of protection on dating violence.

### **Theoretical Foundation**

The ACF developed by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1993, 1999) will serve as theoretical foundation for the present study. One primary ACF assumption is advocates sharing the same core beliefs will help bring about policy change. The framework also speculates that advocates belonging to the same policy subsystem will make known internally and externally the institution they wish to influence. In addition, ACF concludes that advocates devote a significant amount of time and effort to rise above challenges of adversaries looking to impede the desired reforms of policy advocates (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999).

Many theories and frameworks (such as the theory of subsystem-linked, framework of multiple streams and policy windows and ACF) have been influential in the development of public policy arena. For example, ACF has been more apparent because it provides tools that have analyzed some of the processes that lie at the center of policy changes. Some states have made changes to their domestic violence laws to facilitate the development of teen dating violence laws. The states that have not made any changes could be following a macro-level assumption that the laws are unlikely to change with the lack of significant agitation external to the subsystem. For example: socio-

economic, and system-wide government conditions, public opinion or policy output from other subsystems could impact victims of teen dating violence at the micro-level (i.e. "social settings," home, school, or community) living in those states. If the state's meso-level is faced with no policy change to their domestic violence laws then victims of teen dating violence should be deeply concerned. For example, changes or lack of changes in the state domestic violence laws can affect victims of teen dating violence when seeking help from the law.

ACF presented an essential theoretical construct for this research; a review of the extant literature has found that the ACF framework has limitations as an explanatory framework for public policy change. While it proposes a rational and sound theoretical approach for dealing with the complexities of the policy-change process, the logic of the framework allows researchers to rise above traditional explanations that mostly focus on formal institutions. This is facilitated through an actor-oriented approach that is constant with the findings of existing research on the progress of public policy (Anderson, 2003; John, 2003). The ACF can be acknowledged as an effective theory because its assumptions and hypotheses have been established, censured, and commented on throughout several scholarly literatures (for example Elgin & Weible, 2013; Leifield, 2013; Pierce, 2011; Pollack, Phillips, & Vajihala, 2011). The hypotheses related to policy change and policy learning are especially important to this current study and were formulated by Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith. The table below is based on Sabatier and

Pelkey (1990); Sabatier, Hunter, and McLaughlin (1993); Sabatier and Brasher (1993) & Sabatier et al., (2003) and highlights key assumptions and premises:

Table 2

*Summary of Application of ACF Applied to Teen Dating Violence*

ACF Component	Teen Dating Violence Laws Application
Relatively Stable Parameters	States Domestic Violence Statutes
Basic attribute of problem area	Lack of provision in law for teen victims
Basic distribution of state resources	Protection rights and access to PO's
Fundamental cultural values and social basic constitutional structure	Fragmented governance including the court system, 9 states and local governments
Policy Subsystem	
Territorial scope	50 U.S. states
Substantive scope	Domestic violence policy
Policy participants	Court system, elected officials, health services, criminal justice system, activists, feminist coalitions and media
Belief Systems	
Deep core beliefs	Teen dating violence victim's welfare and safety is a risk
Policy core beliefs	Teen victims have the right to be protected
Secondary beliefs	PO's and arrest policy, complaints treated and recorded, training for judges and court personnel, specific policy proposals regarding PO's
Advocacy Coalitions	(granting all minor victims access to PO's)
Policy broker	Feminist coalitions vs. traditionalist coalitions
Resources	Late 1970s introduced Domestic Violence Laws
Venues	Scientific and technical information
Mechanisms for policy change/accumulation of evidence	Federal and state courts and collaborative institutions
Hurting stalemate	Data showing the effects of teen dating violence
External shock	President Obama's 2011 Presidential Proclamation declared February teen dating violence Month, led to policy change in a few states (i.e., Coalition compromise)
	Growth of domestic violence movements

*Note.* Based on Sabatier, Hunter, and McLaughlin (1993); Sabatier and Brasher (1993) & Sabatier et al., (2004).

Several studies have analyzed the clarifying authority of the ACF as a theory of public-policy and policy-change processes. In an evaluation of studies significantly applying the ACF, Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1999) noted that practically everyone established that advocacy coalition members shared beliefs not related to their organization (p. 127). Although research studies have sustained this principle of the ACF and other hypotheses, some reported that ACF assumptions do not always apply because of shifts in external and internal factors. A study on changes in domestic violence policy in Britain, conducted by Abrar, Lovenduski, and Margetts (2000), found that external factors, such as the socioeconomic changes or shifts in political leadership addressed in the Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (1999) policy-change hypothesis did not play a significant role in restructuring of the policy but aided in emphasizing the circumstances that made policy change possible. Abrar, Lovenduski, and Margetts (2000) also mentioned that their research backed Sabatier's statement that the probability of policy-oriented learning across belief systems of diverse coalition is likely to increase through the existence of a professional discussion (p. 257).

In another study conducted by Kubler (2001), ACF was applied in an analysis of Swiss drug-policy changes. In evaluating a reallocation from a prohibitionist standpoint to one of harm reduction through social support and rehabilitation, Kubler found that the ACF aided in constructing a conceivable account of the policy change. On the other hand,

Kubler (2001) also acknowledged a limitation of the framework, which is its lack of specific assumptions surrounding drive for the materialization of advocacy coalitions.

The framework rationalizes the influence of external events and socioeconomic conditions, whereas if social structures and constitutional laws inhibit policy change. ACF is considered a significant theory for policy changes with a timeline of a decade or more; with an intergovernmental component that involves public policies or programs that can be exemplified as a set of significant priorities (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993).

### **Literature Review Related to Key Variables**

#### **The Prevalence of Teen Dating Violence**

Dating violence has been identified as a major health and social problem, as well as a developing issue affecting teens from various socioeconomic backgrounds, ethnic groups, and demographics (Foshee, 2010; Miller et al., 2010; Lang, Sales & Salazar, 2011). Teen dating violence is intensifying and, in some cases, occurs more frequently than among adults (Thompson et al., 2012). Adult victims questioned about dating violence stated that their first experiences took place while they were teenagers (Bonomi et al., 2012).. Approximately one in four teenagers will endure some form of violence in dating relationships between the ages of 12 and 21 (Foshee et al., 2012c; CDC, 2012).

Past estimates of physical and sexual dating violence among high school students typically range from 10-15% with a prevalence rate of 10.5% and 14.7% among high school juniors and seniors respectively (CDC, 2011; Foshee et al., 2012c). Date rape accounts for 67% of the sexual assaults reported by adolescents (Taylor, Stein, Woods &

Mumford, 2011). Bonomi et al. (2012) examined dating violence among high school students and found that 12% had physical violence occur at least once in their relationship. The consensus on dating violence is that it is as widespread as domestic violence (Taylor, Stein, Woods & Mumford, 2011; Rothman, Johnson, Azrael, Hall, & Weinberg, 2010; Tharp, 2012; Temple, Shorey, Tortolero, Wolfe, & Stuart, 2013).

Thompson, McGee, and Mays (2012) conducted a representative study using 2011 YRBS data involving 6,897 teenagers in Grades 9-12 to examine race/ethnicity, substance use, and unwanted sexual intercourse among adolescent females in the United States. The study demonstrated African Americans had an 11.2 % prevalence rate of having been forced to have sex and Hispanic adolescent women highest prevalence rate of drinking (76.1%). Whites binge drink at a rate of (28.2%) and Blacks used drugs at a rate of (44.3%).

### **Physical Dating Violence**

More recently, an extensive study conducted by Temple et al. (2013) on the "perpetration of physical assault against dating partners, peers, and siblings among a locally representative sample of high school students in Boston, Massachusetts" (p. 343). The study involving 1398 students from 22 urban high schools revealed a prevalence rate of 18.7% physical dating violence, 41.2% peer violence, and 31.2% sibling violence. Among violence perpetrators, dating violence was 7.9% but when controlled for age and school, sibling violence, and dating violence for males was OR 3.81, 95% CI 2.07-6.99 and for females 1.83; 1.44-2.31. The association between peer violence and dating



violence perpetration was 5.13; 3.15-8.35 for males, and for females 2.57; 1.87-3.52 (Temple et al., 2013).

### **Sexual Dating Violence**

Most of sexual dating violence victims are usually young females (Basile & Smith, 2010). Most sexual assaults occur between the ages of 13 and 19 (Bonomi et al., 2012). A recent CDC report revealed that 40.4 % of adolescent females experience sexual violence, stalking and dating violence before 18 years old (Breiding, Chen & Black, 2014). Even though the prevalence estimates differ due to data collection and measurement, sexual violence is said to be under-reported (Black et al., 2011). Sexual violence experiences among adolescents are associated with other health risk behaviors.

A study conducted by Bonomi et al. (2012), revealed that 64.7 % of females compared to 61.7 % of males reported dating violence victimization between age 13 and 19, with most experiencing numerous incidences. In addition, females had two or more abusive partners and experienced controlling behavior of 35.6 %, put downs/name calling (37.0); pressured sex (42.9); insults (44.3); slapped/hit (50.0); and threats (62.5). While 44.7 % of females first experienced controlling behavior between age 13 and 15, the majority (62.5 %) had pressured sex between age 16 and 17 (Bonomi et al., 2012).

### **Risk Factors and Consequences**

Henry and Zeytinoglu (2012) examined the differences between healthy and unhealthy relationships and found that adolescents often believe that unhealthy relationships are the norm. Many relationships seen on TV, in the movies, and in

magazines are unrealistic or unhealthy examples of relationships. Qualities like respect, good communication, and honesty are absolute requirements for a healthy relationship. Adolescents who are not educated to recognize the signs of abuse before they begin to date may have trouble forming healthy nonviolent relationships with others (CDC, 2011).

The most commonly acknowledged consequences have been substance abuse, sexual risk behaviors, binge drinking, teen pregnancy, eating disorders, suicidal thoughts, mental health problems such as depression, post-traumatic stress disorder (Thompson et al., 2012; CDC, 2011; Foshee et al., 2013), emotional distress, anxiety, trauma, and serious physical injuries that may require hospitalization (Leen, Sorbring, Mawer, Holdsworth, Helsing & Bowen, 2013 ;Tharp & Noonan, 2012 ; Miller, Decker, Raj, Reed, Marable, & Silverman, 2010). Therefore, early intervention in dating violence might be critical in preventing adolescent females from experiencing these negative consequences and help to minimize victimization in their adult dating relationship.

The extant literature identifies additional risk factors. A common risk factor for dating violence victimization is trauma including the death of a loved one, severe life-threatening illness, parental divorce in the past year, assault by a stranger, or natural disaster (Henry & Zeytinoglu, 2012). Female gender is also a risk factor (Miller et al., 2010). A study by Jouriles et al. (2012) on harsh parenting and teens' exposure to domestic violence suggested that such exposure can lead to teen dating violence. These teens are also more likely to engage in teen dating violence (Taylor, Stein, Woods & Mumford, 2011) and become victims of domestic violence when they become adults

(Bonomi et al., 2012.). Research has also shown that if violence takes place once in a dating relationship, it is likely to be repeated (Freeman & Temple, 2010).

To determine the early predictors of adolescent violence on a whole, Ellickson and Mcguigan (2000) carried out a longitudinal study in 30 different schools including more than 4,300 high school seniors. Predictors of adolescent violence were found to be early deviant behavior, having had attended many elementary schools, below average grades, and pro-drug middle school environments. Females were found to demonstrate less violent behavior than males (Ellickson & Mcguigan, 2000; Hamby & Turner, 2012; Taylor, Stein, Woods & Mumford, 2011).

Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) reported similar trends, stating that a lack of awareness, low educational attainment, and existing subcultures exacerbate abusive partners (as cited in Silverman, Raj, Mucci; Hataway, 2001; Foshee et al., 2013).

Banyard and Cross (2008) demonstrated that excessive abuse among teen dating violence occurred especially in during physical and sexual contact, and that conditions were worsened by precarious sex and alcohol and drug abuse. According to Levy (1990), the ties of relationship and the onset of feelings of worthlessness, deprivation, embarrassment and shame resulting from sexual coercion slowly chip away at a victim's ability to escape abusive relationships. Abusive teens use systematic coercive violent activities in heterosexual or homosexual dating relationships that allow them to gain authority and maintain control over their dating companion (Foshee et al., 2013).

A recent cross-sectional study (e.g., Kann et al., 2011) examined variables that may influence dating violence and relationship abuse. Kann et al. (2011) found that adolescent females who report abuse from dating partners are at a significantly elevated risk for a broad range of additional, serious health concerns. Kann et al. (2011) analyzed reports from the CDC's YRBS conducted during the years 2001-2009 in seven states and six large urban school districts with public school students in Grades 9-12. They found that students who only had sexual contact with the opposite sex had a high prevalence in six of 10 risk behaviors groups, including: actions that facilitated violence; the use of alcohol, tobacco and cocaine; unhealthy weight control; sexual health-risk behavior; pregnancy; and pregnant; and suicidal ideation or attempts. Many of the risks associated with experiences of dating violence were heightened for adolescent girls who reported experiencing both physical and sexual forms of abuse (Rothman et al., 2010). Additional studies (e.g., Foshee & Reyes, 2011; Munzo-Rivas, Grana, O'Leary & Gonzalez, 2007; O'Leary, Smith, Avery-Leaf, & Cascardi, 2008) have confirmed that victims of teen dating violence are likely to experience additional severe consequences including drug abuse, eating disorders, mental health issues, and antisocial behaviors. Henry and Zeytinoglu (2012) have also linked significant depressive episodes and posttraumatic stress disorder to teen dating violence. Teens that have experienced dating violence are four times more likely to endure these conditions than teens that have not experienced dating violence (CDC, 2013; Wolitzky-Taylor et al., 2008).

## **Gender Differences**

Studies analyzing the occurrence of violence and abuse among teens have found conflicting gender differences. Some studies have found that female adolescents in heterosexual relationships are more likely to suffer from sexual abuse (Bonomi et al., 2012; Jezl, Molidor, & Wright, 1996), and suffer more relationship violence, emotionally and physically (Offenhauer & Buchalter, 2011 & O’Keefe, 1997). In contrast, male victims seldom seem to fear violence by their dates or girlfriends, often saying that the attacks did not hurt and that they found the violence amusing (Molidor & Tolman, 1998; Offenhauer & Buchalter, 2011). Other researchers have found that females are the perpetrators of dating violence in 29% to 52% of relationships (Foshee, 1997; O’Keefe, 1997; Rothman, Johnson, Azrael, Hall, & Weinberg, 2010). Regardless of the various contradictory theories of gender patterns, differences in the prevalence of perpetration and victimization for males and female remain vague. Research analyzing gender patterns in severe injuries resulting from dating violence is less contentious (Temple, Shorey, Tortolero, Wolfe & Stuart, 2013).

