

Violence Prevention: Primary Prevention Intervention to Reduce Perpetration of Intimate Partner Violence and Sexual Violence among Youth

Summary Evidence Table

Abbreviations Used in This Document:

- IPV: intimate partner violence
- SV: sexual violence
- Effect estimates
 - β : beta coefficient
- Measurement terms
 - CI: confidence interval
 - pct pts: percentage points

- Study design
 - Group RCT: group randomized trial
 - RCT: randomized trial
- Other terms:
 - NA: not applicable
 - NR: not reported
 - NS: not significant
 - SES: socioeconomic status
 - BL: Baseline
 - FU: Follow-up
 - AOR: adjusted odds ratio

Strategies and Definitions of Approaches:

Provide Information

- **Education or awareness** on how to recognize IPV or SV, warning signs, and consequences of IPV or SV; some may address the role of bystanders

Teach Healthy Relationship Skills

- **Social-emotional learning programs** enhance a core set of social and emotional skills including communication and problem-solving, empathy, emotional regulation, conflict management (process of limiting the negative aspects of conflict while increasing the

positive aspects). In addition to providing information about violence, these approaches focus on changing the way children and adolescents think and feel about violence and provide opportunities to practice and reinforce skills.

- **Teach healthy, safe dating and intimate relationship skills** by working to build communication and conflict resolution skills (a method for two or more parties to find a peaceful solution to a disagreement amongst themselves) as well as expectations for caring, respectful, and non-violent behavior.
- **Promote healthy sexuality** by providing education that addresses sexual communication, sexual respect, and consent. These approaches protect against SV by increasing awareness of risks and improving communication between parents and youth. They often focus on sexual health (e.g., risk for HIV or sexually transmitted infections, pregnancy prevention) as well as empowering youth to reduce risk for SV and dating violence by encouraging sexual communication and healthy sexual behavior.

Promote Social Norms that Protect Against Violence

- **Challenge negative attitudes or beliefs that support violence** by challenging gender stereotypes, beliefs about masculinity, and aggression or violence.
- **Bystander empowerment and education** includes promoting social norms that are protective against violence and empower and encourage people to intervene to prevent violence when they see it. Participants in bystander empowerment and education programs learn specific strategies on how to intervene in situations that involve IPV or SV.
- **Men and boys as allies in prevention programs** provide an opportunity to encourage men and boys to be allies in preventing sexual and relationship violence by demonstrating their role in preventing violence and supporting victims, and also teaching skills and reinforcing norms that reduce their own risk for future perpetration. Such approaches work by fostering healthy, positive norms about masculinity, gender, and violence among individuals with potential for these social norms to spread through their social networks.
- **Family-based programs** involve parents and other caregivers in prevention of teen dating violence. Family-based programs operate on the premise that the family is central to the development of norms and values, and therefore amenable to interventions that promote acceptable behavior. These approaches are designed to improve parental awareness and knowledge about teen dating violence, change parental attitudes about the acceptability of teen dating violence, improve parent communication skills around teen dating violence and skills for helping their teens resolve relationship conflicts, and improve parents' rule setting and monitoring skills. **Social marketing and health communications campaigns** incorporate multiple communication channels, such as mass media and social media to promote social norms that protect against intimate partner or sexual violence.

Create Protective Environments

- **Improve school climate and safety** by enhancing safety and feelings of safety, promoting healthy relationships and respectful boundaries, and reducing tolerance for violence among students and school personnel.
- **Modify the physical and social environments of organization, communities, or neighborhoods** to address community-level risk factors by changing, enacting, or enforcing laws, regulations, or organizational policies (e.g., alcohol policies) or by changing the physical environment, economic or social incentives (or consequences) for behavior, or other characteristics of the community (e.g., ability to monitor and respond to problem behavior, increased social controls).
- **Public Policy** involves the creation or enforcement of policies or laws supporting prevention of IPV or SV.

Summary Evidence Table

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary																
<p>Author, Year: Banyard 2007</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (2 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: Undergraduate students between 18 and 23 years who had never trained as a sexual violence advocate</p> <p>Sample size: 389</p> <p>Demographics: Mean age: 19.4 years Gender: 55.8% female Race/ethnicity: 90.4% White SES: NR</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): NR (unknown)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus: SV</i></p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; bystander empowerment and education</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> One or three 90-minute sessions covering basic information about prevalence, causes, and consequences of sexual violence. Included discussion on how community members can play important roles as bystanders observing risky situations before and during acts of sexual violence. 30-minute booster session administered two months after program.</p>	<p>Mean scale score bystander behavior:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1260 406 2016 552"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>BL</th> <th>2 mos FU</th> <th>12 mos FU</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1-session format</td> <td>10.47</td> <td>14.72</td> <td>13.93</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3-session format</td> <td>10.06</td> <td>12.70</td> <td>12.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>9.58</td> <td>11.57</td> <td>12.88</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>1-session format:</i> Relative percent difference 2 mos: 19.8%; $p < 0.05$ Relative percent difference 12 mos: -1.4%; NS</p> <p><i>3-session format:</i> Relative percent difference 2 mos: 5.5%; $p < 0.05$ Relative percent difference 12 mos: -7.2%; NS</p> <p>Other outcomes: efficacy, knowledge, rape myth acceptance, bystander attitudes, decisional balance</p> <p>Conclusions: Participants in both one- and three-session prevention program groups showed improvement across outcome measures from pretest to posttest compared to control group participants. For bystander behavior, results at two months post-intervention indicate intervention effectiveness for both one- and three-session formats, however effects diminished at 12 months post-intervention.</p>		BL	2 mos FU	12 mos FU	1-session format	10.47	14.72	13.93	3-session format	10.06	12.70	12.80	Control	9.58	11.57	12.88
	BL	2 mos FU	12 mos FU																
1-session format	10.47	14.72	13.93																
3-session format	10.06	12.70	12.80																
Control	9.58	11.57	12.88																

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p><i>Length of program:</i> One or three 90-minute sessions plus 30-minute booster session</p> <p>Comparison: Received no prevention program</p> <p>Study Period: Two academic years (time period unknown)</p>	
<p>Author, Year: De Graaf, 2016</p> <p>Study Design: Other design with concurrent comparison</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (4 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: Male middle to high school vocational students 12-17</p> <p>Sample size: Intervention: 4 schools, 260 students</p> <p>Control: Four schools, 261 students</p> <p>Demographics: Mean age: 15.1 years old Gender: 100% male</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: Dutch 63.7% Moroccan/Turkish 10.7% Surinam/Antillean 6.2% Other Western 8.5% Other non-Western 11.0%</p> <p>SES: NR</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): The Netherlands</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; social-emotional learning (resilience), teach healthy dating and intimate relationship skills</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Lessons focused on: (1) resilience, (2) respect and (3) sexual violence. Exercises in physical resilience aimed at centering, grounding and breathing. Exercises in social resilience aimed at body language, feeling, setting and</p>	<p>Sexual aggression/perpetration (%)</p> <p><u>Sexual perpetration (verbal/physical):</u> Intervention: BL: 48.1%; FU:45.0% Control: BL: 41.7%; FU: 55.2%</p> <p><u>Sexual perpetration (verbal coercion):</u> Intervention: BL: 47.3%; FU: 45.0% Control: BL: 39.8%; FU: 54.7%</p> <p>Odds Ratio: 0.49; p<0.05 (reduction in intervention group relative to control)</p> <p>Other outcomes: Self-regulation and self-efficacy</p> <p>Conclusions: The intervention was effective in decreasing verbal aggression (perpetration) and improving self-regulation and general self-efficacy.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>respecting boundaries, intuition, making contact, standing up for oneself and communication skills. Exercises in mental resilience aimed at setting goals, focusing on concentration and perseverance. Sexual violence was an issue that was explained, demonstrated, and discussed.</p> <p>A <i>Rock and Water</i> DVD contained scenes relating to: (1) body language, (2) making contact with a girl while ignoring her personal space, feeling and respecting other people’s boundaries, (3) sexual harassment, peer pressure and homophobia, (4) peer pressure and physical violence, and (5) date rape. DVD was shown to teens and discussed. In addition, all boys had to fill in a questionnaire testing their knowledge on different forms of sexual violence followed up by a group discussion.</p> <p>All boys were prepared for Rock and Water in mentor lessons.</p> <p>Length of program: Seven lessons, 90 minutes each or 10 lessons, 60 minutes each. Over</p>	

