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Our mission:

Blue Shield of California Foundation builds lasting and equitable solutions to make California the healthiest state and end domestic violence.

Total Grantmaking since 2002:
Over $390 million

2017 Grantmaking:
$25.6 million

Independent Board:
9 Trustees

Number of Staff:
25

Source of Funding:
Annual contributions from Blue Shield of California
our bold goal

To make California the healthiest state in the country, and the state with the lowest rates of domestic violence
what we’ve learned

Violence starts early and impacts people **throughout their lives**, so we need approaches that match their life course.
the life course framework
Preventing Domestic Violence and Its Consequences for Community Health and Wellbeing

A LIFE COURSE APPROACH
February 5th, 2018
**FOUNDATION STRATEGIC LEARNING PROCESS**

- **Research Scan and Synthesis**: Conducted extensive scans of the peer-reviewed literature on causes, consequences and interventions for domestic violence.
- **Interviews with Field Leaders**: Conducted 11 interviews with field leaders doing domestic violence work.
- **Staff Planning Workshops**: Held 4 planning workshops with Blue Shield of California Foundation staff.
KEY FOUNDATION GOALS AND CONSIDERATIONS

- **Get at “Root Causes”/Move “Upstream”:** The BSCF’s recent foundation-wide strategy process involves an effort to move upstream with prevention across all of its program areas.

- **Build from the foundation’s strengths and its health mission:** The framework should be guided by the Foundation’s mission of health prevention and its strategic strengths.

- **Apply a Life Course Lens:** There was a specific desire to apply a life course lens to the factors that drive domestic violence.

- **Inter-generational:** There was a desire to address the drivers and consequences of domestic violence across generations.

- **Program and Systems interventions:** There was a call to look at both programmatic and systems-level/policy interventions for preventing family and domestic violence.

- **Proven and Promising:** There was a desire to identify both proven and promising interventions.
PRESENTATION OVERVIEW

Domestic Violence and Its Consequences

Taking a Life Course Approach to Domestic Violence Prevention

Moving Toward Life Course Prevention of Domestic Violence
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND ITS CONSEQUENCES
PREVALENCE OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE VICTIMIZATION

**United States:** Lifetime Prevalence of Intimate Sexual Violence, Physical Violence, or Stalking Victimization by Race & Gender (2010-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Races</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Pacific Islander</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**California:** Lifetime Prevalence of Intimate Sexual Violence, Physical Violence, or Stalking Victimization by Race & Gender (2010-12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Races</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### IMPACT OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE BY GENDER

**The Impact of Intimate Partner Violence by Gender, California**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any Impact</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned for Safety</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any PTSD Symptoms</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed at Least One Day of Work/School</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed Medical Care</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed Legal Services</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed Housing Services</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed Victim Advocate Svcs</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2010-2012 State report
LIFETIME PREVALENCE OF EXPOSURE TO INTERPARENTAL VIOLENCE: AGES 14-17

Eyewitness to parental assault

21%

SOURCE: Children's Exposure to Intimate Partner Violence and Other Family Violence, October 2011
**METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING THE CONSEQUENCES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE EXPOSURE**

**Scanned the Literature:** Conducted a scan for systematic reviews and meta-analyses of the peer-reviewed literature that identify “domestic violence” or “intimate partner violence” and “health” “consequences” “outcomes”

**Longitudinal Studies:** From those reviews, along with additional searches identified longitudinal studies that measure the occurrence of domestic violence victimization before a subsequent health outcome.
Depression is the most common health consequence of domestic violence found in the literature: In longitudinal studies, depression has been shown repeatedly to be a result of exposure to domestic violence:

- A national U.S. longitudinal study found that adult women who experienced IPV were 42 percent more likely to experience depression at a 5-year follow-up compared to women that did not experience IPV. (Zlotnick et al, 2006)

Posttraumatic stress disorder is also another common consequence of domestic violence found in the literature. (Lagdon et al, 2014)

Suicide attempts are also shown in longitudinal studies to increase following IPV incidents (Devries et al, 2013)

In-utero exposure of children leads to preterm birth, low-birth weight and perinatal mortality (Alhusen et al, 2014)
A LIFE COURSE PERSPECTIVE ON THE CAUSES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
NESTED FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Life Course/Developmental factors
- exposure to interparental violence
- child physical abuse
- adolescent antisocial behavior
- chronic violent offending
- violent peer networks
- non-exclusive relationship

Situational factors
- arguments and anger
- escalation dynamics
- alcohol use
- presence of third parties

