

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1998

A Descriptive Study of the Relation Between Domestic Violence and Pet Abuse

Claudia V. Weber
Utah State University

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



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Weber, Claudia V., "A Descriptive Study of the Relation Between Domestic Violence and Pet Abuse" (1998).
All Graduate Theses and Dissertations. 6141.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/6141>

This Dissertation 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.



A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE RELATION BETWEEN
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PET ABUSE

by

Claudia V. Weber

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

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1998

Copyright © Claudia V. Weber 1998

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

A Descriptive Study of the Relation Between
Domestic Violence and Pet Abuse

by

Claudia V. Weber, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 1998

Major Professor: Frank R. Ascione
Department: Psychology

This was a descriptive study that examined the relation between domestic violence and pet abuse. Participants were questioned about their styles of conflict resolution with partners and how pets were treated in the home. Information was gathered using the Conflict Tactics Scale, and three surveys were developed for this study: the Battered Partner Shelter Survey, Families and Pets Survey, and the Child's Observations and Experience with Pets. Four groups were recruited: (a) women in crisis shelters who chose to include one of their children in the study ($n = 39$), (b) women in crisis shelters who did not include one of their children in the study ($n = 62$), (c) women who had not been subjected to domestic violence and chose to share information about one of their children ($n = 30$), and (d) women who had not been subjected to domestic violence and did not provide information about one of their children ($n = 30$). Mothers who chose to include one of their children in the

study completed a Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) for that child. Five shelters in the state of Utah--Logan, Brigham City, Ogden, Salt Lake City, and Provo--were included. Data collection in the shelters occurred over 17 months. Participants in the comparison group were recruited via newspaper advertisements in the Herald Journal in Logan.

Analyses of the data confirmed the coexistence of domestic violence and pet abuse. The results revealed that the severity of threats and abuse toward pets, and the severity of violent means of interpartner conflict resolution escalate in a parallel manner. However, many of the male partners who become violent toward women have a history of pet abuse that precedes their relationship with the woman. This study increased awareness of the coexistence of these two types of violence both as it was run and as a source for future professional presentations. The importance of this study and implications for future research are discussed.

(361 pages)

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my son,
Matthew Frank Arthur,
and
the memory of my three canine friends,
Ginger, Blazer, and Cinnamon.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the generous financial contributions from the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation and Utah State University's Vice President for Research. This funding allowed us to offer monetary incentives to shelters and participants, an offer that both expedited our research and allowed us to help, in some small way, the women and children who graciously agreed to share their stories with use.

I would also like to thank the people directly responsible for making this study happen, the interviewers and participants. I would like to express appreciation to the women and children who patiently shared their stories while experiencing a great deal of personal distress. In spite of overloaded work conditions, constant interface with traumatized women and children, and a tight financial situation, shelter workers in Logan, Brigham City, Ogden, Salt Lake City, and Provo managed to collect a remarkable quantity of high quality data. The comparison group data were collected by Theresa Thompson, in her usual efficient and thorough manner.

Completion of this dissertation has been a learning process that would not have been possible without the input of numerous academic professionals. First, I would like to thank Dr. Frank R. Ascione, a researcher of impeccable integrity, insight, and persistence. His example has shown me what research can be at its best. I would also like to thank my other committee members: Dr. Kim Openshaw, for his supportive attitude; Dr. Don Sisson, for his careful scrutiny of my statistical analyses; Dr. Lori Roggman, for her supportive advice and careful feedback; and Dr. Tamara

Ferguson, for graciously agreeing to sit on my committee at the last minute.

The final group of people, without whom this would not have been possible, are friends and family. Friends who offered words of encouragement that helped me more than they can possibly know include Debra Cupal and Julie Larson. Two special people in the Department of Psychology who offered much needed support were Karen Ransom and Dr. Lani Van Dusen. The patient input and support from my brother-in-law, Charles Arthur, was invaluable. Finally, I want to thank my husband, Clint Arthur, who stood by me, believed in me, and was proud of me. Thank you.

Claudia V. Weber

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ABSTRACT | iii |
| DEDICATION | v |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | vi |
| LIST OF TABLES | xi |
| CHAPTER | |
| I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE | 1 |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Statement of Purpose | 3 |
| II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 7 |
| Underlying Theories | 7 |
| Macro Theory: Why Does This Problem Exist? | 7 |
| Micro Theories | 8 |
| Critique and Review of the Literature | 15 |
| III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES | 18 |
| Design and Procedures | 18 |
| Population and Sample | 22 |
| Generalizability | 24 |
| Measures | 25 |
| Analysis | 32 |
| IV. RESULTS | 34 |
| Overview | 34 |
| Pilot Study Data | 35 |
| Data Management | 36 |

| | Page |
|---|---------|
| Analysis Plan | 37 |
| Demographic Information | 42 |
| Pet Ownership | 51 |
| Type of Pets | 53 |
| Number of Pets in the Last Five Years | 55 |
| Veterinary Care | 56 |
| Care for the Pet | 59 |
| Threats Toward Pet | 63 |
| Abuse of Pet(s) | 73 |
| Reporting Incidents of Pet Abuse | 81 |
| Emotional Response Following Abuse of Pet | 82 |
| Others Who Hurt Pet | 86 |
| Concern for Pet Keeping Women From Coming in to the Shelter Sooner | 94 |
| Change in Willingness to Use Violence | 96 |
| Pet-Related Issues | 99 |
| Child Behavior Checklist | 102 |
| Observations by Child in the Study | 106 |
| Conflict Tactics Scale | 112 |
| Additional Influences | 119 |
| Child Factors | 144 |
| Summary | 145 |
| V. DISCUSSION | 149 |
| Coexistence of Domestic Violence and Pet Abuse | 149 |
| Relation Between Pet Abuse and Changing Levels of Violence in the Home | 160 |
| Influence of Domestic Violence on Children | 165 |
| Increase Awareness of Pet Abuse and Domestic Violence | 173 |
| Summary | 181 |
| VI. CONCLUSION | 182 |
| Strengths and Limitations | 182 |
| Importance of Findings | 189 |
| Future Research | 192 |
| Summary | 197 |

| | Page |
|--|------|
| REFERENCES | 199 |
| APPENDIXES | 208 |
| Appendix A: Algorithm for Potential Prevalence of Pet Abuse in Homes With Domestic Violence | 209 |
| Appendix B: For Women With Pet and Child in Study | 210 |
| Appendix C: Advertisement in Herald Journal | 214 |
| Appendix D: CTS | 216 |
| Appendix E: Battered Partner Shelter Survey | 219 |
| Appendix F: Drawing by Child | 242 |
| Appendix G: Codebook | 243 |
| Appendix H: Type of Pets | 305 |
| Appendix I: Transcript of Threats | 310 |
| Appendix J: Transcript of Abuse | 317 |
| Appendix K: Nonsignificant Findings | 325 |
| Appendix L: Transcript of Pet-Related Items | 326 |
| Appendix M: Relation Between Child in Home and Sites on Threats | 332 |
| Appendix N: Correlations Between Severity of Threat and Abuse and CTS Subscales, S-NC Group: With Children, No Children, and Children Under Five | 335 |
| Appendix O: Summary to Shelters | 338 |
| Appendix P: Questionnaire for States | 342 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE | 343 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|---|------|
| 1 Mean Age (in Years) by Group | 43 |
| 2 Marital Status by Group, Percentage (Number) | 44 |
| 3 Number of Boys in Each Group by Age Grouping | 45 |
| 4 Number of Girls in Each Group by Age Grouping | 45 |
| 5 Ethnic Distribution by Group with Comparison Groups; Percentage (Number) | 46 |
| 6 Years of Education, Women (Number) | 48 |
| 7 Years of Education, Men (Number) | 48 |
| 8 SES: Both Partners Employed (Number) | 49 |
| 9 SES: Only the Partner Employed (Number) | 49 |
| 10 SES: Only the Woman Employed (Number) | 50 |
| 11 One-Way Analysis of Variance: SES by Group, Both Partners Employed | 51 |
| 12 One-Way Analysis of Variance: SES by Group, Only the Partner Employed | 51 |
| 13 One-Way Analysis of Variance: SES by Group, Only the Woman Employed | 52 |
| 14 Scheffé Post Hoc Comparisons: SES by Group, Both Partners Employed | 52 |
| 15 Scheffé Post Hoc Comparisons: SES by Group, Only the Partner Employed | 53 |
| 16 Scheffé Post Hoc Comparisons: SES by Group, Only the Woman Employed | 54 |

| | | |
|----|--|----|
| 17 | Do You Currently Own a Pet? Percentage (Number) | 54 |
| 18 | Have You Had a Pet Within the Past 12 Months? Percentage (Number) | 55 |
| 19 | Number of Pets in the Last Five Years, by Group | 56 |
| 20 | Veterinary Care by Group: Percentage Responding Yes (Number) | 58 |
| 21 | Veterinary Care by Site, with Child, Percentage Responding Yes | 59 |
| 22 | Veterinary Care by Sites, No Child: Percentage Responding Yes | 59 |
| 23 | Partner Caring for Pet: Percentage Responding Yes; by Group (Number) | 61 |
| 24 | Child Providing Care for Pet: Percentage Responding Yes; by Group (Number) | 62 |
| 25 | Percentage Reporting Threats Toward Pet by Group (Number) | 65 |
| 26 | Type of Pet Threatened: Percentage (Number) in Each Group | 66 |
| 27 | What Was Said to Threaten the Pet: Percentage (Number) of Threats in Each Group | 67 |
| 28 | Reasons for Threatening Pet: Percentage (Number) Reported by Group | 68 |
| 29 | Motivating Factors for Threat(s): Percent age (Number) by Group | 69 |
| 30 | Severity of Threat: Percentage in Each Category by Group | 70 |
| 31 | One-Way Analysis of Variance: Severity of Threat by Group | 71 |
| 32 | Scheffé Post Hoc Comparisons for Severity of Threat by Group | 72 |
| 33 | Frequency of Repeated Threat: Percentage (Number) in Each Category by Group | 72 |

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| 34 | Has Partner Ever Hurt Pet: Percentage (Number) Responding Yes by Group | 74 |
| 35 | Type of Pet Hurt: Percentage (Number) in Each Group | 76 |
| 36 | What Was Done to the Pet: Percentage (Number) of Behaviors by Group . . | 77 |
| 37 | Reasons for Hurting Pet: Percentage (Number) Reported by Group | 78 |
| 38 | Motivating Factors for Hurting Pet: Percentage (Number) by Group | 79 |
| 39 | Severity of Abuse: Percentage (Number) in Each Category by Group | 80 |
| 40 | Frequency of Abuse: Percentage (Number) in Each Category by Group . . . | 81 |
| 41 | Report of Woman's Feelings Following Threat Toward Pet: Percentage (Number) Responding in Each Category by Group | 83 |
| 42 | Report of Woman's Feelings Following Abuse of Pet: Percentage (Number) Responding in Each Category | 84 |
| 43 | How Close Were You to the Pet That Was Hurt: Percentage (Number) Responding in Each Category by Group | 85 |
| 44 | Indication of Relief That Pet Was Threatened or Hurt and Not Woman: Percentage Responding No by Group | 86 |
| 45 | How Was the Pet Hurt by the Woman: Percentage (Number) Responding Yes in Each Category | 87 |
| 46 | Severity of Injury to Pet by Woman: Percentage (Number) in Each Group . | 89 |
| 47 | Did Concern About Your Pet Keep You From Coming to Shelter Sooner? Percentage by Shelter Groups, (Number) | 96 |
| 48 | Woman's Concern for Pet Kept From Coming to Shelter: Percentage (Number) Responding Yes Under Conditions of Threat or Hurt, by Group | 97 |
| 49 | Change in Partner's Use of Violence Toward Woman and Pet: Percentage Responding Yes by Shelter Groups, (Number) | 99 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 50 | Change in Partner's Use of Violence Under Conditions of Threat Only, Abuse Only, Neither, or Both; Percentage in Each Category in S-C Group, (Number) | 101 |
| 51 | Change in Partner's Use of Violence Under Conditions of Threat Only, Abuse Only, Neither, or Both; Percentage in Each Category in S-NC Group (Number) | 102 |
| 52 | Indication That Woman Felt Kindly Toward Animals: Percentage (Number) Responding by Group | 103 |
| 53 | Results of t test: CBCL Mean T Scores for External, Internal, and Total by Group, with Significant p Value & Effect Size, (Number) | 104 |
| 54 | Percent in Normal, Borderline, and Clinical Range for CBCL, by Group . . | 105 |
| 55 | What Was Done to the Child's Pet: Percentage (Number) Each Category . . | 108 |
| 56 | What Did You Do To Protect Your Pet: Percentage (Number) in Each Category | 111 |
| 57 | Four CTS Categories of Conflict Resolution: Mean Score and Percentage Reporting Use of That Technique in Each Group: Woman's Self-Report, (Number) | 115 |
| 58 | Four CTS Categories of Conflict Resolution: Mean Score and Percentage Reporting Use of That Technique in Each Group, Partner's Actions, (Number) | 116 |
| 59 | One-Way Analysis of Variance: CTS by Group, Woman | 118 |
| 60 | Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Verbal Aggression by Group, Woman | 120 |
| 61 | Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Minor Physical Aggression by Group, Woman . | 121 |
| 62 | Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Severe Physical Aggression by Group, Woman . | 122 |
| 63 | One-Way Analysis of Variance: CTS by Group, Partner | 123 |
| 64 | Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Verbal Reasoning by Group, Partner | 124 |
| 65 | Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Verbal Aggression by Group, Partner | 125 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 66 | Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Minor Physical Aggression by Group, Partner | 126 |
| 67 | Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Severe Physical Aggression by Group, Partner | 127 |
| 68 | Partner Caring for the Pet: Percentage (Number) Responding Yes Under Conditions of Threat, Abuse, Neither, or Both; by Group | 127 |
| 69 | Percentage Reporting Veterinary Care Items Under Threat/Hurt Conditions: S-C Group (Number) | 128 |
| 70 | Percentage Reporting Veterinary Care Items Under Threat/Hurt Conditions: S-NC Group (Number) | 128 |
| 71 | Percentage Reporting Veterinary Care Items Under Threat/Hurt Conditions: NS-C Group | 129 |
| 72 | Percentage Reporting Veterinary Care Items Under Threat/Hurt Conditions: NS-NC Group (Number) | 129 |
| 73 | Mean Score for CTS Subgroups Under Conditions of Only Threat, Only Hurt, Neither, or Both by Group, Woman's Self-Report | 132 |
| 74 | Mean Score for CTS Subgroups Under Conditions of Only Threat, Only Hurt, Neither, or Both by Group, Partner | 133 |
| 75 | Mean \bar{T} Scores for CBCL Under Conditions of Only Threat, Only Hurt, Neither, or Both, by Groups | 134 |
| 76 | Percentage of Children in Clinical Range for External, Internal, and Total CBCL Categories, Under Conditions of Only Threat, Only Hurt, Neither, or Both; S-C Group | 135 |
| 77 | Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS Correlated With Severity of Threats Toward Pets; S-C Group, Woman, $n = 17$ | 137 |
| 78 | Means Tables: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Threat Toward Pet; S-C Group, Woman (Number) | 138 |
| 79 | Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS With Severity of Abuse Toward Pets in the S-C Group, Woman, $n = 23$ | 139 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 80 | Means Tables: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Abuse Toward Pet in the S-C Group, Woman | 140 |
| 81 | Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS with Severity of Threats Toward Pets in the S-C Group, Partner, $n = 18$ | 141 |
| 82 | Means Tables: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Threat Toward Pet(s) in the S-C Group, Partner (Number) | 142 |
| 83 | Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS with Severity of Abuse of Pets in the S-C Group, Partner, $n = 23$ | 144 |
| 84 | Means Tables: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Abuse of Pet in the S-C Group, Partner, (Number) | 145 |
| 85 | Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS with Severity of Abuse of Pets in the S-NC Group, Partner, $n = 26$ | 146 |
| 86 | Means Table: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Abuse of Pet in the S-NC Group, Partner | 147 |
| 87 | Average Number, Range, and Percentage of Pets: Current Ownership | 308 |
| 88 | Average Number, Range, and Percentage of Pets; Past 12 months | 309 |
| 89 | One-Way Analysis of Variance: Severity of Threat by Group | 325 |
| 90 | Severity of Abuse by Groups (S-C & S-NC): t Test | 325 |
| 91 | Percentage of Partner Threats to Pet: by Site | 333 |
| 92 | Percentage of Partner Injuring Pet: by Site | 334 |
| 93 | Correlation Between Severity of Threat and Hurt and CTS Subscales; Partner, S-NC Group with Children, $n = 11$ | 335 |
| 94 | Correlation Between Severity of Threat and Hurt and CTS Subscales; Partner; S-NC Group No Children, $n = 7$ | 336 |
| 95 | Correlation Between Severity of Threat and Hurt and CTS Subscales; Partner, S-NC Group, Children Under 5 Years Old, $n = 7$ | 337 |

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Introduction

Between 10 and 11 women die on average each day due to domestic violence in the United States (McCann & Wagner, 1994b). In addition, three to four children die each day of neglect or physical abuse (Devlin & Reynolds, 1994). Where violence is directed toward women and children in the home, there often coexists abuse of animals, including pets. Anecdotal reports (Adams, 1994a) suggest that the killing of a pet may be associated with an escalation of risk to women and children in the home and with an increased level of acceptance of abuse. If animal abuse were recognized as an indicator of increasing violence in the home, perhaps women at risk would heed the signal and seek outside assistance or leave with their children.

The purposeful injury or killing of a pet in the home is considered both physical and psychological violence. Under the Utah Code of Criminal Procedures (Cohabitant Abuse Procedures Act, 1993), inflicting physical, sexual, or emotional trauma on a partner is a criminal offense. In Utah, the definition for physical abuse includes the damaging of property or pets (Librett, 1995). The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV, 1994) lists abuse, torture, or killing of pets to cause mental anguish as a form of psychological abuse.

Jaffe, Wolfe, and Wilson (1990) reported that observing and experiencing violent behaviors may lead to serious, long-term psychological and behavioral

problems in women and children. The more traumatic an experience, the more likely it is that the individual's response to the trauma will generalize to other situations and people (Garmezy, 1986).

Domestic violence is a serious national problem. According to the NCADV (1994), a woman is beaten every 15 seconds in the United States. Each year as many as 4 million women require medical or police attention as a result of battering. In Utah alone there are upwards of 55,000 cases of domestic violence annually (McCann & Wagner, 1994a).

The NCADV also reported that in homes where there is abuse of a spouse, the rate of child abuse is 1500% higher than the national average. The estimated number of children, ages 3 to 17, exposed to parental violence is 3.3 million. The Utah State Department of Human Services, Division of Family Services, estimated that 144,000 children in Utah witnessed abuse in their homes in 1994 (McCann & Wagner, 1994c).

Cruelty toward pets is seldom reported to humane societies, rarely addressed in crisis shelters (Ascione, Weber, & Wood, 1997), and infrequently discussed in therapy sessions. Pet abuse represents an additional focus of violence in the home, one not previously examined in relation to other aspects of domestic violence. Based on the United States Bureau of the Census statistics (1993) on pet ownership and estimates of the prevalence of domestic violence (Hotaling, Finkelhor, Kirkpatrick, & Straus, 1988), it is probable that there are between 2 and 20 million households in the United States where pets live in a climate of domestic violence (see Appendix A for algorithm). No national statistics are available on the prevalence of pet abuse. In a

pilot study, Ascione (1998) found that approximately 75% of the women coming in to a shelter had pets at home. Of these, approximately 71% reported incidents of threatened or actual animal abuse in the home. In addition, approximately 30% of the women noted that their children had participated in some form of animal abuse.

In 1874, a social worker in New York City contacted the founder of the ASPCA for suggestions on how to intervene on the behalf of an abused child (Zawistowski, 1992). Children, their mothers, and their pets remain vulnerable to the cycle of domestic violence. After 123 years, perhaps an increased awareness of domestic cruelty toward animals can still serve to enable women and children who are being abused in the home to protect themselves better.

Statement of Purpose

This study had four purposes: (a) to confirm the coexistence of domestic violence and pet abuse; (b) to further explore the relation between escalating domestic violence coupled with pet abuse; (c) to look at behavioral and emotional problems in children exposed to both domestic violence and pet abuse; and finally, (d) to increase awareness of the abuse of women, children, and their pets in homes where there is domestic violence. It is hoped that this study may provide information that could help shelter workers better meet the needs of the mothers and children in need of respite.

In a speech on the nature of violence, Fortune (1993) quoted Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel as saying, "Let us remember that what hurts the victim most is not the cruelty of the oppressor but the silence of the bystander." Abuse of pets in

the home is often minimized, covered up, or discounted as unimportant. Fortune continued:

Silence is a lie that we think protects us from violence. It does not. It is our job to speak the truth so that our daughters and sons and our granddaughters and our grandsons will know that the way things are, is not the way they have to be. (p. 287)

An increased awareness of pet abuse may directly benefit those who work with women and children in shelters in a number of ways. Knowledge of pet abuse in the home may guide shelter workers to appropriate therapies for those abused. Because coercive behaviors that involve threats or actual harm to a pet are traumatic to an individual, recipients may have been subjected to a form of psychological torture. Often, children have nightmares, act out in socially inappropriate ways, fear for their own lives, or fear for the lives of their pets.

Women are often reluctant to reveal everything that is going on in the home, or they may want to portray the home situation as less violent than it actually is. Knowledge of pet abuse in the home may be an indirect way to assess the climate of violence in the home. For example, while reporting the abuse or killing of a pet, a woman may indicate that weapons are readily available in the home and her partner is willing to use them. This is a potentially valuable piece of information for shelter workers interested in protecting women and children.

A woman's fear for her pet may delay her first visit to a shelter. Identification of changes in the woman's situation that motivate her to come in to the shelter have value. In a small study done in the shelter in Logan, Utah, Ascione

(1998) found that 18% of the women with pets reported that they would have sought shelter earlier if they had not been concerned for the safety of their pets.

Many women are reluctant to leave an abusive situation, tending to discount their own pain and fear. But, if abuse or killing of a pet by their partner were clearly linked with a high risk of violence in the environment, perhaps more women would recognize the danger and seek a safer environment.

The identification of animal abuse in the home may alert shelter workers to homes where physical violence is most likely to escalate to life-threatening levels. Adams (1994b) suggested that domestic violence escalates from verbal abuse to destruction of property and pets. This is often followed by violent acts toward women and children.

When shelter workers ask about the presence of pet abuse in the home it may indicate to the woman that this behavior is problematic. The message is conveyed that harming pets for coercive purposes is not acceptable. As this view is seldom expressed in public, the unspoken becomes the uncertain. A woman who otherwise strives to minimize the negative aspects of her home life may come to see abuse of the family pet as acceptable.

Women in abusive domestic situations often fail to recognize pet abuse as an additional source of psychological trauma. In addition, they may not believe that they are important enough as human beings to be allowed to grieve over the death of a pet. When something that they have cared about is threatened, abused, or destroyed, they may fail to acknowledge their loss of support and love. Some women may rationalize

that they somehow deserved to experience the associated loss and pain. Confronting violence directed toward pets as wrong would allow women to grieve and seek support.

It is possible that the child's experience with regard to their pet may differ from their mother's, and mother may be unaware of this. It is not uncommon for fathers who abuse their children to threaten to harm their pet if the child reveals the abuse (DeViney, Dickert, & Lockwood, 1983).

Children learn by observation. A broader understanding of the types of behaviors children have observed, such as violent words or actions against their mother, siblings, or pets, will give shelter workers some insight into the likelihood of a child behaving violently toward other animals or children. Some of the children coming in to the shelter may already have harmed their pets or other animals. Early identification of this behavioral pattern could be helpful in guiding therapeutic interventions. Finally, mothers, children, and shelter workers would benefit from understanding the multiple facets of domestic violence, including the abuse of animals. In such circumstances, increased awareness and the opportunity to share a painful experience can lead to healing.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Underlying Theories

This literature review is limited to studies that examined the abuse of pets, children, and women by men. Of all reported domestic violence incidents, 95% are committed by men against women. Men seeking protection from violent female partners are often ridiculed and dismissed by the legal system, to the extent that less than 1% of the protective orders sought in Utah between 1992 and 1993 were for the protection of men (McCann & Wagner, 1994b).

To better understand aggression directed toward women, children, and pets, exploration of the theoretical approaches to understanding domestic violence will be rewarding. Several theories are presented that address the following questions: (a) Why do men batter women and children and abuse their pets? (b) what are the psychological dynamics of an abusive interaction? and (c) what are the likely effects of domestic violence and observations of pet abuse on children's psychological well-being? Theories addressing these questions are directed at two levels: (a) broad, societal values, and (b) interpersonal conflict. Trauma and developmental theories are presented to address the enduring effects of abuse.

Macro Theory: Why Does This Problem Exist?

Domestic violence is not unique to our time and place. An interpretation of

archeological evidence by Eisler (1988) suggests that, around 4000 B.C., the power to dominate and destroy with deadly force gradually supplanted the societal view of power as the capacity to support and nurture life. Fear conditioning was used to maintain a dominator society. As taking lives came to represent power, the status of nature and animals declined. The status of women, who had been aligned with nature and animals, was also lowered. "Many cultures did not have labels for spouse abuse; it was hidden, disguised, ignored, and accepted as a culturally consistent behavior" (Pirsig, 1991). Children, closely associated with mothers, had very little power or status. It was not until the fourth century A.D. that the killing of a child was considered a crime (Shafer, 1997). Systematic efforts by society to protect women, children, and animals are relatively recent.

Micro Theories

Conflict Theories

There are three theories on the cyclical nature of violence: The frustration-aggression model states that as frustration increases so does aggression; the cognitive trigger theory suggests that violence is the outcome of a series of cognitive interpretations; and, the wheel of control theory postulates that men perpetuate the underlying social belief in male domination (Gondolf, 1993). All of these theories suggest that violent behaviors occur in fairly predictable, cyclic patterns. Speaking at a 1995 conference on domestic violence, Diane Stuart, the domestic violence

advocacy specialist for the State of Utah, noted that the acts of violence in the cycle generally increase in frequency and severity over time.

Psychological Dynamics of Torture Compared With Pet Abuse

To better understand the psychological impact of an abusive interaction where lives are in jeopardy, a parallel is drawn between torture and violent domestic situations where a woman, child, or pet may be abused or killed.

The essential features of torture include the following: "at least two persons- the perpetrator and the victim, the torturer must be able to physically control the victim, physical pain and mental suffering is used to break the will of the victim, and the torture is a purposeful, systematic activity" (Morgan, 1982, p. 112). Many acts of domestic violence are impulsive acts of rage representing behavior that is out of control. In some domestic situations, abuse of a pet is a purposeful, systematic behavior designed to create human mental suffering for coercive purposes.

There are many parallels between coercive techniques used on political prisoners and methods used to harm animals and terrorize women (Adams, 1994b). Donna Shalala, Secretary of Health and Human Services, was quoted as saying that violence in America's homes has reached the level of "domestic terrorism" (McCann & Wagner, 1994a). One common torture technique is the use of isolation to deprive the victim of social support and to increase the victim's dependence on the torturer. It is not uncommon for women in abusive relationships to report that their partner denied them access to outside family and friends. In addition, the killing of a pet

may represent the loss of a source of love and support. It is well known that torturers use threats and demonstrations of omnipotence. The man who tortures or kills a pet will often threaten to kill the animal and/or suggest that the animal's death is a prelude to killing his spouse. Killing the animal is a display of dominance.

Degradation is also frequently used by torturers. The batterer may use an animal to rape his wife, he may make her drink from the animal's dish, or may sexually exploit the animal. And, perversely, torturers may occasionally indulge their prisoners. Interestingly, men who abuse and kill companion animals may, on occasion, give their wife or child a pet (Adams, 1994b).

There are strong parallels between domestic violence and torture. The battering of a woman or child by a partner or father is compounded by the fact that the batterer is someone they trust. In domestic violence, the sense of betrayal and vulnerability is particularly intense (Koss et al., 1994).

Adams (1994b) noted, "Making someone watch torture is a particular form of terror" (p. 8). In a study of people who had been detained and tortured between 1973 and 1976, being forced to witness the torture of others was used as a component of psychological abuse 65% of the time (Allodi et al., 1985).

The overt abuse or killing of an animal enhances the sense of unreality and abnormality in the family unit. As companion animals are often thought of as a member of the family by children and adults, parallels may be drawn with a torture situation.

Of all the dramatic situations I witnessed in clandestine prisons, nothing can compare to those family groups who were tortured often together, sometimes separately, but in view of one another, or in different cells, while one was aware of the other being tortured. The entire affective world, constructed over the years with utmost difficulty, collapses with a kick in the father's genitals, a smack on the mother's face, an obscene insult to the sister, or the sexual violation of a daughter. Suddenly an entire culture based on familial love, devotion, the capacity for mutual sacrifice collapses. Nothing is possible in such a universe, and that is precisely what the torturers know. (Stover & Nightengale, 1985, p. 53)

Exposure to Violence: Effects on Children

Kenneth Dodge (1980) has proposed that a social-cognitive bias leads aggressive children to attribute hostile intent to people and situations where none exists. This false cognitive perception of threat may strongly influence a child's interpersonal relations and interactions with pets. Gerald Patterson (1982) found that highly aggressive children often grew up in coercive home environments. Threatening, abusing, or killing a pet is a potent coercive technique.

Erikson's theory of psychosocial development (1959) suggests that between the ages of 6 and 12 children seek to resolve the issues of industry versus inferiority. Social and academic skills are of paramount importance to the child during this stage. Failure to acquire appropriate social skills will lead to feelings of inferiority. In a home where conflict is resolved with violence and coercion, the child fails to learn the appropriate tools for healthy social interactions. For the developmental period from age 12 through adolescence, the process of establishing identity is the salient task. Failure leads to role confusion. In a chaotic home evidencing poor social

skills, a child's access to peers--the most important socializing agent at this stage--will be minimized. Another component of identity development, the idea that the individual can control some aspects of environment and destiny, is also at risk in an unstable home. If a child is terrorized, and learning that those of lower status, such as a pet, are powerless, a sense of helplessness will pervade the child's identity development.

Theories on the effects of trauma (Jaffe et al., 1990; O'Keefe, 1995; van der Kolk, 1987) suggest that exposure to traumatic events may lead to externalizing behaviors, such as cruelty toward animals, and psychopathology. Developmental theory by Cicchetti, Toth, and Bush (1988) suggests that abnormal interactions between parent, child, and environment are likely to result in reciprocal, abnormal responses. Cicchetti et al. implied that observations of a father's response to frustration will influence his children in a reciprocal manner. Inappropriate responses (abuse of a pet) by the father are likely to create equally inappropriate responses (abuse of a pet) by his children. Zahn-Waxler, Hollenbeck, and Radke-Yarrow (1984) have reported that children have been found to imitate parental cruelty toward animals.

Children who observe violence in the home are more likely to experience psychological problems (Taylor, Zuckerman, Harik, & Groves, 1994) and behavioral problems (Holden & Ritchie, 1991). Behavioral difficulties may be observed from infancy through adulthood. Infants who witness violence may cry frequently and sleep poorly; preschoolers may be irritable, yell, or act timidly; elementary school

children often regress behaviorally; and adolescents become angry, aggressive, and anxious (Jaffe et al., 1990). Children exposed to domestic violence may have multiple emotional problems. They are withdrawn and may engage in self-destructive behaviors that range from nail biting and hair pulling to suicidal gestures (Jaffe et al., 1990). Social interactions are awkward and anxiety levels high among child witnesses. This constellation of symptoms has been conceptualized (Jaffe et al., 1990) into two categories: internalizing (anxiety, social reticence, and sadness) and externalizing (cruelty to animals, aggression, and disruptive behavior). When the Child Behavior Checklist (Achenbach, 1991) was filled out by women in shelters, Holden and Ritchie (1991) found a high incidence of internalizing behaviors, noting, as Jaffe et al. did, that this is found more often in females than males. Both internalizing behaviors and the total problem behavior T-score were higher among shelter children than in a comparison group of children who had not been exposed to domestic violence. No significant differences were found on the externalizing scale. However, the shelter children were rated as more aggressive than comparison children.

Wissow, Wilson, Roter, Larson, and Berman (1992) used the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) as a barometer for family violence. The CTS is a self-report checklist developed by Straus (1979) designed to assess styles of conflict resolution in families. Where conflicts were resolved with violent physical aggression (use of knives and guns), mothers reported that their children had significantly more general behavioral problems and poor emotional health than children in less violent homes.

Children exposed to violence in the home often develop inappropriately passive or aggressive styles of problem solving and have poor social skills (Jaffe et al., 1990). This may lead to serious problems later in life such as depression, substance abuse, and perpetrating violent crimes or abuse (Finkelhor & Dzuiba-Leatherman, 1994).

Trauma Theory (Additive Effects)

In a chaotic home with several forms of extant violence, it is likely that the additional psychological stress of observing pet abuse will threaten the psychological well-being of those who are forced to observe the violence. It is especially upsetting for children when the perpetrator of trauma is a family member (Pynoos, 1990). Exposure to life-threatening events early in life subjects one to "a continuity of vulnerability first seen in childhood and subsequently evident in a maladaptive adulthood" (Pynoos, 1990, p. 27).

Reexposure to violence later in life may overload individuals and exacerbate their symptoms (Pynoos & Nader, 1988). There is evidence (Finkelhor & Dzuiba-Leatherman, 1994) that early sexual and psychological abuse can lead to higher rates of psychopathology and substance abuse in later life. Children who have both witnessed violence and been subjected to abuse are significantly more likely to exhibit externalizing behavior problems than those who experience either form of abuse separately (Jaffe et al., 1990; O'Keefe, 1995).

A psychological explanation for continuing vulnerability secondary to early

trauma is offered by van der Kolk (1987). His research suggests that children who are exposed to a cluster of early traumas (physical, sexual, psychological--singly or in combination) will be particularly sensitive to subsequent traumas. It is logical to assume that the addition of pet abuse, a form of psychological terrorism, to an already fragile system can predispose a child to develop fairly serious psychopathology. The history of many violent criminals includes reports of watching their father abuse or kill their pets (Besharov, 1990; Ressler, Burgess, Hartman, Douglas, & McCormack, 1986). Ford and Linney (1995) found that 15 to 20% of juvenile sex offenders had early spontaneous memories of a family member killing a pet.

Critique and Review of the Literature

This review of the literature on domestic violence directed toward women, children, and pets finds research centered on three areas: (a) abuse of child and pet, (b) battering of women and their pets, and (c) miscellaneous reports of animal abuse in special populations.

The relation between domestic violence and the abuse of pets has been the subject of little research. In a detailed study on the relation between child abuse and abuse of pets in the home, DeViney et al. (1983) found a high correlation between physical abuse of children and cruelty to pets. This research had several technical difficulties. The determination of pet abuse was by case worker observations in the home. Formal reliability was threatened by having only one observer in each home. Comparison to a control group was accomplished by noting the results of a study

conducted by different researchers (Franti, Kraus, Borhani, Johnson, & Tucker, 1980). DeViney et al. (1983) did not include a control group in their study. The study looked at the specific population of abused children and their pets.

According to the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (1994), in homes where the mother is battered, there is a 70% chance that the children are also abused. The variable of battering against the mother was not factored in the research by DeViney et al. In addition, by not studying both mothers and children it cannot be determined if there were differences in mothers' and children's experiences with pet abuse.

In a 1992 study of lesbian relationships, Renzetti found that 38% of the couples with pets reported that one partner had abused their pet. In this same population, 30% of the children who were living with the couple were also abused.

In a comprehensive review of the literature on children who are cruel to animals, Ascione (1993) discussed a broad range of populations that have been involved with pet abuse. This form of abuse is found across different cultures (Levinson, 1989), in families where there is child abuse (DeViney et al., 1983) in lesbian relations (Renzetti, 1992), and among some clients diagnosed with Dissociative Identity Disorder (Young, Sachs, Braun, & Watkins, 1991). Ascione speculated on the potential for children to learn to abuse pets by observing parental or sibling abuse of pets. He also noted the correlation between abuse of children--especially sexual abuse--and the children's subsequent cruelty to animals. This review

did not identify any research that addresses the dynamics of abuse in the home when mother, child, and pet are all battered.

Researcher Carol Adams (1994a, 1994b) has presented numerous anecdotal reports on the abuse of pets by spouses who batter women and children. She has suggested that the abuse or killing of a pet by the woman's partner may serve as a signal that domestic violence has escalated to life-threatening levels. Adams' writing consists of compelling reports of abuse. However, little of it is based on formal research. In Adams' feminist writings, there is little emphasis on the direct effects of pet abuse on children or families.

An overview of research in this area suggests that in homes where there is battering of women, there is likely to be concurrent abuse of children and pets. There is no literature that compares mothers' and children's experiences and perceptions of pet abuse in the home. The literature notes the presence of pet abuse and suggests various potential negative outcomes, both psychological and behavioral. However, not one of the studies offers concrete suggestions on how knowledge of pet abuse might directly benefit women and children in violent domestic environments. Ideas obtained from the review of the literature were incorporated into the questionnaires developed for this study. This review of the literature guided the interpretation of results in the final two chapters of discussion and conclusion.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Design and Procedures

This study is descriptive and cross-sectional. It used questionnaires and both contemporary and retrospective reports from women and children to assess the relation between style of conflict resolution in the home and the presence of threats or abuse toward pets. It was a static-group comparison among four groups: (a) women in crisis shelters who elected to include one of their children in the study, (b) women in crisis shelters with no child in the study, (c) women who had not experienced domestic violence and shared information about one of their children, and (d) women with no personal experience with domestic violence with no child in the study.

This study was designed to describe the relation between domestic violence and violence directed toward pets. Crisis shelters were targeted as the most likely place to find a population of women and children who had experienced domestic violence. Approval for this study came from two sources. The Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Utah State University provided the necessary approval for university-based research. Shelters in the state of Utah are under the administrative umbrella of the Department of Human Services. Approval for research in the shelters was obtained from the deputy executive director (Robin Arnold-Williams) of the Department of Human Services.

Preliminary discussions with the directors of the Logan and Salt Lake City

shelter sites had a twofold purpose. First, it was necessary to determine if an acceptable number of participants could be obtained in a reasonable period of time. Based on the directors' reports of intake and turnover, it seemed probable that a sufficient number of participants could be enlisted over a 3- to 6-month period of time. Second, it was important for the directors to be aware of what would be asked of the women, how extensive the questionnaires were, and the extent to which their shelter staff would have to be involved. Both directors were satisfied with the information shared and expressed a desire to be involved. Preliminary meetings were held with the shelter staff for feedback and suggestions on all instruments. At the suggestion of the Salt Lake City site, a complete set of questionnaires was made available in Spanish. A graduate student in the language department at Utah State University was hired to translate the questionnaires into Spanish. A local professional woman, whose native language was Spanish, translated from the Spanish back into English to ensure the accuracy of the translation.

A small pilot study was run to determine how easy the questionnaires were to use and identify any problems encountered by the shelter staff. Within 3 weeks, two completed questionnaires were obtained from the Logan site and five from the Salt Lake City site. No problems with data collection were reported from either site.

After 5 months of data collection, it became evident that a sufficient number of participants could not be obtained from the Logan and Salt Lake City sites, so three additional sites (Brigham City, Ogden, and Provo) were added. Before each site started testing, the directors of each of the five shelters in Utah were contacted and

arrangements were made to meet with their staff members for a brief training period. Each site was given a folder containing a detailed description of the protocol for participant selection, a cover letter to be read to the participants, and the names and phone numbers of the principal investigator, researcher, and Institutional Review Board representative (see Appendix B).

The information gathered from the women fit two broad categories: (a) information concerning threats toward pets and actual harm of pets in the home by the partner, children, and the woman as addressed by the Battered Partner Shelter Survey and (b) style of conflict resolution as addressed by the Conflict Tactics Scale (described in Measures). It is important to note that reports on behaviors of another person are biased. In particular, women in shelters may be more likely to provide a negative perspective on a partner from whom they are seeking protection. Women were asked about their interest in participating in the study within the first 48 hours after coming in to the shelter, but after their initial crisis response had subsided. At the Salt Lake City shelter, the women were recruited at a daily orientation meeting for women who had come in to shelter within the last 24 hours. At the other shelters, women were recruited on an individual basis. Both women with and without a child in the study and children in the study were asked to read and sign (with initials on the bottom of the first page) an informed consent form.

This study was funded by a grant from the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation and funds from Utah State University's Vice President for Research. Each shelter was offered \$40.00 for the completion of each mother/child packet of questionnaires

and \$30.00 for each completed group of questionnaires given to women without a child in the study. Each woman received \$10.00 for completing all forms. Children who participated in the study received two, one-dollar gift certificates to McDonalds. In Logan, the children received a coupon for one free sandwich at Subway, donated by the sandwich shop.

Women who elected to include one of their children in the study were interviewed by a staff member using the Battered Partner Shelter Survey-mother/child version, described in Measures. This form included questions that specifically related to their child in the study. In addition, they were asked to complete a Child Behavior Checklist, described in Measures for that child. Women without a child in the study were interviewed with the Battered Partner Survey, in a version identical to the BPSS given to women with a child in the study, except that it did not have any items asking about a child in the study. Both groups of women were asked to complete the Conflict Tactics Scale, described in Measures, on their own. Shelter workers reported that completion of all forms took approximately 1 hour. Women with a child in the study required roughly a quarter-hour more.

The children were interviewed with the Child's Observation and Experience with Their Pet form, described in Measures. This brief survey of the child's observations of threats to and abuse of pets also included questions on the child's participation in pet care and their history of harming pets or other animals. The time necessary for completion of this interview varied from 10 to 60 minutes. Some children had fewer experiences to report and others chose to disclose very little.

To monitor for a continuing high level of quality, completed forms were picked up frequently. Participant recruitment was slow in Logan and Brigham City due to a normally small shelter population. The Ogden and Provo sites were able to collect a satisfactory number of participants in a relatively short period of time once they had a sufficient number of staff members available. The Salt Lake City site was buffeted by high staff turnover, several changes of directors, illnesses, accidents, inadequate staffing, and a high shelter census. Collection at this site was sporadic, ranging from one daily to bimonthly.

Population and Sample

The shelter participants were drawn from battered women and children with pets who came to crisis shelters in Brigham City, Logan, Ogden, Provo, and Salt Lake City. There were two subgroups in the shelters: women who had designated one of their children to participate in the study, and women who responded to the questionnaire, but did not include one of their children in the study or did not have children. Selection criteria for participants, women and children, included the ability to read and write or respond verbally, willingness to complete the questionnaire, and pet ownership, currently or within the past 12 months. Women who chose to include one of their children in the study were asked to select the child who was willing to participate and was most familiar with their pet. The children ranged in age from 5 to 17. After 17 months of data collection, data from 39 participants with a child in the study and 62 participants with no child in the study were collected.

