

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1996

Is There a Connection? An Exploratory Study of Abuse Experiences and Perpetration Patterns Among College Males

Monique R. Frazier
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Frazier, Monique R., "Is There a Connection? An Exploratory Study of Abuse Experiences and Perpetration Patterns Among College Males" (1996). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 6091.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/6091>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



IS THERE A CONNECTION? AN EXPLORATORY STUDY OF
ABUSE EXPERIENCES AND PERPETRATION PATTERNS
AMONG COLLEGE MALES

by

Monique R. Frazier

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1996

Copyright © Monique R. Frazier 1996

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Is There a Connection? An Exploratory Study of
Abuse Experiences and Perpetration Patterns
Among College Males

by

Monique R. Frazier, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1996

Major Professor: Dr. Frank Ascione
Department: Psychology

The purpose of this study was to examine self-reported experiences of primary, secondary, and perpetrated abuse of an emotional, physical, and sexual nature among a male, nonclinical, noncriminal sample. One hundred forty-two subjects completed the Youth Experiences and Behaviors Questionnaire (YEBQ) (developed by the author) and the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). Results indicated that overall, the YEBQ demonstrated moderate to high levels of internal consistency reliability and moderate levels of concurrent and divergent validity. Various descriptive statistics, scale, and subscale correlations for the YEBQ were provided.

Results indicated that secondary abuse information was most predictive of later abuse perpetration with the exception of sexual abuse. Primary and secondary abuse

information was found to be most predictive of abuse perpetration types of the same nature (e.g., emotional abuse history/witness scores best predicted emotional abuse perpetration scores and family abuse history/witness scores best predicted abuse perpetration toward family members scores) except in the cases of sexual abuse and stranger abuse. Theoretical interpretations and implications for these results are provided.

(147 pages)

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my family. To my mom, dad, and brother--Ida, Bud, and Brandon Poppinga--who provided me with a wonderful childhood, instilled in me the desire to put forth my best effort in all things, encourage me in my educational endeavors, and love me unconditionally.

I give special thanks and love to my husband and greatest source of happiness--Lance--who in addition to helping me improve my writing skills, always shows interest and pride in my work and wholeheartedly supports my career ambitions. More importantly, he is constantly teaching me the value of living a balanced life and has shown me a beautiful world beyond that of school.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Frank Ascione for his support and assistance throughout the course of this project. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee: Dr. Ken Merrell, a caring advisor whose door is always open, for his encouragement, confidence in my abilities, and unfailing advice; Dr. Xiato Fan for his patient explanations and expert counsel regarding statistical matters; and Dr. Sue Crowley for her support, humor, and help in setting limits on the project. I am very grateful to my friend and research assistant, Marla Bowen, without whose excellent work habits and enthusiasm I could not have completed the project. I would like to specially thank the Psychology Department secretaries, Karen Ranson, Cathryn Peterson, and Jennifer Watts, for their assistance in collecting data, and for their encouragement and support--it meant a great deal. I am also indebted to the many USU professors who graciously helped recruit subjects for the project. Finally, I would like to thank my classmates and best of friends--Tracy, Benita, Mike, and Chris--for being there through thick and thin and for making graduate school a wonderful experience.

Monique R. Frazier

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
CHAPTER	
I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Purpose and Objectives	3
Research Questions	4
Operational Definitions	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Abuse Prevalence Rates	7
How Abuse Is Examined	11
Lack of Differentiation	13
Abuse Samples	18
The Sexual Abuse Cycle in Females	19
The Sexual Abuse Cycle in Males	20
The Physical Abuse Cycle in Males	23
Secondary Abuse	25
III. METHODOLOGY	32
Subjects	32
Procedures	33
Measures	36
IV. RESULTS	46
Internal Reliability	46
Concurrent and Discriminant Validity	48
Descriptive Statistics	51
Correlational Statistics	61
V. CONCLUSIONS	69
YEBQ Internal Consistency Reliability	69
Concurrent and Discriminant Validity	70
Descriptive and Correlational Data	74
Limitations	87

REFERENCES 90

APPENDIXES 99

 APPENDIX A: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW

 BOARD APPROVAL 100

 APPENDIX B: RECRUITMENT MEMORANDUM 103

 APPENDIX C: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET 105

 APPENDIX D: YOUTH EXPERIENCES AND

 BEHAVIORS QUESTIONNAIRE 107

 APPENDIX E: CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE 132

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Description of Subjects	34
2 Internal Reliability of the YEBQ (Cronbach's Alpha)	47
3 Concurrent Validity Coefficients	49
4 Discriminant Validity Coefficients	51
5 Descriptive Statistics for YEBQ Scores (Mean, Median, Mode, <u>SD</u> , Min., Max., and Var.)	52
6 Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Primary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) <u>N</u> = 142	57
7 Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Secondary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) <u>N</u> = 142	57
8 Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Perpetrating Abuse (By Category of Victim) <u>N</u> = 142	58
9 YEBQ Scale and Subscale Correlations (Perpetration Scale Score with: History and Witness Scale Scores; Emotional, Physical, and Sexual Subscale Scores; and Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger Subscale Scores) <u>N</u> = 142	62
10 YEBQ Subscale Correlations (Emotional, Physical, and Sexual History Plus Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscales)	64
11 YEBQ Subscale Correlations (Emotional, Physical, and Sexual History and Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores)	65
12 YEBQ Subscale Correlations (Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger History Plus Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores)	66
13 YEBQ Subscale Correlations (Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger History and Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores)	67

CHAPTER I

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

The emotional, physical, and sexual abuse of children is a pervasive, destructive, clinically, and socially significant problem in our society. Because of the prevalence of child abuse and its devastating impact on children, families, and society at large, further research is desperately needed.

Over the last several decades, an extensive literature base analyzing various factors related to child abuse has evolved. Studies examining incidence and prevalence rates, risk factors, correlates, potential causes, short- and long-term effects, prevention strategies, and treatments for victims and abusers have all been conducted in the hopes of alleviating the problems related to child abuse.

One crucial finding that has arisen from this work is the discovery that those who commit abusive acts tend to have suffered abuse in their own childhoods (Bowers, 1990; Wahler & Dumas, 1986; Walsh, 1992; Widom, 1989b,c; Widom, 1988). This phenomenon where some individuals abused in their youth later victimize others has been variably referred to as the "cycle of violence" (Widom, 1989c), the "victim-perpetrator cycle" (Browne & Finkelhor, 1986), and "cross-generational violence" (Wahler & Dumas, 1986). (For a thorough review of cross-generational violence studies,

see Kaufman & Zigler, 1987; Wahler & Dumas, 1986.) Widom (1989a) described the cycle as a process where certain abused children become abusers and certain victims of violence become violent victimizers. Although she and others (e.g., Hunter, 1990; Kaufman & Zigler, 1987) take care to note that most abused children do not become abusers, Widom has acknowledged that being abused as a child significantly increases one's risk of having an adult criminal record, and for males, a violent one (1989a).

The existing research on the transmission of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse across generations has provided us with vital information. Direction for further research, however, is found by noting the following deficiencies or gaps in the cross-generational abuse literature.

First, most research on the victim-perpetrator cycle has tended to limit itself to a single form of maltreatment with the preponderance of attention focusing on sexual abuse (Briere & Runtz, 1990). Studies examining the separate and compound patterns of psychological, physical, and sexual abuse victimization and perpetration are scarce.

Second, the literature has tended to focus more on girls who are victims of abuse to the neglect of boys who have experienced mistreatment in their upbringing.

Third, research has largely been inclined toward emphasizing the effects of direct abuse experiences rather than the individual and combined impact that experiencing

and witnessing abuse may have on future behavior. A notable exception to this general rule is the increasing attention given to children who witness domestic violence and animal/pet abuse (Ascione, 1995; Brier, 1987; Carrol, 1977; Milner, Robertson, & Rogers, 1990; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980).

Finally, studies examining abuse experiences have centered around criminal or clinical samples. Information regarding abuse among nonclinical, noncriminal groups for purposes of normative comparison is lacking.

Purpose and Objectives

In an attempt to address these weaknesses, the current study examined a male, nonclinical, noncriminal sample's self-reported experiences of psychological, physical, and sexual abuse. This examination included an assessment of primary (first-hand) and secondary (witnessed) victimization experiences of respondents as well as their perpetration of abusive acts.

The Youth Experiences and Behaviors Questionnaire (YEBQ) has been developed by the author to gain this information. The YEBQ is a 145-item questionnaire that assesses (a) emotional, physical, and sexual abuse (abuse type); (b) abuse of a primary, secondary, and perpetrated nature (abuse context); and (c) abuse committed by and toward family members, acquaintances, strangers, and

pets/animals (perpetrator/victim category). The YEBQ also assesses the frequency and severity of any abuse individuals report having suffered or committed. The self-report data gathered from this instrument served to provide comprehensive descriptive and correlational findings on abuse victimization and perpetration patterns reported by college males. This information may also serve as normative comparison data for abuse studies of male clinical and criminal samples.

Since the YEBQ is a new instrument, another purpose of the study was to assess its level of internal reliability. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of the YEBQ.

The final purpose of the study was to assess the YEBQ's level of concurrent and discriminant validity. This was accomplished by correlating scores from the YEBQ with scores from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979), an established measure of intra- and extrafamilial responses to conflict. For concurrent validity, CTS verbal and physical abuse scores were utilized. For discriminant validity, CTS reasoning scores were utilized.

Research Questions

1. What is the YEBQ's level of internal consistency reliability as determined by Cronbach's coefficient alpha?

2. What are the YEBQ's levels of concurrent and discriminant validity as based on correlations with scores from the CTS (Straus, 1979)?

3. What descriptive statistics (e.g., means, medians, modes, standard deviations, ranges, minimum and maximum values, variances, and percentages), scale, and subscale correlations are generated from this nonclinical sample of young men regarding their abuse histories and perpetration patterns?

Operational Definitions

As Fromuth and Burkhart (1987) highlighted, different definitions of abuse generate markedly different reported prevalence rates among college males (e.g., rates of sexual abuse vary from 4% to 24%, depending on the definition). It is therefore of utmost importance that emotional, physical, and sexual abuse definitions are deliberately specified with an awareness of their possible effects on endorsement rates of abuse experiences.

For this reason, self-definitions of abuse that allow social and cultural biases to affect perceptions of such experiences are not employed. Instead, the YEBQ provides standardized definitions for each type of abuse. By providing clear guidelines as to what constitutes abuse and various levels of frequency and severity, subjective interpretation is minimized.

To illustrate, the YEBQ states that a person has been emotionally hurt if another person has engaged in behavior (for the complete definition, see Appendix D) to make him/her feel very angry, scared, worthless or bad about him/herself. Note that for behaviors to be considered emotionally hurtful, they must occur on a regular basis or be severe. Scales #1 and #2 of the YEBQ provide guidelines for specifying the frequency and severity of emotional hurt (see Appendix D).

The YEBQ states that a person has been physically hurt if someone has used force or violence toward them (for the complete definition, see Appendix D) that caused them fear or pain. Scales #3 and #4 of the YEBQ provide guidelines for specifying the frequency and severity of physical hurt (see Appendix D).

The YEBQ states that a person has been sexually hurt if someone has performed any sexual or sexually-related act or behavior (for the complete definition, see Appendix D) towards them that made them uneasy or scared. Note that behaviors need not seem hurtful nor cause pain to be considered sexual hurt. This rather inclusive definition encompasses noncontact experiences and experiences with age peers. It also considers the individual's perception of the abuse. Scales #5 and #6 provide guidelines for specifying the frequency and severity of sexual hurt (see Appendix D).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This review will summarize specific areas of the child abuse and abuse cycle literature as well as identify gaps in the existing research. To begin with, prevalence rates for various types of abuse (emotional, physical, and sexual) as they occur in different populations will be provided. Second, the review will examine how researchers have typically studied abuse. Third, the common failures in the literature to differentiate between types of abuse (emotional, physical, and sexual) and to categorize perpetrators and victims (e.g., family members, acquaintances, strangers, or animals) are treated. Fourth, typical samples used in abuse cycle studies are described. Fifth, major findings from sexual abuse cycle studies in females and in males are considered. Sixth, physical abuse cycle research in males is discussed. Finally, secondary abuse or abuse that is witnessed, but not directly experienced by the victim, is addressed.

Abuse Prevalence Rates

Considerable uncertainty and debate exist about the extent of child abuse and neglect. The following section will provide statistics on the prevalence of various types of abuse from a number of studies.

McCurdy and Daro (1994), from their national surveys of appointed child protective service representatives, found that from 1985 to 1992, the rate of reports on abused and neglected children increased from 30 to 45 per 1,000, an increase of 50%. In 1992, close to 3 million children were reported as alleged victims of child maltreatment. Given the substantiation rate of 53% (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1988), this means that approximately 1,160,400 children were confirmed victims of abuse and neglect. Further analysis found that approximately 27% of reported cases involved physical abuse, 17% sexual abuse, 45% neglect, 7% emotional maltreatment, and 8% unspecified or other. Also, from 1985 to 1992, the fatality rate for abused and neglected children rose by 49%.

While these numbers are tragic, they are in all likelihood a gross underestimate of actual rates since half the cases of abuse or neglect identified by professionals are said to go unreported (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 1988). The remainder of the section will describe evidence from the perspective of children, parents, and adult recollections that paint an uglier picture, indeed.

In regard to witnessing physical abuse, a survey of 7- to 15-year-old, inner-city children found that 78% had witnessed a beating, 26% a shooting, and 30% a stabbing. Among 10- to 19-year-olds, 50% knew someone who had been

raped, over 26% knew someone who had been shot or stabbed, 50% had witnessed a robbery, over 34% had witnessed a stabbing or shooting, and 23% had witnessed a killing (Bell & Jenkins, 1993).

In regard to direct experiences of physical violence, 16% of 10- to 19-year-olds indicated having been the victim of a robbery, 22% threatened with a knife, 17% threatened with a gun, and 10% shot at. In regard to perpetration of physical abuse, over 15% admitted having pulled a knife, and almost 9% reported having stabbed someone. Twenty-one percent of elementary-school children indicated they were involved in fights at least once or twice a week.

In a study by Gelles (1978), 63% of anonymously surveyed parents reported at least one violent episode toward their child during the last year, and 73% reported at least one violent episode during the course of raising their child. Daro and Gelles (1992) found 45% of parents reported insulting or swearing at their children, and 53% reported spanking or hitting their children in the past year.

A self-report survey of community college students registered for services in a learning center (Miller & Miller, 1986) revealed that approximately one third had a history of moderate physical abuse and 5%-10% had a history of severe physical abuse during their developmental years. Physical abuse included being slapped or spanked (77% prevalence rate), hit with an object (33%), pushed or shoved

(24%), kicked, bit, or hit with a fist (13%), sexually abused (4%), or threatened with a knife or gun (2%).

In another self-report study conducted with 375 college students (Milner et al., 1990), 91.2% indicated having experienced some type of physical abuse (e.g., whipping, slapping/kicking, poking/punching, or hair pulling), about 21% some form of physical abuse sequelae (e.g., bruises/welts, cuts/scratches, dislocation, burns, or bone fractures), and over 10% some type of sexual abuse (e.g., inappropriate touching, sexual fondling, intercourse/rape, or exhibition/flashing). About 87% said they had witnessed some type of physical abuse, 15% had witnessed some form of physical abuse sequelae, and 5% had observed some type of sexual abuse. More males than females (95.7% versus 87.7%) reported a history of physical abuse, but more females (15.7% versus 4.3%) reported a history of sexual abuse.

In regard to sexual abuse among females, research on rape (Gavey, 1991; Koss, 1988) has revealed that more than half of women surveyed indicated experiencing some form of sexual abuse and more than one in four college-aged women identified themselves as victims of rape or attempted rape. Russell (1983) found that prior to age 18, approximately 16% of adult women experience incest and 38% may be victims of extrafamilial sexual abuse. In agreement with previous studies (e.g., Finkelhor, 1979), Runtz and Briere (1986) found that approximately 15% of undergraduate women were

identified as having had sexual contact with a person at least five years their senior before they reached age 15.

For males, Fromuth and Burkhart (1987) have noted that depending on the definition, childhood sexual abuse rates reported by college men vary from 4% (very restrictive definitions including only physical contact with adults that was negatively perceived) to 24% (more inclusive definitions including noncontact experiences such as exhibitionism).

In another study, 13%-15% of college males described at least one sexually abusive experience in childhood (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1989). Similarly, in a study of 200 university male students, 14% self-disclosed unwanted childhood sexual contact (Violato & Genuis, 1993). Based on a 1992 review of the data, Violato and Genuis (1993) reported a lower prevalence rate of 11.5% with the caution that this figure is probably low due to underreporting.

As is true of women, the majority of men's perpetrators have been found to be related to (71%; Roane, 1992) or known by (83%-96%; Fromuth & Burkhart, 1989) their victims.

How Abuse Is Examined

Briere and Runtz (1990) emphasized that most research on the link between childhood abuse and subsequent problems tends to restrict itself to a single form of maltreatment, with sexual abuse having received the greatest amount of

attention. They noted that, with the exception of their 1988 study, almost no empirical work has been done on the long-term effects of psychological child abuse.

Failing to consider the individual and additive effects of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, however, provides an incomplete picture at best. In order to gain a more complete understanding of how abuse histories relate to later behaviors, abuse histories must be explored fully and in detail. This can be done by examining the individual and combined effects of emotional, physical, and sexual child abuse.