Structural/Cultural factors
- aggregate unemployment
- educational levels
- gender/age inequality
- concentrated disadvantage
- harmful cultural norms (e.g. masculine ideology)

Domestic violence incidents
THE CAUSES OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PERPETRATION AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

Structural Factors
• Income/Poverty
• Isolation/Social Marginalization
• Weak Social Safety Net
• Harmful Gender Cultural Norms

Pre-Domestic Violence Risk Trajectories

Life Course Factors

Perpetration of Domestic Violence

Domestic Violence Re-Occurrence

The health consequences of domestic violence for direct and indirect victims

The consequences of domestic violence exposure for children’s risk of domestic violence perpetration in adulthood (cycle of violence)
PRE-DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PERPETRATION RISK TRAJECTORIES
**METHOD FOR IDENTIFYING LIFE COURSE PREDICTORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

**Scanned the Literature:** Conducted a scan for systematic reviews and meta-analyses of the peer-reviewed literature that identify predictors of “domestic violence” or “intimate partner violence”

**Longitudinal Studies:** From those reviews, along with additional searches identified longitudinal studies that measure a risk factor for domestic violence before the domestic violence occurs. Cross-sectional studies can’t establish “temporal order”.

**Limited to larger longitudinal studies:** Narrowed the several dozen studies identified to only those that were “prospective” not “retrospective”, that had a sample with n=400 for identifying small effects, that included more than two waves and several control variables

In total **25 longitudinal studies** were identified

The reported effect sizes on the next slides were determined using multivariate and multinomial logistic regression to establish the independent effect of the risk factor on domestic violence outcome(s) when controlling for several covariates.
AT WHAT AGE DOES DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PEAK IN THE GENERAL POPULATION?


IPV peaks during the early 20s for the mother and during early childhood for their children.

50% of children directly exposed to domestic violence are under the age of 6

Fantuzzo et al (2007)

Figure 1. Age curve for IPV perpetration by gender from age 13 to 28.
**LIFE COURSE PREDICTORS FOR ADULT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PERPETRATION**

Risk factors for adult domestic violence perpetration (ages 19 to 26)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>0-5</th>
<th>6-11</th>
<th>12-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ecological Factors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Exposure to parental violence</td>
<td>1.9 child physical abuse</td>
<td>1.9 Parent Alcohol Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life course Factors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Non - exclusive Relationship</td>
<td>2.7 Witnessing Parental violence</td>
<td>2.4 Chronic Violent Offending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Development Factors:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Positive attitude toward IPV</td>
<td>4.0 Conduct Disorder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Effect size**
- **Moderate:** 2.5, 2.3, 2.1
- **Small to moderate:** 1.9, 1.7, 1.8
- **Small:** 1.9, 1.7
# ADOLESCENT RISK FACTORS FOR TEEN DATING VIOLENCE

Risk factors for adult domestic violence perpetration (ages 12-18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ecological Factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner’s prior use of teen dating violence in the same relationship: 80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer dating violence: 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimized by peers: 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent-child boundary violations: 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased involvement with antisocial peers: 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early involvement with antisocial peers: 2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Factors:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General antisocial behavior: 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement in peer violence: 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug and alcohol use: 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General aggression: 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th-Grade sexual initiation: 1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Odds ratio:
- >10.0: very large
- >4.0: large
- >2.1: medium
- >1.5: small
EARLY RISK PATHWAYS TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PERPETRATION IN ADULTHOOD

EARLY CHILDHOOD
- Early Childhood IPV Exposure (ages 1-5)

CHILDHOOD
- Childhood IPV Exposure
- Childhood Abuse
- Childhood Physical Abuse

ADOLESCENT
- Adolescent IPV Exposure
- Adolescent Peer-Influenced

Adolescent Externalizing Behavior

PTSD & Substance Abuse

Adult Antisocial Personality Disorder

Alcohol Abuse (women)
- Swinford (2000)
- Capaldi et al (2001)