Women and children in a crisis shelter who have experienced domestic violence represent a convenient sample. An attempt was made to compare them with women and children who had not experienced domestic violence. The comparison group was recruited by distributing flyers at local businesses and places of employment. Flyers were posted in Logan (see Appendix C) at E.A. Miller, Fred Meyers, KMart, Macey's, Pepperidge Farm, and WalMart. After 1 month, no responses were received, and it was decided to place an advertisement in the Logan Herald Journal (see Appendix C). Two advertisements were run for a period of 7 days each, approximately 1 month apart. Both the flyers and the newspaper advertisements offered \$10.00 for participating in the study. Both newspaper advertisements brought in numerous telephone calls. Participants calling in were initially screened by the Department of Psychology secretary, and more closely screened by a graduate assistant for the presence of a pet in the home, currently or within the last 12 months, the presence of a child in the home between the ages of 5 and 17, a partner living in the home, and the absence of domestic violence. There were two final comparison groups that consisted of 30 participants each. One group of women had a child in the home and agreed to share information about their child for the study. The other group of women did not have a child who participated in the study. The comparison group participants were not in a setting to receive supportive services following disclosure of potentially upsetting information. Therefore, there was no direct reporting by children in the comparison group, only the mother's report about the child. This approach avoided a possible retraumatization of the child.

There was also the possibility that the woman's disclosure of personal information may have been upsetting to her. A list of local support services (psychologists, psychiatrists, family therapists) was made available to the women who participated in the comparison group.

Generalizability

Findings from these samples pertain to women and children who are subjected to domestic violence and seek protection in a crisis shelter. The participants represent a subset of women who experience domestic violence. The findings cannot be generalized to all women and children who live in violent domestic situations.

The comparison sample responded to an advertisement in the newspaper. One may assume they were literate, had an interest in research, were motivated to seek a \$10 reimbursement, and had some flexibility in their scheduling that allowed availability for a daytime interview. The comparison group represented a subset of women and children who were reportedly not subjected to domestic violence. Generalization is limited to women who read the newspaper and have the interest and available time to participate in a research study.

It should be noted that this study represents the first attempt at a comprehensive description of the relation between domestic violence and pet abuse. The limited generalizability of these samples was anticipated and serves to guide further research in this area. Sampling was nonrandom and there were fixed effects.

Measures

Conflict Tactics Scale

Description

The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979) questionnaire consists of 18 items designed to measure three potential methods of conflict resolution: reasoning, verbal aggression, and violence. The scale contains a hierarchy of escalating behaviors progressing from "discussed the issue calmly" to "used a knife or gun." Straus (1979) suggested collapsing the 18 items into four separate subscales: verbal, verbal aggression, minor physical aggression, and severe physical aggression. The last six items included under severe physical aggression are qualitatively more severe than the previous items. Straus also suggests weighing these six items to account for the increased intensity of these tactics. The respondent is asked to identify his or her own conflict resolution behaviors as well as those of the partner. The CTS questionnaire was designed to be filled out by either partner.

Reliability

Straus (1979) computed a Cronbach alpha for the three areas of resolution (reasoning, verbal aggression, and violence) for six possible family roles. The correlation coefficient ranged from .50 for husband-to-wife reasoning, to .88 for couples' agreement on the presence of violence. Interrater agreement was established

by having students and their parents simultaneously complete the CTS ($r = .51$ for verbal aggression, $r = .64$ for minor and severe physical violence).

Validity

Straus (1979) addressed content and concurrent validity. An instrument that appears to measure the construct it claims to measure is said to have content validity. Each item on the CTS (see Appendix D) describes a tactic that may be used to resolve conflicts. Evidence for concurrent validity comes from connections between theory and what the instrument actually measures. Social learning theory suggests that patterns of violence may be transmitted from one generation to another. Straus (1974) reported that several studies have used the CTS to confirm intergenerational patterns of violence. Many researchers have theorized about the relation between risk factors and domestic violence. Two National Family Violence Surveys used the CTS to confirm this relation (Straus, 1974).

Children's Observation and Experience with Their Pets

Battered Partner Shelter Survey, and

Families and Pets Survey

Description

Three questionnaires (see Appendix E) were developed for this study: (a) Battered Partner Shelter Survey (BPSS, for women), (b) Children's Observation and

Experience with Their Pets (COETP, for children), and (c) Families and Pets Survey (FPS, for women in comparison groups).

All questionnaires start with demographic information including age, marital status, ethnic group, education, and job title. The children's questionnaire (COETP) asks children to report their gender and grade in school. This information may be used for matching the experimental and control groups. The second section inquires about the presence and care of a pet. This is to obtain a general idea of the family's baseline level of care for their pet. This section asks if the pet was threatened, hurt, or killed. Theory (Eisler, 1988) suggests that in environments where one individual has power over others, the lives of women, children, and animals will be devalued. The third section also asks about the participant's emotional response to observations of pet abuse. It asks if, in general, they found the abuse or killing to be upsetting. It also asks if they have ever hurt a pet or another animal.

The FPS questionnaire, intended for use with the comparison group, does not include questions concerning a child included in the study. In addition, the last three questions on the BPSS address issues specific to coming in to a shelter and domestic violence. These questions are not included on the Families and Pets Survey.

To facilitate the gathering of data, the COETP questionnaire given to the children in the shelters includes the option of drawing a picture of what happened to the pet. Pynoos and Eth (1986) suggested that having a child draw a picture of a traumatic event is an effective technique for initiating therapy with traumatized children. The drawings were simply intended to promote reporting of pet abuse and

were not intended to be used as a projective instrument. Only one of the 39 responses from children included a picture (see Appendix F).

Validity

The Battered Partner Shelter Survey was designed to assess threats or abuse directed toward pets in the home. There are specific items on the survey that ask if the partner had ever threatened or hurt the pet. The respondent is asked to describe the incident(s). The women are also asked if they, or their child in the study, or another child in the home had ever hurt a pet. This instrument has face validity.

A connection between theory and what an instrument measures is evidence for construct validity. The BPSS measures the presence of verbal and physical violence toward pets. The instrument was given to women seeking shelter from domestic violence.

Child Behavior Checklist

Description

The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL; Achenbach, 1991), for ages 4 through 18, may be filled out by the child's mother, father, or teacher. One advantage of the CBCL is that it can easily be self-administered. It requires fifth-grade reading skills and can be completed in 10 to 15 minutes. For this study, the child's mother filled out the CBCL. The first four questions address the child's adaptive functioning in the areas of sports, hobbies, group involvement, and chores. The mother is asked to

indicate the time spent on the activity relative to peers and the child's level of competence in each area. The frequency and quality of social interactions with friends and siblings are assessed by questions 5 and 6. Question 7 addresses academic functioning and school related problems. The last 2 pages of the CBCL address specific behaviors via 118 problem items. The mother is asked to circle 0 if the item is not true, 1 if it is somewhat true, and 2 if it is very often true. Several items request a further description of the problem. The description allows the scorer to determine if the child's problem fits the item or, if another item would be more specific. A computer-scored CBCL generates a problem profile listing nine syndromes: withdrawn, somatic complaints, anxious/depressed, social problems, thought problems, attention problems, delinquent behavior, aggressive behavior, and sex problems. The withdrawn, somatic complaints, and anxious/depressed syndrome scales are grouped under the "internalizing" heading. The delinquent behavior and aggressive behavior syndrome scales are grouped under the "externalizing" heading. The computer-generated profile assigns T scores, based on percentiles, to each of the syndromes, to externalizing behaviors, and to internalizing behaviors, and to a total problem score. Note that the T score referred to with the CBCL is a normalized score based on percentiles of the total problem score. Because of a skewed raw score distribution, the mean of the T scores is above 50 and the standard deviation is less than 10. For the syndromes, internalizing, and externalizing, a T score above 70 is considered clinically significant. A T score between 67 and 70 is considered borderline. For the total problem score, a T score between 60 and 63 is considered

borderline. A total problem T score above 63 is considered indicative of clinically significant problems. Be aware that the CBCL is intended as just one indicator on a multi-axial assessment that is performed to determine a child's areas of difficulty.

Reliability

The reliability of an instrument can be assessed on two dimensions: interrater reliability, the degree that two independent testers agree on their assessment of the same phenomena; and test/retest, the agreement between test results administered at two separate times. The interrater reliability is .927 for the competence items and .959 for the 118 specific problem items. Both were significant at $p < .001$. Test/retest correlations and t tests were performed on CBCLs completed by parents with a mean interval of 7 days. All test/retest Pearson r s were significant at $p < .01$. The mean test/retest reliability was $r = .89$ for the competence scales, and $r = .89$ for the problem scales. The stability of the instrument was assessed at 2 and 4 months. At 2 months the mean correlation was .75, and at 4 months was .66.

Cronbach's alpha (α) is a reliability coefficient that represents the relation between the sum of individual variances for each of the test items and the variance for test score totals. Cronbach's alpha was computed for each scale on the CBCL by gender and age groups (4 to 11 and 12 to 18). The minimum alpha score was .42 (for activities, boys ages 12 to 18) and the maximum was .96 (for sex problems, total; on all subjects).

Validity

Content validity, an indication that the instrument measures what it says it will, is supported by evidence that most items on the CBCL are able to discriminate between matched clinical and nonclinical samples.

Construct validity is the degree that the instrument measures the theoretical constructs it was designed to assess. Children's scores on the CBCL syndromes were correlated with their scores on other instruments that had analogous scales (Connors Parent Questionnaire and Quay-Peterson Revised Problem Behavior Checklist).

The CBCL was developed as a tool to directly assess categories of childhood disorders proposed by the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th edition; DSM-IV, 1994). Achenbach did not believe that the DSM-IV could be used as a criterion for empirically derived scales. In this study, referral to clinical services was the criterion used to test the discriminative power of the CBCL. This criterion is fallible as not all children who were referred required services; some of the children who were not referred were in need of behavioral or emotional support. However, Achenbach (1991) believed that there were no other valid indices. When the demographic differences were partialled out, both the CBCL scale scores and the clinical cutoff points were found to have the ability to identify referred and nonreferred populations of children.

Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to define the samples and portray the results obtained from the questionnaires. Chi-square (χ^2) was run where the difference between groups on a dichotomous variable was of interest. Dichotomous responses involved yes/no answers to questions about behaviors toward pets.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine differences between group means for socioeconomic status, severity of threats or abuse of pets, and the Conflict Tactics Scale. Additional post hoc univariate analyses were performed where appropriate. If differences between only two groups were of interest, such as the shelter participants with a child in the study and the comparison group with a child in the study, a t test was run.

Pearson correlations r were run to assess the strength of linear relationships between severity of threat or abuse and the subscales on the Conflict Tactics Scale. Effect sizes (ES) and variance effect (η^2) were also calculated when appropriate. A more detailed description of how these two strength of association measures were computed is provided in Chapter IV under Analysis Plan. The level of statistical significance set for this study was .05.

The results of this study were discussed in two ways. The results in Chapter IV were organized to follow the information obtained from the questionnaires. This allows the reader to easily access results from specific areas queried. The discussion in Chapter V was an integrated summary that ties to the initial 4 research questions

proposed in Chapter I. This was intended to allow the reader to focus on the salient points embedded in a large body of data.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview

This was a descriptive study of the relation between domestic violence and pet abuse. The majority of the results are presented in the form of descriptive data, as text, and in tables. There are several salient relations between various parts of this study's questionnaires that are presented with appropriate statistical analyses.

Recruitment of participants in the four groups used for this research was influenced by both convenience and accessibility. It was reasoned that the most likely place to find women who had been subjected to domestic violence, and were willing to talk about this, would be in crisis shelters. Several shelter directors indicated an interest in this line of research and a willingness to become involved. In general, children are a difficult population to access for information on violence and abuse in the home. The two sites initially selected, Logan and Salt Lake City, had good youth programs and expressed an interest in gathering information from children.

One shelter group consisted of women in the shelter who chose to include one of their children in the study. The other shelter group encompassed women who did not have a child participate in the study. Reasons for not including a child in the study were, (a) having no child between the ages of 5 and 17; (b) having no children; or (c) having an objection to including one of their children in the study.

There is a high degree of certainty that women in crisis shelters have

experienced domestic violence. The same level of confidence, with regard to absence of domestic violence, was not possible in the comparison groups. It is not uncommon for women to minimize, or fail to acknowledge, incidents of violence in the home. The comparison groups, like the shelter groups, were divided into women with a child in the study and women with no child in the study. Reports from children were not included in the comparison group to avoid any retraumatization of children who may have had no access to a support system.

As with the shelters, women in the comparison groups volunteered to participate. Women in both the shelter and the comparison groups represented a nonrandom sample of participants who elected to be involved with this research. A more detailed discussion of the participants is presented under Strengths and Limitations in Chapter VI.

Pilot Study Data

Data collected from the pilot study guided the development of scoring criteria for subjective responses on the BPSS, COEP, and FAPS questionnaires. A preliminary examination of data collected from the pilot study indicated a coexistence of domestic violence and pet abuse in the homes of women who seek shelter. It was also evident from the completed forms that the questionnaires developed for this study provided consistent responses, and enabled the shelter staff to easily and efficiently collect data. Completion of all the forms for each woman required around 1 hour. Approximately 15 additional minutes were required for women with a child in the

study. No formal analyses were run on the pilot study data as the number ($n = 5$) collected was too small to draw meaningful conclusions.

Data Management

The information from the BPSS, FAPS, COEP, and the CTS was transformed into computer-ready data using a 45-page codebook (see Appendix G). Open-ended descriptions were coded on five criteria: (a) the type of animal threatened or hurt, (b) what was said or done, (c) why the pet was threatened or injured, (d) what motivated the insult, and (e) the severity of the threat or abuse. Computer scoring of the CBCL generated a profile of results. The information contained on this profile was entered directly into the data file.

After all 161 questionnaire packets were scored, another individual performed a 10% check on the data. Two to three questionnaires were selected at random from each of the five shelter sites and the two comparison groups. In the shelter populations, at least one questionnaire was chosen from a mother with a child in the study and one from a woman with no child in the study. Sixteen questionnaires were rescored. Information on demographics, pet ownership, CTS, CBCL, and any additional responses where the participant selected a response had 100% reliability. On the more subjective descriptions of threats or harm of pets, reliability was 93%.

Data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS/PC) system. Note that this was a slightly older version of SPSS that immediately preceded SPSS for Windows®. All analyses were printed out. Most printouts were

transformed to tables before the information was integrated into this document. Two statisticians were consulted: Dr. D. Sisson and Roxanne Pfister.

Analysis Plan

In general, analyses proceeded from the simple to the complex. Presentation of results is in the following order: demographics, pet ownership, pet care, threats toward pets, actual harm or killing of pets, reporting incidents of pet abuse, women's ratings of their emotional responses, others who hurt pets (women and children), concern for pet welfare, change in partner's willingness to use violence, pet-related issues, the CBCL, responses by the child in the study (observations of abuse, hurting, and caring), and the CTS.

This was a descriptive study encompassing a large amount of data. It did not represent an exact replication of any previous research. Therefore, the decision was made to do an analysis on all questions of interest. In particular, each item on the questionnaires was addressed and the four research questions were explored. Many of the subgroups selected were too small for an accurate interpretation, some results revealed no pattern, and many results were nonsignificant. If there was a suspicion that some questions may be of interest to future researchers with access to a larger or more controlled database, analyses and results were included (i.e., many of the subgroupings for conditions of threat only, hurt only, neither threat nor hurt, or both threat and hurt had very small *ns* but posed potentially interesting questions).

Descriptive statistics on demographic information, presence or absence of

threat or abuse, CTS, and CBC were obtained using the frequency command on SPSS/PC. This provided the number of participants in each group, the frequency each variable had for a specific response, a minimum and maximum value, the standard deviation, and the percent of responses in each category. Cross-tabulations also provided a visual representation of the data that was easily interpretable.

Many of the questions involved dichotomous responses in the form of yes/no answers. The most appropriate statistic for categorical data is the chi-square statistic, a goodness-of-fit measurement. It tests the hypothesis that the data come from a predicted probability distribution. Chi-square serves as a numerical index of how much observed frequencies deviate from expected frequencies. The significance of a chi-square statistic is a function of the degrees of freedom, $df = (r-1)(c-1)$; r = number in row, c = number in column. A chi-square value of approximately 10 is significant at the .01 level when there are only two to three degrees of freedom. Interpretation of chi-square testing is an art that involves careful decision making. There were sufficient data in the contingency tables to make the chi-square test useful. Greenwood and Nikulin (1996) noted that chi-square tests are not useful when data are sparse (n less than or equal to 5). For subgrouping of data (i.e., threat/no threat/neither/both) numbers were often very small ($n = 1$ or 2) in the cells. For these cases, although a chi-square test was obtained, no meaningful interpretation could be made. The decision to use chi-square was based on the type of data (categorical), ability of the test to give useful information with small n s (greater than 5), and independence between participants' reports.

A one-way analysis of variance is an extension of the t test that allows the comparison of more than two groups. The null hypothesis tested by this statistic is that the group means are equal. For this study, a one-way analysis of variance with fixed effects was selected. For a one-way analysis of variance, the influence of one independent variable (with multiple levels) on the dependent variable is examined. ANOVA (two-way analysis of variance) would have been appropriate if there were several independent variables that, separately and jointly, influenced the dependent variable. This was a fixed effect model because groups with specific characteristics (i.e., in shelter, with children, owned a pet) were chosen to answer research questions. With a fixed effects model, care must be taken with generalizations to other groups.

Many one-way analyses of variance rejected the null hypothesis of equal means and produced statistically significant F values. However, the particular comparisons responsible for the significant findings were not evident from this analysis. Post hoc comparisons were run to detect specific differences between or among means. In general, post hoc comparisons have little power. Often they will not reveal a significant difference unless it is very large and obvious (Lindman, 1974). The post hoc method selected for this research was the Scheffé method. This test has the ability to accommodate unequal sample sizes, is applicable to any comparison, and is robust with regard to normality and homogeneity of variance. The conservative Scheffé test decreases the chances of making a Type I (alpha) error, finding significant differences where there are none. However, as the risk of a Type I error

decreases, the possibility of a Type II (beta) error increases (missing significant differences that do exist). For this study the scoring of the data was subjective and reports from the participants were retrospective and emotionally laden. Therefore, it was felt that it was more important to carefully report only true differences than to miss a few potential differences that could be perhaps better explored with a tighter design.

To judge if differences were large enough to be important, two strength of association measures were used: effect size (ES) and η^2 (η^2). The ES is appropriate for the comparison of two populations, such as a t test, or the Scheffé, a modified t test. The effect size was calculated by dividing the difference between the means of the two groups by the pooled standard deviation (SD). This produced a standardized mean difference ES. The ES can be either greater than 1 or less than 1 in either direction, negative or positive. The number obtained is related to a z score. An ES of 1.00 is equivalent to the 84th percentile. Cohen (1988) developed an arbitrary interpretation of univariate effect sizes: An ES of 0.50 is low, ES of 0.70 is moderate, ES of 0.90 or greater is high. Inferences about the practical significance of these values should account for the variables of interest and area of study.

When an analysis of variance was used, the η^2 statistic was appropriate. η^2 estimated the proportion of variability explained by the model. It was calculated by dividing the sum of squares of the main effect (between groups) by the sum of squares for the total. This gave a statistic equal to R^2 , the proportion of total variability attributable to differences among groups. A large η^2 (η^2) suggests that the

differences between groups are large relative to the variability within groups and the differences may be practically important. It also indicates that the overlap between the scores in the different groups is small (Lindman, 1974; Wampold & Drew, 1990).

The relation between sequential reports of threats or abuse was explored with Pearson's r correlations. When there were only two groups to compare, t tests were performed.

This was a descriptive study covering a specific aspect of domestic violence. As far as the author is aware, a comparable study of this type has not yet been conducted. There are several limitations inherent in designing and running an original study, including several that were not apparent until the study was well underway. For a descriptive study of this nature, using nonrandom samples, extensive statistical analyses would not be appropriate.

In an effort to summarize and clarify the bulky data set numerous tables are provided. Percentages presented on the tables apply to the column unless otherwise noted (i.e., on Table 2, percent married in the S-C group is listed at 56%, or 22 or the women reported that they were married). On some tables there is an overlap between categories, so the column will not sum to 100% (e.g., on Table 22 there is overlap between types of veterinary care). However, the percentages still refer to the column. In the S-C group, 58% of the participants reported that their pet(s) received regular veterinary care. Forty-nine percent reported the use of emergency veterinary care, and 71.8% reported vaccinations. Various combinations of all three items were reported by women in each group.

In addition to the percentages, most tables also indicate the number of participants in each category. This is important for many of the tables with a small number of reports, subdivisions, and uneven reporting. Table 29 details the threats made toward pets. Of the 39 women in the S-C group, only 19 reported specific threats. Of those 19, 31.6%, or 6 women, reported nonspecific threats to hurt a pet. On Table 70, reports of partner caring for the pet are subdivided into four conditions (threat, hurt, neither, or both). On this table, high percentages again refer to small numbers of responses. Due to the nature of data collection (i.e., shelter participants, numerous interviewers at several sites, and differing experiences reported), all participants did not respond to all questions. The resultant unevenness in data collection is evident from the numbers on the tables.

Demographic Information

The four groups in this study are designated as follows: shelter, with child in the study (S-C); shelter, with no child in the study (S-NC); nonshelter, with child in the study (NS-C); and nonshelter, with no child in the study (NS-NC).

Age

The mean age for participants in the S-C group was 34; for S-NC, 30; for NS-C, 40; and for NS-NC, 26 (see Table 1).

Table 1Mean Age (in Years) by Group

| <u>Statistics</u> | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-------------------|-------|------|------|-------|
| Mean | 34.05 | 30.2 | 40.3 | 25.7 |
| <u>SD</u> | 5.6 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 8.3 |
| Minimum | 21 | 17 | 20 | 19 |
| Maximum | 44 | 51 | 57 | 57 |

Marital Status

There was a broad variation in marital status among S-C participants: 56% were married, 15% divorced, 23% single, and 5% widowed. Women in the S-NC group reported a slightly smaller percentage of marriage (47%), comparable levels of divorce (16%), and a considerably higher percentage were not married (37%). The entire NS-C group was married. The NS-NC group reported 73% were married and 27% single (see Table 2).

Number of Children in Each Group

The comparison group with no child in the study (NS-NC) reported no children, in the study or not. All women with children from the community sample

Table 2

Marital Status by Group, Percentage (Number)

| <u>Marital Status</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> |
|-----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Married | 56 (22) | 47 (29) | 100 (30) | 73 (22) |
| Divorced | 15 (6) | 16 (10) | -- | -- |
| Single | 23 (9) | 37 (23) | -- | 27 (8) |
| Widowed | 5 (2) | -- | -- | -- |

chose to include a child in the study. Thus, only women with no children participated in the NS-NC group. The S-NC group included many women who had a child or children but chose not to include one in the study. Or, the child did not fit the age requirements of the study: Many were under the age of 5 (see Tables 3 and 4).

Ethnicity

The ethnic mix found in the shelter sample was more varied than the comparison participants, and differed considerably from the ethnic composition in Utah. However, it closely matched a demographic report on shelter populations (Thompson, 1994). The ethnic mix found in the comparison sample leaned heavily toward Caucasian participants, with Native Americans the only other ethnic group

Table 3

Number of Boys in Each Group, by Age Grouping

| <u>Age Groups</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> |
|-------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Between 5 and 18 | 41 | 17 | 33 |
| Over 18 | -- | -- | 7 |
| Under 5 | 8 | 23 | 6 |

Table 4

Number of Girls in Each Group, by Age Grouping

| <u>Age Groups</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> |
|-------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Between 5 and 18 | 44 | 11 | 29 |
| Over 18 | -- | 1 | 2 |
| Under 5 | 12 | 18 | 6 |

represented. Notably absent from the comparison group were any Hispanic women. Statewide (Thompson, 1994), Hispanic people represent 5% of the population (see Table 5).

Table 5

Ethnic Distribution by Group with Comparison Groups; Percentage (Number)

| <u>Ethnic Group</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> | <u>Utah</u> | <u>Shelter Study</u> |
|---------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|
| Caucasian | 72 (29) | 66 (41) | 93 (28) | 100 (30) | 94 | 75 |
| Hispanic | 16 (6) | 10 (6) | -- | -- | 5 | 10 |
| Native Am. | 3 (1) | 10 (6) | 7 (2) | -- | 1 | 8 |
| Black Am. | 5 (2) | 10 (6) | -- | -- | 1 | 4 |
| Other | 3 (1) | 5 (3) | -- | -- | 4 | 3 |

Note. Shelter study percentages from Thompson (1994). Number of participants not available from Utah data or Thompson's shelter study.

Education

In general, women and partners in the comparison sample had greater educational accomplishments than those in the shelter sample. The shelter sample, on the other hand, had a broader range of educational experience, from a low of 5 years of primary school, to a high of 17 years, indicative of some graduate school. Several women reported completion of primary school (8 years). All women in the comparison sample reported at least 12 years of education for both themselves and their partner. A few comparison group participants reported high educational levels

(20 to 24 years of education), indicative of professional degrees (i.e., 12 years + 8 years medical school + 4 years internship and residency for a physician) (see Tables 6 and 7).

Socioeconomic Status

Computation of the SES was performed per Hollingshead's formula: SES = occupational scale score [1-9, based on occupational title] multiplied by 5 plus the educational factor [1-7] based on years of schooling multiplied by 3. By using this formula developed by Hollingshead (1975), an SES rating was determined based on the employment of either or both of the partners. Both SES means of the comparison sample were higher than those of the shelter group. There was one exception to this: If just the woman was employed, the mean SES in the S-C group was higher than either the S-NC or NS-NC groups. Note that there were no women in the NS-C group who reported themselves as the sole source of income in the home.

Based on Hollingshead's recommended formula (Hollingshead, 1975), the SES range was 8 to 66. Professionals and heads of major businesses have a rating of 55 to 66. Business middle management and technical employees range from 40 to 54. Those who are in sales or skilled crafts will have a SES rating from 30 to 39. Semiskilled workers are rated from 20 to 29. Unskilled laborers will score from 8 to 19 on this scale (see Tables 8, 9, and 10).

To assess the significance of the different SES levels found in each group, a one-way analysis of variance was performed. The results indicated that there was a

Table 6

Years of Education, Women (Number)

| <u>Statistics</u> | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Mean | 12.6(38) | 12.1(62) | 14.6(30) | 15.0(30) |
| <u>SD</u> | 2.3 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| Minimum | 8 | 7 | 12 | 12 |
| Maximum | 17 | 16 | 21 | 18 |

Table 7

Years of Education, Men (Number)

| <u>Statistics</u> | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Mean | 11.8(35) | 11.8(60) | 15.5(30) | 14.4(30) |
| <u>SD</u> | 1.3 | 2.2 | 3.6 | 1.9 |
| Minimum | 8 | 5 | 12 | 12 |
| Maximum | 15 | 17 | 24 | 20 |

Table 8

SES: Both Partners Employed (Number)

| <u>Statistics</u> | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Mean | 30.6(16) | 33.9(20) | 44.5(19) | 39.6(22) |
| <u>SD</u> | 7.7 | 9.6 | 12.0 | 8.7 |

Table 9

SES: Only the Partner Employed (Number)

| <u>Statistics</u> | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-------------------|----------|----------|----------|---------|
| Mean | 26.9(12) | 31.0(25) | 42.7(11) | 32.0(4) |
| <u>SD</u> | 7.2 | 8.7 | 15.1 | 2.5 |

significant difference between groups for all three working conditions; both working, just the partner working, and just the woman working. Eta^2 was calculated by dividing the sum of squares between groups by the total sum of the squares. Eta^2 provides an estimate of the proportion of variance in the SES accounted for by membership in different groups. In homes where just the partner was working or where both partners were working, eta^2 s were .25 and .23, respectively. This

Table 10

SES: Only the Woman Employed (Number)

| Statistics | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|------------|---------|---------|------|---------|
| Mean | 53.0(3) | 31.0(6) | -- | 44.7(3) |
| <u>SD</u> | 7.0 | 9.8 | -- | 9.1 |

suggests that a small proportion of the variance in SES was due to differences between the groups. If just the woman was working, η^2 was .58. This suggested that in homes where just the woman was employed, a moderate amount of the variability in SES was accounted for by membership in different groups (see Tables 11, 12, and 13).

One-way analyses of variance did not specify where the significant differences between the groups were. To further explore the data, post hoc analyses, using the Scheffe' statistic, were conducted. In homes where both partners were employed or where only the partner was employed, there was a significant difference between the NS-C group and both shelter groups. The NS-C group had the highest SES. If just the woman was working, the only significant group difference was found between the S-C and S-NC groups. The SES of the S-C group was higher than that found in the S-NC group (see Tables 14, 15, and 16).

Table 11

One-Way Analysis of Variance: SES by Group, Both Partners Employed

| Source | <u>df</u> | Mean squares | <u>F</u> Ratio | Sig of <u>F</u> | η^2 |
|---------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|
| Between group | 3 | 676.551 | 7.245 | .0003 | .23 |
| Within group | 73 | 93.387 | -- | -- | -- |

Table 12

One-Way Analysis of Variance: SES by Group, Only the Partner Employed

| Source | <u>df</u> | Mean squares | <u>F</u> Ratio | Sig of <u>F</u> | η^2 |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|
| Between groups | 3 | 527.069 | 5.381 | .003 | .25 |
| Within groups | 48 | 97.939 | -- | -- | -- |

Pet Ownership

More than 90% of the women in all groups reported owning a pet within the past 12 months. Current pet ownership was slightly lower, with over 80% of the participants in both comparison groups reporting current pet ownership. In the shelter population, current pet ownership was 64.1% for the S-C group and 70.5% for the

Table 13

One-Way Analysis of Variance: SES by Group, Only the Woman Employed

| Source | df | Mean squares | F Ratio | Sig of F | η^2 |
|----------------|----|--------------|---------|----------|----------|
| Between groups | 2 | 529.125 | 6.395 | .018 | .58 |
| Within groups | 9 | 82.741 | -- | -- | -- |

Table 14

Scheffé Post Hoc Comparisons: SES by Group, Both Partners Employed

| Group | Mean (SD) | Differences between groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 4 | Group 3 |
| 1 S-C | 30.59 (7.67) | -- | .13 | 1.10 | 1.42 |
| 2 S-NC | 33.97 (9.55) | 3.38 | -- | .60 | 1.01 |
| 4 NS-NC | 39.57 (8.74) | 8.98 | 5.60 | -- | .46 |
| 3 NS-C | 44.47 (12.02) | 13.88* | 10.50* | 4.90 | -- |

* Significant differences determined at $p < .05$ confidence level.

Table 15

Scheffé Post Hoc Comparisons: SES by Group, Only the Partner Employed

| Group | Mean (SD) | Difference between groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 1 | Group 2 | Group 4 | Group 3 |
| 1 S-C | 26.92 (7.18) | -- | .49 | .90 | 1.39 |
| 2 S-NC | 31.00 (8.73) | 4.08 | -- | .14 | 1.05 |
| 4 NS-NC | 32.00 (2.45) | 5.08 | 1.00 | -- | .99 |
| 3 NS-C | 42.73 (15.12) | 15.81* | 11.73* | 10.73 | -- |

* Significant differences determined at $p < .05$ confidence level.

S-NC group. These lower percentages may reflect an increasing instability in the homes that precedes women seeking shelter. See Chapter VI Limitations for a discussion of differences between current and past pet ownership and differences between groups (see Tables 17 and 18).

Type of Pets

The participants were asked to report the number of dogs, cats, birds, or other kinds of pets they owned. Other kinds reported included fish, gerbils, rabbits, snakes, and goats. For a detailed report of the numbers and types of pets reported in each group see Appendix H.

Table 16

Scheffé Post Hoc Comparisons: SES by Group, Only the Woman Employed

| Group | Mean (SD) | Difference between groups/ <u>ES</u> | | |
|---------|--------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 2 | Group 4 | Group 1 |
| 2 S-NC | 31.00 (9.82) | -- | 1.43 | 2.48 |
| 4 NS-NC | 44.67 (9.07) | 13.67 | -- | 1.05 |
| 1 S-C | 53.00 (7.00) | 22.00* | 8.33 | -- |

* Significant differences determined at $p < .05$ confidence level.

Table 17

Do You Currently Own a Pet? Percentage (Number)

| Response | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| No | 33.3 (13) | 29.5 (18) | 10.0 (3) | 16.7 (5) |
| Yes | 64.1 (25) | 70.5 (43) | 90.0 (27) | 83.3 (25) |
| Not sure | 2.6 (1) | -- | -- | -- |

Table 18

Have You Had a Pet Within the Past 12 Months? Percentage (Number)

| <u>Response</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> |
|-----------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| No | 7.9 (3) | 9.7 (6) | -- | -- |
| Yes | 92.1 (36) | 90.3 (56) | 96.6 (29) | 100 (30) |
| Not sure | -- | -- | 3.4 (1) | -- |

Number of Pets in the Last Five Years

We speculated that in unstable environments there would be a higher turnover of pets. To test this, participants were asked to report the number of pets they have had in the past 5 years. There was not a large variation in the mean number of pets among the four groups. However, the ranges varied considerably. The S-C and NS-NC groups had a similar range (1 to 44 and 1 to 45, respectively). The S-NC group reported a range of 1 to 70 on number of pets owned in the last 5 years. A much smaller range was evident in the NS-C group (1 to 20). In the NS-NC group, some of the participants reported that they provided foster care for pets. This might account for the high numbers in the shelter population although none of the shelter participants specified this (see Table 19).

Table 19

Number of Pets in the Last Five Years, by Group

| <u>Statistics</u> | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-------------------|------|------|------|-------|
| Mean | 9.2 | 6.2 | 5.6 | 5.4 |
| <u>SD</u> | 10.9 | 9.5 | 4.5 | 8.1 |
| Range | 1-44 | 1-70 | 1-20 | 1-45 |

Veterinary Care

The participants were asked if their pets received regular veterinary care, emergency veterinary care, and vaccinations. This cluster of questions was not necessarily intended to indicate the level of caring in the home toward pets. In many rural areas, farm animals and pets are treated with gentleness and respect, and veterinary care is minimal. It is not uncommon for farmers and ranchers to provide medical care for their own animals. In addition, in these environments there is often an acceptance of the natural life and death cycle, and exceptional efforts are not made to provide medical care to animals. However, these questions did offer a rough index of positive involvement with pets. The two sites most likely to service a rural population were Logan and Brigham City.

All three veterinary care items, regular care, emergency care, and

vaccinations, were higher in the comparison groups (NS-C and NS-NC) than in the shelter sample (S-C and S-NC). The one exception was that emergency veterinary care was higher in the S-C group than in the S-NC or NS-NC groups. It is possible that pets in this population live in an unstable, unsafe environment.

To determine if there was a significant difference in the use of veterinary care, a chi-square statistic was run. For regular veterinary care, the chi-square test value was 15.49, with $p = .0014$. In the comparison groups, it was evident that the use of regular veterinary care exceeded the expected values. In the shelter sample, the use of regular veterinary care was less than that expected.

The same analyses were run on emergency care. For this item, the chi-square test value was 15.36, with $p = .0015$. For the S-C and NS-NC groups, the observed values roughly matched the expected values. In the S-NC group, emergency veterinary care was less than the expected value. In the NS-C group, emergency veterinary care was more than the expected value.

Finally, a chi-square test was run on vaccinations by group. This revealed a smaller, but still significant difference. Chi-square was 9.46, with $p = .028$. In both comparison groups, the observed value for vaccinations was more than the expected value. In the shelter groups, pets received vaccinations at a lower rate that would be expected by chance alone. Note that there is overlap between veterinary care items; columns do not sum to 100% (see Table 20).

When a comparison was made of regular veterinary care, emergency care, and vaccinations by sites, it was evident that the sites targeted as being more rural,

Table 20

Veterinary Care by Group: Percentage Responding Yes (Number)

| Type of Care | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC | χ^2 |
|--------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------|
| Regular | 53.8 (21) ^a | 56.5 (35) ^a | 80.0 (24) ^b | 90.0 (27) ^b | 15.49 |
| Emergency | 41.0 (16) ^c | 25.8 (16) ^a | 66.7 (20) ^b | 30.0 (9) ^c | 15.36 |
| Vaccination | 71.8 (28) ^a | 73.8 (45) ^a | 93.1 (27) ^b | 93.1 (27) ^b | 9.46 |

^a = value less than expected; ^b = value more than expected; ^c = approximately expected value.

Brigham City and Logan, did not report lower levels of veterinary care. In homes, both with and without children, the participants from Salt Lake City reported low levels of regular and emergency veterinary care. The lowest level of vaccinating pets was found in Logan participants with children (25%). Emergency veterinary care was lowest in the Ogden group with no child in the study. Regular veterinary care was least prevalent in Salt Lake City, both for groups with and without a child in the study (see Tables 21 and 22).

Table 21

Veterinary Care by Site, with Child, Percentage Responding Yes

| Type of Care | Logan | Brigham | Ogden | SLC | Provo | Comparison |
|--------------|-------|---------|-------|------|-------|------------|
| Regular | 50.0 | 100.0 | 57.1 | 47.1 | 60.0 | 80.0 |
| Emergency | 50.0 | 50.0 | 71.4 | 17.6 | 60.0 | 66.7 |
| Vaccination | 25.0 | 100.0 | 71.4 | 76.5 | 80.0 | 90.0 |

Table 22

Veterinary Care by Sites, No Child: Percentage Responding Yes

| Type of Care | Logan | Brigham | Ogden | SLC | Provo | Comparison |
|--------------|-------|---------|-------|------|-------|------------|
| Regular | 75.0 | -- | 66.7 | 48.4 | 60.0 | 90.0 |
| Emergency | 50.0 | 50.0 | 16.7 | 19.4 | 30.0 | 30.0 |
| Vaccination | 87.5 | -- | 83.3 | 74.2 | 60.0 | 90.0 |

Care for the Pet

Partner

The BPSS and the FPS asked if the partner, child in the study, or other

children in the family helped care for the pet. Three patterns emerged with the partners. First, a higher percentage of partners in the comparison groups (NS-C and NS-NC) helped care for the pet. The lowest level of partner care of pet was found in the S-C group. Second, the most active partner involvement with pet care--feeding, walking, playing, and grooming--was found in the comparison groups. In shelter groups, women reported that their partners' involvement was often limited to feeding, or letting the pet outside. In households with no child in the study, the partner was more involved with pet care than in those with a child in the study (S-NC greater than S-C, and NS-NC greater than NS-C). Third, a partner taking the pet to the veterinarian was routine in both comparison groups, but was rare in the S-NC group (mentioned only twice). No mention was made of the partner taking a pet to the veterinarian in the S-C group. To determine if care of the pet by the partner was different from what would be expected by chance, a chi-square test was performed. The chi-square result was 14.71, with $p = .002$. In both comparison groups, the partner's care for pets exceeded expected values. In both shelter populations, fewer women reported that their partners cared for pets (see Table 23).

Child in Study

The mother was asked to report if the child in the study and/or other children in the home were responsible for pet care. These results were biased by the selection criteria. Women were asked to select a child who was most involved with the pets.

Table 23

Partner Caring for Pet: Percentage Responding Yes; by Group (Number)

| S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC | χ^2 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 51.3(20) | 69.4(43) | 86.7(26) | 86.7(26) | 14.71 |

The results reflect this. Mothers in the S-C and NS-C groups indicated that greater than 95% of their children were involved with caring for their pets. Extensive of pet involvement--feeding, walking, playing, and grooming--was found in the NS-C group; in the S-C group, fewer of these activities were reported. The percentage of high level pet caregiving of the NS-C group was more than double that found in the S-C group. A chi-square statistic revealed no significant difference in care provided by the child for either of the groups with a child (S-C and NS-C).

Other Child

Again, secondary to selection bias, participation in pet care by other children was lower than for children participating in the study. This question was not asked of women in the comparison group. The type of pet care provided by other children was more varied. Only feeding, only playing, and feeding, walking, playing, grooming were all approximately equal in the S-C and S-NC groups. Thus, the

highest level of involvement with pet care by the largest number of children was found among the NS-C group. A chi-square statistic showed no statistical difference between the presence or absence of care provided by other children in the home.

If any response by the mother suggested that the child also loved their pet, this was coded separately. This proved to be a low level of response ($n = 1$ to 3) that was found across all groups (S-C, S-NC, NS-C) with children (see Table 24).

Relation Between Partner and Child Pet Care

Based on the premise that children imitate adult caregiving behaviors, it was expected that there would be a relation between partner and child involvement with pet care. In general, higher pet care by children was related to higher partner participation. There were small differences between the percentage of pet care provided by children in homes where the man did provide care for the pet (91.5%),

Table 24

Child Providing Care for Pet: Percentage Responding Yes; by Group (Number)

| Child Providing Care | S-C | NS-C |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Child in study | 94.9 (37) | 96.7 (29) |
| Other child in family | 87.9 (29) | 78.9 (30) |

and homes where the man did not provide care for the pet (88%). Where partners in the study cared for the pet(s), children were more likely to imitate this positive behavior. General trends were noted but no statistical significance was found.

Other children in the S-NC group showed a lower percentage of pet care than those in the S-C group. If the participant reported that her partner provided care for the pet, 80% of the other children in those households also cared for pets. If it was reported that the partner did not provide care for the pet, 83% of the other children helped care for the pet. Partners in the S-NC group were more likely to provide pet care than those in the S-C group. Many of the households in the S-NC group had no child in the home. Perhaps, as seen in the NS-NC group, when there is no child in the home, the partner is more involved with providing care for the pet.

In the S-NC group, some households had a child but did not include the child in the study, while others had no child in the home. The difference between pet care provided by partners in homes with a child (71.1%) and homes without a child (65.2%) was small.

Threats Toward Pet

Participants were asked to respond yes or no if their partner had ever threatened to hurt their pet(s). If yes, they were then asked to describe the event(s). (See Appendix I for complete transcript of threats.) The descriptions were coded on five criteria: (a) what type of animal was threatened, (b) what was said (i.e., I will hurt, kill, etc...), (c) why the pet was threatened (i.e., pet bit, woman threatened to

leave), (d) what was the threat related to (i.e., the animal's action, a desire to coerce woman), and (e) the severity of the threat on a 1 to 4 scale (i.e., minor, annoy, pain, kill). A maximum of two incidents was coded from each participant. Each incident was qualitatively different and, therefore, not averaged with the other. Selection was based on clarity of the description (i.e., given two reports: [1] "He hurt the cat bad" and [2] "He hit the dog with a club and broke its leg," the second report offers more information, is clearer, and would be selected over the first report for coding).