Many researchers have either focused on only one type of abuse (e.g., not assessing for physical and emotional abuse in their sexual abuse studies), or have not distinguished between victims of sexual versus physical or emotional abuse (e.g., Byles, 1980). Briere and Runtz (1990), however, stated that "a more ecologically valid approach would be to assess the extent of all forms of maltreatment (e.g., physical, sexual, and psychological) experienced..." (1990, p. 358).

One exception to this general limitation in the research is found in a study by Briere and Runtz (1990). Their analysis of undergraduate women examined the relation of past psychological, physical, and sexual abuse to three types of current psychosocial dysfunction. Results indicated that a history of psychological abuse was uniquely

associated with low self-esteem, physical abuse was linked to aggression toward others, and sexual abuse was specifically related to maladaptive sexual behavior. A combination of psychological and physical abuse was associated with symptomology in all three spheres. A negative association was found between maladaptive sexuality and aggression, leading the authors to suggest that in nonclinical female populations, physical and sexual abuse can represent substantially different phenomena (see also Finkelhor, 1979; Gil, 1973).

This finding leads one to contemplate whether similar patterns would surface in men. Indeed, Briere and Runtz (1990) suggested replications of their study be conducted using different groups, different measuring devices, or assessing different forms of later disturbance.

Lack of Differentiation

Experts in the abuse cycle field are well aware of the importance of specific, detailed information in the construction of effective prevention and treatment programs. Many researchers have called for well-designed studies to distinguish between various types of offenders according to their victimization histories.

For instance, Bowers (1990) has made a general call for additional studies on whether perpetrators' patterns of abusive behavior reveal the nature of their primary trauma.

Friedman and Rosenbaum (1988), who studied crimes directed toward persons versus property, have noted that "rarely is consideration given to whether the causes of crime differ for distinct types of criminal activity" (p. 363).

Fagan and Wexler (1988) have pointed out that few studies have investigated whether the causes and correlates of juvenile sexual offenders overlap with other violent behaviors or develop along independent etiological paths. They have emphasized the need for further study to differentiate sexual violence from other forms of delinquency. Knight and Prentky (1993) have also identified the need for identifying more homogenous typologies of juvenile sex offenders (e.g., child molesters, rapists).

Widom (1991), more generally, has stressed the need for continued research to unravel the linkages among childhood victimization and later violent criminal behavior. Many other researchers in the area have appealed for more specific research as well (Fehrenbach, Smith, Monastersky, & Deisher, 1986; Ford & Linney, 1995; Rosenbaum, 1989). These authors have made pleas for acquiring information not only about various types of abusive behavior (emotional, physical, and sexual), but also toward whom the abuse was directed or committed by (family members, acquaintances, strangers, or animals).

Some researchers have begun to differentiate among various types of violent perpetrators. Their studies have

investigated whether specific types of crime and specific victimization patterns may be related. The remainder of the section discusses the mixed findings in this area.

Some researchers dispute the fact that a statistically significant relationship exists between specific types of abuse and later behavior. For example, Sandberg (1986) found no significant relationship between specific types of childhood abuse and later delinquency. Also, while a 1981 study conducted by Alfaro (as cited in Wahler & Dumas, 1986) found a high incidence of abuse and neglect among delinquent populations, no such link was found between specific types of abuse and subsequent delinquency. Both of these studies, however, failed to catalogue all juvenile offenses for the participants. For this reason, Sandberg admitted to being "left with an uncomfortable feeling" (p. 218) about the finding.

In a study comparing deprived (presence of marital instability, parental illness, poor domestic and physical care of the children and homes, social dependency, overcrowding, or poor mothering ability) and nondeprived children, Kolvin, Miller, Fleeting, and Kolvin (1988) found that different types of deprivation were not associated with a distinctive offender profile. The deprivation factors, however, did not include abuse histories.

As for sexual abuse, Ageton (1983) has concluded that the reasons youth commit sexual assault are not generally

different from those for other types of crimes they commit.

Fagan and Wexler, however, in their 1988 study cited evidence to the contrary, and labeled juvenile sexual offenders a "hidden" population distinct from violent chronic offenders. They pointed out that sexual offenders reported more frequent witnessing of parental violence and more experiencing of child physical and sexual abuse as compared to chronic nonsexual violent offenders. Additionally, youth sex offenders' and their siblings' official records showed more reports for spouse abuse, physical child abuse, and sexual child abuse in their histories.

Graves (1993), in his conceptualization of the youthful male sex offender, conducted a meta-analytic examination of offender characteristics by offense type. The study analyzed four types of offenders: (1) sexual assault offenders, (2) pedophilic youth, (3) mixed offense offenders, and (4) combined youth sex offenders. Graves found important differences between these groups. For instance, high rates of sexual assault offenders came from single-parent-headed families. This salient feature distinguished them from both pedophilic youth and mixed offense offenders. Pedophilic youth differed considerably from other groups in their higher rates of family dysfunction, hostile and impulsive temperaments, and histories of neglect and sexual abuse. Mixed offense

offenders (those who committed a variety of offenses) displayed the most widespread and severe problems. They more often came from low-SES households, often had families with serious problems, were generally uncooperative, experienced academic difficulties, and committed their first offense at a younger age. Graves noted that the combined data from these three types (called combined youth sex offenders) blurred the results and made the youth appear more troubled than they were. He also highlighted the fact that sexual assault offenders often differed dramatically from the combined offender profile.

In another study, Lewis, Shanok, Pincus, and Glaser (1979) found that a history of abuse by parents or parent substitutes strongly distinguished a more violent group of children from a less violent group. The more and less violent groups also differed significantly in their exposure to violence; 78.6% of the more violent versus 20% of the less violent group witnessed extreme violence directed at others.

Finally, in a study of substantiated cases of child sexual abuse (Friedrich, cited in Ascione, 1993), parents reported that 35% of boys and 27% of girls who had been sexually abused exhibited cruelty toward animals. In contrast, only 3-5% of nonabused boys and girls engaged in such behavior.

Abuse Samples

In child sexual abuse studies, most findings relating abuse histories to later behaviors have involved special groups such as juvenile delinquents, prostitutes, therapy clients, or convicted criminals (Herman, 1981; Ross, 1980; Silbert & Pines, 1981). More specifically, studies on childhood sexual abuse of boys have tended to focus on clinical samples (Violato & Genuis, 1993). Fromuth and Burkhart (1987) agreed that little information exists on the childhood sexual victimization of males, especially as it occurs in nonclinical samples. Studies using nonclinical samples would be useful in serving as normative comparison groups for the clinical and criminal samples of past and future studies.

Koss and Dinero (1988) are among researchers who have alerted professionals to the fact that most studies of sexually aggressive men involve those who are convicted rapists, incarcerated in prisons, or patients in hospitals for the mentally ill. Additionally, Miller and Miller (1986) note that the college student population has been neglected in the literature of both physical and sexual abuse.

A flaw of many studies that examine criminal samples has been their sole reliance on official criminal records to obtain information about subsequent effects of childhood abuse (e.g., Widom, 1989a). This method, however, tends to

overlook abusive acts that are unreported, unofficial, or unsubstantiated. Self-report studies, despite having their own limitations, confidentially obtain first-hand information from abuse victims and perpetrators.

A final shortcoming in the literature is that studies examining juvenile delinquents and the abuse cycle have been known to consider only subsequent delinquent behavior in looking at the effects of abuse (e.g., Runtz & Briere, 1986; Widom, 1989a). Unfortunately, this method disregards other important types of abusive behavior such as sexual abuse or animal abuse (Ascione, 1993).

The Sexual Abuse Cycle in Females

Although the current study examines cross-generational abuse in males, a look at recent findings with females provides interesting information. For this type of material we turn to the realm of sexual abuse, where the greatest amount of research on the abuse cycle in females has been conducted.

A study by Bagley (1984) that systematically assessed the impact of child sexual abuse on women yielded correlations between childhood sexual abuse and a number of negative adolescent behaviors, including aggression.

In another study using retrospective reports, Runtz and Briere (1986) examined the link between women's childhood histories of sexual abuse and later "delinquent" behaviors

(e.g., school problems, conflicts with authority, early sexual behaviors). Discriminant function analysis indicated a significant difference in teen behaviors between the sexually abused and nonabused victims. Abused females, for example, were more likely to have engaged in behaviors considered "delinquent."

The Sexual Abuse Cycle in Males

The findings from studies with females lead us to consider whether similar patterns apply to males. Unfortunately, the long-term effects of sexual abuse on males are poorly understood and further research is urgently required (Beitchman et al., 1992; Brown & Finkelhor, 1986). Fromuth and Burkhart (1987) noted that little information exists on the childhood sexual victimization of males, especially as it occurs in nonclinical samples.

And while studies of female victims of sexual abuse abound, far fewer exist that consider male victims (noted exceptions include Finkelhor, 1981; Fritz, Stoll, & Wagner, 1981; Landis, 1956). Fischer (1992) pointed out that most child sexual abuse studies have focused on females and "as a result, what is known about gender differences, especially offender gender differences, is limited." Violato and Genuis (1993) concur that due to the scarcity of clinical and empirical evidence little is known about the extent, consequences, and effects of sexual abuse for boys. Hunter

(1990) agreed with these researchers as is evident in his informative book entitled Abused Boys: The Neglected Victims of Sexual Abuse.

Unfortunately, of the few empirical studies examining the long-term effects of child sexual abuse with males, most have been characterized by less methodological sophistication and rigor (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1989). Many have also fallen short in that only basic issues such as incidence rates are researched, case studies predominate (e.g., Goodwin, Simms, & Bergman, 1979), or control groups are lacking (Runtz & Briere, 1986).

The research that does exist on the effects of childhood sexual abuse on males' later behavior has yielded conflicting results. Some studies (Finkelhor, 1979; Johnson & Shrier, 1985; Landis, 1956) conducted with nonclinical samples of men seem to indicate a positive correlation between sexual abuse histories and later abusive behavior of varying types. Others have shown no such relationship.

One example of a study supporting the positive abused-to-abuser correlation compared self-reported sexually abused (defined as unwanted sexual contact from genital touching and fondling to anal penetration while the victim was under the age of 18) and nonabused nonclinical males between the ages of 18 and 27 years (Violato & Genuis, 1993). The authors found that those who reported prior abuse tended to come from unstable environments (e.g., father was an

unskilled laborer or unemployed), and also experienced more frequent early separation from parents. They also found that a significantly greater number of subjects who disclosed childhood sexual abuse were interested in having sex with male children than those who did not disclose such abuse.

A study by Koss and Dinero (1988) has also provided support for the victim-perpetrator correlation. They found that men who reported engaging in severe sexual aggression had usually become sexually active at an early age, recalled more childhood sexual experiences, and were exposed to more family violence and childhood sexual abuse.

On the other hand, an investigation by Fromuth and Burkhart (1989) comparing sexually abused and nonabused nonclinical males found no such relationship. Although a number of small correlations (.14-.22) between a history of abuse and psychological adjustment were discovered, very few significant correlations between a history of abuse and later sexual adjustment and behavior were found. Fischer (1992) also concluded that child sexual abuse is not a significant predictor of adult sexual abuse in college men.

Although the above findings on the victim-to-perpetrator cycle are mixed, several studies have shown that males sexually abused as children may be more vulnerable to suffering additional sexual abuse in the future. According to a literature review conducted by Benson, Charlton, and

Goodheart (1992), surveys indicated that men are victims in 10% of acquaintance rapes. The authors also reported significant associations between a history of child sexual abuse and vulnerability to acquaintance rape (although this finding appears to be more solid for women). Fischer (1992), in addition to finding that males were more likely to be victimized by a nonnuclear family member male, discovered that males who were childhood victims of abuse were at significantly higher risk for teenage and adult victimization than nonabused children.

In summary, evidence exists which both supports and refutes the connection between childhood sexual abuse and later perpetration. Although it is still unclear to what degree sexual abuse in males is subject to cross-generational transmission, the need for further research in this area is evident.

The Physical Abuse Cycle in Males

Studies examining the aftermath of childhood physical abuse on boys lend credence to the abuse cycle theory. One perspective maintains that interpersonal violence is partially a function of broadly held attitudes and beliefs that condone aggression against those with lesser power (Burt, 1980). Other authors have highlighted the importance of developmental incidents (such as witnessing media or family scenes of male violence against women and children,

or the experience of having been abused as a child) in which attitudes and expectations endorsing violence might be socialized (Carroll, 1977). This social learning perspective highlights the widespread cultural norms supportive of wife battering and the accompanying rationale for the use of physical violence to maintain the male's superior position in the nuclear family (Straus et al., 1980).

Briere (1987), in a study asking male university students to rate their potential likelihood of wife battering, found the likelihood of battering to covary with the presence of physical child abuse in two of five hypothetical cases. Briere also found that childhood witnessing of wife battering was a significant predictor in one of the five hypothetical instances.

More compelling evidence from other investigations indicates that approximately 50-80% of batterers were raised in families where wife battering was modeled by male authority figures (Carroll, 1977; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981b; Stacey & Shupe, 1983). These authors assert that a boy may learn how to gain power and control over his partner through either his own direct victimization or witnessing of victimization. Additionally, many cultures maintain the notion that men are driven uncontrollably by sexual urges and should not only initiate sex, but overcome resistance to it as well (Benson et al., 1992).

Further research is needed to clarify the relationship between a history experiencing and witnessing physical abuse and later emotional, physical, and sexual abusiveness.

Secondary Abuse

A significant amount of research has been conducted on children who grow up witnessing abuse. This section will discuss research findings regarding the possible connection between witnessing abuse and abusing others (referred to here as cross-generational transmission of secondary abuse). Two theories used to explain this phenomenon will first be discussed, followed by an examination of research findings on the effects of witnessing violence within the family and in the neighborhood.

Social learning theory has been used by some (e.g., Pagelow, 1981) to explain the cross-generational transmission of secondary abuse. According to this theory, boys imitate the aggression they observe in same-sex parents or in other same-sex role models.

More recently, however, another theory has been utilized to explain the connection between witnessing and perpetrating abuse (Osofsky, 1995; Silvern & Kaersvang, 1989; Zeanah, 1994). According to this theory, witnessing abuse is classified as a traumatic event and reenactments of the abuse, termed "posttraumatic play," serve as coping mechanisms.

Children of violent marriages, for example, have been found to display elevated frequencies of conduct disorders and aggression (e.g., Moore, Calcius, & Pettican, 1981; Pfouts, Schopler, & Henley, 1982).

Another study using parental and self-report ratings of preschool children showed associations between (a) verbal conflict and moderate levels of conduct problems, (b) verbal plus physical conflict and clinical levels of conduct problems and moderate levels of emotional problems, and (c) verbal plus physical conflict plus women's shelter residence and clinical levels of conduct problems, higher levels of emotional problems, and lower levels of social functioning and perceived maternal acceptance (Fantuzzo et al., 1991).

Additionally, adult spouse abusers have been found more likely than their nonviolent counterparts to have observed violence between their own parents (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Straus et al., 1980; Telch & Lindquist, 1984). Also, another study revealed that a substantial number of adolescents witnessing marital violence reported being depressed, running away, hitting their parents, and hitting and being hit by dating partners. Findings also indicated that males exposed to spousal abuse were significantly more likely to run away and report suicidal thoughts and somewhat more likely to hit their mothers (Carlson, 1990).

Pfouts et al. (1982) compared children who witnessed their mothers' abuse and children who witnessed siblings'

abuse. Sibling abuse witnesses were found to be "good" children--strictly conforming to demands and avoiding trouble. Described as "living in the shadow of violence," 37% of these children were diagnosed as depressed and 40% as anxious. In contrast, children who witnessed abuse of their mothers were found to imitate the adult violence they observed, with 53% acting out with parents, 60% acting out with siblings, and about 30% acting out with peers and teachers. The authors argued that both groups were negatively affected by the abuse and expressed fear that these children may likely become the abusing husbands and abused wives of the next generation. Confirming this concern, Suh and Abel (1990) found child witnesses of spousal abuse to be at greater risk of becoming targets of physical and emotional abuse and of developing behavioral problems.

Other findings related to the transmission of secondary abuse have been less clear. Suh and Abel (1990), in their review of 258 case files of women's shelter spouse abuse victims, found that whereas children witnessing family violence were likely to be abusive toward siblings, they were not more likely to hit their parents or those outside the family. And although some studies have found children from violent homes to evidence significantly more externalizing behavior than their counterparts (Jaffe, Wilson, & Wolfe, 1986; Wolfe, Jaffe, Wilson, & Zak, 1985),

others have found no such distinctions (Hughes, 1988; Wolfe et al., 1986).

Some studies have suggested that nonabused witnesses may be at lesser risk than abused witnesses for becoming abusers. Hughes (1988) compared abused and nonabused child witnesses to parental violence residing in women's shelters on measures of self-esteem, anxiety, depression, and behavior problems, using mothers' and self-reports. Results indicated significantly more distress in the abused-witness children than in the comparison group, with nonabused witness children's scores falling between the two. Davis and Carlson (1987) also found that children who both witness abuse and are abused appear more seriously affected than those who are only witnesses. Nonabused witness children were found to struggle more with internalizing symptoms than with externalizing ones.

It is important to remember, however, that many children who witness family violence are also abused. As various authors have pointed out (Straus et al., 1980; Suh & Abel, 1990), the overlap is substantial, with estimates as high as 40% to 60%. Also, another study by Jaffe, Wolfe, Wilson, and Zak (1986) found equally high disturbance among nonabused boys who had witnessed spousal abuse and physically abused boys.

In regard to neighborhood violence, high rates of exposure to violence for children in inner-city

neighborhoods have been well documented (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Marans & Cohen, 1993). Significant relationships between intrafamily conflict and children's reported exposure to community violence have also been found (Osofsky, Wewers, Hann, & Fick, 1993).