## **Cost and Consequences of Dating Violence**

The cost of dating violence and abuse against women has been approximated at \$5.8 billion (CDC, 2010). Medical and mental healthcare costs \$4.1 billion and close to \$1.8 billion in unintended expenditures related to lost productivity (CDC, 2010). This included the cost for physical assault (\$6.2 billion), the assessment of loss of lives (\$1.2 billion), rape (\$460 million), and stalking (\$461 million). Rivara et al. (2007) stated that

increased yearly healthcare costs for dating violence victims can last if 15 years after the abuse ends. Additionally, dating violence victims forfeit nearly 5.6 million days of lost household output each year and 8 million days of paid work—the equivalent of more than 32,000 full-time jobs (CDC, 2010).

### **State Laws and Teen Dating Violence**

Recent research has emphasized the legal aspects of intimate partner violence (e.g., Benitez, McNeil, & Binder, 2010; Bell, Goodman & Dutton, 2011; Logan & Walker, 2010). Researchers have also analyzed the legal consequences of dating violence for perpetrators of violent behavior and violence among adolescents and young adults. Peek-Asa, Wallis, Harland, Beyer, Dickey & Saftlas (2011) found that perpetrators are not suffering the consequences for their actions to suppress their behavior or prevent future violent behaviors. Although the authors believe that legal intervention is the best remedy, state laws require a burden of proof, and in many cases, there may be insufficient evidence for a domestic violence case (Logan & Walker, 2010).

Research on domestic violence involving adult couples suggested that female victims are also faced with barriers when seeking an order of protection (Bell, Perez, Goodman & Dutton, 2011). Nearly 80% of domestic violence is underreported because female victims feel embarrassed, protective of their abusers, or apprehensive about retaliation (Moracco, Andersen, Buchanan, Espersen, Bowling, & Duffy, 2010). Presently, research has not determined if the use of legal interventions differ by gender, culture, or financial status among dating couples. Researchers agree that domestic

violence statutes create barriers that affect victims of teen dating violence (Klein et al., 2013; Breakthecycle.org, 2010). They found that these barriers minimize the accessibility to teen victims and do not provide the present resources and protections made available adults who experience domestic violence (Breakthecycle.org, 2010).

### **Barriers to Obtaining Orders Protection**

Relationship requirements, age requirements, and parental consent requirements are the main barriers recognized by studies preventing teens from obtaining orders of protection (Offenhauer & Buchalter, 2011). A recent study examined teens' understanding of the use of orders of protection as a remedy for dating violence found that teen victims of dating violence had very little understanding of and experience with using orders of protection and assumed significant barriers to obtaining them (Klein et al., 2013).

The study analyzed 1,200 juveniles who petitioned New York Family Courts for orders of protection from the year 2009 to 2010 against their abusers. Approximately 10 % were police related incidents. The "petitioners (64.3 %) received temporary orders, and merely 20.8% final orders" (Klein et al., 2103, p.15). Nearly all petitioners were female, and their abusers were an average of 2.92 years older. "In more than 90 percent of cases, petitioners were female" (Klein et al., 2013, p.10). In addition, teens reported a common lack of consciousness and knowledge of the new amendments to domestic violence law that accommodates teen victims. The teens were not enthusiastic in ending their abusive

relationship or willing to seek orders of protection for fear of it not protecting them and being labeled "snitches by their peers" (Klein et al., 2013, p.12).

### **Relationship Requirements**

The exclusion of dating relationship' from nine states' (Table 3) domestic violence statute creates a problem for teen victims in dating relationships. Most teens live with their parents and do not have children with their abusers. Teen victims should be able to petition the court for and granted temporary or permanent orders of protection (Breakthecycle.org, 2010).

Table 3

*Break the Cycle State Law Report Card 2010*

States	Statutes
Alabama	Id. § 30-5-2(a)(4)
Georgia	Id. § 30-5-2(a)(4)
Ohio	Id. § 3113.31(A)(3)
Kentucky	Id. § 403.720
South Carolina	Id. § 20-4-20(b)
South Dakota	Id. § 25-10-1(2)
Utah	Id. § 78B-7-102(2)
Virginia	Id. § 16.1-228

*Note.* These states were automatically given a grade of F because of their laws exclusions of persons in dating relationships.

### **Age Requirements**

Some states are not specific about what age a person can petition the court for an order of protection. This statutory barrier leaves teen victims without legal protection and other services rendered to adults in domestic violence. A study by Breakthecycle.org recommended that victims of 12 years and older should be granted access to orders of



protection (2010). A seventeen-year-old is regarded as an adult in Missouri, the only state that clearly prohibits any person under sixteen to petition the court. While North and South Dakota, Ohio and Wyoming does not specify at what age a person can access an order of protection. There are nine states' statutes (Table 4) that prohibits all minors from petitioning the court (breakthecycle.org, 2010).

Table 4

*States with Statutes That Prohibits all Minors from Petitioning the Court*

States	Statutes
Alabama	Id. § 30-5-2(a)(5)
Arkansas	Id. § 18.66.100(a)
Georgia	Id. § 19-3-(a)
Louisiana	Id. § 46:2133(C)
Maine	Id. §§ 4005(1)
Mississippi	Id. § 93-21-7(1)
New Jersey	Id. § 2c:25-19(c)
Texas	Id. § 82.002(c)
Wisconsin	Id. § 813.122(2)

### **Parental Consent Requirements**

The prevalent statutory limitations that exist are intensified by these barriers (relationship, age and parental-consent requirement) for teens victims because dating violence are acknowledge by only a small number of states (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). Any legal services or resources requiring parental consent deny access for those teens who are afraid to talk to their parents about the abuse experienced in their dating relationships (Offenhauer & Buchalter, 2011). Domestic violence statutes vary among states to whether minors can petition the court on their own behalf for an order of

protection. Nine states featured (Table 5) and the District of Columbia clearly allows minors to petition the court on their own behalf.

Table 5

*States that Allow Minors to Petition the Court on Their Own-behalf for Orders of Protection*

States	Statutes	Requirements
California	Id. § 372(a); § 372(b)(1)	Minors under 12 years old must be accompanied by a guardian
Minnesota	Id. § 518B.01(4)(a)	Minors under 16 years old must be accompanied by a guardian
New Hampshire	Id. § 173-B:3(II)(b)	Law does not specify at what age a minor can file
Oregon	Id. § 107.726	Law does not specify at what age a minor can file
Rhode Island	Id. §§ 15-15-3(a); 15-15-1(2)	Law does not specify at what age a minor can file
Tennessee	Id. § 36-3-602(b)	With the signature of a parent/guardian
Utah	Id. §§ 78B-7-102(2), 78B-7-103(1)	Minors under 16 years old need guardian to petition
Washington	Id. § 26.50.020(2). (1)	Minors under 16 years old need guardian to petition

*Note.* Except for California, only minors 16 or older do not need parental consent.

### **Study Justification**

The present study will examine whether the prevalence rate of victims reporting physical and sexual violence differ between states that have statutory barriers for victims of teen dating violence and those that do not when filing an order of protection.

According to Ulin (2005) a quantitative research study will facilitate the ability to clarify “how variables interact, shape events, and cause outcomes” in quantitative expressions

(p. 15). The researcher's goal is to establish the relationship between one object (an independent variable) and another (a dependent variable) in a group or population (York, 1998). A quantitative research design is practical when collecting data for the present exploratory research, or creating data for a potential research. The secondary data obtained from the surveys used for this study measured objects in their natural environments and no effort was made to modify behavior or settings (Ross, 1999). The use of this method allows the measuring of relevant variables at a single point in time from many participants, behaviors and observations (Trochim, 2001). This method usually requires a sample of hundreds or even thousands of subjects. The projected relationship has a less chance of bias if there are many respondents in the randomly selected sample (Schirver, 2001). In a quantitative research, numerical data can be quantified to measure experiences and construct results to establish credibility (York, 1998). In this study, I examined whether the prevalence rate of victims reporting physical and sexual violence differ between states that have statutory barriers for victims of teen dating violence and those that do not when filing an order of protection. Therefore, this method was found to be suitable for the research study.

### **Summary**

This chapter provided a review of the literature related to teen dating violence, including the ACF; the prevalence of dating violence; gender differences; risk factors and effects; state law and domestic violence; barriers to obtaining orders of protection; cost and consequences and justification of the study.

Chapter 3 outlines the methodology for the study, including the research design, sample and setting, data collection, analysis, ethical concerns and further discuss the variables.

## Chapter 3: Methodology

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to examine differences among domestic violence statutes across the United States to determine whether there was a difference in reported dating violence among states that do and do not provide victims of teen dating violence the same protections; that have been traditionally provided to adult victims of domestic violence and the role of advocacy coalitions. This chapter includes a description of the methodology that was used to conduct the study. Following the discussion of research methodology is a review of data collection methods, population and sample, instrumentation, data analysis, and ethical considerations used to analyze teen dating violence and the barriers prohibiting teens experiencing dating violence from obtaining an order of protection. The secondary data was derived from the CDC's 2011 State Youth Risk Behavior Survey, Break the Cycle 2010 State Law Report Card, Domestic Violence Counts: A National Census of Domestic Violence Services, and Survey of Teen Dating Violence Laws. These data were influential in formulating the results of the study.

### **Research Design and Rationale**

This quantitative study was conducted after approval from Walden University's Institutional Review Board (IRB Approval: 02-20-17-0125922), this study was conducted using secondary data from the CDC's 2011 State Youth Risk Behavior survey (YRBS) to examine teens' reporting of physical and sexual violence from a dating partner. Also, the Break the Cycle 2010 State Law Report Card: A National Survey on Teen Dating

Violence Laws and Domestic Violence Counts: A National Census of Domestic Violence Services were examined to evaluate the impact on teens seeking protection from abusive relationships by accessing Civil Protection Orders and other services. Lastly, archival data from Domestic Violence Counts: A National Census of Domestic Violence Services was discussed.

Instead of collection primary data, secondary data sets were used in this study because they are (a) known to reduce resources, (b) known to reduce difficulties in data collection, (c) often operational for SPSS, (d) able to provide for comparatively easy storage, able to access longitudinal and cross-cultural data, (e) able to access larger samples on a national level along with more current and influential statistics, and (f) able save time and money (Shultz, Hoffman, & Reiter-Palmon, 2005).

Secondary data sets have several advantages, but they also create limitations with respect to (a) the suitability of the data, (b) the completeness of the documents, (c) the illusion of quick and easy research, (d) the duplication of existing research, and (e) the acquisition of data collection and analysis skills for students (Shultz, Hoffman, & Reiter-Palmon, 2005). These limitations may affect internal and external validity.

Given that many surveys deal with national populations, researchers interested in studying a distinctive group may have difficulty finding applicable data. If similar variables are not accessible, data can be manipulated in a way that reduces the validity of the original research. Research of large samples can involve large data files and difficult statistical packages. Document analysis is a research methodology used to

examine archival data and documents (Shultz, Hoffman, & Reiter-Palmon, 2005). For this study, the documents that were analyzed are the CDC State YRBS (2011) of female students who reported the abuse and Break the Cycle 2010 State Law Report Card: A National Survey on Teen Dating Violence Laws.

### **The Youth Risk Behavior Survey**

Developed in 1991, the CDC's YRBS is a self-administered questionnaire conducted every two years during the spring semester. The survey selects respondents based on a three-stage cluster sample designed to obtain a nationally representative sample of United States high schools students in Grades 9-12 to monitor health risk behaviors.

The YRBS analyzes six types of primary health-risk behaviors among youth and young adults, including behaviors that contribute to unintentional injuries and violence; tobacco use; alcohol and other drug use; sexual behaviors that contribute to unintended pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), including human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) infection; unhealthy dietary behaviors; and physical inactivity. (CDC, 2011)

Researchers have also used the YRBS to monitor the prevalence of obesity and asthma. Each of the 50 states is responsible for conducting the YRB survey within their county public and private schools. The YRBS uses teachers to recruit student participants, conduct the survey, and provide the findings, which saves time and lessens the risk of participant discomfort and researcher bias. After informed consent is obtained, each participant is asked to complete a set of questionnaires. Students are given the

freedom to complete the survey in a classroom setting at their leisure. Given that the participants are in a familiar environment, their response rates may be augmented.

YRBS 2011 respondents utilize paper and pencil surveys, which are later scanned onto computers and confirmed using Tele-form software. Presently, electronically based surveys are administered at schools that can accommodate this version of web-based surveys. Design and electronic collection of the students' responses is created by Survey Monkey, one of the world's leading providers of web-based surveys. The electronic version of the survey is cost effective, but it is not practical for all schools participating in the survey. Whether the survey is collected manually or electronically, all data are pooled into one data set for the whole country. Data are subjective to the population of students within counties and analyzed by means of the subjective data (CDC, 2011).

For this study, data on physical and sexual violence as well as race/ethnicity will be extracted from the 2011 YRBS to examine prevalence rate between states with exclusions in their domestic violence laws that create barriers (i.e., parental consent) for teen victims seeking protection orders. According to Royce (1991), survey methods are the most operative approach when collecting material in the social sciences, as they create a photographic image or representation of outlooks, theories, or actions implemented at a given point and time. Limited information is available about the specific type of abuse or violence that occurs among female victims of dating violence and the extent of the protection provided by states' domestic violence laws. The YRBS was chosen as the basis for this study's data as it is utilized when limited information is



available about a definite subject or issue (Royce, 1991) on teen violence and health disparities. Several researchers have found it to be a reliable resource when conducting their investigations on the prevalence of teen dating violence (Henry & Zeytinoglu, 2011; Khan et al., 2011; Thompson, McGee, & Mays, 2012). Moreover, use of the YRBS provides accessibility to information that would otherwise be difficult to obtain due to the need for parental consent and the vulnerability of the sample. The 2011 YRBS state data set did not include (California, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania and Washington). Also, it is not compulsory for states to take part in this study and some states do not amass data.

#### **State Law Report Cards: A National Survey on Teen Dating Violence Laws**

A National Survey of Teen Dating Violence Laws was conducted by Break the Cycle, a national nonprofit organization founded in 1996. The organization's mission "is to engage, educate, and empower youth to build lives free from domestic and dating violence" (Breakthecycle.org, 2010, p. 30). Break the Cycle put together the State Law Report Cards to survey the civil domestic violence protection order laws of all fifty states and the District of Columbia (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). The purpose was to evaluate their impact on teens seeking protection from abusive relationships by accessing CPOs and other services. The grading system, developed with the University of Minnesota, is to help facilitate the law's receptiveness to the individual needs of teen and young adults.

The survey focal points were (a) Access to Civil Protection Orders (CPOs); (b) Access to Sensitive Services; and (c) School Response to Dating

Violence. Indicators were devised for grading from the expertise of legal professionals who have worked consistently with teen clients as well as from the existing literature on the most common legal barriers facing youth experiencing dating violence (Breakthecycle.org, 2010). Regarding teens' access to CPOs, the indicators are shown in the table below.