All coding was conservative for both threat and abuse. Some descriptions led to speculation about the probable intent, severity, or frequency of the incident. However, unless these details were explicit, they were coded as "not clear from description." This has resulted in an accurate report that probably underestimates several factors related to threats and abuse toward pets.

Presence of Threats

A chi-square procedure was run to determine if there was a significant difference between responses for each group. The chi-square statistic was 19.94, with $p = .0002$. In both comparison groups the percent of threats was lower than what one would expect by chance. In the two shelter groups, the reported threats were higher than a chance distribution would predict.

The percentage of partners who reportedly threatened to hurt a pet is low in both comparison groups, with the NS-NC group reporting the lowest incidence. The

percentage reporting threats was approximately equal for both shelter populations--S-C and S-NC (see Table 25).

Type of Pet Threatened

As noted earlier, for all groups, both currently and within the past 12 months, the most common pet owned was the dog. It is interesting that, even with more dog ownership, cats were threatened at an equal or higher rate than dogs. In the S-NC and NS-C populations, the percentages of threats toward cats and dogs were similar. In the S-C group, cats were threatened more than dogs, yet this S-C group reported more dog ownership. Only in the NS-NC group were there more threats toward dogs than cats, but as the number of threats was so small in this (NS-NC) group, it is difficult to get a clear picture of the significance of this, if any (see Table 26).

Table 25

Percentage Reporting Threats Toward Pet by Group (Number)

| S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| 52.6 (20) | 51.6 (32) | 20.0 (6) | 13.3 (4) |

Table 26

Type of Pet Threatened: Percentage (Number) in Each Group

| <u>Type of Pet</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> |
|--------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Dog | 30.0 (6) | 34.4 (11) | 50.0 (3) | 75.0 (3) |
| Cat | 55.0 (11) | 37.5 (12) | 50.0 (3) | 25.0 (1) |
| Dog and Cat | 10.0 (2) | 15.6 (5) | -- | -- |
| Bird | -- | 9.4 (3) | -- | -- |
| Rabbit | 5.0 (1) | -- | -- | -- |
| Reptile | -- | 3.1 (1) | -- | -- |

What Was Said

Most threats implied that the partner would hurt (i.e., kick, throw) or kill the pet. The next most common threat was abandonment. Most abandonment threats involved taking the pet to a remote area and leaving it behind. In general, partners in the shelter population were more likely to threaten to kill than to threaten to injure. The widest variety of threats was found in the S-NC group (see Table 27).

Why Pet Was Threatened

For most descriptions, no apparent reason was evident for a threat; it was not

Table 27

What Was Said to Threaten the Pet: Percentage (Number) of Threats in Each Group

| Threats | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Hurt | 31.6 (6) | 25.0 (8) | 66.7 (4) | -- |
| Kill | 57.9 (11) | 46.9 (15) | -- | 75.0 (3) |
| Hurt and kill | 5.3 (1) | 6.3 (2) | 16.7 (1) | -- |
| Kill and make woman eat | -- | 3.1 (1) | -- | -- |
| Abandon | -- | 6.3 (2) | 16.7 (1) | 25.0 (1) |
| Get rid of | 5.3 (1) | 3.1 (1) | -- | -- |
| Skin cat and hang on door | -- | 3.1 (1) | -- | -- |
| Release birds | -- | 3.1 (1) | -- | -- |
| Drop from second floor | -- | 3.1 (1) | -- | -- |

coded unless a specific reason was clear from the description. The incidence of threats was low in the comparison samples, making it difficult to discern a pattern of threat types in the NS-C and NS-NC groups (see Table 28).

Table 28

Reasons for Threatening Pet: Percentage (Number) Reported by Group

| <u>Reasons</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| No reason given | 68.4 (13) | 62.5 (20) | -- | -- |
| Soiled carpet | 5.3 (1) | 3.1 (1) | 16.7 (1) | -- |
| Bit, growled | 5.3 (1) | 6.3 (2) | 33.3 (2) | -- |
| Chewed, bumped child | -- | -- | 16.7 (1) | -- |
| Mother threatened to leave | 10.5 (2) | 6.3 (2) | -- | -- |
| Cat killed bird | -- | 3.1 (1) | -- | -- |
| To threaten woman | 10.5 (2) | 6.3 (2) | -- | -- |
| To threaten child | -- | 6.3 (2) | 16.7 (1) | 25.0 (1) |
| Disliked pet | -- | 3.1 (1) | -- | 50.0 (2) |
| Ran into traffic | -- | -- | 16.7 (1) | -- |
| Anger over death of child | -- | -- | -- | 25.0 (1) |
| Moving | -- | 3.1 (1) | -- | -- |

Underlying Reason for Threat

For most descriptions, it was not clear what motivated the partner to make his

threat(s). The animal's actions were more often a source of threats among the comparison group. The use of threats for clearly coercive purposes--that is, "If you leave, I will hurt the cat"--was found only in the shelter groups: S-C and S-NC (see Table 29).

Severity and Frequency of Threats

There were four levels of threat severity: (a) minor, teasing, nondestructive, nonpainful; (b) frighten, annoy, restrain, minimal discomfort; (c) inflict pain or discomfort, broke leg; (d) kill, torture, prolonged suffering, permanent loss of function. In the S-C, S-NC, and NS-NC groups, most threats suggested that the

Table 29

Motivating Factors for Threat(s): Percentage (Number) by Group

| <u>Motivating Factors</u> | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Not clear | 52.6 (10) | 56.3 (18) | 16.7 (1) | 50.0 (2) |
| Animal's actions | 15.8 (3) | 25.0 (8) | 83.3 (5) | 50.0 (2) |
| Coercion | 21.1 (4) | 15.6 (5) | -- | -- |
| Both animal's actions and coercion | 10.5 (2) | 3.1 (1) | -- | -- |

partner intended to kill the pet. Threats related to mild punishment were the next most common across all groups. Note that the severity of threats is on a 1-to-4 scale (minor = 1, frighten = 2, pain = 3, and kill = 4; see Table 30).

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine if the differences between the groups were significant. Results indicated that there was a significant difference between groups on the severity of threats. The η^2 value was 0.142, indicating that 14.2% of the variability in severity of threat(s) was attributable to differences between groups (see Table 31).

Post hoc analyses with the Scheffé procedure were employed to determine exactly where the differences between groups were. Significant differences (at the $p = .05$ level) were found between the comparison group with children (NS-C) and

Table 30

Severity of Threat: Percentage (Number) in Each Category by Group

| Severity | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Minor | -- | 6.7 (2) | 33.3 (2) | -- |
| Frighten | 21.1 (4) | 16.7 (5) | 33.3 (2) | 25.0 (1) |
| Pain | 10.5 (2) | 10.0 (3) | 16.7 (1) | -- |
| Kill | 68.4 (13) | 66.7 (20) | 16.7 (1) | 75.0 (3) |

Table 31

One-Way Analysis of Variance: Severity of Threat by Group

| Source | <u>df</u> | Mean squares | <u>F</u> Ratio | Sig of <u>F</u> | η^2 |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|
| Between groups | 3 | 2.855 | 3.047 | .036 | 0.142 |
| Within groups | 55 | .937 | -- | -- | -- |

both of the shelter groups (S-C and S-NC). The lowest levels of severity of threats were found among the NS-C group (see Table 32).

Frequency of Threats

It was evident from responses of the women that in all groups at least 50% of the threats were repeated numerous times. The number of responses was lower in the comparison groups, yet no clear pattern emerged. Most responses were clear enough to determine if the threat occurred once or more often. It is possible that if the descriptions from the shelter population were clarified, a distinctive pattern might emerge (see Table 33).

Number of Distinct Threats

Only two threats were coded for each description. However, the total number

Table 32

Scheffé Post Hoc Comparisons for Severity of Threat by Group

| Group | Mean (SD) | Differences between groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|--------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 3 | Group 2 | Group 1 | Group 4 |
| 3 NS-C | 2.167 (1.17) | -- | 1.14 | 1.01 | 1.23 |
| 2 S-NC | 3.367 (0.99) | 1.20* | -- | .12 | .13 |
| 1 S-C | 3.474 (0.84) | 1.31* | .11 | -- | .03 |
| 4 NS-NC | 3.500 (1.00) | 1.33 | .14 | .03 | -- |

* Significant differences determined at $p < .05$ level.

Table 33

Frequency of Repeated Threat: Percentage (Number) in Each Category by Group

| Frequency | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|--------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Not clear | 15.0 (3) | 16.7 (5) | -- | -- |
| One time | 30.0 (6) | 33.3 (10) | 50.0 (3) | 50.0 (2) |
| More than one time | 55.0 (11) | 50.0 (15) | 50.0 (3) | 50.0 (2) |

of threats was noted. The same threat repeated more than once toward the same animal was coded as one incident. A qualitatively different threat toward the same, or different, animal was viewed as a distinct incident; that is, "He threatened to hit the cat every time it did anything to annoy him" was coded as one incident, repeated multiple times while, "He said he would hit the cat and threatened to abandon the dog," was coded as two incidents.

In the S-C, NS-C, and NS-NC groups, most participants reported only one distinct threat. One subject each in the S-C and NS-NC group reported two distinct threats. In the S-NC group, there were up to three different threats reported with six participants reporting one and two threats. A Pearson's correlation was run between the first and second reported threats and no relation was found between them (correlation coefficient = $r^2 = .00$, $p = 1.000$). The number of qualitatively different threats may be an inexact barometer of the level of disruption in the home. It is possible that in the S-NC group, the wider variety of threats reflects more disorder in the home.

Abuse of Pet(s)

All of the women who participated in the study were asked to respond yes or no if their partner had ever hurt their pet(s). Those answering yes were then asked to describe what was done to the pet(s). (See Appendix J for complete transcript of pet abuse.) The responses to these open-ended questions were coded on the same five criteria described in the previous section on threats toward pets: (a) type of animal

hurt, (b) what was done to the pet, (c) why pet was hurt, (d) what motivated the abuse, and (e) the severity of the injury to the pet. A maximum of two distinct incidents was coded. Selection was based on the clarity of the descriptions.

Presence of Abuse of Pet

The S-C group had the highest percentage (69%) of partners who hurt pets. Participants in the S-NC group reported that 44% of their partners (44%) hurt pets. In both comparison groups, NS-C and NS-NC, more than 90% of the partners did not hurt pets. The chi-square statistic was 47.12, with $p = .00$. This indicated that the observed percentage of pet abuse differed significantly from what would be expected by chance. The NS-C group had a lower percentage who reported pet abuse. No incidents were reported by the NS-NC group, and both shelter groups were higher on this item than chance would predict (see Table 34).

Table 34

Has Partner Ever Hurt Pet: Percentage (Number) Responding Yes by Group

| S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-----------|-----------|---------|-------|
| 69.2 (27) | 45.2 (28) | 6.7 (2) | -- |

Type of Pet Hurt

As discussed earlier in this section, the most common pet owned was the dog. In the S-C group, cats were abused 11% more than dogs. In the S-NC group, the abuse of dogs exceeded that of cats by about 7%. In the NS-C group, only two reports of pet abuse were made, both involving dogs. The widest variety of pet abuse was found in the S-C group, that did not report owning the largest variety of pets. The widest variety of pet ownership was found in the S-NC group (see Table 35).

What Was Done

Most abuse involved throwing, hitting, or kicking the pet. Pet deaths resulted from choking, drowning, shooting, driving over, breaking neck, throwing from a moving car, or an unspecified method. Unusual methods of hurting the pet(s) included inducing alcohol intoxication, tail removal, taping the animal to a fan and turning it on, and shaving the animal and putting it outside in the winter. One report involved killing a dog and nailing it to the bedroom door, which is particularly cruel. As found with threats, the widest variety of abuse methods was found in the S-NC group (see Table 36).

Why Pet Was Abused

The majority of the responses did not provide a clear indication of the partner's reason for abusing the pet. This may be both a weakness of the interview

Table 35

Type of Pet Hurt: Percentage (Number) in Each Group

| Type of Pet | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|---------|-------|
| Dog | 37.0 (10) | 53.6 (15) | 100 (2) | -- |
| Cat | 48.1 (13) | 46.4 (13) | -- | -- |
| Dog and cat | 3.7 (1) | -- | -- | -- |
| Bird | 7.4 (2) | -- | -- | -- |
| Rabbit | 3.7 (1) | -- | -- | -- |

conducted by the shelter workers and an honest reflection of the women's knowledge of the dynamics of the abuse. No abuse was reported in the NS-NC group. Only two experiences with pet abuse were reported in the NS-C group. In both shelter groups, more than 50% did not indicate a reason for the abuse. The most common reasons in the S-NC population were pet soiling the carpet and barking. In the S-C group, two participants indicated that the pet was hurt because the woman talked back to the man (see Table 37).

Underlying Reason for Abuse

Again, as with threats, it was not clear from most descriptions what motivated the man to abuse the pet. In the shelter population, over 60% gave no clear

Table 36

What Was Done to the Pet: Percentage (Number) of Behaviors by Group

| Abuse | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-------|
| Throw | 25.9 (7) | 17.9 (5) | -- | -- |
| Hit or Kick | 33.3 (9) | 35.7 (10) | 50.0 (1) | -- |
| Choke | -- | 7.1 (2) | -- | -- |
| Drown | 7.4 (2) | -- | -- | -- |
| Shot | 3.7 (1) | -- | -- | -- |
| Killed-general | 11.1 (3) | 3.6 (1) | 50.0 (1) | -- |
| Broke leg(s) | 3.7 (1) | 7.1 (2) | -- | -- |
| Drove over | -- | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- |
| Broke neck | 3.7 (1) | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- |
| Killed & nailed to bedroom door | -- | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- |
| Gave alcohol | 7.4 (2) | -- | -- | -- |
| Removed tail | -- | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- |
| Taped on fan and turned on | -- | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- |
| Neglect | 3.7 (1) | -- | -- | -- |
| Threw rocks at | -- | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- |
| Threw out of moving car | -- | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- |
| Shaved and put out in winter | -- | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- |

Table 37

Reasons for Hurting Pet: Percentage (Number) Reported by Group

| <u>Reasons</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| No reason given | 70.4 (19) | 60.7 (17) | -- | -- |
| Soiled carpet | 3.7 (1) | 10.7 (3) | -- | -- |
| Bit | 3.7 (1) | 3.6 (1) | 50.0 (1) | -- |
| Excited or scratched | 7.4 (2) | 7.1 (2) | 50.0 (1) | -- |
| Woman threatened to leave | -- | 7.1 (2) | -- | -- |
| Barking | 3.7 (1) | 10.7 (3) | -- | -- |
| Discipline | 3.7 (1) | -- | -- | -- |
| Woman talked back to man | 7.4 (2) | -- | -- | -- |

indication of the underlying reason for hurting the pet. The most common reason given was the animal's actions. As with the threats, a clearly coercive motivation was found only among the shelter participants (see Table 38).

Severity and Frequency of Abuse

There were four levels of abuse severity: (a) minor, teasing, nondestructive,

Table 38

Motivating Factors for Hurting Pet: Percentage (Number) by Group

| <u>Motivating Factors</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> |
|---|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Not clear | 70.4 (19) | 64.3 (18) | -- | -- |
| Animal's action | 18.5 (5) | 21.4 (6) | 100.0 (2) | -- |
| Coercion | 11.1 (3) | 10.7 (3) | -- | -- |
| Both animal's action and coercion | -- | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- |

nonpainful; (b) frighten, annoy, restrain, minimal discomfort; (c) inflict pain or discomfort, broke leg; and (d) kill, torture, prolonged suffering, permanent loss of function. Most threats suggested that the partner intended to kill the pet. Reports of actual abuse differ somewhat from this. Most abuse of the pets was severe, involving pain and suffering for the pet, but not killing. The second most common category involved annoying or frightening the pet. The two reports of pet abuse in the NS-C group involved frightening or killing a pet. Note that the severity of abuse is on a 1-to-4 scale (1 = minor, 2 = frighten, 3 = pain, and 4 = kill; see Table 39).

A one-way analysis of variance was performed to determine if the differences between the groups were significant with regard to severity of pet abuse. Results indicated that there were no significant differences between the groups on the severity

Table 39

Severity of Abuse: Percentage (Number) in Each Category by Group

| Severity | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|----------|-----------|-----------|----------|-------|
| Minor | 3.7 (1) | -- | -- | -- |
| Frighten | 33.3 (9) | 17.9 (5) | 50.0 (1) | -- |
| Pain | 37.0 (10) | 50.0 (14) | -- | -- |
| Kill | 25.9 (7) | 32.1 (9) | 50.0 (1) | -- |

of abuse of pets. There were few reports by participants in the comparison groups (NS-C and NS-NC). To explore the possibility that there were significant differences between the two shelter groups (S-C and S-NC) with regard to severity of pet abuse, a t test was run. The mean severity level was slightly higher for the S-NC group but, not significantly so ($p = .178$). (See Appendix K for analysis of variance and t -test tables.)

Most of the abuse was repeated multiple times in the shelter population. In both shelter groups, there was a higher percentage of multiple abuse incidents than multiple threats. For the two reports of abuse in the NS-C group, the frequency was either not clear or abuse only occurred once (see Table 40).

Table 40Frequency of Abuse: Percentage (Number) in Each Category by Group

| <u>Frequency</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> |
|------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Not clear | 20.0 (4) | 5.3 (1) | 50.0 (1) | -- |
| Once | 10.0 (2) | 42.1 (8) | 50.0 (1) | -- |
| More than once | 70.0 (14) | 52.6 (10) | -- | -- |

Number of Distinct Reports of Abuse

Only two descriptions of abuse were coded for each report, but the number of distinct abusive incidents was also noted. The same behavior repeated multiple times toward one pet was coded as one incident, multiple frequency. Different behaviors toward the same animal, or different animals, were coded as distinctly different abusive events. In the S-C group, up to nine distinct events were reported but only one case for three or more incidents. The S-C group had a few high outliers, while in the S-NC group there was a cluster of reports for each of one, two, three, and five distinct events. As with the threats, the S-NC group was somewhat more violent.

Reporting Incidents of Pet Abuse

The majority of participants reported that no calls were made to report the

abuse or killing of a pet. The highest reporting rate, 15.2%, was found in the S-NC group. Neither of the participants in the NS-C group reported abuse events. In the S-C group, only two participants (7.1%) reported to someone outside of the family following the abuse or killing of their pet.

In the S-C group, both reports were made by the woman. In the S-NC group, most of the reports (60%, $n = 3$) were made by women to outside authorities. Reports were also made by neighbors (20%, $n = 1$), and one woman's mother (10%, $n = 1$).

In the S-C group, one of the calls was made to the police and one to the Humane Society. In the S-NC group, participants reported calls to the police, two stated that the Humane Society was called, and one participant called both the police and the Humane Society.

The most common response by either agency was to take a report over the phone. In one case, in the S-C group, there was an investigation by the Humane Society but no charges were brought. Two of the participants in the S-NC group reported that following the involvement of both the police and the Humane Society, the man was sentenced to community service and ordered to pay a fine. Note that this happened in only the most severe cases; that is, nailing the dog on the door and cutting off the pet's tail.

Emotional Response Following Abuse of Pet

Participants were offered four categories of emotional response to threats or

abuse of pet: (1) extremely upset but felt numb; (2) terrible, very upset; (3) mildly upset; and (4) didn't bother me at all. The most common response, under all groups, was "terrible, very upset" in response to both threats and abuse. The most intense category, extremely upset, was chosen only by participants in the S-NC group, for both threats and abuse. Only a very small percentage of the women reported that they had no emotional response to threats or abuse of pet (see Tables 41 and 42).

Feelings Toward the Pet That Was Hurt

The affective response to violence toward a pet is closely aligned with how close one feels toward that pet. This question was asked only for pets that were hurt,

Table 41

Report of Woman's Feelings Following Threat Toward Pet:

Percentage (Number) Responding in Each Category by Group

| Response | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|----------------------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Extremely upset | -- | 18.8 (6) | -- | -- |
| Terrible, very upset | 90.0 (18) | 68.8 (22) | 33.3 (2) | 75.0 (3) |
| Mildly upset | 10.0 (2) | 9.4 (3) | 33.3 (2) | 25.0 (1) |
| Didn't bother | -- | 3.1 (1) | 33.3 (2) | -- |

Table 42

Report of Woman's Feelings Following Abuse of Pet:Percentage (Number) Responding in Each Category by Group

| <u>Response</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Extremely upset | -- | 7.1 (3) | -- | -- |
| Terrible, very upset | 85.7 (26) | 85.7 (30) | 50.0 (1) | -- |
| Mildly upset | 10.7 (3) | 7.1 (3) | 50.0 (1) | -- |
| Didn't bother | 3.6 (1) | -- | -- | -- |

not threatened. Participants were given the following choices: (1) not close, (2) liked but not close, or (3) very close. In the shelter groups, a high percentage of the women reported that they were very close to the pet that was hurt. In the NS-C group, one woman reported that she was not close to the pet, and the other woman stated that she liked the pet but did not feel close to it. These two women reported that they felt terrible or mildly upset when their pet was hurt. The largest number of women who reported that they were not close to the pet was found in the S-C group (see Table 43).

Feelings of Relief That Pet Was Threatened
or Hurt and Not Self

There are anecdotal, personal reports that women living in a violent, chaotic home are sometimes relieved when the violence is directed toward another family member and they are not the focus of aggression. These thoughts are often accompanied by feelings of guilt. To determine if this also happened when the pet was threatened or hurt, participants were asked if they were relieved that their pet was threatened or abused, and not them. Understanding the associated guilt and the buffering effect of time, these results should be viewed with caution. The overwhelming majority (84 to 100%) reported that they were not relieved when the

Table 43

How Close Were You to the Pet That Was Hurt:

Percentage (Number) Responding in Each Category by Group

| <u>Response</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> |
|----------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| Not close | 10.0 (3) | 2.8 (1) | 50.0 (1) |
| Liked, but not close | 6.7 (2) | 8.3 (3) | 50.0 (1) |
| Very close | 83.3 (25) | 88.9 (32) | -- |

pet was threatened or hurt and not themselves. In the S-NC group, five women did report that they were relieved when it was the pet that was threatened. In the S-C group, three women reported feelings of relief that aggression was directed toward the pet and not them (see Table 44).

Others Who Hurt Pet

Participant Hurting Pet

When study participants were asked if they had ever hurt a pet, they gave the above open-ended question retrospective answers from recent adult experiences and their own childhood. The overwhelming majority, 89 to 96%, of the women in all groups indicated that they had never hurt a pet. The highest frequency of "yes"

Table 44

Indication of Relief That Pet Was Threatened or Hurt and
Not Woman: Percentage (Number) Responding No by Group

| To Pet | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Threat | 95.0 (19) | 84.4 (27) | 100.0 (6) | 100.0 (4) |
| Hurt | 89.5 (25) | 96.6 (28) | 100.0 (2) | no cases |

responses was found in the shelter populations. Eleven women in the shelter populations (S-C = 4, S-NC = 7) and two women in the comparison groups (NS-C and NS-NC) reported some type of incident where they hurt a pet. The most common pets hurt were dogs and cats. The two most common type of events were mild punishment and accidentally running the pet over with a car. Both of these behaviors happened when the woman was an adult. "Swinging by tail," "kicking," and nonspecified "killed" were actions the women took as a young child (see Table 45).

Table 45

How Was the Pet Hurt by the Woman: Percentage (Number)

Responding Yes in Each Category

| <u>How Woman Hurt Pet</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> | <u>NS-C</u> | <u>NS-NC</u> |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|
| Mild punishment | 50.0 (2) | 28.6 (2) | -- | -- |
| Swung by tail | -- | 14.3 (1) | 100.0 (1) | -- |
| Kick | -- | 14.3 (1) | -- | -- |
| Kill | -- | 14.3 (1) | -- | 100.0 (1) |
| Hit with car (accident) | 50.0 (2) | 28.6 (2) | -- | -- |

Why Woman Hurt the Pet

Fifty-four percent of the woman's actions, across all groups, centered on the animal's behaviors, that is, soiled carpet, bit, chewed. The next most common reasons for harming the pet were accidental behaviors by the women or behaviors performed by the woman when she was a child.

Severity of Woman's Injury to Pet

Severity of the injury was equally divided between annoying or frightening the pet and killing the pet. As observed with the partner's threats and abuse, the S-NC group exhibited the widest variety of responses to severity of pet injury. All women who reported that they hurt a pet clearly indicated that this was a one-time incident (see Table 46).

Observation of Violence Toward Pet by Child in the Study

When the participants were asked if the child they chose to include in the study had ever observed pet abuse in the home, a distinct difference emerged between the shelter sample (S-C) and the comparison group (NS-C). In the shelter group (S-C), 33% said "no," 62% said "yes," and two women were not sure if their child had observed pet abuse. In the comparison group, 97% of the women reported that their child had not observed pet abuse in the home. Only one participant in the comparison group stated that her child had observed violence toward the pet in the home.

Table 46

Severity of Injury to Pet by Woman: Percentage (Number) in Each Group

| Severity | S-C | NS-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Minor | -- | 14.3 (1) | -- | -- |
| Frighten | 50.0 (2) | 28.6 (2) | 100.0 (1) | -- |
| Pain | -- | 28.6 (2) | -- | -- |
| Kill | 50.0 (2) | 28.6 (2) | -- | 100.0 (1) |

It is not uncommon in a home with domestic violence for the mother to underestimate or minimize a child's contact with aggression. To see if the mother's perception matched the child's experience, a comparison was made between their responses. Almost half (48.6%) of the mothers and children agreed that the child had observed pet abuse in the home. Mothers and children also agreed (12.5%) that the child had not observed any violence toward their pet. Almost one quarter (20.5%) of the mothers reported that their child in the study had not observed pet abuse, while their child reported that they had observed this. Conversely, 17.9% of the mothers reported that their child had observed pet abuse when the child stated that they had not. Note that data collection for this information was uneven with several participants failing to report information here.

Report of Child in Study Hurting a Pet

Children imitate adult behaviors. One of the concerns for children growing up in violent homes is that they will learn to imitate aggressive behaviors toward others. It is possible that children who observe their father or stepfather abuse a pet will start to abuse pets. Mothers in this study were asked if the child they chose to include in the study, or any other children in the home, had hurt pets. Participants reported that only 10% of the children in the S-C group had hurt a pet. In the NS-C group, 20% of the children were known to have hurt a pet. A comparison between the mother's report and the child's response indicated that most (76.9%) of the mothers and children in the study reported no injury by a child to a pet. In a small percentage of the cases, the mother's report did not match the child's. Some of the mothers (7.6%) said, "No, my child has not hurt a pet," while their child admitted to hurting a pet. Even fewer (5.1%) of the mothers stated that their child had injured a pet while their child denied this.

No pattern emerged for type of pet hurt. The women reported one incident for each of the following pets: dog, cat, bird, rabbit, snake, and fish.

The most common violent behavior was kicking a pet. This was only seen in the NS-C group. Other behaviors included throwing, pulling tail, restraining, breaking leg, and adding excess bleach to the fish tank. Each of these behaviors was reported only once.

Most of the mothers specified no reason for their child hurting a pet. Several

of them suggested that the injury to the pet was accidental. In all cases, there was no clear motivating factor (animal's action or coercion) indicated from the description.

The severity of injury to the pet was mostly (60%, $n = 3$) mild in the comparison group (NS-C) with one incident of frightening and one incident of killing. In the shelter group (S-C), there was one incident each of frightening, inflicting pain, and killing.

Most of the incidents (S-C: 75%, $n = 3$; NS-C: 50%, $n = 2$) happened within the last year. In the S-C group, one incident happened 6 years ago. In the NS-C group, two incidents happened 5 years ago and one 14 years ago.

In the shelter group (S-C), most (75%, $n = 3$) of the children who hurt pets were boys. In the comparison group (NS-C), all of the children ($n = 4$) who injured an animal were boys.

In the comparison group (NS-C), most of the children ($n = 3$) were under 5 years old when they hurt the pet, although one report was submitted of a 14-year-old adolescent who injured a pet. In the S-C group, the ages of the children ranged from 1 to 8.

In the shelter group (S-C), 50% ($n = 2$) of the children were reprimanded. For the other two children, the mothers both noted that their children were extremely upset by the incident, and that they did not feel that an additional reprimand would be appropriate. In the comparison group, the mothers indicated that all of the children were reprimanded. The mothers reported that all children, in both groups (S-C and NS-C), only engaged in this behavior once.

Report of Other Children Observing Pet Abuse

There were large differences in the percentage of children who observed pet abuse between the two S-C and S-NC groups. In the S-C group, 43.5% of the mothers reported that their other children had observed pet abuse. In the S-NC group, 20.9% of the mothers reported that their other children had observed pet abuse. No reports were tendered by the NS-C group on other children observing pet abuse.

Report of Other Children Hurting a Pet

Participants were also asked to report if any of their other children had been involved with hurting a pet. By the mother's report, fewer of the other children were involved with hurting pets than the child in the study. The percentage of other children who did hurt a pet was close to equal for the S-C (23.0%) and the S-NC (14.5%) groups. The most common type of pet hurt was the dog (S-C, 44%; S-NC, 25%). The second most common type of pet hurt was the cat (S-C, 33.3%; S-NC, 37.5%). Other pets hurt, at a low rate, were bird, rabbit, and snake.

The behavior seen most frequently was kicking the pet (S-C, 66.7%; S-NC, 37.5%). Throwing (S-C, 22.2%; S-NC, 12.5%) and pulling tail (S-NC, 37.5%) were also prevalent. Restraining (S-C) and shutting door on pet (S-NC) were reported only once.

Most of the descriptions (S-C, 88.9%; S-NC, 50.0%) did not provide a clear

indication of why the other child hurt a pet. Other reasons, reported only once, included soiled carpet, biting, accident, parents fighting, or child was angry. In the shelter group (S-C), about half of the child's actions were related to the animal's actions and slightly less than half were not specified. In the S-NC group, most (87.5%) of the descriptions did not provide a clear indication of what motivated the child to hurt a pet.

Severity of injury to the pet by other children was closely divided between minor (37.5%), frighten (25.0%), and inflict pain (37.5%) for the S-NC group. A higher percentage of children in the S-C group caused pain (66.7%) or frightened the pet (33.3%). No children in the S-C group were reported with a minor severity incident. Neither the S-C nor the S-NC group children killed a pet.

As with the child in the study, the majority of the incidents reported happened within the last year. Other incidents happened within the last 5 years for both the S-C and S-NC groups. One child in the S-C group was 10 years old at the time of the incident. Unlike reports for the children in the study, there was a more even distribution of gender for other children who hurt a pet.

The shelter group (S-C) contained slightly more boys (55.6%) than girls (44.4%); for the S-NC group, more girls (62.5%) than boys (37.5%). The age of the child at the time of the incident ranged from 3 to 20 for the S-C group. In the S-NC group, the age range was 1 to 9 years old.

In contrast to the reports on the study children, the other children were reprimanded at a high rate (S-C, 77.8%; S-NC, 85.7%). A low percentage (S-C,

11.1%; S-NC, 14.3%) had no parental response to their behavior. One woman in the shelter group reported that she called the authorities following her child's abuse of a pet.

Another difference from reports on children in the study was the finding that some of the other children (S-C, 20%; S-NC, 66.7%) repeated the incident multiple times. One-time behaviors were most common in the S-C group (80.0%), and less common in the S-NC group (22.2%).

The reports on children's observations with regard to pets were further subdivided into conditions where there were just threats, just abuse, neither threats nor abuse, and both threats and abuse of pets in the home. In homes where the partner just threatened to hurt the pet(s), the mother reported that about 50% of the other children in the S-C group and 25% of the children in the S-NC group had observed pet abuse in the home. When the partner both threatened and hurt a pet, a higher percentage (66.7%) in the S-C group and 26.3% in the S-NC group of the other children were reported to have observed pet abuse in the home.

Concern for Pet Keeping Women From Coming in to the Shelter Sooner

Anecdotal reports suggest that some women are reluctant to seek shelter because they fear that their pets will be hurt or killed if left alone. Participants in this study were asked if concern for their pet's safety kept them from coming in to a shelter sooner. Most of the women in the shelters indicated that concern for pets was

not an issue for them (S-C, 76.9%; S-NC, 77.4%). These responses in isolation are misleading. Many of the women reported that they were not concerned because they had found a safe place for their pet before coming in to the shelter. In the S-C group, 46.2% made prior arrangements for the pet's safety. In the S-NC group, a comparable percentage (47.4%) made sure their pet was safe before coming in to a shelter. Many of the women felt that their pet was in imminent danger and did not want to leave their pet to be hurt or killed (S-C, 30.8%; S-NC, 42.1%). One woman in each group reported that she did not leave until her pet had died. A few women (S-C, 15.4%, $n = 2$; S-NC, 5.3%, $n = 1$) stated that they did not want to leave their pets because they would miss them (see Table 47).

Analysis of the reasons for a woman's concern for her pet noted the presence or absence of threats of abuse or actual abuse of a pet in the home. Given threats of abuse or actual abuse of a pet in the home, then the women reported they were more concerned about leaving their pet(s). Again, some of the women who expressed no concern did so because they had already provided a safe place for their pet. However, there does seem to be a tendency for more women to be concerned if their partner threatened or hurt pets. The chi-square statistic for this datum was small and not significant, both where the partner threatened the pet (S-C, 1.82; S-NC, 0.03) and where he abused the pet (S-C, 0.049; S-NC, 1.21). Note that chi-square values less than 10 with two degrees of freedom are not significant. If the partner threatened or hurt the pet, the woman was more likely than would be expected, by a small margin,

Table 47

Did Concern About Your Pet Keep You From Coming to
Shelter Sooner? Percentage by Shelter Groups, (Number)

| <u>Response</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> |
|-----------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Not concerned | 76.9 (30) | 77.4 (48) |
| Made prior arrangements | 46.2 (6) | 47.4 (9) |
| Worried pet might be killed | 30.8 (4) | 42.1 (8) |
| Would miss pet | 15.4 (2) | 5.3 (1) |

Note. Columns do not sum to 100% as there is overlap between categories.

to express concern for leaving the pet. This pattern was evident for both the S-C and S-NC groups (see Table 48).

Change in Willingness to Use Violence

Participants in the shelters, but not comparison samples, were asked if their partner had changed in his use of violence both toward them and toward their pets during their relationship. The four options given for both self and pet were as follows: (a) no--never violent; (b) no--always violent; (c) yes--less violent; and (d) yes--more violent. Both the S-C and the S-NC groups had a higher percentage of

Table 48

Woman's Concern for Pet Delayed Woman From Coming to Shelter: Percentage
(Number) Responding Yes Under Conditions of Threat or Hurt, by Group

| Group | Threat | | | Hurt | | |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| | No | Yes | χ^2 | No | Yes | χ^2 |
| S-C | 11.1 (2) ^a | 35.0 (7) ^b | 1.82 | 16.7 (2) ^a | 25.9 (7) ^b | .05 |
| S-NC | 20.7 (6) ^a | 25.8 (8) ^b | .03 | 14.7 (5) ^a | 29.6 (8) ^b | 1.21 |

^a = less than expected; ^b = more than expected

women who reported that the partner had always been violent toward them, than those who reported that he had never been violent toward them. In contrast, the women reported a higher percentage of their partners had never been violent toward their pets, than had always been violent toward pets. In both groups (S-C and S-NC), a substantial proportion of the partners were reported to have become more violent, both toward the women and toward pets. A chi-square analysis for both changes in violence toward the woman and changes in violence toward the pet was not significant (woman, 1.99; pet, 0.84). A closer examination of the residual values confirmed the impression that these results vary little from the expected values. As suspected, the two shelter groups showed little difference with regard to changing patterns of

violence toward women and pets in the home. Percentages reported for changes toward the woman and pets were very similar for the two groups (see Table 49).

If the woman reported that her partner did not threaten the pet, then it was more likely that he had become less violent toward her during their relationship together. This was true in both the S-C and S-NC groups. If the woman reported that her partner did threaten the pet, it was more likely that her partner had become more violent toward her during their relationship. The same schema was observed for hurting behaviors: Men who did not hurt the pet tended to become less violent toward women; men who did hurt the pet were more likely to become more violent. Again, this was true for both the S-C and S-NC groups. If the woman reported that her partner did threaten the pet, it was most likely that he had always been violent and had become more violent toward the pet during his relationship with the woman. This was also true for both the S-C and S-NC groups. The same picture emerged if the partner hurt the pet. Partners who were always violent toward the pet increased their violent behaviors toward the pet during their relationship with the woman.

If the partner neither threatened nor hurt the pet, he was more likely to have become less violent in the S-C group, and he was more likely to have become more violent in the S-NC group during their relationship. When the woman reported that her partner neither threatened nor hurt the pet, the results indicated that 100% of the partners had never been violent toward the pet. Again, this was true for both groups (S-C and S-NC). If the partner both threatened and hurt the pet, it was more likely that he had always been violent toward the pet, and this violence had escalated during

Table 49

Change in Partner's Use of Violence Toward Woman and Pet:Percentage Responding Yes by Shelter Groups, (Number)

| <u>Partner's Violence</u> | <u>S-C</u> | <u>S-NC</u> |
|---------------------------|------------|-------------|
| Toward you | | |
| No, never | 5.1 (2) | 3.2 (2) |
| No, always | 15.4 (6) | 16.1(10) |
| Yes, less | 20.5 (8) | 11.3 (7) |
| Yes, more | 59.0(23) | 69.4(43) |
| Toward pet | | |
| No, Never | 33.3(13) | 41.9(26) |
| No, always | 28.2(11) | 22.6(14) |
| Yes, less | 7.7 (3) | 6.5 (4) |
| Yes, more | 30.8(12) | 29.0(18) |

his relationship with the woman (see Tables 50 and 51).

Pet-Related Issues

The last question on the BPSS and the FPS questionnaire asked if the participant wanted to divulge any pet-related observations. See Appendix L for

transcript of pet-related items. Between 30 and 48% of the women shared additional information about pets in their lives. Roughly 65% of the stories shared were about dogs or cats. Other pets mentioned were birds, rabbits, reptiles, and snakes. A broad range of abusive actions were provided, including: throwing, kicking, hitting, starving, and killing of pets, leaving a pet out in the cold, name calling, rock throwing, trying to hit with a car, initiating a dog fight, forcing wife to have sex with a dog, poisoning, threatening to drop from the fourth story of a building, and hunting. These events were either more bizarre than those reported on the questionnaire or did not quite fit the format of the questionnaire, for example, hunting. Many of the events involved the partner's behavior toward stray animals or neighbors' pets. There was a qualitative difference between the reports from the shelter samples and descriptions from the comparison groups. Participants in the comparison groups often talked about the positive qualities of pets, and frequently shared a story about their special animal friend often seen as a member of the family. In the shelter populations, the stories often portrayed the partner's generalized cruelty toward animals, often beginning in childhood and shared by other family members. Some of the participants offered comments to indicate that they felt particularly kindly toward animals, especially those in the comparison groups (see Table 52).

For the pet related incidents, most participants (S-C, 85.7%; S-NC, 75.0%) indicated no reason for the animal(s) being hurt. They were also not clear what the motivating factors were (S-C, 75%; S-NC, 85%). There were two reports in each of these groups indicating that coercion was the motivating factor. Most incidents in the

Table 50

Change in Partner's Use of Violence Under Conditions of ThreatOnly, Abuse Only, Neither, or Both; Percentage in EachCategory in S-C Group, (Number)

| <u>Partner's Violence</u> | <u>Threat</u> | <u>Abuse</u> | <u>Neither</u> | <u>Both</u> |
|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|
| Change toward woman | | | | |
| Never violent | -- | -- | 14.3(1) | -- |
| Always violent | 40.0(2) | 9.1(1) | 14.3(1) | 13.3(2) |
| Less violent | -- | 27.3(3) | 42.9(3) | 13.3(2) |
| More violent | 60.0(3) | 63.6(7) | 28.6(2) | 73.3(11) |
| Change toward pet | | | | |
| Never violent | -- | 45.5(5) | 100.0(7) | -- |
| Always violent | 60.0(3) | 18.2(2) | -- | 40.0(6) |
| Less violent | -- | 9.1(1) | -- | 13.3(2) |
| More violent | 40.0(2) | 27.3(3) | -- | 46.7(7) |

S-C group were no doubt painful for the animal. In the S-NC group, most incidents shared were very severe and involved the killing of an animal.

Table 51

Change in Partner's Use of Violence Under Conditions of Threat Only, Abuse Only, Neither, or Both; Percentage in Each Category in S-NC Group (Number)

| Partner's Violence | Threat | Abuse | Neither | Both |
|--------------------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Toward woman | | | | |
| Never violent | -- | 12.5 (1) | 5.0 (1) | -- |
| Always violent | 16.7 (2) | 12.5 (1) | 10.0 (2) | 15.8 (3) |
| Less violent | -- | 12.5 (1) | 20.0 (4) | 5.3 (1) |
| More violent | 83.3(10) | 62.5 (5) | 65.0(13) | 78.9(15) |
| Toward pet | | | | |
| Never violent | 16.7 (2) | 12.5 (1) | 100.0(20) | 5.3 (1) |
| Always violent | 25.0 (3) | 25.0 (2) | -- | 42.1 (8) |
| Less violent | 25.0 (3) | -- | -- | 5.3 (1) |
| More violent | 33.3 (4) | 62.5 (5) | -- | 47.4 (9) |

Child Behavior Checklist

The CBCL (Achenbach, 1991) was completed by mothers in the S-C and NS-C groups. Three key T scores were obtained: internalizing T, externalizing T, and

Table 52

Indication That Woman Felt Kindly Toward Animals:Percentage (Number) Responding by Group

| S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 12.8 (5) | 14.5 (9) | 30.0 (9) | 30.0 (9) |

total T. Internalizing T is associated with social withdrawal, somatic complaints, anxiety, and depression. Externalizing T is associated with delinquent and aggressive behaviors. For these two syndromes, a T score above 70 is considered clinically significant. A borderline clinical score is between 67 and 70. The total T score is a rough indication of overall problems. A total T score above 63 is associated with clinical problems. A total T score between 60 and 63 is considered the borderline range.

