Executive Summary

Dating in adolescence and young adulthood is considered a healthy and important aspect of youth development. Unfortunately, youth's romantic relationships can sometimes include abuse. Youth dating violence (YDV) is considered a serious public health issue, with victimization rates in countries like the U.S. remaining relatively stable in the last 20 years. Some researchers have indicated that the COVID-19 pandemic has contributed to an increase in YDV. As online and media technology improves and becomes more accessible, YDV processes have extended into the online realm. Given that YDV is associated with physical health problems and mental health issues, as well as lower relationship satisfaction and perceived relationship quality, the development and implementation of prevention efforts are key. Understanding and identifying YDV are essential for developing prevention measures, decreasing instances of violence, and reducing the harms experienced by victims of YDV.

The purpose of this report is to examine the concept of YDV more fully, including varying definitions, prevalence, signs of YDV, and risk factors for victimization, as well as strategies for prevention and intervention. The first section of this literature review outlines definitions of YDV, signs of abuse, gaslighting, online youth dating violence, and prevalence estimates of YDV. The second section presents information on victims of YDV, including risk and protective factors of victimization. The third section examines characteristics of YDV perpetrators, motivations to perpetrate YDV, and protective factors for perpetration. The fourth section outlines the consequences and outcomes of YDV victimization and perpetration. The final fifth section considers prevention strategies for YDV and associated harms.

Targeted prevention efforts during adolescence are thought to be especially crucial given the harmful consequences of YDV during this time, including increased risk for poor attachment development, vulnerability to subsequent victimization, and acceptance of violence. YDV interventions have been found to be most effective when youth perceive them as relevant, and their implementation is sustainable. Recommended strategies for preventing online YDV include incorporating the topic into general dating violence prevention programs that address healthy versus unhealthy relationships, educating youth on digital literacy and safe Internet use, educating youth on the importance of reporting online YDV and seeking help, and educating youth on available and accessible community resources. However, it is worth noting that information on effective YDV perpetration prevention strategies is relatively limited, and more research is needed in this area.
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1. Introduction

Dating in adolescence and young adulthood is considered a healthy and important aspect of youth development (Connolly et al., 2014). Positive dating relationships can foster the development of social, emotional, and sexual communication skills as well as provide increased emotional support, companionship, and intimacy (Mauer & Reppucci, 2019). Unfortunately, romantic relationships can sometimes include abuse (Coker et al., 2014; Dion et al., 2021; Foshee et al., 2014). Youth dating violence (YDV) has been described as “an adverse childhood experience involving a spectrum of controlling or aggressive behaviours” (Emezue et al., 2021, p. 138). More formally, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC; 2018) defines YDV as physical, sexual, or psychological/emotional violence, including stalking, occurring between current or former dating partners. Dating violence may also include threatened psychological, physical, and sexual dating violence, in-person and online bullying, and adolescent dating homicide (Adhia et al., 2019; Niolon et al., 2015).

Given that YDV is associated with physical health problems and mental health issues, as well as lower relationship satisfaction and perceived relationship quality, the development and implementation of prevention efforts are key (Lara & Lopez-Cepero, 2021). Chiefly, understanding and identifying YDV are essential for developing prevention measures, decreasing instances of violence, and reducing the harms experienced by victims of YDV (Spraitz et al., 2018). The purpose of the current report is to examine the concept of YDV more fully, including varying definitions, prevalence, signs of YDV, risk factors for victimization, as well as strategies for prevention and intervention.

The first section of this literature review outlines definitions of YDV, signs of abuse, gaslighting, online youth dating violence, and prevalence estimates of YDV. The second section presents information on victims of YDV, including risk and protective factors of victimization. The third section examines characteristics of YDV perpetrators, motivations to perpetrate YDV, and protective factors for perpetration. The fourth section outlines the consequences and outcomes of YDV victimization and perpetration. The final fifth section considers prevention strategies for YDV and associated harms. Peer-reviewed research literature was the primary source for this report, but other evidence-based documents from reputable organizations (e.g., Centers for Disease Control and Prevention) were also consulted. Attempts were made to consult more current literature (i.e., within the last 10 years), but in some cases older literature was examined.

2. Definitions and Prevalence of Youth Dating Violence

2.1 Defining Youth Dating Violence

Within the research literature, young people may be referred to as youth, young adults, teens, preteens, or adolescents, which can result in a variety of terms used to describe dating violence. Terms like dating violence, domestic violence, dating abuse, interpersonal violence, and intimate partner violence are often used interchangeably to describe instances of coercive control in
Youths’ dating relationships (Lara & Lopez-Cepero, 2021; Storer et al., 2020). Currently, there is no agreed upon definition for any of these terms among domestic violence advocates, social service providers, academics/researchers, members of the general public, or the criminal justice system (Storer et al., 2020). Despite YDV consisting of psychological, physical, and sexual abuse, these behaviours are generally studied separately, which has also led to largely siloed or distinct bodies of literature on this topic (Ybarra & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2019).

Generally, dating violence can be defined as “physical, sexual, and/or emotional abuse displayed toward a dating partner, regardless of the length or seriousness of the relationship” (Emelianchik-Key et al., 2021, p. NP10013). Intimate partner violence (IPV) is considered an umbrella term that refers to “threatening or injurious physical, psychological, verbal, or economic behaviours directed toward a romantic partner, regardless of marital status, and including both ongoing and terminated relationships (Farrington & Ttofi, 2021, p. 110). While dating violence is like IPV, it differs in that the people involved do not need to be in a close, intimate relationship (Emelianchik-Key et al., 2021). It has also been suggested that youth IPV differs from adult IPV in that adults more often cohabitate, share finances, and have children, which can make it more difficult for adults to leave the relationship (Cutter-Wilson & Richmond, 2011).

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP; 2020) defines teen dating violence as “a deliberate act of violence, whether physical, sexual, or emotional, by one partner in a dating relationship” (p. 1). The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2020) has also revised their definition of teen dating violence as “a form of IPV that happens between people in a close relationship, and may include physical violence, sexual violence, psychological aggression, and stalking, in-person or electronically” to account for the online context in which violence can occur (p. 1). One of the more comprehensive definitions comes from Mulford and Blachman-Demner (2013) who defined adolescent dating violence as “a range of abusive behaviours that preteens, adolescents, and young adults experience in the context of past or present romantic or dating relationships. The behaviours include physical and sexual violence, stalking, and psychological/emotional abuse, which includes control and coercion. Abuse may be experienced in person or via technology” (p. 756).

Physical violence refers to the intentional use of physical force to cause harm, and might include pinching, slapping, punching, stabbing, choking, biting, and/or kicking (Blais et al., 2022; Espelage et al., 2020). Psychological/emotional violence may be characterized by threatening or harming a partner’s sense of self-worth via name-calling/put downs, shaming, humiliating, verbal intimidation, threats, jealousy, controlling behaviours, or isolating them from others (Blais et al., 2022; Espelage et al., 2020). Finally, sexual violence can include pressure, threats, or force with respect to engaging in unwanted or non-consensual sexual activities, including penetrative and nonpenetrative sexual contact (Blais et al., 2022; Espelage et al., 2020).