Table 6

*Indicators Used to Evaluate States Domestic Violence Laws Concerning Teen Dating Violence and Civil Orders of Protection(CPO's)*

Indicators	Definitions
Minors can be granted CPOs (20%)	Points were awarded based on whether minors may be granted CPOs. An automatic failure was assigned to states that explicitly prohibit minors from getting CPOs.
Dating relationships (20%)	Points were awarded based on the types of relationships that qualify for CPOs. An automatic failure (F) was assigned to states that do not recognize dating relationships.
Minor can file on own behalf (10%)	Points were awarded based on the circumstances, if any, under which minors can file for themselves. Special consideration was given to minimum age requirements.
Parental notification (10%)	Points were awarded based on whether a minor's parents may be notified about the proceedings
Same-sex couples (7.5%)	Points were awarded based on whether a same-sex couple qualifies for CPOs
If a minor cannot file, who can? (5%)	Points were awarded based on the availability of options to minors regarding adults who may file for them in situations where they cannot file for themselves
Qualifying definitions of abuse (5%)	Points were awarded based on the types of abuse that qualify for CPOs. Special attention was paid to whether property damage and use of technology was included.
Where the case is heard (5%)	Points were awarded according to whether a not the minors' cases were heard in courts familiar with domestic violence law

Modifiable (5%)

Points were awarded based on the modifiability of CPO

---

Ten points are awarded to the states that meet all the criteria for a specific indicator. Those with too many exclusions received no points. Letter grades are awarded to states who earned eight points or more received an (A). Scores of at least seven points but less than eight points received a (B). Those with a minimum of six points but fewer than seven points received a (C), and those with at least five points but less than six points received a (D). A failing grade was assigned to any state with a raw score lower than five. Additionally, states that prohibit minors from getting civil protection orders or states where dating relationships do not qualify for civil protection orders were coded as having automatically failed and awarded a grade of F. (Breakthecycle.org, 2010)

**Domestic Violence Counts: A National Census of Domestic Violence Services**

Over 25 years ago the National Network to end Domestic Violence (NNEDV) came into existence as the leading voice of domestic violence survivors. In 1990, NNEDV a significant group of domestic violence victim advocates unified to encourage federal legislation associated to domestic violence (nnedv.org, 2016). In the early stages, the group was known as Domestic Violence Coalition on Public Policy. After being in existence for four years the group expanded its services nationwide as an advocate of domestic violence shelter programs and statewide groups and coalitions against domestic violence (nnedv.org, 2016).

The landmark Violence against Women Act (VAWA) in 1994 was facilitated in part by NNEDV and created by then Senator Joe Biden. The VAWA act was the first historic federal legislation to reinforce government reaction to crimes carried out against domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking and dating violence. Presently, NNEDV make available "training and assistance to the statewide and territorial coalitions against domestic violence." It also furthers "public awareness of domestic violence and changes beliefs that condone intimate partner violence" (nnedv.org, 2016, p.1).

NNEDV works to make domestic violence a national priority; change the way communities respond to domestic violence; and strengthen efforts against intimate partner violence at every level of government. Their signature programs include

- Empowering domestic violence survivors to lead independent lives free from abuse
- Supporting the 56 statewide and territorial coalitions against domestic and sexual violence
- Advancing economic empowerment and financial literacy for domestic violence survivors and their allies
- Improving high-profile media coverage of domestic violence cases
- Educating survivors and their allies about safe technological practices and how batterers misuse technology to further abuse
- Building the capacity of local and statewide coalitions against domestic and sexual violence

- Providing state-specific legal information for domestic violence survivors.
- Promoting federal legislation that effectively hold perpetrators accountable and strengthen services for survivors and their children (www.nnedv.org, 2016).

Domestic Violence Counts is a National Census of Domestic Violence Services conducted by The National Network to end Domestic Violence (NNEDV) beginning in 2006. The annual census summarizes the count of adult and children looking for domestic violence services in a solo 24-hour period. In addition, it documents the nature of services required, the number of services applied for that could not be met due to lack of resources, and the problems and barriers domestic violence programs must deal with as they struggle to provide services domestic violence victims (nnedv.org, 2016). The census data “is instrumental in raising awareness about domestic violence and the incredible work that local domestic violence programs and advocacy coalitions do every day” (nnedv.org, 2016. p.2). National Network to end Domestic Violence put together the Domestic Violence Counts survey to count the number of individuals who contact domestic violence programs looking for assistance (nnedv.org, 2016). The purpose was to evaluate their impact on individuals seeking services from domestic violence programs on Census day.

#### Table 7

*Programs Used to Analyze States Advocacy Coalition's Strength in Domestic Violence Services and Support during Domestic Violence Counts: National 24-hour Census*

Programs	Services
----------	----------

Individual support/advocacy	The hotline provided victims the needed support, information safety planning, and resources
Children's support/advocacy	Support/advocacy provided the children non-residential service and assistance
Court Legal Accompaniment/advocacy	Legal cases involving domestic violence/dating violence can be difficult and complex involving filing for an order of protection and testifying against the abuser
Support/advocacy to teen/young adult victims of dating abuse	On census day advocates provided information support and therapy/counseling by a licensed practitioner

The National 24-hour Census data on comprehensive advocacy and support was used as a proxy to analyze the states' advocacy coalition strengths. The survey does not count everyone that was a domestic victim on that day. The only counted victims were those who sought services from domestic violence programs on Census day (nnedv.org, 2016). Of the 1,894 identified domestic violence programs in the United States, 1,752 participated in the September 16, 2015 National Census of Domestic Violence Services resulting in 71,828 victims gaining access to services provided by their state local programs (nnedv.org, 2016). The data will be analyzed by services and programs made available on the day of the Census for each state for the last (2011-2015) 5 years by comparing their strength or weaknesses for having the resources to provide these programs: (a) Individual Support/ Advocacy, (b) Children's Support/Advocacy, (3) Court Advocacy/Legal Accompaniment and (4) Support/Advocacy to Teen/Young Adult Victims of Dating Violence programs.

States with 80 to 100% for a specific indicator who could provide services on Census day are considered as lowercase in that area. Scores of at least 70% but less than

80% considered Stronger. Those with a minimum of 60% points but fewer than 70% considered no change, and those with at least 50% points but less than 60% received a score of Weaker. Any state with a raw score lower than 50% was considered much weaker (nnedv.org, 2016).

### Research Variables

According to McNabb (2008), variables are facts or things rearticulated so they can be measured. Variables are either dependent and subjective to other variables or independent and acts upon dependent variable. Operationalization of variables in a policy analysis fosters an understanding of the concepts to be measured by specification of the research questions. Consequently, the independent and dependent variables for this study (taken from the 2011 YRBS; see Table 8) will be identified by criterion involving specific indicators of states' domestic violence statues exclusions of age and relationship requirements.

Table 8

*CDC YRBS, Break the Cycle State Law Report Card and NNDEV Census Study Variables*

Variable type	Variable	Type	Test
Dependent	States that allow minors to petition on their own behalf	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test
	States that prohibit all minors from petitioning	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test
	States that prohibit persons in dating relationships from petitioning	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test

Independent	Physical violence	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test	
	Sexual violence	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test	
	Advocacy Coalition Framework	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test	
	Individual support/advocacy	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test	
	Court Advocacy/legal accompaniment	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test	
	Children's Support/advocacy	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test	
	Support/advocacy to teen young adult victims of dating violence	Nominal	<i>t</i> -test	
	Response Rate	Continuous	ANOVA	
	Covariates	Age	Continuous	Mean
		Gender	Nominal	Frequency
Race/ethnicity		Nominal	Frequency	
Grades		Nominal	Frequency	

### Setting and Sample

This study included the 2011 State YRBS data file, which was comprised of responses from 39,184 participants including 24,527 females in the weighted sample who responded to questions on physical violence and 2,178 sexual violence twelve months before the survey was conducted. The sample size was calculated employing an independent, cross-sectional, three-stage cluster design to produce a representative sample of 194 public and private high school students in Grades 9-12 reporting physical and sexual dating violence (CDC, 2011). The first sampling stage was selected from students with probability proportional to the school enrollment size. In the second sampling stage, integral classes (e.g., English or social studies) or a required period (e.g.,



homeroom or second period) were sampled randomly, with all students in the sampled classes deemed eligible to participate (CDC YRBS, 2011). Multivariate logistic regression was used to examine all significant independent relationships.

Participants in the sample for this study (as taken from the State YRBS, 2011) will meet the following inclusion criteria: (a) between ages 14-17, (b) enrolled in high school (Grades 9-12), (c) previously or presently in a dating relationship, (d) have reported at least one incidence of physical or sexual violence in the context of a dating relationship, and (e) female. As such, only females who replied to the questions about physical and sexual dating violence in the YRBS will be utilized for this study. Female participants in the survey were evenly distributed among respondents for both questions. Of the female students who responded yes to physical and sexual violence ( $N = 24,527$ ,  $N = 2,178$ ), Black were (10.8%), White (21.3%) and Hispanic (39%) populations (CDC, 2011). Female students in 12th grade for physical and sexual violence (20.7%), 11th grade (21.3%), 10th grade (18.7%), 9th grade (19.0%) populations (CDC, 2011).

### **Data Collection and Procedures**

This study used a convenience sample of females ( $N = 39,184$ ) and related data from the 2011 YRBS survey of the 43 states that participated. The data will be comprised of statistics regarding the prevalence of physical and sexual dating violence of adolescent girls, who responded to the question whether the student had “ever been hurt physically and or sexually by a date or someone you were going out with. This could involve being shoved, slapped, hit or forced into any sexual activity”. Feasible answers that occurred

include: “No, I was not hurt by a date,” “Yes, I was hurt physically,” and “Yes, I was hurt sexually”. The type of responses was not combined to circumvent double counting of cases within the examination of both forms of dating violence (CDC, 2011).

Findings from the YRBS survey of sexual and physical violence was entered in SPSS Version 23.0 for Windows to calculate the states prevalence of dating violence. Univariate analysis will be performed for descriptive purposes to supply frequency distributions (percentages) of the variables and measures of central tendencies (mean, median and mode), for age, gender, race and grade, the independent variables. Bivariate analysis, including  $\chi^2$  test for sexual and physical violence, states that allow minors to petition on their own behalf, states that prohibit all minors from petitioning and states that prohibits persons in dating relationships(the dependent variables) will be conducted to and compared to the states with these barriers prohibiting teens experiencing dating violence from obtaining orders of protection also a comparison of the distribution of the variables using logistic regression model will be used to examine whether any association exist between states that allow minors to petition and states that do not. This research procedure follows a model established by Kann et al. (2011), which used the YRBS to collect data regarding sexual identity, sex of sexual contacts, and health-risk behaviors.

### **Review of the Hypotheses**

Research has shown that clear and concise questions help to evaluate evidence and discern which information will be useful. A question also makes it easier to know when enough information is gathered and find an answer. This study’s main question

concerns whether there were differences in the prevalence rates of teen dating violence between states that include teen dating violence in their domestic violence statutes, and those that do not. More specifically, as stated in Chapter 1, the study posed the following questions and hypotheses:

### **Research Question 1**

Is there a difference in the rate of female teens reporting in CDC YRBS of experiencing physical and sexual violence between states that do not require parental consent when filing an order of protection and those that do require parental consent?

$H_{01}$ : There is difference in rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual violence between states that require parental consent when filing an order of protection and those that do not.

$H_{a1}$ : There is no difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual violence between states that require parental consent when filing an order of protection and those that do not.

### **Research Question 2**

Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) between states that prohibit all minors from *filing an order of protection and those that do not?*

$H_{02}$ : There is a difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual violence between states that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection and those that do not.

$H_{a2}$ : There is no difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual violence between states that prohibit all minor from filing an order of protection and those that do not.

### **Research Question 3**

Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual dating violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) between states that explicitly exclude persons in dating relationships from filling an order of protection and those that do not?

$H_{03}$ : There is a difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual dating violence between states that explicitly exclude persons in a dating relationship from filling an order of protection and those that do not.

$H_{a3}$ : There is no difference in the rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual dating violence between states that explicitly exclude persons in a dating relationship from filling an order of protection and those that do not.

### **Research Question 4**

Does the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual dating violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) depend on the strength of a state's advocacy coalitions programs and services for persons in dating relationships when filling an order of protection and those that do not?

$H_{04}$ : The rate of female teens who reported physical and sexual dating violence does depend on the strength of a state's advocacy coalitions that provide services and

programs persons in a dating relationship from filling an order of protection and those that do not.

*H<sub>a4</sub>*: The rate of victims who reported physical and sexual dating violence differs between the strength of state's advocacy coalitions that provide services and programs for persons in a dating relationship from filling an order of protection and those that do not.

### **Data Analysis**

This analysis was based on the hypotheses and responses to the self-reporting questions 22 and 23 on CDC 2011 State YRB Survey, and the correlation between the 2010 State Law Report Cards and 2011-2015 National Census of Domestic Violence Services. Particularly, the study hypothesized that the reporting of physical and sexual violence would differ according to the barriers imposed on some states domestic violence laws. For all hypotheses, dependent variables (states that allow minors to petition on their own behalf, states that prohibit all minors from petitioning and States that prohibit persons in dating relationship from petitioning), independent variables (physical violence, sexual violence, individual support/advocacy, children support/advocacy, court advocacy/legal accompaniment and group support/advocacy), and covariates (age, sex, race/ethnicity and grades) were used.

Correlation analysis is normally used to identify relations between variables when experiments are not readily available to collect and examine the data. The study design was appropriate to examine associations among variables (Davis, Gamble, Humphries, Mitchell, & Pendergrass, 2011). The goal of the research was to investigate units of

analysis in order to identify and determine whether there is a relationship between two or more variables. Correlation analysis is a quantitative method of research in which two or more quantitative variables are from the same group of subjects (Waters, 2011).

Creswell also argued that “a correlation is a statistic, its use in research has contributed to a specific research design called correlational research. An explanatory correlational design explains or clarifies the degree of association among two or more variables at one point in time” (Creswell, 2008, p. 343). This was applied to the current study by examining how teen victims reporting in CDC YRBS of experiencing physical and sexual dating violence differ between the strength of state's advocacy coalitions programs and services for persons in dating relationships from filling an order of protection and those that do not based on nominal and numeric responses.

The evidence was in the form of archived data of the self-reported experiences in response to Centers for Disease Control’s 2011 State Youth Risk Behavior survey, including a representative population-based sample of adolescent high school girls, as well as archived statistical data of Break the Cycle State Law Report Cards 2010: A National Survey of Teen Dating Violence Laws of all 50 states and Domestic Violence Counts: A National Census of Domestic Violence Services. Not only was dating violence verified, but implications of the research problem were also supported by the survey responses of the participants. Therefore, the data analyzed established an inclusive argument that justified the research.