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		three months or less Comparison: usual care Study Period: NR	
<p>Author, Year: Coker, 2016</p> <p>Study Design: Repeat cross sectional</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Moderate</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: 1st year college students age 18-24 years old</p> <p>Sample size: Intervention: 2979 Control: 4132</p> <p>Demographics: <i>Intervention</i> Mean age: NR; majority 19 years old Gender: 63.8% female Race/ethnicity: 14.2% Non-White SES: NR</p> <p><i>Comparison</i> Mean age: NR; majority 19 years old Gender: 60.9% female Race/ethnicity: 13.7% Non-White SES: NR</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Lexington, KY, Cincinnati, OH, Columbia, SC (assume urban)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> IPV and SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, promote social norms</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information, bystander empowerment and education (bystander approaches), social marketing</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School (university)</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Phase 1: motivational speeches targeting first-year students in introductory-level courses</p> <p>Phase 2: Intensive Bystander Training delivered to student leaders: interactive skill-</p>	<p>Perpetration Type: Adjusted Risk Ratio (95% CI) <u>Summary Effect*</u>:</p> <p>Any unwanted sex: 0.74 (0.50, 1.1) Sexual harassment: 0.75 (0.64, 0.87) Physical dating violence: 0.91 (0.78, 1.1) Psychological dating violence: 0.87 (0.76, 0.98)</p> <p>Victimization Type: Adjusted Risk Ratio and 95% CI</p> <p>Any unwanted sex: 0.75 (0.67, 0.83) Sexual harassment: 0.80 (0.73, 0.87) Physical dating violence: 0.93 (0.80, 1.1) Psychological dating violence: 0.84 (0.77, 0.92) * Data for baseline and follow-up not reported</p> <p>Other outcomes: Any interpersonal violence, stalking, subgroup analysis by gender</p> <p>Conclusions: The study provides a longer-term evaluation of the potential impact of a bystander intervention on IPV and SV victimization and perpetration among first-year students. These findings indicate that Green Dot is associated with lower rates of IPV and SV over time measured at the campus level. This observation suggests that Green Dot is a promising strategy for the prevention of sexual and other forms of violence victimization and perpetration among students.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>development conducted in groups of 20-25 and provided at least once a semester during study period; over time all interested students were welcomed, as were leaders from sororities or fraternities; programming elements included social marketing, delivering speeches to university staff, and asking faculty to endorse <i>Green Dot</i> in syllabi; focused on sexual violence risk, sexual harassment, stalking, and partner violence.</p> <p>Length of program: Phase 1: 50 minutes Phase 2: 4-6 hour intensive training</p> <p>Comparison: All campuses provided campus police, student health services, and psychological support and counseling as requested.</p> <p>Note: Midway through data collection (Fall 2011), one comparison campus implemented a bystander program (Stand Up Carolina! www.sa.sc.edu/shs/savip/stand-up/).</p>	

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		Study Period: 2010-2013	
<p>Author, Year: Espelage 2015 (linked 2013)</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Good (1 limitation)</p>	<p>Study population: 6th graders at 36 Midwestern schools</p> <p>Sample size: 3616 students from 36 schools</p> <p>Demographics: Mean age: 11.24 years Gender: 48.1% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 26.4% African-American 34.2% Hispanic 24.7% White/Caucasian 14.7% biracial/other</p> <p>SES: 74.1% free or reduced lunch</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Illinois and Kansas, US (NR)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus: SV</i></p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; social-emotional learning programs; teaching healthy, safe dating and intimate relationship skills</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> school</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Trained teachers delivered lessons to 6th grade students. Curriculum included content related to bullying, problem-solving skills, emotion management, and empathy. Lessons were highly interactive, incorporating small-group discussions and activities, dyadic exercises, whole-class instruction, and individual work.</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> one 50-minute or two 25-minute</p>	<p>Sexual violence perpetration odds ratio (95% CI): <u>Summary Effect*</u>:</p> <p>Illinois 0.70 (0.58, 0.85) Kansas 1.05 (0.85, 1.27)</p> <p>* Data for baseline and follow-up not reported</p> <p>Sexual violence victimization odds ratio (95% CI): <u>Summary Effect*</u>:</p> <p>Illinois 0.76 (0.64, 0.91) Kansas 1.11 (0.92, 1.36)</p> <p>* Data for baseline and follow-up not reported</p> <p>Other outcomes: Bullying perpetration and victimization, homophobic perpetration, and victimization</p> <p>Conclusions: Students in intervention schools were less likely to report sexual violence perpetration than students in control schools in Illinois. No differences were seen for students attending schools in Kansas.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		classroom sessions taught weekly or semiweekly throughout school year Comparison: Wait-listed control Study Period: September 2010 – May 2011	
Author, Year: Foshee 2015 Study Design: RCT Suitability of Design: Greatest Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)	Study population: Mothers who had been in an abusive relationship but were currently living apart from their abusive partner and had 12-15 year-old adolescent(s) exposed to domestic violence. Mothers and adolescents were recruited through coalitions in parts of the Domestic Violence Prevention Enhancement and Leadership Alliances (DELTA) program. Sample size: 409 families (mothers and adolescents) Demographics: <i>Adolescents</i> Mean age: 13.6 years Gender: 35.9% female Race/ethnicity: 54.8% Black 26.9% White 18.3% other	Location (urbanicity): US (NR) Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> IPV <i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills; promote social norms that protect against violence <i>Approach:</i> Provide information; teaching healthy, safe dating and intimate relationship skills; family-based programs <i>Intervention setting:</i> Home <i>Program Content:</i> Moms and Teens for Safe Dates (MTSD) program consists of 6 booklets of dating abuse prevention information and interactive activities that mothers complete with their adolescent(s). Booklets are mailed every two weeks.	Summary Effect*: Psychological perpetration β: 0.49 ($p=0.06$) Cyber perpetration β: 0.20 ($p=0.26$) Physical perpetration β: 0.08 ($p=0.31$) Sexual perpetration β: -0.04 ($p=0.46$) Psychological victimization β: 0.29 ($p=0.39$) Cyber victimization β: -0.18 ($p=0.18$) Physical victimization β: 0.38 ($p=0.06$) Sexual victimization β: 0.13 ($p=0.90$) * Data for baseline and follow-up not reported Other outcomes: none Conclusions: Effects were moderated by the amount of adolescent exposure to domestic violence. MTSD appears to be more effective for adolescents who have a greater exposure to domestic violence.