Osofsky (1995) recently asserted that reactions to witnessing violence are likely to be similar to those following early abuse and neglect, putting witnesses of abuse at greater risk for developing aggressive behaviors and negative emotions. Other researchers have found connections between boys who witness parental arguments and fights and externalizing responses (Cummings & Zahn-Waxler, 1992).

In an examination of exposure to violence and self-reports of aggression in African American inner-city children, Bell and Jenkins (1993) asked participants about the victimization, witnessing, and perpetration of abuse. The authors reported that the extent to which children witnessed life-threatening violence, regardless of gender and age, was astounding. Also, a high correlation was found between witnessing violence and involvement in fights. Those who had perpetrated a violent act were also found to have witnessed violence and been directly victimized. Bell and Jenkins asserted that victims of physical violence, whether primary or secondary, should be treated as "at risk"

for future perpetration and provided with preventative treatment.

In her recent report on chronic community violence, Osofsky (1995) noted that children's witnessing of violence is frequently overlooked and further research and clinical attention on this problem are desperately needed.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

Because the intent of the present research was to assess the level of abuse experienced and perpetrated by a nonclinical, male population, the target population for this study consisted of college men, ages 18-28. The accessible population consisted of men enrolled in Utah State University (USU) undergraduate classes. The sample can be considered representative of the USU population as a whole and findings should generally apply to undergraduate men in this age range. It should be emphasized that over 90% of the sample was Caucasian, thereby minimizing generalizations to men of other ethnic origin. Another unique demographic factor is that the majority of USU undergraduate students (52% in 1993; S. Summers, personal communication, September 24, 1995) belong to the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons).

The research incorporated data collected at USU during the spring and summer quarters of 1995. USU is located in the small community of Logan, Utah, in Cache County. Recent figures (U. S. Department of Commerce, 1990) list the median age of Cache County residents as 23.7 years with over 94% of the population being white. Per capita personal income for

1987 was \$10,181 (Bureau of Economic and Business Research, 1990).

Since participants were selected from a university population, they might be expected to reflect better psychological adjustment than samples drawn from the general population. Due to the university screening process, which requires a certain minimal level of general functioning, the composition of the present sample may to some extent have excluded victims and perpetrators who have been involved in more serious abuse. Results are not necessarily generalizable to recruited sexually abused males or to clinical samples of any type. Results are also less generalizable to those who have been in the welfare system, or those who have been legally punished for abusive behavior. Given the nature of the study (voluntary, self-reporting subjects), estimates of the incidence and effects of abuse and perpetration in the general population are unknown.

The sample for the present research consisted of 142 male volunteer students. Table 1 presents basic demographic data for the sample.

Procedures

Sample Selection Procedures

Students enrolled in undergraduate classes from a variety of departments (e.g., Psychology, Biology,

Table 1

Description of Subjects

Variable	Mean (SD)
Mean Age	21.6 (2.7)
Mean Yrs of Ed.	13.9 (1.3)

Ethnicity	Percent of Sample
Caucasian	90.1
Black	.7
Hispanic	.7
Asian	4.2
American Indian	0.0
Other/Missing	4.3

Engineering, Family and Human Development, Physical Education, etc.) were offered an opportunity to earn a minimal amount of extra credit by volunteering to anonymously complete a questionnaire packet for research purposes. A research assistant or class instructor broadly described the nature of the study and the participation requirements to each targeted class. This recruitment procedure was standardized through the provision of a script (Appendix B) read by recruiters.

Data Collection

Institutional Review Board approval was obtained (Appendix A), and data collection was conducted according to

the American Psychological Association's ethical guidelines for research with human subjects.

Upon reporting to the Department of Psychology office, participants were given a questionnaire packet to complete. The packet consisted of the following: (a) a Participant Information Sheet (Appendix C), which outlined the nature of the study, participation requirements, benefits and risks of participating, the confidential and voluntary nature of the study, and the right to end participation at any point without penalty; (b) the Youth Experiences and Behaviors Questionnaire (YEBQ, Appendix D), a self-report measure of abuse experienced, witnessed, and perpetrated by respondents (developed by the author); and (c) the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979; Appendix E), an intra- and extrafamilial measure of reasoning, verbally aggressive, and physically aggressive responses to conflict. After having read and completed the forms, subjects returned the packet to the Psychology Department office. At that time participants were given an extra credit slip (with no name on it) to present to their instructor. Assistants from the Psychology Department were trained in procedures for handling documents to ensure that complete confidentiality was maintained.

Confidentiality

Subjects were not identified in any manner on the CTS, YEBQ, or Participant Information Sheet. Only a code number

and demographic information were included on the YEBQ and CTS. The only individuals who had access to the packets were the student researcher, research assistants, and departmental assistants. Completed questionnaire packets were handled confidentially and were reviewed exclusively by the student researcher, who did not know the identity of respondents.

Debriefing

In order to minimize any risk of psychological harm to respondents, the final page of the YEBQ included a referral section for those who may have experienced distress or desired counseling in relation to issues raised during their participation. Subjects were provided with the telephone numbers of the USU Counseling Center, the USU Community Clinic, Citizens Against Physical and Sexual Abuse, and Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Center. Additionally, the Participant Information Sheet notified subjects of their right to end participation at any time for any reason without penalty during their participation.

Measures

Youth Experiences and Behaviors Questionnaire

The Youth Experiences and Behaviors Questionnaire (YEBQ; Appendix D) is 145-item self-report measure designed by the author to assess the level of emotional, physical,

and sexual abuse an individual has experienced, witnessed, and perpetrated.

Following brief instructions on how to complete the YEBQ, demographic information (gender, age, place of birth, education level, and ethnicity) is assessed. This information is for use in attending to sample homogeneity and representativeness as recommended by Porter and Critelli (1992) in their critical review of self-reported methods of measuring sexual aggression.

The YEBQ then continues with the following four main sections: (1) abuse history, (2) global disclosure response scale, (3) abuse witnessed, and (4) abuse perpetrated. Sections one, three, and four contain subsections addressing emotional, physical, and sexual hurt. Each subsection is further divided into perpetrator/victim categories of family, acquaintances, strangers, and animals (where appropriate). Due to recent empirical findings regarding the relationship between cruelty to animals and later antisocial behavior and the implications of cruelty to animals in regard to child abuse and wife battering (Ascione, 1993), respondents are asked to also consider witnessed and perpetrated abuse toward animals in their responses.

Widom (1989a) stresses that the outcome of suffering abuse as a child may depend on a variety of factors such as the type and severity of abuse sustained and the

characteristics of the abuser. The YEBQ is designed to tease out these and other important factors. By asking participants a detailed series of questions, a more extensive picture of abuse patterns is obtained.

The questionnaire is organized in a 3 x 3 x 3-4 design --abuse experienced, witnessed, and perpetrated x emotional, physical, and sexual abuse x family, acquaintances, strangers, animals (animal questions apply to the physical and sexual perpetration sections only).

Respondents are asked five questions in each of 29 specific category groups (e.g., emotional abuse experienced at the hands of a family member, sexual abuse perpetrated against a stranger, etc.). They are asked to indicate the presence, frequency, and severity levels of abuse as well as the number of, gender of, and relationship to their abusers/victims.

For example, the first question in one category group asks, "Were you ever emotionally hurt by a family member/s?" If the respondent indicates no, he/she skips to the next category group (emotional hurt by acquaintances). If the respondent indicates yes, he/she is then asked to indicate how many family members he/she has been emotionally hurt by, and to rate how often and how severe the hurt was. This "broad funnel" type of protocol where subjects first respond to a broad question and then branch into a more detailed evaluation of their experiences follows the recommendations

of Fromuth and Burkhart (1987). The final question in each category group asks the respondent to indicate the relationship type and gender of the person they were abused by or abused (e.g., mother, friend--male).

The YEBQ utilizes a 3-point scale to assess the frequency and severity of abuse experienced or perpetrated. A laminated sheet comprised of six scales (frequency and severity scales for emotional, physical, and sexual abuse) is included with each questionnaire. Each scale lists operational definitions for frequency and severity ratings of "1," "2," and "3." For example, the physical abuse frequency scale defines a "1" as "the hurt happened less than once each month," a "2" as "the hurt happened more than once each month but less than weekly," and a "3" as "the hurt happened at least once each week." In rating frequency and severity, respondents are asked to think of the most frequent and most severe incidents of abuse they have suffered. This method (patterned after that of Briere and Runtz, 1990) is used to maximize clarity and standardization by ensuring that all respondents rate their most harsh experiences.

Section 2, the global disclosure response section, initially asks participants whether they have ever disclosed experiences of abuse and whether any abuse they may have experienced has ever been discovered by others. If abuse experiences were disclosed to or discovered by others,

participants check one of five statements regarding the level of support and protection they received. This five-point scale ranges from a "1" of "No one who knew about the abuse believed that I was being hurt, did anything to stop me from being hurt, protected me or supported me," to a "5" of "Everyone who knew about the abuse believed that I was being hurt, did something to stop me from being hurt, protected me or supported me."

Further support for the inclusion of these YEBQ variables comes from a meta-analysis of 45 studies of sexual abuse (Kendall-Tackett, Williams, & Finkelhor, 1993). The authors illustrated that penetration, abuse frequency, level of force, the relationship of the perpetrator to the child, and maternal support were all found to affect the degree of symptomatology observed. The YEBQ assesses these important variables.

The YEBQ consists of four scale scores, nine subscale scores, and 29 category scores. The scale scores include the global disclosure response score (GDR; range 0-5), an abuse history score (H; range 0-81), an abuse witnessed score (W; range 0-81), and an abuse perpetrated score (P; range 0-99). The final three scale scores include all types of abuse (emotional, physical, and sexual) and all categories of perpetrator and victim (family, acquaintance, stranger, and animal).

The subscale scores range from 0-27 (with the exception of two scores, PHP and SXP, which range from 0-36) and break down the scale scores by type of abuse (emotional, physical, and sexual). They include an emotional abuse history score (EMH), a physical abuse history score (PHH), and a sexual abuse history score (SXH); an emotional abuse witness score (EMW), a physical abuse witness score (PHW), and a sexual abuse witness score (SXW); and an emotional abuse perpetration score (EMP), a physical abuse perpetration score (PHP), and a sexual abuse perpetration score (SXP). These subscale scores subsume all categories of perpetrator and victim.

The first three subscale scores (EMH, PHH, and SXH) are summed to derive the abuse history scale score (H). The second three subscale scores (EMW, PHW, and SXW) are summed to derive the abuse witness scale score (W). The third three subscale scores (EMP, PHP, and SXP) are summed to derive the abuse perpetrate scale score (P).

Finally, the category scores break down the subscale scores by the category of perpetrator or victim. For example, the physical abuse witness subscale score (PHW) is computed by adding the three category scores of the physical family witness score (pfw), the physical acquaintance witness score (paw), and the physical stranger witness score (psw). Likewise, the sexual abuse perpetrate subscale score (SXP) is computed by adding the four category scores of the

sexual family perpetrate score (sfp), the sexual acquaintance perpetrate score (sap), the sexual stranger perpetrate score (ssp), and the sexual pet/animal perpetrate score (spp).

The category scores range from 0 to 9. If the specified type of abuse was not experienced, the score will be a zero. If the specified type of abuse was experienced, the score will range from three to nine, depending on the number of specified individuals abusing/being abused (1-3 points), the frequency of the abuse (1-3 points), and the severity of the abuse (1-3 points). All subscale and scale scores originate from the category scores.

Since the YEBQ was only recently developed for use in this study, no reliability or validity data are available. One purpose of the current study was to assess internal consistency reliability of the YEBQ as well as its convergent and discriminant validity based on scores from Straus's Conflict Tactics Scale (1979; described below). Readers are directed to the Results section for specific reliability and validity figures.

Conflict Tactics Scale

The present research utilized Form A of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979). The CTS is a well-established self-report questionnaire of responses to intra- and extrafamilial conflict. It assesses individual responses to situations involving conflict and is composed

of the following three scales: (1) reasoning, (2) verbal aggression, and (3) physical aggression.

Cronbach's alpha has been found to range from .42 to .88 for the three scales. Of the eight studies conducted to examine the CTS factor structure, six confirmed the original structure. Concurrent validity as examined by comparing separate reports from husbands and wives and parents and children reportedly range from .19 to .80 with a mean of about .4 (Touliatos, Perlmutter, & Straus, 1990). For a detailed overview of the psychometric properties of the CTS, the reader is referred to the CTS manual (Straus, 1995).

The CTS asks respondents to think of times when they have had conflicts or disagreements with another person (e.g., mother, father, sibling) and to indicate how often they and the other person engaged in various CTS item behaviors in a given year. Examples of CTS item behaviors from each scale include "discussed an issue calmly," "insulted or swore at him/her," and "slapped him/her."

The CTS Form A questionnaire was designed for use in research with college students (Straus 1973, 1974). It assesses conflict responses during the respondent's last year of high school for the following five relationships: (1) child-sibling, (2) child-father, (3) child-mother, (4) father-mother, and (5) child-nonfamily member. For each intrafamilial relationship, respondents rate the frequency

of 15 (A-O) behaviors. For the extrafamilial relationship, respondents rate the frequency of five behaviors (A-E).

Although Straus (1995) described many acceptable scoring methods, for the purpose of the present research, the CTS Form A was scored by summing all scores within each scale (reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical violence) for each relationship. Familial reasoning scale scores range from 0-25 (A-D, O), familial verbal aggression scale scores range from 0-30 (E-I, O), and familial physical aggression scale scores range from 0-30 (J-N, O). Extrafamilial scale scores range from 0-5 for verbal aggression and 0-20 for physical violence.

In order to compute concurrent and discriminant validity with the YEBQ, 13 scores were computed from these scale scores--verbal aggression between parents (VP; range 0-60), physical violence between parents (PP; range 0-60), verbal aggression toward the child (VtC; range 0-90), verbal aggression by the child (VbC; range 0-90), physical violence toward the child (PtC; range 0-75), physical violence by the child (PbC; range 0-75), verbal aggression by nonfamily members toward the child (VOC; range 0-5), verbal aggression toward nonfamily members by the child (VCO; range 0-5), physical violence by nonfamily members toward the child (POC; range 0-20), physical violence toward nonfamily members by the child (PCO; range 0-20), reasoning between

parents (RP; range 0-50), reasoning toward the child (RtC; range 0-75), and reasoning by the child (RbC; range 0-75).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The presentation of results is divided into the following four sections: (1) internal consistency reliability of the Youth Experiences and Behaviors Questionnaire (YEBQ), (2) concurrent and discriminant validity for YEBQ scores using Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) scores as criteria, (3) YEBQ descriptive statistics, and (4) YEBQ scale and subscale score correlational data.

Internal Reliability

Cronbach's coefficient alpha was used to estimate the internal consistency of the YEBQ. Coefficients were computed for (a) the entire 145-item YEBQ, (b) the abuse history, witness and perpetrate scales, (c) the family subscale, (d) the acquaintance subscale, and (e) the stranger subscale. The family subscale consists of items that assess the direct experiencing, witnessing, and perpetration of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse by and toward family members. The acquaintance and stranger subscales consist of items that assess the same phenomena by and toward acquaintances and strangers, respectively. Table 2 shows the results of this analysis.

Note that the first column in Table 2 lists the alpha reliability coefficients for the entire sample (142 subjects). The second column lists the alpha reliability

Table 2

Internal Reliability of the YEBQ (Cronbach's alpha)

	<u>N</u> = 142	<u>N</u> = 108
YEBQ (all items)	.93	.92
Abuse History, Witness, and Perpetrate Scales	.85	.77
Family Abuse Subscale	.82	.78
Acquaintance Abuse Subscale	.79	.71
Stranger Abuse Subscale	.65	.61

coefficients for those 108 subjects (76% of the sample), who scored greater than 10 points on the abuse history (ceiling of 81), abuse witnessed (ceiling of 81), or abuse perpetrated (ceiling of 99) scales. This second analysis was conducted to provide a more accurate estimation of the YEBQ's internal consistency since the low levels of abuse reported by some subjects may have produced statistically inflated coefficients in the first set.

A very high level of reliability (.93 for the entire sample and .92 for the filtered sample) was observed for the entire measure. A relatively high consistency level of .85 for the entire sample and .77 for the filtered sample was found for the abuse history, witness, and perpetrate scales. Acceptable levels of reliability were found for the family, acquaintance and stranger subscales, ranging from .61 to .82.

Concurrent and Discriminant Validity

The concurrent validity of a test is determined by relating the test scores of a group of subjects to a criterion measure administered at the same time or within a short interval of time. This criterion measure may assess real-life outcomes or may be another test measuring the same construct (Borg & Gall, 1989). Although standards for judging concurrent validity coefficients are not clear, Cronbach's (1970) calculations show that the mean concurrent validity coefficient for widely used tests and subtests is .37. Cronbach noted that it is unusual for a validity coefficient to rise above .60, however.

For this study, concurrent validity coefficients for various YEBQ scores were computed by correlating them with scores measuring similar constructs from the Conflict Tactics Scale, Form A (CTS; Straus, 1979). The results of this analysis are presented in Table 3. For interpretation of the combined subscale score abbreviations, note that the first four letters indicate the types of abuse (e.g., "EM.PH" for emotional plus physical abuse), the next two to four letters indicate the perpetrator/victim category (e.g., "FM" for family, "AC.ST" for acquaintance plus stranger abuse), and the last letter indicates the context of the abuse ("H" for abuse history, "W" for abuse witnessed, and "P" for abuse perpetrated).