---

1 For the purposes of this review, the term youth dating violence (YDV) will be primarily used, unless a specific publication is very particular about the age-specific dating violence term.
2.2 Signs of Abuse, Violence Escalation, and Violence De-Escalation

Early “warning signs” of YDV and IPV outlined in the literature include subtle forms of psychological/emotional abuse like verbal denigration (e.g., criticism), personal and public degradation (e.g., shaming), jealous or possessive behaviours, and threats of aggression (Francis & Pearson, 2021; Lang, 2011). Other examples of emotional abuse include humiliation, rejection, exploitation, insults, and name calling (Black et al., 2011; Follingstad & DeHart, 2000). Because more subtle abusive behaviours are often psychological and covert rather than physical and overt, they are more easily overlooked (Towler et al., 2020). It is important to note that although more subtle abusive behaviours do not always predict future violence (Jory, 2004), they can also result in harm. Better predictors of escalation from early warning signs of abuse to violence are repetition over time of behaviours as well as behaviours occurring simultaneously (Murphy, 2013).

Recognizing problematic partner behaviours, clarifying personal rights, and asserting personal boundaries early in intimate relationship interactions are key to reducing the likelihood of unhealthy relationship dynamics from forming (Murphy & Smith, 2010). Unfortunately, many of the YDV early “warning signs” are considered normative or typical (Francis & Pearson, 2021; Minto et al., 2022; Wekerle & Wolfe, 1999), and youth often have difficulty recognizing signs of violence in romantic relationships (Borges et al., 2020; Caridade, 2011). Research on individual responses to early signs of YDV is sparse (Francis & Pearson, 2021).

YDV is often explained by a “circle of violence” hypothesis (Carlson, 2003; Mauer & Reppucci, 2019), also referred to as the cycle of violence. There are three phases to this circle of violence. The first phase is tension, where violent partners use verbal abuse toward a victim, and where victims try to control the situation by appeasing or avoiding their partner. The second phase is explosion, where the tension reaches a peak, and the violent partner may begin to use physical violence. The violent partner may feel ashamed of their behaviour at the same time and try to make up for it. The third phase is honeymoon, where the violent partner expresses regret for their behaviour and offers generous, well-meaning gestures. They often promise not to be violent again, which leads their partner to forgive them and remain in the relationship (Carlson, 2003; Mauer & Reppucci, 2019). However, the honeymoon phase eventually ends, everyday tensions accumulate, and the cycle of violence begins again (Carlson, 2003; Mauer & Reppucci, 2019).

2.3 Gaslighting

Another form of abuse that has been gaining attention in the public and among researchers is gaslighting, “a type of psychological abuse aimed at making victims seem or feel ‘crazy’, creating a ‘surreal’ interpersonal environment” (Sweet, 2019, p. 851). Gaslighting has also been conceptualized as a “dysfunctional interpersonal dynamic, emerging from normative conflict patterns” (Graves & Samp, 2021). Sweet (2019) argues that gaslighting is “rooted in social inequalities and executed in power-laden intimate relationship” (p. 851). For example, perpetrators of gaslighting may use gender-based stereotypes (e.g., women are irrational and...
overly emotional); structural vulnerabilities based on race, nationality, and sexuality; and institutional inequalities to manipulate victims’ realities (Sweet, 2019). As such, some researchers argue that women, racially marginalized individuals, and LGBTQ individuals are the most common victims of gaslighting (Abramson, 2014; Stark, 2019; Sweet, 2019).

Calef and Weinshel (1981) argue that gaslighting involves mental gamesmanship (i.e., mind tricks), often at a nonconscious level to the perpetrator, where they may project anxieties onto a victim and manipulate them into identifying with the projected reality. For example, if a gaslighter has anxieties about appearing wrong in a situation, they may project that anxiety onto their partner by denying errors and in turn blaming the partner for the errors (Graves & Samp, 2021). Stern (2007) developed a four-step model outlining the roles of gaslighters and gaslightees which can sustain a gaslighting dynamic: 1) the gaslighter engages in unreasonable conflict with the gaslightee due to insecurities; 2) the gaslightee engages in this conflict seeking approval of the gaslighter; 3) the gaslighter withholds approval, becomes hostile, and demands their judgements be accepted as accurate; and 4) the gaslightee is overburdened by the conflict and gives in to the gaslighter’s demands.

While the research literature on IPV and YDV have not formally and regularly adopted the term gaslighting, there are ample reports of victims experiencing this form of abuse (Klein et al., 2022; Sweet, 2019). Prolonged engagement in this dynamic can lead to negative psychological, relational, and health outcomes (Klein et al., 2022; Stern, 2007). One study found that gaslighting victimization was associated with decreased sense of self and mistrust of others (Klein et al., 2022). Victims may be able to recover from gaslighting by separating from the perpetrator, prioritizing healthier relationships, and engaging in meaningful re-embodying and self-care activities (e.g., professional counselling, physical activity, meditation) (Klein et al., 2022).

2.4 Online Youth Dating Violence
Increasingly, youth are making use of various technology practices, such as texting; instant messaging; creating and circulating photos, videos, and memes; and interacting with social media platforms to construct their identities, relationships, and social worlds (Cutbush et al., 2021). Most teens in North America have access to the Internet, have a cell or smartphone, and report that texting is their preferred mode of communication (Cutbush et al., 2021). Text messaging or social media posting also appear to be regularly used by youth to both initiate and dissolve relationships (Baker & Carreo, 2016). While digital media can provide opportunities for positive interpersonal communication, it can also create a context where harmful and abusive behaviours can occur (Baker & Carreo, 2016). To read more about this, you can refer to the Saskatchewan Prevention Institute’s reports on sexting (An Environmental Scan of Online Resources Related to Sexting: https://skprevention.ca/resource-catalogue/sexual-health/an-environmental-scan-of-online-resources-related-to-sexting/ and Youth Sexting: A Critical Review of the Research Literature: https://skprevention.ca/resource-catalogue/sexual-health/youth-sexting-a-critical-review-of-the-research-literature/) and grooming (Grooming for the Purpose of

Just as harassment and bullying (or electronic aggression) can occur through technology or electronic media (e.g., texting, instant messaging, social networking platforms), dating violence can also take place using these mediums. Electronic, or online, dating violence has been defined as “the occurrence of electronic aggression specifically within youth dating relationships, wherein a dating partner monitors, controls, harasses, or otherwise abuses a dating partner via technology” (Cutbush et al., 2021, p. NP2508). Online dating violence tends to be used as a means of power and control within a relationship and often originates when someone distrusts and feels jealous (Baker & Carreo, 2016). Online abusive behaviour usually takes place via spying/monitoring on current locations, activities, and companions; sexting; and password sharing or account access (Randell et al., 2016).