Analyzing domestic violence advocacy's strengths scoring for intensity reflected the total number of services provided by local programs. The range of scores is 0 to 100, with higher numbers indicating much stronger advocacy. Scoring for frequency involves adding the total number of services provided over the 24-hour period during the census. A standard correlation  $t$  test was used to determine whether there are differences between the mean values of the dependent variables or the independent variables and for different levels of covariates.

Descriptive statistics was used in the analysis for the quantitative responses and will be followed by correlation analysis. Once the data was collected and prepared, the descriptive and correlation data analysis was applied to evaluate the strength of relationships between the study variables as they related to teen victims reporting in CDC YRBS experiencing physical and sexual dating violence, and the difference between the strength of state's advocacy coalitions programs and services for persons in dating relationships from filling an order of protection and those that do not. There were no preliminary analyses undertaken.

### **Secondary Data Analysis**

Many research questions can be answered more rapidly and efficiently by means of data that have already been collected. For that purpose, this study used secondary data analysis. Secondary data analysis is the use of existing data to evaluate research questions other than the original ones for which the data were initially collected. Some of the advantages of secondary data analysis are reduction of time and money, sources of large

regional and national data sets that are publicly available and do not have a main researcher. Computerized databases such as the census and government databases are useful for studying effectiveness and making decisions for community improvement (Grady, Cummings, & Hulley, 2013).

### **Threats to Validity**

The YRBS survey has some limitations with respect to validity based on respondents' self-reporting behaviors. Studies of self-reported assessments of substance abuse by adolescents suggest that reports are influenced by both cognitive and situational factors and can be validated by testing for the substance (Brener, Billy, & Grady, 2003). The validity of all self-reported behaviors that are included on the YRBS questionnaire has never been examined (Brener, Kann, & McManus, 2002). However, in 2003, the CDC assessed the cognitive and situational factors that might affect the validity of adolescent self-reporting of behaviors measured by the YRBS questionnaire by reviewing existing empirical literature (Brener, Billy & Grady, 2003). The CDC concluded that, these factors do not threaten the validity of self-reports of each type of behavior equally, even if self-reports of these types of behaviors are affected by both cognitive and situational factors (CDC, 2011).

In addition, there is no existing standard to validate the respondent behavior. Self-reporting can be validated by an objective measure to the extent in which each type of behavior differs. For example, reports of physical and sexual violence may be subjected to self-reporting bias (Brener, Billy, & Grady, 2003). Experiencing physical and or sexual



dating violence is a very sensitive matter and for the most part can be affected by situational influences, even though it was established that this measure had substantial reliability using 1999 YRBS data (Brener, Kann & Mc Manus, 2002).

### **Limitations**

The State YRBS has several limitations. As YRBS data is self-described, the truthfulness of student response cannot be determined. These limitations are cognitive (e.g. the ability to recall, or to fully understand the questions) and situational (e.g. the desire to socially fit- in, being noticed and worried about the shame (Thompson, McGee & Mays, 2012)). Also, the data pertains only to students in attendance when the survey was administered and, therefore, is not representative of all persons in this age group. This also means that the 6% of students not enrolled or present in school were not surveyed, though teens who do not attend school on a regular basis are more likely to participate in unsafe activities. The Break the Cycle 2010 State Law Report Card: A National Survey on Teen Dating Violence Laws presents a summary of state domestic violence statutes. The states that did not allow teens in dating relationships to petition the court were automatically given an F grade. Finally, state domestic violence laws differ in every state, and some of the states have amended their laws since 2010 making this too broad an overview to analyze for this study.

Domestic Violence Counts: National Census of Domestic Violence Services only surveyed the domestic violence programs and individuals in seeking assistance. In 2015 they provided 71, 828 adults and children that sought help at 1,752 domestic violence

organizations across the United States. However, the census did not identify individuals who were victims of domestic violence.

### **Ethical Procedures**

The YRBS followed ethical guidelines including obtaining parental consent and the protection of the students' identities. Schools participating in the YRBS were advised of confidentiality requirements, and educated to safeguard and protect students' privacy and anonymity. The surveys did not require student names, and were not administered if less than 100 students were available to participate in any given subgroup (CDC, 2011). Schools administering the survey electronically used Survey Monkey, an Internet survey service with reliable privacy protections. During this course of obtaining informed consent, school administrators informed students of their rights as participants, including the measures that would be taken to protect their identities and the voluntary nature of the study (CDC, 2011). Data collected for this research was properly stored and password access protected. After the research is completed all data will be destroyed after five years.

### **Summary**

Chapter 3 discussed the methodology that was utilized in this study. The main data collected was analyzed to find results concerning the impact state domestic violence laws on the prevalence of teen dating violence. Data was analyzed using SPSS 23 and logistic regression to determine whether there is an association between the prevalence

rates of physical and sexual violence and the accessibility of state orders of protection for teens. Chapter 4 discusses the findings of the study.

## Chapter 4: Results

### **Introduction**

Although teens face the same extent of violence as their adult counterparts, these two forms of abuse are treated differently by most states (Logan et al., 2006). State order of protection laws currently fail to protect teen victims experiencing dating violence, due to many barriers including the age of the victim, how a “relationship” is defined, parental involvement if the victim is under 18 years of age, filing for a civil order of protection and the absence of teen domestic violence laws (Cornelius et al., 2009; Jenson, 2007; Largio, 2007).

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a difference in reported dating violence (physical and sexual) among states that do and do not provide victims of teen dating violence the same protections that have been traditionally provided to adult victims of domestic violence and the role of advocacy coalitions. A quantitative research design was used to conduct a secondary analysis using data sets from the CDC’s 2011 State Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System survey, an examination of State Law Report Cards 2010: A National Survey of Teen Dating Violence Laws of all 50 states, and Domestic Violence Counts: National Census of Domestic Violence Services.

This chapter presents the results of the analytical methodologies outlined in Chapter 3. A description of the sample’s demographics is first presented. A series of *t tests* and ANOVAs were carried out to examine whether there were differences in dating violence in states that did and did not provide protections.

### Data Collection

YRBS data from the states that participated in the 2011 survey were used to determine whether there is a difference in reported dating violence (physical or sexual) among states, depending on whether they provided protections for teen violence dating victims. There were missing data due to (a) a lack of participation from some states; (b) some states did not include the question on physical and sexual violence. The strength of advocacy coalitions programs was operationalized through the response rates gleaned from the National 24-hour Census data on Comprehensive Advocacy and Support survey.

A total of 39,184 female participants, Grades 9-12, from the 2011 YRBS State Data were analyzed. Table 9 reports the participant demographics in terms of grade, age and race. In terms of grade, the participants were roughly evenly split among the grade levels, with 21.3% in the 11<sup>th</sup> grade, 20.7% in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade and 19% in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade. In terms of age, the participants were also roughly evenly split, although participants who were aged 18 or older (8%) and 14 years (7.8%) were in the minority. As anticipated, the majority of the participants were White (21.3%) while the next largest group was comprised of Black students (10.3%).

Table 9

#### *Participant Demographics*

	Item	Participants	Percent
Grade	9th Grade	7,444	19.0
	10th Grade	7,309	18.7

	11th Grade	8,357	21.3
	12th Grade	8,092	20.7
	Ungraded or Other	109	0.3
	Total	31,311	79.9
Missing	-99	7,873	20.1
Total		39,184	100
<hr/>			
Age	12 or younger	6,831	17.4
	13 years	6,602	16.8
	14 years	3,053	7.8
	15 years	6,729	17.2
	16 years	6,697	17.1
	17 years	6,068	15.5
	18 or older	3,127	8.0
	Total	39,107	99.8
Missing	-99	77	0.2
Total		39,184	100
<hr/>			
Race	White	8,332	21.3
	Asian	1,310	3.3
	Black or African American	4,038	10.3
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	3,924	10
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	189	0.5
	Hispanic/Latino	15,288	39
	Multiple	1,054	2.7
	Hispanic/Latino Multiple Non-Hispanic/Latino	59	0.2
	Total	34,194	87.3
Missing	-99	4,990	12.7
Total		39,184	100

The students were asked whether they had experienced physical violence within the context of a dating relationship and a large portion of the female students (62.6%) reported that they experienced physical violence ( $n = 24,527$ ) while the rest of the

respondents (31.0%;  $n = 13,674$ ) reported that they did not experience physical violence. Respondents were also asked whether they had experienced sexual violence within the context of a dating relationship. 6.9% reported that they had experienced sexual violence ( $n = 2,178$ ) while the rest said that they did not (54.0%;  $n = 21,166$ ). Notably, 39% of the respondents did not provide responses to the inquiry; these were considered as missing data and were excluded from the analysis. Table 10 reports the physical and sexual violence as reported by the participants.

Table 10

*Physical and Sexual Violence Reported by the Female Teens*

Type of Violence	Response	Number of Responses	Percent
Physical Violence	Yes	24,527	62.6
	No	12,150	31.0
	Total	36,677	93.6
	Missing	2,507	6.4
Total		39,184	100.0
Sexual Violence	Yes	2,718	6.9
	No	21,166	54.0
	Total	23,884	61.0
	Missing	15,300	39.0
Total		39,184	100.0

## Results

Research Question 1: Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report physical and sexual violence (as reported in the CDC YRBS) between states that require parental consent when filing an order of protection and states that do not?

Inferential statistics was carried out to assess whether there were differences in reported dating violence (physical and sexual) among states that do and do not allow minors to petition the courts on their own behalf after controlling for age, grade and race. YRBS data coded responses that answered “Yes” as “1”, while responses that were “No” were coded as “2.” Data is for adjusted mean and standard error. The results indicated that states that did not allow minors to petition the courts ( $M = 1.367$ ,  $SE = .009$ ) had a lower rate of reported physical dating violence than states that allowed minors to petition on their own behalf ( $M = 1.106$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) and that this difference was statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = 731.076$ ,  $p < .001$ . This implied that reported physical violence was higher for states that allowed minors to petition on their own behalf than states that do not allow them to petition on their own behalf. Tables 11 and 12 present the results of the analysis.

Table 11

*Summary Statistics for Reported Physical Violence by State*

State Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound



States that do not allow minors to petition on their own behalf	1.367 <sup>a</sup>	0.009	1.349	1.386
States that allow minors to petition on own behalf	1.106 <sup>a</sup>	0.002	1.103	1.109

a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Age = 4.69, Grade = 2.47, Race = 4.79.

Table 12

*Results of the Analysis for Physical Violence based on whether the State allows Minors to Petition the Courts on their Own Behalf*

Source	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4	303.331	5395.710	0.000
Intercept	1	4124.365	73364.991	0.000
Age	1	281.118	5000.588	0.000
Grade	1	139.335	2478.514	0.000
Race	1	81.317	1446.488	0.000
State by Group	1	41.099	<b>731.076***</b>	0.000
Error	26,316	0.056		
Total	26,321			
Corrected Total	26,320			

Note. Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

For sexual violence, it was revealed that reported sexual violence was lower in states that allowed minors to petition the court on their own behalf for orders of protection ( $M = 1.916$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) than states that do not allow minors to petition on their own behalf ( $M = 1.910$ ,  $SD = .011$ ) and that this difference was not statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = .248$ ,  $p = .618$ . This suggested that the rates of reported sexual

violence were the same for states that do and do not allow minors to petition the court on their own behalf for orders of protection. Tables 13 and 14 present the summary statistics for reported sexual violence and results of the analysis for sexual violence for states that do and do not require parental consent when filing an order of protection.

Table 13

*Summary Statistics for Reported Sexual Violence by State*

States by Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
States that do not allow minors to petition on their own behalf	1.910 <sup>a</sup>	0.011	1.889	1.931
States that allow minors to petition on own behalf	1.916 <sup>a</sup>	0.002	1.912	1.919

a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Age = 4.66, Grade = 2.47, Race = 4.75.

Table 14

*Results of the Analysis for Sexual Violence Based on Whether the State allows Minors to Petition the Courts on their Own Behalf*

Source	<i>df</i>	Mean square	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
Corrected Model	4	0.159	2.057	0.084
Intercept	1	5270.808	68001.292	0.000
Age	1	0.15	1.935	0.164
Grade	1	0.53	6.836	0.009
Race	1	0.000	0.002	0.967

States by Group	1	0.019	0.248	0.618
Error	27,034	0.078		
Total	27,039			
Corrected Total	27,038			

---

*Note.* Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

Research Question 2: Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report physical and sexual violence (as reported in the CDC YRBS) between states that prohibit all minors from filing order of protection and those that do not?

Inferential statistics was also performed to assess whether there were differences in reported dating violence (physical and sexual) among states that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection and those that do not after controlling for age, grade and race. YRBS data coded responses that answered “Yes” as 1, while responses that were “No” were coded as 2. Data is for adjusted mean and standard error. The results indicated that states that did not prohibit all minors from filing ( $M = 1.120$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) had a lower rate of reported physical dating violence than states that prohibited all minors from petitioning in court ( $M = 1.102$ ,  $SD = .003$ ) and this difference was statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = 26.232$ ,  $p < .001$ . This demonstrated that reported physical violence was higher for states that prohibit all minors from petitioning in court. Tables 15 and 16 present the results of the analysis.

Table 15

*Summary Statistics for Reported Physical Violence by State*

State by Group	95% Confidence Interval			
	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
States that prohibit all minors from petitioning in court	1.102 <sup>a</sup>	0.003	1.096	1.108
States that do not prohibit all minors from petitioning in court	1.120 <sup>a</sup>	0.002	1.117	1.124

a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Age = 4.69, Grade = 2.47, Race = 4.79.

Table 16

*Results of the Analysis for Physical Violence Based on Whether the State Prohibited all Minors from Filing an Order of Protection*

Source	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4	293.435	5083.65	0.000
Intercept	1	4009.429	69461.884	0.000
Age	1	526.426	9120.132	0.000
Grade	1	254.035	4401.068	0.000
Race	1	93.4	1618.112	0.000
State by Group	1	1.514	<b>26.232***</b>	0.000
Error	26,316	0.058		
Total	26,321			
Corrected Total	26,320			

Note. Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

For sexual violence, it was revealed that reported sexual violence was lower in states that do not prohibit all minors from filing orders of protection ( $M = 1.918$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) than states that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection ( $M = 1.908$ ,  $SD = .002$ ) and this difference was statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = 5.99$ ,  $p = .014$ . This suggested that reported sexual violence was higher for states that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection than states that do not. Tables 17 and 18 present the summary statistics for reported sexual violence and results of the analysis for sexual violence for states that do and do not prohibit all minors from filing orders of protection.