Correlation coefficients were computed between the

Table 3

Concurrent Validity Coefficients

YEBQ Score	CTS Score	Correlation Coefficient
EM.PH.FM.H	VPTC	.25**
EM.PH.FM.W	VPP	.03
EM.PH.FM.P	VPBC	.16
EM.PH.AC.ST.H	VPOC	.40**
EM.PH.AC.ST.P	VPCO	.46**

** $p < .01$

following pairs of scores: (a) a YEBQ family abuse history score (EM.PH.FM.H; composed of ratings of emotional and physical abuse perpetrated by family members against respondents) and a CTS intrafamilial primary abuse score (VPTC), (b) a YEBQ family abuse witness score (EM.PH.FM.W; composed of ratings of emotional and physical abuse witnessed by respondents) and a CTS intrafamilial secondary abuse score (VPP), (c) a YEBQ family abuse perpetration score (EM.PH.FM.P; composed of ratings of emotional and physical abuse perpetrated by respondents against family members) and a CTS intrafamilial abuse perpetration score (VPBC), (d) a YEBQ acquaintance and stranger abuse history score (EM.PH.AC.ST.H; composed of ratings of emotional and physical abuse experienced by respondents from nonfamily members) and a CTS extrafamilial primary abuse score (VPOC), and (e) a YEBQ acquaintance and stranger abuse perpetration

score (EM.PH.AC.ST.P; composed of ratings of emotional and physical abuse perpetrated by respondents against nonfamily members) and a CTS extrafamilial abuse perpetration score (VPCO).

These concurrent validity coefficients are of low to moderate magnitudes, ranging from .03 to .46. Family scores tended to yield lower values whereas nonfamily scores yielded more moderate values.

Discriminant validity coefficients for various YEBQ scores were computed by correlating them with scores from the CTS measuring different constructs. Correlation coefficients were computed between the following pairs of scores: (a) a YEBQ family abuse history score (FMH; composed of ratings of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse perpetrated by family members against respondents) and a CTS intrafamilial reasoning score (RTC); (b) a YEBQ family abuse witnessed score (FMW; composed of ratings emotional, physical, and sexual abuse perpetrated by family members and witnessed by respondents) and a CTS parental reasoning score (RP); and (c) a YEBQ family abuse perpetrated score (FMP; composed of ratings of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse perpetrated by respondents toward family members) and a CTS respondent reasoning score (RBC). The results of this analysis are presented in Table 4.

These discriminant validity coefficients are of near-zero magnitudes, ranging from -.003 to -.036, with the

Table 4

Discriminant Validity Coefficients

YEBQ Score	CTS Score	Correlation Coefficient
FMH	RTC	.023
FMW	RP	-.003
FMP	RBC	-.036

Note. None of the correlation coefficients reached statistical significance.

family history subscale score coefficient being positive in direction and the family witness and perpetration subscale score coefficients negative in direction.

Descriptive Statistics

In order to clearly describe the characteristics of the sample, the means, medians, modes, standard deviations, minimum and maximum values, and variance for YEBQ scale and subscale scores are provided in Table 5.

To aid in the interpretation of the variable abbreviations, note that scale scores are represented by one or two letter abbreviations indicating the context of the abuse ("H" for history, "W" for witnessed, "P" for perpetrated, and "HW" for history plus witnessed). The one exception to this rule is the global disclosure response scale score, abbreviated GDR. Subscale scores are represented by three- or four-letter abbreviations. The

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for YEBO Scores (Mean, Median, Mode, SD, Min., Max., and Var.)

Variable	Mean	Med.	Mode	<u>SD</u>	Min.	Max.	Var.
<u>Scale Scores:</u>							
H history	12.7	11.5	0	9.9	0	57	97.1
W witnessed	17.6	15.5	0	13.2	0	56	175.5
P perpetrated	13.1	12	0	10.4	0	50	108.1
GDR global disclosure response	.9	0	0	1.6	0	5	2.5
<u>Abuse History Subscale Scores:</u>							
EMH emotional	6.4	6	0	4.8	0	22	23.4
PHH physical	5.4	5	0	4.6	0	23	21.5
SXH sexual	.9	0	0	2.5	0	18	6.3
<u>Abuse Witnessed Subscale Scores:</u>							
EMW emotional	9.1	9	0	6.4	0	26	41.5
PHW physical	7.7	7	0	6.7	0	27	45.3
SXW sexual	.9	0	0	2.3	0	15	5.4

(table continues)

Variable	Mean	Med.	Mode	<u>SD</u>	Min.	Max.	Var.
----------	------	------	------	-----------	------	------	------

Abuse Perpetrated Subscale Scores:

EMP emotional	5.4	6	0	4.3	0	19	18.6
PHP physical	6.8	6	0	6.4	0	32	40.5
SXP sexual	.8	0	0	2.3	0	14	5.1

Family Abuse Subscale Scores:

FMH history	5.2	6	0	4.3	0	22	19.1
FMW witnessed	4.7	4	0	4.5	0	20	20.0
FMHW history and witnessed	10.0	10	0	8.0	0	39	63.9
FMP perpetrated	5.0	5	0	3.8	0	17	14.5

Acquaintance Abuse Subscale Scores:

ACH history	5.8	5.5	0	4.8	0	22	23.4
ACW witnessed	7.0	6.5	0	5.6	0	24	30.9
ACHW history and witnessed	12.8	12	0	8.9	0	39	78.9
ACP perpetrated	4.4	3	0	4.3	0	16	18.2

(table continues)

Variable	Mean	Med.	Mode	<u>SD</u>	Min.	Max.	Var.
<u>Stranger Abuse Subscale Scores:</u>							
STH history	1.7	0	0	2.9	0	14	8.4
STW witnessed	5.9	4.5	0	6.1	0	24	37.2
STHW history and witnessed	7.7	6	0	7.5	0	37	56.1
STP perpetrated	1.3	0	0	2.9	0	15	8.7
<u>Pet/Animal Abuse Subscale Scores:</u>							
PAP perpetrated	2.3	0	0	3.0	0	12	9.0

first two letters indicate the type of abuse ("EM" for emotional, "PH" for physical, and "SX" for sexual) or the perpetrator/victim category ("FM" for family member, "AC" for acquaintance, "ST" for stranger, and "PA" for pet/animal). The second one or two letters indicate the context of the abuse ("H" for abuse history, "W" for abuse witnessed, "P" for abuse perpetrated, and "HW" for abuse history plus abuse witnessed).

All scale and subscale scores have a mode or most common score of 0. The abuse history and witnessed scale score means are relatively low (12.7 and 17.6, respectively), considering the ceiling for these scores is 81. The abuse perpetrated mean of 13.1 (ceiling of 99) is

also relatively low. Due to the university screening process, which requires students to evidence minimal levels of functioning and may exclude some victims and perpetrators of abuse, these findings are not surprising.

The global disclosure rating mean of .9 seems to indicate that most subjects either had no abuse to disclose or if they did, they did not confide in others nor did others discover the abuse. For those who did disclose or whose abuse was discovered by others (31% of the sample), almost half indicated that no one or few people who knew about the abuse did anything to stop it, protect them or support them. Just over 40% indicated that most or all people who knew about the abuse did something to stop it, protected or supported them. Just over 10% indicated that some people acted to stop the abuse, or protect or support them. Finally, the correlation between global disclosure response scores (GDR) and total perpetration scores (P) was $-.42$. The correlations between GDR and total physical abuse perpetrated scores and total acquaintance abuse perpetrated scores were $-.57$ and $-.36$, respectively. These correlations were significant at the .05 level.

In examining the abuse type subscale scores, most of which had ceilings of 27 (with the exception of the physical and sexual abuse perpetration subscales with ceilings of 36), some respondents did reach (or nearly reach) the ceiling levels. Respondents indicated that witnessing

emotional abuse was the most common phenomenon, followed by witnessing physical abuse, perpetrating physical abuse, experiencing emotional abuse, perpetrating emotional abuse and experiencing physical abuse, experiencing and witnessing sexual abuse, and perpetrating sexual abuse. For all contexts of abuse (experiencing, witnessing, or perpetrating) and all categories of victims/perpetrators (family, acquaintances, and strangers), sexual abuse was by far the least reported phenomenon.

In examining the perpetrator/victim subscale scores, most of which had ceilings of 27 (with the exception of the history plus witness subscales with ceilings of 54 and the pet/animal abuse perpetrate subscale with a ceiling of 18), no respondents reached a ceiling level. Respondents indicated that witnessing abusive acquaintances was the most common phenomenon, followed by witnessing abusive strangers, being abused by acquaintances, being abused by family members, abusing family members, witnessing abusive family members, abusing acquaintances, abusing pets, being abused by strangers, and abusing strangers. For all types of abuse (emotional, physical, and sexual) and all categories of victims/perpetrators (except for family members), witnessing abuse was the most frequently reported phenomenon.

We also examined the percent of respondents who reported experiencing different types of abuse. Tables 6, 7, and 8 list the percentage of total respondents who

Table 6

Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Primary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) N = 142

A b u s e H i s t o r y								
Emotional 83.8%			Physical 76.8%			Sexual 14.8%		
low	med	hi	low	med	hi	low	med	hi
78%	21%	1%	85%	14%	1%	98%	2%	0%
fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str
71%	82%	24%	84%	62%	25%	33%	76%	19%

Table 7

Percentage of Respondents Who Reported Secondary Abuse (By Category of Perpetrator) N = 142

A b u s e H i s t o r y								
Emotional 85.2%			Physical 74.7%			Sexual 15.5%		
low	med	hi	low	med	hi	low	med	hi
52%	39%	9%	63%	30%	7%	99%	1%	0%
fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str	fam	acqu	str
70%	82%	59%	57%	78%	65%	27%	46%	46%

indicated experiencing, witnessing, and perpetrating various types of abuse. For each group, those who acknowledged abuse are grouped according to the number of perpetrators/victims involved, the frequency, and the severity of the abuse. "Lo" are those with the least number

Table 8

Percent of Respondents Who Reported Perpetrating Abuse (By Category of Victim) N = 142

A b u s e P e r p e t r a t e d											
Emotional 78.2%			Physical 73.2%				Sexual 14.1%				
low	med	hi	low	mlo	mhi	hi	low	mlo	mhi	hi	
83%	16%	1%	68%	29%	2%	1%	99%	1%	0%	0%	
fam	acq	str	fam	acq	str	pet	fam	acq	str	pet	
88%	73%	18%	73%	58%	19%	60%	55%	60%	5%	15%	

of perpetrators/victims and the least severe and frequent abuse (composite scores of 3-9 on these variables). "Med" are those with a moderate number of perpetrators/victims and moderate severity and frequency of abuse (composite scores of 10-18). "Hi" are those with the greatest number of perpetrators/victims and the highest severity and frequency of abuse (composite scores of 19-27). Also, for each group acknowledging abuse, the percentage who were victimized by or perpetrated against family members, acquaintances, strangers, and pets/animals is indicated.

Table 6 lists the percentages of respondents who directly experienced various types of abuse. Over 83% of respondents indicated having experienced emotional abuse. Of this group, 71% identified family members as perpetrators, 82% identified acquaintances as perpetrators,

and 24% identified strangers as perpetrators. Over 76% indicated having experienced physical abuse. Of these respondents, 84% reported being abused by family members, 62% by acquaintances, and 25% by strangers. Over 14% indicated having experienced sexual abuse. Of this group, 76%

identified acquaintances, 33% identified family members, and 19% identified strangers as the perpetrators. In regard to number of perpetrators, frequency and severity of abuse, most of the sample experienced relatively mild abuse. Small proportions experienced more moderate abuse and severe abuse. This pattern becomes more pronounced from emotional to physical to sexual abuse.

Table 7 lists the percentages of respondents who witnessed various types of abuse. Over 85%, 74%, and 15% of respondents indicated that at some point in their lives, they were a firsthand witness to emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, respectively. Of those who witnessed emotional abuse, 82% identified acquaintances, 70% identified family members, and 59% identified strangers as perpetrators. Of those who witnessed physical abuse, 78% reported acquaintances, 65% reported strangers, and 57% reported family members as abusers. Of those who witnessed sexual abuse, 46% identified both acquaintances and strangers as perpetrators, and 27% identified family members as perpetrators. In regard to the number of perpetrators,

and the frequency and severity of abuse witnessed, once again, most respondents witnessed more mild abuse, some witnessed moderate abuse, and few witnessed severe abuse. As in abuse experienced, the pattern becomes more pronounced from emotional to physical to sexual abuse, but for witnessed abuse, the group exposed to moderate abuse is notably higher.

Table 8 lists the percentages of respondents who engaged in various types of abuse. Over 78%, 73%, and 14% of respondents indicated that they committed acts of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, respectively. Of those respondents who acknowledged having been emotionally abusive, 88% reportedly abused family members, 73% reportedly abused acquaintances, and 18% reportedly abused strangers. Of those who acknowledged having committed acts of physical abuse, 73% targeted family members, followed by 60% targeting animals, 58% targeting acquaintances, and 19% targeting strangers. Of those respondents who disclosed acts of sexual abuse, 60% reportedly abused acquaintances, 55% family members, 15% pets or animals, and 5% strangers. Mirroring the results for abuse experienced and witnessed, most of the abuse perpetrated by respondents was of a mild nature, some was of a mild-moderate nature, and very little was of a severe-moderate or severe nature. As before, the pattern becomes more pronounced from emotional to physical to sexual abuse.

Correlational Statistics

The final section of the results addresses correlations between various scale and subscale scores from the YEBQ. As an aid in the interpretation of the variable abbreviations, note that subscale scores are represented by three- or four-letter abbreviations. The first two letters indicate the type of abuse ("EM" for emotional, "PH" for physical, and "SX" for sexual) or the perpetrator/victim category ("FM" for family member, "AC" for acquaintance, "ST" for stranger, and "PA" for pet/animal). The second one or two letters indicate the context of the abuse ("H" for abuse history, "W" for abuse witnessed, "P" for abuse perpetrated, and "HW" for abuse history plus abuse witnessed).

Table 9 lists correlation coefficients for the total abuse perpetrated scale score and various scale and subscale scores for primary and secondary abuse.

In the first row segment, correlations between the total abuse perpetrated scale score and abuse history, abuse witnessed, and abuse history plus witnessed scores are of a strong magnitude, ranging from .67 to .82. In the second and third row segments, correlations between abuse perpetrated and primary and secondary abuse according to abuse type (emotional, physical, or sexual) are mostly of moderate to strong magnitude, ranging from .30 to .83. The highest correlations with abuse perpetration are seen in the physical abuse realm (.65, .79, and .83) followed by

emotional abuse (.55, .66, and .71) and sexual abuse (.30, .37, and .43). Row segments four and five show moderate to strong correlations (.35 to .79) between abuse perpetrated and primary and secondary abuse according to category of perpetrator (family member, acquaintance, or stranger). Overall, the strongest correlations can be seen between abuse perpetrated and abuse by acquaintances (.63, .70, and .79) with abuse by family members close behind (.58, .73, and .72). Abuse by strangers had the lowest correlations with abuse perpetration at levels of .35, .50, and .55.

Tables 10 through 13 all show the correlation coefficients between the same seven abuse perpetration subscale scores--emotional, physical, sexual, family, acquaintance, stranger, and pet abuse perpetration--and various abuse history and witness subscale scores. Tables 10 and 11 break down primary and secondary abuse by abuse type (emotional, physical, and sexual) while Tables 12 and 13 break down primary and secondary abuse by perpetrator category (family member, acquaintance, and stranger). Tables 10 and 12 combine abuse history and witnessed into a composite subscale while Tables 11 and 13 separate abuse history and abuse witnessed subscales.

Table 10 correlates the abuse perpetration subscale scores with composite history plus witness subscale scores for emotional, physical, and sexual abuse. Correlations between sexual abuse experiences and abuse perpetration are

Table 10

YEBO Subscale Correlations (Emotional, Physical, and Sexual History Plus Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscales)

ABUSE TYPE hist & wit:	EMHW emotional	PHHW physical	SXHW sexual
PERP. TYPE:			
EMP emotional	.73***	.67***	.39***
PHP physical	.53***	.77***	.35***
SXP sexual	.38***	.38***	.23*
FMP family	.71***	.68***	.43***
ACP acquaintances	.62***	.70***	.37***
STP strangers	.33***	.44***	.32***
PAP animals/pets	.37***	.59***	.10

N = 142

* $p < .05$

*** $p \leq .001$

of low to moderate magnitude (.10 to .43), and correlate least strongly with the perpetration subscales. Reported physical and emotional abuse experiences also have moderate to high correlation coefficient ranges with the perpetration subscales, ranging from .38 to .77 for physical abuse, and from .33 to .73 for emotional abuse. For the abuse type perpetration subscales, the highest correlations are between the emotional perpetration subscale and the emotional history/witness subscale (.73), and between the physical

Table 11

YEBO Subscale Correlations (Emotional, Physical, and Sexual History and Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores)

Abuse: Perp:	Abuse History			Abuse Witnessed		
	EMH emotional	PHH physical	SXH sexual	EMW emotional	PHW physical	SXW sexual
EMP emotional	.58***	.53***	.37***	.67***	.64***	.25*
PHP physical	.41***	.58***	.30***	.48***	.74***	.26*
SXP sexual	.25*	.34***	.17*	.37***	.33***	.20*
FMP family	.60***	.57***	.38***	.61***	.62***	.30***
ACP acquaint.	.47***	.52***	.31***	.57***	.69***	.27***
STP stranger	.23*	.43***	.27***	.32***	.35***	.24*
PAP animal	.24*	.37**	.11	.38**	.62**	.05

$N = 142$

* $p < .05$

*** $p \leq .001$

perpetration subscale and the physical history/witness subscale (.77). For the perpetrator category perpetration subscales, the highest correlations are between the family perpetration subscale and the emotional history/witness subscale (.71), and between the acquaintance perpetration subscale and the physical history/witness subscale (.70).