The Violence Against Women Learning Network (cited in Endleman, 2021) has identified six general types of cyber violence against women and girls, including hacking, impersonation, surveillance/tracking, harassment/spamming, recruitment, and malicious distribution. Hacking involves using technology to gain access to another’s accounts to obtain personal information, change or modify information, or slander and degrade victims. Impersonation involves the use of technology to assume the identity of the victim or someone else to access to personal information, embarrass or humiliate victims, contact victims, or create fake identity documents. Surveillance/tracking involves the use of technology to stalk and monitor victims’ activities, locations, and behaviours. Harassment/spamming involves the use of technology to incessantly contact, annoy, and/or threaten victims. Recruitment is the use of technology to entice potential victims into violent situations. Finally, malicious distribution is the use of technology to manipulate and circulate insulting and illegal materials related to the victim.

2.5 Prevalence Estimates of Youth Dating Violence

Prevalence estimates of YDV vary widely. Rates of YDV victimization and perpetration can vary due to stigma, the way violence is defined and understood, societal acceptance and perceptions of violence, and gender norms (O’Campo et al., 2017). Reported rates of YDV in research literature can also vary based on the research methods employed (e.g., sampling, measurement) and the constructions of dating violence recognized and measured (Emelianchik-Key et al., 2021; Storer et al., 2020). Nonetheless, YDV is considered a serious public health issue and victimization rates in countries like the U.S. have remained relatively stable in the last 20 years (Rothman et al., 2022). However, some researchers have indicated an increase in IPV during the COVID-19 pandemic, including among adolescents (Ragavan et al., 2020).

Based on a youth risk behaviour report where American students from grades 9 to 12 were surveyed, one in every eight students reported experiencing some form of dating violence (e.g., physical violence, sexual violence) (Basile et al., 2020). Further, one in five surveyed students
reported experiencing harassment in a dating relationship on school premises, and an additional 15.7% reported experiencing dating relationship harassment online (Basile et al., 2020). High rates of dating violence among youth have also been found in areas of Europe, such as Sweden, where more than half of a sample of 526 high school youth aged 15 to 19 years reported experiencing dating violence at least once in their lifetime, with girls reporting higher victimization rates (Korkmaz et al., 2020). One study reported that adolescent girls are equally likely to perpetrate physical and psychological abuse compared to adolescent boys, but boys are more likely to perpetrate sexual violence (Ybarra et al., 2016). Results of one meta-analysis based on primarily North American systematic review data estimated that between 5.8% to 92% of adolescents experience psychological-verbal aggression, 1% to 57.5% experience physical abuse, and 10% to 64.6% experience sexual abuse in their dating relationships (Hossain et al., 2020). Findings from another meta-analysis found that 21% of adolescents aged 13-18 years were victims of physical YDV (e.g., pinching, slapping, punching, kicking), and 9% experienced sexual violence in their relationships (e.g., pressure, threats, or force to engage in unwanted sexual activities) (Wincentak et al., 2017).

A national prevalence study reported that over one in three Canadian youth experienced and/or used dating violence in the prior 12 months (Exner-Cortens et al., 2021). Victim-reported prevalence rates were as follows: 11.8% for experiencing physical aggression, 27.8% for experiencing psychological aggression, and 17.5% for experiencing cyber aggression (Exner-Cortens et al., 2021). Perpetrator-reported prevalence for using physical aggression was 7.3%, for psychological aggression was 9.3%, and for cyber aggression was 7.8% (Exner-Cortens et al., 2021). Non-binary and socially marginalized youth (e.g., those experiencing poverty) had the highest rates of victimization and perpetration of dating violence in this study (Exner-Cortens et al., 2021).

A North American study on dating violence victimization and perpetration among youth found that sexual minority girls and boys (58% and 36%, respectively) were more likely to experience dating violence than heterosexual girls and boys (38% and 25%, respectively) (Norris et al., 2022). Substance use was also found to be associated with dating violence victimization and perpetration for sexual minority girls (Norris et al., 2022). Forced sex and dating violence also appear to be more common among transgender and gender diverse youth. For example, a North American research group found that sexual minorities who are also transgender or gender diverse are 2.5 to 3.7 times more likely to be forced to have sex and experience physical dating violence compared to transgender and gender diverse heterosexual youth (Kattari et al., 2021). Youth who are transfeminine, transmasculine, and nonbinary are more likely to experience forced sex and physical dating violence compared to individuals questioning their gender (Kattari et al., 2021). Compared to white youth, black and multiracial youth are also more likely to experience dating violence (Kattari et al., 2021).

Prevalence rates also vary with respect to online dating violence. In one study, 32% of a sample of 795 U.S. youth reported perpetrating dating violence online, and 51% reported being
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Youth Dating Violence has been identified as a significant issue, with studies showing that up to 26% of youth experienced online victimization (Cutbush et al., 2021). Other studies report online dating violence prevalence rates among youth of 10-20% (Peskin et al., 2017), and 12-56% (Stonard et al., 2014). One study reported that more than 12% of youth in a relationship were perpetrators of online YDV, with significantly more boys being perpetrators (Zweig et al., 2013). Higher rates of online YDV victimization and perpetration have also been reported among LGBTQ youth (Zweig et al., 2013).

3. Victims of Youth Dating Violence

3.1 Risk Factors for Victimization

Research has identified a variety of sociodemographic factors that are associated with a higher likelihood of experiencing YDV, including gender inequality, age and age differences, racial discrimination, immigrant status, homophobia/homonegativity, low socioeconomic status, and experience of and exposure to familial violence (Cala & Soriano-Ayala, 2021; Siller et al., 2021; Taquette & Monterio, 2019). Results of a recent meta-analysis suggest that some of the strongest correlated risk markers for physical YDV victimization include substance use, risky sexual behaviours, having carried a weapon, suicide attempts, disordered eating, physical dating violence perpetration, sexual dating violence victimization, emotional dating violence victimization, neighbourhood disorganization, and low socioeconomic status (Spencer et al., 2021). Sexting has also been correlated with dating violence (Morelli et al., 2016; Ross et al., 2016).

With respect to sex/gender, there is some disagreement among researchers whether girls or boys are more likely to experience YDV (Luo, 2021; Miller-Perrin et al., 2018). While both girls and boys can be victims of physical YDV, girls appear to be the primary victims of sexual YDV and the overall consequences of YDV appear to be worse for girls (Edwards, 2018; Korkmaz et al., 2020; Taquette & Monterio, 2019; Vagi et al., 2015). These differences have been explained by some researchers as being a result of patriarchal culture, gender inequality, and gender roles/stereotypes (Taquette & Monterio, 2019). For example, within a patriarchal culture, boys are often encouraged to use violence to protect and impose themselves (Diaz-Aguado & Martinez, 2015; Gressard et al., 2015; Reidy et al., 2015). Researchers caution that risk and protective factors for YDV may also differ for boys and girls (Espelage et al., 2020). For example, alcohol consumption is considered a risk factor for girls’ YDV perpetration but not boys’ (Foshee et al., 2001; Foshee et al., 2004).