In general, the T scores were higher for all areas (internal, external, and total) in the S-C group. When t tests were performed, significant differences were found between the S-C and NS-C groups for all three of the T scores. Effect sizes, appropriate when there are two groups, were calculated by dividing the difference between the two means by the pooled standard deviation. For CBCL internalizing, externalizing, and total scales, effect size calculations indicated that children in

Table 53

Results of t Test: CBCL Mean T Scores for External, Internal, and Total;
by Group, with Significant p Value and Effect Size, (Number)

| <u>Groups, p Value, ES</u> | <u>Internal</u> | <u>External</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| S-C | 61.5(37) | 59.5(37) | 62.2(37) |
| NS-C | 52.4(30) | 51.4(30) | 52.3(30) |
| <u>p</u> | .003 | .003 | .000 |
| <u>ES</u> | .771 | .770 | .919 |

shelters scored close to a full standard deviation above children not in shelters (see Table 53).

A higher percentage of the children in the shelter group (S-C) scored in the clinical range and fewer were in the normal range than the comparison group (see Table 54).

An adaptive functioning score was computed by summing the activity, social, and school scores. A t test produced a significant difference ($p = .012$) between the S-C and NS-C groups. Adaptive function, where higher scores are associated with better adaptation, was higher in the NS-C group. The effect size, calculated by dividing the differences between means by the pooled standard deviation, was -0.737 .

Table 54

Percent in Normal, Borderline, and Clinical Range for CBCL, by Group

| <u>CBCL by Group</u> | <u>Normal</u> | <u>Borderline</u> | <u>Clinical</u> |
|----------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| S-C | | | |
| Internal | 61.5(24) | 5.1 (2) | 28.2(11) |
| External | 61.5(24) | 12.8 (5) | 20.5 (8) |
| Total | 46.2(18) | 10.3 (4) | 38.5(15) |
| NS-C | | | |
| Internal | 93.3(28) | 3.3 (1) | 3.3 (1) |
| External | 93.3(28) | 3.3 (1) | 3.3 (1) |
| Total | 80.0(24) | 6.7 (2) | 13.3 (4) |

Children in the shelter groups scored .737 standard deviations below children in the nonshelter group on adaptive functioning.

Cruelty to Animals Item

One specific item on the CBCL asks if the child is cruel to animals. For both the S-C and NS-C groups, the response rate was very low on this item ($\underline{n} = 2$). It is of interest, however, that while no children in the NS-C group were identified as being cruel to animals on this item, the mother of one child in the S-C group marked

this item. Her child came from a family where, by the woman's report, the partner hurt but did not threaten pets.

The manual for the CBCL (Achenbach, 1991) suggests that when a child's behavior is not consistent--kind to some animals but not to others, or mostly kind to one kind of animal but occasionally cruel to it--mothers might rate this item in the middle of the scale. Without additional information, this item alone is not a clear indication of cruelty to animals.

Observations by Child in the Study

Demographic Information

There were 39 children in the S-C group who responded to the Children's Observations and Experiences with Their Pets questionnaire. Responses were obtained by interviews with a member of the shelter staff. The average age of the children was 9.9 years, with a range of from 5 to 18 years. There were 56.4% male and 43.6% female respondents. The children's grade in school ranged from kindergarten to 12th grade. The minimum number of brother and sisters was zero; the maximum, seven.

Pet Ownership

When asked if they currently had a pet, 47.4% of the children responded "no," 52.6% said "yes." Pets reported included dogs, cats, birds, rabbits, gerbils,

and snakes. The range on number of pets owned was from one to nine, with most children owning only one pet. Within the past 12 months, a higher percentage indicated that they had owned a pet (92.3%). Pets reported included dogs, cats, birds, rabbits, gerbils, guinea pigs, and snakes. Again, the range for number of pets was from one to nine, with most children owning only one pet. Owning multiple pets in the past 12 months was most common among cat owners.

Was Pet Hurt

When children were asked if they had ever seen their pet hurt, 66.7% stated that they had seen this. (See findings under Observations of Violence Toward Pet by Child in the Study in the previous section of this chapter for comparison of the child and mother's perceptions.) The most common type of pet hurt was the dog (51.9%). Most reports described the pet being thrown or being struck by a motor vehicle (see Table 55). One particularly disturbing report described the visit of a police officer to the house of a child whose pet dog ran out to see the visitor, neither barking nor growling by the child's report, yet, subsequently shot by the officer in the child's presence.

From most of the children's descriptions, it was not possible to determine why the pet was hurt (59.3%), or what motivated the injury (70.4%). The most common reasons for a pet being hurt included accidental injury to the pet by an adult, or actions by the animal such as biting, chewing, or overturning the trash. Most of the incidents (25.9%) were described as motivated by the animal's actions.

Table 55

What Was Done to the Child's Pet: Percentage (Number) in Each Category

| <u>Behavior</u> | <u>Percentage (Number)</u> | <u>Behavior</u> | <u>Percentage (Number)</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|
| Thrown | 18.5 (5) | Poisoned | 7.4 (2) |
| Kicked | 7.4 (2) | Object thrown | 3.7 (1) |
| Hit | 7.4 (2) | Cat ate birds | 7.4 (2) |
| Hit by car | 25.9 (7) | Left outside in cold | 3.7 (1) |
| Strangled | 7.4 (2) | Shot | 7.4 (2) |
| Put to sleep | 3.7 (1) | | |

Fifty percent of the injuries to pets reported were severe and resulted in the death of the pet. Severity levels that involved frightening or causing pain to the animal were less common, 11.5% and 38.5%, respectively.

The two most frequent perpetrators of injury to pets were the father and an individual unknown to the child. Injury by stepfathers and the mother's boyfriends was also common. Other people mentioned by the child included brothers, uncles, neighbors, the dog catcher, and a police officer.

The children were asked how they felt after their pet was hurt. They were given the option of responding in four different ways: (a) very upset, (b) sort of upset, (c) not upset at all, and (d) not sure. Simple drawings were provided to

illustrate each affective state for younger children who may have had difficulty verbalizing the difference between feelings. Most of the children (59%) reported that they were very upset. A third of them stated that they were sort of upset. Only two children reported that they were not upset at all or not sure. Most of the children (89.3%) stated that they were not relieved when the pet was hurt and not them. A few children (10.7%, $n = 3$) did acknowledge they were relieved that the pet was hurt and not them.

Threats Toward Pet

Most of the children (60%) reported no threats toward their pet(s). If the pet was threatened, dogs were the most common (64.3%) pet threatened. Roughly a quarter of the threats (28.6%) were directed toward cats. Paralleling the reports of threats by women, most threats were quite serious in nature, suggesting that the pet would be killed. The children's descriptions of threats were more limited than the women's and did not involve as much variety. No reason was apparent from most (64.3%) of the descriptions. Reasons offered by the children included such pet actions as soiling the carpet, biting, killing the bird, barking, and getting out of the yard. Again, from the description, the motivating factor was not clear (71.4%). However, when it was clear, the animal's actions were the most common factor.

As with the injuries, the severity of threats was high. Killing was the suggested outcome for most (71.4%) of the threats. Annoying or frightening was the

level of severity for 21.4%. Only 7.4% of the threats portended serious abuse; there were no reports of threats of minor abuse.

Have You Taken Care of a Pet?

To make the interview experience less traumatic, several questions were included to give the child an opportunity to talk about positive interactions with pets. When children were asked if they had ever taken care of a pet, 92.1% reported that they had provided care for a pet. At least half of the children (51.4%) also noted that they had, at some point, protected a pet. The most common things that were done included moving the animal or blocking it from injury. Most acts of protection (82.4%) were performed only once. A small percentage (17.6%) were repeated multiple times (see Table 56).

Favorite Pet

All of the children reported that they had a favorite pet; most often the dog (55.3%), with cats the next most popular pet (23.7%). Other pets mentioned included birds, rabbits, guinea pig, and snake. Most (67.6%) of the children stated that they would like pets treated better in their home. Slightly less than a third of the children felt that they would be satisfied if the pets continued to be treated about the same as they are now.

Table 56

What Did You Do to Protect Your Pet: Percentage (Number) in Each Category

| <u>Behavior</u> | <u>Percentage (Number)</u> |
|------------------|----------------------------|
| Said something | 5.9 (1) |
| Blocked | 29.4 (5) |
| Moved the animal | 47.1 (8) |
| Kept in my room | 5.9 (1) |
| Saved | 5.9 (1) |
| Took to vet | 5.9 (1) |

Child Hurting Pet or Other Animal?

A large majority of the children said that they had never hurt a pet (86.8%) or another animal (89.5%). The pet most commonly hurt was the cat (40%). Other pets hurt (one time each) were a dog, bird, rabbit, and gerbil. There were only two reports of injury to animals other than pets. One animal was a mouse, which was caught in a trap; the other, an unspecified animal, was shot. Injuries to pets included throwing (20%, $\underline{n} = 1$), hitting (40%, $\underline{n} = 2$) and stepping on (40%, $\underline{n} = 2$). Children reported that the reasons the pet was hurt were biting (20%, $\underline{n} = 1$), discipline for pet (40%, $\underline{n} = 2$), and accident (40%, $\underline{n} = 2$). No clear reasons were

evident for reports of other animals being hurt, nor was it clear what motivated the behavior. Most pets were hurt as a result of their actions. Injury to pets included both the less severe level of annoying and frightening (60%, $n = 3$) and the highest level, killing (40%, $n = 2$).

Conflict Tactics Scale

The CTS is a self-report form comprised of 19 separate items that describe a tactic for resolving interpersonal conflict. The items escalate from "discussing an issue calmly" to "threatening with a gun." The 19 items were subdivided (Straus, 1979) into verbal, verbal aggression, minor physical aggression, and severe physical aggression. The last six items, qualitatively more severe than the previous items, were weighted. See Appendix D for a description of the subgroups and weighing of items.

All women participating in the study were asked to select the frequency of the event in the past year; once, twice, 3 to 5 times, 6 to 10 times, 11 to 20 times, more than 20 times. They were also asked if the tactic had ever been used. Women were asked to rate both themselves and their partner. Reports about one person by another person may potentially result in the loss of a degree of freedom in the analyses. However, the same reports were completed the same way in all four groups. Therefore, these results were not analyzed to account for one less degree of freedom.

The mean score for use of verbal techniques was approximately the same in all four groups for the woman's self-report. All of the women in the comparison groups

and most of the women in the shelter groups (S-C, 97%; S-NC, 98.3%) reported using verbal techniques. Partner's use of verbal techniques, as per the woman's report, was almost twice as frequent in the two comparison groups. The percentage of men who used verbal techniques was high across all groups. Use was slightly higher in the comparison groups (S-C, 79.5%; S-NC, 90.3%; NS-C, 100%; NS-NC, 96.7%).

The mean score for verbal aggression was higher in the shelter groups than in the comparison groups for the women's self-report. All of the women in the S-NC, NS-C, and NS-NC groups reported some use of verbal aggression. A high percentage (97%) of the women in the S-C group reported use of verbal aggression. Verbal aggression was used more frequently by men in the shelter groups (S-C and S-NC), than by men in the comparison groups (NS-C and NS-NC). A high percentage of men in both groups used verbal aggression.

Women in the comparison group used less minor physical aggression than women in the shelter group. Both shelter groups (S-C and S-NC) had a higher percentage of women who reported using minor physical aggression; their partners also used more minor physical aggression than comparison partners. Minor physical aggression was used by a much higher percentage of men in the shelter groups (S-C, 79.5%; S-NC, 91.9%) than in the comparison groups (NS-C, 20%; NS-NC, 16.6%).

Severe physical aggression was the technique least used by women in any group. However, it was more prevalent among women in shelters than women in the

comparison group. The use of severe physical aggression was high among partners of women in the shelter. This is intuitively predictable because many of the women in shelter are seeking protection from domestic violence. Use of severe physical violence was very low among men in the comparison groups. The percentage of men from the shelter groups who used severe physical aggression was similar to the use of minor physical aggression (S-C, 79.5%; S-NC, 83.8%). In the comparison groups, very few men used severe physical aggression to resolve conflicts (NS-C, 6.7%; NS-NC, 10%).

In general, most women used verbal techniques and verbal aggression to resolve conflict. The use of calm verbal techniques was approximately equal across all groups. The use of verbal aggression was more frequent among women in shelters. Women used minor physical aggression less than either verbal technique. The frequency of minor physical aggression was greater among women in shelters than among comparison-group women. Severe physical aggression was used by approximately the same percentage of women who use minor physical aggression. However, the frequency of use of severe physical aggression was much lower for both shelter and comparison populations. The most infrequent use of severe physical aggression was found with women in the comparison groups.

For partners of participants, use of verbal techniques was more common in comparison groups. All types of aggression--verbal, minor physical, and severe physical--were more common in the two shelter groups than among comparison partners (see Tables 57 and 58).

Table 57

Four CTS Categories of Conflict Resolution: Mean Score and Percentage Reporting
Use of That Technique in Each Group; Woman's Self-Report, (Number)

| CTS Categories | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-------------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Verbal | | | | |
| Mean | 31.39 | 26.56 | 23.56 | 27.90 |
| Percentage | 97.0(38) | 98.3(61) | 100.0(30) | 100.0(30) |
| Verbal aggression | | | | |
| Mean | 78.72 | 78.95 | 21.86 | 23.66 |
| Percentage | 97.0(38) | 100.0(62) | 100.0(30) | 100.0(30) |
| Minor physical | | | | |
| Mean | 10.62 | 11.08 | 0.50 | 0.46 |
| Percentage | 66.6(26) | 69.4(43) | 13.3 (4) | 23.3 (7) |
| Severe physical | | | | |
| Mean | 21.84 | 28.84 | 0.36 | 0.36 |
| Percentage | 61.5(24) | 54.8(34) | 10.0 (3) | 10.0 (3) |

Note. Due to the different number of items in each category and the weighing used, mean score comparisons between categories is not warranted. Percentages reported refer to members of each group in the four listed categories. Columns do not sum to 100%.

Table 58

Four CTS Categories of Conflict Resolution: Mean Score and Percentage Reporting
Use of That Technique in Each Group, Partner's Actions, (Number)

| CTS Categories | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|-------------------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Verbal | | | | |
| Mean | 12.22 | 12.21 | 23.13 | 21.86 |
| Percentage | 79.5(31) | 90.3(56) | 100.0(30) | 96.7(29) |
| Verbal aggression | | | | |
| Mean | 102.11 | 100.11 | 15.76 | 18.53 |
| Percentage | 89.7(35) | 98.4(61) | 96.7(29) | 100.0(30) |
| Minor physical | | | | |
| Mean | 35.60 | 34.11 | 0.05 | 1.27 |
| Percentage | 79.5(31) | 91.9(57) | 20.0 (6) | 16.6 (5) |
| Severe physical | | | | |
| Mean | 148.65 | 142.73 | 0.17 | 0.83 |
| Percentage | 79.5(31) | 83.8(52) | 6.7(13) | 10.0 (3) |

Note: Due to the different number of items in each category and the weighing used, mean score comparisons between categories is not warranted. Percentages reported refer to members of each group in four listed categories. Columns do not sum to 100%.

Significant Differences on CTS, Woman

To determine if the above differences in conflict resolution tactics were significant between groups, a one-way analysis of variance was run. For the woman's report on her own behaviors, only verbal reasoning was not found to be significantly different between groups. The largest η^2 value is associated with verbal aggression. A small to moderate percentage of the variance in verbal aggression (37%) is accounted for by differences in group membership (see Table 59).

Post hoc analyses with a Scheffé procedure revealed a more precise picture of where the differences were. For verbal reasoning used by women, no significant difference was found between any of the groups. For verbal aggression used by women, there was a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the S-C and NS-C groups, and between the S-NC and NS-NC groups. The use of verbal aggression was much higher in both shelter groups. There was a significant difference ($p < .05$) between the S-NC and NS-NC groups for the use of minor physical aggression by women. The mean score for minor physical aggression was higher in the two shelter groups. The S-NC group was also significantly different from the NS-C group for minor physical aggression by women. A significant difference ($p < .05$) was found between the S-NC and NS-NC groups for use of severe physical aggression by women. There was also a significant difference between S-NC and NS-C groups.

Table 59

One-Way Analyses of Variance: CTS by Group, Woman

| CTS/Source | <u>df</u> | Mean Squares | <u>F</u> Ratio | Sig of <u>F</u> | η^2 |
|-------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|
| Verbal | | | | | |
| Between | 3 | 366.00 | 1.07 | .364 | .02 |
| Within | 156 | 341.96 | -- | -- | -- |
| Verbal aggression | | | | | |
| Between | 3 | 39058.88 | 30.02 | .000 | .37 |
| Within | 154 | 1301.18 | -- | -- | -- |
| Minor physical | | | | | |
| Between | 3 | 1355.21 | 6.08 | .001 | .10 |
| Within | 155 | 222.78 | -- | -- | -- |
| Severe physical | | | | | |
| Between | 3 | 8661.14 | 5.20 | .002 | .09 |
| Within | 155 | 1665.58 | -- | -- | -- |

The mean score for severe physical aggression was, again, higher among shelter participants (see Tables 50, 61, and 62).

Significant Differences on CTS, Partner

To determine if the partner's use of conflict resolution tactics differed between groups, a one-way analysis of variance was computed. The results indicated a significant difference for all resolution tactics. Eta^2 was strongest for verbal aggression, indicating that 55% of the variance in use of verbal aggression can be accounted for by group differences (see Table 63).

Post hoc analyses with Scheffé highlighted specific intragroup differences. The use of verbal techniques, verbal aggression, minor physical aggression, and severe physical aggression by the partner was significantly different ($p < .05$) between the S-NC and NS-NC groups and the S-NC and NS-C groups. There were also significant differences between the S-C group and the NS-NC groups and the S-NC group and NS-C groups (see Tables 64, 65, 66, and 67).

Additional Influences

Four main interactions were explored: (a) the presence or absence of threats to and/or abuse of pets, (b) severity of threat or injury to pet, (c) presence of a child in the home, and (d) the shelter site.

Threat Only, Abuse Only, Neither, or Both

In homes where the partner "threatened but did not hurt the pet," "only hurt,

Table 60

Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Verbal Aggression by Group, Woman

| Group | Mean (SD) | Differences between groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|--------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 3 | Group 4 | Group 1 | Group 2 |
| 3 NS-C | 21.87 (19.2) | -- | .08 | 1.58 | 1.58 |
| 4 NS-NC | 23.67 (21.6) | 1.8 | -- | 1.51 | 1.52 |
| 1 S-C | 78.72 (44.7) | 56.85* | 55.05* | -- | .01 |
| 2 S-NC | 78.95 (41.7) | 57.08* | 55.28* | .23 | -- |

* Significant difference at $p < .05$.

but does not threaten the pet," "neither threatened nor hurt the pet," and "both threatened and hurt the pet," it might be expected that women and pets would be treated differently. It is also possible that children were treated in different ways under these conditions. The CBCL is the only measure of child functioning available to this study. Partner caring for the pet and veterinary care were seen as indexes of caring behaviors directed toward pets. The Conflict Tactics Scale assesses conflict resolution styles the couple used in the home. These four factors--partner care, veterinary care, CTS, and CBCL--were examined where pets experienced threats or injuries.

Table 61

Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Minor Physical Aggression by Group, Woman

| Group | Mean (SD) | Differences Between groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 4 | Group 3 | Group 1 | Group 2 |
| 4 NS-NC | 0.467 (1.0) | -- | .02 | .77 | .65 |
| 3 NS-C | 0.500 (1.6) | .03 | -- | .77 | .65 |
| 1 S-C | 10.622 (17.3) | 10.15 | 10.12 | -- | .02 |
| 2 S-NC | 11.081 (19.6) | 10.61* | 10.58* | .46 | -- |

* Significant difference at $p < .05$.

Relation Between Partner Care and Threatening or Hurting Pets

Under conditions where the partner threatened only to harm the pet, at least 60% of the partners were also reported to provide some care for the pet. The percentage of partners who cared for the pet was higher in the comparison groups.

When it was reported that the partner abused the pet without threats, there was less partner care in the S-C group and more in the S-NC group. If the partner neither threatened nor harmed the pet, more caring behaviors were exhibited by the partner in the S-C and S-NC groups. If the partner both threatened and hurt the pet, women reported fewer caring behaviors by the partner. On the following tables, the percentages do not sum across or down. Each category is self-contained, i.e., there

Table 62

Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Severe Physical Aggression by Group, Woman

| Group | Mean (SD) | Differences Between Groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 3 | Group 4 | Group 1 | Group 2 |
| 3 NS-C | 0.367 (1.2) | -- | 0 | .66 | .61 |
| 4 NS-NC | 0.367 (1.2) | 0 | -- | .66 | .61 |
| 1 S-C | 21.842 (42.7) | 21.48 | 21.48 | -- | .13 |
| 2 S-NC | 28.836 (56.4) | 28.47* | 28.47* | 6.99 | -- |

* Significant difference at $p < .05$.

were five reports from women in the S-C group who indicated that their partner threatened only; of these, three, or 60%, reported that the partner provided care for the pet. (See Table 68.)

Relation Between Veterinary Care and
Threatening or Hurting Pets

Each group was subdivided into domestic situations where the partner only threatened, only hurt, never threatened nor hurt the pet, and both threatened and hurt the pet. For threatening conditions only, the NS-C group seemed to be associated with a lower level of regular veterinary care. In the S-C group, when the partner

Table 63

One-Way Analysis of Variance: CTS by Group, Partner

| CTS/Source | <u>df</u> | Mean Squares | <u>F</u> Ratio | Sig of <u>F</u> | η^2 |
|-------------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|
| Verbal | | | | | |
| Between | 3 | 1326.036 | 7.75 | .0001 | .13 |
| Within | 155 | 171.132 | | | |
| Verbal aggression | | | | | |
| Between | 3 | 86278.91 | 61.95 | .0000 | .55 |
| Within | 152 | 1392.83 | | | |
| Minor physical | | | | | |
| Between | 3 | 14057.57 | 26.35 | .0000 | .34 |
| Within | 152 | 533.55 | | | |
| Severe physical | | | | | |
| Between | 3 | 255914.01 | 12.28 | .0000 | .19 |
| Within | 151 | 20831.95 | | | |

only hurt the pet, a lower level of emergency veterinary care was provided.

Emergency veterinary care was more prevalent in the S-NC group where the partner both threatened and hurt the pet. A lower percentage of pets was vaccinated in the

Table 64

Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Verbal Reasoning by Group, Partner

| Group | Mean (SD) | Differences Between Groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 2 | Group 1 | Group 4 | Group 3 |
| 2 S-NC | 12.209 (12.7) | -- | .001 | .73 | .83 |
| 1 S-C | 12.216 (11.8) | 0.01 | -- | .75 | .85 |
| 4 NS-NC | 21.866 (14.3) | 9.66* | 9.65* | -- | .09 |
| 3 NS-C | 23.133 (14.0) | 10.92* | 10.92* | 1.27 | -- |

* Significant difference at $p < .05$.

S-C group where the partner neither threatened nor hurt, or both threatened and hurt the pet. Either threatening or hurting alone was associated with a higher incidence of vaccinated pets in this (S-C) group. In the S-NC group, the highest percentage of vaccinated pets was found under conditions where the partner both threatened and hurt the pet.

Intuitively, one would expect that in more violent homes there would be fewer caring behaviors toward pets. If veterinary care was an index of care toward pets, it should be lower in homes where the partner both threatened and hurt the pet. As the above discussion indicates, no clear pattern was found in the association between veterinary care and homes with both threats and abuse of the pet existed. Note that

Table 65

Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Verbal Aggression by Group, Partner

| Group | Mean (SD) | Difference Between Groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|----------------|--------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 3 | Group 4 | Group 2 | Group 1 |
| 3 NS-C | 15.767 (16.3) | -- | .13 | 2.29 | 2.38 |
| 4 NS-NC | 18.53 (25.9) | 2.76 | -- | 2.12 | 2.17 |
| 2 S-NC | 100.115 (43.3) | 84.35* | 81.58* | -- | .04 |
| 1 S-C | 102.114 (45.9) | 86.35* | 83.58* | 1.99 | -- |

* Significant difference at $p < .05$.

on the following veterinary care tables there is an overlap between categories and columns do not sum to 100% (see Tables 69, 70, 71, and 72).

Relation Between CTS and Threatening or Hurting Pet, Woman

The woman's use of verbal techniques to resolve conflicts was not associated with the use of either threats or abuse of pets. The one exception was the NS-C group: If the partner both threatens and hurts the pet, the prevalence of verbal reasoning techniques declined.

If the partner only threatened to hurt the pet, the S-C group women used high levels of verbal aggression. These women also used relatively high levels of verbal

Table 66

Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Minor Physical Aggression by Group, Partner

| Group | Mean (SD) | Differences Between Groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 3 | Group 4 | Group 2 | Group 1 |
| 3 NS-C | 0.500 (1.2) | -- | 0.23 | 1.41 | 1.56 |
| 4 NS-NC | 1.267 (4.4) | 0.76 | -- | 1.37 | 1.52 |
| 2 S-NC | 34.115 (28.9) | 33.62* | 32.85* | -- | 0.05 |
| 1 S-C | 35.600 (29.8) | 35.10* | 34.33* | 1.48 | -- |

* Significant difference at $p < .05$.

aggression if the partner neither threatened nor hurt, or both threatened and hurt the pet. Participants in the NS-C group were only verbally aggressive if the partner both threatened and hurt a pet.

Minor physical aggression by the women in the S-C group was more likely if their partner just threatened a pet. If the partner both threatened and hurt a pet, these women were also more likely to use severe physical aggression.

In the S-NC group, the women's use of verbal aggression, minor physical aggression, and severe physical aggression did not appear to be sensitive to the partner's use of threats or physical abuse of the pet. Both nonshelter groups (NS-C

Table 67

Scheffé Post Hoc Analyses: Severe Physical Aggression by Group, Partner

| Group | Mean (SD) | Differences Between Groups/ <u>ES</u> | | | |
|---------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | Group 3 | Group 4 | Group 2 | Group 1 |
| 3 NS-C | 0.167 (.6) | -- | 0.32 | 1.17 | 1.11 |
| 4 NS-NC | 0.833 (2.9) | 0.66 | -- | 0.92 | 1.11 |
| 2 S-NC | 142.733 (187.6) | 142.90* | 141.90* | -- | 0.03 |
| 1 S-C | 148.657 (177.2) | 148.49* | 147.82* | 5.9 | -- |

* Significant difference at $p < .05$.

Table 68

Partner Caring for the Pet: Percentage (Number) Responding 'Yes'Under Conditions of Threat, Abuse, Neither, or Both; by Group

| Group | Threat | Abuse | Neither | Both |
|-------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| S-C | 60.0 (3) | 54.5 (6) | 71.4 (5) | 40.0 (6) |
| S-NC | 66.7 (8) | 87.5 (7) | 80.0 (16) | 57.91 (11) |
| NS-C | 100.0 (3) | 100.0 (1) | 87.0 (20) | no cases |
| NS-NC | 75.0 (3) | no cases | 88.0 (22) | no cases |

Table 69

Percentage Reporting Veterinary Care Items Under Threat/Hurt Conditions: S-CGroup, (Number)

| <u>Type of Care</u> | <u>Threat only</u> | <u>Hurt only</u> | <u>Neither</u> | <u>Both</u> |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Regular care | 60.0(3) | 54.5(6) | 57.1(2) | 53.3 (8) |
| Emergency care | 40.0(2) | 27.3(3) | 42.9(3) | 53.3 (8) |
| Vaccinations | 80.0(4) | 81.8(9) | 57.1(4) | 66.7(10) |

Table 70

Percentage Reporting Veterinary Care Items Under Threat/Hurt Conditions: S-NCGroup, (Number)

| <u>Type of Care</u> | <u>Threat only</u> | <u>Hurt only</u> | <u>Neither</u> | <u>Both</u> |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Regular care | 50.0 (6) | 62.5 (5) | 50.0(10) | 57.9(11) |
| Emergency care | 16.7 (2) | 25.0 (2) | 20.0 (4) | 31.6 (6) |
| Vaccinations | 58.3 (7) | 75.0 (6) | 65.0(13) | 89.5(17) |

Table 71

Percentage Reporting Veterinary Care Items Under Threat/Hurt Conditions: NS-CGroup

| <u>Type of Care</u> | <u>Threat only</u> | <u>Hurt only</u> | <u>Neither</u> | <u>Both</u> |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Regular care | 66.7 (2) | 100.0 (1) | 87.0(20) | 100.0 (1) |
| Emergency care | 100.0 (3) | 100.0 (1) | 60.9(14) | 100.0 (1) |
| Vaccinations | 66.7 (2) | 100.0 (1) | 91.3(21) | 100.0 (1) |

Table 72

Percentage Reporting Veterinary Care Items Under Threat/Hurt Conditions: NS-NCGroup, (Number)

| <u>Type of Care</u> | <u>Threat only</u> | <u>Hurt only</u> | <u>Neither</u> | <u>Both</u> |
|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Regular care | 100 (4) | no cases | 88(22) | no cases |
| Emergency care | 25 (1) | no cases | 32 (8) | no cases |
| Vaccinations | 100 (4) | no cases | 88(22) | no cases |

and NS-NC) used minimal minor physical and severe physical aggression, regardless of the condition.

Relation Between CTS and Threatening or Hurting

Pet, Partner

In the S-C group, if the partner neither threatened nor hurt the pet, he was more likely to use verbal reasoning. In the S-NC group, partners who only hurt pets were least likely to use verbal reasoning. In the comparison groups, the likelihood of the partner using verbal techniques increased under conditions of hurting only, neither threat nor hurt, and both threat and hurt.

In both shelter groups the partner was more likely to use verbal aggression if he both threatened and hurt the pet. In the NS-C group, partners who only threatened, or both threatened and hurt the pet were more likely to be verbally aggressive. In the NS-NC group, verbal aggression by the partner was associated with the use of threats alone toward a pet.

The conditions of only threatening, or both threatening and hurting, were associated with the use of minor physical aggression in both shelter groups; the use of minor physical aggression by the partner was low. If the NS-NC partners only threatened the pet(s), they were most likely to use minor physical aggression.

The use of severe physical aggression was negligible in the comparison groups. For the two shelter groups, the pattern noted for minor physical aggression was repeated for severe physical aggression; threats only, and both threats and injury were associated with higher levels of severe physical aggression. It was of interest that the S-NC group also had moderately high levels of minor and severe aggression

associated with the partner only hurting, and neither threatening nor hurting the pet(s).

Note that numerical comparisons between tactics are valueless. Each subscale contained a different number of items and several of the more severe items were weighted. However, comparing the mean scores of one tactic among all four groups did give a good idea of how the groups differ with the use of each tactic. The range of mean scores for each subgroup of the CTS is noteworthy: verbal techniques (0-75), verbal aggression (0-175); minor physical aggression (0-75); severe physical aggression (0-725; see Tables 73 and 74).

CBCL Scores Under Four Conditions:

Threat, Hurt, Neither, and Both

The CBCL was administered to the mothers in the S-C and NS-C groups. In the S-C group, the highest scores in all three areas (total, internal, and external) were found under conditions where the partner only threatened to hurt the pet. The second highest scores, again in all three areas, were associated with both threatening and hurting the pet. In the NS-C group, the highest mean score for the total and internal syndromes was associated with the partner just hurting the pet(s). No clear pattern emerged with the NS-C children for externalizing behaviors. The children's scores under the total, internal, and external domains were relatively stable under the four conditions (see Table 75).

In the S-C group, a child was more likely to fall in the clinical range for

Table 73

Mean Score for CTS Subgroups Under Conditions of Only Threat, Only Hurt,
Neither, or Both by Group, Woman's Self-Report

| <u>CTS Subgroup</u> | <u>Group</u> | <u>Only Threat</u> | <u>Only Hurt</u> | <u>Neither</u> | <u>Both</u> |
|---------------------|--------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Verbal | S-C | 23.3 | -- | 36.4 | 38.1 |
| | S-NC | 26.9 | 20.1 | 24.5 | 38.1 |
| | NS-C | 17.3 | 29.0 | 25.6 | 3.0 |
| | NS-NC | 19.3 | -- | 29.2 | -- |
| Verbal aggression | S-C | 96.3 | -- | 61.8 | 77.7 |
| | S-NC | 82.2 | 69.6 | 86.6 | 81.8 |
| | NS-C | 24.3 | 9.0 | 19.3 | 90.0 |
| | NS-NC | 37.3 | -- | 22.1 | -- |
| Minor physical | S-C | 22.75 | 13.90 | 3.00 | 7.40 |
| | S-NC | 18.58 | 5.13 | 11.55 | 9.68 |
| | NS-C | 0.3 | -- | 0.4 | -- |
| | NS-NC | 0.5 | -- | 0.04 | -- |
| Severe physical | S-C | 31.75 | 21.09 | 2.00 | 27.40 |
| | S-NC | 41.58 | 27.13 | 11.58 | 39.79 |
| | NS-C | -- | -- | 0.13 | -- |
| | NS-NC | 0.5 | -- | 0.04 | -- |

Table 74

Mean Score for CTS Subgroups Under Conditions of Only Threat, Only Hurt,
Neither, or Both by Group, Partner

| CTS Subgroup | Group | Only threat | Only hurt | Neither | Both |
|-------------------|-------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------|
| Verbal | S-C | 4.8 | -- | 15.2 | 10.2 |
| | S-NC | 21.3 | 3.5 | 16.3 | 10.8 |
| | NS-C | 12.3 | 29.0 | 25.1 | 27.0 |
| | NS-NC | 10.3 | -- | 25.1 | -- |
| Verbal aggression | S-C | 93.3 | -- | 74.4 | 118.1 |
| | S-NC | 107.0 | 71.3 | 92.3 | 124.2 |
| | NS-C | 30.7 | 8.0 | 15.5 | 50.0 |
| | NS-NC | 57.0 | -- | 14.2 | -- |
| Minor physical | S-C | 31.50 | 39.60 | 2.20 | 44.80 |
| | S-NC | 39.08 | 21.13 | 27.21 | 44.26 |
| | NS-C | 1.3 | -- | 0.26 | 8.0 |
| | NS-NC | 10.0 | -- | 0.4 | -- |
| Severe physical | S-C | 182.50 | 198.90 | 16.40 | 158.47 |
| | S-NC | 173.42 | 47.38 | 75.10 | 243.28 |
| | NS-C | -- | -- | 0.4 | -- |
| | NS-NC | 0.75 | -- | 0.12 | -- |

internal, external, and the total T score if the partner only threatened, or both threatened and hurt the pet. In homes where the partner just hurt the pet, there was also a high percentage of children in the clinical range for internalizing behaviors. No obvious pattern emerged for the NS-C group. A clear interpretation was hampered by the small numbers under the specific conditions. Note that in the following table neither the columns nor rows sum to 100%. In the S-C group there

Table 75

Mean T Scores for CBCL Under Conditions of Only Threat,

Only Hurt, Neither, or Both, by Groups

| CBCL Scores | Group | Only threat | Only hurt | Neither | Both |
|-------------------|-------|-------------|-----------|---------|------|
| Total <u>T</u> | S-C | 74.5 | 56.5 | 58.3 | 66.1 |
| | NS-C | 52.3 | 60.0 | 51.1 | 50.0 |
| Internal <u>T</u> | S-C | 75.5 | 60.7 | 57.5 | 65.3 |
| | NS-C | 51.0 | 61.0 | 51.3 | 57.0 |
| External <u>T</u> | S-C | 68.0 | 52.6 | 56.0 | 65.3 |
| | NS-C | 50.3 | 50.0 | 51.1 | 45.0 |

were five cases where the partner only threatened the pet. Three of those five cases, or 60%, were in the clinical range for internal behaviors (see Table 76).

Relation Between Severity of Threats and Hurt on CTS

Intuitively, there should be a relation between the severity of threats and abuse imposed on pets and the intensity of abuse the partner directed toward the woman. Correlations were run between the severity of threats or abuse and the four subgroups of the CTS. Severity of pet abuse was scored on a 1-to-4 scale: minor discomfort scored 1, frightening scored 2, inflicting pain scored 3, and killing scored 4. The four CTS subscales were continuous variables that ranged from 0 to 75 for verbal

Table 76

Percentage of Children in Clinical Range for External, Internal, and Total CBCL Categories, Under Conditions of Only Threat, Only Hurt, Neither, or Both:

S-C Group

| <u>CBCL Categories</u> | <u>Only threat</u> | <u>Only hurt</u> | <u>Neither</u> | <u>Both</u> |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Internal | 60.0(3) | 9.1(1) | 14.3(1) | 40.0(6) |
| External | 20.0(1) | 9.1(1) | no cases | 40.0(6) |
| Total | 60.0(3) | 18.2(2) | 14.3(1) | 60.0(9) |

reasoning and minor physical aggression, 0 to 175 for verbal aggression, and 0 to 725 for severe physical aggression. Both statisticians were consulted and agreed that a Pearson's correlation would be an appropriate statistic to use here. However, it was noted that four levels, as seen with the severity scales, were the fewest number considered reliable for a comparison. This suggests that the results may be viewed with some caution. However, several strong and consistent patterns emerged that merit consideration.

Woman's Self-Report, Threats

In the S-C group, all correlations between the severity of threat and the four CTS subgroups had a negative correlation coefficient. For verbal aggression, minor physical aggression, and severe physical aggression, the correlations coefficients were strong: -0.52, -0.41, and -0.62, respectively. For verbal aggression and severe physical aggression, the coefficients were significant: $p = .033$, and $p = .007$, respectively (see Table 77).

To further explore the relation between threats and conflict styles, a means table was constructed. From this it was evident that the use of minor and severe physical aggression by the woman to resolve conflicts was most prevalent when the partner only threatened to frighten the pet (level 2). The woman most often used verbal techniques, both reasoning and aggression, when the partner threatened to inflict pain on the pet (level 3; see Table 78).

Table 77

Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS Correlated With the Severity of ThreatsToward Pets; S-C Group, Woman, n = 17

| CTS | Pearson r | Significance of r (p) |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Verbal | -0.02 | .939 |
| Verbal aggression | -0.52 | .033 |
| Minor physical | -0.41 | .090 |
| Severe physical | -0.63 | .007 |

No clear pattern emerged in the S-NC group. None of the correlations were strong or significant. A means table did not provide any further clarity. Many of the subgroups were rather small in number and the means were approximately equal under all four levels of severity of threat. Similarly, the number of participants in each subgroup was too small to draw any reliable conclusions in the comparison groups.

Woman's Self-Report, Hurt

In the S-C group all of the correlation coefficients were strong and negative, except for verbal reasoning techniques: verbal aggression, -0.51 , $p = .01$; minor

Table 78

Means Tables: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Threat Toward Pet; S-C Group,Woman, (Number)

| Severity | Score | Verbal reasoning | Verbal aggression | Minor physical aggression | Severe physical aggression |
|----------|-------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Minor | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Frighten | 2 | 28.5 (4) | 116.0 (4) | 25.5 (4) | 88.8 (4) |
| Pain | 3 | 64.5 (2) | 131.0 (2) | 6.5 (2) | 42.5 (2) |
| Kill | 4 | 31.5(12) | 61.4(11) | 7.3(12) | 8.2(12) |

Note. Each subscale has a different number of items and is weighted differently, making comparisons between tactics valueless.

physical aggression, -0.57 , $p = .03$; severe physical aggression, -0.39 , $p = .06$; see Table 79.

To further interpret the meaning of these correlations, a means table was again constructed. If the partner killed the pet (severity level 4) the woman was least likely to use verbal reasoning or verbal aggression. The woman's use of minor and severe physical aggression declined dramatically as the partner's abuse of the pet escalated to severity level 4 (killing the pet; see Table 80).

Table 79

Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS with Severity of AbuseToward Pets in the S-C Group, Woman, n = 23

| CTS | Pearson r | Significance of r (p) |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Verbal | .05 | .83 |
| Verbal aggression | -0.51 | .01 |
| Minor physical | -0.57 | .004 |
| Severe physical | -0.39 | .06 |

Again in the S-NC group, no clear pattern emerged. There were too few participants in most of the subgroups to allow a reliable interpretation. A general pattern was seen: The woman's use of minor and severe physical aggression peaked when the partner's abuse of the pet was at level-3 severity. As there were only two participants in the NS-C group, and none in the NS-NC group who reported any pet abuse, appropriate analyses were not possible. In general, when the partner threatened to kill or actually killed the pet, the use of all the woman's conflict resolution tactics decreased.

Table 80

Means Tables: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Abuse Toward Pet in
the S-C Group, Woman

| Severity | Score | Verbal reasoning | Verbal aggression | Minor physical aggression | Severe physical aggression |
|----------|-------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Minor | 1 | 33.0(1) | 142.0(1) | 58.0(1) | 40.0(1) |
| Frighten | 2 | 26.2(9) | 98.8(9) | 18.8(8) | 53.6(9) |
| Pain | 3 | 39.0(9) | 80.3(9) | 7.7(9) | 18.0(9) |
| Kill | 4 | 25.8(7) | 37.8(5) | .3(7) | .7(7) |

Note. Each subscale has a different number of items and is weighted differently making comparisons between tactics valueless.

Partner, Threats

A correlation between the severity of threat and the partners' use of conflict resolution techniques yielded negative correlation coefficients for the S-C group. However, none of the correlations were either strong or significant (see Table 81).

A closer examination of the relation between CTS responses and severity of partners' threats using the means tables revealed a general pattern. The more severe the partner's threats were, the less likely he was to use verbal reasoning. When the

Table 81

Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS with Severity of Threats Toward Pets in the S-C Group, Partner, n = 18

| CTS | Pearson r | Significance of r (p) |
|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Verbal | -0.13 | .61 |
| Verbal Aggression | -0.01 | .97 |
| Minor physical | -0.14 | .56 |
| Severe physical | -0.23 | .35 |

severity of his threats increased to level 3, inflicting pain, he was most likely to also use verbal aggression also. If the partner's threats were very severe, killing the pet, his use of verbal aggression declined. If the partner threatened to inflict pain on the pet, he was most likely to direct minor and severe physical aggression toward the woman. Threats to kill the pet were not associated with as much minor and severe physical aggression directed toward the woman (see Table 82).

