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OBJECTIVES

• Describe the qualitative analytic strategy of creating nested typologies to construct a theoretical framework.

• Demonstrate how this strategy was used in a study of adolescent dating violence.
FUNDING

• Study was funded by the Centers for Disease Control, Center for Injury Prevention and Control [RO1 1CE00183-01]
TYPOLOGY

Qualitative typological classification: Systematic and methodologically guided qualitative procedures to divide cases based on one or more selected features or characteristics
QUALITATIVE CROSS-CASE ANALYSIS

- Determine the primary theoretically relevant characteristics of cases
- Examine cases for repeating patterns or configurations of characteristics
- Aggregate the cases into groups that have
  - Internal homogeneity
  - External heterogeneity
- Abstract, interpret, and summarize the groups to determine types

NESTED TYPOLOGIES

◆ A series of empirically derived typologies combined to construct a “higher order” typology to capture the complexity of a phenomenon of interest.
Purpose of study: To develop a mid-range theory that describes, explains, and predicts how dating violence unfolds in adolescence

88 young adults (18 to 21) who experienced adolescent dating violence as teens

Community recruitment techniques

Two-phase interview
- Life narrative interviews
- Event-focused interviews

Data analysis:
- First-Level Typology: Aggressive Events
- Second-Level Typology: Aggressive Relationships
- Third-Level Typology: Trajectories of Adolescent Dating Violence
FIRST-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: AGGRESSIVE EVENTS

◆ A typology of common aggressive events that occur in the context of adolescent dating relationships
FIRST-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: AGGRESSIVE EVENTS

◆ Situational or events perspective
  ▪ Focuses on interactional sequences rather than characteristics of actors
FIRST-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: AGGRESSIVE EVENTS

- Extract all descriptions of specific violent events
- Develop event grids (n = 184)
- Develop case-by-domain matrix
- Conduct the cross-case analysis
## FIRST-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: EVENT GRID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant 018 Event 1</th>
<th>Context: Apartment couple shares, no one else present, no weapons, no drugs or alcohol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Precursors**          | Couple had not defined issues of exclusiveness  
Participan became interested in a classmate  
Partner described as “jealous” |
| **Antecedents**         | Partner discovered texts from classmate  
Partner confronts participant |
| **First act of aggression** | Participant screams at partner for going through her phone |
| **Second act of aggression** | Partner grabs the phone and throws it out open window |
| **Point of escalation** | Participant slaps partner across the face  
Partner pushes participant to ground; she hits her head on corner of table |
| **Point of de-escalation** | Partner rushes to participant asking if she is okay  
Participant says her head hurts |
| **Aftermath**           | Couple goes to urgent care; says injury was from fall, tested for concussion, no further treatment  
Partner apologizes “profusely” and participant agrees not to see classmate again |
# FIRST-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: CASE-BY-DOMAIN MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Precursors</th>
<th>Antecedents</th>
<th>First aggressive act</th>
<th>Second aggressive act</th>
<th>Other aggressive acts</th>
<th>Escalation</th>
<th>De-Escalation</th>
<th>Aftermath</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>018-1</td>
<td>Apartment C shares C were alone</td>
<td>Relationship rules unclear P became interested in a classmate Pa became &quot;jealous&quot;</td>
<td>Pa found text from classmate Pa confronts P</td>
<td>P <em>screams</em> at Pa for going through her phone</td>
<td>Pa <em>grabs</em> the phone and <em>throws</em> it out open window</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C goes to urgent care saying injury was from fall, tested for concussion, no further treatment Pa apologizes &quot;profusely&quot; and P agrees not to see classmate again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030-2</td>
<td>School hallway</td>
<td>Other students present</td>
<td>Pa feels he is dating &quot;up&quot; Pa &quot;in control&quot; of what C does</td>
<td>Pa <em>drops</em> books and P <em>fails</em> to pick them up</td>
<td>Pa <em>berates</em> P saying he was lazy and stupid P &quot;mortified&quot; as crowd gathered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042-5</td>
<td>P's cousin's house Many friends/family present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P = participant; Pa = partner; C = couple; W = weapons; D/A = drugs/alcohol involved
# FIRST-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: CODING CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Core characteristics (always occurring)</th>
<th>Key characteristics (occurring most of the time)</th>
<th>Common characteristics (commonly occurring)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tumultuous | Noisy and disorderly, confusedly or violently agitated | 1. The event would be **best described** as tumultuous  
2. The trajectory of the event is chaotic, dramatic, and involves a complex series of interactions | 1. Bidirectional violence, although of different severity  
2. Third parties involved in the incident  
3. Drugs and/or alcohol used by one or more of the partners or others present  
4. “Spills out” from one locale  
5. Story is hard-to-follow; details change on second telling | 1. Weapons  
2. Law enforcement involvement  
3. Injury |
| Explosive | Giving vent to an emotion, suddenly or violently | 1. The event would be **best described** as explosive  
2. The trajectory of the event involves escalation to an identifiable and defining explosive event  
3. The event would not meet criteria for a tumultuous event | 1. An argument escalates towards an explosive event that is usually physical but may be verbal  
2. Bidirectional violence, but typically one partner initiates the explosive violence and the other person defends himself/herself in some way  
3. Third parties involved as rescuers, bystanders, or supporters after the event | 1. Drugs or alcohol use by one partner, usually the explosive partner  
2. Weapons  
3. Law enforcement involvement  
4. Injury  
5. Apology |
| Scuffling | A confused or disorderly struggle between people at close quarters, usually one regarded as minor and not resulting in serious harm | 1. The event would be **best described** as scuffling  
2. The trajectory involves a series of somewhat minor arguments or altercations, has a back an forth or progressive quality but no major escalation  
3. Does not meet criteria for a tumultuous or an explosive event because the violence is not as severe or the event is not as chaotic | 1. Bidirectional violence, combination of verbal abuse and "mild" physical abuse (slapping, scratching, grabbing). | 1. Minor injuries at most (scars, scratches)  
2. Weapons are household or ordinary items (e.g., spatula) |
TYPES OF DATING VIOLENCE EVENTS