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
	<p><i>Mothers</i> SES: 56.7% of mothers were unemployed 84.0% of mothers received public assistance</p>	<p>Adolescents received \$15 gift card for each completed booklet.</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> Three months</p> <p>Comparison: Families were not sent any program materials</p> <p>Study Period: Nine months (time period not specified)</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Foshee, 2012</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: Families with at least one 13-15 year old in residence</p> <p>Sample size: 324 families (140 intervention; 184 control)</p> <p>Demographics: <i>Intervention</i> Mean age: NR, 13-15 years Gender: 62.0% female Race/ethnicity: 14.0% Black 7.0% other 79.0% Not reported</p> <p>SES: 86.0% of caregivers had education > high school</p> <p><i>Comparison</i> Mean age: NR, 13-15 years Gender: 55.0% female</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Throughout US (NR)</p> <p>Intervention Activities: Focus: IPV</p> <p>Strategy: Provide information, teach healthy relationship skills, promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> Home</p> <p>Program Content: Families received the <i>Getting Started</i> booklet for caregivers and five activity booklets. Booklet content was developed by designing new activities and drawing from relevant activities of <i>Safe Dates</i>. Five booklets included a variety of interactive activities that</p>	<p><u>Summary Effect*:</u></p> <p>Psychological Perpetration β (SE): -0.17 (0.10); p=0.09</p> <p>Psychological Victimization β (SE): -0.29 (0.19); p=0.14</p> <p>Physical Perpetration OR (95% CI): 0.48 (0.14, 1.67); p=0.25</p> <p>Physical Victimization OR (95% CI): 0.26 (0.07, 0.94); p=0.04</p> <p>* Data for baseline and follow-up not reported</p> <p>Other outcomes: Acceptance of dating abuse, conflict resolution skills, perceived negative consequences</p> <p>Conclusions: Trends in treatment effects on psychological perpetration and physical dating abuse victimization were in the expected directions (with</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
	<p>Race/ethnicity: 11.0% Black, 9.0% other SES: 80.0% of caregivers had education > high school</p>	<p>caregivers and teens do together; designed to alter risk factors for dating abuse. A health educator called the caregiver two weeks after each booklet was mailed to determine whether activities were completed and answer questions. Structure modeled after <i>Family Matters</i>, an intervention to prevent teen alcohol and tobacco abuse.</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> NR</p> <p>Comparison: Did not receive an intervention</p> <p>Study Period: NR (follow up took place 3 months after the intervention)</p>	<p>significant results for physical victimization for the first family-based teen dating abuse prevention program evaluated).</p>
<p>Author, Year: Foshee 2005 (linked 1996, 1998, 2000, 2004)</p> <p>Study Design: Group RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p>	<p>Study population: 8th or 9th graders in one of 14 included public schools (10 schools with 8th graders, 4 schools with 9th graders)</p> <p>Analytic sample size: 1566</p> <p>Demographics: Mean age: 13.9 years Gender: 51.4% female Race/ethnicity: 72.2% White SES: NR</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Johnston County in eastern North Carolina</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills; promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information, social-emotional learning</p>	<p>Calculated perpetration from scale scores:</p> <p>36 month follow up</p> <p><u>Psychological abuse perpetration:</u> Intervention BL: 3.65 FU: 2.88 Control BL: 3.54 FU: 3.08</p> <p><u>Moderate physical abuse perpetration:</u> Intervention BL: 1.06 FU: 0.91 Control BL: 0.86 FU: 0.89</p> <p><u>Severe physical abuse perpetration:</u> Intervention BL: 0.03 FU: 0.25</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Quality of Execution: Good (1 limitation)</p>		<p>programs teach healthy dating skills (conflict resolution), challenge negative attitudes or beliefs that support violence</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School and community</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> 1) a play performed by students enrolled in a theater course, 2) a 10-session curriculum of 45-minutes taught by health and physical education teachers, interactive activities addressing dating violence norms, gender stereotyping, conflict management skills for dating; two sessions included activities where peers practiced helping friends in violent relationships, and 3) a poster contest based on curriculum content. Curriculum developed over two years of extensive formative research that involved focus group, test pilots, and input from a school committee. Interested students developed posters addressing themes from the curriculum for the contest, in which all students were required to vote for their top 3 choices. Community activities included special services for adolescents in</p>	<p>Control BL: 0.31 FU: 0.27</p> <p><u>Sexual abuse perpetration:</u> Intervention BL: 0.10 FU: 0.05 Control BL: 0.07 FU: 0.07</p> <p>Total relative percent difference(calculated by Community Guide staff) -10.1%, NR</p> <p><u>Summary Effect*:</u></p> <p>Psychological abuse victimization: $\beta = -0.48 (-1.2, -.02)$</p> <p>Moderate physical victimization: $\beta = -0.49 (-0.86, -0.11)$</p> <p>Severe physical victimization: $\beta = -0.19 (-0.44, 0.07)$</p> <p>Sexual victimization: $\beta = -0.06 (-0.13, 0)$</p> <p>* Data for baseline and follow-up not reported</p> <p>Other outcomes: Also includes test for moderation</p> <p>Conclusions: Study found positive program effects over time. Adolescents exposed to <i>Safe Dates</i> in the eighth or ninth grade, as compared to those who were not, reported less psychological, moderate physical, and sexual dating violence perpetration and less psychological and moderate physical dating violence victimization.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>abusive relationships (a crisis line, support groups, materials for parents) and community service provider training workshops (attended by providers from social services, mental health, health department, emergency room, Harbor Inc., sheriff's department, county police departments, and schools).</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> Five months</p> <p>Comparison: Received access to same community activities provided to the intervention group</p> <p>Study Period: October 1994 – May 1999</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Foubert 2000</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution:</p>	<p>Study population: Fraternity members at a mid-Atlantic public university</p> <p>Sample size: 217 participants from 8 fraternities</p> <p>Demographics: Mean age: 20.33 years</p> <p>Gender: 100% male</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Mid-Atlantic region of US (NR)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; challenge negative attitudes and</p>	<p>Mean scale score sexual coercion: Intervention: 0.44 Control: 0.35 Relative percent difference: 31.4%, NS</p> <p>Other outcomes: Rape myth acceptance, likelihood of committing rape</p> <p>Conclusions: Although there was no evidence of a change in sexually coercive behavior, there were significant declines in rape myth acceptance and the likelihood of committing rape at seven months post-</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
Fair (4 limitations)	Race/ethnicity: 91% White 2% African-American 4% Asian American or Pacific Islanders 2% Hispanic 1% other SES: NR	beliefs that support violence; men and boys as allies in prevention; bystander empowerment <i>Intervention setting:</i> School (university) <i>Program Content:</i> Included a basic review of rape definitions, a video describing a male-on-male rape situation, and basic skills on how to help a woman recover from a rape. Men were encouraged to communicate openly in sexual encounters and to help change societal norms that condone rape. <i>Length of program:</i> 60-minute program Comparison: No program Study Period: September 1997 – April 1998	intervention. Results suggest that a peer educator-led, rape prevention program for men may change attitudes.
Author, Year: Foubert 2007 Study Design: Pre-post with comparison group	Study population: Males; first year students at included university Sample size: 565 (intervention and control)	Location (urbanicity): Small to mid-sized public university, southeastern US Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> SV	Narrative results: Men who later joined a fraternity and who participated in the intervention committed significantly fewer acts of sexually coercive behavior than men who later joined fraternity and were part of the control group ($F(1, 109) = 4.1, (p < 0.05)$) Other outcomes: Rape myth acceptance

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p>	<p>Demographics: Mean age: NR Gender: 100% male Race/ethnicity: NR SES: NR</p>	<p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; challenge negative attitudes and beliefs that support violence; men and boys as allies in prevention; bystander empowerment</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School (university)</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Included a basic review of rape definitions, a video describing a male-on-male rape situation, and basic skills on how to help a woman recover from a rape. Men were encouraged to communicate openly in sexual encounters and to help change societal norms that condone rape.</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> 60-minute program</p> <p>Comparison: No program</p> <p>Study Period: Academic year (about 7 months)</p>	<p>Conclusions: Results suggest that a peer educator-led, rape prevention program for men may change attitudes and sexually coercive behaviors; men in the intervention group who joined fraternities were less likely to commit coercive acts than control group men who joined fraternities</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary												
<p>Author, Year: Gidycz 2011</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: 1st year male students at a medium-sized Midwestern university who were residents of 6 randomly selected 1st year residence halls</p> <p>Sample size: 1285</p> <p>Demographics: Mean age: NR; majority 18-19 years</p> <p>Gender: 100% male</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 91.8% White 5% African-American 1.7% Asian 0.2% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander 0.3% American Indian or Alaska Native 0.9% other 2.5% Hispanic or Latino</p> <p>SES: NR</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Midwestern US (NR)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus: SV</i></p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; challenge negative attitudes or beliefs that support violence; men and boys as allies in prevention</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School (university)</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Program fosters empathy regarding sexual assault and rape by providing men with the opportunity to describe the impact of sexual assault on women in their lives and discuss alternative explanations for men’s perceptions of false accusations of assault. The program increases awareness about consent and aims to foster bystander intervention and resocialization. Booster session was a review of program materials approximately</p>	<p>Prevalence of sexual aggression perpetration: Intervention: 1.5% Control: 6.7% Absolute change: -5.2 percentage points;</p> <p>Mean scale score personal engagement in bystander intervention:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1255 479 2026 592"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Pretest</th> <th>4-month</th> <th>7-month</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Intervention</td> <td>33.48</td> <td>33.54</td> <td>31.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Control</td> <td>32.49</td> <td>31.87</td> <td>31.11</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Relative percent difference 4 mos: 1.9% Relative percent difference 7 mos: -0.5%</p> <p>Other outcomes: Hyper gender ideology, rape myth acceptance, peer disapproval for sexual aggression, perception of peer engagement in bystander intervention, association with aggressive peers, modeling of sexual aggression, reinforcement of sexual aggression</p> <p>Conclusions: Compared to the control group, intervention participants reported less perpetration of sexual aggression over the four month follow-up period. Intervention participants also reported less reinforcement for engaging in sexually aggressive behavior, reported fewer associations with sexually aggressive peers, and indicated less exposure to sexually explicit media.</p>		Pretest	4-month	7-month	Intervention	33.48	33.54	31.88	Control	32.49	31.87	31.11
	Pretest	4-month	7-month												
Intervention	33.48	33.54	31.88												
Control	32.49	31.87	31.11												