The correlation coefficients in the S-NC group were partly positive, partly negative, and not strong. None of the correlations were significant. A closer look at these relations with the means tables indicated no clear pattern. There was some indication that when the severity of the threat was at the third level, inflict pain on

Table 82

Means Tables: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Threat TowardPet(s) in the S-C Group, Partner (Number)

| Severity | Score | Verbal reasoning | Verbal aggression | Minor physical aggression | Severe physical aggression |
|----------|-------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Minor | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Frighten | 2 | 10.3 (4) | 100.2 (4) | 45.2 (4) | 174.5 (4) |
| Pain | 3 | 6.5 (2) | 152.0 (2) | 62.5 (2) | 437.5 (2) |
| Kill | 4 | 7.1(12) | 106.2(12) | 38.5(12) | 122.5(12) |

Note. Each subscale has a different number of items and is weighted differently making comparisons between tactics valueless.

pet, the partner was most likely to use verbal reasoning along with minor and severe physical aggression toward the woman.

Again, the number of participants in the comparison groups was too small to draw reliable conclusions. In the NS-C group, the correlation between severity of threat and verbal aggression and minor physical aggression was strong and negative: -0.83 and -0.82, respectively. Caution should be used in interpreting these results due to the small number of responses (6). The means tables indicated that, as the

severity of the partner's threats toward pets increased, the use of verbal aggression and minor physical aggression toward the woman decreased.

Partner, Hurt

All of the correlations between severity of abuse of the pet and the partner's conflict tactics were negative in the S-C group. However, they were neither strong nor significant (see Table 83).

The means tables suggest that the more severe the partner's abuse of the pet, the less likely he was to use verbal reasoning with the woman. The highest level of verbal aggression was associated with minor behaviors (first level) toward the pet. As the severity of his abuse of the pet increased, his use of minor and severe physical aggression toward the woman decreased (see Table 84).

In the S-NC group, the correlations between severity of injury to the pet and the conflict resolution tactics were all positive, but not significant (see Table 85).

As the severity of the partner's abuse of the pet increases, so does his use of verbal reasoning. The highest level of verbal aggression, and minor and severe physical aggression toward the woman, is associated with the most severe abuse of the pet, namely, fourth level, killing (see Table 86).

There were not enough responses to merit an analysis for the comparison groups NS-C and NS-NC: only two cases in the NS-C group and none in the NS-NC group.

Table 83

Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS with Severity of Abuse of Pets in the S-CGroup; Partner, n = 23

| CTS | Pearson r | Significance of r (p) |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Verbal | -0.28 | .17 |
| Verbal aggression | -0.04 | .84 |
| Minor physical | -0.21 | .31 |
| Severe physical | -0.22 | .28 |

Child Factors

Represented within the S-NC group were homes with and without children. To further explore the effect of a child in the home on the use of conflict resolution tactics, a t test was run. There was no significant difference between homes with and without a child for any of the conflict tactics used either by the mother or her partner. The mean score for the use of verbal aggression by the partner was higher in the subgroup with no child (mean = 114.8), than in the subgroup with a child (mean = 92.9), and approached significance ($p = .057$). Additionally, negligible differences were found between homes with or without a child on the use of threats or harm

Table 84

Means Tables: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Abuse of
Pet in the S-C Group, Partner, (Number)

| Severity | Score | Verbal reasoning | Verbal aggression | Minor physical aggression | Severe physical aggression |
|----------|-------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Minor | 1 | 25.0(1) | 125.0(1) | 75.0(1) | 250.0(1) |
| Frighten | 2 | 13.3(9) | 106.1(9) | 45.1(9) | 201.8(9) |
| Pain | 3 | 14.0(9) | 111.6(9) | 43.2(9) | 186.7(9) |
| Kill | 4 | 6.6(7) | 103.8(6) | 34.8(6) | 96.8(6) |

Note. Each subscale has a different number of items and is weighted differently making comparisons between tactics valueless.

toward the pet in the S-NC group. The influence of children in the home is discussed in more detail in Chapter V.

A detailed exploration of differences between sites in subgroups with and without children is described in Appendix M.

Summary

Analyses of the data offered a rich description of multiple factors related to

Table 85

Pearson r Correlation Coefficient: CTS with Severity of Abuse of Pets in the S-NC Group, Partner, n = 26

| CTS | Pearson r | Significance of r (p) |
|-------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Verbal | .15 | .46 |
| Verbal aggression | .22 | .27 |
| Minor physical | .30 | .13 |
| Severe physical | .32 | .16 |

both women and children who own pets and seek shelter from domestic violence, and those who own pets but were not subjected to domestic violence. Information obtained concerning pets included a rough estimate of the level of veterinary care in the home, patterns of pet ownership, and the type of care provided for the pet by the woman's partner and children.

Additional areas explored with descriptive statistics included the prevalence of reporting pet abuse, and the women and children's emotional responses to observations of their pet being harmed. Both the women and children were asked to report if they had ever harmed a pet. A comparison between mothers' and children's reports revealed some discrepancies between reports by children and their mothers with regard to the children's experiences with harming pets and observing pet abuse

Table 86

Means Tables: Mean CTS Scores by Severity of Abuse of Pet in the S-NC Group.Partner

| Severity | Score | Verbal reasoning | Verbal aggression | Minor physical aggression | Severe physical aggression |
|----------|-------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Minor | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Frighten | 2 | 7.4 (5) | 105.6 (5) | 27.6 (5) | 99.0 (5) |
| Pain | 3 | 5.6(14) | 92.5(13) | 29.9(14) | 132.5(13) |
| Kill | 4 | 10.0 (9) | 126.6 (9) | 50.9 (9) | 282.5 (9) |

Note. Each subscale has a different number of items and is weighted differently making comparisons between tactics valueless.

in the home. Many of the women reported that they were reluctant to come in to the shelter until they had secured a safe place for their pet. A large number of the women expressed no concern for their pet because they did find a safe shelter for their pet prior to coming to shelter.

Maltreatment of pets was described by reports from women and children on threats and abuse of pets in the home. Descriptions of what happened were coded for type of pet, what was said or done, why the pet was threatened or harmed, motivating factors, severity, and frequency. Descriptive and statistical analyses revealed

statistical differences in severity of threats to pets. There were both quantitative and qualitative differences between the shelter and comparison groups with regard to threats and abuse of pets.

Women in the shelters were asked about the changes they had observed in their partner's use of violence toward both themselves and their pets. A low percentage of the men entered the relationship being violent toward the woman but many became more violent as the relationship progressed. An interesting finding was that a much higher percentage of the men were reported to have always been violent toward pets. However, during the relationship with the woman, violence toward pets also increased.

The CTS offered predictable results, confirming the efficacy of the original screening process. Domestic violence was more prevalent among the shelter sample than with the comparison group. A relation was found between high levels of domestic violence and severe abuse of pets.

Data analyses from the CBCL suggested the possibility that children in shelters, exposed to both domestic violence and abuse of their pets, have more psychological and behavioral problems. It is important to note that the CBCL has limited diagnostic properties.

The data analyses offered a description of pet treatment and domestic violence and their relation to each other. Close examination of the data revealed the dynamics of this relationship. The analyses also found a potentially important difference with regard to the escalation of pet abuse and violence directed toward women.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The main objectives of this study were as follows: (a) to uncover corroboration for the coexistence of domestic violence and pet abuse; (b) to explore the relation between pet abuse and an escalating level of violence in the home; (c) to consider the association between domestic violence, pet abuse, and psychological and behavioral problems in children; and (d) to increase awareness of pet abuse as a common comorbid factor among those involved with women and children subjected to domestic violence. Results associated with each objective are addressed individually below. The final chapter discusses the strengths and limitations of the research, the importance of study findings, and possible directions for future research.

Coexistence of Domestic Violence and Pet Abuse

Both the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCADV, 1994) and, locally, the Cohabitant Abuse Procedures Act of the State of Utah acknowledge pet abuse as a component of some domestic violence cases. Anecdotal reports in the literature (Adams, 1994a, 1994b) and research studies (Ascione, 1993; DeViney et al., 1983; Renzetti, 1992) confirm the coexistence of domestic violence and pet abuse, although with some limitations. With these reports before us, we expected women in shelters to report higher rates of pet abuse than a comparison group of women free from violence in the home.

To test this premise, we sought to answer the following questions: (a) Is pet ownership approximately equal among all four groups? (b) what is the nature, frequency, and severity of threats and abuse toward pets in each group? (c) is there a difference between groups on the severity of conflict resolution tactics couples use with each other? and (d) is there a connection between threats and abuse of pets and how couples resolve conflict?

The reader is reminded that the CTS and BPSS were completed by the woman participating in the study. She was asked to provide both a self-report and her perceptions of her partner's use of conflict resolution tactics and his behaviors toward the pet. There was no way to independently verify these reports. Ideally, direct reports from the partner would be provided to produce a more accurate picture of the partners' interaction. Edelson and Brygger (1986) noted the lack of agreement between men and women in abusive relationships asked to provide assessments of each other.

Pet Ownership

Owning a pet at any time within the past 12 months was a baseline criterion for participation in the study. A slightly higher percentage of nonshelter participants reported pet ownership, both currently and in the past 12 months, than shelter participants. The lowest percentage of current pet ownership was found among the shelter participants. This may reflect an increasing instability in the home environment that precedes the need to seek shelter. The relevant period of pet

ownership (currently or within the past 12 months) parallels the period of time covered by the Conflict Tactics Scale.

Threats and Abuse of Pets

Partners of women in shelters both threatened and abused pets at a higher rate than partners of women who do not experience domestic violence. Slightly more than half of the women in shelters reported threats toward their pet(s). A markedly lower percentage of the comparison groups reported threats toward pets. Pet abuse was reported by at least 40% of the women in the shelter groups. Reports of inflicting harm to a pet were less than 10%; no reported instances of pet abuse occurred in the NS-NC group. It is evident that threats toward pets and abuse of pets are more prevalent among the shelter samples than among the two comparison samples.

Not only does a difference exist in the prevalence of threats and abuse of pets, but there are qualitative differences between the groups on the descriptions of threats and the actual abuse of pets. Threats and abuse by partners of women in shelters were more elaborate, often involving specific actions that would be emotionally traumatic for anyone. Threats from the shelter groups included such statements as "kill the dog and make the woman eat it" and "skin the cat and hang it on the door." Women in shelters reported that their partners had done such things as "killed dog and nailed to bedroom door," or "taped cat on fan and turned on," or "forced woman to have sex with dog," or "shaved cat and put out in winter." All of these reports from the shelter samples are horrifying. The threats promised and actions performed

appear designed to have a powerful psychological impact on the women, not unlike techniques used by torturers. Threats to, and abuse of, pets in the comparison groups were less creative, involving threats to kick or abandon the pet, or causing death with no method specified.

Reasons for threatening and hurting the pet were also more varied in the shelter groups. Partners in the comparison groups had fewer triggers for exhibiting aggressive verbal and physical behaviors toward pets. Women from both shelter and comparison groups cited aversive stimuli from the pets such as barking, biting, scratching, or soiling the carpet as causal agents for their partners' threats and abusive actions toward pets. Berkowitz (1993) has suggested that aversive stimulation of any type leads to "a desire to hurt" and, often, subsequent physical aggression. Predictably, irritable infants who cry frequently and pets who bark are often victims of aggressive behaviors from adult caretakers. Zillmann's excitation Transfer Theory (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994) also suggests that arousal from a secondary source such as noise may enhance arousal from a provocation and increase the likelihood of an aggressive interaction. From this theory one could easily imagine that the undisciplined actions of a young animal could facilitate an intensification of a violent domestic interaction.

It is of interest to note that coercion as a motivating factor for threats to, or abuse of, pets was found only in the shelter samples, because some of the threats and actions toward pets are perhaps done with the intent to reexert control over the woman. Coercive acts, intended to harm or force compliance, may take three forms:

(a) bodily harm, (b) threats, or (c) punishment (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). Fear of bodily harm is the primary motivating factor for women seeking shelter. Physical violence is a common coercive technique used by partners of women in shelters. It is evident from this study that pets may be a component of the other two types of coercive actions--threats and punishment. Threats may be contingent, compliance demanded with threats of harm for noncompliance, or noncontingent, threats to frighten or humiliate. Women participating in the study reported the use of both contingent and noncontingent threats toward pets that were intended to both control the women's behavior and frighten them. It was also evident that many of the partners used punishment, threatening to hurt or kill a pet, to emotionally harm a woman who may have been close to the pet. Killing a pet may harm a woman by depriving her of a valued social resource.

There was a significant difference between groups on severity of threats. There were too few reports ($n = 2$) in the NS-NC group to draw valid statistical conclusions. The weight of the difference in severity of threats was between the NS-C group and both of the shelter groups, S-C and S-NC. More than 65% of the threats issued by women in the shelter groups suggested that the partner intended to kill the pet. There were no significant differences between the NS-C, S-C, and S-NC groups on severity of abuse. The small number of abuse reports in the comparison groups (NS-C = 2; NS-NC = 0) precluded an accurate comparison with the shelter groups. The two shelter groups were not significantly different from each other. Most pet abuse by partners of women in shelters involved inflicting pain. It is clear

from these analyses that the partners' threats and abuse of pets are frequently severe.

When a person who makes threats is perceived as both serious and dangerous, his threats are more potent and likely to control the behaviors of others. Most of the threats made by partners of women in shelters expressed the intent to kill the pet. The women reported that the men were more likely to threaten to kill the pet than to actually kill it. If control can be exerted by sending a strong coercive message, fewer acts of overt coercion will be necessary (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). Only a few clear statements of coercive intent (i.e., "If I left he said he would kill the dog") were reported. However, the high percentage of threats to kill pets does suggest that many of the partners may have been using threats toward pets in a coercive manner to frighten or control the woman.

Further evidence for the coexistence of pet abuse and domestic violence comes from observations of pet abuse by children in the shelter group: Sixty-seven percent of the children in the study report that they have observed their pet being abused in the home. A comparable percentage of the women also reported that their children have observed pet abuse in the home. Forty percent of the children were also aware of threats being made toward their pets. Mothers in shelters also reported that their other children have observed pet abuse in the home. Observations by other children vary from 44% in the S-C group to 21% in the S-NC group. It is evident that both the women in shelters and their children are aware of threats and abusive behaviors toward pets in the home.

To summarize, partners of women in shelters threatened to hurt, and engage in

abusive behaviors toward pets more often than partners of women who are not in shelters and not experiencing domestic violence. There was a qualitative difference in the type of threats and abuse among the shelter samples, with those in the S-C and S-NC groups being more intricate, planned, and traumatic. Partners of women in shelter groups commonly threatened to kill, torture, or disable the pets and often engaged in cruel and painful acts that traumatized and injured pets. Both the threats and the abuse were repeated frequently.

Aggression Between Partners

Participants from the comparison groups were screened for the absence of domestic violence. As mentioned previously, there was no way of having absolute assurance that no domestic violence occurred in those homes. However, based on the recruiting process, it was expected that there would be differences between the shelter groups and the comparison groups with regard to use of conflict resolution tactics. In the comparison groups, both the women and their partners used predominantly verbal reasoning and verbal aggression to resolve interpartner conflicts. In the shelter groups, women used mainly verbal reasoning and verbal aggression. Their use of minor and severe physical aggression was lower than their partner's use, yet higher than such use among women in the comparison groups.

Partners in the shelter groups used low levels of verbal reasoning and high levels of aggressive techniques--verbal aggression, minor physical violence, and severe physical violence. With one exception, there were significant differences

between the comparison and shelter groups for all of the techniques used by either the woman or her partner. The one exception was the approximately equal use of verbal reasoning by all groups of women. The differences found serve to confirm the effectiveness of the screening process. It was curious that although the comparison group was screened for no domestic violence, a few of the women in the comparison group did report the use of minor and severe physical aggression by their partners. Also of note was the observation that the women in the shelter groups were more aggressive verbally and physically (both minor and severe) than their counterparts in the comparison groups. Three possible scenarios might account for these findings: (a) women who marry violent men tend to be more violent themselves, (b) women learn to protect themselves if their partner is violent, or (c) women begin to imitate the violent behaviors of their partner while living with him.

Research by Gentry (1970) suggests that an individual is more likely to respond with aggression if they are attacked than if they are frustrated. Verbal attacks in the form of insults, criticism, or disagreements threaten a person's inner desire to be viewed positively by others and may be perceived as aggression (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). Self-reports by women in shelters indicated that they often use verbal aggression to resolve conflicts with their partners. When attacks are viewed as intentional, an individual is more likely to respond with coercive actions.

Tedeschi and Felson (1994) noted that perhaps domestic violence is more related to conflicts created by living together than to gender differences. In addition, when violent-prone people are together, violence is more likely. As conflicts

escalate, both husbands and wives are likely to use violence.

It is evident from the findings of this study that women in shelters and their partners use more violent styles of conflict resolution than those of the comparison samples. This supports the premise that women in shelters are subjected to domestic violence.

To further explore the parallel nature of domestic violence and pet abuse, it is useful to look at the association between specific conditions of pet treatment--threat only, hurt only, neither nor hurt, both threat and hurt--and conflict resolution tactics. Mean CTS scores for each group under conditions of threat only, hurt only, neither threat nor hurt, and both threat and hurt (see Tables 74 and 75) were compared with overall CTS scores by group (see Tables 58 and 59).

Woman's Conflict Resolution Style

Both threaten and hurt. To summarize, when the partner both threatened and hurt pets, women in shelters were most likely to self-report use of verbal reasoning or severe physical aggression. Women in the NS-C comparison group were more likely to report verbal aggression when the partner threatened and hurt a pet.

Neither threaten nor hurt. If the partner was neither threatening nor hurting the pet, women in the S-C group stated that they used less aggression and more verbal reasoning. The S-NC group became more verbally aggressive and the comparison group showed little change.

Hurt. If the partner only hurt the pet, there were small decreases in the use of

all tactics, with one exception. The exception was the NS-C group, which increased use of verbal reasoning and decreased use of verbal aggression.

Threaten. Under conditions of only threatening the pet, the mean scores, for women in shelters, for the use of verbal, minor, and severe physical aggression, were higher than the mean scores before subdividing. Women in the comparison groups used slightly more verbal aggression.

Partners' Conflict Resolution Style

Both threaten and hurt. Partners who both threatened and hurt pets used more verbal, minor, and severe physical aggression. In the shelter groups, the mean scores for verbal reasoning by partners were lower when the man both threatened and hurt the pets than when the scores were not subdivided.

Neither. Partners who neither threatened nor hurt pets used more verbal reasoning and less verbal, minor, and severe physical aggression to resolve interpartner conflicts. Again, this was in relation to the mean scores on the CTS that were not subdivided by threat only, hurt only, neither threat nor hurt, and both threat and hurt categories.

Hurt. When the partner only hurt the pet, the S-C group used no verbal reasoning, used no verbal aggression, and increased their use of minor and severe physical aggression. Partners in the S-NC group used lower levels of all tactics when they only hurt the pets.

Threat. Partners in all groups who only threatened pets used less verbal

reasoning, in relation to CTS means before the scores were subdivided, to resolve conflicts. In the S-C group, they used slightly less verbal aggression; the S-NC, NS-C, and NS-NC groups used more verbal aggression. The use of minor physical aggression was higher for the NS-NC group, and approximately the same for the other groups. The mean scores for severe physical aggression were higher in both shelter groups than the mean scores before subdividing.

Based on the women's reports about their partners, men who were verbally threatening to pets were less likely to reason with, but more likely to be verbally aggressive with their partners. Men who physically abused pets in the absence of threats used fewer conflict resolution tactics. Verbal reasoning was the predominant form of conflict resolution used by men who neither threaten nor hurt pets. Men who both threaten and hurt pets used more verbal, minor, and severe physical aggression toward women.

Summary

Women participating in the study in both shelter and comparison groups reported similar levels of pet ownership. Pets were threatened and hurt at a higher rate, were injured more severely, and were abused in a qualitatively different way among the shelter samples. Participants in the shelter groups reported more domestic violence, by both men and women, than those in the comparison groups. Men who both threatened and hurt pets were reported as verbally and physically aggressive

toward women. Accordingly, this study generated supportive evidence for the coexistence of domestic violence and abuse of pets.

Relation Between Pet Abuse and Changing Levels of Violence in the Home

It is evident from the above discussion that pet abuse is often found in violent homes. Adams (1994a, 1994b) has suggested that, when there is pet abuse in violent homes, there may be an escalation of harm, torture, or killing of pets intended to terrorize the woman. Adams proposed in her writings that women who remain in situations where there is cruelty toward animals are in life-threatening danger.

To explore this premise, we asked whether or not partners who hurt, or hurt and threatened the pet were more likely to be aggressive toward the woman than those who only threatened pets. Then, we looked at the relation between the severity of the threat or abuse toward the pet and the level of aggression the partner directed toward the woman. Finally, the women's reports of escalating violence toward her and toward pets were examined.

Threat Versus Hurt

Based on the women's reports, partners who only threatened their pets were more verbally and physically aggressive with women than those who neither threatened nor hurt pets. However, they used less physical aggression toward women than men who both threatened and hurt pets. The highest levels of physical

aggression toward women were associated with men who both threatened and hurt pets.

Severity of Threats and Abuse

An interesting pattern was seen when severity of threats to and abuse of pets was compared to conflict resolution tactics. The results are discussed only for the two shelter groups, as the number of reports from the comparison groups was too small for an accurate analysis. Both the partner's and the woman's use of conflict resolution tactics, with different levels of severity of threats and abuse are discussed.

Partner

When the partner hurts the pet, opposite patterns of violence toward the women emerged for the two shelter groups. As the men in the S-C group became increasingly severe in their abuse of pets, they became less violent toward women; men in the S-NC group became more violent toward women. One may speculate that when a man feels anger toward a woman, his aggressive behaviors may be displaced to either a pet or child in the family. A general pattern emerged for threats: In both shelter groups, reports on men who threatened to inflict pain on pets indicated parallel use of the highest levels of verbal, minor physical, and severe physical aggression to resolve conflicts with women.

Correlations run between the severity of threats or injury to pets, and the level of severe physical aggression directed toward the woman, were neither strong nor

significant. No clear relation was established between high levels of severe physical abuse directed toward women and intense threats or injury to pets.

Women

When a partner threatened to kill or actually killed the pet, there was an associated decrease in the use of all tactics by women in the S-C group, while women in the S-NC group used more gentle means of resolving conflicts. When a partner reached the point of extreme violence, threatening to kill or killing a pet, women in all shelter groups decreased their use of all aggressive techniques for resolving conflict.

A correlation between the severity of threat toward the pet and the woman's use of severe physical aggression directed to her partner was neither strong nor significant. However, the correlation between the severity of pet abuse and the woman's use of severe physical aggression was significant ($r = -.35$, $p = .05$). One could speculate that women living with men who kill pets are not likely to be physically aggressive toward their partner, thus decreasing their chances of being the target of physical retaliation.

Change in Use of Violence

The research presented confirms that men who both threaten and hurt pets are very physically aggressive toward women. As the severity of abuse to pets increased, some men became less violent toward women, while others became more violent.

The numbers in the subgroups were not large; however, a general pattern did emerge. As the severity of the man's threats toward pets increased to the level of inflicting pain, so did his violence toward women. However, men who threatened to kill pets were less violent toward women.

Two possible mechanisms may help to explain this: displacement of aggression and the pet's role in buffering anger. Classical conditioning principles dictate that there is an increased likelihood of stimulus generalization when the novel stimulus is similar to the original stimulus. While there are obvious physical differences between a woman and her cat or dog, it is important to remember that pets are often viewed as another family member and many pets are identified with one particular family member (i.e., "that cat is hers"). Tedeschi and Felson (1994) suggest that when aggressive behavior toward one individual is inhibited, a similar second individual will be the likely target of aggressive behaviors. Perhaps if a man's anger escalates to the point where he realizes that he may seriously harm the woman, he inhibits that aggressive behavior and directs it instead toward the pet, or another family member that may be closely identified with the woman. In this way, the pet serves to buffer direct aggression to the woman. It is possible that anger toward the woman may also be displaced toward children, who are less threatening than an adult woman and, like a pet, may also be identified with the woman. In addition, the man may feel frustration and anger and choose to aggress against a pet, an action that is more socially acceptable, less likely to draw attention from sources external to the home, and likely to reaffirm his dominant role.

It is clear that a relationship exists between severity of threats and abuse toward pets and violence shown toward women, and that violence toward pets and women escalated in a parallel fashion. Participants in the shelter groups were asked if a change in their partner's use of violence toward them or their pets had occurred during their relationship. As expected, more than half of the men were reported by the women participating in the study as becoming more violent toward the women. A low percentage of the men were either never violent or always violent.

Violence toward the pet appears to be a more certain characteristic. A larger percentage of the men were reported as either never violent or always violent toward pets. However, when compared to changes in violence toward women, a lower percentage of men was reported as becoming more violent toward pets.

A closer reading of these results suggests that a high percentage of men who both threatened and hurt pets had become more violent toward women. A relatively low percentage had always been violent. Of the men who both threatened and hurt pets, none were reported as never having been violent toward women. Also, a large percentage of men who only threatened pets were reported as becoming more violent toward women.

When examined in this manner, there is suggestive evidence that violence towards pets is a more certain characteristic of impending violence toward women. Partners who both threatened and hurt pets were more likely to have always been violent toward pets than toward women. Almost half of the partners had become more violent toward pets.

To summarize, the partners of women in shelters who threatened and hurt pets were likely to hurt women. Threats to inflict pain on the pet were associated with high levels of violence toward women. Some men who severely abused or killed pets were also very violent toward women, but some were less violent toward women. More women reported that violence toward them had escalated more than violence toward their pets. Men who threatened and hurt pets, or who only threatened them, had increased their violence toward women more than men who neither threatened nor hurt pets. While it is evident that there is a clear connection between both the presence and severity of threats and abuse toward pets and the severity and escalation of violence toward women, the results suggest that they do not escalate in a parallel manner. Violence toward pets appears to be a more reliable indicator of potential violence toward women and is more likely than violence toward women to have always been present.

Influence of Domestic Violence on Children

Children of women in shelters were exposed to more violence in the form of both threats and actual harm toward both their mothers and pets than children in a comparison group screened for a lack of domestic violence. The differences were large and significant.

Straus and Hamby (1993) found that children raised in families where conflicts were resolved with violent physical aggression had more behavioral and psychological problems. Other researchers (Jaffe et al., 1990; O'Keefe, 1995; van der Kolk, 1987)

have also noted that children exposed to traumatic events may exhibit externalizing behaviors later on.

A consistent risk marker for men who batter their partners is witnessing and experiencing violence as a child (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). A closer look by the same researchers suggests that witnessing violence in the family of origin is a more powerful predictor of severe husband-to-wife violence than experiencing violence as a child (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). A study of children in shelters by Holden and Ritchie (1991) found a higher incidence of internalizing behaviors and a higher total T score than in a comparison group of children with no exposure to domestic violence. Some of these researchers (Jaffe et al., 1990; O'Keefe, 1995) have found externalizing behavioral problems among children who have not only observed violence, but have also experienced it directed at them. This study found that all three scales of the CBCL were elevated in the shelter group. Although violence toward children was not assessed in this study, based on the above conclusions, one might want to examine in the future the hypothesis that the study shelter children may also have been abused.

A social interactionist perspective (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994) addresses the reciprocal nature of the parent-child relationship. The CBCL scores of children in the shelters suggest that these children do have more behavioral and emotional problems. Parental use of coercive behaviors to control children can escalate to abusive interactions whereby the children are harmed both physically and psychologically. Subsequent to these interactions the children may exhibit more problem behaviors.

However, the focus of this study was not on children and the information gathered about children was minimal. The CBCL is not intended as a singular diagnostic tool. It is meant to be used as only one piece of evidence in judging possible psychological and behavioral problems with children. The CBCL results, while certainly worthy of consideration, must be interpreted with caution.

Significant differences were found between the S-C and NS-C groups for all three areas of the CBCL. Effect-size calculations indicate that the shelter-group scores were almost one standard deviation above the scores for the nonshelter group on all three scales. The scores from the shelter children are not only higher, but a higher percentage are in the clinical range. Adaptive functioning (activity, social, and school) was also significantly lower for the shelter group. This suggests that children in the shelters may have more psychological and behavioral problems.

When the CBCL scores were subdivided into conditions of only threat, only hurt, neither threat nor hurt, and both threat and hurt, the samples became too small--one to two responses in each cell--to draw accurate conclusions about differences between the groups. However, a pattern did emerge for the shelter children: When the partner only threatened, or both threatened and hurt the pet, 20-60% of the children's scores on all three scales fell in the clinical range.

It is possible that homes where the man threatens or threatens and hurts the pet are particularly upsetting for children. It is also probable that, as earlier evidence suggests, partners who only threaten and both threaten and hurt pets are more likely to be violent toward women. The obvious additional factor, not investigated by this

study, is violence toward children. Children are more likely to score in the clinical range, suggestive of some psychological and behavioral difficulty, if there is violence toward their mother and pets in the home. A brief summary of research findings by Tedeschi and Felson (1994) notes that performing aggressive behaviors increases aggressiveness.

Additional evidence that children in the shelter group may have been troubled might have come from reports of children harming pets. Zahn-Waxler et al. (1984) found that children imitate parental cruelty toward animals. The results of this study do not support this. Only 10% of the S-C group children reportedly harmed pets, while 20% of NS-C group children hurt a pet. In most cases, the reasons for a child's abuse of a pet were either accidental or not evident from the description.

The S-NC group consisted of women who chose not to include one of their children in the study. Many of the women who chose not to include a child in the study did actually have a child in the home. To look closer at the possible influence of having a child in the home, the S-NC group was further subdivided into three groups: (a) no child in the home ($\underline{n} = 24$); (b) child in the home, all ages included ($\underline{n} = 38$); and (c) only children under 5 years of age in the home ($\underline{n} = 24$). Note the overlap between group 2 and 3.

It was postulated that the presence of a child in the home may influence the severity of threats of abuse of pets and the parents' use of tactics to resolve conflicts. Further, it is possible that there are qualitative differences in parental use of

aggression in homes with very young (under 5 years of age) children and older children.

In homes where the partner kills a pet and there are no children, both women and their partners were likely to use severe physical aggression to resolve conflicts. When the partner severely hurts or threatens a pet, women with young children (under 5 years of age) reported the common use of minor and severe physical aggression.

In homes with children (all ages), there was a weak negative correlation between the severity of pet abuse and the partner's use of all tactics reported on the CTS. This mirrors the pattern reported by the S-C group.

In the S-NC homes with no children, there was a strong positive correlation between the severity of pet abuse and all aggressive techniques used by the partner. Again, this suggests the possibility that high levels of aggression toward both pets and partners exists in homes with no children.

In homes with only young children (under 5 years of age), there were strong negative correlations between the severity of threat of abuse of pet and all aggressive techniques used by the man toward the woman. Of particular interest was a strong, significant correlation between threats toward pets and the partner's use of severe physical aggression ($r = -.91$, $p = .005$, $n = 7$). Low levels of threats were associated with high levels of physical aggression toward the woman. (See Appendix I for correlation tables.)

From these results it seems possible that having a child in the home does

influence the dynamics of aggression between family members. Tedeschi and Felson (1994) noted that the presence of a third party can diminish parental use of coercion. A third party can serve as a guardian, provider of respite care, and offer support. The results of this study suggest that the presence of children can alter the use of violence between partners and toward pets. Additional explanations for the negative correlation between aggression toward pets and the partner's use of aggression directed toward women in homes with children include displacement of aggression directed toward children and the use of psychological aggression, in the form of severe threats toward pets.

An additional factor associated with aggression in children is a coercive home environment (Patterson, 1982). This study did find that threatening or abusing pets for coercive purposes took place exclusively among those in the shelter groups. The use of coercion to control children is prevalent in the American culture. It is often used appropriately to socialize children. However, when it escalates to physical and psychological violence, most would label it abuse. Coercion is a form of power assertion.

It is not surprising that women in shelters report that their partners, a population of men who have low levels of education, limited job opportunities, and low income, use extreme coercive techniques. One could speculate that these men attempt to establish control and power in their lives wherever possible. People are motivated to use coercion to acquire something they value (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). Among men who batter women, dominance and control may be desirable qualities.

Only a low percentage of the men in the shelter groups, identified by default as violent toward women, clearly abused pets for coercive purposes. It has been noted in the literature (Goode, 1971) that once a reputation as "tough guy" has been established, an implied threat may be sufficient to control behavior, and few acts of overt coercion are necessary. A high percentage of the reports by women in the shelters lacks any indication of the motivating factors for pet abuse. Further exploration of the motivating factors may explain the connection between pet abuse, the use of coercive tactics, and later aggressive behaviors of children in violent homes. The t tests run between shelter groups who reported clear cases of coercion and those who did not on the use of the woman's conflict tactics reveal no significant differences between groups. There did not appear to be an association between the woman's style of conflict resolution and the man's use of pets for coercion.

Several researchers (Besharov, 1990; Kellert & Felthouse, 1985; Ressler et al., 1986) have noted the connection between an early history of observing pet abuse and later involvement with violent crimes. As Pynoos (1990) noted, observations of violence committed by a family member are particularly upsetting for children. The most common perpetrators of violence toward pets in this study are fathers, stepfathers, mother's boyfriend, and unidentified males. The majority of children in this study (59%) reported that they were very upset after seeing their pet hurt. Several of the children reported active involvement in protecting the pet, especially moving the animal to safety, or standing between the animal and the abuser. While there were no reports from the children indicating how they felt about

protecting a pet, one could speculate that this might be a traumatizing event for a child.

In summary, children in shelters are exposed to increased levels of domestic violence and pet abuse. Factors contributing to the child's level of distress include family members as abusers, attempts to protect the pet, and observing the abuse of their pet. It is possible that the use of coercive techniques to control women and children may be a stronger predictor of later aggression in children than the specific abuse of pets. Coercion is an intentional behavior including both actions and threats that is targeted toward controlling others' behaviors. It is not surprising that children subjected to coercion would subsequently reassert control toward others, often in inappropriate ways.

Only two measures were used to determine the possible effects of violence in the home toward children: The CBCL and reports of pet abuse by children. The mother's reports of pet abuse by her children in the study did not suggest an association between domestic violence, pet abuse, and imitation of violent behaviors toward pets by the child. The CBCL does, however, suggest that, among children in the shelter group (S-C) exposed to domestic violence toward their mother and threats and violence toward their pet, there are higher levels of both psychological and behavioral problems. In homes where there are no children, both pets and women are more likely to be severely abused.

Increase Awareness of Pet Abuse and Domestic Violence

The final objective of this study was to increase awareness of the relation between domestic violence and pet abuse, among those sheltering women and children from violent domestic situations. The opportunity to change awareness occurred at many levels: (a) asking the shelters to participate in the study and complete the questionnaires heightened their awareness of the problem; (b) a follow-up report to all of the shelters provided a summary of the findings; (c) a brief, national study, run simultaneously, provided additional information concerning the level of awareness in shelters across the country; and (d) presentations at national conferences and publications in journals will provide a broad exposure of these findings to the professional community.

Shelter Involvement

When the shelter directors were approached about involvement with the study, they shared anecdotal reports such as that of a woman who found the head of her show horse in the kitchen sink, reminiscent of the memorable scene in The Godfather. Many directors shared the closeness they felt toward their own pets and spoke of how devastating pet abuse by a violent partner would be. Stories of particularly cruel acts toward pets, and their own empathic feelings toward animals, suggest to the directors that pets are likely targets of abuse in homes where there is domestic violence. And, this abuse is likely to be upsetting to the women and children in those homes. This

study generated enthusiasm and interest at the shelter sites. Shelter directors and workers, contacted numerous times throughout the study, were often eager to share their impressions and experiences.

This study did find that most of the women in the shelter groups were very close to the pets that were hurt. Understandably, they also reported feeling terrible after the pet was threatened or abused. Most of them were not relieved that the pet was threatened or hurt in their stead.

Threats of abuse of pets solely for coercive purposes were exclusively restricted to the shelter groups. Given coercive behaviors as a form of psychological torture, it is likely that women in the shelters experience intense psychological distress when their pets are abused, concurrent with or subsequent to the traumatic effects of their own battery.

While talking with the shelter workers and scoring the questionnaires, it became evident that some women were eager to share their stories of pet abuse, providing extensive descriptions of abuse. The shelter workers also observed that some participants, initially reluctant to share their stories, revealed a history of pet abuse in their homes as they became more comfortable with the interviewer. Many of the shelter participants expressed an interest in the outcome of the research.

This study also found discrepancies between reports of pet abuse from mothers and their children. Sixty percent of the reports from the mothers matched the reports of their children (47% observed abuse; 13% did not observe abuse). A fifth of the mothers (21%) were not aware that their child had observed pet abuse in the home.

It is helpful for shelter workers, especially if they have direct contact with children, to be aware that a mother's reports of her child's experience in the home are not entirely accurate.

There was some evidence that children in the study may imitate positive caretaking behaviors toward pets as observed being performed by the male partner. The evidence that children imitated negative abusive behaviors was weak. It is possible that imitation of pet abuse may not occur until the child is in a position of power. It is also possible that children in violent homes with pet abuse behave aggressively toward siblings and peers.

More than 50% of the partners threatened pets and approximately up to 70% hurt or killed a pet. Understandably, women in these circumstances often fear for the safety of their pets. They are reluctant to be separated from them, as they are often viewed as a source of both support and friendship in a hostile environment. In both of the shelter populations, almost half of the women made arrangements for their pet's safety before coming into a shelter. Women who currently had a pet were more likely to express concern over leaving their pet than women who reported having a pet within the last 12 months. Women were more likely to indicate concern for their pet as a factor that delayed them coming in to the shelter if they also reported that their partner threatened or hurt the pet. It is evident that there is a population of women living under conditions of threats and abuse toward themselves and their pets--and probably their children--who are reluctant to come to shelter until a safe

place is found for their pet(s). Thus, the traumatization of women and children may be prolonged while shelter is sought for their pet(s).

The connectedness of pet abuse and violent behaviors developed in this study helped to increase awareness among shelter workers of the women and children's emotional distress, of the unique use of threats and abuse of pets for coercive purposes toward women, of discrepancies between what the mother thinks the child sees and what the child actually sees, and of the role that concern over a pet versus safety may have in delaying a woman from seeking protection. The study itself involved shelter workers and women exposed to domestic violence. Shelter mothers also increased their awareness of the relationship between domestic violence and pet abuse. Beyond that, many of the issues explored generated relevant information that will enhance efforts to help women and children in shelters.

Reports to Shelters

Several shelter directors were concerned that research conducted in shelters is seldom reported back to them. They routinely collect the data but rarely hear of the outcome. Before this study was initiated at any of the sites, a steadfast commitment was made to share a summary of the findings with both the shelter staff and the participants. A four-page summary of the research findings was duly prepared and copies were distributed to each of the sites (see Appendix J). Participants had the option of leaving a self-addressed envelope at the shelter so that the summary could be mailed to them. The Salt Lake City site expressed interest in obtaining a poster,

detailing the findings of this study. Such a display should increase awareness of the relationship between domestic violence and pet abuse for those women and children who come in to the Salt Lake City shelter in the future.

National Study

This study increased awareness of the relationship between domestic violence and pet abuse at shelters for women in Utah. It has led to curiosity about the level of awareness of this problem at a national level. A supplementary portion of this study involved a survey of national shelters to assess their awareness of pet abuse in homes where domestic violence exists. One shelter in each state was selected from the 1994 edition of the National Directory of Domestic Violence Programs published by the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. The directory lists shelters for women and children in each of the 50 states, and the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, of which the last three and Utah were not included in the sampling. Criteria for selecting one shelter in each state included the availability of overnight accommodations, the capacity to work with a large number of women and children, and the availability of a structured program for children. Most selections were located in major cities. Utah was excluded because of the extensive research already being conducted in the shelters for this study. There was no response to several inquiries regarding the presence of a shelter in the District of Columbia, so it was not included in this study. A one-page questionnaire consisting of seven items was mailed to the selected site in each state (see Appendix K). Included were the

following items: (a) the number of clients served in a 6-month period; (b) the presence of any questions on their intake interview regarding the presence of pet abuse in the home; (c) whether or not women or children in their shelter ever mentioned pet abuse; (d) any shelter worker's awareness of the coexistence of pet abuse and domestic violence; and (e) their estimate of the overlap between these forms of violence, if any. The mailing also included a cover letter briefly explaining our intent, a copy of the Institutional Review Board approval, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which to return the questionnaire. A follow-up mailing was done several months later to those sites who had not responded to the initial request. After several more months, the remaining unresponsive sites were contacted and surveyed by telephone. The mailed questionnaires were completed by the shelter directors; the telephone surveys were conducted with either shelter directors or shelter workers directly involved with clients. The act of contacting shelters that were unaware of the relation between domestic violence and pet abuse served to heighten their awareness of the problem. Several uncooperative shelters initially misunderstood the full intent of this research, suggesting that this line of research lacked prejudicial sensitivity toward the plight of women subjected to domestic violence. After clarification, they came to understand the coercive nature of violence toward pets and the impact that it has on the women. The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence has also expressed interest, requesting a copy of this portion of the research.

Forty-eight of the fifty shelters contacted responded, for a 96% response rate. The mean number of women staying overnight in these shelters was 186. In response to the question, Do women who come in to your shelter talk about incidents of pet abuse?, 85% said "Yes." When asked if children talked about pet abuse, 63% of the 46 shelters responding to this item gave an affirmative response.

Concerning awareness of the coexistence of pet abuse and domestic violence among shelter populations, 83% of the respondents indicated that they knew of the connection, and 50% of the shelters provided estimates of the extent of occurrence, ranging from 1% to 85%, with a mean of 44%. Twenty-seven percent of the shelters ($n = 13$) indicated that they do have questions on their intake interview concerning pets. Forty-two percent of the shelters contacted requested a brief summary of the study when it was completed.

The survey also found that only 6 shelters of the 48 responding (8%) indicated any provisions for foster care for pets while women resided in shelters. Collaborative arrangements were made with pet advocacy programs, humane societies, animal shelters, and veterinary clinics. A few shelters reported taking the pets in along with the women and children. These preliminary efforts, while commendable, lack consistent organization and have restricted availability. There is no readily identifiable agency consistently responsible for the welfare of pets in unstable domestic situations.

Of all the reports of animal abuse gathered from the shelters, only a small percentage (S-C, 7.1%; S-NS, 15.2%) indicated that abuse of the pet was reported to

either the police or to the humane society. One possible reason for the low incidence of reporting pet abuse may be that humane societies, animal shelters, and veterinary clinics are not viewed by the public as advocates for the safety and protection of animals. Perhaps, if collaborative arrangements were established between shelters for women and shelters for pets, an increased awareness of the protective role animal agencies play might occur, increasing the likelihood that pet abuse would be reported.

