SESSION INTRODUCTION: The proliferation of scientific scholarship has many benefits, but it also creates challenges for researchers trying to keep up-to-date on the latest findings. This will be one of two related sessions of 20X20 talks that bring together an experienced group of violence researchers. Each researcher will highlight some of the most important findings from their empirical research programs from the last several years. The presentations focus on "big picture" findings, including those that present new conceptual models, de-bunk widely held myths, present strengths-based alternatives to working with victims and perpetrators of violence, and offer provocative new avenues for increasing the impact of the field's efforts to prevent violence. The presentations address health inequities, especially the disparities in outcomes among those exposed to violence compared to those who are not, but also differences in risk and protective factors among numerous vulnerable groups, including rural Appalachians, LGBT youth and young adults, inner-city youth, and substance-using youth.

Panel I will focus on risk and protective factors and a range of under-recognized or over-simplified risk and protective factors. Liu and colleagues explore the influence of a group that has received surprisingly little attention in many violence prevention efforts: parents and their role in preventing dating violence. Low et al likewise take up the influence of parents and longitudinally examine the role of externalizing behaviors in the link between early violence exposure and later partner violence perpetration. Mitchell Lema and colleagues address widespread stereotypes about cyberbullying versus in-person bullying and help the field focus on the most distressing aspects of peer victimization. Sterzinger et al. focus on microaggressions as part of the cumulative burden of victimization for individuals with LGBT identities and propose ways to incorporate multiple identities into a more comprehensive model of victimization. Temple and Choi address the intersecting vulnerabilities of alcohol use and intimate partner violence. Although these are often treated as separate issues, they have many interconnections and effective prevention programming would benefit from addressing these links. Ybarra and Chen take up the issue of cyberbullying and the challenges of bringing theoretical consistency to the bullying literature as more victimization moves online.

1ST PAPER WITHIN ORGANIZED 20 X 20 PRESENTATION

TITLE: Early Exposure to Parental Violence and Young Adult IPV: A Developmental Dynamics Systems Model

Introduction: Systematic reviews of predictors of young adult IPV indicate early exposure to violence, as well as youth psychopathology, are robust predictors. Yet, few studies use prospective designs or integrate proximal relationship processes. Aims of the current study were to employ a developmental dynamics system model, to consider the conjoint influence of family, individual and relationship dynamics on young adult IPV. Specifically, we examined early childhood exposure to parental IPV, internalizing and externalizing symptoms during adolescence, and young adult IPV and relationship dynamics.
**Methods:** Data for this paper were drawn from a longitudinal study of children who were part of the LIFT evaluation in early childhood. When participants turned 18, they were invited to participate in a couples assessment, which comprised 323 youth (184 females, 139 males; average age 21 years,) and their partners (146 females, 177 males, average age 22). The sample was community-based, but high risk as indicated by arrest records. Both parents completed the CTS during early childhood, and both youth and their partner reported on physical, psychological and sexual IPV in young adulthood. A multi-reporter strategy was used to create internalizing and externalizing constructs during adolescence. Lastly, observational data was utilized to assess negative interaction during young adulthood (with romantic partner).

**Results:** Analyses were conducted in Mplus version 7.3 (Muthen & Muthen, 2012). First, three simple mediation models were fitted, examining whether adolescent psychopathology mediated the effect of early IPV exposure on young adult IPV perpetration. Next, we examined whether the mediating role of adolescent psychopathology in predicting young adulthood IPV perpetration from childhood IPV exposure differentially operated depending on (a) whether boys or girls were observed to have had greater adolescent psychopathology attributable to childhood IPV exposure or (b) the amount of time both partners spent negatively engaged during real-time interactions. Results suggest that adolescent externalizing (but not internalizing) behaviors are a mechanism through which IPV is transmitted across generations, with boys who were exposed to IPV as children as well as couples who spent more time negatively engagement with one another at even more heightened risk for IPV perpetration in young adulthood.

**Conclusion:** Findings suggest that exposure to moderate levels of parental IPV are more strongly related to externalizing symptoms versus internalizing, when assessed longitudinally, especially for males. Furthermore, these data suggest that proximal relationship processes, based on observed interaction, contribute to risk for IPV involvement. Findings are discussed in regards to intervention and theory, and translational science more broadly.