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>four months following initial participation. Participants received monetary incentives for participation (attendance and questionnaires).</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> 90-minute session plus 60-minute booster session</p> <p>Comparison: Wait-listed controls who also received monetary incentives for participation (questionnaires)</p> <p>Study Period: Two year period (time period not specified)</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Gidycz, 2001</p> <p>Study Design: pre-post with comparison</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (2 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: College students attending large university in Ohio recruited from Introduction to Psychology class</p> <p>Sample size: 1108 participants included in analysis</p> <p>Demographics: Age: 82% between 18 and 19 years old Gender: 73% female Race/Ethnicity:</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Midwestern US (NR)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Category:</i> Educational <i>Focus:</i> SV <i>Strategy:</i> Provide information</p> <p>Approach: Provide information</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School (university)</p>	<p>Prevalence of Victimization: Intervention: BL: 52.4% FU: 23.1% Control: BL: 45.3% FU: 19.0%</p> <p>Absolute percentage point difference: -3 pct pts; $p > 0.05$</p> <p>Other outcomes: Attitudes toward women, rape empathy, rape myth acceptance, perpetration by history of perpetration</p> <p>Conclusions: The program reported evidence of less rape myth acceptance, however, there was no significant effect on attitudes toward women, rape empathy, or sexual aggression or victimization.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
	93% Caucasian 5% African-American 1.3% Asian 0.6% Hispanic 0.1% Native American SES: NR	<p><i>Program Content:</i> One-hour program with the following objectives: 1) cite basic statistics regarding prevalence of sexual assault; 2) distinguish between myth and fact about rape/rapists; 3) identify behavior characteristics and attitudes that are often exhibited by rapists; 4) describe techniques women can use to increase personal safety; and describe how men and women can avoid situations that could potentially lead to a rape; 5) identify community/campus resources</p> <p>Length of program: 50-60 minutes</p> <p>Comparison: Brief handout on sexual assault</p> <p>Study Period: Two years (data collected over five academic quarters throughout a two-year period)</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Gonzalez Guarda 2015</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p>	<p>Study population: 9th graders between the ages of 13-16, self-identified as Hispanic, with at least one parent or legal guardian willing to participate in the program</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Miami, FL (urban)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> IPV</p>	<p>Calculated perpetration from percent reporting: 12 month follow up</p> <p><u>Psychological perpetration:</u> Intervention BL: 51.1% Intervention FU: 18.7% Control BL: 43.5%</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (2 limitations)</p>	<p>Sample size: Intervention: 41 Control: 41</p> <p>Demographics total sample:</p> <p>Mean age: 14.3 years Gender: 56.0% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 100% Cuban-American</p> <p>SES: NR</p>	<p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, teach healthy relationship skills, promote social norms to protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Teach healthy dating and intimate relationship skills, challenge negative attitudes or beliefs, bystander component</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Six large group sessions for adolescents, two for their parents, and two for school personnel. Each session included psychoeducational and skill-building activities that were delivered using videos, music, group discussion, and other modalities. Sessions included discussion about acculturation differences between adolescents and adults to highlight differences in norms according to acculturation level and generation, taking pictures of images that represented healthy qualities of relationship and sharing these images with one another to encourage discussion of healthy intimate relationships, engaging in role-playing activities that provided opportunities to act</p>	<p>Control FU:22.4% Absolute change: -11.3 pct pts, p=NR</p> <p><u>Physical/sexual perpetration:</u> Intervention BL: 34.3% Intervention FU: 33.6% Control BL: 41.3% Control FU: 42.7% Absolute change: -2.1 pct pts, p=NR</p> <p><u>Average combined (Calculated by Community Guide staff):</u> Intervention BL: 42.7% Intervention FU: 26.1% Control BL: 42.4% Control FU: 33.0% Absolute change: -6.7 pct pts, p=NR</p> <p>3 month follow up <u>Psychological perpetration:</u> Intervention BL: 51.1% Intervention FU: 19.5% Control BL: 43.5% Control FU: 31.7% Absolute change: -19.5 pct pts, p=NR</p> <p><u>Physical/sexual perpetration:</u> Intervention BL: 34.3% Intervention FU: 22.1% Control BL: 41.3% Control FU: 34.8% Absolute change: -4.7 pct pts, p=NR</p> <p><u>Average combined (calculated by Community Guide</u></p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>out healthy bystander behaviors with friends who were in risky situations and at risk for physical or sexual harm.</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> Offered in October, November and January of the 2012-2013 academic year. Length of sessions Not Reported.</p> <p>Comparison: Participants received no program during study period, however were given the intervention after the study period</p> <p>Study Period: 2012-2013 school year with 12 month follow up</p>	<p>staff): Intervention BL: 42.7% Intervention FU: 21.3% Control BL: 42.4% Control FU: 33.0% Absolute change: -12.3 pct pts, p=NR</p> <p>Psychological victimization: Beta = -0.004 (p=0.71)</p> <p>Physical and sexual victimization: Beta = -0.007, (p=0.46)</p> <p>Other outcomes: None reported</p> <p>Conclusions: The intervention had effects on dating violence victimization and perpetration for male participants but not for females. Intervention effects were not statistically significant over time.</p>
<p>Author, Year: Jaycox, 2006</p> <p>Study Design: Group RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (2 limitations)</p>	<p>Study Population: Latino 9th graders in health class at high schools</p> <p>Sample size: Analytic sample 2540 of 3800 enrolled students (1384 intervention, 1156 control)</p> <p>Demographics: Mean Age: 14.41 Gender: 51.7% female Race/Ethnicity:</p>	<p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> provide information; promote social norms</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> provide information; challenge negative attitudes or beliefs that support violence</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> school</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Three-class-period program that teaches</p>	<p>Total Victimization Score Intervention: 0.00 Comparison: 0.03 Standardized z-score: 0.10 (-0.10, 0.30)</p> <p>Total Perpetration Score Intervention: -0.06 Comparison: -0.01 Standardized z-score: 0.06 (-0.13, 0.25)</p> <p>Other Outcomes: Knowledge, acceptance of aggression, help-seeking, and abusive/fearful dating experiences (battering)</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
	<p>92.3% Latino/Hispanic</p> <p>SES: NR</p> <p>Nativity/Immigration: 74.2% Born in US; 12.0% >10 years in US 7.3% 5-10 years in US 4.4% 2-5 years in US 1.7% 1-2 years in US 0.6% < 1 year in US</p>	<p>youth that the law protects victims of domestic violence and can punish perpetrators. It is taught by attorneys to emphasize the legal dimension, to increase students' comfort with speaking with attorneys, and to underscore that Break the Cycle—a private, nonprofit organization—offers free legal services to youth. The curriculum aims to reverse acceptance of violence by stressing that intimate partner violence is illegal and to increase knowledge and help-seeking by providing information and resources.</p> <p>Length of program: Three days</p> <p>Comparison: Standard health curriculum</p> <p>Study Period: Fall 2001 – Spring 2004 (Three years)</p>	<p>Conclusion: Students receiving the program showed improved knowledge about legal rights in regard to intimate partner violence, less acceptance of female-against-male violence, greater perception that others would help them, and higher likelihood that they would seek help. There was no evidence of changes in reports of recent abusive/fearful dating experiences, or in dating violence victimization or perpetration.</p>
<p>Author, Year: Joppa 2016</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design:</p>	<p>Study population: Adolescents aged 14-19 in the 10th grade enrolled in health class. Must be English-speaking, have parental consent, and provide assent.</p> <p>Sample size: 413</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Massachusetts, US (urban)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, teach healthy relationship skills;</p>	<p>Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI) <u>Summary effect*</u></p> <p>Total** perpetration odds ratio**: 0.31 (0.13, 0.71)</p> <p>Total** victimization odds ratio**: 0.25 (0.15, 0.41)</p> <p>* Baseline and follow up data not reported</p> <p>**Measured psychological and physical dating violence</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (2 limitations)</p>	<p>Demographics: Mean age: 15.85 years</p> <p>Gender: 52.9% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 20% Hispanic/Latino 73% White 12% African-American 6% Asian 3% Native American 1% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 12% other SES: NR</p>	<p>promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; social-emotional learning programs; teach healthy, safe dating and intimate relationship skills; challenge negative attitudes or beliefs that support violence</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Brief, manualized, group-based curriculum that is rooted in social learning theory with lessons to modify cognitions and behaviors to help students foster healthy relationship. Program uses observational learning, discussion, role-play, and modeling of healthy relationship skills. Material covered included identifying types of violence, rights in relationships, personal power and self-esteem, conflict resolution, communication skills, components of healthy relationships, taking responsibility for choices and actions, expectations of dating relationships, stereotypes and the media’s portrayal of gender</p>	<p>Other outcomes: Approval of aggression (general and retaliatory), attitudes about female dating violence perpetration, attitudes about male dating violence perpetration, dating attitudes, dating violence knowledge, emotional/verbal dating violence perpetration and victimization, relational aggression perpetration and victimization, threatening behaviors perpetration and victimization, physical dating violence perpetration and victimization</p> <p>Conclusions: A brief, community-based dating violence prevention curriculum can promote change in behaviors, attitudes, and knowledge among high school students. Students in the intervention program reported significantly less emotional/verbal and total dating violence perpetration and victimization at three months post intervention.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>roles, the cycles of violence, and warning signs of dating violence.</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> Five 50 to 60-minute sessions</p> <p>Comparison: Usual health class that later received dating violence prevention curriculum in May 2013</p> <p>Study Period: February 2013 – May 2013</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Jouriles, 2016a</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Good (1 limitation)</p>	<p>Study population: First year university students</p> <p>Sample size: BL 213; FU 209</p> <p>Demographics:</p> <p><i>Intervention</i> Mean Age: 19.2 yrs</p> <p>Gender: 79.3% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 83.8% White 5.4% Asian 9.0% Hispanic Other 10.8%</p> <p>SES: NR</p> <p><i>Comparison</i></p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Southwest US and Northern Midwest US (NR, likely mixed)</p> <p>Intervention Activities: <i>TakeCARE</i></p> <p><i>Focus: SV</i></p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, promote social norms that protect against violence, bystander approach</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information, bystander empowerment and education</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School (university)</p>	<p>Mean Number of Behaviors</p> <p>Bystander Behavior Intervention: BL: 30.83 FU: 28.50 Comparison: BL: 27.95 FU: 21.35</p> <p>Absolute change: 4.3 (Relative change 16.1%)</p> <p>Other outcomes: Bystander efficacy</p> <p>Conclusions: Students who viewed <i>TakeCARE</i> reported engaging in more bystander behavior on behalf of friends than did students in the control group.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
	<p>Mean Age: 19.1 yrs</p> <p>Gender: 82.4% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 84.3 % White 4.9% Asian 10.8% Hispanic Other 10.8%</p> <p>SES: NR</p>	<p><i>Program Content:</i> Participants viewed <i>TakeCARE</i> on computer. Program describes the likelihood of SV or relationship abuse happening to someone they know, and how they can help “take care” of their friends to help prevent these negative experiences. <i>TakeCARE</i> presents and discusses three vignettes designed to demonstrate ways in which students can intervene.</p> <p>Comparison: Participants viewed “How to Get the Most Out of Studying” on computer</p> <p>Study Period: BL and post video assessment September – October 2014; FU one month later October – November 2014</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Jouriles, 2016b</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Good (1 limitation)</p>	<p>Study population: 1st year university students</p> <p>Sample size: BL 213; FU 209</p> <p>Demographics: <i>Intervention</i> Mean Age: 18.22 yrs Gender: 48.1% female Race/ethnicity:</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Southwest</p> <p>Intervention Activities: <i>TakeCARE</i></p> <p><i>Focus:</i> SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provides information, promotes social norms that protect against violence,</p>	<p>Bystander Behavior Intervention: BU: 31.12 FU: 38.56 Comparison: BU: 34.13 FU: 33.97 Absolute change: 7.6 pct pts (Relative change 24.37%)</p> <p>Other outcomes: Bystander efficacy</p> <p>Conclusions: Students who viewed <i>TakeCARE</i> reported engaging in more bystander behavior on behalf of friends than did students in the control group.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
	<p>68.5% White 15.7% Asian 10.2% Hispanic 15.7% Other</p> <p>SES: NR</p> <p><i>Comparison</i> Mean Age: 18.27 yrs Gender: 52.4% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 68.0% White 15.5% Asian 11.7% Hispanic 16.5% Other</p> <p>SES: NR</p>	<p>bystander approach</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provides information, bystander empowerment and education</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School (university)</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Participants viewed <i>TakeCARE</i> on computer. Program describes the likelihood of SV or relationship abuse happening to someone they know, and how they can help “take care” of their friends to help prevent these negative experiences. <i>TakeCARE</i> presents and discusses three vignettes designed to demonstrate ways in which students can intervene.</p> <p>Comparison: Participants viewed “How to Get the Most Out of Studying” on computer</p> <p>Study Period: BL and post video assessment September – October 2014; FU one month later October – November 2014</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Kleinsasser, 2015</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p>	<p>Study population: University students</p> <p>Sample size: 93</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): assume Dallas, TX (urban+suburban)</p> <p>Intervention Activities:</p>	<p>Bystander behavior (measured using Modified Bystander Behaviors Scale, yes/no questions about past 2 months)</p> <p>Bystander behaviors for strangers:</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (2 limitations)</p>	<p>Demographics:</p> <p><i>Total sample</i> Mean Age: 19.8 yrs Gender: 80.6% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity (for interventions and control combined): 66.7% White 14.0% Asian 8.6% Hispanic 4.3% Black 4.3% Bi/multiracial 2.2% American Indian or Alaska Native</p> <p>SES: NR</p>	<p><i>Focus:</i> SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, promote social norms that protect against violence, bystander approach</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information, bystander empowerment and education</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School (university)</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> TakeCARE was presented via a presentation-design website. Includes three brief video vignettes designed to demonstrate ways in which students can intervene when they see sexual coercion or violence or when they see situations that might result in it; and encourage college students to look out for their friends in social situations. Program describes how likely it is that people they know may become a victim of sexual violence and how they can help “take care” of their friends to help prevent victimization experiences.</p>	<p>Intervention: BL: 8.09 adjusted FU: 5.40 Comparison: BL: 6.51 adjusted FU: 5.31 Absolute change: -1.5 pct pts (relative change -14.9%), NS</p> <p>Bystander behaviors for friends: Intervention: BL: 1.52 adjusted FU: 1.34 Comparison: BL: 1.31 adjusted FU: 0.88 Absolute change: 0.25 pct pts (relative change 30.0%); p<0.05</p> <p>Conclusions: Participants who viewed <i>Take Care</i> engaged in more bystander behaviors for friends in the 2-month period following the intervention than did students in the control condition, whose bystander behaviors decreased over the follow-up period, compared to those who view the control program.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>Comparison: A 20-minute online program with information about study skills.</p> <p>Study Period: January – May 2013, (20 minute video and two month FU)</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2012</p> <p>Study Design: Group RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p>	<p>Study Population: At-risk adolescent females from a teen center from which they were receiving health department assistance for their teen pregnancy</p> <p>Sample size: Intervention: 39 Control: 33</p> <p>Demographics: Gender: 100% female</p> <p>Mean age: 17.2 years old</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity Black 93.1% White 4.2% Other 2.8%</p> <p>SES Household Income ≤ \$10,000 68.6% \$10,000 - \$50,000 31.4%</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Mobile, AL (urban)</p> <p>Intervention activities:</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; social-emotional learning; teach healthy relationship skills</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> Community</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Targeted risk factors in <i>BALL</i> prevention program were theoretically and empirically derived and included poor communication skills (aggressive strategies, escalation tendencies, and negative reciprocity and demand-withdrawal patterns); emotional regulation difficulties (anger</p>	<p>Psychological abuse perpetration: Intervention: BL 8.0% FU: 5.38% Control: BL 6.74% FU: 8.22% Absolute difference: -4.1 pct pts</p> <p>Physical abuse perpetration (mild and physical): Intervention: BL: NR FU 4.4% Control BL: NR FU 15.0% Absolute difference: -10.6 pct pts</p> <p>Other Outcomes: Physical victimization</p> <p>Conclusions: There was a significant reduction in the psychological abuse perpetrated by the women who successfully completed the <i>BALL</i> program compared to women randomly assigned to the waitlist control condition.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>management, attachment style, jealousy, distrust, and feeling neglected); and lack of skills to cope in a high-stress environment. One session was devoted to each of these three main risk factors; the remaining session (which was delivered first) was centered on delineating what IPV consists of, creating a safety plan, and knowing the signs of healthy versus unhealthy romantic relationships.</p> <p>Session One focuses on the signs of healthy versus unhealthy romantic relationships; teens also make a safety plan and choose a personal relationship skill goal to focus on during the intervention (e.g., listen better, manage anger more effectively).</p> <p>Session Two discusses coping with disrespect and handling disappointment and anger in productive and nonviolent ways; the focus is on emotional regulation.</p> <p>Session Three promotes healthy couple communication assertiveness, problem-solving</p>	