Additional Evidence of General Awareness

One hopeful indication of coming changes appeared in a recent article in Best Friends Magazine (Getting Out, 1997). Not only does it acknowledge the coexistence of pet abuse and domestic violence, it also suggests a viable solution. In the San Francisco Bay Area, the Peninsula Humane Society and San Mateo's Center for Domestic Violence Prevention have collaborated to create the Safe Pets Program. This program ensures that women coming in to the shelter who are concerned about the safety of their pet are guaranteed a minimum of 2 weeks free boarding, including food and veterinary care, for their pets.

Distribution of Research Findings

As noted in the previous section, a small parallel study conducted simultaneously (Ascione et al., 1997) has already been published and has generated interest from the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. A brief summary of the results of this study were provided to the funding agency, the Geraldine R. Dodge

Foundation. In addition, the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS), at their national conference in Washington, DC in September 1997, chose the theme of domestic violence and pet abuse. In addition, a new comparison group, with characteristics more comparable to those found in the shelter population, is being assembled. Analyses run on the new data will be included in a manuscript submitted for publication. It is also hoped that this information will be presented at national conferences on pet abuse and domestic violence.

Summary

This study increased awareness of the relation between pet abuse and domestic violence by involving shelter workers and women and children seeking refuge in those shelters. The information gathered by the study will serve to enhance services for women subjected to domestic violence and abuse of their pets. In addition, a follow-up report to the shelters will provide them with specific information on the dynamics of pet abuse in violent homes. A national survey indicates that most shelter workers are aware of the connectedness of violence toward women and pets, but seldom ask their clients about it. Information gained from this study will be disseminated via professional conferences and journals.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The results of this study support the premise that domestic violence and pet abuse coexist in homes of women who come in to shelters, and that many men who are extremely violent toward pets are also violent toward women. The women's reports on their partners suggest that many men have always been violent toward pets, but not always violent toward them. For the duration of the relationship, the partner's use of violence toward both pets and women escalates. There is evidence that children who are exposed to threats and abuse of pets have significantly higher scores in the clinical range on the CBCL, suggestive of psychological and behavioral problems. The study increased awareness in the shelters of the overlapping nature of the abuse of women and their pets.

This final chapter presents the strengths and limitations of the study; it discusses the importance of the research findings; and it offers suggestions for further research.

Strengths and Limitations

Strengths

Although this study was structured to build on extant research results, it does not replicate previous research: No study of the relation between pet abuse and domestic violence of this scope has been done to the best of this researcher's

knowledge. By including a large number of participants and a comparison group, an in-depth analysis of the dynamics of pet abuse in relation to domestic violence becomes possible. At 17 months, time was available to collect a substantial number of responses from a population that is difficult to access. A comparison group was included to compare and contrast the effects of domestic violence, and to explore differences in patterns of pet treatment. Grant funding from the Geraldine R. Dodge Foundation and Utah State University's Vice President for Research allowed for stipends to the sites and participants for their involvement with the study. This modest monetary incentive was a motivating factor for shelter and participant involvement. It also allowed the shelters to offer an additional form of support for women and children in crisis. It was noted by one shelter worker that if you have nothing, \$10 may provide the transportation to escape an abusive environment and seek safety.

The study was conducted in shelters for women who are seeking refuge from domestic violence. It may appear that coming to the shelter is a self-selection process that allows the researcher easy access to a homogeneous population of women who are subjected to domestic violence. However, once in the shelter many women are too distraught to participate in any research project. In addition, their stay is often unpredictable, with some unexpectedly leaving within a day. Women who work in the shelters are often negatively impacted by hearing stories of terror and horror from women seeking shelter, and may lack the psychological strength to cope with the additional burden represented by a research study. Perhaps some of the instability

among testers at all sites is a reflection of the work-related stress shelter workers experience. The frequent turnover in shelter directors observed as the study progressed is also indicative of stress. By the end of the study, every shelter involved had changed their director at least once. In spite of the above difficulties, this study represents a successful collaboration with five shelters for women in the state of Utah to generate the collection of extensive, detailed data.

Limitations

Sexual Abuse

As the CTS was scored, it became apparent that some of the women coming in to the shelter reported low levels of physical battering. The suspicion that some of the women who come in to shelter have been subjected to a sexual assault or rape by their partner is unmistakable. One limitation of this study is that there was no assessment of sexual aggression, of any nature, by the partner. Research by Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) suggests that men who batter their wives also display a constellation of related violent behaviors that includes sexual aggression toward wives or partners. There are numerous studies (Russell, 1982; Shields & Hanneke, 1983; Washburn & Frieze, 1981) that find sexual aggression by men toward their spouses associated with battering of women.

Ford and Linney (1995) found that some of the children who observed pet abuse early in their lives became sex offenders in adolescence. One could speculate that children translate the coercive techniques learned by observing pet abuse into

sexual coercion as they mature into adolescence. Mothers reporting on children in this study were not asked if their adolescent children were involved with any sexual misconduct. Responses to the "sex problems" item on the CBCL were very rare with no descriptions provided by mothers.

Child Reports

In general, the children who were involved in this study were reluctant to talk. The shelter workers who had direct contact with the children reported that it was difficult to get the children to relax and talk about what had happened to their pets. If they were responsive, the interviewers sensed that the children were sharing only limited information about what happened to their pets.

The accuracy of children's reports on domestic violence increases as they repeatedly talk about it and gain a level of comfort discussing observed traumatic events (Kruttschnitt & Dornfeld, 1992). Discussion of the abuse or killing of a pet was infrequent. It is possible that the interview for this study was the first time the child had an opportunity to talk about pet abuse in their home. Thus, one may anticipate that the children's reports may be less accurate and complete than the mother's reports. It is of interest that when the children were asked if they would like to draw a picture of what happened to their pet, only 1 of the 39 children included in the study chose that option. Children who come in to shelters are confused and frightened. They, like their mothers, are often in a psychological state that is not conducive to accurate reporting of pet abuse. It is important to note that

the children may have been threatened by their father with serious consequences for reporting any acts of violence, including abuse of a pet, that they had witnessed. Or, their father may have threatened to kill their pet if they talked about any aspects of violence in the home. Accordingly, allowance must be made for inaccurate or insufficient data received from children in shelters.

Pet Ownership

One of the selection criteria for inclusion in the study was current pet ownership, or pet ownership within the last 12 months. As the study progressed, interviewers in the shelters reported that they felt a 12-month interval was too restrictive. Their observation was that unemployment, financial difficulties, and frequent moves accompany the deterioration of the family. When there are few financial resources and no stability in the living situation, pets are often given up. In addition, a woman may report past ownership but no current pet ownership because the pet was killed. Many of the women in shelters would report that they had a pet a few years ago but, because their partner was unemployed, they could neither afford to feed a pet nor provide for its safety. By extending the criteria for pet ownership to a 3-year interval, a much larger pool of participants might have been available.

Comparison Group

There were two difficulties in selecting the comparison groups: method of collection and matching. The first plan was to recruit participants by advertisements posted in various stores and businesses in town. After several weeks, there were no

responses to this approach. The decision was made to place an advertisement in the classified section of the Logan Herald Journal offering \$10 to women who wished to participate in a study on pets. There was an immediate and substantial response to this approach. Significant biases are inherent in this method: Only people who read the newspaper will be aware of the study, inducing a shift to a more literate segment of the population; only women with time available during the day for an interview could participate; the \$10 incentive may have been particularly appealing to some women; and, women responding to a newspaper advertisement that asks for help with research on pets probably had more positive feelings about pets and research than the average person.

The initial plan was to match the comparison sample, successfully screened for absence of domestic violence, with the participants in the shelters on age and SES. As data collection in the shelters was slow and erratic, we decided to collect the comparison sample before completion of the study in the shelters to avoid extension of the study beyond 17 months. The match between shelter and comparison groups on age and SES was not as close as originally anticipated. However, there was sufficient overlap to allow for meaningful interpretation of results.

When working with a comparison group that is not closely matched to the experimental group, one needs to be attentive to the differences and acknowledge possible confounds. Some of the differences reported are influenced by socioeconomic status (SES) differences (i.e., education, veterinary care, reports to authorities), and some of the differences were specifically screened for (i.e., presence

or absence of domestic violence). On variables sensitive to SES differences, a closer look at the variance reveals no large differences between the groups.

Speculating that unemployment may influence the partner's use of violence toward the woman, t tests were run between employed and unemployed partners in each group on the four CTS subscales. No significant differences were found on the use of the CTS by either the women or her partner for conditions of employment.

The veterinary care items did not offer strong supportive evidence for SES differences between groups. Many communities offer free or reduced rate services at annual vaccination clinics. In more rural communities, or among people comfortable working with animals, regular veterinary care may be routinely performed by the owner in the home. When the need for emergency veterinary care arises, finances are often not an issue for individuals closely bonded to their pet(s). For the above reasons, the veterinary care items were poor discriminators of SES differences.

Data Collection

Data were collected by employees of the shelters and were not directly controlled by the researchers. Overall, the interviewers provided complete, thorough responses to each question on all of the questionnaires. However, several items from different participants were left blank with no explanation provided, resulting in some unpreventable unevenness in data reporting.

Importance of Findings

This study provides support for the premise that domestic violence and pet abuse coexist. While this is important, a unique contribution of this study is a closer look at the dynamics of the relationship between the two. Not only do partners of women who seek shelter threaten and abuse pets at a higher rate than those partners in a nonabusive comparison group, but they do so in a qualitatively different manner. Particularly cruel acts toward pets, and threatening and abusing pets for coercive purposes are found to be features unique to the shelter sample. There are also differences between the women in shelter and the women in comparison groups in the way that they resolve conflicts with their partner under varying conditions of threat or abuse. A few general patterns of conflict resolution were evident, used both by women who experienced domestic violence and those who did not; whereas women in the comparison groups use high levels of verbal aggression, women in shelters use high levels of verbal reasoning or severe physical aggression. Partners of women in shelters who only threaten pets use high levels of verbal aggression toward women. Men who are both verbally and physically aggressive toward women threaten and abuse pets. As the severity of threats and abuse increases, different patterns of interpartner conflict resolution became apparent: Partners of women in shelters who threaten to inflict pain on pets use high levels of verbal and physical aggression toward women; threatening to kill a pet is associated with lower levels of aggression toward women. Increasing severity of pet abuse is associated with declining levels of

aggression toward shelter group women who included a child in the study, and an escalation of aggression toward women who had no child in the study. There are some variances in the women's use of aggression to resolve conflicts associated with an increase in the severity of threats and abuse of pets. However, when the partner threatens to kill--or actually kills--a pet, consistently low levels of all conflict resolution tactics are used by all women.

Research conducted prior to this study has implied an association between domestic violence and pet abuse, but no other study known to this author goes beyond the identification of the problem to describe the dynamics of violence targeted at women and pets. This study offers valuable insight into the relation between the partner's use of violence toward pets and the parallel escalation of his violence toward women. It also confirms, in a methodical way, the danger to personal safety that women may experience when their partner threatens to seriously harm their pets.

Additionally, we have shown that some men who kill pets are less physically violent toward women, while some are more violent. Women who did not include a child in the study (group S-NC) were more likely to experience a concomitant escalation of pet abuse and physical violence toward themselves. This group of women also had more varied responses to most questions, more children under 5 years of age, and more of them were divorced or not married. The women who included a child in the study were less likely to be abused physically as their partners' pet abuse intensified. It is possible that such additional factors as stability in the home, sexual violence, the use of coercion, and the man's prior acts of animal abuse

may influence the relationship between domestic violence and pet abuse.

Unemployment, which may also contribute to domestic tension, was roughly the same in the S-C group (19%) and in the S-NC group (26%), ruling out the possible negative influence of lack of employment on domestic violence in this study. Future research is needed to conclusively identify the killing of a pet as a barometer of extreme physical danger toward women.

Another important contribution of this study is the finding that a fairly high percentage of the partners of women in shelters have always been violent toward pets. Previous research assumed that violence toward women and pets escalated in a parallel manner. This research suggests that many violent men enter into relationships with a high baseline level of pet abuse. It is possible that they have abused pets since childhood. As the domestic relationship evolves, the partner frequently becomes more violent toward both the woman and the pet. There is also a subset of men who, though physically aggressive toward women, have never been violent toward pets, suggesting some independence between pet abuse and domestic violence.

When targeting abuse-prevention efforts, it is important to know the predisposing factors and the evolving factors in the context of a relationship. An awareness of prior cruelty toward animals from a partner may anticipate potential violence toward the woman in the relationship, suggesting appropriate intervention methods. This research may help structure efforts to combat a spectrum of violence in the home. Inculcation of a respect for all life and development of problem-solving

skills among young children in troubled environments may reduce both current and future cruelty to animals.

Dissemination of this research may reinforce dawning public awareness that violence toward pets is not an isolated behavior. Preliminary results from a national study conducted by the Humane Society also suggest a strong association between those who abuse animals and those who hurt people (Cannon, 1997). Violence toward pets is associated with physical violence toward women and, although not addressed by this study, probably children as well. Knowledge of a potential partner's abuse should alert women to the potential danger inherent in entering into such a relationship. The warning to avoid or get out of a relationship with a violent man should not be the death of a pet.

Future Research

Insights developed from this study suggest points of departure for additional research into the relationship between domestic violence and pet abuse. Four pivotal areas for future investigation relate to (a) how prior pet abuse might warn of future spousal battery, (b) possible sexual abuse, (c) potential child abuse, (d) marital discord, and (e) destruction of property. Each area will be addressed individually.

Partner's History of Childhood Pet Abuse

Other researchers (Besharov, 1990; Kellert & Felthous, 1985; Ressler et al., 1986) have cited both childhood and adult histories of pet abuse and observations of

pet abuse among violent criminals. A few women in this study mentioned that their partner had been cruel to animals as a child. The results from this study indicate that at least 40% of the partners of women in shelters have always been violent toward pets. This is a much higher percentage than those partners reported as always violent toward women. It would appear that the expression of violence toward animals in an adult reflects behaviors learned early in life.

Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) did not include pet abuse in their survey of risk markers for violence toward women. However, they did note that men who are violent toward their wives or partners are also often sexually aggressive, abuse their own children, and use violence against nonfamily members. Future research that looked for a history of animal abuse among men who were violent toward their wives or partners would be useful in determining the strength of the connection.

As noted in the previous section, some men are violent toward women but not pets. A few women in this study stated that their partner provides all the care for the pet because it was his. These men neither threaten nor hurt pets. It is possible that men who feel a bond with pets do not hurt them, a dynamic similar to that observed in stepfamilies where stepchildren are at greater risk of abuse than biological children (Wilson & Daly, 1987). Another plausible explanation is that some men have difficulty achieving closeness with people but are able to develop a strong, positive bond with a pet (Briere, 1997). This unique subset of men who do not abuse pets, yet are violent toward women, would also be of interest for future research.

Further clarification of the type of abuse with the type of animal harmed may

also hold promise. Some women in this study indicated that their partner was cruel to stray cats only. Early anecdotal reports from shelter directors suggested that farm animals are abused by some men. It may be helpful to know if the partner was generally cruel to all animals, or if there was a particular species he victimized more than another, or if pets were the primary targets of violence.

Sexual Abuse

As noted earlier, the CTS does not include any questions about sexual violence between partners. Several of the women seeking protection from their partners reported only low levels of physical violence, yet they were obviously frightened of their partners.

Ford and Linney (1995) provided evidence of an association between early observations of pet abuse and adult sexual misbehavior. Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) noted a strong connection between the battering of women and sexual aggression. Given that sexual molestation and/or rape are expressions of a profound lack of respect for another human being, and that pet abuse not only encompasses this same lack of respect, but also reflects a possible need to dominate and control those less powerful, similarities between sexual abuse and the purposeful harming of a pet become especially alarming. Results presented here argue strongly that sexual coercion, pet abuse, and physical violence toward women coexist in the homes of women who seek shelter. Future research would do well to address sexual abuse when exploring the relation between domestic violence and pet abuse.

Child Abuse

As the data were analyzed, it became apparent that, to fully understand the concomitant nature of violence toward pets and women, the existence of violence toward children in the home must be considered. Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) have suggested that men who are physically violent toward their wives often exhibit violent behaviors in other areas, including violence toward their children. An extensive review of the literature by Edelson (1996, p. 4) found strong evidence for "a significant overlap between child abuse and woman battering in the same families." Of the CBCL scores for children in the shelters in this study (60%) were in the clinical range for both internalizing and externalizing behaviors. The presence of externalizing behaviors is often associated with physical abuse of the child. This study pointedly avoided asking either the children or their mothers about child abuse. As, by law, reports of abuse must be reported to child protection agencies, and given awareness on the part of the interviewees of the legal obligation to report such abuse, it was anticipated that information about other forms of violence in the home, such as pet abuse, would be withheld. Future research should endeavor to assess child abuse in relation to violence toward pets and women. It may be possible to identify children already classified as abused so as to ask them about abuse of pets in their home.

Children and their mothers in this study were asked if they had ever harmed a pet or other animal. The responses did not indicate that children imitated abusive

behaviors toward pets. Perhaps the imitation presented as aggressive behaviors directed toward siblings or peers. An assessment of the level of aggression shown by children in violent domestic situations, whether directed toward pets or other children, is warranted.

Marital Discord

An in-depth exploration of marital discord may illuminate the dynamics of domestic violence. Disagreements between individuals are on a graded continuum that range from friendly to fatal. Future research may focus on the treatment of pets in homes with marital discord but no physical violence. This may further explain the parallel escalation of domestic violence and pet abuse.

It may also be of interest to look at marital discord and domestic violence in homes with and without pets. This research suggests that children may alter the aggressive dynamics between partners. Perhaps the presence of pets has a similar effect.

Destruction of Property

It is naive to believe that violence in the home is limited to the abuse of women, children, and pets. One common coercive tactic used by violent men is the destruction of property, particularly items that have sentimental value for the woman or child. This study did not ask about the destruction of property. Future research

directed toward eliciting any connection between the destruction of property and escalating violence toward women, children, and pets could prove fruitful.

Summary

Public awareness of the relationship between domestic violence and pet abuse is expanding. Careful, well-conducted research in related areas of investigation is necessary. As the topic is an emotional one, with many people holding strong, passionate, or intuitive opinions, care must be taken to avoid distribution of unproven statements that may be inflammatory to the public. It is hoped that this study will encourage researchers to fully explore all aspects of violence in the home in a thoughtful, scientific manner. Compelling research in this area has the potential to guide future interventions that may ultimately create a gentler environment for all.

How are we to build a new humanity? Reverence for life.
Existence depends more on reverence for life than the law
and the prophets.
Reverence for life comprises the whole ethic of love in its
deepest and highest sense.
It is the source of constant renewal for the individual
and for mankind.

(Albert Schweitzer, Reverence for Life).

Oh yet we trust that somehow good
will be the final goal of ill,
To pangs of nature, sins of will
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood;
That nothing walks with aimless feet;
That not one life shall be destroyed,
or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete.

Alfred, Lord Tennyson, In Memoriam

REFERENCES

- Achenbach, T.M. (1991). Child Behavior Checklist for ages 4-8. Burlington: University of Vermont.
- Adams, C. (1994a). Woman-battering and harm to animals. Unpublished manuscript.
- Adams, C. (1994b). Bringing peace home: A feminist philosophical perspective on the abuse of women, children, and pet animals. Hypatia, 9(2), 63-84.
- Allodi, F., Randall, G.R., Lutz, E.L., Quiroya, J., Zunzunegui, M.V., Kolff, C.A., Deutsch, A., & Doan, R. (1985). Physical and psychiatric effects of torture: Two medical studies. In E. Stover & E.O. Nightingale (Eds.), The breaking of bodies and minds: Torture, psychiatric abuse, and the health professions (pp. 58-78). New York: Freeman.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Ascione, F.R. (1993). Children who are cruel to animals: A review of research and implications for developmental psychopathology. Anthrozoos, 6(4), 226-246.
- Ascione, F.R. (1998). Battered women's reports of their partners' and their children's cruelty to animals. Journal of Emotional Abuse, 1, 119-133.

- Ascione, F.R., Weber, C.V., & Wood, D. (1997). The abuse of animals and domestic violence: A national survey of shelters for women who are battered. Society and Animals, 5(3), 205-218.
- Berkowitz, L. (1993). Aggression: Its causes, consequences, and control. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Besharov, D.J. (1990). Recognizing child abuse. New York: The Free Press.
- Briere, J. (1997, April). Assessment and treatment of trauma. Presentation: Utah State University Counseling Center, Logan, UT.
- Cannon, A. (1997, September 10). Many animal abusers also hurt people, Humane Society says. The San Diego Union-Tribune, p. A-9.
- Cicchetti, D., Toth, S., & Bush, M. (1988). Developmental psychopathology and incompetence in childhood: Suggestions for intervention. In B. Lahey & A. Kazdin (Eds.), Advances in clinical child psychology (pp. 156-187). New York: Plenum Press.
- Cohabitant Abuse Procedures Act, 36 U.C.C.P., Chapter 77-36-1 (1993).
- Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- DeViney, E., Dickert, J., & Lockwood, R. (1983). The care of pets within child abusing families. International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems, 4, 321-329.
- Devlin, B.K., & Reynolds, E. (1994). Child abuse: How to recognize it, how to intervene. American Journal of Nursing, 3, (pp. 13-17).

- Dodge, K.K. (1980). Social cognition and children's aggressive behavior. Child Development, 54, 162-170.
- Edelson, J.L. (1996, September). The overlap between child maltreatment and woman abuse. Paper presented at the National Resource Center on Domestic Violence. Harrisburg, PA: [National Electronic Network on Violence Against Women--VAWnet].
- Edelson, J.L., & Brygger, M.P. (1986). Gender differences in reporting of battering incidences. Family Relations, 35, 377-382.
- Eisler, R. (1988). The chalice and the blade. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.
- Erikson, E. (1959). Identity and the life cycle. New York: International Universities Press.
- Finkelhor, D., & Dzuiba-Leatherman, J. (1994). Victimization of children. American Psychologist, 49(3), 173-183.
- 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.
- Fortune, M.M. (1993). The nature of abuse. Pastoral Psychology, 41(5), 275-288.
- Franti, C.E., Kraus, J.F., Borhani, N.O., Johnson, S.L., & Tucker, S.D. (1980). Pet ownership in rural northern California (El Dorado County). JAVMA, 176, 143-149.

- Garmezy, N. (1986). Children under severe stress: Critique and commentary. American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 25(3), 384-392.
- Gentry, W.D. (1970). Effects of frustration, attack, and prior aggressive training on overt aggression and vascular processes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16, 718-725.
- Getting out together: Abused women don't have to leave pets behind. (1997, October). Best Friends Magazine, 2, p. 8.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1993). Male batterers. In R.L. Hampton, T.P. Gulotta, G.R. Adams, E.H. Potter II, & R.P. Weissberg (Eds.), Family violence: Prevention and treatment (pp. 230-257). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Goode, W.J. (1971, November). Force and violence in the family. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 624-635.
- Greenwood, P.E., & Nikulin, M.S. (1996). A guide to chi-squared testing. New York: Wiley.
- Holden, G.W., & Ritchie, K.L. (1991). Linking extreme marital discord, child rearing, and child behavior problems: Evidence from battered women. Child Development, 62, 311-327.
- Hollingshead, A.B. (1975). Four-Factor Index of Social Status. New Haven, CT: Yale University, Department of Sociology.
- Hotaling, G.T., & Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. Violence and Victims, 1,(2), 101-124.

- Hotaling, G.T., Finkelhor, E., Kirkpatrick, J.T., & Straus, M.A. (1988). Family abuse and its consequences: New directions in research. New York: Sage.
- Jaffe, P.G., Wolfe, D.A., & Wilson, S.K. (1990). Children of battered women. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Kellert, S.R., & Felthous, A.R. (1985). Childhood cruelty toward animals among criminals and noncriminals. Human Relations, 38, 1113-1129.
- Koss, M.P., Goodman, L.A., Browne, A., Fitzgerald, L.F., Keita, G.P., & Russo, N.F. (1994). Male violence against women at home, at work, and in the community. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Kruttschnitt, C., & Dornfeld, M. (1992). Will they tell? Assessing preadolescents' reports of family violence. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 29,(2), 136-147.
- Levinson, D. (1989). Family violence in cross-cultural perspective. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Librett, A. (1995). Guidelines for assessment, treatment and referral for victims of partner abuse. Salt Lake City: Utah Domestic Violence Advisory Council.
- Lindman, H.R. (1974). Analysis of variance in complex experimental designs. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.
- McCann, S.T., & Wagner, N. (1994a, May 1). Violence at home. Salt Lake Tribune, pp. 1, 5.

- McCann, S.T., & Wagner, N. (1994b, May 15). Violence at home. Salt Lake Tribune, pp. 1, 4, 5.
- McCann, S.T., & Wagner, N. (1994c, May 29). Violence at home. Salt Lake Tribune, pp. 1, 8, 9.
- Morgan, S.M. (1982). Conjugal terrorism: Psychological and community treatment model of wife abuse. Palo Alto, CA: R & E Research Associates.
- National Coalition Against Domestic Violence. (1994). Fact sheet. Denver, CO.
- National Directory of Domestic Violence Program. (1994). Denver, CO: Author.
- O'Keefe, M. (1995). Predictors of child abuse in maritally violent families. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 10,(1), 3-25.
- Patterson, G. R. (1982). Coercive family processes. Eugene, OR: Castilia Press.
- Pirsig, R.S. (1991). LILA: An inquiry into morals. New York: Bantam.
- Pynoos, R.S. (1990). Post-traumatic stress disorder in children and adolescents. In B.D. Garfinkel, G.A. Carlson, & E.B. Weller (Eds.), Psychiatric disorders in children and adolescents (pp. 48-63, 187). Philadelphia, PA: Saunders.
- Pynoos, R.S., & Eth, S. (1986). Witness to violence: The child interview. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 25,(3), 306-319.
- Pynoos, R.S., & Nader, K. (1988). Psychological first aid and treatment approach to children exposed to community violence: Research implications. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 1,(4), 445-473.

- Renzetti, C.M. (1992). Violent betrayal: Partner abuse in lesbian relationships.
Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ressler, R.K., Burgess, A.W., Hartman, Douglas, J.E., & McCormack, A. (1986).
Murderers who rape and mutilate. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1,
273-287.
- Russell, D.E.H. (1982). Rape in marriage. New York: Macmillan.
- Shafer, D.R. (Ed). (1997). Developmental psychology: Childhood and
adolescence (3rd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Shields, N.M., & Hanneke, C.R. (1983). Battered wives' reactions to marital rape.
In D. Finkelhor, R.J. Gelles, G.T. Hotaling, & M.A. Straus (Eds.), The dark
side of families: Current family violence research (pp. 132-148). Beverly
Hills, CA: Sage.
- Stover, E., & Nightengale, E.O. (1985). The breaking of bodies and minds:
Torture, psychiatric abuse, and the health professions New York:
Freeman.
- 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 Scales (CTS). Journal of Marriage and the Family, 2,
75-88.

- Straus, M.A., & Hamby, S.L. (1993). Measuring physical and psychological maltreatment of children with the Conflict Tactics Scales. Durham: University of New Hampshire.
- Sugarman, D.B., & Hotaling, G.T. (1989). Violent men in intimate relationships: An analysis of risk markers. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19(12), 1034-1048.
- Taylor, L., Zuckerman, B., Harik, V., & Groves, B. (1994). Witnessing violence by young children and their mothers. Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, 15, 2, 120-123.
- Tedeschi, J.T., & Felson, R.B. (1994). Violence, aggression, and coercive actions. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Thompson, K.D. (1994). Officially reported characteristics of spouse abuse victims seeking assistance in Utah, 1992. Unpublished master's thesis, Utah State University, Logan.
- United States Bureau of the Census. (1993). Statistical abstract of the United States: 1993 (113th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- van der Kolk, B. (1987). Psychological trauma. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
- Wampold, B.E., & Drew, C.J. (1990). Theory and application of statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Washburn, C., & Frieze, I.H. (1981, November). Methodological issues in studying battered women. Paper presented at the First National Conference for Family Violence Researchers: University of New Hampshire, Durham.
- Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1987). Risk of maltreatment of children living with stepparents. In R.J. Gelles & J.B. Lancaster, (Eds.), Child abuse and neglect: Biosocial dimensions (pp. 215-232). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Wissow, L.S., Wilson, M.E., Roter, D., Larson, S., & Berman, H.I. (1992). Family violence and the evaluation of behavioral concerns in a pediatric primary care clinic. Medical Care, 30(5), 150-162.
- Young, W.C., Sachs, R.G., Braun, B.G., & Watkins, R.T. (1991). Patients reporting ritual abuse in childhood: A clinical syndrome report of cases. Child Abuse and Neglect, 15, 181-189.
- Zahn-Waxler, C., Hollenbeck, B., & Radke-Yarrow, M.R. (1984). The origins of empathy and altruism. In M.S. Fox & L.D. Mickley (Eds.), Advances in animal welfare, (pps. 21-41). Norwell, MA: Kluwer Academic.
- Zawistowski, S. (1992, Fall/Winter). The legacy of Mary Ellen. ASPCA Animal Watch, p. 10.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A:

Algorithm for Potential Prevalence of Pet Abuse
in Homes With Domestic Violence

National Census Bureau Statistics (1992) (both statistics):

96 million households in the United States

X 75% with pets

72 million households with pets

National rates of domestic violence vary from 3 to 28%

3% of 72 million = 2 million households

28% of 72 million = 20 million

Therefore, there are 2 to 20 million households in the United States with pets living in a climate of domestic violence.

Appendix B:

For Women With Pet and Child in Study

| |
|--|
| <p style="text-align: center;">PROTOCOL FOR SUBJECT SELECTION</p> |
|--|

WHEN: After the precipitating crisis has subsided within the first week.

WHO: For women and children who stay in the shelter:

Women with: 1. a child between the ages of 5 and 17 years
 2. a pet or pets within the past 12 months

Child with 1. with a pet or pets within the last 12 months
 2. between the ages of 5 and 17 years

NOTE: Only one child is selected from each family.
 Have the mother designate the child who has the most contact (positive or negative) with pets to participate. If possible, ask the mother with the children present to assure the child's willingness to participate. If possible, interview the child before the mother.

WHAT: The following forms are to be completed by the mother and her child:

Women:

Forms that may be given to the woman to fill out and return to a shelter worker:
 Permission and Informed Consent
 Conflict Tactics Scale
 Child Behavior Checklist

Form to be completed in an interview format:
 Battered Partner/Pet Maltreatment Survey

Child:

Youth Consent: May be read and signed by the child, or read aloud for them to sign

Child's Observation
 and Experience with
 Their Pet:: To be completed in an interview format

PAYMENT: Each woman will receive \$10.00 for the return of a completed form. At the time the woman turns in the form, pay her \$10.00 and fill out a receipt (in the attached receipt book). In addition, give a gift certificate to eat out to each family that has a child complete a survey.

Note: If there is a difficulty with language or literacy, a shelter worker may administer all forms in an interview format. A few forms are available in Spanish. If you are short on Spanish forms, a few copies can be made.

Next to marital status, item #2 on the Battered Partner Pet Maltreatment Survey, designate a lesbian relation with an L.

**Cover Letter to Read to Participants
Mother/Child Version**

We have been asked to participate in a study concerning the relation between domestic violence and abuse of pets in the home. Any information you could share with us would be appreciated. You will receive \$10.00 for completing the forms. A gift certificate to McDonalds (or other fast food restaurant) will be given to each family that has a child fill out a survey. All information will be absolutely confidential. The researchers will not know your identity. If you are interested in a summary of this study when it is completed, put your name and address on the attached envelope and return it to the shelter worker. If you are interested, but do not want it sent to your home, just put your name on the envelope. The envelope will stay in a locked file in the shelter. It is hoped that the information you share with us can be used to help other women, children, and their pets in the future.

Thank you for your participation.

FOR WOMEN WITH PETS BUT **NO** CHILDREN
OR **NO** CHILD IN STUDY

PROTOCOL FOR SUBJECT SELECTION

WHEN: After the precipitating crisis has subsided within the first week

WHO: For women who stay in the shelter.
Women with a pet or pets within the past 12 months

WHAT: The following forms are to be completed by the woman:

Forms that may be given to the woman to fill out and return to a shelter worker:

Informed consent
Conflict Tactics Scale

Form to be completed on an interview format :

Battered Partner/Pet Maltreatment Survey

PAYMENT: Each woman will receive \$10.00 for completing all forms. At the time the woman finishes all forms, pay her \$10.00 and fill out a receipt (in the attached receipt book).

Note: If there is a difficulty with language or literacy, a shelter worker may administer all forms in an interview format. A few forms are available in Spanish. If you are short on Spanish forms, a few copies can be made.

Next to marital status, item #2 on the Battered Partner Pet Maltreatment Survey, designate a lesbian relation with an L.

Cover Letter to Read to Participants

We have been asked to participate in a study concerning the relation between domestic violence and abuse of pets in the home. Any information you could share with us would be appreciated. You will receive \$10.00 for completing the forms. All information will be absolutely confidential. The researchers will not know your identity. If you are interested in a summary of this study when it is completed, put your name and address on the attached envelope and return it to the shelter worker. If you are interested, but do not want it sent to your home, just put your name on the envelope. The envelope will stay in a locked file in the shelter. It is hoped that the information you share with us can be used to help other women, children, and their pets in the future.

Thank you for your participation.

Appendix C:
Advertisement in Herald Journal

Under Pets and Supplies:

DO YOU HAVE A PET?

Or, have you had a pet within the last 12 mon.

Women only. Get paid

\$10 for answering questions about your pet.

Takes about 1 hr. Call

797-1460.

Under Help Wanted:

HELP WANTED

For research project.

Women only. Be ques-

tioned by interviewer

about your pet. Takes

about 1 hr. \$10 per in-

terview. Call 797-1460.

WOMEN WITH PETS AND FAMILIES
WITH OR WITHOUT CHILDREN

DO YOU CURRENTLY HAVE A PET?

HAVE YOU HAD A PET WITHIN THE PAST 12 MONTHS?

WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN BEING PAID \$10

FOR SHARING SOME OF YOUR EXPERIENCES

(POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) WITH YOUR PET?

CALL 797-1460



| | | |
|----|----------|------|
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |
| \$ | 797-1460 | Pets |

Appendix D:

CTS

Participant Code:

CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE

(When you and your partner have a problem,
what sort of things have you done to solve it?)

RATE YOURSELF

| | <u>In Past Year</u> | | | | | | | <u>Has it Ever Happened?</u> | |
|---|---------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|------------------------------|--------|
| | 1 - Once | 2 - Twice | 3 - 3-5 Times | 4 - 6-10 Times | 5 - 11-20 Times | 6 - More than 20 | 0 - Never | 1 - Yes | 0 - No |
| A. Discussed an issue calmly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| B. Got information to back up your side of things | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| C. Brought in, or tried to bring in, someone to help settle things | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| D. Insulted or swore at him | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| E. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| F. Stomped out of the room or house or yard ... | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| G. Cried | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| H. Did or said something to spite him | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| I. Threatened to hit or throw something at him . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| J. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| K. Threw something at him | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| L. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved him | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| M. Slapped or spanked him | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| N. Kicked, bit, or hit him with a fist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| O. Hit or tried to hit him with something | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| P. Beat him up | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Q. Burned or scalded him | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| R. Threatened him with a knife or gun | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| S. Used a knife or fired a gun | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

| |
|-------------------|
| Participant Code: |
|-------------------|

CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE

(When you and your partner have a problem,
what sort of things have you done to solve it?)

**RATE
YOUR
PARTNER**

| | In Past Year | | | | | | | | Has it Ever Happened? | |
|---|--------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------|---------|--------------------------|--|
| | 1 - Once | 2 - Twice | 3 - 3-5 Times | 4 - 6-10 Times | 5 - 11-20 Times | 6 - More than 20 | 0 - Never | 1 - Yes | 0 - No | |
| A. Discussed an issue calmly | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| B. Got information to back up his side of things | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| C. Brought in, or tried to bring in, someone to help settle things | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| D. Insulted or swore at you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| E. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| F. Stomped out of the room or house or yard | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| G. Cried | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| H. Did or said something to spite you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| I. Threatened to hit or throw something at you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| J. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| K. Threw something <u>at</u> you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| L. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| M. Slapped or spanked you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| N. Kicked, bit, or hit you with a fist | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| O. Hit or tried to hit you with something | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| P. Beat you up | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| Q. Burned or scalded you | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| R. Threatened you with a knife or gun | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |
| S. Used a knife or fired a gun | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | |

Weighting and subdivision of CTS scale

Compute fistw = (fstfrpa * 2).

Compute somew = (somfrpa * 3).

Compute beatw = (betfrpa * 5).

Compute burnw = (burnfrpa * 5).

Compute thgunw = (TGUNFRPA * 6).

Compute gunw = gunfrpa * 8).

Verbal reasoning:

Compute Verbpa = (DISCUSFR + INFOFR + OUTHEPFR).

Verbal aggression:

Compute Veragpa = (INSLFRPA + SULKFRPA + STMPFRPA +
CRYFRPA + SPTFRPA + THTFRPA + THRFRPA).

Minor physical aggression:

Compute Minphpa = (ATFRPA + PSHFRPA + SLPFRPA).

Severe physical aggression:

Compute Sevphpa = (FISTW + SOMEW + BEATW + BURNW +
THGUNW + GUNW).

Appendix E:

**BATTERED PARTNER SHELTER SURVEY
(BPSS)/PET MALTREATMENT SURVEY**

 F. R. ASCIONE & C. WEBER © 1995
Mother/Child Version

Participant Code: _____

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Age _____ 2. Marital Status _____
(married, divorced, single)
3. Children living with you now:
- | | <u>Boys</u> | <u>Girls</u> |
|------|-------------|--------------|
| Ages | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |
4. Education (last grade of school completed) Partner _____
(e.g., 11 = Junior in high school, 13 = 1 year of college) Self _____
5. Employment (job title or description)
(e.g., homemaker, unemployed, mechanic, teacher,....)
 Partner _____
 Self _____
6. Ethnic group (self)
 Caucasian _____ Hispanic _____ Asian _____
 Native American _____ Black American _____ Other (specify) _____

PETS IN THE HOME

7. Do you now have a pet animal or animals?
 No _____ Yes _____
 If Yes, kind(s) Dog _____ Cat _____ Bird _____ Other (specify) _____
8. Have you had a pet animal or animals in the past 12 months?
 No _____ Yes _____
 If Yes, kind(s) Dog _____ Cat _____ Bird _____ Other (specify) _____

GO TO NEXT PAGE

9. Do your pets receive regular veterinary care? No ____ Yes ____
10. Have your pets ever received emergency veterinary care? No ____ Yes ____
11. Do your pets have most of their vaccinations? No ____ Yes ____
12. How many pets have you had in the last 5 years? _____

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PETS

13. Has your partner helped care for your pets?
 No ____ Yes ____
 Please describe the type of care provided:
14. Has your partner ever THREATENED to hurt or kill one of your pets?
 No ____ Yes ____
 PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:
15. How did you feel after the pet was THREATENED?
 ____ Numb, I was extremely upset but felt nothing.
 ____ Terrible, I felt very upset.
 ____ Mildly upset.
 ____ It didn't bother me at all.
16. Were you relieved that the pet was being threatened and not you?
 No ____ Yes ____
17. Has your partner ever ACTUALLY HURT or KILLED one of your pets?
 No ____ Yes ____
 PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS YOU ARE ABLE:

18. How did you feel after the pet was hurt or killed?
 Numb, I was extremely upset but felt nothing.
 Terrible, I felt very upset.
 Mildly upset.
 It didn't bother me at all.
19. Were you relieved that the pet was being threatened and not you?
 No Yes
20. How close were you to the pet that was abused or threatened?
 Not at all close.
 Liked but not very close.
 Very close; source of comfort and friendship.
21. Did anyone call the police or humane society (or animal control) to report the animal abuse?
 No Yes
 If yes, who made the call? _____
 Who was called? Police Humane Society or Animal Control
 What was their response? _____
22. Have you ever hurt or killed one of your pets?
 No Yes
 PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:
23. Does your child, who will be completing the questionnaire for this study, help care for your pets?
 No Yes
 PLEASE DESCRIBE THE TYPE OF CARE GIVEN.
24. Has your child, who will be filling out the questionnaire for this study, ever observed pet abuse in the home?
 No Yes

25. Has the child you have chosen to complete the questionnaire ever hurt or killed one of your pets?

No Yes

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE.

How long ago did this occur?

Sex and age of the child when this happened:

Boy Girl
 years old

26. What was done at the time of the incident?

- Nothing
 Child was reprimanded
 Authorities were called
 Other (please describe)

Answer the next three questions (#27, 28, and 29) if you have other children who will not be participating in the study.

27. Do your other children help care for your pets?

No Yes

Please describe the type of care given.

28. Have any of your other children ever OBSERVED pet abuse in the home?

No Yes

29. Have any of your other children ever hurt or killed one of your pets?

No Yes

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:

How long ago did this occur? _____

Sex and age of the child when this happened:

Boy Girl
 years old

GO TO NEXT PAGE

30. What was done at the time of the incident?

- Nothing
- Child was reprimanded
- Authorities were called
- Other (please describe)

31. Did concern over your pet's welfare keep you from coming to this shelter sooner than now?

No Yes Please explain:

32. During the time together with your current partner have you noticed any change in your partner's willingness to use violence against you or your children?

- No, he has NEVER been violent.
- No, he has ALWAYS been violent.
- Yes, he has become LESS violent.
- Yes, he has become MORE violent.

33. Have you noticed any change in your partner's willingness to threaten or abuse your pet?

- No, he has NEVER threatened or hurt our pet(s).
- No, he has ALWAYS threatened or hurt our pet(s).
- Yes, he has become LESS threatening and abusive toward pets.
- Yes, he has become MORE threatening and abusive toward pets.

34. Are there any other pet or animal-related issues you would like to describe (e.g., treatment of farm animals, wild animals, strays)?

No Yes

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:

Utah State UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
Logan, Utah 84322-2810
Telephone: (801) 797-1460
FAX: (801) 797-1448

Participant Code: _____

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PET ABUSE

PERMISSION AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, the undersigned, _____ understand that I am granting voluntary permission for my son/daughter, named _____, to participate in a research project whose general focus is on the relation between domestic violence toward women and children and pet abuse. I also understand that my child will be given the right to agree or to refuse to participate.

I understand that my child will be asked if he/she has ever heard or seen his/her pet threatened, hurt, or killed. My child will also be asked if he/she has ever harmed a pet. I understand that my child may choose to draw a picture of what happened to his/her pet. I consent to the release of any art work my child does. I understand that there will be no identifying information on the picture.

