

Appendix
Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence Among Youth: A Systematic Review
Johnson et al.

Appendix Table 1. Characteristics and Main Findings of Studies Examining Relationships Between Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence

Author (Year)	Sampling, follow-up, and setting	Population	Dating violence assessment		Measurement of neighborhood factors				Key findings
			DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	
Banyard, et al. (2006)	3 school districts in WI (n=980).	7-12th graders; 69% 13-16 years; 52% female	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	Physical DV-P was associated with neighborhood monitoring ($r=-0.11, p<0.001$) and neighborhood support ($r=-0.17, p<0.001$). After adjustment for risk factors in a logistic regression model, neither neighborhood monitoring (aOR=0.87, 95% CI=0.62-1.23), nor neighborhood support (aOR=0.77, 95% CI=0.49-1.21) were statistically significant.
Champion, et al. (2008)	Schools in mixed urban-rural county school systems, NC (n=2,090).	9-12th graders; 49.4% female; 61.1% white, 30% black	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	The bivariate Spearman's rho correlation coefficients of neighborhood factors and physical DV-P were: (1) Community Safety: -0.033 (NS), (2) Neighborhood Organization: -0.149 ($p<0.05$), (3) Local Laws Enforced: 0.052 ($p<0.05$); (4) Drugs & Guns Available: -0.095 ($p<0.05$), (5) Neighborhood Connectedness : -0.041 (NS). The bivariate Spearman's rho correlation coefficients of neighborhood factors and physical DV-V were: (1) Community Safety: 0.006 (NS), (2) Neighborhood Organization: -0.110 ($p<0.05$), (3) Local Laws Enforced: 0.037 (NS); (4) Drugs & Guns Available: -0.060 ($p<0.05$), (5) Neighborhood Connectedness : -0.030 (NS).
Chang, et al. (2015)	At baseline, 6th-8th graders were recruited from 2 public school systems in rural counties in NC. There were 7 waves of data	50% female; 41.5% white, 50.2% black, 8.6% Other	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	Data from youth in the different grades were reclassified by grade to model a developmental trajectory for physical DV-P. The bivariate correlation coefficients of neighborhood factors and physical DV-P among girls are: (1) Neighborhood Disadvantage: 0.11 ($p<0.05$), (2) Residential Instability: 0.08 ($p<0.05$), (3) Ethnic Heterogeneity: 0.02 (NS); (4) Physical Disorder: 0.09

Appendix
Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence Among Youth: A Systematic Review
Johnson et al.

	collection, in 6 month intervals. Addresses were geocoded at Wave 3. The current study used data from Waves 4-7 ($n=3,218$).	physical DV-P ranged from 5% to 8% among boys, and from 20% to 24% among girls.	who have lived in the Census block for >5 years, and % of renter-occupied homes. Ethnic heterogeneity was one minus the sum of the squared proportions of each racial/ethnic group. Collective efficacy was assessed with parents' responses to Sampson's 10-item scale. Neighborhood disorder was assessed with 3 items on physical appearance of the neighborhood.						$(p<0.001)$, (5) Collective Efficacy: -0.08 ($p<0.001$). The bivariate correlation coefficients of neighborhood factors and physical DV-P among boys are: (1) Neighborhood Disadvantage: -0.02 (NS), (2) Residential Instability: -0.01 (NS), (3) Ethnic Heterogeneity: 0.03 (NS); (4) Physical Disorder: 0.02 (NS), (5) Collective Efficacy: -0.01 (NS).
East, et al. (2010)	15-18 year old girls with a younger sister (aged 12-17) were recruited from schools and clinics in southern CA serving low-income people. Cross-sectional analysis of Wave 3 data from a longitudinal study with 3 follow-ups ($n=122$ sister dyads).	At Wave 3, older sisters aged 18-25 (m age=22.1), and younger sisters were aged 16-22 (m age=18.6); 100% female; 68% Hispanic, 32% black	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	After controlling for older sisters' victimization, perceived neighborhood crime was not associated with physical DV-V.
			Lifetime physical DV-V assessed with a binary, single item asking whether a partner has ever "hit, slapped, or punched you so hard it left a mark or bruise". The prevalence of lifetime physical DV-V for older and younger sisters was, respectively, 29.5% and 17.1%.						2 items assessed older and younger sisters' perceptions of neighborhood crime and neighborhood safety ; reports from both sisters and both items were combined to create a composite score.
Edwards, et al. (2014)	18-24 year olds in 16 rural counties in New England and the Southern U.S. were recruited using multiple	67.4% female; 94.4% white; m age=21.1	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	After adjusting for gender and individual income, neighborhood poverty was associated with DV-P (aOR=1.08, 95% CI: 1.06-1.10), as was collective efficacy (aOR=0.53, 95% CI: 0.46-0.60). After adjusting for gender and individual income, neighborhood poverty was associated with DV-V (aOR=1.13, 95% CI: 1.10-1.16), as was collective efficacy (aOR=0.69, 95% CI: 0.64-0.75).
			Past year physical DV-V and physical DV-P were assessed using the CTS-2 (12 items each), and results were						Information on county-level poverty came from the Census, and was the percentage of households with incomes below the federal poverty line.