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>techniques, and conflict management strategies.</p> <p>Session Four concludes with stress, coping, and time-management skills that were specifically tailored so that pregnant teens could use these skills as they became mothers.</p> <p>Each session consisted of material to be taught didactically, facilitated group discussions, and planned content-related activities. No official out-of-session homework was assigned; however, participants were given suggestions on ways to focus on their self-identified program-related goal between sessions.</p> <p>Length of Program: Four sessions; each lasted 1.5 hrs; one session per week</p> <p>Comparison: NA; participants were waitlisted to receive the intervention</p> <p>Study Period: Two years</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Miller 2015</p>	<p>Study population: 7th and 8th grade students who were able to complete questionnaire in</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): NR (urban)</p>	<p><u>Summary effect*:</u> Psychological perpetration β coefficient: -0.03 ($p>0.05$)</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Study Design: Other design with concurrent comparison</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p>	<p>English or Spanish and were not in a self-contained classroom. Required parental consent.</p> <p>Sample size: 1517 students from 8 schools</p> <p>Demographics:</p> <p>Mean age: NR; 96% of sample aged 12-13 years</p> <p>Gender: 50% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 23% White 28% African-American 32% Latino, 17% other/multiple races</p> <p>SES: across the 8 included schools, proportion of students in free/reduced school lunch program ranged from 43% to 95%</p>	<p>Intervention activities:</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, teach healthy relationship skills; promote social norms that protect against violence; create protective environments</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; teach healthy, safe dating and intimate relationship skills; challenge negative attitudes or beliefs that support violence; improve school climate and safety</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Multicomponent initiative that was designed to focus on the developmental needs of middle school students and to enhance skills and attitudes consistent with promotion of healthy relationships and reduction of teen dating violence. Program elements included implementing school-based teen dating violence prevention curricula, engaging key influencers to help young teens understand healthy</p>	<p>Physical perpetration β coefficient: -0.01 ($p>0.05$)</p> <p>Electronic perpetration β coefficient: -0.01 ($p>0.05$)</p> <p>Psychological victimization β coefficient: -0.03 ($p>0.05$)</p> <p>Physical victimization β coefficient: -0.03 ($p>0.05$)</p> <p>Electronic victimization β coefficient: -0.01 ($p>0.05$)</p> <p>* Data for baseline and follow-up not reported</p> <p>Other outcomes: Gender stereotypes, acceptance of dating violence, negative consequences, response to anger, communication skills, parent-child communication, relationship satisfaction, relationship support, relationship criticism, relationship dominance</p> <p>Conclusions: Findings were not significant for teen dating violence perpetration or victimization. It may be that teen dating violence rates for more serious violence are lower in early adolescents.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>relationships, using social marketing strategies, and working on policy and environmental changes.</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> NR</p> <p>Comparison: No program</p> <p>Study Period: Two academic years (time period not specified)</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Miller, 2012, 2013</p> <p>Study Design: Group RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (2 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: Male high school students athletes</p> <p>Sample size: 1798 at 3 months, 1513 at 1 year</p> <p>Demographics:</p> <p><i>Intervention</i> (based on 1 year)</p> <p>Age: 33.6% 9th grade 34.5% 10th grade 31.9% 11th grade</p> <p>Gender: 100% male</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 27.3% White 23.6% Black 21.5% Hispanic 8.7% Asian 5.7% Native American/Pacific Islander</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Sacramento County, CA (urban)</p> <p>Intervention Activities: <i>Coaching Boys into Men</i></p> <p><i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, teach healthy relations skills, promote social norms that protect against violence, create protective environments</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information, challenge negative attitudes or beliefs that support violence (promote gender equitable attitudes/norms), men and boys as allies in prevention, bystander empowerment</p>	<p>(No baseline data reported in paper.)</p> <p>Total Perpetration Intervention: 3 mos: 0.35 FU: 38.56 Comparison: 3 mos: 0.38 FU: 33.97 Absolute change 3 mos FU: -0.11, NS (relative change: -29.4%) Absolute change 12 mos FU: -0.21, NS (relative change: -61.7%)</p> <p>Positive bystander behavior Intervention: 3 mos: 0.73 FU: 0.58 Comparison: 3 mos: 0.48 FU: 0.53 Absolute change 3 mos: 0.28, NS (relative change: 38.0%) Absolute change 12 mos: 0.08 (relative change: 3.7%)</p> <p>Other outcomes: negative bystander behavior</p> <p>Conclusions: This school athletics-based dating violence prevention program is a promising approach to</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
	<p>11.9% Other</p> <p>SES: 5.7% some high school 20.7% high school graduate 24.7% some college/technical schools 22.3% college graduate 11.2% completed graduate school</p> <p><i>Comparison</i></p> <p>Age: 33.2% 9th grade 34.1% 10th grade 32.8% 11th grade</p> <p>Gender: 100% male</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 41.0% White 18.5% Black 17.2% Hispanic 11.5% Asian 2.9% Native American/Pacific Islander 8.0% Other</p> <p>SES: 3.2% some high school 13.1% high school graduate 21.9% some college/technical schools</p>	<p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> <i>Coaching Boys into Men</i> is intended to alter norms by engaging coaches as positive role models to deliver violence prevention messages to adolescent male athletes. Program consists of a one-hour training for coaches led by a trained violence prevention advocate to introduce the Coaches Kit, which provides strategies for opening conversation about violence against women with athletes. Eleven "Training Cards" guide coaches to lead 10-15 minute weekly discussions with athletes about respect and dating violence prevention throughout the sports season. The advocate is available to assist coaches with concerns that arise during the program. Students received \$10 gift card for participating in each survey.</p> <p>Comparison: Coaching as usual</p> <p>Study Period: 2009 – 2010 school year (program approximately 12 weeks)</p>	<p>reduce perpetration and negative bystander behaviors that condone dating violence among male athletes.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
	31.3% college graduate 21.6% completed graduate school		
<p>Author, Year: Moynihan, 2015</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: 1st year university students</p> <p>Sample size: 948</p> <p>Demographics: Mean Age: 18.2 yrs Gender: 47.8% female Race/ethnicity: 85.2% White</p> <p>SES: Father's education: At least some college: 73.2%; Grad school or professional degree: 20%</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): New England, US (mixed urban + rural)</p> <p>Intervention Activities: <i>Bringing in the Bystander</i> + <i>Know Your Power</i>®</p> <p>Focus: SV</p> <p>Strategy: Provide information; promote social norms that protect against violence, bystander approach</p> <p>Approach: Provide information, bystander empowerment and education, social marketing</p> <p>Intervention setting: school (university)</p> <p>Program Content: <i>Bringing in the Bystander</i> led single gender groups of program participants through discussions about how community members can play prevention roles as bystanders. <i>Know Your Power</i>® is a social marketing campaign</p>	<p>Bystander Behavior:</p> <p>Total helping behavior for a friend: Intervention: BL: β 0.32 ($p < .05$) FU: β 0.12 ($p < .05$) Comparison: NR Summary effect: $\beta = 0.12, p < .05$</p> <p>Total helping behavior for a stranger: Intervention: BL: β 0.16 ($p < .05$): FU: β 0.04 (NS) Comparison: NR Summary effect: $\beta = 0.04, NS$</p> <p>Conclusions: Although both groups had a decrease in behavior over time, participants in the intervention group reported significantly higher levels of bystander behavior related to helping a friend.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary															
		<p>consisting of images modeling prosocial bystander behavior in the prevention of sexual and relationship violence. Posters were hung throughout each campus, images appeared on table tents in the dining halls, bookmarks distributed in libraries and bookstores, the sides of buses (one of two campuses), and splash pages on campus computer clusters (one of two campuses). At the start of each campaign, students received promotional products.</p> <p>Comparison: <i>Know Your Power®</i> bystander social marketing campaign</p> <p>Study Period: Pre-test taken two weeks before program; final survey taken about a year later</p>																
<p>Author, Year: Peskin, 2014</p> <p>Study Design: gRCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of</p>	<p>Study Population: Middle school youths enrolled in 7th grade also participated in 8th grade and were followed to 9th grade</p> <p>Sample size: Intervention 303; Control 463 - Total 766</p> <p>Demographics:</p>	<p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p>	<p>Adjusted odds for intervention group relative to control group.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1253 1235 1640 1268">Dating Violence Behavior</th> <th data-bbox="1640 1235 1892 1268">AOR (95% CI)</th> <th data-bbox="1892 1235 2030 1268">p-value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1253 1268 1640 1300">Physical victimization*</td> <td data-bbox="1640 1268 1892 1300">.66 (.52, .83)</td> <td data-bbox="1892 1268 2030 1300">p <0.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1253 1300 1640 1333">Emotional victimization*</td> <td data-bbox="1640 1300 1892 1333">.57 (.45, .74)</td> <td data-bbox="1892 1300 2030 1333">p <0.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1253 1333 1640 1365">Physical perpetration*</td> <td data-bbox="1640 1333 1892 1365">.96 (.67, 1.49)</td> <td data-bbox="1892 1333 2030 1365">NS</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1253 1365 1640 1398">Emotional perpetration*</td> <td data-bbox="1640 1365 1892 1398">.63 (.44, .90)</td> <td data-bbox="1892 1365 2030 1398">p <0.05</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Dating Violence Behavior	AOR (95% CI)	p-value	Physical victimization*	.66 (.52, .83)	p <0.01	Emotional victimization*	.57 (.45, .74)	p <0.01	Physical perpetration*	.96 (.67, 1.49)	NS	Emotional perpetration*	.63 (.44, .90)	p <0.05
Dating Violence Behavior	AOR (95% CI)	p-value																
Physical victimization*	.66 (.52, .83)	p <0.01																
Emotional victimization*	.57 (.45, .74)	p <0.01																
Physical perpetration*	.96 (.67, 1.49)	NS																
Emotional perpetration*	.63 (.44, .90)	p <0.05																