Table 17

*Summary Statistics of Reported Sexual Violence by State*

States by Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
States that prohibit all minors from petitioning in court	1.908 <sup>a</sup>	0.003	1.902	1.915
States that do not prohibit all minors from petitioning in court	1.918 <sup>a</sup>	0.002	1.914	1.922

a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Age = 4.66, Grade = 2.47, Race = 4.75.

Table 18

*Results of the Analysis for Sexual Violence based on whether the State Prohibits all Minors from Filing Orders of Protection*

Source	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4	0.271	3.493	0.007
Intercept	1	5990.432	77301.924	0.000

Age	1	0.124	1.601	0.206
Grade	1	0.522	6.74	0.009
Race	1	0.009	0.113	0.737
States by Group	1	0.464	<b>5.99*</b>	0.014
Error	27,034	0.077		
Total	27,039			
Corrected Total	27,038			

---

*Note.* Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

Research Question 3: Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report physical and sexual violence (as reported in the CDC YRBS) between states that explicitly exclude persons in dating relationships from filing an order of protection and those that do not?

Inferential statistics was also used to assess whether there were differences in reported dating violence (physical and sexual) among states that explicitly exclude persons in dating relationships from filing orders of protection and those that do not while controlling for age, grade and race. YRBS data coded responses that answered “Yes” as 1, while responses that were “No” were coded as 2. Data is for adjusted mean and standard error. The results indicated that states that do not allow victims to apply for protection orders against a dating partner ( $M = 1.160$ ,  $SE = .006$ ) had a lower rate of reported physical dating violence than states that allowed victims to apply for protections against a dating partner ( $M = 1.112$ ,  $SD = .002$ ) and that this difference was statistically

significant,  $F(1,26,316) = 67.552, p < .001$ . This demonstrated that reported physical violence was higher for states that allow victims to apply for protection orders against a dating partner. Tables 19 and 20 present the summary statistics and results of the analysis for physical violence.

Table 19

*Summary Statistics for Reported Physical Violence by State*

State by Group	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
States that do not allow Victims to Apply for Protection Orders Against a Dating Partner	1.160 <sup>a</sup>	0.006	1.149	1.171
States that allow Victims to Apply for Protection Orders Against a Dating Partner	1.112 <sup>a</sup>	0.002	1.109	1.115

a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Age = 4.69, Grade = 2.47, Race = 4.79.

Table 20

*Results of the Analysis for Physical Violence Based on Whether the State Explicitly Excludes Persons in Dating Relationships from Filing an Order of Protection*

Source	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4	294.03	5101.944	0.000
Intercept	1	3968.774	68865.398	0.000
Age	1	518.812	9002.332	0.000

Grade	1	251.165	4358.162	0.000
Race	1	98.781	1714.035	0.000
State by Group	1	3.893	<b>67.552***</b>	0.000
Error	26,316	0.058		
Total	26,321			
Corrected Total	26,320			

Note. Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

For states that do and do not provide protections within the context of a dating relationship, inferential analysis revealed that reported sexual violence was lower in states that allow victims to apply for protection orders against a dating partner ( $M = 1.916$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) than states that allow victim to apply for protections from a dating partner ( $M = 1.913$ ,  $SE = .006$ ). However, this difference was not statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = .171$ ,  $p = .679$ . This implied that reported physical violence was the same for states that do and do not explicitly exclude persons in dating relationships from filing orders of protection. Tables 21 and 22 present the summary statistics for reported sexual violence and results of the analysis for sexual violence.

Table 21

*Summary Statistics for Reported Sexual Violence by State*

Dating Partner	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower	Upper
			Bound	Bound
States that do not Allow Victims Protections from Dating	1.913 <sup>a</sup>	0.006	1.901	1.925



## Partner

States that allow victims protections from dating partner	1.916 <sup>a</sup>	0.002	1.912	1.919
---	--------------------	-------	-------	-------

a Covariates appearing in the model are evaluated at the following values: Age = 4.66, Grade = 2.47, Race = 4.75.

Table 22

*Results of the Analysis for Sexual Violence based on whether the State Explicitly Excludes Persons in Dating Relationships from filing an Order of Protection*

Source	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4	0.158	2.037	0.086
Intercept	1	5820.07	75087.375	0.000
Age	1	0.14	1.808	0.179
Grade	1	0.539	6.959	0.008
States by Group	1	0.013	0.171	0.679
Error	27,034	0.078		
Total	27,039			
Corrected Total	27,038			

Note. Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

Research Question 4: Does the rate of female teens who report physical and sexual violence (as reported in the CDC YRBS) depend on the strength of the state's advocacy coalition programs and services?

The states were classified into four groups depending on the strength of their advocacy and coalition programs. State scores were derived from the average responses from states that participated in the National 24-hour Census data on Comprehensive Advocacy and Support. States who scored 80-100% were categorized into the "Much Stronger" group, 70 to 79% into the "Stronger" group, 60- 69% into the "No Change"

group, 50-59% into the “Weaker” group, while those who scored less than 50% were considered “Much Weaker” with regard to the strength of their advocacy coalition programs and services. Responses to physical and sexual violence were coded as “1” for “Yes,” and “2” for “No.”

A series of *Anovas* were carried out to determine whether there were differences in reported physical and sexual violence depending on the strength of the state’s advocacy programs. The results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the reported physical violence between states depending on the strength of their advocacies,  $F(3,3,673) = 2,023.282, p < .001$ . A post hoc comparison using the Games-Howell test revealed that there was a mean decrease in states categorized as “Much Stronger” to “Stronger” ( $M = -.386, SE = .007$ ) which was statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ); “Stronger” to “No Change” ( $M = -.258, SE = .014$ ) which was statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ); “No Change” to “Much Weaker” ( $M = -.035, SE = .016$ ) which was not statistically significant ( $p = .149$ ). These results suggested that stronger state advocacy and coalition programs resulted in more reported incidents of physical violence among female teens. However, the rate of reported incidents was the same for states with low state advocacy coalitions programs and services (States in the “No Change” and “Much Weaker” groups). Tables 23 and 24 present the summary statistics and Games-Howell post hoc test for reported physical violence depending on the strength of state advocacy coalition programs.

Table 23

*Summary Statistics for Reported Physical Violence Depending on the Strength of State Advocacy and Coalition Programs and Services*

Variable	State Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Physical Violence	Much Weaker	581	1.93	0.262	0.011	1.9	1.95
	No Change	634	1.89	0.312	0.012	1.87	1.92
	Stronger	5929	1.63	0.482	0.006	1.62	1.65
	Much Stronger	29533	1.25	0.431	0.003	1.24	1.25
	Total	36677	1.33	0.471	0.002	1.33	1.34

Table 24

*Results of the Games-Howell Post hoc Test Depending on the Strength of State Advocacy Coalition Programs and Services*

Variable	(I) State Advocacy	(J) State Advocacy	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Physical Violence	Much Weaker	No Change	0.035	0.016	0.149	-0.01	0.08
		Stronger	<b>.293***</b>	0.013	0.000	0.26	0.33
		Much Stronger	<b>.679***</b>	0.011	0.000	0.65	0.71
	No Change	Much Weaker	-0.035	0.016	0.149	-0.08	0.01
		Stronger	<b>.258***</b>	0.014	0.000	0.22	0.29

	Much Stronger	<b>.644***</b>	0.013	0.000	0.61	0.68
Stronger	Much Weaker	<b>-.293***</b>	0.013	0.000	-0.33	-0.26
	No Change	<b>-.258***</b>	0.014	0.000	-0.29	-0.22
	Much Stronger	<b>.386***</b>	0.007	0.000	0.37	0.4
Much Stronger	Much Weaker	<b>-.679***</b>	0.011	0.000	-0.71	-0.65
	No Change	<b>-.644***</b>	0.013	0.000	-0.68	-0.61
	Stronger	<b>-.386***</b>	0.007	0.000	-0.4	-0.37

---

*Note.* Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

For sexual violence, the results of the *Anova* determined that there was a significant difference in reported sexual violence depending on the strength of state advocacies,  $F(3,3,673) = 3.520$ ,  $p = .014$ . A post hoc comparison using the Games-Howell test revealed that there was a mean decrease in states categorized as “Much Stronger” to “Stronger” ( $M = -.010$ ,  $SE = .004$ ) which was statistically significant ( $p = .004$ ); “Stronger” to “No Change” ( $M = -.012$ ,  $SE = .010$ ) which was not statistically significant ( $p < .658$ ); “No Change” to “Much Weaker” ( $M = .022$ ,  $SE = .010$ ) which was not statistically significant ( $p = .097$ ). Taken in entirety, the findings implied that stronger state advocacy and coalition programs resulted in higher reported incidents of sexual violence among female teens. Tables 25 and 26 present the summary statistics and Games-Howell post hoc test for reported physical violence depending on the strength of state advocacies.

Table 25

*Summary Statistics for Reported Sexual Violence Depending on the Strength of State Advocacies*

Variable	State Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Sexual Violence	Much Weaker	28433	1.92	0.278	0.002	1.91	1.92
	No Change	631	1.94	0.241	0.010	1.92	1.96
	Stronger	5080	1.93	0.261	0.004	1.92	1.93
	Much Stronger	31193	1.92	0.277	0.002	1.91	1.92
	Total	65337	1.92	0.276	0.001	1.91	1.92

Table 26

*Results of the Games-Howell Post hoc Test Depending on the Strength of State Advocacies*

Variable	(I) State Advocacy	(J) State Advocacy	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	Much Weaker	No Change	-0.022	0.010	0.097	-0.05	0.00
		Stronger	<b>-.011*</b>	0.004	0.040	-0.02	0.00
		Much Stronger	0.000	0.002	0.999	-0.01	0.01
	No Change	Weaker	0.022	0.010	0.097	0.0	0.05

	Stronger	0.012	0.010	0.658	-0.01	0.04
	Much					
	Stronger	0.022	0.010	0.104	0.00	0.05
	Much					
Stronger	Weaker	<b>.011*</b>	0.004	0.040	0.00	0.02
	No Change	-0.012	0.010	0.658	-0.04	0.01
	Much					
	Stronger	<b>.010*</b>	0.004	0.047	0.00	0.02
Much	Much					
Stronger	Weaker	0.000	0.002	0.999	-0.01	0.01
	No Change	-0.022	0.010	0.104	-0.05	0.00
	Stronger	<b>-.010*</b>	0.004	0.047	-0.02	0.00

---

*Note.* Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

### Summary

The purpose of this study was to reveal whether there is a difference in reported dating violence (physical and sexual) among states that do and do not provide victims of teen dating violence the same protections that have been traditionally provided to adult victims of domestic violence and the role of advocacy coalitions across the United States. The statistical package SPSS 23 was used to perform the data analysis for this study. The ACF was applied and age, gender and race were tested to determine whether an effect present between each variable and the states domestic violence policies exclusions. Quantitative research techniques demonstrated that reported physical violence was higher

for states that allow minors to petition on their own behalf than states that do not. Moreover, the results also determined that reported physical violence was higher for states that prohibit all minors from petitioning in court than states that do not. It was also demonstrated that reported sexual violence was higher for states that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection than states that do not. Additionally, it was also revealed that reported physical violence was higher for states that allow victims to apply for protection orders against a dating partner than states that do not. For teen dating violence, the laws that provide accessibility for minors to obtain civil protection orders are stronger than laws that possess barriers because as noted in the literature review, civil protection orders reduce or deter contact between perpetrator and survivor. States domestic violence policies (as measured by the grades given by Break the Cycle), were associated with lower prevalence of teen dating violence. Finally, the results determined that stronger state advocacy and coalition programs resulted in higher reported incidents of physical and sexual violence among female teens. However, the rate of reported physical violence was the same for states with low state advocacy coalitions programs (States in the “No Change” and “Much Weaker” groups).

Chapter 5 follows with interpretation of findings, recommendations and conclusions of the study.

## Chapter 5: Recommendations and Conclusions

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in domestic violence statutes across the United States to determine whether there is a difference in prevalence rates of reporting dating violence among states that have been traditionally provided protections to adult victims of domestic violence and the role of advocacy coalitions. This study used a quantitative approach and multiple data sets from the CDC's State YRBS (2011) to assess the number of female teens who reported experiencing physical and/or sexual violence during the past 12 months. Break the Cycle State Law Report Cards 2010: A National Survey of Teen Dating Violence Laws was used to identify state laws related to teen access to order of protections and Domestic Violence Counts: National Census of Domestic Violence Services advocacy responses to dating violence and access to programs and services.

The outcomes helped to explain the problem. The use of secondary data involved accumulating statistics and surveys which examined results that created data-driven analysis to prove the hypothesis. Three data sources were chosen to aid in the analysis of the examination of states domestic violence laws impact of protective orders on teen dating violence. Break the Cycle and the CDC to date have done the most extensive research on teen dating violence and its effects. The study made use of research as an empirical foundation to demonstrate that dating violence transpires irrespective of one's culture, gender, or economic status (e.g., Toscano, 2012). Another study discussed the



need for accessibility [for whom? To what?] and enforcement of orders of protection for teen victims involved in abusive relationships (Cornelius et al., 2009).

In this study, I addressed the following four research questions: (a) Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) between states that do not require parental consent when filing an order of protection to those that do? (b) Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) between states that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection and those that do not? (c) Is there a difference in the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual dating violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) between states that explicitly exclude persons in dating relationship from filing an order of protection and those that do not? and (d) Does the rate of female teens who report experiencing physical and sexual violence (as reported in CDC YRBS) depend on the strength of a state's advocacy coalitions programs and services?

Descriptive statistics were shown, together with logistic regression model and a “*t* test”. Results from all the research questions and hypothesis were disclosed. This chapter provides an interpretation of findings, the limitations of the study, along with the study’s recommendations and implications of social change.

### **Interpretations of Findings**

The findings revealed that 24, 527 female students (62.6%) reported experiencing physical violence compared to 2,178 female students (6.9%) who had experienced sexual

violence within the context of a dating relationship. A key finding that emerged from the data analysis was statistically significant difference in age, gender and race when examining physical sexual dating violence among high school females and the states that creates barriers for teens in dating relationships when filing protection orders. Findings from the study typically underpin the statistical model and suggest that states domestic violence policy involving civil protection orders may be a significant approach in addressing teen dating violence. States that require parental consent when filing a protection order courts ( $M = 1.367$ ,  $SE = .009$ ) had a lower rate of reported physical dating violence than states that allowed minors to petition on their own behalf ( $M = 1.106$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) showing that this difference was statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = 731.076$ ,  $p < .001$ . This implied that minors experiencing dating violence were less likely to report the violence and reporting of physical violence was higher for states that allowed minors to petition on their own behalf. For sexual violence, it was revealed that reported sexual violence was lower in states that allowed minors to petition the court on their own behalf for orders of protection ( $M = 1.916$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) than states that do not allow minors to petition on their own behalf ( $M = 1.910$ ,  $SD = .011$ ) and that this difference was not statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = .248$ ,  $p = .618$ . This suggested that the rates of reported sexual violence were the same for states that do and do not allow minors to petition the court on their own behalf for orders of protection.