Appendix
Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence Among Youth: A Systematic Review
Johnson et al.

	strategies, e.g., mass e-mailings at local colleges, newspaper advertisements (<i>n</i> =178).		dichotomized. Among women, the prevalence of physical DV-V was 23.4% and physical DV-P was 23.9%. Among men, the prevalence of physical DV-V was 31.5% and DV-P 20.4%.							Collective efficacy was assessed with Sampson's 10-item scale.
Foshee, et al. (2008)	7 public schools in a rural county in NC. Longitudinal analysis of data from a dating violence prevention program (controls only); follow-ups at 1, 12, 24 and 36 months (<i>n</i> =959).	At baseline, 8th-9th graders (<i>m</i> age=14.3); 50.8% female; 74.7% white, 17.9% black, 7.4% Other	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD		Data from youth in the different grades were reclassified by grade to model a developmental trajectory for moderate and severe physical DV-P. After adjustment for demographic factors, neighborhood disadvantage was not associated with moderate physical DV-P (β =-0.007, SE=0.02) or severe physical DV-P (β =-0.022, SE=0.01).
Foshee, et al. (2011)	Public school systems in 3 nonmetropolitan counties in NC. Longitudinal analysis; 3 follow-ups at 6, 12, and 24 months (<i>n</i> =2,808).	At baseline, 8th-10th graders; 52.9% female; 59.4% white, 30% black, 10.7% Other	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD		Comparing youth who engaged in both physical DV-P and peer violence perpetration vs. no violence perpetration (ref), neighborhood deviant behavior was associated with violence perpetration (aOR: 1.06, 95% CI: 1.05-1.08), and neighborhood social control was protective for violence perpetration (aOR: 0.96, 95% CI: 0.94-0.98).
Iritani, et al. (2013)	Cross-sectional analysis data from the school-	Age 18-26 years; 100%	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD		The ORs for neighborhood factors and physical DV-P (ref=no perpetration) were: (1) >1 on-premise outlets: 1.17 (0.95-1.44); (2) >1 off-premise outlets: 1.26 (1.04-1.52); (3) Poverty: 1.01

Appendix
Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence Among Youth: A Systematic Review
Johnson et al.