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Execution: Good (1 limitation)</p>	<p>Mean age: 13 years Gender: 57.8% female</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: 44.3% Black 42.2% Hispanic 13.6% Other (all other racial groups)</p> <p>SES: >90% eligible for free and reduced lunch (at each school)</p>	<p><i>Program Content: It's Your Game. . .Keep It Real (IYG)</i> is a health education program designed to delay sexual behavior and promote healthy dating relationships in ethnic-minority middle school youths. It is based on the premise that healthy relationships are foundational to healthy adolescent sexual health.</p> <p><i>IYG</i> includes both classroom- and computer-based activities in a 24-lesson curriculum (12 lessons in seventh grade, 12 lessons in eighth grade). Computer-based activities are set within a virtual world environment and include interactive skills-training exercises, peer role model videos, quizzes, animations, fact sheets, and "real world" style adolescent serials. Select activities are tailored by gender and sexual experience. In addition to group-based classroom activities, the curriculum includes six parent-child homework activities and individualized journaling activities at each grade level to help students personalize information.</p>	<p>*BL and FU data not reported</p> <p>Conclusions: Control students had significantly higher odds of physical dating violence victimization, emotional dating violence victimization, and emotional dating violence perpetration than did intervention students.</p> <p>The odds of physical dating violence perpetration were not significantly different between the two groups.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>Specific topics in 7th grade related to healthy relationships included identifying characteristics of healthy and unhealthy friendships and dating relationships; skills-training related to evaluating relationships, peer pressure, and social support; setting personal limits and respecting others' limits; and recognizing peer norms. Topics were reviewed in the 8th grade curriculum. Parent-child homework activities focused on increasing communication regarding healthy friendships and dating relationships, using effective refusal skills, dating partner expectations, and parental rules regarding dating relationships. Trained facilitators implemented all lessons using a detailed teaching manual.</p> <p>There was extensive community input in the development of the intervention.</p> <p>Length of program: Two years</p> <p>Comparison: Routine, unmodified health education classes at the schools.</p>	