Data on YDV among gender diverse youth is limited, but what has been published suggests that transgender and non-binary youth are more likely to be victimized compared to their cisgender peers (Exner-Cortens et al., 2021; Johns et al., 2017). Potential explanations for this disparity include gender diverse youth witnessing and experiencing stigma, prejudice, and discrimination;

---

2 Researchers have proposed theories for some YDV risk markers, such as substance use (e.g., Temple & Freeman, 2011), but many are still not well understood. For example, a clear rationale for why YDV victimization and risky sexual behaviour are strongly correlated could not be located within the current research literature.
difficulty navigating gender identity and expression which can create tension in relationships; feeling pressured to follow traditional gender roles and social norms of dating; and lack of culturally appropriate services and education on healthy relationships (Gillum & DiFulvio, 2012; Ismail et al., 2007; Otis et al., 2006; Weisz et al., 2007).

The importance of age in determining YDV victimization risk is mixed within the research literature. While some researchers report that dating violence is more frequent within the adolescent period (ages 13 to 16 years) (Johnson et al., 2015), others report that frequency and severity of YDV increases with age and is more prominent among older students (grade 12) (Basile et al., 2020; Coulter et al., 2017). It is not clear why there are differences in reported prevalence rates of YDV risk based on age. What is clearer within the literature is that the age difference between YDV perpetrators and victims matters. Specifically, within relationships where there is an age gap, younger partners are more likely to be physically, emotionally, and sexually abused by their older partner (Reppucci et al., 2013; Volpe et al., 2013).

With respect to sexual orientation, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer youth are reported to be at greater risk for YDV victimization and perpetration compared to heterosexual peers (Dank et al., 2014; Norris et al., 2022; Reuter et al., 2015). A recent youth risk behaviour survey identified lesbian, homosexual, and bisexual students, and students questioning their sexual identity as having the highest prevalence rates of YDV (Basile et al., 2020). Another study similarly reported that lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth are more likely to experience YDV compared to heterosexual youth (Olsen et al., 2020). Overall, though, more research on YDV among sexually diverse youth is needed (Norris et al., 2022). Reasons lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth may have an increased risk of experiencing YDV include growing up amidst stigma, prejudice, and discrimination toward sexually diverse individuals; less exposure to healthy relationship models; pressure to conform to traditional gender roles and dating norms; less external support; more relationship isolation; reduced help-seeking behaviour due to fear of exposure and outing; sexual orientation integration stress (e.g., internalized homophobia or biphobia); and/or inadequate violence prevention programs (Decker et al., 2018; Ismail et al., 2007; Otis et al., 2006).

Risk of YDV can also vary geographically between rural and urban settings. Specifically, research suggests that rural youth are more likely to experience physical dating violence compared to urban youth (Sianko et al., 2019; Storer et al., 2020). Researchers indicate that rural youth are more likely to be victims of YDV due to the pervasiveness of traditional gender role attitudes towards male dominance over women, having less access to peers and resources for help, and a reduced sense of anonymity making victims reluctant to disclose abuse (Peek-Asa et al., 2011; Pruitt, 2008; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001).

Racial and ethnic disparities can also result in YDV risk disparities (Siller et al., 2021). An increasing body of literature suggests that socially and racially marginalized youth are more likely to experience and perpetrate YDV compared to youth from more socially dominant groups.
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Youth Dating Violence (Farhat et al., 2015; Luo et al., 2014). For example, African American adolescents from underserved and resource-poor urban environments are reportedly at a higher risk for experiencing YDV (Black et al., 2015), as are Latinx youth (Boyce et al., 2022). For Black American youth, depictions and reinforcement of stereotypical gender and racial frameworks in the media are proposed as one line of reasoning for increased risk of YDV (e.g., hypersexuality of black women, promiscuity of black men, male-female antagonism, and centering male-female relationships as being focused on sexual interactions) (Eaton & Stephens, 2018). Exposure to high rates of community violence in low-resource neighbourhoods and “trickle down” of societal violence into relationship violence have also been suggested as reasons for the disparity (Eaton & Stephens, 2018). For Latinx youth, research suggests some aspects of Hispanic culture (e.g., marianismo and machismo beliefs) are associated with greater acceptance and prevalence of violence (Eaton & Stephens, 2018). Marianismo beliefs suggest that women should be passive, submissive, humble, asexual, and self-sacrificing (Castillo et al., 2010). Within relationships, this can mean that women are expected to defer to and depend on men and not challenge them in the face of disagreements (Eaton & Stephens, 2018). Machismo relates to men’s expression of masculinity and is characterized by physical prowess, aggression, toughness, being in charge, risk-taking, as well as dominance, superiority, and strength in relationships (Marrs et al., 2012). This can lead to men controlling their partners within romantic relationships (Eaton & Stephens, 2018).

Research on the topic of relationship violence within Indigenous groups is limited. One publication specifically noted that American Indian and Alaskan Native approaches to dating and relationships are often overlooked (Schultz & Noyes, 2020). However, from the limited published research there does appear to be disproportionately higher rates of IPV reported among American Indian and Alaskan Native women (Rosay, 2016). Given the well-established link between IPV and YDV, it is probable that American Indian and Alaskan Native youth are at a higher risk for experiencing YDV (Basile et al., 2020; Coulter et al., 2017; Schultz & Noyes, 2020). The higher rates of relationship violence and limited research on American Indian and Alaskan Native youth have been explained by social, political, and historical forces, including settler colonialism, systemic racism, and patriarchal systems of governance (Schultz & Noyes, 2020). Beyond physical and psychological relationship violence, American Indian and Alaskan Native women have also indicated that loss of culture and self are additional relationship threats (Schultz & Noyes, 2020).