	based National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) collected during Wave 3 (<i>n</i> =4,430).	female; 11% Hispanic; 71% white; 14% black; 3% Asian; American Indian 1%	P assessed with 2 items on aggressive acts; Past year sexual DV-P assessed with 1 item. The outcome variable had 3 levels: physical DV-P only (22.6%); physical and sexual DV-P or sexual DV-P only (3.5%); and no dating violence.	(i.e., no. of outlets per square kilometer) was aggregated to the Census Tract; outlets were classified as on- or off-premise. Neighborhood poverty was a composite of variables from the 2000 US Census: % unemployed, % below poverty level, and % FHH. Transience was a composite of: % who had moved <5 years; and the % of renter-occupied housing units. Additional variables included: % who were born outside the US ; the % of vacant housing units; and population density (i.e., number of persons per square kilometer).	(1.00-1.01); (4) Transience: 1.00 (0.99-1.00); (5) Foreign-born residents: 1.25 (0.64-2.46); (6) Vacant housing: 2.49 (0.71-8.70); and (7) Population density: 0.99 (0.97-1.01). The ORs for neighborhood factors and physical/sexual DV-P (ref=no perpetration) were: (1) >1 on-premise outlets: 1.21 (0.79-1.87); (2) >1 off-premise outlets: 1.18 (0.77-1.81); (3) Poverty: 1.01 (1.00-1.02); (4) Transience: 0.99 (0.98-1.01); (5) Foreign-born residents: 2.13 (0.70-6.47); (6) Vacant housing: 2.29 (0.06-83.65); and (7) Population density: 1.03 (1.00-1.05).		
Jain, et al. (2010)	Youth and adults in neighborhoods in Chicago, IL randomly sampled. Longitudinal study with multiple waves, article was a longitudinal analysis using data from (<i>n</i> =633).	At Wave 3, 18-25 years (<i>m</i> age=21.2 years); 56% female; 37% black; 44% Hispanic; 16% white; 4% other	DV-P DV-V	Past-year physical DV-V and physical DV-P assessed with 7-items from a modified CTS. The prevalences of physical DV-V for women and men were, respectively, 24% and 28%. The prevalences of physical DV-P among women and men were, respectively, 38% and 17%.	D&SC AO ND SD	Concentrated poverty was a composite of variables from 1990 US Census: % unemployed, % receiving public assistance, % below the federal poverty level. Perceived neighborhood violence assessed with a 5-items scale on neighborhood problems (e.g., fights). Collective efficacy assessed with Sampson's scale.	Neither concentrated poverty, perceived neighborhood violence, nor collective efficacy were associated with physical DV-V or physical DV-P in multivariate regression models. In sex-stratified multivariate regression models, collective efficacy was protective against physical DV-V for and males ($\beta = -0.76, p < 0.05$), but not for females.
Li, et al. (2010)	Women seeking prenatal care, 8 clinics,	Women, 14-44 years (<i>m</i>	DV-P DV-V	Composite of physical	D&SC AO ND SD	Concentrated	Neither concentrated disadvantage (aOR = 0.84, 95% CI: 0.62-1.13) nor violent crime (aOR = 17.80, 95% CI: 0.01-infinity) were associated with physical DV-V. Residential stability was

Appendix
Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence Among Youth: A Systematic Review
Johnson et al.

Jefferson County, AL (n=2,887).	age=21.8 years); 85% black	DV-V during pregnancy and past year physical DV-V or sexual DV-V, assessed with Abuse Assessment Screening tool (3 items); binary physical DV-V variable created. Prevalence of DV-V was 7.4%.	disadvantage was a composite of variables from the 2000 US Census: % below poverty level, % receiving public assistance, % unemployed, % Black, % FHH. Residential stability was assessed by the % of households in the same residence for 5 years. Neighborhood violent crime was calculated by classifying geocoded violent crime rates (e.g., murder, rape, robbery, assaults).						positively associated with physical DV-V (aOR = 4.29, 95% CI: 1.13-16.33).
Longmore, et al. (2014)	7 school districts, Lucas County, OH. Follow-up surveys conducted 1, 3, 5, and 10 years later (n=927).	22-29 years (m=25.4); 55% female; 67% white, 21% black, 11% Hispanic	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	Those reporting victimization were more likely to have lived in a high-poverty Census tract in adolescence (results not shown).
			Past year physical DV-V assessed if respondents endorsed any physical victimization items on the CTS2, assessed at the 10-year follow up interview. Prevalence of physical DV-V was 20.5%.		Neighborhood poverty was from the US Census (% people below the poverty level), assessed using the address from the baseline interview.				
McNaughton Reyes, et al. (2012)	2 public school systems in low SES, rural counties in NC. Longitudinal analysis; 3 follow-ups at 6, 12, and 24 months (n=2,311).	At Wave 1, 8th-10th graders aged 12-19 years; 53% female; 45% white, 47% black, 8%	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	Data from youth in the 3 grades were reclassified by grade to estimate a single developmental trajectory curve, used to model dating violence across grades 8-12. After adjustment for risk factors at multiple levels including heavy drinking, perceived neighborhood disorder was not associated with physical DV-P ($\beta=0.004$, $SE=0.01$).
			Past 3-month physical DV-P assessed at each wave using the short version of the Safe Dates Physical Abuse Perpetration Scale. The baseline prevalence of any past 3-month physical DV-P was		Perceived neighborhood disorder (4 items) assessed at each Wave.				