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>Study Period: Fall 2004 – Fall 2006</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Peterson 2016</p> <p>Study Design: Pre-post with concurrent comparison</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (3 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: Freshman students enrolled in fall 2013 freshman seminar</p> <p>Sample size: 625 (baseline for intervention and control group)</p> <p>Demographics: Total sample demographics at baseline (including a third group not included in this review)</p> <p>Age: NR Gender: 50.9% female</p> <p>Race/Ethnicity: 69.9% White 7.1% Black 14.3% Hispanic 4.5% Asian 0.5% Native American 3.7% Other</p> <p>SES: NR</p> <p>Note: reports history of victimization</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Western US, assume Colorado (NR)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information, bystander empowerment and education</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School (university)</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Focused on how all students are affected by violence and how all students can play a role in preventing it both at the individual and at the community level. Defined bystanders as persons who, in situations of violence or potential violence, may choose to provide assistance, do nothing, or contribute to the negative behavior; bystander education outlined the elements of</p>	<p>Mean score on bystander scale: Intervention: BL: 4.6 FU: 7.0 Comparison: BL: 347 FU: 4.9</p> <p>Relative percent difference: 19.7%, p<0.05</p> <p>Other outcomes: Rape myth acceptance, acceptance of physical, sexual, or emotional abuse toward intimate partners, sexist attitudes, bystander efficacy, intention to help</p> <p>Conclusions: Findings were not significant for teen dating violence perpetration or victimization. It may be that teen dating violence rates for more serious violence are lower in early adolescence.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>bystander decision making before, during, and after crisis situations. The “three D” approach was taught for responding as a bystander - direct, delegate, and distract responses; students also spent time learning how to listen, believe, and be empowered to assist; all education was presented through a combination of lecture PowerPoint, video clips, interactive scenarios, group discussion, and questions/ answers</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> One 90-minute session</p> <p>Comparison: No program</p> <p>Study Period: Two academic years (time period not specified)</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Salazaar, 2014</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution:</p>	<p>Study population: University students</p> <p>Analytic sample size: 215</p> <p>Demographics:</p> <p><i>Intervention</i></p> <p>Mean Age: 20.42 yrs Gender: 100% male</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Atlanta, GA (urban)</p> <p>Intervention Activities: <i>RealConsent</i></p> <p><i>Focus: SV</i></p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, promote sexual norms that</p>	<p>Sexual Violence Perpetration: AOR: 0.27, p=0.007</p> <p><u>Plotted unadjusted means</u></p> <p>Intervention: BL: approx. 0.52 FU: approx. 0.25 Comparison: BL: approx. 0.75 FU: approx. 0.51</p> <p>Bystander Action (% reporting prosocial intervening): RealConsent reported significantly more prosocial intervening behaviors than comparison</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Fair (2 limitations)</p>	<p>Race/ethnicity: 45.2% White 22.1% African American or Black 10.1% Hispanic or Latino 3.2% American Indian, Alaska Native or Hawaiian</p> <p>SES: NR</p> <p><i>Comparison</i> Mean Age: 20.33 yrs Gender: 100% male</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 43.1% White 22.6% African American or Black 11.4% Hispanic or Latino 3.0% American Indian, Alaska Native or Hawaiian</p> <p>SES: NR</p>	<p>protect against violence, bystander approach</p> <p>Intervention setting: School (university)</p> <p><i>Program Content: RealConsent</i> delivered through web portal; six 30-minute modules. Each module involved interactivity, didactic activities, and episodes of a serial drama, which allowed implementers to model positive behaviors and illustrate both positive and negative outcome expectations for intervening and for perpetrating violence against women. Behaviors modeled in the serial drama included intervening, communicating with female sex partners, and obtaining effective consent for sex. <i>RealConsent</i> was programmed so participants could not skip or click-through segments within each module.</p> <p>Comparison: Web-based, general health promotion program titled <i>Health Connection</i></p> <p>Study Period: Six months</p>	<p><u>Plotted unadjusted means</u> Intervention: BL: approx. 0.725 FU: approx. 0.810 Comparison: BL: approx. 0.720 FU: approx. 0.718</p> <p>Conclusions: At six-month follow-up RealConsent participants intervened more often and engaged in less sexual violence perpetration.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Author, Year: Taylor, 2010</p> <p>Study Design: Group RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Fair (2 limitations)</p>	<p>Study population: 6th and 7th graders</p> <p>Sample size: 1639 students in 123 classrooms from 7 schools</p> <p>Demographics: <i>Both Intervention groups</i> Gender: 52% female</p> <p><i>Comparison</i> Gender: 48% female</p> <p><i>Total sample</i> Mean age: NR; between ages 11 and 13</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 27% African American 52% White 3% Asian 3% Hispanic 2% Native American 13% multiracial or other ethnicities</p> <p>SES: Not reported</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Cleveland, OH (urban/suburban)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <u>Intervention 1: Interaction-based curriculum</u></p> <p><i>Focus:</i> IPV and SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills; promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information (including the role of the bystander), teach healthy, safe dating and intimate relationship skills to adolescents</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Focused on setting and communicating boundaries in relationships, formation of deliberate relationships and friendships and the continuum between friendship and intimacy, the determination of wanted and unwanted behaviors, and the role of the bystander as intervener</p> <p>Length of program: Five lessons</p>	<p>(No baselines reported in paper)</p> <p>Prevalence of sexual perpetration against peer: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = -0.013$, NS Law and justice-based curriculum: $\beta = 0.002$</p> <p>Prevalence of sexual perpetration against partner: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = 0.018$, NS Law and justice-based curriculum $\beta = 0.028$; $p < 0.10$</p> <p>Prevalence of nonsexual perpetration against partner: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = 0.43$, NS Law and justice-based curriculum: $\beta = .054$, NS</p> <p>Prevalence of all types of perpetration against partner: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = 0.061$, NS Law and justice-based curriculum: $\beta = 0.083$, $P < 0.05$</p> <p>Prevalence of sexual harassment perpetration: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = -0.022$, NS Law and justice-based curriculum: $\beta = -0.066$, NS</p> <p>Prevalence of sexual victimization by peer: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = -0.073$, $P < 0.05$ Law and justice-based curriculum: $\beta = -0.009$, NS</p> <p>Prevalence of sexual victimization by partner: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = 0.010$, NS Law and justice-based curriculum: $\beta = 0.014$, NS</p> <p>Prevalence of nonsexual victimization by partner: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = 0.040$, NS</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>(designed to last 40 minutes each, once per week)</p> <p><u>Intervention 2: Law and justice-based curriculum</u></p> <p><i>Focus:</i> IPV and SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information</p> <p>Intervention setting: School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Focused on laws, definitions, information, and data about penalties for sexual assault and sexual harassment as well as results from research about the consequences for perpetrators</p> <p>Length of program: Five lessons (designed to last 40 minutes each, once per week)</p> <p>Comparison: Standard health education, which did not include dating violence prevention</p> <p>Study Period: Six months during 2006-2007 school year</p>	<p>Law and justice-based curriculum: $\beta = 0.008$, NS</p> <p>Prevalence of sexual harassment victimization: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = -0.022$, NS Law and justice-based curriculum: $\beta = -0.066$, NS</p> <p>Prevalence all types of victimization by a partner: Interaction-based curriculum: $\beta = -0.048$, NS Law and justice-based curriculum: $\beta = -0.022$, NS</p> <p>* $P < 0.05$</p> <p>Other Outcomes: Frequency of perpetration and victimization, attitudes and knowledge</p> <p>Conclusion: Results reported for both intervention groups were mixed for perpetration and victimization outcomes. However, students in the law and justice-based curricula had significantly improved outcomes in awareness of their abusive behaviors, attitudes toward gender violence, sexual harassment, and personal space, and knowledge, compared with control group. Students in interaction-based curricula experienced increased awareness of abusive behaviors and improved attitudes toward personal space.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Author, Year: Taylor, 2013</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Good (1 limitation)</p>	<p>Study population: 6th and 7th grade students attending public middle schools in New York City</p> <p>Sample size: 2655 students from 117 classrooms</p> <p>Demographics: Mean age: NR Gender: 53.0% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 34% Hispanic 31% African-American 16% Asian American 13% White</p> <p>SES: One-third of students enrolled at included schools are from families below the poverty level</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): New York, NY (urban)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Shifting Boundaries</i> has three <i>intervention arms:</i> <u>Building Intervention</u></p> <p><i>Focus:</i> IPV, SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; create protective environments</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; improve school climate and safety</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Temporary building-based restraining orders, posters in school buildings to increase awareness and reporting of dating violence/sexual harassment, identification of hotspots coupled with an increase in staff presence in those areas</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> 6-10 weeks</p> <p><u>Classroom Intervention</u></p> <p><i>Focus:</i> IPV, SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills</p>	<p>Summary effect*: Average** sexual violence perpetration odds ratio: Building Intervention: 0.73 Classroom Intervention: 1.0 Building and Classroom Intervention: 0.67</p> <p>Average** sexual violence victimization odds ratio: Building Intervention: 1.2 Classroom Intervention: 1.0 Building and Classroom Intervention: 0.89</p> <p>*Data for baseline and follow-up not reported**Average of peer sexual violence, dating sexual violence, and sexual harassment</p> <p>Other outcomes: Sexual harassment perpetration and victimization, peer sexual violence perpetration and victimization, dating sexual violence perpetration and victimization</p> <p>Conclusions: <i>Shifting Boundaries</i> can be effective in preventing dating violence and sexual harassment among middle school students. Intervention appears to be effective for both boys and girls.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; teach healthy, safe dating and intimate relationship skills</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Intervention synthesized lessons from two components (personal interaction and law and justice curriculum from Taylor 2010). Team further refined intervention with significant input from NYC Department of Education central office personnel. Curriculum emphasized the consequences for perpetrators of dating violence/sexual harassment, state and federal laws, the setting and communicating of one’s boundaries in interpersonal relationships, and role of bystanders as interveners.</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> Six sessions over 6-10 weeks</p> <p><i>Building and Classroom Intervention</i> <i>Focus:</i> IPV, SV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information; teach healthy relationship skills; create protective environments</p>	