I understand that my child will be assured that what he/she shares will not be told to me or shown to me, as the parent. I understand that the exceptions to this are if my child talks about harming himself/herself, harming someone else, or incidents of abuse directed toward himself/herself. I am being informed of this to help me in making my decision about giving permission for participation. I understand that it is okay for my child to stop answering questions at any time they choose.

I have been informed that I will be asked questions that are similar to the questions that my child was asked. In addition, I have been informed that I will be asked questions about how my spouse and I resolve domestic conflicts.

I have been informed that all of the information I provide will be treated as confidential. The informed consent forms with identifying information will be kept in locked files at the Shelter. The researchers will not be aware of the identity of any participants. Identifying information about individuals will not be included in any reports, published or unpublished. I understand that neither my child nor I shall be identified in any way, other than by code number. I understand that, because of the research nature of the questionnaires, I will not be given specific information about my child's performance.

Initials _____

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PET ABUSE
PERMISSION AND INFORMED CONSENT FORM

PAGE TWO

I understand that I have the right to refuse to participate in this project and so does my child. In addition, if at any time I or my child wants to discontinue participation and withdraw from the research, either of us have the right to do this as well. Our decision will be respected at all times.

I also understand that whether or not my child or I participate is unrelated to the services my child and/or I may be receiving. My decision and my child's decision about participating will not increase or decrease the amount or quality of services provided.

Parent/guardian signature

Date

Persons to contact if you have questions or concerns about this project:

Frank R. Ascione, PhD Office: 797-1464
Principal Investigator Home: 753-3544

Claudia Weber, MS
Researcher Home: 563-6028

True Rubal
Staff Assistant
Institutional Review Board Office: 797-6924

**BATTERED PARTNER SHELTER SURVEY
(BPSS)/PET MALTREATMENT SURVEY
F. R. ASCIONE & C. WEBER © 1995**

Participant Code: _____

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Age _____ 2. Marital Status _____
(married, divorced, single)
3. Children living with you now (if any):
- | | <u>Boys</u> | <u>Girls</u> |
|------|-------------|--------------|
| Ages | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |
4. Education (last grade of school completed) Partner _____
(e.g., 11 = junior in high school, Self _____
13 = one year of college)
5. Employment (job title or description)
(e.g., homemaker, unemployed, mechanic, teacher,....)
Partner _____
Self _____
6. Ethnic group (self)
Caucasian _____ Hispanic _____ Asian _____
Native American _____ Black American _____ Other (specify) _____

PETS IN THE HOME

7. Do you now have a pet animal or animals?
No _____ Yes _____
If Yes, kind(s) Dog _____ Cat _____ Bird _____ Other (specify) _____
8. Have you had a pet animal or animals in the past 12 months?
No _____ Yes _____
If Yes, kind(s) Dog _____ Cat _____ Bird _____ Other (specify) _____

GO TO NEXT PAGE

9. Do your pets receive regular veterinary care? No ____ Yes ____
10. Have your pets ever received emergency veterinary care? No ____ Yes ____
11. Do your pets have most of their vaccinations? No ____ Yes ____
12. How many pets have you had in the last 5 years? ____

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PETS

13. Has your partner helped care for your pets?
 No ____ Yes ____
 Please describe the type of care provided:
14. Has your partner ever THREATENED to hurt or kill one of your pets?
 No ____ Yes ____
 PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:
15. How did you feel after the pet was THREATENED?
 ____ Numb, I was extremely upset but felt nothing.
 ____ Terrible, I felt very upset.
 ____ Mildly upset.
 ____ It didn't bother me at all.
16. Were you relieved that the pet was being threatened and not you?
 No ____ Yes ____
17. Has your partner ever ACTUALLY HURT or KILLED one of your pets?
 No ____ Yes ____
 PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS YOU ARE ABLE:

18. How did you feel after the pet was hurt or killed?
 Numb, I was extremely upset but felt nothing.
 Terrible, I felt very upset.
 Mildly upset.
 It didn't bother me at all.
19. Were you relieved that the pet was being threatened and not you?
 No Yes
20. How close were you to the pet that was abused or threatened?
 Not at all close.
 Liked but not very close.
 Very close; source of comfort and friendship.
21. Did anyone call the police or humane society (or animal control) to report the animal abuse?
 No Yes
 If yes, who made the call? _____
 Who was called? Police Humane Society or Animal Control
 What was their response? _____
22. Have you ever hurt or killed one of your pets?
 No Yes
 PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:

If your children are all either younger than 5 or older than 17,

OR

if you have children between 5 and 17, but no child participating in the study, please complete the next four questions (#23, 24, 25, and 26)

If not applicable, skip questions #23, 24, 25, and 26; continue with #27.

23. Do your children help care for your pets?
 No Yes
 Please describe the type of care given.
24. Have any of your children ever OBSERVED pet abuse in the home?
 No Yes

GO TO NEXT PAGE

25. Have any of your children ever hurt or killed one of your pets?

No ___ Yes ___

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:

How long ago did this occur? _____

Sex and age of the child when this happened:

Boy ___ Girl ___
 ___ years old

26. What was done at the time of the incident?

- Nothing
- Child was reprimanded
- Authorities were called
- Other (please describe)

27. Did concern over your pet's welfare keep you from coming to this shelter sooner than now?

No ___ Yes ___ Please explain:

28. During the time together with your current partner have you noticed any change in your partner's willingness to use violence against you or your children?

- No, he has NEVER been violent.
- No, he has ALWAYS been violent.
- Yes, he has become LESS violent.
- Yes, he has become MORE violent.

29. Have you noticed any change in your partner's willingness to threaten or abuse your pet?

- No, he has NEVER threatened or hurt our pet(s).
- No, he has ALWAYS threatened or hurt our pet(s).
- Yes, he has become LESS threatening and abusive toward pets.
- Yes, he has become MORE threatening and abusive toward pets.

GO TO NEXT PAGE

30. Are there any other pet or animal-related issues you would like to describe (e.g., treatment of farm animals, wild animals, strays)?

No Yes

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:

Utah State UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
Logan, Utah 84322-2810
Telephone (801) 797-1460
FAX (801) 797-1448

Participant Code:

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PET ABUSE

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, the undersigned, _____ agree to participate in a research project whose general focus is the relation between domestic violence toward women and children and pet abuse. I understand that I will be asked if I have ever heard or seen my pet threatened, hurt, or killed. I will also be asked if I have ever harmed a pet.

I have been informed that I will be asked questions about how my spouse and I resolve domestic conflicts. If I have children younger than 5 or older than 17, I understand that I will be asked a few questions regarding their experience with pets.

I have been informed that all of the information I provide will be treated as confidential. The informed consent forms with identifying information will be kept in locked files at the Shelter. The researchers will not be aware of the identity of any participants. Identifying information about individuals will not be included in any reports, published or unpublished. I understand that I shall not be identified in any way, other than by code number. I understand that I have the right to refuse to participate in this project. In addition, if at any time I want to discontinue participation and withdraw from the research, I have the right to do this as well. My decision will be respected at all times.

Initials _____

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PET ABUSE

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

PAGE TWO

I also understand that whether or not I participate is unrelated to the services I may be receiving. My decision about participating will not increase or decrease the amount or quality of services provided.

Signature

Date

Persons to contact if you have questions or concerns about this project:

Frank R. Ascione, PhD
Principal Investigator

Office: 797-1464
Home: 753-3544

Claudia Weber, MS
Researcher

Home: 563-6028

True Rubal
Staff Assistant
Institutional Review Board Office:

797-6924

**CHILDREN'S OBSERVATION AND EXPERIENCE
WITH THEIR PETS (COEP)**
F. R. Ascione & C. Weber © 1995

Participant Code:

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Age _____ 2. Boy _____ Girl _____ 3. Grade _____
4. Number of brothers and sisters _____

PETS IN THE HOME

5. Do you NOW have a pet animal or animals?
No _____ Yes _____
Kind(s) Dog _____ Cat _____ Bird _____ Other _____
6. Have you had a pet animal or animals in the past 12 months (since around last Thanksgiving)?
No _____ Yes _____
Kind(s) Dog _____ Cat _____ Bird _____ Other _____
7. Have you ever SEEN or HEARD one of your pets HURT or KILLED?
No _____ Yes _____
PLEASE TELL WHAT HAPPENED AS YOU REMEMBER IT
(You may draw a picture if that would be helpful)
8. Who hurt or killed your pet?
Father _____ Stepfather _____ Mother _____ Brother _____ Sister _____
Mother's boyfriend _____ Other _____

GO TO NEXT PAGE

9. How did you feel when your pet was hurt or killed?
Very upset ___ Sort of upset ___ Not upset at all ___
10. Has anyone ever said they would hurt or kill one of your pets but not do it?
No ___ Yes ___
PLEASE TELL WHAT HAPPENED AS YOU REMEMBER IT

11. Have you ever taken care of a pet? (Like fed, walked, or played with it)
No ___ Yes ___
12. Have YOU ever hurt or killed one of your pets?
No ___ Yes ___
PLEASE TELL WHAT HAPPENED AS YOU REMEMBER IT
(You may draw a picture if that would be helpful)

13. Have you ever hurt or killed other animals?
No ___ Yes ___
PLEASE TELL WHAT HAPPENED AS YOU REMEMBER IT

14. How did you feel after you hurt or killed an animal?
Very upset ___ Sort of upset ___ Not upset at all ___

GO TO NEXT PAGE

15. Have you ever protected one of your pets or saved it from being hurt?

No ___ Yes ___

PLEASE TELL WHAT HAPPENED AS YOU REMEMBER IT.

16. Did you ever have a favorite pet that you cared about a lot?

No ___ Yes ___

Kind: Dog _____ Cat _____ Bird _____

Other (describe) _____

17. How would you like to see pets treated in your home?

___ better than they have been treated

___ about the same as they have been treated

___ not as good as they have been treated

Utah State
UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
Logan, Utah 84322-2810
Telephone: (801) 797-1460
FAX: (801) 797-1448

| |
|-------------------|
| Participant Code: |
|-------------------|

YOUTH CONSENT INFORMATION

We would like to ask you a few questions about your pet. Sometimes people treat pets in ways that are not good. They may say that they are going to hurt a pet but not do it. There are good ways and bad ways to be with animals. We would like to ask you about things that might have happened to your pet. We would like to know if you were ever scared or worried about your pet or pets because of something another person said or did to it. We would like to know how you feel about your pet and some of the things you may have done with it.

We promise not to tell your parents about the answers you give unless you tell us that someone has hurt you. We have talked about this promise with your mother and she said that this was okay. The only time we would have to break this promise about not telling others is if you talked about planning to hurt yourself or talked about planning to hurt another person.

The paper you write on will not have your name on it—it will only have a code number. No one else will know that you have given these answers.

If you decide that you do not want to answer any of the questions, that is okay.

If you do want to answer the questions, but when you start, you change your mind and want to stop, that is okay, too.

I understand what you are asking me to do.

I understand I can stop answering questions whenever I want to and it will be okay.

Child's/Adolescent's signature

Date

FAMILIES AND PETS SURVEY 1996

F. R. ASCIONE & C. WEBER © 1995

Participant Code: _____

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Age _____
2. Marital Status _____
(married, divorced, single)
3. Children living with you now (if any):

| | Boys | Girls |
|------|-------|-------|
| Ages | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |
| | _____ | _____ |
4. Education (last grade of school completed) Partner _____
(e.g., 11 - junior in high school, Self _____
13 - one year of college)
5. Employment (job title or description)
(e.g., homemaker, unemployed, mechanic, teacher,....)
Partner _____
Self _____
6. Ethnic group (self)
Caucasian _____ Hispanic _____ Asian _____
Native American _____ Black American _____ Other (specify) _____

PETS IN THE HOME

7. Do you now have a pet animal or animals?
No _____ Yes _____
If Yes, kind(s) Dog _____ Cat _____ Bird _____ Other (specify) _____
8. Have you had a pet animal or animals in the past 12 months?
No _____ Yes _____
If Yes, kind(s) Dog _____ Cat _____ Bird _____ Other (specify) _____

GO TO NEXT PAGE

9. Do your pets receive regular veterinary care? No ____ Yes ____
10. Have your pets ever received emergency veterinary care? No ____ Yes ____
11. Do your pets have most of their vaccinations? No ____ Yes ____
12. How many pets have you had in the last 5 years? _____

| |
|---------------------------|
| WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PETS |
|---------------------------|

13. Has your partner helped care for your pets?
 No ____ Yes ____
 Please describe the type of care provided:
14. Has your partner ever THREATENED to hurt or kill one of your pets?
 No ____ Yes ____
 PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:
15. How did you feel after the pet was THREATENED?
 ____ Numb, I was extremely upset but felt nothing.
 ____ Terrible, I felt very upset.
 ____ Mildly upset.
 ____ It didn't bother me at all.
16. Were you relieved that the pet was being threatened and not you?
 No ____ Yes ____
17. Has your partner ever ACTUALLY HURT or KILLED one of your pets?
 No ____ Yes ____
 PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS YOU ARE ABLE:

GO TO NEXT PAGE

18. How did you feel after the pet was hurt or killed?
- Numb, I was extremely upset but felt nothing.
- Terrible, I felt very upset.
- Mildly upset.
- It didn't bother me at all.
19. Were you relieved that the pet was being threatened and not you?
- No Yes
20. How close were you to the pet that was abused or threatened?
- Not at all close.
- Liked but not very close.
- Very close; source of comfort and friendship.
21. Did anyone call the police or humane society (or animal control) to report the animal abuse?
- No Yes
- If yes, who made the call? _____
- Who was called? Police Humane Society or Animal Control
- What was their response? _____
22. Have you ever hurt or killed one of your pets?
- No Yes
- PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:

If you have a child or children, please respond to the next four questions: (#23, 24, 25, and 26).

23. Do your children help care for your pets?
- No Yes
- Please describe the type of care given.
24. Have any of your children ever OBSERVED pet abuse in the home?
- No Yes

25. Have any of your children ever hurt or killed one of your pets?

No ___ Yes ___

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:

How long ago did this occur? _____

Sex and age of the child when this happened:

Boy ___ Girl ___
_____ years old

26. What was done at the time of the incident?

- ___ Nothing
- ___ Child was reprimanded
- ___ Authorities were called
- ___ Other (please describe)

27. Are there any other positive or negative pet or animal-related experiences you would like to describe (e.g., treatment of farm animals, wild animals, strays)?

No ___ Yes ___

PLEASE DESCRIBE THE INCIDENT(S) IN AS MUCH DETAIL AS POSSIBLE:

28. Where did you see this research advertised?

- ___ Maceys
- ___ Weslo
- ___ Fred Meyer
- ___ Smiths
- ___ Albertsons
- ___ Pepperidge Farm
- ___ Other

Utah State UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
Logan, Utah 84322-2810
Telephone: (801) 797-1460
FAX: (801) 797-1448

Participant Code:

FAMILIES AND PETS

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

I, the undersigned, _____ agree to participate in a research project whose general focus is the relation between families and pets. I understand that I will be asked to share both positive and negative experiences with my pet.

I have been informed that I will be asked questions about how my spouse and I resolve domestic conflicts. If I have children younger than 5 or older than 17, I understand that I will be asked a few questions regarding their experience with pets. I will also be asked to fill out a checklist concerning children's behaviors (if you have a child between the ages of 5 and 17).

I have been informed that all of the information I provide will be treated as confidential. Identifying information about individuals will not be included in any reports, published or unpublished. I understand that I shall not be identified in any way, other than by code number. I understand that I have the right to refuse to participate in this project. In addition, if at any time I want to discontinue participation and withdraw from the research, I have the right to do this as well. My decision will be respected at all times.

Signature

Date

Persons to contact if you have questions or concerns about this project:

Frank R. Ascione, PhD Office: 797-1464
Principal Investigator Home: 753-3544

Claudia Weber, MS
Researcher Home: 563-6028

True Rubal
Staff Assistant
Institutional Review Board Office: 797-6924

Initials _____

Appendix F:
Drawing by Child



Appendix G:

Codebook

Mother/child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | Card 1 | CARD1 |
| 2-4 | Code # SLC: 001-050 = mother/child 051-100 = woman(w/o child) Logan: 101-150 = mother/child 151-200 = woman(w/o child) Brigham: 201-250 = mother/child 251-300 = woman(w/o child) Ogden: 301-350 = mother/child 351-400 = woman(w/o child) Provo: 501-550 = mother/child 551-600 = woman(w/o child) | CODE |
| 5 | Site 0 = SLC 1 = Logan 2 = Brigham City 3 = Ogden 4 = Provo 5 = Logan/control | SITE |
| 6 | Group 1 = experimental 2 = control | GRP |

CODEBOOK - continued

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

| | | |
|-------|---|----------|
| 7-8 | Age (in years) | AGE |
| 9 | Marital status | MARSTAT |
| | 1 = married | |
| | 2 = divorced | |
| | 3 = single | |
| | 4 = lesbian | |
| | 5 = widow | |
| 10-25 | Children living with you now | |
| 10-11 | Boy 1 - age in years | B1 |
| 12-13 | Boy 2 - age in years | B2 |
| 14-15 | Boy 3 - age in years | B3 |
| 16-17 | Boy 4 - age in years | B4 |
| 18-19 | Girl 1 - age in years | G1 |
| 20-21 | Girl 2 - age in years | G2 |
| 22-23 | Girl 3 - age in years | G3 |
| 24-25 | Girl 4 - age in years | G4 |
| | Education | |
| | Last grade of school completed | |
| 26-27 | Partner education | EDUCPART |
| 28 | Educational factor (Hollingshead) | EDFACTP |
| | 1 = less than 7th grade | |
| | 2 = junior high school (9th grade) | |
| | 3 = partial high school (10-11th gr) | |
| | 4 = high school graduate (trade school) | |
| | 5 = partial college (at least one yr) | |
| | 6 = standard college (4 yrs) | |
| | 7 = graduate professional training | |

CODEBOOK - continued

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 29-30 | Self education | EDUCSELF |
| 31 | Educational factor - self See #1-7 above | EDFACTS |
| 32-34 | Employment Hollingshead codes for careers Partner | EMPLPART |
| 35 | Occupational Scale code-partner 1 - 9 on Hollingshead rating | OCCSCALP |
| 36-38 | Hollingshead code for career Self | EMPLSELF |
| 39 | Occupational Scale code-self 1 - 9 on Hollingshead rating | OCCSCALS |
| 40 | Ethnic group (self) 1 = Caucasian 2 = Hispanic 3 = Asian 4 = Native American 5 = Black American 6 = other | ETHNIC |

PETS IN THE HOME

| | | |
|----|---|----------|
| 41 | Do you now have a pet? 1 = no 2 = yes | NOWPET |
| | If yes, what kind | |
| 42 | dog (#) | DOGKIND |
| 43 | cat (#) | CATKIND |
| 44 | bird (#) | BIRDKIND |
| 45 | other (#) | OTHRKIND |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------------------------|--|-------------|
| 46 | Have you had a pet in the past 12 months? 1 = no 2 = yes | PASTPET |
| | If yes, what kind | |
| 47 | dog (#) | DOGKINDP |
| 48 | cat (#) | CATKINDP |
| 49 | bird (#) | BRDKINDP |
| 50 | other (#) | OTHKINDP |
| 51 | Regular veterinary care? 1 = no 2 = yes | REGVET |
| 52 | Emergency veterinary care? 1 = no 2 = yes | EMERVET |
| 53 | Most of their vaccinations? 1 = no 2 = yes | VACCIN |
| 54-55 | Number of pets in last 5 years | NUMPETS5Y |
| WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PETS | | |
| 56 | Has partner helped care for pets? 1 = no 2 = yes | PARTCARE |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Column</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| 57-58 | Describe type of care 1 = feed, buy food 2 = walk, put out, clean up after 3 = play, groom, bathe, pet 4 = 1 & 2 5 = 1 & 3 6 = 1,2, & 3 7 = take to vet 8 = help bury 9 = care for (any 1-8 answer) PLUS love | TYPECARP |
| 59 | Has partner ever <u>threatened</u> to hurt or kill pet? 1 = no 2 = yes Describe incident | THREAT |
| 60 | Number of events described EVENT #1 | NUMPTHRT |
| 61 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | THRETPET |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Column</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| 62-63 | What was said 1 = hurt (throw, kick) 2 = kill 3 = hurt & kill 4 = kill and make woman eat pet 5 = abandon 6 = get rid of 7 = skin cat & hang on door 8 = let birds go outside 9 = threatened to drop off 2nd floor | THRETSER |
| 64-65 | WHY was pet threatened? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = killed bird 7 = to threaten woman 8 = to threaten child 9 = fear of pet, disliked pet 10 = ran into traffic 11 = anger over death of child 12 = moving 13 = scratched baby 14 = angry | THRETWHY |
| 66 | Threat related to: 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | ANCOER |

249
Department of Psychology
Utah State University
85 OMU
Logan, Utah 84302

CODEBOOK

| <u>Column</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| 67 | Severity - how severe was it? 1 = minor, teasing 2 = threatens punishment of animal annoying 3 = threatens serious abuse 4 = threatens to kill | THRETSEV |
| | EVENT #2 | |
| 68 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | THRTPET2 |
| 69-70 | What was said 1 = hurt (throw, kick) 2 = kill 3 = hurt & kill 4 = kill and make woman eat pet 5 = abandon 6 = get rid of 7 = snake bite woman 8 = wring bird's neck and stuff it | THRETS2D2 |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | |
|----------------|--|----------|
| 71-72 | WHY was pet threatened? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed, excited 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = killed bird 7 = to threaten woman 8 = woman paying attention to pet 9 = to threaten child | THRETWY2 |
| 73 | Threat related to: 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | ANCOER2 |
| 74 | Severit-how severe was it? 1 = minor, teasing 2 = threatens punishment of animal annoying 3 = threatens serious abuse 4 = threatens to kill | THRETSV2 |
| 75 | How did you feel after pet was threatened? 1 = numb 2 = terrible 3 = mild 4 = didn't bother me 5 = other | THRETFEL |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 76 | Were you relieved that pet was threatened & not you? 1 = no 2 = yes | THRETREL |
| 77 | Were the threats repeated: 1 = not clear from description 2 = one time only 3 = multiple times | FREQTHR |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | Card 2 | CARD2 |
| 2-4 | Code # | CODE2 |
| 5 | Site 0 = SLC 1 = Logan 2 = Brigham City 3 = Ogden 4 = Provo | SITE2 |
| 6 | Group 1 = experimental 2 = control | GRP2 |

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE PETS (continued) (? # 17 ON WOMAN W/O CHILD)

| | | |
|---|--|----------|
| 7 | Has your partner actually hurt or killed one of your pets? 1 = no 2 = yes Describe incident in detail | HURT |
| 8 | Number of events | NUMPHURT |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| | EVENT #1 | |
| 9 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | HURTPET |
| 10-11 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = hit, kick 3 = choke 4 = beat 5 = drowned 6 = shot 7 = killed (exact method not specified) 8 = broke leg(s) 9 = drove over pet 10 = broke neck (killed) 11 = killed, nailed to bedroom door 12 = gave EtOH, poison 13 = cut off tail 14 = put on fan, went around 15 = neglect 16 = throw rocks at 17 = put out in cold 18 = shaved in winter 19 = killed, thrown out of moving car | HURTDID |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Column</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| 12-13 | <p>WHY was pet hurt?</p> <p>1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed, excited, scratched 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = barking 7 = discipline 8 = woman talked back to man 9 = angry at woman (woman left, woman not paying enough attention to man) 10 = child did not feed 11 = tried to get in house 98 = humane killing after accident 99 = accident</p> | HURTWHY |
| 14 | <p>Action related to</p> <p>1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3</p> | HURCOER |
| 15 | <p>Severity</p> <p>1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function</p> | HURTSEV |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Column</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|---------------|---|-------------|
| | EVENT #2 | |
| 16 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | HURTPET2 |
| 17-18 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = hit, kick 3 = choke 4 = beat 5 = drowned 6 = shot 7 = killed (exact method not specified) 8 = broke leg(s) 9 = drove over pet 10 = broke neck (killed) 11 - 18 = see Event #1 19 = put fireworks on | HURTSSED2 |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Column</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| 19-20 | Why was pet hurt? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = barking 7 = discipline 8 = woman talked back to man 9 = angry at woman (woman left, woman talking back to man) 98 = humane killing after accident 99 = accident | HURTWHEY2 |
| 21 | Action related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | HURCOER2 |
| 22 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | HURTSEV2 |
| 23 | How did you feel after your pet was hurt? 1 = numb 2 = terrible 3 = mild 4 = didn't bother me 5 = other | HURTFEEL |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Column</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| 24 | Were you relieved that pet was hurt and not you? 1 = no 2 = yes | HURTREL |
| 25 | How close were you to the pet that was abused or threatened? 1 = not close at all 2 = liked - but, not close 3 = very close | HURTCLOS |
| 26 | Did anyone call to report incident? 1 = no 2 = yes | CALL |
| 27 | If yes, who? 1 = self 2 = neighbor 3 = mother | WHOCALLD |
| 28 | Who was called? 1 = police 2 = humane society/animal control 3 = other 4 = 1 & 2 | WHORESP |
| 29 | What was their response? 1 = took report over phone 2 = came out & investigated 3 = took animal away 4 = fine and community service 5 = nothing | RESPONSE |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 30 | Have you ever hurt or killed one of your pets? 1 = no 2 = yes Describe incident | UHURT |
| 31 | Number of incidents EVENT #1 | NUMUHURT |
| 32 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | UHURTPET |
| 33-34 | What did you do? 1 = spanked, mild punishment 2 = swung pet by tail 3 = severe punishment (throw,kick) 4 = kill 98 = hit with car (accident) 99 = fishing, hunting | YOUDO |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 35-36 | Why did you hurt the pet? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = young 6 = accident 7 = sick | UHURTWBY |
| 37 | Action related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | UANCOER |
| 38 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | UHURTSEV |
| EVENT #2 | | |
| 39 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | UHURTP2 |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 40-41 | What did you do? 1 = spanked, mild punishment 2 = swung pet by tail 3 = severe punishment (throw,kick) 4 = kill 5 = starved 6 = set on fire 98 = hit with car (accident) 99 = fishing, hunting | YOUDO2 |
| 42-43 | Why did you hurt the pet? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = young 6 = accident | UHURTWY2 |
| 44 | Action related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | UANCOER2 |
| 45 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | UHURTSV2 |

CODEBOOK
Mother/Child

Mother/child - WITH CHILD IN STUDY

| <u>Columns</u> <u>Name</u> | <u>Description</u> | |
|-------------------------------|--|----------|
| | WHAT HAPPENED TO PET - CHILD IN STUDY (Starts with ? #23 on mother with child version) | |
| 46 | Does the child who will be completing the questionnaire help care for your pets? 1 = No 2 = Yes | CHCARE |
| 47-48 | If yes, describe 1 = feed, buy food 2 = walk, put out, clean up after 3 = play, groom, bathe, pet 4 = 1 & 2 5 = 1 & 3 6 = 1,2, & 3 7 = take to vet 8 = help bury 9 = care for (any #1-8 answer) PLUS love | CHDESCAR |
| 49 | Has the child in the study ever <u>observed</u> pet abuse in the home? 1 = No 2 = Yes | |
| CHOBS | 3 = don't know | |
| 50 | Has the child in the study ever hurt or killed a pet? 1 = no 2 = yes 3 = don't know | CHSTHURT |

CODEBOOK
Mother/Child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| | If yes, describe: | |
| 51 | Number of incidents | NUMCHST |
| | EVENT #1 | |
| 52 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | CHURPET |
| 53-54 | What did the child do? 1 = throw 2 = kick, hit 3 = pull tail, tease 4 = restrain 5 = broke leg 6 = excess chlorox in fish tank 7 = suffocated | CHHURDON |
| 55-56 | Why did the child hurt the pet? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 99 = accident | CHHURWHY |

CODEBOOK
Mother/Child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 57 | Action related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | CHANCOER |
| 58 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | CHHURSEV |
| EVENT #2 | | |
| 59 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | CHURPET2 |
| 60-61 | What did the child do? 1 = throw 2 = kick, hit 3 = pull tail, tease 4 = restrain | CHURDON2 |

CODEBOOK
 Mother/Child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 62-63 | Why did the child hurt the pet? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 99 = accident | CHURWHY2 |
| 64 | Action related to: 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | CHANCOR2 |
| 65 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | CHURSEV2 |
| 66-67 | How long ago did this occur? (in years) Code as 1 if < 12 months | CHHURREC |
| 68 | Sex of child 1 = boy 2 = girl | CHGENDER |
| 69-70 | Age of child when this was done | CHAGE |
| 71 | What was done at time of incident? 1 = nothing 2 = reprimanded 3 = authorities called 4 = nothing, child very upset w/self | CHINCID |

CODEBOOK
Mother/Child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 72 | Frequency partner hurt the pet: 1 = not clear from description 2 = one time only 3 = multiple times | FREQPHUR |
| 73 | Frequency child hurt the pet: 1 = not clear from description 2 = one time only 3 = multiple times | FREQCHHU |

CODEBOOK
Mother/Child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | Card 3 | CARD3 |
| 2-4 | Code # | CODE3 |
| 5 | Site 0 = SLC 1 = Logan 2 = Brigham City 3 = Ogden 4 = Provo | SITE3 |
| 6 | Group 1 = experimental 2 = control | GRP3 |

START WITH ?#27 ON MOTHER/CHILD VERSION; #23 on woman w/o child

| | | |
|---|---|----------|
| 7 | Do other children help care for you pets? 1 = no 2 = yes | OTHCHCAR |
| 8 | Describe the type of care given 1 = feed, buy food 2 = walk, put out, clean up after 3 = play, groom, bathe, pet 4 = 1 & 2 5 = 1 & 3 6 = 1,2, & 3 7 = take to vet 8 = help bury 9 = care for (any #1-8 answer) PLUS love | OTHTYCAR |

CODEBOOK
Mother/Child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 9 | Have any of your other children <u>observed</u> pet abuse in the home? 1 = no 2 = yes 3 = not sure | OTHCHOBS |
| 10 | Have any of your other children ever hurt or killed one of your pets? 1 = no 2 = yes 3 = not sure | OTCHHURT |
| | If yes, please describe in detail: | |
| 11 | Number of incidents | OTCHNUM |
| | EVENT #1 | |
| 12 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | OTCHPET |

CODEBOOK
Mother/Child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Names</u> |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| 13-14 | <p>What was done</p> <p>1 = throw 2 = kick, hit 3 = pull tail, tease 4 = restrain 5 = shut door on</p> | OTCHDON |
| 15-16 | <p>Why was pet hurt?</p> <p>1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = parents fighting 6 = child mad 99 = accident</p> | OTCHWHY |
| 17 | <p>Incident related to</p> <p>1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3</p> | OTCHANCR |
| 18 | <p>Severity of incident</p> <p>1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function</p> | OTHCHSEV |

CODEBOOK
Mother/Child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| EVENT #2 | | |
| 19 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | OTCHPET2 |
| 20-21 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = kick, hit 3 = pull tail, tease 4 = restrain 5 = shut door on 6 = smother | OTCHDON2 |
| 22-23 | Why was pet hurt? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 99 = accident | OTCHWHY2 |
| 24 | Incident related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | OTCHANC2 |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Names</u> |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| 25 | Severity of incident 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | OTHCHSV2 |
| 26-27 | How long ago did this occur? Code as 1 for <= 12 months | OTCHWHN |
| 28 | Gender of child 1 = boy 2 = girl | OTCHSEX |
| 29-30 | Age of child when this happened | OTCHAGE |
| 31 | What was done at the time of the incident? 1 = nothing 2 = child was reprimanded 3 = authorities were called | OTCHINC |
| 32 | Did concern over you pet's welfare keep you from coming to this shelter sooner than now? 1 = no 2 = yes | CONCERN |
| 33 | Please explain... 1 = made arrangements for pets safety 2 = did not want to leave pet to be hurt or killed 3 = did not leave until pet died 4 = did not want to leave pet | EXPLCONC |

CODEBOOK
Mother/Child

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Names</u> |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| 34 | <p>During time with partner, has there been a <u>change</u> in willingness to use violence toward your or children</p> <p>1 = no - never violent 2 = no - always violent 3 = yes - less violent 4 = yes - more violent</p> | 2UCHANGE |
| 35 | <p>During time with partner, has there been a <u>change</u> in willingness to use violent toward pet?</p> <p>1 = no - never violent 2 = no - always violent 3 = yes - less violent 4 = yes - more violent</p> | PETCHANG |
| 36 | <p>Are there other pet-related issues you would like to describe?</p> <p>1 = no 2 = yes</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">If yes, please describe in detail:</p> | RELPETIS |
| 37 | <p>Number of events</p> <p>EVENT #1</p> | NUMPREV |
| 38 | <p>Type of animal</p> <p>1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified</p> | PETRELTY |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Names</u> |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| 39-40 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = kick 3 = hit 4 = starved 5 = killed 6 = left out in cold 7 = name calling 8 = threw rocks at, tried to hit with car 9 = tried to initiate dog fight 10 = chased with snake 11 = forced wife to have sex with dog 12 = poisoned 13 = threaten to drop from 4th floor 99 = hunting | PETRELDN |
| 41-42 | Why was pet hurt? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = barking 7 = discipline 8 = woman talked back to man 9 = angry at woman (woman left, woman talking back to man) 10 = stray 98 = humane killing after accident 99 = accident | PETRELWY |
| 43 | Action related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | PETRELAC |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 44 | Severity of incident 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | PETRELSE |
| EVENT #2 | | |
| 45 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | PETRLTY2 |
| 46-47 | What was done 1 = throw 10 = chased with snake 2 = kick 3 = hit 4 = starved 5 = killed 6 = left out in cold 7 = name calling 8 = threw rocks at, tried to hit with car 9 = tried to initiate dog fight 10 = try to drive over dead cats 99 = hunting | PETRLDN2 |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 48-49 | Why was pet hurt? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = barking 7 = discipline 8 = woman talked back to man 9 = angry at woman (woman left, woman talking back to man) 98 = humane killing after accident 99 = accident | PETRLWY2 |
| 50 | Incident related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | PETRLAC2 |
| 51 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | PETRLSE2 |
| 52 | Statement indicating that the respondent has a kindly, or caring attitude toward animals (code as 1) | KIND |

275
Department of Psychology
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84302

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 53 | Frequency other child (not in the study) hurt pet: 1 = not clear from description 2 = one time only 3 = multiple times | FREQOTHC |
| 54 | 7 = Herald Journal 8 = Hyrum Thriftway 9 = University board | |

CODEBOOK
Conflict Tactics Scale - self report

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | Card 4 | CARD4 |
| 2-4 | Code # | CODE4 |
| 5 | Site 0 = SLC 1 = Logan 2 = Brigham City 3 = Ogden 4 = Provo | SITE4 |
| 6 | Group 1 = experimental 2 = control | GRP4 |
| RATE YOURSELF | | |
| | <u>In past year</u> 1 = once 2 = twice 3 = 3-5 times 4 = 6-10 times 5 = 11-20 times 6 = > 20 times 0 = never | |
| | <u>Has it ever happened to you?</u> 1 = no 2 = yes | |
| 7 | Discussed calmly - frequency | DISCUSFR |
| 8 | Discussed calmly - ever | DISCUSEV |
| 9 | Got info - frequency | INFOFR |
| 10 | Got info - ever | INFOEV |
| 11 | Outside help - frequency | OUTHLPFR |
| 12 | Outside help - ever | OUTHLPEV |

CODEBOOK
Conflict Tactics Scale - self report

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 13 | Insulted or swore - frequency | INSULFR |
| 14 | Insulted or swore - ever | INSULEV |
| 15 | Sulked or refused to talk - freq. | SULKFR |
| 16 | Sulked or refused to talk - ever | SULKEV |
| 17 | Stomped out - frequency | STOMPFR |
| 18 | Stomped out - ever | STOMPEV |
| 19 | Cried - frequency | CRYFR |
| 20 | Cried - ever | CRYEV |
| 21 | Did or said something to spite-freq | SPITEFR |
| 22 | Did or said something to spite-ever | SPITEEV |
| 23 | Threatened to hit or throw-freq | THHITFR |
| 24 | Threatened to hit or throw - ever | THHITEV |
| 25 | Threw,smashed,hit,kicked - frequency | THREWFR |
| 26 | Threw,smashed,hit,kicked - ever | THREWEV |
| 27 | Threw something <u>at</u> him - frequency | THRATFR |
| 28 | Threw something <u>at</u> him - ever | THRATEV |
| 29 | Pushed, grabbed, or shoved - freq | PUSHFR |
| 30 | Pushed, grabbed, or shoved - ever | PUSHEV |
| 31 | Slapped or spanked - frequency | SLAPFR |

CODEBOOK
Conflict Tactics Scale

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 32 | Slapped or spanked - ever | SLAPEV |
| 33 | Kicked,bit,hit with fist - freq | FISTFR |
| 34 | Kicked,bit,hit with fist - ever | FISTEV |
| 35 | Hit with something - frequency | SOMEFR |
| 36 | Hit with something - ever | SOMEEV |
| 37 | Beat up - frequency | BEATFR |
| 38 | Beat up - ever | BEATEV |
| 39 | Burned or scalded - frequency | BURNFR |
| 40 | Burned or scalded - ever | BURNEV |
| 41 | Threatened w/knife or gun - freq | THGUNFR |
| 42 | Threatened w/knife or gun - ever | THGUNEV |
| 43 | Used a knife or gun - frequency | GUNFR |
| 44 | Used a knife or gun - ever | GUNEV |

CODEBOOK
Conflict Tactics Scale - Your partner

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | Card 5 | CARD5 |
| 2-4 | Code # | CODE5 |
| 5 | Site 0 = SLC 1 = Logan 2 = Brigham City 3 = Ogden 4 = Provo | SITE5 |
| 6 | Group 1 = experimental 2 = control | GRP5 |

YOUR PARTNER

In past year

- 1 = once
- 2 = twice
- 3 = 3-5 times
- 4 = 6-10 times
- 5 = 11-20 times
- 6 = > 20 times
- 0 = never

Has it ever happened to you?