Appendix
Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence Among Youth: A Systematic Review
Johnson et al.

		other.	18% at Wave 1.								
			DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD			
Raghavan et al. (2009)	Entering male undergraduate students at a large public urban university (n=479).	Ages 18-28 (m age=19); 42% Hispanic, 28% white, 17% black, 8% Asian; 5% other	Past year physical DV-P assessed with a modified version of the CTS. Prevalence of physical DV-P was 30.1%.		Perceived community violence assessed with the adult version of the My Exposure to Violence scale (10 items).				Controlling for male network violence and female network violence, community violence was not associated with physical DV-P ($\beta=0.01, p=0.09$).		
Raiford, et al. (2012)	Heterosexual, non-married, men recruited from barber shops, Atlanta, GA (n=65)	M age = 23; 100% male; 100% black	Past 3 month physical, emotional, and sexual violence perpetration assessed with Abusive Behavior Inventory (24 items, m=31, SD=5.3, range: 24-120.		Perceived neighborhood disorder and violence was assessed with the City Stress Inventory (11 items).				After adjustment for demographic factors and attitudes supportive of partner violence, perceived neighborhood disorder was associated with partner violence perpetration ($\beta=0.17, p=0.01$).		
Reed, et al. (2011)	Young men recruited from health clinics, Boston, MA (n=275).	Aged 14-20 years (m age = 17); 100% male; 54% black, 9% white, 3% Asian, 46% Hispanic.	Partner violence perpetration was a composite of information from scales of physical DV-P (4 items), sexual DV-P (4 items), psychological violence (1 item), and threats of violence (2 items). Prevalence of dating violence perpetration was 28%.		Perceived neighborhood disorder assessed with a 3-item survey about crime, gangs, and shooting.				After adjusting for demographic variables, perceived neighborhood disorder was associated with an increased risk of dating violence perpetration (aOR = 3.0, 95% CI: 1.4-6.3).		
Rothman,	22 public	9-12th	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	After adjustment for demographic factors, adolescents'		

Appendix
Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence Among Youth: A Systematic Review
Johnson et al.

et al. (2011)	schools in Boston, MA (<i>n</i> =1,530).	graders; 54% female; 43% black, 34% Hispanic, 9% white	Past 30-day physical DV-P assessed with 2 items on aggressive acts. Prevalence of physical DV-P was 14.3%.	Neighborhoods in Boston were classified into 38 “neighborhood clusters” containing contiguous Census tracts. Adolescent perceptions of neighborhoods were aggregated up to the neighborhood cluster, and served as predictor variables. Neighborhood factors included: Sampson’s Collective Efficacy scale (10 items) and its two 5-item subscales (social cohesion, social control); an index of perceived neighborhood disorder (6 items).	aggregate reports of 3 of the 6 neighborhood factors were associated with dating violence perpetration for both girls and boys: collective efficacy (aOR=1.95, 95% CI=1.09-3.52), social control (aOR=1.92, 95% CI=1.07-3.43), and neighborhood disorder (aOR=1.19, 95% CI=1.05-1.35), as well as for girls only. (Sex-stratified analyses were not conducted for boys.) Results for social cohesion were not statistically significant (aOR=1.58, 95% CI: 0.98-2.55).						
Schnurr & Lohman (2013)	A stratified random sample of impoverished children and their parents in Boston, MA, Chicago, IL, and San Antonio, TX. Longitudinal analysis; baseline in 1999, follow-ups in 2001 and 2005 (<i>n</i> =765).	16-20 years at Wave 3; 53% female; 42% black, 53% Hispanic	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	Lifetime physical DV-P assessed with a modified version of CTS2 (<i>m</i> =0.92, <i>SD</i> =1.53, range=0-8); 34% reported any physical DV-P.	Concentrated poverty was a composite of variables from the 2000 U.S. Census: % below poverty level, % non-owner occupied housing units). Additional factors were: residential segregation (% of racial and ethnic minorities); residential instability (i.e., % residents who had moved in <5 years); caregiver report of neighborhood crime (11 items, Wave 1); caregiver report of collective efficacy (Wave 3), using a modified version of Sampson’s scale.	In a multiple regression model including demographics, risk behaviors, family violence, and school factors, none of the neighborhood-level factors in Wave 1 were associated with physical DV-P. In a multiple regression model including demographics, risk behaviors, family violence, school factors, and Wave 1 neighborhood factors, collective efficacy was not associated with physical DV-P for the full sample, but was (counter-intuitively) positively associated it with for among Black males ($\beta=0.21, p=0.05$).
Waller,	Cross-sectional	Age 18-	DV-P	DV-V	D&SC	AO	ND	SD	Alcohol outlet density was not associated with physical DV-		

Appendix
Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence Among Youth: A Systematic Review
Johnson et al.