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p><i>Approach:</i> Provide information; teach healthy, safe dating and intimate relationship skills; improve school climate and safety</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> Combination of both building and classroom interventions</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> Six sessions over 6-10 weeks</p> <p>Comparison: Students experienced their normal class schedule without any elements of the classroom or building-level interventions</p> <p>Study Period: September 2009–June 2010</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Wolfe, 2009</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution:</p>	<p>Study population: 9th grade students</p> <p>Sample size: 1,722</p> <p>Demographics:</p> <p><i>Intervention</i></p> <p>Mean Age: NR, all participants were 9th grade student</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Southwestern Ontario Canada (urban and rural)</p> <p>Intervention Activities:</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, teach healthy relationship skills,</p>	<p>Calculated odds ratio (inverse from what is reported in paper)</p> <p>Total Perpetration: OR: 0.41 (95% CI: 0.16, 1.0)</p> <p>Conclusions: A school-based intervention that teaches youth about healthy relationships as part of their required health curriculum can reduce physical dating violence.</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
<p>Good (1 limitation)</p>	<p>Gender: 51% female Race/ethnicity: NR</p> <p>SES: Parent education: 28% ≤ high school 17% some college 55% college graduate</p> <p><i>Comparison</i> Mean Age: NR; all participants were 9th grade students Gender: 55% female Race/ethnicity: NR</p> <p>SES: Parent education: 28% ≤ high school 14.1% some college 58% college graduate</p>	<p>promote sexual norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Teach skills, promote healthy sexuality, challenge attitudes and beliefs</p> <p><i>Intervention setting:</i> School</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> A 21-lesson curriculum delivered during 28 hours by teachers with additional training in the dynamics of dating violence and healthy relationships. Dating violence prevention was integrated with core lessons about healthy relationships, sexual health, and substance use prevention using interactive exercises. Relationship skills to promote safer decision making with peers and dating partners were emphasized.</p> <p>Comparison: Usual health education class: teachers were expected to teach 21 required lessons that cover the same three units as those covered in intervention schools but without training or background on these topics or access to a structured curriculum that emphasizes</p>	

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
		<p>relationship skills for preventing violence and risk behaviors. These classes were also segregated by sex.</p> <p>Study Period: Three years; 9/20/04 to 5/31/07. Intervention 1 semester; FU, 2.5 years (30 months)</p>	
<p>Author, Year: Wolfe, 2003</p> <p>Study Design: RCT</p> <p>Suitability of Design: Greatest</p> <p>Quality of Execution: Good (1 limitation)</p>	<p>Study population: 14 to 16 year olds considered at-risk of developing abusive relationships because of history of maltreatment; identified through Child Protective Services (CPS) agencies</p> <p>Analytic sample size: 158 adolescents (96 intervention, 62 control)</p> <p>Total Sample Demographics:</p> <p>Mean age: 15.2 years Gender: 51.8% female</p> <p>Race/ethnicity: 85% White 8% First Nations 4% African Canadian 3% Asian</p>	<p>Location (urbanicity): Toronto, Ontario Canada (urban)</p> <p>Intervention activities: <i>Focus:</i> IPV</p> <p><i>Strategy:</i> Provide information, teach healthy relationship skills, promote social norms that protect against violence</p> <p><i>Approach:</i> Teach healthy, safe dating and intimate relationship skills to adolescents (problem-solving skills); challenge negative attitudes or beliefs that support violence</p> <p>Intervention setting: Community</p> <p><i>Program Content:</i> 18-session program focusing on positive alternatives to aggression-based interpersonal problem-solving</p>	<p>(No baseline data reported in paper)</p> <p>Physical Abuse Perpetration Conditional growth model beta contrast = -0.01 (p<0.05)</p> <p>Emotional Abuse Victimization Conditional growth model beta contrast = -0.02 (p<0.01)</p> <p>Emotional Distress Conditional growth model beta contrast = -0.46 (p<0.05)</p> <p>Narrative results: Data not shown for emotional abuse perpetration or physical abuse victimization; neither were statistically significant but there was a gender interaction</p> <p>Other outcomes: Healthy relationship skills</p> <p>Conclusions: Growth curve analyses showed that intervention aimed at at-risk youth was effective in</p>

Study	Population Characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Major Results and Summary
	<p>SES: Participants typically from lower income families</p>	<p>and gender-based role expectations. Curriculum involved three components: 1) education and awareness, 2) skill development, and 3) social action. Program is interactive and uses a variety of learning strategies, including guest speakers, videos, behavioral rehearsal, visits to community agencies, and a social action project in the community. Draws from skill- and learning-based approaches and from feminist theories regarding societal values that maintain inequality and promote gender-based violence, such as violent and sexist media, sex-role stereotyping, and gender socialization.</p> <p><i>Length of program:</i> Four months</p> <p>Comparison: Received standard CPS services, which consisted primarily of bimonthly visits from a social worker and the provision of basic shelter and care</p> <p>Study Period: Four years</p>	<p>reducing incidents of physical and emotional abuse and symptoms of emotional distress over time.</p>