Several studies have found a correlation between youth dating violence victimization and perpetration and communication skill deficits (Antônio & Hokoda, 2009; Foshee et al., 2008; Messinger et al., 2011). For example, flooding, or the tendency to become overwhelmed and leave an argument, and “the four horsemen” (i.e., criticism, contempt, defensiveness, and stonewalling) are associated with higher likelihood of YDV (Rueda et al., 2021). Reported conflict negotiation strategies used by youth with dating partners include facilitative (e.g., having a someone act as a mediator or “in between” for the couple) (McIsaac et al., 2008), minimization (e.g., suggesting that the conflict is not that bad) (Tuval-Mashiach & Shulman, 2006), avoidance
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(e.g., avoiding the conflict altogether) (Messinger et al., 2011), withdrawal (e.g., shutting down emotionally) (Bonache et al., 2017), and blaming and criticism (e.g., putting the conflict responsibility on one’s partner rather than taking personal responsibility) (Rueda & Williams, 2015). Adolescents have been found to minimize or deny the existence of disagreement within their relationships, spend less time discussing relationship conflicts, and criticize or blame their partners for relationship problems (Rueda et al., 2021; Tuval-Mashiach & Shulman, 2006). Common areas of conflict for adolescents are jealousy and infidelity concerns (Giordano et al., 2015; Rueda et al., 2015). While adolescents may easily end relationships they no longer desire (Connolly & McIsaac, 2009), they may also experience peer pressure that encourages them to stay in unhealthy or violent relationships (Smith & Donnelly, 2001). Youth may also find it difficult to leave an unhealthy relationship if they feel attached, close, in love, or fear retaliation from a partner (Williams et al., 2015). Additionally, lower overall communication levels and increased problematic communication with parents can put youth at an increased risk for experiencing YDV (Ombayo et al., 2019). Witnessing IPV in peer contexts or in the family home is also associated with youth experiencing YDV in their own relationships (Halpern et al., 2009).

Although the previously discussed factors are associated with an increased risk of YDV victimization, research suggests that within the context of YDV, victimization and perpetration tend to co-occur (Bates, 2016; Hamby & Grych, 2013; Park & Kim, 2019; Taylor & Sullivan, 2017). In other words, youth involved in YDV often report being both a victim and perpetrator of dating violence (Giordana et al., 2010; Haynie et al., 2013). However, researchers who adopt a gender-based violence perspective have argued that the notion of bi-directional (two-way) dating violence is misleading (Reed et al., 2010). These researchers argue, for example, that female violence perpetration is often in defense against male violence, whereas male violence is considered more predatory and motivated by gender-related power differences (Eisner, 2021). The importance of relationship dynamics is emphasized by researchers who adopt a gender symmetry perspective (Eisner, 2021). Within this perspective, it is recognized that YDV is often the result of dyadic dysregulation (i.e., poor emotional regulation by both partners), with both partners contributing to communication breakdowns, escalation of conflict, and subsequent escalation of violence (Capaldi et al., 2018; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010).

Another important concept within the context of YDV is poly-victimization which recognizes that youth can experience multiple forms of victimization or chronic victimization, subsequently putting them at greater risk for experiencing concurrent or long-term behavioural and psychological problems (Butcher et al., 2016; Finkelhor et al., 2011). Indeed, research has shown that victims of YDV are often revictimized within the same relationship or with subsequent partners (Exner-Cortens et al., 2017). Further, youth in abusive relationships often return after leaving abusive partners (Toscano, 2014).

1.2 Protective Factors for Victimization

Parental support is a major protective factor in decreasing the risk of YDV victimization (Hebert et al., 2019). Particularly, bonding and closeness with parents can foster a sense of self-worth,
which can reduce the likelihood of getting involved with and tolerating relationships with abusive partners (Hebert et al., 2019). Positive parental monitoring (e.g., effective discipline, setting limits, open communication, conflict negotiation, knowledge of youths’ activities) has also been linked to reduced risk of YDV (Hebert et al., 2019). Parental monitoring may also contribute to counteracting the isolation that can occur in YDV (Hebert et al., 2019). Affiliation with prosocial or supportive friends has been noted as another protective factor for YDV victimization (Hebert et al., 2019). Involvement with a positive social network may increase the likelihood of dating individuals within the network, and positive relationships with peers may result in setting similar expectations for romantic relationships (Hebert et al., 2019).

Education about healthy relationships can also function as a protective factor by providing youth with knowledge and skills for identifying unhealthy relationship patterns, managing conflict, and building healthy romantic relationships (Benham-Clarke et al., 2022). Researchers note that, historically, education on healthy relationships has featured less prominently in formal school health and sex education curricula (Benham-Clarke et al., 2022). Among existing healthy relationship education programs, young people’s involvement in program development is lacking and needed to ensure their perspectives and experiences are recognized within the education content (Benham-Clarke et al., 2022).

4. Perpetrators of Youth Dating Violence

4.1 Characteristics of Perpetrators

There are numerous personal and sociocultural factors that can increase the likelihood that individuals will perpetrate YDV. Chief among the many factors is prior trauma exposure, such as family violence, child maltreatment, community violence exposure, surviving a natural disaster, and car accidents (Clare et al., 2021; Cohen et al., 2018; Dardis et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2011; Semenza, 2021; Temple et al., 2011). Among men who were traumatized in childhood or adolescence, perpetration of IPV has been explained by two main factors: 1) antisocial orientation or antisociality; and 2) low social competence (Daly & Marshall, 2021). Antisociality has been defined as “a pattern of disregard for, and violation of, the physical and emotional rights of others, characterized by deliberate aggression, lawlessness, manipulation, deceit, and lack of remorse” (Daly & Marshall, 2021, p. 472). Low social competence has been conceptualized as “lack of ‘know-how’, or general ineptitude in navigating the complexities of interpersonal relationships” (Daly & Marshall, 2021, p. 472).

YDV perpetration has been linked to other social skills deficits such as low levels of emotional intelligence, poor communicative ability, difficulties with social information processing, lack of impulse control, emotional flooding (i.e., becoming overwhelmed with emotion, unable to access the logical part of our brain/prefrontal cortex), and poor-quality relationships with friends and family (Fernández-González et al., 2018; Rueda et al., 2018). Many of these deficits are related to poor development of socioemotional skills in adolescence, including mentalization (i.e., ability to understand one’s own behaviour, and the behaviour of others, as guided by underlying mental states), emotion regulation, compromise, and establishing
appropriate relationship boundaries (Allemand et al., 2015; Blakemore, 2008; Connolly & McIsaac, 2009). Emotion dysregulation (lack of awareness, understanding, and acceptance of emotional experiences and inability to control impulsive behaviours and engage in goal direct behaviour when distressed), more specifically, has been correlated with higher probabilities of physical YDV in girls and psychological YDV in girls and boys (Theoret et al., 2022). Other correlated risk markers for YDV perpetration are approval of violence, risky sexual behaviours, alcohol use, depression, and delinquency (Spencer et al., 2021).