et al. (2012a)	analysis data from the school-based National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) collected during Wave 3 (n=4,432).	27 years; 100% female; 11% Hispanic; 71% white; 14% black; 3% Asian, American Indian 1%	Past year physical DV-V assessed with 2 items on aggressive acts; Past year sexual DV-V assessed with 1 item. The outcome variable had 3 levels: physical DV-V only (13%); physical and sexual dating violence victimization or sexual DV-V only (6%); and no dating violence victimization.	Alcohol outlet density was operationalized as the number of on- and off-premise alcohol outlets per square kilometer, aggregated to the Census Tract level. Neighborhood poverty was a composite of variables from the 2000 U.S. Census: % unemployed, % below poverty level, and % FHH. Transience was a composite of: % who had moved <5 years; and the % of non-owner-occupied housing units. Additional variables included: % who were born outside the U.S. ; and the % of vacant housing units .	V. After adjustment for drinking, age, race, alcohol outlet density, marital status, childhood abuse, neighborhood transience was associated with a marginally reduced likelihood of physical DV-V (aOR=0.99, p<0.01; ref=no victimization). After adjustment for drinking, age, race, alcohol outlet density, marital status, childhood abuse, neighborhood poverty was associated with a marginally increased likelihood of physical or sexual DV-V (aOR = 1.01, p<0.05; ref=no victimization).
Waller, et al. (2012b)	Cross-sectional analysis of Add Health data collected during Wave 3 (n=3,197).	Age 18-27 year; 100% male; 13% Hispanic; 69% White; 15% Black; 3% Asian; American Indian 1%	DV-P DV-V Past year physical DV-V assessed with 2 items on aggressive acts; Past year sexual DV-V assessed with 1 item. The outcome variable had 3 levels: physical DV-V only (16%); physical and sexual dating violence victimization or sexual DV-V only (6%); and no dating violence victimization.	D&SC AO ND SD See Waller et al. (2012a)	After adjustment for drinking, high alcohol outlet density was associated with physical DV-V (ref=no victimization, aOR=2.07, 95% CI: 1.19-3.63). After adjustment for drinking, age, race, alcohol outlet density, marital status, and childhood abuse, none of the neighborhood-level factors were associated with dating violence victimization.
Waller,	Cross-sectional	Ages 18-	DV-P DV-V	D&SC AO ND SD	After adjustment for drinking, race, age, marital status, and

Appendix
Neighborhood Factors and Dating Violence Among Youth: A Systematic Review
Johnson et al.

et al. (2013)	analysis of Add Health data collected during Wave 3 (n=3,194).	26 years; 100% men; 13% Hispanic, 69% White, 15% Black, 3% Asian; American Indian 1%	Past year physical DV-P assessed with 2 items on aggressive acts; Past year sexual DV-P assessed with 1 item. The outcome variable had 3 levels: physical DV-P only (12%); physical and sexual dating violence perpetration or sexual DV-P only (4%); and no dating violence perpetration.	See Waller et al. (2012a)	childhood abuse, high alcohol outlet density was associated with physical DV-P (ref=no perpetration, aOR=1.86, 95% CI: 1.05-3.27). Neighborhood poverty, transience, foreign-born citizens, and vacant housing units were not associated with dating violence perpetration, after adjustment for drinking, race, age, marital status, and childhood abuse, and alcohol outlet density.
---------------	--	--	--	---------------------------	--

FHH, female-headed households; CTS, Conflict Tactics Scales; DV-V, dating violence victimization; DV-P, dating violence perpetration; D&SC, demographic and structural characteristics; AO, alcohol outlets; ND, neighborhood disorder; SD, social disorganization; NS, not statistically significant. Official state abbreviations, as designated by the U.S. Census, are used.

Notes. Analyses are cross-sectional unless otherwise noted. The reported *n* represents the number of subjects in the analytic sample.

Waller et al., 2012a: Waller MW, Iritani BJ, Christ SL, Clark HK, Moracco KE, Halpern CT, et al. Relationships among alcohol outlet density, alcohol use, and intimate partner violence victimization among young women in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 2012;27:2062-86.

Waller et al., 2012b: Waller MW, Iritani BJ, Christ SL, Tucker Halpern C, Moracco KE, Flewelling RL. Perpetration of intimate partner violence by young adult males: the association with alcohol outlet density and drinking behavior. *Health & Place* 2013;21:10-9.