Table 11 presents separate correlation coefficients for abuse history and abuse witnessed subscales (rather than

Table 12

YEBO Subscale Correlations (Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger History Plus Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores)

Abuse Type: hist & wit	FMHW family	ACHW acquaintance	STHW stranger
Perp Type:			
EMP emotional	.66***	.70***	.52***
PHP physical	.63***	.67***	.43***
SXP sexual	.31***	.40***	.31***
FMP family	.77***	.65***	.46***
ACP acquaintance	.57***	.68***	.52***
STP stranger	.26*	.46***	.36***
PAP animal	.47***	.50***	.22*

$N = 142$

* $p < .05$

** $p \leq .001$

combining the two as in Table 10) for a more detailed analysis. Overall, the results here mirror those of Table 10. Notably, for the emotional and physical abuse subscales, correlations with abuse perpetration scores are almost always higher in the abuse witnessed subscales than in the abuse history subscales. For sexual abuse, however, this pattern reverses itself and correlations with abuse perpetration subscale scores are typically higher with primary abuse scores than with secondary abuse scores.

Table 13

YEBQ Subscale Correlations (Family, Acquaintance, and Stranger History and Witness Subscale Scores with Perpetration Subscale Scores)

Abuse: Perp:	Abuse History			Abuse Witnessed		
	EMH emotional	PHH physical	SXH sexual	EMW emotional	PHW physical	SXW sexual
EMP emotional	.55***	.58***	.35***	.64***	.62***	.47***
PHP physical	.49***	.53***	.27***	.64***	.61***	.40***
SXP sexual	.24*	.33***	.20*	.32***	.35***	.28***
FMP family	.69***	.54***	.31***	.69***	.57***	.42***
ACP acquaint.	.46***	.53***	.33***	.57***	.63***	.28***
STP stranger	.20*	.42***	.35***	.26*	.37***	.26*
PAP animal	.28***	.36**	.03	.57**	.48**	.26*

$N = 142$

* $p < .05$

** $p \leq .001$

Table 12 correlates the abuse perpetration subscale scores with composite history plus witness subscale scores for family, acquaintance, and stranger abuse. Correlations between stranger abuse experiences and abuse perpetration are of low to moderate magnitude (.22 to .52), and correlate least strongly with the perpetration subscales.

Acquaintance abuse experiences tend to correlate most

strongly with the perpetration subscales and range in the moderate to strong magnitudes of .40 to .70. Family abuse experiences correlate with abuse perpetration scores at a weak to high magnitude, ranging from .26 to .77. For the abuse-type perpetration subscales, the highest correlations are between the emotional perpetration subscale and the acquaintance history/witness subscale (.70) and between the emotional perpetration subscale and the family history/witness subscale (.66). For the perpetrator category perpetration subscales, the highest correlations are between the family perpetration subscale and the family history/witness subscale (.77), and between the acquaintance perpetration subscale and the acquaintance history/witness subscale (.68).

Table 13 presents separate correlation coefficients for abuse history and abuse witnessed subscales for a more detailed analysis. Overall, the results here mirror those of Table 12. Notably, for the family, acquaintance, and stranger abuse subscales, correlations with abuse perpetration scores are almost always higher in the abuse witnessed subscales than in the abuse history subscales. The two exceptions are found in the stranger perpetration subscale scores where correlations are higher with abuse history scores (.42 and .35) than abuse witness scores (.37 and .28) for the acquaintance and stranger subscales, respectively.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The three primary questions posed in the present research concerned (a) the internal consistency reliability of the Youth Experiences and Behaviors Questionnaire (YEBQ), (b) the concurrent and discriminant validity of various YEBQ scores using scores from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979) as criterion measures, and (c) the descriptive and correlational statistics on this sample of college men in regard to their abuse histories and patterns of abuse perpetration. The following discussion will include a brief review and interpretation of the results followed by a discussion of the limitations of the study.

YEBQ Internal Consistency Reliability

As was mentioned in Chapter IV approximately 24% of the sample indicated little (as defined by scores of 10 or below out of a possible 81 or 99 on abuse history, witnessed, and perpetration scale scores) or no involvement in primary, secondary, or perpetrated abuse. For this reason, two internal consistency reliability analyses were conducted--one with the entire sample of 142 subjects and one with a "filtered sample" of 108 subjects who scored above 10 on the abuse history, witnessed, or perpetration scales.

Using Cronbach's coefficient alpha, the internal consistency reliability of the YEBQ was found to be moderate

to very high (.61 to .93). The internal consistency reliability for the entire instrument was found to be .93 for the total sample, and .92 for the filtered sample. Internal consistency reliability for the abuse history (H), abuse witness (W), and abuse perpetrate (P) scales was found to be .85 for the total sample and .77 for the filtered sample. By considering analyses for both the total and filtered sample, the internal reliability of the victim/perpetrator category subscale scores ranged from .61 to .82. The lower reliability for the stranger subscale (.61) is not surprising given the typical one-time nature of abuse incidents committed by or towards strangers. Logically, acquaintance and family subscale internal reliability coefficients, which are more likely to assess repeated abuse incidents by the same perpetrators across abuse types, were higher (.82/.78 and .79/.71).

Concurrent and Discriminant Validity

For the concurrent validity analysis, YEBQ family and nonfamily emotional and physical abuse history, witness, and perpetrate scores were correlated with CTS intra- and extrafamilial verbal and physical aggression (toward and by respondent) scores from the CTS. The concurrent validity coefficients for these pairs of scores were found to be of low to moderate magnitudes, ranging from .03 to .46. Inter-

family scores yielded the lowest values and nonfamily scores yielded more moderate values.

There are several possible explanations for the findings of lower magnitudes. Since correlation coefficients measure the relationship between scores, not constructs (Glass & Hopkins, 1984), one possible explanation for the low magnitude of some validity coefficients is that the constructs measured by the YEBQ and the CTS differ. Some clear construct-related differences between the two instruments need to be highlighted.

First, the CTS, a conflict-response measure, is a much more indirect indicator of abuse than the YEBQ. Whereas the CTS asks respondents to indicate how often they responded in a limited set of ways to disagreements with others, the YEBQ defines various type of abuse, provides examples, and then directly asks whether respondents have ever been hurt in such a manner. The CTS, therefore, may decrease the social desirability effect to a greater extent than the YEBQ, accounting for the difference in responses.

Second, whereas the CTS asks respondents to consider conflict responses only during their last year of high school, the YEBQ asks respondents to consider abuse at any age and specifically calls for ratings of the most frequent and severe incidents. The difference in these referent periods is substantial and could account for a great deal of response variation.

Finally, the CTS and the YEBQ significantly differ in their assessment of abuse severity. Whereas the CTS equates acts that could differ greatly in seriousness (e.g., pushing and hitting a person with something hard), the YEBQ asks respondents to precisely rate the severity of abusive incidents on an anchored 3-point scale.

Another factor to consider in assessing concurrent validity is the adequacy of the criterion measure (Borg & Gall, 1989). Straus (1995) provided evidence supporting the factor structure, content validity, and moderate internal consistency reliability (of the verbal and physical aggression scales) of the CTS, but evidence for validity is less compelling. Although Straus (1995, p. 10) provided "at least some evidence of construct validity," concurrent validity coefficients for a college sample as examined by comparing separate reports from parents and children ranged from $-.12$ to $.64$ (Bulcroft & Straus, 1975). Straus contended that validity is the most difficult aspect of an instrument to ascertain and states that despite a huge literature, the criteria for judging the validity of an instrument are far from precise. He noted that no established standards for judging concurrent validity coefficients exist.

For the discriminant validity analysis, YEBQ family abuse history, witness, and perpetrator scores were correlated with various family reasoning scores from the

CTS. The discriminant validity coefficients for these pairs of scores were found to be of near-zero magnitudes, ranging from $-.003$ to $-.036$. None of these coefficients were statistically significant. Predictably, these results show that almost no relationship exists between the measured constructs.

Although the YEBQ family abuse scores and the CTS reasoning scores may at first appear to be converse in nature (leading one to expect negative correlation coefficients of a high magnitude), closer examination reveals that this is not the case.

In understanding this finding, it is important to realize that the constructs of reasoning, verbal, and physical aggression in the CTS are not mutually exclusive. In other words, the presence of one behavior type does rule out the presence of the other types. To illustrate, since the reasoning scale of the CTS assesses reasoning responses to conflict, low reasoning scores may indicate that either aggressive responses to conflict are more common or that little conflict is occurring. On the other hand, high reasoning scores may mean that either there are few aggressive responses to conflict or that both reasoning and aggressive responses to conflict are common. Due to the uncertainty of the meaning of the CTS reasoning scale scores, the lack of relationship seen with YEBQ family abuse scores is understandable. Notably, Straus (1995) himself

has stated that the poor internal consistency reliability level and lack of validity evidence for the reasoning scale makes it one of the weakest aspects of the CTS.

Descriptive and Correlational Data

The first segment of this section will discuss the descriptive statistical findings from the study. Secondly, the correlational findings will be discussed.

Several interesting findings were discovered in the descriptive statistical analysis of the study. As was mentioned in Chapter IV, the mode of every YEBQ scale and subscale score was zero and the means for the abuse history, abuse witnessed, and abuse perpetrated scale scores were relatively low. This indicates that most respondents denied experiencing, witnessing, and perpetrating the various types of abuse assessed in the YEBQ, and for those who did acknowledge abuse, the frequency and severity levels were relatively low. This finding corresponds with the notion that the university screening process is likely to exclude many who have been severely abused, and as a result are not functioning at the level required to gain university admittance (Runtz & Briere, 1986).

The global disclosure rating scale scores revealed interesting information. First, 69% of the sample did not disclose abuse experiences nor were any such experiences discovered by others. Although some respondents had little

or no abuse to disclose, this percentage is still very high. In comparison, Benson et al. (1992) found that 42% of female victims of sexual assault never told anyone. Although this figure is alarming, it is lower than that found in the male sample. This finding speaks to the fear and intense shame male victims of abuse typically feel (Hunter, 1990).

Of those who disclosed abuse experiences or whose abuse was discovered, almost 60% indicated that all, most, or some people who knew about the abuse failed to intervene to stop the abuse, protect them, or support them. About 20% indicated that most people who knew about the abuse attempted to stop the abuse, protect them, or support them. Although this figure appears more encouraging, note that even if most people are supportive and protective, but just one important individual (e.g., a parent, spouse, etc.) reacts negatively, the abused person is revictimized. Unfortunately, only 20% indicated that everyone who knew of the abuse acted to stop it, protect or support them. Overall, these statistics attest to the need for public education on how to respond to abuse victims (especially males) in an understanding and caring manner that will assist them in their recovery (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1987; Hunter, 1990; Violato & Genuis, 1993).

The correlations between the global disclosure response scale scores and total abuse perpetrated, physical abuse perpetrated, and acquaintance abuse perpetrated scores

(-.42, -.57, and -.36, respectively) indicate that as the level of support and protection received by victims from those who were told about the abuse or those who found out about the abuse increases, the level of perpetration by the victim decreases. This finding attests to the apparent importance peoples' responses have, not only in helping stop current abuse and in aiding victims' recoveries, but also in preventing future abuse of other potential victims.

Although the majority of participants denied experiencing and perpetrating abuse, examination of the descriptive statistics reveals that some respondents acknowledged experiencing, witnessing, and perpetrating highly frequent and severe levels of abuse. In regard to abuse type and context, witnessing emotional and physical abuse was found to be the most common experience, whereas experiencing, witnessing, and perpetrating sexual abuse were less common. In regard to perpetrator/victim category and abuse context, witnessing abusive acquaintances and strangers was the most common experience, whereas being abused by strangers and abusing acquaintances, pets, and strangers were less common. These results confirm recent concern over the prevalence of secondary abuse and the long-term effects on child witnesses of abuse (Davis & Carlson, 1987; Osofsky, 1995; Sternberg et al., 1993; Suh & Abel, 1990).

Further analyses provide yet another way of comprehending respondents' abuse patterns. Over 83% of respondents indicated having been emotionally abused, most frequently by acquaintances (82%) and family members (71%), and primarily mild in nature (78%; as defined by perpetrator number, abuse frequency, and severity). Only 1% of those acknowledging a history of emotional abuse rated the nature of the abuse as severe. Although the current prevalence rates are similar to those found in a sample of college women (Briere & Runtz, 1990), little empirical work exists on the psychological abuse of boys, and future studies are needed to replicate these findings.

Over 76% of respondents indicated having been physically abused, again most frequently by family members (84%) and acquaintances (62%), and primarily mild in nature (85%). Only 1% of those acknowledging a history of physical abuse rated the nature of the abuse as severe. These findings are congruent with those of Gelles (1978), whose survey of parents found that 73% reported at least one violent episode during the course of raising their child. Compared to a self-report study of community college learning center students (Miller & Miller, 1986) and a study of inner-city school children (Bell & Jenkins, 1993), the present sample presented lower levels of physical abuse frequency and severity. These differences could reflect the dissimilarity of the samples (e.g., SES, education level,

community violence, etc.), however. A sample of college males surveyed by Milner et al. (1990) reported only slightly higher frequency and severity levels of physical abuse than did respondents in the current study.

Over 14% of respondents indicated having been sexually abused, most frequently by acquaintances (76%), and primarily mild in nature (98%). Only 2% of those acknowledging a history of sexual abuse rated the nature of the abuse as moderate, and none rated the nature of the abuse as severe. The incidence rate for this sample (14.8%) matches rates found by other researchers (13%-15%) who have used a similarly broad definition of sexual abuse (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1989; Violato & Genuis, 1993). Congruent with previous findings (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1989; Violato & Genuis, 1993), the majority of sexually abused respondents identified acquaintances as perpetrators (76%), followed by family members (33%) and strangers (19%).

These findings indicate that family members and acquaintances are by far the most frequent perpetrators of all types of abuse, and for this sample, abuse suffered is typically of a mild nature.

Rates of abuse witnessed by respondents were remarkably similar to what they experienced directly, with about 85%, 75%, and 15% disclosing secondary emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, respectively. The severity levels and perpetrators of secondary abuse, however, showed a different

pattern from that of primary abuse. For secondary emotional and physical abuse, rates of mild abuse were lower (52% and 63%), and moderate (39% and 30%) and severe (9% and 7%) abuse rates were more common. Although family members and acquaintances continued to be common perpetrators, witnessing abuse perpetrated by strangers was also very common (59%, 65%, and 46% for emotional, physical, and sexual abuse). Although studies on the prevalence of witnessing emotional and sexual abuse are lacking, the 75% prevalence rate for witnessing physical abuse in this study is similar, but slightly less than other secondary physical abuse rates for college students (87%; Milner et al., 1990).

Respondents' rates of abuse perpetration mirrored those of primary and secondary abuse, with over 78%, 73%, and 14%, respectively, revealing acts of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse toward others. Due to the lack of research, comparisons for emotional and physical abuse perpetration are again difficult to make. Rates of sexual abuse perpetration have been studied, however, and the 14% rate of sexual abuse perpetration found in the current study can be compared to a previous finding that over 25% of college males admitted to some degree of sexually aggressive behavior (Koss, 1988). Also, the current finding that only 5% of sexual abuse perpetrators victimized strangers concurs with the determination (Gavey, 1991) that strangers account

for only a small percentage of sexual abuse incidents against college women.

As was seen in abuse experienced and witnessed, most abuse was described to be of a mild nature and very little abuse fell into the moderately severe or severe levels. Family members and acquaintances were by far the most common targets of abuse of all types. In regard to physical abuse, pets/animals were cited among the victims by 60% of perpetrators. This finding validates recent concerns over the prevalence of pet/animal abuse and its connection with other types of violent behavior (Ascione, 1993).

The final section of this chapter discusses the correlational findings from the YEBQ scale and subscale scores. The correlations interpreted in the remainder of the chapter were conducted on the entire sample of 142 subjects. As has been mentioned, a portion of the sample (24%) indicated little exposure to or perpetration of abuse. It is therefore important to note that the following correlations may likely be impacted by this restriction of variability in the sample. Also, the results described here provide information only about the nature of relations between YEBQ variables--they do not attest to causality.

The first series of correlations between the abuse perpetrated scale score and various primary and secondary abuse scale and subscale scores gives us information as to the strength of the relation between the total amount of

abuse perpetrated by respondents and variables from their past primary and secondary abuse.

Strong correlations between perpetrated abuse and primary (.67), secondary (.77), and primary plus secondary abuse (.82) were found. Squaring the correlation coefficients yields proportion of predictable variance scores (Glass & Hopkins, 1984), which reveal that the common variance between abuse perpetrated scores and primary abuse scores is 45%, and the common variance with secondary abuse scores is 59%. This finding supports those of many researchers (Briere, 1987; Carroll, 1977; Koss & Dinero, 1988; Pfouts et al., 1982; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Stacey & Shupe, 1983; Violato & Genuis, 1993) who have found a connection between experiencing and witnessing abuse and its perpetration.