States that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection ( $M = 1.120$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) had a lower rate of reported physical dating violence than states that prohibited all

minors from petitioning in court ( $M = 1.102$ ,  $SD = .003$ ) and this difference was statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = 26.232$ ,  $p < .001$ . This demonstrated that reported physical violence was higher for states that prohibit all minors from petitioning in court. For sexual violence, it was revealed that reported sexual violence was lower in states that do not prohibit all minors from filing orders of protection ( $M = 1.918$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) than states that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection ( $M = 1.908$ ,  $SD = .002$ ) and this difference was statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = 5.99$ ,  $p = .014$ . This suggested that reported sexual violence was higher for states that prohibit all minors from filing an order of protection than states that do not.

States that explicitly exclude all persons in dating relationship from filing ( $M = 1.160$ ,  $SE = .006$ ) had a lower rate of reported physical dating violence than states that allowed victims to apply for protections against a dating partner ( $M = 1.112$ ,  $SD = .002$ ) and that this difference was statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = 67.552$ ,  $p < .001$ . This demonstrated that reported physical violence was higher for states that allow victims to apply for protection orders against a dating partner. The results indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the reported physical violence between states depending on the strength of their advocacies,  $F(3,3,673) = 2,023.282$ ,  $p < .001$ . Sexual violence was lower in states that allow victims to apply for protection orders against a dating partner ( $M = 1.916$ ,  $SE = .002$ ) than states that allow victim to apply for protections from a dating partner ( $M = 1.913$ ,  $SE = .006$ ). However, this difference was not statistically significant,  $F(1,26,316) = .171$ ,  $p = .679$ . This implied that reported

physical violence was the same for states that do and do not explicitly exclude persons in dating relationships from filing orders of protection.

Based on the results of the differences in reported physical and sexual violence depending on the strength of the state's advocacy programs there was a statistically significant difference between the reported physical violence between states depending on the strength of their advocacies,  $F(3,3,673) = 2,023.282, p < .001$ . There was a mean decrease in states categorized as much stronger to stronger ( $M = -.386, SE = .007$ ) which was statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ); stronger to no change ( $M = -.258, SE = .014$ ) which was statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ); no change to much weaker ( $M = -.035, SE = .016$ ) which was not statistically significant ( $p = .149$ ). These results suggested that stronger state advocacy and coalition programs resulted in more reported incidents of physical violence among female teens. However, the rate of reported incidents was the same for states with low state advocacy coalitions programs and services (states in the No Change and Much Weaker groups).

For sexual violence, the results of the determined that there was a significant difference in reported sexual violence depending on the strength of state advocacies,  $F(3,3,673) = 3.520, p = .014$ . Also, the test revealed that there was a mean decrease in states categorized as Much Stronger to Stronger ( $M = -.010, SE = .004$ ) which was statistically significant ( $p = .004$ ); Stronger to No Change ( $M = -.012, SE = .010$ ) which was not statistically significant ( $p < .658$ ); No Change to Much Weaker ( $M = .022, SE = .010$ ) which was not statistically significant ( $p = .097$ ).

The findings implied that stronger state advocacy and coalition programs resulted in higher reported incidents of sexual violence among female teens. Results indicated that states with stronger coalitions could provide more services and promote awareness leading to higher reporting of dating violence. It is possible that with more resources and programs they could educate teens and facilitated help seeking behaviors. These study findings implied that strong advocacy coalitions may be a significant approach to address teen dating violence. Moreover, the finding that strong state advocacy coalitions programs and services are associated with higher reporting of teen dating violence is hopeful.

Of the respondents (62.6%) reported that they experienced physical violence and (6.9%) experienced sexual violence (CDC, 2012). Findings demonstrated the need for policy makers to amplify teen access to protection orders and eliminate any and all existing barriers for teens seeking protection. In addition, strong state policies related to protection orders may impact teen dating violence prevalence is reassuring. These finding confirms what was found in peer reviewed, affirming that teen dating violence is a widespread problem and protection orders can be used as a viable tool to deter dating violence.

### **Limitations of the Study**

There are significant limitations to this study. For example, the extent and existing situation of the violence occurred also limits the tested hypotheses and the interpretation of results. In addition, victims of teen dating violence assessed in this study may be more

prevalent among adolescents who live in the states that allow teens to file an order of protection. Some of the states did not participate in survey and some did not include the questions regarding physical and sexual dating violence. I also found missing data from several states that did not include the questions regarding physical and sexual dating violence in their survey. The 43 states that participated was sufficient to proceed and states that did not participate (Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Washington, and Missouri) in the survey was not included in the study.

Hence, the barriers and the relationships examined, the services and programs rendered biased because of the potentially non-representative nature of this sample. In addition, the findings from this sample of female students at a public high school are simplified compared to private high school students or individuals who have dropped out of high school. I was also unable to openly identify the sex of abusers involved in reported violence. In addition, I lack confidence in average total found for the four programs analyzed because of inconsistencies in the different wordings used by the states. They each reported on different services and programs offered on census day and the variations in data could be contributed to the response rates. States with fewer resources and people were not able to provide the same programs and services as the other states and that limited how the problem investigated differ. Those inconsistencies and missing data led me to use the overall response rates for each state as a proxy of advocacy coalition. The census did not identify individuals who were victims of domestic violence. Finally, state domestic violence laws differ in every state, and some of the

states have amended their laws since 2010 making domestic violence laws too broad an overview to analyze for this study.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

Presently a great deal of attention is being given to domestic violence, but it is also significant to identify that teens are the increasing population at risk. Teen dating violence is recognized as a public health problem by the CDC (2009). Additionally, physical abuse and violence in teen dating relationships often continues into their adult relationships, increasing the risk for victims to experience negative consequences as well as added domestic violence and abuse (Silverman, Raj, Mucci, & Hathaway, 2001). Teens are in dating relationships as early as middle school, so it is evident that the domestic violence laws should be adjusted to provide resources and protection to accommodate victims of teen dating violence.

Teens are involved in dating relationships that are just as abusive as adult dating relationships. In 2013, the CDC reported approximately 9.8% of high school teens endured physical violence; 7.4% experienced forced sexual intercourse; and 28.5% had experienced violence consecutively during a 12-month period (CDC, 2013). A 2013 national survey also found that when divided by gender, 15.7% of female adolescents and 7.8% of male adolescents were affected by physical dating violence. Combined with sexual abuse, the figures rose to 24.4% for females, and 9.9% for males (CDC 2013, p. 2).

In the United States, an order of protection is a viable tool in deterring and reducing domestic violence (Logan & Walker, 2011). Studies have shown that civil orders of protection prevent further occurrences of domestic violence for most victims (Carlson, Harris, & Holden, 1999; Harrell & Smith, 1996; Keilitz, Efke, & Hannaford, 1997; Logan & Walker, 2011; Logan et al., 2006). The vast majority of adult victims believe the orders of protection were effective and reported feeling less fearful after obtaining them. Among the orders of protection issued for domestic violence "between 30 and 77 percent were not violated" (Carlson, Harris & Holden, 1999; Logan & Walker, 2011, p. 2). Adults experiencing domestic violence can seek orders of protection to protect them from further abuse. Since teens are faced with similar violence and abuse in their dating relationships, it would be worthwhile to include teen victims in states' domestic violence laws.

Therefore, a recommendation is to include teens in dating relationship that experience physical and sexual abuse in domestic violence laws. Adjusting the laws to accommodate teens and making the necessary provisions may help to deter dating violence. The states domestic violence laws that present barriers in obtaining protection orders can make it more accessible to teens. States domestic violence advocates because of designing programs to influence teens in becoming advocates for promoting healthy relationships is an important step in the right direction since teens are able to influence their peers.



Even though there are existing teen dating violence prevention programs that provide resources no research was found that examined the impact of protective orders on teen dating violence. Regarding the research findings from this study, dating violence is common amongst teens as well as the lack of protection provided by some states domestic violence laws pertaining to victims of teen dating violence. This calls for concern and justification to confront the issue of most states domestic violence laws exclusions of victims of teen dating violence. While this study provided some insight into the role a protection order plays in teen dating violence. A better understanding will result from a broader investigation of the state's domestic violence laws that create barriers for victims of teen dating violence. The benefits of including victims of teen dating violence within domestic violence laws may help to promote awareness and acceptance that the problem is widespread. Incorporating existing initiatives and programs such as protection orders and resources available to adult victims may help to deter the violence.

Further research is recommended so that policy-makers can facilitate legal indication regarding dating violence and protection for teens experiencing violence in their relationship. Given that some states domestic violence laws presently exclude teens the association of barriers should be explored in this subgroup of dating violence victims. A significant amount of high school females responded yes to being sexually abuse by their dating partner. Other research should address the effect of state laws mandating governing teen dating violence programs and policies in schools. There is evidence to

suggest that there is a pattern of abuse among dating teens at a young age. Therefore, coverage of penal and civil domestic violence laws within the United States should include dating relationships as well as protection for teen victims. Through widespread acknowledgment of teen dating violence and prevention initiatives, maybe societal attitudes will change and in doing so help to create a society that encourages healthy relationships. Therefore, it becomes imperative for further research to be conducted in this field, particularly examining the impact of protection orders on teen dating violence.

### **Implications for Social Change**

This study aims to create positive social change by encouraging policymakers and crime prevention specialists to consider implementing policy changes in domestic violence statutes to accommodate teen victims. Teen dating violence affects every teen no matter their ethnicity or economic status. The widespread of teen dating violence has created a public health problem that can have unfavorable outcomes for teens throughout their lives. The study contributed to positive social change by bringing about awareness of the existing exclusions in some states domestic violence laws. This study provided an opportunity to examine the impact of protection orders on teen dating violence. The revelation and understanding about protection orders impact on teen dating violence can facilitate changes to social norms around teen dating violence, and influence policy changes by informing domestic violence policymakers about the lack of provisions in teen dating violence laws. This will further support law enforcement, researchers, practitioners, and educators who believe that despite awareness campaigns, “the legal

response to teen dating violence has not been sufficient” (Largio, 2007, p. 958). Study findings may also facilitate practice implications for counselors, health care and social workers that have direct contact with youths to become knowledgeable about domestic violence statutes regarding teen dating violence and providing the information to them. Domestic violence advocacy and professional organizations need to advocate for stronger laws regarding teen dating violence in the capacity of civil protection orders.

The effectiveness of protection orders regarding teen dating violence has not been examined and limited research exists to explain how these protection orders serve teen dating violence. In this research study, I present results that support a great deal to be learned about teens in dating relationship access to protection orders. States domestic violence laws accommodation of teen victims can provide awareness to the public and promote programs to educate teens in state laws on what they can do to protect themselves. The data examined substantiates the urgency to make available protection orders and other resources afforded to adult victims of domestic violence as well as victims of teen dating violence. The study aim was to examine whether there is an impact of protective orders on teen dating violence. Despite its generalizations, the study results do support and indicate a need among the teen dating population. The awareness and legal response to teen dating violence should be treated with urgency to help protect teen victims and impact the deterrence of teen dating violence which is the underlying objective.

## **Conclusion**

Teen dating violence is a component of domestic violence, and it is excluded from the domestic violence statutes in some states. While teen dating violence affects teens of all race, gender, and socioeconomic background it has many potential consequences and effects creating serious health problems. This research is most constructive in supporting teen dating violence female victims as they seek legal help when faced with dating violence.

Although various advancements have been used to deter and minimize teen dating prevalence, research up to this point have not been able to demonstrate what can be done to create a better life for teens in dating relationship. This research demonstrates that some state laws influence levels of teen dating violence. The responses to teens experiencing physical and sexual violence and the barriers they are faced with when seeking an order of protection. Including teens in dating relationships to states domestic violence statutes can promote awareness and facilitate positive action.

This research approach was based on the ACF elements relevant to domestic violence and the inclusion of a belief system. Its significance is that it is the belief system that compels and necessitates policy change. The show of strength within the states Domestic Violence Coalitions services and programs response to teen dating violence started with National Network to end Domestic Violence (NNEDV). This organization works to make domestic violence a national priority; change the way communities

respond to domestic violence; and strengthen efforts against intimate partner violence at every level of government.

There was some statistically significant difference in the rate of teen victims reporting in CDC YRBS survey of experiencing physical and sexual violence between states that do and do not present barriers when filing an order of protection. The logistic regression model analyses confirmed the confounding effects in the rate of teen victims reporting in CDC YRBS survey of experiencing physical and sexual violence differ between the strength of a state's advocacy coalitions programs and services of states. In the study, I concluded that these findings can make a substantial contribution in promoting awareness of teen dating violence and the need to include teen victims in states domestic violence laws. I found the findings emphasized the need for awareness and a method for advocates to become involved in reaching out to the policy-makers. The findings will also assist in filling in the gaps of literature and provide up to-date studies to address the impact of protection orders on teen dating violence.

Since teens are faced with dating violence as early as middle school it is vital to continue researching this concept to promote awareness of teen dating violence. It is evident that a protection order is available to adults and it has a positive impact on preventing future domestic violence for most adult victims. To take advantage of this process would be an effective strategy for making protection orders accessible to teens. Finally, continuing to address the legal response to teen dating violence, conduct research studies that will aid in the health problems that are created by dating violence, advocate

for the needed policy changes that can benefit society in the deterrence of teen dating violence and abuse. It is now evident (even if it is minimal) that strong advocacy is affiliated with increased levels of reporting among teens in dating violence.

## References

- Afifi, T. O., MacMillan, H., Cox, B. J., Admundson, G. J., Stein, M. B., & Sareen, J. (2009). Mental health correlates of intimate partner violence in marital relationships in a nationally representative sample of males and females. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(8), 1398-1417. doi:10.1177/088626050832219.
- Arbrar, S., Lovenduski, J., & Margetts, H. (2000) Feminist ideas and domestic policy change. *Policy Studies, 48*, 239-262.
- Bandura, A. (1998). Health promotion from the perspective of social cognitive theory. *Psychology and Health, 13*, 623-649.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:
- Banyard, V., & Cross, C. (2008). Consequences of teen dating violence: Understanding intervening variables in ecological context. *Violence Against Women, 14*(9), 998-1013.
- Basile, K. C, Black, M. C., Simon, T. R., Arias, I., Brener, N. D., & Saltzman, L. E. (2006). The association between self-reported lifetime history of forced sexual intercourse and recent health-risk behaviors: Findings from the 2003 national youth risk behavior survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*(752), e1-e7.
- Basile K. C., & Smith S. G. (2011). Sexual violence victimization of women. *American Journal Lifestyle Medicine., 5*,407–17.