Antisocial Behavior

Young Adult IPV Perpetration (ages 19-26)
# Do Life Course Predictors of Domestic Violence Differ by Gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Family-of-Origin</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- age</td>
<td>- Witnessed parental domestic violence</td>
<td>- Depression</td>
<td>- Separation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education</td>
<td>- Witnessed mother hitting the father</td>
<td>- Social support</td>
<td>- Relational distress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Income</td>
<td>- Witnessed the father hitting the mother</td>
<td>- Trauma</td>
<td>- Verbal arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Employment status</td>
<td>- Child physical abuse</td>
<td>- PTSD</td>
<td>- Demand/withdraw communication patterns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Number of children</td>
<td>- Maternal physical abuse</td>
<td>- Drug use</td>
<td>- Psychological abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marital status (married or divorced)</td>
<td>- Paternal physical abuse</td>
<td>- Alcohol problems</td>
<td>- Forced sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Length of relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Physical health</td>
<td>- Previous violence toward a current partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Chelsea Spencer, Bryan Cafferky and Sandra Stith, “Gender Differences in Risk Markers for Perpetration of Physical Partner Violence: Results from a Meta-Analytic Review” (2016)
Most longitudinal studies do not measure predictors in early childhood. The limited studies that do, show a robust long-term relationship between early childhood IPV exposure and adult IPV.

Most longitudinal studies of predictors of adult IPV perpetration do not measure IPV perpetration in adolescence. We are thus less able to examine patterns of continuity and/or desistance and how those patterns relate to later IPV.

Family violence—child physical and sexual abuse and interparental abuse—are robust long-term predictors of adult domestic violence.

Peer relationships in adolescence, particularly with antisocial, violent or relationship abusive peers, pose a strong short-term risk for teen dating violence as well as strong long-term risk for adult IPV.

Chronic violent offending and delinquency are robust risk factors for adult IPV.

The risk factors for IPV perpetration are largely the same for males and females.
MOVING TOWARD LIFE COURSE PREVENTION
The focus of the Domestic Violence system is here.

Pre-Domestic Violence Risk Trajectories ➔ Perpetration of Domestic Violence ➔ Domestic Violence Re-Occurrence
INTERACTION WITH THE DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SYSTEM FOLLOWING A FAMILY VIOLENCE INCIDENT

1. 25.2% of family violence incidents led to police contact
2. 11.8% of family violence incidents led to an arrest
3. 8.3% of incidents led to the filing of criminal charges
4. 3.1% of incidents resulted in a conviction or guilty plea
5. 1.9% resulted in sentencing to prison or jail
6. 14.9% of incidents led to contact by a Domestic Violence advocate

CORE DV SYSTEM RESPONSES FOCUSED ON PREVENTING DV RE-OCCURRENCE

- Punishment & Deterrence of Perpetrators
  - Arrest and Prosecution

- Crisis Response for Victims
  - Survivor Services

- Treatment and Behavior Change for Perpetrators
  - Batterer Intervention Programs
**PUNISHMENT & DETERRENCE: ARREST AND PROSECUTION**

---

**Early findings...**

- Mandatory arrest laws require police officers to make an arrest if there is an allegation of domestic violence, regardless of whether the victim wishes to press charges.

- The Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment (1987-88) found that mandatory arrest reduced revictimization in the 6 month follow up leading to the adoption of mandatory arrest laws across the country.

---

**...debunked by later rigorous research**

- Arrests don’t reduce domestic violence re-occurrence
  - National study of domestic violence incidents between 1996-2012, it was found arrests had zero effect on rates of revictimization for victims. Xie and Lynch (2016)

- Mandatory arrest increased IPV homicides
  - Using a quasi-experimental design researchers found that states adopting those laws saw a 60 percent increase in intimate partner homicides compared to states that did not. Iyengar, (2007)

- Increased death rates of domestic violence victims from arresting vs. warning suspects
  - In a 23-year follow-up to those randomized to “arrest” vs “warning,” victims were found to be 64% more likely to die of all-cause mortality (most commonly heart disease) if their abuser was arrested rather than warned. The effect was concentrated among black women (whose risk rose by 100% compared to 9% for whites), particularly if they had jobs at the time (+420%). Sherman and Harris (2014)
Advocacy services help survivors meet unmet needs, obtain legal assistance, protection orders, new housing, and public services.

A meta-analysis of advocacy interventions for domestic violence survivors found that “intensive advocacy may improve short-term quality of life and reduce physical abuse one to two years after the intervention for women recruited from domestic violence shelters.

Brief advocacy may provide small short-term mental health benefits and reduce abuse, particularly in pregnant women and for less severe abuse.” Rivas et al (2015)
The most common Batterer Intervention Programs (BIPs) are based on “The Duluth Model” created in the 1980s that arose from a framework centered on revising men’s patriarchal views about male power and control.

This approach is less concerned with implementing therapeutic principles to combat the causes of violence in individuals and rather focuses on confronting the endorsement of learned violent behavior. Many principles in this model relate to the “power and control wheel,” which outlines the numerous ways in which men exert control over women.