Surprisingly, the correlation between secondary abuse and perpetration was found to be stronger than the correlation between primary abuse and perpetration. This outcome is interesting in light of the general finding that witnesses of abuse tend to evidence more internalizing behavior problems (Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1985; Wolfe et al., 1986), and that abused witnesses have been found to exhibit statistically significantly greater and more intense externalizing conduct disorder-type problems than nonabused witnesses (Hughes, 1988). Abuse witness scores were frequently better predictors of perpetration in the present

study, however, suggesting the need to consider the experience of witnessing abuse as a distinct risk factor for becoming abusive. One possible explanation for this finding is that victims who witness, but do not directly experience abuse, learn that abusive behavior can result in the ability to control others and obtain some type of gain (e.g., material goods, respect). It is also more likely that witnesses fail to realize the negative impact abuse has since they do not directly experience victims' pain and anguish, and since they likely receive explanations that victims deserve their abuse. If this is the case, education about the consequences of abuse and empathy training for children witnesses of abuse would be of primary importance. One way to accomplish this would be to expand programs for child witnesses of abuse in battered womens' shelters and to make battered women aware of the effects witnessing of violence has on their children. Future research is needed to clarify this issue.

Not surprisingly, the combined scores of primary and secondary abuse yielded the strongest correlation with total perpetration scores and was associated with 62% of the variance in perpetration scores.

In summary, results showed a relation of high magnitude between respondents' reported amount of experienced and witnessed abuse and their abuse perpetration levels, with the combination of primary and secondary abuse scores most

predictive of abuse perpetration levels. Again, as other researchers have emphasized (Kaufman & Zigler, 1987; Widom, 1989a), it is vital to note this relation is correlational (not causal) in nature and does not indicate that those who have experienced or witnessed abuse are destined to become abusers.

When primary and secondary abuse were divided into emotional, physical, and sexual components, the highest correlations with abuse perpetrated scores were seen in the physical abuse realm (.65, .79, and .83), whose scores were associated with 69% of the variance in abuse perpetration scores. This finding is consistent with the "hurt or be hurt" mentality accompanying increasing rates of community violence and gang activity (Bell & Jenkins, 1993; Osofsky, 1995), and also with previous findings on the overlap between victims and offenders of physical abuse (e.g., Dennis, Kirk, & Knuckles, 1981, as cited in Bell & Jenkins, 1993). These findings attest to the importance of community mental health programs and of gang prevention programs for children.

Emotional abuse history and witness scores correlated moderately with perpetration scores (.55, .66, and .71), while sexual abuse history and witness scores showed weak to moderate correlations with perpetration scores (.37, .30, and .43).

For all abuse types, combining primary and secondary abuse scores yielded higher correlations with perpetration than either one alone. For emotional and physical, but not sexual abuse, abuse witnessed scores correlated higher with perpetration scores than did abuse history scores.

When primary and secondary abuse were divided into family, acquaintance, and stranger perpetrator components, stranger scores yielded the weakest correlations (.35, .50, and .55) of the three groups. Correlations between abuse by family members and acquaintances with abuse perpetration ranged in magnitude from moderate to strong. For primary abuse, there was a correlation of higher magnitude with abuse by acquaintances (.63) than with abuse by family members (.58), but for secondary abuse, there was a correlation of slightly higher magnitude with abuse by family members (.73) than with abuse by acquaintances (.70). When primary and secondary abuse were combined, the correlation between abuse by acquaintances and perpetration scores was highest (.79), followed by abuse perpetrated by family members (.72) and strangers (.55). This finding coincides with a review of 45 studies (Kendall-Tackett et al., 1993), which found that a perpetrator who was close to the victim caused more serious effects (including aggression, cruelty, delinquency, and inappropriate sexual behavior) than one who was less close. One possible explanation for these findings is that abuse victims whose

perpetrators are known to them may tend to make more personal, internal, and stable attributions (Grand Forks Abuse and Rape Crisis Center, 1990), which may complicate recovery and lead to negative outcomes.

To summarize, results indicate that scores reflecting a history of primary and secondary physical abuse, as well as abuse by acquaintances and family members, are most strongly associated with abuse perpetration scores on the YEBQ. Weak to moderate magnitude correlations were seen between abuse perpetration scores and scores for primary sexual abuse, secondary sexual abuse, and stranger abuse.

The second series of correlations were computed between various abuse perpetration subscale scores and abuse history and witness subscale scores (categorized by abuse type and perpetrator/victim category). In following the recommendation of many researchers (Bowers, 1990; Fagan & Wexler, 1988; Friedman & Rosenbaum, 1988), this more detailed analysis helped determine whether the pattern of perpetrators' abusive behavior was correlated with the nature of the primary abuse trauma.

In fact, the most interesting outcome of these analyses was that in many cases, the strongest relations between abuse experienced and abuse perpetrated scores were found between the same abuse types and victim/perpetrator categories. For example, emotional abuse history and witness scores correlated most strongly with emotional abuse

perpetration scores (.58, .67, and .73). Similarly, physical abuse, family abuse, and acquaintance abuse experiences showed the strongest relationships with physical abuse perpetration (.58, .74, and .77), family abuse perpetration (.69, .69, and .77), and acquaintance abuse perpetration (.53, .63, and .68), respectively.

In regard to physical abuse, these results parallel those of Lewis et al. (1979), who found that 78.6% of a more violent group of offenders had witnessed extreme violence directed at others versus only 20% of the less violent group. As for the high correlations found between emotional, family, and acquaintance abuse history and perpetration scores, future studies confirming or refuting these results will be of interest. In the meantime, these findings have important implications, not only for preventative treatment of abuse victims as has been discussed, but also for treatment of offenders. Namely, one component of therapy needs to address offenders' abuse histories and their relation to current perpetration in detail.

The two exceptions to the general pattern of the strongest correlations with abuse perpetration existing between the same abuse types and perpetrator/victim categories were in the areas of sexual abuse and stranger abuse. The strongest relation with sexual abuse perpetration scores was seen in correlations with emotional

and physical abuse history scores (rather than with sexual abuse history scores). And the strongest relation with stranger abuse perpetration scores was seen in correlations with scores of acquaintance abuse experiences.

Various explanations can be offered for these two exceptions to the pattern. First, it is likely that many individuals who have personally experienced the pain and shame of sexual abuse would never consider putting another person through such trauma. In fact, Hunter (1990) pointed out that it is common for sexually abused males to associate their sexuality with fear, shame, and confusion, and limit its expression. Second, keep in mind that victims of abuse perpetrated by strangers are more likely to attribute their trauma to external and nonpersonal causes rather than internal and personal causes (Grand Forks Abuse and Rape Crisis Center, 1990). In this sense, it is not surprising that abuse aimed at strangers has a stronger connection with a history of being abused by family members and acquaintances, both experiences which have been shown to cause more serious effects (including aggression, cruelty, delinquency, and inappropriate sexual behavior) than experiences of abuse by a perpetrator who is unknown to the victim (Kendall-Tackett et al., 1993).

Limitations

The purpose of the following section is to delineate

the limitations of the present study so that readers may make informed and accurate conclusions about its results and so that future studies in this area can expand the current knowledge base and be methodologically enhanced. Five main limitations have been identified.

One obvious limitation of the study is its retrospective nature. The results of the study rest to some degree on the participants' accuracy of memory for events that occurred years before and on their willingness to admit such experiences. Perhaps more so than with women, men's recollections might be influenced by cultural expectations regarding gender-role behavior (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1989). In an effort to minimize such social desirability effects, complete anonymity was assured through the use of subject code numbers and the exclusion of personally identifying questions.

A second limitation of the study involves the voluntary nature of the sample. A qualitative difference may exist between those willing to participate and those unwilling (Borg & Gall, 1989). The voluntary nature of the study may yield an underestimation of the rates of abuse experienced, witnessed, and perpetrated. Guarantees of confidentiality were used in an effort to minimize this effect.

Third, the use of a college student sample restricts the generalizability of the study. It is likely that the use of a "healthy" sample may overlook men severely

influenced by their past abuse. Additionally, due to the young age of the sample members, behaviors that emerge later in life may be masked (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1989).

Fourth, since the analyses were of a descriptive and correlational nature, no conclusions can be drawn regarding cause and effect (Glass & Hopkins, 1984).

Finally, it must be noted that as operational definitions of abuse differ from study to study, markedly dissimilar results in the data are observed (Fromuth & Burkhart, 1987). Rather than allowing respondents to create their own definitions of abuse, however, explicit criteria were outlined for the definitions, frequency, and severity levels of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse. Results of this study can best be compared to those who use broad, encompassing definitions, especially in regard to sexual abuse.

REFERENCES

- Ageton, S. S. (1983). Sexual assault among adolescents. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Ascione, F. R. (1993). Children who are cruel to animals: A review of research and implications for developmental psychopathology. Anthrozoos, 6(4), 226-247.
- Ascione, F. R. (1995). Domestic violence and cruelty to animals. Paper presented at the 4th International Conference on Family Violence, Durham, NH.
- Bagley, C. (1984). Mental health and the in-family sexual abuse of children and adolescents. Canada's Mental Health, June, 17-23.
- Beitchman, J. H., Zucker, K. J., Hood, A. E., DaCosta, G. A., Akman, K., & Cassavia, E. (1992). A review of the long-term effects of child sexual abuse. Child Abuse and Neglect, 16, 101-118.
- Bell, C. C., & Jenkins, E. J. (1993). Community violence and children on Chicago's southside. Psychiatry, 56, 46-54.
- Benson, D., Charlton, C., & Goodheart, F. (1992). Acquaintance rape on campus: A literature review. Journal of American College Health, 40(4), 157-165.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction (5th ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Bowers, L. B. (1990). Traumas precipitating female delinquency: Implications for assessment, practice and policy. Child and Adolescent Social Work, 7(5), 389-403.
- Briere, J. (1987). Predicting self-reported likelihood of battering: Attitudes and childhood experiences. Journal of Research in Personality, 21, 61-69.
- Briere, J., & Runtz, M. (1990). Differential adult symptomatology associated with three types of child abuse histories. Child Abuse and Neglect, 14, 357-364.
- Browne, A., & Finkelhor, D. (1986). Impact of child sexual abuse: A review of the research. Psychological Bulletin, 99, 66-77.

- Bulcroft, R. A., & Straus, M. A. (1975). Validity of husband, wife, and child reports of conjugal violence and power. Durham: Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire.
- Bureau of Economic and Business Research, University of Utah. (1990). Statistical abstract of Utah. Salt Lake City: Author.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 217-230.
- Byles, J. A. (1980). Adolescent girls in need of protection. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 50, 264-278.
- Carlson, B. E. (1990). Adolescent observers of marital violence. Journal of Family Violence, 5(4), 285-299.
- Carroll, J. C. (1977). The intergenerational transmission of family violence: The long term effects of aggressive behavior. Aggressive Behavior, 3, 289-299.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1970). Essentials of psychological testing, (3rd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.
- Cummings, E. M., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (1992). Emotions and the socialization of aggression: Adults' angry behavior and children's arousal and aggression. In A. Fraczek & H. Zumley (Eds.), Socialization and aggression (pp. 61-84). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Daro, D., & Gelles, R. J. (1992). Public attitudes and behaviors with respect to child abuse prevention. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7(4), 517-531.
- Davis, L. V., & Carlson, B. E. (1987). Observation of spouse abuse: What happens to the children? Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2(3), 278-291.
- Fagan, J., & Wexler, S. (1988). Explanations of sexual assault among violent delinquents. Journal of Adolescent Research, 3(3-4), 363-385.
- Fantuzzo, J. W., DePaola, L. M., Lambert, L., Martino, T., Anderson, G., & Sutton, S. (1991). Effects of interparental violence on the psychological adjustment and competencies of young children. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 59(2), 258-265.

- Fantuzzo, J., & Lindquist, C. (1988). Violence in the home: The effects of observing conjugal violence on children. Journal of Family Violence, 4, 77-90.
- Fehrenbach, P. A., Smith, W., Monastersky, C., & Deisher, R. W. (1986). Adolescent sexual offenders: Offender and offense characteristics. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 56(2), 225-233.
- Finkelhor, D. (1979). Sexually victimized children. New York: Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1981). The sexual abuse of boys. Victimology, 6, 76-84.
- Fischer, G. J. (1992). Gender differences in college student sexual abuse victims and their offenders. Annals of Sex Research, 5(4), 215-226.
- Ford, M. E., & Linney, J. A. (1995). Comparative analysis of juvenile sexual offenders, violent nonsexual offenders, and status offenders. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10(1), 56-70.
- Friedman, J., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1988). Social control theory: The salience of components by age, gender, and type of crime. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 4(4), 363-381.
- Fritz, G. S., Stoll, K., & Wagner, N. N. (1981). A comparison of males and females who were sexually molested as children. Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy, 7, 54-59.
- Fromuth, M. E., & Burkhart, B. R. (1987). Childhood sexual victimization among college men: Definitional and methodological issues. Violence and Victims, 2(4), 241-253.
- Fromuth, M. E., & Burkhart, B. R. (1989). Long-term psychological correlates of childhood sexual abuse in two samples of college men. Child Abuse and Neglect, 13, 533-542.
- Gavey, N. J. (1991). Sexual victimization among Auckland-University students: How much and who does it? New Zealand Journal of Psychology, 20, 63-70.
- Gelles, R. J. (1978). Violence toward children in the United States. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 48, 580.

- Gil, D. (1973). Violence against children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1984). Statistical methods in education and psychology. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goodwin, J., Simms, M., & Bergman, R. (1979). Hysterical seizures: A sequel to incest. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 49, 698-703.
- Grand Forks Abuse and Rape Crisis Center. (1990). Volunteer advocate training manual. Grand Forks, ND: Author.
- Graves, R. B. (1993). Conceptualizing the youthful male sex offender: A meta-analytic examination of offender characteristics by offense type. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, Logan.
- Herman, J. L. (1981). Father-daughter incest. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hershorn, M., & Rosenbaum, A. (1985). Children of marital violence: A closer look at the unintended victims. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 55, 260-266.
- Hughes, H. M. (1988). Psychological and behavioral correlates of family violence in child witnesses and victims. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 58(1), 77-90.
- Hunter, M. (1990). Abused boys: The neglected victims of sexual abuse. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Jaffe, P., Wilson, S., & Wolfe, D. (1986). Promoting changes in attitudes and understanding of conflict resolution among child witnesses of family violence. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 143, 74-77.
- Jaffe, P., Wolfe, D., Wilson S., & Zak, L. (1986). Similarities in behavioral and social maladjustment among child victims and witnesses to family violence. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 56(1), 142-146.
- Johnson, R. L., & Shrier, D. K. (1985). Sexual victimization of boys: Experience at an adolescent medicine clinic. Journal of Adolescent Health Care, 6, 372-376.
- Kaufman, J., & Zigler, E. (1987). Do abused children become abusive parents? American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57(2), 186-192.

- Kendall-Tackett, K. A., Williams, L. M., & Finkelhor, D. (1993). Impact of sexual abuse on children: A review and synthesis of recent empirical studies. Psychological Bulletin, 113(1), 164-180.
- Knight, R. A., & Prentky, R. A. (1993). Exploring characteristics for classifying juvenile sex offenders. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kolvin, I., Miller, F. J. W., Fleeting, M., & Kolvin, P. A. (1988). Social and parenting factors affecting criminal-offence rates: Findings from the Newcastle thousand family study (1947-1980). British Journal of Psychiatry, 152, 80-90.
- Koss, M. P. (1988). Hidden rape: Sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample in higher education. In A. W. Burgess (Ed.), Rape and sexual assault II (pp. 3-25). New York: Garland.
- Koss, M. P., & Dinero, T. E. (1988). Predictors of sexual aggression among a national sample of male college students. Annals of New York Academy of Science, 528, 133-147.
- Landis, J. T. (1956). Experiences of 500 children with adult sexual deviation. Psychiatric Quarterly Supplement, 30, 91-109.
- Lewis, D. O., Shanok, S. S., Pincus, J. H., & Glaser, G. H. (1979). Violent juvenile delinquents: Psychiatric, neurological, psychological, and abuse factors. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 18, 307-319.
- Marans, S., & Cohen, D. (1993). Children and inner-city violence: Strategies for intervention. In L. Leavitt & N. Fox (Eds.), Psychological effects of war and violence on children (pp. 281-302). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McCurdy, K., & Daro, D. (1994). Child maltreatment. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 9(1), 75-94.
- Miller, E. K., & Miller, K. A. (1986). Abusive histories in youth/young adult students. International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling, 9, 159-165.
- Milner, J. S., Robertson, K. R., & Rogers, D. L. (1990). Childhood history of abuse and adult child abuse potential. Journal of Family Violence, 5(1), 15-34.

- Moore, J., Galcius, A., & Pettican, K. (1981). Emotional risk to children caught in violent marital conflict--the Basildon Treatment Project. Child Abuse and Neglect, 5, 147-152.
- Osofsky, J. D. (1995). The effects of exposure to violence on young children. American Psychologist, 50(9), 782-788.
- Osofsky, J. D., Wewers, S., Hann, D. M., & Fick, A. C. (1993). Chronic community violence: What is happening to our children? Psychiatry, 56, 36-45.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1981). Woman battering: Victims and their experiences. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pfouts, J. H., Schopler, J. H., & Henley, H. C., Jr. (1982). Forgotten victims of family violence. Social Work, 27(4), 367-368.
- Porter, J. F., & Critelli, J. W. (1992). Measurement of sexual aggression in college men: A methodological analysis. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 21(6), 525-542.
- Roane, T. H. (1992). Male victims of sexual abuse: A case review within a child protective team. Child Welfare, 71, 231-239.
- Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1981a). Children: The unintended victims of marital violence. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 51, 692-699.
- Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1981b). Marital violence: Characteristics of abusive couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49, 63-71.
- Rosenbaum, J. L. (1989). Female dysfunction and female delinquency. Crime and Delinquency, 35(1), 31-44.
- Ross, R. R. (1980). Violence in, violence out: Child-abuse and self-mutilation in adolescent offenders. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 22, 273-287.
- Runtz, M., & Briere, J. (1986). Adolescent "acting-out" and childhood history of sexual abuse. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1(3), 326-334.
- Russell, D. E. H. (1983). The incidence and prevalence of intrafamilial and extrafamilial sexual abuse of female children. Child Abuse and Neglect, 7, 133-146.