**2ND PAPER WITHIN ORGANIZED 20 X 20 PRESENTATION**

**TITLE:** Sexual Orientation, Gender, and Gender Identity Microaggressions: Toward an Intersectional Framework for Prevention Research

Microaggressions are a covert, subtle, and often unconsciously perpetrated form of discrimination that can negatively impact the target’s mental and behavioral health. Although microaggressions can contribute to health disparities for marginalized groups, little is known about the frequency, mechanisms, and impact of microaggressions on sexual minorities, cisgender women, and gender minorities—particularly for those with intersecting marginalized identities (e.g., Black transwomen). This 20x20 extends our current understanding of microaggressions by (a) examining the theoretical mechanisms of minority stress and historical, vicarious, and individual-level trauma that can potentially explain the impact of microaggressions on health and well-being and (b) proposing future research directions for prevention science that explore the potential influence of developmental processes (e.g., physical maturation and identity development) and social contexts (e.g., family, education, and supportive safe spaces) on mental and behavioral health outcomes. For example, gender-based microaggressions (e.g., sexual objectification) may start earlier and be more impactful for girls who experience early menarche, while transgender microaggressions may be more impactful
when experienced within spaces that are designed to be safe and supportive (e.g., transwomen telling other transwomen how to properly enact femininity) in comparison to microaggressions experienced by strangers on the street. This presentation concludes with a discussion of the implications of an intersectional microaggression framework for prevention research and practice. While it remains essential for prevention researchers to understand the nature and effects of single-identity based forms of microaggressions (e.g., microaggressions experienced by a White, heterosexual, able-bodied, cisgender female), a multiplicative model is needed that recognizes single incidents of intersectional microaggressions that simultaneously target multiple aspects of an individual’s identity (i.e., race, gender identity, and sexual orientation) may be profoundly more impactful.

3RD PAPER WITHIN ORGANIZED 20 X 20 PRESENTATION

TITLE: Does Technology Amplify Harm Associated with Peer Harassment? the Importance of Testing Assumptions

Peer harassment and bullying continue to be prevalent problems for youth but there is particularly high anxiety around use of technology in these situations. This concern stems mainly from the idea that technology-based harassment and bullying could cause greater harm than traditional forms. There are a variety of thoughts about why this might be the case; many of which are based on anecdotal events as well as assumptions about the technology and how kids today are using it. Findings from the national Technology Harassment Victimization (THV) Study of 791 youth, ages 10-20, is among the first to shed light on these assumptions of why technology might increase distress resulting from peer harassment victimization.

Thirty-four percent of youth reported at least one peer harassment victimization in the past year (n=230 youth). These youth talked to us about a total of 311 unique harassment incidents. Of these incidents, over half (54%) only occurred in-person – no technology was involved in any way; 31% were mixed in-person and technology incidents where the harassment occurred in both types of environments; and 15% only occurred through technology.

In this 20x20 talk four common assumptions about why technology might amplify the harm of peer harassment will be discussed by drawing on quantitative findings from the THV Study. Specifically, the assumptions that: 1) more youth can see the abuse and join in when it occurs online; 2) the ability to post content anonymously and to widespread audiences is expanded through technology; 3) the idea that victims cannot get away from it once harassing content is online; and 4) that incidents involving technology are actually more emotionally upsetting. Findings should help to quell concerns about possible inherently harmful features of technology. Youth reporting mixed technology and in-person harassment should be a priority for educators and prevention experts who are trying to identify the most serious and harmful experiences.

4TH PAPER WITHIN ORGANIZED 20 X 20 PRESENTATION

TITLE: Profiles of Parent-Child Interactions Predicting Adolescent Relationship Abuse and Conditional Tolerance: A Latent Class Analysis

Research shows that adolescent relationship abuse (ARA, also known as teen dating violence or
TDV) is a widespread public health problem with significant negative consequences. Anecdotal evidence suggests that parents play an important role in adolescents’ attitudes about ARA as well as their ARA perpetration and victimization experiences. Families for Safe Dates and other family-based TDV interventions are built upon the notion that parents play important roles in preventing ARA. Research to date has been limited to local samples providing youth reports of the parent-child interaction, with little attention to dating-specific communications. Moreover, past studies took a variable centered approach (e.g., regression analysis). Questions about whether there are distinguishable profiles of parent-youth interactions have been left unanswered. Using an innovative person-centered approach (latent class analysis), this study was set to identify profiles based on six measures of parent-child relationship and interactions, including dating restrictions, dating guidance, parent-child communication, physical punishment, parent-child relationship quality, as well as critical parenting. The data are from the nationally representative Survey on Teen Relationships and Intimate Violence (STRiV; N=1,117) study of youth ages 12-18. A three-class model was selected to best represent the data, including (1) a “positive parenting” class featuring a positive relationship with the child, a high level of dating guidance (with some dating restrictions), a high likelihood of communicating about sex and birth control, little or no harsh or critical parenting; (2) a “harsh parenting” class, featuring a negative relationship with the child, strict dating rules, high probability of communicating about sex and birth control with child, harsh and critical parenting; and (3) a “poor parenting” class featured with negative relationship with child, little dating guidance or restrictions, lack of communication about sex and birth control and a high likelihood of harsh and critical parenting. Several parent and child covariates predict class membership, aiding prevention program and message design. In addition, children in the “positive parenting” class are significantly less likely to perpetrate ARA and to be tolerant of violence against boys under any conditions. Effects of class membership on ARA victimization and conditional tolerance of violence against girls are in the expected direction, but failed to reach statistical significance. Findings point out the need to addressing parent-child relationship and interaction issues in universal prevention programs aiming to reduce ARA victimization and perpetration, as well as indicated efforts to target specific groups. Detailed implications for prevention research will be discussed.