- Bell, M., Perez, S., Goodman, L., Dutton, M. (2011). Battered woman perceptions of civil and criminal court helpfulness: The role of the court outcome and process. *Violence Against Women, 17*(1), 71-88.
- Benitez, C., McNeil, E., & Binder, R. (2010). Do protection orders protect? *Journal American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 38*, 376-385.
- Bennice, J., Resick, P., Mechanic, M., & Astin, M. (2003). The relative effects of intimate partner physical and sexual violence on post-traumatic stress disorder symptomatology. *Violence and Victims, 18*(1), 87-94.
- Binta, A., Coleman-Cowger, V., Crown, L., Gibbons, M., & Vines, L. (2011). The Effects of Dating Violence, Substance Use and Risky Sexual Behavior Among a Diverse Sample of Illinois Youth. *Journal of Adolescence, 34*(1), 11–18.
- Black, B. M., Tolman, R. M., Callahan, M., Saunders, D. G., & Weisz, A. N. (2008a). When will adolescents tell someone about dating violence victimization? *Violence Against Women, 14*, 741–758. doi:10.1177/1077801208320248
- Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., & Stevens, M. R. (2011b). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Retrieved from [http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/NISVS\\_Report2010-a.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/pdf/NISVS_Report2010-a.pdf)



- Bonomi, A., Anderson, M., Nemeth, J., Bartle-Haring, S., Buettner, C., & Schipper, D. (2012). Dating violence victimization across the teen years: Abuse frequency, number of abusive partners, and age at first occurrence. *BMC Public Health*, 12(1), 637.
- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 297-311.
- Brant, R. (2014). Inference for proportions: Comparing two independent samples. Retrieved from <http://www.stat.ubc.ca/~rollin/stats/ssize/b2.html>.
- Brener, N. D., Billy J., & Grady W. R. (2003). Assessment of factors affecting the validity of self-reported health-risk behavior among adolescents: Evidence from the scientific literature. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 33, 436–57.
- Brener, N. D., Collins J. L., Kann L, Warren C. W., Williams B. I. (1995). Reliability of the Youth Risk Behavior Survey questionnaire. *American Journal Epidemiology*, (141), 575–80.
- Brener, N.D., Kann L., & McManus T, et al. (2002). Reliability of the 1999 Youth Risk Behavior Survey Questionnaire. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 31, 336–42.
- Breiding, M.J., Chen, J. & Black, M.C. 2014. Intimate partner violence in the United States - 2010. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Carlson, M., Harris, S., & Holden, G. (1999) Protective orders and domestic violence: Risk factors for re-abuse, *Journal of Family Violence*, 14(2), 205-226.

- Caskey, C. (2006). Teen love often includes abuse: Friends usually don't know when violence is part of the relationship. In D. Largio (Ed.), *Refining the meaning and application of "dating relationship" language in domestic violence statutes*. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=27329588&site=bsi-live>.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2003) Costs of intimate partner violence against women in the United States. Retrieved from [http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/ipv\\_cost/ipv.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/ipv_cost/ipv.htm).
- Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2008). Adverse Health Conditions and Health Risk Behaviors Associated with Intimate Partner Violence - United States, 2005. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 57(5), 113-140.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). Youth risk behavior surveillance: United States, 2010. *MMWR Surveillance Summaries*, 61(SS-4).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance—United States, 2011. *MMWR* 2012; 61 (No. SS-4): 1-162.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2014). Youth risk behavior surveillance: United States, 2013. *MMWR Surveillance Summaries*, 61(SS-4).
- Cochran, J. K., Sellers, C. S., Wiesbrock, V., & Palacios, W. R. (2011). Repetitive intimate partner victimization: An exploratory application of social learning theory. *Deviant Behavior*, 32, 790-817.

- Cornelius T. L., Shorey R., & C. Kunde A. (2009). Legal consequences of dating violence: A critical review and directions for improved behavioral contingencies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 14 ,194–204.
- Cornelius, T. L., & Resseguie, N. (2007). Primary and secondary prevention programs for dating violence: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 364–375.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davis, K., Gamble, J., Humphries, G., Mitchell, L., & Pendergrass, E. (2011). A correlational study of breastfed 11th graders and PSAT scores. Retrieved from <http://www.lagrange.edu/resources/pdf/citations/nursing/A%20Correlational%20Study.pdf>.
- Danielson, C. K., & Holmes, M. M. (2004). Adolescent sexual assault: An update of the literature. *Current Opinion in Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 16(5), 383-388.
- DeMaris, A. (1992). Intimate violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives. In E. C. Viano (Ed.), *Male versus female initiation of aggression: The case of courtship violence*. (pp. 111-120). New York: Hemisphere Publishing Corp.
- Dejong, C., & Proctor, A. (2006). A summary of personal protection order status in the United States. *Violence Against Woman*, 12(1), 68-88.

- Duterte, E.E., Bonomi, A.E., Kernic, M.A., Schiff, M.A., Thompson, R.S., & Rivara, F.P. (2008). Correlates of medical and legal help-seeking among women reporting intimate partner violence. *Journal of Women's Health, 17*, 85-95.doi: 10.1089/jwh.2007.0460.
- Eaton, D. K., Davis, K. S., Barrios, L., Brener, N., & Noonan, R. K. (2007). Associations of dating violence victimization with lifetime participation, co-occurrence, and early initiation of risk behaviors among U.S. high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*, 585-602.
- Elgin, D., and Weible, C., (2013). A Stakeholder Analysis of Colorado Climate and Energy Issues Using Policy Analytical Capacity and the Advocacy Coalition Framework. *Review of Policy Research, 30*(1), 114-133.DOI: 10.1111/ropr.12005.
- Espelage, D. L., Low, S., & De La Rue, L. (2012). Relations between peer victimization subtypes, family violence, and psychological outcomes during early adolescence. *Psychology of Violence, 2*(4), 313.
- Exner-Cortens, D., Eckenrode, J., & Rothman, E. (2013). Longitudinal associations between teen dating violence victimization and adverse health outcomes. *Pediatrics, 71*, 71-78.
- Fagan, A. (2005). The relationship between adolescent physical abuse and criminal offending: Support for an enduring and generalized cycle of violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*, 279–290.

- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Arriaga, X. B., Helms, R. W., Koch, G. G., & Linder, G. F. (1998a). An evaluation of Safe Dates, an adolescent dating violence prevention program. *American Journal of Public Health, 88*(1), 45-50.
- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Ennett, S. T., Linder, G. F., Benefield, T., & Suchindran, C. (2004b). Assessing the long-term effects of the Safe Dates program and a booster in preventing and reducing adolescent dating violence victimization and perpetration. *American Journal of Public Health, 94*(4), 619-625.
- Foshee, V. A., Reyes, H. M. N., and Ennett, S. T. (2010c). Examination of sex and race differences in longitudinal predictors of the initiation of adolescent dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 19*(5), 492-516.
- Foshee, V. A., Reyes-McNaughton, H. L., Ennett, S. T., Cance, J. D., Bauman, K. E., & Bowling, J. M. (2012d). Assessing the effects of Families for Safe Dates, a family-based teen dating abuse prevention program. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 51*, 349-356.
- Foshee V. A., Reyes-McNaughton, H. L., Gottfredson, N. C., Chang, L. Y, & Ennett, S. T. (2013e). A longitudinal examination of psychological, behavioral, academic, and relationship consequences of dating abuse victimization among a primarily rural sample of adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 53*, 723-729.
- Gamache, D. (1991). Domination and control: The social context of dating violence. Retrieved from [www.fap.sagepub.com/content/3/3/319.full.pdf](http://www.fap.sagepub.com/content/3/3/319.full.pdf).

- Giordano, P., Manning, W., & Longmore, M. (2005). *The Romantic Relationships of African-American and White Adolescents*. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 3(46), 545–568.
- Giordano, P., Soto, D., Manning, W., & Longmore, A. (2010). The Characteristics of Romantic Relationships Associated with Teen Dating Violence. *Social Science Research*, 39(6), 863–74. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.03.00910.
- Halpern, C. T., Oslak, S. G., Young, M. L., Martin, S. L., & Kupper, L. L. (2001). Partner violence among adolescents in opposite sex romantic relationships: Findings from the national longitudinal study of adolescent health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91, 1679-1685.
- Hamby, S., & Turner, H. (2012). Measuring teen dating violence in males and females: Insights from the national survey of children's exposure to violence. *Psychology of Violence*, 9(6), 756-770. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801213494705>.
- Hamby, S. L., & Grych, J. H. (2013). *The web of violence: Exploring connections among different forms of interpersonal violence and abuse*. Retrieved December 1, 2015, from [http://epublications.marquette.edu/marq\\_fac-book/112](http://epublications.marquette.edu/marq_fac-book/112).
- Hamel, J., & Nichols, T. (Eds.) (2006). *Family Approaches in Domestic Violence: A Practitioners Guide Gender-Inclusive Research and Treatment*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Harrell, A., & Smith, B. (1996). Effects of Restraining Orders on Domestic Violence Victims. In Buzawa, A., & Buzawa. C. (Ed.), *Do Arrests and Restraining Orders*

- Work?* (pp. 214-242). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Heclo, H. (1978). Issue networks and the executive establishment In A. King (Ed.), *The new American political system* (pp. 87–124). Washington DC: American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.
- Henry, R., & Zeytinoglu, S. (2012). African Americans and teen dating violence. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 40*, 20-32.
- Holt, V. L., Kernic, M. A., Lumley, T., Wolf, M. E., and Rivara, F. P. (2002). Civil protection orders and risk of subsequent police-reported violence. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 288*(5), 589-594.
- Howell, D. C. (2010). *Statistical methods for psychology* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Jackson, S. M. (1999). Issues of dating violence research: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 4*(2), 233-247.
- James, W. H., West, C., Deters, K. E., & Armijo, E. (2000). Youth and dating violence. *Adolescence, 35*(139), 455-465.
- Jaycox, L. H., McCaffrey D. F., Ocampo, B.W., Shelley, G, A., Blake, S. M., Peterson DJ, et al. (2006), Challenges in the evaluation and implementation of school-based prevention and intervention programs on sensitive topics. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*, 320–336.

- Jezi, D. R., Molidor, C. E., & Wright, T. L. (1996). Physical, sexual, and psychological abuse in high school dating relationships: Prevalence rates and self-esteem issues. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 13*(1), 69-87.
- Jouriles, E. N., Grych, J. H., Rosenfield, D., McDonald, R., & Dodson, M. C. (2011). Automatic cognitions and teen dating violence. *Psychology of Violence, 1*(4), 302–314.
- Jouriles, E. N., Mueller, V., Rosenfield, D., McDonald, R., & Dodson, M. C. (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.
- Keilitz, S., P. Hannaford, & H. Efke (1997). Civil Protection Orders: The Benefits and Limitations for Victims of Domestic Violence. Final report for National Institute of Justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/242131.pdf>.
- Kingdon, J. W. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd ed.) New York: Longman.
- Klein, A., Salomon, A., Elwyn, L., Barasch, A., Powers, J., Maley, M., Gilmer, J., ...Exner-Cortens, D. (2013). *An Exploratory Study of Juvenile Orders of Protection as a Remedy for Dating Violence*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/242131.pdf>.



- Kreiter, S. R., Krowchuk, D. P., Woods, C. R., Sinal, S. H., Lawless, M. R., & DuRant, R. H. (1999). Gender differences in risk behaviors among adolescents who experience date fighting. *Pediatrics, 104*(6), 1286-1292.
- Kubler, D. (2001). Understanding policy change with the advocacy coalition framework: An application to Swiss drug policy. *Journal of European Public Policy, 8*(4), 623–641.
- Largio, D. (2007). Refining the meaning and application of “dating relationship” language in domestic violence statutes. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=27329588&site=bsi-live>.
- Leen, E., Sorbring, E., Mawer, M., Holdsworth, E., Helsing, B., & Bowen, E. (2013). Prevalence, dynamic risk factors and the efficacy of primary interventions for adolescent dating violence: An international review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 18*(1), 159- 174.
- Leifield, P. (2013). Reconceptualizing Major Policy Change in the ACF: A Discourse Network Analysis of German Pension Politics. *Policy Studies Journal, 41*(1), 169-198. DOI: 10.1111/psj.12007.
- Levy, B. (1990a). Abusive teen dating relationship: An emerging issue for the '90s. *Response to the Victimization of Women and Children, 13*(1), 59.
- Levy, B. (1990b). *Dating violence: Young women in danger*. Seattle, WA: Press.

- Levesque, R. J. (1997). Dating Violence, adolescents, and the law. *Virginia Journal of Social Policy and Law*, 4, 339-379.
- Logan, T., Shannon, L., Walker, R., & Faragher, T. (2006). Protective orders: Questions and conundrums. *Trauma Violence Abuse*, 7(3), 175-205.
- Logan, T., R. & Walker, C. (2010). Civil protective order effectiveness: Justice or just a piece of paper? *Violence and Victims*, 25(3), 332-348.
- MacGowan, M. J. (1997). An evaluation of a dating violence prevention program for middle school students. *Violence and Victims*, 12(3), 223-235.
- Makin-Byrd, K., & Bierman, K. L. (2013). Individual and family predictors of the perpetration of dating violence and victimization in late adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 42(4), 536-550.
- McNabb, D. E. (2008). *Research methods in public administration nonprofit management: Quantitative and qualitative approaches* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharp, Inc.
- Miller, E., Decker, M. R., Raj, A., Reed, E., Marable, D., and Silverman, J. G. (2010). Intimate partner violence and health care-seeking patterns among female users of urban adolescent clinics. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, 14(6), 910-917.
- Miller, E., Tancredi, D. J., McCauley, H. L., Decker, M. R., Virata, C. D. M., Anderson, H. A., Silverman, J. G. (2013). One-year follow-up of a coach-delivered dating violence prevention program: A cluster randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 45, 108-112.

- Molidor, C., & Tolman, R. M. (1998). Gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 180-194. Retrieved from <http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR2-3/nau.html>.
- Moracco, R., Andersen, K., Buchanan, M., Eaperson, J., Bowling, M., & Duffy, C. (2010). Who are the Defendants in Domestic Violence Protection Order Cases? *16*(11), 1201-1223. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801210387036>.
- Munoz-Rivas M. J., Grana J. L., O'Leary K.D., Gonzalez, M. P. (2007). Aggression in adolescent dating relationships: prevalence, justification, and health consequences. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 40*:298–304.
- National Network to End Domestic Violence. (2016). Domestic Violence Counts: National Census of Domestic Violence Services. Retrieved from <http://www.nnedv.org>.
- Nelson, A. (2009). Red flags: A universal teen dating violence screen. Retrieved from <http://www.cyfd.org/pdf/redflags.pdf>.
- Nightingale, H., & Morrissette, P. (1993). Dating violence: Attitudes, myths, and preventative programs. *Social Work Education, 15*(4).
- Ocampo, B. W., Shelley, G. A., & Jaycox, L.H. (2007). Latino teens talk about help-seeking and help-giving in relation to dating violence. *Violence Against Women, 13*(2), 172-189.