According to Dutton and White (2012), romantic attachment insecurities are key predictors of YDV perpetration in both adolescents and adults. The primary dimension of romantic attachment insecurity that appears related to YDV and IPV is attachment anxiety (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Attachment anxiety relates to negative self-representation or feeling that one is unworthy of love and affection (Theoret et al., 2022). Individuals with high attachment anxiety may desire more physical closeness, be hypersensitive to potential signs of rejection, and worry that their partner will be unavailable when they need them (Theoret et al., 2022). In contrast to those with high attachment anxiety, securely attached individuals tend to have a positive self-representation (low attachment anxiety) and positive representation of others (low attachment avoidance) in relationships (Theoret et al., 2022). Individuals with high attachment anxiety may be violent towards their romantic partner if they perceive their attachment needs are not being met by them (Mikulincer & Shaver, 2016). A 2018 systematic review (Velotti et al., 2018) indicated that most studies found an association between attachment anxiety and IPV, but none of the included studies had investigated these variables and relationships among youth dating relationships. A 2022 publication by Theoret and colleagues did find that attachment anxiety was directly related to higher probability of all forms of YDV perpetration.

Although it has been researched less, research findings suggest that YDV perpetrators can experience negative outcomes resulting from their behaviour similar to victims, even when adjusting for cases where they have been also victimized (Foshee et al. 2016; Moore et al. 2014; Nahapetyan et al., 2014). For example, Coker and colleagues (2000) found that boys’ severe physical dating violence perpetration increased the risk of suicide attempts. Ely and colleagues (2011) found that physical dating violence perpetration was associated with suicidal thoughts among adolescent girls. In their 2014 study, Nahapetyan and colleagues similarly found that adolescents involved in physical YDV victimization and perpetration were more likely to report suicidal ideation.

4.2 Motivations for Perpetration

While adult IPV is often characterized by “systematic patterns of power and control perpetrated by one partner against another” (p. NP3982), some researchers argue that YDV is less frequently motivated by control (Blais et al., 2022). Instead, YDV perpetration is thought to be more often the result of difficulties with communication, emotional expression, and/or emotional
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3 A clear rationale for why YDV perpetration and risky sexual behaviour are strongly correlated could not be located within the research literature. More research in this area may be warranted.
regulation (Elmquist et al., 2016), as well as lack of experience in dealing with relationship conflict (Wincentak et al., 2017). Certain types of peer victimization, such as physical bullying, have also been found to increase the risk of YDV perpetration (Garthe et al., 2017). Acceptance of violence as a normal behaviour in romantic relationships has also been found to put individuals at risk of YDV perpetration (Karlsson et al., 2016; Temple et al., 2016). Problematic relationship characteristics, such as verbal conflict, jealousy, cheating, manipulative tactics, and lack of identity support and instrumental (tangible) support have also been associated with YDV perpetration (Giordano et al., 2010; Vivolo-Kantor et al., 2016). Longer relationship duration, large age difference, more time spent with partner, sex with partner, and unbalanced power dynamics can also increase the risk of YDV perpetration (Giordano et al., 2010; Vivolo-Kantor et al., 2016). Results of a recent meta-analysis suggest some of the strongest risk markers for YDV perpetration include experiencing physical and emotional YDV victimization, previously perpetrating physical and emotional YDV, witnessing peer YDV, witnessing parental IPV, experiencing child abuse within one’s family of origin, personal approval of violence, engagement in risky sexual behaviour, alcohol use, experiencing depression, and engaging in delinquent behaviour (e.g., physical aggression, bullying, defiance, theft, vandalism) (Spencer, 2021).

Dysfunctional attitudes and thought patterns justifying aggression are both thought to underlie YDV and promote perpetration (Ybarra & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2019). In particular, sexual, romantic, or dating scripts can provide an outline for social and cultural expectations regarding one’s behaviour in these contexts (Ybarra & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2019). For example, and as discussed previously, YDV has been linked to endorsement of masculine gender-role ideology as well as adherence to traditional sex roles and beliefs supporting male domination (Ybarra & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2019).

4.3 Protective Factors for Perpetration
While risk factors for YDV perpetration are well-known, protective factors are less well-understood (Espelage et al., 2020). Some protective factors for YDV perpetration include relationship quality with parents, conflict resolution skills, and responsibility (Spencer et al., 2021). Results of a longitudinal study found that empathy, social support, parental monitoring, and school belonging are all protective factors for YDV perpetration (Espelage et al., 2020). Some longitudinal protective factors at the individual and relationship levels include low discrepancy between one’s attitudes toward dating violence and one’s own behaviours (i.e., cognitive dissonance), high empathy, a high grade point average, a high verbal IQ, having a positive relationship with one’s mother, and having a high degree of school belonging (Vagi et al., 2013).

5. Consequences and Outcomes of Youth Dating Violence
There are a number of negative consequences and outcomes related to YDV that have been reported in the literature. It is important to note that these are associations (correlations) and not causal links. In other words, YDV is associated with the negative outcomes discussed below, but it
does not mean that YDV caused these outcomes. Rather, the outcomes are more likely to be experienced by those who have also experienced YDV.

Reported associated outcomes of YDV include engagement in risky sexual behaviours (e.g., lack of condom use), increased likelihood of being tested for sexually transmitted infections (STIs), increased likelihood of receiving a STI diagnosis, deviance-prone gang involvement, early onset of substance use, unintended and early teen pregnancies, development of eating disorders, suicide and self-harm, poor academic and social involvement, as well as sexual abuse, neglect, and family dysfunction (Chen et al., 2016; Foshee et al., 2013; Hess et al., 2012; Miller-Perrin et al., 2017; Taquette & Monteiro, 2019; Wincentak et al., 2017). YDV has also been correlated with experiencing depression and anxiety, engaging in future violence, suicidality, and binge drinking (Goncy et al., 2017; Lubell & Vetter, 2006; Miller-Perrin et al., 2017; Murray & Azzinaro, 2019; Walsh et al., 2017). Victims of YDV also report having a lower sense of mattering to others (Edwards & Neal, 2017).

Physical YDV, more specifically, has been linked to poor academic performance, anxiety, posttraumatic stress, depression, and suicidal ideation (Exner-Cortens et al., 2013; Vagi et al., 2015). Not surprisingly, physical YDV has also been linked to physical health consequences and injury (Munoz-Rivas et al., 2007), with physical YDV perpetrated by boys tending to result in more serious injuries (Hamby & Turner, 2013) and inducing a greater sense of fear (Reidy et al., 2016). An emerging area of literature has suggested that youth who have experienced both physical and psychological YDV are at a greater risk of experiencing mental health problems compared to youth who have solely experienced psychological abuse (Choi et al. 2017; Haynie et al. 2013; Reyes et al. 2017).

Witnessing or being exposed to YDV and IPV can also result in youth’s development of depression, suicidality, anxiety, stress, aggression, posttraumatic stress, sleeping problems, substance use issues, compromised coping skills, and self-harm (Georgsson et al., 2011; Haynie et al., 2009; Jocson et al., 2018; Olaya et al., 2010; Viosin & Hong, 2012). As a result of witnessing relationship violence, youth may also develop challenges in school, challenges with peers, difficulty processing and recalling information, bullying, victimization in school, school dropout, teen pregnancy, feelings of guilt, helplessness, and sense of responsibility for the violence (Georgsson et al., 2011; Haynie et al., 2009; Jocson et al., 2018; Olaya et al., 2010; Viosin & Hong, 2012).