A meta-analysis of 22 studies evaluating treatment efficacy for violent batterer males found that BIPs produced little reduction in recidivism beyond the effect of arrest. Babcock (2004)
The vast majority of domestic violence incidents do not become involved in the Domestic Violence system.

Most core components of the domestic violence system are weak on prevention even though their focus is only on re-occurrence of domestic violence.

Law-enforcement aspects of the domestic violence system, focused as they are on arrest and prosecution, appear to produce more harm than good for victims. The punitive deterrence paradigm is largely counterproductive.

Intensive domestic violence advocacy survivor services generally appear beneficial.

Batterer Intervention Programs (BIPs) that receive public funding to serve court-mandated abusers do not appear effective at reducing domestic violence recidivism.
MOVING TO DEEP PREVENTION

Getting to “Deep” Prevention

The Domestic Violence system is focused here

Pre-Domestic Violence Risk Trajectories

Perpetration of Domestic Violence

Domestic Violence Re-Occurrence
Humane Development and Behavioral Consequences that Can Lead to Domestic Violence Perpetration

1. Alter ecological exposures

   Early Childhood
   Child’s age 0-5
   Mother’s age 20-26
   - Exposure to parental violence, child physical and/or sexual abuse, impaired mother-infant bonding

   Middle Childhood
   Child’s age 6-11
   Mother’s age 27-32
   - Witness parental violence, child physical and/or sexual abuse

   Adolescence
   Child’s age 12-18
   Mother’s age 33-39
   - Witness parental violence, child physical and/or sexual abuse, parent alcohol abuse, parent-child boundary violation, exposure to violent or delinquent peers, violence by peers or dating partner

2. Alter behavioral trajectories

   Life Course and Developmental Factors
   - Insecure attachment, stress dysregulation, externalizing behavior, PTSD, emotion regulation problems

   Ecological Risk Factors
   Family and Social
   - Stress dysregulation, externalizing behavior, PTSD, emotion regulation problems

   Behavioral Outcomes
   Pathway to Adult Domestic Violence Perpetration
   - Peer aggression, behavioral problems
   - Academic problems, peer aggression, behavioral problems
   - Alcohol/substance abuse, general delinquency and antisocial behavior, perpetration of violence (including dating violence)
   - Adult domestic violence perpetration and risk of continuing the cycle

Forward Change
1. Family-centered prevention, particularly for families with young children
2. Prevention pathways outside formal domestic violence system, including voluntary couple/family services
3. Address healing as much as behavioral change priorities
4. De-prioritize punitive approaches and systems
5. Dual-generation from pre-natal through adolescence
6. Target high-poverty neighborhoods
7. Interventions that bridge health and domestic violence sectors
8. Interventions targeted to and effective for communities of color, low income people, undocumented people and those living in neighborhoods of concentrated disadvantage
QUESTIONS
CITATIONS

- Sherman and Harris (2014) “Increased death rates of domestic violence victims from arresting vs. warning suspects in the Milwaukee Domestic Violence Experiment”
- Lagdon et al (2014) “Adult experience of mental health outcomes as a result of intimate partner violence victimisation: a systematic review”
PRIMARY EXPOSURE PATHWAYS TO IPV PERPETRATION IN EMERGING ADULTHOOD (AGES 20-26)

EARLY CHILDHOOD

- Early Childhood IPV Exposure to Adolescent Externalizing Behavior Pathway [Naryan et al, (2013) Developmental timing and continuity of exposure to interparental violence and externalizing behavior as prospective predictors of dating violence]

CHILDHOOD

- Childhood IPV Exposure to later PTSD and/or Substance Abuse Pathway [Brown et al, (2015) Adverse childhood experiences and intimate partner aggression in the US: Sex differences and similarities in psychosocial mediation]


- Childhood Abuse to Adult Antisocial Personality Disorder pathway [White and Widom (2013) Intimate Partner Violence Among Abused and Neglected Children in Young Adulthood]

- Childhood Abuse to later Alcohol Problems for women pathway [White and Widom (2013) Intimate Partner Violence Among Abused and Neglected Children in Young Adulthood]

ADOLESCENT


reaction

Nan Stoops
Strategic Advisor
Washington State Coalition
Against Domestic Violence
Eve Sheedy, J.D.
Executive Director
Domestic Violence Council, L.A.
County Dept. of Public Health
insights and actions
insights and actions
Q+A

Please submit questions via the Q+A function in WebEx.
thank you & next steps

@PeterLongBSCF @BlueShieldFound
facebook.com/blueshieldcafoundation
youtube.com/user/blueshieldcafdn