1. Tumultuous events
2. Explosive events
3. Scuffling events
4. Violating events
5. Threatening events
6. Controlling events
7. Disparaging events
8. Rejecting, ignoring, disrespecting events
TUMULTUOUS EVENTS

Noisy and disorderly, confusedly or violently agitated
EXPLOSIVE EVENTS

Giving vent to an emotion, suddenly or violently
SCUFFLING EVENTS

A confused or disorderly struggle between people at close quarters, usually one regarded as minor and not resulting in serious harm.
VIOLATING EVENTS

Disregarding, disturbing, or defiling something scared
THREATENING EVENTS

Expressing an intention to do something that will cause harm, trouble, or inconvenience to somebody else unless that person does what is demanded.
CONTROLLING EVENTS

Limiting or restricting somebody or something
DISPARAGING EVENTS

Showing or expressing disapproval or contempt, often with a barrage of insults or putdowns.
REJECTING, IGNORING, DISPRECTING EVENTS

Behaving unkindly, not showing attention, or showing a lack of respect when the other person has a right to expect it due to the nature of the relationship.
SECOND-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: AGGRESSIVE RELATIONSHIPS

◆ A typology of aggressive relationships in which adolescent dating violence occurs
SECOND-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: AGGRESSIVE RELATIONSHIPS

- List event types in chronological order for each aggressive relationship
- Develop relationship grids (n = 114)
- Develop case-by-domain matrix
- Conduct the cross-case analysis
### SECOND-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: RELATIONSHIP GRID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Event 1</th>
<th>Event 2</th>
<th>Event 3</th>
<th>Event 4</th>
<th>Event 5</th>
<th>Event 6</th>
<th>Event 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>007-RELATIONSHIP 1</td>
<td>Violating</td>
<td>Violating</td>
<td>Violating</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Violating</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007-RELATIONSHIP 2</td>
<td>Maltreatment</td>
<td>Maltreatment</td>
<td>Maltreatment</td>
<td>Maltreatment</td>
<td>Disparaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007-RELATIONSHIP 3</td>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>Explosive</td>
<td>Tumultuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089-RELATIONSHIP 1</td>
<td>Explosive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089-RELATIONSHIP 2</td>
<td>Scuffling</td>
<td>Scuffling</td>
<td>Scuffling</td>
<td>Scuffling</td>
<td>Scuffling</td>
<td>Scuffling</td>
<td>Scuffling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092-RELATIONSHIP 1</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Controlling</td>
<td>Violating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SECOND-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: AGGRESSIVE RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECURRING AGGRESSION</th>
<th>PRIMARILY TWO-DIRECTIONAL</th>
<th>PRIMARILY ONE-DIRECTIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TURBULENT RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td>Marked by frequent and frenzied, dramatic, and often violent altercations between partners. Most common type of aggressive events: tumultuous, interspersed with explosive and scuffling.</td>
<td><strong>MALTREATING RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRAWLING RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td>Marked by angry and heated physical fights between partners.</td>
<td><strong>VOLATILE RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BICKERING RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td>Marked by frequent petulant and peevish arguments or wrangling between partners. Most common types of aggressive events: scuffling.</td>
<td><strong>DEPRECATING RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRUSIVE RELATIONSHIPS</strong></td>
<td>Marked by attempts by one partner to contact, spend time, or dictate the actions of the other with behaviors that are unwelcome, disruptive, or uninvited. Most common types of aggressive events: controlling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THIRD-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: TRAJECTORIES OF ADOLESCENT DATING VIOLENCE

◆ A typology of trajectories of dating violence throughout adolescence
THIRD-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: TRAJECTORIES OF ADOLESCENT DATING VIOLENCE

- List relationship types in the order that the relationships occurred
- Develop trajectory grids (n = 88)
- Develop case-by-domain matrix
- Conduct the cross-case analysis
## THIRD-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: TRAJECTORY GRIDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-HIGH SCHOOL</th>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
<th>SECOND YEAR</th>
<th>THIRD YEAR</th>
<th>FOURTH YEAR</th>
<th>POST-HIGH SCHOOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turbulent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>Bickering</td>
<td>Bickering</td>
<td>Deprecating Maltreating</td>
<td>Volatile</td>
<td>Volatile</td>
<td>Volatile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>088</td>
<td>Maltreating</td>
<td>Maltreating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bickering</td>
<td>Bickering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# THIRD-LEVEL TYPOLOGY: TRAJECTORIES OF ADOLESCENT DATING VIOLENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trajectories</th>
<th>Number of Aggressive Relationships</th>
<th>Trajectory Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contained ADV</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>&lt; 1 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prolonged ADV</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>&gt; 1 academic year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetitive ADV</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>No change in violence severity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escalating ADV</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Increased violence severity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS

1. Nested typologies provide an alternative to typologies that are based on one group characteristic (e.g., physical, sexual, emotional violence) to capture more complex phenomena.

2. Cross-case analysis allows investigators to determine which group characteristics are most meaningful in understanding the phenomenon (e.g., essence rather than severity of aggression).

3. Adolescent dating violence is an example of a phenomenon that occurs on several “levels” and therefore provides an exemplar for the use of nested typologies.