Additionally, some research suggests that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and queer YDV victims experience worse outcomes compared to heterosexual YDV victims, including higher rates of depression, binge drinking, and poor academic performance (Edwards, 2018). Proposed explanations for these findings include LGBQ victims having poorer social support systems, increased barriers to disclosure and help seeking, and less community acknowledgement and readiness to address dating violence among LGBQ individuals (Edwards, 2018).

Little research has been conducted on how the justice system responds to YDV (Douglas & Walsh, 2022). In particular, it is unclear whether youth tend to be charged when they perpetrate YDV, the
age of youth who are charged and sentenced, and the kinds of penalties that are imposed (Douglas & Walsh, 2022). Further, many practitioners and families do not support criminal law responses to YDV (Douglas & Walsh, 2018; Fitz-Gibbon et al., 2021), particularly because youth perpetrators of YDV are thought to have a different level of responsibility due to their lower developmental capacity to understand the consequences of their behaviour (Douglas & Walsh, 2022).

6. Preventing Youth Dating Violence and Associated Harms

Non-profit and community-based organizations, post-secondary health promotion teams, foundations, and researchers are continually developing new strategies for addressing YDV (Rothman et al., 2022). Targeted prevention efforts during adolescence are thought to be especially crucial given the severe consequences of YDV during this time, including increased risk for poor attachment development, vulnerability to subsequent victimization, and acceptance of violence (Boyce et al., 2022; Clare et al., 2021). YDV primary prevention programs generally focus on creating positive social norms and strong conflict management skills, while secondary prevention programs tend to focus on teaching people to recognize early signs of YDV victimization and perpetration (Debnam et al., 2021; Espelage et al., 2020). Primary prevention interventions such as Safe Dates, Green Dot, Coaching Boys Into Men, and the Fourth R have shown some success in reducing YDV, but only for limited components (e.g., harassment, stalking, physical violence perpetration) (Coker et al., 2015; Crooks et al., 2015; Miller et al., 2015). Bystander-focused programs, like Bringing in the Bystander, Coaching Boys Into Men, and Green Dot, focus more on teaching youth skills and self-efficacy to safely intervene when they witness YDV (Debnam et al., 2021). Tertiary violence prevention generally focuses on long-term responses to address consequences of violence and reducing re-occurrence of violence (e.g., safety planning) (Prothrow-Stith & Davis, 2010).

Increasingly, technology is being utilized in YDV prevention efforts. Safety planning apps, like myPlan, allow individuals to access tailored safety planning services from their smartphones or personal computers (Debnam et al., 2021; Emezue et al., 2021).

While curriculum-based programs are important for YDV prevention, they rarely account for differences in gender, dating history, experiences with YDV, and skill application readiness (Fellmath et al., 2013; Levesque et al., 2017). YDV interventions have been found to be most effective when their implementation is sustainable and youth perceive them as relevant (Alvarez et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2021; Levesque et al., 2017). Highlighting this, a qualitative study on youths’ perceptions of a YDV prevention app, myPlan, indicated that such apps should be responsive to youths’ diverse needs, capture the unique safety dilemmas encountered by youth (e.g., not having a personal vehicle for the purposes of escaping, not having resources for travelling to safety, etc.), clarify the signs of unhealthy or abusive relationships, and offer resources for immediate help (Debnam et al., 2021).

The association between communication skill deficits and YDV has led many prevention curricula to include conflict resolution content (Rueda et al., 2021). Rueda and colleagues (2021) found that
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4 See the Appendix for examples of YDV prevention programs and apps.
teaching youth adaptive communication skills (e.g., using humour, taking breaks, minimizing use of negative statements) as part of a comprehensive intervention for reducing YDV and enhancing healthy relationships was particularly meaningful for youth. For example, using humour, taking discussion breaks, and minimizing the use of negative statements in communication with partners can help minimize friction and tension (The Gottman Institute, n.d.).

A study on dating and relationships among American Indian and Alaska Native adolescents found that loss of culture and self were the greatest threats in intimate relationships (Schultz & Noyes, 2020). As such, it was concluded that the promotion of cultural safety, identity, and involvement, as well as a focus on broader systems in place, are key in promoting healthy relationships among this population of youth (Schultz & Noyes, 2020). Further, the authors indicated that American Indian and Alaska Native adolescents, particularly young women, should have access to supportive networks and mentorships related to identity and cultural involvement (Schultz & Noyes, 2020). Given the high rates of YDV that occur on school property (e.g., Young et al., 2008), the role of school personnel (e.g., school administrators, teachers, and coaches) and parents are increasingly being recognized by researchers and practitioners as important in the prevention of YDV (Edwards et al., 2020). This idea is consistent with increasing recognition that all community members can and should intervene when they witness violence as bystanders (Edwards et al., 2020). Bystanders can intervene at multiple points, including before violence occurs, during violence that has started, and afterwards when victims need support (Edwards et al., 2020). Bystanders can also help shift social norms regarding tolerance of violence and promotion of bystander action (Edwards et al., 2020). Edwards and colleagues (2020) reported that some of the intervention strategies school personnel have used as bystanders of YDV were talking with teens about healthy relationship, breaking up fights between dating partners, and comforting victims.

Consistent with some cognitive theories (e.g., gender and feminist theories of violence perpetration) YDV prevention efforts have largely focused on addressing sexual, gender-role, and violence-related attitudes and beliefs (Ybarra & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2019). While research has found single-component interventions can be effective for preventing YDV, the effects tend to be small or short-lived (Community Preventive Services Task Force, 2018; DeGue et al., 2014). YDV prevention strategies that adopt a comprehensive approach are increasingly being recognized as more promising for achieving positive population-level effects (Basile et al., 2016; DeGue et al., 2016; Niolon et al., 2017). Interventions that adopt comprehensive approaches and more ecological theoretical frameworks that target social, cultural, institutional, and physical environments that support positive, healthy behaviours are thought to be more efficacious in creating long-term change in both individual behaviour and social norms (Debnam & Temple, 2021; Rothman et al., 2015). For example, multicomponent, comprehensive YDV prevention programs like Dating Matters (see Appendix for description and link) ensure that their content is context-dependent by considering various factors that can influence YDV perpetration and help-seeking (Debnam & Temple, 2021; Rothman et al., 2015).
Results of a recent meta-analysis indicate that some programs designed to address YDV can effectively increase knowledge about dating violence, change attitudes and beliefs towards dating violence, increase bystander behaviours (e.g., speaking up when you hear a friend call their partner a rude name), and reduce incidents of dating violence perpetration and victimization (Lee & Wong, 2022). However, these programs were not found to significantly impact rates of victimization (Lee & Wong, 2022).