- Sandberg, D. N. (1986). The child abuse delinquency connection: Evolution of a therapeutic community. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 18(3), 215-220.
- Silbert, M., & Pines, A. (1981). Sexual abuse as an antecedent to prostitution. Child Abuse and Neglect, 5, 407-411.
- Silvern, L., & Kaersvang, L. (1989). The traumatized children of violent marriages. Child Welfare, 68(4), 421-436.
- Stacey, W. A., & Shupe, A. (1983). The family secret: Domestic violence in America. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sternberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Greenbaum, C., & Cicchetti, D. (1993). Effects of domestic violence on children's behavior problems and depression. Developmental Psychology, 29(1), 44-52.
- Straus, M. A. (1973). A general systems theory approach to a theory of violence between family members. Social Science Information, 12, 105-125.
- Straus, M. A. (1974). Leveling, civility, and violence in the family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 13-29.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41, 75-88.
- Straus, M. A. (1995). Manual for the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). Durham: University of New Hampshire, Family Research Laboratory.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family. New York: Doubleday/Anchor.
- Suh, E. K., & Abel, E. M. (1990). The impact of spousal violence on the children of the abused. Journal of Independent Social Work, 4(4), 27-34.
- Telch, C. L., & Lindquist, C. U. (1984). Violent vs. nonviolent couples. Psychotherapy: Theory Research and Practice, 21, 242-248.
- Touliatos, J., Perlmutter, B. F., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Handbook of family measurement techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- United States Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, Bureau of the Census (1990). General population characteristics: Utah. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services. (1988). Study of the national incidence and prevalence of child abuse and neglect. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Violato, C., & Genuis, M. (1993). Factors which differentiate sexually abused from nonabused males: An exploratory study. Psychological Reports, 72, 767-770.
- Wahler, R. G., & Dumas, J. E. (1986). "A chip off the old block": Some interpersonal characteristics of coercive children across generations. In P. S. Strain, M. J. Guralnick, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), Children's social behavior: Development, assessment, and modification (pp.49-91). New York: Academic Press.
- Walsh, A. (1992). Genetic and environmental explanations of juvenile violence in advantaged and disadvantaged environments. Aggressive Behavior, 18, 187-199.
- Widom, C. S. (1989a). Child abuse, neglect, and adult behavior: Research design and findings on criminality, violence, and child abuse. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59, 355-367.
- Widom, C. S. (1989b). Does violence breed violence? A critical examination of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 106, 3-28.
- Widom, C. S. (1989c). The cycle of violence. Science, 244, 160-166.
- Widom, C. S. (1991). The role of placement experiences in mediating the criminal consequences of early childhood victimization. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 61(2), 195-209.
- Wolfe, D. A., Jaffe, P., Wilson, S. K., & Zak, L. (1985). Children of battered women: The relation of child behavior to family violence and maternal stress. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53, 657-665.
- Wolfe, D. A., Zak, L., Wilson, S., & Jaffe, P. (1986). Child witnesses to violence between parents: Critical issues in behavioral and social adjustment. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 14, 95-104.

Zeanah, C. H. (1994). The assessment and treatment of infants and toddlers exposed to violence. In J. D. Osofsky & E. Fenichel (Eds.), Caring for infants and toddlers in violent environments: Hurt, healing, and hope (pp. 29-37). Arlington, VA: Zero to Three/National Center for Clinical Infant Programs.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

Utah State UNIVERSITY

VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH OFFICE

Logan, Utah 84322-1450

Telephone: (801) 797-1180

FAX: (801) 797-1367

INTERNET: [pgerity@champ.usu.edu]

June 1, 1995

TO: Frank R. Ascione - PI
Monique R. Frazier - Student Researcher

FROM: True Rubal 

SUBJECT: Proposal Titled, "Is there a connection? An exploratory study of abuse experience and perpetration patterns among college males."

The above-referenced proposal has been reviewed by this office and is exempt from further review by the Institutional Review Board. However, the IRB strongly recommends that you, as a researcher, continually recognize the importance of ethical research conduct. Further, while your research project does not require a signed informed consent, you should consider (a) offering a general introduction to your research goals, and (b) informing, in writing or through oral presentation, each participant as to the rights of the subject to confidentiality, privacy or withdrawal at any time from the research activities.

The research activities listed below are exempt from IRB review based on the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations for the protection of human research subjects, 45 CFR Part 46, as amended to include provisions of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, June 18, 1991.

1. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (a) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (b) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (b) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could

reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

3. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (2)(b) of this section, if: (a) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (b) federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
4. Research, involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.
5. Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (a) public benefit or service programs; (b) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (c) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or (d) possible changes in methods or levels of payment or benefits or services under those programs.
6. Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (a) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed, or (b) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Your research is exempt from further review based on exemption number 2. Please keep the committee advised of any changes, adverse reactions or termination of the study. A yearly review is required of all proposals submitted to the IRB. We request that you advise us when this project is completed, otherwise we will contact you in April of 1996.

APPENDIX B:
RECRUITMENT MEMORANDUM

Memorandum

To: USU Professors
From: Monique Frazier, USU Psychology Graduate Student
Subject: Recruiting research subjects

As a graduate student in the USU psychology department, my research team and I are in the process of recruiting subjects for my master's thesis. We are asking departments outside psychology for their cooperation in order to obtain a more generalizable sample. I hope that you may be willing to take 2-3 minutes to read this announcement to your undergraduate class(es) and offer your students a small amount of extra credit in order to help the research efforts of our university. If you are willing to assist, directions follow. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!

Please read (or have your TA's read) the following recruitment statement to any classes for which you are willing to give extra credit points for research participation.

"Males ages 18-28 have a chance to earn _____ extra credit points for participating in a research study that is being conducted in the psychology department. You will not be penalized if you choose not to participate. If you choose to participate, you will be asked to take about one hour of your time to fill out two questionnaires. Names won't appear on any of the questionnaires. If you are interested, go to the Psychology Department, located on the 4th floor of the Education building in room 487. Ask for a questionnaire packet from the secretary. She will then direct you to a room to complete the questionnaires. After you are finished, you will take them back to the Psychology Department and the secretary will give you an extra credit slip to turn into me. Any questions? If you forget what to do, just go to the Psychology Department and you'll be given instructions there. I encourage you to participate--it is a good opportunity to gain extra credit as well as to learn something about research."

P.S. If you do not like the idea of offering extra credit only to males, you can offer this opportunity to all of your students and we will provide the questionnaires to accommodate them.

****If you have any questions, please contact me at 755-3290.**

APPENDIX C:
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Participant Information Sheet

Participation requirements: In order to receive extra credit points for your undergraduate class, the following will be required of you:

- 1) read this participant information sheet;
- 2) complete the enclosed Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)--be sure to read all directions and answer all questions. The CTS is a measure of intra-familial conflict, violence, and child abuse; and
- 3) complete the enclosed Youth Experiences and Behaviors Questionnaire (YBEQ)--be sure to read all directions and answer all questions. The YBEQ is a measure of emotional, physical, and sexual hurt to which you have been exposed or in which you have participated.

Completing these tasks will require approximately one hour of your time.

Benefits and Risks of Participation: While some of the questions may be difficult or painful to answer, you may find it useful to identify these areas of difficulty and take action toward their resolution. If any of the questions you answer bring up issues you would like to talk about further, please contact 1) the USU Counseling Center at 797-1012, 2) the USU Community Clinic at 797-3401, 3) Citizens Against Physical and Sexual Abuse at 752-4493, or 4) Intermountain Sexual Abuse Center at 753-5411. There is no risk that participating in this project could affect your standing at USU or your program of study. Your participation will help researchers to better understand the problem of abuse and its effects on people's lives.

Confidentiality: All information you provide is COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL. Do not write your name on any of the enclosed papers. We are only interested in group information for the purpose of this study. Information packets will be handled in a confidential manner. The only individuals who will have access to the information you give are the primary researchers and research assistants for this project. While they will see your answers, they will not know it was you who provided the information.

Rights: If you have decided you do not want to participate in this project, that is fine. You will not be penalized. If you want to participate, but when you start change your mind and want to stop, that is fine too. Again, you will not be penalized.

Directions: If you have decided to participate, complete the CTS and then the YBEQ. When you have completed ALL questions, turn the packet in to a Psychology Department Secretary in the psychology department office. The secretary will put your packet in a locked file cabinet and give you an extra credit slip for your participation. The secretary will not look at your answers.

YOU MAY KEEP THIS SHEET FOR YOUR INFORMATION.

APPENDIX D:
YOUTH EXPERIENCES AND BEHAVIORS QUESTIONNAIRE

YOUTH EXPERIENCES AND BEHAVIORS QUESTIONNAIRE

Code # _____

INSTRUCTIONS

Please take the next thirty minutes or so to answer the following questions about hurt. You will be asked about times in the past when you may have been hurt, when you may have seen others being hurt, and when you may have hurt others. Three kinds of hurt will be addressed--emotional, physical and sexual. Each type of hurt will be defined. It is very important that you read the definitions carefully and be completely honest in answering the questions about the hurt that has happened in your life. Remember, your answers are completely confidential. Although no one deserves to be hurt, most people have been hurt by others at some point in their lives. When you read these questions about the hurt in your life, don't think about whether the person who did the hurting is bad or good, whether the hurt was deserved or not, or whether the hurt was for punishment. If the person who did the hurting just had a bad temper or was drinking alcohol or doing drugs at the time, we still want to know about it. No matter where the hurt may have happened--at home, at school, on the streets, or anywhere else--please tell us about the experience. The main thing that is important for us to know today is whether or not the hurt happened.

Please supply the following information without including your name:

*Date: _____ *Age: _____ *Place of Birth: _____

*Educational Level (circle highest level completed):

High School:	1 yr.	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yrs.
Undergraduate:	1 yr.	2 yrs.	3 yrs.	4 yrs.

*Ethnicity (Caucasian, Black, Hispanic, Asian, Am. Ind., Mixed/Other): _____

YOUR ABUSE HISTORYEmotional Hurt

Please read the following definition of emotional hurt carefully. A person has been emotionally hurt if another person has done something to make them feel very angry, scared, worthless or bad about themselves. If a person has regularly been...

-ignored	-insulted	-humiliated
-shamed	-put down	-called names
-yelled at	-unfairly blamed	-threatened
-said mean words to	-forced to do something mean	
-controlled	-not taken proper care of	

-stopped from seeing other people, or
-forced to see harm or death come to a loved one or pet or
threatened of this

...that person has been emotionally hurt.

You will be asked if different types of people have emotionally hurt you. If they have, you will be asked to indicate how many people in a specified category hurt you and rate how often and how badly you were emotionally hurt. Please make sure that you circle a response for each question number unless otherwise indicated.

F A M I L Y

1. Were you ever emotionally hurt by a family member/s (e.g. parent, step-sibling, uncle, cousin, etc.)?

circle-- yes no (if no skip to #6)

2. How many family members have hurt you emotionally?

circle-- 1-3 4-6 more than 6

3. Think of the time in your life you were most often hurt by a family member/s. Using scale #1 of the laminated sheet, rate from 1 to 3 how often the emotional hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

4. Think of the worst or most severe time when you were emotionally hurt by a family member/s. Using scale #2 of the laminated handout, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the emotional hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3 efh_____

5. Please indicate which family member/s hurt you emotionally. DO NOT WRITE NAMES, rather write how they are related to you and whether they are male or female. For example, cousin, female.
-
-
-

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

6. Were you ever emotionally hurt by a person/people you knew but who were not family members (like classmates, friends, teachers, etc.)?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #11)

7. How many people that you knew have hurt you emotionally?

circle-- 1-3 4-6 more than 6

8. Think of the time in your life you were most often hurt by a person/people you knew. Using scale #1, rate from 1 to 3 how often the emotional hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

9. Think of the worst or most severe time when you were emotionally hurt by a person/people you knew. Using scale #2, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the emotional hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

eah_____

10. Please indicate which acquaintances hurt you emotionally. DO NOT WRITE NAMES, rather write a category (eg. classmate, neighbor, teacher) and whether they are male or female.

S T R A N G E R S

11. Were you ever emotionally hurt by a stranger?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to the physical hurt section after #15)

12. How many strangers have hurt you emotionally?

circle-- 1-3 4-6 more than 6

13. Think of the time in your life you were most often hurt by a stranger/s. Using scale #1, rate from 1 to 3 how often the emotional hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

14. Think of the worst or most severe time when you were emotionally hurt by a stranger/s. Using scale #2, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the emotional hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

esh_____

15. Please indicate whether the strangers who hurt you were male or female (eg. 2 females, 1 male, about 75% males).
-
-
-

Physical Hurt

EAH _____

Please read the following definition of physical hurt carefully. A person has been physically hurt if another person has used force or violence toward them that caused them fear or pain. If someone has...

-pinched	-squeezed	-spit at	-scratched
-bitten	-pulled your hair	-spanked	-slapped
-grabbed	-pushed	-shoved	-thrown
-hit	-kicked	-choked	-burned, or

-used weapons such as household items, knives, or guns against another person
...that person has been physically hurt.

You will be asked if different types of people have physically hurt you. If they have, you will be asked to indicate how many people in a category hurt you and rate how often and how badly you were physically hurt. Again, please circle an answer for every question, unless otherwise indicated.

F A M I L Y

16. Were you ever physically hurt by a family member/s?

circle-- yes no (if no skip to # 21)

17. How many family members have hurt you physically?

circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4

18. Think of the time in your life you were most often hurt by a family member/s. Using scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

19. Think of the worst or most severe time when you were physically hurt by a family member/s. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

pfh _____

20. Please indicate which family member/s hurt you physically. Again, DO NOT WRITE NAMES, rather write how they are related to you and whether they are male or female (eg. brother-male, and 2 cousins-1 male and 1 female.
-
-
-
-

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

21. Were you ever physically hurt by a person/people you knew but who were not family members?
- circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #26)
22. How many people that you knew have hurt you physically?
- circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4
23. Think of the time in your life you were most often hurt by a person/people you knew. Using scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.
- circle-- 1 2 3
24. Think of the worst or most severe time when you were physically hurt by a person/people you knew. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.
- circle-- 1 2 3
- pah_____
25. Please indicate which acquaintances hurt you physically. DO NOT WRITE NAMES, rather write a category (eg. classmate, babysitter, friend) and whether they are male or female.
-
-
-
-

S T R A N G E R S

26. Were you ever physically hurt by a stranger?
 circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to the sexual hurt section following #30)
27. How many strangers have hurt you physically?
 circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4
28. Think of the time in your life you were most often hurt by a stranger/s. Using scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.
 circle-- 1 2 3
29. Think of the worst or most severe time when you were physically hurt by a stranger/s. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.
 circle-- 1 2 3
30. Please indicate whether the strangers who hurt you were male or female and include any special categories they belong to (eg. gang members).

psh_____

PAH_____

Sexual Hurt

Please read the following definition of sexual hurt carefully. A person has been sexually hurt if another person (authority figure, adult, older or intimidating youth, friend, etc.) has done any sexual or sexually-related act or behavior towards them that made them uneasy or scared--whether or not it seemed "hurtful" or caused the person any physical pain. If a person has been...

- criticized or teased sexually
- kissed or touched when they didn't want to be
- pressured into or forced to have sex or perform sexual acts
- involved in child prostitution or pornography
- talked into, pressured or forced to have sex after a beating
- forced to have sex with weapons present

-forced to have sex or perform sexual acts with animals, or
 -physically attacked against sexual parts of their body (with the
 exception of spanking used to discipline)
 ...that person has been sexually hurt.

You will be asked if different types of people have sexually hurt you. If they have, you will be asked to indicate how many people in a category hurt you and rate how often and how badly you were sexually hurt.

F A M I L Y

31. Were you ever sexually hurt by a family member/s?

circle-- yes no (if no skip to # 36)

32. How many family members have hurt you sexually?

circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3

33. Think of the time in your life you were most often hurt by a family member/s. Using scale #5 from the opposite side of the laminated handout, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

34. Think of the worst or most severe time when you were sexually hurt by a family member/s. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

sfn_____

35. Please indicate which gender and type of family member/s hurt you sexually.

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

36. Were you ever sexually hurt by a person/people you knew but who were not family members?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #41)

37. How many people that you knew have hurt you sexually?

circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3

38. Think of the time in your life you were most often hurt by a person/people you knew. Using scale #5, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

39. Think of the worst or most severe time when you were sexually hurt by a person/people you knew. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

sah_____

40. Please indicate the gender and type of acquaintances who hurt you sexually.

S T R A N G E R S

41. Were you ever sexually hurt by a stranger?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to the global disclosure response section after #45)

42. How many strangers have hurt you sexually?

circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3

43. Think of the time in your life you were most often hurt by a stranger/s. Using scale #5, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

44. Think of the worst or most severe time when you were sexually hurt by a stranger/s. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

ssh_____

45. Please indicate whether the strangers who hurt you were male or female.

SAH _____

AH _____

GLOBAL DISCLOSURE RESPONSE:

Have you ever told anyone about any abuse you may have experienced?
(Circle one please.) Yes No

Has anyone ever found out about any abuse you may have experienced?
(Circle one please.) Yes No

If you answered "no" to both of the above questions, you may go on to the abuse witnessed section starting on page 10. If you answered "yes" to either question, take a moment to reflect on how people reacted when you told them or when they found out that you were being hurt and check the one statement below that best describes your situation.