- 1 = no
- 2 = yes

| | | |
|----|------------------------------|----------|
| 7 | Discussed calmly - frequency | DISFRPA |
| 8 | Discussed calmly - ever | DISEVPA |
| 9 | Got info - frequency | INFOFRPA |
| 10 | Got info - ever | INFOEVPA |

CODEBOOK
Conflict Tactics Scale - Your partner

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 11 | Outside help - frequency | OHLPFRPA |
| 12 | Outside help - ever | OHLPEVPA |
| 13 | Insulted or swore - frequency | INSLFRPA |
| 14 | Insulted or swore - ever | INSLEVPA |
| 15 | Sulked or refused to talk - freq. | SULKFRPA |
| 16 | Sulked or refused to talk - ever | SULKEVPA |
| 17 | Stomped out - frequency | STMPFRPA |
| 18 | Stomped out - ever | STMPEVPA |
| 19 | Cried - frequency | CRYFRPA |
| 20 | Cried - ever | CRYEVPA |
| 21 | Did or said something to spite-freq | SPTFRPA |
| 22 | Did or said something to spite-ever | SPTEVPA |
| 23 | Threatened to hit or throw - freq | THTFRPA |
| 24 | Threatened to hit or throw - ever | THTEVPA |
| 25 | Threw,smashed,hit,kicked - freq | THRFRPA |
| 26 | Threw,smashed,hit,kicked - ever | THREVPA |
| 27 | Threw something <u>at</u> him - freq | ATFRPA |
| 28 | Threw something <u>at</u> him - ever | ATEVPA |
| 29 | Pushed, grabbed, or shoved - freq | PSHFRPA |

CODEBOOK

Conflict Tactics Scale - your partner

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|
| 30 | Pushed, grabbed, or shoved - ever | PSHEVPA |
| 31 | Slapped or spanked - frequency | SLPFRPA |
| 32 | Slapped or spanked - ever | SLPEVPA |
| 33 | Kicked,bit,hit with fist - freq | FSTFRPA |
| 34 | Kicked,bit,hit with fist - ever | FSTEVPA |
| 35 | Hit with something - frequency | SOMFRPA |
| 36 | Hit with something - ever | SOMEVPA |
| 37 | Beat up - frequency | BETFRPA |
| 38 | Beat up - ever | BETEVPA |
| 39 | Burned or scalded - frequency | BURNFRPA |
| 40 | Burned or scalded - ever | BURNEVPA |
| 41 | Threatened w/knife or gun - freq | TGUNFRPA |
| 42 | Threatened w/knife or gun - ever | TGUNVPA |
| 43 | Used a knife or gun - frequency | GUNFRPA |
| 44 | Used a knife or gun - ever | GUNEVPA |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observation & Experience w/Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | Card 6 | CARD6 |
| 2-4 | Code # | CODE6 |
| 5 | Site 0 = SLC 1 = Logan 2 = Brigham City 3 = Ogden 4 = Provo | SITE6 |

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

| | | |
|-------|--|----------|
| 6-7 | Age (in years) | AGE6 |
| 8 | Gender 1 = boy 2 = girl | GENDER6 |
| 9-10 | Grade 0 = kindergarten 1 = first grade - etc... | GRADE6 |
| 11-12 | Number of brothers and sisters (Total - brothers + sisters) | BROSIS |
| 13 | Do you NOW have a pet? 1 = no 2 = yes | COEPETNW |
| | If yes, kind of pet | |
| 14 | dog (#) | KINDDOG |
| 15 | cat (#) | KINDCAT |
| 16 | bird (#) | KINDBIRD |
| 17 | Other (#) | KINDOTHR |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observation & Experience
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 18 | Have you had a pet w/in last 12 months? 1 = no 2 = yes | PET12MO |
| | If yes, kind of pet | |
| 19 | dog (#) | KINDDOGP |
| 20 | cat (#) | KINDCATP |
| 21 | bird (#) | KINDBRDP |
| 22 | other (#) | KINDOTHP |
| 23 | Have you ever SEEN or HEARD one of your pets hurt? 1 = no 2 = yes 3 = not sure | SEENHURT |
| | If yes, please describe | |
| 24 | Number of events | NUMEVOBS |
| | EVENT #1 | |
| 25 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | COEPSETP |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observation & Experience
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 26-27 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = kick 3 = hit 4 = hit by motor vehicle-accident 5 = strangle 6 = put to sleep 7 = poisoned 8 = something thrown at pet 9 = not sure 10 = cat ate birds 11 = left in cold 12 = shot 13 = starved 14 = stepped on | COEPDONE |
| 28-29 | Why was pet hurt? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed, into trash, sniffed 5 = mother threatened to leave 99 = accident | COEPWHY |
| 30 | Incident related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | COEANCOE |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observation & Experience
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 31 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort; strangle; step on 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | COEPSEV |
| EVENT #2 | | |
| 32 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | COEPSTP2 |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observation and Experience
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 33-34 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = kick 3 = hit 4 = hit by motor vehicle-accident 5 = strangle 6 = put to sleep 7 = poisoned 8 = something thrown at pet 9 = not sure 10 = cat ate birds 11 = left in cold 12 = shot 13 = starved 14 = stepped on | COEPDO2E |
| 35-36 | Why was pet hurt? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed, into trash, sniffed 5 = mother threatened to leave 99 = accident | COEPWHY2 |
| 37 | Incident related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | COEANCO2 |

CODEBOOK
 Children's Observation and Experience
 With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 38 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | COEPSEV2 |
| 39-40 | Who hurt or killed your pet? 1 = father 2 = stepfather 3 = mother 4 = brother 5 = sister 6 = mother's boyfriend 7 = don't know 8 = uncle 9 = aunt 10 = neighbor 11 = dog catcher 12 = police officer | WHOHURT |
| 41 | How did you feel when your pet was hurt or killed? 1 = very upset 2 = sort of upset 3 = not upset at all 4 = not sure | CHFEEL |
| 42 | Has anyone ever said that they would hurt or kill one of your pets but not do it? 1 = no 2 = yes | THRTCP |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observation and Experience
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| | If yes, please describe | |
| 43 | Number of events | COENUMTH |
| | EVENT #1 | |
| 44 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | PETTHTY |
| 45-46 | What was threatened 1 = hurt (throw, kick, hit) 2 = kill/shoot 3 = hurt and kill 4 = get rid of 5 = abandon | PETTHDON |
| 47-48 | Why was pet threatened? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = killed bird 7 = to threaten mother 8 = to threaten child 9 = pet out of yard, pet in house 10 = did not like | PETTHWHY |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observations and Experiences
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 49 | Threat related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | COEANCTH |
| 50 | Severity 1 = minor, teasing 2 = threatens punishment of animal annoying 3 = threatens serious abuse 4 = threatens to kill | PETTHSEV |
| EVENT #2 | | |
| 51 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | PETTHTY2 |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observations and Experiences
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 52-53 | What was threatened 1 = hurt (throw, kick, hit) 2 = kill/shoot 3 = hurt and kill 4 = get rid of 5 = abandon 6 = starve | PETTHDN2 |
| 54-55 | Why was pet threatened? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed, barked 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = killed bird 7 = to threaten mother 8 = to threaten child 9 = pet out of yard | PETTHWY2 |
| 56 | Incident related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | COEANCT2 |
| 57 | Severity 1 = minor, teasing 2 = threatens punishment of animal annoying 3 = threatens serious abuse 4 = threatens to kill | PETTHSV2 |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observations and Experiences
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 58 | Have you ever taken care of a pet? 1 = no 2 = yes 3 = not sure | CAREPET |
| 59 | Have you ever hurt or killed one of your pets? 1 = no 2 = yes If yes, please describe | PETUHURT |
| 60 | Number of events EVENT #1 | COENUMUH |
| 61 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | PETUTYP |

CODEBOOK
 Children's Observations and Experiences
 With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 62-63 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = kick 3 = hit 4 = stepped on | PETUDON |
| 64-65 | Why was pet hurt or killed? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = barking 7 = discipline animal 8 = discipline child 99 = accident | PETUWHY |
| 66 | Threat related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | COEANCH |
| 67 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | PETUSEV |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| EVENT #2 | | |
| 68 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | PETUTYP2 |
| 69-70 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = kick 3 = hit 4 = stepped on | PETUDON2 |
| 71-72 | Why was pet hurt or killed 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = mother threatened to leave 6 = barking 7 = discipline animal 8 = discipline child 99 = accident | PETUWHY2 |
| 73 | Incident related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | COEANCH2 |

CODEBOOK

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 74 Severity | | PETUSEV2 |
| | 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful | |
| | 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort | |
| | 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort | |
| | 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observation & Experience w/Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | Card 7 | CARD7 |
| 2-4 | Code # | CODE7 |
| 5 | Site 0 = SLC 1 = Logan 2 = Brigham City 3 = Ogden 4 = Provo | SITE7 |
| 6 | Have you ever hurt or killed OTHER ANIMALS? 1 = no 2 = yes If yes, please describe | HURTOT |
| 7 | Number of events EVENT #1 | NUMOTHH |
| 8 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat, mice) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | TYPHRTOT |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observation & Experience w/Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| 9-10 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = kick 3 = hit 4 = shot 5 = mouse in trap | OTHDON |
| 11-12 | Why was pet hurt or killed? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = | OTHWHY |
| 13 | Incident related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | OTHANC |
| 14 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | OTHSEV |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observations and Experiences
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|---|-------------|
| | EVENT #2 | |
| 15 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | TYPHRTT2 |
| 16-17 | What was done 1 = throw 2 = kick 3 = hit 4 = shot | OTHDON2 |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observations and Experiences
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Names</u> |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| 18-19 | Why was pet hurt or killed? 1 = no reason given 2 = soiled carpet 3 = bit 4 = chewed 5 = | OTHWHY2 |
| 20 | Incident related to 1 = not specified or clear from description 2 = animal's action 3 = coercion 4 = both 2 & 3 | OTHANC2 |
| 21 | Severity 1 = minor teasing; nondestructive, nonpainful 2 = annoy, restrain, frighten; minimal discomfort 3 = broke leg; pain or discomfort 4 = killed animal, prolonged suffering, torture; permanent loss of function | OTHSEV2 |
| 22 | How did you feel after you hurt or killed an animal? 1 = very upset 2 = sort of upset 3 = not upset at all 4 = not sure | FEELOTH |
| 23 | Have you ever protected one of your pets from being hurt? 1 = no 2 = yes | PROTECT |

CODEBOOK
 Children's Observations and Experiences
 With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> If yes, please describe | <u>Names</u> |
|----------------|---|--------------|
| 24 | Type of animal 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil,rabbit guinea pig,rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | TYPProt |
| 25-26 | What was done 1 = said something 2 = blocked 3 = moved 4 = kept in room 5 = saved 6 = took to vet | TYPRoDON |
| 27-28 | Frequency - number of times you protected your pet (10 = many) | PROTFREQ |
| 29 | Did you ever have a favorite pet that you cared about a lot? 1 = no 2 = yes | FAVPET |

CODEBOOK
Children's Observations and Experiences
With Their Pets

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Names</u> |
|----------------|--|--------------|
| 30 | Kind of pet 1 = dog 2 = cat 3 = dog & cat 4 = bird 5 = small rodent (gerbil, rabbit guinea pig, rat) 6 = reptile 7 = fish 8 = horse 9 = other or not specified | KINDFAV |
| 31 | How would you like to see pets treated in your home? 1 = better 2 = same 3 = not as good | PETHOME |

CODEBOOK
Child Behavior Checklist

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | Card 8 | CARD8 |
| 2-4 | Code # | CODE8 |
| 5 | Site 0 = SLC 1 = Logan 2 = Brigham City 3 = Ogden 4 = Provo | SITE8 |
| 6 | Group 1 = experimental 2 = control | GRP8 |
| 7 | Gender 1 = boy 2 = girl | GENDER8 |
| 8-9 | Age (in years) | AGE8 |
| 10-11 | Activities T-score | ACTIVITY |
| 12-13 | Social T-score | SOCIAL |
| 14-15 | School T-score | SCHOOL |
| 16-17 | Withdrawn T-score | WITHDRAW |
| 18-19 | Somatic complaints T-score | SOMATIC |
| 20-21 | Anxious/depressed T-score | ANXDEP |
| 22-23 | Social problems T-score | SOCIALPR |
| 24-25 | Thought problems T-score | THOUGHT |
| 26-27 | Attention problems T-score | ATTENT |

CODEBOOK
Child Behavior Checklist

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| 28-29 | Delinquent problems T-score | DELINQ |
| 30-31 | Aggressive behavior T-score | AGGRESS |
| 32-33 | Sex problems T-score | SEXPROB |
| 34-35 | Total T-score | TOTALT |
| 36-37 | Internal T-score | INTERNAL |
| 38-39 | External T-score | EXTERNAL |
| | Other problems | |
| 40 | ActOppSex(5) | ACOPSEX |
| 41 | BM out (6) | BMOUT |
| 42 | CruelAnim (15) | CRUELAN |
| 43 | Harm self (18) | HARMSELF |
| 44 | Not eat (24) | NOTEAT |
| 45 | Eat non food (28) | EATNONFD |
| 46 | Fears (29) | FEARS |
| 47 | Fear School (30) | FEARSCHO |
| 48 | Accidents (36) | ACCIDENT |
| 49 | Bite nail (44) | BITENAIL |
| 50 | Nightmares (47) | NITEMARE |
| 51 | Constipation (48) | CONSTIP |

CODEBOOK
Child Behavior Checklist

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------|
| 52 | Overeat (53) | OVEREAT |
| 53 | Other Physical (56h) | OTHPHY |
| 54 | Pick skin (58) | PICKSKIN |
| 55 | Sex Prts P\$ (59) | SEXPS |
| 56 | Sex Prts M\$ (60) | SEXMS |
| 57 | Sex Probs (73) | SEXPS |
| 58 | Sleep less (76) | SLEEPLS |
| 59 | Sleep more (77) | SLEEPMOR |
| 60 | Smear BM (78) | SMEARBM |
| 61 | Speech Problems (79) | SPEECHPR |
| 62 | Stores up (83) | STORESUP |
| 63 | Talk suicide (91) | TALKSUIC |
| 64 | Sleep walk (92) | SLEPWALK |
| 65 | Thumb suck (98) | THUMSUCK |
| 66 | Too neat (99) | TOONEAT |
| 67 | Sleep Problems (100) | SLEPPROB |
| 68 | Wets self (107) | WETSELF |

CODEBOOK
Child Behavior Checklist

| <u>Columns</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Name</u> |
|----------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 69 | Wets bed (108) | WETBED |
| 70 | Whining (109) | WHINE |
| 71 | Wish opposite sex (110) | WHOPSEX |
| 72 | Other problems (113) | OTHPROB |

Appendix H:

Type of Pets

Dogs

The average number of dogs, both currently and in the past 12 months, was one for all groups except the NS-NC group, that reported owning an average of two dogs, both currently and in the past 12 months. The NS-NC group also had the largest range in number of dogs--one to nine (current ownership); one to six in past 12 months. Both groups with children, S-C and NS-C, reported owning one to three dogs currently and in the past 12 months. The S-NC group had one to five dogs currently and in the past 12 months.

Cats

The average number of cats was two for all groups except for NS-C (current ownership) and for S-NC (past 12 months), where it was one. The minimum number of cats for all groups was one. The largest range on number of cats was found in the S-C population, whose participants reported a range of from one to nine (for both current ownership and having a pet within the past 12 months). The S-NC and NS-NC groups both had a range of from one to five, currently and within the past 12 months. The NS-C group reported a range of from one to four for cat ownership both currently and over the past 12 months.

Birds

The average number of birds ranged from one to three. The S-C group reported an average of three birds currently owned and two birds within the past 12 months. The S-NC and NS-NC had an average of only one bird, currently and over the past 12 months. The NS-C group had an average of two birds, currently and within the past 12 months. The largest range in number of birds was found in the S-C group. They reported that within the past 12 months, and currently, they owned from one to six birds. The NS-C group had a range of from one to three birds, currently and within the past 12 months. The NS-NC group never had more than one bird. The S-NC group reported a range of from one to two birds for current ownership.

Other kinds

All groups reported an average of two other kinds of pets (rabbits, gerbils, fish, snakes, goats), both currently and in the past 12 months. The exception is the S-NC group that reported three currently. The minimum number was one for all groups. The range was one to four for all groups except the S-NC group, that reported a range of from one to nine for current ownership, and the NS-C group that had five other types of pets during the past 12 months.

Popularity

The most popular pet, overall, was the dog. Participants in the comparison groups owned dogs more frequently than those in the shelter populations. There were

15 (current ownership) to 20 (past twelve months) fewer cats than dogs across all groups. Bird ownership was low, ranging from 6.6% to 16.1%. The highest percentage of bird ownership was in the two shelter groups for the past 12 months. Other kinds of pets included rabbits, gerbils, fish, and snakes. Ownership under this classification remained around 27% for all groups, current and past. The exception to this was the two shelter groups, where a much smaller percentage (slightly under 13%) reported owning rabbits, gerbils, fish, or snakes. A one-way analysis of variance was performed, with a post-hoc Scheffe' procedure, revealing that the only significant (at the .05 level) difference in pet ownership was found in Provo for birds (see Tables 87 and 88).

Table 87

Average Number, Range, and Percentage of Pets: Current Ownership

| Pet | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|--------------|------|------|------|-------|
| Dog | | | | |
| Average | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Range | 1-3 | 1-5 | 1-3 | 1-9 |
| Percent | 41.1 | 45.1 | 66.7 | 53.3 |
| Cat | | | | |
| Average | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Range | 1-9 | 1-5 | 1-4 | 1-5 |
| Percent | 33.4 | 32.2 | 46.7 | 33.3 |
| Bird | | | | |
| Average | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Range | 1-6 | 1-2 | 1-3 | 0 |
| Percent | 7.6 | 11.3 | 6.6 | 6.7 |
| Other | | | | |
| Average | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Range | 1-4 | 1-9 | 1-4 | 1-4 |
| Percent | 12.9 | 12.8 | 33.4 | 23.3 |

Table 88

Average Number, Range, and Percentage of Pets: Past 12 Months

| Pet | S-C | S-NC | NS-C | NS-NC |
|---------|------|------|------|-------|
| Dog | | | | |
| Average | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Range | 1-3 | 1-5 | 1-3 | 1-6 |
| Percent | 61.6 | 66.1 | 73.3 | 63.3 |
| Cat | | | | |
| Average | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Range | 1-9 | 1-5 | 1-4 | 1-5 |
| Percent | 56.5 | 41.9 | 46.6 | 40.0 |
| Bird | | | | |
| Average | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| Range | 1-6 | 0 | 1-3 | 0 |
| Percent | 12.9 | 16.1 | 6.6 | 6.7 |
| Other | | | | |
| Average | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Range | 1-4 | 1-4 | 1-5 | 1-4 |
| Percent | 28.2 | 20.9 | 30.0 | 30.0 |

Appendix I

Transcript of Threats

| <u>ID #</u> | <u>Threats</u> |
|-------------|---|
| 005 | Threatened to kick dog |
| 014 | He would lock himself in bathroom with cat and threaten him. |
| 016 | Happens when arguing. Puppy jumps up and partner says "Get the f... out. I'll kill you". Tells partner that she loves the dog more than him and should kill dog. |
| 019 | If he was in good mood cats could lay by him and he would play with them. But, if in bad mood he would say get cats away or I will kill them. |
| 032 | Had birds on a perch - brought in cats and said birds would have to defend for themselves. Threatened her with his pet snake. Let snake loose (rattle snakes). |
| 043 | He says he would put the animals to sleep. When she left him, if she would not take them with her. |
| 053 | Told children, if their mother left him, the pets would be dead when they returned. |

- 081 If you don't get rid of snake, I will kill it
- 083 Threatened to kill every one of them - When he is
drunk.
- 085 Cussing and calling animal names. Threatens to
hurt when animals are around and especially cross
in front of him.
- 103 Threaten to get rid of the cat. Never told her
how he would if by harm or by giving the cat away.
- 104 Daughter's dog. The dog bit the little girl. The
husband grab the dog by the neck - jerking it around
screaming he was going to kill the dog.
- 108 Threatened cats life for killing the bird.
- 111 He threatened to beat him because he went to the
restroom in the living room.
- 116 My friends told me he would shoot the dogs if I
didn't come back.
- 117 Said he would pop bird's neck.
- 118 Told children, if they and mother left him, the
pets would be dead when they returned.
- 130 He threatened to skin her cat and hang it outside
her door. He threatened to wring the bird's neck
and stuff it.

- 404 Had a whole bunch of cats and he was threatening
to kill it.
- 457 Threatened to torture, Stranger (her dog).
- 502 "Get the cats out of here or I'm gonna kill it".
- 505 He said he was going to kick the cat if it didn't
stop biting him.
- 506 He doesn't like cats but he accepts her. He gets
incredibly upset when she poops in the house.
Says that the cat doesn't have a family - to hurt
6 year old son. Scares the cat.
- 507 He gets sick of them and instead of having them he
just wants to kill them - "I'm going to kill that
dog".
- 508 He threatened to kill one puppy and the guinea
pig.
- 552 One time the pit bull bit him and threatened to
kill it.
- 553 Threatened the cat for no reason. Threatened to
throw it off the roof of the house or sick the dog
on it.
- 558 He told my sister to keep the cats out of his way
or he would run over it.

- 560 He would take them away and she never saw them
again.
- 623 She didn't want dog, daughter died, then she
bought dog for husband. Husband directed anger at
the dog by yelling at it. She thinks it is because he was hurt
and confused over death of daughter.
- 636 Husband took dogs for a walk, let them run in
empty field without leash. Dogs took off and wouldn't come back.
He went home and locked them out of the house. Flys off
the handle and gets angry with dogs when they won't obey.
It was only like this for one month. He is better now. She
said she told him to pull it together and be nicer. Mother
an alcoholic - rough month for husband. Took it out on
animals by yelling at them, pushing them, leaving them
outside.
- 639 Raised on farm so if dogs became a problem they'd
take them out and shoot them. If she couldn't find the dog
a home he said they'd kill him. She said the dog shouldn't
have to suffer for their decision to move (they couldn't keep him).
- 640 Partner tripped over leash of cat and almost fell
into a campfire. Said if he had fallen in the fire he would
have killed the cat. She put cat in pickup truck.

646 Dog is hyper and "spazzes" all over, accidently knocked
daughter over. Husband mad threatens to get rid of her or
shoot her.

654 If cat didn't go in the litter box, he'd threaten
(teasingly) to get rid of cat - take it to woods and drop it
off.

Appendix J:

Transcript of Abuse

| <u>ID #</u> | <u>Abuse</u> |
|-------------|---|
| 013 | He would kick and throw the cat whenever he saw it in the house. |
| 014 | Shot cat with BB gun and he had to be put to sleep. He would kick dogs and be cruel to all pets. |
| 016 | Kicked them and thrown them across room. |
| 019 | Kicked male cat after he tripped and threw the cats across the room. |
| 032 | Killed the cats. Broke their necks in front of the family just to be cruel. |
| 033 | Tossed kitten across room and yard. Hurlled cat at her and their son. |
| 034 | Throw outside. |
| 041 | Gave bird alcohol |
| 042 | Slapped once. |
| 043 | He refused to take her cat to the vet. When the cat was ran over by a car. He kicked her German Shepherd in the ribs. |
| 044 | The pet was suffering, so her husband killed it. |

- 080 When the dog had bowel movement on the floor he
grabbed her by the top of the head and you could
see the white of her eyes. He hits her on the head. He
used to have his own dog and would kick him and throw him
against the wall.
- 085 Killed one of her little dogs while she was not at
home then acted sly about it. Hung the dog on a
nail on the bedroom door to get at her and because
he said the dog was in the way.
- 101 He has killed cats that have been run over only to
put them out of their misery - he shot them.
- 103 Hits the dog
- 104 He hurt the dog who bit the girl. He choked the
dog. He kicked her another time because of
barking. Two birds died suddenly while I was away. He
also trains by choking dogs to make them obey.
- 110 Would kick dog in head and side to discipline the
dog. Also punched it in the head.
- 116 He hit my dog once and was bitten.
- 117 Kick, throw, drop kick the dog.
- 128 He has kicked a puppy - breaking his pelvis bones.

- 130 Her cat ended up missing. She found the cat in
the dumpster with its head bashed in.
- 140 He was always hitting them. He has kicked the cat
down the stairs.
- 142 He killed her kitten, by throwing the cat out of
the car on the highway.
- 144 He took one cats and threw her across the room.
- 151 Broke puppy's front paw because she was paying
more attention to the puppy than to him.
Tormented dogs - pinched them. Purposely clip
dog's nails so short dog would limp - he'd laugh.
Broke neck and killed her puppy because puppy peed
on the floor. Drowned both cats - would hold them
under and bring them back up. Did this repeatedly
until they both drowned.
- 153 Threw the cat.
- 202 He kicked a dog and broke its jaw. The same dog
he raised over his head and threw to the ground
and broke it's front leg. He kicked another dog
in the stomach and it died. He hit dogs with a
miniature baseball ball too many times to count.

- 301 Beat up my cat. Killed one of his dogs in front
of me and my daughter. Shot to death two of my
puppies. Hurt my cats ribs and her head. Tried to choke
her. Choked my cat.
- 304 Kicked the dog and beat her severly, beat in the
head, stomach, all over.
- 306 He would grab it by the tail and swing it, trying
to get rid of it. He kicked it out the door and
punch it. When it was purring while her partner
was sleeping, he would pick it up by the ears and throw it.
- 307 He kicked the cat. Would blame everything on the
cat. Chased it around the house and teasing it.
- 308 Dogs got out of the yard, he chased them down with
car and tried to run them over. When dogs have
messed in the house he tried to kick them.
Exposed them to subzero degree weather without
protection. Dog was trying to get in the house
and he slammed the door on her foot twice,
crushing the bones in her foot.
- 309 He would kick the cat.

- 351 He was kicked into a door's edge, and picked up by
his neck, off of the floor, and almost choked, just because
I was talking back, and cared more about the cat than my
boyfriend.
- 352 Used to punch my dog, kick my dog.
- 354 When pet was excited he would kick her in the
stomach or face. The dog ran into traffic and he
said he wanted to kill her while he was dragging
her back home on a leash.
- 359 Threw the dog down the stairs to get out of my
clients way, because he was aggitated at client.
(only incident).
- 360 He has kicked the dog and thrown rocks at him.
Leave it out in the cold snow.
- 361 Kicked the dogs and threw a kitten against a tree
and busted its neck and killed it, because it
wouldn't stop following her (wild)! Suspect that
he had something to do with her older cat disappearing.

- 404 He tried to kill neighbors dog by throwing stones.
The dog messed in the house and he threw a rock at its head.
The vet would not give it back because of the damage. He ran over the
dog in the street. He caught a mouse and crushed it in his hands.
Daughter's reported sexual abuse and then the cat
disappeared. He accused the daughter of killing
it. He used to flick the birds in their cages with his fingers.
In front of the children he drowned the kittens in the kitchen sink,
because they would not feed the cats. (Note that the child included in
the study from this family did not want to talk about what happened to
the pets).
- 501 Gets mad and throws them in the swimming pool.
- 503 Does neglect, doesn't care for them much.
- 504 Kicked violently if got in his way or will hit with things, clubs, wood.
- 506 Smacked and rubbed her nose in the poop.
- 507 He has grabbed the dog and smacked his head in the
ground, kicked him, and grabbed his jaw until the
dog cried.

- 508 I believe he poisoned one of my dogs and the vet saved it, but it disappeared later. He poisoned the guinea pig. He severely abused the other puppy choked, hit, punched.
- 509 The baby grabbed the dog and the dog nipped her and her husband hit him (the dog).
- 552 Seven or eight years ago he was mad at the cat for scratching the couch. He cut off the cats tail and continued to torture it until the cat ran away into a field and died.
- 553 He would punch and kick the dog for no reason.
- 554 Kicked across room because poohed on bed.
- 555 Cat mostly, mean to it - inside cat but would try to go outside, chase after it, slapped it. Dog was big but only slapped it.
- 556 Grabs car, throws off table/across room into wall, yells at it.
- 558 He made it a game to shoot and maim birds. He shaved the cats in the winter, he would kick his dog. He strapped fireworks to cats, would swing cats by their tail - it was a game to him.

560 He punched it and it fell and hurt its spinal cord.
he put it out of its misery as soon as
possible.

Then

654 Shot their dog who "ate" their cat. Mutual
decision between husband and wife. "Nobody
enjoyed it".

Appendix K:
Nonsignificant Findings

Table 89

One-Way Analysis of Variance: Severity of Threat by Group

| Source | <u>df</u> | Mean squares | <u>F</u> Ratio | Sig of <u>F</u> | η^2 |
|----------------|-----------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|----------|
| Between groups | 2 | .582 | .902 | .412 | .032 |
| Within groups | 54 | .645 | -- | -- | -- |

Table 90

Severity of Abuse by Groups (S-C & S-NC): t Test

| Group | Mean (SD) | t | p | ES |
|----------------|------------|-------|------|-----|
| Group 1 (S-C) | 2.85 (.86) | -1.37 | .176 | .41 |
| Group 2 (S-NC) | 3.14 (.71) | -- | -- | -- |

Appendix L:

Transcript of Pet-Related Items

| <u>ID #</u> | <u>Pet Related Items</u> |
|-------------|---|
| 001 | It is wrong that people abuse animals. When I got my dog she had three broken ribs and her face was swollen. |
| 013 | She feels sorry for stray animals and when she and daughter could they would feed stray animals. |
| 018 | He is a pet lover. If anyone hurts his pet he would come down on them. |
| 019 | He chased her with a snake (she was really scared). Almost jumped over the cliff to get away from snake until son came and took the snake away. |
| 031 | First husband used to hit dog a lot. Hit the dog with his fist on the dogs head. He was pretty mean to the dog. |
| 032 | When they go camping, he would get slingshot or BB gun and hit squirrels. He thought it was funny. |
| 033 | Just recently been so violent with pets. |
| 041 | Let the dog run away because of his irresponsibility - took dog off the leash. |

- 042 Their dog always got between children when partner
was yelling or got aggressive.
- 081 He treats strays mean, like throws stuff at them.
- 083 Forced wife to have sex with their dog.
- 084 He would get mad if anything would happen to the
dog. He was very protective. He doesn't like cats. Used
to feed cats and then refused to feed them and would call them names.
He had threatened to kill them. After returning home, she found only
three (of original 50) cats around.
- 085 Had a horse but didn't tell partner because she
was afraid partner would kill horse.
- 101 Gang of strays around the neighborhood. Partner
had a bad attitude about cats, calling them infested
mutants, etc. One week ago, he came at client, got out of
car and kicked the neighbor's dog viciously. The dog limped
away and limped for three days.
- 102 Raised that dog was more important than person.
- 103 When my partner was a boy, his father had no
respect for life and taught his son the "fun" of
killing animals. They did a lot of hunting together and so my partner
was raised to view animals as less than equal creatures.

- 104 I believe should have medicine for pain prevention
before surgery of any kind for any reason.
- 107 He is really good with animals, but not so good
with people.
- 109 Back home I would adopt any stray cats that needed
a home. Dogs as well.
- 110 When I was a child, I would give burials to any
animal I observed to be dead (bugs, lizzards,
etc...). I also provided them with headstones made
of sticks.
- 117 Strays...he tries to run over in his car. He hates cats and thinks they
are worthless. Runs cats and dogs out of yard.
- 119 Treats pets and likes better than wife. If stray
kittens would stay at their residence he would drown them rather than
leave at a shelter. He would do it only if kittens not dogs.
- 141 He would take their kitten and hold him outside
their fourth story window and threaten to drop
him. Her seven year old boy would beg him not to
hurt the kitten. He also would kick the bird cage during
their fights.
- 142 He has set a cat on fire. He has killed about three or four other
animals in the past.

- 151 Threw rocks at neighbor's animals.
- 154 There is extreme difficulty finding housing that
will allow pets. It is not fair.
- 251 She found dog in a coma after leaving partner one
time. He was starving. He was at the Vet for a
week.
- 302 Female stray cat is abused the most.
- 307 When partner's mother comes around he gets rid of
the pets for his mother.
- 309 He was a duck hunter
- 351 We had stray cats living under our porch and he
wouldn't let me call animal control, he said "let them
freeze".
- 352 He hit my son's horse on the head with a stick.
He killed my rabbit. He killed a few cats and birds and pet
rats when he was younger.
- 357 He will go out of his way to run over a cat. When
he had a dog (which he treated better than the
family), he would sick the dog on any cat.
- 361 Neighbor had farm animals and a turkey was in the
road and her mother hit it to teach the lady to
keep her animals on her property.

- 404 When a kid he used to treat the farm animals
(chickens) badly throwing rocks and shooting at
them.
- 457 I told him I wanted to leave with only my clothes
and my animal. He told me that I cared about that
damn animal than I cared about him. And, sometimes I did
because animals give unconditional love and husbands do
not.
- 504 Very indifferent to their suffering.
- 505 He would only abuse the pets of the children who
weren't his. He wouldn't hurt his own son's pets.
- 508 She doesn't know of any, but she thinks he has a
history of abusing animals.
- 551 He threatened someone's housebird. He threatened
to throw the bird against the wall and hit it
because the bird did not want to be picked up, and
when he picked it up it bit him. He wanted to force the
bird to be picked up and it didn't want to.
- 552 He will try to run over wild animals (rabbits, etc.) if they
are on the road and he is driving.
- 554 Younger, partner was really mean to animals.

- 555 Told me he would shoot the strays that were
around. He said "that's the humane way to be".
- 556 He chased strays away but he wasn't rude or mean
to them.
- 558 If he sees a cat in the road, he will swerve to
hit it or he will purposely run over one that is already dead.

Appendix M:

Relation Between Children in Home and Sites on Threats

In homes with a child, Salt Lake City and the comparison group (NS-C) had a low percentage of reported threats. Provo and Logan reported a 50% rate of threats and Brigham City and Ogden both reported a rate of 100%. In domestic situations with no child in the home, Brigham City, Ogden, and Salt Lake City reported an incidence of threats of some 50%. Logan and the comparison group (NS-NC) indicated a low percentage of threats toward pets. In homes without children, the Provo site exhibited a high incidence (70%) of threats toward pets. At most sites, the presence of a child in the home was associated with a higher percentage of threats.

The S-NC group was designated as a no child group because these participants did not have a child, did not have a child that met the selection criteria--too young--or chose not to include one of their children in the study. A closer examination revealed that 62.3% of the participants in this group (S-NC) had a child in their home. The presence of a child in the home did not have an effect on the partner's use of threats toward pets. The chi-square statistic revealed no significant difference. With a child in the home, threats were slightly lower than without a child in the home.

To further examine the effect of having a child in the home on the severity of threats toward pets, a t test was computed for the child-and no-child subdivisions of the S-NC group. No significant differences were found. The mean severity of threats was slightly higher for the subdivision of the S-NC group that had no children

Table 91

Percentage of Partner Threats to Pet: by Site

| Presence | Logan | BC | Ogden | SLC | Provo | Comparison |
|---------------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|------------|
| Child present | 50.0 | -- | 100.0 | 35.3 | 50.0 | 20.0 |
| Child absent | 25.0 | 50.0 | 58.3 | 45.2 | 70.0 | 13.3 |

in the home. The exception was Provo; there, not having a child in the home was associated with a higher percentage of threats.

Relation Between Children in Home and Sites on Abuse

In homes with a child, the lowest percentage of pet abuse by the partner was found in the NS-C group. Percentage of pet abuse was roughly equal across all sites. In homes with no children, the percentage abuse was lowest in the Logan and Salt Lake City sites: 37.5% and 35.5% respectively. There were no reports of pet abuse in the NS-NC group. Provo, as in the case with threats toward pets, reported the highest percentage of abuse in homes where there was no child. Across all sites, the presence of a child in the home was generally associated with a higher percentage of abuse toward pets.

Table 92

Percentage of Partner Injuring Pet: by Site

| <u>Presence</u> | <u>Logan</u> | <u>BC</u> | <u>Ogden</u> | <u>SLC</u> | <u>Provo</u> | <u>Comparison</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------------|
| Child present | 75.0 | | 71.4 | 70.6 | 70.0 | 6.7 |
| Child absent | 37.5 | | 58.3 | 35.5 | 70.0 | |

To look more closely at the influence children in the home might have on pet abuse, the S-NC group was subdivided into two groups: Those who had no child in the home and those who had a child in the home but not in the study. This comparison revealed a less than one percentage point difference between homes with and homes without children and the percentage reporting pet abuse. The chi-square statistic indicated no significance difference ($p = 1.000$). A t test indicated no significant difference between either group on the severity of abuse. The level of severity was higher in the subgroup with no children.

Appendix N:

Correlations Between Severity of Threats and Abuse and CTS Subscales
 S-NC Group: With Children, No Children, and Children Under Five

Table 93

Correlation Between Severity of Threat and Hurt and CTS Subscales;

Partner; S-NC Group With Children, n = 11

| CTS | Pearson r | Significance of r (p) |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Severity of threat | | |
| Verbal | .09 | .79 |
| Verbal aggression | .15 | .66 |
| Minor physical | .07 | .83 |
| Severe physical | -.28 | .41 |
| Severity of abuse | | |
| Verbal | -.16 | .63 |
| Verbal aggression | -.28 | .41 |
| Minor physical | -.22 | .52 |
| Severe physical | -.04 | .91 |

Table 94

Correlation Between Severity of Threat and Hurt and CTS Subscales;Partner; S-NC Group No Children, n = 7

| CTS | Pearson r | Significance of r (p) |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Severity of threat | | |
| Verbal | -.29 | .52 |
| Verbal aggression | .56 | .19 |
| Minor physical | .02 | .96 |
| Severe physical | .03 | .94 |
| Severity of abuse | | |
| Verbal | .05 | .92 |
| Verbal aggression | .68 | .09 |
| Minor physical | .67 | .10 |
| Severe physical | .59 | .16 |

Table 95

Correlation Between Severity of Threat and Hurt and CTS Subscales;Partner; S-NC Group, Children Under 5 Years Old, n = 7

| CTS | Pearson r | Significance of r (p) |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------|
| Severity of threat | | |
| Verbal | .37 | .42 |
| Verbal aggression | -.39 | .38 |
| Minor physical | -.41 | .36 |
| Severe physical | -.91 | .005 |
| Severity of abuse | | |
| Verbal | .16 | .73 |
| Verbal aggression | -.56 | .19 |
| Minor physical | -.59 | .24 |
| Severe physical | -.32 | .49 |

Appendix O:

Summary to Shelters

The Relation Between Domestic Violence
and Pet Abuse:
Results of a Study Done in Five Shelters in Utah
(Logan, Brigham City, Ogden, Salt Lake City, and Provo)
November 1995 - March 1997

Do Men who Batter Women also Threaten and Abuse Pets? YES

| | Women in shelters | | Women NOT in shelter | |
|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| | With Child in Study | NO Child in Study | With Child in Study | NO Child in Study |
| Partner THREATENED pet | 53% | 52% | 20% | 13% |
| Partner INJURED pet | 69% | 45% | 7% | none |

How Severe Were the Men's Threats and Abuse of Pets?

THREATS

| | Women in Shelters | | Women NOT in Shelters | |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| | With Child in Study | NO Child in Study | With Child in Study | NO Child in Study |
| Threatened to Annoy or Frighten | 21% | 23% | 67% | 25% |
| Threatened Serious Pain or Killing of Pet | 79% | 77% | 33% | 76% |

ABUSE

| | Women in Shelters | | Women NOT in Shelters | |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| | With Child in Study | NO Child in Study | With Child in Study | NO Child in Study |
| Annoy or Frighten Pet | 37% | 18% | 50% | none |
| Inflicted Pain or Killed Pet | 63% | 82% | 50% | none |

What Sort of Things Did the Partners Commonly Threaten to do to the Pet?

Hurt, kill, abandon, and get rid of.

What Sort of Things Did the Partners Actually do to the Pet?

Throw, hit, kick, choke, drown, killed (nonspecific), break legs, break neck, give poison, and throw something at.

COERCION: The use of threats or actual harm to pets by a man as a way to control the woman was **ONLY** found among partners of women in shelters.

How did the women feel after their partner threatened or abused their pet?

THREAT

| | Women in Shelters | | Women NOT in Shelters | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | <u>With Child in Study</u> | <u>NO Child in Study</u> | <u>With Child in Study</u> | <u>NO Child in Study</u> |
| Extremely Upset or Terrible | 90% | 88% | 33% | 75% |
| Mildly Upset or Not Bothered | 10% | 12% | 66% | 25% |

ABUSE

| | Women in Shelters | | Women NOT in Shelters | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| | <u>With Child in Study</u> | <u>NO Child in Study</u> | <u>With Child in Study</u> | <u>NO Child in Study</u> |
| Extremely Upset or Terrible | 86% | 93% | 50% | none |
| Mildly Upset or Not Bothered | 14% | 7% | 50% | none |

CHILDREN

Have Children of Women in Shelters Observed Pet Abuse in Their Home?

Most (67%) of the children who were asked, reported that they had seen one of their pets abused in their home.

Were the Children Upset by What They Saw? Most (60%) of the children reported that they were very upset by seeing their pet abused.

Based on mothers' reports on their children, it was found that children in shelters have significantly more emotional and behavioral difficulties than children who come from homes reporting no domestic violence. One additional contributor to the challenges children face in violent homes is observing the abuse of their pet.

Change in the Partner's Use of Violence

Have Partners of Women in Shelters Always Been Violent Toward the Woman?

NO. Most women (around 85%) reported that their partner was not violent when their relationship started.

Do Partners of Women in Shelters Become More Violent Toward Women During Their Relationship Together? YES. Most of the women (60-70%) reported that their partner had become more violent toward them during their relationship.

Have Partners of Women in Shelters Always Been Violent Toward Pets? Around 25% of the women reported that YES their partner had always been violent toward pets.

Do Partners of Women in Shelters Become More Violent Toward Pets During Their Relationship with the Woman? Around 30% of the women reported that YES their partner had become more violent toward pets during their relationship together.

Men who threaten to inflict serious pain on pets or actually kill pets are most likely to use verbal aggression and severe physical aggression toward women.

If the man you are with has a history of abusing pets and has threatened to seriously harm or has actually killed your pet, it is likely that he will behave aggressively toward you--both verbally and physically. GET OUT - GET HELP.

Appendix P:

Questionnaire for states

THE RELATION BETWEEN DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND PET ABUSE

-
1. Number of women who stayed in your shelter
(at least one night) between
November 1, 1995 and May 1, 1996 _____
 2. Do you have any questions in your intake
interview concerning pets? No _____ Yes _____
 3. If yes, what question(s) do you currently ask?
 4. Do women who come in to your shelter talk about
incidents of pet abuse? No _____ Yes _____
 5. Do children who come in to your shelter talk about
incidents of pet abuse? No _____ Yes _____
 6. In your experience with shelters, have you observed the coexistence
of domestic violence and pet abuse? No _____ Yes _____
 7. What is your best estimate of the percentage of homes where
domestic violence and pet abuse coexist? _____ percent

Please add any further comments, suggestions, or observations that you feel may be relevant.

Would you be interested in receiving a brief summary of this study when it is completed?

No _____ Yes _____

If yes, your name _____

CURRICULUM VITAE

Claudia Virginia Weber

EDUCATION

Ph.D. Developmental and Professional-Scientist/Clinical
Utah State University, Logan: 1997
Major Professor: Frank R. Ascione, Ph.D.

M.S. Family and Human Development
Utah State University, Logan: 1990
Major Professor: Ann Austin, Ph.D.

B.S. Pharmacy
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis: 1975

PROFESSIONAL AND CLINICAL EXPERIENCES

9/96 - 8/97 Psychology intern
Utah State University, Counseling Center
Logan, Utah

1992-1994; Teaching assistant
Undergraduate Developmental Psychology
Utah State University
Logan, Ut

May-Aug. 1995 Practicum student/Assessment
Neurology Learning and Behavior Institute
Salt Lake City, Utah

1992-1993 Practicum student/Therapy
& Utah State University, Community Clinic
1994-1995 Logan, Utah

1993-1994 Practicum student/Therapy
Center for Persons with Disabilities
Logan, Utah

1993-1994 Practicum student/Therapy
Utah State University, Counseling Center
Logan, Utah

PUBLICATIONS

- Ascione, F.R., Weber, C.V., Wood, D.S. (1997). The abuse of animals and domestic violence" A national survey of shelters for women who are battered. Society and Animals, 5(3), 205-218.
- Ascione, F.R. & Weber, C.V. (1997). Children's attitudes about the humane treatment of animals and empathy: One-year follow-up of a school-based intervention. Anthrozoos, Vol. IX, No. 4, 188-192.
- Austin, A.M.B., Godfrey, M.K., Weber, C.V., Martin, C.A., & Holmes, L.B. (1991). The relationship between security of attachment and the development of a personal premise system of relationships and expectations for peer interaction. Early Education and Development, 3, 214-226.
- Eiserman, W., McCoon, M., & Weber, D. (1992). A cost-effectiveness analysis of two alternative program models for serving speech disordered preschoolers: A second year follow-up. Journal of Communication Disorders, 25, 77-106.
- Eiserman, W., Weber, D., & McCoon, M. (1995). Parent and professional roles in early intervention: A longitudinal comparison of the effects of two intervention configurations. The Journal of Special Education, 29(1), 20-44.

- Mauk, G. & Weber, C. (1991). Peer survivors of adolescent suicide: Perspectives on grieving and postvention. Journal of Adolescent Research, 6, 113-131.
- Weber, C., Behl, D., & Summers, M. (1994). Watch them play. Watch them learn. Teaching Exceptional Children, 27(1), 30-35.

PRESENTATIONS

- Ascione, F.R. & Weber, C.V. (1993, March). Children's attitudes about the humane treatment of animals and empathy: One-year follow-up of a school-based intervention. Paper presented at the Biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, New Orleans, LA.
- Eiserman, W. & Weber, D. (1990). A cost-effectiveness study of parents as teachers to their preschoolers. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.
- Weber, C.V. (1997, May). Play Therapy. Paper presented at the annual conference of Association of Mormon Counselors and Psychologists. Salt Lake City, UT.
- Weber, C.V. & Ascione, F.R. (1992, March). Humane attitudes and human empathy: Relations in adulthood. Poster presented at the Bicentennial meeting of the Southwestern Society for Research in Human Development, Tempe, AZ.
- Weber, C.V. & Ascione, F.R. (1992, July). Humane attitudes and human empathy: Relations in adulthood. Paper presented at the Delta Society Sixth International Conference on Animals and Us, Montreal, Canada.
- Weber, C., Behl, D., & Summers, M. (1989, October). The use of play as an assessment and intervention strategy. Paper presented at the Division for Early Childhood Conference on Children with Special Needs, Minneapolis, MN.

AFFILIATIONS

American Psychological Association (APA) 1992 - present.