Recommended strategies for preventing online YDV include incorporating the topic into general dating violence programs which address healthy versus unhealthy relationships, educating youth on digital literacy and safe Internet use, educating youth on the importance of reporting online YDV and seeking help, and educating youth on available and accessible community resources (Endleman, 2021). The Saskatchewan Prevention Institute’s reports on sexting and grooming provide more information on digital literacy and safe Internet use (An Environmental Scan of Online Resources Related to Sexting: https://skprevention.ca/resource-catalogue/sexual-health/an-environmental-scan-of-online-resources-related-to-sexting/, Youth Sexting: A Critical Review of the Research Literature: https://skprevention.ca/resource-catalogue/sexual-health/youth-sexting-a-critical-review-of-the-research-literature/, and Grooming for the Purpose of Exploitation and Abuse: What Caregivers and Educators Should Know: https://skprevention.ca/resource-catalogue/sexual-health/grooming-for-the-purposes-of-exploitation-and-abuse-a-literature-review/). The Prevention Institute’s youth-friendly booklet Building Healthy Online Relationships (https://skprevention.ca/resource-catalogue/sexual-health/building-healthy-online-relationships/) provides information about how to build healthy online relationships, including information on online safety and communication, as well as tips to help navigate cyberbullying, grooming, sextortion, and more.

Overall, more research is needed on effective YDV prevention strategies and programs for youth (Lee et al., 2021). More resources on how to disseminate, implement, and scale prevention programs are also needed (Ragavan & Miller, 2021). Importantly, such research would benefit from including youth voices to ensure interventions meet their distinct needs and preferences (Lee et al., 2021; Ustunel, 2021). With sexually diverse youth, paying special attention to the stigma, mental health, and other challenges they experience due to marginalization are essential for engaging youth in these programs (Debnam & Temple, 2021). Health equity frameworks that consider community and structural level challenges (i.e., intergenerational trauma, structural racism, transphobia) and benefits of social facilitators (i.e., collective efficacy or shared belief through collective action, ethnic pride) are also essential for YDV program development (Ragavan & Miller, 2021). Similarly, covering the impact of acculturation and conflicts between traditional and Western norms on dating and sexuality are important to include when addressing YDV among immigrant youth (Gonzalez-Guarda et al., 2013; Malhotra et al., 2015). Some researchers suggest that the use of a healing justice framework, which creates space for youth to heal from systemic inequities and intergenerational trauma, may be useful in reducing YDV as well as supporting youth in dismantling oppressive systems and structures that impact their health and well-being (Ragavan & Miller, 2021).
7. Conclusions

Increasing our understanding of and ability to identify instances of YDV, both online and offline, are essential for developing effective and sustainable prevention measures, decreasing overall instances of violence, and reducing the harms of YDV for both victims and perpetrators. More research on effective and sustainable YDV prevention strategies and programs for youth are needed, as well as resources to disseminate, implement, and scale prevention programs. The inclusion of youths’ voices will ensure that interventions meet their needs and preferences. In addition to involving youth, decreasing YDV and minimizing its associated harms also requires involvement from parents/caregivers and educators.
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# Appendix: Youth Dating Violence Prevention Programs and Apps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>URL</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BC Society of Transition Houses Teen Digital Dating Violence Toolkit</strong></td>
<td><a href="https://bcsth.ca/2022/05/31/teen-digital-dating-violence-toolkit/">bcsth.ca/2022/05/31/teen-digital-dating-violence-toolkit/</a></td>
<td>A toolkit designed to help teens identify digital dating violence, providing information, tips, and ideas for what to do, and what kind of help and resources are available (bcsth.ca).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coaching Boys Into Men</strong></td>
<td><a href="https://www.futureswithoutviolence.org/engaging-men/coaching-boys-into-men/">https://www.futureswithoutviolence.org/engaging-men/coaching-boys-into-men/</a></td>
<td>A violence prevention program for athletic coaches designed to inspire them to teach their young male athletes about the importance of respect for themselves, others, and particularly women and girls (Futures Without Violence.org).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dating Matters®: Strategies to Promote Healthy Teen Relationships</strong></td>
<td><a href="https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/dm_overview-a.pdf">https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/dm_overview-a.pdf</a></td>
<td>A comprehensive YDV prevention model designed to address risk and protective factors of YDV among adolescents before they begin dating developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (DeGue et al., 2021; Luo et al., 2022; Niolon et al., 2019; Vivolo-Kantor et al., 2021).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dating SOS</strong></td>
<td><a href="https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-08487-x#:~:text=The%20intervention%2C%20called%20SOS%20Namoro,management%20skills%20and%20help%20seeking">https://bmcpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12889-020-08487-x#:~:text=The%20intervention%2C%20called%20SOS%20Namoro,management%20skills%20and%20help%20seeking</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A comprehensive preventive program targeted to young people aged 15 to 29 years with a current dating partner; designed to reduce victimization and perpetration of YDV as well as increase relationship quality, conflict management skills, and help seeking (Murta et al., 2020).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Fourth R</strong></td>
<td><a href="https://youthrelationships.org/">https://youthrelationships.org/</a></td>
<td>Uses a social cognitive model to teach youth behavioural strategies in decision-making, non-aggressive conflict resolution, and self-efficacy to prevent YDV, substance misuse, and peer-directed aggression (Temple et al., 2021).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Me &amp; You...Building Healthy Relationships</strong>&lt;br/&gt;<a href="https://sph.uth.edu/research/centers/chppr/meandyouhealthy/MeYou-Parent-Newsletter-2-03-14-14-FINAL-ENG-BW.pdf">https://sph.uth.edu/research/centers/chppr/meandyouhealthy/MeYou-Parent-Newsletter-2-03-14-14-FINAL-ENG-BW.pdf</a></td>
<td>A school-based program designed predominantly for ethnic-minority 6th graders (Peskin et al., 2019).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moms and Teens for Safe Dates</strong>&lt;br/&gt;<a href="https://iprc.unc.edu/momsestudy/">https://iprc.unc.edu/momsestudy/</a></td>
<td>A YDV prevention program for IPV-exposed mothers/maternal caregivers and their teens. The program consists of a series of booklets families complete together that include interactive activities to promote positive family communication and health teen relationships. An online version of this program has been developed called eMoms and Teens for Safe Dates (Reyes et al., 2022).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>myPlan app</strong>&lt;br/&gt;<a href="http://www.myplanapp.org">www.myplanapp.org</a></td>
<td>Provides easy access to tailored safety planning services for college-aged women (Debnam et al., 2021; Emezue et al., 2021).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shifting Boundaries</strong>&lt;br/&gt;<a href="https://preventipv.org/materials/shifting-boundaries">https://preventipv.org/materials/shifting-boundaries</a></td>
<td>Focuses on middle-school aged participants with an emphasis on classroom and school community level interventions for reducing YDV victimization and perpetration (Taylor et al., 2013).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>