_____ No one who knew about the abuse believed that I was being hurt, did anything to stop me from being hurt, protected me or supported me.

_____ Few people who knew about the abuse believed that I was being hurt, did something to stop me from being hurt, protected me or supported me.

_____ Some people who knew about the abuse believed that I was being hurt, did something to stop me from being hurt, protected me or supported me.

_____ Most people who knew about the abuse believed that I was being hurt, did something to stop me from being hurt, protected me or supported me.

_____ Everyone who knew about the abuse believed that I was being hurt, did something to stop me from being hurt, protected me or supported me.

gdr _____

ABUSE WITNESSED

Now you will be asked about times you may have personally and directly seen people emotionally, physically or sexually hurting others (including animals). You will be asked if you have seen different types of people hurting others. If you have, you will be asked to indicate how many people in a category you have seen hurt others and rate how often you saw the hurt and how bad it was. Please take a moment to refamiliarize yourself with the definitions of emotional, physical, and sexual hurt by referring to pages 1, 4, and 6.

F A M I L Y

46. Have you ever seen a family member/s hurt anyone emotionally?
 circle-- yes no (if no skip to # 51)
47. How many family members have you seen hurt others emotionally?
 circle-- 1-3 4-6 more than 6
48. Think of the time in your life you most often saw a family member/s hurting others. Using scale #1 of the laminated handout, rate from 1 to 3 how often the emotional hurt happened.
 circle-- 1 2 3
49. Think of the worst or most severe time when you saw a family member/s hurting others. Using scale #2, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the emotional hurt was.
 circle-- 1 2 3
50. Please indicate which family member/s you have seen hurting others emotionally. Again, DO NOT WRITE NAMES, rather write how they are related to you and whether they are male or female (eg. cousin, female).

eFw_____

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

51. Have you ever seen a person/people you knew but who were not family members hurt others emotionally?
 circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #56)
52. How many people that you knew have you seen hurt others emotionally?
 circle-- 1-3 4-6 more than 6
53. Think of the time in your life you most often saw a person/people you knew hurt others. Using scale #1, rate from 1 to 3 how often the emotional hurt happened.
 circle-- 1 2 3
54. Think of the worst or most severe time when you saw a person/people you knew emotionally hurt others. Using scale #2, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the emotional hurt was.
 circle-- 1 2 3
 eaw_____
55. Please indicate the gender and type of acquaintances you have seen hurting others emotionally.
-
-
-

S T R A N G E R S

56. Have you ever seen a stranger emotionally hurt others?
 circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #61)
57. How many strangers have you seen hurt others emotionally?
 circle-- 1-3 4-6 more than 6
58. Think of the time in your life you most often saw a stranger/s hurt others emotionally. Using the scale #1, rate from 1 to 3 how often the emotional hurt happened.
 circle-- 1 2 3

59. Think of the worst or most severe time when you saw a stranger/s emotionally hurt others. Using scale #2, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the emotional hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

esw _____

60. Please indicate whether the strangers who you have seen hurting others were male or female. (eg. 2 females, 1 male).

RAW _____

F A M I L Y

61. Have you ever seen a family member/s hurt a person or animal physically?

circle-- yes no (if no skip to # 66)

62. How many family members have you seen hurt people/animals physically?

circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4

63. Think of the time in your life you most often saw a family member/s hurting people/animals. Using scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

64. Think of the worst or most severe time when you saw a family member/s hurting people/animals. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

pfw _____

65. Please indicate the gender and type of family member/s you have seen hurting people/animals physically.

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

66. Have you ever seen a person/people you knew but who were not family members hurt a person or animal physically?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #71)

67. How many people that you knew have you seen hurt people/animals physically?

circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4

68. Think of the time in your life you most often saw a person/people you knew hurt other people/animals. Using scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

69. Think of the worst or most severe time when you saw a person/people you knew physically hurt people/animals. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

paw _____

70. Please indicate the gender and type of acquaintances you have seen hurting people/animals physically.

S T R A N G E R S

71. Have you ever seen a stranger/s physically hurt a person or animal physically?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #76)

72. How many strangers have you seen hurt people/animals physically?

circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4

73. Think of the time in your life you most often saw a stranger/s hurt people/animals physically. Using scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

74. Think of the worst or most severe time when you saw a stranger/s physically hurt people/animals. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3
psw_____

75. Please indicate whether the strangers who you have seen hurting people/animals physically were male or female. (eg. 2 females, 1 male).

PAW_____

F A M I L Y

76. Have you ever seen a family member/s hurt a person or animal sexually?

circle-- yes no (if no skip to # 81)

77. How many family members have you seen hurt people/animals sexually?

circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3

78. Think of the time in your life you most often saw a family member/s hurting people/animals. Using scale #5, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

79. Think of the worst or most severe time when you saw a family member/s hurting people/animals. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3
sfw_____

80. Please indicate the gender and type of family member/s you have seen hurting people/animals sexually.

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

81. Have you ever seen a person/people you knew but who were not family members hurt a person or animal sexually?
- circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #86)
82. How many people that you knew have you seen hurt people/animals sexually?
- circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3
83. Think of the time in your life you most often saw a person/people you knew hurt people/animals. Using scale #5, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.
- circle-- 1 2 3
84. Think of the worst or most severe time when you saw a person/people you knew sexually hurt people/animals. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.
- circle-- 1 2 3
- saw _____
85. Please indicate the gender and type of acquaintances you have seen hurting people/animals sexually.
-
-
-

S T R A N G E R S

86. Have you ever seen a stranger/s sexually hurt a person or animal?
- circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #91)
87. How many strangers have you seen hurt people/animals sexually?
- circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3
88. Think of the time in your life you most often saw a stranger/s hurt people/animals sexually. Using scale #5, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.
- circle-- 1 2 3

89. Think of the worst or most severe time when you saw a stranger/s sexually hurt people/animals. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

ssw _____

90. Please indicate whether the strangers who you have seen hurting people/animals sexually were male or female. (eg. 2 females, 1 male).

SAW _____

AW _____

ABUSE PERPETRATED

Finally, you will be asked about the people/animals you may have hurt. You will be asked if you have hurt different types of people/animals. If you have, you will be asked to indicate how many people/animals in a category you have hurt and rate how often and how badly you hurt the person/animal. Please take a moment to refamiliarize yourself with the definitions of emotional, physical, and sexual hurt on pages 1, 4, and 6.

F A M I L Y

91. Have you ever hurt a family member/s emotionally?

circle-- yes no (if no skip to # 96)

92. How many family members have you hurt emotionally?

circle-- 1-3 4-6 more than 6

93. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt a family member/s. Using scale #1, rate from 1 to 3 how often the emotional hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

94. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt a family member/s. Using scale #2, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the emotional hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

efp _____

95. Please indicate which family member/s you hurt emotionally. Again, DO NOT WRITE NAMES, rather write how they are related to you and whether they are male or female (eg. cousin, female).
-
-
-

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

96. Have you ever hurt a person/people you knew but who were not family members emotionally?
- circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #101)
97. How many people that you knew have you hurt emotionally?
- circle-- 1-3 4-6 more than 6
98. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt a person/people you knew. Using the scale #1, rate from 1 to 3 how often the emotional hurt happened.
- circle-- 1 2 3
99. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt a person/people you knew emotionally. Using the scale #2, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the emotional hurt was.
- circle-- 1 2 3 eap_____
100. Please indicate the gender and type of acquaintances you hurt emotionally.
-
-
-

S T R A N G E R S

101. Have you ever hurt a stranger emotionally?
- circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #106)
102. How many strangers have you hurt emotionally?
- circle-- 1-3 4-6 more than 6

103. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt a stranger/s. Using scale #1, rate from 1 to 3 how often the emotional hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

104. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt a stranger/s emotionally. Using scale #2, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the emotional hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

esp_____

105. Please indicate whether the strangers you hurt emotionally were male or female. (eg. 2 females, 1 male).

EAP_____

F A M I L Y

106. Have you ever hurt a family member/s physically?

circle-- yes no (if no skip to # 111)

107. How many family members have you hurt physically?

circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4

108. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt a family member/s. Using scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

109. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt a family member/s. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

PEP_____

110. Please indicate the gender and type of family member/s you hurt physically.
-
-
-

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

111. Have you ever hurt a person/people you knew but who were not family members physically?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #116)

112. How many people that you knew have you hurt physically?

circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4

113. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt a person/people you knew. Using scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

114. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt a person/people you knew physically. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

pap_____

115. Please indicate the gender and type of acquaintances you hurt physically.
-
-
-

S T R A N G E R S

116. Have you ever hurt a stranger physically?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #121)

117. How many strangers have you hurt physically?

circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4

118. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt a stranger/s. Using the scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

119. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt a stranger/s physically. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

PSP_____

120. Please indicate whether the strangers you hurt physically were male or female. (eg. 2 females, 1 male).

A N I M A L S

121. Have you ever hurt an animal/s physically?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #126)

122. How many animals have you hurt physically?

circle-- 1-2 3-4 more than 4

123. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt an animal/s. Using scale #3, rate from 1 to 3 how often the physical hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

124. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt an animal/s physically. Using scale #4, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the physical hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

PPP_____

125. Please indicate the type and sex of the animals you hurt physically (eg. 2 female cats, 1 mouse, unknown).
-
-
-

PAP_____

F A M I L Y

126. Have you ever hurt a family member/s sexually?

circle-- yes no (if no skip to # 131)

127. How many family members have you hurt sexually?

circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3

128. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt a family member/s. Using scale #5, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

129. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt a family member/s. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

efp_____

130. Please indicate the gender and type of family member/s you hurt sexually.
-
-
-

A C Q U A I N T A N C E S

131. Have you ever hurt a person/people you knew but who were not family members sexually?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #136)

132. How many people that you knew have you hurt sexually?

circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3

133. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt a person/people you knew. Using scale #5, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

134. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt a person/people you knew sexually. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

sap_____

135. Please indicate the gender and type of acquaintances you hurt sexually.

S T R A N G E R S

136. Have you ever hurt a stranger sexually?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to #141)

137. How many strangers have you hurt sexually?

circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3

138. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt a stranger/s. Using scale #5, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

139. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt a stranger/s sexually. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

ssp_____

140. Please indicate whether the strangers you hurt sexually were male or female. (eg. 2 females, 1 male).

A N I M A L S

141. Have you ever hurt an animal/s sexually?

circle-- Yes No (if no, skip to)

142. How many animals have you hurt sexually?

circle-- 1 2-3 more than 3

143. Think of the time in your life you most often hurt an animal/s. Using scale #5, rate from 1 to 3 how often the sexual hurt happened.

circle-- 1 2 3

144. Think of the worst or most severe time when you hurt an animal/s sexually. Using scale #6, rate from 1 to 3 how severe the sexual hurt was.

circle-- 1 2 3

spp_____

145. Please indicate the type and sex of the animals you hurt sexually (eg. 2 female dogs, 1 male cat).

SAP_____

AP_____

You may now give this packet to a secretary in the Psychology Department Office and collect your extra credit slip.

If you experienced distress related to the above questions or identified issues of concern and would like to talk to someone, please call 1) the USU Counseling Center at 797-1012, 2) the USU Community Clinic at 797-3401, 3) Citizens Against Physical and Sexual Abuse at 752-4493, or 4) Intermountain Sexual Abuse Center at 753-5411 and set up an appointment to speak with a counselor.

Thank you for your time and participation!

APPENDIX E:
CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE

CONFLICT TACTICS SCALES
FORM A

Murray A. Straus
Family Research Laboratory, University of New Hampshire
Durham, NH 03824 (603) 862-2594

RELATIONS WITH YOUR BROTHERS AND SISTERS

This part of the questionnaire asks about conflicts which occurred between you and your brothers and sisters and how these conflicts get settled.

1. Please try to decide on the brother or sister you had the most disagreements or conflicts with during your last year in high school and then answer the following questions about that person:
 - A. Was this brother or sister living at home that year?
 - No
 - Yes
 - Only child or none alive then
 - B. Sex of that brother or sister:
 - Male
 - Female
 - C. Was this brother or sister:
 - Older
 - Younger
 - D. How many years older or younger? _____

2. During your last year in high school, what would you say were the three most serious conflicts or disagreements between you and this brother or sister?
 - a. _____
 - b. _____
 - c. _____

3. Which one of the above disagreements or conflicts would you say was the most intense, a, b, or c? _____

4. Here is a list of things that you and the brother or sister named in question #1 might have done when you had a conflict. Now taking all disagreements into account (not just the ones listed), we would like you to say how often you had done the things listed at any time during your last year in high school. Answer by circling one of these numbers for the brother or sister named in question #1 and one for yourself.

- 0 = Never
 1 = Once that year
 2 = Two or three times
 3 = Often, but less than once a month
 4 = About once a month
 5 = More than once a month

		The BROTHER or SISTER in <u>question #1</u>					<u>ME</u>						
A.	<u>Tried</u> to discuss the issue relatively calmly.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
B.	<u>Did</u> discuss the issue relatively calmly.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
C.	Got information to back up his or her side of things.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
D.	Brought in someone else to help settle things (or tried to).....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
E.	Argued heatedly but short of yelling.	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
F.	Yelled and/or insulted.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
G.	Sulked and/or refused to talk about it.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
H.	Stomped out of the room.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
I.	Threw something (but not at the other) or smashed something.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
J.	Threatened to hit or throw something at the other.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
K.	Threw something <u>at the other</u>	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
L.	Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other.	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
M.	Hit (or tried to hit) the other person but <u>not</u> with anything.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
N.	Hit (or tried to hit) the other person with something hard.....	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
O.	Other. Please describe _____	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

CONFLICT WITH PARENTS

5. During your last year in high school, what would you say were the three most serious disagreements or conflicts between you and your father and mother?

WITH FATHER

- A. _____

- B. _____

- C. _____

WITH MOTHER

- A. _____

- B. _____

- C. _____

6. Which of the above disagreements or conflicts (A, B, or C) would you say was the most intense? Circle one for father and one for mother.

Father: A B C

Mother: A B C

Here is the same list of things that you and your father and mother might have done when you had a conflict. Now taking into account all disagreements (not just the most serious one), we would like you to say how often you had done the things listed at any time during your last year in high school. Answer by circling one of these numbers for each person.

- 0 = Never
- 1 = Once that year
- 2 = Two or three times
- 3 = Often, but less than once a month
- 4 = About once a month
- 5 = More than once a month

<u>FATHER</u>	<u>ME</u>		<u>MOTHER</u>	<u>Me</u>
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	A. <u>Tried</u> to discuss the issue relatively calmly	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	B. <u>Did</u> discuss the issue relatively calmly	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	C. Got information to back up his or her side of things	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	D. Brought in someone else to help settle things (or tried to)	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	E. Argued heatedly but short of yelling	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	F. Yelled and/or insulted	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	G. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	H. Stomped out of the room	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	I. Threw something (but not at the other) or smashed something	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	J. Threatened to hit or throw something at the other	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	K. Threw something <u>at the other</u>	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	L. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	M. Hit (or tried to hit) the other person but <u>not</u> with anything	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	N. Hit (or tried to hit) the other person with something hard	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5	O. Other. Please describe.	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5

FATHER-MOTHER CONFLICT RESOLUTION

7. Here is the last aspect of intra-family conflict which we will cover. As before, please list what you think were the three most serious kinds of disagreement or conflict between your mother and your father:

- A. _____

- B. _____

- C. _____

8. Which one of these disagreements or conflicts would you say was the most intense, A, B, or C? _____

Finally, we have the same list of things your father and mother might have done when they had a conflict. Now, taking all disagreements into account (not just the most serious one), how often did they do the things listed at any time during your last year of high school? 0 = Never

- 1 = Once that year
- 2 = Two or three times
- 3 = Often, but less than once a month
- 4 = About once a month
- 5 = More than once a month

	<u>FATHER</u>	<u>MOTHER</u>
A. <u>Tried</u> to discuss the issue relatively calmly.....	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
B. <u>Did</u> discuss the issue relatively calmly.....	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
C. Got information to back up his or her side of things.....	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
D. Brought in someone else to help settle things (or tried to).....	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
E. Argued heatedly but short of yelling.	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
F. Yelled and/or insulted.....	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
G. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it.....	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5
H. Stomped out of the room.....	0 1 2 3 4 5	0 1 2 3 4 5

- 1 = Once that year
 2 = Two or three times
 3 = Often, but less than once a month
 4 = About once a month
 5 = More than once a month

	FATHER					MOTHER						
I.	Threw something (but not at the other) or smashed something.....											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
J.	Threatened to hit or throw something at the other.....											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
K.	Threw something <u>at the other</u>											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
L.	Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other.											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
M.	Hit (or tried to hit) the other person but <u>not</u> with anything.....											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
N.	Hit (or tried to hit) the other person with something hard.....											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
O.	Other. Please describe _____											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5

CONFLICTS AND FIGHTS OUTSIDE THE FAMILY

How often during that last year in high school did any of the following happen in an argument with someone outside your family? Please answer each question by circling one of these numbers for things you did and also for things others did to you:

- 0 = Never
 1 = Once that year
 2 = Two or three times
 3 = Often, but less than once a month
 4 = About once a month
 5 = More than once a month

	I DID					OTHERS DID TO ME						
A.	Yelled at and/or insulted the person _____											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
B.	Threw something at the other person											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
C.	Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
D.	Hit (or tried to hit) the other person but <u>not</u> with anything											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
E.	Hit (or tried to hit) the other person with something hard											
	0	1	2	3	4	5	0	1	2	3	4	5
9.	How many brothers and sisters (including step brothers and sisters) were living at home with you during your last year in high school? _____											