- Offenhauer, P. & Buchalter, A. (2011). *Teen dating violence: A literature review and annotated bibliography*. National Institute of Justice. Grant # 2010IJR8832. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, Federal Research Division, NCJ 235368.
- O'Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 546-568.
- O'Keefe, N. K., Brockopp, K., & Chew, E. (1986). Teen dating violence. *Social Work, 31*, 465-468.
- O'Keefe, M., & Treister, L. (1998). Victims of dating violence among high school students: Are the predictors different for males and females? *Violence Against Women, 4*(2), 195-223.
- Olshen, E., McVeigh, K. H., Wunsch-Hitzig, R. A., & Rickert, V. I. (2007). Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Suicide Attempts Among Urban Teenagers. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 161*, 539-545.
- Peace Over Violence. (2000). *Dating violence and sexual violence policy pilot project*. Retrieved from [peaceoverviolence.org/media/.../policy\\_pilot\\_project.pdf](http://peaceoverviolence.org/media/.../policy_pilot_project.pdf).
- Peek-Asa, C., Wallis, A., Harland, K., Beyer, K., Dickey, P., & Saftlas, A. (2011). Rural Disparity in Domestic Violence Prevalence and Access to Resources. *Journal of Women's Health, 20*(11), 1743-1749. <https://doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2011.2891>.

- Pierce, J. (2011). Policy Change and Learning in Response to Extreme Flood Events in Hungary: An Advocacy Coalition Approach. *Policy Studies Journal*, 39(3), 485–511.
- Pollack, M., Johnson Phillips, S., and Vaijhala, S. (2011). Carbon capture and storage. policy in the United States: A new coalition endeavors to change existing policy. *Global Environmental Change*, 21(2), 313-323.
- Rivara, F., Anderson, M., Fishman, P., Bonomi, A., Reid, R., Carrell, D., & Thompson, R. (2007). Healthcare Utilization and Costs for Women with a History of Intimate Partner Violence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 32(2), 89-90.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2006.10.00>.
- Robers, S., Kemp, J., & Truman, J. (2013). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2012* (Report No. NCES 2013-036/NCJ 241446). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education; U.S. Department of Justice.
- Ross, J. (1999). Ways of approaching research. Retrieved from <http://fortunecity.com/greenfield/grizzly/432/rra3.htm>.
- Rothberg, B. (2003). We don't have time for social change: Cultural compromise and the Battered Women's Syndrome. *Gender and Society*, 17(5), 771-787.
- Rothman, E. F., Johnson, R. M., Azrael, D., Hall, D. M., & Weinberg, J. (2010). Perpetration of physical assault against dating partners, peers, and siblings among a locally representative sample of high school students in Boston, Massachusetts. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine*, 164, 1118-1124.

- Sabatier P. A., & Jenkins-Smith H. (Eds.). (2004). *ACF: Published papers and research*  
[http://: www. des.ucdavis.edu/faculty/Sabatier/Research.html](http://www.des.ucdavis.edu/faculty/Sabatier/Research.html).
- Sabatier, P., & Jenkins-Smith, H. C. (1993). *Policy change and learning: An advocacy coalition approach*. Boulder CO: Westview Press.
- Sabatier, P., & Jenkins-Smith, H. C. (1999). The ACF: *Assessment, revisions and implications for scholars and practitioners*. In P. Sabatier (Ed.), *Theories of the Policy Process*. (pp.189-222). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Sabatier, P., & Pelkey, N. (1990). *Land of Development at Lake Tahoe*. (pp.1960-84).  
Davis, CA: Institute of Ecology.
- Sabatier (Eds.). (1999). *ACF: Theories of the policy process: Theoretical lenses on public policy change and learning*. (pp. 117–166). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Saltzman, L. E., Fanslow, J. L., McMahon, P. M. & Shelley, G. A. (2002). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements* (Version 1.0). Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Retrieved from  
<http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention>.
- Schlager, Edella (1995) ‘Policy making and collective action: designing coalitions within the ACF’, *Policy Sciences* 28: 243–70.
- Schrivver, J.M. (2001). *Human behavior in the social environment: Shifting paradigms in essential knowledge for social work practice* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

- Shorey, R.C., Cornelius, T. L., Bell, K. M. (2008). A critical review of theoretical frameworks for dating violence: Comparing the dating and marital fields. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*, 185–194.
- Silber-Ashley, O., & Foshee, V. A. (2005). Adolescent help-seeking for dating violence: Prevalence, sociodemographic correlates, and sources of help. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 36*, 25-31.
- Silverman, J. G., Raj, A., Mucci, L. A., & Hathaway, J. E. (2001). Dating violence against adolescent girls and associated substance use, unhealthy weight control, sexual risk behavior, pregnancy, and suicidality. *The Journal of the American Medical Association, 286*(5), 572-579.
- Simnitt, E. (2005). Stop the violence. In D. Largio (Ed.), Refining the meaning and application of “dating relationship” language in domestic violence statutes. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com.ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=27329588&site=bsi-live>.
- Simon, H. 1985. "Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science." *American Political Science Review, 79* (June): 293-304.
- State Law Report Cards 2010: A National Survey of Teen Dating Violence Laws. *Break the Cycle* (2010). Retrieved from [www.breakthecycle.org](http://www.breakthecycle.org).
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2012). *Using multivariate statistics* (6<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2004). Injunctive social norms of adults regarding teen

- violence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 34*(6), 468-479.
- Taylor, B. G., Stein, N. D., Woods, D., & Mumford, E. (2011). Shifting boundaries: Final report on an experimental evaluation of a youth dating violence prevention program in New York City middle schools. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. Grant # 2008-MU-MU-0010, National Institute of Justice, NCJ 236175.
- Temple, J. R., Shorey, R. C., Tortolero, S. R., Wolfe, D. A., & Stuart, G. L. (2013). Importance of gender and attitudes about violence in the relationship between exposure to inter-parental violence and the perpetration of teen dating violence. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 37*(5), 343-352.
- Tharp, A. (2012). Dating matters: The next generation of teen dating violence prevention. *Prevention of Science, 13*, 398-401.
- Thompson, N. J., McGee, R. E., & Mays, D. (2012). Race, ethnicity, substance use, and unwanted sexual intercourse among adolescent females in the united states. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine, 13*(3), 283-290.
- Trochim, W.M. (2001). Research methods knowledge base. Retrieved April 25, 2015, from <http://trochim.human.cornell.edu/kb>.
- Toscano, S. E. (2012). Exploration of a methodology aimed at exploring the characteristics of teenage dating violence and preliminary findings. *Applied Nursing Research, 2*(25), 81-88. doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2010.08.002.



- Vagi, K. J., Rothman, E., Latzman, N. E., Teten-Tharp, A., Hall, D. M., & Breiding, M. (2013). Beyond correlates: A review of risk and protective factors for adolescent dating violence perpetration. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42*, 633-649.
- Voisin, D. R., & Hong, J. S. (2012). A conceptual formulation examining the relationship between witnessing domestic violence and bullying behaviors and victimization among youth. *Educational Psychology Review*.
- Walker, L. E. (1977). Battered women and learned helplessness. *Victimology: An International Journal, 3-4*, 525-534.
- Weisz, A. N., Tolman, R. M., Callahan, M. R., Saunders, D. G., & Black, B. M. (2006). Informal helper's responses when adolescents tell them about dating violence or romantic problems. *Journal of Adolescence, 30(5)*, 853-868.
- Weisz, A. N., & Black, B. M. (2010). Peer education and leadership in dating violence prevention: Strengths and challenges. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 19(6)*, 641-660.
- Weisz, A., & Black, B. (2008). Peer intervention in dating violence: beliefs of African American middle school adolescents. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity in Social Work, 17*, 177-196.
- Werkerle, C., Leung, E., Wall, A., MacMillian, 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 & Neglect, 33*, 45-58.

- Wekerle, C., & Wolfe, D. A. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical Psychology Review, 19*(4), 435-456.
- Wolitzky-Taylor, K. B., Ruggiero, K. J., Danielson, C. K., Resnick, H. S., Hanson, R. F., Smith, D. W., Kilpatrick, D. G. (2008). Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a national sample of adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 47*, 755-762.
- York, R.O. (1998). *Conducting social work research: An experiential approach*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

IRB Approval: 02-20-17-0125922

## Appendix A: 2010 State Law Report Cards: An Overview of Grades

Alabama	F	Failing grade less than 5	Texas	C	6>
Alaska	B	7-7.9	Utah	F	5<
Arizona	B	7-7.9	Vermont	B	7>
Arkansas	C	6-6.9	Virginia	F	5<
California	A	8 or more	West Virginia	B	7>
Colorado	C	6-6.9	Wisconsin	D	5>
Connecticut	C	6-6.9	Wyoming	F	5<
Delaware	B	7-7.9			
District of Columbia	A	8>			
Florida	B	7-7.9			
Georgia	F	5<			
Hawaii	C	6-6.9			
Idaho	C	6-6.9			
Illinois	A	8>			
Indiana	B	7>			
Iowa	C	6>			
Kansas	C	6>			
Kentucky	F	5<			
Montana	C	6>			
Nebraska	C	6>			
Nevada	C	6>			
New Hampshire	A	8>			
New Jersey New	B	7>			
Mexico	B	7>			
New York	B	7>			
North Carolina	C	6>			
North Dakota	D	5-5.9			
Ohio	F	5<			
Oklahoma	A	8>			
Oregon	D	5>			
Pennsylvania	D	5>			
Rhode Island	A	8>			
South Carolina	F	5<			
South Dakota	F	5<			
Tennessee	B	7>			

## Appendix B: CDC 2011 State Youth Risk Behavior Survey

This survey is about health behavior. It has been developed so you can tell us what you do that may affect your health. The information you give will be used to improve health education for young people like yourself.

DO NOT write your name on this survey. The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write. Answer the questions based on what you really do.

Completing the survey is voluntary. Whether you answer the questions will not affect your grade in this class. If you are not comfortable answering a question, just leave it blank.

The questions that ask about your background will be used only to describe the types of students completing this survey. The information will not be used to find out your name. No names will ever be reported. Make sure to read every question. Fill in the ovals completely. When you are finished, follow the instructions of the person giving you the survey.

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 45 minutes per response, including time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to: CDC Reports Clearance Officer, 1600 Clifton Road, MS D-74, Atlanta, GA 30333. ATTN:PRA (0920-0493)

### Directions:

- Use a #2 pencil only.
- Make dark marks.
- Fill in a response like this: A B C D
- If you change your answer, erase your old answer completely.

### Questions:

22. During the past 12 months, did your boyfriend or girlfriend ever hit, slap, or physically hurt you on purpose?

- A. Yes
- B. No

23. Have you ever been physically forced to have sexual intercourse when you did not want to?

- A. Yes
- B. No

Appendix C: Demographics of 2011 State YRBS Female Participants ( $n = 39,184$ )*Participant Demographics*

	Item	Participants	%
Grade	9th Grade	7,444	19.0
	10th Grade	7,309	18.7
	11th Grade	8,357	21.3
	12th Grade	8,092	20.7
	Ungraded or Other	109	0.3
	Total	31,311	79.9
Missing	-99	7,873	20.1
Total		39,184	100
Age	12 or younger	6,831	17.4
	13 years	6,602	16.8
	14 years	3,053	7.8
	15 years	6,729	17.2
	16 years	6,697	17.1
	17 years	6,068	15.5
	18 or older	3,127	8.0
	Total	39,107	99.8
Missing	-99	77	0.2
Total		39,184	100
Race	White	8,332	21.3
	Asian	1,310	3.3
	Black or African American	4,038	10.3
	Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	3,924	10
	American Indian/Alaskan Native	189	0.5
	Hispanic/Latino	15,288	39
	Multiple Hispanic/Latino	1,054	2.7
	Multiple Non-Hispanic/Latino	59	0.2
	Total	34,194	87.3
	Missing	-99	4,990
Total		39,184	100

Research Question 1: Results of the Analysis for Sexual Violence Based on Whether the State allows Minors to Petition the Courts on their Own Behalf

Source	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4	0.159	2.057	0.084
Intercept	1	5270.808	68001.292	0.000
Age	1	0.15	1.935	0.164
Grade	1	0.53	6.836	0.009
Race	1	0.000	0.002	0.967
States by Group	1	0.019	0.248	0.618
Error	27,034	0.078		
Total	27,039			
Corrected Total	27,038			

Note. Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

Research Question 2: Results of the Analysis for Sexual Violence based on whether the State Prohibits all Minors from Filing Orders of Protection

Source	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4	0.271	3.493	0.007
Intercept	1	5990.432	77301.924	0.000
Age	1	0.124	1.601	0.206
Grade	1	0.522	6.74	0.009
Race	1	0.009	0.113	0.737
States by Group	1	0.464	<b>5.99*</b>	0.014
Error	27,034	0.077		
Total	27,039			

Corrected Total 27,038

Note. Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

Research Question 3: Results of the Analysis for Sexual Violence based on whether the State Explicitly Excludes Persons in Dating Relationships from filing an Order of Protection

Source	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4	0.158	2.037	0.086
Intercept	1	5820.07	75087.375	0.000
Age	1	0.14	1.808	0.179
Grade	1	0.539	6.959	0.008
States by Group	1	0.013	0.171	0.679
Error	27,034	0.078		
Total	27,039			
Corrected Total	27,038			

Note. Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$

Research Question 4: Results of the Games-Howell Post Hoc Test Depending on the Strength of State Advocacies

Variable	(I) State Advocacy	(J) State Advocacy	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
		Much					
Sexual Violence	Weaker	No Change	-0.022	0.010	0.097	-0.05	0.00
		Stronger	<b>-0.11*</b>	0.004	0.040	-0.02	0.00
	No Change	Much					
		Stronger	0.000	0.002	0.999	-0.01	0.01
		Much					
	No Change	Weaker	0.022	0.010	0.097	0.0	0.05

	Stronger	0.012	0.010	0.658	-0.01	0.04
	Much					
	Stronger	0.022	0.010	0.104	0.00	0.05
	Much					
Stronger	Weaker	<b>.011*</b>	0.004	0.040	0.00	0.02
	No Change	-0.012	0.010	0.658	-0.04	0.01
	Much					
	Stronger	<b>.010*</b>	0.004	0.047	0.00	0.02
Much	Much					
Stronger	Weaker	0.000	0.002	0.999	-0.01	0.01
	No Change	-0.022	0.010	0.104	-0.05	0.00
	Stronger	<b>-.010*</b>	0.004	0.047	-0.02	0.00

---

*Note.* Significance is noted by \* if  $p < 0.05$ , \*\* if  $p < 0.01$  \*\* and \*\*\* if  $p < 0.001$