5TH PAPER WITHIN ORGANIZED 20 X 20 PRESENTATION

TITLE: The Inextricable and Temporal Link Between Dating Violence and Alcohol Use

Introduction: Although the link between alcohol use and dating violence (DV) is well established, their longitudinal association is less understood. To address this gap in knowledge, we examine 1) whether there are distinct subgroups based on past-year DV and alcohol use and 2) whether female adolescents change DV and alcohol use classes over time.

Method: Waves 2, 3, and 4 of an ongoing 6-year longitudinal study were used. 550 female adolescents from 7 public high schools in Texas participated in the study (Wave 2 mean age=16.1, SD=.79). Approximately one third of participants self-identified their racial/ethnic background as Hispanic, White, or African American. The Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (Wolfe et al., 2001) and yearly alcohol use, monthly alcohol use, and episodic heavy drinking were used to identify Latent DV and alcohol use classes. Latent Transition Analysis (LTA) with measurement invariance was used to examine transition probability of an individual’s latent status at Wave 3(4) given their latent status at Wave 2(3).
Results: Five DV and alcohol-user classes were identified: 1) Not-involved/users (NIU, 28.5% at W2, 30.9% at W3, 26.4% at W4); 2) Only Psychological Abuse involved (PsyI, 15% at w2, 14% at w3, 7.8% at W4); 3) Psychological abuse-involved alcohol users (PsyAU, 18.5% at w2, 16.9% at w3, 21.6% at w4), 4) Only Alcohol Users (AU, 23.6% at w2, 24.4% at w3, 30.5% at w4), and 5) Psychological and Physically-involved alcohol users (PsyPhyAU, 14.1% at w2, 16% at w3, 13.6%). LTA showed that the majority of females stayed in the same class over time. When AU moved to different classes, they were more likely to transition to PsyAU across waves. When PsyI moved to different classes, they were more likely to transition to either NIU or PsyPhyAU. Also, PsyAU were more likely to move to either AU or PsyPhyAU from wave2 to 3 whereas PsyAU were most likely to move to AU only from wave 3 to 4. However, PsyPhyAU were more likely to move to either AU or PsyI from wave2 to 3 while PsyPhyAU were more likely to move to PsyAU or AU from wave3 to 4.

Discussion: Most female adolescents remained in the same DV/alcohol class over time. When a change did occur, it was generally to a more severe class. Interventions will benefit by targeting DV and alcohol use or, more efficiently, targeting the shared risk and protective factors of both behaviors before either begins.

6TH PAPER WITHIN ORGANIZED 20 X 20 PRESENTATION

TITLE: The Importance of Differential Power and Repetition As Defining Features of Cyberbullying

It’s hard to remember that only a decade ago, the term “cyberbullying” was just beginning to emerge in the public’s consciousness as ‘A Thing’. Since then, both media and research attention has resulted in a much needed raised public awareness of the larger problem of youth bullying. It also has resulted in overuse and misapplication of the term, often as a way to garner attention that might not otherwise be received without a buzzword in a media headline.

As with traditional (i.e., in-person or face-to-face) bullying, bullying that occurs online is a distinct type of aggression that is overlapping with, but different from, what some refer to as ‘online harassment.’ Consistent with Olweus’ definition of bullying, we believe that cyberbullying must be intentional abuse that includes: (a) a power imbalance between the aggressor and victim, (b) repetition over time, and (c) intent. The definitions of both power imbalance and repetition as they relate to cyberbullying have been debated in the literature. We argue however that while the Internet has perhaps changed the way these features can be experienced, both power balance and repetition should be used when defining whether an online experience meets the criteria for bullying or not.

In this talk, we will provide concrete examples and comparisons of online and offline experiences (e.g., anonymity as form of imbalance of power) as well as present data demonstrating the differential psychosocial correlates of those bullied online versus those who are victims of other types of online peer aggression. We assert that it is critical to be clear and consistent with the terms researchers use and their associated definitions if we are to make progress in the field. Within this context, we argue that cyberbullying needs to be applied only in circumstances that meet the definition of bullying: purposefully aggressive incidents between people with differential power and that is repetitive over time. At the same time, we echo
Finkelhor and colleagues’ call to focus not only on bullying, but also on peer victimization more generally; and to focus not only on online spaces, but all of the spaces and places youth need to learn how to navigate healthfully.